Exhibit 2

CaseC3x346-3m166027/45813 Document 2419162d 1701607/116/03/149e Pany 62 of 7

1 2 3 4 5	Tesfaye W. Tsadik, Esq., CSB#108103 Law Offices of Tesfaye W. Tsadik 1736 Franklin Street, 10 th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 839-3922 Facsimile: (510) 444-1704 Email: ttsadik@pacbell.net Attorney for Plaintiff				
6	SIOUM GEBEYEHOU				
7					
8					
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
11					
12	SIOUM GEBEYEHOU) Case No.				
13	Plaintiff,) COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES vs.				
14 15 16	MONSANTO COMPANY and DOES 1 through 25 Defendantss. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED				
17	Plaintiff, SIOUM GEBEYEHOU ("Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned attorney,				
18	hereby brings this Complaint for damages against Defendants Monsanto Company and Does 1				
19	through 25 and alleges the following:				
20	NATURE OF THE CASE				
22	1. This is an action for damages suffered by Plaintiff as a direct and proximate result of				
23	Defendants' negligent and wrongful conduct in connection with the design, development,				
24	manufacture, testing, packaging, promoting, marketing, advertising, distribution, labeling, and/or sale of the herbicide Roundup®, containing the active ingredient glyphosate.				
25					
26	2. Plaintiff maintains that Roundup® and/or glyphosate is defective, dangerous to				
27	human health, unfit and unsuitable to be marketed and sold in commerce, and lacked proper				
28	Plaintiff's Complaint for Damages -1-				

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

warnings and directions as to the dangers associated with its use.

3. Monsanto, since it began selling Roundup®, has represented it as safe to humans and the environment. Indeed, Monsanto has repeatedly proclaimed and continues to proclaim to the world, and particularly to United States consumers, that glyphosate-based herbicides, including Roundup®, create no unreasonable risks to human health or to the environment.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants and as this action is brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and Defendants. Defendants MONSANTO COMPANY is incorporated in Delaware and, with its principal place of business in St. Louis, Missouri and Plaintiff is a citizen of California.
- 5. The amount in controversy between Plaintiff and Defendants exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and cost.
 - 6. The Court also has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- Venue is proper within this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 in that Defendants conduct business in this judicial district and are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district and Plaintiff resides in this judicial district and was diagnosed with his injury in this District. Furthermore, Defendants sell, market, and/or distribute Roundup® within the this judicial District.

PARTIES

- 8. Plaintiff, SIOUM GEBEYEHOU, is a natural person and at all relevant times a resident Alameda County, citizen of California. Plaintiff brings this action for personal injuries sustained by exposure to Roundup® ("Roundup") containing the active ingredient glyphosate and the surfactant POEA. As a direct and proximate result of being exposed to Roundup, Plaintiff developed non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma and related medical conditions.
 - 9. Defendant MONSANTO COMPANY is a Delaware corporation, a multinational

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	AIMEE H. WAGSTAFF (SBN 278480) aimee.wagstaff@andruswagstaff.com DAVID J. WOOL (pro hac vice anticipated) david.wool@andruswagstaff.com ANDRUS WAGSTAFF, PC 7171 West Alaska Drive Lakewood, Colorado 80226 Telephone: (720) 255-7623 Facsimile: (303) 376-6361 KATHRYN M. FORGIE (SBN 110404) kathryn.forgie@andruswagstaff.com ANDRUS WAGSTAFF, PC 6315 Ascot Drive Oakland, California 94611 Telephone: (720) 255-7623 Facsimile: (303) 376-6361		
10	10 Attorneys for Plaintiff 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 13		
11			
12			
13			
14	EDWIN HARDEMAN,	Civil Action No.: 4:16-cv-00525-DMR	
15	Plaintiff v.	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT	
16		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
17	MONSANTO COMPANY and JOHN DOES 1-50.	JUNI TRIAL DEMANDED	
18	Defendant.		
19			
20	COMPLAINT		
21			
22	Plaintiff, Edwin Hardeman ("Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned attorneys, hereb		
23	brings this Complaint for damages against Defendants Monsanto Company and John Does 1-50, and		
24	alleges the following:		
25	26		
26			
27			
28			
Andrus Wagstaff, P.C.	Andrus Wagstaff, P.C.		
	Complaint for Damages		

Case 3:16-md-02741-VC Document 2419-3 Filed 01/03/19 Page 5 of 7

Case 4:16-cv-00525-DMR Document 6 Filed 02/12/16 Page 2 of 30

1	
1	

234

5 6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

28
Andrus Wagstaff, P.C.

NATURE OF THE CASE

- 1. This is an action for damages suffered by Plaintiff as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent and wrongful conduct in connection with the design, development, manufacture, testing, packaging, promoting, marketing, advertising, distribution, labeling, and/or sale of the herbicide Roundup[®], containing the active ingredient glyphosate.
- 2. Plaintiff maintains that Roundup® and/or glyphosate is defective, dangerous to human health, unfit and unsuitable to be marketed and sold in commerce, and lacked proper warnings and directions as to the dangers associated with its use.
- 3. Plaintiff's injuries, like those striking thousands of similarly situated victims across the country, were avoidable.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants and this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and Defendants. Defendants are all either incorporated and/or have their principal place of business outside of the state in which the Plaintiff resides.
- 5. The amount in controversy between Plaintiff and Defendants exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and cost.
 - 6. The Court also has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 7. Venue is proper within this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 in that Defendants conduct business here and are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district. Furthermore, Defendants sell, market, and/or distribute Roundup® within the District of California. Also, a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred within this district.

PARTIES¹

- 8. Plaintiff, Edwin Hardeman, is a natural person and at all relevant times a resident and citizen of Sonoma County, California. Plaintiff brings this action for personal injuries sustained by exposure to Roundup® ("Roundup") containing the active ingredient glyphosate and the surfactant
- ¹ Plaintiff was incorrectly listed as Edward Hardeman in the original complaint rather than Edwin Hardeman.

CURTIS G. HOKE (SBN 282465)

THE MILLER FIRM LLC

108 Railroad Avenue Orange, Virginia 22960

Tel: (540) 672-4224 Fax: (540) 672-3055 choke@millerfirmllc.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELAINE STEVICK and CHRISTOPHER STEVICK;

Plaintiffs,

CIVIL No.: 3:16-cv-02341

vs.

MONSANTO COMPANY,

COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Defendant.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. Federal diversity jurisdiction in this Court is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because Plaintiffs are citizens of a different state from the Defendant Monsanto Company's states of citizenship, and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Monsanto under C.C.P. § 410, because Monsanto knows or should have known that its Roundup® products are sold throughout the State of California.
- 11. Monsanto maintains sufficient contacts with the State of California such that this Court's exercise of personal jurisdiction over it does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Additionally, Monsanto caused the Plaintiffs' tortious injury by acts and omissions in this judicial district and caused tortious injury in this district by acts and omissions outside this district while regularly doing and soliciting business, engaging in a persistent course of conduct, and deriving substantial revenue from goods used or consumed and services rendered in this judicial district.
- 12. Venue is proper within this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this claim occurred within this judicial District.

THE PARTIES

Plaintiffs

13. Plaintiff Elaine Stevick resides in Sonoma County, California and did at all relevant times. Plaintiff Christopher Stevick was at all relevant times the lawful spouse of Elaine Stevick.

Defendant

14. Defendant Monsanto Company ("Monsanto") is a Delaware corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business in St. Louis, Missouri.