

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Comes now, Plaintiff, Anas Aremeyaw Anas ("Plaintiff") in the above styled matter, and now files this Complaint for damages against the defendants herein; and shows as follows:

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 1. Plaintiff is an internationally acclaimed investigative journalist and attorney at law, who works primarily to uncover corruption and human rights abuses in the Republic of Ghana and all over Africa.
- 2. In 2008, Plaintiff received the United States ("US") State Department Heroes award for his work relating to the combat of human trafficking; while the Global Health Council in Washington DC (USA) honored him with an award for excellence in Journalism in 2010.
- 3. Plaintiff's work has received special mention by various world leaders including Former US President, Barack Obama, former UN General Secretary Kofi Annan, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and other world leaders.
- 4. Plaintiff has collaborated with the British Broadcasting Corporation ("BBC"), Aljazeera English ("AJ"), Cable News Network ("CNN"), and others on some of his investigative works.



- 5. Plaintiff has received awards including, foreign journalist of the year from the US based Association of Black Journalists (NABJ) in 2021, International Sports Press Association in Switzerland in 2019; the key to the city of Worcester, Massachusetts in the US in 2016, and the African Hero award from the Ohio University in the US in 2016.
- 6. Plaintiff was invited to France by the former United Nations (UN) Secretary General, Mr. Kofi Annan, the 39th President of the USA, President Jimmy Carter, the former President of Ireland, Nobel Peace Prize laureate, and former UN High Commissioner for human rights, Mary Robinson, and Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, Archbishop Desmond Tutu; and was decorated for his fight against human rights abuses in the world.
- 7. Prior to the conduct that underlies this action, Plaintiff was frequently engaged and invited to speak at universities and colleges like Harvard University, Duke University, Cambridge University, Oxford University, and London School of Economics, among others.
- 8. Plaintiff frequently visits the US, where he visits several states including the State of New Jersey; where he has family, friends, and supporters.
- 9. Defendant, Kennedy Ohene Agyapong, ("the First Defendant") is a self-proclaimed "rich" businessman, who is a former US permanent residency card holder; and a property owner in the city of West Orange in Essex County, in the State of New Jersey; and has business interests in other parts of the US and is a current member of the Parliament of the Republic of Ghana in West Africa.
- 10. Defendant, Frederick Asamoah, ("the Second Defendant") is a self-styled "social media commentator," who hails from the Republic of Ghana, and is currently a resident of the State of Maryland.
- 11. The Second Defendant owns and operates www.theannouncernewsonline.com, which is dedicated to reporting news from and about the Republic of Ghana, that targets as its audience, citizens and former citizens of the Republic of Ghana, resident in the US including in the State of New Jersey; and who also operates an internet based broadcast service dubbed "the Daddy Fred Show," which is broadcast live and on demand via social media platforms like Facebook and YouTube.
- 12. The Daddy Fred Show is targeted at an audience that consist of citizens and former citizens of the Republic of Ghana, resident in several States in the US including the State of New Jersey.
- 13. The First Defendant is subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court by

virtue of his tortious conduct committed by the First Defendant, during an interview conducted over the internet with the Second Defendant, while in his house within the jurisdiction of this Court, and purposely intended for the consumption of citizens of the State of New Jersey, which constituted "virtual contacts" sufficient for specific jurisdiction purposes; and can be served in his family home at 7 Walter Street, West Orange, New Jersey, 07052.

- 14. The Second Defendant is subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court by virtue of his tortious conduct committed by transmitting via the internet, defamatory material emanating from within the jurisdiction of this Court, and purposely intended for consumption of citizens of the State of New Jersey, constituted "virtual contacts" sufficient for specific jurisdiction purposes.
- 15. Venue is proper in this Court because the tortious conduct that forms the basis of this action was committed in the city of West Orange, in Essex County, in the State of New Jersey.

