

Drug Manufacturer or Association	Court Where Case Was Filed	Order / Opinion Last Issued	State Law Being Challenged	Court's Holding	Case Status
PhRMA	Eastern District of Arkansas	<a href="#">March 12</a> (Opinion by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals)	<a href="#">Arkansas Act 1103</a>	The Eighth Circuit affirmed the district court's granting of summary judgment in favor of covered entities that intervened in the case, rejecting PhRMA's assertion that the law was preempted by the 340B statute or the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.	Petition for rehearing <i>en banc</i> and petition for rehearing by the panel were denied on May 2.  On July 31, PhRMA filed a petition for a <i>writ of certiorari</i> to have the case heard by the US Supreme Court.
PhRMA	Western District of Louisiana	<a href="#">July 27, 2023</a> (Complaint filed)	<a href="#">HB 548</a>	No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	PhRMA filed a motion for summary judgment on November 3, 2023, and the defendants filed cross motions for summary judgment on December 15, 2023. A hearing on the motions occurred on June 6.
Novartis	District of Maryland	<a href="#">May 29</a> (Complaint filed)	<a href="#">HB 1056</a>	No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.

Drug Manufacturer or Association	Court Where Case Was Filed	Order / Opinion Last Issued	State Law Being Challenged	Court's Holding	Case Status
PhRMA	Southern District of Mississippi	<a href="#">July 1</a> (Opinion and order denying motion for preliminary injunction)	<a href="#">HB 728</a>	<p>A district court denied the plaintiffs' respective motions for a preliminary injunction, declining to block HB 728 while the respective cases are pending.</p> <p>In each case, the district court found that the plaintiffs had not demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits. Among other issues, the court explained that the plaintiffs failed to demonstrate how HB 728 creates a substantial obstacle to the purposes of the 340B statute. Instead, HB 728 "prohibits manufacturers from interfering with covered entities ordering delivery of Section 340B drugs to pharmacies for distribution," which the 340B statute neither requires nor precludes. "If anything," the court concluded, "H.B. 728 arguably promotes Section 340B's objective of ensuring covered-entity patients can conveniently access their medications."</p>	Pending appeal of the orders denying the motions for a preliminary injunction before the Fifth Circuit.
AbbVie		<a href="#">July 22</a> (Opinion and order denying motion for preliminary injunction)			
Novartis	Southern District of West Virginia	<a href="#">May 31</a> (Complaint filed)	<a href="#">SB 325</a>	No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.

Drug Manufacturer or Association	Court Where Case Was Filed	Order / Opinion Last Issued	State Law Being Challenged	Court's Holding	Case Status
<b>PhRMA</b>		<a href="#">May 31</a> (Complaint filed)			Defendants filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on August 9.
<b>AbbVie Allergan Aptalis Pharma US Durata Therapeutics Pharmacyclics</b>	District of Minnesota	<a href="#">August 20</a> (Amended complaint filed)	<a href="#">HB 4757</a>	No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.
<b>AstraZeneca</b>		<a href="#">August 23</a> (Amended complaint filed)		No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.

<b>Drug Manufacturer or Association</b>	<b>Court Where Case Was Filed</b>	<b>Order / Opinion Last Issued</b>	<b>State Law Being Challenged</b>	<b>Court's Holding</b>	<b>Case Status</b>
<b>AbbVie</b> <b>Allergan</b> <b>Aptalis Pharma US</b> <b>Durata Therapeutics</b> <b>Pharmacyclics</b>	District of Kansas	July 1 (Complaint filed)	<a href="#">SB 28</a>	No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.
<b>AstraZeneca</b>		July 2 (Complaint filed)		No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.
<b>Novartis</b>		<a href="#">July 30</a> (Complaint filed)		No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.

<b>Drug Manufacturer or Association</b>	<b>Court Where Case Was Filed</b>	<b>Order / Opinion Last Issued</b>	<b>State Law Being Challenged</b>	<b>Court's Holding</b>	<b>Case Status</b>
<b>PhRMA</b>		<a href="#">August 5</a> (Complaint filed)		No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.
<b>AbbVie Allergan Aptalis Pharma US Durata Therapeutics Pharmacyclics</b>	Eastern District of Missouri	<a href="#">July 22</a> (Complaint filed)	<a href="#">SB 751</a>	No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.
<b>Novartis</b>	Western District of Missouri	August 2 (Complaint filed)		No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.

<b>Drug Manufacturer or Association</b>	<b>Court Where Case Was Filed</b>	<b>Order / Opinion Last Issued</b>	<b>State Law Being Challenged</b>	<b>Court's Holding</b>	<b>Case Status</b>
<b>AstraZeneca</b>	Western District of Missouri	August 21 (Complaint filed)		No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.
<b>PhRMA</b>	Western District of Missouri	August 22 (Complaint filed)		No substantive ruling yet on the merits of the complaint.	Complaint filed; answer not yet pled.