

1 Steve W. Berman (*pro hac vice* to be filed)  
2 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
3 1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000  
4 Seattle, WA 98101  
5 Telephone: (206) 623-7292  
6 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
7 Email: steve@hbsslaw.com

Robert C. Hilliard (*pro hac vice* to be filed)  
HILLIARD MARTINEZ GONZALES LLP  
719 S. Shoreline Blvd.  
Corpus Christi, TX 78401  
Telephone: (361) 882-1612  
Facsimile: (361) 882-3015  
Email: bobh@hmglawfirm.com

8 Shana E. Scarlett (SBN 217895)  
9 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
10 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202  
11 Berkeley, CA 94710  
12 Telephone: (510) 725-3000  
13 Facsimile: (510) 725-3001  
14 Email: shanas@hbsslaw.com

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
16 *[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]*

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 AARON K. HOOPER, ALEATHEA BOWEN,  
20 ANDRE CURRENT, ANGELA VENABLE,  
21 ANTHONY HOLSTON, ARTHUR HAYES III,  
22 BRANDY POSPISIL, BRIDELEE GITTENS,  
23 CHRISTOPHER JONES, CORY M. BYNUM,  
24 CRAIG M. RIXNER, CURTIS HARVEY WATTS,  
25 DAVID HEARD, DIANE CLARK CHAVIS,  
26 DWAYNE SMITH, EDWARD N. DODSON,  
27 FLOYD EVANS, GREGORY J. WALKER,  
28 ILENE M. BELTON, JAMES W. TERRY,  
JAMISON D. MCGLOTHLEN, JESSE HODSON,  
JOHN KLIMOWICZ, LARY BANK, MARILYN  
FAULKES, MAURICE ROYAL, MONICA  
THOMPSON, NORMAN J. NESMITH, REGINA  
THOMPSON-XADU, RICHARD BERRYMAN,  
RICHARD J. TREITNER, ROBIN WARREN,  
RYAN L. ALLEN, TERRI BELL, TERRY  
BOURN, THOMAS L. GIST, TIMOTHY JOHN  
GAUB, TIMOTHY M. HOLLAND, TODD  
BAKER, TRACY OXENDINE, WILLIE  
BRASLEY, and YUSEF MOORE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,

Defendant.

No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Page

1			
2			
3	I.	NATURE OF THE ACTION.....	1
4	II.	JURISDICTION AND VENUE.....	5
5	III.	INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT .....	5
6	IV.	PARTIES.....	5
7	V.	FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.....	21
8	A.	Background.....	21
9		1. Laws and regulations governing the approval and labeling of prescription drugs. ....	21
10		2. Tenofovir and Gilead’s TDF- and TAF- containing drug products indicated for use in treating HIV. ....	24
11	B.	Gilead knew before Viread was approved that TDF posed a significant safety risk.....	29
12	C.	Gilead’s knowledge of TDF toxicity grew as patients’ kidneys and bones were damaged by the TDF Drugs. ....	32
13	D.	Before Gilead developed Stribild, it knew that renal adverse events were more likely when patients took TDF as part of a boosted regimen. ....	36
14	E.	Before Gilead developed each of the TDF Drugs, it knew that TAF was less toxic to kidneys and bones than TDF.....	37
15	F.	Gilead withheld its safer TAF design to protect its TDF sales and extend profits on its HIV franchise. ....	44
16	G.	Gilead knowingly designed its TDF drugs to be unreasonably dangerous and unsafe to patients’ kidneys and bones. ....	46
17	H.	Gilead obtained FDA approval for its TAF-based products by relying on studies demonstrating TAF’s superiority over TDF.....	49
18	I.	Gilead markets TAF as superior to TDF. ....	51
19	J.	Gilead failed to adequately warn about the risks of TDF.....	56
20		1. Gilead failed to adequately warn doctors about the risks of TDF.....	56
21		2. Gilead failed to adequately warn patients about the risks of TDF.....	70
22		3. Gilead could have unilaterally strengthened its TDF drug labels.....	72
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1 a. Gilead could have unilaterally strengthened its warnings  
before FDA approval.....72

2

3 b. Gilead could have unilaterally strengthened its warnings  
after FDA approval.....73

4 (1) Before August 22, 2008.....73

5 (2) On and after August 22, 2008 through July 2012 .....74

6 VI. TOLLING OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS .....79

7 VII. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF.....81

8 COUNT I STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY – DESIGN DEFECT UNDER THE  
9 LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND THE STATES OF  
10 ARKANSAS, COLORADO, GEORGIA, NEW YORK, RHODE ISLAND,  
SOUTH CAROLINA, SOUTH DAKOTA, TENNESSEE, TEXAS, WEST  
11 VIRGINIA, AND WISCONSIN .....81

12 COUNT II STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY – FAILURE TO WARN UNDER  
13 THE LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND OF THE STATES  
OF ARKANSAS, COLORADO, GEORGIA, NEW YORK, RHODE  
ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA SOUTH DAKOTA, TENNESSEE, WEST  
14 VIRGINIA, AND WISCONSIN .....83

