90017 AU036

		i i qua							
2 3 4	MICHAEL L. ARMITAGE, Esq., CA Bar No. JILLIAN RICE-LOEW, Esq., CA Bar No. 253 WATERS & KRAUS, LLP 222 N. Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 1900 El Segundo, CA 90245 310-414-8146 Telephone 310-414-8156 Facsimile	FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES							
5 6 7 8	ALLEN M. STEWART, Esq., CA Bar No. 262 ALLEN STEWART, P.C. The Republic Center 325 N. St. Paul St., Suite 2750 Dallas, Texas 75201 214-965-8700 Telephone 214-965-8701 Facsimile	John A. Clarke, Expertive Officer/Clerk BY Amber La-Fledr-Clayton, Deputy							
9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	035 Dantel Buckley							
10 11 12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES								
13 14 15	ROSLYN DAUBER, JOHN DI COSTANZO, AND GREGORY CARLOS	Case No B C 4 8 3 3 4 2 UNLIMITED CIVIL ACTION							
16 17 18 19 20	Plaintiffs, vs. MONSANTO CO., SOLUTIA INC., PHARMACIA CORP., PFIZER INC., SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO., and; DOES 1-350 INCLUSIVE,	COMPLAINT FOR PERSONAL INJURY (NEGLIGENCE; DESIGN DEFECT-CONSUMER EXPECTATION; DESIGN DEFECT - RISK/BENEFIT;) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL							
21	Defendants.	3							
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	CARLOS (hereinafter "Plaintiffs") who compl INT 1. This case involves I polychlorinated biphenyls, also known as "PCI 2. Plaintiffs are California being exposed to chemical products designed	Plaintiffs' personal injuries caused by sexposure to							
		1							

BE/23/12

Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each defendant designated herein as a DOE is responsible, negligently or in some other actionable manner, for the events and happenings hereinafter referred to, and caused injuries and damages proximately thereby to the Plaintiffs, as hereinafter alleged.

- 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege that at all times herein mentioned, defendants Monsanto Co. (New Monsanto) (sued individually and as successor in interest to Pharmacia Corp.), Solutia, Inc. (sued individually and as successor-in-interest to Monsanto Chemical Co.(Old Monsanto)), Pharmacia (sued individually and as successor-in-interest to Monsanto Chemical Co.(Old Monsanto)), Pfizer (sued individually and as successor-in-interest to Pharmacia Corp.), SoCal Gas Co, and DOES 1-350 INCLUSIVE were and are authorized to do and are doing business in the State of California, or the laws of some other state or foreign jurisdiction, and that said defendants, and each of them, were and are authorized to do and are doing business in the State of California, and that said defendants have regularly conducted business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that each of the defendants is responsible, negligently, intentionally and/or in some actionable manner, including as corporate successors liable for the acts of their predecessors, for the events and happenings referred to herein, and caused and continue to cause injuries and damages to Plaintiffs, as alleged herewith, either through each defendant's own conduct, or through the conduct of its agents, servants, or employees, or due to ownership, maintenance or control of the instrumentality causing them injury, or in some other actionable manner.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 15. This Court has jurisdiction of this matter because the amount in controversy exceeds its jurisdictional minimum, exclusive of costs and interest. Moreover, this Court has jurisdiction over this matter and these defendants because these defendants have done business in the State of California, committed torts, in whole or in part, in the State of California, and/or have continuing contacts with the State of California.
- 16. THIS CAUSE IS NOT REMOVABLE. This action involves claims by multiple California Plaintiffs against at least one defendant that is a California citizen, thus it is not removable. "[An] action shall be removable only if none of the parties in interest properly joined and served as defendants is a citizen of the State in which such action is brought." (28 U.S.C. § 1441(b)). Further,

Plaintiffs affirmatively disclaim any damages or action arising under the constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States (including any claim arising from an act or omission on a federal enclave, or of any officer of the United States or any agency or person acting under him or her occurring under color of such office). No claim of admiralty or maritime law is raised. Plaintiffs are not asserting any claims against any foreign state or agency.

17. Pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure* §395, venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles County, State of California because Plaintiffs either reside in Los Angeles County or previously resided in Los Angeles County at the time of their exposure to PCBs and suffered personal injuries in the county.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 18. Whenever reference in this Complaint is made to any named defendant or other defendants as may be named later, the allegation shall be deemed to mean that the officers, directors, agents, representatives, subsidiaries, affiliates and employees of that defendant did or authorized the act while actively engaged in the management, direction, or control of affairs of that defendant, and while acting within the course of and scope of their employment.
- 19. From 1901 to 1997 the original Monsanto Co., also known as Monsanto Chemical Co., operated as a Missouri corporation manufacturing a variety of chemicals and agricultural products. This original corporate Monsanto entity, which is now sometimes referred to as "Old Monsanto," ceased to exist in 1997 as the result of a series of corporate spin-offs and acquisitions. At that time, Old Monsanto's chemical division was split off and reformed into a newly-independent corporation, which was renamed Solutia, one of the defendants in this action. As part of this 1997 spin-off, defendant Solutia assumed certain of Old Monsanto's debts and liabilities, including all liabilities related to Old Monsanto's production and sale of PCBs. Although defendant Solutia was recently reorganized pursuant to Chapter 11 of the federal bankruptcy laws, it emerged from bankruptcy in February 2008. In 2000, the remaining portion of Old Monsanto, comprised of Old Monsanto's Life Sciences division, merged with defendant Pharmacia/Upjohn Corp., which meant that Old Monsanto no longer existed as a separate corporate entity.

20. In 2003, Defendant Pharmacia (i.e., what remained of "Old Monsanto") merged with Defendant Pfizer.

- 21. As part of Defendant Solutia's federal bankruptcy plan of reorganization, Defendant New Monsanto agreed to indemnify it for all tort "legacy liabilities" related to Old Monsanto's activities, including the production and sale of PCBs. As a result of these various transactions, defendants Pharmacia, Pfizer, Solutia and New Monsanto (collectively, the "Monsanto Defendants" herein) collectively have legal responsibility for Old Monsanto's conduct in the production, sale, and distribution of PCBs, which is the subject of Plaintiffs' claims in this case.
- 22. PCBs are a class of 209 discrete chemical compounds, called congeners, in which one to ten chlorine atoms are attached to biphenyl. From 1935, when Old Monsanto purchased the rights to produce PCBs from the Swann Chemical Co., until 1977, when Congress banned the manufacture of PCBs, Old Monsanto produced and sold more than 99 percent of all of the PCBs that were ever manufactured and sold in the United States. Over these six decades, Old Monsanto sold PCBs as liquid mixtures, under the trade name "Aroclor," to a variety of industrial customers, for a wide variety of industrial uses. Each of Old Monsanto's Aroclor products contained a combination of different PCB congeners.
- 23. Many of Old Monsanto's PCBs were used by its customers as insulating fluids, also known as "dielectric fluids," in certain electrical equipment, including high-temperature transformers and capacitors. However, Old Monsanto's Aroclor and other PCB products were also marketed and used for many other purposes, including in inks, paints, de-dusting agents, pesticides, plasticizers, hydraulic fluids, lubricants, adhesives, and carbonless copy paper. Until 1971, approximately 40 percent of Old Monsanto's PCBs were sold for purposes other than use as insulating fluid for electrical equipment. From 1971 to 1977, Old Monsanto sold PCBs exclusively for use as insulating fluid for transformers and capacitors.
- 24. Like other chlorinated organic compounds, such as dioxins, which are collectively known as "organochlorines," PCBs are considered "persistent organic pollutants" because they do not readily degrade in the environment after disposal, and they are not easily metabolized or broken down by humans or animals after absorption. PCBs are lipophilic, and are stored in the fat tissue of humans

and animals that have been exposed. Because PCBs were dumped into the environment over decades by Old Monsanto, its customers, and the end users of various PCB-containing products, PCBs are now ubiquitous in the environment. PCBs can be found in most animals, as well as in water, soil, sediment, and numerous other environmental media. Thus, measurable quantities of PCBs are typically found in most of the foods that Americans consume on a daily basis, including fish, beef, poultry, dairy products, and even fruits and vegetables. Throughout the six decades that Old Monsanto produced and sold PCBs, the company knew or should have known that many of its PCBs would ultimately be disposed of in ways that would allow those PCBs to enter the environment.

- 25. Because Old Monsanto's PCBs have contaminated the food chain and continue to be ubiquitous contaminants of the air, water, and soil, all or almost all Americans, including Plaintiffs, have been substantially exposed to Old Monsanto's PCBs through their diet and through other environmental exposures. Although Old Monsanto's PCBs were incorporated into many other products before being dumped into the environment, those PCBs to which Plaintiffs have been exposed are substantially the same chemicals as when they left Old Monsanto's possession.
- 26. Throughout the decades during which Old Monsanto produced PCBs, the company was aware that exposure to PCBs carried significant health risks. Despite this knowledge, and despite the availability of substitute products, Old Monsanto continued to produce and market PCBs, while hiding from the public, its customers, and applicable governmental authorities the true health risks associated with PCBs. Such conduct was done with a willful disregard of the rights and safety of others. In other words, Old Monsanto was aware that its continued production and sale of PCBs would result in probable dangerous consequences in the form of environmental devastation and significant health risks for users and others exposed to its PCBs, and Old Monsanto deliberately chose to market its PCBs over the course of decades, despite this knowledge.
- 27. In addition to being exposed to PCBs through the food chain and other various environmental sources, Plaintiffs have also been exposed to Old Monsanto's PCBs that were released from PCB-contaminated natural gas pipelines owned and operated by Defendant SoCal Gas. Plaintiffs are residents of Southern California who have lived, worked, and/or recreated in the County of Los Angeles, where they have been exposed to PCBs released from defendant SoCal Gas' pipelines. Since

the 1970s or before, continuing through today, Old Monsanto's PCBs released from defendant SoCal Gas pipelines have contaminated indoor and outdoor air, water, soil, and sediment throughout the entire region of Southern California, which has in turn resulted in additional PCB exposure to Plaintiffs. This additional PCB exposure from defendant SoCal Gas' pipelines (in both Los Angeles County and surrounding counties) has been a substantial factor in the development of Plaintiffs' injuries (lymphomas).

- lubricant consisting mostly of PCBs. Turbinol was used by the Transwestern Pipeline Co. ("Transwestern") in its natural gas pipeline system, which connects with the natural gas pipeline system of Defendant SoCal Gas. One of the established sources of PCB contamination in the SoCal Gas pipeline system is the Transwestern pipeline compressor station in New Mexico. From 1968 to 1972, Transwestern purchased 24,000 gallons of PCB-containing Turbinol lubricant. Transwestern's own tests revealed Turbinol leaking from its compressors in New Mexico had contaminated its entire pipeline west to Needles, California, where it entered defendant SoCal Gas' pipeline system, thus introducing PCBs into defendant SoCal Gas' system. Even though Transwestern stopped using Turbinol in 1972, once the PCBs entered defendant SoCal Gas pipeline system, they coated and clung to the pipe walls and thus continued to infect the pipeline condensate more than 20 years later. (*Transwestern Pipeline Co. v. Monsanto Co.*, (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 502). Therefore, defendant SoCal Gas' pipelines and natural gas were contaminated with PCBs from 1968 through at least the 1990s.
- 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant SoCal Gas also contaminated its own gas pipeline with PCBs intentionally, through the use of a technique known as "oil fogging." In that process, SoCal Gas injected a fine mist of PCB-containing oil into the pipeline in order to retard rust and corrosion. This "oil fogging" technique resulted in further contamination of SoCal Gas' pipeline with PCBs, over and above the PCBs resulting from the leaking compressors in the Transwestern pipeline.
- 30. By no later than 1981, Defendant SoCal Gas knew or should have known that its entire natural gas pipeline system was contaminated with PCBs. By then, defendant SoCal Gas also knew or should have known that the PCB contamination of its pipeline system posed a threat of causing

exposure to PCBs to all residents of Southern California through emissions from the pipelines and all outlets of natural gas that traveled through the pipelines.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND THE DISCOVERY RULE

21. Plaintiffs hereby plead and invoke the "discovery rule" as established in *Code of Civil Procedure* § 340.8. Plaintiffs' personal injuries arose from exposures to hazardous PCBs released into the environment. Plaintiffs further plead the federally required commencement date pursuant to 42 *United States Code* § 9658. Plaintiffs will show that after reasonably exercising due diligence, they did not learn the nature of the cause of their cancers or that such cancers were chemically-related until less than two years prior to the filing of this complaint. Plaintiffs' personal injuries arose from exposures to hazardous substances (i.e., PCBs) released into the environment from multiple "facilities," as that term is defined in 42 *United States Code* § 9601(9). Pursuant to 42 *United States Code* § 9658 and *Code of Civil Procedure* § 340.8, Plaintiffs' claims did not accrue until they knew or reasonably should have known of their cancers and the causes of their cancers. Plaintiffs will show that they neither knew nor reasonably should have known that their cancers were caused by exposure to PCBs until they learned the results of tests showing that they each had elevated blood levels of PCBs. Plaintiffs first learned of their elevated PCB blood levels on the following dates: a) Plaintiff ROSLYN DAUBER: June 20, 2011; b) Plaintiff JOHN DI COSTANZO: April 7, 2011; and c) Plaintiff GREGORY CARLOS: April 14, 2011.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligence)

PLAINTIFFS COMPLAIN OF DEFENDANTS AND DOES 1-350, AND EACH OF THEM, AND FOR A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENCE ALLEGE AS FOLLOWS:

32. At all times herein mentioned, each of the named defendants and DOES 1 through 350 was the successor, successor in business, successor in product line or a portion thereof, parent, subsidiary, wholly or partially owned by, or the whole or partial owner of or member in an entity that manufactured, fabricated, designed, labeled, distributed, supplied, sold, marketed, warranted, and packaged PCB-containing products. Each of the herein named defendants is liable for the tortious conduct of each successor, successor in business, successor in product line or a portion thereof, assign, predecessor in product line or a portion thereof, parent, subsidiary, whole or partial owner, or wholly or

partially owned entity, or entity that it was a member of, or funded.

- 33. At all times herein mentioned, defendants, and each of them, were and are engaged in the business of researching, manufacturing, fabricating, designing, labeling, distributing, using, supplying, selling, marketing, warranting, and packaging and advertising PCBs and PCB-containing products.
- 34. Defendants, and each of them, owed to Plaintiffs and the public a duty to act reasonably and to exercise ordinary care in pursuit of the activities mentioned above, and defendants, and each of them, breached said duty of due care.
- 35. Defendants, and each of them, owed to Plaintiffs and the public a duty to act reasonably and to exercise ordinary care with respect to the safe, legal, and proper generation, use, handling, emission, clean up, collection, transportation, management, storage, processing and disposal of toxic PCBs and PCB-containing products. These duties include, but are not limited to: the duty to prevent the discharge or release of toxic PCBs capable of adversely affecting the surrounding communities' air, soil, water, food and environment; the duty to comply with laws, regulations, guidelines and reasonable safety practices applicable to the generation, use, handling, emission, clean up, collection, transportation, management, storage, processing and disposal of toxic PCBs and PCB-containing products; to monitor and study the levels of toxic PCBs released into the environment as a result of defendants' manufacturing and marketing of PCBs and PCB-containing products, or as a result of defendants' business operations; and to remedy the effects of these toxic PCBs on the environment.
- 36. Additionally, defendants, and each of them, owed to Plaintiffs and the public a duty to provide accurate, reliable, and completely truthful information regarding the nature of the toxic chemicals manufactured, used, distributed and/or supplied by them and to provide accurate, reliable, and completely truthful information regarding releases, discharges, and fugitive emissions of these toxic chemicals.
- 37. At all times herein mentioned, defendants, and each of them, singularly and jointly, negligently and carelessly manufactured, fabricated, designed, tested or failed to test, warned or failed to warn of the health hazards, labeled, distributed, handled, used, supplied, sold, marketed, warranted, packaged and advertised PCBs and PCB-containing products, in that said substance and

products proximately caused personal injuries to Plaintiffs through environmental exposures from sources contaminated with PCBs which include, but are not limited to, natural gas, air, water, sediment, soil and food products. PCBs were released into the environment while being used in a manner that was reasonably foreseeable, thereby rendering said substance unsafe and dangerous to Plaintiffs.

- 38. Old Monsanto's decision to market and distribute its various PCB products was negligent. As described above, for decades the company was aware of the hazards of PCBs, and either knew or should have known that its PCBs would be released into the environment. Despite this actual and constructive knowledge, and despite the availability of numerous alternatives to PCBs for each of their uses, Old Monsanto continued to manufacture and market PCBs and PCB-containing products. Old Monsanto's ongoing negligent decisions to market and distribute those PCBs and PCB-containing products for decades led to Plaintiffs' environmental exposures, and were a substantial factor in the development of Plaintiffs' cancers.
- 39. Throughout the six decades that Old Monsanto produced and sold PCBs, defendants, and each of them, knew and intended for the aforementioned PCBs to be used in various products. Defendants, and each of them, knew and intended, or through the exercise of reasonable care and skill should have known, that through the foreseeable use and/or handling of said products, they would ultimately be disposed of in ways that would release toxic levels of PCBs into the environment, including, but not limited to, natural gas, air, water, sediment, soil and food products.
- 40. Throughout the six decades that Old Monsanto Company produced and sold PCBs, defendants, and each of them, knew and intended for the aforementioned PCBs to be used in various products. defendants, their "alternate entities", and each of them, knew and intended, or through the exercise of reasonable care and skill should have known, that through the foreseeable use and/or handling of said products by consumers, they would release toxic levels of PCBs into the environment, which would expose the end users and members of the public such as Plaintiffs, to such toxic levels of PCBs.
 - 41. All defendants, and each of them were negligent in the following ways:
 - a. Defendants knew, or through the exercise of reasonable care and skill should have known, that Plaintiffs would be exposed to unsafe levels of PCBs through

1	l
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	

sources which include, but are not limited to, air, water, sediment, soil, food products and natural gas. Further, defendants, and each of them, knew, or through the exercise of reasonable care and skill should have known, that unsafe levels of PCBs would be ingested, inhaled, and/or absorbed by Plaintiffs through said sources.

- b. Defendants, and each of them, knew, or through the exercise of reasonable care and skill should have known, that unsafe levels of PCB exposure would cause substantial health risks to those who were exposed, including the development of cancer.
- c. Despite defendants' knowledge or constructive knowledge of the dangers posed by the release of PCBs into the environment, defendants, and each of them continued to manufacture, market and distribute PCBs and PCBcontaining products.
- d. Despite defendants' knowledge or constructive knowledge of the dangers posed by the release of PCBs into the environment, defendants, and each of them failed to test for dangerous PCB concentrations in the PCB-contaminated natural gas, air, water, sediment, soil and food in Plaintiffs' communities.
- e. Despite defendants' knowledge or constructive knowledge of the dangers posed by the release of PCBs into the environment, defendants, and each of them failed to take remedial measures to reduce dangerous PCB concentrations in the PCB-contaminated natural gas, air, water, sediment, soil and food in Plaintiffs' communities.
- f. Despite defendants' knowledge or constructive knowledge of the dangers posed by the release of PCBs into the environment, defendants, and each of them failed to warn the public and Plaintiffs regarding toxic PCB concentrations in the natural gas, air, water, sediment, soil and food in Plaintiffs' communities.

- g. Defendants, and each of them, knew, or with the exercise of reasonable care and skill should have known, that their manufacture, fabrication, design, labeling, distribution, handling, using, supply, sale, and marketing of PCBs created an unreasonable risk of harm to persons living and working in the areas contaminated with PCBs.
- 42. Plaintiffs additionally contend that defendant SoCal Gas was negligent because, as alleged above, by 1981, it knew or should have known that its entire natural gas pipeline system was contaminated with PCBs. By then, defendant SoCal Gas also knew or should have known that the PCB contamination of its gas pipelines posed a threat of causing exposure to PCBs to its customers throughout Southern California through emissions from the pipelines and all outlets of natural gas that traveled through the pipelines. The negligence of defendant SoCal Gas includes, but is not limited to, continuing to distribute natural gas contaminated with PCBs after it knew or should have known of the contamination and health risks involved; failing to warn customers and residents in Southern California about the likelihood of PCB exposure and failing to take remedial measures to reduce the contamination and risk.
- 43. The acts of defendants, and each of them, as herein alleged, constitute violations of the duty of ordinary care and skill owed by defendants, and each of them, to Plaintiffs.
- 44. Plaintiffs have used, handled, inhaled, ingested, consumed, absorbed or been otherwise exposed to PCBs and PCB-containing products referred to herein in a manner that was reasonably foreseeable.
- 45. Plaintiffs suffer from non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, lymphohematopietic and other cancers, and other serious injuries and illnesses, including injuries and illnesses secondary to the treatment for those conditions, caused by an exposure to PCBs. Plaintiffs were not aware at the time of exposure that PCBs presented any risk of injury and/or disease.
- 46. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and lymphohematopietic cancer is caused by exposure to PCBs without perceptible trauma and that said disease results from exposure to PCBs over a period of time.

///

- 47. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiffs' have been exposed to PCBs that has caused them to suffer severe and permanent injuries, including, but not limited to, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, lymphohematopietic and other cancers, and other serious injuries and illnesses, including injuries and illnesses secondary to the treatment for those conditions.
- 48. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs have suffered, and continue to suffer, permanent injuries and/or future increased risk of injuries to their persons, bodies and health, including, but not limited to, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, lymphohematopietic cancer, other cancers, and other serious injuries and illnesses, and the mental and emotional distress attendant thereto, from the effect of exposure to PCBs, all to their general damage in a sum in excess of the jurisdictional limit of a limited civil case.
- 49. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of defendants, and each of them, Plaintiffs have incurred, are presently incurring, and will incur in the future, liability for physicians, surgeons, nurses, hospital care, medicine, hospices, X-rays and other medical treatment, the true and exact amount thereof being unknown to Plaintiffs at this time, and Plaintiffs pray leave to amend this complaint accordingly when the true and exact cost thereof is ascertained.
- 50. As a further direct and proximate result of the said conduct of defendants, Plaintiffs have incurred, and will incur, loss of income, wages, profits and commissions, a diminishment of earning potential, and other pecuniary losses, the full nature and extent of which are not yet known to Plaintiffs; and leave is requested to amend this complaint to conform to proof at the time of trial.
- 51. Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, directors, and managing agents participated in, authorized, expressly and impliedly ratified, and had full knowledge of, or should have known of, each of the acts set forth herein.
- 52. Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, directors, and managing agents participated in, authorized, expressly and impliedly ratified, and had full knowledge of, or should have known of, each of the acts set forth herein.
- 53. The herein-described conduct of defendants, and each of them, was and is willful, malicious, fraudulent, outrageous, and in conscious disregard and indifference to the safety and health of

Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs, for the sake of example and by way of punishing said defendants, and each of them, seek punitive damages according to proof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as hereinafter set forth.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Strict Products Liability For Design Defect- Consumer Expectation)

AS AND FOR A THIRD, SEPARATE, FURTHER AND DISTINCT CAUSE OF ACTION FOR STRICT LIABILITY FOR DESIGN DEFECT, PLAINTIFFS COMPLAIN OF DEFENDANT

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY, DOES 301-350, AND EACH OF THEM, AND

ALLEGE AS FOLLOWS:

- 54. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference, as though fully set forth therein, all of the previous allegations.
- 55. From 1968 and through the 1990's, Defendant SoCal Gas has supplied, sold and distributed natural gas contaminated with PCBs. Turbinol is a synthetic, fire-resistant lubricant consisting mostly of PCBs. Turbinol was used by the Transwestern Pipeline Co., which reached California through the Transwestern natural gas pipeline. One source of PCB contamination in the SoCal Gas Company system is the Transwestern pipeline compressor station in New Mexico. From 1968 to 1972, Transwestern purchased 24,000 gallons of PCB-containing Turbinol lubricant. Transwestern's own tests revealed Turbinol leaking from its compressors in New Mexico had contaminated its entire pipeline west to Needles where it entered the SoCal Gas Pipeline, thus introducing PCBs into the entire SoCal Gas distribution system. Even though Transwestern stopped using Turbinol in 1972, once the PCBs entered the SoCal Gas pipelines, they coated and clung to the pipe walls and thus continued to infect the pipeline condensate more than 20 years later. In addition, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant SoCal Gas also contaminated its own gas pipeline with PCBs intentionally, through the use of a technique known as "oil fogging." In that process, SoCal Gas injected a fine mist of PCB-containing oil into the pipeline in order to retard rust and corrosion. This "oil fogging" technique resulted in further contamination of SoCal Gas' pipeline with PCBs, over

25

26

27

でき/アタシノブラ

おも/ スぷ/ もな

and above the PCBs resulting from the leaking compressors in the Transwestern pipeline.

- 56. Therefore, the SoCal Gas pipelines and natural gas were contaminated with PCBs from at least 1968 (and perhaps much earlier) and well into the 1990's.
- 57. This defect existed in the natural gas at the time it left the possession of Defendant SoCal Gas. The contaminated natural gas did, in fact, cause personal injuries to Plaintiffs, including non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and lymphohematopietic cancer, and other serious injuries and illnesses, while being used in a reasonably foreseeable manner, thereby rendering the same defective, unsafe, and dangerous for use.
- 58. Said PCB-containing natural gas was defective and unsafe for its intended purpose in that defendant SoCal Gas' consumers, including Plaintiffs, would not expect that their natural gas would contain carcinogenic PCBs that could cause them to develop non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, lymphohematopietic and other cancers and other serious injuries and illnesses from using the natural gas sold and supplied by Defendant SoCal Gas.
- 59. Plaintiffs did not know of the substantial danger of using said products. Said dangers were not readily recognizable by Plaintiffs. The foreseeable use of PCB-containing natural gas involved a substantial danger not readily recognizable to an ordinary user, consumer, bystander, or other exposed person, but which was known or knowable to defendants, and each of them.
- 60. At all times mentioned herein, the above-referenced PCB-containing natural gas failed to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer and/or other exposed persons would expect when used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner.
- 61. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and lymphohematopietic cancer is caused by exposure to PCBs without perceptible trauma and that said disease results from exposure to PCB and PCB-containing products over a period of time.
- 62. As a result of having used Defendant SoCal Gas' natural gas for normal and foreseeable residential or business purposes over many years, Plaintiffs have developed non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, a lymphohematopietic cancer.
- 63. Plaintiffs' use of Defendant SoCal Gas' natural gas was a substantial factor in causing their non-Hodgkin's lymphoma because they were directly exposed to this PCB-contaminated

natural gas numerous times every day.

- 64. As a direct and proximate result of the actions and conduct outlined herein, Plaintiffs have suffered the injuries and damages alleged herein.
- 65. Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, directors, and managing agents participated in, authorized, expressly and impliedly ratified, and had full knowledge of, or should have known of, each of the acts set forth herein.
- 66. The herein-described conduct of said defendants, and each of them, was and is willful, malicious, fraudulent, outrageous, and in conscious disregard and indifference to the safety and health of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs, for the sake of example and by way of punishing said defendants, and each of them, seek punitive damages according to proof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as hereinafter set forth.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Strict Products Liability For Design Defect- Risk/Benefit)

AS AND FOR A FOURTH, SEPARATE, FURTHER AND DISTINCT CAUSE OF ACTION FOR STRICT LIABILITY FOR DESIGN DEFECT, PLAINTIFFS COMPLAIN OF THE MONSANTO DEFENDANTS, DOES 1-301, AND EACH OF THEM, AND ALLEGE AS FOLLOWS:

- 67. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference, as though fully set forth therein, all of the previous allegations.
- 68. From 1935, when Old Monsanto purchased the rights to produce PCBs from the Swann Chemical Co., until 1977, when Congress banned the manufacture of PCBs, Old Monsanto produced and sold more than 99 percent of all of the PCBs that were ever manufactured and sold in the United States. Over those six decades, Old Monsanto sold PCBs as liquid mixtures, under the trade name "Aroclor," to a variety of industrial customers, for a wide variety of industrial uses. Many of Old Monsanto's PCBs were used by its customers as insulating fluids, also known as "dielectric fluids," in certain electrical equipment, including high-temperature transformers and capacitors. However, Old Monsanto's Aroclor and other PCB products were also marketed and used for many other purposes, including in inks, paints, dedusting agents, pesticides, plasticizers, hydraulic fluids, lubricants,

adhesives, and carbonless copy paper.

- 69. PCBs are considered "persistent organic pollutants" because they do not readily degrade in the environment after disposal, and they are not easily metabolized or broken down by humans or animals after absorption. Because PCBs were dumped into the environment over decades by Old Monsanto, its customers, and the end users of various PCB-containing products, PCBs are now ubiquitous in the environment. PCBs can be found in most animals, as well as in water, soil, sediment, and numerous other environmental media. Throughout the six decades that Old Monsanto produced and sold PCBs, the company knew or should have known that many of its PCBs would ultimately be disposed of in ways that would allow those PCBs to enter the environment and injure the public, including Plaintiffs.
- 70. Although Old Monsanto's PCBs were incorporated into many other products before being dumped into the environment, those PCBs to which Plaintiffs have been exposed are substantially the same chemicals as when they left Old Monsanto's possession.
- 71. Plaintiffs were exposed to PCBs as a result of the reasonably foreseeable use of the PCBs, because throughout the six decades that Old Monsanto produced and sold PCBs, defendants, and each of them, knew and intended that the aforementioned PCBs would be used in various products, and that through the foreseeable use and/or handling of said products, they would ultimately be disposed of in ways that would release toxic levels of PCBs into the environment where consumers and the public would be exposed through contaminated natural gas, air, water, sediment, soil, and food products. The foreseeable use of PCB-containing products led to Plaintiffs' injuries.
- 72. Plaintiffs were exposed to defendants' PCBs during the time that Old Monsanto manufactured PCBs, and for the many years after that, PCBs continued to contaminate the natural gas, air, water, sediment, soil and food products in Plaintiffs' communities.
- 73. Plaintiffs suffer from non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, lymphohematopietic and other cancers, and other serious injuries and illnesses, including injuries and illnesses secondary to the treatment for those conditions, caused by an exposure to PCBs.
- 74. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and lymphohematopietic cancer is caused by exposure to PCBs without perceptible trauma

///

and that said disease results from exposure to PCBs and PCB-containing products over a period of time.

