

Bobby J. Bell, Jr
Hollis, Wright, Clay & Vail, P.C.
2201 Morris Avenue
Birmingham, AL 35203
Telephone: 205-324-3600
Facsimile: 205-324-3636
E-mail: bob@hollis-wright.com
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

Attorney for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE: INVOKANA (CANAGLIFLOZIN)
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Brian K. Armstrong,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Janssen Pharmaceuticals Inc.,
1125 Trenton-Harbourton Road
Titusville, NJ 08560
and

Janssen Research & Development
LLC
1125 Trenton-Harbourton Road
Titusville, NJ 08560
and

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933
and

Janssen Ortho LLC
c/o S.M. Rosenberg
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933

Defendants.

MDL NO. 2750

**JUDGE BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI
JUDGE LOIS H. GOODMAN**

**DIRECT FILED COMPLAINT PURSUANT
TO CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER 4
AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Civil Action No.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Brian K. Armstrong files this Complaint pursuant to CMO No. 4 and is to be bound by the rights, protections and privileges and obligations of that CMO. Further, in accordance with CMO No. 4, Plaintiff hereby designates the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, as the place of remand as this case may have originally been filed there.

Plaintiff by and through the undersigned attorney, submits this complaint and jury demand against Defendants JANSSEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, LLC, JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JANSSEN ORTHO, LLC, and JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

As more specifically set forth below, Plaintiff maintains that the diabetes drug, Invokana, is defective, dangerous to human health, unfit and unsuitable to be marketed and sold in commerce and lacked proper warning to the dangers associated with its use. This case is being filed in accordance with Case Management Order No. 4 of the *In re: Invokana* MDL No. 2750.

I. NATURE OF ACTION

1. Defendants are the manufacturers of the prescription drug Invokana, developed and indicated for the treatment of type 2 diabetes. It was initially approved by the FDA in January of 2014 and is in a class of new diabetes drugs called glucose cotransporter-2 (“SGLT-2”) inhibitors. SGLT-2 is a protein in humans that facilitates glucose reabsorption in the kidneys. As the name suggests, SGLT-2 inhibitors decrease sugar in the bloodstream by inhibiting glucose reabsorption. The extra sugar is then eliminated from the body through urine produced by the user’s kidneys, putting extra strain on the kidneys of patients that already have increased insult to their kidneys by virtue of having diabetes.

2. In May 2015, the FDA issued a safety communication warning that SGLT-2 inhibitors (including Invokana) can cause life-threatening injuries, having discovered more than 20 cases that had been reported to FDA's adverse event reporting system ("FAERS").

3. The Plaintiff herein, Brian K. Armstrong had type 2 diabetes, used Invokana and developed an acute ischemic stroke. Plaintiff contends that the Defendants knew of this risk with Invokana, but failed to inform him or his doctor regarding this risk, and therefore brings this Complaint against Defendants.

II. PARTIES

4. Plaintiff Brian K. Armstrong ingested and was physically harmed by the defendant's product. "Plaintiff," when used in the singular, refers to plaintiff Brian K. Armstrong the plaintiff that ingested Invokana and was physically harmed.

5. At all relevant times since Brian K. Armstrong's initial use of Invokana, Plaintiff was a resident and citizen of Birmingham, Alabama located in Jefferson County.

6. Defendant, JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. f/k/a JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICIA INC., f/k/a ORTHO-MCNEIL-JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. ("Janssen"), was at all relevant times, a Pennsylvania corporation with a principal place of business at 1125 Trenton-Harbourton Road, Titusville, New Jersey 08560. Janssen is a subsidiary of Johnson and Johnson. At all times relevant and material hereto, Janssen was, and still is, a pharmaceutical company involved in the manufacturing, research, development, marketing, distribution, sale, and release for use to the general public of pharmaceuticals, including Invokana, in New Jersey and Alabama and throughout the United States.

7. Janssen is registered to do business throughout the United States, including New Jersey and Alabama where Plaintiff resides and where Plaintiff was treated for his injuries.

8. Janssen, by its employees or agents attended meetings and/or participated in telephone calls regarding the research, and/or development, and/or FDA approval, and/or marketing of Invokana.

9. Janssen is the wholly owned subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson (“J&J”). J&J and Janssen worked together to achieve the common business purpose of selling and profiting from Invokana.

10. Janssen’s President and Chief Executive Officer at all relevant times reports directly to a J&J Company Group Chairman, who in turn reports to J&J’s Executive Committee and Board of Directors. At all relevant times, J&J and Janssen worked together to achieve the common business purpose of selling Invokana.

