	Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 1 of 12				
	PETER D. DURNEY, ESQ. Nevada State Bar No. 57 DURNEY & BRENNAN, LTD.				
	190 W. Huffaker Ln., Ste. 406 Reno, NV 89511				
4	(775) 322-2923				
5	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
8	BRENDA HESS,)				
9	Plaintiff,				
10	vs.) Case No.				
	FRANCK'S LAB, INC., doing) business as FRANCK'S)				
12	COMPOUNDING LAB; PAUL W.) FRANCK; ANTHONY JAMES)				
13	CAMPBELL; and DOES 1 through) 10, inclusive,				
14	Defendants.				
15)				
16	COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND				
17	COMES NOW Plaintiff BRENDA HESS, by and through her counsel of				
18	record, Peter D. Durney, Esq., of the law offices of Durney &				
	Brennan, Ltd., and for causes of action against the Defendants, and				
	each of them, alleges:				
21	JURISDICTION & PARTIES				
22	1. This is an action for personal injuries arising from a				
2.1	defective product. This Court has diversity jurisdiction as this				
25	is a controversy between parties of diverse citizenship and an				
	amount in controversy that exceeds \$75,000 pursuant to the				
26 27	provisions of 42 U.S.C. §1332.				
27 28	2. Plaintiff, BRENDA HESS, is a citizen of Reno, Nevada.				
28 Law Offices of DURNEY & BRENNAN, LTD. 190 W. Huffaker Ln., Ste. 406 Reno, Nevada 89511 (775) 322-2923	3. Defendant, FRANCK'S LAB, INC., dba FRANCK'S COMPOUNDING				

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 2 of 12

1 LAB is a corporation incorporated under the laws of Florida with its 2 principal place of business in the State of Florida and selling 3 compounded or formulated products for utilization in the medical 4 field, including Brilliant Blue-G ("BBG") dye; Triamcinolone ("TMC") 5 and Avastin.

6 4. Defendant, PAUL W. FRANCK is a citizen of the State of
7 Florida, is a principal and shareholder of defendant FRANCK'S LAB
8 INC. and was involved in the management and operations of FRANCK'S
9 LAB, INC., and direction the manner in which BBG, TMC and Avastin
10 were compounded in the laboratory.

11 5. Defendant, ANTHONY JAMES CAMPBELL, is a citizen of the 12 State of Florida, was a lead chemist with FRANCK'S LAB, INC. and 13 had responsibility for overseeing the laboratory operations and 14 assuring compliance with the rules, laws and regulations concerning 15 compounding pharmacies, including the federal rules and regulations 16 concerning the manufacture, sale and distribution of drugs, 17 including BBC, TMC and Avastin.

18 6. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10 are 19 unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Plaintiff is informed and 20 believes and thereon alleges that these DOE defendants are in 21 someway liable for the events referred to in this Complaint and 22 caused damage to Plaintiff. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint 23 when their identities and relationship to his injuries are 24 discovered. Does 1 through 10 and not citizens of the State of 25 Nevada or corporations with their principal place of business in the 26 State of Nevada.

27 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all time herein
28 mentioned, the defendants, and each of them, were the agents,

- 2 -

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 3 of 12

1 servants, employees, joint venturers, and partners of each other and 2 at all times were acting within the course and scope of said 3 relationships.

8. Venue is proper in this district and in this, the
unofficial northern division thereof, because Plaintiff is a citizen
in this district, the tort occurred in this district and the
Defendants were doing business in this district at the time of the
injury.

9

10

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(FOR PRODUCT LIABILITY - NEGLIGENCE)

9. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-8
as though fully set forth herein.

13 On November 22, 2011, Plaintiff underwent a vitrectomy 10. 14 procedure on her right eye performed by Dr. Steven Friedlander at 15 the Northern Nevada Medical Center located at 2375 E. Prater Way in 16 Sparks, Nevada. During the procedure, Dr. Friedlander injected 17 Plaintiff's eye with BBG, the product the Defendants formulated, 18 manufactured, compounded, marketed and sold as an appropriate 19 product to be utilized in such procedure. The Defendants 20 represented that BBG was pure, sterile, and fit for the represented 21 purpose of assisting in procedures like vitrectomies and the product 22 could be injected into an eyeball in order to assist the doctor in 23 achieving the desired result.

11. Plaintiff's condition worsened after the November 15, procedure, and she lost her vision and use of her right eye. 12. Plaintiff was advised that numerous other patients who were injected with BBG had suffered similar complications. Plaintiff was further advised that the sudden, unexpected and plaintiff was further advised that the sudden, unexpected and plaintiff was further advised that the sudden.

- 3 -

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 4 of 12

1 unusual number of patients who developed the same or similar 2 complications led to an investigation by the doctor, the Federal 3 Drug Enforcement Agency (FDA) and others which concluded that all 4 of the patients who suffered these complications due to BBG which 5 was negligently manufactured.

6 13. The investigation by numerous state, county and federal 7 health agencies concluded that the Defendants' BBG product was 8 negligently manufactured and that the Defendants had violated 9 numerous federal rules and regulations. On July 9, 2012, the United 10 States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") issued a Warning Letter 11 FLA-12-38, which advised PAUL W. FRANCK and FRANCK'S LAB, INC., 12 that:

- a. The subject BBG was adulterated within the meaning
 of Section 501(a)(1) of the Act [21 U.S.C.§ 351
 (a)(1)] and that it was contaminated with filthy,
 putrid or decomposed substances;
- b. The BBG was adulterated within the meaning of Section 501(c) of the Act [21 U.S.C.§ 351 (c)] in that its strength different from, or its purity or quality fell below, that which is purported to possess;

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

c. The BBG and all sterile drugs compounded by the Defendants were adulterated under Section 501(a)(2)(A) of the Act [21 U.S.C.§ 351 (a)(2)(A)] in that they were prepared, packed and stored under unsanitary conditions whereby they may have been contaminated by filth;

d. The BBG was misbranded within the meaning of Section

- 4 -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

502(a) of the Act [21 U.S.C.§ 352 (a)] because their labeling was false and misleading;

e. The FDA investigators observed numerous instances of unsanitary and inappropriate practices by compounding technicians who left and re-entered clean rooms without changing lab coats, who were touching non-sterile items while wearing their sterile gloves and then returned to compounding activities, etc.; and

f. The BBG drug products were misbranded insofar as they were labeled as being sterile, and they contained filthy, putrid, or decomposed substances.

13 14. The Defendants knew that failing to follow safe and 14 appropriate compounding practices could result in complications, 15 including fatal ones. In 2009, the Defendants compounded cocktails 16 that were given to prized polo horses from the Venezuelan-owned 17 Lechuza Caracas team in preparation for championship matches near 18 West Palm Beach, Florida. Twenty-one of these prized polo horses 19 died from errors committed by the Defendants in compounding these 20 cocktails.

21 15. The FDA investigation following the incident with the polo 22 horses led the agency to conclude that the Defendants were mixing 23 brews outside of federal guidelines and were utilizing drugs that 24 had not been approved for use in the United States.

16. Tragic complications of the patients who ended up receiving injections of the contaminated BBG are just one example of the problems in the largely unregulated area of compounding pharmacies. Recently, hundreds of patients who underwent steroid

- 5 -

1 injections were stricken with meningitis due to the contamination
2 of the steroid fluid.

3 17. The Defendants owed a duty of reasonable care to Plaintiff 4 to design, compound, manufacture, market, sell and distribute the 5 BBG in a condition that was safe for its intended purpose and consistent with the representations that it was a sterile product. 6 7 The Defendants' duty included a duty to insure that the product did 8 not cause patients who were injected with BBG in their eye to suffer 9 from unreasonable risks of injury from the product, especially in 10 light of the fact that it is known that infections in the eye are 11 extremely difficult to treat.

