

1 John H. Gomez (171485)  
2 Kristen K. Barton (303228)  
3 **GOMEZ TRIAL ATTORNEYS**  
4 655 West Broadway, Suite 1700  
5 San Diego, CA 92101  
6 Telephone: (619) 237-3490  
7 Facsimile: (619) 237-3496  
8 Email: [john@thegomezfirm.com](mailto:john@thegomezfirm.com)  
9 [kbarton@thegomezfirm.com](mailto:kbarton@thegomezfirm.com)

10 Zoe B. Littlepage (Pro Hac Vice Pending)  
11 T. Matthew Leckman (Pro Hac Vice Pending)  
12 **LITTLEPAGE BOOTH LECKMAN**  
13 1912 W. Main St.  
14 Houston, TX 77098  
15 Telephone: (713) 529-8000  
16 Facsimile: (713) 529-8044  
17 Email: [zoe@littlepagebooth.com](mailto:zoe@littlepagebooth.com)  
18 [matt@leckmanlaw.com](mailto:matt@leckmanlaw.com)

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff* CHERYL MAHNKE

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

22 CHERYL MAHNKE,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 vs.

25 BAYER CORPORATION; BAYER  
26 HEALTHCARE LLC; BAYER  
27 HEALTHCARE PHARMACEUTICALS,  
28 INC.; MCKESSON CORPORATION;  
MCKESSON MEDICAL-SURGICAL, INC.;

and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,  
Defendants.

) Case No.:

) **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

- ) 1) STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY:  
FAILURE TO WARN
- ) 2) STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY:  
DESIGN DEFECT
- ) 3) STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY:  
MISREPRESENTATION
- ) 4) NEGLIGENCE
- ) 5) BREACH OF EXPRESS  
WARRANTY
- ) 6) BREACH OF IMPLIED  
WARRANTY
- ) 7) NEGLIGENT  
MISREPRESENTATION
- ) 8) FRADULENT  
MISREPRESENTATION
- ) 9) CONSUMER PROTECTION  
VIOLATIONS

) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 COMES NOW Plaintiff CHERYL MAHNKE (“Plaintiff”) and alleges as follows:

2 **INTRODUCTION**

3 1. This action arises out of Plaintiff Cheryl Mahnke’s injuries and damages, which  
4 were directly and proximately caused by her exposure to Defendants’ Magnetic Resonance  
5 Imaging (“MRI”) prescription Gadolinium-based Contrast Agents (“GBCAs”) in the State of  
6 California. Plaintiff’s damages are a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ and/or their  
7 corporate predecessors negligent, willful, and wrong conduct in connection with the research,  
8 development, design, testing, licensing, manufacturing, distribution, supply, labeling, marketing  
9 and/or sale of GBCAs.

10 **PARTIES**

11 2. Plaintiff Cheryl Mahnke, at all relevant times, was a resident and citizen of the  
12 State of California.

13 ***Defendant Bayer Corporation***

14 3. Defendant Bayer Corporation is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged in the  
15 research, development, design, testing, licensing, manufacturing, distribution, supply, labeling,  
16 marketing, and sale of the prescription GBCAs: Magnevist, Eovist, and Gadavist.

17 4. Defendant Bayer Corporation is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged in the  
18 distribution, supply, marketing, and sale of Magnevist, Eovist, and Gadavist in the State of  
19 California. This Court has personal jurisdiction over said Defendant under the doctrine of  
20 specific jurisdiction because said Defendant purposefully availed itself of the benefits and  
21 protections of California’s laws, and Plaintiff’s claim arises out of Defendant’s forum-related  
22 activities.

23 5. Defendant Bayer Corporation is a for-profit corporation that is incorporated under  
24 the laws of Indiana.

25 6. Defendant Bayer Corporation contends that its principal place of business is in  
26 New Jersey.

27 7. Defendant Bayer Corporation may be served with process by serving its  
28 registered agent, CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Services, located at 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive,

1 Suite 150 N, Sacramento, CA 95833.

2 **Defendant Bayer HealthCare, LLC**

3 8. Defendant Bayer HealthCare LLC is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged  
4 in the research, development, design, testing, licensing, manufacturing, distribution, supply,  
5 labeling, marketing, and sale of the prescription GBCAs: Magnevist, Eovist, and Gadavist.

6 9. Defendant Bayer HealthCare LLC is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged  
7 in the distribution, supply, marketing, and sale of Magnevist, Eovist, and Gadavist in the  
8 State of California. This Court has personal jurisdiction over said Defendant under the doctrine  
9 of specific jurisdiction because said Defendant purposefully availed itself of the benefits and  
10 protections of California's laws, and Plaintiff's claim arises out of Defendant's forum-related  
11 activities.

12 10. Defendant Bayer HealthCare LLC is a for-profit limited liability company  
13 organized under the laws of Delaware.

14 11. Defendant Bayer HealthCare LLC contends that its principal place of business is  
15 in New Jersey.

16 12. Defendant Bayer HealthCare LLC consists of nine (9) members, which are as  
17 follows:

- 18 (a) NippoNex, Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal place of  
19 business in New Jersey;
- 20 (b) Bayer West Coast Corporation, a Delaware corporation with its  
21 principal place of business in New Jersey;
- 22 (c) Bayer Essure Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal place of  
23 business in New Jersey;
- 24 (d) Bayer Medical Care Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal  
25 place of business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;
- 26 (e) Bayer Consumer Care Holdings LLC, a limited liability company, the  
27 sole member of which is Bayer East Coast LLC and the sole preferred  
28 member of which is Bayer HealthCare US Funding LLC. Bayer East

1 Coast LLC's sole member is Bayer US Holding LP, and Bayer  
2 HealthCare US Funding LLC's members are Bayer AG, Bayer Pharma  
3 AG, and Bayer World Investments B.V. Bayer US Holding LP is a  
4 limited partnership in which Bayer World Investments B.V. is the sole  
5 General Partner and Bayer Solution B.V. is the sole limited partner.  
6 Bayer Solution B.V. is a private company with limited liability  
7 organized under the laws of the Netherlands and is wholly-owned by  
8 Bayer World Investments B.V. Bayer World Investments B.V. is a  
9 private company with limited liability organized under the laws of  
10 Netherlands and is wholly owned by Bayer AG. Bayer AG and Bayer  
11 Pharma AG are German Aktiengesellschafts organized under the laws  
12 of Germany whose stock is publicly traded in Germany, and their  
13 principal places of business are in Germany;

14 (f) Dr. Scholl's LLC, a limited liability company, the sole member of  
15 which is Bayer HealthCare US Funding LLC;

16 (g) Coppertone LLC, a limited liability company, the sole member of  
17 which is Bayer HealthCare US Funding LLC;

18 (h) MiraLAX LLC, a limited liability company, the sole member of which  
19 is Bayer HealthCare US Funding LLC; and

20 (i) Bayer HealthCare US Funding LLC, a limited liability company, whose  
21 members are Bayer AG, Bayer Pharma AG, and Bayer World  
22 Investments B.V.

