1					
1	Sandra A. Edwards (State Bar No. 154578)				
2	Joshua W. Malone (State Bar No. 301836) Farella Braun + Martel LLP				
3	235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104	FILE D			
4	Telephone: (415) 954-4400; Fax: (415) 954-4480	) Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco			
	sedwards@fbm.com jmalone@fbm.com  Clerk of the Court				
5	Joe G. Hollingsworth (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i> )	BY:KALENE APOLONIO Deputy Clerk			
6	Kirby T. Griffis (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i> ) Eric G. Lasker (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i> )				
7	William J. Cople (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i> ) Hollingsworth LLP				
8	1350 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005				
9	Telephone: (202) 898-5800; Fax: (202) 682-1639				
10	jhollingsworth@hollingsworthllp.com kgriffis@hollingsworthllp.com elasker@hollingsworthllp.com wcople@hollingsworthllp.com				
11					
12	James M. Hilmert (appearance pro hac vice) Winston & Strawn LLP 35 West Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60601 Telephone: (312) 558-5969; Fax: (312) 558-5700 glombard@winston.com jhilmert@winston.com				
13					
14					
15					
16	Attorneys for Defendant				
17	MONSANTO COMPANY				
18	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO				
19					
20					
21	DEWAYNE JOHNSON,	Case No. CGC-16-550128			
22	·				
23	Plaintiff,	DECLARATION OF SANDRA A. EDWARDS IN SUPPORT OF			
24	VS.	DEFENDANT MONSANTO COMPANY'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S			
25	MONSANTO COMPANY,	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF COMPLAINTS FILED AGAINST			
26	Defendant.	MONSANTO			
27		Honorable Judge Suzanne R. Bolanos			
28		Department: 504			
40	1				

Farella Braun + Martel LLP 235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor San Francisco, California 94104 (415) 954-4400 34812\6761198.1

## Exhibit 1

1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
3	
4	DEWAYNE JOHNSON,
5	Plaintiff,
6	vs. Case No. CGC-16-550128
7	MONSANTO COMPANY, et al.,
8	Defendants.
9	
10	
11	VOLUME II
12	
13	Proceedings June 20, 2018, at 10:22 a.m.
14	before the Honorable Suzanne R. Bolanos.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	REPORTED BY:
24	Mary Hogan, CSR No. 05386
25	

```
2:05PM 1
           Trial Court, some of which he said is denied
2:05PM
           without prejudice.
       2
2:05PM
                       This is not one of them.
                                                 This is one
2:05PM
       4
           where there was a tentative ruling, formal
2:05PM
           argument, and a final ruling.
       5
2:05PM
                       He had very well reasoned a succinct
2:05PM
       7
           opinion which I think Your Honor already stated
2:05PM
           you are aware of. There is nothing about a lack
2:06PM
           of foundation or any concerns about the evidence
2:06PM 10
           coming in.
2:06PM 11
                       Judge Karnow ruled that these
2:06PM 12
           complaints would be treated as notice to Monsanto
2:06PM 13
           of the alleged connection between glyphosate and
2:06PM 14
           the injury at issue in this case.
2:06PM 15
                       Monsanto made the arguments they are
2:06PM 16
           making today. Judge Karnow said this shouldn't
2:06PM 17
           block Plaintiffs from also introducing the facts
2:06PM 18
           of the six or seven cases.
2:06PM 19
                       I believe there may be more than
2:06PM 20
           and I am happy to go on if the
```

2:06PM 25 Court likes with more substantive topics.

2:11PM different litigation in Federal Court, preparing 2:11PM for a comprehension examination by this person and 2:11PM this deposition that you are showing me is not 2:11PM even from this case, it's from another case in a 4 2:11PM different court, and that's going to come in by 5 2:11PM virtue of them trying to go down that road. 2:11PM 7 They don't have to. They can just 2:11PM 8 challenge him on his opinions and the basis of 2:11PM them. We're okay with that. 2:11PM 10 I'm just flagging that they have the 2:12PM 11 opportunity to avoid to this pitfall, and I guess 2:12PM 12 we can see how it comes in at trial, Your Honor. 2:12PM 13 MR. LOMBARDI: I think the suggestion 2:12PM 14 seems to be that they will get to cross on 2:12PM 15 compensation of our experts but if we want to 2:12PM 16 cross on theirs we have to talk about 4000 cases. 2:12PM 17 Inherently unfair, Your Honor. 2:12PM 18

2:13PM	14	MR. WISNER: Fair enough, Your Honor.
2:13PM	15	I just want to be clear.
2:13PM	16	They can attack our experts for the
2:13PM	17	amount of money they have made but they can't say
2:13PM	18	the basis for that money. That's what I
2:13PM	19	understand this ruling is saying and how is that
2:13PM	20	fair?
2:13PM	21	THE COURT: It depends on how the
2:13PM		question is phrased.
	22	quescion is phiaseu.
2:13PM		The witness may answer the question
2:13PM 2:13PM	23	The witness may answer the question

 $2:13\,\mathrm{PM}$  25 4000 cases, but if a Defense lawyer asks the

3:01PM 1	I, the undersigned, a Certified
3:01PM 2	Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do
3:01PM 3	hereby certify:
3:01PM 4	That the foregoing proceedings were
3:01PM 5	taken before me at the time and place herein set
3:01PM 6	forth; that any witnesses in the foregoing
3:01PM 7	proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn;
3:01PM 8	that a record of the proceedings was made by me
3:01PM 9	using machine shorthand which was thereafter
3:01PM 10	transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing
3:01PM 11	transcript is a true record of the proceedings.
3:01PM 12	I further certify that I am neither
3:01PM 13	financially interested in the action nor a
3:01PM 14	relative or employee of any attorney or party to
3:01PM 15	this action.
3:01PM 16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date
3:01PM 17	subscribed my name.
3:01PM 18	
3:01PM 19	Dated: June 20, 2018
3:01PM 20	
3:01PM 21	Mary Hogan
10:49AM 22	CSR No. 05386
9:26AM 23	
4:49PM 24	