12 18. Defendants breached their duty to Plaintiff in the 13 testing, design, compounding, manufacturing, packaging, storing, 14 warnings, marketing, advertising, promotion and distribution of BBG 15 and otherwise failed to exercise ordinary care to avoid the risk of 16 infection and harm.

17 19. The Defendants knew prior to the date of Plaintiff's 18 surgery of November 22, 2011, that their dye was contaminated, non-19 sterile and unfit to be used in eye surgery procedures; posed an 20 unreasonably dangerous risk of infection and they failed to do 21 anything to recall the product from the market or warn the medical 22 community and the public of the substantial risk of serious 23 complications.

24 20. The Defendants recklessly and wantonly conducted their 25 laboratory compounding practices in clear violation of applicable 26 federal law and allowed such filthy and inappropriate conditions to 27 exist to the point that it was all but certain that the drugs they 28 were compounding were going to be contaminated.

- 6 -

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 7 of 12

1 21. The Defendants knew that the patients who were going to 2 be injected with their BBG were at risk for developing serious 3 injuries and complications but they nevertheless continued with 4 their practices in conscious disregard of the health and safety of 5 the ultimate consumes of BBG.

6 As a direct, proximate and legal result of the negligence, 22. carelessness, recklessness and other wrongdoing actions of the 7 8 Defendants, and each of them as described herein, Plaintiff BRENDA 9 HESS sustained general damages from debilitating and painful 10 injuries including blindness of her right eye and was required to 11 undergo additional invasive surgeries and procedures, all to no 12 avail, causing her additional pain, suffering, anxiety, worry and 13 depression. Plaintiff has also incurred and is likely to incur in 14 the future, special damages for medical, hospital and related 15 services in an amount to be established at the time of trial.

16 23. The Defendant's conduct was so reckless, malicious, 17 oppressive, fraudulent and despicable and carried on with a willful 18 and conscious disregard for the safety of the patients who were 19 likely to be injected with BBG. Therefore, punitive damages should 20 be imposed upon the Defendants, and each of them, by way of an 21 example and to punish such conduct in an amount to be determined by 22 the trier of fact.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

23

24

(FOR STRICT LIABILITY)

25 24. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-23
26 as though fully set forth herein.

27 25. The subject BBG was defective in its compounding and 28 manufacture since it was different from the manufacturer's intended

- 7 -

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 8 of 12

1 result as set forth on the packaging and related material that 2 accompanied the product, specifically that the product was sterile 3 and free of any contamination. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the batch of the product that included the BBG that was 4 5 injected into her eye was defective in compounding and manufacture 6 in that it differed from other batches of BBG from these Defendants. 7 26. The defect in the compounding and manufacture of the 8 product, specifically the contamination and non-sterile nature of 9 the product, existed in the product when it left the possession of 10 the Defendants.

11 27. The defect in the compounding and manufacture of the BBG 12 resulted in complications to the Plaintiff's procedure and blindness 13 in her right eye.

14 28. The use of this contaminated BBG, by the Plaintiff or by 15 her physician during her procedure, was completely foreseeable by 16 the Defendants and each of them since the Plaintiff's doctor was 17 utilizing the product as intended by the Defendants and the medical 18 community.

19 29. The BBG injected into the Plaintiff's eye failed to 20 perform as safely and reasonably as a consumer would expect when 21 used as intended.

30. As a direct, proximate and legal result of the strict aliability and other wrongdoing actions of the Defendants, and each of them as described herein, Plaintiff BRENDA HESS suffered general damages from debilitating and painful injuries including blindness of her right eye and was required to undergo additional invasive surgeries and procedures, all to no avail, causing her additional pain, suffering, anxiety, worry and depression. Plaintiff has also

- 8 -

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 9 of 12

1 incurred and is likely to incur in the future, special damages for 2 medical, hospital and related services in an amount to be 3 established at the time of trial.

4 31. The Defendant's conduct was so reckless, malicious, 5 oppressive, fraudulent and despicable and carried on with a willful 6 and conscious disregard for the safety of the patients who were 7 likely to be injected with BBG. Therefore, punitive damages should 8 be imposed upon the Defendants, and each of them, by way of an 9 example and to punish such conduct in an amount to be determined by 10 the trier of fact.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

11

12

(FOR STRICT LIABILITY - FAILURE TO WARN)

13 32. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-31
14 as though fully set forth herein.

15 33. The BBG which was injected into Plaintiff's eye on 16 November 22, 2011, was defective in that there was no warning on the 17 product that it was, or could be, contaminated with filth or foreign 18 matter.

19 34. The Defendants, and each of them, knew that doctors would 20 utilize their BBG relying on the representations of the Defendants 21 that the product was sterile and that they would have no reason to 22 believe that the product was not sterile and, in fact the Defendants 23 knew, or reasonably should have known based upon their background 24 and experience, that a contaminated dye to be injected into the eye 25 could cause serious and debilitating injuries, including blindness 26 of the injected eye.

27 35. As a direct, proximate and legal result of the failure to 28 warn and other wrongdoing actions of the Defendants, and each of

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 10 of 12

1 them as described herein, Plaintiff BRENDA HESS suffered general 2 damages from debilitating and painful injuries including blindness 3 of her right eye and was required to undergo additional invasive 4 surgeries and procedures, all to no avail, causing her additional 5 pain, suffering, anxiety, worry and depression. Plaintiff has also 6 incurred and is likely to incur in the future, special damages for 7 medical, hospital and related services in an amount to be 8 established at the time of trial.

9 36. Plaintiff understands that the Defendants were aware of 10 the problems with their BBG prior to November 22, 2011, yet failed 11 to recall the product, issue warnings to the medical community or 12 otherwise do anything to avert this contaminated product being 13 injected into the eye of patients like the Plaintiff.

14 37. The conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, was 15 reckless, malicious, fraudulent and depressive and so despicable and 16 contemptible that punitive damages should be awarded by the trier 17 of fact.

18

19

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(FOR BREACH OF WARRANTY)

38. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-37
as though fully set forth herein.

39. The Defendants represented and warranted to Plaintiff
through the medical community that their BBG dye was safe and
effective to be utilized in conjunction with eye surgery.

40. The subject BBG dye product that was utilized in the Plaintiff's eye procedure was, in fact, not inconsistent with the warranties and representations of the Defendants but, instead, was non-sterile and contaminated that caused Plaintiff serious and

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 11 of 12

1 permanent injuries as further set further herein.

2	41.	As a direct, proximate and legal result of the breach of
3	warranty	and other wrongdoing actions of the Defendants, and each
4	of them as	s described herein, Plaintiff BRENDA HESS suffered general
5	damages f	rom debilitating and painful injuries including blindness
6	of her ri	ght eye and was required to undergo additional invasive
7	surgeries	and procedures, all to no avail, causing her additional
8	pain, suf:	fering, anxiety, worry and depression. Plaintiff has also
9	incurred .	and is likely to incur in the future, special damages for
10	medical,	hospital and related services in an amount to be
11	establish	ed at the time of trial.
12	WHER	EFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:
13	1.	For general damages in excess of the Court's
14		jurisdictional minimum in a sum to be determined at the
15		time of trial;
16	2.	For special damages for past and future medical expenses
17		according to proof;
18	3.	For other damages incurred as a result of the conduct of
19		the defendants, according to proof;
20	4.	For punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter
21		this kind of conduct which is becoming more common in the
22		field of compounding pharmacies;
23	5.	For pre-judgment interest;
24	6.	For cost of suit incurred herein; and
25	7.	For any such other relief as the Court may deem
26		appropriate.
27		
28	•••	
		- 11 -

	Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 12 of 12
1	The undersigned affirms that this document does not contain the
2	social security number of any person.
3	DATED this 11 th day of MARCH, 2013.
4	DURNEY & BRENNAN, LTD.
5	
6	By: /s/ Peter D. Durney PETER D. DURNEY
7	190 W. Huffaker Ln., Ste. 406 Reno, Nevada 89511
8	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
9	
10	
11	
12	
13 14	
14	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	- 12 -

I

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1-1 Filed 03/11/13 Page 1 of 1 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 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 by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DEFENDANTS **BRENDA HESS** FRANCK'S LAB, INC.; FRANCK'S COMPOUNDING LAB; PAUL W. FRANCK; and ANTHONY JAMES CAMPBELL (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Washoe Florida County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Attorneys (If Known) Peter D. Durney, 190 W. Huffaker Ln., Ste. 406, Reno, NV 89511 [775] 322-2923 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) **D** 1 U.S. Government □ 3 Federal Question PTF DEF PTF DEF (U.S. Government Not a Party) Plaintiff Citizen of This State **X** 1 01 Π 4 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State □ 2 U.S. Government X 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State Incorporated and Principal Place 0 5 **X** 5 Defendant of Business In Another State (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) Citizen or Subject of a **D** 3 3 Foreign Nation 06 06 Foreign Country NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) IV. CONTRACT FORFEITURE/PENALTY TORTS BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY □ 610 Agriculture 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reapportionment 120 Marine ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury -□ 423 Withdrawal 410 Antitrust 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractice □ 130 Miller Act 625 Drug Related Seizure 28 USC 157 σ 430 Banks and Banking 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability স 365 Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 881 П 450 Commerce □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ٥ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability 🗇 630 Liquor Laws PROPERTY RIGHTS п 460 Deportation & Enforcement of Judgment Slander D 368 Asbestos Personal 🗇 640 R.R. & Truck 820 Copyrights Π 470 Racketeer Influenced and 151 Medicare Act n 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product 650 Airline Regs. 830 Patent Corrupt Organizations 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability Liability 660 Occupational 🗇 840 Trademark Π 480 Consumer Credit Student Loans ۵ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERTY Safety/Health 490 Cable/Sat TV п □ 690 Other (Excl. Veterans) ٥ 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud 810 Selective Service ٥ 153 Recovery of Overpayment Liability σ 371 Truth in Lending LABOR SOCIAL SECURITY 850 Securities/Commodities/ Π of Veteran's Benefits ۵ 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Personal 710 Fair Labor Standards 861 HIA (1395ff) ٥ Exchange 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage 875 Customer Challenge Act 862 Black Lung (923) 190 Other Contract Product Liability 385 Property Damage 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 12 USC 3410 195 Contract Product Liability σ 🗇 864 SSID Title XVI 360 Other Personal Product Liability 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting 890 Other Statutory Actions σ 196 Franchise 🗇 865 RSI (405(g)) Injury & Disclosure Act 891 Agricultural Acts **REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS** PRISONER PETITIONS 740 Railway Labor Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS 892 Economic Stabilization Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 210 Land Condemnation П 441 Voting 510 Motions to Vacate 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 893 Environmental Matters Ο 220 Foreclosure 442 Employment Sentence 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. or Defendant) 894 Energy Allocation Act σ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: Security Act D 871 IRS-Third Party 895 Freedom of Information 240 Torts to Land Accommodations 26 USC 7609 530 General Act 245 Tort Product Liability 444 Welfare 535 Death Penalty IMMIGRATION 900Appeal of Fee Determination ۵ П □ 290 All Other Real Property 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Ο 540 Mandamus & Other Ο 462 Naturalization Application Under Equal Access Employment 550 Civil Rights 463 Habeas Corpus to Justice Π 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -In 555 Prison Condition Alien Detainee 950 Constitutionality of 465 Other Immigration Other State Statutes Ο. 440 Other Civil Rights Actions Appeal to District Judge from V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Transferred from □ 2 Removed from State Court Original Ο3 Remanded from \Box 4 Reinstated or \Box 5 ☐ 6 Multidistrict ☐ 7 another district Magistrate Proceeding Litigation Appellate Court Reopened (specify) Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 42 U.S.C. Sect. 1332 Judgment ÷ VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause: Product liability causing loss of vision in eye ÷ VII. REOUESTED IN DEMAND \$ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 **COMPLAINT:** JURY DEMAND: 🗹 Yes 🗆 No VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions); IF ANY JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER DATE PERFORD ון /3 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY AMOUNT RECEIPT # APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG, JUDGE

