

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PARTIES	8
I. PLAINTIFF.....	8
II. DEFENDANTS	8
A. Manufacturer Defendants.....	8
B. Distributor Defendants.....	10
C. Pharmacy Defendants	11
JURISDICTION AND VENUE	12
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	12
I. PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS ARE HIGHLY DANGEROUS.....	12
II. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS HAVE LEGAL DUTIES TO DISCLOSE ACCURATELY THE RISKS OF OPIOIDS.....	13
III. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS VIOLATED THEIR DUTIES.....	14
A. Manufacturer Defendants Made Misleading Statements About the Risks of Prescribing Opioids to Treat Chronic Pain and Failed to State Accurately the Magnitude of Those Risks	14
1. Manufacturer Defendants Misrepresented the Risks of Addiction to Prescription Opioids	14
2. Manufacturer Defendants Misleadingly Claimed that Patients Who Were Showing Signs of Addiction Were Not Actually Addicted	18
3. Manufacturer Defendants Falsely Claimed There Was No Risk in Increasing Opioid Dosages to Treat Chronic Pain.....	19
B. Manufacturer Defendants’ Misleading Statements Were Designed for Maximum Effect and Targeted to Specific Audiences	21
C. Manufacturer Defendants Knew or Should Have Known That Their Statements Were Misleading	25
D. Manufacturer Defendants’ Conduct Violated Their Duties.....	30

IV.	DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS AND PHARMACY DEFENDANTS HAVE LEGAL DUTIES TO PREVENT OPIOID DIVERSION.....	31
A.	Federal Law Sets a Standard of Care for Distributor Defendants to Follow	32
1.	Duties Under Federal Laws and Regulations.....	32
B.	Federal Law Sets a Standard of Care for Pharmacy Defendants to Follow.....	32
1.	Duties Under Federal Laws and Regulations.....	33
V.	DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS AND PHARMACY DEFENDANTS HAVE FAILED TO FULFILL THEIR DUTIES	35
A.	Distributor Defendants Understood Their Duties and Violated Them Anyway...	35
1.	Distributor Defendants Understood and Acknowledged Their Duties	35
2.	Prior Regulatory Actions Against Distributor Defendants for Failing to Prevent Diversion	38
a.	Cardinal.....	38
b.	McKesson	39
c.	AmerisourceBergen	40
3.	Despite Prior Regulatory Actions, Distributor Defendants Violated Their Duties	41
B.	Pharmacy Defendants Understood Their Duties and Violated Them Anyway	43
1.	Pharmacy Defendants Understood and Acknowledged Their Duties.....	43
2.	Prior Regulatory Actions Against Pharmacy Defendants for Failing to Prevent Diversion	45
a.	CVS.....	45
b.	Walgreens	48
c.	Walmart.....	50
3.	Despite Prior Regulatory Actions, Pharmacy Defendants Continue to Violate Their Duties.....	50
VI.	DEFENDANTS’ MISCONDUCT HAS INJURED AND CONTINUES TO INJURE THE NAVAJO NATION AND ITS CITIZENS	51

A.	Manufacturer Defendants’ Misconduct Has Injured and Continues to Injure the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens	51
B.	Distributor Defendants’ Misconduct has Injured and Continues to Injure the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens	54
C.	Pharmacy Defendants’ Misconduct Has Injured and Continues to Injure the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens	56
D.	Defendants’ Misconduct Has Damaged the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens	58
COUNT I – LANHAM ACT		
	(15 U.S.C. § 1125) (Against All Defendants).....	58
COUNT II – VIOLATION OF NEW MEXICO UNFAIR PRACTICES ACT		
	(N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 TO -26) (Against Manufacturer Defendants).....	60
COUNT III – VIOLATION OF ARIZONA CONSUMER FRAUD ACT		
	(A.R.S. §§ 44-1521 TO -1534) (Against Manufacturer Defendants).....	61
COUNT IV – VIOLATION OF UTAH CONSUMER SALES PRACTICE ACT		
	(U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 TO -23) (Against Manufacturer Defendants).....	62
COUNT V – NUISANCE (Against Manufacturer Defendants).....		
		63
COUNT VI – NEGLIGENCE (Against Manufacturer Defendants)		
		65
COUNT VII – UNJUST ENRICHMENT (Against Manufacturer Defendants).....		
		67
COUNT VIII – VIOLATION OF NEW MEXICO UNFAIR PRACTICES ACT		
	(N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 TO -26) (Against Distributor Defendants And Pharmacy Defendants).....	68
COUNT IX – VIOLATION OF ARIZONA CONSUMER FRAUD ACT		
	(A.R.S. §§ 44-1521 TO -1534) (Against Distributor Defendants And Pharmacy Defendants).....	69
COUNT X – VIOLATION OF UTAH CONSUMER SALES PRACTICE ACT		
	(U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 TO -23) (Against Distributor Defendants And Pharmacy Defendants).....	70
COUNT XI – NUISANCE (Against Distributor Defendants And Pharmacy Defendants)		
		71
COUNT XII – NEGLIGENCE (Against Distributor Defendants And Pharmacy Defendants)...		
		74
COUNT XIII – UNJUST ENRICHMENT (Against Distributor Defendants And Pharmacy Defendants).....		
		77
COUNT XIV – CIVIL CONSPIRACY (Against All Defendants)		
		78

PRAYER FOR RELIEF 79
REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL 87

Plaintiff, the Navajo Nation, brings this Complaint for compensatory, punitive, and other damages, and restitution, disgorgement, and civil penalties. The Defendants are (A) Purdue Pharma L.P., Purdue Pharma Inc., The Purdue Frederick Company, Endo Health Solutions Inc., and Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. (collectively, “Manufacturer Defendants”); (B) McKesson Corporation, Cardinal Health, Inc., AmerisourceBergen Corporation, (collectively, “Distributor Defendants”); and (C) CVS Health Corporation, Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc., and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (collectively, “Pharmacy Defendants”). Collectively, the Manufacturer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the Pharmacy Defendants are referred to herein as the “Defendants.”

INTRODUCTION

1. Prescription opioids are powerful pain-reducing medications. When used properly, they can help manage pain for certain patients. But, even then, these drugs can cause addiction, overdose, and death. When used to treat chronic pain, or when used for non-medical purposes, those risks are amplified.

2. In recent years, prescription opioid use for both chronic pain and non-medical purposes has grown dramatically, resulting in an epidemic of abuse. Nationwide, millions of Americans are addicted to prescription opioids, and tens of thousands die annually from opioid overdoses. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”), in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, where parts of the Navajo Nation are located, 7,309 people died of drug overdoses between 2014 and 2016, and the “main driver” of these deaths was prescription and illicit opioids.¹

¹ CDC, *Drug Overdose Death Data*, <https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/data/statedeaths.html> (last updated December 19, 2017) (Arizona: 1,211 deaths in 2014, 1,274 deaths in 2015, 1,382 deaths in 2016; New Mexico: 547 deaths in 2014, 501 deaths in 2015, 500 deaths in 2016; Utah: 603 deaths in 2014, 646 deaths in 2015, 635 deaths in 2016).

3. Defendants' conduct caused this epidemic.

4. Manufacturer Defendants have engaged, and continue to engage, in a massive marketing campaign to misstate and conceal the risks of treating chronic pain with prescription opioids. Although manufacturers are prohibited from marketing prescription opioids through misstatements or omissions of material facts, Manufacturer Defendants did so throughout this campaign, including through use of websites, promotional materials, conferences, guidelines for doctors, and other vehicles.

5. This aggressive marketing campaign enabled Manufacturer Defendants to overcome the medical consensus that opioids are unsafe for the treatment of chronic pain, and between 1999 and 2016, the number of opioids prescribed nationwide quadrupled.² Not surprisingly, deaths from prescription opioids also quadrupled over the same period.³

6. The increase in opioid prescriptions to treat chronic pain in turn led to a massive increase in the number of people seeking prescription opioids for non-medical uses and becoming addicted. Nationally, the number of people who take prescription opioids for non-medical purposes is now greater than the number of people who use cocaine, heroin, hallucinogens, and inhalants combined.⁴ In Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, data from the

² Li Hui Chen et al., *Drug-Poisoning Deaths Involving Opioid Analgesics: United States, 1999–2011*, 166 Nat'l Ctr. for Health Statistics Data Brief (Sept. 2014), <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db166.pdf>; Rose A. Rudd et al., *Increases in Drug and Opioid-Involved Overdose Deaths—United States, 2010–2015*, 65 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 1445 (Dec. 30, 2016), <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/wr/mm655051e1.htm>.

³ Anna Lembke, *Drug Dealer MD: How Doctors Were Duped, Patients Got Hooked, and Why It's Hard To Stop* 4 (2016).

⁴ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Servs. Admin., *Results from the 2009 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Volume I. Summary of National Findings*, NSDUH Series H-38A, HHS Publication No. SMA 10-4586 Findings (2010).

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration indicate that over 545,000 residents use prescription opioids for non-medical purposes each year.⁵

7. This increase in non-medical demand and addiction has led to an increase in diversion, which occurs when the supply chain of prescription opioids is broken and drugs are transferred from a legitimate channel to an illegitimate one.

8. The legitimate supply chain for prescription opioids begins with the manufacture and packaging of the pills. Manufacturers (including Manufacturer Defendants) then transfer the pills to distributors (including Distributor Defendants, who, upon information and belief, together account for at least 85% of opioid shipments in the United States). Distributors (again, including Distributor Defendants) then supply opioids to pharmacies (including Pharmacy Defendants) and other healthcare providers, who then dispense the drugs to consumers.

9. At the distributor level, diversion occurs whenever prescription opioid distributors fill suspicious orders from retailers such as pharmacies. As discussed below, under Federal and applicable state law, suspicious orders include orders of an unusually large size, orders of a size that are disproportionately large in comparison to the population of a community served by a pharmacy, orders that deviate from a normal pattern, and orders of unusual frequency. Diversion also occurs when distributors allow opioids to be lost or stolen from inventory or in transit.

10. At the pharmacy level, diversion occurs whenever a pharmacist fills a prescription despite having reason to believe it was not being filled for a legitimate medical purpose. A prescription may lack a legitimate medical purpose when a patient is either a drug dealer or opioid-dependent, seeks to fill multiple prescriptions from different doctors, travels great

⁵ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Servs. Admin., *National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Comparison of 2002–2003 and 2013–2014 Population Percentages (50 States and the District of Columbia)* 16–17 (2015), <http://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUHsaeLongTermCHG2014/NSDUHsaeLongTermCHG2014.pdf> (4.43% of people age 12 or older in New Mexico engage in the non-medical use of prescription pain relievers).

distances between a doctor and a pharmacy to fill a prescription, presents multiple prescriptions for the largest dose of more than one controlled substance such as opioids and benzodiazepines, or when there are other red flags surrounding the transaction. Opioids are also diverted from retail outlets when they are stolen by employees or others, obtained through the use of stolen or forged prescriptions, or sold without prescriptions.

11. Of the opioid prescriptions issued in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah each year, national studies suggest that as many as 12.8% of those prescriptions are diverted to non-medical uses.⁶ These conclusions about the extent of prescription opioid diversion are further supported by Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”) data showing that in the past few years the states in which the Navajo Nation is located have seen annual distribution exceeding 504 milligrams per citizen,⁷ and 4,580 milligrams per opioid user.⁸

12. As detailed below, Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants have legal obligations to combat diversion. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants have routinely and continuously violated these obligations, and instead have taken advantage of the massively increased demand for prescription opioids for non-medical uses by profiting heavily from the sale of opioids that they knew, or should have known, were being diverted from the

⁶ The studies estimate that the percentage of prescription opioids that are diverted to illegitimate purposes ranges from 1.9% to 12.8% of total prescriptions. B.L. Wilsey et al., *Profiling Multiple Provider Prescribing of Opioids, Benzodiazepines, Stimulants, and Anorectics*, 112 *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 99 (2010) (estimating that 12.8% of prescriptions are diverted); N. Katz et al., *Usefulness of Prescription Monitoring Programs for Surveillance—Analysis of Schedule II Opioid Prescription Data in Massachusetts, 1996–2006*, 19 *Pharmacoeconomics and Drug Safety* 115 (2010) (estimating the diversion rate at 7.7% when defining likely diversion as patients that obtain opioids from at least three prescribers and at least three pharmacies in a year); D.C. McDonald & K.E. Carlson, *Estimating the Prevalence of Opioid Diversion by “Doctor Shoppers” in the United States*, 8 *PLoS ONE* (2013) (estimating the diversion rate at 1.9% of all prescriptions and 4% of total grams dispensed).

⁷ Drug Enforcement Admin., ARCOS 3 – Report 1, *Retail Drug Distribution By Zip Code Within State by Grams Weight*, https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/2013/2013_rpt1.pdf; https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/2014/2014_rpt1.pdf; https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/2015/2015_rpt1.pdf; https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/report_yr_2016.pdf.

⁸ Wenjun Zhong et al., *Age and Sex Patterns of Drug Prescribing in a Defined American Population*, 7 *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 697, 700 (2013).

legitimate supply chain to illegitimate channels of distribution. The failure of Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants to comply with their legal obligations to prevent diversion and to alert authorities to potential diversion continues today, despite (a) the well-known harm resulting from the prescription opioid crisis, and (b) substantial fines for diversion levied against multiple Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants.

13. The misconduct of Defendants, including their consistent failure to comply with their legal obligations, has led to an epidemic of prescription opioid abuse. American Indians, including the Navajo Nation, have been significantly impacted by this epidemic. American Indians suffer the highest per capita rate of opioid overdoses.⁹

14. Hundreds of American Indians have died of opioid overdoses in recent years. And for every opioid overdose death, there are 10 treatment admissions for abuse, 32 emergency room visits, 130 people who are addicted to opioids, and 825 non-medical users of opioids.¹⁰

15. The impact on American Indian children is particularly devastating. The CDC has reported that approximately one out of every ten American Indian youths aged 12 or older used prescription opioids for non-medical purposes in 2012.¹¹ This is double the rate for white youths.¹² Similarly, it has been reported that by twelfth grade, nearly 13% of American Indian

⁹ National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center, *Reflecting on a Crisis Curbing Opioid Abuse in Communities* (Oct. 2016), http://www.ncai.org/policy-research-center/research-data/prc-publications/Opioid_Brief.pdf.

¹⁰ Jennifer DuPuis, Associate Dir. Human Servs. Div., Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, *The Opioid Crisis in Indian Country*, at 37, <https://www.nihb.org/docs/06162016/Opioid%20Crisis%20Part%20in%20Indian%20Country.pdf> (last visited Mar. 27, 2018); Gery P. Guy, Jr. et al., *Emergency Department Visits Involving Opioid Overdoses, U.S., 2010–2014*, 54 *Am. J. of Preventive Medicine* e37 (Jan. 2018), [http://www.ajpmonline.org/article/S0749-3797\(17\)30494-4/fulltext](http://www.ajpmonline.org/article/S0749-3797(17)30494-4/fulltext).

¹¹ National Congress of American Indians Policy Research Center, *Reflecting on a Crisis Curbing Opioid Abuse in Communities* (Oct. 2016), http://www.ncai.org/policy-research-center/research-data/prc-publications/Opioid_Brief.pdf.

¹² *Id.*

teens have used OxyContin, an opioid manufactured by Defendant Purdue.¹³ The fact that American Indian teens are easily able to obtain OxyContin at these alarming rates indicates the degree to which drug diversion has created an illegal secondary market for prescription opioids.

16. The opioid epidemic resulting from Defendants' conduct has injured even the youngest members of Indian tribes. In 1992, in the United States, only two percent of pregnant women admitted for drug treatment services abused opioids. By 2012, opioids accounted for 38% of all drug treatment admissions.¹⁴ Many tribal women have become addicted to prescription opioids and have used these drugs during their pregnancies. As a result, many tribal infants suffer from opioid withdrawal and Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome, which can have adverse short- and long-term developmental consequences.¹⁵

17. Pregnant American Indian women are up to 8.7 times more likely than pregnant white women to be diagnosed with opioid dependency or abuse, and in some communities more than 1 in 10 pregnant American Indian women have a diagnosis of opioid dependency or abuse.¹⁶ On information and belief, women on portions of the Navajo Nation suffer similar rates of opioid dependency or abuse.

18. On information and belief, the opioid use and abuse have resulted in prescription opioid-related deaths among Navajo Nation citizens.

19. Defendants' prescription opioid diversion on and near the Navajo Nation contributes to and exacerbates a range of existing social problems. Adverse social outcomes

¹³ Linda R. Stanley, *Rates of Substance Use of American Indian Students in 8th, 10th, and 12th Grades Living on or near Reservations: Update 2009–2012*, 129 Pub. Health Report 156 (2014), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3904895/table/T1/>.

¹⁴ Naana Afua Jumah, *Rural, Pregnant, and Opioid Dependent: A Systematic Review*, 10 Substance Abuse 35 (2016), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4915786/>.

¹⁵ Jean Y. Ko et al., *CDC Grand Rounds, Public Health Strategies to Prevent Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome*, 66 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 242 (Mar. 10, 2017), <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/66/wr/pdfs/mm6609a2.pdf>.

¹⁶ DuPuis, *supra* note 10, at 64.

include child abuse and neglect, family dysfunction, poverty, unemployment, and social despair. As a result, Navajo Nation resources are devoted to addiction-related problems, leaving a diminished pool of resources available for education, cultural preservation, and social programs. Meanwhile, the prescription opioid crisis diminishes the Navajo Nation's available workforce, decreases productivity, increases poverty, and consequently requires greater expenditures for governmental assistance.

20. Damages suffered by the Navajo Nation include the increased costs of: (a) medical care, therapeutic and prescription drugs, and other treatments for patients suffering from opioid-related addiction, overdoses, or disease; (b) opioid-related counseling and rehabilitation services; (c) welfare for children whose parents suffer from opioid-related disease or incapacitation; (d) law enforcement; and (e) social services. Damages also include lost productivity of the Navajo Nation's citizens and businesses.

