

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  
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION IN  
LIMINE NO. 26 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE  
OR ARGUMENT ALLEGING THAT  
MONSANTO DECEIVED THE EPA**

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

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND ARGUMENT**

2 Plaintiff provide no basis for allowing evidence of a fraud-on-the-EPA allegation to go to  
3 the jury. First, contrary to Plaintiff’s claim, Monsanto’s argument that “fraud on the agency”  
4 allegations are preempted under *Buckman Co. v. Plaintiffs’ Legal Committee*, 531 U.S. 341  
5 (2001), did not “fail.” See Pl.’s Opp’n to MIL No. 26 at 5. Rather, the Court denied the summary  
6 judgment motion as procedurally improper, noting “Monsanto’s contentions [regarding  
7 preemption of fraud on the EPA arguments] do not dispose of any cause of action.” 5/17/2018  
8 Order on *Sargon* and Summary Judgment Motions at 43. Under these circumstances, a motion *in*  
9 *limine* is a proper means by which Monsanto is permitted to exclude evidence of a fraud-on-the  
10 agency argument. See, e.g., *In re Trasyolol Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 763 F. Supp. 2d 1312, 1331 (S.D.  
11 Fla. 2010); *Bouchard v. Am. Home Prod. Corp.*, 213 F. Supp. 2d 802, 812 (N.D. Ohio 2002).

12 On the merits, Plaintiffs try to distinguish *Buckman* by claiming it applies only to fraud-on-  
13 the-FDA (not EPA) arguments. See Pl.’s Opp’n to MIL No. 26 at 6 (citing *Buckman Co. v.*  
14 *Plaintiffs’ Legal Committee*, 531 U.S. 341, 343 (2001)). But the Ninth Circuit and many other  
15 courts have held that *Buckman* applies with equal force to preempt fraud-on-the-EPA claims. See  
16 *Nathan Kimmel, Inc. v. Dowelanco*, 275 F.3d 1199, 1205, 1208 (9th Cir. 2002) (preempting state  
17 law fraud-on-the-EPA claims because “the rationale articulated by the Supreme Court in *Buckman*  
18 applies with equal force to the facts before us and compels a similar result”); *Giglio v. Monsanto*  
19 *Co.*, No. 15-cv-2279 BTM (NLS), 2016 WL 1722859, at \*3 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2016) (“Plaintiff’s  
20 claims based on failure to warn the EPA of dangers of Roundup are preempted.”); *Syngenta Crop*  
21 *Prot., LLC v. Willowood, LLC*, No. 1:15-CV-274, 2016 WL 6783628, at \*1 (M.D.N.C. Aug. 12,  
22 2016) (“The Court concludes that Syngenta’s Chapter 75 claim, as pled, is little more than a fraud-  
23 on-the-EPA claim and is impliedly pre-empted by FIFRA.”). Plaintiff does not dispute this and  
24 offers no response whatsoever to *Nathan Kimmel, Inc.*, which refutes his argument. 275 F.3d at  
25 1205, 1208.

26 Plaintiff has provided no reason to diverge from the controlling precedent set forth in  
27 *Buckman* and *Nathan Kimmel*. Plaintiff claims that the “overwhelming majority of courts have  
28 rejected Defendant’s arguments and found that evidence that a company provided inadequate and

1 incomplete data . . . are relevant to Plaintiff's state law claims for negligence and strict liability  
2 failure to warn." See Pl.'s Opp'n to MIL No. 26 at 6-7. This is simply wrong, as shown above.  
3 In many of Plaintiff's cited cases, there was no indication the plaintiffs would even be introducing  
4 the challenged evidence, so the issue was moot. *Placencia v. I-Flow Corp.*, No. CV10-2520 PHX  
5 DGC, 2012 WL 5877624, at \*6 (D. Ariz. Nov. 20, 2012) ("Plaintiffs state that they make no claim  
6 for fraud on the FDA . . . The Court will . . . ensure at trial that no claim for fraud on the FDA is  
7 made"); *Frazier v. Mylan Inc.*, 911 F. Supp. 2d 1285, 1301 (N.D. Ga. 2012) ("[P]laintiff does not  
8 allege here that Pfizer committed fraud on the FDA, or more specifically, that the FDCA required  
9 Pfizer to make disclosures to the FDA and Pfizer made misrepresentations to the FDA when  
10 submitting information to the agency"). The others simply leave open the question of  
11 admissibility or otherwise are unhelpful to Plaintiff. See, e.g., *In re Vioxx Prod. Liab. Litig.*, No.  
12 MDL 1657, 2005 WL 3164254, at \*1 (E.D. La. Nov. 21, 2005) (Plaintiff's fraud on the FDA  
13 claims "will have to be dealt with at the time of trial."); see also *Globetti v. Sandoz Pharm. Corp.*,  
14 No. CV98-TMP-2649-S, 2001 WL 419160, at \*3 (N.D. Ala. Mar. 5, 2001) (granting defendant's  
15 motion for partial summary judgment on plaintiff's fraud-on-the-FDA claim).

16 Finally, while Plaintiff claims that Monsanto's failure to disclose certain data to the EPA  
17 or consumers is "relevant," relevance has no bearing on preemption. See Pl.'s Opp'n to MIL No.  
18 26 at 2, 5, 8. See *In re Incretin Mimetics Prod. Liab. Litig.*, No. 13MD2452 AJB MDD, 2014 WL  
19 4987877, at \*4 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2014). Further, any argument or testimony suggesting that  
20 Monsanto failed to submit certain data to the EPA or refused to conduct certain studies are  
21 irrelevant and misleading under Cal. Evid. Code §§ 210, 350. Such allegations prejudice  
22 Monsanto by allowing the jury to find liability based on conduct that cannot legally serve as the  
23 basis for liability, and create the possibility for sideshows or trials-within-trials, none of which  
24 have any bearing on whether Roundup Pro® and Ranger Pro® products caused Plaintiff's mycosis  
25 fungoides.

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **II. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should exclude any evidence or arguments that  
3 Monsanto deceived the EPA in connection with the registration and approval of glyphosate.  
4

5 Dated: June 12, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

6 FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

7  
8 By: 

9 

---

Sandra A. Edwards

10 Attorneys for Defendant  
11 MONSANTO COMPANY  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28