

EXHIBIT B1

1 LUKE ELLIS, ESQ., C.S.B. 68863
2 KRISTIN LUCEY, ESQ., C.S.B. 184153
3 GILLIN, JACOBSON, ELLIS & LARSEN
2 Theatre Square, Suite 230
Orinda, CA 94563
4 Telephone: (925) 253-5800
Facsimile: (925) 253-5858

ENDORSED FILED
SOLANO SUPERIOR COURT
06 JUN 15 PM 2:41
LINDA G. ASHCRAFT
BY G. ROBINS
DEPUTY CLERK

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
6 CLIFFORD HOSLER and
DALE PATTON

ASSIGNED TO
JUDGE PAUL L. BEEMAN
FOR ALL PURPOSES

8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO

BY FAX

12 CLIFFORD HOSLER and DALE PATTON
13 Plaintiffs,
14 v.
15 GUIDANT CORPORATION; GUIDANT
16 SALES CORPORATION; CARDIAC
PACEMAKERS, INC.; BOSTON
17 SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION; SUTTER
SOLANO MEDICAL CENTER;
18 NORTHBAY HEALTHCARE
CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 100,
19 inclusive,
20 Defendants.

Case No.: FCS028004
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

21 Plaintiffs, CLIFFORD HOSLER and DALE PATTON, by and through their attorneys,
22 Gillin, Jacobson, Ellis & Larsen, for causes of action against Defendants, and each of them,
23 allege the following:

24 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

25 **I. THE PARTIES AND VENUE ALLEGATIONS**

26 1. Plaintiff, CLIFFORD HOSLER, is a resident of the State of California, County of
27 Solano. The County of Solano was the County where the products complained of herein were
28 actually used. At all times herein mentioned, the County of Solano was the site of acts,

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

1

Filed By
One Legal

1 LUKE ELLIS, ESQ., C.S.B. 68863
2 KRISTIN LUCEY, ESQ., C.S.B. 184153
3 GILLIN, JACOBSON, ELLIS & LARSEN
4 2 Theatre Square, Suite 230
Orinda, CA 94563
Telephone: (925) 253-5800
Facsimile: (925) 253-5858

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
6 CLIFFORD HOSLER and
DALE PATTON

7
8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO
10

11
12 CLIFFORD HOSLER and DALE PATTON

Case No.:

13 Plaintiffs,

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

14 v.

15 GUIDANT CORPORATION; GUIDANT
16 SALES CORPORATION; CARDIAC
PACEMAKERS, INC.; BOSTON
17 SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION; SUTTER
SOLANO MEDICAL CENTER;
18 NORTHBAY HEALTHCARE
CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 100,
19 inclusive,

20 Defendants.

21 Plaintiffs, CLIFFORD HOSLER and DALE PATTON, by and through their attorneys,
22 Gillin, Jacobson, Ellis & Larsen, for causes of action against Defendants, and each of them,
23 allege the following:

24 **PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

25 **I. THE PARTIES AND VENUE ALLEGATIONS**

26 I. Plaintiff, CLIFFORD HOSLER, is a resident of the State of California, County of
27 Solano. The County of Solano was the County where the products complained of herein were
28 actually used. At all times herein mentioned, the County of Solano was the site of acts,

1 negligence, and wrongful and tortious conduct that resulted in the injuries and damages
2 complained of as set forth herein.

3 2. Plaintiff, DALE PATTON, is a resident of the State of California, County of
4 Solano. The County of Solano was the County where the products complained of herein were
5 actually used. At all times herein mentioned, the County of Solano was the site of acts,
6 negligence, and wrongful and tortious conduct that resulted in the injuries and damages
7 complained of as set forth herein.

8 3. Defendant Sutter Solano Medical Center ("SUTTER SOLANO") is, and at all
9 times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of
10 California and a resident of the State of California, County of Solano. Plaintiff is informed and
11 believes and thereon alleges, that at all times herein concerned, Defendant SUTTER SOLANO
12 was licensed to do business in, and was at all times herein alleged doing business in the County
13 of Solano, State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all
14 times herein concerned, Defendant SUTTER SOLANO owned and operated Sutter Medical
15 Center, located at 300 Hospital Drive in Vallejo, California.