Factual Background

- 16. On 6 June 2018, Plaintiff debuted a documentary produced in conjunction with the BBC which chronicled the corrupt practices in Ghanaian and African professional football titled "Betraying the Game," popularly known in the Republic of Ghana as "Number 12."
- 17. Some scenes from "Betraying the Game" contained allegations that the President of the Republic of Ghana, and some high-ranking members of his cabinet were open to being financially influenced in exchange for the performance of official acts, on a guid pro quo basis.
- 18. The Republic of Ghana is a constitutional democracy that practices what is known as "winner takes all politics;" which, in the Ghanaian sense, is the practice by which by means of divisive and partisan selection, all Ghanaians who are not part of one of two main political parties that gains the most popular votes in the most recent Presidential elections, are excluded from national governance and decision making in a manner that polarizes the nation and dissipates its human resource endowments.
- 19. At all times relevant to this Complaint, the government of the Republic of Ghana ("GOG") was controlled by the members of the New Patriotic Party ("NPP"); of which the First Defendant is a key member.
- 20. The allegations referenced in paragraph 17, caused an uproar amongst citizens of the Republic of Ghana and further afield, resident within the Republic of Ghana; and resident elsewhere in the world, including places like West Orange

and other parts of the State of New Jersey; and embarrassed the GOG; amid threats by its citizens to change the political fortunes of the government of the day.

- 21. At all times relevant to this Complaint, the First Defendant held himself out to be a de facto spokesperson for his party, the NPP and mouthpiece of the GOG.
- 22. In the aftermath of the debut of "Betraying the Game;" the First Defendant stated his intent to launch an *ad hominem* attack on the Plaintiff, to assassinate his character; so as to ostensibly neutralize the effect of the allegations referenced in paragraph 17 herein, in the minds of the citizens and voters of the Republic of Ghana.
- 23. As part of the attack referenced in paragraph 22 herein, the First Defendant released pictures and the identity of Ahmed Suale, an undercover journalist who hitherto kept his identity a secret, and who worked on "Betraying the Game;" and openly called for his assault. Again, the First Defendant disclosed Ahmed Suale's residential address which was also hitherto, unknown to the public and threatened to put out the car numbers of Ahmed Suale because he (First Defendant) had tracked the said car numbers.
- 24. On 16 January 2019, Ahmed Suale, was shot twice in the heart and once in the neck and murdered in broad daylight by unknown assailants.
- 25. As of the time of authoring this Complaint, no one has been tried and convicted for the murder referenced in paragraph 24 herein.
- 26. The First Defendant has also been exceptionally vicious and brazen in his attacks on the Plaintiff, calling on the general public to physically attack and assault him as well as calling for the Plaintiff to be lynched, on both live radio and television programs.
- 27. The First Defendant signified his commitment to his call for the lynching of the plaintiff by his gesture of making a choking sound and dragging his finger across his throat during a live television program on 29 May 2018.
- 28. Similarly, the defendant incited the general public to physically attack and assault the plaintiff on 30 May 2018 during the course of a live program on television.
- 29. Then also on 4 June 2018 during a live program broadcast on radio called for the hanging of the plaintiff.

- 30. Between 29 May 2018 and 20 November 2018, the First Defendant made a series of defamatory statements on a radio station owned by the First Defendant in the Republic of Ghana regarding the Plaintiff; including that he murdered several Chinese nationals.
- 31. On 8 June 2018, the Plaintiff instituted legal action against the First Defendant in Ghana for the conduct referenced in paragraph 30 herein.
- 32. On or about 18 March 2019, the First Defendant was quoted on live radio broadcast in the Republic of Ghana, as saying;

"after mounting a spirited defense for the party against undercover journalist Anas Aremeyaw Anas, I was disgraced in parliament like a child. Look at how the party is using me and eventually will disgrace me. I have had enough and I am quitting I am telling you in plain words. Before the Anas video came out, those who had the chance to preview it were alarmed and knew it will put the party in a bad light. They sent emissaries to my house at dawn to go and defend the party; thereafter they disgraced me in parliament. Anybody who is at the NPP headquarters lobbying to be a Minister if I am not an MP he cannot run me down. Nobody can also come and ask me to leave my house at 7am and go to defend the party on radio or television. Politics is not the only means through which one can make it. I am tired of NPP and the embarrassments."