21. To remedy Defendants' misconduct, the Navajo Nation brings this action for: (a) violations of the Lanham Act; (b) unfair trade practices; (c) common law nuisance; (d) negligence; (e) unjust enrichment; and (f) civil conspiracy.

22. The Navajo Nation seeks: (a) injunctive relief; (b) compensatory damages for the increased costs to the Navajo Nation's healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, law enforcement, and education system, as well as the cost of lost productivity; (c) statutory damages and penalties pursuant to Federal and applicable state law; (d) reimbursement of all payments fraudulently induced by Defendants' conduct; (e) disgorgement of all amounts unjustly obtained by Defendants; (f) restitution of all expenditures by the Navajo Nation resulting from Defendants' conduct; (g) punitive damages; (h) attorneys' fees and costs; and (i) such further relief as justice may require.

PARTIES

I. PLAINTIFF

23. The Navajo Nation is a federally recognized Indian tribe with a membership of over 300,000 citizens. The Navajo Nation covers 27,000 square miles that extend into the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. It exercises sovereign governmental authority within its territory and over its citizens.

24. The Navajo Nation provides health care to its members directly and through entities on or near its territory to which the Navajo Nation delegates its authority for the purpose of entering into contracts under the Indian Self Determination Act to provide health care services to Navajo Nation citizens. These entities include the Alamo School Board, Fort Defiance Indian Hospital Board, Navajo Health Foundation–Sage Memorial Hospital, Ramah Navajo School Board, Tuba City Regional Health Care Corporation, Utah Navajo Health System, and Winslow Indian Health Care Center. As used herein, references to the Navajo Nation include the Navajo Nation itself and these duly authorized entities.

25. Ethel Branch, Attorney General of the Navajo Nation, brings this action on behalf of the Navajo Nation itself and under its *parens patriae* authority on behalf of its citizens in the public interest to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the Navajo Nation to stop the prescription opioid crisis on and near the Navajo Nation and to recover damages and seek other redress from harm caused by Defendants' improper marketing, sales, distribution, dispensing, and reporting practices related to prescription opioids.

II. DEFENDANTS

A. Manufacturer Defendants

26. Defendant Purdue Pharma L.P. (together with Purdue Pharma Inc. and The Purdue Frederick Company, "Purdue") is a Delaware limited partnership with its principal place

of business in Connecticut. At all relevant times, Purdue Pharma L.P. has manufactured and distributed substantial amounts of prescription opioids that have been and continue to be sold nationwide, including within New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

27. Defendant Purdue Pharma Inc. (together with Purdue Pharma L.P. and The Purdue Frederick Company, “Purdue”) is a New York corporation with its principal place of business in Connecticut. At all relevant times, Purdue Pharma Inc. has manufactured and distributed substantial amounts of prescription opioids that have been and continue to be sold nationwide, including within New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

28. Defendant The Purdue Frederick Company (together with Purdue Pharma L.P. and Purdue Pharma Inc., “Purdue”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Connecticut. At all relevant times, The Purdue Frederick Company has manufactured and distributed substantial amounts of prescription opioids that have been and continue to be sold in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

29. Defendant Endo Health Solutions Inc. (together with Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc., “Endo”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Pennsylvania. At all relevant times, Endo Health Solutions Inc. has manufactured and distributed substantial amounts of prescription opioids that have been and continue to be sold within New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

30. Defendant Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. (together with Endo Health Solutions Inc., “Endo”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Pennsylvania. At all relevant times, Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. has manufactured and distributed substantial amounts

of prescription opioids that have been and continue to be sold in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

31. As discussed further below, in violation of their legal obligations, Manufacturer Defendants have made misstatements or omitted information regarding the risks of using prescription opioids to treat chronic pain.

B. Distributor Defendants

32. Defendant McKesson Corporation (“McKesson”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in California. McKesson is authorized to conduct business in New Mexico. At all relevant times, McKesson has distributed substantial amounts of prescription opioids in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

33. Defendant Cardinal Health, Inc. (“Cardinal”) is an Ohio corporation with its principal place of business in Ohio. Cardinal is authorized to conduct business in New Mexico. At all relevant times, Cardinal has distributed substantial amounts of prescription opioids in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

34. Defendant AmerisourceBergen Corporation (“AmerisourceBergen”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Pennsylvania. AmerisourceBergen is authorized to conduct business in New Mexico. During all relevant times, AmerisourceBergen has distributed substantial amounts of prescription opioids in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

35. As discussed below, Distributor Defendants have consistently failed to comply with their legal obligations concerning prescription opioid diversion, and have paid civil penalties to resolve government allegations regarding prescription opioid diversion.

C. Pharmacy Defendants

36. Defendant CVS Health Corporation (“CVS”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Rhode Island. CVS is authorized to conduct business in New Mexico. At all relevant times, CVS has sold and continues to sell prescription opioids at locations that service Navajo Nation citizens, including in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and in close proximity to Navajo Nation hospitals, clinics, and other healthcare facilities serving Navajo Nation citizens.

37. Defendant Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc., f/k/a Walgreen Co. (“Walgreens”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Illinois. Walgreens is authorized to conduct business in New Mexico. At all relevant times, Walgreens has sold and continues to sell prescription opioids at locations that service Navajo Nation citizens, including in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and in close proximity to Navajo Nation hospitals, clinics, and other healthcare facilities serving Navajo Nation citizens.

38. Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (“Walmart”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Arkansas. Walmart is authorized to conduct business in New Mexico. At all relevant times, Walmart has sold and continues to sell prescription opioids at locations that service Navajo Nation citizens, including in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah, and in close proximity to Navajo Nation hospitals, clinics, and other healthcare facilities serving Navajo Nation citizens.

39. As discussed below, each Pharmacy Defendant has consistently failed to comply with its legal obligations concerning prescription opioid diversion, and has paid civil penalties to resolve government allegations regarding prescription opioid diversion.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

40. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action presents a federal question, and under 28 U.S.C. § 1362 because this action is brought by an Indian tribe. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law causes of action under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 because the state-law claims are part of the same case or controversy.

41. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants because each Defendant has substantial contacts and business relationships with New Mexico, including consenting to be sued in New Mexico by registering an agent for service of process and/or obtaining a distributor license, and has purposefully availed itself of business opportunities in New Mexico, including by marketing, distributing, or selling prescription opioids in New Mexico and on and near the Navajo Nation's communities.

42. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this action occurred in this judicial district and because all Defendants are subject to this Court's jurisdiction.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS ARE HIGHLY DANGEROUS

43. Prescription opioids are powerful pain-reducing medications that include non-synthetic, partially-synthetic, and fully-synthetic derivatives of the opium poppy. While these drugs can have benefits when used properly, they also pose serious risks. In particular, they present “substantially increase[d]” risk when used to treat chronic pain and “can cause serious harm, including addiction, overdose and death” when “misused or abused.”¹⁷

¹⁷ Food and Drug Admin., *Opioid Medications*, <https://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/InformationbyDrugClass/ucm337066.htm> (last updated Feb. 15, 2018).

44. Given these risks, the marketing, distribution, and sale of prescription opioids are heavily regulated by Federal law, including the Federal Controlled Substances Act (“FCSA”), 21 U.S.C. §§ 801 *et seq.*, and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (“FDCA”), 21 U.S. §§ 321 *et seq.* Similarly, numerous state regulations—including numerous professional regulations related to persons who handle, prescribe, and dispense controlled substances—provide strict controls and requirements throughout the prescription opioid distribution chain.

45. As discussed below, despite the dangers of prescription opioids, Manufacturer Defendants wrongfully marketed them through misleading statements that minimized the risks of these drugs and failed to disclose accurately the true magnitude of those risks. The actions of Manufacturer Defendants created a huge market for prescription opioids, which in turn led to massive diversion of these drugs from legitimate to illegitimate channels. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants, who have duties to prevent diversion, wrongfully turned a blind eye to it. As a result of the Defendants’ wrongful acts, the Navajo Nation and its citizens have suffered injuries and damages.

II. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS HAVE LEGAL DUTIES TO DISCLOSE ACCURATELY THE RISKS OF OPIOIDS

46. Manufacturer Defendants have a duty under Federal and Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah law to exercise reasonable care in marketing and selling prescription opioids.

47. The FDCA prohibits “the introduction . . . into interstate commerce of any . . . drug . . . that is adulterated or misbranded.” 21 U.S.C. § 331(a). “Misbranding” includes misleading advertising. 21 U.S.C. § 352. Misleading advertising, in turn, includes both “representations made or suggested by statement, word, design, device, or any combination thereof,” and

the extent to which the labeling or advertising fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations or material with respect to consequences which may

result from the use of the article to which the labeling or advertising relates under the conditions of use prescribed in the labeling or advertising thereof or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

21 U.S.C. § 331(n).

48. Manufacturer Defendants also have a common law duty to make a full and fair disclosure as to the matters about which they choose to speak.

III. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS VIOLATED THEIR DUTIES

A. Manufacturer Defendants Made Misleading Statements About the Risks of Prescribing Opioids to Treat Chronic Pain and Failed to State Accurately the Magnitude of Those Risks

49. Manufacturer Defendants have engaged in a multi-million dollar marketing campaign to minimize and misstate the risks of addiction and abuse when prescription opioids are used to treat chronic pain.

50. Manufacturer Defendants made statements through websites, promotional materials, conferences, guidelines for doctors, and other vehicles that suggested that the risk of opioid addiction when used for chronic pain was low—statements directly contrary to established scientific evidence. Manufacturer Defendants’ marketing claims also differ from the safety warnings that Manufacturer Defendants must place on many of their opioid products. In fact, as discussed further below, Manufacturer Defendants have been repeatedly fined or otherwise sanctioned for their misleading statements in the marketing of prescription opioids.

1. Manufacturer Defendants Misrepresented the Risks of Addiction to Prescription Opioids

51. Manufacturer Defendants contributed content and funding to numerous “guidelines” on prescription opioid use that misleadingly downplayed the risks of opioid addiction when prescribed for chronic pain. For instance, “A Policymaker’s Guide to Understanding Pain & Its Management,” an October 2011 American Pain Foundation pamphlet

“made possible by support from Purdue Pharma LP,” asserted that “[l]ess than 1 percent of children treated with opioids become addicted” and that pain was generally “undertreated” due to “misconceptions about opioid addiction.”¹⁸ Similarly, “Clinical Guidelines for the Use of Chronic Opioid Therapy in Chronic Noncancer Pain,” a February 2009 article funded by the American Pain Society and written by several authors with financial ties to Manufacturer Defendants, promoted opioids as “safe and effective” for chronic pain treatment and indicated that the risk of addiction was manageable for all patients regardless of past drug abuse history.¹⁹ Likewise, “Treatment Options: A Guide for People Living with Pain,” a 2006 American Pain Foundation pamphlet financially supported by Purdue, claimed that addiction is rare and limited to certain extreme cases.²⁰ Endo also sponsored the American Pain Foundation—in 2010 alone, the organization received more than \$2,500,000 from Endo.²¹

52. Manufacturer Defendants produced and provided directly to doctors and patients marketing materials that made similar misstatements. Purdue issued marketing materials, starting in 1996, stating that “addiction to opioids legitimately used in the management of pain is very rare.”²² On information and belief, Endo distributed a pamphlet, “Living with Someone with Chronic Pain,” which stated that most health care providers agree that most people do not develop an addiction.

53. Manufacturer Defendants ran websites that promoted similar misleading claims. For example, Endo sponsored painknowledge.com and painaction.com, which claimed, as of

¹⁸ Am. Pain Found., *A Policymaker’s Guide to Understanding Pain & Its Management* (Oct. 2011), <http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/277603/apf-policymakers-guide.pdf>.

¹⁹ Roger Chou et al., *Clinical Guidelines for the Use of Chronic Opioid Therapy in Chronic Noncancer Pain*, 10 *The J. of Pain* 113 (Feb. 2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2008.10.008>.

²⁰ Am. Pain Found., *Treatment Options: A Guide for People Living with Pain* (2006), <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/277605/apf-treatmentoptions.pdf>.

²¹ Am. Pain Found., *2010 Annual Report* (Dec. 20, 2011), <https://archive.org/details/277604-apf-2010-annual-report>.

²² Drug Label for Oxycodone Hydrochloride 5mg Capsule, <https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/archives/fdaDrugInfo.cfm?archiveid=41068>.

2004 and 2015, respectively, that “[p]eople who take opioids as prescribed usually do not become addicted” and that “[m]ost chronic pain patients do not become addicted to the opioid medications that are prescribed for them.”

54. Endo also represented that “[t]aking opioids for pain relief is not addiction” and that “[a]ddiction to an opioid would mean that your pain has gone away but you still take the medicine regularly when you don’t need it for pain, maybe just to escape from your problem.”²³

In the same publication, Endo suggested that patients use the following test to determine whether they are addicted to opioids: “Ask yourself: Would I want to take this medicine if my pain went away? If you answer no, you are taking opioids for the right reasons—to relieve pain and improve your function. You are not addicted.”²⁴

55. Manufacturer Defendants trained salesmen to minimize the risk of addiction. For instance, Purdue salesmen were instructed to tell doctors that prescription opioids’ addiction risk was “less than one percent.”²⁵

56. Manufacturer Defendants sponsored training sessions where doctors were given similar misleading information regarding the risks of prescription opioid addiction. For example, Purdue sponsored training sessions in the late 1990s and early 2000s where opioid addiction was described as “exquisitely rare.”²⁶

57. All of these statements were false. The CDC has stated that: (1) there is “extensive evidence” of the possible harms of opioids, including addiction; (2) “[o]pioid pain

²³ Endo Pharmaceuticals, *Understanding Your Pain: Taking Oral Opioid Analgesics* (2004), <https://perma.cc/QN86-62PK>.

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ U.S. Gov’t Accountability Office, *Prescription Drugs: OxyContin Abuse and Diversion and Efforts to Address the Problem* (Dec. 2003), <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GAOREPORTS-GAO-04-110/content-detail.html>.

²⁶ Barry Meier, *Pain Killer: A “Wonder” Drug’s Trail of Addiction and Death* 190 (2003).

medication use presents serious risks,” including addiction; and (3) using opioids to treat chronic pain “substantially increases” the risk of addiction.²⁷ A 2016 CDC guideline discusses studies that found that up to 26% of long-term users of opioids experience problems with addiction or dependence.²⁸

58. Moreover, in August 2016, the U.S. Surgeon General expressed concern that “heavy marketing to doctors” had led many to be “taught – incorrectly – that opioids are not addictive when prescribed for legitimate pain,” and noted the “devastating” results that followed from this misinformation.²⁹

59. Findings by the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) similarly belie Manufacturer Defendants’ assertions that prescription opioids are safe for treating chronic pain. These findings show that: (1) “most opioid drugs have ‘high potential for abuse’”; (2) treatment of chronic pain with opioids poses “known serious risks,” including “addiction, abuse, and misuse . . . overdose and death” even when used “at recommended doses”; and (3) opioids should be used only “in patients for whom alternative treatment options” have failed.³⁰ And several studies finding double-digit rates of prescription opioid abuse in chronic pain patients controvert Manufacturer Defendants’ claims that addiction rates are only one percent.³¹

²⁷ Deborah Dowell et al., *CDC Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain – United States, 2016*, 65 *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1 (Mar. 18, 2016), <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/rr/rr6501e1.htm>.

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ Letter from U.S. Surgeon General Vivek H. Murthy (Aug. 2016), <https://perma.cc/VW95-CUYC>.

³⁰ Letter from Janet Woodcock, M.D., Dir. of Food and Drug Admin., Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, to Andrew Kolodny, M.D. Responding to Petition Submitted by Physicians for Responsible Opioid Prescribing (Sept. 10, 2013), http://www.supportprop.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/FDA_CDERS_Response_to_Physicians_for_Responsible_Opioid_Prescribing_Partial_Petition_Approval_and_Denial.pdf.

³¹ Caleb J. Banta-Green et al., *Opioid Use Behaviors, Mental Health and Pain—Development of a Typology of Chronic Pain Patients*, 104 *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 34 (Sept. 2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2009.03.021>; Joseph A. Boscarino et al., *Risk Factors for Drug Dependence Among Out-Patients on Opioid Therapy in a Large US Health-Care System*, 105 *Addiction* 1776 (Oct. 2010), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2010.03052.x>; Jette Højsted et al., *Classification and Identification of Opioid*

60. Similarly, a prominent neuropharmacologist at the Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis, Dr. Theodore Cicero, remarked in 2016 that Purdue's OxyContin dosing is "the perfect recipe for addiction" due to its encouragement of psychological and physical withdrawal symptoms.³²

61. As recently as June 2017, the New England Journal of Medicine published an analysis finding that Purdue's introduction of OxyContin into the marketplace coincided with a significant increase in misleading dissemination of the claim that addiction to opioids is rare. Moreover, this analysis concluded that "[w]e believe that this citation pattern contributed to the North American opioid crisis by helping to shape a narrative that allayed prescribers' concerns about the risk of addiction associated with long-term opioid therapy."³³

2. Manufacturer Defendants Misleadingly Claimed that Patients Who Were Showing Signs of Addiction Were Not Actually Addicted

62. Manufacturer Defendants also made false statements that individuals showing signs of prescription opioid addiction might instead have untreated pain requiring additional opioids—a baseless theory labeled "pseudoaddiction."

63. On information and belief, Purdue published a physician education pamphlet in 2011 suggesting that drug-seeking behavior could be a sign of such "pseudoaddiction," which was described as "[drug-seeking behaviors] in patients who have pain that has not been effectively treated." Purdue employed the term "pseudoaddiction" in numerous other marketing materials, including a 2007 book titled "Responsible Opioid Prescribing – A Physician's

Addiction in Chronic Pain Patients, 14 European J. of Pain 1014 (Nov. 2010), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpain.2010.04.006>.

³² Harriet Ryan et al., 'You Want a Description of Hell?' *OxyContin's 12-Hour Problem*, L.A. Times, May 5, 2016, <http://www.latimes.com/projects/oxycontin-part1/>.

