

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

CHARLESTON DIVISION

KATHLEEN TOENNIES,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:12-cv-02687

ETHICON, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**  
(Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment)

Pending before the court is the Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 53] filed by defendants Ethicon, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson (collectively, "Ethicon"). As set forth below, Ethicon's Motion is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**.

**I. Background**

This action involves an Illinois plaintiff who was implanted with a mesh product manufactured by Ethicon, Tension-free Vaginal Tape ("TVT"), on March 19, 2010, at Memorial Hospital, Belleville, Illinois, by Dr. Sekou Kelsey. Compl. [ECF No. 2] ¶¶ 1–9.<sup>1</sup> The case resides in one of seven MDLs assigned to me by the Judicial

---

<sup>1</sup> The plaintiff has not filed an Amended Short Form Complaint in this case; the original Complaint includes eight counts: Count I (Negligence), Count II (Strict Liability – Design Defect), Count III (Strict Liability – Manufacturing Defect), Count IV (Strict Liability – Failure to Warn), Count V (Breach of Express Warranty), Count VI (Breach of Implied Warranty), Count VII (Loss of Consortium), and Count VIII (Punitive Damages). Compl. In the Complaint, Kathleen Toennies and her husband Glennon Toennies filed as co-plaintiffs with Mr. Toennies asserting the loss of consortium claim. *Id.* On August 22, 2016, I granted Mr. Toennies' Amended Motion for Voluntary Dismissal with Prejudice dismissing Mr. Toennies and Count VII. [ECF No. 48].

Panel on Multidistrict Litigation concerning the use of transvaginal surgical mesh to treat pelvic organ prolapse (“POP”) and stress urinary incontinence (“SUI”). In the seven MDLs, there are more than 60,000 cases currently pending, nearly 28,000 of which are in the Ethicon MDL, MDL 2327.

In an effort to efficiently and effectively manage this massive MDL, the court decided to conduct pretrial discovery and motions practice on an individualized basis so that once a case is trial-ready (that is, after the court has ruled on all summary judgment motions, among other things), it can then be promptly transferred or remanded to the appropriate district for trial. To this end, the court ordered the plaintiffs and defendants to submit a joint list of 200 of the oldest cases in the Ethicon MDL that name only Ethicon, Inc., Ethicon, LLC, and/or Johnson & Johnson. These cases became part of a “wave” of cases to be prepared for trial and, if necessary, remanded. *See* Pretrial Order No. 210, *In re Ethicon, Inc. Pelvic Repair Sys. Prods. Liab. Litig.*, No. 2:12-md-002327, Dec. 18, 2015, *available at* <http://www.wvsc.uscourts.gov/MDL/ethicon/orders.html>. The plaintiff’s case was selected as an “Ethicon Wave 3 case.”

## **II. Legal Standards**

### **A. Summary Judgment**

To obtain summary judgment, the moving party must show that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). In considering a motion for summary judgment, the court will not “weigh the evidence and determine the truth

of the matter.” *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 249 (1986). Instead, the court will draw any permissible inference from the underlying facts in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587–88 (1986).

Although the court will view all underlying facts and inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, the nonmoving party nonetheless must offer some “concrete evidence from which a reasonable juror could return a verdict” in his or her favor. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 256. Summary judgment is appropriate when the nonmoving party has the burden of proof on an essential element of his or her case and does not make, after adequate time for discovery, a showing sufficient to establish that element. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322–23 (1986). The nonmoving party must satisfy this burden of proof by offering more than a mere “scintilla of evidence” in support of his or her position. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 252. Likewise, conclusory allegations or unsupported speculation, without more, are insufficient to preclude the granting of a summary judgment motion. *See Dash v. Mayweather*, 731 F.3d 303, 311 (4th Cir. 2013); *Stone v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 105 F.3d 188, 191 (4th Cir. 1997).

## **B. Choice of Law**

The parties appear to agree that Illinois choice-of-law principles apply to this case and that these principles compel the application of Illinois law to the plaintiff’s substantive claims. To determine the applicable state law for a dispositive motion, I generally refer to the choice-of-law rules of the jurisdiction where a plaintiff first filed

her claim. *See In re Air Disaster at Ramstein Air Base, Ger.*, 81 F.3d 570, 576 (5th Cir. 1996). If a plaintiff files her claim directly into the MDL in the Southern District of West Virginia, however, I consult the choice-of-law rules of the state in which the plaintiff was implanted with the product. *See Sanchez v. Boston Scientific Corp.*, 2:12-cv-05762, 2014 WL 202787, at \*4 (S.D. W. Va. Jan. 17, 2014). Here, the plaintiff filed her initial complaint in the Southern District of Illinois. Compl. Thus, the choice-of-law principles of Illinois guide this court's choice-of-law analysis.

Illinois is the plaintiff's state of residence, where the TVT implant surgery took place, and where the claimed injuries occurred. For the reasons discussed in *Huskey v. Ethicon, Inc.*, I agree with the parties that Illinois law applies to the plaintiff's substantive claims. *See Huskey v. Ethicon, Inc.*, 29 F. Supp. 3d 736, 740–41 (S.D.W. Va. 2014) (Illinois uses the “most-significant-relationship” test and permits dépeçage—a separate choice-of-law analysis for each individual issue). In *Huskey*, I also found that New Jersey law—rather than Illinois law—applied to the *Huskey* plaintiffs' punitive damages claim. *Id.* Here, I need not decide at this time what law applies to punitive damages because Ethicon does not directly challenge punitive damages.

### **III. Analysis**

Ethicon argues it is entitled to summary judgment because the relevant statute of limitations bars certain claims. Ethicon also argues it is entitled to summary judgment because the plaintiff's claims are without evidentiary or legal support.

**A. Manufacturing Defect**

The plaintiff points to no evidence that the TVT device departed from its intended design at the time it left Ethicon's control. Accordingly, Ethicon's Motion on this point is **GRANTED**.

**B. All Remaining Claims**


The court **FINDS** that genuine disputes of material fact exist regarding the plaintiff's remaining claims challenged by Ethicon, including timeliness under the Illinois statute of limitations. Accordingly, Ethicon's Motion as to all remaining claims is **DENIED**.

**IV. Conclusion**

For the reasons discussed above, it is **ORDERED** that Ethicon's Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 53] is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**. Ethicon's Motion is **GRANTED** with regard to the following claim: Manufacturing Defect. Ethicon's Motion is **DENIED** in all other respects.

The court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: May 8, 2017



JOSEPH R. GOODWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE