Douglas W. Crandall, ISB No. 3962 CRANDALL LAW OFFICE 910 West Main Street, Suite 222 Boise, Idaho 83702

Telephone: (208) 343-1211
Facsimile: (208) 336-2088
Crandall_law@msn.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

GERALD PAYNE,)	
,)	Case No.
	Plaintiff,)	
)	COMPLAINT
v.)	
)	Jury Trial Demanded
ETHICON, INC.)	·
)	
	Defendants.)	
)	

COMES NOW Plaintiff Gerald Payne and files this Complaint against Defendant Ethicon, Inc., and alleges as follows:

PARTIES AND JURISDICTION

- 1. Plaintiff Gerald Payne is a resident of Ada County, Idaho.
- 2. Defendant Ethicon, Inc. ("Ethicon") is a New Jersey corporation headquartered in Sommerville, New Jersey
- 3. This is a lawsuit for personal injury damages in excess of \$75,000.00. The parties are citizens/entities of different states. Subject matter jurisdiction is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

4. Defendant is subject to *in personam* jurisdiction in the U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho because it placed a defective product in the stream of commerce and that product caused personal injuries to Plaintiff, who resides in Idaho.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 5. Following a surgery in 2010, Plaintiff developed an incisional hernia.
- 6. Plaintiff underwent a laparoscopic ventral incisional hernia repair with mesh placement on August 26, 2010 at St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center, Boise, Idaho.
- 7. Following the surgery, there was a noticeable "bulge" that did not resolve until the mesh was eventually removed on November 14, 2017.
- 8. From August 26, 2010 to present, Plaintiff suffers from chronic increased pain in the area from which the mesh was placed.
- 9. In addition to the constant and worsening pain, Plaintiff felt "weak," lost core strength, had restricted activities of daily living, had bouts of nausea and had to wear a "binder" which was needed for all activities, which limited Plaintiff's mobility.
- 10. In August 2017, Plaintiff's symptoms became so severe that he went to the St. Alphonsus Emergency Room in Eagle, Idaho, where providers performed a CT scan, among other tests, and determined that Plaintiff's intestinal tract was being "blocked" by the mesh and Plaintiff was sent by ambulance to St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center in Boise, Idaho.
- 11. Dr. Steve Williams was able to relieve the bowel obstruction but explained to Plaintiff that the relief was "very temporary" and that Plaintiff required a "component separation surgery." That surgery was scheduled on November 14, 2017.

- 12. Dr. Williams explained to Plaintiff that the mesh "had not done its job" and had not "adhered to the muscle as intended."
- 13. Dr. Williams removed the mesh. The Anatomic Pathology diagnosis read, "PhysioMesh and omentum, resection: Adipose tissue with focal foreign body consistent with mesh and associated foreign body giant cell reduction."
- 14. Plaintiff's recovery from the November 14, 2017 surgery has been extremely difficult, painful and debilitating, to the point that he has been unable to work.
- 15. Ethicon designs, manufactures, markets, packages, labels and sells medical devices, including a medical device known as Physiomesh, a composity mesh product implanted to treat persons like Plaintiff for hernias (also referred to as the "Product").
- 16. The Product has numerous defects that create a high risk of unreasonable and dangerous injuries and side effects with severe permanent adverse health consequences including that the material in the Product abrades tissues adversely affecting patient health and regularly fail to perform the purpose of its implantation such that the patient requires repair and/or removal of the Product and repeated treatment and surgery.
- 17. Prior to the time that the Product was implanted in Plaintiff, Defendant was aware of numerous defects in the Product. Despite being aware of the numerous defects and unreasonable risks in the Product, Defendant manufactured, marketed, and distributed the Product with the intent they would be implanted in patients. Defendant was aware that implanting the Product in patients was likely to cause injury and harm to the patients into whom the Product was implanted. Alternatively, Defendant failed to

exercise reasonable care in determining the risks and potential adverse consequences of implanting the Product into patients.

- descriptions, product labels, promotional materials and other materials that asserted that implanting the Product in patients was safe and would not cause harm to patients. These statements were made with the intent that medical professionals and members of the public would rely upon them, with the intent that members of the public would pay for the Product and that the Product would be implanted in patients. When Defendant made these statements, Defendant knew that the statements were inaccurate. Alternatively, when Defendant made these statements Defendant should have known the statements were inaccurate.
- 19. Representatives of Defendant also made statements to numerous individuals, including medical professionals, that implanting the Product in patients was safe and would not cause harm to patients. When Defendant's representatives made these statements, Defendant knew that the statements were inaccurate. Alternatively, when Defendant's representatives made these statements, Defendant should have known the statements were inaccurate.
- 20. Before Plaintiff suffered the injuries complained of herein, Defendant was on notice of numerous bodily injuries caused by the Product, and based thereon, Defendant knew or should have known that the Product caused an unreasonably high rate of infection, extrusion, perforation, chronic pain and/or abscess in people implanted with the Product.

