

**Senate Bill No. 474**

(By Senators Kessler (Acting President), Prezioso, Beach,  
Williams, Edgell, Palumbo, Plymale, Wills, D. Facemire, Klempa  
and Yost)

\_\_\_\_\_  
[Introduced February 9, 2011; referred to the Committee on the  
Judiciary.]  
\_\_\_\_\_

A BILL to amend the Code of West Virginia, 1931, as amended, by  
adding thereto a new section, designated §55-7-23a, relating  
to products' reliability claims that are based upon  
prescription drug manufacturer's alleged failure to warn.

*Be it enacted by the Legislature of West Virginia:*

That the Code of West Virginia, 1931, as amended, be amended  
by adding thereto a new section, designated §55-7-23a, to read as  
follows:

**ARTICLE 7. ACTIONS FOR INJURIES.**

**§55-7-23a. Prescription drugs; claims based on inadequate  
warnings.**

(a) A manufacturer of a prescription drug is not liable in a  
products liability action for failing to provide a warning or other  
instruction directly to a consumer if an adequate warning or  
instruction has been provided to the physician or other legally

1 authorized person who prescribes that prescription drug for the  
2 claimant and if the manufacturer has not done direct to consumer  
3 advertising regarding the prescription drug: *Provided*, That the  
4 provisions of this section do not apply if the United States Food  
5 and Drug Administration requires that direct consumer warnings or  
6 instructions accompany the product.

7 (b) If the warning or instruction given in connection with a  
8 prescription drug has been approved by the United States Food and  
9 Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act,  
10 21 U.S.C. §301, *et seq.* or the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C.  
11 §201, *et seq.*, the warning or instruction is presumed to be  
12 adequate.

13 (c) For the purposes of this section, the term "drug" has the  
14 meaning defined in the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

NOTE: The purpose of this bill is to codify the learned  
intermediary doctrine, which recognizes:

(1) That prescribing physicians are in a superior position to  
impart drug warning to patients and provide independent medical  
decisions as to whether use of the drug is appropriate for  
treatment of a particular patient;

(2) That drug manufacturers lack effective means to  
communicate directly with each patient; and

(3) That imposing a duty to warn upon drug manufacturers would  
unduly interfere with the physician-patient relationship.

This section is new; therefore, strike-throughs and  
underscoring have been omitted.