

1 Timothy Litzenburg (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
2 Curtis G. Hoke (State Bar No. 282465)  
3 **THE MILLER FIRM, LLC**  
4 108 Railroad Ave.  
5 Orange, VA 22960  
6 Telephone: (540) 672-4224  
Facsimile: (540) 672-3055  
tlitzenburg@millerfirmllc.com  
choke@millerfirmllc.com

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
8 DEWAYNE JOHNSON

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

11  
12 DEWAYNE JOHNSON,  
13 Plaintiff,  
14 vs.  
15 MONSANTO COMPANY,  
16 Defendant.

Case No.: CGC-16-550128

**PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO  
MONSANTO'S MOTION IN LIMINE  
NO. 28**

---

Trial Judge: TBD

Trial Date: June 18, 2018

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Department: TBD

1  
2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 Defendant Monsanto Company (“Monsanto”) seeks to exclude “[a]ny mention of  
4 Monsanto's profits or financial position." Def’s Mot. at 2:21-22. In its Motion, it argues that even  
5 a mention of its profits would "incite the jury to abandon its ability to objectively observe and  
6 assess the facts . . ." Def’s Mot. at 2:22-23. Not so. First, Monsanto is grossly underestimating a  
7 California jury. Second, Monsanto’s sweeping motion is overly broad and not limited in the  
8 scope of the evidence that Monsanto seeks to exclude – “[a]ny mention of Monsanto's profits or  
9 financial position." Def’s Mot. at 2:21-22 (emphasis added). Third, Monsanto would seek to  
10 exclude any mention of its profits and finances, but at the same time claim that the proper studies  
11 and testing of glyphosate-based products is cost prohibitive. Monsanto cannot have it both ways.  
12 Fourth, Monsanto’s financial condition supports Plaintiff’s claim that Monsanto was able to  
13 influence government officials and regulators through lobbying.  
14

15  
16 **II. ARGUMENT**

17 Only evidence that is relevant to the issues before the Court is admissible. California  
18 Evidence Code Section § 350. However, evidence need not bear directly on any issue, and it is  
19 still "admissible if it tends to prove the issue, or constitutes a link in the chain of proof." *Dike v.*  
20 *Golden State Co.*, 269 P.2d 619, 622 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 1954)(quoting *Firlotte v. Jessee*, 172  
21 P.2d 710, 711 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 1946).  
22

23 **A). Evidence Of Monsanto's Financial Circumstances and Profits Is Relevant To**  
24 **Rebut Monsanto's Anticipated Argument That Proper Testing Proposed By**  
25 **The Plaintiff Is Cost Prohibitive**

26 In order to prove his failure to warn claim, Plaintiff is required to show "that the

1 defendant did not adequately warn of a particular risk that was known or knowable in light of the  
2 generally recognized and prevailing best scientific and medical knowledge available at the time  
3 of manufacture and distribution." *Carlin v. Super. Ct.*, 920 P.2d 1347, 1351 (Cal. 1996). In order  
4 to prove this claim, in part, Plaintiff will seek to introduce evidence at trial that Monsanto did not  
5 properly test the glyphosate-based products, and as such breached its duty to test its products  
6 before introducing them to the public. *Oxford v. Foster Wheeler LLC*, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 418, 435  
7 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 2009). It is then likely that Monsanto will seek to introduce evidence of the  
8 cost and expense of conducting studies that Plaintiff puts forth as the proper testing that  
9 Monsanto should have done before introducing glyphosate-based products to the public. If  
10 Monsanto does such, it will open the door to allow Plaintiff to introduce evidence to the jury of  
11 Monsanto's financial circumstances and profits.

14 A litigant opens the door to prejudicial testimony when he submits evidence that leaves a  
15 false or misleading impression if not corrected by the prejudicial testimony he seeks to exclude.  
16 *United States v. Maldonado* (5th Cir. 1994) 472 F.3d 388, 398 abrogated on other grounds,  
17 *Kentucky v. King*, (2011) 563 U.S. 452, 131 S.Ct. 1849. Monsanto should not be allowed to  
18 exclude evidence of its financial circumstances and profits while at the same time claiming that  
19 certain studies and tests of glyphosate products is cost prohibitive.

21 Finally, Monsanto extensively lobbied senators, congressman, EPA officials, and foreign  
22 governments to ensure that glyphosate remained on the market with few restrictions. It takes  
23 substantial financial resources to have this extensive influence on government officials.  
24 Evidence of Monsanto's financial condition will tend to show that it was capable and effective of  
25 the lobbying that Plaintiff alleges occurred.



1 Monsanto's Motion *in limine* No. 28.

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 **THE MILLER FIRM, LLC**

4  
5 DATED: June 7, 2018

6 By:/s/ Timothy Litzenburg  
7 Timothy Litzenburg (appearance *pro hac vice*)  
8 Curtis G. Hoke (SBN 282465)  
9 **THE MILLER FIRM, LLC**  
10 108 Railroad Ave.  
11 Orange, VA 22960  
12 (540) 672-4224 phone  
13 (540) 672-3055 fax  
14 tlitzenburg@millerfirmllc.com  
15 choke@millerfirmllc.com

16  
17  
18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff,*  
19 *DEWAYNE JOHNSON*

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I, Curtis G. Hoke, declare as follows:

3 I am a citizen of the United States and am employed in Orange County, Virginia. I am over the  
4 age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 108 Railroad  
5 Avenue, Orange, Virginia 22960. On June 7, 2018 \_\_\_\_\_, I served the following  
6 documents by the method indicated below:

7 PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MONSANTO'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 28  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  **By Electronically Serving** the document(s) described above via LexisNexis File & Serve  
16 by 7:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time on all parties appearing on the LexisNexis File & Serve  
17 service list.

18 **SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST**

19 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above  
20 is true and correct.

21 Executed on this June 7, 2018 at Orange, Virginia.

22   
23 \_\_\_\_\_

24 Curtis G. Hoke,  
25 Declarant  
26  
27

1 *Johnson v. Monsanto Company, et al.*  
2 **San Francisco Superior Court Case No.: CGC-16-550128**

3 **SERVICE LIST**

4 George C. Lombardi, Esq. 5 James M. Hilmert, Esq. 6 <b>WINSTON &amp; STRAWN LLP</b> 7 35 West Wacker Drive 8 Chicago, IL 60601 9 Tel: (312) 558-5969 10 Fax: (312) 558-5700 11 glombard@winston.com 12 jhilmert@winston.com	Counsel for Defendant  Served electronically Via Lexis Nexis File&Serve Xpress
10 Joe G. Hollingsworth, Esq. 11 Eric G. Lasker, Esq. 12 Martin C. Calhoun, Esq. 13 Kirby T. Griffis, Esq. 14 William J. Cople III, Esq. 15 <b>HOLLINGSWORTH LLP</b> 16 1350 I Street, N.W. 17 Washington, DC 20005 18 Tel: (202) 898-5800 19 Fax: (202) 682-1639 20 jhollingsworth@hollingsworthllp.com 21 elasker@hollingsworthllp.com 22 mcalhoun@hollingsworthllp.com 23 kgriffis@hollingsworthllp.com 24 wcople@hollingsworthllp.com	Counsel for Defendant  Served electronically via Lexis Nexis File&Serve Xpress
20 Sandra A. Edwards, Esq. 21 Joshua W. Malone, Esq. 22 <b>Farella Braun + Martel LLP</b> 23 235 Montgomery Street, 17 <sup>th</sup> Floor 24 San Francisco, California 94104 25 Tel: (415) 95404400 26 Fax: (415) 954-4480 27 sedwards@fbm.com 28 jmalone@fbm.com	Counsel for Defendant  Served electronically via Lexis Nexis File&Serve Xpress

28 PROOF OF SERVICE