Case 3:16-md-02741-VC Docume	ent 2627	Filed 01/31/19	Page 1 of 5
ANDRUS WAGSTAFF, PC Aimee H. Wagstaff (SBN 278480) 7171 W. Alaska Drive			
Lakewood, CO 80226 Tel: (303) 376-6360			
Fax: (303) 376-6361 Aimee.wagstaff@andruswagstaff.com			
WEITZ & LUXENBERG, P.C. Robin L. Greenwald			
700 Broadway			
New York, NY 10003 Tel: (212) 558-5802			
Fax: (646) 293-4921 rgreenwald@weitzlux.com			
THE MILLER FIRM, LLC Michael J. Miller (<i>pro hac vice</i>)			
Brian K. Brake (<i>pro hac vice</i>) 108 Railroad Ave.			
Orange, VA 22960 Telephone: (540) 672-4224			
Facsimile: (540) 672-3055			
mmiller@millerfirmllc.com bbrake@millerfirmllc.com			
Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs			
UNITED STATES	DISTRI	CT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF (CALIFORNIA	
IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS		MDL No. 2741	
LIABILITY LITIGATION		Case No. 16-me	d-02741-VC
This document relates to:		PLAINTIFFS'	NOTICE OF D MOTION IN
Hardeman v. Monsanto Co., et al., 3:16-cv-0525-VC;		LIMINE NO. 1	I TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY, AN
Stevick v. Monsanto Co., et al.,		ARGUMENT	REGARDING
3:16-cv-02341-VC; <i>Gebeyehou v. Monsanto Co., et al.</i> 3:16-cv-5813-VC			RETENTION AN ADVERTISING
	1		
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN <i>LIMINE</i> NO. 13 TO EXC	1 CLUDE EVI	DENCE TESTIMO	NY AND ARGUME

1			
2	TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:		
3 4	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT beginning on February 13, 2019 in Courtroom 4 of the United		
5	States District Court, Northern District of California, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San		
6	Francisco, CA 94102, or as ordered by the Court, Plaintiffs will present their Motion in <i>Limine</i> to		
7	Exclude Evidence, Testimony, and Argument Regarding Attorney Retention and Attorney		
8	Advertising. A supporting memorandum is filed herewith.		
9 10	Dated: 1/30/2019 Respectfully submitted,		
10	/s/ Aimee Wagstaff		
12	Aimee H. Wagstaff (SBN 278480)		
13	aimee.wagstaff@andruswagstaff.com Andrus Wagstaff, P.C.		
14	7171 W. Alaska Drive Lakewood, CO 80226		
15	Tel: (303) 376-6360		
16	/s/ Robin Greenwald Robin L. Greenwald		
17	rgreenwald@weitzlux.com Weitz & Luxenberg		
18 19	700 Broadway New York, NY 10003		
20	Tel: (212) 558-5802		
21	/s/ Michael J. Miller		
22	Michael J. Miller (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Brian K. Brake (<i>pro hac vice</i>)		
23	mmiller@millerfirmllc.com bbreake@millerfirmllc.com		
24	The Miller Firm LLC 108 Railroad Ave.		
25	Orange, VA 22960 Telephone: (540) 672-4224		
26	Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel		
27 28			
20	2 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN <i>LIMINE</i> NO. 13 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE, TESTIMONY, AND ARGUMENT REGARDING ATTORNEY RETENTION AND ATTORNEY ADVERTISING		

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Plaintiffs hereby submit the following memorandum of points and authorities in support of their motion in *limine* to preclude any mention of attorney retention and attorney advertising.

INTRODUCTION

I.

This motion in *limine* is based upon FRE 401 and 403 and made upon the grounds that attorney retention and attorney advertising are irrelevant in this case. This Court should exclude any evidence or argument suggesting that this case was generated by attorneys, or any other evidence or argument of attorney involvement or motivation. Such remarks are inflammatory, and constitute an improper attempt to prejudice the jury through the suggestion that Plaintiffs are pursuing their claims only because an attorney advised it.

It is anticipated that Defendant may attempt to introduce evidence or argument that this case is driven solely by attorneys, by attorney advertising, and that Plaintiffs' counsel specializes in litigating pharmaceutical and/or product liability cases, and/or that Plaintiffs' counsel represents plaintiffs in a large volume of Roundup® or other pending lawsuits. Such evidence or argument is irrelevant and highly prejudicial and should be excluded.

II. ARGUMENT

A. Evidence of Attorney Advertising Is Irrelevant To The Issues In This Case And Highly Prejudicial.

Any statements or evidence regarding an attorney's involvement in a lawsuit necessarily encroaches on the attorney-client privilege. It likewise has no relevance to the issues in this case and results in unfair prejudice to Plaintiffs. Such evidence or argument has no bearing on whether Defendant's product was defective and was the cause of Plaintiffs' NHL.

Courts are hesitant to allow even limited evidence of attorney advertisements, in order to protect a fair trial for plaintiffs, as well as to protect attorney-client privilege. *See In re Norplant Contraceptive Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL 1038, 1997 WL 81087, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 21, 1997) (*granting* Plaintiffs' motion in *limine* to exclude defendants' experts' opinions regarding negative

media stories and attorney advertisements); In re Prempro Prods. Liab. Litig., 4:04CV01169, 2007 WL 3125106, at *1 (E.D. Ark. Oct. 24, 2007). Similarly, whether Plaintiffs' counsel represents a large volume of clients due to injuries caused by Roundup® or any other defective product cases. is irrelevant to the issues in this case and could only prejudice the Plaintiffs if admitted Accordingly, this evidence is irrelevant and should be excluded.

