

1 **CHRIS CONNOLLY, ESQ., SBN 180392**
2 **LAW OFFICES OF CHRIS CONNOLLY**
3 **18039 Chatsworth Street, #33143**
4 **Granada Hills, CA 91394**
5 **Tel: (818)831-3117**
6 **Fax: (818)366-8164**

7 Attorney for Plaintiff, **DANIELLE WHITE**

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **LOS ANGELES DIVISION**

11 **DANIELLE WHITE,**

12 **Plaintiff,**

13 **vs.**

14 **COVIDIEN LP AND MEDTRONIC, INC.,**

15 **Defendants.**

) **CASE NO.**

) **COMPLAINT FOR MONEY DAMAGES**

) **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

16
17
18
19 **COMES NOW**, Plaintiff, **DANIELLE WHITE** ("Plaintiff"), by and through her undersigned
20 counsel, and brings this Complaint for damages against Defendants, **COVIDIEN LP AND**
21 **MEDTRONIC, INC.** ("Defendants"). and in support thereof states the following:

22 1. This is a device tort action brought on behalf of the above-named Plaintiff arising out of the
23 failure of Defendants' hernia mesh products, the Covidien Parietex Optimized Composite Mesh
24 ("Parietex Composite Mesh") and the Covidien Parietex Hydrophilic Anatomical Mesh ("Parietex
25 Hydrophilic Anatomical Mesh") (collectively referred to as "Parietex Products"). As a result,
26 Plaintiff **DANIELLE WHITE** ("Plaintiff") has suffered permanent injuries and significant pain and
27 suffering, emotional distress, lost wages and earning capacity, and diminished quality of life. Plaintiff
28 respectfully seeks all damages to which she may be legally entitled.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

2
3

4
5
6
7

8
9
0

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

8. This Court has diversity subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because the events or

10. Defendants have conducted, and continue to conduct, substantial business in the State of California and in this District; distribute Covidien Products in this District; receive substantial compensation and profits from sales of Covidien Products in this District; and make material omissions and misrepresentations and breaches of warranties in this District, so as to subject them to personal jurisdiction in this District.

11. Covidien and Medtronic are registered to transact business in California.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

12. On or about January 8, 2018, Plaintiff underwent laparoscopic ventral hernia repair by Dr. Khattar Ahmad at San Geronio Memorial Hospital. A Parietex Mesh was implanted in Plaintiff during this repair.

13. Defendants manufactured, sold, and/or distributed the Parietex Products to Plaintiff, through Plaintiff's doctors, to be used for treatment of hernia repair.

14. Plaintiff continues to suffer from abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, and constipation after hernia repair in January 2018, which has resulted in multiple visits to the Emergency Room, appointments with her primary care physician, surgery consultations, and the use of a substantial amount of narcotics in order to ease the symptoms.

20. Defendants' Parietex Composite Mesh is a two-sided composite mesh with an absorbable collagen barrier on the visceral side and a hydrophilic three-dimensional polyester textile on the peritoneal side used in the treatment of hernias such as laparoscopic ventral hernia repair.

21. Defendants claim that the Parietex Composite Mesh is coated with a protective absorbable collagen barrier to help prevent tissue attachment. However, the absorbable collagen barrier on the visceral side of Parietex Composite Mesh fails to protect the body from the hydrophilic

1 three-dimensional polyester textile on the parietal side because the absorbable collagen barrier breaks
2 down after coming in contact with moisture.

3 22. Defendants claim that the Parietex Composite Mesh incites true tissue integration rather
4 than inflammatory encapsulation and is optimized to minimize shrinkage. The composition of
5 polyester in the Parietex Composite Mesh is weak. It tears easily during handling and is known to
6 unravel causing the polyester fiber to detach and travel to other parts of the body inciting an
7 inflammatory response. Parietex Composite Mesh further contracts over time causing tension to
8 increase where secured by tacks and sutures resulting in tearing.

9 23. Contrary to the representations of Defendants, Parietex Composite Mesh has a high rate
10 of failure, injury, and complication; fails to perform as intended; and causes severe and irreversible
11 injuries like those suffered by Plaintiff.

12 24. Defendants' Parietex Hydrophilic Anatomical Mesh combines Parietex 2D weave with
13 Parietex 3D weave. The 2D weave is lightweight and macroporous with a design that is rigid,
14 making it ideal for laparoscopic applications due to its handling properties. The 3D weave is also a
15 lightweight, macroporous mesh but has a design that provides compliance and softness.

16 25. Defendants represent that Parietex Hydrophilic Anatomical Mesh provides a custom
17 designed mesh for laparoscopic inguinal hernia repair. Additionally, they represent that the material's
18 softness allows for gentle placement over sensitive nerve and vessel structures in the inguinal area.

19 26. Defendants applied for clearance from the United States Food and Drug
20 Administration ("FDA") to market the Parietex Products pursuant to Section 510(k) of the Food,
21 Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The Section 510(k) process allowed Defendants to skip pre-market clinical
22 studies and research intended to ensure the safety of the Parietex Products. The approval of the
23 Parietex Products was based on a substantial equivalence to legally marketed predicate devices.

24 27. The FDA maintains a database of adverse incidents related to medical implants and
25 devices and there are numerous reports documenting serious adverse events associated with the
26 Parietex Products. Defendants misrepresented the Parietex Products as a safe and effective treatment
27 for hernias; wrongly marketed the Parietex Products as safer and more effective than other meshes
28 or methods for hernia repair; and improperly minimized the adverse effects of the Parietex Products.

1 28. Defendants knew or should have known that the Parietex Products were not a safe and
2 effective treatment for hernias. Defendants also knew or should have known that the Parietex
3 Products were considerably more harmful and inadequate than other meshes or methods for hernia
4 repair. Additionally, Defendants knew or should have known that the Parietex Products were
5 unreasonably dangerous as well as defective and likely to cause severe complications.

6 29. Defendants knew or should have known of the defective nature of the Parietex Products
7 but continued to research, design, develop, test, manufacture, label, package, promote, advertise,
8 market, supply, sell, and/or distribute Parietex Products so as to maximize sales and profits at the
9 expense of the health and safety of the general public and Plaintiff. Defendants acted in conscious
10 disregard for the foreseeable harm caused by Parietex Products in not adequately warning the FDA,
11 the general public, the medical community, or Plaintiff of the numerous side effects, complications,
12 and contraindications of the Parietex Products.

13 30. Defendants were responsible for the research, design, development, testing, manufacture,
14 production, marketing, promotion, distribution, and sale of Parietex Products, including providing
15 the warnings and instructions concerning the product.

16 31. Among the intended purposes for which Defendants designed, manufactured, and sold
17 Parietex Products was use by surgeons for hernia repair surgeries. That is the purpose for which the
18 Parietex Products were implanted in Plaintiff.

19 32. Defendants represented to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's physicians that the Parietex Products
20 were a safe and effective product for hernia repair.

21
22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **STRICT LIABILITY – MANUFACTURING DEFECT**

24 33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all prior paragraphs.

25 34. Defendants expected and intended the Parietex Products to reach users such as Plaintiff in
26 the condition in which the products were sold.

27 35. The implantation of the Parietex Products in Plaintiff's body was medically reasonable and
28 was a type of use that Defendants intended and foresaw when they designed, manufactured and sold

1 45. Defendants provided no warning to physicians that the Parietex Composite Mesh's
2 collagen barrier quickly disintegrates once implanted and then exposes bare polyester to any
3 underlying organs. This results in infections and dense adhesions to the bowel resulting in bowel
4 obstructions, which are common with the Parietex Composite Mesh.

5 46. Defendants failed to adequately warn physicians that after implantation the unsealed edges
6 of the Parietex Products can begin to unravel causing polyester fibers to detach and travel to other
7 parts of the body inciting an inflammatory response.

8 47. Defendants failed to adequately warn physicians that Covidien's Parietex Mesh shrinks
9 and contracts to a significant degree after it is implanted. The polyester fibers that create the Parietex
10 are weaker than the titanium tacks or polypropylene sutures used to secure the mesh. Because of
11 this, the polyester fibers will tear on the securing tacks or sutures after tension increases due to the
12 mesh contracting. Once the mesh tears, the patient can re-herniate, and the mesh can migrate or ball
13 up.