³³ Pamela T. M. Leung et al., *A 1980 Letter on the Risk of Opioid Addiction*, 376 New England J. of Med. 2194 (June 1, 2017), <http://www.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc1700150>.

Guide.”³⁴ On information and belief, Endo also published materials promoting “pseudoaddiction.”

64. However, there is no scientific support for the concept of “pseudoaddiction,” a term coined by Dr. J. David Haddox, the Vice President of Health Policy for Purdue.³⁵ In fact, Endo’s Vice President for Pharmacovigilance and Risk Management recently testified that he was not aware of any research validating the “‘pseudoaddiction’ concept.”³⁶

65. The 2016 CDC guideline rejects the concept of pseudoaddiction. Rather than recommending that prescription opioid doses be increased if patients do not experience pain relief, the Guideline states that “[p]atients who do not experience clinically meaningful pain relief early in treatment . . . are unlikely to experience pain relief with longer term use”³⁷ and that doctors should “reassess[] pain and function within 1 month” so as to “minimize risks of long-term opioid use”³⁸

3. Manufacturer Defendants Falsely Claimed There Was No Risk in Increasing Opioid Dosages to Treat Chronic Pain

66. Manufacturer Defendants also falsely claimed that doctors and patients could increase prescription opioid dosages indefinitely without added risk.

67. Guidelines edited and sponsored by Purdue and Endo³⁹—namely “Treatment Options: A Guide for People Living with Pain” (2006) and “A Policymaker’s Guide to

³⁴ Scott M. Fishman, *Responsible Opioid Prescribing: A Physician’s Guide* (2007).

³⁵ Marion S. Greene & R. Andrew Chambers, *Pseudoaddiction: Fact or fiction? An Investigation of the Medical Literature*, 2 *Current Addiction Reports* 310 (Oct. 1, 2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40429-015-0074-7>.

³⁶ Assurance of Discontinuance Under Executive Law Section 63, Subdivision 15 at 7, *In re Endo Health Solutions Inc.*, No. 15-228 (Attorney General of the State of N.Y. 2016), https://ag.ny.gov/pdfs/Endo_AOD_030116-Fully_Executed.pdf.

³⁷ Deborah Dowell et al., *CDC Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain – United States, 2016*, 65 *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1, 13 (Mar. 18, 2016), <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/rr/rr6501e1.htm>.

³⁸ *Id.* at 25.

³⁹ Am. Pain Found., *2010 Annual Report* (Dec. 20, 2011), <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/277604-apf-2010-annual-report>.

Understanding Pain & Its Management” (2011)—claim that: (a) some patients “need” a larger opioid dose, regardless of the dose prescribed; (b) opioids have “no ceiling dose” and are therefore the most appropriate treatment for severe pain; and (c) dosage escalations, even unlimited ones, are “sometimes necessary.”⁴⁰

68. As recently as June 2015, Purdue’s “In the Face of Pain” website was promoting the notion that if a patient’s doctor does not prescribe what, in the patient’s view, is a sufficient dosage of prescription opioids, the patient should find another doctor who will. Also in 2015, Purdue presented a paper on the Problems of Drug Dependence, challenging the correlation between prescription opioid dosage and overdose.⁴¹ And in 2016, Purdue’s Dr. Haddox falsely claimed that evidence does not show that Purdue’s opioids are being abused in large numbers.⁴²

69. Endo distributed a pamphlet in 2004, “Understanding Your Pain: Taking Oral Opioid Analgesics,” which stated that patients “won’t ‘run out’ of pain relief” so long as they increase dosages.⁴³ Endo also sponsored a website from 2004 to 2007, painknowledge.com, which claimed that prescription opioid dosages may be increased until “you are on the right dose of medication for your pain.”

70. Manufacturer Defendants made these statements despite strong contrary scientific evidence. The FDA has stated that the available data “suggest a relationship between increasing

⁴⁰ Am. Pain Found., *Treatment Options: A Guide for People Living with Pain* (2006), <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/277605/apf-treatmentoptions.pdf>; Am. Pain Found., *A Policymaker’s Guide to Understanding Pain & Its Management* (Oct. 2011), <http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/277603/apf-policymakers-guide.pdf>.

⁴¹ A. DeVeugh-Geiss et al., *Is Opioid Dose a Strong Predictor of the Risk of Opioid Overdose?: Important Confounding Factors that Change the Dose-Overdose Relationship*, CPDD 76th Annual Scientific Meeting Program (June 2014), <http://cpdd.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/2014CPDDprogrambook.pdf>.

⁴² Harrison Jacobs, *There is a Big Problem with the Government’s Plan to Stop the Drug-Overdose Epidemic*, Business Insider, Mar. 14, 2016, <http://www.businessinsider.com/robert-califf-abuse-deterrent-drugs-have-a-big-flaw-2016-3>.

⁴³ Endo Pharmaceuticals, *Understanding Your Pain: Taking Oral Opioid Analgesics* (2004), <https://perma.cc/QN86-62PK>.

opioid dose and risk of certain adverse events.”⁴⁴ The CDC has stated that there is “an established body of scientific evidence showing that overdose risk is increased at higher opioid dosages,” and has specifically recommended that doctors “avoid increasing doses” above 90 morphine milligram equivalents (“MME”) per day.⁴⁵

71. Nonetheless, Manufacturer Defendants misrepresented the effects of escalating dosages to further their relentless pursuit of corporate profit. The ability to escalate dosages was critical to Manufacturer Defendants’ efforts to market prescription opioids for chronic pain treatment because doctors would otherwise abandon treatment when patients built up tolerance and no longer obtained pain relief. And for at least some products, escalation of dosage was key: of the seven available OxyContin tablet strengths, the three strongest—40 milligrams (120 MME), 60 milligrams (180 MME), and 80 milligrams (240 MME)—all exceed the CDC limit when taken twice per day as directed.

B. Manufacturer Defendants’ Misleading Statements Were Designed for Maximum Effect and Targeted to Specific Audiences

72. Manufacturer Defendants disseminated these misstatements to doctors through a wide array of sources, each designed to maximize impact and targeted to a specific receptive audience.

73. Manufacturer Defendants often delivered their misstatements through “opinion leaders”—doctors in the field of pain management who were heavily funded by Manufacturer

⁴⁴Letter from Janet Woodcock, M.D., Dir. of Food and Drug Admin., Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, to Andrew Kolodny, M.D. Responding to Petition Submitted by Physicians for Responsible Opioid Prescribing (Sept. 10, 2013), http://www.supportprop.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/FDA_CDERR_Response_to_Physicians_for_Responsible_Opioid_Prescribing_Partial_Petition_Approval_and_Denial.pdf.

⁴⁵Deborah Dowell et al., *CDC Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain – United States, 2016*, 65 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 1 (Mar. 18, 2016), <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/rr/rr6501e1.htm>.

Defendants. Manufacturer Defendants frequently used opinion leaders to deliver their message because they knew that doctors often place great confidence in seemingly independent peers.

74. One notable opinion leader was Dr. Russell Portenoy, who held himself out as an unbiased expert on opioids but received substantial funding from Manufacturer Defendants. Dr. Portenoy gave, in his words, “innumerable” lectures and media appearances promoting opioids.⁴⁶ During these appearances, he routinely downplayed the dangers of opioids. In 2010, he said on Good Morning America that “[a]ddiction, when treating pain, is distinctly uncommon” and that “most doctors can feel very assured that that person is not going to become addicted.” He also regularly repeated—including in a 1986 paper published in the journal of the American Pain Society, a 1996 paper written on behalf of the American Pain Society and the American Academy of Pain, and numerous lectures—the unsubstantiated claim that the addiction risk posed by opioids was lower than one percent.⁴⁷ Dr. Portenoy later conceded that some of his statements were misleading. In December 2012, he was quoted as saying, “Did I teach about pain management, specifically about opioid therapy, in a way that reflects misinformation? Well . . . I guess I did.”⁴⁸

75. Between 2001 and 2010, Purdue’s “In the Face of Pain” website similarly presented statements of Dr. Portenoy and other opinion leaders who were portrayed as independent experts. The website did not disclose that Purdue had paid many of these opinion

⁴⁶ Thomas Catan & Evan Perez, *A Pain-Drug Champion Has Second Thoughts*, The Wall Street Journal, Dec. 17, 2012, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887324478304578173342657044604>.

⁴⁷ Russell Portenoy & K. Foley, *Chronic Use of Opioid Analgesics in Non-Malignant Pain: Report of 38 Cases*, 25 Pain 171 (May 1986), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2873550>; Russell Portenoy, *Opioid Therapy for Chronic Nonmalignant Pain: A Review of the Critical Issues*, 11 J. of Pain and Symptom Mgmt. 203 (Apr. 1996), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0885-3924\(95\)00187-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0885-3924(95)00187-5); Russell Portenoy, *Opioid Therapy for Chronic Nonmalignant Pain*, 1 Pain Research and Mgmt. 17 (1996), <http://downloads.hindawi.com/journals/prm/1996/409012.pdf>.

⁴⁸ Thomas Catan & Evan Perez, *A Pain-Drug Champion Has Second Thoughts*, The Wall Street Journal, Dec. 17, 2012, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887324478304578173342657044604>.

leaders for other work, and did not identify Purdue's involvement beyond a small copyright notice at the bottom of the website.⁴⁹

76. Manufacturer Defendants also often disseminated their misstatements through industry groups that presented themselves to the public as independent patient advocacy organizations, but whose content and funding came largely from Manufacturer Defendants. These groups included the American Pain Foundation, the American Pain Society, and the American Academy of Pain Medicine. Much like the opinion leaders, these industry groups allowed Manufacturer Defendants to present their misstatements as if they came from unbiased experts.

77. These groups published many of the misleading "guidelines" described above, based on content and funding provided by Manufacturer Defendants, including: (1) "Clinical Guidelines for the Use of Chronic Opioid Therapy in Chronic Noncancer Pain" (2009);⁵⁰ (2) "A Policymaker's Guide to Understanding Pain & Its Management" (2011);⁵¹ and (3) "Treatment Options: A Guide for People Living with Pain" (2006).⁵² In 2007, the American Pain Society repeated, at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, Manufacturer Defendants' misstatements that addiction was a "rare problem" for patients using prescription opioids for chronic pain and that there was "no causal effect . . . between the marketing of [a particular opioid] and the abuse and diversion of the drug."⁵³

⁴⁹ Advocacy Voices, *In the Face of Pain* (archived Nov. 7, 2010), <https://web.archive.org/web/20101107090355/http://www.inthefaceofpain.com:80/search.aspx?cat=4#7>.

⁵⁰ Roger Chou et al., *Clinical Guidelines for the Use of Chronic Opioid Therapy in Chronic Noncancer Pain*, 10 *The J. of Pain* 113 (Feb. 2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2008.10.008>.

⁵¹ Am. Pain Found., *A Policymaker's Guide to Understanding Pain & Its Management* (Oct. 2011), <http://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/277603/apf-policymakers-guide.pdf>.

⁵² Am. Pain Found., *Treatment Options: A Guide for People Living with Pain* (2006), <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/277605/apf-treatmentoptions.pdf>.

⁵³ *Evaluating the Propriety and Adequacy of the OxyContin Criminal Settlement: Hearing Before the S. Comm. on Judiciary*, 110th Cong. 1 (2007) (Statement of James Campbell, M.D.).

78. Manufacturer Defendants also conducted conferences, training sessions, and educational programs for doctors, often with all expenses paid at resort destinations. These events were useful to Manufacturer Defendants because studies show that such events influence the attending practitioners' prescribing habits and views towards a drug.⁵⁴

79. From 1996 to 2001, Purdue conducted more than 40 pain management and speaker training sessions at resorts to recruit and train physicians, nurses, and pharmacists as speakers on behalf of Purdue.⁵⁵ Purdue trained more than 5,000 people at these all-expenses-paid events.⁵⁶ In addition, the DEA has estimated that Purdue funded over 20,000 opioid pain-related educational programs between 1996 and July 2002 through direct sponsorship or financial grants.⁵⁷

80. Manufacturer Defendants also used direct salesmen to market prescription opioids. These salesmen often received the majority of their compensation based on individual sales figures, ensuring that they were strongly motivated to present their audiences with misleading information minimizing the risks of prescription opioids.⁵⁸

81. Manufacturer Defendants not only issued misstatements through channels thought to be the most productive, but also targeted marketing to doctors who would be most receptive to the misstatements.

⁵⁴ Ray Moynihan, *Doctors' Education: The Invisible Influence of Drug Company Sponsorship*, 336 *The BMJ* 416 (Feb. 21, 2008), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39496.430336.DB>; A.C. Anand, *Professional Conferences, Unprofessional Conduct*, 67 *Medical J. Armed Forces India* 2 (Jan. 2011), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0377-1237\(11\)80002-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0377-1237(11)80002-X); David McFadden et al., *The Devil Is in the Details: The Pharmaceutical Industry's Use of Gifts to Physicians as Marketing Strategy*, 140 *J. of Surgical Research* 1 (2007), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2006.10.010>.

⁵⁵ U.S. Gov't Accountability Office, *Prescription Drugs: OxyContin Abuse and Diversion and Efforts to Address the Problem* (Dec. 2003), <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GAOREPORTS-GAO-04-110/content-detail.html>.

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ *Id.*

⁵⁸ *Id.*

82. Manufacturer Defendants specifically targeted their marketing to primary care physicians, who are generally less aware of the medical literature regarding the dangers of treating chronic pain with prescription opioids. One longtime Purdue collaborator speaking to an FDA advisory panel on January 30, 2002 acknowledged this fact, stating that “[g]eneralists are adopting [opioid] therapy without adequate knowledge of pain management principles.”⁵⁹ On information and belief, Manufacturer Defendants also directly targeted susceptible patients like veterans and the elderly.

83. Manufacturer Defendants developed methods to target specifically physicians who were already prescribing higher-than-average numbers of opioids. Purdue created a database to identify physicians with large numbers of chronic-pain patients (which also showed which physicians were simply the most frequent prescribers of opioids). This database gave Purdue extensive knowledge of where and how its drugs were being used across the country, including in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, and has allowed Purdue to target doctors already susceptible to its message.⁶⁰

C. Manufacturer Defendants Knew or Should Have Known That Their Statements Were Misleading

84. The problems caused by the deceptive, unfair, and false marketing of prescription opioids were specifically known by Manufacturer Defendants. Manufacturer Defendants knew their statements were misleading not only because they knew their statements were contrary to established fact, but also because they were fined and otherwise sanctioned by various government entities for misleading marketing.

⁵⁹ Food and Drug Admin., Anesthetic and Life Support Drugs Advisory Comm., Tr. of Meeting (Jan. 30, 2002), <https://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/02/transcripts/3820t1.pdf>.

⁶⁰ Art Van Zee, *The Promotion and Marketing of OxyContin: Commercial Triumph, Public Health Tragedy*, 99 Am. J. of Public Health 221, 222 (Feb. 2009), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2622774/pdf/221.pdf>.

85. In 2007, Purdue settled federal allegations that it had introduced misbranded drugs into interstate commerce. Purdue paid over \$700 million and three of its former executive officers pleaded guilty to federal crimes.⁶¹ Purdue acknowledged that “some employees made, or told other employees to make, certain statements about OxyContin to some healthcare professionals that were inconsistent with the FDA-approved prescribing information for OxyContin and the express warning it contained about risks associated with the medicine.”⁶²

86. In August 2015, New York State settled claims against Purdue related to its marketing and sales practices. The settlement required Purdue to ensure that its sales representatives flag doctors and other professionals who were improperly prescribing and/or diverting opioids, stop calling and/or marketing to doctors on the company’s “no-call list,” and provide information to health care providers about FDA-approved training programs regarding the appropriate prescription of opioids. The agreement also required Purdue to stop making representations on its website “www.inthefaceofpain.com” implying that the website was neutral or unbiased, and to disclose the financial relationship Purdue’s purported neutral experts have with the company.⁶³

87. In August 2017, Purdue settled, for over \$20 million, claims by numerous Canadian plaintiffs that the company failed to warn about the dangers of OxyContin, including its addictive properties.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Plea Agreement at 4, *United States v. The Purdue Frederick Co.*, No. 1:07-cr-00029-JPJ (W.D. Va. May 10, 2017).

⁶² Shannon Henson, *Purdue, Employees to Pay \$700M in OxyContin Case*, LAW360, (May 10, 2007, 12:00 AM), <https://www.law360.com/illinois/articles/24509/purdue-employees-to-pay-700m-in-oxycotin-case>.

⁶³ Press Release, N.Y. State Office of the Attorney General, A.G. Schneiderman Announces Settlement with Purdue Pharma That Ensures Responsible and Transparent Marketing of Prescription Opioid Drugs by the Manufacturer (August 20, 2015), <https://ag.ny.gov/press-release/ag-schneiderman-announces-settlement-purdue-pharma-ensures-responsible-and-transparent>.

⁶⁴ See Will Davidson LLP, *Purdue Pharma Agrees to OxyContin Settlement, but Is it Fair?*, Lexology (Aug. 22, 2017), <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=d53ee1ee-44cb-4ef5-b916-e570a385b568>.

88. In 2016, Endo settled claims with New York and agreed to halt misleading advertisements it had been running there concerning the safety of prescription opioids. New York found that opioid use disorders “appear to be highly prevalent in chronic pain patients treated with opioids, with up to 40% of chronic pain patients treated in specialty and primary care outpatient centers meeting the clinical criteria for an opioid use disorder.”⁶⁵ Endo had claimed on its website that “[m]ost healthcare providers who treat patients with pain agree that patients treated with prolonged opioid medicines usually do not become addicted,” but New York found that Endo had no evidence for that statement.⁶⁶ Consistent with this finding, Endo agreed not to make statements in New York that opioids “generally are non-addictive” or “that most patients who take opioids do not become addicted.”⁶⁷

89. Manufacturer Defendants have also represented to the public that they are taking steps to curb the opioid epidemic, rather than creating it.

a) As recently as November 2017, Purdue stated on its website that “. . . too often these medications [opioids] are diverted, misused, and abused. Teenagers, in particular, are vulnerable to prescription drug abuse, which has become a national epidemic.”⁶⁸ In response to the misuse of prescription opioids, Purdue said that “Corporations have a responsibility to address this issue, and Purdue has dedicated vast resources for helping to prevent drug abuse”⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Assurance of Discontinuance Under Executive Law Section 63, Subdivision 15 at 7, *In re Endo Health Solutions Inc.*, No. 15-228 (Attorney General of the State of N.Y. 2016), https://ag.ny.gov/pdfs/Endo_AOD_030116-Fully_Executed.pdf.

