Michael J. Miller (appearance pro hac vice) 1 Timothy Litzenburg (appearance pro hac vice) Curtis G. Hoke (State Bar No. 282465) **ELECTRONICALLY** 2 THE MILLER FIRM, LLC FILED 108 Railroad Ave. Orange, VA 22960 Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco Phone: (540) 672-4224 06/12/2018 Clerk of the Court Fax: (540) 672-3055 mmiller@millerfirmllc.com 5 BY:VANESSA WU tlitzenburg@millerfirmllc.com Deputy Clerk choke@millerfirmllc.com 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 DEWAYNE JOHNSÖN 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO** 11 Dwayne Johnson Case No. CGC-16-550128 12 13 PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT Plaintiff, OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN 14 LIMINE NO. 12 TO EXCLUDE ANY VS. ARGUMENT AND TESTIMONY 15 THAT EPA REGISTRATION Monsanto Company PRECLUDED MONSANTO FROM 16 WARNING OF THE RISK OF NON-Defendant 17 HODGKIN'S LYMPHOMA 18 Trial Date: June 18, 2018 19 Time: 9:30 a.m. Department: TBD 20 21 **ARGUMENT** 22 Monsanto essentially seeks to argue carte blanche to the jury that even if Roundup is 23 carcinogenic, and even if Monsanto was aware of such dangers and failed to warn, the EPA's 24

1

registration of Roundup precluded Monsanto from informing the public that the herbicide can

cause cancer. This would gut the jury's ability to assess Monsanto's legal obligations under

California law to warn of the dangers of a defective product. Additionally, Monsanto cites to

inapposite case law for its argument. Neither Amos v. Alpha Prop. Mgmt., 73 Cal. App. 4th

25

26

27

28

895, 901 (1999) nor *Carlin v. Superior Court*, 13 Cal. 4th 1104, 1114-1115 (1996), stand for the proposition that mere registration with the EPA would *preclude* a manufacturer from warning of a product's dangers, particularly since compliance does not absolve Monsanto of liability under California law. *Stand Up for California! v. State* (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 686, 703 (a case is not authority for a proposition not therein considered); Preemption Order at 42 ("EPA's approval of Roundup's label would preempt conflicting state law if it had the force of law under *Wyeth*, but finding no indication that EPA's approval of Roundup's label had the force of law."); *Buccery v. General Motors Corp.* (1976) 60 Cal.App.3d 533, 540–54 (compliance with federal safety standards does not preclude liability for defective design).

Lastly, Judge Karnow following U.S. Supreme Court precedent ruled that EPA approval does not preempt negligence causes of action brought under state law. FIFRA allows state juries to make determinations that manufacturers violated FIFRA. 4/17/2018 Order re: Sargon and Summary Judgment, pp. 38-39. "Under the express terms of the statute, EPA approval of a pesticide is not a defense for the commission of any offense under FIFRA..." *Id.* at 42. Therefore, EPA approval cannot be a defense to a negligence per se theory premised on the commission of an offense under FIFRA.

The case cited by Defendants involves California regulations in which it was accepted as fact that the Defendant "complied with applicable safety regulations." *Amos v. Alpha Prop. Mgmt.*, 73 Cal. App. 4th 895, 901, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34 (1999). Obviously, where it is undisputed that a defendant did not violation a safety regulation than there can be no negligence per se. Here, however, we are dealing with a federal statute that does not preempt California law; and there is a disputed issue of fact as to whether Monsanto did in fact comply with applicable safety regulations. The fact that the EPA has not concluded there is a violation, does not prevent a California jury from concluding that Monsanto did not comply with FIFRA and therefore liable under a negligence per se theory.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this honorable Court grant Plaintiff's Motion *in limine* No. 12 to exclude any argument and testimony that EPA

| 1 | registration precluded Monsanto from warning of the risk of cancer. | |
|----|---|---|
| 2 | DATED: June 12, 2018 | Respectfully submitted, |
| 3 | BITTED: June 12, 2010 | respectivity submitted, |
| 4 | | THE MILLED FIRM LLC |
| 5 | | THE MILLER FIRM, LLC |
| 6 | | By: /s/ Curtis G. Hoke |
| 7 | | Michael I Miller (appearance pro hac vice) |
| 8 | | Timothy Litzenburg (appearance pro hac vice) Curtis G. Hoke (State Bar No. 282465) THE MILLER FIRM, LLC |
| 9 | | 108 Railroad Ave. |
| 10 | | Orange, VA 22960 (540) 672-4224 phone; (540) 672-3055 fax mmiller@millerfirmllc.com |
| 11 | | tlitzenburg@millerfirmllc.com choke@millerfirmllc.com |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | Attorneys for Plaintiff DEWAYNE JOHNSON |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |

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 age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 108 Railroad Avenue, Orange, Virginia 22960. On June 12, 2018 , I served the following 5 documents by the method indicated below: 6 PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 12 TO EXCLUDE ANY ARGUMENT AND TESTIMONY THAT EPA REGISTRATION 7 PRECLUDED MONSANTO FROM WARNING OF THE RISK OF NON-HODGKIN'S LYMPHOMA 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 abla15 By Electronically Serving the document(s) described above via LexisNexis File & Serve by 7:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time on all parties appearing on the LexisNexis File & Serve service list. 17 SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST 18 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above 19 is true and correct. 20 21 Executed on this June 12, 2018 at Orange, Virginia. 22 23 24 Curtis G. Hoke, Declarant 25 26 27

28

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

1

2

27

28

SERVICE LIST

| 3 | SERVICE LIST | | |
|----|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| 4 | George C. Lombardi, Esq. | Counsel for Defendant | |
| 5 | James M. Hilmert, Esq. | | |
| | WINSTON & STRAWN LLP | Served electronically Via Lexis Nexis | |
| 6 | 35 West Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60601 | File&Serve Xpress | |
| 7 | Tel: (312) 558-5969 | | |
| 8 | Fax: (312) 558-5700 | | |
| | glombard@winston.com | | |
| 9 | jhilmert@winston.com | | |
| 10 | Joe G. Hollingsworth, Esq. | Counsel for Defendant | |
| 11 | Eric G. Lasker, Esq. | | |
| | Martin C. Calhoun, Esq. | Served electronically via Lexis Nexis | |
| 12 | Kirby T. Griffis, Esq. William J. Cople III, Esq. | File&Serve Xpress | |
| 13 | HOLLINGSWORTH LLP | | |
| 14 | 1350 I Street, N.W. | | |
| 14 | Washington, DC 20005 | | |
| 15 | Tel: (202) 898-5800 | | |
| 16 | Fax: (202) 682-1639 jhollingsworth@hollingsworthllp.com | | |
| | elasker@hollingsworthllp.com | | |
| 17 | mcalhoun@hollingsworthllp.com | | |
| 18 | kgriffis@hollingsworthllp.com | | |
| 19 | wcople@hollingsworthllp.com | | |
| | | | |
| 20 | Sandra A. Edwards, Esq. | Counsel for Defendant | |
| 21 | Joshua W. Malone, Esq. | | |
| 22 | Farella Braun + Martel LLP | Served electronically via Lexis Nexis | |
| | 235 Montgomery Street, 17 th Floor San Francisco, California 94104 | File&Serve Xpress | |
| 23 | Tel: (415) 95404400 | | |
| 24 | Fax: (415) 954-4480 | | |
| 25 | sedwards@fbm.com | | |
| 25 | jmalone@fbm.com | | |
| 26 | | | |
| | 1 | | |

PROOF OF SERVICE