1			
1	Sandra A. Edwards (State Bar No. 154578)		
2	Joshua W. Malone (State Bar No. 301836) Farella Braun + Martel LLP		
	235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor	ELECTRONICALLY FILED	
3	San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 954-4400; Fax: (415) 954-4480	Superior Court of California,	
4	sedwards@fbm.com jmalone@fbm.com	County of San Francisco 05/24/2018	
5		Clerk of the Court BY:VANESSA WU	
6	Joe G. Hollingsworth (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>) Martin C. Calhoun (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>)	Deputy Clerk	
	Kirby T. Griffis (appearance pro hac vice)		
7	William J. Cople (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>) Hollingsworth LLP		
8	1350 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005		
9	Telephone: (202) 898-5800; Fax: (202) 682-1639)	
10	jhollingsworth@hollingsworthllp.com mcalhoun@hollingsworthllp.com		
11	kgriffis@hollingsworthllp.com wcople@hollingsworthllp.com		
12	George C. Lombardi (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>)		
	James M. Hilmert (appearance pro hac vice)		
13	Winston & Strawn LLP 35 West Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60601 Telephone (212) 558, 5060; Feyn (212) 558, 5700		
14			
15	Telephone: (312) 558-5969; Fax: (312) 558-5700 glombard@winston.com	J	
16	jhilmert@winston.com		
17	Attorneys for Defendant MONSANTO COMPANY		
	INONSANTO COMPANT		
18	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
19			
20	COUNTY OF SA	AN FRANCISCO	
21			
	DEWAYNE JOHNSON,	Case No. CGC-16-550128	
22	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANT MONSANTO COMPANY'S	
23	VS.	MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 22 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE, ARGUMENT, OR	
24		REFERENCE TO ENDOCRINE	
25	MONSANTO COMPANY,	DISRUPTION, BIRTH DEFECTS, OR EFFECTS ON GUT BACTERIA	
26	Defendant.	Trial Date: June 18, 2018	
		Time: 9:30 a.m.	
27		Department: TBD	
28			

Farella Braun + Martel LLP 235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor San Francisco, California 94104 (415) 954-4400

MONSANTO'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 22 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE, ARGUMENT, OR REFERENCE TO ENDOCRINE DISRUPTION, BIRTH DEFECTS, OR EFFECTS ON GUT BACTERIA - Case No. CGC-16-550128

34812\6689445.1

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Monsanto Company ("Monsanto") respectfully requests that the Court exclude any evidence or argument that glyphosate causes endocrine disruption, causes birth defects, or affects gut bacteria. Plaintiff Dewayne Johnson ("Plaintiff") has made no allegation that he has suffered harm from any of these putative mechanisms. Previously, this Court ruled that "evidence relating to glyphosate exposure through breast milk should be excluded" because there "is no allegation or argument that Johnson was exposed to glyphosate through breast milk." 04/03/2018 Order on Motions *In Limine* at 6. That same logic and ruling applies here.

II. ARGUMENT

Evidence about endocrine disruption, birth defects, and gut bacterial enzymes is absolutely irrelevant and would serve only to confuse the issues, prejudice Monsanto, and inflame the jury. *See* Cal. Evid. Code §§ 210, 350, 352. Moreover, there is no scientific support for the assertion that glyphosate is capable of causing any such harms to any other person.

Plaintiff alleges that he has developed mycosis fungoides, a type of non-Hodgkin lymphoma, based on his use of glyphosate-containing herbicides. *See* Complaint at ¶ 75 (claiming that "Mr. Johnson was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin lymphoma"). Plaintiff has proffered an oncologist, Dr. Nabhan, to testify about Plaintiff's cancer. But Dr. Nabhan does not claim that Plaintiff suffers from endocrine disruption, birth defects, or harmed gut bacteria. Plaintiff has also proffered a group of other experts purporting to be epidemiologists, toxicologists, or statisticians, to testify about the alleged link between cancer and glyphosate. But none of these experts make any claim that glyphosate disrupted Plaintiff's endocrine system, caused him birth defects, or disrupted his gut bacteria, and Plaintiff himself makes no such claims. *See*, *e.g.*, Declaration of Sandra A. Edwards ("Edwards Decl.") at ¶ 32, Ex. 31 (Dep. of Dewayne Johnson ("Johnson Dep.") Vol. 3 at 719:8–723:17 (Jan. 20, 2018) (testifying about his health status and injuries without identifying endocrine system injuries, concerns with birth defects, or issues related to complications with his gut bacteria)).

