Allegation: No "Paper Trail"

Massachusetts AG FAC ¶228:

By 2008, Purdue was working on a crush-proof reformulation of OxyContin to extend Purdue's patent monopoly. The Sacklers learned that another company was planning clinical research to test whether crush-proof opioids are safer for patients. Mortimer Sackler suggested that Purdue conduct similar studies to find out whether reformulated OxyContin was really safer before selling it to millions of patients. He wrote to Richard Sackler: "Purdue should be leading the charge on this type of research and should be generating the research to support our formulation. Why are we playing catch up ...? Shouldn't we have studies like this ...?" The Sacklers decided not to do the research because they wanted the profits from a new product, regardless of whether the deaths continued. Richard didn't want a paper trail, so he instructed Mortimer to call him, and CEO John Stewart met with his staff to plan how to phrase a carefully worded reply. Later that month, Stewart wrote to Richard that reformulating OxyContin "will not stop patients from the simple act of taking too many pills."

nined that two sales reps hired in the 2008 expansion rescriptions in Massachusetts that they were among y rewarded them with bonuses and all-expense-paid trips amples to motivate other reps to sell more opioids. ¹²⁷ and intended that the sales reps would push higher doses a Richard Sackler directed Purdue management to strength, giving higher measures to higher strengths. ¹¹²⁸ kler on the instruction. The Sacklers knew higher doses as the 1990s, Jonathan and Kathe Sackler knew that high doses of an opioid are used for long periods of

Sacklers voted to pay former CEO and criminal convict as one of several multi-million-dollar payments to the oyalry and protect the Sackler family. orking on a crush-proof reformulation of OxyContin to the Sacklers learned that another company was planning troof opioids are safer for patients. ¹¹² Mortimer Sackler studies to find out whether reformulated OxyContin was of patients. He wrote to Richard Sackler: "Purdue should search and should be generating the research to support

Sypek pg. 120; 2018-03-01 deposition of Timothy Quinn pg. 99 PLPC012000170948-949. D1701785443.

n, pg. 2, PPLPC012000159022 PC013000244844.

7

2008 Email Requests A Phone Call To Discuss A Study

From: Sackler, Dr Richard

Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2008 8:26 PM

To: Sackler, Mortimer JR **Cc:** Stewart, John H. (US)

Subject: RE: Columbia University - Abuser Tamper Testing

My sentiments exactly the first time I read it. But you should read it again. If you do and ask yourself what it means, I think you may come to a very different conclusion, as I now have.

The reason I sent it to you was that it was presented more than a year ago and perhaps to surprise, no one broke down the door to take over the product. We know that they have back-burnered the project, so when you reread it, ask yourself why it didn't generate a licensee.

We should talk about it. Give me a call at home.

- Innocuous email about a Columbia University study
- OIG <u>confirmed compliance</u> for 2008

CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=79393528]; Landau, /CN=LANDAUC]

ply to this. Will you be in the

But you should read it again. If you may come to a very different

ented more than a year ago and down the door to take over the red the project, so when you licensee.

Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2008 8:05 PM
To: Sackler, Dr Richard; Stewart, John H. (US)
Subject: Re: Columbia University - Abuser Tamper Testing

Purdue should be leading the charge on this type of research and should be generating the research to support our formulation. Why are we playing catch up

CONFIDENTIAL

PPLPC013000244843

2/12/08 Email from R. Sackler (PPLPC013000244843)