IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Abingdon Division

-----x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v. : 1:07CR29

PURDUE FREDERICK COMPANY, et al., :

Defendant. : Abingdon, Virginia

: July 20, 2007

-----x 1:00 p.m.

SENTENCING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES P. JONES CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

S. RANDALL RAMSEYER, Esquire
RICK A. MOUNTCASTLE, Esquire
Assistant U.S. Attorneys
180 West Main Street, Room 104
Abingdon, Virginia 24210
For the United States of America.

HOWARD M. SHAPIRO, Esquire
KIMBERLY A. PARKER, Esquire
WilmerHale
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20006
Counsel for the Defendant Purdue Frederick.

Proceedings recorded by Stenography, transcript produced by computer.

BRIDGET A. DICKERT
UNITED STATES COURT REPORTER
180 WEST MAIN STREET, ROOM 104
ABINGDON, VIRGINIA 24210
(276) 628-5115

1	APPEARANCES (cont.):
2	MARK F. POMERANTZ, Esquire
3	Paul, Weiss, Rifkin, Wharton & Garrison 1285 Avenue of the Americas
4	New York, New York 10019 Counsel for the Defendant Friedman.
5	
6	MARYJO WHITE, Esquire Debevoise & Plimpton
7	919 Third Avenue New York, New York 10022
8	Counsel for the Defendant Udell.
9	
10	ANDREW GOOD, Esquire Good & Cormier
11	83 Atlantic Avenue Boston, Massachusetts 02110
12	Counsel for the Defendant Goldenheim.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	
-	

1 (Proceedings commenced at 1:00 p.m.) 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and 3 gentlemen. The clerk will call the case. THE CLERK: United States of America v. The 4 Purdue Federick Company, Incorporated, and others, 5 6 Case Number 1:07CR29. 7 THE COURT: This is the date scheduled for 8 sentencing. I want to first verify from defense 9 counsel that the defendants and their counsel have 10 read and discussed the pre-sentence reports. So, if 11 each counsel would confirm that to me? 12 MR. SHAPIRO: Yes, Your Honor, on behalf of 13 the Purdue Federick Company we have. Thank you. 14 MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, I'm Mark Pomerantz. On behalf of Michael Friedman we have 15 16 received the pre-sentence report. I've reviewed it, 17 I reviewed it with Dr. Friedman, and we have no 18 objections to it. 19 MS. WHITE: Your Honor, Maryjo White for 20 Udell. We also received the pre-sentence report, 21 reviewed it, and we have no objections to it. 2.2 MR. GOOD: Your Honor, my name is Andrew 2.3 Good. I represent Dr. Paul Goldenheim. We've 2.4 received and read the report. 25 THE COURT: Thank you, very much. The

court has previously announced it would allow persons to speak to the court, and a number of people have signed up to speak. And what I'd like to do now is to allow the persons who have signed up to speak, and the process will be as I call their names, if they'll come forward and speak directly to me at the lectern.

2.1

2.3

2.4

A number of people have signed up to speak, and so in order to make sure that everybody gets an opportunity to speak to me, I'm going to ask that you limit your comments to two minutes. I'll ask Mrs. Cook, the clerk, to indicate when that time is up. I'll call these persons in alphabetical order as I have them.

The first person I have is Teresa Ashcraft.

Yes, ma'am, if you'll just come forward. Let me say, also, I have received a number of letters, and many of those who have signed up to speak have also written me, and I have read every letter that has been sent to me. And so I want to make sure everybody understands that.

So, yes, ma'am, Ms. Ashcraft.

MS. ASHCRAFT: I'm a little nervous, Your Honor. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Teresa Ashcraft. I come from a small town in DeBary, Florida. On September 23, 2001 my son,

Robert Lee Ashcraft, Jr. died from an accidental overdose of OxyContin. I refer to it as heroin in a pill. He was only 19 years old. He left behind a brother who was only 16 at the time.

2.1

2.3

2.4

He got his OxyContin because of Purdue's criminal actions. The OxyContin that took my son's life came from a prescription that was given to a mother who must have been so high that she didn't realize that her son was taking her drug into the neighborhood and selling it to the local teens.

All deaths are related to a prescription from somewhere which, in turn, came from the lies that Purdue has told the American people.

The amount of money that Purdue is being asked to pay is pennies. Let us not forget that Purdue has made over \$10,000,000,000 from OxyContin. Let us not forget how over the years Purdue Pharma has bragged on how many lawsuits they have won, how they would say that our children were addicts, that we as parents needed to take the responsibility.

Our children were not addicts; they were just your typical teenagers. Purdue, you knew the truth, you started phony drug awareness programs, so please don't sit there and claim you didn't know.

The actions of Purdue have not only take the,

the life of my son, but the aftermath has slowly taken the life of his little brother. No, it's not from drugs, but it's from the depression and the guilt and the devastation it has caused him and our family. His pain some days is so unbearable it scares me. My husband and I worry every day about each other and our families.

2.1

2.3

2.4

The actions of the three criminals have affected so many lives, and it doesn't go away. We have been given the life sentence due to their lies and their greed.

THE COURT: Thank you, very much, ma'am. Paul and Wanda Begley.

MR. BEGLEY: I want to thank the court for allowing us to do this today. My wife's not going to speak. We're here today to talk about the tragic consequences of addiction through the drug,

OxyContin, which is readily available from drug dealers on almost any street corner in our neighborhood.

We lost our grandson, who was 21 years old, from a drug overdose. I went to his bedroom to wake him, and I couldn't get him awake. We started CPR, called 911. He died at the hospital at 2:00 p.m. on June 8, 2006.

Josh was an outstanding young man, never in trouble. He excelled in sports. He won a football scholarship to the University of Virginia at Wise. He did something that most kids who play football never do. He won the state, all state title in Virginia and Tennessee, because he finished his senior year in Tennessee, and he also won the state shot put championship.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Unfortunately, Josh will never finish college. His dreams will never be realized. They'll go forever unrealized. Your children are special, your grandchildren are special, but when you raise your grandchildren, they're extra special, and we raised Josh from the age of five. So, we used to go to his football games and cheer him on. Now we go to his grave and weep. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Edward Bisch, is it?

MR. BISCH: Thank you, Your Honor. My name is Ed Bisch. The first time I heard the word

OxyContin, my 18 year old honor student son was dead from it after taking it at a party.

I started a website to warn kids about this drug. Soon Purdue contacted me. I told Purdue that a lot of death and addiction stories I am getting

through my website were from patients. Their response was less than one percent of patients get addicted, which was a lie. They also said there was a study where if a patient is not receiving a high enough dose, they will exhibit all symptoms of an addict. All they really need is a higher dose.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

The sales force also used this story on doctors, but they did not even know the whole theory was based on a single patient.

Patients easily wean off OxyContin, I was told.

Another lie. I have met the three criminals before.

I was at the first Congressional hearing on

OxyContin. There it came out that Purdue knew of all
the top prescribing doctors, even those who went off
the charts, when asked at the time that they did not
report these top prescribers they took the Fifth
Amendment.

At a later trial the Purdue lawyer responded to this same question that Purdue was under no legal obligation to report these top prescribers. Where was your moral obligation?

This corporate policy insured millions of pills would reach the streets. By the way, Purdue referred to these doctors as whales, but I call them pill mill doctors.

For these three men to claim it was only a few rogue individuals guilty of crimes is ludicrous. Purdue painted themselves as champions of chronic pain patients. I'm sure you will hear from some today with severe injuries which warrant Oxys, and you'll also hear from so called pain experts who Purdue funds, but the fact was Purdue spent hundreds of millions of dollars on marketing this heroin like drug for moderate pain. Two hundred million, alone, was spent in 2001, the year my son died.

2.3

2.4

In the summer of 2001 OxyContin was front page news, and there was Congressional hearings scheduled for the fall. By the way, Purdue was denying this epidemic existed. I was optimistic something concrete would be done to stop the death and destruction that this epidemic was causing.

Unfortunately, on 9/11/01 everything changed and the OxyContin was no longer a priority, understandably so.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Bisch.

Mr. Bisch? Mr. Bisch, let me interrupt you. I

really want to give everybody a chance. If you'll
just sum up now.

MR. BISCH: On 9/12/01 they sent out company-wide voice mail stating since the terrorists

had taken Oxy out of the headlines, let's get to the top prescribers and push the Oxy. The lies and deceits started at the top and caused to ruin countless lives. Please do not allow this plea bargain to proceed. These criminals deserve jail time.

2.2

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Victor Del Regno.

MR. DEL REGNO: Thank you, Your Honor. I will go to my grave believing with every fiber of my body that my son, Andrew, would be alive today if OxyContin wasn't illegally marketed and misbranded, and therefore made so readily available on the college campuses, in our high schools, and on the streets. And to you, James W. Heins, if you are in the courtroom, you are quoted in today's Providence Journal, today's lead cover story, I quote, "We do not believe that our promotion of OxyContin to health care professionals has resulted in injury to anyone." Yet, Mr. Heins, in the Roanoke Times there's a quote that Purdue top three officers pleaded guilty to charges of over promoting OxyContin.

Our son was a great kid. He was in college. He was at St. Michael's College. He was a junior. We were close, we're a close family. He was planning on

going to Italy for his spring semester, Your Honor. We spoke to him the night before he died. Everything was fine. He went out with some friends. He made a mistake, we know that. He took OxyContin with some alcohol. He didn't wake up.

2.3

2.4

When the State Policeman came to our house the next morning he said, "Your son had died." I said, "What? No, not Andrew. Car accident?" They said, "No, drug overdose." So, when they talk about these kids and make these statements that they make bad decisions because they're bad people, I think they better evaluate a little further. We told him we loved him before he died and thank God we had that.

I would like to ask Mr. Friedman, Mr. Udell and Mr. Goldenheim what if it was your son or daughter you saw in the morgue when we went there and he was autopsied, sliced and diced? Then what would they do if they were confronted by donor people with just minutes to make a decision, they wanted his skin and his bones. Well, we had him skinned, and he was cremated. I know you received the letter, so I won't go over with it. I would, with the court's permission, just one paragraph that a detective wrote after 15 months.

THE COURT: All right. You may read that.

MR. DEL REGNO: "I began this investigation not knowing anything about Andrew. Now that the investigation has concluded I feel in a way I have come to know Andrew quite well, and know what kind of person he was. I found that he comes from a very supportive and caring family who loved him dearly. I found that every person he came into contact with he touched in some way. I found that those who had the pleasure of knowing him knew that he was caring and committed to his friends and family. He was someone that if you met just once you would always remember."

Closing comment. Oh, yes, our son did make a bad decision by his own choice, and it cost him his

2.2

2.3

2.4

bad decision by his own choice, and it cost him his life. What should it really cost each of you for your bad decisions and choices? I know if the roles were reversed, Your Honor, and those three men were standing where I am right now, and it was their loved one who had died from fraudulent marketing of a lethal drug, they, you, those men would want more punishment than a company check being written to pay a fine. You would want true justice to be served.

THE COURT: Peter Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Your Honor, for the opportunity to address the court in this proceeding. My name is Peter W. Jackson, and my wife

and I reside in Arlington Heights, Illinois where we have raised one boy and one girl.

2.2

2.3

2.4

On August 18, 2006 our daughter, Emily, only 18 years of age, three days from her first day in college, was killed accidentally when she consumed OxyContin that had been prescribed for a relative.

Emily was not an experienced drug user, and all it took was one encounter with this drug. She had no chance to learn from this one time experience. Had she any idea how deadly this heroin-like drug was, she would still be alive.

Emily's tragedy can be traced to the aggressive and dishonest marketing campaign of Purdue Pharma that began when the drug was first put on the market in 1996.

Purdue chose to expand the use of OxyContin for profit, in spite of possessing the knowledge that OxyContin was prone to abuse, addiction and death.

Given its widespread distribution in the years that followed, and the resultant ready access to the drug, teenagers across the country soon became aware of the drug's heroin-like high and how to circumvent the time release mechanism. Oxys became a household word in the vernacular of our young people, who too often make the assumption that any drug that has been

FDA approved and prescribed by a doctor is safe.

They have no idea how lethal this drug is. Purdue

Pharma knew.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

In light of the plea agreement for the three executives for Purdue Pharma, brings me to ask this question: Why does a person in this country who gives someone, by giving them OxyContin in prison would get off under the plea agreements by simply paying the fine for what was an intentional crime that resulted in, directly and indirectly, in thousands of deaths and addictions?

I would like to close by telling you a few things about our daughter, and I'll make it short. She was a bright, funny, artistic, loving friendly, compassionate person who cared more about the people around her than herself. She suffered from thyroid cancer and went through three major surgeries in her last four years of life. Nonetheless, she supported the people around her who she cared more about. Her sweet disposition gave meaning and life to family and friends. We could not be more proud of our daughter.

The three executives of Purdue Pharma who are defendants in this proceeding deserve to be punished severely for what they have done. They marketed this drug to the American public as though it was safe.

And they knew better. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Larry Golbom.

3 MR. GOLBOM: Thank you, sir. Larry Golbom.

4 Many people in this courtroom have lost their loved

5 ones because of OxyContin being implicated in their

6 | lives. My wife and I grieve for these families. It

7 | appears our son may have the same, may have a

8 | terminal illness of addiction which started with

9 | oxycodone.

1

2

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Before these three men started peddling oxycodone in 1995 few people had heard of it. My wife and I will never know if our lives would be different if the actions of those three men would have been different.

Sir, I know you have seen a diagram of OxyContin and heroin. I sent it to you. Sir, if it quacks like a duck it is a duck. If it smells like a skunk, it is a skunk.

Today this venue is not to talk about the personal responsibility of my son and the other children; today is not the venue to talk about the personal responsibility of my wife and I as parents; today is not even the venue to ask why our government has allowed such a dangerous drug to remain on the market; today I am here to talk about the personal

responsibility of the three executives in this courtroom.

2.1

2.3

2.4

You have seen the diagram and proof before you. The three of them were part of a coordinated and ingenious effort to unleash a drug that is chemically similar to heroin. I hope that your actions today will help us stop the lies surrounding the drug OxyContin.

As a pharmacist, I can stand before any one of the Purdue experts or attorneys and explain the half truths and mistruths surrounding the drug. It is not a miracle drug as these three executives paid so many people to tell you.

