1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Michael J. Miller (appearance pro hac vice) Timothy Litzenburg (appearance pro hac vice) Curtis G. Hoke (State Bar No. 282465) The Miller Firm, LLC 108 Railroad Ave. Orange, VA 22960 (540) 672-4224 phone; (540) 672-3055 fax mmiller@millerfirmllc.com tlitzenburg@millerfirmllc.com choke@millerfirmllc.com  Attorneys for Plaintiff DEWAYNE JOHNSON		ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California County of San Francisco 06/12/2018 Clerk of the Court BY:VANESSA WU Deputy Cler
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	FOR THE COUN	NTY OF SAN FRAN	NCISCO
12	DEWAYNE JOHNSON,	Case No. CGC-16	5-550128
13	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF'S R	EPLY IN SUPPORT OF
14	v.		OTION IN LIMINE NO. 9 EVIDENCE OF EXPERT'S
15	MONSANTO COMPANY ET AL.,	FINANCES AND	PERSONAL ASSETS
16	Defendants.	INVOLVING GI	
17		CONTAINING E HODGKIN'S LY	IERBICIDES AND NON- MPHOMA
18 19		Trial Judge: TBD	
20		Trial Date:	June 18, 2018
21		Time: Department:	9:30 a.m. TBD
22		Department.	100
23			
24			
25		1	
26			
27			
ı	I and the second		

### I. ARGUMENT

22.

The Defendant has not shown via their Opposition why specific information as to the expert's yearly total income or unrelated case specific information is relevant and thus such information should be excluded.

Although the Defendant may be allowed to discover what percentage of the expert's practice involved plaintiff and defense medical examinations and a numerical estimate of the compensation the expert in question received from that work, the Defendant is not entitled to learn the precise details of the expert's billing and accounting records or exact dollar amounts for the purpose of showing bias. *Allen v. Superior Court*, supra, 151 Cal.App.3d at p. 453, 198 Cal.Rptr. 737.

The Defendant cites *Stony Brook I Homeowners Ass'n v. Superior Court*, 84 Cal. App. 4th 691, in an attempt to bolster their argument but their reliance on the case is misplaced in that *Stony Brook* followed the *Allen* standard of percentages and not requiring "exact information" about specific income totals. ("Although an expert must provide such information about his role in prior proceedings as will permit an adversary a meaningful opportunity to demonstrate any bias or prejudice, precise information about the number of cases in which the expert has testified or the amount of compensation the expert has received is not required.") *Id.* at 693.

While *Stony Brook* may support discovery into numerical estimates of defense and plaintiff-related work and a numerical estimate of the amount of income generated from that defense and plaintiff-related litigation, it does not permit unfettered access to an expert's potential bias. *Id.* at 699.

Thus, the Defendant should be limited to evidence of numerical estimates on the amount of income Plaintiff's expert has generated from defense and plaintiff-related litigation. Plaintiff should not have to give a detailed break down of exact dollar amounts or case specific information for each litigation that he has worked on which is unrelated to the matter at hand.

## II. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff Dewayne Johnson respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order granting Plaintiff's Motion *in Limine* No. 9.

DATED: June 12, 2018 Respectfully submitted, THE MILLER FIRM, LLC By: Curtis G. Hoke (SBN 282465) Timothy Litzenburg (appearance pro hac vice) Michael J. Miller (appearance pro hac vice) THE MILLER FIRM, LLC 108 Railroad Ave. Orange, VA 22960 (540) 672-4224 phone (540) 672-3055 fax tlitzenburg@millerfirmllc.com choke@millerfirmllc.com Attorneys for Plaintiff, 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 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. 9 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF EXPERT'S FINANCES AND PERSONAL ASSETS THAT 7 ARE UNRELATED TO LITIGATION INVOLVING GLYPHOSATE-CONTAINING HERBICIDES AND 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

# 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@hollingsworthlp.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 <sup>th</sup> 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