

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

In Re: FEMA TRAILER
FORMALDEHYDE PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL NO. 07-1873

SECTION "N" (5)

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO
Member Case Nos. 10-4112; 10-4408; 10-4129
09-8436; 10-3627; 10-3631; 10-3633

ORDER AND REASONS

Before the Court is the "Motion for New Trial and or Reconsideration Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(a)(b)(c)" (Rec. Doc. 20894), filed by Plaintiffs Sharren Taylor, Paula Gonzales English, Earl Norman, Nathaniel Levy, Adelliny Dison, Louis Ussin, Anthony Tasker, and others. Specifically, this motion seeks reconsideration of the January 19, 2011 Order and Reasons (Rec. Docs. 19856 and 19899), wherein the Court granted the Motions to Dismiss as to member cases 10-4112; 10-4408; 10-4129; 09-8436; 10-3627; 10-3631; 10-3633. Considering the memoranda of the parties and the applicable law,

IT IS ORDERED that the "Motion for New Trial and or Reconsideration Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(a)(b)(c) (Rec. Doc. 20894) is **GRANTED** to the following extent:

The Order and Reasons at Rec. Doc. 19856 may is hereby **AMENDED** to the extent that it

dismissed Bechtel National, Inc. from the *English* (10-4112), *Norman* (10-4408) and *Taylor* (10-4129) civil actions.¹ Further, the Order and Reasons at Rec. Doc. 19899 is hereby **AMENDED** to the extent that it dismissed Shaw Environmental, Inc. from the *Levy* (09-8436) and *Ussin* (10-3631) matters, Fluor Enterprises, Inc. from the *Disson* (10-3627) matter, and CH2M HILL Constructors, Inc. from the *Tasker* (10-3633) case.²

Also, this motion is granted as unopposed to the extent that it relates to any claims against the Manufacturer Defendants in the above stated member cases as no opposition from that group was timely received.

New Orleans, Louisiana, this 9th day of September, 2011.


KURT D. ENGELHARDT
United States District Court

¹ The Contractor defendants do not oppose this result; however, they notably do not concede that Plaintiffs' allegations regarding the identity of the contractors that allegedly installed their trailers is correct. (See Rec. Doc. 21640).

² The Contractor defendants do not oppose this result; however, they notably do not concede that Plaintiffs' allegations regarding the identity of the contractors that allegedly installed their trailers is correct. (See Rec. Doc. 21640).