But most importantly, even though this case of misbranding ends in 2001, these executives brazenly continued to market the drug OxyContin aggressively after 2001. The number of so-called experts who have either been paid directly or indirectly by this company to expound upon the virtue of the drug that is addicting and killing thousands is shameful.

The selling and marketing of OxyContin continues today, just not as blatantly and misleadingly as in 2001 and before.

The people who are taking the drugs and expounding the attributes of OxyContin are also

unfortunately possibly addicted to the drug, and at the very least must plead for the drug to prevent violent withdrawal from the effects of oxycodone. That may sound like a callous statement, but the total truth about this drug must be told. Today, sir, you have a chance to save many people. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Gary Harney.

MR. HARNEY: Thank you, Judge. Gary

Harney. I lost my son August 20th. I'm from

Sarasota, Florida, and in Manatee County we lost

about 1,700 that year.

I want to talk about Dr. Frederick -- not
Frederick, Dr. Friedman. Dr. Friedman isn't a
medical doctor. He has his Ph.D. in sales and
marketing. He's an expert in sales, and he's an
expert in marketing. He's a regular P.T. Barnum. He
has got this drug across this country. We in Florida
are swamped with it. Lives are being destroyed. And
as the person in front of me so eloquently said, they
have not stopped their marketing of the way it was.
They're still marketing it.

This trial is nothing more than a play on chess.

It's just another move. They haven't changed a

thing. They're working it just as hard as ever.

They're going to take money out of the checkbook, pay it, keep going.

2.2

2.3

2.4

We're having deaths every day down there in Florida. Three a day on just Oxy, five a day on prescription drugs. I kind of wish it was manatees washing up on the beach because maybe we'd get a lot more attention. But that amount of people that are dying, the sheer numbers show a total back of responsibility from that company, and I hope they never have to feel that type of pain because it's never ending. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Kenny Keith.

MR. KEITH: Your Honor, I have nothing written down here. I thank you for allowing me to come. I am a blessed person because I am one of the patients who got addicted to OxyContin, who lived through it. I was given it for chronic pain, which I still have. My doctors thought that it was right, and because of the information they had been given.

It took very little time for me to be addicted to this drug because whenever I tried to stop it the withdrawals were worse than the pain that I was having. It took me over two and a half to three years to get off this drug.

I kept getting more from the doctor. The

doctors would give them to me, but I could get more off the street, and it was to match what I needed to take because of the addiction I had.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Your Honor, I had a family, I had a home, I had motorcycles, I had a car. Those are worldly possessions, except for my family, but Your Honor, I lost all of that because I spent every cent of our family's money on it, including my daughter's Christmas money, the last thing that happened. My wife left me and took my daughter, rightly so, because I was a man and I was an animal out of control.

It took me still after that a month or two that I had to do something right, and finally I figured I had nothing to live for, and I just wanted to die.

And I tried to commit suicide because I knew I could not get off the OxyContin without the horrible pain of withdrawals. And if anyone says it's not, they're a liar.

Thank you. One little thing more, sir. I went through a program, drug court in Roanoke, Virginia. I was arrested for the first time, and at 48 years old, and I went through that process, and now I'm clean, and I'm taking non-narcotic medicines for my pain. And you can live through it, but very few do.

Thank you, sir.

2.2

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Lynn Locascio.

MS. LOCASCIO: Thank you, Judge. My name
is Lynn Locascio. I'm from Palm Harbor, Florida. I
should be at work today, but I'm here. My 22 year
old son is a recovering Oxy addict.

Michael Friedman, Howard Udell, Paul Goldenheim, you are responsible for my son's life being trashed. He should be a firefighter right now, and he should be a paramedic right now, and he's not. He had a car accident, he had surgery, he was prescribed OxyContin. When he became addicted the doctor dropped him. The doctor was not educated enough about this.

Gentlemen, you are responsible for a modern day plague. It is killing our children every day. Every day. On Sunday before we made our journey to come up here, we had a reporter come to my house, she did a great story. The next day I went to work, the very first e-mail I got was this: "My son committed suicide on June 23, 2007 from this terrible addiction. He purchased \$800 worth of OxyContin the night before his death from the streets. Kids are getting prescriptions for this drug and selling them for \$50 a pill. I want to know what I can do to get

this off the streets. My son was 24 years old. My only child. He shot himself because he couldn't get off the drugs. He spent \$5,500 in five weeks on these drugs in Pinellas County, Florida."

2.3

2.4

This lady's heart is broken, and will be forever. We refuse to suffer in silence, and to be told our beloved children are not victims. We are parents that placed our children in proper child safety seats, parents that read labels on toys to make sure they were age appropriate, parents that participated in the Just Say No to Drugs campaign -- by the way, mine graduated that with honors and received an award from the Sheriff's Department -- it didn't work ten years later because of your drug.

I could go on and on. I do want to say one thing. I think jail is too good for you guys. I think you should go spend some time in a rehab facility like my son did and watch that. Maybe you'll change your minds. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you ma'am. Leona Nuss.

MS. NUSS: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you for allowing me to be here. My name is Leona Nuss. I live in Palm Coast, Florida. On May 1, the year 2003, my husband and I lost our only child, an 18 year old son named Randall. The cause of his

death was an accidental overdose of OxyContin.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Your Honor, right before this happened to my son he was getting ready to go to college. His college was paid for. Four months after he graduated he had an overdose of this OxyContin. His pre-paid college ended up paying for his funeral.

For me to conceive Randall it took 11 years with the help of modern technology and miracle drugs. How ironic can life be that 18 years later Purdue dumped OxyContin as their miracle drug and it took my son's life.

I feel, I feel that you are illegal drug users, nothing more than a large corporate drug cartel. You created this drug, you promoted it, you pushed it, you lied about it, you even had the ex-mayor of New York City defend it. You have killed and continue to kill our future of tomorrow. You killed my son, and many others, and continue to do so as I speak.

OxyContin has caused addiction, crimes, destruction of families and the ultimate, death. You and your drug, OxyContin, have caused legal genocide in this country. Illegal drug pushers get jail time, and so should you.

Your Honor, please reject the plea agreement.

Money means nothing to them. Let the punishment fit

the crime.

2.3

2.4

And one more thing, Your Honor, this is the remains of my son, Randall. This is from your drug, OxyContin, and here he is in this courtroom, which I thank you, Your Honor, because he was put out of the courtroom in the year 2005 at Karen White's trial against Purdue Pharma. They made my son, in this little jar, Your Honor, leave the courtroom and go out of the building, or they were going to call for a mistrial. And I had wrote in my son's book, "You weren't there in body, but you were there in spirit, and you will return." And here he is. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Robert Palmisano.

MR. PALMISANO: Thank you for letting me speak, Your Honor. My name is Robert Palmisano, and I'm an addict. At least I am now, or I have to say I am when I go to meetings. I'm a recovering addict. I'm 17 months clean.

OxyContin destroyed my life. I was prescribed, and I almost died. I was prescribed the drugs from approximately 19 to 21 years old. I was doctor shopping to get more of the drug once I got addicted because I couldn't get enough. I was taking it for physical pain, emotional pain, and for fun. It

wasn't worth it.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

I got charged with possession and doctor shopping of the drug. I was sentenced to a year in county jail. I was still hooked on the drugs when I got sentenced. I was given no medical treatment in there, and I withdrew for about 45 days. I did not sleep for ten of those days. I was miserable. I wished I had a weapon; I would have killed myself. I would not want to go through that misery again, ever. That's why I am recovering.

I think it would be ridiculous to see a slap on the wrist and a misdemeanor charge in a plea agreement for money. Money can't buy all the lives that were lost, nor the years of my life that I have lost back. They have tons of it. Money doesn't make you a person, and you can't get respect for it, either.

I have no respect for those three executives there at all. It's a cop out, and I would be absolutely appalled to see them walk away with a misdemeanor crime and a fine. That's all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Joanne Peterson.

MS. PETERSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity for our voices to be heard today. My name is Joanne

Peterson, and I'm from Massachusetts. I'm standing to speak for 400 strong in our group in the southern part of Massachusetts. Some of them are here today outside, families who grieve for the sons and daughters, families are, are trying to save their sons and daughters, families who will lose their sons and daughters. It is not over. We all grieve for the losing of the future they were meant to have.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

A tsunami hit our state in 2001 in the form of a little white pill. Thank you. There was no warning, no defense, and it snuffed out lives, destroyed families, and today it continues. Just in the past two weeks two young men and one young woman have been buried, and we've had to deal with that, and it just continues daily. The fourth funeral was today in Massachusetts, and that family today is grieving, and they're in the beginning of the pain that was suffered by the other families you're hearing from. All in their twenties, all gone.

Every Monday I've had a support meeting in Massachusetts, and every Monday there's new heartbroken mothers and fathers coming to our meeting, desperately seeking help for their children.

Some are as young as 15 years old. In 28 communities a year long investigation from death certificates revealed from January, '04 through August of '06, 74 people lost their lives, but the numbers are even higher than that. These are just the reported cases. Shame and stigma prevent families from speaking out about it like myself.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Irresponsible corporate greed led to horrific pain and loss that affects generations to come. It leads to millions in costs. Every one has paid a price for greed.

I'm here in honor of Mikey today, my friend,
Carol's, son. No parent should have to find their
child barely breathing. No parent should have to
bury their child. My son today is a survivor. He
has two years clean. But his life will never be the
same, nor will my family's, my younger children.

To be sentenced to pay pennies for people's lives doesn't fit the crime. We feel you should be sentenced to work in a detox and deal with the families as they are turned away because there are no more beds available because they're all full, or you should have to attend the wakes that I have to attend all the time, and that wouldn't be enough. The price is too high. God love my son, God bless my son, and

God bless my family and ever person in this courtroom. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Julie Rinaldi.

MS. RINALDI: Thank you for letting us speak today. My name is Julie Rinaldi. I'm from Tampa, Florida. I lost my only child, my daughter, Sarah. She was 17. She died June 30, 2006, just a little over a year ago. I'm just here as a mom, a mom that will never be called Grandma, I'll never see my daughter walk down the aisle. I didn't even get to see my daughter graduate high school. She died of an accidental overdose of OxyContin.

We're losing kids in Florida daily. Our drive up here yesterday, we got a phone call, lost another 19 year old girl a couple of days ago due to OxyContin.

I just want to see Purdue Pharma be held accountable for their actions. Nobody is being held responsible for anything these days, and whatever you decide to do I know it will be the right thing. But I just wanted to come here and tell you my story about my daughter. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Marianne Skolek.

25 MS. SKOLEK: Thank you, Your Honor. My

name is Marianne Skolek. I had a beautiful 29 year old daughter named Jill who had the misfortune of being prescribed OxyContin in January, 2002 and being killed in April of 2002. She left behind her son, Brian, who was six years old at the time of her death. Brian is here in the courtroom with me today because he needed to see that bad things do happen to bad people.

2.2

2.3

2.4

My initial research on Purdue Pharma began four and a half years ago, and focused on David Haddox, dentist turned psychiatrist and Senior Medical Director of Purdue Pharma, as well as Robin Hogan, former P.R. spokesman for Purdue Pharma.

Unfortunately they were not charged for their involvement in the criminal activities of OxyContin.

Pain patients from pain societies will speak of the merits of OxyContin and their quality of life being restored. These pain societies throughout the country are funded by Purdue Pharma. Let the pain patient not part of any pain society funded by Purdue Pharma speak about the quality of their life after they become addicted by this less than addictive drug and have to go out on the street and purchase it.

I would like to know why the FDA allowed OxyContin to cause such destruction to victims, why

12 warning letters were sent to the FDA about their marketing of the drug, and to this day they are not required to put addictive or highly addictive on the label of the drug. I just want to know why Attorney General Blumenthal of Connecticut's citizen petition which requests strengthened warnings on the OxyContin label as a result of their investigation has been sitting at the FDA without any action since 2004. I wanted to know how Rudy Giuliani could be hired by Purdue Pharma to play down the abuse of OxyContin and also get paid by the DEA.

2.2

2.3

2.4

I will be working to have Paul (sic) Udell disbarred for his activities, and I will also be working that the three criminals not being able to work in the pharmaceutical industry again because they are criminals who criminally marketed OxyContin. I will accomplish this. Do not doubt me in being successful in achieving this.

I will reach out to any organization that

Mr. Friedman speaks to about having a member of his

family survive the Holocaust, and contact that group

and say to them that Friedman is no better than

Adolph Hitler who killed and destroyed countless

lives; Hitler through death and torture, Friedman

through death and addiction.

I would like to thank U.S. Attorney Brownlee and all that were involved in this long process of proving Purdue Pharma guilty, and these criminals guilty. In particular, I would like to thank a very special person who knows who he is for never letting us down. Her name was Jill Carol Skolek. Purdue will never forget the name Jill Carol Skolek. The criminal activities of Friedman, Udell, Goldenheim, Haddox and Hogan are absolute monsters in every sense of the word. Jill was all about good; they are all about sheer evil.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Edward

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Edward

13 Swain.

2.2

2.3

2.4

MR. SWAIN: Judge Jones, I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you today. My name is Ed Swain. I speak on behalf of myself and my wife, who his a board certified family practitioner, who is now in federal prison incarcerated in Alderson, West Virginia. She prescribed OxyContin before the horrific publicity on the drug. Purdue representatives stressed that OxyContin time release formulation provided -- sir?

THE COURT: Sir, let me interrupt you.

It's a little hard for me to hear you. If you'll speak right up to that microphone, and relax. You

don't need to -- you just tell me your story.

2.1

2.3

2.4

MR. SWAIN: I'm sorry, sir. Purdue represented OxyContin as the ideal drugs for treatment of chronic pain; safe, and effective, and unabusable. They flooded doctors' offices with graphs and charts to prove it, placed full page ads in every medical journal. Purdue reps lied to these physicians when they claimed that OxyContin was specifically formulated to prevent the possibility of abuse. OxyContin's actually the most dangerous drug ever approved for use in the United States.

OxyContin is the only drug ever approved by FDA for the treatment of pain which can kill a normal, healthy adult with just one pill.

Purdue physicians who prescribed this product and the enormity of the crimes correlated directly with the astronomical profits. They did not only sell their souls, but also the souls of thousands of unsuspecting patients who are forever scarred. These crimes committed by them will last for generations.

