

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA**
Norfolk Division

CAREFIRST OF MARYLAND, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-629

ORDER

Before the Court is the parties' joint motion for entry of final judgment in Defendants Johnson & Johnson and Janssen Biotech, Inc.'s (collectively, "J&J") favor pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58. ECF No. 923. The Court's Opinion and Order on summary judgment (ECF No. 794) granted in part and denied in part J&J's motion for summary judgment and denied the plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judgment in its entirety. The Court's Opinion and Order on J&J's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 887) vacated in part the denial of J&J's motion for summary judgment and granted summary judgment in favor of J&J as to the plaintiffs' Momenta patents acquisition theory of monopolization. The parties represent that "[a]lthough the Court's orders did not dispose of all issues related to the '307 [p]atent, . . . as a practical matter . . . it adjudicates the case adversely to the plaintiff." ECF No. 923 at 2 (quotation marks and citation omitted) (alteration accepted).

On February 10, 2026, the Court held a status conference on the motion. And during the conference, the plaintiffs agreed that the Court's orders on summary judgment and J&J's motion for reconsideration adjudicated all claims in favor of J&J.

There being no dispute left to resolve, the parties' motion (ECF No. 923) is **GRANTED**.

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to enter judgment in favor of the defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/



Jamar K. Walker
United States District Judge

Norfolk, Virginia
February 10, 2026