23 13. Defendant Bayer HealthCare LLC may be served with process by serving its  
24 registered agent, CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Services, located at 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive,  
25 Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833.

26 **Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc.**

27 14. Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is, and at all relevant times has  
28 been, engaged in the research, development, design, testing, licensing, manufacturing,

1 distribution, supply, labeling, marketing, and sale of the prescription GBCAs: Magnevist, Eovist,  
2 and Gadavist.

3 15. Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is, and at all relevant times has  
4 been, engaged in the distribution, supply, marketing, and sale of Magnevist, Eovist, and Gadavist  
5 in the State of California. This Court has personal jurisdiction over said Defendant under the  
6 doctrine of specific jurisdiction because said Defendant purposefully availed itself of the benefits  
7 and protections of California’s laws, and Plaintiff’s claim arises out of Defendant’s forum-  
8 related activities.

9 16. Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is a for-profit corporation that  
10 is incorporated under the laws of Delaware.

11 17. Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc. contends that its principal  
12 place of business is in New Jersey.

13 18. Defendant Bayer HealthCare Pharmaceuticals, Inc. may be served with process by  
14 serving its registered agent, CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Services, located at 2710 Gateway  
15 Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833.

16 **Defendant McKesson Corporation**

17 19. Defendant McKesson Corporation (“McKesson”) distributes Magnevist and other  
18 GBCAs in California and elsewhere. Plaintiff alleges that McKesson distributed Magnevist  
19 and/or other GBCAs that were injected into Plaintiff.

20 20. Defendant McKesson Corporation is a for-profit Delaware corporation with its  
21 principal place of business and headquarters in Irving, Texas.

22 21. Defendant McKesson Corporation is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged  
23 in the distribution of Magnevist and other GBCAs in the State of California. This Court has  
24 personal jurisdiction over said Defendant under the doctrine of specific jurisdiction because said  
25 Defendant purposefully availed itself of the benefits and protections of California’s laws, and  
26 Plaintiff’s claim arises out of Defendant’s forum-related activities.

27 22. Defendant McKesson Corporation may be served with process by serving its  
28 registered agent, CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Services, located at 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive,

1 Sacramento, CA 95833.

2 **Defendant McKesson Medical-Surgical, Inc.**

3 23. Defendant McKesson Medical-Surgical, Inc. distributes Magnevist and other  
4 GBCAs in California and elsewhere. Plaintiff alleges that McKesson Medical-Surgical, Inc.  
5 distributed Magnevist and/or other gadolinium-based contrast agents that were injected into  
6 Plaintiff.

7 24. Defendant McKesson Medical-Surgical, Inc. is a Virginia corporation with its  
8 principal place of business and headquarters in Irving, Texas.

9 25. Defendant McKesson Corporation is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged  
10 in the distribution of Magnevist and other GBCAs in the State of California. This Court has  
11 personal jurisdiction over said Defendant under the doctrine of specific jurisdiction because said  
12 Defendant purposefully availed itself of the benefits and protections of California's laws, and  
13 Plaintiff's claim arises out of Defendant's forum-related activities.

14 26. Defendant McKesson Corporation may be served with process by serving its  
15 registered agent, CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Services, located at 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive,  
16 Sacramento, CA 95833.

17 **Defendant Does 1-20**

18 27. The true names and capacities of those Defendants designated as DOES 1-20 are  
19 unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that DOES 1-20 manufactured,  
20 marketed and/or distributed gadolinium-based contrast agents that were injected into Plaintiff  
21 and that these fictitiously named defendants bear some legal responsibility for the events and  
22 damages set forth herein. This Court has personal jurisdiction over said Defendant under the  
23 doctrine of specific jurisdiction because said Defendant purposefully availed itself of the benefits  
24 and protections of California's laws, and Plaintiff's claim arises out of Defendant's forum-  
25 related activities. Plaintiff will amend this complaint if necessary to show the identity of each  
26 fictitiously named Defendant when they have been ascertained.

27 //

28 //

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1  
2 28. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (diversity  
3 jurisdiction). The amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional minimum of this Court,  
4 exclusive of interest and costs. There is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and  
5 Defendants. Plaintiff is a resident and citizen of and is domiciled in the State of California. As  
6 set forth more fully above, all Defendants are entities organized in states other than the State of  
7 California, all Defendants have their principal place of business in a state other than the State of  
8 California, and none of the Defendants is a citizen or resident of the State of California.

9 29. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants because they supplied,  
10 distributed, shipped, and delivered their GBCAs to healthcare providers throughout the United  
11 States, including, upon information and belief, to Plaintiff’s healthcare providers in the State of  
12 California.

13 30. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants because Defendants have  
14 engaged in continuous, systematic, and substantial business activities in the State of California  
15 including but not limited to the marketing, sale and distribution of their GBCAs throughout the  
16 State of California.

17 31. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a), because  
18 Defendants marketed, advertised, and distributed the GBCAs in this District, Defendants do  
19 substantial business in the State of California and within this District, and Defendants developed,  
20 manufactured, promoted, marketed, tested, researched, distributed, warranted, and sold GBCAs,  
21 including Magnevist, Eovist, and Gadavist in interstate commerce.

22  
23 **NATURE OF ACTION**

24 32. Gadolinium (Gd) is a rare earth metal.

25 33. Gadolinium-based Contrast Agents (“GBCAs”) are chemical compounds that are  
26 introduced into the body prior to an MRI procedure in order to enhance the imaging.

27 34. The instant action arises from Plaintiff’s exposure to Defendants’ GBCA products  
28 by way of having undergone MRI procedures as detailed *infra*.