It's ironic that prosecutors who demanded prison time for physicians who were duped by Purdue and their reps, and their reps misrepresented to those physicians who prescribed OxyContin in good faith, are now asking the court for only a slap on the wrist

for the men who created the whole OxyContin hoax.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Your Honor, we urge you to reject the plea agreement and hold accountable for criminal prosecution these Purdue executives who are men without honor, and are motivated solely by greed.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MR. SWAIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Donnie Trent.

MR. TRENT: Thank you, Your Honor, for letting me speak today. I'm a grateful recovering addict, recovering from OxyContin. I've been in recovery for approximately a year and a half. First time I -- I never will forget the first time I tried OxyContin. I was at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, stationed there. And it's safe to say I was hooked right from the very beginning, the first time I tried it, the whole euphoria, the feeling of it, and everything; and two, I will never forget the first day I went into withdrawals from not having OxyContin in my system, just like it was yesterday. struggled with addiction to OxyContin for a period of five years, in and out of detoxes, trying to get off the drug, and actually went through a treatment center for about ten months before I was able to actually establish some kind of recovery.

I had lost all hope. I had lost all self-respect, all my values. I lost my family's trust, and I was spiritually dead due to the drug OxyContin.

2.3

2.4

But I am grateful to say today that I am in recovery. But, you know, the drug, itself, has changed so many lives, and it's hurt so many people and so many families, and I just can't see that there can be any amount of money or dollar sign that could be compared for the loss. And just probation or community service, I don't see how that can be accountable for their actions, and how they misled doctors and the public.

And also, too, you know, if there is some kind of -- the monies, you would think it would be important for some of the monies that are going to be paid, if they are, would go toward treatment because jails are not the answer to addiction. Treatment is the answer to addiction. And otherwise, I just thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Barbara Van Rooyan.

MS. VAN ROOYAN: Hello, Your Honor. Thank you for allowing me to be here today. My husband and I have come from California to be here today because

my son, Patrick Stuart, had his life cut short at age 24 with just one OxyContin. And you heard previously from a gentleman about a healthy, normal individual losing their life to one OxyContin. My son was another example of that.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

You know from my letter that he was a San Diego State University graduate. He was an artist, and he was a certified personal trainer. What I learned after Patrick's death about OxyContin and Purdue shocked and sickened me, enough that almost every day for a year I wasn't sure I wanted to be alive. But I got up, and two months after Patrick's death I went back to work because, as a college counselor, I knew that I had a platform, a platform for educating others about the dangers of OxyContin, and about the life taking campaign of deception that Purdue Pharma has engaged in.

I told Patrick's story in classrooms, in auditoriums, in meeting rooms and at college fairs. I talked to thousands of people between the ages of 16 and 90. We have a student as old as 90. And because I was a counselor, and because I was willing to talk about Patrick's story, people responded to me with their own tragic OxyContin stories, or those of a friend or relative.

Purdue would like you to believe that those who died or become addicted have only themselves to blame. But here's what I learned firsthand from talking to thousands of students. Many, many, many people were routinely being prescribed OxyContin for minor to moderate pain from minor sports injuries, removal of skin cancers, wisdom teeth, arthritis and bursitis, and I heard that people put their trust in their doctors, and these same doctors put their trust in Purdue Pharma's drug dealers. And I mean drug dealers who were, as they've admitted, lying to the doctors.

1.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

The result of that broken trust has been addiction and/or death. It doesn't take a smart person to figure out where the blame lies. It lies on the shoulders of the people who put a narcotic strong enough to kill with just one pill into hundreds of thousands of medicine cabinets across the nation and the continent. For this they're being fined.

There is no justice that can atone for Patrick's death or all the other deaths. I am here today not just for justice, but to help to protect future victims, and a fine is not enough to insure that protection. The message needs to be sent that money

cannot be made by taking or destroying lives. I don't know what it will take, exactly, to get that message across. I am trusting that you will know the right thing to do. A fine, alone, will not send the message that can prevent future victims.

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Kirk Van Rooyan.

MR. VAN ROOYAN: Your Honor, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. My comments today will be made as a physician, as a consultant to the Medical Board of California. Even though it had no proper clinical data documenting OxyContin's indications and line of toxicity, Purdue's marketing practices purposely violated the essential medical principle of no treatment without a specific scientific diagnosis.

It unconscionably promoted the drug as safe for chronic moderate pain of all types. In fact, targeted physicians with less expertise in pain management. The result was a tremendous volume of legitimately prescribed but improperly directed OxyContin, inevitably followed by substantial diversion and abuse, and substantial reports of adverse side effects, addictions and deaths.

Purdue's response to these highly troubling events

should have been ethical and professional. Instead, it has been a highly organized and financed campaign of deception. In the face of overwhelming documentation to the contrary, Purdue has arrogantly and feloniously maintained the validity of their shotgun approach to chronic pain as a disease unto itself; that the addiction and deaths is due to illicit, not prescription, use of OxyContin.

2.2

2.3

2.4

They claim chemical reformulation is a daunting task and a minor issue, and taking a pill every 12 hours instead of every four somehow eliminates break through pain.

A substantial number, as you've heard today, of the persons harmed by OxyContin were responsible, productive, law abiding individuals who did nothing wrong except trust their physicians or their friends' reassurances that it was a safe prescription drug.

The OxyContin issue is not mutually exclusive. You will hear, undoubtedly, from patients today who have benefitted from the drug. There is an appropriate medical use for the drug, and we here praise the positive outcomes, but only in the proper medical situation. That's an important consideration.

As a medical professional, Your Honor, I am

demeaned and outraged by the disrespect for medical ethics and science so wilfully and repeatedly demonstrated by these men.

2.3

2.4

As a citizen I cannot agree that monetary sanctions without incarceration, parole or community service is a punishment consistent with their crimes. But most important, as a physician committed to the relief of suffering, I am appalled at the harm -- and yes, Mr. Heins, there was harm -- the individual devastation and heartache that these men have perpetrated on so many in this court today, and throughout the country.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Ed Vanicky.

MR. VANICKY: Afternoon, Your Honor. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity this afternoon to address the court.

My wife was involved in an auto accident in January of 2000. Among her injuries she was diagnosed with a herniated disc. After referral to a pain management physician in late February, 2000 she was prescribed OxyContin. A drug as powerful as OxyContin never should have been prescribed for that type of injury. Although she complained about the side effects of the OxyContin, itching and shortness of breath, the doctor convinced her the OxyContin was

necessary for treatment, and subsequently increased her dosage from ten milligrams to 20, and then finally 40 milligrams. He was writing prescriptions for her to take the OxyContin every six to eight hours, and also giving her oxycodone for break through pain.

2.2

2.3

2.4

I woke up to discover my wife unresponsive next to me on the morning of January 27, 2000. After repeated attempts myself using CPR, the emergency technicians failed to resuscitate her. She was pronounced at 5:55 a.m. She had been taking OxyContin as prescribed for five months, and it killed her.

Besides myself she left behind a daughter, two sons and a granddaughter. I found out after her death that this particular pain management physician was one of the doctors initially targeted and referred to as a whale by Purdue.

The emotional pain and suffering I've endured since my wife's sudden death, and continue to struggle with now, will never compare to the pain and suffering my wife endured when she died as a direct result of your drug, OxyContin. If anyone abused anything it was this criminal organization, and these three criminal defendants. They abused the

government's trust for their own monetary gain. They abused the government's trust in an effort to get OxyContin approved for sale. Once they had that approval and OxyContin sales skyrocketed, along with the death toll, they sat in their plush Stamford, Connecticut offices watching the money roll in while wives, husband, fathers and mothers are burying citizens across this country.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

As with all dishonest acts, it all catches up with you. It has caught up with Purdue. Although we are grateful these prayers have been answered, our work is not done. This is a despicable company, and they will be allowed to hawk OxyContin. I can promise them we will continue to speak, and write our elected national and state official, as well as law enforcement on both levels, as well as call for further investigations. Also we will continue to petition the FDA to reclassify OxyContin and tighten its restrictions for use. It should just be prescribed for terminal severe medical conditions, also.

In closing, we appreciate the fact that Purdue Frederick Company will carry its conviction permanently as part of the criminal record, but we also pray that each and every one of these people

will be forever haunted by the victims of their many crimes. When the end comes for each of you and you stand before God to be judged, you better pray that he forgives you because none of us ever will. Thank you, very much.

2.2

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Now, attorney Russell Butler has filed a motion, and Mr. Butler, if you wish to come forward and I will be glad to hear you.

MR. BUTLER: May it please the court, my name is Russell Butler, and I represent the victim Jane Doe. And I thank you for allowing her to maintain her name in privacy.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: But on behalf of my client we have filed a motion under the Crime Victim Rights Act to assert her right as a victim under federal law.

And I think it's clear, Your Honor, from what we've set forth in our motion, and I know that Your Honor does not have a lot of time so I will try to not repeat, but we would ask the court to very carefully look at all the legal arguments, and we believe for those legal arguments the court, at least at this point, should not accept the plea.

I believe that the law is very clear. I think

the defendants have admitted that as a condition of probation this court has the ability to order restitution against other persons. I think there are other provisions of the Code that we've cited that allows it to do that, as well. I don't think there's any doubt under the statute that the statute requires that in order for the corporate defendant, as they've pled guilty, that they have, have intent to deceive the public.

2.3

2.4

There are victims, these people who came before Your Honor in two minutes, or a little more, and I'm sure they're grateful for the court allowing them to have a little additional time, have clearly stated it was the intent to deceive in terms of the misbranding this caused harm to a great number of people, including my client.

Your Honor has her written victim impact statement in her affidavit. I only wish she could be here because she is now currently addicted, and she believes after going through one course of treatment, detoxification she's going to be okay. I'm not sure, after hearing all these people, that that's even going to be true.

Your Honor, we believe that the plea is not in the interests of justice. Is the plea to punish,

protect, deter? I think Purdue Frederick, in response to Blue Cross/Blue Shield said exactly what the purpose of this plea is, and it is to provide significant resources to federal and state governments; \$600,000,000 from the corporate defendant, 34.5 million dollars from the individual defendants, only to have the state and federal government have that money instead of the victims.

2.2

2.3

2.4

We've cited the statute that the court needs to protect the interests of victims and not the monetary sanctions that go to governments.

Your Honor, is there acceptance of responsibility in this case? From my practice, I represented criminal defendants, I talked to my clients about mea culpa and what it meant to talk from the heart and accept responsibility. Your Honor, I think by the pleadings of the corporate defendant and the individual defendants they have clearly not accepted responsibility. They have agreed to pay this money, it's in their corporate interests, it's in their individual interests, but they say there's no victims. Well, if there are no victims then what are they? Casualties of corporate greed? They say bring on the civil suits. These people can't profit. We've got lots of money. This

is only -- the money we're giving is from the proceeds of the periods of information. We have plenty of money for selling OxyContin after that time, and for other medications.

2.2

2.3

2.4

You know, to agree with their argument, the drug laws that our Congress passed would be that they do not protect the citizens, and of course the reason for those drugs laws were to protect these citizens, and all these people and my client have been harmed by the actions of the individual and corporate defendants.

They got tremendous plea offers from the Government, misdemeanor offenses for the individual defendants. You know, I heard these other people say that, you know, this is payment, this is get out of jail money, you know. You can hear the pain of these victims, you can hear in my client's statement her pain of being addicted, and what it was like to try to get off of OxyContin. Clearly, my client has a long row to hoe, but she does not have the money for treatment. She's trying to get her family members to borrow to be able to do this. I can only imagine, unlike a lot of these people that have spoken before you, I am glad that neither I nor my family have had to deal with this drug.

But I will tell you, Your Honor, what rings loud and clear to me is that the severity of the punishment needs to fit the crime. It is a travesty of justice if this court allows these individual defendants not to be on probation. Think of the pain of all these people who are suffering the consequences of OxyContin, and they get off with disgorgement of money that they benefitted as a result of what they somewhat have admitted as their wrongful conduct.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Is this plea fair to my client, Jane Doe? No. She's been harmed by the statute. We have cited the law. It may be fair to the defendants, it may be fair to the Government, the state government, the federal government for the money they get, but that is not the standard of being in the interests of justice.

So, Your Honor, on behalf of my client, we would ask the court not to accept the plea, or modify the plea, at least to the extent that the individual victims of this drug are compensated, and not just the state and federal government entities. And if the court rejects it, this court, a jury will speak and the defendants will have to suffer the consequences of their conviction. If they really do

agree, they would agree to pay, and not, and make it very clear that they plan to litigate, and litigate, and litigate. One can only imagine the millions and billions of dollars they have spent in attorneys' fees, not in this case, but defending all these cases.

2.3

2.4

Mea culpa, Your Honor, says we're wrong, we're sorry for our wrong, we admit that we've harmed people, and we're going to take action and not just make a corporate decision to pay money so that the corporation can go on and that the individual defendants don't go to jail.

I would be happy to address the legal arguments if the court would like, but my understanding is that was not the purpose of this hearing.

THE COURT: Mr. Butler, I have read your memorandum, and your pleadings, and thank you, very much.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Have a good day.

THE COURT: Now, other third parties have filed pleadings in this case by counsel. I know

Mr. Bragg is local counsel. Is there anything else those attorneys wish to say? I take it not. Now, as I am advised the defendant, Purdue, would like to

```
1
    present some witnesses, and I'll be glad to hear
 2
    those persons at this time.
 3
              MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Your Honor. Your
 4
    Honor, Purdue would call for purposes of the
    sentencing hearing Mr. Dillie Walker to the stand,
 5
 6
    please.
 7
              THE COURT: Mr. Walker, if you'd come
    forward and face the clerk and be sworn, please.
 8
 9
          DILLIE WALKER, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN
10
                      DIRECT EXAMINATION
11
    BY MR. SHAPIRO:
12
         Mr. Walker, could you state your name clearly
13
    and spell your last name for the record?
         Dillie R. Walker.
14
15
         Where do you live, sir?
16
         Bay City, Michigan.
17
         How old are you?
18
         I'm 48.
19
         Did you serve in the military, Mr. Walker?
20
         Yes, sir.
21
         And when was that?
22
         From 1976 to 1978.
2.3
         After you were discharged from the military what
2.4
    sort of job did you do?
```

I became a tool and die maker apprentice.

