1	Richard A. Clark	
2	State Bar No. 39558	ELECTRONICALLY
	(rclark@pmcos.com) Steven R. Platt	FILED
3	State Bar No. 245510	Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
4	(splatt@pmcos.com)	06/06/2016
_	PARKER, MILLIKEN, CLARK, O'HARA	Clerk of the Court BY:MADONNA CARANTO
5	& SAMUELIAN, P.C.	Deputy Clerk
6	555 S. Flower Street, 30th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071	
7	Telephone: (213) 683-6500	
	Facsimile: (213) 683-6669	
8	I C II II a consider (admitted on the city)	
9	Joe G. Hollingsworth (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) (jhollingsworth@hollingsworthllp.com)	
10	Eric G. Lasker (admitted pro hac vice)	
	(elasker@hollingsworthllp.com)	
11	Martin C. Calhoun (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) (mcalhoun@hollingsworthllp.com)	
12	HOLLINGSWORTH LLP	
13	1350 I Street, N.W.	
13	Washington, DC 20005	·
14	Telephone: (202) 898-5800	
15	Facsimile: (202) 682-1639	
	Attorneys for Defendants	
16	MONSANTO COMPANY and STEVEN D. GOULD	
17	·	·
18	SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
	FOR THE COUNT	Y OF SAN FRANCISCO
19	DEWAYNE JOHNSON,	CGC-16-550128
20	,	CGC-10-330128
21	Plaintiff,	
	V.	ANSWER OF MONSANTO COMPANY AND STEVEN D. GOULD TO PLAINTIFF'S
22	MONGANITO COMPANIV STEVEN D	UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT; DEMAND
23	MONSANTO COMPANY, STEVEN D. GOULD, WILBUR- ELLIS COMPANY,	FOR JURY TRIAL
24	GOULD, WILBUR-ELLIS COMPANY, LLC, and WILBUR-ELLIS FEED, LLC,	Complaint filed: January 28, 2016
24	Defendants.	Receipt of Remanded Case: May 6, 2016
25		Trial Date: Not assigned
26		Tital Date. 140t assigned
27		
27		
28		

MONSANTO COMPANY'S AND STEVEN GOULD'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

MONSANTO COMPANY'S AND STEVEN GOULD'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

1	instructions, in accordance with the state of the art and the state of scientific and technological	
2	knowledge.	
3	<u>FIFTH DEFENSE</u>	
4	(STATUTORY AND REGULATORY	
5	COMPLIANCE – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
6	7. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because the products at issue were	
7	not defective or unreasonably dangerous in that they complied with, at all relevant times, all	
8	applicable government safety standards.	
9	<u>SIXTH DEFENSE</u>	
10	(FIFRA STATUTORY PREEMPTION – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
11	8. Plaintiff's claims are preempted, in whole or in part, by applicable federal law	
12	relating to the design, testing, producing, manufacturing, labeling, distributing, modeling,	
13	processing, and supply of Roundup® branded products and/or glyphosate-containing products.	
14	SEVENTH DEFENSE	
15	(PREEMPTION – CONTINUED EPA APPROVAL – ALL	
16	CAUSES OF ACTION)	
17	9. Plaintiff's claims are preempted, in whole or in part, because of U.S. EPA findings	
18	that glyphosate does not cause cancer in humans and/or because of U.S. EPA-approved product	
19	labeling.	
20	EIGHTH DEFENSE	
21	(PRIMARY JURISDICTION – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
22	10. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of primary	
23	jurisdiction, including by the authority delegated by Congress to the U.S. EPA.	
24	<u>NINTH DEFENSE</u>	
25	(INDEPENDENT/INTERVENING/SUPERSEDING CAUSES – ALL CAUSES	
26	OF ACTION)	
27	11. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because plaintiff's injuries, if any,	
28	were the result of conduct of plaintiff, independent third parties, and/or events that were	

MONSANTO COMPANY'S AND STEVEN GOULD'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

1	extraordinary under the circumstances, not foreseeable in the normal course of events, and/or	
2	independent, intervening and superseding causes of the alleged injuries, including but not limited	
3	to plaintiff's pre-existing medical conditions.	
4	TENTH DEFENSE	
5	(RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 402A, COMMENTS J AND K – ALL	
6	CAUSES OF ACTION)	
7	12. The doctrines contained in Restatement (Second) of Torts § 402A, comments j and	
8	k, bar plaintiff's claims against Monsanto in whole or in part.	
9	ELEVENTH DEFENSE	
10	(STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
11	13. Applicable statutes of limitations bar plaintiff's claims in whole or in part.	
12	TWELTH DEFENSE	
13	(MISUSE OR FAILURE TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS – ALL CAUSES	
14	OF ACTION)	
15	14. Plaintiff's misuse or abnormal use of the product or failure to follow instructions	
16	bar the plaintiff's claims in whole or in part.	
17.	THIRTEENTH DEFENSE	
18	(ALTERNATIVE CAUSES – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
19	15. If plaintiff suffered injury or damages as alleged, which is denied, such injury or	
20	damage resulted from acts or omissions of persons or entities for which Monsanto is neither liable	
21	nor responsible or resulted from diseases and/or causes that are not related or connected with any	
22	product sold, distributed, or manufactured by Monsanto. Such acts or omissions on the part of	
23	others or diseases or causes constitute an independent, intervening and sole proximate cause of	
24	plaintiff's alleged injury or damages.	
25	FOURTEENTH DEFENSE	
26	(LACK OF PRIVITY; NO DUTY – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
27	16. Monsanto has no legal relationship or privity with plaintiff and owes no duty to	
28	plaintiff by which liability could be attributed to it	

- 3 - MONSANTO COMPANY'S AND STEVEN GOULD'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

