



New York Diet Drug Litigation

Search

[Advanced Scholar Search](#)[Read this case](#)[How cited](#)**MATTER OF NEW YORK DIET DRUG**Highlighting **New York Diet Drug Litigation** [Remove highlighting](#)**47 A.D.3d 586 (2008)
850 N.Y.S.2d 408**

**In the Matter of NEW YORK DIET DRUG LITIGATION.
CLARA APPEL-HOLE et al., Plaintiffs,
v.
WYETH-AYERST LABORATORIES et al., Defendants.
PARKER & WAICHMAN LLP et al., Intervenor Respondents;
NAPOLI, KAISER & BERN, LLP, et al., Intervenor Appellants.**

Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Department.

Decided January 31, 2008.

Concur — Mazzairelli, J.P., Marlow, Catterson and Kavanagh, JJ.

P & W, the referring attorneys, claim that in a mass settlement of **litigation** arising from the use of Fen-Phen, settling attorneys Napoli, Kaiser & Bern (NKB) misallocated settlement awards and costs to the referred clients. The court properly allowed P & W, as well as a group of its clients, to intervene and seek disclosure of certain documents in support of a settlement order dated November 7, 2001. "The remedy for fraud allegedly committed during the course of a legal proceeding must be exercised in that lawsuit by moving to vacate the civil judgment (CPLR 5015 [a] [3]), and not by another plenary action collaterally attacking that judgment" (*St. Clement v Londa*, 8 AD3d 89, 90 [2004]). P & W and its clients properly so moved. Furthermore, P & W's action in moving to intervene was not untimely. To the contrary, any delay in P & W's motion was due largely to NKB's own action in moving ex parte for the settlement order despite its own awareness that P & W disputed the settlement allocations.

We have considered NKB's other contentions and find them unavailing.

[About Google Scholar](#) - [About Google](#) - [My Citations](#)

©2011 Google