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.*

⁶⁸ Purdue Pharma, *Combating Opioid Abuse*, <http://www.purduepharma.com/healthcare-professionals/responsible-use-of-opioids/combating-opioid-abuse/> (last visited Mar. 27, 2018).

⁶⁹ *Id.*

b) Purdue also stated in November 2017 that it is “committed to being part of the solution to prescription drug abuse” and that it “offers an array of programs focused on education, prevention, and deterrence, and through partnerships with (1) healthcare professionals, (2) families and communities, and (3) law enforcement and government” to combat the “widespread abuse of opioid prescription pain medications [that] can lead to tragic consequences, including addiction, overdose, and death.”⁷⁰

c) Also in November 2017, Purdue discussed the opioid epidemic and its response to it, stating that “The nation is experiencing a public health crisis involving licit and illicit opioids. Purdue endorses the following policies that support a comprehensive approach to reducing addiction, abuse, diversion, and overdose related to opioids.”⁷¹ Those policies include limiting the duration of one’s first opioid prescription; use of prescription drug monitoring programs; requiring demonstrated competence for opioid prescribing; and expanding the use of naloxone, an opioid reversal agent.

90. However, on information and belief, these representations are untrue. For example, despite its public statements of corporate responsibility, Purdue has failed to report to authorities illicit or suspicious prescribing of its opioids, even as it has publicly and repeatedly touted its “constructive role in the fight against opioid abuse” and “strong record of coordination with law enforcement.”⁷²

⁷⁰ Purdue Pharma, *Responsible Use of Opioids*, <http://www.purduepharma.com/patients-caregivers/responsible-use-of-opioids/> (last visited Mar. 27, 2018).

⁷¹ Purdue Pharma, *Public Policies to Address the Opioid Crisis*, <http://www.purduepharma.com/about/purdue-pharma-public-policy/> (last visited Mar. 27, 2018).

⁷² See Press Release, Purdue Pharma L.P., *Setting the Record Straight on OxyContin’s FDA-Approved Label* (May 5, 2016), <http://www.purduepharma.com/news-media/get-the-facts/setting-the-record-straight-on-oxycontin-fda-approved-label/>; Press Release, Purdue Pharma L.P., *Setting the Record Straight on Our Anti-Diversion Programs* (July 11, 2016), <http://www.purduepharma.com/news-media/get-the-facts/setting-the-record-straight-on-our-anti-diversion-programs/>.

91. In 2012, Endo took the remarkable step of asserting that the FDA should block generic versions of Endo's Opana ER because the drug was dangerously susceptible to abuse and misuse.⁷³ Endo made no such assertions before it faced financial competition regarding the drug.

92. Additionally, since at least 2002, Purdue has maintained a database of health care providers suspected of inappropriately prescribing OxyContin or other opioids. According to Purdue, physicians could be added to this database based on observed indicators of illicit prescribing, such as excessive numbers of patients, cash transactions, patient overdoses, and unusual prescribing volume. Purdue has said publicly that “[o]ur procedures help ensure that whenever we observe potential abuse or diversion activity, we discontinue our company’s interaction with the prescriber or pharmacist and initiate an investigation.”⁷⁴

93. Yet, according to a 2016 investigation by the Los Angeles Times (the “Times”), Purdue failed to cut off these providers’ prescription opioid supply at the pharmacy level and failed to report these providers to state medical boards or law enforcement—meaning Purdue continued to generate sales revenue from their prescriptions.⁷⁵

94. The Times’s investigation also found that “for more than a decade, Purdue collected extensive evidence suggesting illegal trafficking of OxyContin” and yet consistently failed to report suspicious dispensing or to stop supplies to the pharmacy.⁷⁶ Despite its knowledge of illicit prescribing, Purdue did not report its suspicions, for example, until years after law enforcement shut down a Los Angeles clinic that Purdue’s district manager described

⁷³ See David Heath, *Drugmaker Set to Profit from an Opioid it Said Was Unsafe*, CNN, Oct. 30, 2017, <http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/30/health/opana-endo-opioid-profit/index.html>.

⁷⁴ *Id.*

⁷⁵ See Harriet Ryan et al., *More Than 1 Million OxyContin Pills Ended Up in the Hands of Criminals and Addicts. What the Drugmaker Knew*, L.A. Times, July 10, 2016, <http://www.latimes.com/projects/la-me-oxycontin-part2/>.

⁷⁶ *Id.*

internally as “an organized drug ring” and that had prescribed more than 1.1 million OxyContin tablets.⁷⁷

D. Manufacturer Defendants’ Conduct Violated Their Duties

95. Manufacturer Defendants have continued to promote, directly and indirectly, deceptive marketing messages that misrepresent, and fail to include material facts about, the dangers of prescription opioid usage, despite actual or constructive knowledge that the prescription opioids were ultimately being consumed for unsafe and non-medical purposes.

96. Manufacturer Defendants have negligently or recklessly failed to control adequately the content and distribution of marketing materials and sales efforts regarding prescription opioids. A reasonably prudent manufacturer of opioids would have anticipated the dangers of widely advertising and distributing dangerous opioid products, and protected against it. A reasonably prudent manufacturer could have: (a) ensured physicians were judicious in considering when to prescribe opioids; (b) carefully worded its marketing materials to ensure the risks of opioids were clearly communicated; (c) conducted and publicized scientific studies testing the risks of opioid products; (d) taken greater care in hiring, training, and supervising employees responsible for marketing and selling opioid products; (e) investigated demographic or epidemiological data concerning the increasing demand for narcotic painkillers and the linkage of that demand with Manufacturer Defendants’ marketing efforts; and (f) followed applicable statutes, regulations, professional standards, and guidance, as Manufacturer Defendants agreed to do when settling prior actions against them.

97. On information and belief, Manufacturer Defendants failed to take any of these steps to prevent their misrepresentations and omissions from contributing to the opioid epidemic.

⁷⁷ *Id.*

IV. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS AND PHARMACY DEFENDANTS HAVE LEGAL DUTIES TO PREVENT OPIOID DIVERSION

98. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants have a common law duty to exercise reasonable care under the circumstances. In addition, each Distributor Defendant and each Pharmacy Defendant assumes a duty, when it speaks publicly about prescription opioids, to speak accurately.

99. Moreover, applicable state and Federal laws and regulations impose duties on Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants, and create a standard of conduct to which they must adhere.

100. These statutes and regulations were designed to prevent drug diversion (which, as discussed above, occurs whenever the supply chain of prescription opioids is broken and the drugs are transferred from a legitimate channel to an illegitimate one) by creating a legal framework for distributing and dispensing controlled substances and monitoring and controlling them from manufacture through delivery to the patient. These statutes and regulations include the FCSA, 21 U.S.C. §§ 801 *et seq.*, state controlled substances acts, laws regarding branding of drugs, and regulations related to persons who handle, prescribe, and dispense controlled substances. These statutes and regulations impose strict controls throughout the prescription opioid distribution chain.

101. The Navajo Nation is not asserting a cause of action under these laws. But just as a driver's violation of a speed limit can demonstrate that he acted negligently, so, too, Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' violations of applicable state and Federal laws and regulations show that they failed to meet the relevant standard of care.

A. Federal Law Sets a Standard of Care for Distributor Defendants to Follow

102. On information and belief, each Distributor Defendant distributes prescription opioids throughout the States of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah including on and near the Navajo Nation.

1. Duties Under Federal Laws and Regulations

103. The FCSA sets the standard of conduct to which Distributor Defendants must adhere. The FCSA requires all prescription opioid distributors to maintain effective controls against prescription opioid diversion and to employ a system to identify and report to law enforcement suspicious orders of controlled substances.

104. Distributor Defendants must (a) send transaction data to the DEA on each acquisition or reduction of inventory, as well as any lost or stolen inventory, and (b) maintain a complete and accurate record of each substance manufactured, sold, delivered, or otherwise disposed of. 21 U.S.C. § 827(a).

105. Importantly, Distributor Defendants must employ a system to inform the DEA of suspicious orders. 21 C.F.R. § 1301.74(b).

106. The DEA's Automation of Reports and Consolidation Orders System ("ARCOS") accumulates data on distributors' controlled substances transactions, which are then summarized into reports used by the DEA to identify any diversion of controlled substances into illicit channels of distribution. 21 C.F.R. § 1304.33.

B. Federal Law Sets a Standard of Care for Pharmacy Defendants to Follow

107. The FCSA also imposes specific obligations on Pharmacy Defendants. These requirements, along with their related regulations and agency interpretations, set a standard of care for pharmacy conduct.

1. Duties Under Federal Laws and Regulations

108. The FCSA requires pharmacists to review each controlled substance prescription and, prior to dispensing medication, make a professional determination that the prescription is effective and valid.

109. Under the FCSA, pharmacy registrants are required to “provide effective controls and procedures to guard against theft and diversion of controlled substances.” *See* 21 C.F.R. § 1301.71(a). In addition, 21 C.F.R. § 1306.04(a) states, “[t]he responsibility for the proper prescribing and dispensing of controlled substances is upon the prescribing practitioner, but a *corresponding responsibility* rests with the pharmacist who fills the prescription.” (Emphasis added.)

110. Therefore, pharmacists must ensure that prescriptions for controlled substances are valid, and that they are issued for a legitimate medical purpose by an individual practitioner who is approved and registered with the DEA to write prescriptions for opioids acting in the usual course of his professional practice.

111. The DEA has informed pharmacists that “[a]n order purporting to be a prescription issued not in the usual course of professional treatment or in legitimate and authorized research is an invalid prescription.”⁷⁸ Filling such a prescription is illegal. As the DEA states, “The law does not require a pharmacist to dispense a prescription of doubtful, questionable, or suspicious origin. To the contrary, the pharmacist who deliberately ignores a questionable prescription when there is reason to believe it was not issued for a legitimate medical purpose may be [criminally] prosecuted.”⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Michele Leonhart et al., *Pharmacist’s Manual: An Informational Outline of the Controlled Substances Act*, Drug Enforcement Admin., Diversion Control Div. (Revised 2010), <https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/pubs/manuals/pharm2/>.

⁷⁹ *Id.*

112. Questionable or suspicious prescriptions include: (a) prescriptions written by a doctor who writes significantly more prescriptions (or in larger quantities) for controlled substances than other practitioners in the area; (b) prescriptions that should last for a month in legitimate use, but are refilled more frequently; (c) simultaneous prescriptions for antagonistic drugs, such as depressants and stimulants; (d) prescriptions that look “too good” or where the prescriber’s handwriting is too legible; (e) prescriptions with atypical quantities or dosages; (f) prescriptions that do not comply with standard abbreviations and/or contain no abbreviations; (g) photocopied prescriptions; or (h) prescriptions containing different handwritings. Most of the time, these questionable or suspicious attributes are not difficult to detect or recognize; they should be apparent to an adequately trained pharmacist.

113. Pharmacists are also instructed to be suspicious of signs that a customer is seeking to divert prescription opioids, including customers who: (a) appear to be returning too frequently; (b) are seeking to fill a prescription written for a different person; (c) appear at the pharmacy counter simultaneously, or within a short time, all bearing similar prescriptions from the same physician; (d) are not regular patrons or residents of the community, and present prescriptions from the same physician; (e) drive long distances to have prescriptions filled; (f) seek large volumes of controlled substances in the highest strength in each prescription; (g) seek a combination of other drugs with prescription opioids such as tranquilizers and muscle relaxers that can be used to create an “opioid cocktail”; and (h) pay large amounts of cash for their prescriptions rather than using insurance. Ignoring these suspicious signs violates industry standards and DEA guidelines and is illegal under multiple laws.

114. Other “red flags” that should alert a pharmacist to potential diversion include: (a) prescriptions that lack the technical requirements of a valid prescription, such as a verifiable

DEA number and signature; (b) prescriptions written in excess of the amount needed for proper therapeutic purposes; (c) prescriptions obtained through disreputable or illegal web-based pharmacies; and (d) patients receiving multiple types of narcotic painkillers on the same day.

115. Each prescriber of controlled substances is issued a number identification by the DEA and must sign each prescription. Industry standards require pharmacists to contact the prescriber for verification or clarification whenever there is a question about any aspect of a prescription. If a pharmacist believes the prescription is forged or altered, he or she should not fill it, but instead should call the local police. If a pharmacist believes there is a pattern of prescription abuse, the local Board of Pharmacy and the DEA must be contacted.

V. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS AND PHARMACY DEFENDANTS HAVE FAILED TO FULFILL THEIR DUTIES

A. Distributor Defendants Understood Their Duties and Violated Them Anyway

1. Distributor Defendants Understood and Acknowledged Their Duties

116. In addition to state and Federal laws and regulations regarding controlled substances, Distributor Defendants received detailed, specific instructions for identifying and minimizing the risk of prescription opioid diversion.

117. To combat prescription opioid diversion, the DEA has provided readily-available guidance to distributors on the requirements of suspicious order reporting.

118. Since 2006, the DEA has briefed distributors regarding legal, regulatory, and due diligence responsibilities. During these briefings, the DEA pointed out the red flags distributors, including Distributor Defendants, should look for to identify potential diversion.

119. Since 2007, the DEA has hosted at least five conferences to provide registrants with updated information about diversion trends and regulatory changes that affect the drug

supply chain and suspicious order reporting.⁸⁰ All of the major distributors, including Distributor Defendants, attended at least one of these conferences.

120. On September 27, 2006, and December 27, 2007, the DEA's Office of Diversion Control sent letters to all registered distributors, including Distributor Defendants, providing guidance on suspicious order monitoring and the distributors' obligations to conduct due diligence on controlled substance customers to help prevent diversion.⁸¹

121. The September 27, 2006 letter reminded distributors, including Distributor Defendants, of their legal obligation to use due diligence to avoid filling orders that might be diverted into the illicit market. The letter explained that each distributor must exercise due care in confirming the legitimacy of all orders. It also described circumstances that could indicate diversion, including orders of (a) excessive quantities of a limited variety of controlled substances while ordering few, if any, other drugs, or (b) the same controlled substance from multiple distributors.

122. The December 27, 2007 letter reminded distributors, including Distributor Defendants, that suspicious orders must be reported when discovered and that monthly transaction reports of excessive purchases did not meet the regulatory criteria for suspicious order reporting. The letter also advised distributors (a) that they must independently analyze a suspicious order before the sale to determine if the controlled substances would likely be

⁸⁰ Drug Enf't Admin., *Distributor Conferences*, <https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/mtgs/distributor/index.html>; Drug Enf't Admin., *Manufacturer Conferences*, https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/mtgs/man_imp_exp/index.html; Drug Enf't Admin., *National Conference on Pharmaceutical and Chemical Diversion*, https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/mtgs/drug_chemical/index.html; Drug Enf't Admin., *Diversion Awareness Conferences*, https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/mtgs/pharm_awareness/index.html.

⁸¹ *Masters Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*; Decision and Order, 80 Fed. Reg. 55,418, 55,421 (Drug Enf't Admin. Sept. 15, 2015) (No. 13-39), 2015 WL 5320504.

diverted and (b) that filling a suspicious order and then completing the sale does not absolve the distributor from legal responsibility.

123. Distributor Defendants were on notice that their own industry group, the Healthcare Distribution Management Association, published Industry Compliance Guidelines entitled “Reporting Suspicious Orders and Preventing Diversion of Controlled Substances” that stressed the critical role of each member of the supply chain in distributing controlled substances.⁸²

124. These industry guidelines further explained that, by being “[a]t the center of a sophisticated supply chain, distributors are uniquely situated to perform due diligence in order to help support the security of controlled substances they deliver to their customers.”⁸³

125. Opioid distributors, including Distributor Defendants, have themselves recognized the magnitude of the problem and have made statements assuring the public they recognize their duty to curb the opioid epidemic.

126. A Cardinal executive recently claimed that Cardinal uses “advanced analytics” to monitor its supply chain; Cardinal assured the public it was being “as effective and efficient as possible in constantly monitoring, identifying, and eliminating any outside criminal activity.”⁸⁴

127. McKesson has publicly stated that it has a “best-in-class controlled substance monitoring program to help identify suspicious orders,” and is “deeply passionate about curbing the opioid epidemic in our country.”⁸⁵

⁸² Healthcare Distrib. Mgmt. Ass’n (HDMA), *Industry Compliance Guidelines: Reporting Suspicious Orders and Preventing Diversion of Controlled Substances*, filed in *Cardinal Health, Inc. v. Holder*, No. 12-5061 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 7, 2012), Doc. No. 1362415 (App. B at 1).

⁸³ *Id.*

⁸⁴ Lenny Bernstein et al., *How Drugs Intended for Patients Ended up in the Hands of Illegal Users: ‘No One Was Doing Their Job’*, Wash. Post, Oct. 22, 2016, <http://wapo.st/2vCRGLt>.

⁸⁵ Scott Higham et al., *Drug Industry Hired Dozens of Officials from the DEA as the Agency Tried to Curb Opioid Abuse*, Wash. Post, Dec. 22, 2016, <http://wapo.st/2uR2FDy>.

128. At the very least, these assurances about eliminating criminal activity from the supply chain and curbing the opioid epidemic created a duty for Distributor Defendants to act reasonably by following through on their assurances.

