

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**

20  
21 DEWAYNE JOHNSON,  
22 Plaintiff,  
23 vs.  
24 MONSANTO COMPANY,  
25 Defendant.

Case No. CGC-16-550128  
**DEFENDANT MONSANTO COMPANY'S  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 4 TO  
EXCLUDE EVIDENCE AND  
ARGUMENT THAT PLAINTIFF FAILED  
HIS QUALIFIED APPLICATOR TEST  
THREE TIMES**

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

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Plaintiff Dewayne Johnson (“Plaintiff”) alleges that Roundup PRO® and Ranger Pro® are  
3 defective and that his exposure to the products caused his mycosis fungoides (“MF”), a subtype of  
4 non-Hodgkin lymphoma. In his motion *in limine*, Plaintiff argues that because California does not  
5 technically require pesticide applicators to pass the Qualified Applicators exam to be able to spray  
6 Roundup PRO® or Ranger Pro®, then evidence that Plaintiff failed that exam three times must be  
7 irrelevant. But Plaintiff’s taking of the exam four times is relevant for reasons other than whether  
8 California technically requires the certification. Namely, Plaintiff’s failures led to his intensively  
9 studying for about a year and half about the safe handling, use and applications of pesticides as he  
10 attempted to pass the exam. He studied materials discussing, among various subjects, how to  
11 safely apply the products and minimize personal exposure, which is directly relevant here to the  
12 issue of specific causation. Similarly, this evidence does not prejudicially imply that Johnson was  
13 somehow an “incompetent” or “failed” applicator, as Plaintiff argues, but is relevant to a material  
14 issue in this trial. Plaintiff’s Motion should be denied.

15 **II. BACKGROUND**

16 Plaintiff alleges that he was diagnosed with MF after spraying Ranger Pro® on weeds  
17 between June 2012 and early 2016 as the Integrated Pest Manager for Benicia Unified School  
18 District (“BUSD”). *See* Declaration of Sandra A. Edwards (“Edwards Decl.”) at ¶ 2, Ex. 1 (Depo.  
19 of Dewayne Johnson (“Johnson Dep.”) at 15:20-22 (Dec. 7, 2017)) (stating that he began applying  
20 Ranger Pro® around June 2012). As part of his duties as Integrated Pest Manager, his employer  
21 BUSD required Plaintiff to obtain his qualified applicator certification (“QAC”). *See id.* at 40:12-  
22 41:7. The QAC is a certification granted by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation to  
23 pesticide applicators upon passing a written exam.

24 Plaintiff failed the QAC exam three times, but each time he failed, he was motivated to and  
25 did continue to study and learn about how to safely apply Ranger Pro®. *See id.* at 37:21-38:6 (“So  
26 how I learned is by failing the test. I failed the test three times. Then the fourth time, I passed, but  
27 I just kept learning, I kept learning, I kept learning, I kept learning.”). Plaintiff followed an  
28 intensive self-study routine and attended an all-day QAC test preparation class. *See id.* at 38:7-10;

1 619:15-620:1 (Dec. 7, 2017 and Jan. 20, 2018). By the time Plaintiff eventually passed his exam  
2 and became a certified pesticide applicator, he had been studying extensively for approximately 16  
3 to 18 months. *See id.* at 39:14-40:11 (Dec. 7, 2017).

4 **III. ARGUMENT**

5 Plaintiff devotes the bulk of his Motion to the largely immaterial issue of whether  
6 California law required Plaintiff to have a QAC to spray Roundup PRO® or Ranger Pro®. Pl.’s  
7 Mot. at 3-4. But Plaintiff’s reasoning is unduly narrow: these technical legal requirements are not  
8 determinative of whether his taking the QAC exam multiple times is relevant, and Plaintiff fails to  
9 explain why its relevance should hinge upon this issue. This Court must determine only whether  
10 Plaintiff’s failing the QAC exam has “*any* tendency in reason to prove or disprove *any* disputed  
11 fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action.” Cal. Evid. Code § 210 (emphasis  
12 added). Indeed, Plaintiff’s studying for 16 to 18 months about how to safely apply Ranger Pro®  
13 partly demonstrates his proficiency as a pesticide applicator, which bears directly on Plaintiff’s  
14 actual level of exposure – a central issue in this case.