25

- Q How long did you remain in that business?
- 2 | A Until 1991 when I was injured on the job.
- 3 Q Tell us what happened when you were injured on
- 4 \parallel the job?

1

- 5 A I was lifting a hydraulic manifold, and I felt
- 6 \parallel my back begin to hurt, and I went and sat down at the
- 7 | lunch room table and I couldn't get back up. I was
- $8 \parallel \text{taken to Detroit Industrial Clinic.}$ They did x-rays,
- 9 put me off of work. From there I went to my family
- 10 doctor, and then I went to an orthopedic surgeon for
- 11 | evaluation and treatment.
- 12 \parallel Q Did they determine what was wrong, sir?
- 13 A Yeah. I was, I had two bulging discs, sciatic
- 14 | nerve entrapment, and degenerative disc disease.
- 15 \parallel Q And what course of treatment did the doctor
- 16 pursue at that time?
- 17 | A He tried all kinds of different therapies,
- 18 | aquatic, that's in the water, land based back
- 19 | stabilization exercises, medications, all different
- 20 \parallel types of medications, injections, epidural blocks,
- 21 | multitude of injections into my back. And after
- 22 \parallel about eight months he decided I was a candidate for
- 23 \parallel spinal fusion surgery with a lumbar laminectomy.
- 24 \parallel Q Did you, in fact, undergo spinal fusion surgery?
- 25 \parallel A Yes, on 9/29, 1992 I had a spinal fusion surgery

- 1 of the L5-S1, your lower lumbar, and also a lumbar
- 2 | laminectomy, and it failed.
- 3 \parallel Q When you say it failed, sir?
- 4 A The bone graft didn't grow to support my spinal
- 5 cord.
- 6 | Q What condition were you left in?
- $7 \parallel A = I$ was worse than before. I was in constant
- $8 \parallel \text{pain.}$ The pain increased, in fact, and I lost
- 9 mobility.
- 10 \parallel Q Would you say, sir, that the pain was severe?
- 11 | A It was unbearable. I couldn't think about
- 12 \parallel anything but pain.
- 13 \parallel Q What was your life like at that point,
- 14 | Mr. Walker?
- 15 A At that point I was a complete shut in. I spent
- 16 | roughly 23 hours a day in bed. I couldn't walk. I
- 17 | shut myself off from the world, literally, and my
- 18 | family, too. I didn't want my kids to see me like
- 19 \parallel that. I closed my bedroom door and stayed in there.
- 20 Q How long did that last?
- 21 A Well, that was about three years. And then I
- 22 | went to, I enrolled myself into the Veterans
- 23 | Administration Pain Clinic because I was just looking
- 24 | for help anywhere I could find it.
- 25 \parallel Q Did you find help there, sir?

1 Well, they tried, for every two weeks for a year 2 I went, went through more injections in my spinal 3 cord, and that was a very, very painful procedure, out patient procedure, and with no results, and also 4 therapies. Didn't help me. And then my doctor at 5 6 the Veteran's Hospital, I kept complaining to him 7 about stomach aches from the medications I was taking, and he said, "Well, let's try oxycodone or 8 9 OxyContin." And he did, put me on OxyContin, 10 20 milligrams, and my stomach pain stopped hurting, 11 my stomach stopped hurting, I got more mobility back and I felt better for the first time in years. 12 13 very happy. And then what happened? 14 15 Well, in order, at the Veteran's Hospital they 16 want you to continue with the injections, and I had 17 been through a year of injections every two weeks, 18 and I was tired of them sticking needles in my back, 19 so I went to my private neurologist and told him that 20 I had all these injections, they're just aggravating my back more than they're helping it. The one thing 21 22 I did find out at the Veteran's Hospital was this 2.3 OxyContin medicine helped me, it made me feel better, 2.4 it took the pain away, and I got more mobility and I 25 could function on it. And my doctor, knowing all the

- 1 things I've been through said, "You don't have to have no more of these procedures. You've been 3 through enough. I'll give you the OxyContin without being stabbed in the back anymore." That's what he 4 did. He put me on OxyContin. 5 6 Has that treatment worked, sir? 7 Yes, yes. I've been on OxyContin since 1998, 8 and I feel great. I run a business, I help my wife 9 run businesses, I get to spend time with my kids. I
- 10 got 70 percent of my normal life back. Before that I
- 11 was in bed 23, 24 hours a day. But now I'm outside
- 12 | playing catch with my kids, I'm running businesses.
- I feel like I'm a functional, productive person now again. I got my self esteem back.
- 15 | Q Sir, did you get a high from taking OxyContin?
- 16 A I don't get high from it. To me it goes
- 17 straight to my pain. I don't get a buzz like
- 18 everybody says, or a high, or anything like that. It
- 19 goes straight to my pain, lowers my pain level, and
- 20 \parallel allows me to be more functional.
- 21 Q How would you sum up, Mr. Walker, how has
- 22 | OxyContin affected your life?
- 23 \parallel A It's made my life a lot better. I feel bad for
- 24 | anyone that's had bad effects, but I feel a lot
- 25 | better. If I didn't have OxyContin, I couldn't have

```
1
    started two businesses, I couldn't have spent time
 2
    with my son with all the hockey games and baseball
 3
    games. I couldn't do anything, I couldn't be here
    today. I'd be stuck in that room with the door shut.
 4
        Did you travel here today from Michigan so that
 5
 6
    you could give this testimony?
 7
        That's right.
 8
              MR. SHAPIRO: I have nothing further.
 9
              THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shapiro.
10
    Questions?
11
              MR. MOUNTCASTLE: No, Your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step
13
    down.
14
              MR. SHAPIRO: Purdue would call Ms. Joyce
    Walker, Your Honor. My colleague, Ms. Parker, will
15
16
    examine.
17
           JOYCE WALKER, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN
18
                      DIRECT EXAMINATION
19
    BY MS. PARKER:
20
        Good afternoon. Can you state your name,
21
    please, for the court?
22
         Joys Renee Walker.
2.3
         Where do you live, Mrs. Walker?
2.4
         Bay City, Michigan.
    Α
25
         How old are you?
```

- 1 | A Forty-seven.
- 2 | Q Do you know Mr. Walker, who previously
- 3 ∥ testified?
- 4 A Yes, he's my husband.
- 5 Q And how long have you been together?
- 6 \parallel A Twenty-three years.
- 7 Q Did you see first hand how pain affected
- 8 Mr. Walker's life?
- 9 | A When I first started dating him and going out
- 10 | with him he was like macho man, you know, a man, he
- 11 \parallel just loved life and he was good at everything
- 12 | athletic, and a very good husband and father, and
- 13 \parallel everything. And when pain took him over, he was bed
- 14 | ridden, he couldn't do anything. And the pain just
- 15 \parallel took him right over. It was terrible.
- 16 | Q And did that change when he started taking
- 17 | OxyContin?
- 18 A Yup. He got, you know, pretty much better, like
- 19 \parallel he said, about 70 percent better. He was able to
- 20 | function, and do things that he hadn't done in a very
- 21 | long time.
- 22 | Q How did that affect your family?
- 23 | A Before he got on the OxyContin or after?
- 24 Q Yeah.
- 25 \parallel A It was much better than ever. Like he said, he

- was a shut in. He thought he was less of a man. He couldn't do anything. And he hated life. He didn't even want to live no more. But since he's been on OxyContin we've been able to do more normal things.
- 5 He's been, you know, you know, helping me with my
- 6 | business.
- 7 Q Are you a pain patient yourself?
- 8 | A Yes.
- 9 Q Your pain started with polyurethane silicon 10 poisoning?
- 11 | A Yes.
- Q Can you tell the court a little bit about the pain you experienced?
- A I have several, several disabilities, and then I
 was in a car accident, but the pain was so unbearable
 I couldn't stand it myself, you know. I didn't want
 to live. I just, I would go a week without even
 taking a shower, or grooming myself. I didn't want
 to get dressed or move. My kids were, lucky they
- 20 were like ten and up, or around that age, because
- 21 they would have to take care of themselves, and the
- 22 house, and me, and basically their father. He was
- 23 already bad and disabled, and then for me to become
- 24 | the same way, it was like how can I even go on and
- 25 | live like this? I'm looking at him like he is, and

- 1 here I become sick. Life was just totally
 2 devastating. I hated life. I didn't want to go on.
- 3 \parallel Q Were you able to work at that point?
- 4 A No. I couldn't clean the house, or clean
- 5 | myself, or groom myself. There's no way I could work
- 6 or hold a job. No one would hire me, either, I was
- $7 \parallel so bad.$
- 8 \parallel Q Did you try any medicines to treat your pain?
- 9 | A I was on so many medicines I was like in la la
- 10 | land, and just felt like crap. You know what I mean.
- 11 | I had a row of drugs. It was terrible.
- 12 \parallel Q Did any of those medicines work?
- 13 A No. I just, I didn't like any of them. They
- 14 | didn't help me at all. I was a zombie.
- 15 \parallel Q Did you come to try a medicine that did work?
- 16 | A Well, after I had seen how the OxyContin had
- 17 | been helping him, and he was up, and he was given
- 18 back his life, he was like become more of a man
- 19 \parallel again, he was doing things with the family and the
- 20 | kids, and here I'm still laying there feeling like
- 21 \parallel crap, wanting to be like him, and support the family,
- 22 | and get up and move like him, so I was like how can I
- 23 \parallel get that? What can I do to get on OxyContin? When I
- 24 went to the doctors I said, "I want to feel like
- 25 \parallel Dillie feels. I want to participate in life. I want

```
1
    to be a mother, and a wife, and everything again." I
 2
    was given that chance.
 3
    Q How did you feel once you began taking
    OxyContin?
 4
    A I could move, I could groom myself, I would take
 5
 6
    showers, I could feel more like a woman, be with my
 7
    kids, participate in sports. I started two
 8
    businesses since I've been on OxyContin. It's
 9
    wonderful.
10
              MS. PARKER: No further questions, Your
11
    Honor.
12
              THE COURT: Thank you. Questions?
13
              MR. MOUNTCASTLE: No, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You may step
15
    down.
16
              THE WITNESS: I'm very sorry for anybody
17
    else.
18
              THE COURT: Mr. Shapiro, do you have
19
    anything further?
20
              MR. SHAPIRO: One further witness, Your
21
    Honor. Purdue Frederick would call Ms. Katherine
22
    Hamilton.
2.3
       KATHERINE HAMILTON, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN
2.4
                     DIRECT EXAMINATION
25
    BY MR. SHAPIRO:
```

- Q Good afternoon. Could you state your name for the record, please?
- 3 A Katherine Joan Hamilton.
- 4 Q Where do you live, Ms. Hamilton?
 - A I live in Hampton, Virginia.
- 6 Q Are you able to work full time?
- 7 A No, I'm on Social Security disability now. I
- $8 \parallel$ was working before that, though, full time.
- 9 Q And how were you employed when you worked full 10 time?
- 11 A After graduating from college in 1981 I became a
- 12 pharmaceutical sales rep for Burroughs Wellcome. I
- 13 worked for them for a year, then I went to work for
- 14 | another company, Ciba Geigy. The last company I
- 15 | worked for, Searle Pharmaceuticals, which would now
- 16 | be a company, Pfizer, and I had to get off the road
- 17 | in 2001 because of pain problems related to, the
- 18 diagnosis was chronic migraine and complicated
- 19 | migraine with some --
- 20 \parallel Q Let me ask you about that, but before I do just
- 21 | so the record is clear, were you ever employed by
- 22 | Purdue?

5

- 23 \parallel A No. I actually don't know much about Purdue.
- 24 | Q You said you were suffering from migraines. Can
- 25 | you explain that? Is that just a headache?

1 No, that's just, migraine is sort of a misnomer 2 to a lot of people. It means headache, but it means 3 a lot more than that. What I have used to be called classical migraine in the International Headache 4 Society classification. Those terms are kind of old, 5 6 but it's more of a syndrome. It is a headache with 7 nausea and vomiting, and also you can have, like I 8 do, stroke-like symptoms with it, things as, oddly 9 enough, auditory hallucinations, visual problems, 10 gait disturbances, speech problems. It just walks 11 and talks differently than a normal headache, and it 12 doesn't respond typically to normal headache 13 medicine. 14 How frequently would you have those migraines? 15 I've had them since I was a small child. The 16 first one I can recall with any vividness was in 17 1965, and the reason I realize the date is my mother actually took a picture of me in a new dress when I 18 19 came home from school that day, and my father was in 20 Vietnam, and we were sending that picture out to him. 21 It was, I had thrown up on the school bus, and that was my first experience with migraine, and had funny 2.2 2.3 things going on in my head and such. The headache 2.4 was, the headache and the attendant symptoms were 25 episodic through my teenage years. Probably they

```
1
    went from every couple of months to monthly, through
 2
    my twenties. And by the time I was around 30 they
 3
    were coming with increased frequency, about once a
    week. By 2001 they were there daily. My job
 4
    suffered, my ability to do my job suffered. My
 5
 6
    ability, a pharmaceutical rep's job is to
 7
    communicate, and I could not communicate a lot of the
 8
    days.
 9
         Did you seek treatment?
10
         Oh, yeah, yeah. Yes, I did. I saw my family
11
    doctor first, and then saw a local neurologist. I
    was followed by local neurology from 1985, or so, on
12
13
    to present time, and they went through a variety of
14
    medicines, and none of them worked for me, and you're
15
    compliant when you hurt. What I ended up doing was
16
    seeking treatment, seeking help, actually, at the
17
    university level. I went, I went on the internet,
18
    and I looked for researchers.
                                   I found a good
19
    neurologist at SUNY Syracuse. He has retired in the
20
    last year. I was followed by him for three years,
21
    and he transferred me to Columbia University. I see
2.2
    Dr. Ann Remmis (phonetic) at Columbia University.
2.3
         The doctor at the State University New York, how
2.4
    did he treat you?
25
         The local neurologist in Newport News, Virginia
```

```
1
    started me on a small dose of OxyContin. It was
 2
    around, I'm thinking back, it was ten milligrams
 3
    titrated to 20. I was handed over or followed by
    both the local neurologist and local pain management
 4
    people. I was at 30 milligrams of OxyContin at that
 5
 6
    point, and that would have been 2003. And I was
 7
    getting some relief, but I was not really getting
 8
    what I called adequate relief. So I, the doctor at
 9
    SUNY said, "If you're getting some relief, if the
10
    needle is pushing a little bit, let's titrate the
11
    dosage until we see a measure of relief that is
    satisfactory." And that's exactly what we did.
12
13
    just slowly titrated the dose over a year's time.
14
    We, having been on most of the evidence-based
15
    medicines in the past, we, I stayed on a medicine
16
    called Candasartan, but that was, OxyContin was the
17
    mainstay.
18
         Were you able to find a successful, effective
19
    level of relief?
20
         Yes, I was. It's not perfect, it wasn't perfect
21
    but, you know, it provided me with a measure of
2.2
    relief that allowed me to take care of day to day
2.3
    things. It does not affect the auras and the
2.4
    symptoms around migraine like that, but it does
25
    affect the pain, and in a positive way. My problem
```