Despite the irrelevance to his claimed harm, Monsanto expects that Plaintiff will try to make spurious assertions that glyphosate could possibly create these harms in other people. For

example, Plaintiff has offered the report of an agricultural economist who makes assertions about glyphosate's alleged "Capacity to Disrupt the Endocrine System." Edwards Decl. at ¶ 14, Ex. 13 (Expert Report of Charles Benbrook at § IV-C-4 (Dec. 21, 2017)). Plaintiff's counsel has elicited testimony from his client making insinuations about birth defects. *See*, *e.g.*, Edwards Decl. at ¶ 4, Ex. 3 (Deposition of Dewayne Johnson ("Johnson Dep.") (Vol. 1) at 453:7–16 (Dec. 7, 2017)) ("BY [Plaintiff's Counsel]: Q Do you ... see signs out that say there's a chemical here that's known in the state of California to cause ... birth defects? Have you ever seen one for – for Roundup?"). And Plaintiff's toxicologist Dr. Sawyer provides the baseless speculation that "glyphosate *may* disrupt the essential shikimate process in bacteria, particularly the beneficial bacteria of the human intestinal tract," causing a parade of speculated effects—although he makes no claims that any such thing actually occurred to Plaintiff himself or caused him harm. *See* Edwards Decl. at ¶ 30, Ex. 29 (Expert Report of William Sawyer, M.D. at 36 (Dec. 21, 2017)) (emphasis added).

Such testimony has no logical connection to any disputed issue, as the Court has already held in excluding evidence of the purported presence of glyphosate in breast milk. *See* 04/03/2018 Order on Motions *In Limine* at 6 (excluding breast milk testimony); *see Schweitzer v. Westminster Investments*, 157 Cal. App. 4th 1195, 1214 (2007) ("When evidence is not pertinent to the issues raised by the pleadings, the evidence is irrelevant and it is proper to preclude the introduction of such evidence."). Not only is it irrelevant, it is highly inflammatory and improper. Such "evidence"—particularly the insinuations about birth defects—is impermissibly calculated to play on the jury's fears and emotions that *they* or *their children* are at risk of harm. *See People v. Rivera*, 201 Cal. App. 4th 353, 362 (2011) ("[E]vidence should be excluded as unduly prejudicial when it is of such nature as to inflame the emotions of the jury, motivating them to use the information, not to logically evaluate the point upon which it is relevant, but to reward or punish one side because of the juror's emotional reaction.").

Moreover, there is no competent scientific basis for any such misleading claims. The assertions about endocrine disruption come from an *economist* who has no scientific training or basis to make such claims. *See* 05/17/2018 Order on *Sargon* and Summary Judgment Motions at

1	30 (explaining Dr. Benbrook's lack of scientific credentials). No evidence from any witness	
2	supports a claim that glyphosate causes any birth defects or causes harm by inhibiting gut	
3	microbes. On the contrary, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and international	
4	regulators have found no evidence of glyphosate causing these speculated harms. See, e.g.,	
5	Edwards Decl. at ¶ 33, Ex. 32 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EDSP Weight of Evidence	
6	Conclusions on the Tier 1 Screening Assays for the List 1 Chemicals (June 29, 2015)) (concluding	
7	"there was no convincing evidence" that glyphosate interacts with endocrine pathways); Edwards	
8	Decl. at ¶ 34, Ex. 33 (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations & World Health	
9	Organization, Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the	
10	Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group at 159 (2004)) ("The Meeting concluded that	
11	glyphosate is not teratogenic."). The Court should avoid a needless "trial within a trial" on these	
12	improper distractions. See Notrica v. State Comp. Ins. Fund, 70 Cal. App. 4th 911, 928 (1999).	
13	III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	
14	For the reasons discussed, the Court should exclude all evidence, argument, or reference	
15	made that glyphosate causes endocrine disruption, causes birth defects, or affects gut bacteria.	
16		
17	Dated: May 24, 2018 Respectfully submitted.	
18	FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP	
19	By:	
20	Sandra A. Edwards	
21	Attorneys for Defendant	
22	MONSANTO COMPANY	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		