

1 Ramon Rossi Lopez - rlopez@lopezmchugh.com  
(California Bar Number 86361; admitted *pro hac vice*)  
2 Lopez McHugh LLP  
100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600  
3 Newport Beach, California 92660  
949-812-5771

4 Robert W. Boatman (009619) - rwb@gknet.com  
5 Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.  
2575 East Camelback Road  
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225  
602-530-8000

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

8  
9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

11 **IN RE BARD IVC FILTERS**  
12 **PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

No. MD-15-02641-PHX-DGC

**MASTER COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**  
**FOR INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS**

GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.  
2575 EAST CAMELBACK ROAD  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85016-9225  
(602) 530-8000

13  
14 Plaintiffs in this consolidated action, collectively and through the Plaintiffs' Steering  
15 Committee ("PSC") as duly authorized representatives of all Plaintiffs in MDL 2641, hereby  
16 file this Master Complaint for Damages for Individual Claims ("Master Complaint") against  
17 Defendants C.R. BARD, INC. and BARD PERIPHERAL VASCULAR, INC. (collectively,  
18 "Bard" or "Defendants") in MDL 2641.

19 This Master Complaint is created for the convenience of the Court and all parties as a  
20 "long form" complaint giving notice, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 8 and Case  
21 Management Order 2, of allegations that some or all Plaintiffs in cases consolidated in this  
22 MDL allege against Bard, whether those Plaintiffs' claims are for personal injury or wrongful

1 death, and whether brought by an individual person alleging injury or statutory or common  
2 law beneficiaries of claims for wrongful death of a Plaintiff or Plaintiffs' decedent.<sup>1</sup>

3 This Master Complaint does not necessarily include all claims asserted in all of the  
4 actions transferred to this Court, and it is not intended to consolidate for any purpose the  
5 separate claims of Plaintiffs herein. This Master Complaint also does not constitute a waiver  
6 or dismissal of any actions or claims asserted in those individual actions, and no Plaintiff  
7 relinquishes the right to amend their individual complaints to seek any additional claims as  
8 discovery proceeds.

9 Accordingly, Plaintiffs in MDL No. 2641 allege as follows:

10 **INTRODUCTORY ALLEGATIONS**

11 1. Plaintiffs bring this action for personal injuries and/or wrongful death damages  
12 suffered by an injured or deceased party or parties as a direct and proximate result of an  
13 injured or deceased party being implanted with a defective and unreasonably dangerous  
14 Inferior Vena Cava ("IVC") filter medical device manufactured by Bard.

15 2. The subject IVC filters are part of Bard's IVC "retrievable" filter product line  
16 and include the following devices: Recovery<sup>®</sup>, G2<sup>®</sup>, G2<sup>®</sup>X (G2 Express<sup>®</sup>), Eclipse<sup>®</sup>,  
17 Meridian<sup>®</sup> and Denali<sup>®</sup> (for convenience, these devices will be referred to in this complaint  
18 under the generic term "Bard IVC Filters"). The term "Bard IVC Filters" also includes Bard's  
19 Recovery<sup>®</sup> Cone Removal System<sup>®</sup>.

20  
21 <sup>1</sup> Which causes of actions and counts are asserted in individual actions and certain claimant-  
22 or claim-specific allegations will be conveyed to Defendants via individual "short form"  
complaints or profile forms as agreed upon by the parties.



1 continuous injuries and damages. The injuries suffered and damages sought by Plaintiffs  
2 (hereafter, "Injuries and Damages") may include, without limitation: wrongful death of a  
3 spouse, child, parent, or other legally-cognizable relationship; pain and suffering; bodily  
4 injuries of any type (including, without limitation, perforation of organs and venous structures,  
5 thromboembolic events, and cardiovascular injuries); disability; impairment; scarring;  
6 disfigurement; dismemberment; physical; emotional and psychological trauma; anxiety;  
7 diminished capacity; loss of consortium; hedonic damages; past medical expenses; future  
8 medical expenses; caregiving costs; lost wages; loss of earning capacity; and any other form of  
9 damages under the law of any forum which governs any individual case.

10 11. Defendant C.R. Bard, Inc. ("C.R. Bard") is a corporation duly organized and  
11 existing under the laws of the state of Delaware and has its principal place of business in New  
12 Jersey. Bard, at all times relevant to this action, designed, set specifications for,  
13 manufactured, prepared, compounded, assembled, processed, marketed, distributed, and sold  
14 the Recovery<sup>®</sup>, G2<sup>®</sup>, G2<sup>®</sup>X (G2 Express<sup>®</sup>), Eclipse<sup>®</sup>, Meridian<sup>®</sup>, and Denali<sup>®</sup> Filter Systems to  
15 be implanted in patients throughout the United States including the State of Arizona and  
16 Plaintiffs' states of residence and/or injury.

17 12. Defendant Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. ("BPV") is a wholly-owned subsidiary  
18 corporation of Defendant C.R. Bard, with its principal place of business at 1625 West Third  
19 Street, Tempe, Arizona. BPV, at all times relevant to this action, designed, set specifications  
20 for, manufactured, prepared, compounded, assembled, processed, marketed, distributed, and  
21 sold the Recovery<sup>®</sup>, G2<sup>®</sup>, G2<sup>®</sup>X(G2 Express<sup>®</sup>), Eclipse<sup>®</sup>, Meridian<sup>®</sup>, and Denali<sup>®</sup> Filter  
22

1 Systems to be implanted in patients throughout the United States, including the State of  
2 Arizona and Plaintiffs' states of residence and/or injury.

3 13. There exists, and at all relevant times existed, a unity of interest in ownership  
4 between certain defendants and other defendants such that any individuality and separateness  
5 between the certain defendants has ceased and those defendants are the alter ego of the other  
6 certain defendants, and exerted control over those defendants.

7 14. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of these certain defendants as  
8 any entity distinct from other certain defendants would permit an abuse of the corporate  
9 privilege, sanction fraud, and promote injustice.

10 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that at all times herein  
11 mentioned each of the Defendants were the agent, servant, employee, and/or joint venturer of  
12 the other co-defendants, and at all said times each Defendant was acting in the full course,  
13 scope, and authority of said agency, service, employment, and/or joint venture.

14 16. "Bard" or "Defendants" includes any and all parent companies, subsidiaries,  
15 affiliates, divisions, franchises, partners, joint venturers, and organizational units of any kind;  
16 their predecessors, successors, and assigns; their officers, directors, employees, agents,  
17 representatives; and any and all other persons acting on their behalf.

18 17. At all times relevant, Bard was engaged in the business of researching,  
19 designing, testing, developing, manufacturing, packaging, labeling, marketing, advertising,  
20 distributing, promoting, warranting, and selling in interstate commerce Bard IVC Filters,  
21 either directly or indirectly through third parties or related entities.

22



1 inconsistent pretrial rulings (including with respect to discovery, privilege, and  
2 *Daubert* motion practice), and conserve the resources of the parties, their  
counsel and the judiciary.

3 23. Pursuant to the Transfer Order filed on August 17, 2015, cases are being  
4 transferred to The Honorable David G. Campbell in the United States District Court for the  
5 District of Arizona, Phoenix Division, as part of the IN RE: BARD IVC FILTERS  
6 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION MDL 2641.

7 24. Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 2, federal cases against Bard relating  
8 to Bard IVC Filters may be directly filed in this District.

9 **BACKGROUND**

10 **INFERIOR VENA CAVA FILTERS GENERALLY**

11 25. IVC filters were first made commercially available to the medical community in  
12 the 1960s. Over the years, medical device manufacturers have introduced several different  
13 designs of IVC filters.

14 26. An IVC filter is a device that is designed to filter or “catch” blood clots that  
15 travel from the lower portions of the body to the heart and lungs. IVC filters were originally  
16 designed to be permanently implanted in the IVC.

17 27. The IVC is a vein that returns blood to the heart from the lower portions of the  
18 body. In certain people, for various reasons, blood clots travel from the vessels in the legs and  
19 pelvis, through the vena cava and into the lungs. Oftentimes, these blood clots develop in the  
20 deep leg veins, a condition called “deep vein thrombosis” or “DVT.” Once blood clots reach  
21 the lungs, they are considered “pulmonary emboli” or “PE.” Pulmonary emboli present risks  
22 to human health.

1           28.    People at risk for DVT/PE can undergo medical treatment to manage the risk.  
2 For example, a doctor may prescribe anticoagulant therapies such as medications like Heparin,  
3 Warfarin, or Lovenox to regulate the clotting factor of the blood. In some people who are at  
4 high risk for DVT/PE and who cannot manage their conditions with medications, physicians  
5 may recommend surgically implanting an IVC filter to prevent thromboembolic events.

6           29.    As stated above, IVC filters have been on the market for decades and were  
7 permanent implants. However, use of these filters was limited primarily to patients who were  
8 contraindicated for anticoagulation therapy.

9           30.    In order to increase sales of these devices, Bard sought to expand the market for  
10 prophylactic use among nontraditional patient populations that were temporarily at risk of  
11 developing blood clots.

12           31.    Specifically, Bard targeted the bariatric, trauma, orthopedic and cancer patient  
13 population. Expansion to these new patient groups would triple sales and the first  
14 manufacturer to market would capture market share.

15           32.    At the same time, Bard was aware that physicians developed interest in filter  
16 devices that could be easily removed after the risk of clotting in these new patient populations  
17 subsided. This too was an opportunity to gain market share in the lucrative IVC filter market.

18           33.    Other manufacturers also saw this opportunity, triggering a race to market a  
19 device that provided physicians the option to retrieve the filter after the clot risk subsided.

20           34.    Bard was the first medical device manufacturer to obtain FDA clearance for  
21 marketing a “retrievable” IVC filter (the Bard Recovery® filter) in July 2003.

22



1           35. This “clearance” was obtained despite lack of adequate testimony on the safety  
2 and efficacy of the new line of devices.

3           36. As shown below, Bard’s retrievable IVC filters have been plagued with  
4 problems – all created by Bard itself – most notably, the absence of any evidence that the  
5 products were effective in preventing pulmonary embolism (the very condition the product  
6 was indicated to prevent).

