

1 Sandra A. Edwards (State Bar No. 154578)  
Joshua W. Malone (State Bar No. 301836)  
2 Farella Braun + Martel LLP  
235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor  
3 San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 954-4400; Fax: (415) 954-4480  
4 sedwards@fbm.com  
jmalone@fbm.com

5 Joe G. Hollingsworth (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
6 Martin C. Calhoun (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
Kirby T. Griffis (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
7 William J. Cople (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
Hollingsworth LLP  
8 1350 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
9 Telephone: (202) 898-5800; Fax: (202) 682-1639  
jhollingsworth@hollingsworthllp.com  
10 mcalhoun@hollingsworthllp.com  
kgriffis@hollingsworthllp.com  
11 wcople@hollingsworthllp.com

12 George C. Lombardi (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
James M. Hilmert (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
13 Winston & Strawn LLP  
35 West Wacker Drive  
14 Chicago, IL 60601  
Telephone: (312) 558-5969; Fax: (312) 558-5700  
15 glombard@winston.com  
jhilmert@winston.com

16 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
17 MONSANTO COMPANY

18 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
19 **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

21 DEWAYNE JOHNSON,  
22 Plaintiff,  
23 vs.  
24 MONSANTO COMPANY,  
25 Defendant.

Case No. CGC-16-550128

**DEFENDANT MONSANTO COMPANY'S  
MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 9 TO  
EXCLUDE OR LIMIT EVIDENCE,  
ARGUMENT, OR REFERENCE TO  
ADVERSE EVENT REPORTS**

Trial Date: June 18, 2018  
Time: 9:30 a.m.  
Department: TBD

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendant Monsanto Company (“Monsanto”) respectfully submits this motion *in limine* to  
3 preclude Plaintiff Dewayne Johnson (“Plaintiff”) from introducing any evidence, in the form of  
4 testimony or documents, argument, or reference to the irrelevant and unfairly prejudicial adverse  
5 event reports (“AERs”).

6 **II. BACKGROUND**

7 As a part of its regulatory responsibilities, Monsanto reports adverse events and complaints  
8 involving its products to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 159.184.  
9 AERs are submitted to manufacturers primarily by practicing physicians, but also by researchers,  
10 customers, and lawyers. These are generally unverified patient reports of experiences with various  
11 products and are anecdotal in nature. They are not verified by physicians or other medical  
12 personnel, and are not the result of a differential diagnosis or medical analysis of causation.  
13 Monsanto employees and contracted poison control centers compile these AERs with written  
14 notations to reflect what these personnel are told by others, either in telephone conversations or  
15 through correspondence. These AERs include anecdotes involving a variety of Monsanto’s  
16 products, including Ranger Pro<sup>®</sup> and Roundup PRO<sup>®</sup>, the herbicides that Plaintiff claims he used.  
17 They include reports by customers who used various products and claimed to develop various  
18 injuries. The AERs should be excluded.

19 **III. ARGUMENT**

20 **A. Adverse Event Reports Are Inadmissible Hearsay**

21 The AERs are out-of-court statements that Plaintiff likely will attempt to use to prove the  
22 truth of the matter asserted (*i.e.*, that Monsanto’s product caused whatever injury is identified  
23 therein) and, as such, they constitute hearsay. *See* Cal. Evid. Code § 1200. The reports are not  
24 subject to any hearsay exceptions, and reflect the statements of third parties such as physicians,  
25 patients, and others who are not subject to cross-examination. AERs fail to identify the patients  
26 and often it is not possible to verify information from these reports. *See e.g. Kinney v. Sacramento*  
27 *City Emp. Ret. Sys.*, 77 Cal. App. 2d 779, 781-83 (1947) (excluding a report as incompetent  
28 hearsay where it was based on unauthenticated accounts of physicians that allegedly examined the

1 plaintiff).