B. Evidence of Attorney Retention And Advertising Is Protected By Attorney-Client Privilege.

The attorney-client privilege is carefully safeguarded with only a few specific exceptions. Rosso, Johnson, Rosso & Ebersold v. Super. Ct., 237 Cal Rptr. 242, 244 (1987). The privilege applies during preliminary discussions with counsel, even if employment is declined. In re Dupont's Est., 140 P.2d 866, 872 (1943). Any conversations that Plaintiffs had with their counsel, regarding filing a lawsuit and the decision to pursue this case, fall squarely within the attorneyclient privilege. Any information Plaintiffs received from counsel likewise falls squarely within the privilege. As such, any evidence concerning Plaintiffs' decision to proceed with this lawsuit based on any discussions and communications with their attorneys are protected by attorney-client privilege and are inadmissible. Accordingly, Defendant should not be permitted to imply that counsel is driving the lawsuit or that counsel had any effect upon Plaintiffs' decision to pursue this lawsuit.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter an Order granting this motion in limine and excluding any evidence, testimony, and argument regarding attorney retention and attorney advertising.

Case 3:16-md-02741-VC Document 2627 Filed 01/31/19 Page 5 of 5

1			
1	Dated: 1/30/2019 Respectfully submitted,		
2	/s/ Aimee wagstarr		
3	Aimee H. Wagstaff (SBN 278480)		
4	aimee.wagstaff@andruswagstaff.com	m	
4	Andrus Wagstaff, P.C. 7171 W. Alaska Drive		
5	Lakewood, CO 80226		
6	Tol: (202) 276 6260		
7			
8	Robin L. Greenwald rgreenwald@weitzlux.com		
0	Waitz & Lyvenhere		
9	700 Broadway		
10			
	Tel: (212) 558-5802		
11			
12	/s/ Michael J. Miller		
	Michael J. Miller (pro hac vice)		
13			
14	mmiller@millerfirmllc.com		
14	bbreake@milertirmilc.com		
15	The Miller Firm LLC		
	108 Railroad Ave.		
16			
17	Telephone: (540) 672-4224		
	Plaintiffe' Co. Load Coursel		
18	Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel		
19	CEDTIFICATE OF SEDVICE		
20	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
	I certify that on January 30, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing document	with the	
21	Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing	ng to the	
22		C	
23	CM/ECF participants registered to receive service in this MDL.		
24			
	/s/ Aimee Wagstaff	-	
25	aimee.wagstaff@andruswagstaff.com	m	
26			
27			
28	2		
	3 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN <i>LIMINE</i> NO. 13 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE, TESTIMONY, AND ARGU	IMENT	-
	REGARDING ATTORNEY RETENTION AND ATTORNEY ADVERTISING		

	Case 3:16-md-02741-VC Doc	ument 2627-1	Filed 01/31/19	Page 1 of 2	
1 2	Leland H. Belew (SBN 293096) <u>leland@andrusanderson.com</u> Lori E. Andrus (SBN 205816) lori@andrusanderson.com				
3	Jennie Lee Anderson (SBN 203586)				
4	jennie@andrusanderson.com ANDRUS ANDERSON LLP				
5	155 Montgomery Street, Suite 900 San Francisco, CA 94104				
6	Telephone: (415) 986-1400 Facsimile: (415) 986-1474				
7					
8 9	Aimee Wagstaff (SBN 278480) aimee.wagstaff@andruswagstaff.com ANDRUS WAGSTAFF, PC				
10	7171 West Alaska Drive Lakewood, CO 80226				
11	Telephone: (303) 376-6360 Facsimile: (303) 376-6361				
12	Attorneys for Plaintiffs				
13	UNITED	STATES DIST	RICT COURT		
14			F CALIFORNIA		
15					
16	SAN	I FRANCISCO I	DIVISION		
17	IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS	Case N	No. 3:16-md-0274	1-VC	
18	LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL	No. 2741		
19	This document relates to:	ECF A	ATTESTATION		
20					
21	Hardeman v. Monsanto Co., et al., 3:16-cv-0525-VC				
22 23	Stevick v. Monsanto Co., et al., 2:16 ov 2241 VC				
23 24	3:16-cv-2341-VC				
24 25	<i>Gebeyehou v. Monsanto Co., et al.,</i> 3:16-cv-5813-VC				
23 26					
20 27					
27		1			MDI N. 2741
20		-1- ECF ATTESTAT	TION		MDL No. 2741

1	$Pursuant to Civil I = P_{1}(i)(2) the fi$	ling atterney attests he has abteined eensymptope regarding		
2	Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the filing attorney attests he has obtained concurrence regarding			
	the documents submitted in this filing from t	ne signatories therein.		
3 4	Date: January 30, 2019	By:/s/ Leland H. Belew		
5		Leland H. Belew		
6		Leland H. Belew (SBN 293096)		
7		<u>leland@andrusanderson.com</u> Lori E. Andrus (SBN 205816)		
8		lori@andrusanderson.com Jennie Lee Anderson (SBN 203586)		
9		jennie@andrusanderson.com		
9 10		ANDRUS ANDERSON LLP 155 Montgomery Street, Suite 900		
10		San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 986-1400		
		Facsimile:(415) 986-1474		
12 13		<i>Co-Liaison Counsel for Plaintiffs in MDL</i> <i>No. 2741</i>		
14		NO. 2741		
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28		-2- MDL No. 2741		
	ECI	FATTESTATION		