

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

DEWANE D. FRASE, as Special Administrator
of the Estate of Douglas Frase, deceased, &
CAROLE L. FRASE,

Plaintiffs,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

19-cv-273-wmc

ASHLAND CHEMICAL COMPANY DIVISION
OF ASHLAND, INC.; BP PRODUCTS NORTH
AMERICA, INC.; EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION;
FOUR STAR OIL AND GAS COMPANY (f.k.a. GETTY
OIL COMPANY); SHELL CHEMICAL L.P.; SHELL OIL
COMPANY; SUNOCO (R&M), LLC; TEXACO DOWNSTREAM
PROPERTIES, INC.; & UNION OIL COMPANY OF
CALIFORNIA d/b/a UNOCAL CORPORATION,

Defendants.

From approximately 1952 until 1992, Douglas Frase was employed at a tire manufacturing facility, during which time he worked with various “benzene-containing products.” In April of 2016, Frase was diagnosed with Myelodysplastic Syndrome (“MDS”), from which he died approximately seven months later. According to plaintiffs, Frase’s surviving spouse, and his estate’s special administrator, Frase’s death was the result of his exposure to the benzene-containing products. Because defendants designed, manufactured, and/or sold the products, plaintiffs maintain that they should be held liable under negligence and strict product liability theories for Frase’s contracting MDS, suffering and death. Presently before the court is a motion to dismiss by four of the nine defendants in this action, who argue that because plaintiffs failed to serve them timely, they must be

dismissed from this lawsuit. (Dkt. #77.) For the reasons discussed below, the court will deny this motion.

BACKGROUND

On December 28, 2018, plaintiffs filed this products liability action in state court against nine, named defendants. While still in state court, four of the nine defendants moved to dismiss plaintiffs' claims against them due to improper service and lack of personal jurisdiction. These four defendants are Four Star Oil and Gas Company (f.k.a. Getty Oil Company), Shell Chemical L.P., Sunoco (R&M), LLC, and Texaco Downstream Properties, Inc., referred to here as the "Group A defendants." Before this motion had been fully briefed or resolved, however, the remaining defendants removed the case to federal court. These five remaining defendants are Ashland Chemical Company Division of Ashland, Inc., BP Products North America, Inc., Exxon Mobil Corporation, Shell Oil Company, and Union Oil Company of California d/b/a Unocal Corporation, referred to here as the "Group B defendants."

On April 11, 2019, defendants removed this case to federal court, and that same day all defendants moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim. (Dkts. #1, 4, 6-13.) On May 16, 2019, it also came to the attention of the court that the plaintiffs had not responded to the Group A defendants' pending motions to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction and improper service following removal. (Dkt. #24.) The court then directed the Group A defendants to refile their motions so that they could be tracked by the CM/ECF system (previously, they were attached as exhibits to the notice of removal) and set a briefing schedule. (Dkt. #24.)

Rather than filing an opposition brief to these jurisdictional motions, however, plaintiffs filed a notice that purported to dismiss the Group A defendants under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a). (Dkt. #41.) Because Rule 41(a) is limited to dismissals of an entire case, the court construed plaintiffs' notice as a motion to amend their complaint and permitted them to dismiss the Group A defendants without prejudice under Rule 15(a)(2). (June 4, 2019, Order.)¹

On July 25, 2019, without motion or explanation, plaintiffs next filed an amended complaint in which they again named all of the original defendants, including the previously dismissed Group A defendants. (Dkt. #45.) In response to the court's inquiry (dkt. #46), plaintiffs explained that their plan all along had been to dismiss the Group A defendants, then to file an amended complaint adding them back in to perfect service (dkt. #47). The court subsequently ordered plaintiffs to file a motion to seek leave to file their amended complaint (dkt. #49), which plaintiffs did on August 19, 2019 (dkt. #52).

In an order addressing both defendants' motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim and plaintiffs' motion to amend, the court granted the former and denied the latter on the grounds that: (1) plaintiffs' original complaint failed to identify the product at issue adequately; and (2) plaintiffs' proposed amended complaint would be futile since it suffered from the same defect. (Dkt. #59.) However, this dismissal was without prejudice, and plaintiffs' subsequently sought leave to file another amended complaint in which they

¹ For some unknown reason, this text order was not formally assigned a docket number, but can be found in the case docket entries between dkt. ##42 & 43.

again named both the Group A and Group B defendants. (Dkt. #60.) The court granted this motion on March 10, 2021. (Dkt. #72.)

On March 31, 2021, the Group A defendants then moved to dismiss the amended complaint, arguing that plaintiffs still had not served them and this lack of timely service leaves the court without personal jurisdiction over them. (Dkt. #77.) Plaintiffs responded that they were “diligently working to prefect service” on the defendants (dkt. #95), and between April 20, 2021, and June 1, 2021, plaintiffs proceeded to file affidavits of service for each of the four Group A defendants (dkts. #94, 96, 99, 100).

OPINION

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a plaintiff in a federal lawsuit must ensure that each defendant named in the suit receives a copy of the summons and complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(b), (c). Service requirements are important as they “provide notice to parties, encourage parties and their counsel to pursue their cases diligently, and trigger a district court's ability to exercise jurisdiction over a defendant.” *Cardenas v. City of Chicago*, 646 F.3d 1001, 1005 (7th Cir. 2011) (internal citations omitted). The time for proper service of process is governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), which provides:

If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court -- on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff -- must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). The same 90-day period “applies where suits are removed to federal court from state court, except that the period commences upon the date of removal.” *Cardenas*, 646 F.3d at 1004.

Here, plaintiffs have waived any argument that their first complaint was properly served on the Group A defendants. This is because plaintiffs never responded to the Group A defendants’ argument that service was improper, effectively choosing instead to amend their complaint to dismiss them from the suit. *See Bonte v. U.S. Bank, N.A.*, 624 F.3d 461, 466 (7th Cir. 2010) (failure to respond to argument constitutes waiver). The issue at hand, therefore, is whether plaintiffs have now corrected their initial failure to serve by obtaining leave to rename the Group A defendants in an amended complaint and then ultimately serving them.

A closely analogous situation was addressed by the United States Court of Appeals for Seventh Circuit in *UWM Student Ass'n v. Lovell*, 888 F.3d 854 (7th Cir. 2018). In that case, the plaintiffs had also initially filed suit in state court and the case was subsequently removed to federal court. *Id.* at 857. After removal, the district court dismissed a number of defendants because they had not been properly served. *Id.* at 858. Later, the district court gave plaintiffs leave to file an amended complaint, in which plaintiffs attempted to rename most of those same dismissed defendants. *Id.* at 858. Eventually, plaintiffs also filed affidavits showing service on these defendants, although none of the affidavits

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.