11. J&J and Janssen executives were also members of a Pharmaceutical Global Operating Committee, through which J&J set overall corporate goals that guided Janssen’s strategic and tactical plans for Invokana. At all relevant times, J&J and Janssen worked together to achieve the common business purpose of selling Invokana.

12. J&J established Janssen’s business objectives and sales goals and regularly reviewed and approved Janssen’s sales numbers and projections. During the relevant time period, J&J supervised and controlled corporate sales goals; drug research; development, and manufacturing; medical affairs; regulatory affairs and compliance; legal affairs; and public relations. At all relevant times, J&J and Janssen worked together to achieve the common business purpose of selling Invokana.

13. Defendant, JANSSEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, LLC, is a limited liability company organized under the laws of New Jersey which has its principal place of business at 1125 Trenton-Harbourton Road, Titusville, NJ. Defendant Janssen Research &

Development, LLC (formerly known as Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical Research and Development, LLC, and hereinafter referred to as “Janssen R&D”), is a New Jersey limited liability company. Janssen R&D is a wholly owned subsidiary of Centocor Research & Development, Inc., which is not a publically held corporation. Centocor Research & Development, Inc., a Pennsylvania corporation with its principal place of business in Pennsylvania, Janssen R&D is registered to do business throughout the United States, including in New Jersey and Alabama where Plaintiff resides and where plaintiff Brian K. Armstrong was treated for his injuries.

14. Janssen R&D is registered to do business throughout the United States, including in New Jersey where the case is filed and Alabama where Plaintiff resides and where plaintiff Brian K. Armstrong was treated for his injuries.

15. Janssen R&D, by its employees or agents attended meetings and/or participated in telephone calls regarding the research, and/or development, and/or FDA approval, and/or marketing of Invokana.

16. Defendant JOHNSON & JOHNSON (hereinafter “J&J”), is a fictitious name adopted by Defendant JOHNSON & JOHNSON COMPANY, a New Jersey corporation which has its principal place of business at One Johnson & Johnson Plaza, New Brunswick, Middlesex County, New Jersey 08933. Defendant JOHNSON & JOHNSON was engaged in the business of designing, developing, manufacturing, testing, packaging, promoting, marketing, distributing, labeling, and/or selling Invokana.

17. J&J, by its employees or agents attended meetings and/or participated in telephone calls regarding the research, and/or development, and/or FDA approval, and/or marketing of Invokana.

18. Defendant, JANSSEN ORTHO, LLC (“Ortho”) is a Delaware limited liability company with a principal place of business at State road 933 Km 01, Street Statero, Gurabo, Puerto Rico 00778. Ortho is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Ortho manufactures, and continues to manufacture Invokana. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Ortho derived, and continues to derive, substantial revenue from goods and products developed, marketed, sold, distributed and disseminated and used in New Jersey, Alabama and throughout the United States.

19. Ortho, by its employees or agents attended meetings and/or participated in telephone calls regarding the research, and/or development, and/or FDA approval, and/or marketing of Invokana.

20. At all times alleged herein, Defendants shall include any and all named or unnamed parent companies, parent corporations, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, franchises, partners, joint venturers, and any organizational units of any kind, their predecessors, successors, successors in interest, assignees, and their officers, directors, employees, agents, representatives and any and all other persons acting on their behalf.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because Plaintiff and Defendants are citizens of different States and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs.

22. Venue in this action properly lies in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because, at all times material hereto, a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this claim occurred in this District, and 28 U.S.C. §1391(a) because at all times material hereto, Defendants JANSSEN and JOHNSON & JOHNSON had their principal place of

business in this District, and all the defendants conducted substantial business in this District related to Invokana. Additionally, the Multi-District Litigation was created in and assigned to this District.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

23. This action seeks, among other relief, general and special damages due to plaintiff Brian K. Armstrong from suffering severe and life threatening side effects caused by Invokana.

24. Invokana also known as canagliflozin, is a member of gliflozin class of pharmaceuticals also known as sodium glucose co-transporter 2 (“SGLT2”) inhibitors.

25. SGLT2 inhibitors, including Invokana, inhibit renal glucose reabsorption through the SGL2 receptor in the proximal renal tubules, causing glucose to be excreted through the urinary tract instead of reabsorbed into the blood stream thereby putting additional strain on the kidneys.

26. SGLT2 inhibitors, including Invokana, are designed to target primarily the SGLT2 receptor, but have varying selectivity for this receptor, and block other sodium-glucose cotransporter receptors, including SGLT1.

