

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Nos. 24-2184, 24-2185, 24-2189, 24-2194, 24-2202, 24-2203, 24-2256 & 24-2257

In re: Lipitor Antitrust Litigation

(D.N.J. No. 3:12-cv-02389)
(MDL No. 2332)

SUR PETITION FOR REHEARING

Present: HARDIMAN, SHWARTZ, RESTREPO, BIBAS, PORTER, MATEY,
FREEMAN, MONTGOMERY-REEVES, CHUNG, BOVE, MASCOTT and SCIRICA*,
Circuit Judges

The petition for rehearing filed by Appellants Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs in the above-entitled case (Nos. 24-2202 & 24-2203) having been submitted to the judges who participated in the decision of this Court, it is hereby ORDERED that the petition for rehearing by the panel is GRANTED. The Clerk is directed to file the amended opinion

* The Honorable Anthony J. Scirica, a member of the merits panel for this appeal, was unavailable to participate in the decision on panel rehearing. The request for panel rehearing has been submitted to the remaining members of the merits panel, and the request for en banc rehearing has been submitted to all active members of the Court who are not recused. See 28 U.S.C. § 46(d); 3d Cir. I.O.P. 12.1.

contemporaneously with this order. As the revisions do not affect the disposition of the appeal, the judgment will remain as filed.

The petition for rehearing in the above-entitled case (Nos. 24-2202 & 24-2203) having also been submitted to all the available circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service, and a majority of the judges of the circuit in regular service not having voted for rehearing, the petition for rehearing before the Court en banc filed by Appellants Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs is DENIED.

The petition for rehearing filed by Appellants CVS Pharmacy, Inc., et al., Walgreen Co., et al., Meijer, Inc., et al., and Giant Eagle, Inc., in the above-entitled case (Nos. 24-2184, 24-2185, 24-2189, 24-2194, 24-2256 & 24-2257) having been submitted to the judges who participated in the decision of this Court and to all the other available circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service, and no judge who concurred in the decision having asked for rehearing, and a majority of the judges of the circuit in regular service not having voted for rehearing, the petition for rehearing filed by those Appellants is DENIED.

BY THE COURT,

s/Patty Shwartz
Circuit Judge

Date: September 8, 2026
Amr/cc: all counsel of record