- 33. On 19 July 2021, the First Defendant testified under cross examination in the legal action referenced in paragraph 30 herein; wherein admitted that does not have evidence to prove the Plaintiff murdered several Chinese nationals.
- 34. On 7 September 2021, the First Defendant appeared as a guest of the Daddy Fred Show as a guest of the Second Defendant.
- 35. According to the Second Defendant, the First Defendant's appearance on the Daddy Fred Show was to "clear the air" regarding the reputation and character of the First Defendant before citizens and former citizens of the Republic of Ghana resident in the US, including the State of New Jersey.
- 36. During the interview referenced in paragraphs 34 and 35 herein, the First Defendant stated, that he was speaking from his home in West Orange in the State of New Jersey.
- 37. According to the Second Defendant, the interview referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, and 36 herein, was transmitted live on Facebook and on other internet-based platforms and will and has been made available on demand on

Facebook and on other internet-based platforms till date; garnering over twentynine thousand views on Facebook alone as of authoring the instant Complaint.

Count One Defamation

- 38. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every prior allegation of this Complaint as if set forth in detail herein.
- 39. During the interview referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 36, and 37, the First Defendant stated at minute 33:44, that Plaintiff is a criminal.
- 40. By criminal, the First Defendant meant it to be understood by right-thinking members of society, that Plaintiff has been convicted of a crime in the Republic of Ghana.
- 41. The statement in paragraph 39 is false.

<u>Count Two</u> <u>Defamation</u>

- 42. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every prior allegation of this Complaint as if set forth in detail herein.
- 43. On 7, September 2021, during the interview referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 36, 37 and 39 herein, the First Defendant stated at minute 35:31 to minute 35:36, that Plaintiff is behind the murder of Ahmed Suale.
- 44. The statement in paragraph 43 was intended to be understood by right-thinking members of society that Plaintiff is a primary actor or a co-conspirator to the crime of murder as defined by the laws of the Republic of Ghana.
- 45. The statement in paragraph 43 is false.

Count Three Defamation

- 46. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every prior allegation of this Complaint as if set forth in detail herein.
- 47. On 7 September 2021 during the interview referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 36, 37, 39 and 43 of this Complaint, the First Defendant, at minute 35:56 to 36:27, stated, that Plaintiff is responsible for the death of multiple Chinese nationals in the Republic of Ghana, and that, he has videos to that effect.

- 48. The statement in paragraph 47 was intended to be understood by right-thinking members of society that Plaintiff is the primary actor or a co-conspirator in multiple murders as defined by the laws of the Republic of Ghana.
- 49. The statement in paragraph 47 is false.

Count Four Defamation

- 50. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every prior allegation of this Complaint as if set forth in detail herein.
- 51. On 7 September 2021, during the interview referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 43, and 47 of this Complaint, the First Defendant stated at minute 37:00 to 37:07, that Plaintiff is a thief as defined by the laws of the Republic of Ghana.
- 52. The statement in paragraph 51 is false.

Count Five Defamation

- 53. On 7 September 2021, during the interview referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 43, and 47 herein, the First Defendant, at minute 35:56 to 36:27, stated, that, he, the First Respondent has proven in a court of law, that, the Plaintiff has indeed murdered multiple Chinese nationals.
- 54. The statement in paragraph 53 was intended to be understood by right-thinking members of society that Plaintiff is a primary actor or a co-conspirator in multiple murders as defined by the laws of the Republic of Ghana.
- 55. The statement in paragraph 53 is false.

Particulars of Actual Malice

- 56. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every prior allegation of this Complaint as if set forth in detail herein.
- 57. The First Defendant uttered and published the false statements referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 39, 43, 47, 49, and 53 in the instant Complaint with malice and/or with reckless disregard to the reputational damage that will be suffered by the Plaintiff.