2. Prior Regulatory Actions Against Distributor Defendants for Failing to Prevent Diversion

129. Despite knowing the risks of diversion and their broad assurances to regulators, states, and the public, Distributor Defendants have recklessly or negligently allowed diversion. Their misconduct has resulted in numerous civil fines and other penalties recovered by government agencies—including actions by the DEA related to violations of the FCSA.

a. Cardinal

130. Cardinal has paid millions of dollars in multiple DEA and state actions relating to its improper management and distribution of prescription opioids.

131. In 2008, Cardinal paid a \$34 million penalty to settle allegations about prescription opioid diversion taking place at seven warehouses around the United States.⁸⁶ These allegations included failing to report to the DEA thousands of suspicious orders of hydrocodone that Cardinal distributed to pharmacies that filled illegitimate prescriptions originating from rogue Internet pharmacy websites.

132. In 2012, Cardinal reached another settlement with the DEA relating to systemic prescription opioid diversion in its Florida distribution center.⁸⁷ Cardinal's Florida center received a two-year license suspension for supplying more than 12 million dosage units to only four area pharmacies, nearly 50 times as much oxycodone as it shipped to the rest of Florida and

⁸⁶ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of Colo., Cardinal Health Inc., Agrees to Pay \$34 Million to Settle Claims That it Failed to Report Suspicious Sales of Widely-Abused Controlled Substances (Oct. 2, 2008), https://www.justice.gov/archive/usao/co/news/2008/October08/10_2_08.html.

⁸⁷ Press Release, Drug Enf't Admin., DEA Suspends for Two Years Pharmaceutical Wholesale Distributor's Ability to Sell Controlled Substances from Lakeland, Florida Facility (May 15, 2012), <https://www.dea.gov/pubs/pressrel/pr051512.html>.

an increase of 241% in only two years. The DEA found that Cardinal's own investigator warned Cardinal against selling opioids to these pharmacies but that Cardinal did nothing to notify the DEA or cut off the supply of drugs to the suspect pharmacies. Instead, Cardinal's opioid shipments to the pharmacies increased.

133. In December 2016, Cardinal paid \$44 million to settle charges that it had violated the FCSA by failing to report suspicious orders in four states.⁸⁸ The same Florida distribution center at the heart of the 2012 settlement was again implicated in this case. The settlement also covered a Cardinal subsidiary, Kinray LLC, which did not report a single suspicious order regarding its shipments of oxycodone and hydrocodone to more than 20 New York-area pharmacy locations that placed unusually high orders of controlled substances at an unusually frequent rate. Cardinal Health d/b/a Kinray LLC is a licensed wholesale drug distributor in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, and, on information and belief, distributes opioids in those States, and within or near the Navajo Nation.

134. In January 2017, Cardinal paid \$20 million to settle allegations by West Virginia that Cardinal had shipped increasing amounts of opioids to numerous counties without utilizing proper controls; in essence benefitting from West Virginia's problem with prescription opioid abuse.⁸⁹

b. McKesson

135. McKesson has agreed to pay over \$163 million to resolve government charges regarding diversion.

⁸⁸ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of Md., Cardinal Health Agrees to \$44 Million Settlement for Alleged Violations of Controlled Substances Act (Dec. 23, 2016), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-md/pr/cardinal-health-agrees-44-million-settlement-alleged-violations-controlled-substances-act>.

⁸⁹ Eric Eyre, *2 Drug Distributors to Pay \$36M to Settle WV Painkiller Lawsuits*, Charleston Gazette-Mail, Jan. 9, 2017, <http://www.wvgazettemail.com/news-cops-and-courts/20170109/2-drug-distributors-to-pay-36m-to-settle-wv-painkiller-lawsuits>.

136. In May 2008, McKesson paid \$13.25 million to settle claims by the DEA that it had failed to maintain effective controls against diversion.⁹⁰ McKesson allegedly failed to report suspicious orders from rogue Internet pharmacies, resulting in millions of doses of controlled substances being diverted.

137. Following the 2008 settlement, McKesson was supposed to change its ways and fix its flawed processes to prevent prescription opioid diversion. But it did not do so. It was later revealed that McKesson's system for detecting "suspicious orders" from pharmacies was so ineffective and dysfunctional that, in a five-year period, it filled more than 1.6 million orders but reported just 16 orders as suspicious (all from a single consumer). In early 2017, it was reported that McKesson had agreed to pay \$150 million to the Federal government to settle certain prescription opioid diversion claims that it allowed drug diversion at 12 distribution centers in 11 states.⁹¹

c. AmerisourceBergen

138. AmerisourceBergen has paid \$16 million in settlements and had certain licenses revoked as a result of allegations related to prescription opioid diversion.

139. In 2007, AmerisourceBergen lost its license to send controlled substances from a distribution center amid allegations that it was not controlling shipments of prescription opioids to Internet pharmacies.⁹² Again in 2012, AmerisourceBergen was implicated for failing to

⁹⁰ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of Colo., McKesson Corporation Agrees to Pay More than \$13 Million to Settle Claims That it Failed to Report Suspicious Sales of Prescription Medications (May 2, 2008), https://www.justice.gov/archive/usao/co/news/2008/May08/5_2b_08.html.

⁹¹ Press Release, U.S. Dep't of Justice, McKesson Agrees to Pay Record \$150 Million Settlement for Failure to Report Suspicious Orders of Pharmaceutical Drugs (Jan. 17, 2017), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/mckesson-agrees-pay-record-150-million-settlement-failure-report-suspicious-orders>.

⁹² Press Release, AmerisourceBergen, AmerisourceBergen Signs Agreement with DEA Leading to Reinstatement of Its Orlando Distribution Center's Suspended License to Distribute Controlled Substances (June 22, 2007), <http://investor.amerisourcebergen.com/news-releases/news-release-details/amerisourcebergen-signs-agreement-dea-leading-reinstatement-its>.

protect against diversion of particular controlled substances into non-medically necessary channels.⁹³

140. In January 2017, AmerisourceBergen paid the State of West Virginia \$16 million to settle allegations that it knowingly shipped increasing amounts of prescription opioids without sufficient monitoring or control, facilitating six-fold increases in prescription opioid consumption in some counties.⁹⁴ AmerisourceBergen was part of a drug supply chain that included doctors who wrote prescriptions for non-medical purposes and “pill mill” pharmacies that dispensed excessive numbers of painkillers. In addition to the monetary settlement, AmerisourceBergen agreed to adhere to stricter reporting guidelines within West Virginia.

3. Despite Prior Regulatory Actions, Distributor Defendants Violated Their Duties

141. Despite being penalized by law enforcement authorities, Distributor Defendants Cardinal, McKesson, and AmerisourceBergen have not changed their conduct. Rather, they have treated fines as a cost of doing business in an industry that generates billions of dollars in revenue.

142. All of the Distributor Defendants have engaged in a consistent, nationwide pattern and practice of illegally distributing prescription opioids. That pattern and practice has also affected the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

143. In fact, Distributor Defendants have supplied and continue to supply quantities of prescription opioids on and near the Navajo Nation with the actual or constructive knowledge that the opioids were ultimately being consumed by Navajo Nation citizens for non-medical

⁹³ Jeff Overley, *AmerisourceBergen Subpoenaed by DEA over Drug Diversion*, LAW360 (Aug. 9, 2012, 4:28 PM), <https://www.law360.com/articles/368498/amerisourcebergen-subpoenaed-by-dea-over-drug-diversion>.

⁹⁴ Eric Eyre, *2 Drug Distributors to Pay \$36M to Settle WV Painkiller Lawsuits*, Charleston Gazette-Mail, Jan. 9, 2017, <http://www.wvgazettemail.com/news-cops-and-courts/20170109/2-drug-distributors-to-pay-36m-to-settle-wv-painkiller-lawsuits>.

purposes. Many of these shipments should have been stopped or investigated as suspicious orders, but Distributor Defendants negligently or recklessly failed to do so.

144. Each Distributor Defendant knew, or should have known, that the amount of prescription opioids that it allowed to flow into the Navajo Nation was far in excess of what could be consumed for medically necessary purposes in the relevant communities (especially given that each Distributor Defendant knew it was not the only prescription opioid distributor servicing those communities).

145. Distributor Defendants negligently or recklessly failed to control their supply lines to prevent diversion. A reasonably prudent distributor of controlled substances would have anticipated the danger of prescription opioid diversion and protected against it by, for example: (a) taking greater care in hiring, training, and supervising employees; (b) providing greater oversight, security, and control of supply channels; (c) looking more closely at the pharmacists and doctors who were purchasing large quantities of commonly-abused prescription opioids in amounts much greater than appropriate, given the size of the local populations; (d) investigating demographic or epidemiological facts concerning the increasing demand for narcotic painkillers on and near the Navajo Nation; (e) informing pharmacies and retailers about prescription opioid diversion; and (f) in general, following applicable statutes, regulations, professional standards, and guidance from government agencies.

146. On information and belief, Distributor Defendants made little to no effort to visit the pharmacies servicing the Navajo Nation to perform due diligence inspections to ensure that the controlled substances Distributor Defendants had furnished were not being diverted to illegal uses.

147. On information and belief, the compensation Distributor Defendants provided to certain of their employees was affected, in part, by the volume of their sales of opioids to pharmacies and other facilities servicing Navajo Nation citizens, thus improperly creating incentives that contributed to and exacerbated prescription opioid diversion and the resulting opioid abuse.

B. Pharmacy Defendants Understood Their Duties and Violated Them Anyway

1. Pharmacy Defendants Understood and Acknowledged Their Duties

148. Pharmacy Defendants similarly had industry-specific knowledge of the particular risks and harms from filling prescriptions for non-medical purposes and the resulting widespread opioid abuse.

149. The DEA⁹⁵ has provided extensive guidance to pharmacists concerning their duties to the public, as have state pharmacy boards,⁹⁶ and national industry associations.⁹⁷ The guidance teaches pharmacists how to identify red flags, which indicate that there may be a problem with the legitimacy of a prescription presented by a patient.⁹⁸ The guidance also tells pharmacists how to resolve the red flags and what to do if the red flags are unresolvable.

⁹⁵ Michele Leonhart et al., *Pharmacist's Manual: An Informational Outline of the Controlled Substances Act*, Drug Enforcement Admin., Diversion Control Div. (Revised 2010), <https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/pubs/manuals/pharm2/>.

⁹⁶ Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy, *Abuse & Misuse of Prescription Drugs* (last visited Mar. 27, 2018), <https://www.pharmacy.texas.gov/SB144.asp>; Fla. Bd. of Pharmacy, *DEA Guidelines to Prescription Fraud* (June 12, 2013), <http://floridaspharmacy.gov/latest-news/dea-guidelines-to-prescription-fraud/>; Va. Bd. of Pharmacy, *Prescription Drug Abuse: Red Flags for Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians* (Aug. 6, 2014), <https://youtu.be/j5CkhirIZk8>.

⁹⁷ Philip Brummond et al., *American Society of Health-Systems Pharmacists Guidelines on Preventing Diversion of Controlled Substances*, 74 Am. J. of Health-Sys. Pharmacy e10 (Jan. 2017), <http://www.ajhp.org/content/early/2016/12/22/ajhp160919>.

⁹⁸ Va. Bd. of Pharmacy, *Prescription Drug Abuse: Red Flags for Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians* (Aug. 6, 2014), <https://youtu.be/j5CkhirIZk8>; Philip W. Brummond et al., *American Society of Health-Systems Pharmacists Guidelines on Preventing Diversion of Controlled Substances*, 74 Am. J. of Health-System Pharmacy e10 (Jan. 2017), <http://www.ajhp.org/content/early/2016/12/22/ajhp160919>.

150. For instance, the industry guidance tells pharmacists how to recognize: (a) stolen prescription pads; (b) prescription pads printed using a legitimate doctor's name, but with a different call back number that is answered by an accomplice of the drug-seeker; (c) prescriptions written using fictitious patient names and addresses; and (d) other similar red flags.⁹⁹

151. Pharmacy Defendants, through their words or actions set forth in news reports and other public documents, have acknowledged these risks and assured the public that issues affecting public health and safety are their highest priority.

152. In 2015, CVS publicly stated that, "the abuse of controlled substance pain medication is a nationwide epidemic that is exacting a devastating toll upon individuals, families and communities. Pharmacists have a legal obligation under State and Federal law to determine whether a controlled substance was issued for a legitimate purpose and to decline to fill prescriptions they have reason to believe were issued for a non-legitimate purpose."¹⁰⁰

153. Similarly, in 2016, Walgreens issued a press release captioned "Walgreens Leads Fight Against Prescription Drug Abuse with New Programs to Help Curb Misuse of Medications and the Rise in Overdose Deaths."¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Fla. Bd. of Pharmacy, *DEA Guidelines to Prescription Fraud* (June 12, 2013), <http://floridaspharmacy.gov/latest-news/dea-guidelines-to-prescription-fraud/>; Mass. Bd. of Registration in Med., Policy 15-05, *Prescribing Practices Policy and Guidelines* (Oct. 8, 2015), <http://www.mass.gov/eohhs/docs/borim/policies-guidelines/policy-15-05.pdf>.

¹⁰⁰ *Patients Profiled at Pharmacy Counters*, KTNV, Feb. 23, 2015, http://contact1846.rssing.com/channel-30860085/all_p11.html#item217.

¹⁰¹ Press Release, Walgreens, Walgreens Leads Fight Against Prescription Drug Abuse with New Programs to Help Curb Misuse of Medications and the Rise in Overdose Deaths (Feb. 9, 2016), <http://news.walgreens.com/press-releases/general-news/walgreens-leads-fight-against-prescription-drug-abuse-with-new-programs-to-help-curb-misuse-of-medications-and-the-rise-in-overdose-deaths.htm>.

154. In 2017, Walmart acknowledged the need for a “solution to the [opioid] epidemic” and noted the epidemic has “devastated so many families and communities across America.”¹⁰²

2. Prior Regulatory Actions Against Pharmacy Defendants for Failing to Prevent Diversion

155. Despite knowing and even warning of these risks, Pharmacy Defendants recklessly or negligently permitted diversion to occur. In failing to take adequate measures to prevent substantial opioid-related injuries to the Navajo Nation, Pharmacy Defendants have breached their duties under the “reasonable care” standard of New Mexico common law (including violating a voluntarily-undertaken duty to the public which they have assumed by their own words and actions), professional duties under the relevant standards of professional practice, and requirements established by New Mexico and Federal laws and regulations.

156. Pharmacy Defendants were on notice of their ongoing negligence or reckless misconduct towards the Navajo Nation in part because of their history of being penalized for violating their duties in other jurisdictions.

a. CVS

157. CVS has paid fines totaling over \$40 million as the result of a series of investigations by the DEA and the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”). It nonetheless treated these fines as the cost of doing business and has allowed its pharmacies to continue (a) dispensing prescription opioids in quantities significantly higher than any plausible medical need would require, and (b) violating their recordkeeping and dispensing obligations under the FCSA.

¹⁰² Press Release, Walmart, Walmart Supports State of Emergency Declaration on Opioids (Oct. 26, 2017), <https://news.walmart.com/2017/10/26/walmart-supports-state-of-emergency-declaration-on-opioids>.

158. As recently as February 2016, CVS paid \$8 million to settle allegations by the DEA and the DOJ that its stores and pharmacists had been violating their duties under the FCSA and filling prescriptions with no legitimate medical purpose.¹⁰³ CVS has resolved similar allegations by settling with Florida (\$22 million),¹⁰⁴ Oklahoma (\$11 million),¹⁰⁵ Massachusetts and New Hampshire (\$3.5 million),¹⁰⁶ Texas (\$1.9 million),¹⁰⁷ and Rhode Island (\$450,000).¹⁰⁸

159. These cases included evidence that CVS filled prescriptions that were clearly forged. For example, in 2016, CVS settled with the United States to resolve allegations stemming from two DEA investigations that revealed that over 50 CVS stores in Massachusetts and New Hampshire had filled patently forged prescriptions for addictive painkillers more than 500 times between 2011 and 2014.¹⁰⁹ The DEA estimated the street value of the diverted drugs to be over \$1 million. One forger successfully filled 131 prescriptions for hydrocodone at eight CVS stores. One of those stores filled 29 prescriptions for the forger over the course of just six months, an inordinate amount under the circumstances. At a different store, the same individual filled 28 prescriptions that she forged for herself and three other alleged patients, even though the

¹⁰³ Press Release, Drug Enf't Admin., DEA Reaches \$8 Million Settlement Agreement with CVS for Unlawful Distribution of Controlled Substances (Feb. 12, 2016), <https://www.dea.gov/divisions/wdo/2016/wdo021216.shtml>.

¹⁰⁴ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Middle Dist. of Fla., United States Reaches \$22 Million Settlement Agreement with CVS for Unlawful Distribution of Controlled Substances (May 13, 2015), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-mdfl/pr/united-states-reaches-22-million-settlement-agreement-cvs-unlawful-distribution>.

¹⁰⁵ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office W. Dist. of Okla., CVS to Pay \$11 Million to Settle Civil Penalty Claims Involving Violations of Controlled Substances Act (Apr. 3, 2013), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-wdok/pr/cvs-pay-11-million-settle-civil-penalty-claims-involving-violations-controlled>.

¹⁰⁶ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of Mass., CVS to Pay \$3.5 Million to Resolve Allegations That Pharmacists Filled Fake Prescriptions (June 30, 2016), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-ma/pr/cvs-pay-35-million-resolve-allegations-pharmacists-filled-fake-prescriptions>.

¹⁰⁷ Patrick Danner, *H-E-B, CVS Fined over Prescriptions*, San Antonio Express-News, Sept. 5, 2014, <http://www.expressnews.com/business/local/article/H-E-B-CVS-fined-over-prescriptions-5736554.php>.

¹⁰⁸ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of R.I., Drug Diversion Claims Against CVS Health Corp. Resolved with \$450,000 Civil Settlement (Aug. 10, 2015), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-ri/pr/drug-diversion-claims-against-cvs-health-corp-resolved-450000-civil-settlement>.