1 35. Plaintiff's exposure to Defendants' GBCAs has resulted in retention of  
2 Gadolinium in Plaintiff's body, directly and proximately causing Plaintiff to develop Gadolinium  
3 toxicity, manifested by symptoms including brain fog, joint pain and skin problems.

4 36. Plaintiff's development of Gadolinium toxicity has caused Plaintiff pain and  
5 suffering, and mental anguish.

6 37. Plaintiff brings this action, sounding in, *inter alia*, strict products liability,  
7 negligence, and fraud, seeking recovery of compensatory and punitive damages demands a trial  
8 by jury.

9 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND:**

10 **GADOLINIUM AND GADOLINIUM-BASED CONTRAST AGENTS (GBCAs)**

11 38. Gadolinium (Gd) is a chemical element. It sits in the lanthanide metal series of  
12 the periodic table and carries atomic number 64 and a relative atomic mass of 157 u.

13 39. In its natural state, gadolinium exists only in oxidized form as  $Gd^{3+}$ , which is a  
14 cation (an ion with more protons than electrons and hence a positive charge).

15 40. The gadolinium atom contains seven unpaired electrons in its 4f orbit, which is  
16 the highest possible number of unpaired electron spins that an atom can contain.

17 41. These unpaired electrons are what makes gadolinium highly paramagnetic, and  
18 consequently, uniquely effective for use in Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI or MR imaging).

19 42. MR imaging is a medical diagnostic procedure that employs radiofrequency (RF)  
20 waves and a strong magnetic field to temporarily realign protons found in body tissue being  
21 targeted in the particular imaging.

22 43. Once RF is applied, the protons in the body's tissue produce signals captured by a  
23 receiver and are generated into a "picture" of the target area by the MRI machine.

24 44. Prior to the 1980s, magnetic resonance MRI was ordinarily performed in the  
25 clinical setting without the use of contrast agents.

26 45. Eventually, research revealed that introducing a contrast agent into a patient prior  
27 to MRI might safely alter the magnetic properties of target tissues and serve to enhance the  
28 imaging.



1 46. Today, Gadolinium-based Contrast Agents (GBCAs) are the most widely used  
2 contrast agents in MR imaging.

3 47. GBCAs shorten what are called the T1 and T2 “relaxation” times of the target  
4 tissue, with the net result of higher intensity MR signaling and a clearer MR picture. Gadolinium  
5 has the strongest relaxation rate of all the paramagnetic elements.

6 48. But gadolinium is toxic. It does not occur naturally in the body, and it is well  
7 accepted in the medical and scientific community that “free” gadolinium is toxic in biological  
8 systems.

9 49. Because gadolinium cannot be safely introduced into the body by itself, GBCAs  
10 instead are comprised of “chelated” gadolinium—*i.e.*,  $Gd^{3+}$  that is complexed (or “bound”) by a  
11 ligand.

12 50. “Chelate” is Latin for “claw,” and a simple understanding of the nature of  
13 chelated gadolinium is that the ligand serves as a claw holding onto the gadolinium as it passes  
14 through the body.

15 51. Thus, the gadolinium in a GBCA is intended to remain chelated as it passes  
16 through and eventually is eliminated from the body, mainly by the kidneys, after the MRI.

17 52. There are currently nine (9) GBCAs that have been approved by the Food and  
18 Drug Administration (FDA) for use in the United States, and they fall into one of two categories  
19 based on the nature of their chelation: linear or macrocyclic.

20 53. Linear chelates are elongated ligand structures that wrap around the  $Gd^{3+}$  ion, like  
21 a coil around a cylinder. In contrast, macrocyclic chelates are cage-like structures that trap the  
22  $Gd^{3+}$  ion more securely in a center cavity.

23 54. Because of the structure of GBCAs, there is a risk of “de-chelation,” a process  
24 whereby gadolinium can become unbound or freed from its chelate. De-chelation is due in part  
25 to the fact that other substances in the body will “compete” with gadolinium for its chelate,  
26 including zinc, copper, and iron. In fact, the bond in a GBCA can become very weak and  
27 separate very easily in low pH conditions, such as those found in many compartments of the  
28 human body including extracellular fluid spaces.

1           55.     Once de-chelated, the freed, highly reactive cation  $Gd^{3+}$  will immediately—within  
2 femtoseconds—bind to another substance in the body, and there are a variety of substances in the  
3 human body that are available to, and known to bind with, de-chelated  $Gd^{3+}$ , including proteins,  
4 phosphates and other compounds.

5           56.     In short, when de-chelated, gadolinium from GBCAs will bind with, deposit, and  
6 remain in the cells and tissue of various organs in the body.

7           57.     Since as early as 1984, medical and scientific literature have reported on the  
8 deposition of toxic gadolinium in animal tissue.

9           58.     In 1988, Bayer’s Magnevist, a linear GBCA, was the first GBCA to gain FDA  
10 approval for marketing and sale in the United States, and by that time, Bayer was aware of the  
11 evidence of gadolinium deposition in biological systems.

12           59.     September 1989 may have marked the very first report of the retention of toxic  
13 gadolinium in a human, when Tien et al. reported that intracerebral masses “remained enhanced  
14 on MRI images obtained 8 days after injection of gadolinium DTPA dimeglumine (Magnevist).”  
15 *See* Tien, R.D., et al., *Cerebral Erdheim-Chester Disease: persistent enhancement with Gd-*  
16 *DTPA on MR images*, *Radiology*, 1989; Vol. 172, No. 3, p. 791-92. Subsequent chemical  
17 analysis revealed that a high concentration of gadolinium remained in the tissue.

18           60.     In 1993, shortly after FDA’s approval of another linear GBCA, General Electric’s  
19 Omniscan, preclinical safety assessment and pharmacokinetic data were published describing its  
20 pharmacokinetics in rats, rabbits, and cynomolgus monkeys. These studies showed that  
21 quantifiable concentrations of gadolinium were persistent in both the renal cortex and areas  
22 around bone cartilage.

23           61.     Throughout the 1990s, evidence showing retention of gadolinium in human  
24 patients with renal (kidney) insufficiency was mounting, and by 2004, evidence clearly began to  
25 show deposition of gadolinium in human patients *without* compromised renal function.

