1 2 3 4 5 6 7	WILKINSON WALSH + ESKOVITZ LLP Brian L. Stekloff (pro hac vice) (bstekloff@wilkinsonwalsh.com) Tamarra Matthews Johnson (pro hac vice) (tmatthewsjohnson@wilkinsonwalsh.com) Rakesh Kilaru (pro hac vice) (rkilaru@wilkinsonwalsh.com) 2001 M St. NW 10 <sup>th</sup> Floor Washington, DC 20036 Tel: 202-847-4030 Fax: 202-847-4005	ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP 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
<ul><li>8</li><li>9</li><li>10</li><li>11</li><li>12</li><li>13</li></ul>	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
14 15 16 17 18	NORTHERN DISTR IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS	S DISTRICT COURT RICT OF CALIFORNIA  ) ) ) MDL No. 2741
<ul><li>19</li><li>20</li><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	Hardeman v. Monsanto Co., et al., 3:16-cv-0525-VC	) Case No. 3:16-md-02741-VC ) MONSANTO'S PROPOSED JURY ) INSTRUCTIONS AND VERDICT ) FORM REGARDING THE ) CONSUMER EXPECTATION ) TEST
24		)

MONSANTO'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND VERDICT FORM Case No. 3:16-md-02741-VC

### Introduction

Defendant Monsanto Company ("Monsanto") respectfully submits the following proposed instruction regarding the consumer expectation test. However, as indicated in the prior filings and colloquy with the Court, Monsanto does not believe that such a claim is viable as a matter of law.

MONSANTO'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND VERDICT

Case No.: 3:16-md-02741

## JURY INSTRUCTION NO. \_

### (Strict Liability—Design Defect)

In order to prevail on his design defect claim, Mr. Hardeman must prove that Monsanto is legally responsible for the harm that Roundup caused him. Therefore, Mr. Hardeman must prove all of the following:

- 1. That Roundup, in the context of the facts and circumstances of this particular case, is a product about which an ordinary consumer can form reasonable minimum safety expectations;
- 2. That Roundup had a design defect that did not allow it to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected it to perform when used or misused in an intended or reasonably foreseeable way;
- 3. That Roundup's design defect was a substantial factor in causing Mr. Hardeman's harm.

Determining if Roundup's design defect was a substantial factor in causing Mr. Hardeman's harm is a different question than determining that merely using Roundup was a substantial factor in causing Mr. Hardeman's NHL. In Phase 1 you had to decide if Roundup caused Mr. Hardeman's NHL. Here you must decide if Roundup was defectively designed, and, if so, whether that defective design was a substantial factor in causing Mr. Hardeman's NHL.

Source: CACI 1203 (Modified); *Pooshs v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.*, 904 F. Supp. 2d 1009, 1025 (N.D. Cal. 2012) (finding "no evidence that the design of defendants' cigarettes—as opposed to plaintiff's smoking of cigarettes—was a substantial factor in causing her lung cancer."); *Soule v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 882 P.2d 298, 308 (1994) (explaining that the consumer expectation test only allows a finding of defect "*if* the

### Case 3:16-md-02741-VC Document 3141 Filed 03/23/19 Page 4 of 7

failure *resulted* from the product's design.") (emphasis added); *Browne v. McDonnell Douglas Corp.*, 698 F.2d 370, 371 (9th Cir. 1982) (affirming summary judgment in favor of defendants because "a reasonable jury could not find by a preponderance of the evidence that the [airplane's] design was a substantial factor in preventing the crew from seeing the [other airplane] in time to avoid the collision").

## **Verdict Form**

# **Design Defect**

We answer the questions submitted to us as follows:

1.	In the context of the facts and circumstances of this particular case, can an ordinary				
	consumer form reasonable minimum safety expectations about Roundup?				
	Yes No				
	If your answer to question 1 is yes, then answer question 2. If you answered no,				
	stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date				
	this form.				
2.	Did Mr. Hardeman prove that Roundup had a design defect that did not allow it to				
	perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected it to perform when				
	used or misused in an intended or reasonably foreseeable way?				
	Yes No				
	If your answer to question 2 is yes, then answer question 3. If you answered no,				
	stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date				
	this form.				
3.	Did Mr. Hardeman prove that Roundup's design defect, rather than his mere use of				
	Roundup, was a substantial factor in causing Mr. Hardeman's harm?				
	Yes No				
	If your answer to question 3 is yes, then answer question 4. If you answered no,				
	stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date				
	this form.				

MONSANTO'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND VERDICT	
ORM	
S N 2.16 1 02741	

1 Respectfully submitted, DATED: March 23, 2019 2 /s/ Brian L. Stekloff 3 Brian L. Stekloff (pro hac vice) (bstekloff@wilkinsonwalsh.com) 4 Tamarra Matthews Johnson (pro hac vice) 5 (tmatthewsjohnson@wilkinsonwalsh.com) Rakesh Kilaru (pro hac vice) 6 (rkilaru@wilkinsonwalsh.com) WILKINSON WALSH + ESKOVITZ LLP 7 2001 M St. NW, 10th Floor Washington, DC 20036 8 Tel: 202-847-4030 9 Fax: 202-847-4005 10 Pamela Yates (CA Bar No. 137440) (Pamela.Yates@arnoldporter.com) 11 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER, LLP 777 South Figueroa St., 44th Floor 12 Los Angeles, CA 90017 13 Tel: 213-243-4178 Fax: 213-243-4199 14 Eric G. Lasker (pro hac vice) 15 (elasker@hollingsworthllp.com) HOLLINGSWORTH LLP 16 1350 I St. NW 17 Washington, DC 20005 Tel: 202-898-5843 18 Fax: 202-682-1639 19 Michael X. Imbroscio (pro hac vice) 20 (mimbroscio@cov.com) COVINGTON & BURLING LLP 21 One City Center 850 10th St. NW 22 Washington, DC 20001 Tel: 202-662-6000 23 24 Attorneys for Defendant MONSANTO COMPANY 25 26 27 28

MONSANTO'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND VERDICT FORM Case No.: 3:16-md-02741

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 23rd day of March 2019, a copy of the foregoing was filed with the Clerk of the Court through the CM/ECF system which sent notice of the filing to all appearing parties of record.

/s/ Brian L. Stekloff

MONSANTO'S PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND VERDICT	
FORM	
C N 2 16 1 02741	

Case No.: 3:16-md-02741