27. The SGLT2 and SGLT1 receptors are located throughout the body, including in the kidney, intestines, and brain.

28. The active ingredient in Invokana, canagliflozin, is contained in both Invokana and Invokamet has the highest selectivity for the SGLT1 receptor among SGLT2 inhibitors currently marketed in the United States.

29. Invokana has the highest selectivity for the SGLT1 receptor among SGLT2 inhibitors currently marketed in the United States.

30. SGLT2 inhibitors, including Invokana, are currently approved only for improvement of glycemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes.

31. At all times herein mentioned, the Defendants were engaged in the business of researching, licensing, designing, formulating, compounding, testing, manufacturing, producing, processing, assembling, inspecting, distributing, marketing, labeling, promoting, packaging and/or advertising for sale or selling the prescription drug Invokana for the use and application by patients with diabetes, including, but not limited to, Brian K. Armstrong .

32. Defendant J&J, the parent company of Janssen, is involved in the marketing and branding of Invokana, and publishes marketing and warnings regarding the product.

33. Defendants published advertisements on their company websites and issued press releases announcing favorable information about Canagliflozin. For example, the FDA's approval of Canagliflozin (Invokana) on March 29, 2013 was announced on the J&J web site.

34. On April 1, 2013, Defendants announced the approval of Canagliflozin (Invokana) in the United States as a new treatment option for Type 2 diabetes. On March 14, 2016, J&J issued a press release announcing "First Real-World Evidence Comparing an SGLT2 Inhibitor with DPP-4 Inhibitors Shows Adults with Type 2 Diabetes Achieve Greater Blood Glucose Control with INVOKANA® (canagliflozin)". The former announcements did not contain warnings about ketoacidosis, serious infections, etc., while the latter announcement mentioned these conditions.

35. Through these advertisements, press releases, publications, and web sites, J&J has purposefully directed activities nationally including towards residents of Alabama and New Jersey.

36. The Invokana-related pages on the Defendant's web sites are accessible from within Alabama and New Jersey, and have been indexed by search engines so that they are located through searches that are conducted from within Alabama and New Jersey.

37. Defendant J&J also published information touting the strong sales of Invokana in its corporate reports and in earnings calls.

38. Further, J&J employees had responsibility for overseeing promotion strategies for the drug Invokana.

39. Materials including advertisements, press releases, web site publications, and other communications regarding Invokana are part of the labeling of the drug, and could be altered without prior FDA approval.

40. Defendant J&J had the ability and the duty to improve the labeling of Invokana to warn of the propensity of the drug to cause diabetic ketoacidosis, renal injury, renal failure, severe infection, stroke and other adverse side effects.

41. Defendant J&J so substantially dominates and controls the operations of Janssen and Janssen R&D that it could have required them to make changes to the safety label of the drug Invokana.

42. J&J employees hold key roles in the design, development, regulatory approval, manufacturing, distribution, and marketing of Invokana and direct these activities on behalf of J&J, Janssen, and Janssen R&D.

43. In fact, J&J so substantially dominates and controls the operations of Janssen and Janssen R&D, that the entities are indistinct for purposes of this litigation such that Janssen and Janssen R&D should be considered agents or departments of J&J, and J&J is their alter-ego.

44. Defendant Janssen, a wholly owned subsidiary of J&J, acquired the marketing right to Invokana in North America, and marketed, advertised, distributed, and sold Invokana in Alabama and New Jersey and the remainder of the United States.

45. In February, 2014, Janssen R&D submitted an NDA to the FDA for approval to market Invokana in the United States.

46. In August 2014, the FDA approved Invokana as an adjunct to diet and exercise for the improvement of glycemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes.

47. As part of its marketing approval of canagliflozin, the FDA required the defendants to conduct five post-marketing studies: a cardiovascular outcomes trial; an enhanced pharmacovigilance program to monitor for malignancies, serious cases of pancreatitis, severe hypersensitivity reactions, photosensitivity reactions, liver abnormalities, and adverse pregnancy outcomes; a bone safety study; and two pediatric studies under the Pediatric Research Equity Act (PREA), including a pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamics study and a safety and efficacy study.

48. In an effort to increase sales and market share, Defendants have aggressively marketed and continue to aggressively market Invokana to doctors and directly to patients for off-label purposes, including, but not limited to weight loss, reduced blood pressure, kidney benefits, cardiovascular benefits, and for use in type 1 diabetics.