15 COUNT III CONNECTICUT PRODUCTS LIABILITY ACT, CONN. GEN. STAT.  
52-572N ET SEQ .....85

16 COUNT IV LOUISIANA PRODUCTS LIABILITY ACT, LA. R.S. §§ 9:2800.51, *ET*  
*SEQ.*.....87

17 COUNT V WASHINGTON PRODUCTS LIABILITY ACT, REV. CODE WASH.  
§§ 7.72-010 ET SEQ. ....88

18 COUNT VI NEGLIGENCE AND GROSS NEGLIGENCE UNDER THE LAWS OF  
19 THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND THE STATES OF ARKANSAS,  
COLORADO, GEORGIA, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW YORK, NORTH  
20 CAROLINA, RHODE ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA, SOUTH DAKOTA,  
TENNESSEE, TEXAS, WEST VIRGINIA, AND WISCONSIN.....89

21 COUNT VII FRAUD BY OMISSION UNDER THE LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF  
22 COLUMBIA AND THE STATES OF ARKASNAS, COLORADO,  
GEORGIA, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW YORK, NORTH CAROLINA,  
23 RHODE ISLANDS, SOUTH CAROLINA, SOUTH DKOTA, TENNESSEE,  
TEXAS, WASHINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA, AND WISCONSIN .....93

24 COUNT VIII BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY  
25 UNDER THE LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND THE  
STATES OF ARKANSAS, COLORADO, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW  
26 YORK, NORTH CAROLINA, RHODE ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA,  
SOUTH DAKOTA, TENNESSEE, TEXAS, AND WEST VIRGINIA.....95

27 COUNT IX VIOLATION OF STATE CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS .....97

28

1 a. Arkansas, Ark. Code Ann. §§ 4-88-101 *et seq.*.....99

2 b. Colorado, Colo. Rev. Stat. §§ 6-1-101 *et seq.*.....99

3 c. Massachusetts, Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 93A § 1 *et seq.* .....100

4 d. New York: N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349 .....100

5 e. North Carolina, N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 75-1.1 *et seq.* .....101

6 f. Rhode Island, R.I. Gen. Laws §§ 6-13.1 *et seq.*.....101

7 g. South Carolina, S.C. Code Ann. §§ 39-5-10 *et seq.*.....102

8 h. South Dakota, S.D. Codified Laws §§ 37-24-1 *et seq.*.....102

9 i. Texas: Tex. Bus. & Com. Code Ann. §§ 17.41 *et seq.*.....103

10 PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....104

11 JURY DEMAND.....105

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Plaintiffs bring this civil action for damages against Defendant Gilead Sciences, Inc.  
2 (“Gilead” or “Defendant”). Based on the investigation of counsel, Plaintiffs allege on information  
3 and belief as follows:

4 **I. NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5 1. This action arises out of injuries Plaintiffs sustained as a result of ingesting one or more  
6 of the prescription drugs Viread, Truvada, Atripla, Complera, and Stribild, which are manufactured  
7 and marketed by Gilead for the treatment of Human Immunodeficiency Virus-1 (“HIV”) infection.<sup>1</sup>

8 2. Gilead designed each of the drugs to contain a form of the compound tenofovir that  
9 Gilead knew was toxic to patients’ kidneys and bones. Tenofovir is a nucleotide analogue reverse  
10 transcriptase inhibitor (“NRTI”), one of the classes of antiretroviral drugs used to treat HIV. NRTIs  
11 work by blocking an enzyme HIV needs to replicate. Gilead did not discover tenofovir. Scientists in  
12 Europe discovered tenofovir in the 1980s, and though the anti-HIV properties of tenofovir were  
13 promising, it had a downside: it cannot not be administered effectively by mouth.

14 3. Because an intravenous tenofovir formulation had little sales potential, Gilead  
15 developed a form of tenofovir, tenofovir disoproxil, which can be taken orally.<sup>2</sup> The fumaric acid salt  
16 of tenofovir disoproxil is tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (“TDF”). When a patient takes a pill containing  
17 TDF, the patient’s body converts TDF into tenofovir. Although TDF can be taken by mouth, a high  
18 dose of 300 mg is typically required to achieve the desired therapeutic effect.

19 4. Gilead designed TDF 300 mg to be an active ingredient in five drugs that are approved  
20 to treat HIV: Viread (TDF 300 mg tablets), approved October 26, 2001; Truvada (TDF 300  
21 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg tablets), approved August 2, 2004; Atripla (TDF 300 mg/emtricitabine 200  
22 mg/efavirenz 600 mg tablets), approved July 12, 2006; Complera (TDF 300 mg/emtricitabine 200  
23 mg/rilpivirine 25 mg tablets), approved August 10, 2011; and Stribild (TDF 300 mg/emtricitabine 200  
24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Viread is also indicated to treat Hepatitis B. And Truvada is also indicated for use in combination  
26 with safe sex practices for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) to reduce the risk of sexually acquired  
HIV-1 in adults at high risk.

27 <sup>2</sup> Tenofovir disoproxil is a prodrug form of tenofovir. Prodrugs are pharmacologically inactive  
28 compounds that can be more efficiently absorbed into the bloodstream and then converted into the  
active form of the drug within the body.

# 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.