- became that pharmacies, we were hearing out west
 there were problems with, problems with OxyContin in
 the press, and I just didn't, I chose to get off the
- 4 medicine, and asked my physician for another product
- $5 \parallel \text{because of those problems.}$
- 6 | Q And what other product did you change to?
- 7 | A We changed, we tried three at doses that are
- 8 | equal analgesic, and we first went to MSContin, and
- 9 | then we went, it just didn't seem as, I don't know
- 10 | for me, I guess everyone responds individually to a
- 11 drug, or that's what my physician told me, that even
- 12 | though they're in the same class you can vary in your
- 13 response so we tried Avinza, and then ended up on a
- 14 drug called Kadian. It's a 24 hour drug, it is a C2
- 15 | narcotic.
- 16 Q Schedule II?
- 17 A Yes, it is a Schedule II narcotic.
- 18 | Q All of these that you mentioned are strong,
- 19 | opioid based?
- 20 A Absolutely.
- 21 | Q What would your life be like without strong
- 22 | medicines?
- 23 A I would be in bed most days. And days I was not
- 24 | in bed, I would have headache -- if, if you were
- 25 | talking about a pain, our physicians commonly use a

```
1
    pain scale of one to ten, ten being your worst
 2
    headache. Daily would be around a schedule, I mean a
 3
    pain of four or five, and then it would jump to seven
    or eight, even into the nines, ten being the worst
 4
    pain you have. I mean, compared to surgery, for me
 5
 6
    surgery, I've had some surgeries, and that was
 7
    discomfort. This is pain. And it takes -- what
 8
    these products do, or what they have done for me is
 9
    take care of that pain, and bring it back to a
10
    manageable level, probably a one or two.
                                               I still
11
    have problems with the speech, the other things, but
12
    OxyContin, MSContin, any of those drugs, that's not
13
    an indication for those drugs.
14
         Were you able to safely transition from
15
    OxyContin to these drugs?
16
         Oh, absolutely. What we did was drop back, and
17
    you drop back and then you slowly titrate. If you're
    getting woozy or feeling spaced out, I never got that
18
19
    feeling because we didn't titrate at a, we didn't
20
    just jump, jump, jump, but my physician gave me
21
    parameters, he said, "If you're feeling woozy you're
22
    probably getting too much drug on board. You might
2.3
    feel a little light headed for a day or two, but it
2.4
    shouldn't be a long lasting sensation. And if it is,
25
    we'll drop you back in dosage." So, at this time
```

```
1
    I'm, I'm managing pretty well. I do volunteer work,
 2
    I can travel, probably not the way a lot of people
 3
    would like to travel, I have to take breaks, I have
    to manage my schedule a lot more closely. It's
 4
    planning, planning, and I just -- that's
 5
 6
    the way I have to do things.
 7
              MR. SHAPIRO: Nothing further, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: Any questions?
 9
              MR. MOUNTCASTLE: No, Your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You may step
11
    down.
12
              MR. SHAPIRO: We have nothing further.
13
              THE COURT: As I understand, there's no
14
    further evidence that the parties wish to present?
15
              MR. MOUNTCASTLE: That's correct, Your
16
    Honor.
17
              THE COURT: I'll be glad to hear argument,
    first from the Government.
18
19
              MR. MOUNTCASTLE: Your Honor, I'm going to
20
    address the corporate plea agreement or company's
    plea agreement, and Mr. Ramseyer will address the
21
22
    court with respect to the individuals and plea
2.3
    agreements.
2.4
         The United States, Your Honor, respectfully
25
    requests that the court accept the corporate plea
```

agreement in this case because that agreement holds the Purdue Frederick Company criminally responsible for the false and misleading marketing of OxyContin.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

The plea agreements are the product of months of negotiations between the Government and the attorneys for the defendants, and the plea agreements are also the end result of an investigation that was conducted, overseen by the Western District of Virginia and the Department of Justice's Office of Consumer Litigation.

The investigation was conducted by both federal and state agencies. The state agencies were the Virginia Attorney General's Medicaid Control Fraud Unit, the West Virginia State Police and Virginia State Police, and the federal agencies were the Food and Drug Administrations Office of Criminal Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service Criminal Investigation, the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General, the Defense Criminal Investigative Service and the Department of Labor's Office of Inspector General.

Based on the evidence gathered during the four years of investigation, all of the agencies that participated in it were in agreement that the global resolution that is memorialized by the plea agreement

was in the best interests of the people of the United States, and in the interests of justice.

2.3

2.4

In addition, the global resolution was subjected to review by multiple elements of both the Criminal and Civil Divisions of the Department of Justice, as well as the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General.

Now, under the global resolution that's before the court, the corporate defendant acknowledges his felonious conduct in making false and misleading statements in the marketing of OxyContin. Under this resolution the defendant will suffer substantial monetary penalties as a consequence of this unlawful conduct, and in fact the \$635,000,000 total penalty has been reported, at least in some of the news media, as one of the largest in history.

Now, while the financial impact of the crime to which the defendant has pled guilty cannot easily be quantified, the global resolution serves the following public interests, in the opinion of the Government. First, it provides significant punishment in the form of a \$276,100,000 forfeiture, and a \$500,000 fine. Second, it provides significant disgorgement of any possible or potential profits from the illegal conduct in the form of a

\$160,000,000 payment to resolve any potential governmental civil claims, and a \$130,000,000 amount to be paid to resolve private civil claims. Thirdly, it provides for the prevention of future violations in the form of an integrity agreement applicable to Purdue Pharma, L.P. which is the entity which now markets OxyContin, and the expenditure of more than \$4,000,000 to monitor the conduct of that entity to be sure it complies with the integrity agreement and the laws applicable to the marketing of drugs such as OxyContin. And fourthly, it provides for the funding of ongoing healthcare law enforcement efforts in the Commonwealth of Virginia through the \$20,000,000 to fund Virginia's prescription monitoring program, and approximately \$39,000,000 for the Virginia Attorney General's Medicaid Fraud Control Unit Program Income Funds.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

The United States, Your Honor, believes that the global resolution best serves the interests of the people of the United States, and best serves the interests of justice. And we respectfully request the court accept the agreements that implement it.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. RAMSEYER: Your Honor, the court should accept the plea agreements of Michael Friedman, Paul

Goldenheim and Howard Udell as part of the resolution of this case.

2.2

2.3

2.4

They pled guilty to a crime that does not require awareness of some wrongdoing, or conscious fraud. That's what they pled guilty to, and a sentence of probation is within the sentencing guideline range for this case.

Accordingly, a non incarcerative sentence in, unlike many cases, the convictions of the corporate officers has the potential to have a significant deterrents effect on other crimes.

To my knowledge, never before have pharmaceutical corporate officers been held criminally liable for this type of conduct. It just hasn't happened before. It's unprecedented, and it will reaffirm to executives in the pharmaceutical industry that they are held to a higher standard because the products they deal with have such a high potential for endangering public safety.

Recently a paper criticizing the use of this statute was written. The authors called the article *The Crime of Doing Nothing*. The essence of the paper was it just wasn't right to hold these executives responsible for crimes committed by their company without some showing that the executives

actively participated in or knew about the crimes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

But the Supreme Court of the United States has stated exactly why it is right to hold these men criminally responsible in this case. The, this statute, in the words of the Supreme Court, "imposes not only a positive duty to seek out and remedy violations when they occur but also, and primarily, a duty to implement measures that will ensure that violations will not occur. The requirements of foresight and vigilance imposed on responsible corporate agents are beyond question demanding and perhaps onerous, but they are no more stringent than the public has a right to expect of those who voluntarily assume positions of authority in business enterprises whose services and products affect the health and well being of the public who supports them."

Under the law the only way these defendants could avoid criminal responsibility for this misdemeanor offense is if they could prove they were powerless to prevent the crime. By pleading guilty they have admitted that they were not powerless to prevent the crime. As corporate officers these men had a duty to insure that misbranding did not occur. By pleading guilty they are acknowledging that

they've breached that duty. By pleading guilty they are acknowledging that doing nothing just isn't good enough. They should have done something. In the Supreme Court's words, they had a duty to "implement measures that will insure that violations did not occur."

2.3

2.4

And hopefully, after hearing about this case, every pharmaceutical executive started taking extraordinary steps to personally insure that his employees were complying with the law so that he or she would not end up sitting where these defendants are today. And that is a good thing.

Your Honor, this case has, there's a human element to these proceedings that needs to be addressed. Many individuals have addressed the court today, and there are, of course, complex legal questions about the relationship between Purdue's crimes and the events that these individuals have described, and the court is aware of those issues.

I just want to put that aside because the statements made by these individuals, and they've all suffered great losses, it's heart breaking to hear what these people have gone through, and as a prosecutor you see a lot of bad things, but you just don't, it doesn't make it easier; if there's anything

that the Government could do, if there's anything the court could do to bring those people back we'd do it. And I can't imagine the pain that those people have suffered, but we can't bring those people back. That's not something this case can do. I think everyone knows that. It's just beyond our power.

2.1

2.3

2.4

We have to recognize that whatever we do today will be of very small significance to these people. But maybe these plea agreements can serve some purpose for those individuals, and others like them who couldn't be here today.

Many people, and some of them have been here today, have been raising concerns about Purdue for years. Most of those people weren't saying Purdue was solely responsible for their loved ones' losses, they weren't saying it was all Purdue's fault; they were just saying, "Purdue, tell the truth." They were told by Purdue repeatedly that Purdue had never done anything wrong. This case has given them a forum, so those people could publicly face the top three executives of Purdue and express their true feelings. I don't think those people in their wildest dreams, if you asked them six months ago, that they thought they'd be in a courtroom in Abingdon, Virginia with Purdue and their top three

executives pleading guilty, being sentenced, and having an opportunity to tell the court what they thought about Purdue and those people. And this case has given them that forum. I think most of those people probably will say they didn't believe Purdue would ever be brought to justice, but now we're this close to making it happen. And in accepting these plea agreements perhaps the court can help bring some measure of closure to these people. They have fought the good fight, they have said what they wanted to say, they have stood up for truth, and the whole world now knows that Purdue is guilty, and I truly hope that those individuals can find some peace.

2.2

2.3

2.4

As to Purdue, wouldn't it be nice if when I sat down Purdue would show that they finally get it, that after denying, after denying what they did they finally understand that they did wrong. They filed detailed memos setting forth their position on sentencing. What more needs to be said? Wouldn't it be nice if the company's attorney would come to the podium and say Purdue is sorry for the crime it committed, and sat down? Wouldn't it be nice if the individuals' attorneys would come to the podium and say they're sorry they've breach that high standard that they've been entrusted to protect public safety,

and then sit down? Everyone here knows that's not going to happen.

2.1

2.3

2.4

When I sit down the next public relations campaign will begin for Purdue. They will attempt to minimize the crimes to which they pled guilty. They will argue that they have done much good. They will argue that they are the only ones who care about pain management. They'll talk about their, quote, unquote, "extraordinary efforts to stop abuse and diversion," not because it has anything to do with this case; it's all done for public relations purposes, and it will underscore why the court should accept the plea agreements in this case, and find these defendants guilty as charged.

If the court accepts the plea agreements, from this day forward, notwithstanding all the public relations efforts by Purdue, the whole world will know that Purdue is a company that has been convicted of making false and misleading statements, and everything they say should be viewed in that context.

Your Honor, the United States respectfully requests that the court accept the plea agreements in this case, find the defendants guilty as charged, and sentence them in accordance with the plea agreements. Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ramseyer. I'm 2 going to hear from counsel for the defendants, but 3 since we've been in session for a while, before we do that we're going to take about a ten minute recess. 4 (Recess from 2:43 p.m. to 2:55 p.m.) 5 6 THE COURT: I'll be glad to hear from 7 counsel for the defendants. Mr. Shapiro? 8 MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you, Your Honor. Good 9 afternoon. 10 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 11 MR. SHAPIRO: The Purdue Frederick Company 12 stands before you today ready to accept 13 responsibility for the acts of some of its 14 supervisors and employees as described in the agreed 15 statement of facts previously filed with the court. 16 As set forth in the agreed statement of facts, 17 more than six years ago prior to July, 2001 certain 18 employees made or told others to make statements 19 about OxyContin to some health care professionals 20 that were inconsistent with the FDA approved 21 prescribing information for OxyContin and the express 2.2 warnings the OxyContin label contained about risks associated with the medicine. 2.3

Specifically, these misstatements were that

OxyContin was less addictive, less subject to abuse

2.4

25

and diversion, and less likely to cause tolerance and withdrawal.

2.2

2.3

2.4

These statements were far from pervasive. They were not the way the company intended to market its product. Indeed, they violated written company policies regarding adherence to the FDA prescribing information. But these misstatements did, occur and they were wrong.

Notwithstanding Mr. Ramseyer's extraordinary suggestion, I'm not going to sit down now. I am confident that whatever the United States Attorney's Office might wish, that we still live in a country and that this is still a courtroom where one can hold to the belief that justice is best served by hearing from both sides. And an insistence on fact, and truth, and law is not merely public relations.

Purdue was deeply troubled by the misconduct, and believes it has taken significant steps over the past six years to prevent it from recurring. During that time Purdue has implemented substantial changes to its training, compliance and monitoring systems.

In July, 2001 working with the FDA Purdue added amplified warnings to the prescribing information for OxyContin and communicated those warnings to health care professionals. Purdue has enhanced its

compliance infrastructure, increased its training, and developed a risk management program that has been acknowledged to be a model for the industry.

1.0

2.2

2.3

2.4

These efforts seek to insure that the kinds of misconduct that has brought the company before this court today do not occur again.

Your Honor, I sat in the courtroom today, and I heard the moving statements of individuals who have suffered personal tragedies and terrible losses related to OxyContin. One would be less than human not to respect and share their grief and pain. There is no question that OxyContin's abuse and misuse has ravaged a number of communities across the country in recent years, including the one in which this court sits. And like virtually any medication, even the proper use of OxyContin can, on occasion, be associated with serious side effects as reflected in the label.

But it is also important to be precise and accurate about the plea that the Purdue Frederick Company entered into in this case. It does not for one minute disrespect the suffering of these families to say that there is nothing, absolutely nothing in the agreed statement of facts, or in any other evidence of which we are aware, that suggests that

the misbranding that forms the basis for Purdue's plea is in any way connected to, let alone responsible for, that suffering.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

We understand that others have argued that
Purdue's misbranding caused more OxyContin to be
prescribed and thus available for misuse. But
frankly, as Your Honor heard the Government concede
in this courtroom just last week, there is no proof
that a single prescription was written as a result of
any act of misbranding, and there is no evidence that
links any promotional act by Purdue to illegal
diversion or abuse.

Purdue marketed OxyContin only to trained physicians and never to direct consumers. Again, I truly do not mean to minimize the very real harm that these individuals, and many others, have suffered. Prescription drug abuse is a serious problem with often tragic consequences, whether it involves OxyContin or any other medication. The personal and societal consequences that have resulted from the abuse and misuse of OxyContin cannot be denied. And yet, that's only one part of the story. And frankly, Your Honor, not the larger part.

We also heard today from a few of those whose lives have been dramatically improved by access to

this medication, a few of them who have taken medication that is unquestionably safe and effective when taken as directed. It is worth noting that each of the witnesses Purdue called today suffered from extraordinarily painful chronic conditions. Indeed, millions of people suffering from debilitating chronic pain, and not just those battling cancer, have found solace and effective pain relief from OxyContin.

2.1

2.3

2.4

In many, many instances, as you heard just a bit about today, OxyContin has repaired families, has renewed hope, has restored lives. That is why, despite all the negative publicity, the genuine fears of abuse and diversion, and indeed the risk that law enforcement will scrutinize and challenge prescribing doctors' medical judgment, despite all of that OxyContin continues to be one of the most prescribed opioid analgesics on the market today. It continues to have wide support among medical professionals for the simple reason that it works, and works well.

Because day after day, patient after patient, these professionals make the same judgment that the United States Food and Drug Administration has repeatedly made that the enormous benefits of OxyContin far outweigh its risks, even taking into

account the grief from those we've heard about today.

2.2

2.3

2.4

In determining an appropriate sentence for the misbranding offenses to which this company has pled it is important not to lose sight of this central fact. OxyContin, and the company, and the individuals who oversaw its development and brought it to physicians and patients have done vastly more good than harm.

To say Purdue's acts did not cause OxyContin diversion has not been to say the company has been heedless to the abuse that has occurred. All Schedule II products, by definition, have a high risk of abuse. Purdue was attentive to that expected potential abuse, and took steps to try and prevent it. From the time of launch, the OxyContin packaging insert had extensive written warnings about abuse and diversion, including warnings against crushing and chewing tablets.

Dr. Kathy Foley who served for 15 years as the Chief of the Pain Service of Memorial Sloan-Kettering Hospital and is one of the leading pain experts in the world, notes in her letter to the court, and I know that Your Honor has seen it, that the package insert at the time it was first published was viewed as providing even more information on the risks and

benefits of opioids and their potential for abuse than package inserts for comparably available strong opioid drugs.

2.2

2.3

2.4

But that's not all. Since 1996 Purdue has spent in excess of \$325,000,000 attempting to develop a number of opioid formulations that would be resistant to abuse, and that guest continues.

Moreover, in December of 1998, at its own initiative, and at its own expense, Purdue started distributing to physicians hundreds of thousands of copies of guidelines created by the Federation of State Medical Boards which explained how properly to use opioid based pain medications, and how to avoid dispensing them to abusers. Over the years Purdue has handed out more of these materials than the Federation, itself.

Despite these efforts, as we all know, and as we heard, OxyContin became part of, of a wave of increasing drug abuse in the United States, and although OxyContin has never been the most abused prescription drug in the nation, Purdue recognized that it did become a significant part of the prescription drug abuse problem and stepped up its anti-abuse activities through research grants to, and partnerships with, law enforcement agencies and

community and public education initiatives. Purdue has dedicated extraordinary and unprecedented resources to combatting this problem.

2.3

2.4

Purdue has spent more than \$68,000,000 to aid law enforcement to fight abuse and diversion of prescription drugs. These efforts have included distributing more than one million tamper resistant prescription pads in 34 states, including Virginia, to combat prescription counterfeiting, a commonly used method to obtain prescriptions illegally.

Purdue has provided at its own expense placebo tablets.

Purdue developed RxPATROL, the nation's first and only web based clearing house to collect, analyze and disseminate pharmacy theft information.

Since its inception, RxPATROL has collected information on thousands of incidents of robbery, pharmacy robbery, burglary, fraud and forgery leading, in fact, to arrest.

And Purdue has made grants to many community organizations. In Southwest Virginia Purdue has provided \$550,000 in funding to Occupational Enterprises, Inc., a non profit information that provides drug abuse prevention, education, recovery and employment services in eight counties.

And Purdue has developed innovative programs to discourage prescription drug abuses, specially among vulnerable teens.

2.1

2.3

2.4

This is not just public relations; this is part of the story. This is part of what the court, of course, needs to understand in deciding on whether to accept or reject the plea agreement. The efforts I described, along with others I have not highlighted today, have dwarfed those of every other company, including those which also make scheduled opioids.

They have received widespread recognition from law enforcement officials here in Virginia. For example, former Attorney General Mark Early said as long ago as March 1, 2001 that when Purdue learned of the problem of abuse and diversion, quote, "it jumped in with both feet to solve it."

I think Dr. Michael Brennan, an experienced pain physician whose mother suffered for years in agonizing chronic pain, which inspired him to go into this field, I think he said it just right in his letter to the court. He wrote, and I'm quoting, "OxyContin has been misused, no one of probity would argue with that. On the other hand, the appropriate use by physicians has enabled thousands of patients to regain part of their lives otherwise lost to

pain," end quote. That is the rest of the story.

That must, in fairness, be taken into account.

2.1

2.3

2.4

As I said in the outset, the Purdue Frederick Company accepts full responsibility for the acts of misbranding committed by some of its employees. In acceptance of that responsibility, as the court is well aware, the company has agreed to pay enormous sums and fines, penalties, forfeiture and restitution: \$470,000,000 to the United States and state governments, and \$130,000,000 to settle civil claims.

On behalf of the Purdue Frederick Company I respectfully request that the court accept the plea agreement. With its plea Purdue hopes to move forward with renewed focus with its mission of alleviating the suffering of millions from chronic pain, and insuring the acts that led to this plea do not reoccur.

Before I sit down I just want to take a further moment to offer some words about these three individuals who are before you today. As Your Honor is aware, and as the Government has acknowledged, they are not here today because of any misconduct on their part, but because they held the positions of responsible corporate officers at the time of the

acts committed by others at the company which form the basis of the company's plea.

I have come to know these men well over more than the four years this matter has been pending. They are good men. They are good men who have worked hard to bring relief to the millions of Americans who suffer in pain, and have done all that they could do to stop the abuse and diversion of OxyContin.

In the time we have worked together, they have each consistently acted out of concern for what was right, and have conducted themselves throughout with honor, integrity and dignity. I would have been remiss if I had not shared my own personal experience as the court considers the appropriateness of their sentences as well as the company's. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shapiro.

18 Mr. Pomerantz?

2.2

2.3

2.4

MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, I would like to speak briefly on behalf of Michael Friedman. I'm a lawyer because I speak for the defendant, and I say the things I need to say on his behalf, and the Government's suggestion to the contrary is unfortunate and offensive.

I want to say at the outset I will not be

addressing what the court was told by people who lost loved ones because of their involvement with OxyContin. I won't be addressing those comments not because we are unmoved or don't care; I won't be addressing them because we recognize that there is nothing that we can say or do that will ease the pain of a parent who has lost a child, a brother who has lost a sister, a grandfather who has lost a grandson, a husband who has lost a wife. Those are tragedies, each and every one. Anything I could say, anything Michael Friedman could say about those tragedies would be seen as diminishing them or attempting to explain them away, and that is not our purpose.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Instead, I'll focus on the plea that is before the court, and why the sentence that is called for by the plea agreement is appropriate and should be accepted by the court.

As the court knows, the issue is not whether OxyContin is a good drug or a bad drug, and not whether it should be legal to sell it or to prescribe it. Under our system those decisions are made by the Government acting through the Food and Drug Administration.

The crimes for which Michael Friedman's, the crime for which Michael Friedman stands before the

court is not the manufacture or distribution of OxyContin. The simple truth is that it is legal to make the drug, to market it, and to sell it because there is a need for it. And the Government has determined that when it is used properly under a doctor's care the advantages outweigh the risks.

2.1

2.3

2.4

I'm also not standing before the court on a claim that Michael Friedman or, indeed, any of the individual defendants wanted to bring about the abuse of OxyContin, or to encourage its misuse, or to cause the deaths and the tragedies about which we heard earlier.

The truth is, and there is chapter and verse on this in the materials that are before the court, that Purdue never marketed OxyContin to consumers directly, and they tried to educate doctors about the proper use of the drug to prevent its abuse, to keep the drug out of the hands of unscrupulous doctors, and to make sure that it was used safely in the manner that it was intended to be used.

Michael Friedman, in particular, was very loud and clear in trying to stop abuse of OxyContin. The notion that Dr. Friedman, or any of these individuals, did nothing is patently untrue.

Your Honor has before the court, indeed, an

entire book, it simply required a book to describe the efforts these men took. They distributed anti-diversion brochures, anti-fraud prescription pads, they created the Liaison Law Enforcement Unit within Purdue, they created RxPATROL, they distributed placebos and funded law enforcement programs, they discontinued the 160 milligram tablet when it was suggested to them by law enforcement that the amount of harm that it was causing outweighed the benefits. They took steps to prevent the diversion of OxyContin unlawfully from Mexico. Thev established the RADARS system. They, they researched abuse resistant technologies. They funded a public service advertising campaign. They created the Painfully Obvious program. They altered sales representative compensation so that it would not lend itself to abuse. They recorded suspicious prescribers, they funded Occupational Enterprises, Inc. and Virginia One Care. They started a program called 100 Counties Program. I'm not going to elaborate on those because Your Honor has the materials, and they are before the court. The reason, there were several reasons that Michael Friedman tried to prevent OxyContin from being abused. One, I will tell the court, is that he

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

is a good and a decent person. The court has received letter after letter talking about the fact that Michael Friedman is a profoundly good, moral and decent man. I won't belabor the point. I'll just cite one letter to Your Honor from a friend, Rear Admiral Golove, retired from the Coast Guard. "I've known Michael Friedman for more than 20 years. I've known him as a friend, neighbor and family man." Quoting a little bit later in the letter, "Throughout our long relationship he has been a beacon of compassion and fairness, a role model for all of us He has always been (and I am convinced to follow. will always be) a good person of scope beyond anybody else I know. He has often shown how totally committed he is to building and not tearing down, to helping the helpless and not hurting anybody, to 'repairing the world' and not causing it any pain... and much more. He has always been a role model of humility and goodness for me..." Another reason that Dr. Friedman did not want to see OxyContin abused, apart from the fact that he is a decent, honest and moral man, is that the abuse of the company's product was very bad for the company,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

and very bad for its business. It is true, Purdue

sold a lot of OxyContin, and made a lot of money from

selling OxyContin. The company would have sold a lot more of its product and made a lot more money had it not been for the abuse of OxyContin, for the deaths, and for the suffering that resulted when the pills were crushed and taken for the high that could be induced when the continuous release mechanism was defeated.

1.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Purdue recognized that the abuse of OxyContin and the resultant public attention was disastrous to its business, and so the abuse of OxyContin was never something that the company or these individuals wanted to encourage. Never, never. It was just the opposite. Indeed, they spent hundreds of millions of dollars trying to find a formulation for the drug that could not be abused.

The reason Michael Friedman is before the court, Your Honor, is because in a limited number of instances in the time prior to June of 2001, as outlined in the agreed statement of facts, a number of company employees, not Dr. Friedman, not Mr. Udell, not Dr. Goldenheim, made statements about OxyContin that were inconsistent with company policy and that should not have been made. Michael Friedman did not participate in that misconduct. But he is before the court because he was the chief executive

officer of Purdue, and under the law he can be held responsible for conduct that he did not approve, did not recommend, and did not condone.

2.2

2.3

2.4

This is one of the very rare situations under our laws in which an individual can be held criminally responsible without a showing of criminal intent. And as the court knows, there is no claim in the agreed statement of facts that Michael Friedman acted in any respect with criminal intent.

He's here because he is a high ranking corporate officer, was, and under the responsible officer doctrine that is sufficient.

We have agreed with the United States Attorney's Office that the appropriate disposition, if the court accepts the plea, is one that does not include a prison sentence. It does include a financial penalty of \$19,000,000 which already has been paid into the court.

I know that the court has received letters that urge Your Honor to reject the plea agreement, and that argue that these individuals should be sent to prison. We heard some of those arguments here this afternoon. We want to make several points in response, each of which, I think, is compelling.

First, as Your Honor knows, to impose a prison

sentence where there is no proof and no allegation that a defendant committed a specific criminal act, and that he did so with criminal intent would be virtually unprecedented under American law.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

Even in the Park and the Dotterweich cases upon which the Government has relied on bringing this charge, those cases permit criminal liability for responsible corporate officers, but in those cases there were allegations that the defendants failed to act after specific warnings that there was misconduct occurring on their watch.

Here there is no such allegation. The agreed upon statement of facts does not suggest that Michael Friedman intended that bad action be committed. To send him to prison under these circumstances, so far as we have found, would be literally unprecedented in the annals of American law.

These men did not, as has been suggested to the court, buy their way out of a prison sentence. Under our system of laws they didn't do anything that would have justified a prison sentence, and it is precisely for that reason I would suggest to the court that the United States Attorney entered into the plea agreement that is before Your Honor.

And the fact that we are dealing here with an

agreement that has been endorsed by the United States
Attorney is another compelling reason why the guilty
plea should be accepted, and the plea agreement
should be accepted.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Obviously, there's a great deal of emotion surrounding this case and this sentence. People from the community have written the court, have addressed the court this afternoon. Those of us who work in the criminal justice system, particularly those of us who have had the privilege of serving as Assistant United States Attorney and, indeed, United States Attorney, understand that it is the United States Attorney who ultimately speaks for the community. It is the U.S. Attorney who represents the community and the people of the United States here after a lengthy investigation, an investigation that involved many years, millions of documents, dozens of witnesses and many millions of dollars being spent by the Government.

The United States Attorney has come before the court and has told the court that the plea agreement that is before Your Honor is in the best interests of the United States. That agreement may be viewed as too lenient by some; it may be viewed as unwarranted and, indeed, too harsh by others; but it represents

the product of years of labor of well intentioned men and women on both sides of this case.

2.3

2.4

I believe it merits the court's endorsement and I urge the court to accept it and to impose a sentence on Michael Friedman in accordance with it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. White?

MS. WHITE: Thank you, Your Honor. It is

my privilege to speak on behalf of Howard Udell.

This is a very hard day for Mr. Udell. It is also,

obviously, a very hard and painful day for everyone

in this courtroom. Especially for those who are

recalling memories of lost or ill loved ones who used

OxyContin.

As Mr. Pomerantz said, nothing that any of us can say, or the fact that OxyContin has also helped millions of people, can diminish the pain and loss we have heard about today. It is also very hard and impossible for relatives and friends not to blame Purdue and its senior executives for their loss, and not to be cynical when Mr. Udell and others at Purdue express what is, in fact, deep sympathy for their loss, and talk about the commitment and extensive efforts at Purdue to combat the problem of OxyContin abuse and diversion once it was known to be

occurring.

1.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

We obviously don't expect to change those views today, but we do need to talk about the facts as they've been agreed to and with the United States Attorney's Office, what Mr. Udell's plea means and what it doesn't mean, and need to talk about Howard Udell, the person. The court will then decide on the objective facts in the case before it, whether to accept the plea agreements with the Government and impose non incarcerative sentences on Mr. Udell, Mr. Friedman and Dr. Goldenheim. We urge the court to do so, and we submit that the record compellingly leads to that conclusion.

Mr. Udell's guilty plea is to a strict liability misdemeanor. That, as the court knows and has heard, does not require wrongdoing, no participation in misconduct, no knowledge of misconduct, no intent to defraud or mislead anyone. And there is no evidence at all of any personal wrongdoing by Mr. Udell in the agreed statement of facts. Rather, Mr. Udell's plea is based on his position as a senior executive at Purdue at a time when certain Purdue sales and marketing personnel made statements about OxyContin that went beyond statements approved by the FDA.

There's no evidence, however, in the agreed

statement of facts that Mr. Udell knew about this misconduct, and we submit that had he known he would have done everything in his power to stop it.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Mr. Udell is also not charged with harming anyone, and there is no evidence or claim in the agreed statement of facts that Mr. Udell caused any harm to anyone. Committing or condoning misconduct, or causing harm, or letting harm occur to any person is the antithesis of what Mr. Udell and his life are about. He has devoted his professional life to the law. He is high minded and a thoroughly ethical person who always holds himself to the highest standards of conduct. He is a deeply moral, compassionate person, dedicated to his family, friends and colleagues.

Nothing in Mr. Udell's strict liability misdemeanor plea is inconsistent with or detracts from Mr. Udell's exemplary character, or the person who is rightly admired by so many.

The letters submitted to the court on Mr. Udell's behalf provide an accurate and compelling account of this remarkable man and his principles. A uniform theme is that Mr. Udell has shown a life long reverence for the law, always tries to do the right thing, and always urges others to always do the same.

Everyone says that about Mr. Udell because it is true, and evident in everything he does, large and small.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

His sons were brought up that way, and saw it every day. As his son, Jeffrey, a former Assistant United States Attorney in New York wrote to the court, "Respect for the law, itself, is something my father has always taught me and my brother for as long as I can remember. Do the right thing was the way my father taught us to behave, both by express instruction and by example. In my entire life, I have never seen him once falter from that path."

The people at Purdue who have worked with Mr. Udell for many years consider him to be the moral compass of the company, whose constant admonition to the employees at Purdue is also to do the right thing, and as Clint A. Yeager, an at risk youth and community specialist and Purdue's Director of Community Partnerships for three years, himself an extraordinary person who has devoted his life to substance abuse issues, states in his letter to the court, "Mr. Udell's words were not empty words. His philosophy was backed by actions and support."

Another former Purdue employee of 45 years says this: "Mr. Udell is considered the heart and soul of

the organization. In my entire career I never experienced a single incident where he did not do the right thing."

1.0

2.2

2.3

2.4

The former United States Attorney in Maine, Jay McCloskey, who was the public official who brought the OxyContin abuse problem in Maine to Purdue's attention, he dealt directly with Mr. Udell both as U.S. Attorney and later as a consultant to Purdue on abuse issues, he describes Mr. Udell in his letter to the court as honest and highly ethical.

Mr. McCloskey writes that when he explained to Purdue the extent of OxyContin abuse in Maine, Mr. Friedman and Mr. Udell offered to help in any way Purdue could, and Mr. Udell said, "We want to do what is right."

As he says in his letter to the court,

Mr. McCloskey became a firm believer in those words

of Mr. Udell when he saw firsthand all of the actions

Mr. Udell, Michael Friedman and others at Purdue,

including Dr. Paul Goldenheim, took in an effort to

stop the abuse of OxyContin. These efforts, and

you've heard a lot about those from Mr. Shapiro and

Mr. Pomerantz, and I know you have extensive

materials, but these efforts included voluntarily

taking the 160 milligram dose of OxyContin off the

market after Mr. McCloskey expressed safety concerns for young people if they were to abuse tablets of that strength.

1.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

These efforts included eventually stopping altogether the shipment of OxyContin to Mexico because it proved to be an area where there was significant illegal diversion of the drug which was then shipped back into the United States and illegally distributed.

Both of these decisions, Your Honor, were against the commercial interests of Purdue. But they were the right things to do. As Mr. McCloskey says in his letter, "In all my dealings with Howard I do not recall one instance in which he favored Purdue Pharma's business interests over efforts to curb OxyContin diversion. In fact, just the opposite is true. Although Howard is an advocate of legitimate pain patients not being denied access to OxyContin, he has always spent a considerable amount of time to reduce OxyContin abuse and diversion."

Mr. Udell is one who did something about abuse and diversion. Mr. Udell's personal efforts to curb the abuse and diversion of prescription drugs, including OxyContin, also include championing monitoring programs when most others in the industry

were opposed to those programs.

2.2

2.3

2.4

They also support efforts in this district to support Occupational Enterprises that addresses substance abuse issues in Southwest Virginia. Its Executive Director has written a letter to the court praising Mr. Udell and his leadership.

Howard Udell is a man who cares deeply about people. Pamela Bennett, a nurse who joined Purdue in 2000, has written, "When I think of compassion embodied, I think of Howard. He cares about his employees, he cares about patients and he cares about those who suffer from abusing and/or misusing prescription drugs."

As another Purdue employee says in his letter to the court, "Howard is beloved. He treats everyone, whether maintenance man or senior executive, with respect and kindness."

Throughout his career Mr. Udell has given countless hours of pro bono service and advice to educational and other non profit institutions.

Beginning in the late 1980s, for example, long before there was ever an OxyContin, Mr. Udell gave many hours of pro bono service as both legal counsel and board member to Vitam, a residential treatment facility and school in Connecticut that offered

assistance to young people suffering with problems of serious substance abuse.

2.2

2.3

2.4

I know the court has received and read the many letters of support for Mr. Udell, and I won't recount more of them here, but the court has seen in those letters written by people exposed to Mr. Udell in every aspect of his life, the words the writers use to describe Mr. Udell and his actions, and these writers are quite a varied group of credible people, most of whom have spent a significant portion of their careers in public service or serving the community: A former Attorney General of Virginia, two former U.S. Attorneys, three heads of non profit organizations devoted to pain management or substance abuse issues, a former DEA supervisor. The list goes on.

Some of the words and phrases Your Honor has seen in those letters that most often appear include these: Highly ethical, sincere, genuine, an especially caring man, decent, principled, kind, generous, respect for the law, man of integrity, thoughtful, fair, compassionate, hard working, unselfish, upright, humble, intentionally moral man. And just as Mr. Udell's exhortations to himself and to others to always do the right thing are not just

words, the words in these letters aren't just words either. They reflect a lifetime of observations of Mr. Udell and his actions.

2.2

2.3

2.4

For Mr. Udell, a distinguished and highly respected lawyer for over 40 years, to have publicly pled to a crime which he has done is a very severe punishment. The offense involves no allegation of wrongdoing; it is a crime. It will be part of the permanent record, and a painful reminder of what devastation occurred with OxyContin in addition to all of the good that it has done for so many people.

And if complicity in connection with the plea is any indication, it will be difficult for people to understand that Mr. Udell has pled to a strict liability misdemeanor that involves no wrongdoing by Mr. Udell.

Mr. Udell has learned -- indeed, we have all learned -- very painful lessons about the abuse and diversion of OxyContin and other prescription drugs. We all have a responsibility to address this very serious public health issue. Certainly Mr. Udell has been, and will continue to be, a leader in those efforts.

He and others at Purdue are not, as some have said in the media and today, akin to drug dealers or

murderers. Nothing could be further from the truth. And yet, Mr. Udell will have to live with those very public and devastating labels in the eyes of some who do not know what this case is about, what it isn't about, who don't know what the facts are, and who do not know Howard Udell. It isn't fair, it isn't deserved, but it is a harsh reality that is part of Mr. Udell's punishment.

2.3

2.4

What has happened here is a personal tragedy for Mr. Udell. It is a particularly sad irony, Your Honor, that this deeply ethical man who has exhibited life long reverence for the law, an intolerance for even bending of the rules, finds himself here. As Richard Silbert, a lawyer at Purdue who has worked with Mr. Udell for 15 years wrote, "I have difficulty wrapping my mind around the fact that Howard, the most decent and honorable person I know, is pleaing to a crime. It is as if the universe is out of whack." That's what Mr. Silbert said.

But in another sense, as Mr. Silbert and others have written to the court have said, it is not surprising that Howard Udell has stepped up to take responsibility for the misconduct of others at his company. That is also Howard Udell.

As Jennifer Bragg, who worked at the FDA Office

of Chief Counsel, and later for Purdue as an outside counsel puts it, "I believe that during times of adversity the true character of individuals is revealed. Although adversity tempts many to blame others, Howard never abdicated responsibility."

2.2

2.3

2.4

As Jack Crowley, a former DEA supervisor investigator, and now head of Controlled Substance Compliance at Purdue says, "It does not surprise me that Mr. Udell has accepted responsibility in the matter before the court by pleading to a strict liability misdemeanor offense as this is but an example of his upstanding character."

Your Honor, I have tried my best to do justice to and capture the person, remarkable person who is Howard Udell, and who is before you today for sentencing.

As the plea agreement with the Government provides, there should be no incarcerative sentence for Mr. Udell. Neither he nor his conduct remotely deserves it, nor is a period of probation in these unique circumstances justified or needed to fulfill any sentencing or law enforcement purpose. Indeed, it would unjustifiably and needlessly compound the stigma and punishment for an offense and facts that are without personal wrongdoing.

Mr. Udell is a fine, decent and highly principled man who should be seen as the role model he is for integrity, leadership, and trying always to do the right thing. He will continue after today to be that person.

Thank you, very much, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. White.

Mr. Good?

2.2

2.3

2.4

MR. GOOD: If Your Honor please,

Dr. Goldenheim is the only defendant before you who
is a physician. And as a physician I think Your

Honor will recognize how high a value Dr. Goldenheim
places on caring for people, and for relieving
suffering and disease. And Dr. Goldenheim has
devoted his entire professional life and achieved a
great deal in that field.

He's an extraordinary physician in that he is not just a doctor who can treat patients, but he's also a scientist, and he's able to contribute in a way that very few people can to the relief of suffering and disease. And lest anyone believe that Dr. Goldenheim is heedless about addiction and the harm addiction causes, Your Honor has the letter from Dr. Roger Weiss who is the head of Addiction Services at McLean Hospital which is a Harvard teaching

hospital in the Boston area, and Dr. Weiss recounts that he and Dr. Goldenheim many years ago did some research and published two papers which were some of the earliest research on the effect on respiratory systems of people who inhaled cocaine.

2.1

2.3

2.4

So, Dr. Goldenheim, at the very beginning of his career, even before he was at Purdue, was someone who was very aware of the harm that addictive drugs had on the human body and to all of us. And he did, and has done, a tremendous amount to try to alleviate that problem, as well as relieve pain.

And in that course I want to mention the word possible because my brother from the Government has indicated that the only defense available to this crime to which Dr. Goldenheim has pleaded guilty is it's impossible to prevent what has occurred. And I must say, Your Honor, having read all the letters that I know Your Honor has read, as well, if there is a person who might be able to do the impossible it would be Dr. Goldenheim.

This is a man who led the effort to develop

OxyContin as a scientist, and it's an extremely

difficult and challenging endeavor to develop drugs

which have benefitted as many people as this drug

has. I won't try to explain to the court what all

that it takes many, many years, and you have to overcome a great many obstacles and difficulties, scientific difficulties and medical difficulties in order to accomplish that task, and one has to use a tremendous amount of skill, dedication to the truth, scientific truth, to the accuracy of records, to the development of systems to assure that all is done as perfectly as possible, and Dr. Goldenheim did that.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Now, he's pleading guilty here because things happened which may very well be impossible, but he has accepted the legal responsibility, nevertheless. That's the type of person he is.

Dr. Goldenheim is in agony here. And he has been in agony since this whole case began because he is anything but a person who would tolerate that any harm should come to any person from what he has done trying to help people who suffer from pain.