49. Defendants also, through their marketing materials, misrepresented and exaggerated the effectiveness of Invokana, both as to its ability to lower glucose, and its benefit for non-surrogate measures of health, such as reducing adverse cardiovascular outcomes.

50. Defendant's marketing campaign willfully and intentionally misrepresented the risks of Invokana and failed to warn about the risks of diabetic ketoacidosis, kidney failure, sepsis and other injuries.

51. Invokana is one of Defendant's top selling drugs, with annual sales exceeding \$1 billion.

52. In September 2015, the FDA announced that SGLT2 inhibitors cause premature bone loss and fractures.

53. In December 2015, the FDA announced that SGLT2 inhibitors cause diabetic ketoacidosis, pyelonephritis (kidney infections), and urosepsis.

54. In March 2016, the FDA announced that SGLT2 inhibitors cause severe renal impairment, angioedema, and anaphylaxis.

55. In May 2016, the FDA announced that SGLT2 inhibitors have been linked to an increased risk of amputations.

56. At all times herein mentioned, the officers and directors of Defendants participated in, authorized, and directed the production and promotion of the aforementioned product when they knew, or with the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the hazards and dangerous propensities of said product and thereby actively participated in the tortious conduct which resulted in the injuries suffered by Brian K. Armstrong.

57. Defendants, both individually and in concert with one another, misrepresented that Invokana is a safe and effective treatment for type 2 diabetes mellitus when in fact the drug causes serious medical problems which require hospitalization and can lead to life threatening complications.

58. Specifically, Defendants knew or should have known of the risks of injuries based on the data available to them or that could have been generated by them, including, but not limited to animal studies, mechanisms of action, pharmacodynamics, pharmacokinetics, pre-clinical studies, clinical studies, animal models, genetic models, analogous compounds, analogous conditions, adverse event reports, case reports, post-marketing reports, and regulatory authority investigations.

59. Despite their knowledge of data indicating that Invokana causes serious side effects. Defendants promoted and marketed Invokana as safe and effective for persons such as Brian K. Armstrong throughout the United States, including Alabama and New Jersey.

60. Despite Defendant's knowledge of the increased risk of severe injury among Invokana users, Defendants did not warn patients but instead continued to defend Invokana, mislead physicians and the public, and minimize unfavorable findings.

61. Defendants failed to adequately warn consumers and physicians about the risks associated with Invokana and the monitoring required ensuring their patient's safety.

62. Despite Defendant's knowledge of the increased risk of severe injury among Invokana users, Defendants did not conduct the necessary additional studies to properly evaluate these risks prior to marketing the drug to the general public.

63. Consumers of Invokana and their physicians relied on the Defendant's false representations and were misled as to the drug's safety, and as a result have suffered injuries.

64. Consumers, including Brian K. Armstrong, have several alternatives safer methods for treating diabetes, including diet and exercise and other antidiabetic agents.

B. SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS

65. Brian K. Armstrong had several alternative and safer methods to treat his diabetes, including diet and exercise and other diabetes medications. Brian K. Armstrong was prescribed Invokana on July 7, 2015 by his doctor and used it as directed.

66. Brian K. Armstrong was prescribed Invokana to be taken once by mouth daily to improve glycemic control as an adjunct to diet and exercise.

67. On August 21, 2015 as a direct result of his treatment with Invokana, Brian K. Armstrong] was hospitalized with symptoms of dizziness, nausea, vomiting and vertigo.

68. Brian K. Armstrong was ultimately diagnosed with Ischemic Stroke.

69. Brian K. Armstrong was discharged on August 25, 2015

70. Brian K. Armstrong endured pain and suffering, emotional distress, loss of enjoyment of life, and economic loss, including significant expenses for medical care and treatment. Plaintiffs seek actual, compensatory, and punitive damages from Defendants.

71. Defendant's wrongful acts, omissions and fraudulent misrepresentations caused Brian K. Armstrong's injuries and damages.

72. Brian K. Armstrong's injuries were preventable and resulted directly from Defendant's failure and refusal to conduct proper safety studies, failure to properly assess and publicize alarming safety signals, suppression of information revealing serious and life threatening risks, willful and wanton failure to provide adequate instructions, and willful misrepresentations concerning the nature and safety of Invokana. The conduct and the product defects were substantial factor in bringing about Plaintiff's injuries.

73. Defendants had a duty to warn Brian K. Armstrong's prescribing physicians about the risks of Invokana use.

74. Had Brian K. Armstrong and his physicians known the risks associated with the use of SGLT2 inhibitors, including Invokana, Brian K. Armstrong would not have been prescribed Invokana, would not have taken Invokana, and/or she would have been adequately monitored for its side effects, and as a result, would not have suffered injuries and damages from using Invokana.