14 48. Defendants failed to adequately warn physicians of the significant risk of complications
15 associated with mesh migration if the Parietex Products are implanted in the abdomen or inguinal
16 area to repair a hernia.

17 49. The Instructions for Use for the Parietex Products also failed to adequately warn
18 Plaintiff's physicians of numerous risks that Defendants knew or should have known were associated
19 with the Parietex Products, including: risks of the product's immunologic response, pain,
20 encapsulation, rejection, migration, scarification, contraction, adhesion to internal structures or
21 organs, erosion and migration through adjacent tissue and viscera, bowel obstruction, bowel
22 resections, or hernia incarceration or strangulation.

23 50. Defendants failed as well to adequately warn Plaintiff or Plaintiff's physicians about the
24 necessity for invasive surgical intervention in the event of complications with the Parietex Products
25 or train the physicians on the proper treatment of such complications when they occurred.

26 51. Defendants failed to adequately warn Plaintiff or his physicians that: the surgical removal
27 of the Parietex Products in the event of complications would leave the hernia unrepaired; the
28 resulting hernia would be much larger than the original; and further, more complicated medical

1 treatment to attempt to repair the same hernia would be necessary.

2 52. With respect to the complications listed in their warnings, Defendants provided no
3 information or warning regarding the frequency, severity, and duration of those complications,
4 although the complications associated with the Parietex Products were more frequent, more severe,
5 and longer lasting than those in safer feasible alternative hernia repair treatments.

6 53. If Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff's physicians had been properly warned of the defects and
7 dangers of the Parietex Products, and of the frequency, severity, and duration of the risks associated
8 with the products, Plaintiff would not have consented to allow the Parietex Products to be
9 implanted, and Plaintiff's physicians would not have implanted the products in Plaintiff.

10 54. As a direct and proximate result of the inadequate and defective warnings and
11 instructions, Plaintiff suffered injuries and damages as summarized in this Complaint.

12
13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **NEGLIGENCE**

15 55. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all prior Paragraphs.

16 56. Although Defendants had a duty to use reasonable care in designing, testing, inspecting,
17 manufacturing, packaging, labeling, marketing, distributing, and preparing written instructions and
18 warnings for the Parietex Products, they failed to do so.

19 57. Defendants knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that the
20 Parietex Products were defectively and unreasonably designed and/or manufactured and were
21 unreasonably dangerous and likely to injure patients in whom the products were implanted.
22 Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Plaintiff's physicians were unaware of the
23 dangers and defects inherent in the Parietex Products.

24 58. Defendants knew or should have known that polyester should not be used for incisional
25 hernia repair.

26 59. Defendants knew or should have known that the polyester used in the Parietex Products is
27 soft and flimsy compared to similar hernia products that are made of polypropylene.

1 60. Defendants knew or should have known that polyester incites a severe inflammatory
2 response once implanted and continues to incite a severe inflammatory response indefinitely or until
3 removed.

4 61. Defendants knew or should have known that polyester is more likely to cause a severe
5 inflammatory response than polypropylene, despite the protective absorbable collagen barrier that
6 has been applied to the Parietex Products in order to prevent tissue attachment.

7 62. Defendants knew or should have known that the protective absorbable collagen barrier
8 that has been applied to the Parietex Products in order to prevent tissue attachment can cause an
9 inflammatory response.

10 63. Defendants knew or should have known that the unsealed edges of the Parietex Products
11 would cause the products to fray and disintegrate once they have been implanted and organ
12 perforation can result.

13 64. Defendants knew or should have known of the significant risk of complications if the
14 Parietex Products are implanted into the abdomen to repair a ventral hernia. Nonetheless,
15 Defendants marketed the Parietex Products as being safe and effective for inguinal and abdominal
16 incisional hernia repair.

17 65. Defendants knew or should have known that the Parietex Products are more dangerous
18 and less effective than other meshes or methods for hernia repair and cause injury.

19 66. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence in designing, testing,
20 inspecting, manufacturing, packaging, labeling, marketing, distributing, and preparing written
21 instructions and warnings for the Parietex Products, Plaintiff suffered injuries and damages as
22 summarized in this Complaint.

23
24 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY**

26 67. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all prior paragraphs.

27 68. At all material times, Defendants manufactured, marketed, sold, distributed, and
28 otherwise placed into the stream of commerce the Parietex Products.

1 69. In advertising, marketing, and otherwise promoting Parietex Products to physicians,
2 hospitals, and other healthcare providers, Defendants expressly warranted that their products were
3 safe for use and reasonably fit for its intended purposes. In advertising, marketing, and otherwise
4 promoting Parietex Products, Defendants intended that physicians, hospitals, and other healthcare
5 providers rely upon their representations regarding safety and fitness, to induce them to implant the
6 Parietex Products in their patients.

7 70. With respect to Plaintiff **DANIELLE WHITE**, Defendants intended that the Parietex
8 Products be implanted by his treating surgeon in a reasonable and foreseeable manner, and in
9 accordance with the instructions for use and product specifications provided by Defendants. 76.
10 Defendants expressly warranted the following to physicians, hospitals, other healthcare providers,
11 and the general public, including Plaintiff **DANIELLE WHITE**: the Parietex Products were safe
12 and fit for use by consumers; they were of merchantable quality; the risks, side effects and potential
13 complications were minimal and comparable to other hernia mesh products; the Parietex Products
14 were adequately researched and tested; and they were fit for their intended use. Plaintiff and
15 Plaintiff's physicians and healthcare providers reasonably relied upon Defendants' express
16 representations and warranties, and consequently, Plaintiff was implanted with Defendants' products.

17 71. Defendants expressly warranted to physicians, hospitals, other healthcare providers and
18 the general public, including Plaintiff, that the Parietex Products were safe and fit for use for the
19 repair of both groin inguinal and abdominal hernias.

20 72. Defendants represented that the Parietex Products would prevent or minimize hernia
21 recurrence and pain, and facilitate incorporation of the mesh into the body, but it did not. Instead,
22 the Parietex Products caused infections and dense adhesions to the bowel resulting in bowel
23 obstructions and bowel resections.

24 73. Defendants breached these express warranties because the Parietex Products implanted in
25 Plaintiff were unreasonably dangerous, defective, and not as Defendants had represented.

26 74. Defendants breached express representations and warranties to Plaintiff, as well as her
27 physicians and healthcare providers, with respect to the Parietex Products, by representing the
28 following:

1 A. through labeling, advertising, marketing materials, detail persons, seminar
2 presentations, publications, notice letters, and regulatory submissions, among other methods, that
3 their product was safe; but they fraudulently withheld and concealed information about the
4 substantial risks of serious injury associated with using the Parietex Products.

5 B. the Parietex Products were as safe and/or safer than other alternative procedures
6 and devices on the market; but they fraudulently concealed information demonstrating that Parietex
7 Products were not safer than alternative therapies and products available on the market; and

8 C. the Parietex Products were more efficacious than other alternative procedures,
9 therapies and/or devices; but they fraudulently concealed information regarding the true efficacy of
10 the product.

11 75. Defendants' breach of their express warranties resulted in the implantation of
12 unreasonably dangerous and defective products into Plaintiff, placing his health and safety in
13 jeopardy.

14 76. When Defendants made such express warranties, they knew or should have known that
15 the Parietex Products do not conform to the express warranties. Defendants' acts were motivated by
16 financial gain, while the adverse consequences of their conduct was outrageous, fraudulent,
17 oppressive, done with malice or gross negligence, and evidenced reckless indifference to Plaintiff's
18 rights, health, and safety, so as to warrant the imposition of punitive damages.

19
20 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **VIOLATION OF FEDERAL & STATE CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS**

22 77. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all prior paragraphs.

23 78. Plaintiff purchased and used the Parietex Products primarily for personal use, and thereby
24 suffered ascertainable losses as a result of Defendants' actions in violation of the consumer
25 protection laws.

26 79. Had Defendants not engaged in the deceptive conduct described in this Complaint,
27 Plaintiff would not have purchased and/or paid for the Parietex Products and would not have
28 incurred related medical costs and injury.

1 80. Defendants engaged in wrongful conduct, while at the same time obtaining, under false
2 pretenses, moneys from Plaintiff for the Parietex Products, which would not have been paid had
3 Defendants not engaged in unfair and deceptive conduct.

4 81. Unfair methods of competition or deceptive acts or practices that were proscribed by law,
5 include the following:

6 A. representing that goods or services have characteristics, ingredients, uses,
7 benefits or qualities that they do not have;

8 B. advertising goods or services with the intent not to sell them as advertised; and,

9 C. engaging in fraudulent or deceptive conduct that creates a likelihood of confusion or
10 misunderstanding.

11 82. Plaintiff was injured by the cumulative and indivisible nature of Defendants
12 conduct. The cumulative effect of Defendants' conduct directed at patients, physicians, and
13 consumers was to create a demand for and sell the Parietex Products. Each aspect of Defendants'
14 conduct combined to artificially create sales of the products.

15 83. Defendants have a statutory duty to refrain from unfair or deceptive acts or trade
16 practices in the design, labeling, development, manufacture, promotion, and sale of Parietex
17 Products.

18 84. Had Defendants not engaged in the deceptive conduct described above, Plaintiff would
19 not have purchased and/or paid for the Parietex Products and would not have incurred related
20 medical costs.

21 85. Defendants' deceptive, unconscionable, or fraudulent representations, and material
22 omissions to patients, physicians, and consumers, including Plaintiff, constituted unfair and deceptive
23 acts and trade practices in violation of the federal and state consumer protection statutes listed
24 below.

25 86. Defendants' actions constitute unfair competition or unfair, unconscionable, deceptive or
26 fraudulent acts, or trade practices in violation of federal and state consumer protection statutes listed
27 below.

28

1 87. Defendants have engaged in unfair competition or unfair or deceptive acts or trade
2 practices or false advertising, or have made false representations in violation of: 15 U.S.C. §§
3 2301-2312 (1982) Cal. Civ. Code §§1750, et seq. Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2511, et seq.
4 Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. ch. 93A, § 1, et seq. Minn. Stat. Ann. § 325F.68, et seq. 94. Under the
5 statutes listed above Defendants are the suppliers, manufacturers, advertisers, and sellers subject to
6 liability under such legislation for unfair, deceptive, fraudulent, and unconscionable consumer sales
7 practices.

8 88. Defendants violated the statutes enacted in these states to protect consumers against
9 unfair, deceptive, fraudulent, and unconscionable trade and business practices and false advertising,
10 by knowingly and falsely representing that Parietex Products are fit to be used for the purpose for
11 which they were intended, when in fact they are defective and dangerous, and by other acts alleged
12 in this Complaint. These representations were made in marketing and promotional materials.

13 89. Defendants' actions and omissions are uncured or incurable deceptive acts under the
14 consumer protection laws.

15 90. Defendants had actual knowledge of the defective and dangerous condition of the
16 Parietex Products and failed to take any action to cure such defective and dangerous conditions.

17 91. Plaintiff and the medical community relied upon Defendants' misrepresentations and
18 omissions in determining which product and/or procedure to undergo and/or perform.

19 92. Defendants' deceptive, unconscionable, or fraudulent representations, and material
20 omissions to patients, physicians, and consumers, constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices.

21 93. By reason of the unlawful acts in which Defendants engaged, and as a direct
22 and proximate result of those acts, Plaintiff has suffered ascertainable losses and damages.

23 94. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violations of the consumer protection
24 laws, Plaintiff has sustained economic losses and other damages and is entitled to statutory and
25 compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

3

4
5

6
7
8

9
0
1

2
3
4
5

6
7
8
9

20
21
22
23

24
25
26

27

28

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT**

3 103. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all prior paragraphs.

4 104. At all material times, Defendants knew or should have known that Parietex Products
5 caused large numbers of complications. Moreover, they also knew or should have known the
6 following: the surgical technique and training of implanting physicians was not the cause of the
7 adverse events associated with these devices; the safety and efficacy of the Parietex Products had not
8 been proven with respect to, among other things, the product, its components, its performance, and
9 its method of insertion; the Parietex Products were not safe and effective. But, Defendants continued
10 to represent that the Parietex Products were safe and effective.

11 105. Despite what Defendants knew or should have known about the lack of safety and
12 efficacy of the Parietex Products, they failed to disclose this information to Plaintiff DANIELLE
13 WHITE, to Plaintiff's physicians, and to the public at large.

14 106. At all material times, Defendants had the duty and obligation to disclose to Plaintiff and
15 Plaintiff's physicians the true facts concerning Parietex Products: that they are dangerous and
16 defective, lacking efficacy for their purported use and lacking safety in normal use, and the likelihood
17 of the products causing serious consequences to users, including permanent and debilitating injuries.
18 Defendants concealed these material facts before Plaintiff was implanted with their products.

19 107. Defendants were under a duty to Plaintiff to disclose and warn of the
20 defective nature of the Parietex Products because:

21 A. Defendants were in a superior position to know the true quality, safety, and
22 efficacy of the Parietex Products;

23 B. Defendants knowingly made false claims in documents and marketing materials
24 about the safety and quality of the Parietex Products; and

25 C. Defendants fraudulently and affirmatively concealed the defective nature of the
26 Parietex Products from Plaintiff.

27 108. The facts concealed and/or not disclosed by Defendants to Plaintiff and his physician
28 were material facts that a reasonable person would have considered to be important in deciding

1 whether to purchase and/or use the Parietex Products. 116. At all material times, Defendants
2 willfully, intentionally, and maliciously
3 concealed facts as set forth above from Plaintiff and his physicians, with the intent to
4 defraud.

5 109. Defendants intentionally concealed and/or failed to disclose the true defective nature of
6 the Parietex Products so that Plaintiff would request and purchase the products, and his healthcare
7 providers would dispense, prescribe, and recommend Parietex Products; and Plaintiff justifiably acted
8 or relied upon the concealed and/or nondisclosed facts to his detriment.

9 110. At all material times, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's physicians were aware of the facts
10 set forth above. Had they been aware of the facts, they would not have acted as they did, i.e., would
11 not have reasonably relied upon the representations of safety and efficacy and utilized Parietex
12 Products in their treatment. Defendants' failure to disclose this information was a substantial factor
13 in Plaintiff's physicians selecting Defendants' Parietex Products. The failure to disclose also resulted
14 in the provision of incorrect and incomplete information to Plaintiff, as a patient.

15 111. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff was injured.

17 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION**

19 112. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in all prior paragraphs.

20 113. Defendants had a duty to accurately and truthfully represent to the medical
21 and healthcare community, Plaintiff, and the public, that the Parietex Products had not
22 been adequately tested and found to be a safe and effective treatment. Defendants'
23 representations were in fact false.

24 114. Defendants failed to exercise ordinary care in the representations concerning Parietex
25 Products while they were involved in its manufacture, sale, testing, quality assurance, quality control,
26 and distribution in interstate commerce, because Defendants negligently misrepresented or concealed
27 the Parietex Products' high risk of unreasonable and dangerous adverse side effects.

1 115. Defendants breached their duty in representing to Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physicians, and the
2 medical community, that Parietex Products had no serious side effects different from those of other
3 similar products and/or procedures.

4 116. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of Defendants' negligent misrepresentations,
5 they knew or should have known that the Parietex Products had been insufficiently tested or had not
6 been tested at all. As well, they knew or should have known that the products lacked adequate and
7 accurate warnings, creating a high risk—or higher than acceptable or reported and represented
8 risk—of adverse side effects. Those included immunologic response, pain, encapsulation, rejection,
9 migration, scarification, contraction, adhesion to internal structures or organs, erosion and migration
10 through adjacent tissue and viscera, bowel obstruction, bowel resections, or hernia incarceration
11 or strangulation.

12 117. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' acts and omissions, Plaintiff
13 **DANIELLE WHITE** has been injured and sustained severe pain, suffering, disability, impairment,
14 loss of enjoyment of life, loss of care, comfort, and economic damages.

15
16 **PUNITIVE DAMAGES**

17 118. Plaintiff incorporates the allegations in all prior paragraphs.

18 119. Defendants failed to adequately test and study the Parietex Products to determine and
19 ensure that the products were safe and effective before releasing the products for sale for permanent
20 human implantation; and Defendants continued to manufacture and sell the products after having
21 obtained knowledge and information that it was defective and unreasonably unsafe.

22 120. At all material times, Defendants knew or should have known that the Parietex Products
23 were inherently more dangerous with respect to the following risks: immunologic response, pain,
24 encapsulation, rejection, migration, scarification, contraction, adhesion to internal structures or
25 organs, erosion and migration through adjacent tissue and viscera, bowel obstruction, bowel
26 resections, or hernia incarceration or strangulation.

27 121. Defendants' misrepresentations included knowingly withholding material information
28 from the medical community and the public, including Plaintiff, concerning the safety and efficacy of

1 the Parietex Products, thus depriving Plaintiff and his
2 implanting physicians of vitally necessary information to make a fully informed decision
3 about whether to use the products.

4 122. At all material times, Defendants knew and recklessly and/or intentionally disregarded the
5 fact that the Parietex Products can cause debilitating and potentially lifethreatening side effects with
6 greater frequency than safer alternative methods, products,
7 procedures, and/or treatment. But they recklessly failed to advise the medical community
8 and the general public, including Plaintiff, of the risks and side effects.

9 123. At all material times, Defendants intentionally misstated and misrepresented data, and
10 continue to misrepresent data, so as to minimize the perceived risk of injuries and the rate of
11 complications associated with the Parietex Products.

12 124. Notwithstanding the foregoing and the growing body of knowledge and information
13 regarding the true and defective nature of the Parietex Products' increased risk of side effects and
14 serious complications, Defendants continued to aggressively market the product to the medical
15 community and to consumers without disclosing the
16 true risk of such complications.

17 125. When Plaintiff **DANIELLE WHITE** was implanted with the Parietex Products and
18 since then, Defendants have known that the Parietex Products are defective and unreasonably
19 dangerous. Nonetheless, they have continued to manufacture, produce, assemble, market, distribute,
20 and sell the products so as to maximize sales and profits at the expense of the health and safety of the
21 public, in a conscious, reckless and/or intentional disregard of the likely and foreseeable harm caused
22 by the Parietex Products to the public, including Plaintiff.

23 126. At all material times, Defendants have concealed and/or failed to disclose to the public
24 the serious risks and the potential complications associated with the Parietex Products, to ensure
25 continued and increased sales and profits, to the detriment of the public, including Plaintiff.

26 127. Defendants' acts and omissions are of such character and nature so as to entitle Plaintiff
27 to an award of punitive damages in accordance with applicable statutory and common law.
28 Defendants' conduct shows willful misconduct, malice, fraud, wantonness, oppression, or that entire

1 want of care, which raises the presumption of conscious indifference to consequences, thereby
2 justifying an award of punitive damages.

3
4 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, individually, jointly, and
5 severally; and requests compensatory damages and punitive damages, together with interest, costs of
6 suit, attorneys' fees, and such further relief as the Court deems equitable and just.

7
8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**


9 Plaintiff, **DANIELLE WHITE**, demands judgment against Defendants, individually, jointly
10 and severally, and prays for the following relief in accordance with applicable law and equity:

- 11 i. Compensatory damages to Plaintiff for past, present, and future damages, including but not
12 limited to, pain and suffering for severe and permanent personal injuries sustained by Plaintiff,
13 permanent impairment, mental pain and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, health and medical care
14 costs, economic damages, together with interest and costs as provided by law;
- 15 ii. Restitution and disgorgement of profits;
- 16 iii. Punitive damages;
- 17 iv. Reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by law;
- 18 v. Costs of these proceedings, including past and future costs of suit;
- 19 vi. Past, present, and future medical expenses;
- 20 vii. Past, present, and future physical pain and suffering;
- 21 viii. Past, present, and future mental anxiety and anguish;
- 22 ix. Past, present, and future lost wages and earnings;
- 23 x. Past, present, and future loss of earning capacity;
- 24 xi. Past, present, and future loss of enjoyment of life; and
- 25 xii. All reasonable damages as will be more fully shown at trial.
- 26 xiii. All ascertainable economic damages;
- 27 xiv. Prejudgment interest on all damages as allowed by law; and
- 28 xv. Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

DATED: _____

LAW OFFICES OF CHRIS CONNOLLY



CHRIS CONNOLLY, ESQ
Attorney for Applicant,
DANIELLE WHITE

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, DANIELLE WHITE, hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

DATED: _____

LAW OFFICES OF CHRIS CONNOLLY


CHRIS CONNOLLY, ESQ
Attorney for Applicant,
DANIELLE WHITE