7           37. Years after the implantation of retrievable filters into the bodies of patients,  
8 scientists began to study the effectiveness of the retrievable filters – studies that Bard itself  
9 had never done before placing the product on the market. As recently as October 2015, an  
10 expansive article published in the *Annals of Surgery* concerning trauma patients inserted with  
11 IVC filters concluded that IVC filters were not effective in preventing pulmonary emboli, and  
12 instead actually caused thrombi to occur.

13           38. Comparing the results of over 30,000 trauma patients who had not received IVC  
14 filters with those who had received them, the *Annals of Surgery* study published its alarming  
15 results:

- 16           • Almost twice the percentage of patients with IVC filters in the study died  
17           compared to those that had not received them.
- 18           • Over five times the relative number of patients with IVC filters developed  
19           DVTs.
- 20           • Over four times the relative percentage of patients with filters developed  
21           thromboemboli.

22

- 1 • Over twice the percentage of patients developed a pulmonary embolus – the  
2 very condition Bard told the FDA, physicians, and the public that its IVC  
3 Filters were designed to prevent.

4 39. This *Annals of Surgery* study – and many others referenced by it – now shows  
5 without any question that IVC filters are not only utterly ineffective but that they are  
6 themselves a health hazard.

### 7 **THE RECOVERY® FILTER**

#### 8 **A. Development and Regulatory Clearance of the Recovery® Filter**

9 40. Bard has distributed and marketed the Simon Nitinol Filter (“SNF”) device since  
10 1992. The SNF is a permanent filter with no option to retrieve it after implantation.

11 41. The SNF was initially manufactured by a company known as Nitinol Medical  
12 Technologies. In late 1999, Bard worked with Nitinol on the redesign of the SNF in order to  
13 make it retrievable. On October 19, 2001, Bard purchased the rights to manufacture, market,  
14 and sell this new, redesigned product in development at the time. This product ultimately  
15 became the Recovery® filter.

16 42. Bard’s purpose for making a retrievable IVC filter was to increase profits by  
17 expanding the overall IVC filter market and, in turn, Bard’s percentage share of that market.

18 43. Bard engaged in an aggressive marketing campaign for the filter, despite  
19 negative clinical data.

20 44. On November 27, 2002, Bard bypassed the more onerous Food and Drug  
21 Administration’s (“FDA’s”) approval process for new devices and obtained “clearance”  
22 under Section 510(k) of the Medical Device Amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic

1 Act to market the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter as a *permanent* filter by claiming it was substantially  
2 similar in respect to safety, efficacy, design, and materials as the SNF.

3 45. Section 510(k) permits the marketing of medical devices if the device is  
4 substantially equivalent to other legally marketed predicate devices without formal review for  
5 the safety or efficacy of the said device. The FDA explained the difference between the  
6 510(k) process and the more rigorous “premarket approval” (PMA) process in its amicus brief  
7 filed with the Third Circuit in *Horn v. Thoratec Corp.*, which the court quoted from:

8 A manufacturer can obtain an FDA finding of ‘substantial equivalence’ by  
9 submitting a premarket notification to the agency in accordance with section  
10 510(k) of the [Food Drug and Cosmetic Act]. 21 U.S.C. § 360(k). A device  
11 found to be ‘substantially equivalent’ to a predicate device is said to be  
12 ‘cleared’ by FDA (as opposed to ‘approved’ by the agency under a PMA. A  
13 *pre-market notification submitted under 510(k) is thus entirely different from a  
14 PMA which must include data sufficient to demonstrate that the IVC Filters is  
15 safe and effective.*

16 376 F.3d 163, 167 (3d Cir. 2004) (emphasis in original).

17 46. In *Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*, the U.S. Supreme Court similarly described the  
18 510(k) process, observing:

19 If the FDA concludes on the basis of the [manufacturer’s] § 510(k) notification  
20 that the device is “substantially equivalent” to a pre-existing device, it can be  
21 marketed without further regulatory analysis. . . . The § 510(k) notification  
22 process is by no means comparable to the PMA process; in contrast to the 1,200  
hours necessary to complete a PMA review, the § 510(k) review is completed in  
average of 20 hours. . . . As one commentator noted: “The attraction of  
substantial equivalence to manufacturers is clear. Section 510(k) notification  
requires little information, rarely elicits a negative response from the FDA, and  
gets processed quickly.”

1 518 U.S. 470, 478-79 (1996) (quoting Adler, The 1976 Medical Device Amendments:  
2 A Step in the Right Direction Needs Another Step in the Right Direction, 43 Food  
3 Drug Cosm. L.J. 511, 516 (1988)).

4 47. Pursuant to *Wyeth v. Levine*, 555 U.S. 555 (2009), once a product is cleared “the  
5 manufacturer remains under an obligation to investigate and report any adverse events  
6 associated with the drug . . . and must periodically submit any new information that may affect  
7 the FDA’s previous conclusions about the safety, effectiveness, or labeling . . . .” This  
8 obligation extends to post-market monitoring of adverse events/complaints.

9 48. In July 2003, through this 510(k) process, Bard obtained clearance from the  
10 FDA to market the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter for optional retrieval.

11 49. Although Bard began aggressively marketing the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter in 2003, full  
12 market release did not occur until January 2004.

13 50. Bard was aware that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter was also used extensively off-label,  
14 including for purely prophylactic reasons for trauma patients or patients with upcoming  
15 surgeries such as bariatric (weight loss) and orthopedic procedures.

16 51. The Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter consists of two (2) levels of six (6) radially distributed  
17 NITINOL (a nickel titanium alloy whose full name is Nickel Titanium Naval Ordnance  
18 Laboratory) struts that are designed to anchor the filter into the inferior vena cava and to catch  
19 any embolizing clots.

20 52. This filter has six short struts, which are commonly referred to as the “arms,”  
21 and six long struts, which are commonly referred to as the “legs.”

22

1           53. Each strut is held together by a single connection to a cap located at the top of  
2 the filter. According to the patent application filed for this device, the short struts are  
3 primarily for “centering” or “positioning” within the vena cava, and the long struts with  
4 attached hooks are designed primarily to prevent the device from migrating in response to  
5 “normal respiratory movement” or “pulmonary embolism.”

6           54. The alloy NITINOL possesses “shape memory,” meaning NITINOL will change  
7 shape according to changes in temperature, then retake its prior shape after returning to its  
8 initial temperature.

9           55. When placed in saline, the Recovery® filter’s NITINOL struts become soft and  
10 can be straightened to allow delivery through a small-diameter catheter. The NITINOL struts  
11 then resume their original shape when warmed to body temperature in the vena cava.

12           56. The Recovery® filter is inserted via catheter guided by a physician (normally an  
13 interventional radiologist) through a blood vessel into the inferior vena cava. The Recovery®  
14 Filter is designed to be retrieved in a similar fashion.

15           57. According to the Instructions for Use of this medical device, only the Recovery®  
16 Cone System could be used to retrieve the Recovery® filter (as well as subsequent generations  
17 of Bard’s IVC filters).

18           58. The Recovery® Cone System is an independent medical device requiring  
19 approval by the FDA under the pre-market approval process or, if a substantially equivalent  
20 medical device was already on the market, clearance by the FDA pursuant to the 510(k)  
21 application process.  
22

1           59.     Although Bard marketed and sold the Recovery<sup>®</sup> Cone System separately, it  
2 never sought or obtained approval or clearance from the FDA for this device.

3           60.     Bard's sale of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> Cone System was, therefore, illegal.

4           61.     Bard illegally sold the Recovery<sup>®</sup> Cone System in order to promote the  
5 Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter as having a retrieval option.

6           **B.     Post-Market Performance Revealed The IVC Filters Failed to Perform as  
7           Expected**

8           62.     Once placed on the market, Bard immediately became aware of numerous  
9 confirmed events where its Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter fractured, migrated, or perforated the vena cava,  
10 caused thrombus and clotting, and caused serious injury, including death.

11           63.     Premarket and post-market clinical trials revealed that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> failed and  
12 caused serious risk of harm. In addition, peer-reviewed literature reflected that such filters  
13 actually increased the risk of patients developing thromboembolic events.

14           64.     Approximately a month after the full-scale launch of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter, on  
15 February 9, 2004, Bard received notice of the first death associated with this filter. The next  
16 day, a MAUDE analysis was performed which revealed that there had been at least two other  
17 migration-related adverse events reported to Bard in 2003.

18           65.     MAUDE is a database maintained by the FDA to house medical device reports  
19 submitted by mandatory reporters (such as manufacturers and device user facilities) and  
20 voluntary reporters (such as health care providers and patients).

21           66.     Instead of pulling the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter off the market, Bard focused on public  
22 relations and protecting its brand and image. By February 12, 2004, Bard had formed a crisis

1 communication team and drafted at least four communiques to pass onto its sales force  
2 containing false information designed to be relayed to concerned doctors.

3 67. By April of 2004, at least three deaths had been reported to Bard. Yet again,  
4 instead of recalling its deadly device, Bard concealed this information from doctors and  
5 patients and hired the public relations firm Hill & Knowlton to address anticipated publicity  
6 that could affect stock prices and sales.

7 68. Bard made the decision to continue to market and sell the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter until  
8 its next generation product, the G2<sup>®</sup> IVC filter, was cleared by the FDA.

9 69. The G2<sup>®</sup> filter, however, was not cleared for market until August 29, 2005.

10 70. Meanwhile, the death count escalated.

11 71. On July 12, 2004, C.R. Bard CEO Timothy Ring received an executive summary  
12 reporting that there were at least 12 filter migrations resulting in four deaths and at least 17  
13 reports of filter fracture, six cases of which involved strut embolization to the heart.

14 72. This same report advised that fracture rates for the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter exceed  
15 reported rates of other filters.

16 73. These events revealed, or should have revealed, to Bard that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter  
17 is prone to an unreasonably high risk of failure and patient injury following placement in the  
18 human body.

19 74. Bard also learned that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter failed to meet migration resistance  
20 testing specifications.

21 75. In addition, multiple early studies reported that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter has a  
22 fracture and migration rate ranging from 21% to 31.7%, rates that are substantially higher

1 compared to other IVC filters. More recently, fractures were reported to be as high as 40%  
2 after five and a half years from the date of implant.

3 76. Bard had clear evidence that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter was not substantially  
4 equivalent to the predecessor SNF, making the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter adulterated and misbranded,  
5 requiring its immediate withdrawal from the market.

6 77. At least one Bard executive concluded the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter posed an  
7 unreasonable risk of harm and required corrective action, including a recall.

8 78. Likewise, Bard's G2<sup>®</sup> filter was predicted to have fracture rates as high as 37.5%  
9 after five years from date of implant.

10 79. Subsequent Bard IVC Filter models, including the electropolished version of the  
11 G2<sup>®</sup> filter known as the Eclipse, only marginally increased fracture resistance.

12 80. When IVC filter fractures occur, shards of the filter or even the entire filter can  
13 travel to the heart, where they can cause cardiac tamponade, perforation of the atrial wall,  
14 myocardial infarction, and/or death.

15 81. Bard IVC Filters similarly pose a high risk of tilting and perforating the vena  
16 cava walls. When such tilting occurs, the filters can also perforate the adjacent aorta,  
17 duodenum, small bowel, spine, or ureter, which may lead to and, upon information and belief,  
18 already have led to retroperitoneal hematomas, small-bowel obstructions, extended periods of  
19 severe pain, and/or death.

20 82. The Adverse Event Reports ("AERs") associated with all IVC filters  
21 demonstrate that Bard IVC Filters are far more prone to failure than are other similar IVC  
22



1 filters. A review of the FDA MAUDE database from the years 2004 through 2008 shows that  
2 Bard IVC Filters are responsible for the following percentages of all IVC filter AERs:

- 3 a. 50% of all adverse events;
- 4 b. 64% of all occurrences of migration of the IVC Filters;
- 5 c. 69% of all occurrences of vena cava wall perforation; and
- 6 d. 70% of all occurrences of filter fracture.

7 83. These failures were often associated with severe patient injuries such as:

- 8 a. Death;
- 9 b. Hemorrhage;
- 10 c. Cardiac/pericardial tamponade (pressure caused by a collection of blood  
11 in the area around the heart);
- 12 d. Cardiac arrhythmia and other symptoms similar to myocardial infarction;
- 13 e. Severe and persistent pain; and
- 14 f. Perforations of tissue, vessels and organs.

15 84. These failures and resulting injuries are attributable, in part, to the fact that the  
16 Bard IVC Filter design was unable to withstand the normal anatomical and physiological  
17 loading cycles exerted *in vivo*.

18 85. In addition to design defects, Bard IVC Filters suffer from manufacturing  
19 defects. These manufacturing defects include, but are not limited to, the existence of “draw  
20 markings” and circumferential grinding markings on the exterior of the surface of the filters.

21 86. The presence of these draw markings and/or circumferential grinding markings  
22 further compromises the structural integrity of the Bard IVC Filters while in the body. In

1 particular, the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter is prone to fail at or near the location of draw  
2 markings/circumferential grinding markings on the struts of the filters. These exterior  
3 manufacturing defects render Bard IVC Filters too weak to withstand normal placement within  
4 the human body.

5 87. Bard was aware that Bard IVC Filters had substantially higher reported failure  
6 rates than all other IVC filters for fracture, perforation, migration, and death. For example:

7 a. On April 23, 2004, Bard's Corporate VP of Quality Assurance sent an  
8 email noting that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter's reported failure rates "did not  
9 look good compared to permanent filters" and promised to remove the  
10 filter from the market if its reported death rate became "significantly  
11 greater than the rest of the pack."

12 b. On July 9, 2004, a BPV safety analysis of reported failure rates  
13 determined that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter had a reported failure rate that was  
14 28 times higher than all other IVC filters.

15 c. On December 17, 2004, analysis determined that the "[r]eports of death,  
16 filter migration (movement), IVC perforation, and filter fracture  
17 associated with the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter were seen in the MAUDE database  
18 at reporting rates that were 4.6, 4.4, 4.1, and 5.3 times higher,  
19 respectively, than reporting rates for all other filters. . . . These  
20 deficiencies were all statistically significant . . . [and were] significantly  
21 higher than those for other removable filters."  
22

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

- d. By December 2004, according to BPV’s own findings pursuant to its safety procedure, the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter had so many reported failures that it was deemed not reasonably safe for human use and required “correction.”
- e. A BPV safety analysis from June 28, 2011, revealed that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter had a reported fracture rate 55 times higher than the SNF.
- f. Whereas the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter was reported to have caused over a dozen deaths by early 2005, the SNF has never — to Plaintiffs’ knowledge — been reported as associated with a patient death.

**C. Defendants Knew Why the Recovery<sup>®</sup> Filter Was Failing and Were Aware of Available Design Changes that Could Substantially Reduce Failures**

88. Bard knew why the design changes made to the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter were causing failures.

89. Bard was aware that the diameter of the leg hooks was a substantial factor in a filter’s ability to resist migration and fatigue.

90. By reducing the diameter of the hooks on the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter, Bard had reduced the device’s ability to remain stable and not fracture.

91. Bard also reduced the leg span of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter from that of the SNF filter by 25%. As a result, Bard knew its retrievable IVC filters lacked a sufficient margin of safety to accommodate expansion of the vena cava (distension) after placement.

1           92. Bard was also aware that its failure to electropolish the wire material prior to  
2 distribution meant that Bard IVC Filters had surface damage that reduced their fatigue  
3 resistance.

4           93. Bard was also aware that the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter had a high propensity to tilt and  
5 perforate the vena cava, which substantially increased the risk of fracture.

6           94. Bard was also aware that fatigue resistance could be increased by decreasing the  
7 sharpness of the angle of the wire struts where they exited the cap at the top of the IVC filters,  
8 and by chamfering (rounding or reducing the sharpness) of the cap edge against which the  
9 struts rubbed.

10           95. A few examples of Bard's awareness of the unreasonably dangerous problems  
11 with Bard IVC Filters include:

12           a. On June 18, 2003, BPV engineer Robert Carr sent an email noting that  
13 chamfering the edge of the cap would reduce the likelihood of fracture.

14           b. On March 16, 2004, a BPV engineer sent an email admitting that the  
15 surface damage seen on the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter from the manufacturing  
16 process decreases fatigue resistance and that electropolishing increases  
17 fatigue resistance.

18           c. In an April 2004 meeting, BPV was warned by its physician consultants,  
19 Drs. Venbrux and Kaufman, that the migration resistance of the  
20 Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter needed to be raised from 50 mmHg to 140 mmHg.  
21 They further warned BPV that Bard's Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter was a "wimpy"  
22 filter and its radial force was inadequate to assure stability.

- 1 d. On May 5, 2004, a BPV engineer sent an email stating that adding a  
2 “chamfer” to the filter would “address the arm fracture issue.”
- 3 e. On May 26, 2004, a BPV engineer sent an email stating that a proposed  
4 modified Recovery® filter design with a large chamfer lasted 50 bending  
5 cycles before breaking, whereas another proposed modified Recovery®  
6 filter with a small chamfer broke after ten bending cycles.

7 96. Prior to Plaintiffs being implanted with a Bard IVC Filter, Bard was aware of  
8 other design changes that could make the Recovery® filter substantially safer. In a report  
9 dated February 16, 2005, BPV describes the design changes to the Recovery® filter, which  
10 became known as the G2® Filter. The report states that the Recovery® filter has been modified  
11 to “to increase migration and fracture resistance, and to minimize the likelihood of leg  
12 twisting, appendage snagging, filter tilting, and caval perforation.” The document goes on to  
13 describe the design modifications, which include:

- 14 a. Increased ground wire diameter of the hook from .0085” to .0105” in  
15 order to improve the fracture resistance of the hook and to improve the  
16 migration resistance of the filter.
- 17 b. The leg span has been increased from 32mm to 40mm in order to  
18 improve the ability of the filter to expand with a distending vena cava  
19 reducing risk of migration.
- 20 c. The total filter arm length has increased from 20mm to 25mm, enlarging  
21 the arm span from 30mm to 33mm to aid in filter centering.  
22

1 d. An additional inward bend has been applied to the end of the filter arm  
2 in order to improve arm interaction with the vessel wall and to address  
3 caval perforations and appendage snagging.

4 e. The arc of filter arm, as it attaches to the sleeve, has been modified to  
5 have a smooth radial transition instead of sharp angle. This change was  
6 made in order to reduce the stress concentration generated by the sharp  
7 angle and thus improve fracture resistance in the area of the filter.

8 f. The report concludes that the design modifications have substantially  
9 reduced the risk of fracture.

10 97. Subsequent design changes only marginally improved product safety, but did not  
11 fully or adequately address the Bard IVC Filters' deadly defects.

12 98. Electropolishing was added to the Bard IVC Filters in 2010 to reduce the risk of  
13 fracture. Electropolishing implanted Nitinol IVC filters was the industry standard, and  
14 increased fatigue resistance by at least 25%, according to Bard's internal testing.

15 99. Additional anchors were added to the anchoring system on the filter in 2011, in  
16 what became known as the Meridian filter. The purpose of this improvement was to decrease  
17 the risk of tilting, which increases the risk of fracture and perforation, and reduce caudal  
18 migration.

19 100. Bard added penetration limiters with the introduction of Denali Filter in May  
20 2013.

21 101. Penetration limiters are designed to reduce perforation and penetration of the  
22 vena cava.

1           **D. Bard Misrepresented and Concealed the IVC Filters' Risks and Benefits**

2           102. Despite knowing that the Recovery® filter was substantially more likely to  
3 fracture, migrate, tilt, and cause death than any other filter, Bard marketed its IVC filters as  
4 being safer and more effective than all other filters throughout the lifecycle of the product.

5           103. Bard further provided mandatory scripts to its Bard IVC filter sales force, which  
6 required the sales force to falsely tell physicians that the Recovery® filter was safe because it  
7 had the same reported failure rates as all other filters.

8           104. Even Bard's updated labeling in December 2004 downplayed and concealed the  
9 Recovery® filter's dangerous effects because it suggested fractures almost always cause no  
10 harm and that all filters had the same risk of failure.

11           105. Bard's updated labeling also downplayed the risk of harm by stating that serious  
12 injuries had only been "reported" when Bard knew such injuries had in fact occurred.

13           **E. Bard Chose to Keep Selling an Unsafe IVC Filter and Lied to Its Own**  
14           **Sales Force to Ensure Market Share and Stock Prices**

15           106. Instead of warning the public or withdrawing the IVC Filters from the market to  
16 fix the problems with its IVC filters, Defendants retained a public relations firm, opened a task  
17 force to prevent information from getting out to the public, and devised a plan to address the  
18 public if it did.

19           107. In 2004, Bard created a Crisis Communication Team that included members of  
20 Bard's upper level management, Bard's legal department, and independent consultants.

21           108. The Crisis Communication Team created a Crisis Communication Plan, which  
22 summarized Bard's motivation for withholding risk information from the public as follows:

1 The proliferation of unfavorable press in top-tier media outlets can cause an  
2 onslaught of negative activity: a company's employee morale may suffer, stock  
3 prices may plummet, analysts may downgrade the affected company's rating,  
4 reputations may be ruined temporarily or even permanently. Extensive  
5 preparation is critical to help prevent the spread of damaging coverage.

6 109. In an April 2004 email, BPV consultant Dr. John Lehmann, a member of the  
7 Crisis Communication Team, advised Bard to conceal from the public Bard's information  
8 about the material risk of its IVC filters. Bard adopted his advice. His email states, among  
9 other things:

10 Comparison with other filters is problematic in many ways, and we should  
11 avoid/downplay this as much as possible. When pressed, we simply paraphrase  
12 what was said in the Health Hazard. That "Estimates based on available data  
13 suggest that there is no significant difference in the rates of these complications  
14 between any of the IVC Filters currently marketed in the U.S., including the  
15 Recovery IVC Filters.

16 \*\*\*

17 I wouldn't raise this subject if at possible. It would be a most unusual reporter  
18 that will get this far. The testing data I saw in Arizona showed that although  
19 RF was certainly within the boundaries of IVC Filters tested, in larger veins it  
20 was near the bottom. I would avoid as much as possible getting into this  
21 subject, because I'm not sure others would agree with the conclusion that  
22 "Recovery Vena Cava Filter was just as or more resistant to migration than all  
retrievable and non-retrievable competitors.

110. Bard also made false representations and/omissions to the BPV sales force to  
keep them selling the IVC filters. Bard reassured the sales force that despite the failures with  
the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter, the Bard IVC Filters were safe because they had the same failure rates as  
all other IVC filters.

111. By December 2004, BPV's own safety procedure deemed the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter  
not reasonably safe for human use. Yet Bard continued to market and sell the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter



1 into September 2005 and continued to allow its defective product to sit on shelves available to  
2 be implanted for an unknown period of time after September 2005.

3 112. Even after the G2<sup>®</sup> filter was launched in September 2005, Bard still failed to  
4 warn consumers of the increased risk posed by the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter. Instead, Bard again chose  
5 to conceal information about the serious risks of substantial harm from the use of its defective  
6 product.

7 **THE G2<sup>®</sup>, RECOVERY<sup>®</sup> G2 AND G2<sup>®</sup> EXPRESS FILTERS**

8 113. On or about March 2, 2005, Bard submitted a Section 510(k) premarket  
9 notification of intent to market the G2<sup>®</sup> filter for the prevention of recurrent pulmonary  
10 embolism via placement in the inferior vena cava. In doing so, Bard cited the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter  
11 as the substantially equivalent predicate IVC filter, which was an inappropriate and illegal  
12 predicate device since it was being marketed while adulterated and misbranded for failing,  
13 among other things, to be as safe and effective as its predicate device, SNF. Bard stated that  
14 the only differences between the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter and the G2<sup>®</sup> filter were primarily  
15 dimensional, and no material changes or additional components were added. It was  
16 considered by Bard the next generation of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter

17 114. On March 30, 2005, however, the FDA rejected this application unless Bard and  
18 BPV included “black box” warnings that read:

19 Warning: The safety and effectiveness of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> Filter System in  
20 morbidly obese patients has not been established. There have been fatal device-  
related adverse events reported in this population.

21 [and]

22 [C]entral venous lines may cause the filters to move or fracture.

1           115. On April 19, 2005, prior to formally responding to the FDA's request to add a  
2 black box warning, BPV CEO Timothy Ring and C.R. Bard CEO John Weiland received an  
3 executive summary reporting that there were at least 34 migrations and 51 fractures associated  
4 with Bard IVC Filters.

5           116. This same report advised Bard executives that there were then nine deaths, six of  
6 which related to morbidly obese patients. Further, 18 of the 51 fractures resulted in fragments  
7 migrating to the heart.

8           117. On April 20, 2005, without alerting the FDA to the alarming information Bard  
9 executives had the day before, Bard submitted a letter in response to the FDA's request to add  
10 this black box warning stating that, "There is currently a statement in the IFU linking all of our  
11 complications to death."

12           118. On August 29, 2005, the FDA cleared the G2<sup>®</sup> filter for the same intended uses  
13 as the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter, except that it was not cleared for retrievable use.<sup>2</sup> Contrary to the  
14 FDA's suggestion, no black box warning was added to warn the bariatric patient population of  
15 fatalities associated with the use of the filter.<sup>3</sup>

16           119. In September of 2005, Bard quietly and belatedly replaced the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter  
17 on hospital shelves with the G2<sup>®</sup> filter. Bard either told doctors or led them to believe that the  
18 G2<sup>®</sup> was a new and improved version of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter with the same option to retrieve  
19 the filter after implant.

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 <sup>2</sup> The FDA did not clear the G2<sup>®</sup> filter to be used as a retrievable filter until January 15, 2008.

22 <sup>3</sup> A warning was eventually added to the IFU in October of 2009.

1           120. At the same time Bard was selling the G2<sup>®</sup> (then a permanent use filter without  
2 any retrievability option), Bard was also selling the SNF, which had the same indication for  
3 use with nearly zero adverse events.

4           121. Bard marketed the G2<sup>®</sup> filter as having “enhanced fracture resistance,”  
5 “improved centering,” and “increased migration resistance” without any data to back up these  
6 representations. Even if such data existed, Bard witnesses have testified that Bard would not  
7 share any such information with doctors if requested.

8           122. Moreover, as with its predecessor Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter, Bard failed to conduct  
9 adequate clinical and bench testing to ensure that the G2<sup>®</sup> filter would perform safely and  
10 effectively once implanted in the human body.

11           123. The G2<sup>®</sup> filter’s design causes it to be of insufficient integrity and strength to  
12 withstand normal stresses within the human body so as to resist fracturing, migrating, and/or  
13 tilting, and/or perforating the inferior vena cava.

14           124. In addition to the same design defects as its predecessor device, the G2<sup>®</sup> filter  
15 suffers from the same manufacturing defects. These manufacturing defects include, but are  
16 not limited to, the existence of “draw markings” and circumferential grinding markings on the  
17 exterior of the surface of Bard IVC Filters. The presence of these draw markings and/or  
18 circumferential grinding markings further compromises the structural integrity of the G2<sup>®</sup>  
19 filter while *in vivo*.

20           125. In particular, the G2<sup>®</sup> filter is prone to fail at or near the location of draw  
21 markings/circumferential grinding markings on the struts of the IVC Filters.  
22

1           126. Put simply, the G2<sup>®</sup> filter is not of sufficient strength to withstand normal  
2 placement within the human body. The presence of the aforementioned exterior  
3 manufacturing defects makes Bard IVC Filters more susceptible to fatigue, failure, and  
4 migration.

5           127. Similarly, although Bard rounded the chamfer at the edge of the cap of the G2<sup>®</sup>  
6 filter, it continued to fracture at that same location.

7           128. Thus, the G2<sup>®</sup> filter shares similar defects and health risks as the Recovery<sup>®</sup>  
8 filter.

9           129. Almost immediately upon the release of the G2<sup>®</sup> filter, Bard received notice of  
10 the same series of adverse events of migration, fracture, tilt, and perforation causing the same  
11 type of harm as the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter. This time, however, a new and different adverse event  
12 emerged: the G2<sup>®</sup> filter would caudally (moving against blood flow) migrate in the direction  
13 toward the groin.

14           130. The G2<sup>®</sup> filter failures were again associated with reports of severe patient  
15 injuries such as:

- 16           a. Death;
- 17           b. Hemorrhage;
- 18           c. Cardiac/pericardial tamponade (pressure caused by a collection of blood  
19           in the area around the heart);
- 20           d. Cardiac arrhythmia and other symptoms similar to myocardial infarction;
- 21           e. Severe and persistent pain; and
- 22           f. Perforations of tissue, vessels and organs.

1           131. Bard represents the fracture rate of the G2<sup>®</sup> filter to be 1.2%. Based upon a  
2 review of the data available in the public domain (including the FDA MAUDE database  
3 statistics and the published medical literature), this representation does not accurately reflect  
4 the true frequency of fractures for the G2<sup>®</sup> filter.

5           132. As with the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter, Bard was aware of clinical data showing that the  
6 G2<sup>®</sup> filter was not the substantial equivalent of its predecessor SNF device, requiring  
7 immediate recall of the adulterated and misbranded product.

8           133. A review of the MAUDE database from the years 2004 through 2008  
9 demonstrates that the Bard IVC Filters (including the G2<sup>®</sup> Filter) are responsible for the  
10 majority of all reported adverse events related to IVC filters.

11           134. On December 27, 2005, Bard's Medical Affairs Director sent an email  
12 questioning why Bard was even selling the modified version of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter, when  
13 Bard's SNF had virtually no complaints associated with it.

14           135. This further confirms the misbranded and adulterated nature of the device,  
15 requiring corrective action, including recall.

16           136. On January 15, 2008, the FDA allowed a retrievable option for the G2<sup>®</sup> filter, the  
17 G2 Express<sup>®</sup> filter. The G2 Express<sup>®</sup> filter (also known as the "G2<sup>®</sup>X") is identical in design  
18 to the G2<sup>®</sup> filter except that it has a hook at the top of the filters that allows it to be retrieved  
19 by snares, as well as Bard's Recovery Cone.