75. Brian K. Armstrong's prescribing and treating physicians relied on claims made by Defendants that Invokana has been clinically shown to improve glycemic control and was generally safe and effective. These claims reached Brian K. Armstrong's prescribing and treating physicians directly, through sales representatives detailing the product, print and television advertising, articles and study reports funded and promoted by Defendants, and indirectly, through other healthcare providers and others who have been exposed to Defendant's claims through their comprehensive marketing campaigns.

76. Brian K. Armstrong relied on claims made by defendants that Invokana has been clinically shown to improve glycemic control and was generally safe and effective. These claims reached Brian K. Armstrong directly, through print and television advertising, and indirectly, through her healthcare providers and others who have been exposed to Defendant's claims through its comprehensive marketing campaigns.

77. Based on the Defendant's direct to consumer advertising and Defendant's misrepresentations and omissions, Brian K. Armstrong made an independent decision to use Invokana in reference to the overall benefits and risks communicated by Defendants.

78. Brian K. Armstrong's injuries were a reasonable foreseeable consequence of Defendant's conduct and Invokana's hazards, and were not reasonably foreseeable to Plaintiff or Plaintiff's physicians.

V. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

**COUNT ONE
DESIGN DEFECT**

79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein

80. Defendants had a duty to properly design, manufacture, compound, test, inspect, label, distribute, market, examine, maintain, supply, provide proper warnings, and take such steps as to assure that Invokana did not cause users to suffer from unreasonable and dangerous side effects.

81. The aforesaid product was defective and unsafe in design and manufacture such that it was unreasonably dangerous to the user, and was so at the time it was distributed by Defendants and ingested by Brian K. Armstrong

82. Invokana was defective at the time of its manufacture, development, production, testing, inspection, endorsement, prescription, sale and distribution in that warnings, instructions and directions accompanying Invokana failed to warn of the dangerous risks posed by Invokana.

83. Invokana was defective and Defendants knew that Invokana was to be used by consumers without inspection for defects. Moreover, Brian K. Armstrong's prescribing physicians and other health care providers neither knew nor had reason to know at the time of Brian K. Armstrong's use of Invokana of the aforementioned defects. Ordinary consumers would not have recognized the potential risks for which Defendants failed to include the appropriate warnings.

84. Invokana was prescribed to and used by Brian K. Armstrong as intended by Defendants and in a manner reasonably foreseeable to Defendants.

85. The design of Invokana was defective in that the risks associated with using Invokana outweighed any benefits of the design. Any benefits associated with the use of Invokana were either relatively minor or nonexistent and could have been obtained by the use of other, alternative treatments and products that could equally or more effectively reach similar results.

86. The defect in design existed when the product left Defendant's possession.

87. At the time Invokana left the control of Defendants, Defendants knew or should have known of the risks associated with ingesting Invokana.

88. As a result of Invokana's defective condition, Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damages alleged herein.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands that the issues herein contained be tried by a jury.

**COUNT TWO
FAILURE TO WARN**

89. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each proceeding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

90. Defendants designed, developed, researched, tested, licensed, manufactured, packaged, labeled, promoted, marketed, sold, and distributed Invokana in a defective and

unreasonably dangerous condition, including the Invokana used by Brian K. Armstrong. The design defect made Invokana more dangerous than an ordinary consumer would expect and more dangerous than other drugs used to treat diabetes.

91. Invokana's inadequate warnings rendered Invokana unreasonably dangerous and defective.

92. Defendant's defective warnings for Invokana were reckless, willful, wanton, fraudulent, malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the health and safety of users of Invokana. Defendants made conscious decisions not to adequately warn about risks they know or should have known about. Defendant's reckless conduct warrants an award of punitive damages. Defendant's conduct was motivated by greed and the intentional decision to value profits over the safety and well-being of the consumers of Invokana.

93. Brian K. Armstrong was prescribed and used Invokana for its intended purposes and for purposes that the defendants expected and could foresee.

94. Defendants expected and intended Invokana to reach, and did in fact reach, Brian K. Armstrong without any substantial change in the condition of the product from when it was initially manufactured by Defendants.

95. Brian K. Armstrong could not have discovered the unwarned risks of using Invokana through the exercise of reasonable care.

96. Defendants, as manufacturers of pharmaceutical drugs, are held to the level of knowledge of an expert in the field, and further, Defendants knew or should have known that the warnings and other relevant information and data which they distributed regarding the risks of injuries and death associated with the use of Invokana were incomplete and inadequate.