- 75. Plaintiffs' exposure to defendants' PCBs was a substantial factor in causing their non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and lymphohematopietic cancer because they were directly exposed to defendants' PCBs from a number of environmental sources, numerous times every day.
- 76. The benefits of PCBs and PCB-containing products never outweighed the risks of the design because the gravity of potential harm was great, given that PCB contamination would be widespread due to the fact that they are persistent organic pollutants, which do not easily degrade into the environment and are not easily broken down by humans and animals.
- 77. The benefits of PCBs and PCB-containing products never outweighed the risks of the design because the gravity of potential harm was great, given that exposure to toxic levels of PCBs causes serious injuries, such as non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, lymphohematopietic and other cancers and other serious injuries and illnesses.
- 78. The benefits of PCBs and PCB-containing products never outweighed the risks of the design because the likelihood that the aforementioned harm would occur was high, since PCBs cannot be metabolized by humans and were released into the natural gas, air, water, soil and food used by the public at large. The likelihood of harm was very high because Old Monsanto's PCBs contaminated the food chain and continue to be ubiquitous contaminants of air, water, and soil. All or almost all Americans, including Plaintiffs, have been substantially exposed to Old Monsanto's PCBs through their diet and their everyday environment.
- 79. The benefits of PCBs and PCB-containing products never outweighed the risks of the design because there were many other feasible, affordable, equally effective and safer designs that could have been used at the time of manufacture.
- 80. At all times mentioned herein, the above-referenced PCB-containing products failed to perform safely when used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner and the risk of danger inherent in this substance and products outweighed the benefits of said substance and products.
- 81. As a direct and proximate result of the actions and conduct outlined herein, Plaintiffs have suffered the injuries and damages alleged herein.

- 82. The Monsanto Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, directors, and managing agents participated in, authorized, expressly and impliedly ratified, and had full knowledge of, or should have known of, each of the acts set forth herein.
- 83. The herein-described conduct of said defendants, and each of them, was and is willful, malicious, fraudulent, outrageous, and in conscious disregard and indifference to the safety and health of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs, for the sake of example and by way of punishing said defendants, and each of them, seek punitive damages according to proof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendants, and each of them, as is hereinafter set forth.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendants, and each of them, in an amount to be proved at trial in each individual case, as follows:

Plaintiffs:

- 1. For Plaintiffs' general damages according to proof;
- 2. For Plaintiffs' loss of income, wages, and earning potential according to proof;
- 3. For Plaintiffs' medical and related expenses according to proof;
- 4. For Plaintiffs' cost of suit herein;
- For exemplary or punitive damages according to proof; 5.
- 6. For damages for fraud according to proof; and
- 7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper, including costs and prejudgment interest as provided in C.C.P. section 998, C.C.P. section 1032, and related provisions of law.

DATED: April

WATERS, KRAUS & PAUL

By:

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs hereby demand trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

DATED: Apri **23**, 2012

WATERS, KRAUS & PAUL

Ву:

MICHAEL L. ARMUAGE Attorneys for Plaintiffs

8 28

Page 1 of 2

counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court. sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must

to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740. requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed

the case is complex. plaintiffs designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES

case type listed above) (41) Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (arising from provisionally complex Insurance Coverage Claims Warranty Negligent Breach of Contract/ Environmental/Toxic Tort (30) Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence) Securities Litigation (28) Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller Claims Involving Mass Tort (40) or wrongful eviction) Construction Defect (10) Contract (not unlawful detainer Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03) Breach of Rental/Lease Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403) Breach of ConfractWarranty (06) Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Contract

Enforcement of Judgment (20) Enforcement of Judgment

domestic relations) Confession of Judgment (non-County) Abstract of Judgment (Out of

Sister State Judgment

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes Petition/Certification of Entry of (sexet biednu ton) Administrative Agency Award

Other Enforcement of Judgment

RICO (27) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

Injunctive Relief Only (non-Declaratory Relief Only apove) (42) Other Complaint (not specified

Mechanics Lien (Juemssened)

Case (non-ton/non-complex) Other Commercial Complaint

(xəjdwoo-uou/µoj-uou) Other Civil Complaint

Partnership and Corporate Miscellaneous Civil Petition

apove) (43) Other Petition (not specified Governance (21)

Morkplace Molence Civil Harassment

Elder/Dependent Adult

Election Contest əsnq∀

Claim Petition for Relief from Late Petition for Name Change

Other Civil Petition

Page 2 of 2

Collections (e.g., money owed, open

Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff pook accounts) (08)

Case Other Promissory Note/Collections

Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Other Contract (37) Other Coverage Auto Subrogation

Contractual Fraud

Real Property Ofher Contract Dispute

Wrongful Eviction (33) Condemnation (14) Eminent Domain/Inverse

Unlawful Detainer

Writ of Possession of Real Property Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)

Ouiet Title Mortgage Foreclosure

Other Real Property (not eminent

(eurecjoenie) domain, landlord/tenant, or

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal Residential (32) Commercial (31)

drugs, check this item; otherwise,

Asset Forfeiture (05) Judicial Review report as Commercial or Residential)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus Writ of Mandate (02) Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Case Matter Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review of Health Officer Order Other Judicial Review (39) Review

Commissioner Appeals Notice of Appeal-Labor

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET

hor (nadto) @W\@q\Iq-noN Ofher PI/PD/WD Emotional Distress Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress Intentional Infliction of (e.g., assault, vandalism) Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD (lief bns Premises Liability (e.g., slip Other PI/PD/WD (23) ivialpractice Other Professional Health Care Physicians & Surgeons Medical Malpractice-Medical Malpractice (45) toxic/environmental) (24) Product Liability (not asbestos or Wrongful Death Asbestos Personal Injury/ Asbestos Property Damage

Property Damage/Wrongful Death)

arbitration, check this item

case involves an uninsured

motorist claim subject to

Damage/Wrongful Death

Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property

Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury)

(o)uA to bestani

(40) sotsedsA

hoT ofuA

Practice (07) Business Tort/Unfair Business

Wrongful Termination (36) Employment Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35) (not medical or legal) Other Professional Malpractice Legal Malpractice Professional Megligence (25) Intellectual Property (19) Fraud (16) Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) harassment) (08) false arrest) (not civil

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007] Ofher Employment (15)

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is re	equired pursuant to Local Rule 2.0 in all new civil	case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.
Item I. Check the	types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of	nearing expected for this case:
JURY TRIAL? X	YES CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? YES	ES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 20+ HOURS/ X DAYS
Item II. Indicate th	e correct district and courthouse location (4 steps	- If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):
=	first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, f nargin below, and, to the right in Column A , the C	ind the main Civil Case Cover Sheet heading for your ivil Case Cover Sheet case type you selected.
Step 2: Check	one Superior Court type of action in Column B be	elow which best describes the nature of this case.
•	umn C , circle the reason for the court location cho ny exception to the court location, see Local Rule 2	
	Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthous	E Location (see Column C below)
 May be filed in a Location where Location where 	ust be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage). cause of action arose. bodily injury, death or damage occurred. performance required or defendant resides.	 Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle. Location where petitioner resides. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly. Location where one or more of the parties reside. Location of Labor Commissioner Office

- Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.
- B Civil Case Cover One of Category No. Type of Action (Check only one) **Auto Tort** Auto (22) A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death 1., 2., 4. Uninsured Motorist (46) A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death - Uninsured Motorist 1., 2., 4. A6070 Asbestos Property Damage 2. Asbestos (04) A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death 2. Other Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort Product Liability (24) A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) 1., 2., 3., 4., 8. A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons 1., 4. Medical Malpractice (45) A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice 1., 4. A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) 1., 4. Other A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., Personal Injury assault, vandalism, etc.) 1., 4. Property Damage Wrongful Death A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress 1., 3. (23)27 /42 A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death 1., 4.

SHORT TITLE: DAUBER VS. MONSANTO, ET AL.

CASE NUMBER

Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 8 Above
Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	A6017 Legal Malpractice A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case	2., 5., 6. 2., 5.
insurance Coverage (18)	A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Other Contract (37)	A6009 Contractual Fraud A6031 Tortious Interference A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure A6032 Quiet Title A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.
	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No: Business Tort (07) Civil Rights (08) Defamation (13) Fraud (16) Professional Negligence (25) Other (35) Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15) Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance) Collections (09) Insurance Coverage (18) Other Contract (37) Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14) Wrongful Eviction (33) Other Real Property (26) Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31) Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32) Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure (34)	Calegory No. Calegory No.

SHORT TITLE: DAUBER VS. MONSANTO, ET AL. CASE NUMBER

	A Givil/Čase Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	G Applizible Ressons- See Step 8 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
view	Petition re Arbitration (11)	A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandate (02)	A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
gation	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
x Litic	Construction Defect (10)	A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
omple	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
ally C	Securities Litigation (28)	A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	X A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
P	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	A6141 Sister State Judgment A6160 Abstract of Judgment A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
v	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	A6030 Declaratory Relief Only A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	A6121 Civil Harassment A6123 Workplace Harassment A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case A6190 Election Contest A6110 Petition for Change of Name A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8.
<u>6</u> !		A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 9.

SHORT TITLE: DAUBER	VS.	MONSANTO,	EΤ	AL.	CASE NUMBER

Item III. Statement of Location: Enter the address of the accident, party's residence or place of business, performance, or other circumstance indicated in Item II., Step 3 on Page 1, as the proper reason for filing in the court location you selected.

REASON: Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected for this case.			ADDRESS:	818 WEST	SEVENTH	STREET
□1.☒2.☒3.□4.□	5 6 7. [X]8	9				
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:			· .	
LOS ANGELES	CA	90017				
and correct and that the above	e-entitled matter is ct of the Superior C	properly filed fo	r assignme	ent to the <u>Mai</u>	n .	lifornia that the foregoing is true courthouse in the Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Dated: 04. 23.	_			(SIGNATUR MICAH	E OF ATTORY (FILING PARTY

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- 4. Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/11).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.