16 4. Defendant Northbay Healthcare Corporation ("NORTHBAY") is, and at all times
17 herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of
18 California and a resident of the State of California, County of Solano. Plaintiff is informed and
19 believes and thereon alleges, that at all times herein concerned, Defendant NORTHBAY was
20 licensed to do business in, and was at all times herein alleged doing business in the County of
21 Solano, State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all
22 times herein concerned, Defendant NORTHBAY owned and operated Northbay Medical Center,
23 located at 1200 B. Gale Wilson Boulevard in Fairfield, California.

24 5. Defendant Guidant Corporation ("GUIDANT CORP.") is an Indiana corporation,
25 with its principal place of business at 111 Monument Circle, 29th Floor, Indianapolis, Indiana.
26 GUIDANT CORP. develops technology to treat conditions such as heart disease, neurological
27 disorders, and vascular illness. GUIDANT CORP.'s CRM Division is the division that develops,
28 researches, advertises, promotes, markets, and sells all of Guidant's implantable cardioverter

1 defibrillators ("ICDs") and pacemakers, which are marketed under a variety of trade names, with
2 multiple models and serial numbers pertinent to each device. CRM Division's operations are
3 principally conducted out of its facilities at 4100 Hamline Avenue North, St. Paul, Minnesota.

4 6. GUIDANT CORP. sells its ICDs and pacemakers through its wholly-owned
5 subsidiary, Defendant Guidant Sales Corporation ("GUIDANT SALES"). GUIDANT SALES is
6 an Indiana corporation, with its principal place of business at 111 Monument Circle in
7 Indianapolis, Indiana.

8 7. Defendant Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. ("CPI"), a Minnesota corporation, developed
9 Guidant's ICDs and pacemakers. CPI was merged into GUIDANT CORP. in or about
10 September 1994, and is now a wholly-owned subsidiary of GUIDANT CORP., with
11 headquarters at 4100 Hamline Ave. North, St. Paul, Minnesota.

12 8. Defendant Boston Scientific Corporation ("BOSTON SCIENTIFIC") describes
13 itself as a worldwide developer, manufacturer, and marketer of medical devices, whose products
14 are used in a broad range of interventional medical specialties with reported revenue of \$6.3
15 billion in 2005. BOSTON SCIENTIFIC is incorporated in the State of Delaware with its
16 principal executive office located in Natick, Massachusetts. In January 2006, BOSTON
17 SCIENTIFIC entered into an agreement to acquire GUIDANT CORP. and its subsidiaries for
18 approximately \$27 billion. With final approval of that merger, BOSTON SCIENTIFIC is the
19 successor in interest to GUIDANT CORP. and, directly or indirectly, has assumed GUIDANT
20 CORP.'s liabilities in this litigation. BOSTON SCIENTIFIC together with the other Guidant
21 entities referenced above will collectively be referred to throughout this complaint as GUIDANT
22 and/or the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS.

23 9. The GUIDANT DEFENDANTS' business units present themselves under the
24 "Guidant" corporate banner to the general public, including to the Food and Drug Administration
25 ("FDA"), physicians, and individuals. As the Independent Panel that reviewed GUIDANT
26 CORP.'s device surveillance and disclosure policies concluded, "the public views Guidant
27 Corporation as a single entity, rather than a group of individual businesses." Independent Panel
28 Report at 16. GUIDANT CORP. promotes such a view by, among other things, including the

1 Guidant logo on all device marketing materials.

2 10. GUIDANT CORP.'s business units have their own officers but are also tied
3 together at the corporate level by a structure by which GUIDANT CORP. oversees the business
4 units, including through the Guidant Management Committee.

5 11. The products of GUIDANT CORP.'s CRM Division include ICDs, pacemakers,
6 and lead systems. ICDs are implanted medical devices used to detect and treat abnormally fast
7 and irregular heart rhythms, each of which can stop or hinder the heart from pumping blood
8 effectively throughout the body and can result in sudden cardiac death. Pacemakers are medical
9 devices used to detect and treat abnormally slow heart rhythms.