97. Brian K. Armstrong did not have the same knowledge as Defendants and no adequate warning or other clinically relevant information and data was communicated to Brian K. Armstrong or to his treating physicians. The warnings that were given by the Defendants were not accurate and were incomplete.

98. Defendants had a duty to properly test, develop, design, manufacture, inspect, package, label, market, promote, sell, distribute, supply, warn, and take other such steps as necessary to ensure that Invokana did not cause users to suffer from unreasonable and dangerous risks.

99. Defendants knew or should have known that the limited warnings disseminated with Invokana were inadequate, but they failed to communicate adequate information on the dangers and safe use of its product, taking into account the characteristics of and the ordinary knowledge common to physicians who would be expected to prescribe the drug. In particular, Defendants failed to communicate warnings and instructions to doctors that were appropriate and adequate to render the product safe for its ordinary, intended, and reasonably foreseeable uses, including the common, foreseeable, and intended use of the product for treatment of diabetes.

100. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's manufacture, sale and promotion of the defectively designed drug and failure to warn Brian K. Armstrong and his physicians about the significant risks inherent in Invokana therapy, Brian K. Armstrong sustained severe injuries.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands that the issues herein contained be tried by a jury.

**COUNT THREE
NEGLIGENCE**

101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

102. At all times relevant times, Defendants had a duty to use reasonable care to properly manufacture, design, formulate, compound, test, produce, process, assemble, inspect, research, distribute, market, label, package, distribute, prepare for use, sell, prescribe and adequately warn of the risks and dangers of Invokana.

103. At all times material hereto, Defendants had actual knowledge, or in the alternative, should have known through the exercise of reasonable and prudent care, of the hazards and dangers of Invokana.

104. Defendants had a duty to exercise due care and avoid unreasonable risk of harm to others when developing and selling Invokana.

105. Defendants had a duty to disclose to physicians, healthcare providers, and patients the causal relationship or association of Invokana to diabetic ketoacidosis, kidney failure, sepsis, and other life threatening complications such as strokes.

106. Defendants had a duty to accurately communicate the risks and benefits of Invokana to physicians, healthcare provides, and patients.

107. As a result of the Defendant's aggressive marketing campaigns promoting off-label uses, including for type 1 diabetes, weight loss, and to improve blood pressure and kidney function, Defendants knew or should have known and expected that consumers would use Invokana for such off-label uses.

108. Defendants knew or should have known that some patients would develop serious injuries that were not adequately warned about, and these injuries were foreseeable.

109. Brian K. Armstrong did not know the nature and extent of the injuries that could result from Invokana and were misinformed about the benefits of Invokana and could not have discovered this information independently.

110. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants breached their duty of care by failing to exercise reasonable and ordinary care and negligently and carelessly manufacturing, designing, formulating, distributing, compounding, producing, processing, assembling, inspecting, distributing, marketing, labeling, packaging, preparing for use, and selling Invokana, and failing to adequately test and warn of the risks and dangers of Invokana.

111. Despite the fact that Defendants knew or should have known that Invokana caused unreasonable, dangerous side effects, Defendants continued to market Invokana to consumers, including Brian K. Armstrong, when there were safer alternative methods available.

112. Defendant's negligence was a foreseeable and proximate cause of Brian K. Armstrong's injuries, harm and economic loss which she suffered, as described and prayed for herein.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands that the issues herein contained be tried by a jury.

**COUNT FOUR
BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY**

113. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

114. Defendants impliedly warranted to Brian K. Armstrong and his physicians and health care providers that Invokana was of merchantable quality and safe and fit for the use which it was intended.

115. The product did not conform to representations made by the manufacturer.

116. Brian K. Armstrong reasonably relied entirely on the skill, judgment, and implied warranty of the Defendants when using Invokana.

117. As a result, Brian K. Armstrong used the Defendant's product as it was warranted and intended.

118. Invokana was not of merchantable quality, as warranted by Defendants because it was dangerous when used as intended and can cause severe injuries to consumers.

119. As a result of Defendant's breach of implied warranties, Plaintiff suffered injuries and damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands that the issues herein contained be tried by a jury.

COUNT FIVE
BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY

120. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each proceeding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

121. Defendants expressly warranted to Plaintiff's physicians and Plaintiff by and through statements made by Defendants or their authorized agents or sales representatives, orally and in publications, package inserts, marketing, and other written materials intended for physicians and the public that Invokana is safe, effective, fit and proper for its intended use, of merchantable quality, had been adequately tested, contained adequate warnings, and was effective.