¹⁰⁹ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of Mass., CVS to Pay \$3.5 Million to Resolve Allegations That Pharmacists Filled Fake Prescriptions (June 30, 2016), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-ma/pr/cvs-pay-35-million-resolve-allegations-pharmacists-filled-fake-prescriptions>.

prescriptions were identical in every respect other than the patient name. Additionally, 107 of the forged prescriptions bore the Massachusetts address of a dentist who had closed her Massachusetts practice and moved to Maine, something that should have been easily discovered by CVS pharmacists by checking the DEA website or calling the phone number on the prescriptions.

160. CVS also has settled allegations by the DEA and DOJ that its stores and pharmacists had been violating their duty under the FCSA and filling prescriptions with no legitimate medical purpose.¹¹⁰ As part of the settlement, CVS acknowledged that from 2008 to 2012, some of its stores in Maryland dispensed controlled substances, including prescription opioids, in a manner that was not fully consistent with the FCSA and relevant regulations, including failing to comply with a pharmacist's responsibility to ensure that these prescriptions were issued for a legitimate medical purpose. CVS paid \$8 million to settle these claims.

161. CVS also has settled allegations by the DOJ that some of its stores in Connecticut failed to maintain records in accordance with the FCSA.¹¹¹ On over 6,000 occasions, CVS stores in Connecticut failed to keep appropriate records of prescriptions and purchase invoices. CVS settled these allegations for \$600,000.

162. Dating back to 2006, CVS retail pharmacies in Oklahoma and elsewhere intentionally violated the FCSA by filling prescriptions signed by prescribers with invalid DEA

¹¹⁰ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of Md., United States Reaches \$8 Million Settlement Agreement with CVS for Unlawful Distribution of Controlled Substances (Feb. 12, 2016), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-md/pr/united-states-reaches-8-million-settlement-agreement-cvs-unlawfuldistribution-controlled>.

¹¹¹ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office Dist. of Conn., CVS Pharmacy Pays \$600,000 to Settle Controlled Substances Act Allegations (Oct. 20, 2016), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-ct/pr/cvs-pharmacy-pays-600000-settle-controlled-substances-act-allegations>.

registration numbers.¹¹² To fill otherwise illegitimate prescriptions, CVS pharmacists substituted valid DEA registration numbers of non-prescribing practitioners, or substituted false DEA registration numbers in company computer systems, on paper prescriptions, and even in the information that the pharmacy reported to the State of Oklahoma's Prescription Drug Monitoring Program.¹¹³

b. Walgreens

163. Walgreens agreed to the largest settlement in DEA history—\$80 million—to resolve allegations that it committed an unprecedented number of recordkeeping and dispensing violations of the FCSA, including negligently allowing controlled substances such as oxycodone and other prescription pain killers to be diverted for abuse and illegal black market sales.¹¹⁴ As part of the settlement, Walgreens agreed to enhance its training and compliance programs, and to cease compensating its pharmacists based on the volume of prescriptions filled. The settlement resolved investigations into and allegations of FCSA violations in Florida, New York, Michigan, and Colorado that resulted in the diversion of millions of prescription opioids into illicit channels.

164. Walgreens' Florida operations at issue in this settlement highlight its egregious conduct regarding diversion of prescription opioids. Walgreens' Florida pharmacies each allegedly ordered more than one million dosage units of oxycodone in 2011—more than ten times the average amount.¹¹⁵ They increased their orders over time, in some cases as much as

¹¹² Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office W. Dist. of Okla., CVS to Pay \$11 Million to Settle Civil Penalty Claims Involving Violations of Controlled Substances Act (Apr. 3, 2013), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-wdok/pr/cvs-pay-11-million-settle-civil-penalty-claims-involving-violations-controlled>.

¹¹³ See Complaint, *United States v. CVS Pharmacies*, No. 5:11-cv-1124-HE (W.D. Okla. Oct. 5, 2011).

¹¹⁴ Press Release, U.S. Attorney's Office S. Dist. of Fla., Walgreens Agrees to Pay a Record Settlement of \$80 Million for Civil Penalties Under the Controlled Substances Act (June 11, 2013), <https://www.justice.gov/usao-sdfl/pr/walgreens-agrees-pay-record-settlement-80-million-civil-penalties-under-controlled>.

¹¹⁵ Order to Show Cause and Immediate Suspension of Registration, *In the Matter of Walgreen Co.* (Drug Enf't Admin. Sept. 13, 2012).

600% in the span of just two years, including, for example, supplying a town of 3,000 residents with 285,800 orders of oxycodone in a one-month period. Yet Walgreens' corporate officers not only turned a blind eye, but also facilitated the opioid boom in Florida by providing Walgreens' pharmacists with incentives through a bonus program that compensated them based on the number of prescriptions filled at the pharmacy. In fact, corporate attorneys at Walgreens suggested, in reviewing the legitimacy of prescriptions coming from pain clinics, that "if these are legitimate indicators of inappropriate prescriptions perhaps we should consider not documenting our own potential noncompliance," underscoring Walgreens' attitude that profit outweighed compliance with the FCSA or the health of communities.¹¹⁶

165. Walgreens has also settled with a number of state attorneys general, including West Virginia (\$575,000)¹¹⁷ and Massachusetts (\$200,000).¹¹⁸ The Massachusetts Attorney General's Medicaid Fraud Division found that, from 2010 through most of 2015, multiple Walgreens stores across the state failed to monitor the prescription opioid use of some Medicaid patients who were considered high-risk. Such patients are supposed to obtain all prescriptions from only one pharmacy, and that pharmacy is required to track the patient's pattern of prescription use. Some of the state's 160 Walgreens accepted cash for controlled substances from patients in MassHealth (the state's combined program for Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program), rather than seeking approval from the agency. In some cases, MassHealth had rejected the prescription; other times, MassHealth was never billed. In response, Walgreens

¹¹⁶ *Id.*

¹¹⁷ Caleb Stewart, *Kroger, CVS, and Walgreens Settle Lawsuit with West Virginia for \$3 Million*, WHSV, Aug. 16, 2016, <http://www.wHSV.com/content/news/Kroger-CVS-and-Walgreens-settle-lawsuit-with-West-Virginia-for-3-million-390332992.html>.

¹¹⁸ Felice J. Freyer, *Walgreens to Pay \$200,000 Settlement for Lapses with Opioids*, Bos. Globe, Jan. 19, 2017, <https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2017/01/18/walgreens-agrees-better-monitor-opioid-dispensing/q0B3FbMo2k3wPt4hvmTQrM/story.html>.

simply agreed to update its policies and procedures and train its staff to ensure that pharmacists properly monitor and do not accept cash payments from patients deemed high-risk.

c. Walmart

166. In 2009, Walmart paid \$637,000 to resolve allegations of numerous record keeping violations at its pharmacies in Texas. Those allegations included that Walmart had failed to timely file records indicating loss or theft of drugs to the DEA, in violation of the FCSA.¹¹⁹

3. Despite Prior Regulatory Actions, Pharmacy Defendants Continue to Violate Their Duties

167. Despite their extensive understanding of the risks and harms of prescription opioid diversion set forth above, Pharmacy Defendants continue to fail to fulfill their obligations to prevent prescription opioid diversion.

168. Pharmacy Defendants have engaged in a consistent, nationwide pattern and practice of illegally distributing prescription opioids. That pattern and practice has also affected the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

169. On information and belief, Pharmacy Defendants regularly filled opioid prescriptions in circumstances where red flags were present.

170. On information and belief, Pharmacy Defendants regularly filled opioid prescriptions that would have been deemed questionable or suspicious by a reasonably prudent pharmacy.

¹¹⁹ See generally Emma Perez-Trevino, *Wal-Mart Fined for Alleged Recording Keeping Violations*, Brownsville Herald, Jan. 7, 2009, http://www.brownsvilleherald.com/news/local/article_1a19f348-e9ad-534f-a1a1-8423736b0df9.html; *Walmart Fined for Pharmacy Record-Keeping Violations*, Ozarks First, Jan. 7, 2009, <http://www.ozarksfirst.com/news/health-and-medical/walmart-fined-for-pharmacy-record-keeping-violations>

171. On information and belief, Pharmacy Defendants have not adequately trained or supervised their employees at the point of sale to investigate or report suspicious or invalid opioid prescriptions, or protect against corruption or theft by employees or others.

172. On information and belief, Pharmacy Defendants utilized monetary compensation programs for certain employees that are based, in part, on the number of prescriptions filled and dispensed. This type of compensation creates economic disincentives within the companies to change their practices. For example, there have been reports of chain store supervisory personnel directing pharmacists to fill prescriptions regardless of the red flags presented.

VI. DEFENDANTS' MISCONDUCT HAS INJURED AND CONTINUES TO INJURE THE NAVAJO NATION AND ITS CITIZENS

173. Defendants had the ability and the duty to prevent misleading marketing and prescription opioid diversion, both of which presented known or foreseeable dangers of serious injury. But they failed to do so, resulting in substantial injury to the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

A. Manufacturer Defendants' Misconduct Has Injured and Continues to Injure the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens

174. Manufacturer Defendants' marketing campaign has resulted in a significant increase in prescription opioid usage: between 1999 and 2016 the number of opioids prescribed nationwide quadrupled.¹²⁰ Nationally, the number of people who take prescription opioids for non-medical purposes is now greater than the number of people who use cocaine, heroin, hallucinogens, and inhalants combined.¹²¹

¹²⁰ Li Hui Chen et al., *Drug-Poisoning Deaths Involving Opioid Analgesics: United States, 1999–2011*, 166 Nat'l Ctr. for Health Statistics Data Brief (Sept. 2014), <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db166.pdf>; Rose A. Rudd et al., *Increases in Drug and Opioid-Involved Overdose Deaths—United States, 2010–2015*, 65 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 1445 (Dec. 30, 2016), <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/wr/mm655051e1.htm>.

¹²¹ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Servs. Admin., *Results from the 2009 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Volume I. Summary of National Findings*, NSDUH Series H-38A, HHS Publication No. SMA 10-4586 Findings (2010).

175. Every year, millions of Americans misuse and abuse prescription opioid pain relievers in ways that can lead to addiction, overdose, and death. Data from the CDC suggest that over 2.6 million Americans are opioid-dependent and over 16.5 million Americans use prescription opioids for non-medical purposes.

176. In Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, data from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration indicate that over 545,000 residents use prescription opioids for non-medical purposes each year.¹²² Similarly, DEA data show that in the past few years the states in which the Navajo Nation is located have seen annual distribution exceeding 504 milligrams per citizen,¹²³ and 4,580 milligrams per opioid user,¹²⁴ which is far more than is medically necessary.

177. This growth in non-medical demand, addiction, and diversion has led to serious harm to the Navajo Nation and its citizens. The increase in opioid usage has led to levels of addiction that, according to the U.S. Surgeon General, have “devastated” communities across America.¹²⁵ Princeton University economist Alan Krueger found that opioids may be responsible for roughly 20% of the national decline in workforce participation by prime-age men and 25% of the drop by women.¹²⁶ In 2011, the CDC reported that overdose deaths from

¹²² Substance Abuse and Mental Health Servs. Admin., *National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Comparison of 2002–2003 and 2013–2014 Population Percentages (50 States and the District of Columbia)* 16–17 (2015), <http://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUHsaeLongTermCHG2014/NSDUHsaeLongTermCHG2014.pdf> (4.43% of people age 12 or older in New Mexico engage in the non-medical use of prescription pain relievers).

¹²³ Drug Enforcement Admin., ARCOS Report, *Retail Drug Distribution By Zip Code Within State by Grams Weight*, https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/2013/2013_rpt1.pdf; https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/2014/2014_rpt1.pdf; https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/2015/2015_rpt1.pdf; https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/arcos/retail_drug_summary/report_yr_2016.pdf.

¹²⁴ Wenjun Zhong et al., *Age and Sex Patterns of Drug Prescribing in a Defined American Population*, 7 Mayo Clinic Proceedings 697, 700 (2013).

¹²⁵ Letter from U.S. Surgeon General Vivek H. Murthy (Aug. 2016), <https://perma.cc/VW95-CUYC>.

¹²⁶ See Alan B. Krueger, *Where Have All the Workers Gone? An Inquiry into the Decline of the U.S. Labor Force Participation Rate*, Brookings Papers on Econ. Activity Conference Draft (Aug. 26, 2017).

prescription opioids had reached “epidemic levels.”¹²⁷ That year, 16,917 people died from a prescription opioid-related overdose—an increase of more than 20% over the previous three years.¹²⁸ Since then, the national death toll has continued to rise. In 2014, 18,893 people died from a prescription opioid-related overdose.¹²⁹ In 2015, that number increased again to 22,598.¹³⁰ As discussed above, overdose deaths in the United States involving prescription opioids have quadrupled since 1999. CDC data show that over 123,000 people died from prescription opioid overdoses from 2011–2016.¹³¹

178. It was reasonably foreseeable to Manufacturer Defendants that their deceptive, unfair, and false marketing of prescription opioids on and near the Navajo Nation would allow prescription opioids to fall into the hands of addicts and other inappropriate users.

179. It was reasonably foreseeable to Manufacturer Defendants that their deceptive, unfair, and false marketing would cause injuries, including abuse, addiction, overdose, and death. It was also reasonably foreseeable that many of these injuries would be suffered by the Navajo Nation and its citizens, and that the costs of these injuries would be shouldered by the Navajo Nation.

180. Manufacturer Defendants knew or should have known that their continuing efforts to employ deceptive, unfair, and false marketing, despite being previously sanctioned by government agencies for such actions, would contribute to the use and misuse of prescription opioids affecting the Navajo Nation.

¹²⁷ Press Release, CDC, Prescription Painkiller Overdoses at Epidemic Levels (Nov. 1, 2011), https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2011/p1101_flu_pain_killer_overdose.html.

¹²⁸ Li Hui Chen et al., *Drug-Poisoning Deaths Involving Opioid Analgesics: United States, 1999–2011*, 166 Nat'l Ctr. for Health Statistics Data Brief (Sept. 2014), <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db166.pdf>.

¹²⁹ Rose A. Rudd et al., *Increases in Drug and Opioid-Involved Overdose Deaths—United States, 2010–2015*, 65 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 1445 (Dec. 30, 2016), <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/wr/mm655051e1.htm>.

¹³⁰ *Id.*

¹³¹ CDC, Wide-ranging Online Data for Epidemiologic Research (WONDER), <http://wonder.cdc.gov>.

181. Manufacturer Defendants knew or should have known that a substantial amount of the prescription opioids dispensed on and near the Navajo Nation were being dispensed as a result of their deceptive, unfair, and false marketing. It was foreseeable that the increased number of prescriptions for opioids resulting from Manufacturer Defendants' deceptive, unfair, and false marketing would cause harm to individual pharmacy customers, third parties, and the Navajo Nation.

182. Manufacturer Defendants made substantial profits over the years based on the deceptive, unfair, and false marketing of prescription opioids on and near the Navajo Nation. Their participation and cooperation in a common enterprise has foreseeably caused injuries to the citizens of the Navajo Nation and financial damages to the Navajo Nation. Manufacturer Defendants knew or should have known that the Navajo Nation would be unjustly forced to bear the costs of these injuries and damages.

183. Manufacturer Defendants' deceptive, unfair, and false marketing of prescription opioids to the Navajo Nation showed a reckless disregard for the safety of the Navajo Nation and its citizens. Their conduct poses a continuing threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

B. Distributor Defendants' Misconduct has Injured and Continues to Injure the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens

184. It was reasonably foreseeable to Distributor Defendants that their violations of their duties under New Mexico and Federal laws and regulations would allow prescription opioids to be diverted into illegitimate channels for non-medical uses.

185. It was reasonably foreseeable to Distributor Defendants that their failure to prevent diversion would cause injuries, including addiction, overdose, and death. It was also

reasonably foreseeable that many of these injuries would be suffered by the Navajo Nation and its citizens, and that the costs of these injuries would be shouldered by the Navajo Nation.

186. Distributor Defendants knew or should have known that the prescription opioids being diverted from their supply chains would contribute to the opioid abuse on or near the Navajo Nation and among the Navajo Nation's citizens, and would create access to prescription opioids by unauthorized users, which, in turn, would perpetuate the cycle of addiction, demand, and illegal transactions.

187. Distributor Defendants knew or should have known that a substantial amount of the prescription opioids dispensed on and near the Navajo Nation were being dispensed based on invalid or suspicious prescriptions. It was foreseeable that filling suspicious orders for prescription opioids would harm the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

188. Distributor Defendants were aware of widespread prescription opioid abuse on and near the Navajo Nation, but they nevertheless persisted in a pattern of distributing commonly-abused and diverted opioids in geographic areas—and in such quantities, and with such frequency—that they knew or should have known these commonly-abused controlled substances were not being prescribed and consumed for legitimate medical purposes.

189. The use of prescription opioids by Navajo Nation citizens who were addicted or who did not have a medically necessary purpose for using opioids could not have occurred without the actions of Distributor Defendants. If Distributor Defendants had guarded against diversion as required by New Mexico and Federal law, the Navajo Nation and its citizens would have avoided significant injury.

190. Distributor Defendants made substantial profits based on the illegal diversion of prescription opioids on and near the Navajo Nation. Distributor Defendants' participation and

cooperation in a common enterprise has foreseeably caused injuries to Navajo Nation citizens and financial damages to the Navajo Nation. Distributor Defendants knew or should have known that the Navajo Nation would be unjustly forced to bear the costs of these injuries.

191. Distributor Defendants' distribution of excessive amounts of prescription opioids to the Navajo Nation showed a reckless disregard for the safety of the Navajo Nation and its citizens. Their conduct poses a continuing threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

192. At all relevant times, Distributor Defendants engaged in these activities, and continue to do so, knowing that the Navajo Nation in its role of providing protection and care for its citizens, would have to provide or pay for additional costs to its healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system, and would also have to bear the loss of substantial economic productivity.

193. It was reasonably foreseeable to Distributor Defendants that the Navajo Nation would be forced to bear substantial expenses as a result of Distributor Defendants' acts.

194. The conduct of Distributor Defendants, their agents, and their employees was, at the very least, negligent.

C. Pharmacy Defendants' Misconduct Has Injured and Continues to Injure the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens

195. It was reasonably foreseeable to Pharmacy Defendants that filling invalid or suspicious prescriptions for opioids would cause harm to the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

196. It was reasonably foreseeable to Pharmacy Defendants that their failure to prevent diversion would cause injuries, including addiction, overdose, and death. It was also reasonably foreseeable that many of these injuries would be suffered by the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

197. Pharmacy Defendants were aware of widespread prescription opioid abuse on and near the Navajo Nation, but nevertheless persisted in filling invalid or suspicious prescriptions for opioids and failed to address this misconduct.

198. The use of prescription opioids by Navajo Nation citizens who were addicted or who did not have a medically necessary purpose could not have occurred without the actions of Pharmacy Defendants. If Pharmacy Defendants had guarded against diversion, the Navajo Nation and its citizens would have avoided significant injury.

199. Pharmacy Defendants made substantial profits from the diversion of prescription opioids on and near the Navajo Nation. Their participation and cooperation in a common enterprise has foreseeably caused injuries to Navajo Nation citizens and financial damages to the Navajo Nation. Pharmacy Defendants knew or should have known that the Navajo Nation would be unjustly forced to bear the costs of these injuries.

200. At all relevant times, Pharmacy Defendants have engaged in improper dispensing practices, and continue to do so, despite knowing they could take measures to eliminate them in substantial part.

201. At all relevant times, Pharmacy Defendants engaged in these activities, and continue to do so, knowing that the Navajo Nation, in its role of providing protection and care for its citizens, would have to provide or pay for additional costs to its healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system, and would also have to bear the loss of substantial economic productivity.

202. It was reasonably foreseeable to Pharmacy Defendants that the Navajo Nation would be forced to bear substantial expenses as a result of Pharmacy Defendants' acts.

203. The conduct of Pharmacy Defendants, their agents, and their employees is, at the very least, negligent.

D. Defendants' Misconduct Has Damaged the Navajo Nation and Its Citizens

204. Defendants' misleading marketing and failure to prevent prescription opioid diversion on and near the Navajo Nation damaged the Navajo Nation. Defendants' misconduct has contributed to a range of social problems. On information and belief, adverse social outcomes include child neglect, family dysfunction, babies born addicted to opioids, poverty, unemployment, and social despair. As a result, a significant amount of the Navajo Nation's resources are devoted to addiction-related problems. Meanwhile, the prescription opioid crisis diminishes the Navajo Nation's available workforce, decreases productivity, increases poverty, and consequently requires greater expenditures by the Navajo Nation.

COUNT I
LANHAM ACT
(15 U.S.C. § 1125)
(Against All Defendants)

205. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

206. The Lanham Act provides, in pertinent part:

(1) Any person who, on or in connection with any goods or services...uses in commerce any . . . false or misleading description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact, which –

(B) in commercial advertising or promotion, misrepresents the nature, characteristics [or] qualities . . . of his or her or another person's goods, services, or commercial activities, shall be liable in a civil action by any person who believes that he or she is or is likely to be damaged by such act.

207. As alleged in Paragraphs 1–204 of this Complaint, Defendants, in connection with their manufacture, distribution, and/or sale of prescription opioids, made numerous false or misleading descriptions and representations of fact.

208. These false or misleading descriptions and representations of fact occurred during Defendants' advertising, promotion, and sale of prescription opioids.

209. These false or misleading descriptions and representations of fact misrepresented the nature, characteristics, or qualities of the prescription opioids.

210. Specifically, as described herein, Manufacturer Defendants misrepresented the safety and efficacy of prescription opioids.

211. Distributor and Pharmacy Defendants misleadingly represented that they were taking effective steps to prevent diversion.

212. The Navajo Nation was damaged by Defendants' false or misleading descriptions and representations of fact.

213. For instance, Manufacturer Defendants' false or misleading descriptions and representations of fact led patients to seek care from doctors and clinics who prescribed high doses of opioids, rather than from the duly authorized entities to which the Navajo Nation has delegated authority to provide healthcare. But for Manufacturer Defendants' false advertising as to the safety of prescription opioids, these patients would have sought alternative, safer forms of treatment offered by the Navajo Nation's hospitals and clinics.

214. Similarly, Manufacturer Defendants' false or misleading descriptions and representations of fact led Navajo Nation citizens away from drug treatment services, including those provided by the Navajo Nation. But for Manufacturer Defendants' false advertising as to the safety of prescription opioids and Manufacturer Defendants' claims of "pseudoaddiction," more of the Navajo Nation's citizens would have sought drug treatment services from the clinics and other treatment facilities authorized to operate within or near the Navajo Nation, and would have successfully recovered from opioid addiction.

215. The Manufacturer Defendants engaged in a false and misleading advertising campaign designed to deceive doctors and the public into believing that prescription opioids were safe for the treatment of chronic pain.

216. Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' similarly misrepresented that they actively and effectively were preventing the diversion of prescription opioids.

217. As alleged herein, and incorporated into this count, the Defendants engaged in systemic false and misleading representations and advertising, including via print advertising, promotional materials, and other items designed to reach consumers.

218. The Navajo Nation is entitled to legal and equitable relief, including injunctive relief, disgorgement, and damages in an amount to be determined.

COUNT II
VIOLATION OF NEW MEXICO UNFAIR PRACTICES ACT
(N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 TO -26)
(Against Manufacturer Defendants)

219. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

220. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants violated the New Mexico Unfair Trade Practices Act, N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 to -26, by committing unfair or deceptive trade practices.

221. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants, in the regular course of their trade, has knowingly made false or misleading statements in connection with the sale of prescription opioids. Such statements may have, tended to, and/or did deceive or mislead others. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(D).

222. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants falsely represented that prescription opioids have characteristics, uses, and/or benefits that they do not have. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(D)(5).

223. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants falsely represented that prescription opioids were safe and effective. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(D)(7).

224. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants marketed and/or sold prescription opioids in a manner that deceived or tended to deceive by (a) using exaggeration, innuendo, or ambiguity as to material facts, or (b) failing to state material facts regarding the safety and efficacy of these drugs.

225. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants also committed unconscionable trade practices in connection with the marketing and/or sale of prescription opioids by taking advantage of the Navajo Nation and its citizens to a grossly unfair degree and to their detriment. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(E)(1).

226. By reason of these deceptive acts and/or practices, and these unconscionable acts, the Navajo Nation and its citizens were injured.

COUNT III
VIOLATION OF ARIZONA CONSUMER FRAUD ACT
(A.R.S. §§ 44-1521 TO -1534)
(Against Manufacturer Defendants)

227. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

228. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants violated the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act by using deception, deceptive and unfair acts and practices, and fraud in connection with the marketing and/or sale of prescription opioids. A.R.S. § 44-1522.

229. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants violated the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act in connection with the marketing and/or sale of prescription opioids, by making misrepresentations, or by concealing, suppressing, or omitting material facts with the intent that

others would rely on such misrepresentations, concealments, suppressions, or omissions. A.R.S. § 44-1522.

230. As a consequence and proximate result of such deception, deceptive or unfair acts or practices, fraud, misrepresentations, and concealment, suppression, or omission of material facts, the Navajo Nation has been injured and suffered damages.

231. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants has acted wantonly or recklessly or has engaged in conduct that demonstrates a reckless indifference to the interests of others.

232. By reason of these deceptive acts and/or practices, the Navajo Nation and its citizens were injured.

COUNT IV
VIOLATION OF UTAH CONSUMER SALES PRACTICE ACT
(U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 TO -23)
(Against Manufacturer Defendants)

233. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

234. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants violated the Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act, U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 to -23, by engaging in deceptive acts and/or practices in connection with the marketing and/or sale of prescription opioids.

235. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants engaged in these deceptive acts and/or practices by knowingly or intentionally representing that prescription opioids have characteristics, uses, or benefits that they do not have. U.C.A. § 13-11-4(2)(a).

236. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants falsely represented that prescription opioids were safe and effective. U.C.A. § 13-11-4(2)(b).

237. Each of the Manufacturer Defendants engaged in unconscionable acts in the marketing and/or sale of prescription opioids. U.C.A. § 13-11-5.

238. By reason of these deceptive acts and/or practices, and these unconscionable acts, the Navajo Nation and its citizens were injured.

COUNT V
NUISANCE
(Against Manufacturer Defendants)

239. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

240. Manufacturer Defendants have caused, are causing, and will continue to cause a public nuisance, in that they have committed offenses against the public order and economy of the Navajo Nation by unlawfully marketing prescription opioids through misleading statements in ways that facilitate the sale, distribution, and dispensing of such drugs from premises on or near the Navajo Nation to inappropriate users in the Navajo Nation—including children and people at risk of overdose or suicide.

241. Manufacturer Defendants' activities have unreasonably interfered, are interfering, and will interfere with the common rights of the general public:

- a) to be free from reasonable apprehension of danger to person and property;
- b) to be free from the spread of disease within the community, including the disease of addiction and other diseases associated with widespread illegal prescription opioid use;
- c) to be free from the negative health and safety effects of widespread illegal drug sales on premises on and near the Navajo Nation;
- d) to be free from blights on the community created by areas of illegal drug use and opioid sales;

e) to live or work in a community in which local businesses do not profit from using their premises to sell products that serve the criminal element and foster a secondary market of illegal transactions; and

f) to live or work in a community in which community members are not under the influence of narcotics unless they have a legitimate medical need to use them.

242. Manufacturer Defendants' interference with these public rights has been, is, and will continue to be unreasonable and objectionable because it:

a) has harmed and will continue to harm the public health and public peace of the Navajo Nation;

b) has harmed and will continue to harm the Navajo Nation by increasing crime, and thereby interfering with the rights of the community at large;

c) is proscribed by Federal statutes;

d) is of a continuing nature, and has produced long-lasting effects; and

e) is known to Manufacturer Defendants that their conduct has a significant effect upon the public rights of the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

243. In addition and independently, the Manufacturer Defendants' conduct invades a legally protected interest. Manufacturer Defendants' conduct constitutes an unreasonable, intentional, and substantial interference because, *inter alia*, each Manufacturer Defendant has conducted a fraudulent campaign to misrepresent knowingly the safety and efficacy of prescription opioid drugs and to ensure their widespread use for chronic pain.

244. Because Manufacturer Defendants have marketed and sold prescription opioids in a manner contrary to law and because Manufacturer Defendants' conduct has unreasonably,

intentionally, and substantially interfered with a right common to the general public, Manufacturer Defendants are liable for public nuisance.

245. The nuisance has affected the Navajo Nation community in that it has undermined, is undermining, and will continue to undermine the Navajo Nation citizens' public health, quality of life, and safety. It has resulted in severe problems including addiction, overdoses, and dysfunction within the Navajo Nation, its citizens, families, and communities.

246. Public resources have been, are being, and will be consumed in efforts to address prescription opioid abuse, thereby eliminating available resources which could be used to benefit the Navajo Nation.

247. As a direct and proximate result of the nuisance, the Navajo Nation citizens have been injured in their ability to enjoy rights common to the public.

248. As a direct and proximate result of the nuisance, the Navajo Nation has sustained economic harm by spending substantial sums to address the societal harms caused by Manufacturer Defendants' nuisance-causing activity, including costs to the Navajo Nation's healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system.

249. The Navajo Nation has also suffered unique harms of a kind that are different from its citizens at large.

COUNT VI
NEGLIGENCE
(Against Manufacturer Defendants)

250. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

251. Manufacturer Defendants owe a duty to the Navajo Nation to act reasonably under the circumstances.

252. The conduct of Manufacturer Defendants has fallen below the reasonable standard of care. Their negligent acts have included the following:

- a) marketing prescription opioids with misleading statements resulting in oversupply on and near the Navajo Nation of highly addictive prescription opioids;
- b) enhancing the risk of harm from prescription opioids by marketing those drugs with misleading statements and omissions;
- c) inviting criminal activity into the Navajo Nation by marketing prescription opioids in violation of New Mexico and Federal laws;
- d) failing to adhere to all applicable laws and regulations pertaining to the marketing of prescription opioids;
- e) failing to train or investigate their employees properly; and
- f) failing to provide adequate safeguards against misleading marketing.

253. Manufacturer Defendants had a responsibility to exercise reasonable care in marketing prescription opioids.

254. Manufacturer Defendants marketed prescription opioids using misleading statements and omissions knowing that (a) there was a substantial likelihood this marketing would lead to sales for illicit or non-medical purposes, and (b) opioids are inherently dangerous when used for chronic pain and non-medical purposes.

255. Manufacturer Defendants were negligent or reckless in not acquiring or not utilizing special knowledge and special skills that relate to the dangerous activity of selling prescription opioids in order to prevent or ameliorate such distinctive and significant dangers.

256. Manufacturer Defendants breached their duty to exercise the degree of care commensurate with the dangers involved in marketing and introducing into commerce dangerous controlled substances.

257. Manufacturer Defendants were also negligent or reckless in voluntarily undertaking duties to the Navajo Nation that they breached. Manufacturer Defendants, through their affirmative statements regarding protecting consumers, undertook duties to take all reasonable precautions to avoid misleading marketing statements.

258. Manufacturer Defendants' conduct was the cause-in-fact and proximate cause of injuries and damages to the Navajo Nation, including but not limited to the following: increased costs for its healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system, as well as the cost of lost productivity, and additional damages to be proven at trial.

259. The Navajo Nation is without fault, and its injuries would not have happened had Manufacturer Defendants used due care.

260. The reckless, wanton, and reprehensible nature of Manufacturer Defendants' conduct entitles the Navajo Nation to an award of punitive damages and attorneys' fees and costs.

COUNT VII
UNJUST ENRICHMENT
(Against Manufacturer Defendants)

261. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

262. The Navajo Nation has expended substantial amounts of money in an effort to remedy or mitigate the societal harms caused by Manufacturer Defendants' misleading statements.

263. These expenditures by the Navajo Nation have added to Manufacturer Defendants' wealth and have helped sustain Manufacturer Defendants' businesses.

264. In this way, the Navajo Nation has conferred a benefit upon Manufacturer Defendants by paying for what may be called their externalities—the costs of the harm caused by their misleading statements and omissions.

265. In this way, the Navajo Nation has conferred a benefit upon Manufacturer Defendants.

266. Manufacturer Defendants made substantial profits while fueling prescription opioid abuse on and near the Navajo Nation. Manufacturer Defendants continue to receive considerable profits from the sale of controlled substances on and near the Navajo Nation. Manufacturer Defendants are aware of these obvious benefits, and retention of these benefits is unjust. Manufacturer Defendants have been unjustly enriched by these benefits. It would be inequitable to allow Manufacturer Defendants to retain these benefits.

COUNT VIII
VIOLATION OF NEW MEXICO UNFAIR PRACTICES ACT
(N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 TO -26)
(Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants)

267. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

268. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants violated the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 to -26, by committing unfair or deceptive practices.

269. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants, in the regular course of their trade, have knowingly made false or misleading statements in connection with the

distribution and sale of prescription opioids. Such statements may have, tended to, and/or did deceive or mislead others. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(D).

270. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants falsely represented that prescription opioids have characteristics, uses, and/or benefits that they do not have. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(D)(5).

271. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants falsely represented that prescription opioids were safe and effective. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(D)(7).

272. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants distributed, marketed, and/or sold prescription opioids in a manner that deceived or tended to deceive by (a) using exaggeration, innuendo, or ambiguity as to material facts, or (b) failing to state material facts. N.M.S.A. § 57-12-2(D)(14)

273. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants also committed unconscionable trade practices in connection with the distribution, marketing, and/or sale of prescription opioids by taking advantage of the Navajo Nation and its citizens to a grossly unfair degree and to their detriment. N.M.S.A. §57-12-2(E)(1).

274. By reason of these deceptive acts and/or practices, and these unconscionable acts, the Navajo Nation and its citizens were injured.

COUNT IX
VIOLATION OF ARIZONA CONSUMER FRAUD ACT
(A.R.S. §§ 44-1521 TO -1534)
(Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants)

275. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

276. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants violated the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act by using deception, deceptive and unfair acts and practices, and

fraud in connection with the distribution, marketing, and/or sale of prescription opioids. A.R.S. § 44-1522.

277. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants violated the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act in connection with the distribution, marketing, and/or sale of prescription opioids, by making misrepresentations or by concealing, suppressing, or omitting material facts with the intent that others would rely on such misrepresentations, concealments, suppressions, or omissions. A.R.S. § 44-1522.

278. As a consequence and proximate result of such deception, deceptive or unfair acts or practices, fraud, misrepresentations, and concealment, suppression, or omission of material facts, the Navajo Nation and its citizens have been injured and suffered damages.

279. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants has acted wantonly or recklessly or has engaged in conduct that demonstrates a reckless indifference to the interests of others.

280. By reason of these deceptive acts and/or practices, the Navajo Nation and its citizens were injured.

COUNT X
VIOLATION OF UTAH CONSUMER SALES PRACTICE ACT
(U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 TO -23)
(Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants)

281. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

282. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants violated the Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act, U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 to -23, by engaging in deceptive acts and/or practices in connection with the marketing and/or sale of prescription opioids.

283. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants engaged in these deceptive acts and/or practices by knowingly or intentionally representing that prescription opioids have characteristics, uses, or benefits that they do not have. U.C.A. § 13-11-4(2)(a).

284. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants falsely represented that prescription opioids were safe and effective. U.C.A. § 13-11-4(2)(b).

285. Each of the Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants engaged in unconscionable acts in the marketing and/or sale of prescription opioids. U.C.A. § 13-11-5.

286. By reason of these deceptive acts and/or practices, and these unconscionable acts, the Navajo Nation and its citizens were injured.

