

Johnson & Johnson Statement on Matthey Verdict

April 18, 2024 - Attributable to Erik Haas, Worldwide Vice President of Litigation, Johnson & Johnson

“This verdict is yet another loss for the Beasley Allen law firm, which has not won a single case or recovered a dime for its clients in the years that it has pursued these talc claims — but nonetheless has been the primary opponent and impediment to a final and comprehensive settlement that would afford a timely recovery for all claimants, both current and future. Consistent with decades of scientific research, the jury appropriately found that talc is safe, does not contain asbestos and does not cause cancer, which is the same outcome the Company achieved in 16 of 17 ovarian cases tried to date. The plaintiffs’ bar should cease their pursuit of aberrant jackpot verdicts by proffering false and misleading narratives designed to confuse and deceive.

The verdict also furthers the plan the Company outlined last year, to pursue several parallel paths to achieve a comprehensive and final resolution of the talc litigation, including working with a vast majority of talc claimants on a consensual resolution of similar claims through bankruptcy. While those negotiations are proceeding, we will continue to defend the meritless talc claims in the tort system, which we have done successfully and repeatedly this year.

To learn more about our position and the science supporting the safety of talc, visit www.FactsAboutTalc.com.”

Additional Information

- **Plaintiff’s lawyers continue to mislead women into thinking talc can cause ovarian cancer and are unable to support their case through any legitimate science.** Plaintiff lawyers and their paid experts have now stooped to accusing venerable organizations, such as the American Cancer Society, whose membership is dedicated to cancer prevention and treatment, of being involved in a decades-long conspiracy with Johnson & Johnson and others to knowingly hide that talcum powder is allegedly contaminated with asbestos. In this latest trial, they even went so far as to suggest that Irving Selikoff, the namesake of the Mount Sinai Selikoff Centers for Occupational Health, who spent his career protecting workers from the dangers of asbestos, chose to knowingly publish misleading research due to untoward influence by industry. These statements are not just unfounded, they are dangerous.
- **Plaintiff’s lawyers continue to knowingly misstate facts and mischaracterize the evidence.** In this trial, plaintiff’s expert accused Johnson & Johnson employees of improperly influencing public health officials. That never actually happened, as counsel was forced to stipulate that the “johnson and johnson employee” was never employed by our company but rather was an epidemiologist and professor at the Harvard School of Public Health.
- **Plaintiff lawyers continue to exploit claimants - like the Matthey family - in search of jackpot verdicts.** These lawyers ignore the fact that nearly all claimants receive nothing in the tort system. It is long overdue that plaintiff’s attorneys act in the interest of claimants and participate in our contemplated consensual bankruptcy resolution.