

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY  
CAMDEN VICINAGE

IN RE: VALSARTAN, LOSARTAN and : MDL NO. 19-2875(RBK-JS)  
IRBESARTAN PRODUCTS LIABILITY :  
LITIGATION, :  
: \_\_\_\_\_

**O R D E R**

**THIS MATTER HAVING** come before the Court upon the Motion to Reconsider MTD Order 1 and MTD Opinion 1, or in the alternative, for Section 1292(b) Certification [document 709], and the Court having reviewed the papers submitted in support of the Motion, and

**IT APPEARING** that the Motion to Reconsider does not demonstrate that the court has “overlooked” a legal issue that may alter the disposition of the Motion to Dismiss, and that the purpose of a Motion for Reconsideration is not to relitigate an unfavorable outcome, and there being no clear error of law, but rather a disagreement over what the law requires which can be appealed, and

**IT FURTHER APPEARING** that an immediate appeal from the MTD Order 1 would not materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation,

**IT IS ON THIS** 11th day of January, 2021, **ORDERED** that the defendants’ Motion to Reconsider MTD Order 1 and MTD Opinion 1, and in the alternative for this court to certify MTD Order 1 to the Court of Appeals pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1292(b) [document 709], be and is hereby **DENIED**.

s/Robert B. Kugler  
ROBERT B. KUGLER  
United States District Judge