122. The "Warnings and Precautions" section of the Invokana prescribing information purports to expressly describe the relevant and material side-effects that Defendants knew or should have known about.

123. In particular the Consumer Medication Guide did not include any language that would suggest Invokana has been associated with diabetic ketoacidosis, kidney failure, blood infections, kidney infections, stroke or other severe injuries.

124. Brian K. Armstrong's physician prescribed Invokana and Brian K. Armstrong consumed Invokana reasonably relying on these warranties. Brian K. Armstrong and his physician could not have learned independently that Defendants were false and misleading.

125. The product did not conform to representations made by the manufacturer.

126. Defendants knew or should have known Brian K. Armstrong would rely on their warranties.

127. Plaintiff reasonably relied on the skill, judgment, representations, and foregoing express warranties of the Defendants.

128. The warranties and representations are false. Invokana can cause diabetic ketoacidosis, kidney failure, blood infections, kidney infections, and strokes.

129. Invokana does not conform to the Defendant's express representations; therefore, Defendants have breached the express warranties.

130. The breach of express warranties by Defendants was a foreseeable, direct, and proximate cause of Brian K. Armstrong's injuries and damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands that the issues herein contained be tried by a jury.

**COUNT SIX
FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION**

131. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

132. Defendants intentionally and fraudulently misrepresented the safety and efficacy of Invokana in the product label.

133. Specifically Defendants intentionally and fraudulently:

- a. Provided a "Warnings and Precautions" section of the Invokana prescribing information that purports to expressly describe the relevant and material potential side-effects that Defendants knew or should have known about, but in which material and relevant information was fraudulently withheld from this section;
- b. Provided Consumer Medication Guide that expressly indicates "What is the most important information I should know about INVOKANA?" and "What are the possible side effects of INVOKANA?" and "General information about the safe and effective use of INVOKANA" and fraudulently omits information that Invokana has been associated with diabetic ketoacidosis, kidney failure, or cardiovascular adverse events;
- c. On information and belief, each and every advertisement and marketing channel fraudulently omits information about the risks of Invokana and overstates the benefits;

- d. Failed to disclose that Invokana was not as safe and effective as other diabetes drugs;
- e. Failed to disclose that Invokana does not result in safe and more effective diabetes treatments than other available drugs;
- f. Failed to disclose that the risk of harm associated with Invokana was greater than the risk of harm associated with other diabetes drugs;
- g. Failed to disclose that Defendants knew that Invokana was not adequately tested;
- h. Failed to disclose that testing had revealed unreasonably high risk of injury;
- i. On information and belief, failed to disclose that Defendants intentionally withheld safety information from the FDA; and
- j. Affirmatively asserted that Invokana was safe and effective.

134. Defendants knew that their representations were false, yet they willfully, wantonly and recklessly disregarded their obligation to provide truthful representations regarding the safety and risk of Invokana to Brian K. Armstrong other consumers, Brian K. Armstrong's physicians, and the medical community.

135. The representations were made by the Defendants with the intent that doctors and patients, including Brian K. Armstrong and his physicians, rely upon them.

136. Defendant's representations were made with the intent of defrauding and deceiving Brian K. Armstrong other consumers, Brian K. Armstrong's physicians, and the medical community to induce and encourage the sale of Invokana.

137. Defendants J&J, Janssen, and Janssen R&D, in advertisements through their respective websites, and press releases issued by the respective defendants, stated that the drug Invokana was generally well tolerated and safe for use, and was not likely to cause side effects other than the ones listed—these listed side effects did not include diabetic ketoacidosis, renal

injury or renal failure, bone fractures, sepsis etc. Brian K. Armstrong, his doctors, and others relied upon these representations.

138. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate consequence of Defendant's actions, omissions, and misrepresentations Brian K. Armstrong suffered a stroke and other related health complications. Plaintiff has incurred medical and related expenses. Plaintiff's direct medical losses and costs include physician care, monitoring, and treatment. Plaintiff has incurred and will continue to incur mental and physical pain and suffering.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in Plaintiff's favor for compensatory and punitive damages, together with interest, costs herein incurred, attorneys' fees, and all such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. Plaintiff also demands that the issues herein contained be tried by a jury.

VI. PUNITIVE DAMAGES ALLEGATIONS

139. The acts, conduct, and omissions of Defendants, as alleged throughout this Complaint were wanton, willful, fraudulent, dishonest and malicious. Defendants committed these acts with a conscious disregard for the rights, health and safety of Brian K. Armstrong and other Invokana users and for the primary purpose of increasing Defendant's profits from the sale and distribution of Invokana. Defendant's outrageous and unconscionable conduct warrants an award of exemplary and punitive damages against Defendants in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

140. Prior to the manufacturing, sale, and distribution of Invokana, Defendants knew that said medication was in a defective condition as previously described herein and knew that those who were prescribed the medication would experience and did experience severe physical, mental, and emotional injuries. Further, Defendants, through their officers, directors, managers,

and agents, knew that the medication presented a substantial and unreasonable risk of harm to the public, including Brian K. Armstrong and as such, Defendants unreasonably subjected consumers of said drugs to risk of injury or death from using Invokana.

141. Despite its knowledge, Defendants, acting through its officers, directors and managing agents for the purpose of enhancing Defendant's profits, knowingly and deliberately failed to remedy the known defects in Invokana and failed to warn the public, including Plaintiff, of the extreme risk of injury occasioned by said defects inherent in Invokana. Defendants and their agents, officers, and directors intentionally proceeded with the manufacturing, sale, and distribution and marketing of Invokana knowing these actions would expose persons to serious danger in order to advance Defendant's pecuniary interest and monetary profits. Said conduct was motivated by the reprehensible motive of increasing monetary profits for the sale of Invokana.

142. Defendant's conduct was despicable and so contemptible that it would be looked down upon and despised by ordinary decent people, and was carried on by Defendants with willful and conscious disregard for the safety of Brian K. Armstrong, entitling Plaintiffs to exemplary damages.

VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

143. Wherefore, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for compensatory damages as well as exemplary damages and loss of wages to which they are entitled by law, as well as all costs of this action, to the full extent of the law including:

1. Judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendants;
2. Damages to compensate Plaintiff for injuries sustained as a result of the use of Invokana for past and future loss of income proven at trial;

3. Pre and post judgment interest at the lawful rate;
4. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional limits.
5. A trial by jury on all issues of the case; and,
6. For any other relief as this court may deem just, or that may be available under the law of another forum to the extent the law of another forum is applied including but not limited to reasonable attorney's fees and costs and expert fees.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2017

By: /s/ Bobby J. Bell, Jr.
Bobby J. Bell, Jr
(AL Bar 3426-B63B)
Hollis, Wright, Clay & Vail, P.C.
2201 Morris Avenue
Birmingham, AL 35203
Telephone: 205-324-3600
Facsimile: 205-324-3636
E-mail: bob@hollis-wright.com
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

DEMAND FOR A TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff demands a jury trial as to all issues and defenses.

By: /s/ Bobby J. Bell, Jr.
Bobby J. Bell, Jr
(AL Bar 3426-B63B)
Hollis, Wright, Clay & Vail, P.C.
2201 Morris Avenue
Birmingham, AL 35203
Telephone: 205-324-3600
Facsimile: 205-324-3636
E-mail: bob@hollis-wright.com
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

Dated: August 18, 2017

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO L. CIV. R. 11.2

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, this matter is not the subject of any other action pending in any court or of any pending arbitration or administrative proceeding.

By: /s/ Bobby J. Bell, Jr.
Bobby J. Bell, Jr
(AL Bar 3426-B63B)
Hollis, Wright, Clay & Vail, P.C.
2201 Morris Avenue
Birmingham, AL 35203
Telephone: 205-324-3600
Facsimile: 205-324-3636
E-mail: bob@hollis-wright.com
Attorney for PLAINTIFF

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 NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

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

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

DEFENDANTS

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, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 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)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, 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)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various legal categories like Insurance, Personal Injury, Real Property, etc.

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):

Brief description of cause:

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

_____ District of _____

_____)	
<i>Plaintiff</i>)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No.
)	
_____)	
<i>Defendant</i>)	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)*

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:

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

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____; or

Other *(specify)*: _____

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

_____ District of _____

_____)	
<i>Plaintiff</i>)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No.
)	
_____)	
<i>Defendant</i>)	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)*

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:

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

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____; or

Other *(specify):* _____.

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

_____ District of _____

_____)	
<i>Plaintiff</i>)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No.
)	
_____)	
<i>Defendant</i>)	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)*

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:

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

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____ ; or

Other *(specify):* _____ .

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____ .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

_____ District of _____

_____)	
<i>Plaintiff</i>)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No.
)	
_____)	
<i>Defendant</i>)	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)*

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:

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

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____; or

Other *(specify)*: _____.

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: