EXHIBIT 26

```
1
           SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                    COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 3
 4
   DEWAYNE JOHNSON,
 5
                 Plaintiff,
 6
                           Case No. CGC-16-550128
            vs.
 7
   MONSANTO COMPANY, et al.,
 8
                 Defendants.
 9
10
11
        Proceedings held on Monday, August 6, 2018,
12
13
        Volume 24, before the Honorable Suzanne R. Bolanos,
14
        at 1:34 p.m.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 REPORTED BY:
22 LESLIE ROCKWOOD ROSAS, RPR, CSR 3462
23 Job No. 2983879
24
25 Pages 4873 - 5000
```

```
quy was one of the vice presidents. He gave us his name.
         2 He specifically said that they were there for training
           and that this person was giving them information about
           the way Monsanto viewed this greening of the world.
14:54:08
         5
                    And so there really could not be a more disputed
           issue of fact here. Now, they could have called Brett
           Begemann to testify and rebutted this evidence.
           could have even solicited testimony from one of their own
           company witnesses, but they didn't do that, and so the
        10 testimony that's in the record, in the light most
14:54:24
        11 favorable to plaintiff, suggests that that was discussion
        12 made by an officer of Monsanto.
        13
                    THE COURT: All right. You know what, I'm going
        14 to grant the motion to strike the Azevedo testimony
        15 regarding the statement that he relayed from the other --
14:54:38
        16 the Monsanto vice president that Monsanto is about making
        17 money. "Get it straight. Monsanto's about making
        18 money." That motion to strike will be granted, as that
        19 testimony is not relevant and is more prejudicial than
        20
           probative.
14:55:02
        21
                    All right. I think that's it on the plaintiff's
        22 disputed instructions, and then we're turning to the
        23 Monsanto disputed instructions. Let's see, we have the
           failure to warn. Now, I've already ruled on that.
        25
                    Is that something that you've already reached
14:55:19
```

```
REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
1
2
3
            I certify that the proceedings in the
  within-titled cause were taken at the time and place
5 herein named; that the proceedings were reported by
 6 me, a duly Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of
  California authorized to administer oaths and
  affirmations, and said proceedings were thereafter
9 transcribed into typewriting.
10
            I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 Attorney for either or any of the parties to said
12 Proceedings, not in any way interested in the outcome of
13 the cause named in said proceedings.
            IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand:
14
15 August 6th, 2018.
16
17
18
19
                          <%signature%>
                          Leslie Rockwood Rosas
20
                          Certified Shorthand Reporter
                          State of California
21
                          Certificate No. 3462
22
23
24
25
```