15 Plaintiff studied several subjects related to pesticide safety that, as evidenced by his  
16 eventually passing the exam, demonstrate his sophistication in applying Ranger Pro®. Plaintiff  
17 testified that he learned about, among other things, the applicable laws and regulations of pesticide  
18 use, safe spraying techniques (including when and where to spray), and how to properly read a  
19 pesticide label. *See* Edwards Decl. at ¶ 2, Ex. 1 (Johnson Dep. at 618:16-619:5 (Jan. 20, 2018)).  
20 Further, his QAC study materials discuss, among other things, how to control airborne droplets of  
21 pesticide while spraying (“drift”), how and when to wear certain personal protective equipment  
22 (“PPE”), how to safely store and transport pesticides, and what first aid should be applied in the  
23 event of an accidental exposure. *See* Edwards Decl. at ¶ 3, Ex. 2 (QAC Study Materials at  
24 DJohnson-PSR-004483-525). The Ranger Pro® label, in turn, provides product-specific  
25 instruction on proper PPE, first aid, storage and disposal, drift control, the proper ratio for diluting  
26 Ranger Pro® with water, and applying using a backpack sprayer or other “high-volume  
27 equipment,” as used by Plaintiff. *See* Edwards Decl. at ¶ 4, Ex. 3 (Ranger Pro® Label).  
28 Plaintiff’s familiarity with these concepts – reinforced over several months due only to his failing

1 the QAC exam three times – is probative of his sophistication as an applicator. Plaintiff’s  
2 knowledge of practices to help reduce his exposure to drift – which he alleges to be a significant  
3 means by which he was exposed to the product – is relevant to causation. His knowledge of the  
4 function and purpose of wearing PPE is relevant to causation. As is his knowledge of appropriate  
5 dilution and spraying practices. A certified applicator like Plaintiff is more likely to be  
6 knowledgeable about and follow important pesticide safety rules. Monsanto should be able to  
7 introduce evidence about why Plaintiff committed himself to learning these rules for a year and a  
8 half, which will necessarily involve referencing his failed exam attempts.

9 Further, this Court will decide at trial whether to adopt either the consumer expectations  
10 test or risk-benefit test, or both, for determining Plaintiff’s strict product liability claim.<sup>1 2</sup> See  
11 *Romine v. Johnson Controls, Inc.*, 224 Cal. App. 4th 990, 1000-01 (2014) (noting that courts  
12 evaluate design defect claims through the two tests); *Demara v. Raymond Corp.*, 13 Cal. App. 5th  
13 545, 554 (2017) (“The two theories are not mutually exclusive, and depending on the facts and  
14 circumstances of the case, *both* may be presented to the trier of fact in the same case.”). The  
15 consumer expectations test concerns the expectations of only the ordinary consumer. *Romine*, 224  
16 Cal. App. 4th at 1000-01. Ranger Pro® is not intended for ordinary consumer use; it is a  
17 “professional herbicide for industrial, turf and ornamental weed control.” See Edwards Decl. at ¶  
18 4, Ex. 3 (Ranger Pro® Label). Evidence about Plaintiff’s education and training over a 16 to 18-  
19 month period regarding the safe handling and use of herbicides will be directly relevant to the  
20 Court’s determination of the appropriate instruction for the jury at the conclusion of trial.

21 Plaintiff also argues that Monsanto will use Plaintiff’s failed exam attempts to “paint[] him  
22 as an incompetent or ‘failed’ Roundup/RangerPRO applicator,” and that the evidence is unduly  
23 prejudicial as a result. Pl.’s Mot. at 4. For the reasons discussed above, Plaintiff’s

---

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> In his May 17, 2018 Order on Deposition Designations and Certain Proposed Jury Instructions  
26 (“5/17/18 Order”), Judge Curtis E. Karnow declined to exclusively adopt the jury instruction for  
either test, noting that the issue is properly adjudicated at trial. *Id.* at 2-5.

27 <sup>2</sup> Judge Karnow denied without prejudice Monsanto’s request that the risk-benefit instructions be  
28 provided as an alternative if the consumer expectations test instruction is given. 5/17/18 Order at  
5. Monsanto respectfully disagrees with this ruling and intends to raise the issue again with the  
trial court.

1 characterization of Monsanto's position is misguided, and the probative value of that evidence  
2 substantially outweighs its limited prejudicial effect.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 The Court should deny Plaintiff's motion *in limine* and permit the introduction of evidence  
5 that Plaintiff failed his QAC exam three times because it is relevant and probative to issues in  
6 dispute in this case.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: June 7, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

By: 

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra A. Edwards

Attorneys for Defendant  
MONSANTO COMPANY