September 17, 2019

Honorable Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye
and Honorable Associate Justices
Supreme Court of California
Earl Warren Building
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102-4797

       Supreme Court of California Case No. S257378

Dear Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye and Associate Justices:

The American Association for Justice ("AAJ") urges this Court to grant Elisha Echevarria’s Petition for Review of the decision by the Court of Appeal of the State of California, reported at (2019) 37 Cal.App.5th 292. AAJ has studied and fully agrees with the letter brief submitted by the Consumer Attorneys of California ("CAOC") in support of the Petition. Based on its nationwide perspective, AAJ wishes to expand upon the need for this Court’s review of the lower court’s narrow application of this Court’s landmark decision in *T.H. v. Novartis Pharm. Corp.*, (2017) 4 Cal.5th 145 ("Novartis").

**Interest of the American Association for Justice as Amicus Curiae**

The American Association for Justice ("AAJ") is a national, voluntary bar association established in 1946 to strengthen the civil justice system, preserve the right to trial by jury, and protect access to the courts for those who have been wrongfully injured. With members in the United States, Canada, and abroad, AAJ is the world’s largest plaintiff trial bar. AAJ’s members primarily represent plaintiffs in personal injury actions, employment rights cases, consumer cases, and other civil actions, including in California. Throughout its more than 70-year history, AAJ has served as a leading advocate for the right of all Americans to seek legal recourse for wrongful conduct.

AAJ and CAOC filed a joint brief as amici curiae in *Novartis*. AAJ is concerned that the court of appeal’s decision in this case failed to follow this Court’s precedential lead.
Why this Court Should Grant Review

AAJ fully agrees with the CAOC letter brief that review in this case is required (1) to guide lower courts as to the proper scope of this Court’s Novartis decision, (2) to instruct against improperly weighing evidence and assessing credibility in violation of the constitutionally inviolate right to trial by jury, and (3) to provide lower courts with the proper standard of review of jury awards of punitive damages. AAJ is particularly concerned that the first issue requires added guidance from this Court.

In Novartis, this Court moved the law of product liability law a significant step forward. See, e.g., McNair v. Johnson & Johnson, 241 W. Va. 26, 818 S.E.2d 852, 870 (2018) (Workman, C.J., dissenting) (calling Novartis “persuasive and indicative of the concepts this Court should espouse”); Sijin Choi, It Is Emphatically the Province and Duty of State Courts to Say What Tort Law Is, 87 Fordham L. Rev. 2213, 2223 (2019) (noting this Cour.’s “well-reasoned” decision in Novartis). This Court held in Novartis that the manufacturer of a name-brand pharmaceutical could be liable for the failure of another company, manufacturing a generic version of the drug, to warn of known dangers. 4 Cal.5th at 180 & 191 (affirming Conte v. Wyeth, Inc., (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 89, 85 Cal.Rptr.3d 299).

In this case, the court of appeal dismissed Plaintiff’s reliance on Novartis, stating that “the Novartis court’s reasoning and analysis are inextricably tied to the ‘distinctive legal framework governing labeling for brand-name and generic pharmaceuticals.’” 37 Cal.App.5th at 317 (quoting Novartis, 4 Cal.5th at 156). However, this Court in Novartis did not hold that the duty to warn arose only out of the FDA’s prescription drug regulations. Rather, this Court ruled that the relationship between the name-brand manufacturer and the generic manufacturer under those regulations was such that it was clearly foreseeable that the name-brand manufacturer’s negligence in failing to warn of known dangers would result in harm to consumers of the generic manufacturer’s product. Novartis, 4 Cal.5th at 177-78. Here, the lower court made no similar inquiry into whether the relationship between Johnson & Johnson and its wholly-owned subsidiary Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. was such that the parent company’s failure to warn of dangers associated with Johnson’s Baby Powder would foreseeably harm consumers like Eva Echevarria.

Secondly, the portion of the Novartis holding relied upon by the court of appeal in this case was this Court’s holding that “[l]iability may continue even after the original drug maker sells its rights in the brand-name drug to a successor.” 37 Cal.App.5th at 317 (citing Novartis, 4 Cal.5th at 156). But that portion of this Court’s holding had nothing to do with the FDA’s regulations or with prescription drugs. As Justice Corrigan pointed out, the majority’s decision “would extend indefinitely a drug manufacturer’s duty to warn the customers of its successor, even after sale of the product line. No special feature of FDA law or practice warrants this rule.” Novartis, 4 Cal.5th at 193 (Corrigan, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (citing out-of-state decisions involving non-pharmaceutical products).
Finally, even if this Court’s decision in *Novartis* is not controlling outside the context of brand-name and generic prescription drugs, the court of appeal in this case failed to heed this Court’s guidance. In determining whether a duty to warn should be imposed, this Court instructed that a careful assessment is required:

[W]e balance a number of considerations, including “the foreseeability of harm to the plaintiff, the degree of certainty that the plaintiff suffered injury, the closeness of the connection between the defendant’s conduct and the injury suffered, the moral blame attached to the defendant’s conduct, the policy of preventing future harm, the extent of the burden to the defendant and consequences to the community of imposing a duty to exercise care with resulting liability for breach, and the availability, cost, and prevalence of insurance for the risk involved.”


The first three factors focus on the important element of foreseeability; the remaining four focus on public policy. *Id.* at 165. This Court in *Novartis* concluded that the *Rowland* factors supported recognition of a duty in that case. In this case, not only did the court of appeal dismiss *Novartis* as inapplicable, but the court made no independent assessment of the *Rowland* factors in the circumstances presented here.

**Conclusion**

For these reasons, AAJ asks this Court to grant the Petition for Review.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey R. White
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