- 58. At the time all five defamatory statements were uttered, the First Defendant was aware of the falsity of his utterances because he had previously been cross examined and admitted to those falsity the statements referenced in paragraphs 43, 47, 53 while testifying under oath.
- 59. Prior to the time all five defamatory statements were made, the First Defendant is on record to have admitted that he was commissioned by his political party to launch a false ad hominem attack on the Plaintiff to discredit Plaintiff and to soften the impact of the contents of Betraying the game.
- 60. Consistent with the statements made by the First Defendant in paragraph 54 herein, the First Defendant subsequently, uttered and published the false statements referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 37, 43, 47, 49 and 53 herein, intending for it be believed by right thinking members of society, and knowing that it will be foreseeably consumed in the State of New Jersey.
- 61. The Second Defendant is a pro NPP platform which is engaged in a pattern of conduct that can only be reasonably described as the use of its platform in the conduct of public relations for the NPP-led GOG in the US, which is also used by the First Defendant to manage his reputation in the eyes of citizens of the Republic of Ghana resident in the US.
- 62. The Second Defendant deliberately provided the First Defendant with a platform to publish the defamatory statements referenced in paragraphs 34, 35, 37,43, 47, 49 and 53 herein, under the guise of clearing his name; knowing that the statements were false and failed to give the Plaintiff the opportunity to rebut the statements referenced in paragraphs 35, 37, 43, 47, and 53. This is especially true because the intent of the First Defendant for his false *ad hominem* attacks on the Plaintiff as communicated by the First Defendant himself and referenced under paragraphs 32 and 59, were public and same was known to the Second Defendant at the time of his tortious conduct.

<u>Damages</u>

63. The Plaintiff has been traumatized by the actions complained of in this Complaint and has suffered severe emotional distress; because he has had to field mortifying questions from former clients, agents, business associates, and family members who reside all over the world including the City of West Orange in the State of New Jersey.

- 64. Plaintiff also states that the words complained of are utterly false, products of the First Defendant's imagination and were mischievously calculated by First Defendant to disparage the Plaintiff and to create disaffection for him and to bring him into odium in the eyes of right-thinking members of the society in West Orange, Newark, and other parts of the State of New Jersey and the global community.
- 65. For his reward, for launching the false ad hominin attack on the Plaintiff, the First Defendant was awarded several lucrative government contracts by the NPP led government of the Republic of Ghana, running into hundreds of millions of United States Dollars.

Wherefore Plaintiff prays for relief as follows;

- a. An award of presumed damages in the amount of five million (5,000,000.00) United States Dollars:
- b. An award of special damages in the amount of ten million (10,000,000.00) United States Dollars;
- c. An award of actual damages in the amount of five million (5,000,000.00) United States Dollars:
- d. An award of punitive damages in the amount of ten million (10,000,000.00) United States Dollars:
- e. An order restraining the First Defendant from further making the utterances complained of; and ordering the Second Defendant to permanently delete all defamatory statements it has published about the Plaintiff on the worldwide web;
- f. Any other relief as the Court may deem fit.

Respectfully and humbly submitted,

This day of April, 11, 2022.

Anas Aremeyaw Anas

Plaintiff Pro Se

C/O Emmanuel Ansah Mclord

P.O. Box 48

Lodi, NJ 07644

USA

|--|

Civil Case Information Statement

(CIS)

Use for initial Law Division

For Use by Clerk's Office Only
Payment type: ☐ ck ☐ cg ☐ ca
Chg/Ck Number:
Amount:
Overpayment:
Batch Number:

8000 1 1000 I		ivii Fait pleading:	s (not	motions) under Rule 4:5-1				
	Plead	ding will be reject information above	cted fo e the l	or filing, under <i>Rule</i> 1:5-6 black bar is not complete	6(c).	Overpayment:		
				ature is not affixed		Batch Number:		
Attorney/Pro Se Name				Telephone Number	County	of Venue	(1)-1	
ANAS AREMEYA		S		(202) 823-7851	Esse	K		
Firm Name (if applicable)				V-00-	Docket Number (when available)			
Office Address				200	Document Type			
P.O Box 48, Lodi, NJ 07644			.5	COMPLAINT				
ii-					Jury De	mand Yes	□ No	
Name of Party (e.g., J ANAS AREMEYA	ohn Doe, F	Plaintiff)	Caption					
ANAS ALIENETA	MA WINUS	'	ANAS	S AREMEYAW ANAS V. KEI	NEDY	AGYAPONG		
		TA 9755						
Case Type Number (See reverse side for I		Are sexual abuse claims	s	Is this a professional malpractice of	ase?	□ Yes	■ No	
609	isung)	alleged? Yes No		If you have checked "Yes," see N. regarding your obligation to file an	ISA 2A	53A-27 and applicable	_	
Related Cases Pendin	ıg?	If "Yes," list doo	cket num					
☐ Yes	■ No	٥						
Do you anticipate addi	ing any par	t	\neg	Name of defendant's primary insur	эпсе соп	nnany (if known)		_
(arising out of same transaction or occurrence)?				Wiles 55	pany in mounty	None		
☐ Yes ■ No				3.11		☐ Unkne		
The state of the state of	The Inf	ormation Provided	l on Th	nis Form Cannot be Introdu	iced in	to Evidence.		
	1	THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE						
	or Purpose	es of Determining if Case	is Appre	opriate for Mediation				
Do parties have a cum	or Purpose ent, past or	es of Determining if Case or recurrent relationship?	is Appro	Yes," is that relationship	Maighbar	Cibor (ovalein)		
	or Purpose ent, past or	es of Determining if Case	is Appro		_	☐ Other (explain)		
Do parties have a cum	or Purpose ent, past or	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship?	is Appro	Yes," is that relationship Employer/Employee	_			
Do parties have a cum Yes Does the statute gover	or Purpose rent, past or ming this ca	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No ase provide for payment	is Appro	Yes," is that relationship: Employer/Employee	55	☐ Yes	■ No	
Do parties have a cum Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT	or Purpose ent, past or ming this court to THIS CA	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No rase provide for payment o any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF	is Appro	Yes," is that relationship Employer/Employee	perment o	Taccelerated disposition MEN 17 THE DEFE	■ No	
Do parties have a cum Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT	or Purpose ent, past or ming this court to THIS CA	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No rase provide for payment o any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF	is Appro	Yes," is that relationship: Employer/Employee	perment o	Taccelerated disposition MEN 17 THE DEFE	■ No	
Do parties have a cum Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT	or Purpose ent, past or ming this court to THIS CA	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No rase provide for payment o any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF	is Appro	Yes," is that relationship: Employer/Employee	perment o	Yes raccelerated disposition	■ No	
Do parties have a cum Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT DOES NOT DENY	rent, past or ming this court to THIS CA	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No ase provide for payment to any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF	t of fees lacteristic	Yes," is that relationship Employer/Employee	perment o	Taccelerated disposition MEN 17 THE DEFE	■ No	
Do parties have a curred Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT DOES NOT DENY	rent, past or ming this ca the court of THIS CA Y MAKING	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No case provide for payment o any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF IG THE DEFAMATO	t of fees lacteristic	Yes," is that relationship Employer/Employee	perment of LUDG	Taccelerated disposition MEN OF THE DEFE	■ No	
Do parties have a curred Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT DOES NOT DENY	rent, past or ming this cauthe court to THIS CAY MAKING	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No case provide for payment to any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF IG THE DEFAMATO	t of fees lacteristic	Yes," is that relationship Employer/Employee	Gement of UDG	T accelerated is positive of the DEFE OF T	■ No	
Do parties have a curred Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT DOES NOT DENY	rent, past or ming this cauthe court to THIS CAY MAKING	es of Determining if Case r recurrent relationship? No case provide for payment to any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF IG THE DEFAMATO	t of fees lacteristic	Yes," is that relationship Employer/Employee	Gement of UDG	Taccelerated disposition MEN OF THE DEFE	■ No	
Do parties have a curred Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT DOES NOT DENY Do you or you yes Will an interp Yes I certify that confide	ming this can the court to THIS CAY MAKING	es of Determining if Case or recurrent relationship? No case provide for payment to any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF IG THE DEFAMATO case any disability accoma No caseded? No caseded?	t of fees lacteristic TO DORY ST	Yes," is that relationship: Employer/Employee	gement of LOBIC ES	Taccelerated in the DEFE WEN OF THE DEFE W DIVISION SEX VICINAGE ACCOMMODATION	NDANT	
Do parties have a curred Yes Does the statute gover Use this space to alert I BELIEVE THAT DOES NOT DENY Do you or you yes Will an interp Yes I certify that confide	ming this can the court to THIS CAY MAKING	es of Determining if Case or recurrent relationship? No case provide for payment to any special case chara SE LENDS ITSELF IG THE DEFAMATO case any disability accoma No caseded? No caseded?	t of fees lacteristic TO DORY ST	Yes," is that relationship: Employer/Employee	gement of LOBIC ES	Taccelerated in the DEFE WEN OF THE DEFE W DIVISION SEX VICINAGE ACCOMMODATION	NDANT	