20           137. The G2<sup>®</sup>X filter contained no design modifications or improvements to alleviate  
21 the instability, structural integrity, and perforation problems that Bard knew to exist with the  
22 G2<sup>®</sup>X Filter via the 510(k) process.

**THE ECLIPSE® FILTER**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

138. In a failed effort to resolve the complications associated with its previous filters, Bard designed the Eclipse® Vena Cava Filter as the next generation in its retrievable IVC filter family.

139. The Eclipse® filter was cleared by the FDA on January 14, 2010. The only design changes from the G2® family of filters to the Eclipse® filter was that the Eclipse® filter was electropolished.

140. According to Bard's internal testing, electropolishing supposedly increased fracture resistance by 25%. However, longitudinal studies published in peer-reviewed medical literature found that among 363 patients implanted with the Recovery® filter and 658 patients implanted with the G2® filter, the devices experienced fracture rates of 40% and 37.5%, respectively, after five and a half years. Thus, approximately 28.125% to 30% of Eclipse® filters would still be projected to fracture within five and a half years.

141. Without meaningful design changes, the Eclipse® filter continued to share several of the same design defects and complications associated with the Recovery® filter and G2® family of filters.

142. Soon after Bard launched the Eclipse® filter, it began receiving complaints and reports of injuries associated with the Eclipse® filter similar to those received with its predecessor filters.

143. Bard, however, knew and/or soon learned that the Eclipse® filter was not the substantial equivalent of the SNF, making this device also misbranded and adulterated, and subject to recall.

**THE MERIDIAN® FILTER**

1  
2 144. The Meridian® filter was cleared by the FDA in August of 2011.

3 145. Bard represented to the FDA that the Meridian was substantially similar to the  
4 Eclipse® filter and could therefore be cleared via the less onerous 510(k) process.

5 146. Bard, however, knew and/or soon learned that the Meridian® filter was not the  
6 substantial equivalent of the SNF, making this device also misbranded and adulterated, and  
7 subject to recall.

8 147. The Meridian® filter system was the next-generation of Bard's retrievable or  
9 optional filters. The Meridian® filter is made of the same nickel-titanium alloy, NITINOL, as  
10 the Bard Recovery®, G2®, and Eclipse® filters.

11 148. The design of the Meridian is based on the Eclipse® filter, which, in turn, is  
12 based entirely on the G2® filter, which, in turn is based on the Recovery® Filter. Like the  
13 Eclipse®, the wires used in the Meridian® filter are electropolished prior to the forming of the  
14 filter. The only added feature to the Meridian® filter was a caudal anchoring system added in  
15 an attempt to reduce the prevalence of the filter caudal migrating toward the groin.

16 149. However, as seen with the Recovery®, G2®, and Eclipse® filters, soon after its  
17 introduction to the market reports surfaced that the Meridian® filters were fracturing,  
18 perforating, migrating, and/or tilting in the patients in which they were implanted.

19 150. The Meridian® filter was also plagued with the same manufacturing and design  
20 defects that were causing damage to the general public as Bard's predecessor retrievable  
21 filters.

**THE DENALI<sup>®</sup> FILTER**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

151. The Denali<sup>®</sup> filter was cleared by the FDA on May 15, 2013. It is Bard's latest generation device in the IVC filter product line.

152. Bard represented to the FDA that the Denali<sup>®</sup> was substantially similar to the Eclipse<sup>®</sup> filter, again bypassing formal pre-market FDA approval and instead utilizing the 510(k) process.

153. The Denali<sup>®</sup> Filter is also made of NITINOL. Its design is based on the Eclipse<sup>®</sup> filter, which in turn, was based on Bard's predecessor filter line. Like the Eclipse<sup>®</sup>, the NITINOL wires used in the Denali<sup>®</sup> filter are electropolished prior to the forming of the filter. The added features to the Denali<sup>®</sup> Filter were cranial and caudal anchoring systems (to reduce the prevalence of the filter migration) and penetration limiters.

154. However, as seen with the Recovery<sup>®</sup>, G2<sup>®</sup>, G2X<sup>®</sup> (G2 Express<sup>®</sup>), and Eclipse<sup>®</sup> Filters, soon after its introduction to the market, reports were made that the Denali<sup>®</sup> filters were fracturing, perforating, migrating, and/or tilting in the patients in which they were implanted.

155. The Denali<sup>®</sup> filter was likewise plagued with the same manufacturing and design defects that were causing damage to the general public in Bard's predecessor retrievable filter family.

156. At all times material hereto from the design phase, testing, and manufacture of the Recovery<sup>®</sup> filter through the Denali<sup>®</sup> filter, Bard lacked a thorough understanding dynamics of caval anatomy that impacted testing methods.



1 157. At this time, all Bard IVC Filters contain the same or substantially similar  
2 defects resulting in the same or substantially similar mechanism of injury to Plaintiffs and  
3 their decedents.

4 158. At this time, all Bard IVC Filters are misbranded and adulterated by virtue of  
5 them failing to be the substantial equivalent of their predecessor devices, all of which were  
6 required to be as safe and effective as the original predicate device, the Simon Nitinol Filter,  
7 and none were/are, making them subject to corrective action, including recall, in the interest of  
8 patient safety. The use of each of these subject devices was inappropriate and illegal since  
9 each was being marketed while adulterated and misbranded for failing, among other things, to  
10 be as safe and effective as the originating predicate device, SNF.

11 159. At all relevant times, safer and more efficacious designs existed for this product,  
12 as well as reasonable treatment alternatives.

13 **ESTOPPEL FROM PLEADING STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS OR REPOSE**

14 160. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

15 161. Plaintiffs are within the applicable statute of limitations for their claims because  
16 Plaintiffs (and their healthcare professionals) did not discover, and could not reasonably  
17 discover, the defects and unreasonably dangerous condition of their Bard IVC Filters.

18 162. Plaintiffs' ignorance of the defective and unreasonably dangerous nature of the  
19 Bard IVC Filters, and the causal connection between these defects and Plaintiffs' injuries and  
20 damages, is due in large part to Bard's acts and omissions in fraudulently concealing  
21 information from the public and misrepresenting and/or downplaying the serious threat to  
22 public safety its products present.

1           163. In addition, Bard is estopped from relying on any statutes of limitation or repose  
2 by virtue of its unclean hands, acts of fraudulent concealment, affirmative misrepresentations  
3 and omissions.

4           164. Such conduct includes intentional concealment from Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs'  
5 prescribing health care professionals, and the general consuming public of material  
6 information that Bard IVC Filters had not been demonstrated to be safe or effective, and  
7 carried with them the risks and dangerous defects described above.

8           165. Bard had a duty to disclose the fact that Bard IVC Filters are not safe or  
9 effective, not as safe as other filters on the market, defective, and unreasonably dangerous, and  
10 that their implantation and use carried with it the serious risk of developing perforation,  
11 migration, tilting, and/or fracture.

12           **COUNT I: STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY – MANUFACTURING DEFECT**

13           166. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

14           167. Prior to, on, and after the date the Bard IVC Filters were implanted in Plaintiffs,  
15 Bard designed, distributed, manufactured, sold, and marketed Bard IVC Filters for use in the  
16 United States.

17           168. At all relevant times, Bard designed, distributed, manufactured, marketed, and  
18 sold Bard IVC Filters that were unreasonably dangerous, unsafe, and defective in manufacture  
19 when they left Bard's possession.

20           169. Upon information and belief, Bard IVC Filters contain a manufacturing defect,  
21 in that they differed from the manufacturer's design or specifications, or from other typical  
22 units of the same product line.

1 170. As a direct and proximate cause of Bard's design, manufacture, marketing, and  
2 sale of Bard IVC Filters prior to, on, and after the date Plaintiffs used the Bard IVC Filters,  
3 Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

4 **COUNT II: STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY – INFORMATION DEFECT**

5 171. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

6 172. At all relevant times, Bard engaged in the business of testing, developing,  
7 designing, manufacturing, packaging, labeling, marketing and/or promoting, selling and/or  
8 distributing Bard IVC Filters and through that conduct has knowingly and intentionally placed  
9 Bard IVC Filters into the stream of commerce with full knowledge that they reach consumers  
10 such as Plaintiffs who would become implanted with them.

11 173. Bard did in fact test, develop, design, manufacture, package, label, market and/or  
12 promote, sell and/or distribute Bard IVC Filters to Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' prescribing health care  
13 professionals, and the consuming public. Additionally, Bard expected that the Bard IVC  
14 Filters they were selling, distributing, supplying, manufacturing, and/or promoting to reach,  
15 and did in fact reach, prescribing health care professionals and consumers, including Plaintiffs  
16 and Plaintiffs' prescribing health care professionals, without any substantial change in the  
17 condition of the product from when it was initially distributed by Bard.

18 174. The Bard IVC Filters had potential risks and side effects that were known or  
19 knowable to Bard by the use of scientific inquiry and information available before, at, and  
20 after the manufacture, distribution, and sale of the Bard IVC Filters.

21 175. Bard knew or should have known of the defective condition, characteristics, and  
22 risks associated with Bard IVC Filters. These defective conditions included, but were not

1 limited to: (1) Bard IVC Filters posed a significant and higher risk of failure than other similar  
2 IVC filters (fracture, migration, tilting, and perforation of the vena cava wall); (2) Bard IVC  
3 Filter failures result in serious injuries and death; and (3) certain conditions or post-implant  
4 procedures, such as morbid obesity or open abdominal procedures, could affect the safety and  
5 integrity of Bard IVC Filters.

6 176. Bard IVC Filters were in a defective and unsafe condition that was unreasonably  
7 and substantially dangerous to any user or consumer implanted with Bard IVC Filters, such as  
8 Plaintiffs, when used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable way.

9 177. The warnings and directions Bard provided with Bard IVC Filters failed to  
10 adequately warn of the potential risks and side effects of Bard IVC Filters.

11 178. These risks were known or were reasonably scientifically knowable to Bard, but  
12 not known or recognizable to ordinary consumers, such as Plaintiffs, or to Plaintiffs' treating  
13 doctors.

14 179. Bard IVC Filters were expected to and did reach Plaintiff without substantial  
15 change in their condition, labeling, or warnings as manufactured, distributed, and sold by  
16 Bard.

17 180. Additionally, Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' physicians used Bard IVC Filters in the  
18 manner in which they were intended to be used, making such use reasonably foreseeable to  
19 Bard.

20 181. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's information defects, lack of sufficient  
21 instructions or warnings prior to, on, and after the date Plaintiffs used Bard IVC Filters,  
22 Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

1                    **COUNT III: STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY – DESIGN DEFECT**

2                    182. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

3                    183. At all relevant times, Bard designed, tested, distributed, manufactured,  
4 advertised, sold, marketed and otherwise placed into the stream of commerce Bard IVC Filters  
5 for use by consumers, such as Plaintiffs, in the United States.

6                    184. Bard IVC Filters were expected to, and did, reach Bard's intended consumers,  
7 handlers, and persons coming into contact with the product without substantial change in the  
8 condition in which they was researched, tested, developed, designed, licensed, manufactured,  
9 packaged, labeled, distributed, sold, and marketed by Bard.

10                  185. At all times relevant, Bard IVC Filters were manufactured, designed and labeled  
11 in an unsafe, defective, and inherently dangerous condition which was dangerous for use by  
12 the public in general and Plaintiffs in particular.

13                  186. Bard IVC Filters, as researched, tested, developed, designed, licensed,  
14 manufactured, packaged, labeled, distributed, sold, and marketed by Bard were defective in  
15 design and formulation and unreasonably dangerous in that when they left the hands of Bard's  
16 manufacturers and/or suppliers, the foreseeable risks exceeded the alleged benefits associated  
17 with the use of Bard IVC Filters, and the devices were more dangerous than the ordinary  
18 customer would expect.

19                  187. Physicians implanted Bard IVC Filters as instructed via the Instructions for Use  
20 and in a foreseeable manner as normally intended, recommend, promoted, and marketed by  
21 Bard.

1 188. Plaintiffs received and utilized Defendants' IVC Filters in a foreseeable manner  
2 as normally intended, recommended, promoted, and marketed by Bard.

3 189. At the time Bard placed its defective and unreasonably dangerous Bard IVC  
4 Filters into the stream of commerce commercially, technologically, and scientifically feasible  
5 alternative designs were attainable and available.

6 190. These alternative designs would have prevented the harm resulting in Plaintiffs'  
7 Injuries and Damages without substantially impairing the reasonably anticipated or intended  
8 function of Bard IVC Filters.

9 191. As a direct and proximate result of the defective and unreasonably dangerous  
10 condition of Bard IVC Filters, Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

11 **COUNT IV: NEGLIGENCE – DESIGN**

12 192. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

13 193. At the time of the design, distribution, manufacture, advertising, sale, and  
14 marketing of Bard IVC Filters, and their implantation in Plaintiffs, Bard was aware that Bard  
15 IVC Filters were designed and manufactured in a manner presenting:

- 16 a. An unreasonable risk of fracture of portions of the filters;  
17 b. An unreasonable risk of migration of the filters and/or portions of the  
18 filters;  
19 c. An unreasonable risk of filters tilting and/or perforating the vena cava  
20 wall; and  
21 d. Insufficient strength or structural integrity to withstand normal  
22 placement within the human body.

1           194. At the time of the design, distribution, manufacture, advertising, sale, and  
2 marketing of Bard IVC Filters, and their implantation in Plaintiffs, Bard also was aware that  
3 Bard IVC Filters:

- 4           a. Would be used without inspection for defects;
- 5           b. Would be used by patients with special medical conditions such as those  
6 of the Plaintiffs;
- 7           c. Had previously caused serious bodily injury to its users with special  
8 medical conditions such as those of the Plaintiffs;
- 9           d. Had no established efficacy;
- 10          e. Were less efficient than the predicate SNF;
- 11          f. Would be implanted in patients where the risk outweighed any benefit or  
12 utility of the filters;
- 13          g. Contained instructions for use and warnings that were inadequate; and
- 14          h. Required retrieval (as to the Recovery® and G2® filters) by a device  
15 that was not approved or cleared by the FDA.

16           195. Bard had a duty to exercise due care and avoid unreasonable risk of harm to  
17 others in the design of Bard IVC Filters.

18           196. Bard breached these duties by, among other things:

- 19           a. Designing and distributing a product in which it knew or should have  
20 known that the likelihood and severity of potential harm from the  
21 product exceeded the burden of taking safety measures to reduce or  
22 avoid harm;

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

- b. Designing and distributing a product which it knew or should have known that the likelihood and severity of potential harm from the product exceeded the likelihood of potential harm from other IVC filters available for the same purpose;
- c. Failing to perform reasonable pre- and post-market testing of Bard IVC Filters to determine whether or not the products were safe for their intended use;
- d. Failing to use reasonable and prudent care in the design, research, manufacture, and development of Bard IVC Filters so as to avoid the risk of serious harm associated with the use of Bard IVC Filters;
- e. Advertising, marketing, promoting, and selling Bard IVC Filters for uses other than as approved and indicated in the products' labels;
- f. Failing to establish an adequate quality assurance program used in the manufacturing of Bard IVC Filters; and
- g. Failing to perform adequate evaluation and testing of Bard IVC Filters when such evaluation and testing would have revealed the propensity of Bard IVC Filters to cause injuries similar to those that Plaintiffs suffered.

197. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described negligence in design of Bard IVC Filters, Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

**COUNT V: NEGLIGENCE – MANUFACTURE**

198. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.



1            199. At all relevant times, Bard had a duty to exercise due care in the manufacturing  
2 of Bard IVC Filters.

3            200. Bard breached this duty by, among other things:

- 4                    a. Failing to adopt manufacturing processes that would reduce the  
5                    foreseeable risk of product failure;
- 6                    b. Failing to use reasonable care in manufacturing the product and by  
7                    producing a product that differed from their design or specifications or  
8                    from other typical units from the same production line;
- 9                    c. Failing to use reasonable and prudent care in the design, research,  
10                    manufacture, and development of Bard IVC Filters and their  
11                    manufacturing process so as to avoid the risk of serious harm associated  
12                    with the use of Bard IVC Filters; and
- 13                    d. Failing to establish an adequate quality assurance program used in the  
14                    manufacturing of the IVC Filters.

15            201. As a direct and proximate result of the above-described negligence in  
16 manufacture of Bard IVC Filters, Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

17                    **COUNT VI: NEGLIGENCE – FAILURE TO RECALL/RETROFIT**

18            202. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

19            203. At this time, all Bard IVC Filters are misbranded and adulterated by virtue of  
20 them failing to be the substantial equivalent of their predecessor device, making them subject  
21 to corrective action, including recall, in the interest of patient safety.  
22

1           204. Prior to, on, and after the date of Plaintiffs' implantation with Bard IVC Filters,  
2 and at all relevant times, Bard knew or reasonably should have known that Bard IVC Filters  
3 and their warnings were defective and dangerous or were likely to be dangerous when used in  
4 a reasonably foreseeable manner.

5           205. Prior to, on, and after the date of Plaintiffs' implantation with Bard IVC Filters  
6 and at all relevant times thereafter, Bard became aware that the defects of Bard IVC Filters  
7 resulted in Bard IVC Filters causing injuries similar to those Plaintiffs suffered.

8           206. Reasonable manufacturers and distributors under the same or similar  
9 circumstances would have recalled or retrofitted Bard IVC Filters, and would thereby have  
10 avoided and prevented harm to many patients, including Plaintiffs.

11           207. In light of this information and Bard's knowledge described above, Bard had a  
12 duty to recall and/or retrofit Bard IVC Filters.

13           208. Bard breached its duty to recall and/or retrofit Bard IVC Filters.

14           209. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's negligent failure to recall or retrofit,  
15 Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

16                                   **COUNT VII: NEGLIGENCE – FAILURE TO WARN**

17           210. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

18           211. At all relevant times, Bard knew or should have known that Bard IVC Filters  
19 were defective and dangerous or were likely to be dangerous when used in a reasonably  
20 foreseeable manner.

21           212. Such danger included the propensity of Bard IVC Filters to cause injuries and  
22 death similar to those suffered by Plaintiffs.

1           213. At all relevant times, Bard also knew or reasonably should have known that the  
2 users of Bard IVC Filters, including Plaintiffs, would not realize or discover on their own the  
3 dangers presented by Bard IVC Filters.

4           214. Reasonable manufacturers and reasonable distributors, under the same or similar  
5 circumstances as those of Bard prior to, on, and after the date of Plaintiffs' use of Bard IVC  
6 Filters, would have warned of the dangers presented by Bard IVC Filters, or instructed on the  
7 safe use of Bard IVC Filters.

8           215. Prior to, on, and after the date of Plaintiffs' use of the IVC Filters, Bard had a  
9 duty to adequately warn of the dangers presented by Bard IVC Filters and/or instruct on the  
10 safe use of Bard IVC Filters.

11           216. Bard breached these duties by failing to provide adequate warnings to Plaintiffs  
12 communicating the information and dangers described above and/or providing instruction for  
13 safe use of Bard IVC Filters.

14           217. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's negligent failure to warn, Plaintiffs  
15 suffered Injuries and Damages.

16                           **COUNT VIII: NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION**

17           218. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

18           219. Prior to, on, and after the dates during which Plaintiff was implanted with the  
19 IVC Filters, Bard negligently and carelessly represented to Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' treating  
20 physicians, and the general public that Bard IVC Filters were safe, fit, and effective for use.

21           220. These representations were untrue.

22

1           221. Bard owed a duty in all of its undertakings, including the dissemination of  
2 information concerning its IVC filters, to exercise reasonable care to ensure that it did not in  
3 those undertakings create unreasonable risks of personal injury to others.

4           222. Bard disseminated to health care professionals and consumers through published  
5 labels, labeling, marketing materials, and otherwise information concerning the properties and  
6 effects of Bard IVC Filters with the intention that health care professionals and consumers  
7 would rely upon that information in their decisions concerning whether to prescribe and use  
8 Bard IVC Filters.

9           223. Bard, as medical device designers, manufacturers, sellers, promoters and/or  
10 distributors, knew or should reasonably have known that health care professionals and  
11 consumers, in weighing the potential benefits and potential risks of prescribing or using Bard  
12 IVC Filters, would rely upon information disseminated and marketed by Bard to them  
13 regarding the Bard IVC Filters.

14           224. Bard failed to exercise reasonable care to ensure that the information they  
15 disseminated to health care professionals and consumers concerning the properties and effects  
16 of Bard IVC Filters was accurate, complete, and not misleading and, as a result, disseminated  
17 information to health care professionals and consumers that was negligently and materially  
18 inaccurate, misleading, false, and unreasonably dangerous to consumers such as Plaintiffs.

19           225. Bard, as designers, manufacturers, sellers, promoters, and/or distributors, also  
20 knew or reasonably should have known that patients receiving Bard IVC Filters as  
21 recommended by health care professionals in reliance upon information disseminated by Bard  
22 as the manufacturer/distributor of Bard IVC Filters would be placed in peril of developing the

1 serious, life-threatening, and life-long injuries including, but not limited to, tilting, migration,  
2 perforation, fracture, lack of efficacy, and increased risk of the development of blood clots, if  
3 the information disseminated and relied upon was materially inaccurate, misleading, or  
4 otherwise false.

5 226. Bard had a duty to promptly correct material misstatements it knew others were  
6 relying upon in making healthcare decisions.

7 227. Bard failed in each of these duties by misrepresenting to Plaintiffs and the  
8 medical community the safety and efficacy of Bard IVC Filters and failing to correct known  
9 misstatements and misrepresentations.

10 228. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's negligent misrepresentations,  
11 Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

12 **COUNT IX: NEGLIGENCE PER SE**

13 (Violations of 21 U.S.C. §§321, 331, 352 and 21 C.F.R. §§1.21, 801, 803, 807, 820)

14 229. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

15 230. At all times herein mentioned, Bard was subject to a variety of federal, state, and  
16 local laws, rules, regulations and ordinances, including the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic  
17 Act ("FFDCA") and its applicable regulations, concerning the manufacture, design, testing,  
18 production, processing, assembling, inspection, research, promotion, advertising, distribution,  
19 marketing, promotion, labeling, packaging, preparation for use, consulting, sale, warning, and  
20 post-sale warning and other communications of the risks and dangers of Bard IVC Filters.

21 231. By reason of its conduct as alleged herein, Bard violated provisions of statutes  
22 and regulations, including but not limited to:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

- a. FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. §§331 and 352, by misbranding Bard IVC Filters;
- b. FFDCA, 21 U.S.C. § 321, by making statements and/or representations via word, design, device, or any combination thereof failing to reveal material facts with respect to the consequences that may result from the use of Bard IVC Filters to which the labeling and advertising relates;
- c. 21 C.F.R. § 1.21, by misleading its consumers and patients by concealing material facts in light of representations made regarding safety and efficacy of its Bard IVC Filters;
- d. 21 C.F.R. § 801, by mislabeling Bard IVC Filters as to safety and effectiveness of its products and by failing to update its label to reflect post-marketing evidence that Bard IVC Filters were associated with an increased risk of injuries due to tilting, fracture, migration and perforation;
- e. 21 C.F.R. §§801.109 and 801.4 by learning that Bard IVC Filters were adulterated and misbranded and failing to correct and recall the devices.
- f. 21 C.F.R. § 803, by not maintaining accurate medical device reports regarding adverse events of tilting, fracture, migration and perforation and/or misreporting these adverse events maintained via the medical device reporting system;
- g. 21 C.F.R. § 807, by failing to notify the FDA and/or the consuming public when its Bard IVC Filters were no longer substantially equivalent

- 1 with regard to safety and efficacy with regard to post-marketing adverse  
2 events and safety signals;
- 3 h. 21 C.F.R. § 820, by failing to maintain adequate quality systems  
4 regulation including, but not limited to, instituting effective corrective  
5 and preventative actions;
- 6 i. 21 CFR 201.128, by promoting each of their subject devices off-label  
7 and for conditions, purposes and uses beyond their labeled and intended  
8 uses; and
- 9 j. 210 CFR 801.4, by their knowledge of off-label uses of their devices for  
10 unintended and unlabeled conditions, purposes and uses, and failing as  
11 required to provide adequate labeling which accords with such unlabeled  
12 and unintended uses.

13 232. These statutes, rules and regulations, along with those listed in Count XIV, are  
14 designed to protect the health, safety, and well-being of consumers like Plaintiffs.

15 233. Bard's violation of these statutes, rules and regulations, as well as those detailed  
16 in Count XIV, constitutes negligence *per se*.

17 234. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's negligence *per se*, Plaintiffs suffered  
18 Injuries and Damages.

19 **COUNT X: BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY**

20 235. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

21 236. Plaintiffs, though their medical providers, purchased Bard IVC Filters from  
22 Bard.

1           237. At all relevant times, Bard was a merchant of goods of the kind including  
2 medical devices and vena cava filters (i.e, Bard IVC Filters).

3           238. At the time and place of sale, distribution, and supply of Bard IVC Filters to  
4 Plaintiffs (and to other consumer and the medical community), Bard expressly represented and  
5 warranted that Bard IVC Filters were safe; that they were well-tolerated, efficacious, fit for  
6 their intended purpose, and of marketable quality; that they did not produce any unwarned-of  
7 dangerous side effects; and that they was adequately tested.

8           239. At the time of Plaintiffs' purchase from Defendants, Bard IVC Filters were not  
9 in a merchantable condition, and Bard breached its expressed warranties, in that Bard IVC  
10 Filters:

- 11           a. Were designed in such a manner so as to be prone to an unreasonably  
12           high incidence of fracture, perforation of vessels and organs, and/or  
13           migration;
- 14           b. Were designed in such a manner so as to result in a unreasonably high  
15           incidence of injury to the vessels and organs of its purchaser;
- 16           c. Were manufactured in such a manner that the exterior surface of the  
17           filter was inadequately, improperly, and inappropriately constituted,  
18           causing the device to weaken and fail;
- 19           d. Were unable to be removed at any time during a person's life;
- 20           e. Were not efficacious in the prevention of pulmonary emboli;
- 21           f. Carried a risk of use outweighed any benefit; and
- 22           g. Were not self-centering.





1 f. Impliedly representing that its filters would be effective in the prevention  
2 of pulmonary emboli.

3 244. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's breach of its implied warranty,  
4 Plaintiffs have suffered Injuries and Damages.

5 **COUNT XII: FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION**

6 245. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

7 246. At all times relevant to this cause, and as detailed above, Bard intentionally  
8 provided Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' physicians, the medical community, and the public at large with  
9 false or inaccurate information. Bard also omitted material information concerning Bard IVC  
10 Filters, including, but not limited to, misrepresentations regarding the following topics:

- 11 a. The safety of the Bard IVC Filters;  
12 b. The efficacy of the Bard IVC Filters;  
13 c. The rate of failure of the Bard IVC Filters;  
14 d. The pre-market testing of the Bard IVC Filters;  
15 e. The approved uses of the Bard IVC Filters; and  
16 f. The ability to retrieve the device at any time over a person's life.

17 247. The information Bard distributed to the public, the medical community, and  
18 Plaintiffs was in the form of reports, press releases, advertising campaigns, labeling materials,  
19 print advertisements, commercial media containing material representations, and instructions  
20 for use, as well as through their officers, directors, agents, and representatives.

21 248. These materials contained false and misleading material representations, which  
22 included: that Bard IVC Filters were safe and fit when used for their intended purpose or in a

1 reasonably foreseeable manner; that they did not pose dangerous health risks in excess of  
2 those associated with the use of other similar IVC filters; that any and all side effects were  
3 accurately reflected in the warnings; and that they were adequately tested to withstand normal  
4 placement within the human body.

5       249. Bard made the foregoing misrepresentations knowing that they were false or  
6 without reasonable basis. These materials included instructions for use and a warning  
7 document that was included in the package of Bard IVC Filters that were implanted in  
8 Plaintiffs.

9       250. Bard's intent and purpose in making these misrepresentations was to deceive and  
10 defraud the public and the medical community, including Plaintiffs' health care providers; to  
11 gain the confidence of the public and the medical community, including Plaintiffs' health care  
12 providers; to falsely assure the public and the medical community of the quality of Bard IVC  
13 Filters and their fitness for use; and to induce the public and the medical community, including  
14 Plaintiffs' healthcare providers to request, recommend, prescribe, implant, purchase, and  
15 continue to use Bard IVC Filters, all in reliance on Bard's misrepresentations.

16       251. The foregoing representations and omissions by Bard were false.

17       252. Bard IVC Filters are not safe, fit, and effective for human use in their intended  
18 and reasonably foreseeable manner.

19       253. Further, the use of Bard IVC Filters is hazardous to the users' health, and Bard  
20 IVC Filters have a serious propensity to cause users to suffer serious injuries, including  
21 without limitation the injuries Plaintiffs suffered.  
22



- 1           262. These concealed material facts include, but are not limited to:
- 2                   a. Bard IVC Filters were unsafe and not fit when used for their intended
- 3                           purpose or in a reasonably foreseeable manner;
- 4                   b. Bard IVC Filters posed dangerous health risks in excess of those
- 5                           associated with the use of other similar IVC filters;
- 6                   c. That there were additional side effects related to implantation and use of
- 7                           Bard IVC Filters that were not accurately and completely reflected in the
- 8                           warnings associated with Bard IVC Filters; and
- 9                   d. That Bard IVC Filters were not adequately tested to withstand normal
- 10                           placement within the human body.

11           263. Plaintiff and Plaintiffs' healthcare providers were not aware of these and other

12 facts concealed by Bard.

13           264. In concealing these and other facts, Bard intended to deceive Plaintiffs and

14 Plaintiffs' healthcare providers.

15           265. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' healthcare providers were ignorant of and could not

16 reasonably discover the facts Bard fraudulently concealed and reasonably and justifiably relied

17 on Bard's representations concerning the supposed safety and efficacy of Bard IVC Filters.

18           266. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fraudulent concealment of

19 material facts, Plaintiffs suffered Injuries and Damages.

20           **COUNT XIV: VIOLATIONS OF APPLICABLE STATE LAW PROHIBITING**

21           **CONSUMER FRAUD AND UNFAIR DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES**

22           267. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

1           268. Bard had a statutory duty to refrain from unfair or deceptive acts or practices in  
2 the sale and promotion of Bard IVC Filters.

3           269. Bard knowingly, deliberately, willfully and/or wantonly engaged in unfair,  
4 unconscionable, deceptive, fraudulent, and misleading acts or practices in violation of all  
5 states' consumer protection laws identified below.

6           270. Through its false, untrue, and misleading promotion of Bard IVC Filters, Bard  
7 induced Plaintiffs to purchase and/or pay for the purchase of Bard IVC Filters.

8           271. Bard misrepresented the alleged benefits and characteristics of Bard IVC Filters;  
9 suppressed, omitted, concealed, and failed to disclose material information concerning known  
10 adverse effects of Bard IVC Filters; misrepresented the quality and efficacy of Bard IVC  
11 Filters as compared to much lower-cost alternatives; misrepresented and advertised that  
12 Bard IVC Filters were of a particular standard, quality, or grade that they were not;  
13 misrepresented Bard IVC Filters in such a manner that later, on disclosure of the true facts,  
14 there was a likelihood that Plaintiffs would have opted for an alternative IVC filter or method  
15 of preventing pulmonary emboli.

16           272. Bard's conduct created a likelihood of, and in fact caused, confusion and  
17 misunderstanding.

18           273. Bard's conduct misled, deceived, and damaged Plaintiffs, and Bard's fraudulent,  
19 misleading, and deceptive conduct was perpetrated with an intent that Plaintiffs rely on said  
20 conduct by purchasing and/or paying for purchases of Bard IVC Filters.

21           274. Moreover, Bard knowingly took advantage of Plaintiffs, who were unable to  
22 protect their own interests due to ignorance of the harmful adverse effects of Bard IVC Filters.

1           275. Bard's conduct was willful, outrageous, immoral, unethical, oppressive,  
2 unscrupulous, unconscionable, and substantially injurious to Plaintiffs and offends the public  
3 conscience.

4           276. Plaintiffs purchased Bard's IVC Filters primarily for personal, family, or  
5 household purposes.

6           277. As a result of Bard's violative conduct in each of the Plaintiffs' respective states,  
7 Plaintiffs purchased and/or paid for purchases of Bard IVC Filters that were not made for  
8 resale.

9           278. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
10 Alaska Stat. § 45.50.471, *et seq.*

11           279. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
12 Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 44-1522, *et seq.*

13           280. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
14 Ark. Code § 4-88-101, *et seq.*

15           281. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
16 Cal. Civ. Code § 1770, *et seq.* (the "Consumer Legal Remedies Act"), and Cal. Bus. & Prof.  
17 Code § 17200, *et seq.* and § 17500, *et seq.*

18           282. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
19 Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6-1-105, *et seq.*

20           283. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
21 Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42-110b, *et seq.*

22

1           284. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
2 D.C. Code Ann. § 28-3901, *et seq.*

3           285. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
4 6 Del. Code Ann. § 2513, *et seq.*

5           286. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
6 Fla. Stat. § 501.201, *et seq.*

7           287. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
8 Haw. Rev. Stat. § 480, *et seq.*

9           288. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
10 Idaho Code § 48-601, *et seq.*

11           289. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
12 815 Illinois L.C.S. §§ 505/2, 510/2, *et seq.*

13           290. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
14 Ind. Code § 24-5-0.5, *et seq.*

15           291. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
16 Kan. Stat. Ann. § 50-623, *et seq.*

17           292. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
18 KRS § 367.170, *et seq.*

19           293. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
20 5 Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 207, *et seq.*

21           294. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
22 Md. Code, Commercial Law, § 13-301, *et seq.*



1           295. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
2 Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 93A § 1, *et seq.*

3           296. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
4 M.C.L.A. § 445.901, *et seq.*

5           297. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
6 M.S.A. § 325F.69, *et seq.* and M.S.A. § 325D.44, *et seq.*

7           298. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
8 Miss. Code Ann. § 75-24-5.

9           299. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
10 Missouri V.A.M.S. § 407.020, *et seq.*

11           300. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
12 Neb. Rev. St. § 59-1602, *et seq.*

13           301. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
14 Nev. Rev. Stat. §§ 41.600, 598.0903, *et seq.*

15           302. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
16 N.H. Rev. Stat. § 358-A:1, *et seq.*

17           303. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
18 N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1, *et seq.*

19           304. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
20 N.M. Stat. § 57-12-1, *et seq.*

21           305. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
22 N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349, *et seq.*

1           306. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
2 N.C. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 75-1.1, *et seq.*

3           307. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
4 N.D.C.C. § 51-15-02, *et seq.*

5           308. Bard has engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in  
6 violation of Ohio Rev. Code. Ann. § 1345.01, *et seq.*

7           309. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
8 15 Okla. St. Ann. §§ 751-753, *et seq.*

9           310. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
10 Oregon Revised Statutes § 646.605, *et seq.*

11           311. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
12 73 Pa. Stat. § 201-1, *et seq.*

13           312. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
14 R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-13.1-1, *et seq.*

15           313. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
16 S.D. Code Laws § 37-24-1, *et seq.*

17           314. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
18 Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-18-104, *et seq.*

19           315. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
20 Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 17.41, *et seq.*

21           316. Bard engaged in unfair competition or deceptive acts or practices in violation of  
22 Utah Code § 13-11-1, *et seq.*



1 pay for medical aid, treatment, and medications, and will necessarily incur further expenses of  
2 a similar nature in the future as a proximate result of Defendants' misconduct.

3 327. For the reasons set forth herein, Spouse Plaintiffs and/or Family Member  
4 Plaintiffs and/or Domestic Partner Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer the loss  
5 of their loved ones' support, companionship, services, society, love, and affection due to Bard  
6 IVC Filter injury.

7 328. For all Spouse Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs allege their marital relationship has been  
8 impaired and depreciated, and the marital association between husband and wife has been  
9 altered.

10 329. Spouse Plaintiffs and/or Family Member Plaintiffs and/or Domestic Partner  
11 Plaintiffs have suffered great emotional pain and mental anguish.

12 330. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's misconduct, Spouse Plaintiffs and/or  
13 Family Member Plaintiffs and/or Domestic Partner Plaintiffs have sustained Injuries and  
14 Damages.

15 **COUNT XVI: WRONGFUL DEATH**

16 331. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

17 332. Plaintiffs' decedents died as a direct and proximate result of Bard's misconduct  
18 as alleged herein, resulting in Plaintiffs' decedent's use of Bard IVC Filters.

19 333. Plaintiffs' decedents are survived by various family members, named and  
20 unnamed.

21 334. As a direct and proximate result of the acts and/or omissions of Bard, Plaintiffs'  
22 decedents' heirs and family have been deprived of his/her future aid, income, assistance,

1 services, companionship, society, affection and financial support, and Plaintiffs have suffered  
2 Injuries and Damages.

3 335. The representatives or administrators of Plaintiffs' decedents' estates bring these  
4 claims on behalf of the decedents' lawful heirs for the decedents' wrongful death where  
5 appropriate and authorized under relevant state law.

6 **COUNT XVII: SURVIVAL**

7 336. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

8 337. As a direct and proximate result of Bard's misconduct, Plaintiffs' decedents  
9 suffered bodily injury and resulting pain and suffering, disability, disfigurement, mental  
10 anguish, loss of enjoyment of life, medical expenses, loss of earnings and loss of earning  
11 capacity prior to Plaintiffs' decedents' deaths.

12 338. Where authorized under relevant state law, Plaintiffs and/or the appropriate  
13 authorized entity seek all damages the decedents suffered as a result of Bard IVC Filter  
14 injuries prior to death.

15 **PUNITIVE DAMAGES ALLEGATIONS**

16 339. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all prior allegations.

17 340. At all times material hereto, Bard knew or should have known that Bard IVC  
18 Filters were unreasonably dangerous with respect to the risk of tilt, fracture, migration and/or  
19 perforation.

20 341. At all times material hereto, Bard attempted to misrepresent and did knowingly  
21 misrepresent facts concerning the safety of Bard IVC Filters.

22

1           342. Bard's misrepresentations included knowingly withholding material information  
2 from the medical community and the public, including Plaintiffs' physicians, concerning the  
3 safety of its Bard IVC Filters.

4           343. Bard's conduct, alleged throughout this Master Complaint, was willful, wanton,  
5 and undertaken with a conscious indifference and disregard to the consequences that  
6 consumers of their products faced, including Plaintiffs and their decedents.

7           344. At all times material hereto, Bard knew and recklessly disregarded the fact that  
8 Bard IVC Filters have an unreasonably high rate of tilt, fracture, migration, and/or perforation.

9           345. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Bard continued to market Bard IVC Filters  
10 aggressively to consumers, including Plaintiffs, without disclosing the aforesaid side effects.

11           346. Bard knew of its Bard IVC Filters' lack of warnings regarding the risk of  
12 fracture, migration, and/or perforation, but intentionally concealed and/or recklessly failed to  
13 disclose that risk and continued to market, distribute, and sell its filters without said warnings  
14 so as to maximize sales and profits at the expense of the health and safety of the public,  
15 including Plaintiffs, in conscious disregard of the foreseeable harm caused by Bard IVC  
16 Filters.

17           347. Bard's intentional and/or reckless failure to disclose information deprived  
18 Plaintiffs' physicians of necessary information to enable them to weigh the true risks of using  
19 Bard IVC Filters against its benefits.

20           348. Bard's conduct is reprehensible, evidencing an evil hand guided by an evil mind  
21 and was undertaken for pecuniary gain in reckless and conscious disregard for the substantial  
22 risk of death and physical injury to consumers, including Plaintiffs and their decedents.



1 K. Such other additional and further relief as Plaintiffs may be entitled to in law or  
2 in equity.

3 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this \_\_\_\_ day of November, 2015.

4 **GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.**

5 By:  /s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
6 Robert W. Boatman  
7 2575 East Camelback Road  
8 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

9 **LOPEZ McHUGH LLP**

10 Ramon Rossi Lopez (CA Bar No. 86361)  
11 (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
12 100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600  
13 Newport Beach, California 92660

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

15 I hereby certify that on this \_\_\_\_ day of November, 2015, I electronically transmitted  
16 the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and  
17 transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing.

18  /s/ \_\_\_\_\_

19 5121823/26997-1