

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

WILKINSON WALSH + ESKOVITZ LLP

Brian L. Stekloff (*pro hac vice*)
(bstekloff@wilkinsonwalsh.com)
Rakesh Kilaru (*pro hac vice*)
(rkilaru@wilkinsonwalsh.com)
2001 M St. NW
10th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-847-4030
Fax: 202-847-4005

ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER

Pamela Yates (CA Bar No. 137440)
(Pamela.Yates@arnoldporter.com)
777 South Figueroa St., 44th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: 213-243-4178
Fax: 213-243-4199

HOLLINGSWORTH LLP

Eric G. Lasker (*pro hac vice*)
(elasker@hollingsworthllp.com)
1350 I St. NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-898-5843
Fax: 202-682-1639

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Michael X. Imbroscio (*pro hac vice*)
(mimbroscio@cov.com)
One City Center
850 10th St. NW
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202-662-6000

Attorneys for Defendant
MONSANTO COMPANY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

)
) MDL No. 2741
)
) Case No. 3:16-md-02741-VC
)

Hardeman v. Monsanto Co., et al.,
3:16-cv-0525-VC

) **MONSANTO COMPANY'S RESPONSE**
) **TO EDWIN HARDEMAN'S**
) **SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO**
) **PTO 81**
)
)

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Edwin Hardeman's ("Plaintiff") supplemental brief concerning Industrial Bio-Test Labs ("IBT") misrepresents the historical record and IBT has no relevance to any of the issues in Phase 2. Contrary to Plaintiff's suggestion, the IBT fraud was not specific to

1 Monsanto, and there is no evidence that Monsanto was in any way complicit in that fraud.
2 Rather, Monsanto was a victim of a widespread fraud perpetrated by IBT on dozens of
3 manufacturers, including pharmaceutical and other pesticide producers, as well as numerous
4 government agencies. See TX 504 (also available at [https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/
5 ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=91014ULV.txt](https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=91014ULV.txt)).¹ The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”)
6 did not revoke approval of any pesticide, the safety of many of which (including glyphosate)
7 were supported by other, validated studies. *Id.* at 1, 3-4. Instead, EPA required manufacturers to
8 fill any data gaps by conducting new studies. Plaintiff’s attempt to blame Monsanto for IBT’s
9 misconduct is without basis.

10 In the 1970s, IBT was a leading provider of toxicology testing to industry and
11 government agencies. In 1976, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) discovered
12 discrepancies in some of the toxicology tests produced by IBT. *Id.* at 8. Because of this, the
13 EPA demanded an audit of all IBT studies which were used to support pesticide registration.
14 The EPA audit identified widespread problems involving 38 companies, 140 chemicals and 801
15 studies. *Id.* at 7. Monsanto repeated all of the glyphosate studies in question according to EPA
16 guidelines, and no IBT data are currently used in support of glyphosate registration.

17 ARGUMENT

18 The evidence that Plaintiff seeks to introduce concerning IBT is not relevant to the issues
19 in this case and would only serve to waste time and confuse the jury. Such evidence would also
20 be unduly prejudicial against Monsanto.

21 Plaintiff claims that the IBT evidence is relevant to “whether Monsanto used reasonable
22 care to prevent harm to Mr. Hardeman” and to punitive damages. See Edwin Hardeman’s Suppl.
23 Br. Pursuant to PTO 81 at 3, ECF No. 2813. Specifically, Plaintiff claims that the evidence
24 shows Monsanto’s “awareness of and indifference to” IBT’s fraud, which he states is directly
25 relevant to his claim of negligence. *Id.* at 3. But Monsanto was a victim of IBT’s fraud, and
26

27 ¹ See also Mark Seaton, Ph.D., *An Update on FDA’s Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) for Nonclinical Laboratory*
28 *Studies Proposed Rule*, SOT: Regulatory and Safety Evaluation Specialty Section Webinar, FDA, at 12 (Sept. 29,
2017), http://www.toxicology.org/groups/ss/rsees/doc/2017SOTWebinar_with_notesRSESS_Seaton.pdf.

1 there is no evidence that Monsanto knew of the problems with the glyphosate studies until they
2 were discovered by the government investigation. Monsanto is no different than the dozens of
3 other manufacturers and government agencies that were victimized by IBT's misconduct.
4 Plaintiff further seeks to tar Monsanto with the misconduct of one of the implicated IBT
5 scientists, David Wright, but there is no evidence that Mr. Wright engaged in any misconduct
6 while employed by Monsanto or that he was at any time involved in any toxicology studies
7 involving glyphosate. Nor is there any evidence that Monsanto was ever implicated in IBT's
8 fraud.

9 The IBT fraud is not relevant to the Phase 2 issue of whether Roundup[®] is a defective
10 product or whether it should have included a cancer warning. The relevant studies were all
11 replaced decades ago. Monsanto at all times complied with EPA regulations and requirements in
12 selling its Roundup[®] products. And EPA repeatedly has approved Roundup[®] and Roundup[®]
13 labeling without any cancer warning, consistent with its extensive scientific reviews and
14 determinations that glyphosate does not pose a cancer risk in humans.

15 Nor is evidence concerning IBT relevant to punitive damages. Plaintiff has no evidence
16 that demonstrate that Monsanto was involved in perpetuating IBT's fraud and cannot connect
17 IBT's fraud in the 1970s to his own much later use of Roundup[®] products.

18 Allowing a sideshow into IBT would serve no purpose but to confuse and potentially
19 inflame the jury with facts that have nothing to do with the issues before them in this trial.
20 Monsanto should not be required to prove its innocence in a decades-old third-party fraud – in
21 which Monsanto was a victim – to defend the present product liability lawsuit.

22
23 Date: March 4, 2019

/s/ Eric G. Lasker _____

24 Brian L. Stekloff (*pro hac vice*)
25 (bstekloff@wilkinsonwalsh.com)
26 Rakesh Kilaru (*pro hac vice*)
27 (rkilaru@wilkinsonwalsh.com)
28 WILKINSON WALSH + ESKOVITZ LLP
2001 M St. NW
10th Floor

- 3 -

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

Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-847-4030
Fax: 202-847-4005

Pamela Yates (CA Bar No. 137440)
(Pamela.Yates@arnoldporter.com)
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER
777 South Figueroa St., 44th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: 213-243-4178
Fax: 213-243-4199

Eric G. Lasker (*pro hac vice*)
(elasker@hollingsworthllp.com)
HOLLINGSWORTH LLP
1350 I St. NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-898-5843
Fax: 202-682-1639

Michael X. Imbroscio (*pro hac vice*)
(mimbroscio@cov.com)
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
One City Center
850 10th St. NW
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202-662-6000

Attorneys for Defendant
MONSANTO COMPANY