Civil Case Information Statement

(CIS)
Use for initial pleadings (not motions) under Rule 4:5-1

CASE TYPES (Choose one and enter number of case type in appropriate sp

	(0.0000 0.0000 0.0000	type ii	
	k I - 150 days discovery		
151	Name Change	506	PIP Coverage
175	Forfeiture	510	UM or UIM Claim (coverage issues only)
399	Tenancy Real Property (other than Tenancy, Contract, Condemnation, Complex	511	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
355	Commercial or Construction)	512 801	Lemon Law
502	Book Account (debt collection matters only)	802	Summary Action Open Public Records Act (summary action)
505	Other Insurance Claim (including declaratory judgment actions)	999	Other (briefly describe nature of action)
ĺ			The factor of the state of contains
l			
		-	
THE RESERVE	k II - 300 days discovery		
305	Construction		Auto Negligence - Personal Injury (verbal threshold)
509	Employment (other than Conscientious Employees Protection Act (CEPA)	605	Personal Injury
599	or Law Against Discrimination (LAD)) Contract/Commercial Transaction	610	Auto Negligence - Property Damage
	Auto Negligence – Personal Injury (non-verbal threshold)	621 699	UM or UIM Claim (includes bodily injury) Tort - Other
000.1	The realization of closural injury (non-versal unesticid)	099	ton - Other
	7.		
Track	k III'- 450 days discovery		
005	Civil Rights	608	Toxic Tort
301	Condemnation	609	Defamation
602	Assault and Battery	616	Whistleblower / Conscientious Employee Protection Act
604	Medical Malpractice		(CEPA) Cases
606 607	Product Liability Professional Malpractice	617	Inverse Condemnation
007	Froissional Maipractice	618	Law Against Discrimination (LAD) Cases
Track	(IV - Active Case Management by Individual Judge / 450 d	lavs d	iscovery
	Environmental/Environmental Coverage Litigation	COMPANIES OF THE PARTY OF THE P	Insurance Fraud
303	Mt. Laurel	620	False Claims Act
508	Complex Commercial	701	Actions in Lieu of Prerogative Writs
513	Complex Construction		•
Multis	county Litigation (Track IV)		- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1
271	Accutane/Isotretinoin	504	
274	Risperdal/Seroquel/Zyprexa	601	Asbestos
	Bristol-Myers Squibb Environmental	623 624	Propecia Stryker LFIT CoCr V40 Femoral Heads
	Fosamax	625	Firefighter Hearing Loss Litigation
285	Stryker Trident Hip Implants	626	Abilify
286	Levaquin	627	Physiomesh Flexible Composite Mesh
	Reglan	628	Taxotere/Docetaxel
	Pelvic Mesh/Gynecare	629	Zostavax
	Pelvic Mesh/Bard	630	Proceed Mesh/Patch
	DePuy ASR Hip Implant Litigation	631	Proton-Pump Inhibitors
	AlloDerm Regenerative Tissue Matrix	632	
	Stryker Rejuvenate/ABG II Modular Hip Stem Components	633	Prolene Hemia System Mesh
	Mirena Contraceptive Device Olmesartan Medoxomil Medications/Benicar	634	Allergan Biocell Textured Breast Implants
	Talc-Based Body Powders		
- 556			
	If you believe this case requires a track other than that provide	led abo	ve, please indicate the reason on Side 4
	in the space under "Case C	haracte	ristics.
	•		
Ple	ease check off each applicable category 🔲 Putative Clas	ss Act	ion Title 59 Consumer Fraud