2 Furthermore, the AERs contain inadmissible hearsay within hearsay because the personnel  
3 responsible for compiling the reports do not witness the events and most are third party physicians  
4 merely recounting what their patients had told them. *See, e.g., Saari v. Merck & Co.*, 961 F. Supp.  
5 387, 398 (N.D.N.Y. 1997) (explaining that an AER “was simply a report of what plaintiff told [the  
6 doctor] about what she believed was her reaction to the vaccine, and by making that report [the  
7 doctor] was neither confirming nor denying that there is any relationship between her symptoms  
8 and the vaccine.”); *see also DeLuca v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, 791 F. Supp. 1042, 1050  
9 (D.N.J. 1992) (finding that AERs “have inherent biases as they are second-or-third hand reports,  
10 are affected by medical or mass media attention, and are subject to other distortions”), *aff’d*, 6 F.3d  
11 778 (3d Cir. 1993).

12 **B. Adverse Event Reports Not Relating To Cancer Are Irrelevant**

13 Even if the AERs did not constitute inadmissible hearsay, virtually all AERs are irrelevant  
14 on their face because they do not involve the Plaintiff’s condition. Plaintiff has been diagnosed  
15 with mycosis fungoides, a subtype of non-Hodgkin lymphoma (“NHL”). AERs involving  
16 unrelated events— eye irritation, skin rashes, or other non-cancer injuries—have no bearing on the  
17 central question in this case: whether Plaintiff’s use of Ranger Pro<sup>®</sup> or Roundup PRO<sup>®</sup> caused his  
18 mycosis fungoides. Furthermore, since Plaintiff makes no claim that glyphosate causes human  
19 cancers other than NHL, AERs not involving NHL are also irrelevant. AERs dissimilar to  
20 Plaintiff’s claims do not have “any tendency in reason to prove or disprove any disputed fact that  
21 is of consequence to the determination of the action,” and are, therefore, irrelevant and  
22 inadmissible. Cal. Evid. Code §§ 210; 350 (irrelevant evidence is inadmissible).

23 California courts look for a finding of “substantial similarity” to determine that evidence of  
24 other injuries or defects are relevant. *Hasson v. Ford Motor Co.*, 32 Cal. 3d 388, 403-404 (1982);  
25 *see also Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co.*, 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 852 (1977) (finding evidence of an  
26 alleged car defect irrelevant where the plaintiff’s injury was allegedly caused by an “entirely  
27 dissimilar” defect). As such, Plaintiff must make a showing of “substantial similarity” between  
28 his mycosis fungoides and the injuries alleged in the AERs. Plaintiff cannot meet this burden; his

1 experts admit that they do not claim that Ranger Pro<sup>®</sup> or Roundup PRO<sup>®</sup> cause other cancers. *See*  
2 Declaration of Sandra A. Edwards (“Edwards Decl.”) at ¶ 13, Ex. 12 (Dep. of Chadi Nabhan,  
3 M.D. at 102:13-103:7 (August 23, 2017)) (stating he does not claim glyphosate causes any cancer  
4 other than NHL).

5 **C. Adverse Event Reports Not Relating To Cancer Are Unduly Prejudicial and**  
6 **Would Mislead The Jury**

7 Even if the Court finds that certain AERs could have some minimal relevance to this case  
8 – which they do not – the probative value is substantially outweighed by the substantial danger of  
9 undue prejudice, confusing the issues, and misleading the jury. *See* Cal. Evid. Code § 352. The  
10 non-cancer AERs distract from the specific issue, *i.e.*, whether the Plaintiff’s exposure to  
11 Monsanto’s Ranger Pro<sup>®</sup> caused his alleged injury, and will induce the jury to award damages for  
12 injuries that have not been claimed in this case. *See Coursen v. A.H. Robins Co.*, 764 F.2d 1329,  
13 1334 (9th Cir. 1985) (excluding evidence related to a side-effect other than the only alleged injury  
14 to avoid the “prejudice and confusion [that] would be generated by innuendos of collateral  
15 misconduct); *see also O'Banion v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.*, 968 F.2d 1011, 1012-13 (10th  
16 Cir. 1992) (excluding evidence of cancer where the alleged injuries did not include mesothelioma  
17 or other carcinogenic disease because these “purely speculative” damages are non-recoverable).

18 **IV. CONCLUSION**

19 For the aforementioned reasons, the Court should preclude Plaintiff from introducing any  
20 evidence, in the form of testimony or documents, argument, or reference to the irrelevant and  
21 unfairly prejudicial AERs.

22 Dated: May 24, 2018

Respectfully submitted.

23 FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

24 By: 

25 Sandra A. Edwards

26 Attorneys for Defendant  
27 MONSANTO COMPANY

28