And I think none of us who have experienced intense pain, or who have seen people who have experienced intense pain can, can dismiss for a second how important it is for us to try to achieve relief for these people.

It is painful to be addicted, and it's nothing like the pain they experience themselves, and this

man through his scientific skill has relieved a great deal of suffering for millions and millions of people, and there are very few people on the planet who can say that about themselves.

2.3

2.4

So, even though he has done all that, the standard is that he has somehow failed to do what the Government says is possible. I'm not sure it was possible for Dr. Goldenheim to prevent what happened here, but in any event, he has accepted that responsibility and in the process he has been labeled -- because that's what this court proceeding means -- a criminal, and that is horrendously harsh punishment for someone who has done so much good, and under the agreed statement of facts has done nothing wrong.

The word carries harsh punishment, the word criminal. Dr. Goldenheim sometimes says that about himself now, and it is an extraordinarily painful thing for him to say, and for other people to believe about him. It's not deserved because he hasn't done anything wrong, but the law calls this, calls this criminality, and that is a very, very costly thing to do to someone who has done nothing wrong.

And the Government is quite right to say that this is unprecedented. And it is unprecedented in

exactly that sense; that is, that this is an outer extension of this statute that we're talking about here today. And therefore, it imposes punishment over the least blameworthy people who have ever been convicted under this statute. And that calls for, it seems to me, the relationship between the punishment and the least blameworthy people, is the punishment we're asking the court to impose.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

And that's exactly as it should be. The relationship between blameworthiness and punishment is the key one in any judge's mind, I would think. And there is no blameworthiness here, and therefore one has to consider that.

Your Honor, with respect to Paul Goldenheim the person, I just want to say Your Honor has a great many letters, and I know you've read them all, and I think what comes through from these letters is a person of extraordinary ability and accomplishment. I can't imagine a person who is more able, and accomplished, and caring in every way than Dr. Goldenheim is. He's off the charts that way.

To me, the fact that the life he's lived has

To me, the fact that the life he's lived has been ineffective from insulating him from this day is very, very harsh; to lead the life he's lived and done as well as he's done, in all of his endeavors.

He's been very devoted to his family, to education.

He's led the -- Dr. Goldenheim tried to exert his scientific skill through all of this, and I would say to the court, focused on the RADAR Program, as Your Honor has seen.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Epidemiology is the study of the population, the frequency when bad things happen, either disease or whatever, some public health problem, and the federal government had epidemiology with respect to prescription drug abuse but it was national, but it had no local information, there were no, couldn't pinpoint within this country where this problem was occurring, and so Dr. Goldenheim, upon learning this program was beginning to accelerate, was in the forefront of getting the information in a form where you could isolate exactly where it's happening in the United States, and most acutely, so the resources could be addressed to those particular places to try to stop this. This is what a scientist does, and this is not what a person who doesn't care would do. This is a person who cares very deeply and was trying very hard to stop this.

The other thing I think is terribly important for Your Honor to consider, it's been mentioned the company has spent around \$325,000,000 to try to

develop an abuse free, an abuse proof medication.

Now, again, this has so far been impossible. No one has been able to achieve this. It's an enormous scientific challenge to produce a pill that will release medication for beneficial purposes swallowed, but not function to cause a high if crushed or chewed or otherwise destroyed. They have tried through \$325,000,000 worth of effort to do that.

Dr. Goldenheim has been in the forefront of that.

This is hardly a person who is an anti-social

2.2

2.3

2.4

This is hardly a person who is an anti-social person, or a person who doesn't care about the agony that you've heard here today. He cares about it. He's working extremely hard to try to stop what's been happening to these people. And so I ask the court to consider all of that when Your Honor determines the outcome here.

Finally, I would just say on the subject of probation, Your Honor, that I echo what Ms. White has said; that as I mentioned the conviction, itself, is a tremendous punishment. The people who know the most about this case, Dr. Goldenheim wears a label that is undeserved and it is very painful and destructive in his life going forward, and probation would serve no purpose other than to compound the harm, the undeserved harm. So, I ask the court not

to do that, but otherwise to adopt the agreement. Thank you, very much, Your Honor.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Good. Counsel, I want to thank you. I'm going to take a recess now, while I consider my decision in this case.

(Recess from 3:50 p.m. to 4:20 p.m.)

THE COURT: First I want to thank counsel for their professionalism in this case. I also want to thank those who have spoken to the court about their personal experiences, and I appreciate very much the efforts that all of you made in coming here today and sharing those personal experiences with me.

The issue before the court is whether or not to accept the plea agreements in this case. I have carefully read the lengthy paper work in the case, and have listened to everything that's been presented today.

Defendant Purdue has pleaded guilty to misbranding OxyContin with the intent to defraud or mislead, a felony under the Federal Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act. The individual defendants, Michael Friedman, Howard Udell and Paul Goldenheim have pleaded guilty to the misdemeanor charge of misbranding solely as responsible corporate officers. The individual defendants are not charged with

personal knowledge of the misbranding, or with any personal intent to defraud.

2.1

2.3

2.4

These plea agreements which have been submitted to the court are pursuant to the provision of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that allows the parties to agree to a specific sentence to be imposed.

The court is not bound by the plea agreements, and may reject them. If a plea agreement is rejected, the defendant must be given an opportunity to withdraw the guilty plea. The Government has agreed in this case that if the court rejects a plea agreement, the Government will dismiss the information filed in this case without prejudice to its right to later indict the defendants or any other entity or individual on any charge.

Accordingly, if the court rejects any of the plea agreements, the present case may end and it will be up to the Government to decide whether to reprosecute the defendants, or any of them.

The Supreme Court has held that defendants have no absolute right to have the guilty plea accepted.

As the court has stated, a court may reject a plea in exercise of what is called sound judicial discretion.

By leaving the decision whether to accept or reject a

plea to the exercise of sound judicial discretion, the Supreme Court did not intend to allow the courts to reject pleas on an arbitrary basis, but the rules do not limit the reasons for which the court may reject a proposed plea agreement.

2.1

2.3

2.4

The court's responsibility is to consider all of the relevant factors, and rationally construct a decision. The Rules allow the judge to reject the plea agreement if it is too lenient or too harsh.

In determining a proper criminal sentence in the federal courts, the court must consider certain factors set forth by statute. I must consider the nature and circumstances of the offense, and the history and characteristics of the defendant, as well as the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence for criminal conduct and to protect the public from future or further crimes of a defendant.

My mandate is to impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with these purposes.

Under the law Purdue is subject to a penalty of five years probation and a fine of up to half a

million dollars. In its plea agreement Purdue has agreed to additional substantial monetary obligations totaling \$600,000,000.

2.3

2.4

The individual defendants are subject to a maximum punishment of 12 months imprisonment, and a fine of up to \$100,000. In their plea agreements they have agreed to pay a total of 34 and a half million dollars to the Virginia Medicaid Fraud Unit Program Income Fund. In return, the Government has agreed to a sentence without any imprisonment.

Now, there have been several reasons suggested why the court should reject these plea agreements.

These plea agreements preclude other restitution, and a number of alleged victims object to this provision.

The Government and defendants, in agreeing to preclude other restitution, rely on the statute which states, in relevant part, as follows: "To the extent that the court determines that the complication and prolongation of the sentencing process resulting from the fashioning of an order of restitution under this section outweighs the need to provide restitution to any victims, the court may decline to make such an order."

In order to award an alleged victim restitution, the court would have to determine whether that person

was directly and proximately harmed by the misbranding offense that is the subject of the plea agreements.

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

To be considered directly and proximately harmed a person must show that harm resulted from conduct underlying an element of the offense of conviction.

Purdue argues that the third party payors, the insurance companies and others, cannot show that they were directly and proximately harmed by Purdue's misbranding.

Purdue further argues that this chain of causation between the harm and the misbranding offense would have been broken by any intervening act on behalf of a patient or the health care professional.

As to any individuals injured by the use of OxyContin, the difficulties of establishing causation have been demonstrated by numerous civil suits that have been filed by such persons against Purdue, including two filed in this court.

It has been argued that restitution must be handled in this case as in the manner of a civil class action claim, but class certification has generally been denied in OxyContin claims because of the variety of causation issues. So, in spite of

these arguments, I agree that the restitution process would unduly complicate and prolong the sentencing process.

2.2

2.3

2.4

In order to prove causation, litigation over many months would be required before final judgment in this case would be entered, and such a delay would be contrary to the basic principles of our criminal justice system.

I would have preferred that the plea agreements had allocated some amount of the money for the education of those at risk from the improper use of prescription drugs, and the treatment of those who have succumbed to such use. As we've heard today, prescription drug abuse is rampant in all areas of our country, particularly among young people, causing untold misery and harm.

The White House Drug Policy Office estimates that such drug abuse rose 17 percent from the year 2001 to 2005. That office estimates currently there are more abusers of prescription drugs than any new users of any other illicit drug.

Many people mistakenly believe that prescription drugs are safer than street drugs, and as we've heard, accidental prescription drug deaths are increasing. It has been estimated that there are

more than 6.4 million prescription drug abusers in the United States.

2.1

2.3

2.4

On the other hand, I am forbidden by law to participate in plea discussions, and I will not reject these agreements simply because they do not contain provisions that I would have preferred.

The Government has explained that it did not demand inclusion of a treatment provision in the plea agreements because national drug policy has been placed by Congress in an executive agency, and the Government prosecutors were reluctant to direct treatment funds in a manner beyond their expertise and possibly contrary to national policy. I will not second guess their decision in that regard.

It has been disclosed that during the negotiations of these plea agreements former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani played a central role on behalf of Purdue. Of course, Mr. Giuliani is an experienced attorney, and Purdue had a right to hire whomever it wished as its legal counsel.

It has been implied that because Mr. Giuliani is a prominent national politician, Purdue may have received a favorable deal from the Government solely because of politics. I completely reject this claim. I've had long experience with the United States

Attorney for this district, and I am convinced neither he nor the career prosecutors who handled this case would have permitted any political interference. In fact, I am sure they would have refused any plea agreement that they did not sincerely believe was in the best interests of justice.

2.2

2.3

2.4

The plea agreements provide for no incarceration for the individual defendants. The Government points out that a prison sentence would be highly unusual based on the facts of this case. The Government is also convinced that the nature of the convictions of the individual defendants, based on strict liability for misbranding, will send a strong deterrent message to the pharmaceutical industry.

The defendants point to their lack of prior criminal record, their strong commitment to civic and charitable endeavors, as well as their other positive personal attributes.

On the other hand, the potential damage by the misbranding disclosed in this case was substantial. And I do not overlook the danger to the public from this crime.

The defendants voluntarily accepted responsibility over this enterprise for which they

were generously rewarded. For these reasons, the lack of incarceration is the most difficult aspect, to me, of the plea agreements.

2.2

2.3

2.4

I do not doubt that most of our fellow citizens with perhaps only a passing knowledge of the case gleaned from the headlines will believe it inappropriate for no prison sentences to be imposed. I must confess that it bothers me, also, and I've studied this case for many months.

However, after careful deliberation, I have concluded that the plea agreements should be accepted. In the absence of legal proof by the Government that the individual defendants had knowledge of the wrongdoing charged or participated in it, I do not think prison appropriate. While this may not be a popular decision, my job is not to make popular decisions but to follow the law.

Accordingly, I will accept the plea agreements, and I will deny the third party motions.

Now, if there's nothing further, I wish to proceed to sentencing. First, I'm going to pronounce sentence as to the company. Counsel for the company will stand, along with a representative of the company. And does the company representative wish to make any statement to the court before sentence is

pronounced?

1.0

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

THE DEFENDANT PURDUE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Pursuant to the Sentencing
Reform Act, it is the judgment of the court that the
defendant, Purdue Frederick Company, Inc. is placed
on probation for a term of five years.

While on probation the defendant must not commit another federal, state or local crime. In addition, the defendant must comply with the following special condition: The defendant must report in writing to the probation officer once each three months and disclose therein any criminal prosecution, civil litigation, administrative proceeding or investigation or inquiry by any governmental authority commenced against it or any of its affiliated entities since the last such report of which the defendant has knowledge.

The defendant is ordered to pay a fine in the amount of \$500,000 and a special assessment of \$400 due immediately. It is further ordered that the financial sanctions and obligations agreed to in the defendant's plea agreement are hereby imposed on the defendant in the manner set forth in the plea agreement. The defendant has waived its right to appeal this sentence. You may be seated.

1 Now, if the individual defendants would each 2 stand with their counsel. First, Mr. Friedman, is 3 there anything you wish to say to me before I pronounce sentence in your case? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT FRIEDMAN: No thank you, Your 6 Honor. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Udell, is there anything 8 you wish to say to me before I pronounce sentence in 9 your case? 10 THE DEFENDANT UDELL: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Goldenheim, or 12 Dr. Goldenheim, is there anything you wish to say to 13 me before I pronounce sentence in your case? 14 THE DEFENDANT GOLDENHEIM: No, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Pursuant to the Sentencing 16 Reform Act it is the judgment of the court that the 17 defendants Michael Friedman, Howard Udell, Paul Goldenheim are hereby sentenced as follows: They are 18 19 each placed on probation for terms of three years. 20 While on probation, the defendants must comply 21 with the following mandatory conditions of 22 supervision: They must not commit another federal, 2.3 state or local crime; they must not unlawfully 2.4 possess controlled substances; must refrain from any 25 unlawful use of a controlled substance; and mandatory drug testing is waived.

They must comply with the standard conditions of supervision, as well as the following special conditions: They must pay any monetary sanctions imposed by this judgment; they must each provide 400 hours of community service related to prescription drug abuse treatment or prevention as approved in advance by the probation officer.

It is ordered that each defendant pay a fine in the amount of \$5,000, and a special assessment of \$25 due immediately.

It is further ordered that each defendant pay the amount set forth in his plea agreement to the Virginia Medicaid Fraud Unit's Program Income Fund in the manner set forth in such plea agreement.

The defendants have waived their right to appeal. You may be seated. If there's nothing further to be taken up in this case, we are adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 4:40 p.m.)

2.4

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I certify the foregoing is an accurate transcript
4	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled
5	matter.
6	
7	
8	7/25/07 Date /s/ Bridget A. Dickert
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	