COUNT XI
NUISANCE

(Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants)

287. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

288. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants have caused, are causing, and will continue to cause a public nuisance, in that they have committed offenses against the public order and economy of the Navajo Nation by unlawfully:

a) facilitating the diversion of prescription opioids by selling, distributing, or dispensing, or facilitating the sale, distribution, or dispensing of, such drugs from premises on and near the Navajo Nation to unauthorized users—including children and people at risk of overdose or suicide;

b) failing to implement effective controls to guard against theft, diversion, and misuse of controlled substances from legal supply chains;

c) failing to design and operate an adequate system to detect, halt, and report suspicious orders of controlled substances; and

- d) using property for repeated unlawful sales of controlled substances.

289. Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' activities have unreasonably interfered, are interfering, and will interfere with the common rights of the public:

- a) to be free from reasonable apprehension of danger to person and property;
- b) to be free from the spread of disease within the community, including the disease of addiction and other diseases associated with widespread illegal prescription opioid use;

- c) to be free from the negative health and safety effects of widespread illegal drug sales on premises on and near the Navajo Nation;

- d) to be free from blights on the community created by areas of illegal drug use and opioid sales;

- e) to live or work in a community in which local businesses do not profit from using their premises to sell products that serve the criminal element and foster a secondary market of illegal transactions; and

- f) to live or work in a community in which community members are not under the influence of narcotics unless they have a legitimate medical need to use them.

290. Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' interference with these public rights has been, is, and will continue to be unreasonable and objectionable because it:

- a) has harmed and will continue to harm the public health and public peace of the Navajo Nation;

- b) has harmed and will continue to harm the Navajo Nation and its citizens, thereby interfering with the rights of the community at large;

- c) is proscribed by Federal laws and regulations;

d) is of a continuing nature, and has produced long-lasting effects; and

e) is known to Distributor and Pharmacy Defendants that their conduct has a significant effect upon the public rights of the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

291. In addition and independently, the Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' conduct invades a legally protected interest. Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' conduct constitutes an unreasonable, intentional, and substantial interference because, *inter alia*, Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants have permitted dangerous drugs under their control to be diverted for illicit purposes such as to injure the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

292. Because Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants have marketed and sold prescription opioids in a manner contrary to law and because Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' conduct has unreasonably, intentionally, and substantially interfered with a right common to the general public, Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants are liable for public nuisance.

293. The nuisance has affected the Navajo community in that it has undermined, is undermining, and will continue to undermine the Navajo Nation's citizens' public health, quality of life, and safety. It has resulted in severe problems including high rates of addiction, overdoses, and dysfunction within the Navajo Nation, and among the Navajo Nation's citizenry.

294. As detailed above, public resources have been, are, and will continue to be consumed in efforts to address prescription opioid use and abuse, thereby eliminating available resources which could be used to benefit the Navajo Nation public at large.

295. At all times, Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants had the obligation and the ability to control the sale, distribution, or dispensing of prescription opioids in or near the

Navajo Nation. Distributor Defendants had the power to shut off the supply of illicit opioids into the Navajo Nation, and Pharmacy Defendants had the power to prevent the sale of prescription opioids for non-medical purposes on and near the Navajo Nation.

296. As a direct and proximate result of the nuisance, Navajo Nation citizens have been injured in their ability to enjoy rights common to the general public.

297. As a direct and proximate result of the nuisance, the Navajo Nation has sustained economic harm by spending substantial sums trying to fix the societal harms caused by Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' nuisance-causing activity, including costs to the Navajo Nation's healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system.

COUNT XII
NEGLIGENCE

(Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants)

298. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

299. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants owe a duty to act reasonably under the circumstances.

300. The conduct of Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants fell below the reasonable standard of care. Their negligent acts include the following:

- a) oversupplying the market on and near the Navajo Nation with highly-addictive prescription opioids;
- b) using unsafe distribution and dispensing practices;
- c) enhancing the risk of harm from prescription opioids by failing to act as a last line of defense against diversion;

- d) inviting criminal activity into the Navajo Nation by disregarding precautionary measures built into Federal and New Mexico laws and regulations;
- e) failing to adhere to all applicable laws and regulations pertaining to the distribution and sale of prescription opioids;
- f) failing to train or investigate their employees properly;
- g) failing to review prescription orders for red flags;
- h) failing to report suspicious orders or refuse to fill them;
- i) failing to provide effective controls and procedures to guard against theft and diversion of controlled substances; and
- j) failing to police the integrity of the supply chain for prescription opioids.

301. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants had a responsibility to control the sale, distribution, or dispensing of prescription opioids.

302. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants sold prescription opioids when they knew or should have known that (a) there was a substantial likelihood that many of the sales were for non-medical purposes, and (b) prescription opioids are inherently dangerous when used for non-medical purposes.

303. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants were negligent or reckless in not acquiring or not utilizing special knowledge and special skills that relate to the dangerous activity of selling prescription opioids in order to prevent or ameliorate such distinctive and significant dangers.

304. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants were also negligent or reckless in failing to guard against foreseeable third-party negligence or misconduct, including that of

negligent or corrupt prescribers, pharmacists, and staff, and criminals who buy and sell prescription opioids for non-medical purposes.

305. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants breached their duty to exercise the degree of care commensurate with the dangers involved in selling dangerous controlled substances.

306. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants were also negligent or reckless in voluntarily undertaking duties to the Navajo Nation that they breached. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants, through their statements to the media, regulators, insurance companies, customers, and the public at large, undertook duties to take all reasonable precautions to prevent drug diversion.

307. Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' conduct was the cause-in-fact and proximate cause of injuries and damages to the Navajo Nation, including but not limited to increased costs for its healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system, as well as the costs of lost productivity and additional damages to be proven at trial.

308. The Navajo Nation is without fault, and the injuries to it would not have happened in the ordinary course of events if Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants had used due care commensurate to the dangers involved in the distribution and dispensing of controlled substances.

309. The reckless, wanton, and reprehensible nature of Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' conduct entitles the Navajo Nation to an award of punitive damages and attorneys' fees and costs.

COUNT XIII
UNJUST ENRICHMENT
(Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants)

310. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

311. The Navajo Nation has expended substantial amounts of money in an effort to remedy or mitigate the harms caused by Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' conduct.

312. The Navajo Nation's expenditures to support people who use prescription opioids have added to Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' wealth. The expenditures by the Navajo Nation have helped sustain Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' businesses.

313. In this way, the Navajo Nation has conferred a benefit upon Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants, by paying for what may be called Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' externalities—the costs of the harm caused by Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' improper sales, distribution, and dispensing practices.

314. In this way, the Navajo Nation has conferred a benefit upon Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants.

315. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants made substantial profits while fueling the use and abuse of prescription opioids on and near the Navajo Nation.

316. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants continue to receive considerable profits from the sale, distribution, and dispensing of controlled substances on and near the Navajo Nation. Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants are aware of these obvious benefits, which have unjustly enriched Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants, and thus retention of these benefits is not justified under these circumstances.

Indeed, it would be inequitable to allow Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants to retain these benefits.

COUNT XIV
CIVIL CONSPIRACY
(Against All Defendants)

317. The Navajo Nation realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth at length herein.

318. Manufacturer Defendants have engaged, and continue to engage, in a massive marketing campaign to misstate and conceal the risks of treating chronic pain with prescription opioids. Their aggressive marketing campaign enabled Manufacturer Defendants to overcome the longstanding medical consensus that prescription opioids were unsafe for the treatment of chronic pain and resulted in a significant increase in the number of opioids prescribed nationwide.

319. In response to and in conjunction with this increased demand, Distributor Defendants continuously supplied prescription opioids to Pharmacy Defendants, which then dispensed these prescription opioids. These transactions occurred despite Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants having actual or constructive knowledge that they were habitually breaching their common law duties and violating the FCSA.

320. Without Manufacturer Defendants' misrepresentations, which created demand, Distributor Defendants would not have been able to sell to Pharmacy Defendants the increasing number of orders of prescription opioids for non-medical purposes that have found their way to the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

321. Without Distributor Defendants' supply of prescription opioids, Pharmacy Defendants would not have been able to fill the increasing number of orders of prescription opioids for non-medical purposes that have impacted the Navajo Nation and its citizens.

322. Not one of the Defendants would have succeeded in profiting so much from the opioid epidemic without the concerted conduct of the other Defendants.

323. The Defendants agreed with each other to accomplish the unlawful purposes of marketing, selling, distributing, and retailing prescription opioids through violations of law and misrepresentations. The Defendants performed numerous overt acts in furtherance of this conspiracy, including marketing, selling, distributing, and retailing prescription opioids by means of misrepresentations and omissions, violating Federal laws, and turning a blind eye to diversion of prescription opioids.

324. As a result of the concerted action between Manufacturer Defendants, Distributor Defendants, and Pharmacy Defendants, the Navajo Nation and its citizens have suffered damages.

325. Defendants are jointly and severally liable for the results of their concerted efforts.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, the Navajo Nation, prays that this Court enter judgment in its favor against Defendants and:

- a. On Count I (Lanham Act Violation Against All Defendants):
 - i. Enter an order awarding the Navajo Nation its actual damages stemming from Defendants violations of the Lanham Act; and
 - ii. Award the Navajo Nation the costs of bringing this action, investigative costs and fees, attorneys' fees, and such other additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper.
- b. On Count II (Violation of New Mexico Unfair Practices Act Against Manufacturer Defendants):

i. Enter an order that directs Manufacturer Defendants to “cease and desist the[ir] unlawful conduct prospectively,” i.e., cease and desist violating the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 to -26, in connection with the marketing, manufacture, and sale of prescription opioids;

ii. Enter an order awarding the Navajo Nation its actual damages for each and every instance that Manufacturer Defendants, jointly and severally, are found to have breached the provisions of the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, and an order awarding the Navajo Nation three times its actual damages for each and every instance that Manufacturer Defendants, jointly and severally, are found to have willfully breached the provisions of the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, N.M.S.A. § 57-12-10(B);

iii. Award the Navajo Nation such additional relief as may be necessary to remedy Manufacturer Defendants’ violations of the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act; and

iv. Award the Navajo Nation the costs of bringing this action, investigative costs and fees, attorneys’ fees, and such other additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper, in accordance with N.M.S.A. § 57-12-10(C).

c. On Count III (Arizona Consumer Fraud Act Against Manufacturer Defendants):

i. Enter an order that directs Manufacturer Defendants to “cease and desist the[ir] unlawful conduct prospectively,” i.e., cease and desist violating Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, A.R.S. §§ 44-1521–1534, in connection with the marketing, manufacture, and sale of prescription opioids;

ii. Enter an order awarding the Navajo Nation its actual damages for each and every instance that Manufacturer Defendants, jointly and severally, are found to have breached the provisions of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act;

iii. Award the Navajo Nation such additional relief as may be necessary to remedy Manufacturer Defendants' violations of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act; and

iv. Award the Navajo Nation punitive damages in light of the Manufacturer Defendants' conduct that is wanton, reckless, or demonstrates a reckless indifference to the interests of others, which reflects spite and ill-will.

d. On Count IV (Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act Against Manufacturer Defendants):

i. Enter an order that directs Manufacturer Defendants to "cease and desist the[ir] unlawful conduct prospectively," i.e., cease and desist violating the Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act, U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 to -23, in connection with the marketing, manufacture, and sale of prescription opioids;

ii. Enter an order awarding the Navajo Nation its actual damages for each and every instance that Manufacturer Defendants, jointly and severally, are found to have breached the provisions of the Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act;

iii. Award the Navajo Nation such additional relief as may be necessary to remedy Manufacturer Defendants' violations of the Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act; and

iv. Award the Navajo Nation the costs of bringing this action, investigative costs and fees, attorneys' fees, and such other additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper, in accordance with U.C.A. § 13-1-17.5.

e. On Count V (Nuisance Against Manufacturer Defendants):

i. Order Manufacturer Defendants to pay the expenses the Navajo Nation has incurred or will incur in the future to abate fully the nuisance they have caused;

ii. Award the Navajo Nation punitive damages; and

iii. Order such further relief as justice and equity may require.

f. On Count VI (Negligence Against Manufacturer Defendants):

i. Award the Navajo Nation compensatory damages for the substantial costs to the Navajo Nation's healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system, as well as the cost of lost productivity due to Manufacturer Defendants' negligence;

ii. Award the Navajo Nation punitive damages;

iii. Award the Navajo Nation attorneys' fees and costs; and

iv. Order such further relief as justice and equity may require.

g. On Count VII (Unjust Enrichment Against Manufacturer Defendants):

i. Award the Navajo Nation restitution of its costs caused by Manufacturer Defendants' actions, including the costs of addressing Defendants' externalities;

ii. Disgorge Manufacturer Defendants of all amounts they have unjustly obtained; and

iii. Order such further relief as justice and equity may require.

h. On Count VIII (Violation of New Mexico Unfair Practices Act Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants):

i. Enter an order that directs each Distributor Defendant and Pharmacy Defendant to "cease and desist the[ir] unlawful conduct prospectively," i.e., cease and desist violating the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, N.M.S.A. §§ 57-12-1 to -26, in connection with the marketing and sale of prescription opioids;

ii. Enter an order awarding the Navajo Nation its actual damages for each and every instance that each Distributor Defendant and Pharmacy Defendant, jointly and

severally, are found to have breached the provisions of the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, and an order awarding the Navajo Nation three times its actual damages for each and every instance that each Distributor Defendant and Pharmacy Defendant, jointly and severally, are found to have willfully breached the provisions of the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, N.M.S.A. § 57-12-10(B);

iii. Award the Navajo Nation such additional relief as may be necessary to remedy Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' violations of the New Mexico Unfair Practices Act; and

iv. Award the Navajo Nation the costs of bringing this action, investigative costs and fees, attorneys' fees, and such other additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper, in accordance with N.M.S.A. § 57-12-10(C).

i. On Count IX (Violation of Arizona Consumer Fraud Act Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants),

i. Enter an order that directs each Distributor Defendant and Pharmacy Defendant to "cease and desist the[ir] unlawful conduct prospectively," i.e., cease and desist violating the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, A.R.S. §§ 44-1521–1534, in connection with the marketing and sale of prescription opioids;

ii. Enter an order awarding the Navajo Nation its actual damages for each and every instance that each Distributor Defendant and Pharmacy Defendant, jointly and severally, are found to have breached the provisions of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act;

iii. Award the Navajo Nation such additional relief as may be necessary to remedy Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' violations of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act; and

iv. Award the Navajo Nation punitive damages in light of the Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' wanton and reckless conduct, which reflects spite and ill-will.

j. On Count X (Violation of Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants):

i. Enter an order that directs each Distributor Defendant and Pharmacy Defendant to "cease and desist the[ir] unlawful conduct prospectively," i.e., cease and desist violating the Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act, U.C.A. §§ 13-1-1 to -23, in connection with the marketing and sale of prescription opioids;

ii. Enter an order awarding the Navajo Nation its actual damages for each and every instance that each Distributor Defendant and Pharmacy Defendant, jointly and severally, are found to have breached the provisions of the Utah Consumer Sales Practice Act;

iii. Award the Navajo Nation such additional relief as may be necessary to remedy Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' violations of the Utah Consumer Sales Practice; and

iv. Award the Navajo Nation the costs of bringing this action, investigative costs and fees, attorneys' fees, and such other additional relief as the Court may determine to be just and proper, in accordance with U.C.A. § 13-1-17.5.

k. On Count XI (Nuisance Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants):

i. Order Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants to pay the expenses the Navajo Nation has incurred or will incur in the future to abate fully the nuisance they have caused;

- ii. Award the Navajo Nation punitive damages; and
- iii. Order such further relief as justice and equity may require.

l. On Count XII (Negligence Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants):

i. Award the Navajo Nation compensatory damages for the substantial costs to the Navajo Nation's healthcare system, social services program, welfare program, and education system, as well as the cost of lost productivity due to Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' negligence;

- ii. Award the Navajo Nation punitive damages;
- iii. Award the Navajo Nation attorneys' fees and costs; and
- iv. Order such further relief as justice and equity may require.

m. On Count XIII (Unjust Enrichment Against Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants):

i. Award the Navajo Nation restitution of its costs caused by Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' actions, including the costs of addressing Distributor Defendants' and Pharmacy Defendants' externalities and the costs of prescription opioids paid for by the Navajo Nation;

ii. Disgorge Distributor Defendants and Pharmacy Defendants of all amounts they have unjustly obtained; and

- iii. Order such further relief as justice and equity may require.

n. On Count XIV (Civil Conspiracy Against All Defendants):

i. Award the Navajo Nation compensatory and punitive damages for the conspiracy in which Manufacturer Defendants, Distributor Defendants, and Pharmacy Defendants engaged; and

ii. Order such further relief as justice and equity may require.

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

The Navajo Nation respectfully requests that all issues presented by its above Complaint be tried by a jury, with the exception of those issues that, by law, must be tried before the Court.

Date: April 11, 2018

OF COUNSEL:

Scott D. Gilbert
Richard Shore
Mark A. Packman
Michael B. Rush
Jenna A. Hudson
GILBERT LLP
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
gilberts@gotofirm.com
shorer@gotofirm.com
packmanm@gotofirm.com
rushm@gotofirm.com
hudsonj@gotofirm.com

Richard W. Fields
FIELDS PLLC
1700 K Street, NW
Suite 810
Washington, DC 20006
fields@fieldslawpllc.com

Lloyd B. Miller
Donald J. Simon
Whitney A. Leonard
SONOSKY CHAMBERS SACHSE
ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP
1425 K. Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
lloyd@sonosky.net
dsimon@sonosky.net
whitney@sonosky.net

/s/ David C. Mielke

David C. Mielke, NM Bar # 9723
SONOSKY CHAMBERS SACHSE
MIELKE & BROWNELL, LLP
600 Marquette Avenue NW, Suite 660
Albuquerque, NM 87102
dmielke@abqsonosky.com

Attorney General Ethel B. Branch
Assistant Attorney General Paul Spruhan
NAVAJO NATION
P.O. Box 2010
Window Rock, AZ 86515
(928) 871-6343
ebranch@nndoj.org
pspruhan@nndoj.org

Attorneys for the Navajo Nation