

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: GLUGAGON-LIKE	:	CIVIL ACTION
PEPTIDE-1 RECEPTOR AGONISTS	:	
(GLP-1 RAS) NON-ARTERITIC	:	
ANTERIOR ISCHEMIC OPTIC	:	MDL No. 3163
NEUROPATHY PRODUCTS	:	25-md-3163
LIABILITY LITIGATION	:	01-md-3163
_____	:	
	:	
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	:	
	:	HON. KAREN SPENCER MARSTON
<i>ALL ACTIONS/ALL CASES</i>	:	
_____	:	

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 5

PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL

AND NOW, this 23rd day of February, 2026, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Amended Proposed Slate for Plaintiff Leadership, it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The following three counsel are appointed as Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs:
(i) Parvin Aminolroaya of Seeger Weiss LLP, (ii) Jonathan D. Orent of Motley Rice LLC, and
(iii) Sarah Ruane of Wagstaff and Cartmell LLP.

2. The following counsel are appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee:

Jackson Goldstein
Parker Waichman
PEC Co-chair
Federal-State Court Liaison

Bradley Honnold
Goza & Honnold
PEC Co-chair

Keith Verrier
Levin Sedran & Berman

Maxwell Kelly
Seeger Weiss

Grace Chandler
Motley Rice

Ryan Duplechin
Beasley Allen Law Firm

W. Cameron Stephenson
Levin, Papantonio, Proctor, Buchanan,
O'Brien, Barr & Mougey

Hannah Pfeiffer
Aylstock, Witkin, Kries & Overholtz

Sara Schramm
Hammers Law Firm

Craig Silverman
Sullivan Papain Block McManus
Coffinas & Cannavo

Evan Buxner
Gori Law Firm

3. The following two counsel are appointed as Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel: (i) Roberta Liebenberg of Fine, Kaplan & Black, and (ii) Nina Spizer of Dilworth Paxson.

4. Beginning with the in person conference scheduled for March 9, 2026, and at each monthly conference going forward, Plaintiffs Co-Lead Counsel shall report on the inventory of filed and unfiled cases that are expected to be filed in either this MDL or the related state court actions by those firms holding leadership positions.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Karen Spencer Marston

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.

¹ Defendants have asked the Court to impose additional restrictions on those attorneys assigned to leadership positions, including a limitation on counsels' ability to file in state court cases that would qualify for inclusion in this MDL. After reviewing the parties briefing on this issue (Doc. Nos. 32, 33, 47), the Court declines to impose such a restriction at this time. Although the Court is extremely concerned about the potential for forum shopping—especially given the representations made by attorneys in the related MDL No. 3094—there are other methods for Defendants to address those concerns (e.g., forum non conveniens motions in state court).