10 12. GUIDANT holds itself out as "the world leader in the design and development of
11 cardiovascular medical products." Guidant Corp., Corporate Overview,
12 http://www.guidant.com/about/about_us.shtml (last visited May 30, 2006). ICDs have been
13 GUIDANT CORP.'s fastest growing product for at least the last three years. The first ICD was
14 placed on the market in 1985 by CPI, now wholly-owned by GUIDANT CORP. Between 2002
15 and 2004, GUIDANT CORP.'s revenues for sales of ICDs jumped 80% to \$1.786 billion. In the
16 past decade, ICDs and pacemakers have been one of the fastest growing groups of implantable
17 medical devices and according to Defendant GUIDANT CORP.'s Form 10-K filings, ICDs and
18 pacemakers have been one of its highest revenue generating product groups for at least the last
19 five years and is also the source of certain superlative promises, assurances and statements upon
20 which Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' treating physicians relied in selecting the device at issue here.
21 Some of the superlatives in GUIDANT CORP.'S annual reports include:

22 a. In its 2003 Annual Report, defendant GUIDANT CORP. characterized
23 itself as a "pioneer in the development of implantable Defibrillator technologies ..." and that
24 "the company's ongoing leadership is supported by remarkable capabilities in mechanical,
25 electrical and computer engineering."

26 b. Further, touting its engineering capabilities, GUIDANT CORP. stated that
27 "[s]uperior engineering spurred the launch of a new implantable Defibrillator in every quarter of
28 the past year." Defendant GUIDANT CORP. described its manufacturing facilities as

1 "exceptional."

2 c. In its 2003 Annual Report, GUIDANT CORP. stated "[e]xperienced
3 technicians – supported by continued investment in state-of-the-art automated manufacturing
4 equipment and expansion – have streamlined manufacturing processes to reduce costs, improve
5 quality, increase [out]-put and shorten the product development and manufacturing cycle,
6 speeding the delivery of lifesaving therapies to physicians and patients worldwide."

7 d. Emphasizing the company's focus on quality, GUIDANT CORP. stressed
8 in its 2003 Annual Report that it has "an unrelenting focus on quality in everything it does."
9 Defendant GUIDANT CORP. also publicly represented itself to be an open provider of
10 information to patients and physicians. In its 2003 Annual Report, the company stated that
11 "information for patients, physicians, and the public is available around the clock through
12 Guidant's dedicated customer and technical service representatives, as well as its comprehensive
13 web site (www.guidant.com)."

14 e. Nowhere disclosed in any of these financial reports or in its marketing
15 pieces outlined below, did the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS reveal the truth, as laid out herein.

16 13. Defendant DOES 1 through 100 are individuals, corporations, partnerships or
17 other business entities licensed to do business in the State of California, having their principal
18 place of business in the State of California, and/or are residents of the State of California. Their
19 true names or capacities are unknown to Plaintiffs who, therefore, sue said defendants by such
20 fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each of the
21 fictitiously named defendants is legally responsible in some manner for the events and
22 occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiffs' injuries and damages as herein alleged were
23 proximately caused by their conduct. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to allege the true
24 names and capacities of DOES 1 through 100 when the same have been ascertained.

25 14. At all material times herein alleged, the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS were
26 engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, and assembling implantable defibrillators
27 and pacemakers, for the sale and use by members of the public, including Plaintiffs, and as part
28 of their business, defendants designed, manufactured, and assembled the implantable

1 defibrillators and/or pacemakers referenced throughout this complaint and implanted into
2 Plaintiffs.

3 15. At all times herein mentioned, the officers and/or directors of the corporate
4 defendants named herein participated in, authorized and/or directed the production and
5 promotion of the implantable defibrillators and/or pacemakers referenced herein when they knew
6 or with the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the hazards and dangerous
7 propensities of said product and thereby actively participated in the tortious conduct which
8 resulted in the damages and physical injuries suffered by Plaintiffs as described herein.

9 16. At all times herein mentioned, the defendants, and each of them, were the agents,
10 servants, employees, partners, aiders and abettors, coconspirators and/or joint venturers of some
11 or all of the other defendants herein and were at all times operating and acting within the course,
12 scope, and authority of said agency, service, employment, partnership, conspiracy, and/or joint
13 venture, and with the permission and consent of their co-defendants, and rendered substantial
14 assistance and encouragement to the other defendants, knowing that their conduct constituted a
15 breach of duty owed to Plaintiffs. As such, each of said defendants is legally responsible for the
16 actions of the other.

17 17. There exists and, at all times herein mentioned, there existed a unity of interest in
18 ownership between certain of the defendants and certain of the other defendants such that any
19 individuality and separateness between the certain defendants has ceased and these defendants
20 are the alter ego of the other certain defendants and exerted control over those defendants.
21 Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of these certain defendants as an entity distinct
22 from the other certain defendants will permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and would
23 sanction a fraud and/or would promote injustice.

24 18. Plaintiff CLIFFORD HOSLER had a defective Guidant ICD or pacemaker
25 surgically placed in his body on or about April 9, 2002. Prior to the implant, Plaintiff was not
26 advised or informed by defendants or any other person that the GUIDANT product implanted in
27 Plaintiff's body possessed any defect or was susceptible to malfunction and/or failure and
28 Plaintiff did not learn of such potentiality until after becoming aware of the recalls and special

1 advisories from GUIDANT that were published from between June 17, 2005 and May 15, 2006
2 and are outlined in paragraph 36 below. Interestingly, these special advisories began about 3
3 weeks after Defendant GUIDANT CORP.'s Vice President/Chief Medical and Technology
4 Officer sold 23,300 shares of stock in the company for \$1.71 million on May 17, 2005 and
5 another 22,667 shares for \$1.68 million on May 23, 2005.

6 19. On or about August 15, 2005, Plaintiff CLIFFORD HOSLER's defective implant
7 was replaced because of the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS' recall and the risk of malfunction and
8 failure, which are described in more detail below.

9 20. Without Plaintiff CLIFFORD HOSLER's consent, and upon information and
10 belief, a non-medical representative of the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS, was present in the
11 operating room during the implant and/or explantation of the device, in violation of Plaintiff's
12 privacy rights.

13 21. Plaintiff DALE PATTON had a defective Guidant ICD or pacemaker surgically
14 placed in his body on or about September 27, 2002. Prior to the implant, Plaintiff was not
15 advised or informed by defendants or any other person that the GUIDANT product implanted in
16 Plaintiff's body possessed any defect or was susceptible to malfunction and/or failure and
17 Plaintiff did not learn of such potentiality until after becoming aware of the recalls and special
18 advisories from GUIDANT that were published from between June 17, 2005 and May 15, 2006
19 and are outlined in paragraph 36 below. Interestingly, these special advisories began about 3
20 weeks after Defendant GUIDANT CORP.'s Vice President/Chief Medical and Technology
21 Officer sold 23,300 shares of stock in the company for \$1.71 million on May 17, 2005 and
22 another 22,667 shares for \$1.68 million on May 23, 2005.

23 22. On or about June 28, 2005, Plaintiff DALE PATTON's defective implant was
24 replaced because of the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS' recall and the risk of malfunction and
25 failure, which are described in more detail below.

26 23. Without Plaintiff DALE PATTON's consent, and upon information and belief, a
27 non-medical representative of the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS, was present in the operating
28 room during the implant and/or explantation of the device, in violation of Plaintiff's privacy

1 rights.

2 **II. OVERVIEW OF CARDIAC RHYTHM MANAGEMENT IMPLANTABLE**
3 **DEVICES**

4 24. Cardiovascular disease is the leading cause of death for both men and women in
5 the United States. Implantable devices for cardiac rhythm management have become an integral
6 part of cardiovascular therapy. Implantable pacemakers for individuals with bradycardia (a slow
7 heartbeat) were introduced more than 40 years ago, and the first ICD was implanted in 1980.
8 (As used hereinafter, the term "Implantable Device" will refer to pacemakers and/or ICDs
9 manufactured and sold by Defendants.) Thereafter, specialized pacemakers called cardiac
10 resynchronization devices that improve the mechanical function of the heart were introduced and
11 combined with existing ICD technology. Today, Implantable Devices are also commonly used
12 for treatment of arrhythmia (an irregular heartbeat).

13 25. There has been explosive growth in ICD use. There are now, in just the United
14 States, well over one million individuals living with an implanted cardiac rhythm device and this
15 number is increasing rapidly. In 2005, approximately 200,000 people in the United States were
16 implanted with ICDs.

17 26. The ICDs designed, manufactured and distributed into the stream of commerce by
18 GUIDANT consist of three components: (1) a small rectangular generator, approximately two
19 inches wide, which is implanted under the skin just below the collarbone; (2) insulated wires – or
20 leads – which are attached to the generator and threaded through a vein to the heart, to carry the
21 electric current from the generator; and (3) two electrodes, located at the tip of each lead, which
22 deliver an electric shock to the heart.

23 27. The purpose of the ICD is to correct abnormal heart rhythm. The ICD can
24 generate a series of precisely timed, low-intensity, electrical pulses to reset the heart to normal
25 rhythm when the heart beats faster than normal (tachycardia); or the ICD can deliver sudden
26 shocks to the heart to stop potentially fatal heart quivering (ventricular fibrillation). In addition,
27 the ICD may be programmed as a pacemaker to send small electric signals if the heart beats too
28 slowly (bradycardia).

1 28. Implantable CRT-D devices are medical devices that treat heart failure by helping
2 the lower chambers (ventricles) pump synchronously with the upper chambers (atria), while
3 preventing the heart from beating too slowly (bradycardia) and shocking or "over-drive pacing"
4 of heartbeat rhythms that are too fast (a process by which the CRT-D is paced briefly at a rhythm
5 faster than the desired rhythm in order to recapture control of the heartbeat).

6 29. All ICDs function as both pacemakers and defibrillators. The ICD can detect and
7 correct both fast and slow heart rates. The ICD corrects the slow rates and can "over-drive pace"
8 rapid rates and it also can administer shocks to treat ventricular tachycardia and ventricular
9 fibrillation.

10 30. ICDs are used in individuals, like Plaintiffs, who have arrhythmias or irregular
11 heartbeats that are considered life-threatening. These can include individuals with ventricular
12 fibrillation (rapid, ineffective contraction of the ventricles of the heart), ventricular tachycardia
13 (excessively rapid heartbeat) that is poorly controlled by medication, or significant thickening of
14 the heart muscle resulting in arrhythmia. Such conditions can result in the loss of consciousness
15 or death, unless the affected individual receives therapy from an appropriate device to put the
16 heart back into a normal cardiac rhythm. Pacemakers are used in individuals, like Plaintiffs, who
17 have bradycardia that is uncontrolled by medicine alone.

18 31. If an implanted ICD operates properly, it can save an individual's life. If it fails
19 to operate properly, the individual could die within minutes.

20 32. Since 1958, pacemakers have been sold for implantation in individuals who have
21 had certain spontaneous and/or inducible life-threatening arrhythmias, bradycardia, heart block,
22 and congestive heart failure and those who are at high risk of developing bradycardia, heart
23 block, or arrhythmias. Pacemakers are used to manage disorders that disrupt the heart's normal
24 electrical conduction system.

25 33. Pacemakers are designed to be implanted under the skin of the chest wall. The
26 device's power source (pulse generator) is implanted in a pouch formed under the collarbone,
27 just under the skin, usually on the upper left chest. Wires, called leads, are inserted through a
28 blood vessel and attached directly into the heart. These wires, which are connected to the

1 pacemaker or pulse generator, are capable of both sensing a problematic heart rate and
2 stimulating a more appropriate heart rate.

3 34. Some individuals are very dependent on pacemakers to maintain an adequate
4 heart rate, and therefore, cardiac output. For these individuals, failure of the cardiac pacemaker
5 to provide pacing can cause sudden faintness, or loss of consciousness, and can result in death.

6 35. At all times relevant, Defendants misrepresented the safety of its ICDs and
7 pacemakers and negligently manufactured, marketed, advertised, promoted, sold, and distributed
8 those ICDs and pacemakers as safe devices to be used for treatment of individuals with prior
9 myocardial infarction, arrhythmias, and individuals who are at high risk for developing such
10 arrhythmias.

11 III. AN IDENTIFICATION OF THE DEVICES AT ISSUE

12 36. From between 1998 and the present, the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS have
13 knowingly marketed defective devices without disclosing the true risks inherent in their devices,
14 until they were forced to do beginning mid 2005 to the present. A list of the notices, advisories,
15 recalls sent from the GUIDANT DEFENDANTS, by device, model number, date of the notice of
16 defect and the identified defect is identified below:

18 Device Name	18 Model No.	18 Type	18 Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	18 Problem
20 Ventak Prizm 2 DR	1861	ICD	(1) 5/23/05, 5/25/05, 6/17/05;	(1) wire insulator deterioration/short circuit
22 Ventak Prizm 2 DR	1861	ICD	(2) 6/16/05	(2) PEEK insulation material issue
24 Ventak Prizm AVT	1900	ICD	6/17/2005	random memory error/latching
26 Vitality 2 DR	T165	ICD	5/12/06	capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Vitality 2 DR VR	T175	ICD	5/12/06	capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Vitality AVT	A135	ICD	6/17/2005	random memory error/latching
Vitality AVT	A155	ICD	(1) 6/17/2005	(1) random memory error/latching
Vitality AVT	A155	ICD	(2) 5/12/06	(2) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Vitality DS	T125	ICD	5/12/06	capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Vitality DS VR	T135	ICD	5/12/06	capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Vitality HE	T180	ICD	(1) 5/10/06	(1) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit
Vitality HE	T180	ICD	(2) 5/12/06	(2) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal	H135	CRT-D	6/17/2005	wire insulator deterioration/short circuit
Contak Renewal 2	H155	CRT-D	6/17/2005	wire insulator deterioration/short circuit

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

11

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 3	H170	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3	H170	CRT-D	(2) 5/10/06	(2) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit
Contak Renewal 3	H170	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3	H170	CRT-D	(4) 5/16/06	(4) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Contak Renewal 3	H173	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3	H173	CRT-D	(2) 5/12/06	(2) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3	H173	CRT-D	(3) 5/16/06	(3) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Contak Renewal 3	H175	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3	H175	CRT-D	(2) 5/10/06	(2) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hoster, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

12

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 3	H175	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3	H175	CRT-D	(4) 5/16/06	(4) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Contak Renewal 3 AVT	M150	CRT-D	(1) 6/17/05	(1) random memory error/latching
Contak Renewal 3 AVT	M150	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3 AVT	M150	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3 AVT	M155	CRT-D	(1) 6/17/05	(1) random memory error/latching
Contak Renewal 3 AVT	M155	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3 AVT	M155	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3 AVT HE	M157	CRT-D	(1) 6/7/05	(1) random memory error/latching
Contak Renewal 3 AVT HE	M157	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

13

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 3 AVT HE	M157	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3 AVT HE	M159	CRT-D	(1) 6/7/05	(1) random memory error/latching
Contak Renewal 3 AVT HE	M159	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3 AVT HE	M159	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H177	CRT-D	(1) 6/16/05	(1) PEEK insulation material issue
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H177	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H177	CRT-D	(3) 5/10/06	(3) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H177	CRT-D	(4) 5/12/06	(4) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H179	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/05	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H179	CRT-D	(2) 5/10/06	(2) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

14

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H179	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 3 RF	H210	CRT-D	5/24/06	Pre-implant issue: Lower than expected battery voltage prior to implant
Contak Renewal 3 RF	H215	CRT-D	5/24/06	Pre-implant issue: Lower than expected battery voltage prior to implant
Contak Renewal 3 RF HE	H217	CRT-D	5/24/06	Pre-implant issue: Lower than expected battery voltage prior to implant
Contak Renewal 3 RF HE	H219	CRT-D	5/24/06	Pre-implant issue: Lower than expected battery voltage prior to implant
Contak Renewal 4	H190	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/2005	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4	H190	CRT-D	(2) 5/10/06	(2) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit
Contak Renewal 4	H190	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4	H190	CRT-D	(4) 5/16/06	(4) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Contak Renewal 4	H195	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/2005	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

15

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 4	H195	CRT-D	(2) 5/10/06	(2) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit
Contak Renewal 4	H195	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4	H195	CRT-D	(4) 5/16/06	(4) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M170	CRT-D	(1) 6/17/05	(1) random memory error/latching
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M170	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M170	CRT-D	(3) 5/10/06	(3) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M170	CRT-D	(4) 5/12/06	(4) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M170	CRT-D	(5) 5/16/06	(5) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M175	CRT-D	(1) 6/17/05	(1) random memory error/latching

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M175	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M175	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4 AVT	M175	CRT-D	(4) 5/16/06	(4) capacity defect (single supplier) resulting in premature battery depletion
Contak Renewal 4 AVT HE	M177	CRT-D	(1) 6/17/05	(1) random memory error/latching
Contak Renewal 4 AVT HE	M177	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4 AVT HE	M177	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4 AVT HE	M179	CRT-D	(1) 6/17/05	(1) random memory error/latching
Contak Renewal 4 AVT HE	M179	CRT-D	(2) 6/23/05	(2) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4 AVT HE	M179	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4 HE	H197	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/2005	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

17

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 4 HE	H197	CRT-D	(2) 5/10/06	(2) cracked layer of insulation in a flexible hybrid circuit
Contak Renewal 4 HE	H197	CRT-D	(3) 5/12/06	(3) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4 HE	H199	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/2005	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4 HE	H199	CRT-D	(2) 5/12/06	(2) malfunction associated with subpectoral implantation with serial # facing the ribs
Contak Renewal 4 RF	H230	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4 RF	H230	CRT-D	(2) 5/24/06	(2) Pre-implant issue: Lower than expected battery voltage prior to implant
Contak Renewal 4 RF	H235	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/05, 8/1/05	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position
Contak Renewal 4 RF	H235	CRT-D	(2) 5/24/06	(2) Pre-implant issue: Lower than expected battery voltage prior to implant
Contak Renewal 4 RF HE	H239	CRT-D	(1) 6/23/2005	(1) magnetic switch sticking in closed position

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

18

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Contak Renewal 4 RF HE	H239	CRT-D	(2) 5/24/06	(2) Pre-implant issue: Lower than expected battery voltage prior to implant
Contak TR	1241	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery	1174	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery	1175	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery	1273	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery	1274	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery	1275	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	481	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	981	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	1184	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	1186	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	1187	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	1283	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	1284	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

19

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Discovery II	1285	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Discovery II	1286	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Insignia AVT DDD	982	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia AVT DR	1292	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia AVT SR	1192	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia AVT SSI	482	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

20

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Insignia AVT VDD	882	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra DDD	985	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra DDD	986	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra DR	1294	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra DR	1295	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

21

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Insignia Entra DR	1296	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra SR	1195	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra SR	1198	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra SSI	484	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Entra SSI	485	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hostler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Insignia Plus DR	1297	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Plus DR	1298	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Plus SR	1194	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Ultra DR	1290	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Insignia Ultra DR	1291	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

23

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Insignia Ultra SR	1190	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Intelis II	1349	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Intelis II	1384	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Intelis II	1385	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Intelis II	1483	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Intelis II	1484	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Intelis II	1485	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Intelis II	1499	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Meridian	476	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Meridian	976	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Meridian	1176	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Meridian	1276	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Nexus AVT DDD	1432	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus AVT DR	1492	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus AVT SR	1392	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus AVT SSI	1328	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus AVT VDD	1428	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Nexus Entra DDD	1425	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Entra DDD	1426	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Entra DR	1466	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Entra DR	1494	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Entra DR	1495	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Nexus Entra SR	1395	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Entra SR	1398	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Entra SSI	1325	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Entra SSI	1326	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Plus DR	1467	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hostler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

27

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Nexus Plus DR	1468	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Plus SR	1394	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Ultra DR	1490	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Ultra DR	1491	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22
Nexus Ultra SR	1390	Pacemaker	9/22/2005	(1) failure mode caused by foreign material in crystal timing component; (2) another failure mode w/ root cause unknown a/o 9/22

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

28

Device Name	Model No.	Type	Date of Guidant/FDA Notice/Alert/Release	Problem
Pulsar	470	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar	870	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar	970	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar	972	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar	1172	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar	1272	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar Max	1170	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar Max	1171	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar Max	1270	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar Max II	1180	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar Max II	1181	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Pulsar Max II	1280	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Virtus Plus II	1380	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component
Virtus Plus II	1480	Pacemaker	7/18/2005, 1/21/2006	degradation of hermetic sealing component

37. On May 15, 2006, BOSTON SCIENTIFIC published an updated CRM Product

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

29

1 Performance Report, which identified the number of known, confirmed malfunctions and
 2 premature battery depletions with respect to some of the devices referenced above. Again, not all
 3 of the devices listed above were included in this report; in the chart below, separated by device,
 4 is a list of approximately 2000 units with a known defect in the United States and over 2600
 5 units worldwide, that have had identified malfunctions and premature battery depletions with
 6 certain of Guidant ICDs and/or pacemakers:

Trade Name of Device	Model Nos.	Approval Date	US Confirmed Malfunction	US Unconfirmed Premature Battery Depletion	WW Confirmed Malfunction
CRT-D					
Contak Renewal 3 RF HE	H217 H219	Feb-05	0	0	0
Contak Renewal 3 RF	H210 H215	Feb-05	1	0	1
Contak Renewal 3 HE	H177 H179	Jun-03	21	7	21
Contak Renewal 3	H170 H175	Jun-03	40	10	40
Contak Renewal	H135	Dec-02	45	43	65
Contak Renewal TR	H120 H125	Jan-04	0	2	0
ICDs					
Vitality DR HE	T180	May-05	0	0	0
Vitality 2 EL DR	T167	Mar-04	2	0	4
Vitality 2 DR	T165	Mar-04	7	2	7
Vitality 2 EL VR	T177	Mar-04	3	0	3

Trade Name of Device	Model Nos.	Approval Date	US Confirmed Malfunction	US Unconfirmed Premature Battery Depletion	WW Confirmed Malfunction
Vitality 2 VR	T175	Mar-04	3	3	3
Vitality AVT A155	A155	Oct-03	36	4	36
Vitality AVT A135	A135	Mar-03	27	19	32
Vitality DS DR	T125	Jul-03	8	3	8
Vitality DS VR	T135	Jul-03	8	3	8
Vitality EL	T127	Jul-03	4	0	4
Ventak Prizm 2 DR	1861	Aug-00	148	22	188
Ventak Prizm 2 VR	1860	Aug-00	52	12	71
Ventak Prizm DR	1853				
HE	1858	Aug-00	74	53	106
Ventak Prizm VR	1852				
HE	1857	Aug-00	30	8	49
Ventak Prizm DR	1851				
	1856	Jan-00	259	47	382
Ventak Prizm VR	1850				
	1855	Jan-00	73	12	139
Pacemakers					
Insignia Ultra SR	1190	Nov-03	0	0	0
Insignia Ultra DR	1290	Nov-03	2	1	7
Insignia Ultra DR	1291	Nov-03	1	0	4
Insignia Entra SR	1195				
	1198	Mar-02	0	2	2
Insignia Entra DR	1296	Mar-02	3	3	5
Insignia Entra DR	1294	Mar-02	6	0	9

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Hoster, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

31

	Trade Name of Device	Model Nos.	Approval Date	US Confirmed Malfunction	US Unconfirmed Premature Battery Depletion	WW Confirmed Malfunction
		1295				
	Insignia Plus SR	1194	Mar-02	7	1	9
	Insignia Plus DR	1297	Mar-02	3	2	5
	Insignia Plus DR	1298	Mar-02	33	40	40
	Pulsar Max II SR	1180	May-01	1	4	2
	Pulsar Max II SR	1181	May-01	0	0	1
	Pulsar Max II DR	1280	May-01	12	12	1
	Discovery II SR	1184	Mar-00	2	3	2
	Discovery II SR	1186				
		1187	Mar-00	1	1	1
	Discovery II DR	1283	Mar-00	16	40	19
	Discovery II DR	1284				
		1286	Mar-00	6	5	13
	Pulsar Max SR	1170	Jun-99	6	3	10
	Pulsar Max SR	1171	Jun-99	5	0	8
	Pulsar Max DR	1270	Jun-99	77	39	107
	Pulsar DR	1272	Jun-99	1	0	2
	Discovery SR	1174	Apr-98	78	8	131
	Discovery SR	1175	Apr-98	1	0	3
	Discovery DR	1273	Apr-98	145	67	156
	Discovery DR	1274	Apr-98	114	14	181
		1275				
	Meridian DDD	976	Apr-98	4	1	48

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Hosler, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al.

Case No.

32

Trade Name of Device	Model Nos.	Approval Date	US Confirmed Malfunction	US Unconfirmed Premature Battery Depletion	WW Confirmed Malfunction
Meridian SSI	476	Apr-98	0	0	39
Meridian SR	1176	Apr-98	18	10	47
Meridian DR	1276	Apr-98	34	12	55
TOTALS			1417	518	2074

38. As part of the conditions of approval for the devices listed above, Defendants must ensure that no changes be made to the Device that would affect its safety or effectiveness without submission of a Pre-Market Approval ("PMA") supplement for review and approval, and that a PMA supplement is submitted when a device failure necessitates a labeling, manufacturing, or device modification. Violation of such conditions voids their approval.

39. The removal of Devices from the market and other corrective actions taken by Defendants have been classified as Class I or Class II recalls under federal regulations – the highest levels of such recalls.

40. Under federal regulation "[r]ecall means a firm's removal or correction of a marketed product that the Food and Drug Administration considers to be in violation of the laws it administers and against which the agency would initiate legal action, e.g., seizure." 21 C.F.R. § 7.3(g) (2006).

41. The classification of a recall as Class I, II, or III "indicate[s] the relative degree of health hazard presented by the product being recalled." *Id.* § 7.3(m). "Class I is a situation in which there is a reasonable probability that the use of, or exposure to, a violative product will cause serious adverse health consequences or death." *Id.* § 7.3(m)(1). "Class II is a situation in which use of, or exposure to, a violative product may cause temporary or medically reversible adverse health consequences or where the probability of serious adverse health consequences is remote." *Id.* § 7.3(m)(2).