26           62.     Indeed, by 2004, gadolinium had been shown to be deposited in the resected  
27 femoral heads (bones) of people who had undergone gadolinium MRI studies. Since then,  
28 studies have continued to indicate that gadolinium from GBCAs remains within people’s bodies

1 long after their suggested half-lives.

2 63. Because of their structure, macrocyclic GBCAs are more stable and less prone to  
3 de-chelation—and hence deposition—in the body. Indeed, laboratory (*in vitro*) studies assessing  
4 the stability of various GBCAs in human blood have demonstrated that, over time, greater  
5 percentages of gadolinium are released from linear agents as compared to the macrocyclic  
6 agents.

7 64. As direct consequence of the skyrocketing use of GBCAs in MRI in the 1980s  
8 and 1990s, by the early 2000s, the medical and scientific community began to take note of a  
9 never-before-seen disease that was arising in patients with compromised renal function who had  
10 been exposed to GBCAs.

11 65. The disease is characterized by fibrosis of the skin and/or internal organs.  
12 Initially the condition was called “nephrogenic fibrosing dermopathy,” but eventually came to be  
13 known as it is today: nephrogenic systemic fibrosis, or “NSF.”

14 66. The disease was uncovered and understood only by the attentive clinical  
15 observation and work of dermatologists, nephrologists, and other scientists, who connected the  
16 administration of *linear* GBCAs to this rapidly progressive, debilitating and often fatal condition.

17 67. There were over 500 cases of NSF reported, and it was estimated there were well  
18 over a thousand non-reported cases.

19 68. Eventually, the emergence of NSF prompted the FDA to require GBCA  
20 manufacturers, including all Defendants, to strengthen the class product labeling for GBCAs to  
21 include a “black box” warning, which first went into the labeling in 2007:

22 **WARNING: NEPHROGENIC SYSTEMIC FIBROSIS (NSF)**

23 *See full prescribing information for complete boxed warning.*

24 **Gadolinium-based contrast agents (GBCAs) increase the risk for NSF among**  
25 **patients with impaired elimination of the drugs. Avoid use of GBCAs in these**  
26 **patients unless the diagnostic information is essential and not available with**  
27 **non-contrasted MRI or other modalities.**

28 • **Do not administer Magnevist to patients with:**

o **chronic, severe kidney disease (GFR < 30 mL/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>), or**

1           **o acute kidney injury.**

- 2           • **Screen patients for acute kidney injury and other conditions that may**  
3           **reduce renal function. For patients at risk for chronically reduced renal**  
4           **function (for example, age > 60 years, hypertension, or diabetes), estimate the**  
5           **glomerular filtration rate (GFR) through laboratory testing.**

6           69.     Because of the black box warning and the medical community’s awareness of the  
7           clear causal connection between GBCAs and NSF in renally impaired patients, the incidence of  
8           NSF has all but disappeared, as healthcare practitioners have universally changed MRI  
9           prescription habits.

10          70.     It is now settled in the medical community that GBCAs are a cause of NSF.  
11          Authoritative and reliable medical literature has reported that the relative risk for development of  
12          the disease in renally impaired patients exposed to GBCAs might be as high 41 (a 4,000%  
13          increased risk over baseline) compared to baseline. *See* Wagner, B., et al. *Pathophysiology of*  
14          *gadolinium-associated systemic fibrosis*, Am. J. Physiol. Renal Physiol., 311(1): p. F1-F11  
15          (2016).

16          71.     To be sure, the kidneys play a central role in the body’s clearance of GBCAs, but  
17          the name “nephrogenic” systemic fibrosis is misleading, as there is in fact no evidence that this  
18          systemic fibrotic condition is in any way *caused* by the kidneys.

19          72.     Instead, the kidneys are simply a catalyst, insofar as impaired renal function  
20          results in the body’s prolonged exposure to a GBCA dose from an imaging event.

21          73.     Indeed, by 2017, FDA and industry were forced to acknowledge that gadolinium  
22          retention is not a problem only in patients with renal impairment, but instead, that the evidence is  
23          now unequivocal that GBCA exposure results in gadolinium being retained in the bodies—tissue  
24          and organs, including the skin, bones, liver, and brain—of patients who do not suffer from  
25          clinically diagnosed renal impairment.

26          74.     In September 2017, FDA and the GBCA industry collaborated in an advisory  
27          committee meeting—the Medical Imaging Drugs Advisory Committee (MIDAC)—and the  
28          committee voted thirteen to one in favor of adding statements on the GBCA class product  
29          labeling that would reveal to doctors for the first time that gadolinium can be retained in the

1 body even in patients with healthy kidneys.

2 75. In May 2018, the FDA's and industry's statements were formally issued, and  
3 advised healthcare providers, *inter alia*, that:

4 (j) gadolinium is retained for months or years in brain, bone, skin, and  
5 other organs in patients with normal renal function;

6 (k) the highest concentrations of retained gadolinium are found in bone,  
7 followed by other organs (brain, skin, kidney, liver, and spleen);

8 (l) the duration of gadolinium retention is longest in bone and varies by  
9 organ;

10 (m) retention is greater in patients administered linear GBCAs than in those  
11 administered macrocyclic GBCAs;

12 (n) there have been reports of pathological skin changes in patients with  
13 normal renal function; and

14 (o) there have adverse event reports involving multiple organ systems in  
15 patients with normal renal function.

16 76. However, and notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence of causal association  
17 between GBCAs and NSF, the FDA and the GBCA industry have cast the issue of retention as  
18 separate from the medical community's experience with NSF, coming short of acknowledging  
19 any untoward health effects from gadolinium retention in non-renal patients.

20 77. Indeed, to date, the FDA and the GBCA industry have refused to acknowledge  
21 that GBCAs can cause NSF in renal patients but also can cause, in non-renal patients, a variety  
22 of NSF-like injuries and symptoms along a continuum, ranging from minor to severe.

23 78. Plaintiff, who prior to GBCA exposure had never been diagnosed with kidney  
24 disease or been treated for compromised kidney function, alleges that the injuries Plaintiff  
25 suffered, detailed *infra*, were the direct and proximate result of exposure to Defendants' GBCAs  
26 and were on a NSF-like continuum, and Plaintiff brings this complaint to recover damages for  
27 those injuries.

28 //

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND:**

**PLAINTIFF'S GBCA EXPOSURE AND INJURIES**

79. Upon information and belief, on or around the following dates, Plaintiff was exposed to GBCA-enhanced MRIs over twenty (20) times, including but not limited to the following:

09/17/2010: Magnevist  
MRI Spine  
Radiology Associates MRI of San Luis Obispo  
San Luis Obispo, CA – San Luis Obispo County

12/15/2010: Magnevist  
MRI Spine  
Radiology Associates MRI of San Luis Obispo  
San Luis Obispo, CA – San Luis Obispo County

08/06/2014: Magnevist  
MRI Brain, Cervical Spine, Lumbar Spine, and Thoracic Spine  
Selma Carlson Diagnostic Center  
San Luis Obispo, CA – San Luis Obispo County

05/01/2015: Magnevist  
MRI Brain  
Selma Carlson Diagnostic Center  
San Luis Obispo, CA – San Luis Obispo County

80. Prior to Plaintiff's exposure to Defendants' GBCAs as outlined above, Plaintiff had never been diagnosed with kidney disease or been treated for compromised kidney function.

81. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiff's exposure to Defendants' GBCAs, Plaintiff now suffers from gadolinium toxicity, or Gadolinium Deposition Disease (GDD), as characterized by a multitude of symptoms, ailments, injuries, and adverse health effects that she has suffered and continues to suffer, including but not necessarily limited to: neurological and

1 cognitive issues; body, bone, joint and muscle pain; skin issues including paresthesia and rashes;  
2 and extreme fatigue.

3 **FEDERAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS**

4 82. Upon information and belief, the Defendants have or may have failed to comply  
5 with all federal standards and requirements applicable to the sale of GBCAs including, but not  
6 limited to, violations of various sections and subsections of the United States Code and the Code  
7 of Federal Regulations.

8 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

9 **COUNT I – STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY: FAILURE TO WARN**

10 *(all Defendants)*

11 83. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, each  
12 of the foregoing paragraphs and allegations.

13 84. Defendants' linear GBCAs were manufactured, sold, marketed, distributed,  
14 supplied, and/or placed into the stream of commerce by Defendants and were defective at the  
15 time they left Defendants' control in that the drugs failed to include proper and adequate  
16 warnings, instructions and directions relating to the risks associated with the use of linear  
17 GBCAs.

18 85. Defendants knew or should have known that their products created significant  
19 risks of serious bodily harm to consumers yet Defendants failed to adequately warn consumers  
20 and their healthcare providers of such risks.

21 86. Defendants failed to provide proper and adequate warnings to healthcare  
22 providers and users, including Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers, of the increased risk  
23 of gadolinium retention and resulting injuries associated with linear GBCAs. The defect or  
24 defects made the GBCAs unreasonably dangerous to those persons, such as Plaintiff, who could  
25 reasonably be expected to use and rely upon the product.

26 87. Prescribing physicians, healthcare providers and patients, including Plaintiff and  
27 Plaintiff's healthcare providers, neither knew nor had reason to know at the time of their use of  
28 Defendants' linear GBCAs, of the existence of the lack of proper and adequate warnings.

1           88. Ordinary consumers would not have recognized the potential risks or side effects  
2 for which Defendants failed to include appropriate warnings, and which Defendants concealed,  
3 including the risk of gadolinium retention in multiple organs and tissues (e.g., brain, heart, liver,  
4 kidney, bones, and skin), the resulting fibrosis in organs, bone, and skin, and its tendency to  
5 cross the blood-brain barrier and deposit in the neuronal nuclei of the brain.

6           89. At all times alleged herein, Defendants' linear GBCAs were prescribed to and  
7 used by Plaintiff as intended by Defendants and in a manner reasonably foreseeable to  
8 Defendants. The GBCAs injected into Plaintiff's body were neither misused nor materially  
9 altered.

10           90. Defendants' failure to warn includes but is not limited to failure to warn as to the  
11 following:

- 12                   (a) Failing to adequately and correctly warn the Plaintiff, the public, and  
13                   the medical and healthcare communities of the dangers of their linear  
14                   GBCAs with respect to the risk of gadolinium retention;
- 15                   (b) Failing to disclose their knowledge that gadolinium is retained for  
16                   months to years in several organs;
- 17                   (c) Failing to disclose their knowledge that higher concentrations of  
18                   retained gadolinium are found in bone, followed by organs (brain,  
19                   skin, kidney, liver, and spleen);
- 20                   (d) Failing to disclose their knowledge that gadolinium retention is longest  
21                   in bone and varies by organ;
- 22                   (e) Failing to disclose their knowledge that linear GBCAs cause more  
23                   retention than macrocyclic GBCAs;
- 24                   (f) Failing to disclose their knowledge about adverse event reports  
25                   involving multiple organ systems in patients with normal renal  
26                   function;
- 27                   (g) Failing to disclose their knowledge that certain patients are at higher  
28                   risk of adverse effects from linear GBCAs; and



1 (h) Failing to disclose their knowledge that gadolinium has a tendency to  
2 cross the blood-brain barrier and deposit in the neuronal nuclei of the  
3 brain.

4 91. Had Plaintiff and Plaintiff's medical providers been adequately warned of the  
5 risks associated with their linear GBCAs, Plaintiff would not have used, and/or Plaintiff's  
6 healthcare providers would not have administered, Defendants' linear GBCAs and Plaintiff's  
7 injuries would have been avoided.

8 92. Defendants' failure to warn was a factual and proximate cause of Plaintiff's  
9 injuries and damages as set forth herein.

10 WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, Plaintiff demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor  
11 and against the Defendants for an amount in excess of \$50,000.00 each, compensatory and  
12 punitive damages, incidental and consequential damages, including pain and suffering and  
13 mental anguish, delay damages, attorney's fees and costs of suit in an amount to be determined  
14 upon the trial of this matter.

15 **COUNT II – STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY: DEFECTIVE DESIGN**

16 *(all Defendants)*

17 93. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, each  
18 of the foregoing paragraphs and allegations.

19 94. Defendants' linear GBCAs were manufactured, sold, marketed, distributed,  
20 supplied, and/or placed into the stream of commerce by Defendants and were defective at the  
21 time they left Defendants' control in that the drugs were defective in their design.

22 95. At all times alleged herein, Defendants' linear GBCAs were prescribed to and  
23 used by Plaintiff as intended by Defendants and in a manner reasonably foreseeable to  
24 Defendants. The GBCAs injected into Plaintiff's body were neither misused nor materially  
25 altered.

26 96. Under the "consumer expectation test," Defendants' linear GBCAs are defective  
27 because they failed to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected them to  
28 perform when used in an intended, or unintended but reasonably foreseeable way.

1           97. Under the “risk utility test,” Defendants’ linear GBCAs are defective because a  
2 reasonable person would conclude that the possibility and seriousness of the harm pleaded  
3 herein, *passim*, outweighed the burden or cost of making the product safe.

4           98. Defendants have intentionally and recklessly designed, manufactured, marketed,  
5 labeled, sold and distributed the product with wanton and willful disregard for the rights and  
6 health of Plaintiff and others, and with malice, placing their economic interests above the health  
7 and safety of Plaintiff and others similarly situated.

8           99. Defendants’ GBCAs are inherently dangerous and defective, unfit and unsafe for  
9 their intended and reasonably foreseeable use, and do not meet or perform to the expectations of  
10 consumers.

11           100. The foreseeable risks associated with the design or formulation of linear GBCAs  
12 include, but are not limited to, retention of gadolinium in organs and tissues (e.g., brain, heart,  
13 liver, kidney, bones, and skin), resulting fibrosis in organs, bone, and skin, and gadolinium’s  
14 tendency to cross the blood-brain barrier and deposit in the neuronal nuclei of the brain.

15           101. The foreseeable risks associated with Defendants’ design of linear GBCAs,  
16 including the risks of retention of gadolinium in tissues and organs, outweigh their utility for the  
17 foreseeable uses for which they are prescribed to patients like Plaintiff.

18           102. There are GBCAs on the market, including macrocyclic GBCAs, with safer  
19 alternative designs in that they provide equal or greater efficacy and far less risk.

20           103. These safer alternatives would have prevented or significantly reduce the risk of  
21 injury to Plaintiff, without substantially impairing their utility.

22           104. These safer alternatives were both technologically and economically feasible  
23 when Defendants’ GBCAs left the control of Defendants.

24           105. Defendants’ defective design of their linear GBCAs was a factual and proximate  
25 cause of Plaintiff’s injuries and damages as set forth herein.

26           WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, Plaintiff demands judgment in Plaintiff’s favor  
27 and against the Defendants for an amount in excess of \$50,000.00 each, compensatory and  
28 punitive damages, incidental and consequential damages, including pain and suffering and

1 mental anguish, delay damages, attorney's fees and costs of suit in an amount to be determined  
2 upon the trial of this matter.

3 **COUNT III—NEGLIGENCE**

4 *(all Defendants)*

5 106. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, each  
6 of the foregoing paragraphs and allegations.

7 107. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants had a duty to exercise reasonable care to  
8 consumers, including Plaintiff and Plaintiff's prescribing physician, herein, in the design,  
9 development, manufacture, testing, inspection, packaging, promotion, marketing, distribution,  
10 labeling, and/or sale of their linear GBCAs, and post-marketing vigilance regarding same.

11 108. Defendants knew or should have known that injecting their linear GBCAs into the  
12 bodies of patients created an unreasonable risk of dangerous side effects, including gadolinium  
13 retention and resultant injuries, such as those suffered here by Plaintiff.

14 109. Defendants breached their duty of reasonable care to Plaintiff in that they  
15 negligently designed, developed, promoted, marketed, distributed, continued to sell, and/or  
16 labeled their linear GBCAs, including but not limited to the following conduct:

- 17 (a) In the design, development, research, manufacture, testing, packaging,  
18 promotion, marketing, sale, and/or distribution of their linear GBCAs;
- 19 (b) In failing to adequately or correctly warn Plaintiff, the public, and the  
20 medical and healthcare communities, including Plaintiff's healthcare  
21 providers, of the dangerous and defective characteristics of their linear  
22 GBCAs;
- 23 (c) In the design, development, implementation, administration,  
24 supervision, and/or monitoring of clinical trials for their linear GBCAs;
- 25 (d) In promoting their linear GBCAs in an overly aggressive, deceitful, and  
26 fraudulent manner, despite evidence of their defective and dangerous  
27 characteristics in causing irreversible gadolinium retention in multiple  
28 organs (brain, heart, liver, kidney, bones, and skin), resulting in fibrosis

1 in organs, bone, and skin, and its tendency to cross the blood-brain  
2 barrier and deposit in the neuronal nuclei of the brain;

3 (e) In representing that linear GBCAs were safe for their intended use  
4 when, in fact, the drugs were unsafe for their intended use;

5 (f) In failing to perform appropriate pre-market and post-market testing of  
6 their linear GBCAs;

7 (g) In failing to perform appropriate post-market safety surveillance of  
8 their linear GBCAs;

9 (h) In failing to take post-market actions to protect and/or warn consumers  
10 about the risks of linear GBCAs; and

11 (i) In failing to disclose reports of gadolinium retention associated with  
12 their linear GBCAs to medical providers and consumers.

13 110. Defendants knew or should have known that consumers, such as Plaintiff, would  
14 foreseeably suffer injury as a result of Defendants' failure to exercise reasonable and ordinary  
15 care.

16 111. Defendants' negligence was a factual cause of Plaintiff's injuries and damages as  
17 set forth herein.

18 WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, Plaintiff demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor  
19 and against the Defendants for an amount in excess of \$50,000.00 each, compensatory and  
20 punitive damages, incidental and consequential damages, including pain and suffering and  
21 mental anguish, delay damages, attorney's fees and costs of suit in an amount to be determined  
22 upon the trial of this matter.

23 **COUNT IV—BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY**

24 *(all Defendants)*

25 112. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, each  
26 of the foregoing paragraphs and allegations.

27 113. Through their product labeling, marketing, advertising, promotion, and  
28 educational efforts, including but not limited to creation and control of various aspects of the

1 peer-reviewed medical and scientific literature, Defendants expressly warranted to Plaintiff and  
2 the healthcare community that linear GBCAs are safe and fit for their intended uses.

3 114. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers read and relied upon Defendants'  
4 express warranties.

5 115. Defendants breached said warranties by delivering to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's  
6 healthcare providers linear GBCAs that did not conform to said express warranties, insofar as  
7 they are not safe or fit for their intended uses and may produce serious side effects.

8 116. Defendants' breach of said express warranties was a factual cause of Plaintiff's  
9 injuries and damages as set forth herein.

10 WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, Plaintiff demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor  
11 and against the Defendants for an amount in excess of \$50,000.00 each, compensatory and  
12 punitive damages, incidental and consequential damages, including pain and suffering and  
13 mental anguish, delay damages, attorney's fees and costs of suit in an amount to be determined  
14 upon the trial of this matter.

15 **COUNT V—BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY**

16 *(all Defendants)*

17 117. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, each  
18 of the foregoing paragraphs and allegations.

19 118. Defendants developed, designed, formulated, tested, packaged, labeled, produced,  
20 created, marketed, advertised, distributed, and sold their linear GBCAs as safe for use by the  
21 public at large, including Plaintiff, who purchased these drugs.

22 119. Defendants knew the use for which their linear GBCAs were intended and  
23 impliedly warranted their linear GBCAs to be of merchantable quality, safe, and fit for a  
24 particular purpose.

25 120. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers relied on the skill and judgment of  
26 Defendants, and as such, their implied warranties, in using Defendants' linear GBCAs.

27 121. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers used Defendants' linear GBCAs for  
28 the ordinary purposes for which they were indicated for use and pursuant to Defendants'

1 instructions, labeling, and guidance.

2 122. Defendants' linear GBCAs were defective and not of merchantable quality or safe  
3 or fit for their intended use.

4 123. Specifically, Defendants' linear GBCAs are unreasonably dangerous,  
5 unmerchantable, and unfit for the ordinary purpose for which they are intended and were used  
6 because they cause injuries, including but not limited to, retention of gadolinium in organs and  
7 tissues (e.g., brain, heart, liver, kidney, bones, and skin), resulting in fibrosis in organs, bone, and  
8 skin, and gadolinium's tendency to cross the blood-brain barrier and deposit in the neuronal  
9 nuclei of the brain, and foreseeable risks, which Defendants knew or should have known.

10 124. Defendants had reason to know that Plaintiff would purchase their linear GBCAs  
11 for the purpose of diagnostic imaging.

12 125. Defendants had reason to know that Plaintiff would rely on Defendants' skill or  
13 judgment to furnish and produce linear GBCAs in a safe and appropriate manner.

14 126. Defendants breached said implied warranties by delivering to Plaintiff and  
15 Plaintiff's healthcare providers linear GBCAs that did not conform to said implied warranties,  
16 insofar as they are not safe or fit for their intended uses and may produce serious side effects.

17 127. Defendants' breach of said implied warranties was a factual cause of Plaintiff's  
18 injuries and damages as set forth herein.

19 WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, Plaintiff demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor  
20 and against the Defendants for an amount in excess of \$50,000.00 each, compensatory and  
21 punitive damages, incidental and consequential damages, including pain and suffering and  
22 mental anguish, delay damages, attorney's fees and costs of suit in an amount to be determined  
23 upon the trial of this matter.

24 **COUNT VI—NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION**

25 *(all Defendants)*

26 128. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, each  
27 of the foregoing paragraphs and allegations.

28 129. Through their product labeling, marketing, advertising, promotion, and

1 educational efforts, including but not limited to creation and control of various aspects of the  
2 peer-reviewed medical and scientific literature, Defendants have consistently represented that  
3 their linear GBCAs are safe and that linear GBCAs do not pose health risks to patients with  
4 normal renal function.

5 130. At all times relevant hereto, said representations of material facts were false, and  
6 Defendants made said misrepresentations negligently and without any reasonable ground to  
7 believe in their truth.

8 131. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers were  
9 unaware of the falsity of these statements but reasonably believed them to be true.

10 132. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants made said misrepresentations with the  
11 intent to induce reliance on them.

12 133. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers relied on Defendants'  
13 misrepresentations in prescribing and using Defendants' linear GBCAs.

14 134. Defendants' negligent misrepresentations were a factual cause of Plaintiff's  
15 injuries and damages as set forth herein.

16 WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, Plaintiff demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor  
17 and against the Defendants for an amount in excess of \$50,000.00 each, compensatory and  
18 punitive damages, incidental and consequential damages, including pain and suffering and  
19 mental anguish, delay damages, attorney's fees and costs of suit in an amount to be determined  
20 upon the trial of this matter.

21 **COUNT VII—FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION**

22 *(all Defendants)*

23 135. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, each  
24 of the foregoing paragraphs and allegations.

25 136. Through their product labeling, marketing, advertising, promotion, and  
26 educational efforts, including but not limited to creation and control of various aspects of the  
27 peer-reviewed medical and scientific literature, Defendants have consistently represented that  
28 their linear GBCAs are safe and that linear GBCAs do not pose health risks to patients with

1 normal renal function.

2 137. At all times relevant hereto, said representations were of material facts and were  
3 false, and Defendants made said misrepresentations fraudulently and intentionally and with the  
4 intent of misleading Plaintiff, Plaintiff's healthcare providers, and the medical community.

5 138. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers were  
6 unaware of the falsity of these statements but reasonably believed them to be true.

7 139. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants made said misrepresentations with the  
8 intent to induce reliance on them.

9 140. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers relied on Defendants'  
10 misrepresentations in prescribing and using Defendants' linear GBCAs.

11 141. Defendants' fraudulent and intentional misrepresentations were a factual cause of  
12 Plaintiff's injuries and damages as set forth herein.

13 WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, Plaintiff demands judgment in Plaintiff's favor  
14 and against the Defendants for an amount in excess of \$50,000.00 each, compensatory and  
15 punitive damages, incidental and consequential damages, including pain and suffering and  
16 mental anguish, delay damages, attorney's fees and costs of suit in an amount to be determined  
17 upon the trial of this matter.

18 **TOLLING: FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT,**

19 **DISCOVERY RULE, AND EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL**

20 **Fraudulent Concealment**

21 142. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants knew or should have known that linear  
22 GBCAs posed the risk of retention and harmful health effects outlined herein, that macrocyclic  
23 agents are more stable and thus safer, and that systemic fibrotic symptoms and injuries occur in  
24 GBCA-exposed patients irrespective of renal function.

25 143. At all times before Summer 2018, Defendants made misrepresentations and  
26 omissions that concealed from Plaintiff material facts that would have permitted Plaintiff to file  
27 this action for injuries sooner.

28 144. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's healthcare providers relied upon Defendants'



1 misrepresentations and omissions.

2 145. Said reliance prevented Plaintiff from learning or discovering facts that would  
3 lead a reasonably prudent person to make inquiry or assert available legal claims, including those  
4 set forth in the instant complaint, sooner than Plaintiff was in fact able.

5 146. As a result, any statute of limitations applicable to this action was tolled, and did  
6 not begin to run, until at least Summer 2018.

7 **Discovery Rule**

8 147. Plaintiff did not possess facts sufficient to put Plaintiff on notice that the wrongs,  
9 acts, and omissions set forth herein had been committed until at the very earliest, Summer 2018.

10 148. Plaintiff did not know of the claims, and their underlying facts, asserted in this  
11 complaint, nor could any reasonable prudent person have known of such claims, until at the very  
12 earliest, Summer 2018.

13 149. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff exercised reasonable diligence in  
14 investigating potential causes of Plaintiff's injuries, but no information gave Plaintiff a reason to  
15 suspect, or reasonably should have given Plaintiff a reason to suspect, that Defendants' products  
16 or tortious conduct were the cause of such injuries until at the very earliest, Summer 2018.

17 150. Regardless of the exercise of any reasonable diligence, Plaintiff did not know, nor  
18 reasonably should have known, that Plaintiff suffered injuries and that Plaintiff's injuries had  
19 been caused by Defendants' conduct until at the very earliest, Summer 2018.

20 151. Plaintiff neither suspected nor knew of Defendants' wrongdoings as alleged in  
21 this complaint until at the very earliest, Summer 2018.

22 152. In sum, Plaintiff was reasonably unaware, and had no reasonable way of knowing,  
23 that Plaintiff's injuries described herein were caused by Defendants' conduct until at the very  
24 earliest, Summer 2018.

25 153. As a result, any statute of limitations applicable to this action was tolled, and did  
26 not begin to run, until at least Summer 2018.

27 //

28 //

1                    **Equitable Estoppel**

2                    154. Due to their concealment as set forth *supra*, Defendants are equitably estopped  
3 from invoking any statute of limitations as a time bar to Plaintiff's complaint.

4  
5                    **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6                    WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully demands judgment against all Defendants and each  
7 of them, individually, jointly and severally, and request compensatory damages, together with  
8 interest, cost of suit, attorneys' fees, and all such other relief as the Court deems just and proper  
9 as well as:

- 10                    A)    compensatory damages for past, present, and future damages, including, but not  
11                    limited to, great pain and suffering and emotional distress and anguish, for  
12                    personal injuries sustained by Plaintiff, health and medical care costs, together  
13                    with interest and costs as provided by law;
- 14                    B)    for all ascertainable economic and non-economic damages in an amount as  
15                    provided by law and to be supported by evidence at trial;
- 16                    C)    for specific damages according to proof;
- 17                    D)    for Punitive and Exemplary damages according to proof;
- 18                    E)    for pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest as allowed by law;
- 19                    F)    for reasonable attorneys' fees;
- 20                    G)    for the costs of these proceedings; and
- 21                    H)    for such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

22  
23 //  
24 //  
25 //  
26 //  
27 //  
28 //

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

In addition to the above, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury for all causes of action and issues that can be tried by a jury.

DATED this 13th day of May, 2019.

**GOMEZ TRIAL ATTORNEYS**

By: /s/ Kristen K. Barton  
John H. Gomez  
Kristen K. Barton  
655 West Broadway, Suite 1700  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 237-3490  
Fax: (619) 237-3496  
Email: [john@thegomezfirm.com](mailto:john@thegomezfirm.com)  
[kbarton@thegomezfirm.com](mailto:kbarton@thegomezfirm.com)

**LITTLEPAGE BOOTH LECKMAN**

Zoe B. Littlepage  
T. Matthew Leckman  
1912 W. Main St.  
Houston, TX 77098  
Tel: (713) 529-8000  
Fax: (713) 529-8044  
Email: [zoe@littlepagebooth.com](mailto:zoe@littlepagebooth.com)  
[matt@leckmanlaw.com](mailto:matt@leckmanlaw.com)

*Attorney for Plaintiff Cheryl Mahnke*

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-CAND 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

CHERYL MAHNKE

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Luis Obispo County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) John H. Gomez, Kristen K. Barton Gomez Trial Attorneys 655 W Broadway, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 237-3490

DEFENDANTS

BAYER CORPORATION; BAYER HEALTHCARE LLC; BAYER HEALTHCARE PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.; MCKESSON CORPORATION; MCKESSON MEDICAL-SURGICAL, INC.; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 2 U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, HABEAS CORPUS, OTHER, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation-Transfer 8 Multidistrict Litigation-Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C. § 1332

Brief description of cause: Diversity Jurisdiction

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, Fed. R. Civ. P. DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: X Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY (See instructions):

JUDGE Hon. Judge Donato

DOCKET NUMBER 3:18-cv-04146

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil Local Rule 3-2)

(Place an "X" in One Box Only) X SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND SAN JOSE EUREKA-MCKINLEYVILLE

DATE 05/13/2019

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Kristen K. Barton

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS-CAND 44

**Authority For Civil Cover Sheet.** The JS-CAND 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the “defendant” is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section “(see attachment).”
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an “X” in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
- (1) United States plaintiff. Jurisdiction based on 28 USC §§ 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
  - (2) United States defendant. When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an “X” in this box.
  - (3) Federal question. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
  - (4) Diversity of citizenship. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS-CAND 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an “X” in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin.** Place an “X” in one of the six boxes.
- (1) Original Proceedings. Cases originating in the United States district courts.
  - (2) Removed from State Court. Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 USC § 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
  - (3) Remanded from Appellate Court. Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
  - (4) Reinstated or Reopened. Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
  - (5) Transferred from Another District. For cases transferred under Title 28 USC § 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
  - (6) Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 USC § 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
  - (8) Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. Check this box when a multidistrict litigation case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. Please note that there is no Origin Code 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC § 553. Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an “X” in this box if you are filing a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS-CAND 44 is used to identify related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- IX. Divisional Assignment.** If the Nature of Suit is under Property Rights or Prisoner Petitions or the matter is a Securities Class Action, leave this section blank. For all other cases, identify the divisional venue according to Civil Local Rule 3-2: “the county in which a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred or in which a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated.”
- Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.