

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA**

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| CONNIE FRANKLIN and MARVIN FRANKLIN, |) | Civil Action No.: 4:17-cv-00031 |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | |
| |) | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| JOHNSON & JOHNSON and ETHICON, INC., |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |

COMPLAINT

Come now Plaintiffs, Connie Franklin and Marvin Franklin (Collectively, “Plaintiffs”; Connie Franklin may be referred to individually as “Plaintiff”), by and through undersigned counsel, and bring this action against Defendants Ethicon, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson (hereinafter “Defendants”), and allege as follows:

Parties

1. Plaintiffs are, and were, at all relevant times, citizens and residents of Georgia and the United States.

2. Defendant Johnson & Johnson (“J&J”) is a corporation incorporated in New Jersey, and according to its website, the world’s largest and most diverse medical device and diagnostics company, with its principal place of business located at One Johnson & Johnson Plaza, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Defendant J&J is a citizen of New Jersey.

3. Defendant J&J organizes its subsidiary businesses into individual Business Units to coordinate the development, manufacture, testing, marketing promotion, training, distribution

and sale of its products, including but not limited to its hernia repair mesh products. Within J&J there are three sectors: medical devices and diagnostics, pharmaceutical, and consumer. Within the medical devices and diagnostic sector are “Business Units” including the “Ethicon Franchise.” The Ethicon Franchise was charged by J&J with the design, development, promotion, marketing, testing, training, distribution and sale of the hernia repair mesh products at issue in this case. The Company Group Chairman and Worldwide Franchise Chairman for the Ethicon Franchise, Gary Pruden, is employed by J&J. The companies which comprise the Ethicon Franchise are thus controlled by J&J and include, but are not limited to, Ethicon Inc.

4. Defendant Ethicon, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Defendant Johnson & Johnson. Defendant Ethicon, Inc. is a corporation incorporated in the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business in Somerville, New Jersey. Ethicon is a citizen of New Jersey. Ethicon is authorized and registered to transact business within the State of Georgia, and its registered agent is Corporation Process Company, 2180 Satellite Boulevard, Suite 400, Duluth, Georgia 30097.

5. Ethicon is a medical device company involved in the research, development, testing, manufacture, production, marketing, promotion and/or sale of medical devices including Physiomesh (hereinafter may be referred to as the “product”).

6. J&J, directly and/or through the actions of Ethicon, Inc., has at all pertinent times been responsible for the research, development, testing, manufacture, production, marketing, promotion, distribution and/or sale of Physiomesh.

7. Defendants are individually, jointly and severally liable to Plaintiffs for damages suffered by Plaintiff Connie Franklin arising from the Defendants’ design,

manufacture, marketing, labeling, distribution, sale and placement of its defective mesh products at issue in the instant action, effectuated directly and indirectly through their respective agents, servants, employees and/or owners, all acting within the course and scope of their representative agencies, services, employments and/or ownership.

8. Defendants are vicariously liable for the acts and/or omissions of its employees and/or agents who were at all times relevant hereto acting on behalf of Defendants and within the scope of their employment or agency with Defendants.

Jurisdiction and Venue

9. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) based on complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiff and all Defendants. The amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over each of the Defendants pursuant to the Georgia Long-Arm Statute, O.C.G.A. § 9-10-91. Defendants transact business within the State of Georgia, and Defendants committed tortious acts and omissions in Georgia. Defendants' tortious acts and omissions caused injury to Plaintiffs in the State of Georgia. Defendants have purposefully engaged in the business of developing, manufacturing, publishing information, marketing, distributing, promoting and/or selling, either directly or indirectly, medical devices including Physiomesh mesh products in Georgia, for which they derived significant and regular income. The Defendants reasonably expected that that their defective mesh products, including Physiomesh, would be sold and implanted in Georgia.

11. Defendant Ethicon is registered to transact business in Georgia, and is thus also subject to personal jurisdiction pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 14-2-510.

12. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) and M.D. Ga. Local Rule 3.4.

Facts Common To All Counts

13. Plaintiff Connie Franklin was implanted with a Physiomesh (20CM x 25CM) device at Midtown Medical Center in Columbus, Georgia to attempt repair of an incisional hernia.

14. Defendants manufactured, sold, and/or distributed the Physiomesh device to Plaintiff, through her doctors, to be used for treatment of hernia repair.

15. On or about August 1, 2016, Plaintiff Connie Franklin underwent surgery at Midtown Medical Center in Columbus, Georgia for recurrence of her incisional hernia after her Physiomesh device. Ms. Franklin presented with pain, nausea and vomiting. The central portion of the Physiomesh device was not incorporated into the abdominal wall and loops of Ms. Franklin's intestines were protruding through the ruptured central portion of the mesh, and she suffered an intestinal obstruction. The mesh was densely adhered to the loops of Ms. Franklin's intestines. Ms. Franklin underwent a prolonged surgical procedure to attempt to remove the Physiomesh from her intestines and to remove the mesh that failed to incorporate into the abdominal fascia. Portions of the Physiomesh could not be removed, and remain in Ms. Franklin's body.

16. Defendants were responsible for the research, design, development, testing, manufacture, production, marketing, promotion, distribution and sale of Physiomesh, including providing the warnings and instructions concerning the product.

17. Among the intended purposes for which Defendants designed, manufactured and sold Physiomesb was use by surgeons for hernia repair surgeries, the purpose for which the Physiomesb was implanted in Plaintiff Connie Franklin.

18. Defendants represented to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's physicians that Physiomesb was a safe and effective product for hernia repair.

19. Defendants' Physiomesb was defectively designed and/or manufactured, was not reasonably safe for its intended use in hernia repair, and the risks of the design outweighed any potential benefits associated with the design. As a result of the defective design and/or manufacture of the Physiomesb, there was an unreasonable risk of severe adverse reactions to the mesh or mesh components including: chronic pain; recurrence of hernia; foreign body response; rejection; infection; inadequate or failure of incorporation/ingrowth; migration; scarification; deformation of mesh; improper wound healing; excessive and chronic inflammation; adhesions to internal organs; erosion; abscess; fistula formation; granulomatous response; seroma formation; nerve damage; tissue damage and/or death; and other complications.

20. Physiomesb has a unique design incorporating five (5) distinct layers: two layers of polyglecaprone-25 ("Monocryl") film covering two underlying layers of polydioxanone film ("PDS"), which in turn coat a polypropylene mesh. This design is not used in any other hernia repair product sold in the United States. The multi-layer coating was represented and promoted by the Defendants to prevent or minimize adhesion and inflammation and to facilitate incorporation of the mesh into the body, but it did not. Instead, the multi-layer coating prevented adequate incorporation of the mesh into the body and caused or contributed to an intense inflammatory and chronic foreign body response resulting in an adverse tissue reaction including

migration and damage to surrounding tissue in the form of sclerotic, granulomatous and/or fibrotic tissue and improper healing.

21. When affixed to the body's tissue, the impermeable multi-layer coating of the Physiomesh prevents fluid escape, which leads to seroma formation, and which in turn can cause infection, abscess formation and other complications.

22. The multi-layer coating provides a breeding ground for bacteria in which the bacteria cannot be eliminated by the body's immune response, which allows infection to proliferate.

23. The multi-layer coating of Defendants' Physiomesh is cytotoxic, immunogenic, and not biocompatible, which causes or contributes to complications such as delayed wound healing, inflammation, foreign body response, rejection, infection, and other complications.

24. Defendants knew or should have known of the cytotoxic and immunogenic properties of the multi-layer coating of the Physiomesh prior to introducing it into the stream of commerce.

25. The polypropylene mesh portion of the Physiomesh was insufficient to withstand normal abdominal forces, which resulted in recurrent hernia formation and/or rupture and deformation of the mesh itself.

26. When the multi-layer coating of the Physiomesh is disrupted and/or degrades, the "naked" polypropylene mesh is exposed to the adjoining tissue and viscera, and can become adhered to organs, and cause damage to organs, and potentiate fistula formation.

27. These manufacturing and design defects associated with the Physiomesh were directly and proximately related to the injuries suffered by Plaintiff Connie Franklin.

28. Neither Plaintiff Connie Franklin nor her implanting physician were adequately warned or informed by Defendants of the defective and dangerous nature of Physiomesh. Moreover, neither Plaintiff Connie Franklin nor her implanting physician were adequately warned or informed by Defendants of the risks associated with the Physiomesh or the frequency, severity, or duration of such risks.

29. The Physiomesh implanted in Plaintiff Connie Franklin failed to reasonably perform as intended. The mesh failed, caused serious injury and portions of the mesh had to be surgically removed via invasive surgery, and necessitated additional invasive surgery to repair the hernia that the Physiomesh was initially implanted to treat.

30. Plaintiff Connie Franklin's severe adverse reaction, and the necessity for surgical removal of the Physiomesh, directly and proximately resulted from the defective and dangerous condition of the product and Defendants' defective and inadequate warnings about the risks associated with the product, and the frequency, severity and duration of such risks. Plaintiff Connie Franklin has suffered, and will continue to suffer, both physical injury and pain and mental anguish, permanent and severe scarring and disfigurement, and has incurred substantial medical bills and other expenses, resulting from the defective and dangerous condition of the product and from Defendants' defective and inadequate warnings about the risks associated with the product.

COUNT I
Strict Product Liability: Defective Design

31. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the allegations in paragraphs 13 through 29 as if fully set forth herein.

32. At the time the Physiomesh that was implanted in Plaintiff Connie Franklin's body, the product was defectively designed. As described above, there was an unreasonable risk that the product would not perform safely and effectively for the purposes for which it was intended, and Defendants failed to design against such dangers, and failed to provide adequate warnings and instructions concerning these risks.

33. Defendants expected and intended the Physiomesh product to reach users such as Plaintiff in the condition in which the product was sold.

34. The implantation of Physiomesh in Plaintiff's body was medically reasonable, and was a type of use that Defendants intended and foresaw when it designed, manufactured and sold the product.

35. The risks of the Physiomesh design significantly outweigh any benefits that Defendants contend could be associated with the product's design. The multi-layer coating, which is not used in any other hernia mesh product sold in the United States, prevents tissue from incorporating into the mesh, leading to encapsulation, deformation, scarification and contraction, migration, erosion and rejection. The impermeable multi-layer coating leads to seroma formation, and provides a breeding ground for infection, and protects bacteria from being eliminated by the body's natural immune response.

36. The multi-layer coating of the Physiomesh, which was marketed, promoted and intended as a barrier against adhesion to the internal organs, was only temporary; it was expected and intended to degrade over time inside the body. Thus, this coating prevented tissue ingrowth in the short term, and degraded in the long-term, eventually leaving the "naked" polypropylene mesh exposed to the internal viscera and tissues. The degradation of this multi-layer coating

caused or exacerbated an intense inflammatory and foreign body reaction. Once exposed to the viscera, the polypropylene mesh will inevitably adhere to the viscera, initiating a cascade of adverse consequences. Any purported beneficial purpose of the multi-layer coating (to prevent adhesion to the internal viscera and organs) was non-existent; the product provided no benefit while substantially increasing the risks to the patient.

37. The polypropylene mesh within the defective multi-layer coating of the Physiomesh was in itself dangerous and defective, particularly when used in the manner intended by Defendants in the Physiomesh. When implanted adjacent to the intestines and other internal organs, as Defendants intended for Physiomesh, polypropylene mesh is unreasonably susceptible to adhesion, bowel perforation or erosion, fistula formation and bowel strangulation or hernia incarceration, and other injuries.

38. The polypropylene mesh used in the Physiomesh device was insufficient in strength to withstand the internal forces of the abdomen after implantation, which made the device susceptible to rupture and/or deformation, as occurred with the Physiomesh implanted in Ms. Franklin.

39. The appropriate treatment for complications associated with Physiomesh involves additional invasive surgery to remove the mesh from the body, thus eliminating any purported benefit that the mesh was intended to provide to the patient.

40. Physiomesh was designed and intended for intraperitoneal implantation, which involved the product being implanted in contact with the intestines and/or other internal organs, which unnecessarily increased the risks of adhesion, erosion, fistula formation, and other injuries.

41. At the time the Physiomesh was implanted in Plaintiff, there were safer feasible alternative designs for hernia mesh products that would have prevented the injuries she suffered.

42. The Physiomesh product cost significantly more than competitive products because of its unique multi-layer coating, even though the multi-layer coating provided no benefit to consumers, and increased the risks to patients implanted with these devices.

43. The Physiomesh implanted in Plaintiff failed to reasonably perform as intended, and had to be surgically removed necessitating further invasive surgery to repair the very issue that the product was intended to repair, and thus provided no benefit to her.

44. As a direct and proximate result of the defective and unreasonably dangerous condition of the product, Plaintiff suffered injuries and damages as summarized herein.

COUNT II
Strict Product Liability: Failure to Warn

45. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the allegations in paragraphs 13 through 29 as if fully set forth herein.

46. At the time the Physiomesh that was implanted in Plaintiff's body, the warnings and instructions provided by Defendants for the Physiomesh were inadequate and defective. As described above, there was an unreasonable risk that the product would not perform safely and effectively for the purposes for which it was intended, and Defendants failed to design and/or manufacture against such dangers, and failed to provide adequate warnings and instructions concerning these risks.

47. Defendants expected and intended the Physiomesh product to reach users such as Plaintiff in the condition in which the product was sold.

48. Plaintiff and her physicians were unaware of the defects and dangers of Physiomesh, and were unaware of the frequency, severity and duration of the defects and risks associated with the Physiomesh.

49. The Defendants' Instructions for Use provided with the Physiomesh expressly understates and misstates the risks known to be associated specifically with the Physiomesh by stating that "Potential adverse reactions are those typically associated with surgically implantable materials." No other surgical mesh sold in the United States – and no other "surgically implantable material" – suffers the same serious design flaws as Physiomesh. No other device or material contains the dangerous and defective multi-layer coating, which itself causes or increases the risks of numerous complications, including prevention of incorporation, increased risk of seroma formation, immunologic response, increased risk for infection, and increased inflammatory reaction and foreign body response. Defendants provided no warning to physicians about the risks or increased risks specifically associated with the unique design of the Physiomesh.

50. The Defendants' Instructions for Use for the Physiomesh failed to adequately warn Plaintiff's physicians of numerous risks which Defendants knew or should have known were associated with the Physiomesh, including the risks of the product's inhibition of tissue incorporation, pain, immunologic response, dehiscence, encapsulation, rejection, migration, scarification, shrinkage/contraction, adhesion to internal organs and viscera, erosion through adjacent tissue and viscera, intestinal obstruction, failure of repair/hernia recurrence, hernia incarceration or strangulation, or rupture of the mesh.

51. Defendants failed to adequately train or warn Plaintiff or her physicians about the necessity for invasive surgical intervention in the event of complications, or how to properly treat such complications when they occurred.

52. Defendants failed to adequately warn Plaintiff or her physicians that the necessary surgical removal of the Physiomesh in the event of complications would leave the hernia unrepaired, and would necessitate further medical treatment to attempt to repair the same hernia that the failed Physiomesh was intended to treat.

53. Defendants represented to physicians, including Plaintiff's physician, that the multi-layer coating would prevent or reduce adhesion, and expressly intended for the Physiomesh to be implanted in contact with the intestines and internal organs and marketed and promoted the product for said purpose. Defendants failed to warn physicians that the multi-layer coating prevented tissue ingrowth, which is the desired biologic response to an implantable mesh device. Defendants failed to warn physicians that the multi-layer coating was only temporary and therefore at best would provide only a temporary adhesion barrier, and when the coating inevitably degraded, the exposed polypropylene would become adhered to the organs or tissue.

54. With respect to the complications that were listed in the Defendants' warnings, Defendants provided no information or warning regarding the frequency, severity and duration of those complications, even though the complications associated with Physiomesh were more frequent, more severe and lasted longer than those with safer feasible alternative hernia repair treatments.

55. If Plaintiff and/or her physicians had been properly warned of the defects and dangers of Physiomesh, and of the frequency, severity and duration of the risks associated with

the Physiomesh, Plaintiff would not have consented to allow the Physiomesh to be implanted in her body, and Plaintiff physicians would not have implanted the Physiomesh in Plaintiff.

56. As a direct and proximate result of the inadequate and defective warnings and instructions, Plaintiff suffered injuries and damages as summarized herein.

COUNT III
Negligence

57. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the allegations of paragraphs 13 through 56 as if fully set forth herein.

58. Defendants had a duty to use reasonable care in designing, testing, inspecting, manufacturing, packaging, labeling, marketing, distributing, training, and preparing written instructions and warnings for Physiomesh, but failed to do so.

59. Defendants knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that Physiomesh was defectively and unreasonably designed and/or manufactured, and was unreasonably dangerous and likely to injure patients in whom Physiomesh was implanted. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Plaintiff's physicians were unaware of the dangers and defects inherent in the Physiomesh.

60. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence in designing, testing, inspecting, manufacturing, packaging, labeling, marketing, distributing, training and preparing written instructions and warnings for Physiomesh, Plaintiffs suffered injuries and damages as summarized herein.

COUNT IV
Loss of Consortium

61. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the allegations in paragraphs 13 through 29 as if fully set forth herein.

62. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described injuries sustained by Plaintiff Connie Franklin, her husband, Plaintiff Marvin Franklin, has suffered a loss of his wife's consortium, companionship, society, affection, services and support.

Count V
Punitive Damages

63. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the allegations in paragraphs 13 through 62 as if fully set forth herein.

64. Defendants failed to adequately test and study the Physiomesh to determine and ensure that the product was safe and effective prior to releasing the product for sale for permanent human implantation, and Defendants continued to manufacture and sell Physiomesh after obtaining knowledge and information that the product was defective and unreasonably unsafe. Even though Defendants has other hernia repair mesh devices that do not present the same risks as the Physiomesh, Defendants developed, designed and sold Physiomesh, and continue to do so, because the Physiomesh has a significantly higher profit margin than other hernia repair products. Defendants were aware of the probable consequences of implantation of the dangerous and defective Physiomesh, including the risk of failure and serious injury, such as suffered by Plaintiff. Defendants willfully and recklessly failed to avoid those consequences, and in doing so, Defendants acted intentionally, maliciously and recklessly with regard the safety of those persons who might foreseeably have been harmed by the Physiomesh product, including Plaintiffs, justifying the imposition of punitive damages.

WHEREFORE, as a result of the acts and omissions and conduct of Defendants set forth herein, Plaintiff Connie Franklin is entitled to recover for her personal injuries; past, present, and future medical and related expenses; and past, present and future mental and physical pain and suffering; and Plaintiff Marvin Franklin is entitled to recover for loss of consortium and services; Plaintiffs should be awarded punitive damages; and Plaintiffs should recover any other relief, monetary or equitable, to which they are entitled.

Plaintiffs demand trial by jury, judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, for compensatory and punitive damages in an amount not less than \$75,000, as well as costs, attorney fees, interest, and any other relief, monetary or equitable, to which they are entitled.

By: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Connie Franklin and Marvin Franklin

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

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

DEFENDANTSJohnson & Johnson and
Ethicon, Inc.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant **Middlesex Co., NJ**
(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)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.](#)

| CONTRACT | TORTS | FORFEITURE/PENALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise | PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice PERSONAL INJURY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability | <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions | <input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 | <input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes |
| REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property | CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty Other: <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement | | | |

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 ACTIONCite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
28 U.S.C. Sec. 1332 (a)(2)Brief description of cause:
Product liability/personal injury**VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$ >75,000

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

2/2/2017

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
 Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Middle District of Georgia ☐

CONNIE FRANKLIN and
MARVIN FRANKLIN

Plaintiff(s)

v.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON and
ETHICON, INC.

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. 4:17-cv-31

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)* Johnson & Johnson
M.H. Ullman
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08933

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:

[REDACTED]

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 \$ 0.00 .

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:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Middle District of Georgia ☐

CONNIE FRANKLIN and
MARVIN FRANKLIN

Plaintiff(s)

v.

JOHNSON & JOHNSON and
ETHICON, INC.

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No. 4:17-cv-31

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)* Ethicon, Inc.
c/o Corporation Process Company
2180 Satellite Boulevard, Suite 400
Duluth, Georgia 30097

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:

[REDACTED]

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 \$ 0.00 .

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: