

1 Karen Barth Menzies (CA SBN 180234)  
2 GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP  
3 505 14th Street, Suite 1110  
4 Oakland, CA 94612  
5 Tel: (510) 350-9700  
6 Fax: (510) 350-9701  
7 kbm@classlawgroup.com

8 Fletcher V. Trammell, Esq. (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)  
9 Melissa Binstock Ephron, Esq. (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)  
10 TRAMMELL, PC  
11 3262 Westheimer Rd., Ste. 423  
12 Houston, TX 77098  
13 Tel: (800) 405-1740  
14 Fax: (800) 532-0992  
15 fletch@trammellpc.com  
16 melissa@trammellpc.com

17 Alexander G. Dwyer (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)  
18 Andrew F. Kirkendall (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)  
19 Erin M. Wood (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)  
20 KIRKENDALL DWYER LLP  
21 4343 Sigma Rd, Suite 200  
22 Dallas, TX 75244  
23 Tel: 214-271-4027  
24 Fax: 214-253-0629  
25 ad@kirkendalldwyer.com  
26 ak@kirkendalldwyer.com  
27 ewood@kirkendalldwyer.com  
28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS  
LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 2741

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

*Carson v. Monsanto Co., et al.,*  
Case No. 3:20-cv-06238

**PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE OF MOTION  
AND MOTION TO REMAND ACTION  
TO STATE COURT; MEMORANDUM  
OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Hon. Vince Chhabria  
Date: November 5, 2020  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 4

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

1  
2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on November 5, 2020, at 10:00 AM, or as soon thereafter as  
3 counsel may be heard by the above-entitled Court, located at San Francisco Courthouse,  
4 Courtroom 4 – 17th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, in the courtroom  
5 of Judge Vince Chhabria, plaintiff will and hereby does move the Court for an Order remanding  
6 this action to the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco.  
7

8 This motion is brought on the following grounds: (1) that Defendants cannot meet their  
9 burden of demonstrating that diversity of citizenship exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, and (2)  
10 Defendants Wilbur-Ellis Co., LLC and Wilbur-Ellis Nutrition, LLC (formerly Wilbur-Ellis Feed,  
11 LLC) were not fraudulently joined so 28 U.S.C. 1441(b) prevents removal of this case. This  
12 motion is based on the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the papers and pleadings  
13 on file herein, and upon such further evidence, oral or documentary, as may be presented at the  
14 hearing of this motion.

15 Dated: October 1, 2020

**GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP**

16  
17 By: /s/ Karen Barth Menzies

18 Karen Barth Menzies  
19 GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP  
20 505 14th Street, Suite 1110  
21 Oakland, CA 94612  
22 Tel: (510) 350-9700  
23 Fax: (510) 350-9701  
24 kbm@classlawgroup.com  
25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
26  
27  
28

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **INTRODUCTION**

3 Monsanto’s notice of removal is substantively improper, and this action must be remanded  
4 to state court. The case at bar involves a suit brought in California state court against Monsanto,  
5 Wilbur-Ellis Company, Wilbur-Ellis Feed, and DOES defendants for injuries sustained as a result  
6 of Plaintiff’s use and exposure to Monsanto’s Roundup products.

7 Plaintiff, Gail Carson, is and has been a California resident for all applicable times relevant  
8 to this action. Both Wilbur-Ellis Company and Wilbur-Ellis Feed have their principal place of  
9 business in California, as Monsanto admits. As such, complete diversity is lacking, and federal  
10 jurisdiction is lacking in this case as a result.

11 While admitting that complete diversity does not exist, Monsanto attempts to remove this  
12 case on the bases of fraudulent joinder. For the reasons stated herein, this argument is untenable  
13 and should be rejected in favor of immediate remand.

14 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

15  
16 Gail Carson (“Plaintiff”) was exposed to Roundup from the late 2000s until 2018 when she  
17 applied the product to her yard at her California residence. On or about January 23, 2017, Plaintiff  
18 was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin lymphoma, proximately caused by her Roundup use and  
19 exposure. Suit was filed on Plaintiff’s behalf on August 10, 2020. Monsanto then filed a notice of  
20 removal on September 3, 2020.

21 **ARGUMENT**

22 **I. SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL ARE NOT SATISFIED.**

23 Monsanto agrees that complete diversity is lacking on the face of the complaint, clearly  
24 lending to Plaintiff’s argument that this case should be remanded.

25 A federal court can exercise removal jurisdiction over a case only if it would have had  
26 jurisdiction over the case as originally brought by the plaintiff. *Snow v. Ford Motor Co.*, 561 F.2d  
27 787, 789 (9th Cir.1977); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1441. Removal based on diversity jurisdiction  
28 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 requires complete diversity of citizenship (i.e., all plaintiffs must be

1 of different citizenship than all defendants). *Morris v. Princess Cruises, Inc.*, 236 F.3d 1061, 1067  
2 (9th Cir.2001); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Removal is not permitted where one of the defendants  
3 “is a citizen of the State in which such action is brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b).

4 Further, the Ninth Circuit has long held that it is the burden of the party seeking removal to  
5 establish federal jurisdiction, *Holcomb v. Bingham Toyota*, 871 F.2d 109, 110 (9th Cir.1989), and  
6 there is a “strong presumption against removal jurisdiction.” *Abrego Abrego v. Dow Chem.*  
7 *Co.*, 443 F.3d 676, 685 (9th Cir.2006). In fact, removal jurisdiction should be strictly construed in  
8 favor of remand, *Harris v. Bankers Life and Cas. Co.*, 425 F.3d 689, 698 (9th Cir. 2005) (citing  
9 *Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp. v. Sheets*, 313 U.S. 100, 108–09 (1941)), and the law is clear that there  
10 must be *no doubt* that jurisdiction exists. If doubt exists, remand is required. *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*,  
11 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (“Federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is *any doubt* as to  
12 the right of removal.”) (emphasis added). “Doubts as to removability must be resolved in favor of  
13 remanding the case to state court.” *Matheson v. Progressive Specialty Ins. Co.*, 319 F.3d 1089,  
14 1090 (9th Cir. 2003).

15 Regarding the case at bar, Monsanto agrees that the Wilbur-Ellis entities are citizens of the  
16 State of California. Monsanto Company’s Notice of Removal, ¶ 16. Plaintiff, also, is and has been  
17 a citizen of the State of California for all times applicable to this action. As such, on the face of the  
18 complaint, diversity jurisdiction is lacking, and Plaintiff’s case must be remanded to state court.

## 19 **II. THE WILBUR-ELLIS ENTITIES ARE NOT FRAUDULENTLY JOINED.**

20 Faced with an obvious lack of diversity in this case, Monsanto seeks to employ the doctrine of  
21 fraudulent joinder to remove this case to federal court. This argument must fail.

22 Fraudulent joinder constitutes an exception to the requirement of complete diversity. This  
23 doctrine holds that, where a non-diverse defendant has been “fraudulently joined,” the court  
24 disregards that defendant and recognizes complete diversity. *Morris v. Princess Cruises, Inc.*, 236  
25 F.3d 1061, 1067 (9th Cir. 2000). However, fraudulent joinder only exists “[i]f the plaintiff fails to  
26 state a cause of action against a resident defendant, and the failure is obvious according to the  
27 settled rules of the state.” *McCabe v. General Foods Corp.*, 811 F.2d 1336, 1339 (9th Cir. 1987).  
28

1 Further, a defendant must show that the joinder was fraudulent by “clear and convincing  
2 evidence,” *Hamilton Materials, Inc. v. Dow Chem. Corp.*, 494 F.3d 1203, 1206 (9th Cir. 2007). In  
3 determining whether a defendant was joined fraudulently, a court must resolve “all disputed  
4 questions of fact and all ambiguities in the controlling state law in favor of the non-removing  
5 party.” *Plute v. Roadway Package Sys., Inc.*, 141 F. Supp. 2d 1005, 1008 (N.D. Cal. 2001)  
6 (quoting *Dodson v. Spiliada*, 951 F.2d 40, 42-43 (5th Cir. 1992)).

7 Indeed, the district court must remand if there is a “non-fanciful possibility” that the plaintiff  
8 can state a claim against the non-diverse defendant. *See Vu v. Ortho–McNeill Pharm., Inc.*, 602  
9 F.Supp.2d 1151, 1154 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (citation omitted). The relevant inquiry is whether the  
10 plaintiff could state a claim against the non-diverse defendant on any legal theory. *See Grancare,*  
11 *LLC v. Thrower by and through Mills*, 889 F.3d 543, 548 (9th Cir. 2018).

12 When determining if a non-diverse defendant has been fraudulently joined, the court may look  
13 beyond the pleadings and consider summary judgment-type evidence such as deposition testimony  
14 and affidavits. *See Cavallini v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 44 F.3d 256, 265 (5th Cir. 1995)  
15 (“[F]raudulent joinder claims can be resolved by ‘piercing the pleadings’ and considering  
16 summary judgment-type evidence such as affidavits and deposition testimony.”). Thus, the  
17 defendant seeking removal is free to present as many facts as he wishes in order to show  
18 fraudulent joinder. *Ritchey v. Upjohn Drug Co.*, 139 F.3d 1313, 1318 (9th Cir. 1998).

19 Regarding the case at bar, Monsanto avers that “Wilbur-Ellis Company is (and has been) in  
20 the business of, among other things, distributing and selling certain pesticides and herbicides,  
21 including certain glyphosate-based herbicide products.” Hushbeck Declaration, ¶ 6.  
22 However, Monsanto also alleges that Wilbur-Ellis is involved in a limited market only, not  
23 distributing to outlets that sell to the general public. As such, the claim is that Wilbur-Ellis was not  
24 involved in the distribution chain that distributed Roundup to Plaintiff or to which Plaintiff was  
25 exposed and cannot be liable under a product liability theory as a result. As shown below,  
26 Monsanto’s argument is simply untenable. Wilbur-Ellis is a massive company with a massive  
27 reach, constantly touting itself as a leader in distribution, marketing itself as a solution for  
28 *everyone*, and engaging in Pac-Mac like consumption of other entities to make itself grow. Given

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.