

NEWS

ENTERTAINMENT

CLASSIFIEDS

CARS

HOMES

JOB

SHOPPING



TYPE SIZE: S M L

Subscribe to the [Austin American Statesman](#)

More about: [RSS](#) | [Wireless](#) | Search  Site  Web  Archive

Web Search powered by **YAHOO! SEARCH** | [Register Now](#) | [Log In](#)

NEWS | BUSINESS | SPORTS | LIFE | OPINION | WEATHER | BLOGS | MULTIMEDIA | CUSTOMER SERVICE | ADVERTISE

## OPINION

[Editorials](#) | [Op-Ed](#) | [Letters](#) | [Ben Sargent](#) | [Columnists](#) | [Insight](#)

[E-MAIL](#) | [PRINT](#) | [MOST E-MAILED](#) | [CLICK-2-LISTEN](#) | [SHARE](#)

Advertisement

Advertisement



[VIEW ALL TOP JOBS](#) | [SEARCH FOR A JOB](#)



Toby Talbot  
ASSOCIATED PRESS

[\(enlarge photo\)](#)

The U.S. Supreme Court recently upheld a Vermont Supreme Court ruling that forced Wyeth Pharmaceuticals to pay \$6.8 million to Diana Levine, a musician whose lower arm and hand had to be amputated after she was injected with an anti-nausea medication.

**MORE OPINION**

- ▶ [Costly testing shows no steroid problem](#) | Comments (15)
- ▶ [Reclaiming a parched lake](#) | Comments (3)
- ▶ [Green Lantern, Fourth of July doldrums and charity](#) | Comments (34)
- ▶ [Editorial presidential endorsements](#)
- ▶ [Ben Sargent's cartoon](#)

**MORE ON STATESMAN.COM**

- ▶ [Supreme Court rejects limits on drug lawsuits](#) (03/04/2009)
- ▶ [High court ruled in favor of patients](#) (03/09/2009)
- ▶ [Dems move to overturn shield for device makers](#) (03/05/2009)

[EXPAND THIS LIST](#)

**RELATED SUBJECTS**

- ▶ [Judiciary](#)
- ▶ [U.S. Supreme Court](#)
- ▶ [Food and Drug Administration](#)

[EXPAND THIS LIST](#)

**MOST E-MAILED STORIES**

- ▶ [Homebuyers finding bargains as market thaws](#)
- ▶ [Limbaugh wants country to fail? I want Limbaugh to fail](#)
- ▶ [Spread offense era means fewer fullbacks](#)
- ▶ [At least five dead in Liberty County car crash](#)
- ▶ [Longhorns let one slip away](#)

**COMMENTARY**

**McGarity: Wyeth v. Levine is a rare win for consumers**

**Thomas O. McGarity, LOCAL CONTRIBUTOR**

Monday, March 09, 2009

The Supreme Court recently ended an acrimonious battle between large pharmaceutical companies and patients injured by inadequately labeled prescription drugs. In *Wyeth v. Levine*, the court ruled that a Vermont jury could hold one of the world's largest drug companies accountable for the expense and pain that a professional guitarist and pianist suffered when its anti-nausea drug caused her to lose her right hand.

The court's 6-3 holding marks a surprisingly solid victory for patients on an issue that has occupied state and federal courts since the early days of the George W. Bush administration — whether federal regulation of prescription drugs "preempts" lawsuits in state courts over drug safety.

The opinion also is a rare win for consumers in the broader "preemption war" that has been raging in Congress and the courts over whether federal regulatory agencies should trump local juries.

The war continues in other areas where federal agencies regulate potentially dangerous products; set standards for airline, railroad, and motor carrier safety; and attempt to protect consumers from unscrupulous banks and credit reporting agencies. But the Supreme Court's well-reasoned opinion should make federal bureaucracies think twice before concluding that they are the only game in town.

The jury in *Wyeth v. Levine* found that the drug's label did not adequately warn the physician's assistant who administered it about the dangers posed by the technique she used to inject it. The label mentioned that the technique could cause a severe reaction if the drug entered an artery instead of a vein, but the jury found that the warning was inadequate and that the physician's assistant would have used a far less dangerous alternative technique if adequately warned.

Wyeth pointed out that the Food and Drug Administration had over the years approved the drug's label and several modifications, but the jury was not persuaded that FDA approval alone ensured that the label's warning was adequate. Indeed, the evidence demonstrated that in the years following FDA approval, many similar amputations had resulted, and yet Wyeth had not submitted a clearer or more dramatic warning for FDA approval. For its part, FDA lacked authority to require Wyeth to change its label even in light of this clear indication that the existing label was not working.

On appeal, Wyeth pulled out its ace in the hole, asserting that the jury's finding was irrelevant because the FDA's approval of the label preempted any claim by any plaintiff that it was inadequate.

The U.S. Constitution provides that federal law is the "supreme law of the land." State laws therefore must yield to federal laws when they conflict. In deciding whether such conflicts exist, a court must ascertain the intent of Congress in enacting the law that empowers the federal agency to act.

In this case, the relevant federal statute did not explicitly address the question of preemption, so Wyeth argued that the preemption was implied because it was impossible for the company to comply with both its duty to use the federally approved label and the asserted common law duty to use a more stringent warning. The Supreme Court brushed the argument aside, noting that, under FDA regulations, the company was free to add a more stringent warning unilaterally, and making clear that if Congress wanted the federal statute to preempt state tort laws, it could easily have said so on one of the many occasions that it had revisited the statute.

The court also rejected Wyeth's argument that allowing juries to entertain such claims would hamper the broader objectives of the federal statute. Indeed, it noted that the FDA had welcomed state common law actions right up until it suddenly changed its position in 2006.

Throughout its opinion, the court stressed that the "manufacturer bears responsibility for the content of its label at all times." In our civil justice system, innocent people generally have recourse to state courts to hold companies accountable when they shirk their legal responsibilities. The court wisely prevented Wyeth from palming its responsibility to warn doctors and patients off onto an overworked and underfunded federal agency that had been more concerned with meeting industry demands for rapid new drug

approvals than with protecting patients from dangerous drugs.

Federal agencies and state courts have complementary roles to play in protecting consumers from dangerous products and activities. The decision in this case is a welcome sign that the Supreme Court will allow both of them to remain on the stage.

McGarity, a law professor at the University of Texas, wrote 'The Preemption War: When Federal Bureaucracies Trump Local Juries.'

Vote for this story!

## Your Comments

Austinites love to be heard, and we're giving you a bullhorn. We just ask that you keep things civil. Leave out the personal attacks. Do not use profanity, ethnic or racial slurs, or take shots at anyone's sexual orientation or religion. If you can't be nice, we reserve the right to remove your material and ban users who violate our [visitor's agreement](#)

You must be logged in to leave a comment. [Login](#) | [Register](#)

[+ Post Comment](#)



**J.Howard** wrote:

The heading for this article should have read, "A Win for the Plaintiff Attorneys of the World." I am no fan of the drug companies that charge outrageous prices for drugs protected and even promoted by our Federal government. The fact that I can purchase a drug in Mexico for a fraction of the price I pay in Austin is infuriating. But the signal to the Plaintiff Bar that the deep pockets of major drug companies are a fair target for medical malpractice will increase the cost of these already expensive drugs. Perhaps now is the time to rename the Texas University Law School the Joe Jamail Law School.

Posted on 3/9/2009 5:51:10 AM

[Report Abuse](#)

[Top of Comments](#)

[Top of Page](#)

Advertise [Online](#) or [in Print](#) | [Subscribe to the Newspaper](#) | [Make us your Homepage](#)  
Presented by The Austin American-Statesman. [Contact us](#). [Careers](#). [Corrections](#). [Site Requirements](#).  
Please read our [Privacy Policy](#). By using this site, you accept the terms of our [Visitor Agreement](#).

Copyright 2009 The Austin American-Statesman. All Rights Reserved.