1	FIFTEENTH DEFENSE	
2	(NO WARRANTIES – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
3	17. Monsanto made no warranties of any kind or any representations of any nature	
4	whatsoever to plaintiff. If any such warranties were made, which Monsanto specifically denies,	
5	then plaintiff failed to give notice of any breach thereof.	
6	SIXTEENTH DEFENSE	
7	(COMMERCIAL FREE SPEECH – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
8	18. Plaintiff's claims are preempted in whole or part by the Freedom of Speech Clause	
9	of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.	
10	SEVENTEENTH DEFENSE	
11	(PUNITIVE DAMAGES UNCONSTITUTIONAL – ALL	
12	CAUSES OF ACTION)	
13	19. Plaintiff's claims for punitive damages are barred because such an award would	
14	violate Monsanto's due process, equal protection and other rights under the United States	
15	Constitution, the California Constitution, and/or other applicable state constitutions.	
16	EIGHTEENTH DEFENSE	
17	(CONDUCT DOES NOT WARRANT PUNITIVE DAMAGES – ALL	
18	CAUSES OF ACTION)	
19	20. Plaintiff's claims for punitive damages are barred because plaintiff has failed to	
20	allege conduct warranting imposition of punitive damages under California and/or other	
21	applicable state laws.	
22	NINETEENTH DEFENSE	
23	(PUNITIVE DAMAGES BARRED OR LIMITED BY OPERATION	
24	OF LAW- ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
25	21. Plaintiff's claims for punitive damages are barred and/or limited by operation of	
26	state and/or federal law.	
27		
28		

1	TWENTIETH DEFENSE	
2	(CONTRIBUTORY/COMPARATIVE NEGLIGENCE – ALL	
3	CAUSES OF ACTION)	
4	22. Plaintiff's causes of action are barred in whole or in part by plaintiff's own	
5	contributory/comparative negligence.	
6	TWENTY-FIRST DEFENSE	
7	(FAILURE TO MITIGATE DAMAGES – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
.8	23. Plaintiff's causes of action are barred in whole or in part by plaintiff's own failure	
9	to mitigate damages.	
10	TWENTY-SECOND DEFENSE	
11	(SOPHISTICATED USER DOCTRINE – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
12	24. Plaintiff's causes of action are barred in whole or in part by the sophisticated user	
13	doctrine.	
14	TWENTY-THIRD DEFENSE	
15	(COLLATERAL SOURCE – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
16	25. Plaintiff's recovery, if any, shall be reduced by those payments that plaintiff	
17	receives from collateral sources.	
18	TWENTY-FOURTH DEFENSE	
19	(ALLEGED INJURIES NOT CAUSED BY MONSANTO'S	
20	PRODUCT – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
21	26. If plaintiff has been injured or damaged, no injury or damages being admitted,	
22	such injuries were not caused by a Monsanto product.	
23	TWENTY-FIFTH DEFENSE	
24	(MISJOINDER OF PARTIES – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)	
25	27. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because some or all of the parties	
26	have been improperly joined in this action.	
27		
28		

1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

26

27

28

TWENTY-SIXTH DEFENSE

(RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO ASSERT ADDITIONAL

DEFENSES – ALL CAUSES OF ACTION)

28. Monsanto hereby gives notice that it intends to rely upon such other defenses as may become available or apparent during the course of discovery and thus reserves its right to amend this Answer to assert such defenses.

WHEREFORE, defendant Monsanto prays as follows:

- 1. That plaintiff takes nothing by way of his Complaint;
- 2. That the Complaint be dismissed, in its entirety with prejudice;
- 3. That Monsanto be awarded judgment in this action;
- 4. That Monsanto be awarded costs of suit;
- 5. That Monsanto be awarded such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: June 6, 2016

Respectfully submitted

Steven R. Platt Richard A. Clark

PARKER, MILLIKEN, CLARK, O'HARA

& SAMUELIAN, P.C.

Joe G. Hollingsworth (admitted pro hac vice)

Eric G. Lasker (admitted pro hac vice)

Martin C. Calhoun (admitted pro hac vice)

HOLLINGSWORTH LLP

Attorneys for Defendant MONSANTO COMPANY and STEVEN D. GOULD

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Defendants MONSANTO COMPANY and STEVEN D. GOULD hereby demand a jury trial in the above-entitled action.

DATED: June 6, 2016

Respectfully cubmitted,

Steven R. Platt
Richard A. Clark
PARKER, MILLIKEN, CLARK, O'HARA
& SAMUELIAN, P.C.

Joe G. Hollingsworth (admitted *pro hac vice*) Eric G. Lasker (admitted *pro hac vice*) Martin C. Calhoun (admitted *pro hac vice*) HOLLINGSWORTH LLP

Attorneys for Defendant MONSANTO COMPANY and STEVEN D. GOULD

PROOF OF SERVICE

Johnson v. Monsanto Company, CGC-16-550128

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 555 South Flower Street, 30th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071.

On June 6, 2016, I served the foregoing document described as ANSWER OF MONSANTO COMPANY AND STEVEN D. GOULD TO PLAINTIFF'S UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL as follows:

Attorneys for Plaintiff Dewayne Johnson

The Sherman Building

108 Railroad Avenue Orange, VA 22960

8 Curtis G. Hoke The Miller Firm LLC

-

(BY MAIL) By placing a true copy in envelope(s) addressed as referenced above. The envelope(s) were then sealed and deposited for collection and mailing in accordance with my employer's normal procedures. I am readily familiar with the firm's practice for collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service, with all postage prepaid, at Los Angeles, California, on the same day in the ordinary course of business.

(STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on June 6, 2016 at Los Angeles, California.

Malianu Herduy Marianne Hendrix