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1-2 Filed 03/11/13 Page 1 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Nevada

BRENDA HESS))
)
Plaintiff(s))
V.	
FRANCK'S LAB, INC., doing business as FRANCK'S COMPOUNDING LAB; PAUL W. FRANCK; and ANTHONY JAMES CAMPBELL)))
Defendant(s))

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-00121

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) FRANCK'S LAB, INC., doing business as FRANCK'S COMPOUNDING LAB

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Peter D. Durney, Esq. 190 W. Huffaker Lane, Suite 406 Reno, NV 89511 [775] 322-2923

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Case 3:13-cv-00121	Document 1-2	Filed 03/11/13	Page 2 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-00121

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (nam	ne of individual and title, if any)				
was re	ceived by me on (date)					
	□ I personally served the summons on the individual at (<i>place</i>)					
			on (date)	; or		
	□ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (<i>name</i>)					
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides th on (<i>date</i>), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or					
		ons on (name of individual)	n bobolf of (come of comerciae)	, wh	io is	
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization) On (date) ;					
	□ I returned the summons unexecuted because				; or	
	Other (<i>specify</i>):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00		
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this inform	nation is true.			
Date:						
			Server's signature			
			Printed name and title			

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1-3 Filed 03/11/13 Page 1 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Nevada

BRENDA HESS))
)
Plaintiff(s))
v.)
FRANCK'S LAB, INC., doing business as FRANCK'S COMPOUNDING LAB; PAUL W. FRANCK; and ANTHONY JAMES CAMPBELL))))
Defendant(s))

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-00121

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) PAUL W. FRANCK

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Peter D. Durney, Esq. 190 W. Huffaker Lane, Suite 406 Reno, NV 89511 [775] 322-2923

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Case 3:13-cv-00121	Document 1-3	Filed 03/11/13	Page 2 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-00121

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (nam	ne of individual and title, if any)				
was re	ceived by me on (date)	·				
	□ I personally served the summons on the individual at (<i>place</i>)					
			on (date)	; or		
	□ I left the summons		or usual place of abode with (name)	sides there		
	on (<i>date</i>) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or					
	□ I served the summons on (<i>name of individual</i>)			wh	o is	
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization) on (date);					
	□ I returned the summons unexecuted because				; or	
	Other (<i>specify</i>):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00		
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this informat	ion is true.			
Date:						
			Server's signature			
			Printed name and title			

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 3:13-cv-00121 Document 1-4 Filed 03/11/13 Page 1 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the
District of Nevada

) BRENDA HESS)))) *Plaintiff(s)*) v.) FRANCK'S LAB, INC., doing business as FRANCK'S) COMPOUNDING LAB; PAUL W. FRANCK; and) ANTHONY JAMES CAMPBELL)) Defendant(s))

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-00121

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) ANTHONY JAMES CAMPBELL

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Peter D. Durney, Esq. 190 W. Huffaker Lane, Suite 406 Reno, NV 89511 [775] 322-2923

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Case 3:13-cv-00121	Document 1-4	Filed 03/11/13	Page 2 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-00121

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (na	me of individual and title, if a	ny)			
was rec	ceived by me on (date)					
	□ I personally served the summons on the individual at (<i>place</i>)					
			on (date)	; or		
	\Box I left the summons		ence or usual place of abode with (<i>name</i>)	resides there		
	on (date)		copy to the individual's last known address; o		Ξ,	
		ons on (name of individual)	s on behalf of (name of organization)		, who is	
		accept service of process	On (date)	; or		
	□ I returned the sum		; or			
	Other (<i>specify</i>):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and S	for services, for a total of S	\$0.0	. 00	
	I declare under penalt	ty of perjury that this info	ormation is true.			
Date:		-				
			Server's signature			
		-	Printed name and title			

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: