

E-FILED  
9/30/2016

FRESNO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

By: C. Cogburn, Deputy

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California  
2 SUSAN S. FIERING  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
3 State Bar No. 121621  
DENNIS A. RAGEN  
4 Deputy Attorney General  
State Bar No. 106468  
5 LAURA J. ZUCKERMAN  
Deputy Attorney General  
6 State Bar No. 161896  
HEATHER C. LESLIE  
7 Deputy Attorney General  
State Bar No. 305095  
8 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor  
P.O. Box 70550  
9 Oakland, CA 94612-0550  
Telephone: (510) 879-1299  
10 Fax: (510) 622-2270  
E-mail: Laura.Zuckerman@doj.ca.gov  
11 *Attorneys for Defendants and Respondents Office of  
Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and Dr.  
12 Lauren Zeise, Acting Director*

13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

14 FOR THE COUNTY OF FRESNO

15 **MONSANTO COMPANY,**

16 Plaintiff and Petitioner,

17 and

18 **CALIFORNIA CITRUS MUTUAL, ET AL.**

19 Plaintiff-Intervenors,

20 v.

21 **OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH  
22 HAZARD ASSESSMENT, ET AL.,**

23 Defendants and  
24 Respondents,

25 and

26 **SIERRA CLUB, ET AL.; CENTER FOR FOOD  
SAFETY,**

27 Defendant-Intervenors,  
28

Case No. 16CECG00183

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
OEHHA AND DR. ZEISE'S MOTION  
FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS  
ON MONSANTO'S FIRST AMENDED  
PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND  
CALIFORNIA CITRUS MUTUAL ET  
AL.'S COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION**

Date: December 9, 2016

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept: 403

Judge: Hon. Kristi Culver Kapetan

Trial Date: None set.

Action Filed: January 21, 2016

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND .....	2
I.    PROPOSITION 65 .....	2
A.    Step One: OEHHA’s Obligation to List. ....	3
B.    Step Two: Discharge and Warning Requirements. ....	4
FACTUAL BACKGROUND .....	5
I.    THIRTY YEARS OF COURT REVIEW OF THE LABOR CODE LISTING MECHANISM.....	5
II.   HISTORY OF THE CURRENT LITIGATION .....	6
III.  THE INTERNATIONAL AGENCY FOR RESEARCH ON CANCER .....	6
A.    The Monograph Process.....	7
B.    Reliance on IARC by Other Government Entities.....	9
C.    Reliance on IARC by Courts and Industry. ....	11
STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	12
ARGUMENT .....	13
I.    THE LABOR CODE LISTING MECHANISM IS NOT AN IMPERMISSIBLE DELEGATION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY UNDER THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION.....	14
A.    Proposition 65 Does Not Delegate Fundamental Policy Decisions.....	16
B.    Proposition 65 Does Not Grant Rulemaking Authority.....	17
C.    Any Delegation of Authority is Accompanied by Adequate Safeguards and Direction. ....	19
1.    IARC has robust internal safeguards in place. ....	19
2.    IARC has a built-in motivation to act responsibly.....	21
3.    Proposition 65 imposes adequate standards for the listing. ....	22
4.    The voters added safeguards to Proposition 65 to enable companies like Monsanto to prove that chemicals listed by IARC do not pose a significant risk of cancer in humans.....	22
II.   THE LABOR CODE LISTING MECHANISM DOES NOT VIOLATE PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS.....	24
A.    The Decision to List a Chemical is a Quasi-Legislative Action That is Not Subject to Federal or State Constitutional Due Process Review.....	25
B.    Even if Due Process Analysis Were Warranted, OEHHA’s Listing of Glyphosate Would Not Violate the Federal or State Constitutions’ Guarantees of Procedural Due Process.....	26

1  
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  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
1. Monsanto has not been deprived of a constitutionally-protected interest under federal or state law. ....	26
2. Monsanto has the right to raise its scientific arguments in court.....	28
III. THE LABOR CODE LISTING MECHANISM OF PROPOSITION 65 DOES NOT VIOLATE ANY OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE STATE OR FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS. ....	29
A. The Labor Code Listing Mechanism Does Not Constitute an Unlawful Amendment to or Revision of the California Constitution. ....	29
B. The Labor Code Listing Mechanism Does Not Violate Article II, Section 12, of the California Constitution. ....	30
1. IARC is not a private corporation. ....	30
2. The Labor Code listing mechanism does not confer any power, duty, or function on IARC. ....	32
3. The Labor Code listing mechanism incorporates a decision by the Legislature to identify IARC.....	33
C. The Guarantee Clause of the United States Constitution Has No Application to the Operation of the Labor Code Listing Mechanism.....	33
D. Neither the Labor Code Listing Mechanism nor the Anticipated Listing of Glyphosate Would Violate Monsanto’s Right to Free Speech Under the California or U.S. Constitutions. ....	34
CONCLUSION.....	35

1 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

2 **Page**

3 **CASES**

4 *420 Caregivers, LLC v. City of Los Angeles*  
5 (2012) 219 Cal.App.4th 1316 .....13, 27

6 *Adams v. Cooper Industries*  
7 (E.D. Ky. Apr. 4, 2007, No. 03-476-JBC) 2007 WL 1075647 .....11

8 *AFL-CIO v. Deukmejian*  
9 (1989) 212 Cal.App.3d 425..... *passim*

10 *American Manufacturers Mutual Ins. Co. v. Sullivan*  
11 (1999) 526 U.S. 40 .....26, 27, 28

12 *Arcadia Unified School Dist. v. State Dept. of Education*  
13 (1992) 2 Cal.4th 251 .....12

14 *Associated Builders v. Brock*  
15 (3d Cir. 1988) 862 F.2d 63 .....18, 23

16 *Baker v. Carr*  
17 (1962) 369 U.S. 186 .....33

18 *Baldonado v. Wyeth*  
19 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 31, 2012, No. 04 C 4312), 2012 WL 3779100 .....11

20 *Baxter Healthcare Corp. v. Denton*  
21 (2004) 120 Cal.App.4th 333 .....11, 22, 28, 34

22 *Bayside Timber Co. v. Board of Supervisors*  
23 (1971) 20 Cal.App.3d 1 .....19, 20

24 *Beck Development Co., Inc. v. Southern Pacific Transp. Co.*  
25 (1996) 44 Cal.App.4th 1160 .....25

26 *Beeman v. Anthem Prescription Mgmt., LLC*  
27 (2013) 58 Cal.4th 329 .....35

28 *Bi-Metallic Inv. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization*  
(1915) 239 U.S. 441 .....25

*Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth*  
(1972) 408 U.S. 564 .....27

*Cal. Gillnetters Assn. v. Department of Fish & Game*  
(1995) 39 Cal.App.4th 1145 .....25, 33

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1	
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	
28	

<i>Calfarm Ins. Co. v. Deukmejian</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 805 .....	13, 30, 31, 32
<i>California Assn. of Retail Tobacconists v. State of California</i> (2003) 109 Cal.App.4th 792 .....	31
<i>California Chamber of Commerce v. Brown</i> (2011) 196 Cal.App.4th 233 .....	5
<i>Carson Mobilehome Park Owners' Assn. v. City of Carson</i> (1983) 35 Cal.3d 184 .....	15
<i>Current v. Atochem</i> (W.D. Tex. Nov. 30, 2001, No. W-00-CA-332) 2001 WL 36101283 .....	11
<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment</i> (2009) 169 Cal.App.4th 1264 .....	3, 25, 28
<i>In re Guardianship of Ann S.</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1110 .....	13, 14
<i>In re Taylor</i> (2015) 60 Cal.4th 1019 .....	12
<i>Ingredient Communication Council v. Lungren</i> (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 1480 .....	23
<i>Jackson Court Condominiums, Inc. v. City of New Orleans</i> (5th Cir. 1989) 874 F.2d 1070.....	25
<i>Kasky v. Nike, Inc.</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 939 .....	35
<i>King v. Meese</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1217 .....	17
<i>Kugler v. Yocum</i> (1968) 69 Cal.2d 371 .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Las Lomas Land Co., LLC v. City of Los Angeles</i> (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 837 .....	28
<i>Lujan v. G &amp; G Fire Sprinklers, Inc.</i> (2001) 532 U.S. 189 .....	29

# 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.