
**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549**

FORM 8-K

**CURRENT REPORT PURSUANT TO
SECTION 13 OR 15(D) OF THE
SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

Date of Report (Date of earliest event reported) October 6, 2010

BECTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Its Charter)

New Jersey

(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation)

001-4802

(Commission File Number)

22-0760120

(IRS Employer Identification No.)

1 Becton Drive, Franklin Lakes, New Jersey

(Address of Principal Executive Offices)

07417-1880

(Zip Code)

(201) 847-6800

(Registrant's Telephone Number, Including Area Code)

N/A

(Former Name or Former Address, if Changed Since Last Report)

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K Filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the registrant under any of the following provisions (see General Instruction A.2. below):

- Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)
 - Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12)
 - Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b))
 - Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c))
-
-

Item 8.01 Other Events.

As previously reported, on April 27, 2009, Becton, Dickinson and Company (“BD”) entered into a settlement agreement with certain purchaser plaintiffs (including BD’s distributors) in the antitrust class actions consolidated in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey under the caption “In re Hypodermic Products Antitrust Litigation”. The settlement agreement provided for, among other things, the payment by BD of \$45 million in exchange for a release by all potential class members of the direct purchaser claims under federal antitrust laws related to the products and acts enumerated in the complaint, and a dismissal of the case with prejudice, insofar as it relates to direct purchaser claims. On September 30, 2010, the court issued an order denying a motion to approve the settlement agreement, ruling that the hospital plaintiffs, and not the distributor plaintiffs, are the direct purchasers entitled to pursue damages under the federal antitrust laws for certain sales of BD products. The settlement agreement currently remains in effect, subject to certain termination provisions, and the court’s order may be subject to appellate review. Accordingly, BD is not adjusting the provision it recognized for the settlement agreement in the second quarter of fiscal year 2009.

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned hereunto duly authorized.

BECTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY
(Registrant)

By: /s/ Gary DeFazio

Gary DeFazio
Assistant Secretary

Date: October 6, 2010