

Elizabeth J. Cabraser (SBN 083151)
Robert L. Lief (SBN 037568)
Steven E. Fineman (SBN 140335)
LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3339
Telephone: 415.956.1000
ecabraser@lchb.com

William M. Audet (SBN 117456)
AUDET & PARTNERS, LLP
711 Van Ness, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94102-3229
Telephone: 415.568.2555

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class
(additional counsel listed below)*

James R. Dugan, II
TerriAnne Benedetto
THE DUGAN LAW FIRM, APLC
One Canal Place
365 Canal Street, Suite 1000
New Orleans, LA 70130
Telephone: 504.648.0180

Samuel Issacharoff
40 Washington Square South
Suite 411J
New York, NY 10012
Telephone: 212.998.6580

Elizabeth A. Fegan
FEGAN SCOTT LLC
150 S. Wacker Dr., 24th Fl.
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312.741.1019

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

IN RE: ROUNDUP PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL NO. 2741

Case No. 3:16-md-02741-VC

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

Ramirez, et al. v. Monsanto Co.,
Case No. 3:19-cv-02224

**MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CLASS
SETTLEMENT, APPOINTMENT OF
INTERIM CLASS AND SUBCLASS
COUNSEL, DIRECTION OF NOTICE UNDER
FED. R. CIV P. 23(e), SCHEDULING OF A
FAIRNESS HEARING, AND STAY OF THE
FILING AND PROSECUTION OF ROUNDUP-
RELATED ACTIONS BY SETTLEMENT
CLASS MEMBERS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
SETTLEMENT BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY	7
A. The Settlement Class and Subclasses	7
B. Compensation Awards	8
C. Diagnostic Accessibility Grant Program	12
D. Legal Services Program	16
E. Labeling Change	17
F. Research Funding Program.....	17
G. Advisory Science Panel	17
H. Potential Extension of the Settlement.....	18
I. Limited Release (Except for Those Who Accept Compensation Awards).....	19
J. Notice Plan.....	20
K. Attorneys’ Fees, Expenses, and Incentive Awards.....	22
ARGUMENT	23
I. The Court will likely certify the class and subclasses at final approval.	24
A. The class and subclasses meet the requirements of Rule 23(a).	24
1. The class and subclasses are sufficiently numerous.	24
2. Roundup claims raise a cluster of common questions with resolution-driving common answers.....	25
3. The proposed class representatives’ claims are typical.	26
4. The proposed class representatives and Class Counsel have and will adequately represent the class and subclasses.	27
B. The class and subclasses meet the predominance requirement of Rule 23(b)(3).	28
C. Class certification for settlement purposes satisfies the superiority requirement.	33
D. Alternatively, certification under Rule 23(b)(2) is also appropriate.....	36
E. The Court should appoint proposed Class Counsel and Subclass Counsel as Interim Settlement Class Counsel under Rule 23(g)(3).....	37
II. The Court will likely find the Settlement fair, reasonable, and adequate.....	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
A. Rule 23(e)(2)(A): Counsel and the class representatives have and will continue to zealously represent the class.	38
B. Rule 23(e)(2)(B): The Settlement is the product of more than 18 months of adversarial negotiation under the supervision of the Court-appointed mediator.	40
C. Rule 23(e)(2)(C): The Settlement provides guaranteed programmatic relief in exchange for a limited release and a short delay, and compensation to those who choose to accept it in exchange for a full release.	42
1. The Settlement offers class benefits and compensation that are fair, adequate, and reasonable alternatives to the costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal.....	42
2. Class members who are not diagnosed, or who do not accept a compensation award, give up relatively little.	44
a. The litigation stay is a small concession on the part of class members, who by definition have not filed a claim or retained counsel to do so.....	44
b. The release of medical monitoring claims is reasonable in light of the Settlement benefits.	45
c. The release of punitive damages is reasonable.	48
3. Class members are eligible for relief through straightforward processes.	50
4. Counsel will seek reasonable attorneys' fees and costs that pose no obstacle to preliminary approval.....	50
5. There are no side agreements relevant to preliminary approval.	51
D. The Settlement treats all class members equitably relative to one another.	51
E. The Settlement merits preliminary approval under this District's Procedural Guidance.....	53
1. Guidance (1)(a) & (c): The Settlement class and released claims are consistent with the operative complaint.....	53
2. Guidance (1)(e): The Settlement compares favorably to potential litigation.	53
3. Guidance (1)(f): The allocation of the Settlement Fund is considered and reasonable.	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
4. Guidance (1)(g): A substantial number of class members are expected to participate in the Settlement programs.	55
5. Guidance (1)(h) & (8): The Settlement is non-reversionary.....	56
6. Guidance (6): Attorneys’ fees, when requested, will meet all federal and local requirements.	57
7. Guidance (7): The requested incentive awards are reasonable and subject to Court approval.	57
8. Guidance (9): The Settlement provides a reasonable time for class members to exercise their rights.	58
III. The notice plan provides the best practical notice.	58
A. The notice plan was specifically designed to reach those exposed to Roundup who have not yet developed NHL, as well as those who have.	59
B. The concerns articulated in <i>Amchem</i> are not present here.	61
C. Guidance (2): The Administrators and Notice Agents were selected based on capabilities and experience with large, complex settlements.	63
IV. The proposed Settlement addresses the four concerns the Court raised regarding the prior, withdrawn settlement.	64
V. The Court should stay class members from filing or prosecuting new Roundup Lawsuits and Related Party Lawsuits.	66
VI. Requested Timetable.....	69
CONCLUSION.....	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allen v. Monsanto Co.</i> , No. 13-0418, 2013 WL 6153150 (W.V. Nov. 22, 2013).....	47
<i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	passim
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Tr. Funds</i> , 568 U.S. 455 (2013).....	25, 34
<i>Betts v. Reliable Collection Agency, Ltd.</i> , 659 F.2d 1000 (9th Cir. 1981)	24
<i>BMW of N. Am., Inc. v. Gore</i> , 517 U.S. 559 (1996).....	32, 48
<i>Buchanan v. Tata Consultancy Servs., Ltd.</i> , No. 15-1696, 2017 WL 6611653 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 27, 2017).....	32
<i>Carson v. Monsanto Co.</i> , No. 17-237, 2020 WL 7497385 (S.D. Ga., Dec. 21, 2020)	36
<i>Celano v. Marriott Int’l, Inc.</i> , 242 F.R.D. 544 (N.D. Cal. 2007).....	24
<i>Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.</i> , 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004)	58
<i>Cote v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.</i> , No. 19-14074, 2021 WL 162022 (11th Cir. Jan 19, 2021).....	49
<i>Cotter v. Lyft, Inc.</i> , No. 13-4065, Doc. 256 (N.D. Cal. July 1, 2016).....	66, 68
<i>Crawford v. Honig</i> , 37 F.3d 485 (9th Cir. 1994)	36
<i>Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i> , 657 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 2011)	26
<i>Elsea v. U.S. Eng’g Co.</i> , No. 1016-15976 (Mo. Cir. 2018).....	47
<i>Flores v. Dart Container Corp.</i> , No. 19-83, 2021 WL 107239 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2021)	29
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	25, 29, 66, 68

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.