- 21. Even though Defendant has known or should have known that the Product created a foreseeable, unreasonable risk of harm to those patients into whom they were implanted, Defendant continued to market the Product in the United States. Defendant has sold thousands of Product in the United States alone.
- 22. Defendant has never provided adequate warning or information to physicians who implanted the Product, or to people implanted with the Product, of the risks that the Product cause an unreasonably high rate of infection, extrusion, perforation, chronic pain and/or abscess.

COUNT I: STRICT LIABILITY MANUFACTURING DEFECT

- 23. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 24. At all relevant times, Defendant designed, manufactured, tested, packaged, labeled, promoted, distributed and sold the Product and Plaintiff was the recipient of their product.
- 25. The Product was expected to and did reach the usual consumers, handlers, and persons coming into contact with the Product without substantial change in the condition in which it was produced, manufactured, sold, and distributed by the Defendant.
- 26. At those times, the Product was in an unsafe, defective, and inherently dangerous condition, which was dangerous to users, and in particular, Plaintiff. Plaintiff contends that the defective condition of the Product and the lack of ordinary care in manufacturing the Product is obvious and within the range of comprehension of the average juror without speculation.

- 27. The Product manufactured, sold, and distributed by the Defendant was defective in manufacture in that, when it left the hands of the manufacturer and/or suppliers, the foreseeable risk exceeded the benefits associated with the use of the Product.
- 28. The Product implanted into Plaintiff was being used in a manner reasonably anticipated at the time it was implanted in him.
- 29. The Product, at the time they left the possession of Defendant, was inherently dangerous for its intended use and was an unreasonably dangerous product which presented and constituted an unreasonable risk of danger and injury to Plaintiff as follows:
 - a. The Product was sold in a defective condition by manufacture;
 - b. The Product as manufactured was unsafe for Plaintiff;
 - c. The Product as manufactured was unreasonably dangerous to Plaintiff;
 - d. The Product did not perform safely as an ordinary consumer/patient, like Plaintiff, would expect;
 - e. The Product as manufactured was unsafe for its intended use; and
 - f. Defendant knew the component parts of the Product as implemented through manufacture could cause injury to the end user.
- 30. For all these reasons, the Defendant has become strictly liable in tort to Plaintiff for manufacturing, selling, and distributing the Product for use in repairing an ventral incisional hernia.

- 31. The defects in the Product were a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's injuries.
- 32. Defendant acted recklessly, willfully, wantonly and with a significant indifference to, and conscious disregard for the safety of others, including Plaintiff, by manufacturing and selling the dangerous and defective Product to Plaintiff. Defendant's reckless disregard for Plaintiff's safety by deliberately exposing him to the dangerous and defective Product warrant the imposition of punitive damages.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of manufacturing defects in Defendant's Product, Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer injuries and damages.

COUNT II: NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO WARN

- 34. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 35. Defendant failed to adequately warn consumers of the dangers associated with the Product and said failure caused Plaintiff's injury. If Defendant had issued a proper warning to consumers, Plaintiff would not have had the Product implanted and Plaintiff's injuries would have been avoided.
- 36. The Product has numerous defects that create a high risk of unreasonable and dangerous injuries and side effects with severe permanent adverse health consequences including that the material in the Product abrades tissues adversely affecting patient health and regularly fail to perform the purpose of its implantation such that the patient requires repair and/or removal of the Product and repeated treatment and surgery.
- 37. The warnings provided to Plaintiff's healthcare providers in their capacities as learned intermediaries were improper because they did not reflect the full extent of the potential health complications associated with using the Product.

- 38. Had Defendant adequately warned Plaintiff's healthcare providers of the risks associated with the Product, the healthcare providers, acting as reasonably prudent healthcare providers, would have elected not to use the Product to repair Plaintiff's incisional hernia.
- 39. Defendant acted recklessly, willfully, wantonly and with a significant indifference to, and conscious disregard for the safety of others, including Plaintiff, through their negligent failure to adequately warn Plaintiff of the dangerous and defective nature of the Product. Defendant's reckless disregard for Plaintiff's safety through its negligent failure to adequately warn him of the dangerous and defective nature of the Product warrants the imposition of punitive damages.
- 40. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's negligent failure to warn, Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer injuries and damages.

COUNT III: NEGLIGENT PREPARATION OF PRODUCT

- 41. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 42. Defendant had a duty to individuals, including Plaintiff, to use reasonable care in the preparation of the Product for use in repairing inguinal hernias.
- 43. The Product have numerous defects that create a high risk of unreasonable and dangerous injuries and side effects with severe permanent adverse health consequences including that the material in the Product abrades tissues adversely affecting patient health and regularly fail to perform the purpose of its implantation such that the patient requires repair and/or removal of the Product and repeated treatment and surgery.

- 44. Defendant was negligent in preparing the Product for use in repairing incisional hernias. The Product was manufactured improperly. The Defendant has breached their duty to manufacture the Product line without any defects.
- 45. Defendant acted recklessly, willfully, wantonly and with a significant indifference to, and conscious disregard for the safety of others, including Plaintiff, through its negligent preparation of the Product, a dangerous and defective product.

 Defendant's reckless disregard for Plaintiff's safety through their negligent preparation of the Product warrants the imposition of punitive damages.
- 46. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's negligence, Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer injuries and damages.

COUNT IV: ATTORNEY FEES AND COSTS

46. As a result of Defendant's wrongful acts as set forth above, Plaintiff has been compelled to retain Crandall Law Offices to pursue this action. Plaintiff should be awarded his attorney fees and costs pursuant to applicable law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court grant the following relief against the Defendant:

- (A) Money damages representing fair, just and reasonable compensation for his claims;
 - (B) Punitive and/or exemplary damages pursuant to state law;
 - (C) Disgorgement of profits and restitution of all costs;
 - (D) Attorney fees and costs of suit pursuant to state law;
- (E) Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as authorized by state law on the judgments which will enter on Plaintiff's behalf;

(F) Such other relief the Court deems just and appropriate.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury of at least twelve (12) members on all issues properly tried to jury in the above-entitled matter.

Dated this 10th day of January, 2018.

CRANDALL LAW OFFICE

By: <u>/s/Douglas W. Crandall</u>
Douglas W. Crandall
Attorney for Plaintiff Gerald Payne

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

UNITED STATES 1	
District of	
GERALD PAYNE)	
Plaintiff(s) V. ETHICON, INC.)	Civil Action No.
Defendant(s)	
To: (Defendant's name and address) Douglas K. Chai	CIVIL ACTION
Johnson & Johnson One Johnson & Johnson Plaz New Brunswick, New Jersey	
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answ the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion whose name and address are: Douglas W. Crandall Crandall Law Office 910 W. Main Street, Suite 22: Boise, Idaho 83702 P: 208-343-1211 F: 208-336-1211	rer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be er You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	ntered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

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.)

purpose of initiating the civil do	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUCT	IONS ON NEXT PAGE O	rinisro	rivi.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS					
Gerald Payne				Ethicon, Inc.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Ada (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Somerset (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	-			Attorneys (If Known)					
Douglas W. Crandall, Cra 222, Boise, Idaho 83702,			uite						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in C and One Box for		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government I	Not a Party)	Citiz		TF DEF	Incorporated or Pr of Business In T		PTF	DEF 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 🗆 2	Incorporated and I of Business In .		5	Ø 5
				en or Subject of a oreign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT							of Suit Code Des		
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJUR		ORFEITURE/PENALTY = 25 Drug Related Seizure		KRUPTCY al 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Cla		THE RESERVE OF
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	□ 310 Airplane □ 365 Personal II □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 367 Health Ca Pharmacet □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 368 Asbestos □ 345 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 258 Signification □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 278 Signification □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 278 Signification □ 370 Other Fra	☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product	□ 69	of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other LABOR LABOR Act	28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application 840 Trademark		☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations		
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Product Liability Product Liability Stock of the Personal Injury Stock of the Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	roduct Liability Other Personal Proporty Damage prospective of the Personal Proporty Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability Product Liability		20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation	863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))		Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information		
☐ 210 Land Condemulation☐ 220 Forcelosure☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment☐ 240 Torts to Land☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	440 Other Civil Rights 411 Voting 42 Employment 43 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detaince 510 Motions to Vacal Sentence 530 General	□ 7	91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609		☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of		
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	□ 4 her □ 4	IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration Actions	n		State Stat	utes	
	in One Box Only) emoved from 3 ate Court	Remanded from Appellate Court		nstated or	er District	☐ 6 Multidist Litigatio Transfer	n -	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fi	on -
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	atute under which you	are filing	(Do not cite jurisdictional st		versity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Brief description of c								
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		S IS A CLASS ACTIO	ON I	DEMAND \$		HECK YES only URY DEMAND	y if demanded in): 冥Yes	complai □No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 1//0/20	18	SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	1	Jangles to	ノし	undal)					
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JU	DGE		