

1 LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.  
2 REBECCA A. PETERSON (241858)  
3 100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200  
4 Minneapolis, MN 55401  
5 Telephone: (612) 339-6900  
6 Facsimile: (612) 339-0981  
7 E-mail: [rapeterson@locklaw.com](mailto:rapeterson@locklaw.com)

8 Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

9 [Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 IN RE BIG HEART PET BRANDS  
14 LITIGATION

) Lead Case No. 4:18-cv-00861-JSW

) (Consolidated with Nos. 4:18-cv-01465; 4:18-cv-  
15 01466; 4:18-cv-01099; 4:18-cv-01663; and 4:18-  
16 cv-02662)

17 This document relates to:  
18 ALL ACTIONS

) Hon. Jeffrey S. White

) **AMENDED CONSOLIDATED**  
19 **COMPLAINT**

) **CLASS ACTION**

20 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1           1.       Plaintiffs Maclain Mullins, Thomas Roupe, Neil Sebastiano, Nancy Sturm, Kathy  
2 Williamson, Mark Johnson, Norman Todd, Betty Christian, Aubrey Thomas, Joyce Brown,  
3 Roberta Mayo, Jack Collins, Vivian Jilek, and Rosemarie Schirripa (collectively “Plaintiffs”),  
4 individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through their undersigned  
5 attorneys, bring this Amended Consolidated Complaint against defendant Big Heart Pet Brands,  
6 Inc. (“Defendant”), to cause Defendant to disclose that its pet food sold throughout the United  
7 States is adulterated and contains pentobarbital and to restore monies to the consumers and  
8 businesses who purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods (as defined herein) during the time that  
9 Defendant failed to make such disclosures. Plaintiffs also seek to bar Defendant from selling any  
10 dog food that contains any levels of pentobarbital. Plaintiffs allege the following based upon  
11 personal knowledge as well as investigation by their counsel and as to all other matters, upon  
12 information and belief (Plaintiffs believe that substantial evidentiary support will exist for the  
13 allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery).

14                   **DEFENDANT'S CONTAMINATED DOG FOODS ARE ADULTERATED**  
15                   **BECAUSE THEY CONTAIN PENTOBARBITAL, A SUBSTANCE LARGELY**  
16                   **USED TO EUTHANIZE ANIMALS**

17           2.       Defendant manufactures, markets, advertises, labels, distributes, and sells Gravy  
18 Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks, Gravy Train with Beef Chunks, Gravy Train Chunks in  
19 Gravy with T-Bone Flavor Chunks, Gravy Train with T-Bone Flavor Chunks, Gravy Train Chunks  
20 in Gravy with Chicken Chunks, Gravy Train with Chicken Chunks, Gravy Train Strips in Gravy  
21 Beef Strips, Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Lamb & Rice Chunks, Gravy Train Chunks in  
22 Gravy Stew, Beef and Gravy Train Chicken, Liver Medley and the following Kibbles ‘n Bits®  
23 products: Chef’s Choice Bistro Hearty Cuts with Real Beef, Chicken & Vegetables in Gravy;  
24 Home-style Tender Slices with Real Beef, Chicken & Vegetables in Gravy; Bistro Tender Cuts  
25 with Real Beef & Vegetables in Gravy; Home-style Meatballs & Pasta Dinner with Real Beef in  
26 Tomato Sauce; Chef’s Choice Bistro Tender Cuts with Real Turkey, Bacon & Vegetables in  
27 Gravy; and American Grill Burger Dinner with Real Bacon & Cheese Bits in Gravy (the

28

1 “Contaminated Dog Foods”).<sup>1</sup> The Contaminated Dog Foods contain pentobarbital, a barbiturate  
2 drug used as a sedative and anesthetic for animals, rendering it adulterated under relevant federal  
3 and state law. Pentobarbital is now most commonly used for euthanizing animals.

4 3. Pentobarbital is a Class II controlled substance, and there is no safe or set level for  
5 pentobarbital in pet food. If it is present, the food is adulterated.<sup>2</sup> The ingestion of pentobarbital  
6 by your pet can lead to adverse health issues, including:

- 7 • Tyalism (salivation)
- 8 • Emesis (vomiting)
- 9 • Stool changes (soft to liquid stools, blood, mucus, urgency, explosive nature, etc.)
- 10 • Hyporexia (decreased appetite)
- 11 • Lethargy/depression
- 12 • Neurologic abnormalities (tremor, seizure, vocalization, unusual eye movements)
- 13 • Ataxia (difficulty walking)
- 14 • Collapse
- 15 • Coma
- 16 • Death<sup>3</sup>

17 4. Despite laws governing pet foods and providing government oversight, “[p]et food  
18 manufacturers are responsible for taking appropriate steps to ensure that the food they produce is  
19 safe for consumption and properly labeled” including “verify[ing] the identity and safety of the  
20 ingredients they receive from suppliers.”<sup>4</sup>

21 5. “It is not acceptable to use animals euthanized with a chemical substance in pet or  
22 other animal foods.... The detection of pentobarbital in pet food renders the product adulterated.

---

23 <sup>1</sup> Discovery may reveal additional products that also contain pentobarbital and Plaintiffs reserve  
24 the right to include any such products in this action.

25 <sup>2</sup> <http://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/SafetyHealth/ProductSafetyInformation/ucm544348.htm>

26 <sup>3</sup> The Honest Kitchen, “Pentobarbital—What Is It, How It Entered the Pet Food Supply Chain, and  
27 What You Can Do to Protect Your Canines & Felines” (Mar. 1, 2017), *available at*  
28 <https://www.thehonestkitchen.com/blog/pentobarbital-entered-pet-food-supply-chain-can-protect-pet/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/SafetyHealth/ProductSafetyInformation/ucm544348.htm>  
(last visited Apr. 27, 2018)

1 It is the responsibility of the manufacturer to take the appropriate steps to ensure that the food they  
2 produce is safe for consumption and properly labeled.”<sup>5</sup>

3 6. Pentobarbital residue from euthanized animals will continue to be present in pet  
4 food, even if it is rendered or canned at a high temperature or pressure.<sup>6</sup>

5 7. Pentobarbital is routinely used to euthanize animals, and the most likely way it  
6 could get into dog food would be through rendered animal products. Rendered products come  
7 from a process that converts animal tissues to feed ingredients, which may include animals that  
8 were euthanized, decomposed, or diseased. Pentobarbital from euthanized animals survives the  
9 rendering process and could be present in the rendered feed ingredients used in pet food.

10 8. It is not acceptable to use animals euthanized with a chemical substance in pet food,  
11 and the detection of pentobarbital in pet food renders the product adulterated.

12 9. Historically, the FDA has not aggressively taken action under section 342(a)(1) or  
13 (5) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, 21 U.S.C. § 301, *et seq.* (“FDCA”), against the pet food  
14 companies that it found to have used non-slaughtered animals and sold pet food containing  
15 pentobarbital. Therefore, manufacturers in the pet food industry, including Defendant, have  
16 continued their illegal practice of using non-slaughtered animals that may contain poisonous  
17 substances, like pentobarbital, in their pet foods.

18 10. It was recently revealed that Defendant was knowingly, recklessly and/or  
19 negligently selling Contaminated Dog Foods containing pentobarbital, a substance largely used to  
20 euthanize animals.

21 11. On February 8, 2018, it was reported on WJLA, an ABC network affiliate in  
22 Washington, D.C., that an independent investigation determined that the Contaminated Dog Foods  
23 contained pentobarbital. The independent investigation utilized two different labs and both  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>5</sup> *Id.*

28 <sup>6</sup> *Id.*

1 showed that the Contaminated Dog Foods tested positive for pentobarbital. In fact, it was the only  
2 brand that tested positive for pentobarbital.<sup>7</sup>

3 12. The report further stated that pentobarbital is not used on farm animals and  
4 questioned where the pentobarbital is coming from if it is not from euthanized dogs, cats, or horses.  
5 Defendant did not respond to the specific questions raised and instead stated in a press release:  
6 “We launched and are conducting a thorough investigation, including working closely with our  
7 suppliers, to determine the accuracy of these results and the methodology used.”<sup>8</sup>

8 **REACTIONS TO THE NONDISCLOSURE AND MATERIALITY OF THE PRESENCE**  
9 **OF PENTOBARBITAL IN THE CONTAMINATED DOG FOODS**

10 13. Shortly after the public exposure of the fact that the Contaminated Dog Foods  
11 contained levels of pentobarbital, Defendant issued a statement assuring consumers, including  
12 Plaintiffs and the proposed Classes, that it was “confident in the safety of our products and do not  
13 believe you [a consumer] need to take any action at this time.” Exhibit A at 1.

14 14. In this same statement, Defendant admitted that pentobarbital is “not something  
15 that is added to pet food. However, it could unintentionally be in raw materials provided by a  
16 supplier. We regularly audit our suppliers and have assurances from them about the quality and  
17 specifications of the materials they supply us. Raw materials that include pentobarbital do not  
18 meet our specifications.” Exhibit A at 2.

19 15. However, Defendant later officially withdrew certain products from the  
20 marketplace and altered this press release by removing the statements. Exhibit B.

21 16. Defendant further altered the press release by removing its statement that it follows  
22 the American Association Feed Official (AAFCO) standards. *Compare* Exhibit A at 2 and Exhibit  
23 B at 2.

24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>7</sup> <http://wjla.com/features/7-on-your-side/fda-to-investigate-after-abc7-exposes-euthanasia-drug-in-dog-food>

28 <sup>8</sup> *Id.*



1 microbiology laboratory.” Defendant stated that the testing found “a single ingredient (beef fat)  
2 was the source of the contamination.” Exhibit C.

3 23. Defendant did not identify what exactly was tested—whether it was cans of the  
4 food pulled from the shelves, cans shipped directly from the manufacturing plant, and/or isolated  
5 samples of beef fat from the supplier. Defendant did claim the tested beef fat was sourced from  
6 cattle from the United States. However, Defendant has offered no information about how it  
7 identified this particular ingredient or whether it tested any other ingredients included in the  
8 recalled pet foods. *See* Exhibit C. Additionally, beef fat is not an ingredient listed on the label of  
9 any of the Contaminated Dog Foods.<sup>11</sup>

10 24. Defendant also did not specify what animals they tested the Contaminated Dog  
11 Foods for beyond cattle. When doing DNA testing, it must be determined beforehand what species  
12 will be looked for (i.e. dog, cat, cattle, horse, etc.). Defendant has not disclosed whether its testing  
13 looked for dog, cat, or horse DNA.

14 25. In the February 23, 2018, press release, Defendant admitted that the “presence [of  
15 pentobarbital] at any level is not acceptable and is not up to our quality standards.” Exhibit C.

16 26. Defendant updated this statement on March 2, 2018, now claiming that the  
17 laboratory tests confirm the contaminated animal fat was “from cow, pig and chicken and no other  
18 animal of the nine types tested.” Once again, Defendant did not identify what types of animals  
19 were included in that testing. Exhibit D.

20 27. Defendant has yet to disclose the name of the manufacturing plant and/or supplier  
21 that it references as the suspected source of the contaminated raw materials containing  
22 pentobarbital.

23 28. On March 2, 2018, Defendant further changed its statements regarding the “source  
24 of contamination.” The type of animal fats the Defendant now claims are the sources of  
25 pentobarbital in the Contaminated Dog Foods was expanded to include pig and chicken fat and  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>11</sup> <http://wjla.com/features/7-on-your-side/fda-investigation-continues-into-dog-food-contaminated-with-euthanasia-drug>

1 “no other animal of the nine types tested.” However, Defendant has still failed to disclose the nine  
2 sources tested.

3 29. In addition, Defendant further edited its February 23, 2018, press release by  
4 changing from a “voluntary withdrawal” of the specific products to a “class III recall.”<sup>12</sup>

5 30. On March 2, 2018, the FDA formally issued a recall for the Contaminated Dog  
6 Foods “based ... on a test by [Defendant] confirming the presence of pentobarbital in the tallow  
7 ingredient used in the affected products.”<sup>13</sup> The FDA is continuing to investigate the Contaminated  
8 Dog Foods.

9 31. Consumers have also reacted to the news of Defendant allowing its products to be  
10 sold with no disclosure of the inclusion of pentobarbital. Indeed, social media comments highlight  
11 that a reasonable consumer, like Plaintiffs and the Classes, had no idea that they may be feeding  
12 their beloved pet adulterated food and it is something they believe should have been disclosed to  
13 the public.

14 **THE STAGGERING REALITY OF THE EXTENT OF THE CONTAMINATION**  
15 **COULD HAVE BEEN PREVENTED IF DEFENDANT FOLLOWED ITS OWN**  
16 **TOUTED QUALITY AND SUPPLIER STANDARDS**

17 32. In the end, *over ninety million cans* of food manufactured and distributed by  
18 Defendant were recalled because of the inclusion of pentobarbital.

19 33. Moreover, the testing results showed alarmingly high levels of pentobarbital in the  
20 tallow. Specifically, the current supply tested showed levels ranging from 801 ppb to 852 ppb,  
21 and the retained sample from 2017 contained pentobarbital at the level of 529 ppb.

22 34. Despite this, Defendant has publicly represented that the testing showed “extremely  
23 low levels of pentobarbital,” but claimed such levels “do not pose a threat to pet safety.” Defendant  
24 has failed to disclose or acknowledge the testing results that showed the high levels of  
25 pentobarbital in the tallow.

26  
27 <sup>12</sup> *Id.*

28 <sup>13</sup> <https://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/NewsEvents/ucm597135.htm>

1           35.     Indeed, the FDA told Defendant that its “cooperation in this matter is important *to*  
2 *the protection of the general public*” when it formally advised Defendant that a recall was  
3 necessary based on the “finding of pentobarbital in tallow used as an ingredient.”

4           36.     Defendant claims that the source of contaminated tallow comes from one  
5 supplier—JBS USA Holdings, Inc. (a subsidiary of JBS S.A.) and its rendering facility MOPAC  
6 located in eastern Pennsylvania (collectively, “JBS”).

7           37.     JBS knowingly works with meat by-product recycling, including animal by-  
8 products not suitable for human consumption. In fact, it is publicly disclosed that MOPAC has  
9 accepted euthanized horses. Exhibit E.<sup>14</sup>

10          38.     Moreover, JBS has been plagued by investigations, recalls, and other red flag  
11 situations that should have alerted Defendant it needs to confirm the safety, quality, and reputation  
12 of JBS and the products purchased from JBS for inclusion in the Contaminated Dog Foods.

13          39.     Indeed, examples of such red flags are:

- 14         • June 2009 – In response to an E. coli outbreak that sickened at least 23 people, JBS Swift  
15 Beef Company, a Colorado firm, recalled 421,280 pounds of beef products that may have  
16 been contaminated with E. coli O157:H7.
- 17         • September 2010 – The JBS unit was forced to undertake a third recall, this one for 258,000  
18 pounds of cooked beef products.
- 19         • June 2013 – JBS Swift, Tyson Fresh Meat, Beef Products Inc. and several other companies  
20 blamed for the 2010 death of a Minnesota man due to E. coli poisoning in a lawsuit filed  
21 on January 8, 2013.
- 22         • August 2015 – Inhumane treatment in the handling and/or slaughtering of animals was  
23 cited in Quarter 2 at three out of four large-volume plants where USDA meat inspectors  
24 started administrative actions, either now taken or pending, that often end with short  
25 suspensions. The nation’s top meat producers—Cargill Meat Solutions, JBS, and Tyson  
26 Fresh Meats Inc.—own and operate seven of those large plants, where employment tops  
27 500 and production levels put them among the elite high volume plants.
- 28         • April 2017 – Health authorities in Europe, China, and Brazil all temporarily pulled beef  
from the Brazilian meat giant JBS off of grocery store shelves, in response to evidence that  
the company was involved in a massive corruption scandal to export rotten and  
contaminated meat.

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.saveamericashorses.net/slaughter/parender.htm>

- August 2017 – JBS USA, Inc. recalled 4,922 pounds of ground beef products produced at its Lenoir, NC facility because they may be contaminated with extraneous materials, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food Safety and Inspection Service.

40. Yet Defendant chose to utilize JBS as a supplier even though it maintains that it keeps rigorous quality and supplier standards from “start to finish” and performs three-tier auditing that includes third party auditors, to ensure pure ingredients and fair labor are used in its products, including the Contaminated Dog Foods. Given this rigorous auditing process, Defendant knew or recklessly chose to ignore that the Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated pet food as it retained samples of the tallow that should have been tested based on the claimed practices and standards by Defendant and the public knowledge that MOPAC has accepted euthanized horses.<sup>15</sup>

41. Defendant also knew the real risk that pentobarbital may appear in the Contaminated Dog Foods if the manufacturing and sourcing were not properly monitored. Indeed, this is not the first time that the Gravy Train or Kibbles ‘n Bits® lines of food have been determined to include pentobarbital: “Back in 2001, analyses by the FDA found residue of the sedative in popular brands like Nutro, Gravy Train, and Kibbles ‘n Bits.”<sup>16</sup>

42. Moreover, Defendant’s Corporate Responsibility Policy says the top priority is the “safety and quality” of its products:<sup>17</sup>

**Pet food safety and quality.** *Big Heart Pet Brands top priority is the safety and quality of our products. Our goal is to produce the finest pet food products available on the market today. All of our products are made under a system of strict food safety and quality controls combined with ongoing inspection and monitoring. All of our programs are designed to exceed the Global Food Safety Initiative standards. Our products are made with nutritious, quality ingredients that meet the applicable standards and specifications of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Association of American Feed Control Officials (AAFCO) and the Food & Drug Administration (FDA). Each of our products is processed and packaged following strict food safety and quality control procedures that comply with the Good Manufacturing Practices established by the FDA. These procedures ensure that the resulting food will be pure, wholesome and safe for pets.*

43. In this same document, Defendant claims that it has a “rigorous supplier approval process” and only purchases ingredients from “reputable suppliers.” And, Defendant goes further

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.bigheartpet.com/assets/CR-Policy.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.care2.com/causes/fda-says-pet-food-company-cannot-donate-recalled-products-to-shelter.html>

<sup>17</sup> Big Heart Pet Brands, Corporate Responsibility Policy,” <http://www.bigheartpet.com/assets/CR-Policy.pdf>

1 to declare, that once a supplier is approved, “*a comprehensive testing program is in place to assess*  
2 *the safety and quality of the ingredients upon receipt. This includes a combination of laboratory*  
3 *analysis and physical inspection of the ingredients.*”<sup>18</sup>

4 44. Here, Defendant admittedly retained samples of the tallow from JBS. These same  
5 samples showed the alarmingly high levels of pentobarbital once tested in response to the  
6 independent investigation by WJLA. Thus, Defendant either knowingly included the  
7 contaminated tallow as an ingredient in its dog food products or purposefully ignored the publicly  
8 touted testing program it has implemented “to assess the safety of quality of the ingredients” in  
9 manufacturing the Contaminated Dog Foods.

10 45. Finally, Defendant highlights the strict oversight it supposedly applies across all its  
11 brands, including Gravy Train and Kibbles ‘n Bits®, to ensure high quality products “from start to  
12 finish, inside and out.”<sup>19</sup>

13 We apply the same expectations of quality that we  
14 hold for ourselves to our suppliers. Our supplier  
15 management program includes an extensive evaluation  
16 of manufacturing locations and a comprehensive testing  
17 program that is used to assess the safety and quality  
18 of ingredients upon receipt. This program includes  
19 a combination of laboratory analysis and physical  
inspection.

17 Through rigorous commitment to the quality of our  
18 products—from start to finish, inside and out—Big Heart  
19 Pet Brands is able to nurture the bond between pets and  
the people who love them.

20 46. Following the discovery of pentobarbital in the Contaminated Dog Foods,  
21 Defendant’s own actions show the misleading representations concerning its supposed rigorous  
22 and strict quality control. Specifically, Defendant only recently started testing “all of [its] products  
23 for the presence of pentobarbital as a new quality assurance protocol.” Defendant further  
24  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>18</sup> *Id.*

28 <sup>19</sup> Big Heart Pet Brands, “Corporate Responsibility Summary 2014,” <http://www.bigheartpet.com/assets/CorporateResponsibilitySummaryBrochure2014.pdf>

1 acknowledged the lack of proper quality control and oversight by stating: “In addition, we are  
2 enhancing our sourcing and supplier oversight procedures to ensure this does not occur again.”<sup>20</sup>

3 **DEFENDANT NEGLIGENTLY, RECKLESSLY, AND/OR KNOWINGLY MISLEADS**  
4 **CONSUMERS THROUGH ITS REPRESENTATIONS, PACKAGING, LABELS,**  
5 **STATEMENTS, WARRANTIES, AND SELLING OF THE CONTAMINATED**  
6 **DOG FOODS AS UNADULTERATED**

6 47. Defendant formulates, develops, manufactures, labels, distributes, markets,  
7 advertises, and sells its extensive lines of the Contaminated Dog Food products in California and  
8 across the United States.

9 48. Defendant negligently, recklessly, and/or knowingly falsely advertises that the  
10 Contaminated Dog Foods are healthy and provide complete nutrition and quality while omitting  
11 they are adulterated with pentobarbital.

12 49. Defendant wrongfully advertised and sold the Contaminated Dog Foods without  
13 any label or warning indicating to consumers that these products contained any level of  
14 pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized animals that have been euthanized as a protein or meat by-  
15 product source.

16 50. Defendant also wrongfully advertised and sold the Contaminated Dog Foods as  
17 complete nutrition, quality, and healthy despite the presence of pentobarbital.

18 51. Instead, the advertising and labels intentionally omit any reference to the food being  
19 adulterated:



25

26

27

Gravy Train® Chunks In Gravy With Beef Chunks wet dog food is  
bursting with the hearty flavor of real beef. And all the meaty  
goodness is covered in a rich savory gravy to make a hearty meal  
your dog will love.

28 <sup>20</sup> <http://www.gravytraindog.com/information>

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

52. Defendant claims that the Contaminated Dog Foods are “100 percent complete and balanced nutrition,” but fails to mention that the Contaminated Dog Foods are in fact adulterated and contain pentobarbital.<sup>21</sup>

**ABOUT THIS ITEM**

**Disclaimer:** While we aim to provide accurate product information, it is provided by manufacturers, suppliers and others, and has not been verified by us. See our [disclaimer](#).

Serve your four legged friend a deliciously hearty meal with Gravy Train Chunks In Gravy with T-Bone Flavor Chunks Wet Dog Food. Each mouthwatering bite has the flavor of T-Bone steak and all the meaty goodness is covered in a savory gravy that dogs love. This gravy train dog food offers a satisfying meal that provides 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition for all life stages. Feed it to your furry friend as a reward for good behavior or learning a new trick or serve it as a regular meal. Gravy Train Chunks In Gravy with T-Bone Flavor Chunks Wet Dog Food comes in a 13.2 oz can.

53. Defendant’s omissions are material, false, misleading, and reasonably likely to deceive the public. This is especially true in light of the long-standing campaign by Defendant to market all its products, including the Contaminated Dog Foods as “providing safe, healthy, and high-quality food” with “the purest ingredients.”<sup>22</sup>

54. Defendant’s advertising campaign is false, misleading, and/or deceptive by using these descriptions, promises, and representations because there was no label or warning indicating to consumers that these products contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source. Defendant's statements, partial disclosures, and omissions are false, misleading, and crafted to deceive the public as they create an image that the Contaminated Dog Foods are healthy, safe, have only pure ingredients and are manufactured under rigorous standards.

<sup>21</sup> Walmart, Gravy Train T-Bone Flavor Wet Dog Food, <https://www.walmart.com/ip/Gravy-Train-T-Bone-Flavor-Wet-Dog-Food-13-2-Oz/44465093#read-more>

<sup>22</sup>Big Heart Pet Brands, “Pets,” <http://www.bigheartpet.com/corporate-responsibility/pets.aspx>

1           55. Defendant chose to advertise, label, and market its products, including the  
2 Contaminated Dog Foods, as pure, high quality, healthy and safe for dogs to ingest without  
3 disclosing that the Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated and contained pentobarbital. The  
4 Contaminated Dog Foods are available at numerous retail and online outlets.

5           56. In fact, Defendant made affirmative misleading representations that its products,  
6 including the Contaminated Dog Foods, were not adulterated or would contain any controlled  
7 substance, including pentobarbital. Specifically, Defendant promises to its consumers that all  
8 products meet USDA, AAFCO and FDA standards.<sup>23</sup>

9           57. This is untrue because the Contaminated Dog Foods are adulterated, which is not  
10 proper under state and federal laws and regulations. Specifically, under the FDCA, a food is  
11 adulterated if it “bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it  
12 injurious to health.” 21 U.S.C. § 342. Under California law, pet food is considered adulterated if  
13 “it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance that may render it injurious to health”  
14 or “if damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner.” Cal. Health & Safety Code §  
15 113090(a), (h). California’s statute also provides that pet food ingredients “of animal or poultry  
16 origin shall be only from animals or poultry slaughtered or processed in an approved or licensed  
17 establishment.... Animal or poultry classified as ‘deads’ are prohibited.” Cal. Health & Safety  
18 Code § 113035. Other relevant states likewise prohibit the sale of adulterated pet food. Ohio Rev.  
19 Code Ann. § 923.41, *et seq.*; Ala. Code § 2-21-23; Fla. Stat. § 500.10; Ga. Code Ann. § 2-13-11;  
20 505 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 30/11.1; N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 199-A; Tex. Agric. Code Ann. §  
21 141.002, *et seq.*; Tenn. Code Ann. § 44-6-103, *et seq.*; W. Va. Code § 19-14-10, *et seq.*

22           58. The Contaminated Dog Foods are widely advertised.

23           59. Defendant's webpage and adopted corporate policies repeatedly make the false,  
24 misleading, and/or deceptive statements, described above, about the Contaminated Dog Foods  
25 without any mention of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein or  
26 meat by-product source.

27

28 <sup>23</sup> <http://www.bigheartpet.com/assets/CR-Policy.pdf>

1           60. As a result of Defendant's omissions and misrepresentations, a reasonable  
2 consumer would have no reason to suspect the presence of pentobarbital without conducting his  
3 or her own scientific tests, or reviewing third-party scientific testing of these products.

4           61. Consumers have increasingly become more aware and cautious about the  
5 nutritional value and ingredients in the pet food they choose to purchase.

6           62. Additionally, Defendant knew that a consumer would be feeding the Contaminated  
7 Dog Foods multiple times each day to his or her dog, leading to repeated exposure of the  
8 barbiturate to the dog(s).

9           63. A reasonable consumer, such as Plaintiffs and other members of the Classes would  
10 have no reason to expect and anticipate that the Contaminated Dog Foods are made up of anything  
11 other than pure ingredients from reputable suppliers or that quality and safety is not the top priority,  
12 as promised by Defendant. Defendant's non-disclosure and concealment of any level of  
13 pentobarbital or utilization of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
14 Contaminated Dog Foods coupled with partial disclosures and/or misrepresentations that the food  
15 is pure, quality, healthy, and safe by Defendant is intended to and does, in fact, cause consumers  
16 to purchase a product they would not have bought at all if the true quality and ingredients were  
17 disclosed. As a result of these false statements, omissions, and concealment, Defendant has  
18 generated substantial sales of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

19           64. Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated  
20 consumers within the United States who purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, in order to cause  
21 the disclosure of the inclusion of pentobarbital and/or the utilization of euthanized animals as a  
22 protein or meat by-product source in the Contaminated Dog Foods, to correct the false and  
23 misleading perception Defendant has created in the minds of consumers that the Contaminated  
24 Dog Foods are high quality, safe, and healthy, and to obtain redress for those who have purchased  
25 the Contaminated Dog Foods.

26  
27  
28

**CONSUMERS ARE STILL ABLE TO PURCHASE THE RECALLED  
CONTAMINATED DOG FOODS**

1  
2 65. Defendant has represented that “[t]here is nothing more important than ensuring pet  
3 parents can continue to feel confident they are making the best decision for their pets when they  
4 choose our brand” and that it voluntarily withdrew all dog food products that are subject to the  
5 recall.

6 66. Likewise, the FDA has informed the public that Defendant was “withdrawing all  
7 lots of these [the Contaminated Dog Foods] that were manufactured from 2016 through the  
8 present.”<sup>24</sup>

9 67. Yet, to date, consumers are still able to purchase the Contaminated Dog Foods from  
10 stores and online merchants. Thus, consumers who are unaware of the recall are able to purchase  
11 the Contaminated Dog Foods without receiving any notice that the dog food has been recalled or  
12 is adulterated at the time of purchase. Moreover, consumers who have relied on the affirmative  
13 statements by Defendant that the Contaminated Dog Foods are no longer on the shelves or  
14 available to purchase online have been misled into purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods.  
15 Indeed, upon information and belief, consumers were still able to purchase certain lines of the  
16 Contaminated Dog Foods up to June 1, 2018, on a Big-Box store’s website.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17  
18 68. This Court has original jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein under  
19 the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2), because the matter in controversy exceeds  
20 the sum or value of \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs and more than two-thirds of the  
21 Classes reside in states other than the states in which Defendant is a citizen and in which this case  
22 is filed, and none of the exemptions to jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) apply.

23 69. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because Plaintiffs  
24 suffered injury as a result of Defendant’s acts in this district, many of the acts and transactions  
25 giving rise to this action occurred in this district, Defendant conducts substantial business in this  
26

27  
28 <sup>24</sup> <https://www.fda.gov/animalveterinary/newsevents/ucm597135.htm>

1 district, Defendant has intentionally availed itself of the laws and markets of this district, and  
2 Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

3 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

4 70. A substantial portion of the transactions and wrongdoings which gave rise to the  
5 claims in this action occurred in the County of Marin, and as such, this action is properly assigned  
6 to the San Francisco division of this Court.

7 **THE PARTIES**

8 71. Plaintiff Maclain Mullins (“Plaintiff Mullins”) is, and at all times relevant hereto  
9 has been, a citizen of the State of Kentucky. Plaintiff Mullins purchased certain lines of the  
10 Contaminated Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy and Chunks in Gravy with  
11 Beef Chunks) and fed it to his boxer named Cawood. Plaintiff Mullins started purchasing the  
12 Contaminated Dog Foods in or around January 2009 approximately ten to twenty times a year and  
13 continued to purchase until approximately January 2015. Plaintiff Mullins also fed Cawood Gravy  
14 Train dry food. Plaintiff Mullins primarily purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from  
15 Heartland Kroger in Lexington, Kentucky. During that time, based on the false and misleading  
16 claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff  
17 Mullins was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital, a  
18 substance largely used to euthanize animals.

19 72. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct as alleged herein,  
20 Plaintiff Mullins was injured when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods that did not deliver  
21 what it promised and did business with a company he would not have if he knew that the  
22 Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized animals  
23 that have been euthanized as a protein source. He purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog  
24 Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that  
25 it was unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include  
26 euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Mullins encounter the  
27 Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, he could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging,  
28 absent corrective changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

1           73. Plaintiff Thomas Roupe (“Plaintiff Roupe”) is, and at all times relevant hereto has  
2 been, a citizen of the State of Georgia. Plaintiff Roupe purchased certain lines of the Contaminated  
3 Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks and Gravy Train Chunks  
4 in Gravy with Turkey Chunks) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to his two-year old dog,  
5 Prince. Plaintiff Roupe believed the Gravy Train foods he fed his dog were safe and healthy, and  
6 trusted in Defendant’s representations about the safety of its products when purchasing the  
7 Contaminated Dog Foods.

8           74. Plaintiff Roupe has been purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods since  
9 approximately March 2016, and his last purchase was on approximately February 16, 2018.  
10 Plaintiff Roupe no longer purchases the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the presence of  
11 pentobarbital. Plaintiff Roupe primarily purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from his local  
12 Walmart and Piggly Wiggly. During that time, based on the false and misleading claims,  
13 warranties, representations, advertisements, and other marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff Roupe  
14 was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital, a substance  
15 largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff Roupe was injured by purchasing the Contaminated  
16 Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.

17           75. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
18 Plaintiff Roupe was injured when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not  
19 deliver what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.  
20 Plaintiff Roupe was further injured as he did business with a company he would not have if he  
21 knew that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant  
22 utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. He purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog  
23 Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that  
24 it was unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include  
25 euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Roupe encounter the  
26 Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, he could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging,  
27 absent corrective changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

28

1           76. Plaintiff Neil Sebastiano (“Plaintiff Sebastiano”) is, and at all times relevant hereto  
2 has been, a citizen of the State of Florida. Plaintiff Sebastiano purchased certain lines of the  
3 Contaminated Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks and Gravy  
4 Train Strips in Gravy with Beef Strips) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to his dog, Samson,  
5 a rottweiler-shepherd mix. Plaintiff Sebastiano trusted Defendant’s representations about the  
6 safety and quality of its products when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

7           77. Beginning in approximately June 2015, Plaintiff Sebastiano generally purchased  
8 ten-twelve cans of the Contaminated Dog Foods each month from his local Walmart in Spring  
9 Hill, Florida. His last purchase was approximately November 1, 2017. In August 2017, Plaintiff  
10 Sebastiano’s dog became weak and confused, began vomiting, had blood in his stool, lost weight,  
11 no longer wanted to eat, and had trouble standing and walking. At only seven and a half years old,  
12 Samson died, on December 4, 2017.

13           78. During the time Plaintiff Sebastiano purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, and  
14 because of the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other  
15 marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff Sebastiano was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods  
16 contained any level of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff  
17 Sebastiano was injured by purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis*  
18 value because they were adulterated.

19           79. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
20 Plaintiff Sebastiano was injured when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not  
21 deliver what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.  
22 Plaintiff Sebastiano was further injured as he did business with a company he would not have if  
23 he knew the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant  
24 utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. He purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog  
25 Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that  
26 it was unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include  
27 euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Sebastiano encounter the  
28

1 Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, he could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging,  
2 absent corrective changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

3 80. Plaintiff Nancy Sturm (“Plaintiff Sturm”) is, and at all times relevant hereto has  
4 been, a citizen of the State of Illinois. Plaintiff Sturm purchased certain lines of the Contaminated  
5 Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks and Gravy Train Chunks  
6 in Gravy with Lamb and Rice Chunks) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to her six rescue  
7 dogs: Angel, a seventeen-year-old boxer/beagle mix; Penny, a ten-year-old terrier mix; Sugar and  
8 Boots, who are six-year-old sisters that are black lab and golden retriever mixes; Dottie, a four-  
9 year-old Australian shepherd and bluetick coonhound mix; and Maggie a 9 month old mixed breed  
10 puppy. Plaintiff Sturm considers her rescue dogs to be a part of her family and trusted in Defendant  
11 when purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods.

12 81. Plaintiff Sturm has been purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods for over five  
13 years and her last purchase was approximately February 1, 2018. Plaintiff Sturm no longer  
14 purchases the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the inclusion of pentobarbital. Plaintiff  
15 Sturm primarily purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from her local Walmart. During that  
16 time, based on the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and  
17 other marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff Sturm was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods  
18 contained any level of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff Sturm  
19 was injured by purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis* value as  
20 they were adulterated.

21 82. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
22 Plaintiff Sturm was injured when she purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not  
23 deliver what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.  
24 Plaintiff Sturm was further injured as she did business with a Company she would not have if she  
25 knew that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant  
26 utilized animals that have been euthanized as a protein source. She purchased the adulterated  
27 Contaminated Dog Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was  
28 accurate and that it was unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy and safe for dogs to ingest and

1 did not include euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Sturm encounter  
2 the Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, she could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging,  
3 absent corrective changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

4 83. Plaintiff Mark Johnson (“Plaintiff Johnson”) is, and at all times relevant hereto has  
5 been, a citizen of the State of California. Plaintiff Johnson purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods  
6 (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks and Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy  
7 with T-Bone Flavor Chunks) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to his thirteen border collie and  
8 Australian shepherd mixes he used as herding dogs for his cattle. Plaintiff Johnson had seven  
9 males and six female dogs that ranged from ten months to approximately seven years old. Plaintiff  
10 Johnson purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods as supplemental food or as a reward for the dogs  
11 who herd anywhere from 10 to 100 head of cattle. Plaintiff Johnson believed that the Gravy Train  
12 foods he fed his dogs were safe and unadulterated and also trusted in Defendant’s representations  
13 about the safety of its products when purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods. Devastatingly,  
14 Plaintiff Johnson lost all thirteen dogs, including one pregnant female, on January 14 and 15, 2018.  
15 At that time, all of his dogs were showing symptoms of kidney failure so the veterinarian  
16 recommended that all thirteen be put down. All of the dogs were fed the Contaminated Dog Foods  
17 at the same time and all were sick within hours after eating the Contaminated Dog Foods. They  
18 subsequently all died within two days of eating the Contaminated Dog Foods.

19 84. Plaintiff Johnson has been purchasing the various types of the Gravy Train lines of  
20 the Contaminated Dog Foods since approximately January 2015, and his last purchase was in  
21 approximately February 2018. Plaintiff Johnson no longer purchases the various types of the  
22 Gravy Train lines of the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the presence of pentobarbital.  
23 Typically, Plaintiff Johnson purchased five cases of the Contaminated Dog Foods weekly,  
24 primarily from his local Walmart and Big Lots. During that time, based on the false and misleading  
25 claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff  
26 Johnson was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital, a  
27 substance largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff Johnson was injured by purchasing the  
28

1 Contaminated Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated. Plaintiff  
2 Johnson was further injured by incurring vet bills.

3 85. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
4 Plaintiff Johnson was injured when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not  
5 deliver what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.  
6 Plaintiff Johnson was further injured as he did business with a company he would not have if he  
7 knew that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant  
8 utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. He purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog  
9 Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that  
10 it was unadulterated, pure, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include euthanized  
11 animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Johnson encounter the Contaminated Dog  
12 Foods in the future, he could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective  
13 changes to the packaging and advertising of the various types of the Gravy Train lines of the  
14 Contaminated Dog Foods.

15 86. Plaintiff Kathy Williamson ("Plaintiff Williamson") is, and at all times relevant  
16 hereto has been, a citizen of the State of Ohio. Plaintiff Williamson purchased certain lines of the  
17 Contaminated Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks and Kibbles  
18 'n Bits Bistro Tender Cuts with Real Beef & Vegetables in Gravy) and fed the Contaminated Dog  
19 Foods to her two Great Danes, Nova and Sadie. Sadie passed away on Wednesday, September 7,  
20 2016, and Nova passed away on Sunday, January 22, 2017. Plaintiff Williamson believed the  
21 Gravy Train foods she fed her dogs were safe and healthy, and trusted in Defendant's  
22 representations about the safety of its products when purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods.

23 87. Plaintiff Williamson has been purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods since  
24 approximately August 2016, and her last purchase was in approximately December 2016. Plaintiff  
25 Williamson no longer purchases the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the presence of  
26 pentobarbital. Plaintiff Williamson primarily purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from her  
27 local Walmart. During that time, based on the false and misleading claims, warranties,  
28 representations, advertisements, and other marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff Williamson was

1 unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital, a substance  
2 largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff Williamson was injured by purchasing the  
3 Contaminated Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.

4 88. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
5 Plaintiff Williamson was injured when she purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not  
6 deliver what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.  
7 Plaintiff Williamson was further injured as she did business with a company she would not have  
8 if she knew that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that  
9 Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. She purchased the adulterated  
10 Contaminated Dog Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was  
11 accurate and that it was unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and  
12 did not include euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Williamson  
13 encounter the Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, she could not rely on the truthfulness of the  
14 packaging, absent corrective changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog  
15 Foods.

16 89. Plaintiff Norman Todd ("Plaintiff Todd") is, and at all times relevant hereto has  
17 been, a citizen of the State of Alabama. Plaintiff Todd purchased certain lines of the Contaminated  
18 Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks) and fed the Contaminated  
19 Dog Foods to his American pit bull, Tito. Tito passed away on November 18, 2017. Plaintiff  
20 Todd believed the Gravy Train foods he fed his dog were safe and healthy, and trusted in  
21 Defendant's representations about the safety of its products when purchasing the Contaminated  
22 Dog Foods.

23 90. Plaintiff Todd has been purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods since  
24 approximately 2008, and his last purchase was in approximately September 2017. Plaintiff Todd  
25 no longer purchases the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the presence of pentobarbital.  
26 Plaintiff Todd primarily purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from Food Outlet in Millbrook,  
27 Alabama. During that time, based on the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations,  
28 advertisements, and other marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff Todd was unaware that the

1 Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to  
2 euthanize animals. Plaintiff Todd was injured by purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods that  
3 had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.

4 91. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
5 Plaintiff Todd was injured when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not deliver  
6 what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated. Plaintiff  
7 Todd was further injured as he did business with a company he would not have if he knew that the  
8 Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized  
9 euthanized animals as a protein source. He purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog Foods  
10 on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that it was  
11 unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include  
12 euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Todd encounter the Contaminated  
13 Dog Foods in the future, he could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective  
14 changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

15 92. Plaintiff Betty Christian ("Plaintiff Christian") is, and at all times relevant hereto  
16 has been, a citizen of the State of Tennessee. Plaintiff Christian purchased certain lines of the  
17 Contaminated Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Chicken Chunks) and fed  
18 the Contaminated Dog Foods to her dogs, Rusty, a 15 year-old Australian Shepherd, and Smokey,  
19 a one-year old Catahoula Leopard-Plot mix. Plaintiff Christian trusted Defendant's  
20 representations about the safety and quality of its products when she purchased the Contaminated  
21 Dog Foods.

22 93. Plaintiff Christian has purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods on a monthly basis  
23 for at least 15 years. She generally purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from her local  
24 Walmart and Food City. Her last purchase was approximately January 4, 2018. In February 2018,  
25 Smokey became sick and was unable to move, began vomiting, lost control of her bowels, and was  
26 bleeding from her rectum. Plaintiff Christian brought her to the veterinarian, where she stayed for  
27 four days before returning home. After a month-long course of medication, Smokey has recovered.

28

1           94.     During the time Plaintiff Christian purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, and  
2 because of the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other  
3 marketing by Defendant, she was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level  
4 of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals. As the result of Defendant's  
5 deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff Christian was injured when she purchased  
6 the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not deliver what Defendant promised and had no value  
7 or *de minimis* value because they were adulterated. Plaintiff Christian was further injured as she  
8 did business with a company she would not have if she knew the Contaminated Dog Foods  
9 contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein  
10 source. She purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog Foods on the assumption that the  
11 labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that it was unadulterated, pure, high  
12 quality, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include euthanized animals as a protein  
13 source. Further, should Plaintiff Christian encounter the Contaminated Dog Foods in the future,  
14 she could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective changes to the packaging  
15 and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

16           95.     Plaintiff Aubrey Thomas (“Plaintiff Thomas”) is, and at all times relevant hereto  
17 has been, a citizen of the state of West Virginia. Plaintiff Thomas purchased certain lines of the  
18 Contaminated Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Chicken Chunks and  
19 Gravy Train Meaty Ground Dinner with Chicken) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to his dog,  
20 Mia, a one-and-a-half year-old pit bull-lab mix. Plaintiff Thomas trusted Defendant’s  
21 representations about the safety and quality of its products when he purchased the Contaminated  
22 Dog Foods.

23           96.     Beginning in November 2016, Plaintiff Thomas generally purchased twelve cans  
24 of the Contaminated Dog Foods a couple of times each month from his local Walmart in  
25 Fayetteville, West Virginia. His last purchase was in February 2018. Throughout the time that  
26 Plaintiff Thomas fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to Mia, she was sick and vomiting several  
27 times.

28

1           97.     During the time Plaintiff Thomas purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, and  
2 because of the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other  
3 marketing by Defendant, he was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level  
4 of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals. As the result of Defendant's  
5 deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff Thomas was injured when he purchased  
6 the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not deliver what Defendant promised and had no value  
7 or *de minimis* value because they were adulterated. Plaintiff Thomas was further injured as he did  
8 business with a company he would not have if he knew the Contaminated Dog Foods contained  
9 any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. He  
10 purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the  
11 Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that it was unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy,  
12 and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include euthanized animals as a protein source. Further,  
13 should Plaintiff Thomas encounter the Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, he could not rely  
14 on the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective changes to the packaging and advertising  
15 of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

16           98.     Plaintiff Joyce Brown (“Plaintiff Brown”) is, and at all times relevant hereto has  
17 been, a citizen of the State of Texas. Plaintiff Brown purchased certain lines of the Contaminated  
18 Dog Foods (including Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks) and occasionally mixed  
19 the wet food with Gravy Train dry food. She rescues stray dogs and has fed all of them the  
20 Contaminated Dog Foods. Several of her dogs have died over the course of the class period,  
21 including: Speedy, a two-year-old Chihuahua mix who died in December 2016; Humpty, an eight-  
22 or nine-year-old lab-chow mix who died in November 2017; Elly Mae, a ten-year-old lab-chow  
23 mix who died in December 2017; Sara, an eight-year-old lab who died in October 2017; Red, an  
24 eight-year-old lab who died November 2017; Mary, a nine-year-old lab-chow mix who died in  
25 August 2017; Duke, a seven-year-old Great Pyrenees who died in August 2017. Plaintiff Brown  
26 trusted Defendant’s representations about the safety and quality of its products when she purchased  
27 the Contaminated Dog Foods.

28

1           99. Plaintiff Brown has purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods every two days for the  
2 past fifteen years. She generally purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from her local Kroger,  
3 Walmart, and Family Dollar Stores. Her last purchase of the Contaminated Dog Food was in  
4 February 2018.

5           100. During the time Plaintiff Brown purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, and  
6 because of the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other  
7 marketing by Defendant, she was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level  
8 of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals. As the result of Defendant's  
9 deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff Brown was injured when she purchased  
10 the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not deliver what Defendant promised and had no value  
11 or *de minimis* value because they were adulterated. Plaintiff Brown was further injured as she did  
12 business with a company she would not have if she knew the Contaminated Dog Foods contained  
13 any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. She  
14 purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the  
15 Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that it was unadulterated, pure, healthy, and safe for  
16 dogs to ingest and did not include pentobarbital or euthanized animals as a protein source. Further,  
17 should Plaintiff Brown encounter the Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, she could not rely on  
18 the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective changes to the packaging and advertising of  
19 the Contaminated Dog Foods.

20           101. Plaintiff Roberta Mayo ("Plaintiff Mayo") is, and at all times relevant hereto has  
21 been, a citizen of the State of Washington. Plaintiff Mayo purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods  
22 (including Gravy Train with Chicken Chunks and Gravy Train with Beef Chunks) and fed the  
23 Contaminated Dog Foods to her dogs, including Cocheese (a lab mix), Glory B (a chocolate lab  
24 mix), and Blade (an Alaskan husky mix). Most recently, Glory B passed away on or around  
25 February 2, 2018, two days after she consumed a can of Gravy Train with Chicken Chunks on or  
26 around January 31, 2018. On February 5, 2018, Plaintiff Mayo's cat, Midnight, also passed away  
27 after having accidentally ingested some of the Contaminated Dog Food fed to Glory B on January  
28 31st. Plaintiff Mayo believed that the Gravy Train foods she fed her dogs were safe, quality

1 products and trusted in Defendant's representations about the safety of its products when  
2 purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods.

3       102. Plaintiff Mayo began purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods on occasion for her  
4 dogs in or around February 2015, and her last purchase was on or around January 29, 2018, when  
5 she purchased two cans of Gravy Train with Chicken Chunks. Plaintiff Mayo no longer purchases  
6 the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the presence of pentobarbital. Plaintiff Mayo  
7 purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from Safeway in Woodland, Washington; Walmart in  
8 Woodland, Washington; and WinCo Foods in Longview, Washington. During that time, based on  
9 the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other marketing  
10 by Defendant, Plaintiff Mayo was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level  
11 of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff Mayo was injured by  
12 purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis* value as they were  
13 adulterated.

14       103. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
15 Plaintiff Mayo was injured when she purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not  
16 deliver what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.  
17 Plaintiff Mayo was further injured as she did business with a company she would not have if she  
18 knew that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant  
19 utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. She purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog  
20 Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that  
21 it was unadulterated, pure, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include euthanized  
22 animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Mayo encounter the Contaminated Dog  
23 Foods in the future, she could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective  
24 changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

25       104. Plaintiff Jack Collins ("Plaintiff Collins") is, and at all times relevant hereto has  
26 been, a citizen of the State of Maryland. Plaintiff Collins purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods  
27 (including Gravy Train with Beef Chunks; Kibbles 'n Bits Chef's Choice Homestyle Tender Slices  
28 with Real Beef, Chicken & Vegetables in Gravy, Kibbles 'n Bits Chef's Choice American Grill

1 Burger Dinner with Real Bacon & Cheese Bits in Gravy, and Kibbles ‘n Bits Chef’s Choice Bistro  
2 Tender Cuts with Real Beef & Vegetables in Gravy) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to his  
3 miniature poodle, Duffy. Duffy passed away in February 2018, soon after consuming a can of  
4 Gravy Train. Plaintiff Collins believed that the Gravy Train and Kibbles ‘n Bits dog food he fed  
5 his dog were safe, quality products and trusted in Defendant’s representations about the safety of  
6 its products when purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods.

7 105. Plaintiff Collins began purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods in or around May  
8 2016, and his last purchase was in or around February 2018. Plaintiff purchased a case containing  
9 twelve cans of the Contaminated Dog Foods approximately every two to three weeks. Plaintiff  
10 Collins no longer purchases the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the presence of  
11 pentobarbital. Plaintiff Collins purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from Walmart in  
12 Waynesboro, Pennsylvania. During that time, based on the false and misleading claims,  
13 warranties, representations, advertisements, and other marketing by Defendant, Plaintiff Collins  
14 was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital, a substance  
15 largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff Collins was injured by purchasing the Contaminated  
16 Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.

17 106. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
18 Plaintiff Collins was injured when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not  
19 deliver what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.  
20 Plaintiff Collins was further injured as he did business with a company he would not have if he  
21 knew that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant  
22 utilized euthanized animals as a protein source. He purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog  
23 Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that  
24 it was unadulterated, pure, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include euthanized  
25 animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Collins encounter the Contaminated Dog  
26 Foods in the future, he could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective  
27 changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

28

1           107. Plaintiff Vivian Jilek (“Plaintiff Jilek”) is, and at all times relevant hereto has been,  
2 a citizen of the state of Minnesota. Plaintiff Jilek purchased certain lines of the Contaminated Dog  
3 Foods (including Gravy Train with Beef Chunks, Gravy Train with Chicken Chunks, and Gravy  
4 Train Beef and Bacon) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods to her purebred Yorkshire terrier,  
5 Sophie. Plaintiff Jilek believed the Gravy Train foods she fed her dog were safe and healthy, and  
6 trusted in Defendant’s representations about the safety of its products when purchasing the  
7 Contaminated Dog Foods.

8           108. Plaintiff Jilek has been purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods since  
9 approximately 2013, and her last purchase was in approximately April 2018. Plaintiff Jilek no  
10 longer purchases the Contaminated Dog Foods after learning of the presence of pentobarbital.  
11 Plaintiff Jilek primarily purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from Family Dollar in Faribault,  
12 Minnesota and Family Dollar in Owatonna, Minnesota. During that time, based on the false and  
13 misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other marketing by Defendant,  
14 Plaintiff Jilek was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital,  
15 a substance largely used to euthanize animals. Plaintiff Jilek was injured by purchasing the  
16 Contaminated Dog Foods that had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated.

17           109. As the result of Defendant's deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein,  
18 Plaintiff Jilek was injured when he purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not deliver  
19 what Defendant promised and had no value or *de minimis* value as they were adulterated. Plaintiff  
20 Jilek was further injured as she did business with a company she would not have if she knew that  
21 the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized  
22 euthanized animals as a protein source. She purchased the adulterated Contaminated Dog Foods  
23 on the assumption that the labeling of the Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that it was  
24 unadulterated, pure, high quality, healthy, and safe for dogs to ingest and did not include  
25 euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff Jilek encounter the Contaminated  
26 Dog Foods in the future, she could not rely on the truthfulness of the packaging, absent corrective  
27 changes to the packaging and advertising of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

28

1           110. Plaintiff Rosemarie Schirripa (“Plaintiff Schirripa”) is, and at all times relevant  
2 hereto has been, a citizen of the state of New York. Plaintiff Schirripa purchased certain lines of  
3 the Contaminated Dog Foods (including the variety 12-pack of Kibbles ‘N Bits American Grill  
4 Burger Dinner with Real Bacon & Cheese Bits in Gravy and Chef’s Choice Bistro Tender Cuts  
5 with Real Turkey, Bacon & Vegetables in Gravy Variety) and fed the Contaminated Dog Foods  
6 to her dog, Otto, a seven-year-old miniature schnauzer . Plaintiff Schirripa believed the Kibbles  
7 ‘n Bits food she fed her dog were safe and healthy, and trusted in Defendant’s representations  
8 about the safety of its products when purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods. Plaintiff Schirripa  
9 began purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods in June 2017 and last purchased them in October  
10 2017. Plaintiff Schirripa primarily purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from Walmart.com.  
11 After learning of the presence of pentobarbital, Plaintiff Schirripa no longer purchases the  
12 Contaminated Dog Foods. Plaintiff Schirripa trusted Defendant’s representations about the safety  
13 and quality of its products when she purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

14           111. During the time Plaintiff Schirripa purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods, and  
15 because of the false and misleading claims, warranties, representations, advertisements, and other  
16 marketing by Defendant, she was unaware that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained any level  
17 of pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals. As the result of Defendant’s  
18 deceptive and negligent conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff Schirripa was injured when she purchased  
19 the Contaminated Dog Foods, which did not delivery what Defendant promised and had no value  
20 or *de minimis* value because they were adulterated. Plaintiff Schirripa was further injured as she  
21 did business with a company she would not have if she knew the Contaminated Dog Foods  
22 contained any level of pentobarbital or that Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein  
23 source. She purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods on the assumption that the labeling of the  
24 Contaminated Dog Foods was accurate and that it was unadulterated, pure, healthy, and safe for  
25 dogs to ingest and did not include euthanized animals as a protein source. Further, should Plaintiff  
26 Schirripa encounter the Contaminated Dog Foods in the future, she could not rely on the  
27 truthfulness of the packaging, absent correct changes to the packaging and advertising of the  
28 Contaminated Dog Foods.

1           112. Defendant Big Heart Pet Brands, Inc. is a subsidiary of J.M. Smucker Company  
2 and its headquarters are located at One Maritime Plaza, San Francisco, California. Defendant  
3 manufactures, formulates, produces, distributes, labels, markets, advertises, and sells the  
4 Contaminated Dog Foods under the Gravy Train dog food brand name throughout the United  
5 States. The advertising for the Contaminated Dog Foods, relied upon by Plaintiffs was prepared  
6 and/or approved by Defendant and their agents in the State of California, and was disseminated by  
7 Defendant and its agents from the State of California and throughout the United States, through  
8 advertising and labeling that contained the misrepresentations and omissions alleged herein. The  
9 advertising and labeling for the Contaminated Dog Foods was designed to encourage consumers  
10 to purchase the Contaminated Dog Foods and reasonably misled the reasonable consumer, i.e.,  
11 Plaintiffs and the Classes, into purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods. Defendant owns,  
12 manufactures, and distributes the Contaminated Dog Foods, and created and/or authorized the  
13 unlawful, fraudulent, unfair, misleading, and/or deceptive labeling and advertising for the  
14 Contaminated Dog Foods in the State of California.

15           113. The Contaminated Dog Foods, at a minimum, include:

16                   (a) Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Beef Chunks:




25  
26  
27  
28

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

(b) Gravy Train with Beef Chunks:



(c) Gravy Train with T-Bone Flavor Chunks:



(d) Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with T-Bone Flavor Chunks:



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

(e) Gravy Train With Chicken Chunks:



(f) Gravy Train Strips in Gravy With Beef Strips:



(g) Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy with Lamb and Rice Chunks:



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

(h) Gravy Train Chicken, Beef & Liver Medley:



(i) Gravy Train Chunks in Gravy Stew:



(j) Chef's Choice Bistro Hearty Cuts with Real Beef, Chicken & Vegetables in Gravy:



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

(k) Home-style Tender Slices with Real Beef, Chicken & Vegetables in Gravy:



(l) Bistro Tender Cuts with Real Beef & Vegetables in Gravy:



(m) Home-style Meatballs & Pasta Dinner with Real Beef in Tomato Sauce:



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

(n) American Grill Burger Dinner with Real Bacon & Cheese Bits in Gravy:



(o) Bistro Tender Cuts with Real Turkey, Bacon & Vegetables in Gravy



**DEFENDANT'S STATEMENTS AND OMISSIONS VIOLATE RELEVANT STATE LAWS**

114. State laws are designed to ensure that a company's claims about its products are truthful and accurate. Defendant violated the relevant state laws here, including California, by incorrectly, negligently, deceptively, knowingly, and fraudulently claiming that the Contaminated Dog Foods are nourishing, pure, healthy, quality, and safe and offer 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition with the purest ingredients while meeting all relevant federal regulations when in fact the Contaminated Dog Foods are adulterated and contain a controlled substance that is not nourishing, healthy, quality, or pure and causes the product not to meet the so-called rigorous supplier standards utilized by Defendant. Indeed, Defendant negligently, recklessly, and/or

1 intentionally chose to omit that the Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated, contained  
2 pentobarbital, and/or that Defendant utilized euthanized animals as a protein source in the  
3 Contaminated Dog Foods.

4 115. Defendant's marketing and advertising campaign has been sufficiently lengthy in  
5 duration and widespread in dissemination.

6 116. Defendant has engaged in this long-term advertising campaign to convince  
7 potential customers that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, and safe for  
8 consumption and offer 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition with the purest ingredients.

9 **PLAINTIFFS' RELIANCE WAS**  
10 **REASONABLE AND FORESEEN BY DEFENDANT**

11 117. Plaintiffs reasonably relied on Defendant's own false statements,  
12 misrepresentations, and omissions concerning the particular qualities and benefits of the  
13 Contaminated Dog Foods.

14 118. Plaintiffs read and relied upon the labels of the Contaminated Dog Foods in making  
15 their purchasing decisions.

16 119. A reasonable consumer would consider the labeling of a product when deciding  
17 whether to purchase the product. Here, Plaintiffs relied on the specific false statements and  
18 misrepresentations by Defendant, who did not disclose that the Contaminated Dog Foods were  
19 adulterated or contained pentobarbital, a substance largely used to euthanize animals.

20 **DEFENDANT'S KNOWLEDGE AND NOTICE OF BREACHES**  
21 **OF ITS EXPRESS AND IMPLIED WARRANTIES**

22 120. Defendant has received sufficient notice of its breaches of express and implied  
23 warranties. Defendant has, and had, exclusive knowledge of the physical and chemical make-up  
24 of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

25 121. Defendant also had notice of the real risk that pentobarbital may appear in the  
26 Contaminated Dog Foods if the manufacturing and sourcing were not properly monitored. Indeed,  
27  
28

1 this is not the first time that Defendant’s Gravy Train or Kibbles ‘n Bits® lines of food have been  
2 found to contain pentobarbital.<sup>25</sup>

3 **PRIVITY EXISTS WITH PLAINTIFFS AND THE PROPOSED CLASSES**

4 122. Defendant knew that consumers such as Plaintiffs and the proposed Classes would  
5 be the end purchasers of the Contaminated Dog Foods and the targets of its advertising and  
6 statements.

7 123. Defendant intended that the advertising, labeling, statements, and representations  
8 would be considered throughout the United States by end purchasers of the Contaminated Dog  
9 Foods, including Plaintiffs and the proposed Classes.

10 124. Defendant directed the advertising, labeling, statements, representations, and  
11 warranties of the Contaminated Dog Foods from the State of California to end purchasers  
12 throughout the United States, including Plaintiffs and the proposed Classes.

13 125. Defendant directly marketed, from the State of California, to Plaintiffs and the  
14 proposed Classes through statements on its website, labeling, advertising, and packaging  
15 throughout the United States.

16 126. Plaintiffs and the proposed Classes are the intended beneficiaries of the expressed  
17 and implied warranties.

18 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

19 127. Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of the following Class  
20 pursuant to Rule 23(a) and 23(b)(2) and (3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:

21 All persons who are citizens of the United States who, from  
22 February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog  
23 Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the  
“Class”).

24 128. Plaintiffs also bring this action individually and on behalf of the following  
25 Subclasses pursuant to Rule 23(a) and 23(b)(2) and (3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>25</sup> [https://www.care2.com/causes/fda-says-pet-food-company-cannot-donate-recalled-products-  
28 to-shelter.html](https://www.care2.com/causes/fda-says-pet-food-company-cannot-donate-recalled-products-to-shelter.html)

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

All persons who are citizens of California who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “California Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Ohio who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Ohio Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Alabama who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Alabama Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Georgia who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Georgia Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Florida who, from February 1, 2008, to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Florida Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Illinois who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Illinois Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Tennessee who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Tennessee Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of West Virginia who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “West Virginia Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Texas who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Texas Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Washington who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for household or business use, and not for resale (the “Washington Subclass”).

All persons who are citizens of Maryland who, from February 1, 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for

1 household or business use, and not for resale (the “Maryland  
Subclass”).

2 All persons who are citizens of Minnesota who, from February 1,  
3 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for  
4 household or business use, and not for resale (the “Minnesota  
Subclass”).

5 All persons who are citizens of New York who, from February 1,  
6 2008 to the present, purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods for  
7 household or business use, and not for resale (the “New York  
Subclass”).

8

9 129. Excluded from the Class and Subclasses (collectively “Classes”) are the Defendant,  
10 any parent companies, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates, officers, directors, legal representatives,  
11 and/or employees; co-conspirators, all governmental entities, and any judge, justice, or judicial  
12 officer presiding over this matter.

13 130. This action is brought and may be properly maintained as a Class action. There is  
14 a well-defined community of interests in this litigation and the members of the Classes are easily  
15 ascertainable.

16 131. The members in the proposed Classes are so numerous that individual joinder of all  
17 members is impracticable, and the disposition of the claims of all Class members in a single action  
18 will provide substantial benefits to the parties and Court.

19 132. Questions of law and fact common to Plaintiffs and the Classes include, but are not  
20 limited to, the following:

21 (a) whether Defendant owed a duty of care to the Classes;  
22 (b) whether Defendant knew or should have known that the Contaminated Dog  
23 Foods were adulterated or contained pentobarbital;

24 (c) whether Defendant wrongfully represented and continues to represent that  
25 the Contaminated Dog Foods are healthy, quality, pure, and safe;

26 (d) whether Defendant wrongfully represented, and continues to represent, that  
27 the Contaminated Dog Foods are manufactured in compliance with all governing regulations;

28

1 (e) whether Defendant wrongfully failed to state that the Contaminated Dog  
2 Foods are in fact adulterated under federal and relevant state laws;

3 (f) whether Defendant's representations and omissions in advertising and/or  
4 labeling are false, deceptive, and misleading;

5 (g) whether those representations and omissions are likely to deceive a  
6 reasonable consumer;

7 (h) whether Defendant had knowledge that those representations and omissions  
8 were false, deceptive, and misleading;

9 (i) whether Defendant continues to disseminate those representations and  
10 omissions despite knowledge that the representations are false, deceptive, and misleading;

11 (j) whether a representation that a product is healthy, pure, quality and  
12 nutritious coupled with omissions that the Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated or contained  
13 pentobarbital is material to a reasonable consumer;

14 (k) whether Defendant violated sections 17200, *et seq.* of the California  
15 Business & Professions Code;

16 (l) whether Defendant violated sections 17500, *et seq.* of the California  
17 Business & Professions Code;

18 (m) whether Defendant violated sections 1750, *et seq.* of the California Civil  
19 Code;

20 (n) whether Defendant's fraudulently concealed from the Classes that the  
21 Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated;

22 (o) whether Defendant breached its express and implied warranties;

23 (p) whether Defendant's conduct was negligent per se under applicable law;

24 (q) whether Defendant's conduct violated applicable state laws;

25 (r) whether Defendant knowingly and/or recklessly utilized JBS as a supplier  
26 for ingredients for the Contaminated Dog Foods;

27 (s) whether Plaintiffs and the members of the Classes are entitled to actual,  
28 statutory, and punitive damages; and

1 (t) whether Plaintiffs and members of the Classes are entitled to declaratory  
2 and injunctive relief.

3 133. Defendant engaged in a common course of conduct giving rise to the legal rights  
4 sought to be enforced by Plaintiffs individually and on behalf of the other members of the Classes.  
5 Identical statutory violations and business practices and harms are involved. Individual questions,  
6 if any, are not prevalent in comparison to the numerous common questions that dominate this  
7 action.

8 134. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of each Class and Subclass members' claims in that  
9 they are based on the same underlying facts, events, and circumstances relating to Defendant's  
10 conduct.

11 135. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the  
12 Classes, has no interests incompatible with the interests of the Classes, and have retained counsel  
13 competent and experienced in class action, consumer protection, and false advertising litigation.

14 136. Class treatment is superior to other options for resolution of the controversy  
15 because the relief sought for each Class and Subclass member is small such that, absent  
16 representative litigation, it would be infeasible for members of the Class and Subclass to redress  
17 the wrongs done to them individually.

18 137. Questions of law and fact common to the Classes predominate over any questions  
19 affecting only individual members of the Class and Subclasses.

20 138. As a result of the foregoing, Class treatment is appropriate.

21 **COUNT I**

22 **(Negligent Misrepresentation Against Defendant on Behalf of the Classes)**

23 139. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and reallege each and every allegation contained  
24 above, as though fully set forth herein.

25 140. Plaintiffs reasonably placed their trust and reliance in Defendant's representations  
26 that the Contaminated Dog Foods are healthy, safe, pure, high quality, and not adulterated with  
27 substances such as pentobarbital.

28

1 141. Plaintiffs reasonably placed their trust and reliance in Defendant to disclose if the  
2 Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated, contained pentobarbital or utilized euthanized animals  
3 as a protein or meat by-product source.

4 142. Because of the relationship between the parties, Defendant owed a duty to use  
5 reasonable care to impart correct and reliable disclosures concerning the true nature, quality, and  
6 ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods or, based upon its superior knowledge, having spoken,  
7 to say enough to not be misleading.

8 143. Defendant breached its duty to Plaintiffs and the Classes by providing false,  
9 misleading, partial disclosures, and/or deceptive information regarding the true nature, quality, and  
10 ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

11 144. Plaintiffs and the Classes reasonably and justifiably relied upon the information  
12 supplied to them by the Defendant. As a result, Plaintiffs and the Classes purchased the  
13 Contaminated Dog Foods that, being adulterated, should not have been sold at all.

14 145. Defendant failed to use reasonable care in its communications and representations  
15 to Plaintiffs and Classes.

16 146. By virtue of Defendant's negligent misrepresentations, Plaintiffs and the Classes  
17 have been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial or alternatively, seek rescission and  
18 disgorgement under this Count.

19 **COUNT II**

20 **(Violations of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750,**  
21 ***et seq.*, Against Defendant on Behalf of the Classes)**

22 147. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and reallege each and every allegation contained  
23 above, as though fully set forth herein.

24 148. Plaintiffs and each proposed Class member are a “consumer,” as that term is  
25 defined in section 1761(d) of the California Civil Code.

26 149. The Contaminated Dog Foods are “goods,” as that term is defined in section  
27 1761(a) of the California Civil Code.

28

1           150. Defendant is a “person” as that term is defined in section 1761(c) of the California  
2 Civil Code.

3           151. Plaintiffs and each proposed Class member's purchase of Defendant's products  
4 constituted a “transaction,” as that term is defined in section 1761(e) of the California Civil Code

5           152. Defendant’s conduct alleged herein violates the following provisions of California's  
6 Consumers Legal Remedies Act (the “CLRA”):

7                   (a) California Civil Code section 1770(a)(5), by representing that the  
8 Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy and safe for consumption and by failing to  
9 disclose that the Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated with pentobarbital

10                   (b) California Civil Code section 1770(a)(7), by representing that the  
11 Contaminated Dog Foods were of a particular standard, quality, or grade, when they were in fact  
12 adulterated and not fit for consumption;

13                   (c) California Civil Code section 1770(a)(9), by advertising the Contaminated  
14 Dog Foods with the intent not to sell them as advertised; and

15                   (d) California Civil Code section 1770(a)(16), by representing that the  
16 Contaminated Dog Foods have been supplied in accordance with previous representations when  
17 they have not.

18           153. As a direct and proximate result of these violations, Plaintiffs and the Classes have  
19 been harmed, and that harm will continue unless Defendant is enjoined from using the misleading  
20 marketing described herein in any manner in connection with the advertising and sale of the  
21 Contaminated Dog Foods.

22           154. On February 14, 2018, February 22, 2018, March 14, 2018, and March 21, 2018,  
23 counsel for Plaintiffs Mullins, Sturm, Roupe, Sebastiano, Johnson, Williamson, Todd and the  
24 Class sent Defendant written notices (via U.S. certified mail, return receipt requested) that its  
25 conduct is in violation of the CLRA concerning the aforementioned representations and  
26 pentobarbital.

27           155. Defendant failed to provide appropriate relief for its violations of CLRA sections  
28 1770(a)(5), (7), (9), and (16) within thirty days of receipt of Plaintiffs' notifications. In accordance

1 with CLRA section 1782(b), Plaintiffs and the Class is entitled, under CLRA section 1780, to  
2 recover and obtain the following relief for Defendant's violations of CLRA sections 1770(a)(5),(7),  
3 (9) and (16):

- 4 (a) actual damages under CLRA section 1780(a)(1);
- 5 (b) restitution of property under CLRA section 1780(a)(3);
- 6 (c) punitive damages under CLRA section 1780(a)(4) and because Defendant  
7 has engaged in fraud, malice, or oppression; and
- 8 (d) any other relief the Court deems proper under CLRA section 1780(a)(5).

9 156. Plaintiffs seek an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to, inter alia, section 1780(e) of  
10 the California Civil Code and section 1021.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

11 **COUNT III**

12 **(Violations of California False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500,**  
13 ***et seq.*, Against Defendant on Behalf of the Classes)**

14 157. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and reallege each and every allegation contained  
15 above, as though fully set forth herein.

16 158. California's False Advertising Law ("FAL") prohibits any statement in connection  
17 with the sale of goods "which is untrue or misleading." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500.

18 159. As set forth herein, Defendant's claims that the Contaminated Dog Foods are  
19 healthy and safe for consumption are literally false and likely to deceive the public.

20 160. Defendant's claims that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy,  
21 and safe for consumption are untrue or misleading because these claims fail to disclose that the  
22 Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated by containing the controlled substance of  
23 pentobarbital.

24 161. Defendant's claim that the Contaminated Dog Foods provide 100 percent complete  
25 and balanced nutrition are untrue or misleading because Defendant fails to disclose that the  
26 Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated with pentobarbital.

27 162. Defendant knew, or reasonably should have known, that the claims were untrue or  
28 misleading.

1 163. Defendant's conduct is ongoing and continuing, such that prospective injunctive  
2 relief is necessary, especially given Plaintiffs' desire to purchase these products in the future if  
3 they can be assured that the Contaminated Dog Foods are properly unadulterated pet food and  
4 meet the advertising claims.

5 164. Plaintiffs and members of the Classes are entitled to injunctive and equitable relief,  
6 and restitution in the amount they spent on the Contaminated Dog Foods.

7 **COUNT IV**

8 **(Violations of the Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200,**  
9 ***et seq.*, Against Defendant on Behalf of the Classes)**

10 165. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and reallege each and every allegation contained  
11 above, as though fully set forth herein.

12 166. The Unfair Competition Law prohibits any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business  
13 act or practice." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.

14 **Fraudulent**

15 167. Defendant's statements that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality healthy,  
16 and safe and provide 100 percent complete and balance nutrition are literally false and likely to  
17 deceive the public, as is Defendant's failing to make any mention that the Contaminated Dog Foods  
18 are adulterated and contain pentobarbital.

19 **Unlawful**

20 168. As alleged herein, Defendant has sold and advertised the adulterated Contaminated  
21 Dog Foods with false or misleading claims, such that Defendant's actions as alleged herein violate  
22 at least the following laws:

- 23 • the CLRA, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*; and  
24 • the FAL, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*

25 **Unfair**

26 169. Defendant's conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, marketing, and sale  
27 of the Contaminated Dog Foods is unfair because Defendant's conduct was immoral, unethical,  
28

1 unscrupulous, or substantially injurious to consumers and the utility of its conduct, if any, does not  
2 outweigh the gravity of the harm to its victims.

3 170. Defendant's conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, marketing, and sale  
4 of the Contaminated Dog Foods is also unfair because it violates public policy as declared by  
5 specific constitutional, statutory, or regulatory provisions, including, but not limited to, the FAL  
6 and the CLRA.

7 171. Defendant's conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, marketing, and sale  
8 of the Contaminated Dog Foods is also unfair because the consumer injury is substantial, not  
9 outweighed by benefits to consumers or competition, and not one consumers, themselves, can  
10 reasonably avoid.

11 172. In accordance with section 17203 of the California Business & Professions Code,  
12 Plaintiffs seek an order enjoining Defendant from continuing to conduct business through  
13 fraudulent or unlawful acts and practices and to commence a corrective advertising campaign.  
14 Defendant's conduct is ongoing and continuing, such that prospective injunctive relief is  
15 necessary.

16 173. On behalf of himself and the Classes, Plaintiffs also seek an order for the restitution  
17 of all monies from the sale the Contaminated Dog Foods, which were unjustly acquired through  
18 acts of fraudulent, unfair, or unlawful competition.

19 **COUNT V**

20 **(Negligence Against Defendant on Behalf of the Classes)**

21 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and reallege each and every allegation contained  
22 above, as though fully set forth herein.

23 175. Defendant's conduct is negligent per se.

24 176. As set forth above and below, Defendant violated its statutory duties under  
25 California's CLRA and FAL by falsely representing that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure,  
26 quality, healthy, nutritious, and safe for consumption while at the same time failing to disclose that  
27 the Contaminated Dog Foods contained the controlled substance of pentobarbital.

28

1 177. As set forth above, Defendant also violated its statutory duties under Federal,  
2 various state laws by selling adulterated pet food to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes.

3 178. Defendant failed to exercise due care when it sold the Contaminated Dog Foods to  
4 Plaintiffs and the Class Members based on: (1) its exclusive knowledge of the ingredients, content  
5 and sourcing materials of the Contaminated Dog Foods; (2) failing to properly audit and monitor  
6 any third-party suppliers as publicly represented to Plaintiffs and the Classes; and (3) allowing the  
7 inclusion of a controlled substance in the Contaminated Dog Foods when it had previously tested  
8 positive for this exact same drug, pentobarbital.

9 179. Defendant's violations of these statutes were a substantial factor in the harm  
10 suffered by Plaintiffs and the Classes, including purchasing a product with *de minimis* value.

11 180. By virtue of Defendant's negligence, Plaintiffs and the Classes have been damaged  
12 in an amount to be proven at trial or alternatively, seek rescission and disgorgement under this  
13 Count.

14 **COUNT VI**

15 **(Breach of Express Warranty, Cal. Com. Code § 2313,**  
16 **Against Defendant on Behalf of the Classes)**

17 181. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and reallege each and every allegation contained  
18 above, as though fully set forth herein.

19 182. As set forth herein, Defendant made express representations to Plaintiffs and the  
20 Classes that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption and  
21 provide 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

22 183. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiffs and the Classes that the  
23 Contaminated Dog Foods comply with all applicable regulations, including that they are not  
24 adulterated by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the United States.

25 184. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus  
26 constituted express warranties.

27 185. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiffs and the Class members.  
28





1 (c) that the Contaminated Dog Foods were not lawfully sold as labelled  
2 and packaged as they were adulterated.

3 206. Defendant had a duty to disclose these facts, regardless of the existence of privity,  
4 by virtue of (a) Defendant's exclusive knowledge as to the true nature and ingredients of the  
5 Contaminated Dog Foods; (b) Defendant's awareness that Plaintiffs and members of the proposed  
6 Classes were not reasonably likely to discover these facts; (c) Defendant's active concealment of  
7 those facts from Plaintiffs and the proposed Classes (by, among other things, making the false  
8 representations described above); and (d) Defendant's statutory and common-law obligations to  
9 disclose material information to the consumers as alleged herein.

10 207. Plaintiffs and members of the Classes would have acted differently had Defendant  
11 disclosed this information to them and allowed them to make a fully-informed decision before they  
12 purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

13 208. The facts Defendant concealed from Plaintiffs and the Classes are material and  
14 uniform in nature.

15 209. Defendant made misrepresentations of material fact in an effort to conceal the  
16 actual nutritional value, true nature and ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods and to prevent  
17 Class Members from becoming aware of the nutritional value, true nature, and ingredients of the  
18 Contaminated Dog Foods. Plaintiffs and the Classes would have relied on the disclosure of  
19 inclusion of pentobarbital in the Contaminated Dog Foods.

20 210. As a proximate result of Defendant's concealment and suppression of material  
21 facts, Plaintiffs and the Classes have sustained damage by, among other things, paying for  
22 Contaminated Dog Foods that were adulterated and unlawfully sold to consumers, rendering the  
23 Contaminated Dog Foods of zero or *de minimis* value.

24 211. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Classes, seek actual damages for  
25 Defendant's fraudulent concealment.

26 212. Because Defendant engaged in the conduct alleged herein deliberately and with  
27 intent, Plaintiffs and the Classes are entitled to an award of punitive damages, the total amount of  
28 which shall be proven at trial.

**COUNT IX**

**(Violations of Georgia Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Ga. Code Ann. §10-1-370, et seq., Against Defendant on Behalf of the Georgia Subclass)**

213. Plaintiff Roupe incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

214. The conduct described in this Complaint constitutes a violation of the Georgia Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Ga. Code Ann. §10-1-370 *et seq.* (hereinafter “UDTPA”).

215. Defendant engaged in deceptive trade practices in violation of the UDTPA when it claimed that the Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption. These claims are untrue or misleading because they fail to disclose that the Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated with pentobarbital and instead claimed that the Contaminated Dog Foods provide 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

216. Defendant either knew or should have known its Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated and were not as warranted and represented the same on the labeling, packaging, advertising, statements, and public sales of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

217. Defendant’s conduct and omissions described herein repeatedly occurred in Defendant’s trade or business and were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the consuming public.

218. The facts concealed or not disclosed by Defendant are material facts in that Plaintiff Roupe and any reasonable consumer would have considered those facts important in deciding whether to purchase the Contaminated Dog Foods. Had Plaintiff Roupe and the Georgia Subclass known that the Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated with pentobarbital they would not have purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

219. Defendant’s deceptive conduct intended for Plaintiff Roupe and the members of the Georgia Subclass to remain unaware of the material fact that the Contaminated Dog Foods contained pentobarbital. Defendant knew that Plaintiff Roupe and the Georgia Subclass would rely on its packaging, labels, advertisements, statements, and other public representations that the

1 Contaminated Dog Foods were unadulterated. This conduct constitutes consumer fraud within the  
2 meaning of the various consumer protection statutes.

3 220. Defendant’s unlawful conduct is continuing.

4 221. As a direct and proximate result of the deceptive, misleading, unfair and  
5 unconscionable practices of the Defendant set forth above, Plaintiff Roupe and the Georgia  
6 Subclass Members are entitled to injunctive relief, attorney’s fees and costs as set forth in section  
7 10-1-373 of the Georgia Code.

8 **COUNT X**

9 **(Violations of Georgia’s False Advertising Law, Ga. Code Ann. § 10-1-420 *et seq.*, Against**  
10 **Defendant on Behalf of the Georgia Subclass)**

11 222. Plaintiff Roupe incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
12 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

13 223. Georgia’s False Advertising Law prohibits the sale of merchandise advertised “with  
14 intent, design or purpose not to sell ... upon the terms stated therein or otherwise communicated  
15 ...” Ga. Code Ann. § 10-1-420(a).

16 224. Georgia’s False Advertising Law also prohibits advertising that is “untrue or  
17 fraudulent and which is known or which by the exercise or reasonable case should be known to be  
18 untrue or fraudulent.” Ga. Code Ann. § 10-1-421(a).

19 225. As set forth herein, Defendant's claims that the Contaminated Dog Foods are  
20 healthy and safe for consumption are literally false and likely to deceive the public.

21 226. Defendant’s claims that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy,  
22 and safe for consumption are untrue or misleading because these claims fail to disclose that the  
23 Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated with pentobarbital.

24 227. Defendant’s claim that the Contaminated Dog Foods are 100 percent complete and  
25 balanced nutrition are untrue or misleading because it fails to disclose that the Contaminated Dog  
26 Foods were in fact adulterated with pentobarbital.

27 228. Defendant knew, or reasonably should have known, that the claims were untrue or  
28 misleading.





1           242. As set forth herein, Defendant made express representations to Plaintiff Sebastiano  
2 and the Florida Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, safe for  
3 consumption, and provide 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

4           243. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiff Sebastiano and the Florida  
5 Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods meet all applicable regulations, including that they are  
6 not adulterated dog food, by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the United States.

7           244. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus  
8 constituted express warranties.

9           245. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Sebastiano and the Florida  
10 Subclass members.

11           246. On the basis of these express warranties, Defendant sold the Contaminated Dog  
12 Foods to Plaintiff Sebastiano and the Florida Subclass.

13           247. Defendant knowingly breached the express warranties by selling Contaminated  
14 Dog Foods that were adulterated and contained pentobarbital.

15           248. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
16 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a source of protein or meat by-product in the  
17 Contaminated Dog Foods.

18           249. Privity exists because Defendant expressly warranted to Plaintiff Sebastiano and  
19 the Florida Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, safe for  
20 consumption, unadulterated, and provided 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

21           250. Plaintiff Sebastiano and the Florida Subclass reasonably relied on the express  
22 warranties by Defendant.

23           251. As a result of Defendant's breaches of its express warranties, Plaintiff Sebastiano  
24 and the Florida Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for Contaminated Dog Foods that  
25 were not what Defendant represented and were sold in violation of applicable regulations and laws.

26           252. Plaintiff Sebastiano, on behalf of himself and the Florida Subclass, seeks actual  
27 damages for Defendant's breach of warranty.

28

**COUNT XIII**

**(Breach of Implied Warranty, Fla. Stat. § 672.314,  
Against Defendant on Behalf of the Florida Subclass)**

1  
2  
3  
4 253. Plaintiff Sebastiano incorporates by reference and realleges each and every  
5 allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

6 254. As set forth herein, the Contaminated Dog Foods are not fit for their ordinary  
7 purposes for which they are used as they were adulterated or similarly contaminated.

8 255. The Contaminated Dog Foods also do not conform to the promises or affirmations  
9 of fact made on the packaging or labels.

10 256. Defendant is a merchant engaging in the sale of goods to Plaintiff Sebastiano and  
11 the Florida Subclass.

12 257. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Sebastiano and the Florida  
13 Subclass members.

14 258. Defendant breached the implied warranties by selling the Contaminated Dog Foods  
15 that were not fit for their ordinary purpose because they were adulterated dog food that contained  
16 pentobarbital.

17 259. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
18 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a source of protein or meat by-product in the  
19 Contaminated Dog Foods.

20 260. Privity exists because Defendant impliedly warranted to Plaintiff Sebastiano and  
21 the Florida Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods were unadulterated and fit for their ordinary  
22 purpose.

23 261. As a result of Defendant's breach of its implied warranties of merchantability,  
24 Plaintiff Sebastiano and the Florida Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for the  
25 Contaminated Dog Foods that were not as Defendant represented.

26 262. Plaintiff Sebastiano, on behalf of himself and the Florida Subclass, seeks actual  
27 damages for Defendant's breach of warranty.  
28

**COUNT XIV**

**(Violations of Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. 505/1, et seq., Against Defendant on Behalf of the Illinois Subclass)**

263. Plaintiff Sturm incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

264. The conduct described in this Complaint constitutes a violation of the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. 505/1 et seq. (hereinafter, "ICFA").

265. Defendant engaged in unfair or deceptive practices in violation of ICFA when it claimed that the Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption. These claims are untrue or misleading because they fail to disclose that the Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated by the controlled substance of pentobarbital and instead claimed that the Contaminated Dog Foods provide 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

266. Defendant either knew or should have known its Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated and were not as warranted and represented on the labeling, packaging, advertising, statements, and public sales of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

267. Defendant's conduct and omissions described herein repeatedly occurred in Defendant's trade or business and were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the consuming public.

268. The facts concealed or not disclosed by Defendant are material facts in that Plaintiff Sturm and any reasonable consumer would have considered those facts important in deciding whether to purchase the Contaminated Dog Foods. Had Plaintiff Sturm and the Illinois Subclass known that the Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated by containing the controlled substance of pentobarbital they would not have purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

269. Defendant intended that Plaintiff Sturm and the Illinois Subclass would rely on the deception in purchasing the Contaminated Dog Foods, unaware of the undisclosed material facts. Defendant knew that Plaintiff Sturm and the Illinois Subclass would rely on its packaging, labels, advertisements, statements, and other public sales of the Contaminated Dog Foods as an

1 unadulterated. This conduct constitutes consumer fraud within the meaning of the various  
2 consumer protection statutes.

3 270. Defendant's unlawful conduct is continuing.

4 271. As a direct and proximate result of the deceptive, misleading, unfair, and  
5 unconscionable practices of the Defendant set forth above, Plaintiff Sturm and Illinois Subclass  
6 members are entitled to actual damages, compensatory damages, penalties, attorneys' fees and  
7 costs as set forth in section 10a of the ICFA.

8 272. Defendant's deceptive, misleading, unfair and unconscionable practices set forth  
9 above were done willfully, wantonly, and maliciously, entitling Plaintiff Sturm and Illinois  
10 Subclass members to an award of punitive damages.

11 **COUNT XV**

12 **(Breach of Express Warranty, Ala. Code § 7-2-313,**  
13 **Against Defendant on Behalf of the Alabama Subclass)**

14 273. Plaintiff Todd incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
15 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

16 274. As set forth herein, Defendant made express representations to Plaintiff Todd and  
17 the Alabama Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, and safe for  
18 consumption and provide 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition. Defendant intended these  
19 express representations to benefit Plaintiff Todd and the Alabama Subclass, as purchasers of the  
20 Contaminated Dog Foods.

21 275. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiff Todd and the Alabama  
22 Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods meet all applicable regulations, including that they are  
23 not adulterated dog food by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the United States.

24 276. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus  
25 constituted express warranties.

26 277. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Todd and the Alabama  
27 Subclass members.

28



1           287. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiff Williamson and the Ohio  
2 Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods meet all applicable regulations, including that they are  
3 not adulterated dog food by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the United States.

4           288. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and,  
5 thus, constituted express warranties.

6           289. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Williamson and the Ohio  
7 Subclass members.

8           290. On the basis of these express warranties, Defendant sold to Plaintiff Williamson  
9 and the Ohio Subclass the Contaminated Dog Foods.

10           291. Defendant knowingly breached the express warranties by selling the Contaminated  
11 Dog Foods which are defective because they are adulterated and contain pentobarbital.

12           292. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
13 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
14 Contaminated Dog Foods.

15           293. Privity exists because Defendant expressly warranted to Plaintiff Williamson and  
16 the Ohio Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, and safe for  
17 consumption and provided 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition and unadulterated.

18           294. Plaintiff Williamson and the Ohio Subclass reasonably relied on the express  
19 warranties by Defendant.

20           295. As a result of Defendant's breaches of its express warranties, Plaintiff Williamson  
21 and the Ohio Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for the Contaminated Dog Foods  
22 that were not what Defendant represented and in fact not properly sold under applicable regulations  
23 and law.

24           296. Plaintiff Williamson, on behalf of herself and the Ohio Subclass, seeks actual  
25 damages for Defendant's breach of warranty.

26  
27  
28

1 **COUNT XVII**

2 **(Breach of Implied Warranty Against Defendant on Behalf of the Ohio Subclass)**

3 297. Plaintiff Williamson incorporates by reference and realleges each and every  
4 allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

5 298. As set forth herein, the Contaminated Dog Foods are not fit for the ordinary  
6 purposes as they were adulterated or similarly contaminated under section 923.48 of the Ohio  
7 Statute (prohibiting pet food that contains any “poisonous or deleterious substance”), as alleged  
8 herein. Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 923.48(A).

9 299. The Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated at the time Defendant sold the  
10 products to Plaintiff Williamson and the Ohio Subclass.

11 300. Defendant breached the implied warranties by selling the Contaminated Dog Foods  
12 that were not fit for their ordinary purpose as adulterated dog food containing pentobarbital.

13 301. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
14 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
15 Contaminated Dog Foods.

16 302. Defendant impliedly warranted to Plaintiff Williamson and the Ohio Subclass that  
17 the Contaminated Dog Foods were unadulterated and fit for their ordinary purpose

18 303. As a result of Defendant's breach of its implied warranties of merchantability,  
19 Plaintiff Williamson and the Ohio Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for the  
20 Contaminated Dog Foods that were not what Defendant represented.

21 304. Plaintiff Williamson, on behalf of herself and the Ohio Subclass, seeks actual  
22 damages for Defendant's breach of warranty.

23 **COUNT XVIII**

24 **(Breach of Express Warranty, Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-2-313, Against Defendant**  
25 **on Behalf of the Tennessee Subclass)**

26 305. Plaintiff Christian incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
27 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

28

1           306. As set forth herein, Defendant made express representations to Plaintiff Christian  
2 and the Tennessee Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, and safe  
3 for consumption, made of wholesome ingredients, and are 100 percent complete and balanced  
4 nutrition.

5           307. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiff Christian and the  
6 Tennessee Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods meet all applicable regulations, including  
7 that they are not adulterated dog food, by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the  
8 United States.

9           308. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus  
10 constituted express warranties.

11           309. There were sales of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Christian and the Tennessee  
12 Subclass.

13           310. On the basis of these express warranties, Plaintiff Christian and the members of the  
14 Tennessee Subclass purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods from Defendant.

15           311. Defendant's representations and warranties were made in connection with the sale  
16 of the Contaminated Dog Foods to Plaintiff Christian and the members of the Tennessee Subclass,  
17 who relied on Defendant's representations and warranties regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods  
18 when deciding whether to purchase the Defendant's products.

19           312. Defendant knowingly breached the express warranties by selling the Contaminated  
20 Dog Foods to Plaintiff Christian and the Tennessee Subclass, which are adulterated and contain  
21 pentobarbital.

22           313. The Contaminated Dog Foods did not conform to Defendant's representations and  
23 affirmations because they are not suitable for consumption by canines and contain pentobarbital.

24           314. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
25 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
26 Contaminated Dog Foods.

27           315. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Christian and  
28 the members of the Tennessee Subclass suffered actual damages in that they purchased

1 Contaminated Dog Foods that were not what Defendant represented and that they would not have  
2 purchased at all had they known of the presence of pentobarbital.

3 316. Plaintiff Christian, on behalf of herself and the Tennessee Subclass, seeks actual  
4 damages for Defendant's breach of warranty.

5 **COUNT XIX**

6 **(Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability, Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-2-314,**  
7 **Against Defendant on Behalf of the Tennessee Subclass)**

8 317. Plaintiff Christian incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
9 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

10 318. Defendant is a merchant engaging in the sale of goods, such as the Contaminated  
11 Dog Foods, to Plaintiff Christian and the Tennessee Subclass.

12 319. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Christian and the members  
13 of the Tennessee Subclass.

14 320. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant manufactured or supplied the  
15 Contaminated Dog Foods, and prior to the time the Contaminated Dog Foods were purchased by  
16 Plaintiff Christian and the members of the Tennessee Subclass, Defendant impliedly warranted to  
17 them that the Contaminated Dog Foods were of merchantable quality, fit for their ordinary purpose  
18 (consumption by dogs), and conformed to the promises and affirmations made by Defendant  
19 regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods, including that the food was pure, quality, healthy, and  
20 safe for consumption, made of wholesome ingredients, and were 100 percent complete and  
21 balanced nutrition.

22 321. Defendant knew Plaintiff Christian and the members of the Tennessee Subclass  
23 purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods as food for their dogs.

24 322. Defendant marketed its Contaminated Dog Foods with the intent and reasonable  
25 expectation that Plaintiff Christian and the members of the Tennessee Subclass would justifiably  
26 rely on their representations and affirmations regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods.

27  
28



1 are healthy, safe, pure, high quality, and that they were not adulterated with substances such as  
2 pentobarbital.

3 332. Because of the relationship between the parties, Defendant owed a duty to use  
4 reasonable care to impart correct and reliable disclosures concerning the true nature, quality, and  
5 ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods, or based upon its superior knowledge, to say enough  
6 to not be misleading.

7 333. Defendant breached its duty to Plaintiff Christian and the Tennessee Subclass by  
8 providing false, misleading, partial disclosures, and/or deceptive information regarding the true  
9 nature, quality, and ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

10 334. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Christian and the  
11 Tennessee Subclass have suffered actual damages because they purchased Contaminated Dog  
12 Foods that were not what Defendant represented and that they would not have purchased at all had  
13 they known of the presence of pentobarbital.

14 335. Plaintiff Christian, on behalf of herself and the Tennessee Subclass, seeks actual  
15 damages for Defendant's breach of warranty.

16 **COUNT XXI**

17 **(Negligence Against Defendant on Behalf of the Tennessee Subclass)**

18 336. Plaintiff Christian incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
19 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

20 337. Because of the relationship between the parties, Defendant owed a duty to use  
21 reasonable care to impart correct and reliable disclosures concerning the true nature, quality, and  
22 ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods, or based upon its superior knowledge, to say enough  
23 to not be misleading.

24 338. Defendant's conduct was below the relevant standard of care when it represented  
25 to Plaintiff Christian and the Tennessee Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure,  
26 quality, healthy, safe for consumption, made of wholesome ingredients, and are 100 percent  
27 complete and balanced nutrition when such representations were false, misleading, or deceptive  
28 because the Contaminated Dog Foods are adulterated and contain pentobarbital.







1           363. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Thomas and the members of  
2 the West Virginia Subclass.

3           364. The purchased product was unfit for its ordinary purpose. At all times mentioned  
4 herein, Defendant manufactured or supplied the Contaminated Dog Foods, and prior to the time  
5 the Contaminated Dog Foods were purchased by Plaintiff Thomas and the West Virginia Subclass,  
6 Defendant impliedly warranted to them that the Contaminated Dog Foods were of merchantable  
7 quality, fit for their ordinary purpose (consumption by dogs), and conformed to the promises and  
8 affirmations made by Defendant regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods, including that the food  
9 was pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption, made of wholesome ingredients, and was  
10 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

11           365. Defendant marketed its Contaminated Dog Foods with the intent and reasonable  
12 expectation that Plaintiff Thomas and the West Virginia Subclass would justifiably rely on their  
13 representations and affirmations regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods.

14           366. Plaintiff Thomas and the members of the West Virginia Subclass relied on  
15 Defendant's representations and affirmations with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods'  
16 quality, ingredients, and fitness for consumption when deciding what dog food to purchase.

17           367. Because the Contaminated Dog Foods contain pentobarbital, they were not fit for  
18 their ordinary purpose, consumption by dogs, and did not conform to the Defendant's  
19 representations and affirmations of fact when Plaintiff Thomas and the members of the West  
20 Virginia Subclass purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

21           368. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
22 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
23 Contaminated Dog Foods.

24           369. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Thomas and the members of the West  
25 Virginia Subclass have suffered actual damages in that they purchased Contaminated Dog Foods  
26 that were not what Defendant represented.

27           370. Plaintiff Thomas, on behalf of himself and the West Virginia Subclass, seeks actual  
28 damages for Defendant's breach of warranty.

**COUNT XXV**

**(Negligence Against Defendant on Behalf of the West Virginia Subclass)**

1  
2  
3 371. Plaintiff Thomas incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
4 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

5 372. Because of the relationship between the parties, Defendant owed a duty to use  
6 reasonable care to impart correct and reliable disclosures concerning the true nature, quality, and  
7 ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods, or based upon its superior knowledge, to say enough  
8 to not be misleading.

9 373. Defendant breached its duty when it knowingly provided false, misleading, partial  
10 disclosures, and/or deceptive information regarding the true nature, quality, and ingredients of the  
11 Contaminated Dog Foods to Plaintiff Thomas and the West Virginia Subclass.

12 374. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Christian and the  
13 Tennessee Subclass have suffered actual damages because they purchased Contaminated Dog  
14 Foods that were not what Defendant represented.

15 375. By virtue of Defendant's negligence, Plaintiff Thomas and the West Virginia  
16 Subclass have been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial or alternatively, seek rescission  
17 and disgorgement under this Count.

**COUNT XXVI**

**(Fraud by Affirmative Misrepresentation Against Defendant on  
Behalf of the West Virginia Subclass)**

18  
19  
20 376. Plaintiff Thomas incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
21 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

22 377. Defendant represented to Plaintiff Thomas and the West Virginia Subclass that the  
23 Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption, made of wholesome  
24 ingredients, and are 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

25 378. Defendant breached its duty to Plaintiff Christian and the Tennessee Subclass by  
26 providing false, misleading, partial disclosures, and/or deceptive information regarding the true  
27 nature, quality, and ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

28



1 388. There were sales of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Thomas and the members of  
2 the West Virginia Subclass.

3 389. Defendant knowingly acted, used, and employed unfair and deceptive  
4 misrepresentations, statements, and practices in connection with its sale of the Contaminated Dog  
5 Foods. Specifically, Defendant represented that its Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality,  
6 healthy, safe, made of wholesome ingredients, and were 100 percent and balanced nutrition, which  
7 are false and misleading because the Contaminated Dog Foods are adulterated and contain  
8 pentobarbital.

9 390. Defendant knew or should have known that such material representations of fact  
10 were false or misleading or would have the tendency to be misleading.

11 391. Defendant marketed and sold its Contaminated Dog Foods with the intent and  
12 reasonable expectation that Plaintiff Thomas and the West Virginia Subclass would justifiably rely  
13 on their representations and affirmations regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods.

14 392. Plaintiff Thomas and the members of the West Virginia Subclass relied on, and  
15 were deceived by, Defendant's representations and affirmations with respect to the Contaminated  
16 Dog Foods' quality, ingredients, and fitness for consumption when deciding what dog food to  
17 purchase.

18 393. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Thomas and the  
19 West Virginia Subclass have suffered damages because they purchased Contaminated Dog Foods  
20 that were not what Defendant represented and that they would not have purchased at all had they  
21 known of the presence of pentobarbital.

22 394. Plaintiff Thomas and the members of the West Virginia Subclass are entitled to the  
23 greater of their actual damages and the statutory amount of \$200. W. Va. Code § 46A-6-106(a).

24 **COUNT XXVIII**

25 **(Breach of Express Warranty, Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 2.313(a), Against**  
26 **Defendant on Behalf of the Texas Subclass)**

27 395. Plaintiff Brown incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
28 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

1           396. As set forth herein, Defendant made express representations to Plaintiff Brown and  
2 the Texas Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, and safe for  
3 consumption, made of wholesome ingredients, and are 100 percent complete and balanced  
4 nutrition.

5           397. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiff Brown and the Texas  
6 Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods meet all applicable regulations, including that they are  
7 not adulterated dog food, by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the United States.

8           398. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus  
9 constituted express warranties.

10           399. Defendant's representations and warranties were made in connection with the sale  
11 of the Contaminated Dog Foods to Plaintiff Brown and the Texas Subclass, who relied on  
12 Defendant's representations and warranties regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods when deciding  
13 whether to purchase the Defendant's products.

14           400. Defendant knowingly breached the express warranties to Plaintiff Brown and the  
15 Texas Subclass by selling them Contaminated Dog Foods that did not conform to Defendant's  
16 representations and affirmations because they are adulterated and contain pentobarbital.

17           401. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Brown and the  
18 Texas Subclass suffered actual damages in that they purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that were  
19 not what Defendant represented and that they would not have purchased at all had they known of  
20 the presence of pentobarbital.

21           402. Plaintiff Brown and the members of the Texas Subclass reasonably placed their  
22 trust and justifiable reliance in Defendant's representations that the Contaminated Dog Foods are  
23 healthy, safe, pure, high quality, and that they were not adulterated with substances such as  
24 pentobarbital.

25           403. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
26 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
27 Contaminated Dog Foods.

28



1 411. Plaintiff Brown and the members of the Texas Subclass relied on Defendant's  
2 representations and affirmations with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods' quality, ingredients,  
3 and fitness for consumption when deciding what dog food to purchase.

4 412. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
5 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
6 Contaminated Dog Foods.

7 413. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Brown and the members of the Texas  
8 Subclass have suffered actual damages in that they purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that were  
9 not what Defendant represented and that they would not have purchased at all had they known of  
10 the presence of pentobarbital.

11 414. Plaintiff Brown, on behalf of herself and the Texas Subclass, seeks actual damages  
12 for Defendant's breach of warranty.

13 **COUNT XXX**

14 **(Negligent Misrepresentation Against Defendant on Behalf of the Texas Subclass)**

15 415. Plaintiff Brown incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
16 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

17 416. Defendant represented to Plaintiff Brown and the Texas Subclass that the  
18 Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption, made of wholesome  
19 ingredients, and are 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

20 417. In making such representations to Plaintiff Brown and the Texas Subclass,  
21 Defendant provided false, misleading, partial disclosures, and/or deceptive information regarding  
22 the true nature, quality, and ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

23 418. Defendant failed to exercise reasonable care in its communications, marketing, and  
24 representations about the Contaminated Dog Foods to Plaintiff Brown and the Texas Subclass.

25 419. Plaintiff Brown and the Texas Subclass reasonably placed their trust and justifiable  
26 reliance in Defendant's representations that the Contaminated Dog Foods are healthy, safe, pure,  
27 quality, and that they were not adulterated with substances such as pentobarbital. Given the  
28 deceptive manner in which Defendant advertised, represented, and otherwise promoted the

1 Contaminated Dog Foods, Plaintiff Brown and the Texas Subclass’s reliance on Defendant’s  
2 misrepresentations was justifiable.

3 420. As a result of Defendant’s conduct, Plaintiff Brown and the members of the Texas  
4 Subclass have suffered damages in that they purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that were not  
5 what Defendant represented and that they would not have purchased at all had they known of the  
6 presence of pentobarbital.

7 421. By virtue of Defendant’s negligent misrepresentations, Plaintiff Brown and the  
8 Texas Subclass have been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial or alternatively, seek  
9 rescission and disgorgement under this Count.

10 **COUNT XXXI**

11 **(Violations of Maryland’s Consumer Protection Act, Md. Code Ann. Com. Law § 13-101,**  
12 ***et seq.*, Against Defendant on Behalf of the Maryland Subclass)**

13 422. Plaintiff Collins incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
14 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

15 423. This is an action for relief under the Maryland Consumer Protection Act, Md. Code  
16 Ann. Com. Law § 13-101, *et seq.* (“MCPA”).

17 424. Plaintiff Collins and each Maryland Subclass member are each a “consumer,” as  
18 that term is defined in section 13-101(c) of the Maryland Code, Commercial Law.

19 425. The Contaminated Dog Foods are “merchandise,” as that term is defined in section  
20 13-101(f) of the Maryland Code, Commercial Law.

21 426. Defendant is a “merchant,” as that term is defined in section 13-101(g) of the  
22 Maryland Code, Commercial Law.

23 427. Defendant, Plaintiff Collins, and each Maryland Subclass member are each a  
24 “person,” as that term is defined in section 13-101(h) of the Maryland Code, Commercial Law.

25 428. The MCPA states that “[a] person may not engage in any unfair or deceptive trade  
26 practice[.]” Md. Code Ann. Com. Law § 13-303. Further, “Any practice prohibited by this title  
27 is a violation of this title, whether or not any consumer in fact has been misled, deceived, or  
28 damaged as a result of that practice.” Md. Code Ann Com. Law § 13-302.

1           429. Defendant's conduct alleged herein has violated the MCPA by engaging in the  
2 following "unfair or deceptive trade practice" specified under the MCPA:

3                   (a) Md. Code Ann Com. Law § 13-301(1), providing false or misleading oral  
4 or written statement, visual description, or other representation of any kind which has the capacity,  
5 tendency, or effect of deceiving or misleading consumers;

6                   (b) Md. Code Ann Com. Law § 13-301(2), representing that: (i) the  
7 Contaminated Dog Foods have a sponsorship, approval, accessory, characteristic, ingredient, use,  
8 or benefit which they do not have; (ii) Defendant has sponsorship, approval, status, affiliation, or  
9 connection which it does not have; or (iii) the Contaminated Dog Foods are of a particular standard,  
10 quality, grade, style, or model which they are not;

11                   (c) Md. Code Ann Com. Law § 13-301(3), failing to state a material fact if the  
12 failure deceives or tends to deceive;

13                   (d) Md. Code Ann Com. Law § 13-301(5), advertising or offering consumer  
14 goods without the intent to sell them as advertised or offered; and

15                   (e) Md. Code Ann Com. Law § 13-301(9), deception, fraud, false pretense,  
16 false premise, misrepresentation, or knowing concealment, suppression, or omission of material  
17 fact with the intent that Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass rely on the same in connection  
18 with: (i) the promotion or sale of the Contaminated Dog Foods.

19           430. The unconscionable, illegal, unfair, and deceptive acts and practices of Defendant  
20 impacts public interest and violate the MCPA.

21           431. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Collins and the  
22 Maryland Subclass have been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, which shall include, but  
23 is not limited to, all compensatory damages, incidental and consequential damages, attorneys' fees,  
24 costs, injunctive relief, and other damages allowed by law.

25  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT XXXII**

**(Fraudulent Misrepresentation against Defendant on Behalf of  
the Maryland Subclass)**

1  
2  
3  
4 432. Plaintiff Collins incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
5 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

6 433. As alleged more fully herein, at the time Defendant sold the Contaminated Dog  
7 Foods to Plaintiff Collins and Maryland Subclass Members, it knew the Contaminated Dog Foods  
8 were adulterated with pentobarbital.

9 434. At all times relevant herein, Defendant made misrepresentations of material fact to  
10 Plaintiff Collins and Maryland Subclass Members as a means of concealing the true nature and  
11 quality of the Contaminated Dog Foods, claiming it was pure, nutritious, healthy, and pure quality  
12 with no disclosure that the Contaminated Dog Foods were in fact adulterated and contained  
13 pentobarbital.

14 435. Defendant falsely represented to and/or concealed material facts from Plaintiff  
15 Collins and Maryland Subclass Members, including, but not limited to:

- 16 (a) the true nature and quality of the Contaminated Dog Foods;  
17 (b) the inclusion of pentobarbital in the Contaminated Dog Foods; and  
18 (c) that the Contaminated Dog Foods were not lawfully sold as labelled and  
19 packaged as they were adulterated.

20 436. Defendant had a duty to disclose these facts, regardless of the existence of privity,  
21 by virtue of (a) Defendant's exclusive knowledge as to the true nature and ingredients of the  
22 Contaminated Dog Foods; (b) Defendant's awareness that Plaintiff Collins and members of the  
23 Maryland Subclass were not reasonably likely to discover these facts; (c) Defendant's active  
24 concealment of those facts from Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass (by, among other  
25 things, making the false representations described above); and (d) Defendant's statutory and  
26 common-law obligations to disclose material information to the consumers as alleged herein.

1           437. Plaintiff Collins and members of the Maryland Subclass would have acted  
2 differently had Defendant disclosed this information to them and allowed them to make a fully-  
3 informed decision before they purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

4           438. These false representations were material to Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland  
5 Subclass.

6           439. Defendant intentionally and knowingly made these misrepresentations to induce  
7 Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass to purchase its Contaminated Dog Foods.

8           440. Defendant knew that its representations about the Contaminated Dog Foods were  
9 false in that the Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated with pentobarbital. Defendant allowed  
10 its packaging, labels, advertisements, promotional materials, and website to intentionally mislead  
11 consumers, such as Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass.

12           441. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass were ignorant of the falsity of the  
13 representations made by Defendant about the Contaminated Dog Foods.

14           442. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass did in fact rely on the truth of these  
15 misrepresentations and purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods to their detriment. Given the  
16 deceptive manner in which Defendant advertised, represented, and otherwise promoted the  
17 Contaminated Dog Foods, Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass's reliance on Defendant's  
18 misrepresentations was justifiable.

19           443. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's concealment and suppression of  
20 material facts, Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass have sustained damage by, among other  
21 things, paying for Contaminated Dog Foods that were adulterated and unlawfully sold to  
22 consumers, rendering the Contaminated Dog Foods of zero or de minimis value.

23           444. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and  
24 declaratory relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief allowed by law.

25  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT XXXIII**

**(Negligent Misrepresentation against Defendant on Behalf of  
the Maryland Subclass)**

1  
2  
3  
4 445. Plaintiff Collins incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
5 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

6 446. Because of the relationship between the parties, Defendant owed a duty of care to  
7 Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass to use reasonable care to impart correct and reliable  
8 disclosures concerning the true nature, quality, and ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods,  
9 or based upon its superior knowledge, to say enough to not be misleading.

10 447. Defendant breached its duty to Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass by  
11 providing false, misleading, partial disclosures, and/or deceptive information regarding the true  
12 nature, quality, and ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods that were purchased by Plaintiff  
13 Collins and the Maryland Subclass.

14 448. Defendant knew or should have known that the ingredients, qualities, and  
15 characteristics of the Contaminated Dog Foods were not as advertised or suitable for their intended  
16 use, consumption by dogs, and was otherwise not as warranted and represented by Defendant.  
17 Specifically, Defendant knew or should have known that: (1) certain of the Contaminated Dog  
18 Foods were adulterated with pentobarbital; (2) the Contaminated Dog Foods were not, among  
19 other things, safe, healthy, quality, and providing “100 percent complete and balanced nutrition”;  
20 and (3) the Contaminated Dog Foods were otherwise not as warranted and represented by  
21 Defendant.

22 449. Defendant knew or should have known that its false, misleading, partial disclosures,  
23 and/or deceptive information regarding the true nature, quality, and ingredients of the  
24 Contaminated Dog Foods would induce Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass to purchase  
25 the Contaminated Dog Foods and incur loss and/or injury.

26 450. Defendant was negligent in communicating the false information, and therefore  
27 failed to exercise reasonable care or competence.  
28

1 451. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass reasonably placed their trust and  
2 justifiable reliance in Defendant's representations that the Contaminated Dog Foods are healthy,  
3 safe, pure, quality, and that they were not adulterated with substances such as pentobarbital. Given  
4 the deceptive manner in which Defendant advertised, represented, and otherwise promoted the  
5 Contaminated Dog Foods, Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass's reliance on Defendant's  
6 misrepresentations was justifiable when making their purchases.

7 452. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Collins and the members of the  
8 Maryland Subclass have suffered damages in that they purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that  
9 were not what Defendant represented and that they would not have purchased at all had they known  
10 of the presence of pentobarbital.

11 453. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and  
12 declaratory relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief available.

13 **COUNT XXXIV**

14 **(Breach of Express Warranty, Md. Code Com. Law § 2-313,**  
15 **against Defendant on Behalf of the Maryland Subclass)**

16 454. Plaintiff Collins incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
17 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

18 455. Defendant marketed and sold its Contaminated Dog Foods into the stream of  
19 commerce with the intent that the Contaminated Dog Foods would be purchased by Plaintiff  
20 Collins and the Maryland Subclass.

21 456. As set forth herein, Defendant made express representations to Plaintiff Collins and  
22 the Maryland Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, safe for  
23 consumption, and provide 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

24 457. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland  
25 Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods meet all applicable regulations, including that they are  
26 not adulterated dog food, by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the United States.

27

28

1           458. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus  
2 constituted express warranties.

3           459. There was a sale of goods, the Contaminated Dog Foods, from Defendant to  
4 Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass members.

5           460. On the basis of these express warranties, Defendant sold the Contaminated Dog  
6 Foods to Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass.

7           461. Defendant knowingly breached the express warranties by selling Contaminated  
8 Dog Foods that were adulterated and contained pentobarbital.

9           462. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
10 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a source of protein or meat by-product in the  
11 Contaminated Dog Foods.

12           463. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass relied on Defendant's express  
13 warranties regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods in deciding whether to purchase Defendant's  
14 products.

15           464. Privity exists because Defendant expressly warranted to Plaintiff Collins and the  
16 Maryland Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, safe for  
17 consumption, unadulterated, and provided 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

18           465. Defendant's express warranties extend to Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland  
19 Subclass, who are users of the Contaminated Dog Foods and/or persons affected thereby and it is  
20 reasonable to expect that they may use and/or be affected by the Contaminated Dog Foods and be  
21 injured by the breach of the warranty.

22           466. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Collins and the  
23 Maryland Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for Contaminated Dog Foods that were  
24 not what Defendant represented and were sold in violation of applicable regulations and laws.

25           467. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and  
26 declaratory relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief available thereunder  
27 for Defendant's failure to deliver goods conforming to their express warranties and resulting  
28 breach.

**COUNT XXXV**

**(Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability, Md. Code Ann. Com. Law § 2-314,  
Against Defendant on Behalf of the Maryland Subclass)**

1  
2  
3  
4 468. Plaintiff Collins incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
5 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

6 469. Defendant is a merchant engaging in the sale of goods to Plaintiff Collins and the  
7 Maryland Subclass.

8 470. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Collins and members of the  
9 Maryland Subclass.

10 471. The purchased product was unfit for its ordinary purpose. At all times mentioned  
11 herein, Defendant manufactured or supplied the Contaminated Dog Foods, and prior to the time  
12 the Contaminated Dog Foods were purchased by Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass,  
13 Defendant impliedly warranted to them that the Contaminated Dog Foods were of merchantable  
14 quality, fit for their ordinary purpose (consumption by dogs), and conformed to the promises and  
15 affirmations made by Defendant regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods, including that the food  
16 was pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption, made of wholesome ingredients, and were  
17 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

18 472. Defendant marketed its Contaminated Dog Foods with the intent, knowledge, and  
19 reasonable expectation that Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass would justifiably rely on  
20 its representations and affirmations regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods.

21 473. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass justifiably relied on Defendant's  
22 representations and affirmations with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods' quality, ingredients,  
23 and fitness for consumption when deciding what dog food to purchase.

24 474. Because the Contaminated Dog Foods contain pentobarbital, they were not fit for  
25 their ordinary purpose, consumption by dogs, and did not conform to the Defendant's  
26 representations and affirmations of fact when Plaintiff Collins and the members of the Maryland  
27 Subclass purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

1 475. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
2 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
3 Contaminated Dog Foods.

4 476. Privity exists because Defendant expressly warranted to Plaintiff Collins and the  
5 Maryland Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, safe for  
6 consumption, unadulterated, and provided 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

7 477. Defendant's implied warranties extend to Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland  
8 Subclass, who are users of the Contaminated Dog Foods and/or persons affected thereby and it is  
9 reasonable to expect that they may use and/or be affected by the Contaminated Dog Foods and be  
10 injured by the breach of the warranty.

11 478. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Collins and the  
12 Maryland Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for Contaminated Dog Foods that were  
13 not what Defendant represented and were sold in violation of applicable regulations and laws.

14 479. Plaintiff Collins and the Maryland Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and  
15 declaratory relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief available thereunder  
16 for Defendant's failure to deliver goods conforming to its implied warranties and resulting breach.

17 **COUNT XXXVI**

18 **(Violations of Washington's Unfair Business Practices and Consumer Protection Act,**  
19 **Wash. Rev. Code §§ 19.86.010, *et seq.*, against Defendant on Behalf of the**  
20 **Washington Subclass)**

21 480. Plaintiff Mayo incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
22 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

23 481. This is an action for relief under the Washington Unfair Business Practices and  
24 Consumer Protection Act, Wash. Rev. Code §§ 19.86.010, *et seq.* ("WCPA").

25 482. Defendant, Plaintiff Mayo and each Washington Subclass member are each a  
26 "person," as that term is defined in section 19.86.010(1) of the Revised Code of Washington.

27 483. Defendant engaged in "trade" or "commerce" under Washington Code section §  
28 19.86.010(2)



1           490. As alleged more fully herein, at the time Defendant sold the Contaminated Dog  
2 Foods to Plaintiff Mayo and Washington Subclass Members, it knew it was adulterated with  
3 pentobarbital.

4           491. At all times relevant herein, Defendant made misrepresentations of material fact to  
5 Plaintiff Mayo and Washington Subclass Members as a means of concealing the true nature and  
6 quality of the Contaminated Dog Foods, claiming it was pure, nutritious, healthy, and pure quality  
7 with no disclosure that the Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated and contain pentobarbital.

8           492. Defendant falsely represented to and/or concealed material facts from Plaintiff  
9 Mayo and Washington Subclass Members, including, but not limited to:

- 10                   (a) the true nature and quality of the Contaminated Dog Foods;  
11                   (b) the inclusion of pentobarbital in the Contaminated Dog Foods; and  
12                   (c) that the Contaminated Dog Foods were not lawfully sold as labelled and  
13 packaged as they were adulterated.

14           493. Defendant had a duty to disclose these facts, regardless of the existence of privity,  
15 by virtue of (a) Defendant's exclusive knowledge as to the true nature and ingredients of the  
16 Contaminated Dog Foods; (b) Defendant's awareness that Plaintiff Mayo and members of the  
17 proposed Washington Subclass were not reasonably likely to discover these facts; (c) Defendant's  
18 active concealment of those facts from Plaintiff Mayo and the proposed Washington Subclass (by,  
19 among other things, making the false representations described above); and (d) Defendant's  
20 statutory and common-law obligations to disclose material information to the consumers as alleged  
21 herein.

22           494. Plaintiff Mayo and members of the Washington Subclass would have acted  
23 differently had Defendant disclosed this information to them and allowed them to make a fully-  
24 informed decision before they purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

25           495. These false representations were material to Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington  
26 Subclass.

27           496. Defendant intentionally and knowingly made these misrepresentations to induce  
28 Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass to purchase its Contaminated Dog Foods.



1 nature, quality, and ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods that were purchased by Plaintiff  
2 Mayo and the Washington Subclass.

3 505. Defendant knew or should have known that the ingredients, qualities, and  
4 characteristics of the Contaminated Dog Foods were not as advertised or suitable for their intended  
5 use, consumption by dogs, and was otherwise not as warranted and represented by Defendant.  
6 Specifically, Defendant knew or should have known that: (i) certain of the Contaminated Dog  
7 Foods were adulterated with pentobarbital; (ii) the Contaminated Dog Foods were not, among  
8 other things, safe, healthy, quality, and providing “100 percent complete and balanced nutrition”;  
9 and (iii) the Contaminated Dog Foods were otherwise not as warranted and represented by  
10 Defendant.

11 506. Defendant knew or should have known that its false, misleading, partial disclosures,  
12 and/or deceptive information regarding the true nature, quality, and ingredients of the  
13 Contaminated Dog Foods would induce Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass to purchase  
14 the Contaminated Dog Foods.

15 507. Defendant was negligent in communicating the false information, and therefore  
16 failed to exercise reasonable care or competence.

17 508. Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass reasonably placed their trust and  
18 justifiable reliance in Defendant’s representations that the Contaminated Dog Foods are healthy,  
19 safe, pure, quality, and that they were not adulterated with substances such as pentobarbital. Given  
20 the deceptive manner in which Defendant advertised, represented, and otherwise promoted the  
21 Contaminated Dog Foods, Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass’s reliance on Defendant’s  
22 misrepresentations was justifiable.

23 509. As a result of Defendant’s conduct, Plaintiff Mayo and the members of the  
24 Washington Subclass have suffered damages in that they purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that  
25 were not what Defendant represented and that they would not have purchased at all had they known  
26 of the presence of pentobarbital.

27 510. Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and  
28 declaratory relief, attorneys’ fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief available.

**COUNT XXXIX**

**(Breach of Express Warranty, Wash. Rev. Code § 62A.2-313,  
Against Defendant on Behalf of the Washington Subclass)**

1  
2  
3  
4 511. Plaintiff Mayo incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
5 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

6 512. Defendant marketed and sold its Contaminated Dog Foods into the stream of  
7 commerce with the intent that the Contaminated Dog Foods would be purchased by Plaintiff Mayo  
8 and the Washington Subclass.

9 513. As set forth herein, Defendant made express representations to Plaintiff Mayo and  
10 the Washington Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, safe for  
11 consumption, and provide 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

12 514. Defendant also made express representations to Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington  
13 Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods meet all applicable regulations, including that they are  
14 not adulterated dog food, by allowing their sale in various stores throughout the United States.

15 515. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus  
16 constituted express warranties.

17 516. There was a sale of goods, the Contaminated Dog Foods, from Defendant to  
18 Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass members.

19 517. On the basis of these express warranties, Defendant sold the Contaminated Dog  
20 Foods to Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass.

21 518. Defendant knowingly breached the express warranties by selling Contaminated  
22 Dog Foods that were adulterated and contained pentobarbital.

23 519. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
24 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a source of protein or meat by-product in the  
25 Contaminated Dog Foods.

26 520. Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass relied on Defendant's express  
27 warranties regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods in deciding whether to purchase Defendant's  
28 products.

1 521. Privity exists because Defendant fraudulently and/or deceitfully expressly  
2 warranted to Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods were  
3 pure, quality, healthy, safe for consumption, unadulterated, and provided 100 percent complete  
4 and balanced nutrition.

5 522. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Mayo and the  
6 Washington Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for Contaminated Dog Foods that  
7 were not what Defendant represented and were sold in violation of applicable regulations and laws.

8 523. Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and  
9 declaratory relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief available thereunder  
10 for Defendant's failure to deliver goods conforming to their express warranties and resulting  
11 breach.

12 **COUNT XL**

13 **(Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability, Wash. Rev. Code § 62A.2-314,**  
14 **Against Defendant on Behalf of the Washington Subclass)**

15 524. Plaintiff Mayo incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
16 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

17 525. Defendant is a merchant engaging in the sale of goods to Plaintiff Mayo and the  
18 Washington Subclass.

19 526. There was a sale of goods from Defendant to Plaintiff Mayo and members of the  
20 Washington Subclass.

21 527. The purchased product was unfit for its ordinary purpose. At all times mentioned  
22 herein, Defendant manufactured or supplied the Contaminated Dog Foods, and prior to the time  
23 the Contaminated Dog Foods were purchased by Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass,  
24 Defendant impliedly warranted to them that the Contaminated Dog Foods were of merchantable  
25 quality, fit for their ordinary purpose (consumption by dogs), and conformed to the promises and  
26 affirmations made by Defendant regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods, including that the food  
27 was pure, quality, healthy, and safe for consumption, made of wholesome ingredients, and were  
28 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition.

1           528. Defendant marketed its Contaminated Dog Foods with the intent and reasonable  
2 expectation that Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass would justifiably rely on its  
3 representations and affirmations regarding the Contaminated Dog Foods.

4           529. Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass justifiably relied on Defendant's  
5 representations and affirmations with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods' quality, ingredients,  
6 and fitness for consumption when deciding what dog food to purchase.

7           530. Because the Contaminated Dog Foods contain pentobarbital, they were not fit for  
8 their ordinary purpose, consumption by dogs, and did not conform to the Defendant's  
9 representations and affirmations of fact when Plaintiff Mayo and the members of the Washington  
10 Subclass purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods.

11           531. Defendant was on notice of this breach as it was aware of the presence of  
12 pentobarbital and/or the use of euthanized animals as a protein or meat by-product source in the  
13 Contaminated Dog Foods.

14           532. Privity exists because Defendant fraudulently and/or deceitfully expressly  
15 warranted to Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass that the Contaminated Dog Foods were  
16 pure, quality, healthy, safe for consumption, unadulterated, and provided 100 percent complete  
17 and balanced nutrition.

18           533. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Mayo and the  
19 Washington Subclass sustained damages as they paid money for Contaminated Dog Foods that  
20 were not what Defendant represented and were sold in violation of applicable regulations and laws.

21           534. Plaintiff Mayo and the Washington Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and  
22 declaratory relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief available thereunder  
23 for Defendant's failure to deliver goods conforming to its implied warranties and resulting breach.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT XLI**

**Violation of the Minnesota Commercial Feed Law Minn. Stat. § 25.31, *et seq.* Against Defendant on Behalf of the Minnesota Subclass**

535. Plaintiff Jilek incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

536. The Contaminated Dog Foods manufactured, distributed, marketed, and sold by Defendants are “commercial feed” within the meaning of the Minnesota Commercial Feed Law (MCFL).

537. The Contaminated Dog Foods are “misbranded”, within the meaning of the MCFL, because it is, as described above, false, misleading, and deceptive with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods’ ingredients, composition, and suitability.

538. The Contaminated Dogs Foods are “adulterated”, within the meaning of the MCFL, because:

(a) They contain poisonous and deleterious substances rendering them injurious to the health of pets; and

(b) Their composition and quality fall below and differ from that which their labels purport and represent to process.

539. Defendant’s manufacture and distribution of these adulterated and misbranded Contaminated Dog Foods are prohibited by and violations of the MCFL.

540. As a result of Defendant’s conduct, Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass have suffered actual damages in that they have purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that are worth less than the price they paid and that they would not have purchased at all had they known of the presence of pentobarbital. There is an association between Defendant’s acts and omissions as alleged herein and the damages suffered by Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass.

541. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s violations of the MCFL, Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass have suffered actual damages in that they paid money for Contaminated Dog Foods that were not what Defendant represented, and that harm will continue

1 unless Defendant is enjoined from manufacturing, distributing, marketing and selling the  
2 misbranded and adulterated Contaminated Dog Foods described herein.

3 542. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 8.31, subd. 3a, Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass  
4 seek actual damages, equitable relief, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief  
5 available thereunder for Defendant's violations of the MCFL.

6 **COUNT XLII**

7 **Violation of Minnesota Unlawful Trade Practices Act Minn. Stat. § 325D.13, et seq. Against**  
8 **Defendant on behalf of the Minnesota Subclass**

9 543. Plaintiff Jilek incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
10 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

11 544. Defendant is a "person" within the meaning of the Minnesota Unlawful Trade  
12 Practices Act (MUTPA).

13 545. Defendant violated the MUTPA by knowingly misrepresenting the true quality and  
14 ingredients of the Contaminated Dog Foods. Specifically, Defendant represented that its  
15 Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, safe, made of wholesome ingredients, and  
16 were 100 percent balanced nutrition, which is false and misleading because the Contaminated Dog  
17 Foods are adulterated and contain pentobarbital.

18 546. Defendant knew or should have known that the Contaminated Dog Foods did not  
19 have the quality and ingredients described above because they contain pentobarbital.

20 547. Defendant's misrepresentations, concealment, omissions, and other deceptive  
21 conduct were likely to deceive or cause misunderstanding and did in fact deceive Plaintiff Jilek  
22 and the Minnesota Subclass with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods' quality, ingredients, and  
23 suitability for consumption by dogs.

24 548. Defendant intended that Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass would rely on  
25 Defendant's misrepresentations, concealment, warranties, deceptions, and/or omissions regarding  
26 the Contaminated Dog Foods' quality, ingredients, and suitability for consumption by dogs.  
27

28



**COUNT XLIII**

**Violation of Minnesota Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act  
Minn. Stat. § 325D.43, et seq. Against Defendant on behalf of the Minnesota Subclass**

1  
2  
3  
4 555. Plaintiff Jilek incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
5 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

6 556. Defendant is a “person” within the meaning of the Minnesota Uniform Deceptive  
7 Trade Practices Act (MUDTPA).

8 557. Defendant willingly engaged in deceptive trade practices, in violation of the  
9 MUDTPA, by representing that its Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, safe,  
10 made of wholesome ingredients, and were 100 percent balanced nutrition, which is deceptive  
11 because the Contaminated Dog Foods are adulterated and contain pentobarbital.

12 558. Defendant knew or should have known that the Contaminated Dog Foods did not  
13 have the ingredients, uses, and benefits described herein because they contain pentobarbital.

14 559. Defendant knew or should have known that the Contaminated Dog Foods were not  
15 of a superior standard, quality, or grade because they contain pentobarbital, which a reasonable  
16 consumer would consider material.

17 560. Defendant’s misrepresentations, concealment, omissions, and other deceptive  
18 conduct were likely to deceive or cause misunderstanding and did in fact deceive Plaintiff Jilek  
19 and the Minnesota Subclass with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods’ ingredients, uses,  
20 benefits, standards, quality, grade, and suitability for consumption by dogs.

21 561. Defendant intended that Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass would rely on  
22 Defendant’s misrepresentations, concealment, warranties, deceptions, and/or omissions regarding  
23 the Contaminated Dog Foods’ ingredients, uses, benefits, standards, quality, grade, and suitability  
24 for consumption by dogs.

25 562. Defendant’s conduct and omissions described herein occurred repeatedly in  
26 Defendant’s trade or business and were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the consuming  
27 public.

28



1           569. Plaintiff Jilek purchased “goods”, specifically the Contaminated Dog Foods  
2 discussed herein, is a “person” within the meaning of the False Statement in Advertising Act  
3 (FSAA).

4           570. Plaintiff Jilek purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods through advertising that  
5 contained numerous material assertions representations, and statements of fact made, published,  
6 disseminated, circulated, and placed before the public by Defendant that were untrue, deceptive,  
7 and misleading.

8           571. By engaging in the conduct herein, Defendant violated and continue to violate  
9 Minn. Stat. § 325F.67.

10           572. Defendant’s misrepresentations, knowing omissions, and use of other sharp  
11 business practices include, by way of example, representations that the Contaminated Dog Foods  
12 are pure, quality, healthy, safe, made of wholesome ingredients, and were 100 percent balanced  
13 nutrition.

14           573. Defendant, including its agents and distributors, also made untrue, deceptive, and  
15 misleading assertions and representations about the Contaminated Dog Foods by making and  
16 repeating the various statements about the alleged quality, characteristics, and capabilities of the  
17 Contaminated Dog Foods referenced herein.

18           574. As a result of Defendant’s conduct, Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass have  
19 suffered actual damages in that they have purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that is worth less  
20 than the price they paid and that they would not have purchased at all had they known of the  
21 presence of pentobarbital. There is an association between Defendant’s acts and omissions as  
22 alleged herein and the damages suffered by Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass.

23           575. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s violations of the FSAA, Plaintiff  
24 Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass have been injured, and that harm is likely to continue unless  
25 Defendant is enjoined from misrepresenting the ingredients, uses, benefits, standards, quality,  
26 grade, and suitability for consumption by dogs of their Contaminated Dog Foods described herein.

27  
28

1 576. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 8.31, subd. 3a, and § 325F.67, Plaintiff Jilek and the  
2 Minnesota Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorneys’ fees, costs,  
3 and any other just and proper relief available thereunder for Defendant’s violations of the FSAA.

4 **COUNT XLV**

5 **Violation of Minnesota Prevention of Consumer Fraud Act Minn. Stat. § 325F.68, *et***  
6 ***seq.* Against Defendant on Behalf of the Minnesota Class**

7 577. Plaintiff Jilek incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
8 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

9 578. Plaintiff Jilek is a resident of the State of Minnesota.

10 579. Defendant is a “person” within the meaning of the Minnesota Prevention of  
11 Consumer Fraud Act (MPCFA).

12 580. Defendant’s advertisements and representations with respect to the Contaminated  
13 Dog Foods were made in connection with the sale of the Contaminated Dog Foods to Plaintiff  
14 Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass.

15 581. Defendant knowingly acted, used, and employed fraud, false pretenses, false  
16 promises, misrepresentations, misleading statements, and deceptive practices in connection with  
17 the sale of their Contaminated Dog Foods. Specifically, Defendant falsely represented that its  
18 Contaminated Dog Foods are pure, quality, healthy, safe, made of wholesome ingredients, and  
19 were 100 percent balanced nutrition.

20 582. Defendant intended for Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass to rely on and  
21 accept as true these advertisements and representations in deciding whether to purchase the  
22 Contaminated Dog Foods.

23 583. Defendant’s unfair or deceptive acts or practices were likely to deceive reasonable  
24 consumers about the Contaminated Dog Foods’ quality, ingredients, fitness for consumption and,  
25 by extension, the true value of the Contaminated Dog Foods. Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota  
26 Subclass relied on, and were in fact deceived by, Defendant’s advertisements and representations  
27

28

1 with respect to the Contaminated Dog Foods' quality, ingredients, and fitness for consumption in  
2 deciding to purchase them over competitors' dog foods.

3 584. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass have  
4 suffered actual damages in that they have purchased Contaminated Dog Foods that is worth less  
5 than the price they paid and that they would not have purchased at all had they known of the  
6 presence of pentobarbital. There is an association between Defendant's acts and omissions as  
7 alleged herein and the damages suffered by Plaintiff Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass.

8 585. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violations of the MPCFA, Plaintiff  
9 Jilek and the Minnesota Subclass have been injured, and that harm is likely to continue unless  
10 Defendant is enjoined from misrepresenting the quality, ingredients, and fitness for consumption  
11 of their Contaminated Dog Foods described herein.

12 586. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 8.31, subd. 3a, and § 325F.67, Plaintiff Jilek and the  
13 Minnesota Subclass seek actual damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorneys' fees, costs,  
14 and any other just and proper relief available thereunder for Defendant's violations of the MPCFA.

15 **COUNT XLVI**

16 **Violations of New York's Deceptive Acts and Practices, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349,**  
17 **Against Defendant on Behalf of the New York Subclass**

18 587. Plaintiff Schirripa incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
19 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

20 588. New York General Business Law § 349 prohibits deceptive acts or practices in the  
21 conduct of any business, trade, or commerce.

22 589. In its sale of goods throughout New York, Defendant conducts business and trade  
23 within the meaning and intendment of New York General Business Law § 349.

24 590. Plaintiff Schirripa and members of the New York Subclass are consumers who  
25 purchased products from Defendant.

26 591. Defendant violated N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349 by representing that its  
27 Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy, safe, made of wholesome ingredients, and  
28

1 100 percent balanced nutrition, which was deceptive because the Contaminated Dog Foods were  
2 adulterated and contained pentobarbital.

3 592. Defendant intentionally represented that the Contaminated Dog Foods were of a  
4 particular standard, grade, or quality when they were in fact adulterated and not fit for  
5 consumption.

6 593. The facts that Defendant concealed or misrepresented were material in that Plaintiff  
7 Schirripa and any reasonable consumer would have considered them when deciding whether to  
8 purchase the Contaminated Dog Foods.

9 594. Defendant's conduct and omissions described herein repeatedly occurred in the  
10 course of Defendant's business and were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the  
11 consuming public.

12 595. Defendant has engaged and continues to engage in deceptive conduct in violation  
13 of the New York General Business Law.

14 596. Defendant's misrepresentations and deceptive acts or practices resulted in Plaintiff  
15 Schirripa and the New York Subclass suffering actual damages when they purchased  
16 Contaminated Dog Foods that were worth less than the price paid and that they would not have  
17 purchased at all had they known of the presence of pentobarbital.

18 597. Defendant intended for Plaintiff Schirripa and the members of the New York  
19 Subclass to rely on its deceptive misrepresentations and conduct when purchasing its  
20 Contaminated Dog Foods.

21 598. As a direct and proximate result of these violations, Plaintiff Schirripa and the New  
22 York Subclass have been harmed, and that harm will continue unless Defendant is enjoined from  
23 misrepresenting the quality and ingredients of its Contaminated Dog Foods described herein.

24 599. Pursuant to N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349(h), Plaintiff Schirripa and the New York  
25 Subclass seek injunctive and declaratory relief, actual and punitive damages, and attorneys' fees.

26

27

28

**COUNT XLVII**

**Violations of New York False Advertising Law, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350, Against Defendant on Behalf of the New York Subclass**

1  
2  
3  
4 600. Plaintiff Schirripa incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation  
5 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

6 601. New York General Business Law § 350 prohibits false advertising in the conduct  
7 of any business, trade, or commerce.

8 602. Pursuant to N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350, false advertising is defined as “advertising,  
9 including labeling, or a commodity... if such advertising is misleading in a material respect.”

10 603. Defendant’s claims that its Contaminated Dog Foods were healthy and safe for  
11 consumption were literally false and likely to deceive the public.

12 604. Defendant’s claims that its Contaminated Dog Foods were pure, quality, healthy,  
13 safe for consumption, and 100 percent complete and balanced nutrition were untrue or misleading  
14 because such claims failed to disclose that the Contaminated Dog Foods were adulterated with  
15 pentobarbital.

16 605. Defendant knew or should have known that such claims were false or misleading.

17 606. Such false and misleading claims and representations made by Defendant were  
18 material in that Plaintiff Schirripa and any reasonable consumer would have considered them when  
19 deciding whether to purchase the Contaminated Dog Foods.

20 607. Defendant, including its agents and distributors, made untrue, deceptive, and  
21 misleading assertions and representations about the alleged quality, characteristics, and nature of  
22 the Contaminated Dog Foods.

23 608. Defendant’s conduct caused Plaintiff Schirripa and the New York Subclass to suffer  
24 actual damages when they purchased the Contaminated Dog Foods that were worth less than the  
25 price paid and that they would not have purchased at all had they known of the presence of  
26 pentobarbital.

27 609. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s violation of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §  
28 350, Plaintiff Schirripa and the members of the New York Subclass have been injured, and that

1 harm will continue unless Defendant is enjoined from misrepresenting the quality, ingredients,  
2 standards, and suitability for consumption by dogs of its Contaminated Dog Foods.

3 610. Pursuant to N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350, *et seq.*, Plaintiff Schirripa and the members  
4 of the New York Subclass seek injunctive and declaratory relief, actual and punitive damages, and  
5 attorneys' fees.

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, pray  
8 for judgment against the Defendant as to each and every count, including:

9 A. An order declaring this action to be a proper Class action, appointing Plaintiffs and  
10 their counsel to represent the Classes, and requiring Defendant to bear the costs of Class notice;

11 B. An order enjoining Defendant from selling the Contaminated Dog Foods until  
12 pentobarbital is removed;

13 C. An order enjoining Defendant from selling the Contaminated Dog Foods in any  
14 manner;

15 D. An order requiring Defendant to engage in a corrective advertising campaign and  
16 engage in any further necessary affirmative corrective action, such as recalling existing products;

17 E. An order awarding declaratory relief, and any further retrospective or prospective  
18 injunctive relief permitted by law or equity, including enjoining Defendant from continuing the  
19 unlawful practices alleged herein, and injunctive relief to remedy Defendant's past conduct;

20 F. An order requiring Defendant to pay restitution to restore all funds acquired by  
21 means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be an unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business  
22 act or practice, untrue or misleading advertising, or a violation of California's Unfair Competition  
23 Law, FAL, CLRA, or any state law violation alleged herein, plus pre- and post-judgment interest  
24 thereon;

25 G. An order requiring Defendant to disgorge or return all monies, revenues, and profits  
26 obtained by means of any wrongful or unlawful act or practice;

27 H. An order requiring Defendant to pay all actual and statutory damages permitted  
28 under the counts alleged herein;

- 1 I. An order requiring Defendant to pay punitive damages on any count so allowable;  
2 J. An order awarding attorneys' fees and costs to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the  
3 Subclasses; and  
4 K. An order providing for all other such equitable relief as may be just and proper.

5 **JURY DEMAND**

6 Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

7 Dated: June 13, 2018

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.  
ROBERT K. SHELQUIST  
REBECCA A. PETERSON (241858)

8  
9  
10 */s Rebecca Peterson*  
REBECCA A. PETERSON

11 100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200  
12 Minneapolis, MN 55401  
13 Telephone: (612) 339-6900  
14 Facsimile: (612) 339-0981  
E-mail: rkshelquist@locklaw.com  
rapeterson@locklaw.com

15 Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

ROBBINS ARROYO LLP  
KEVIN A. SEELY (199982)  
STEVEN M. MCKANY (271405)  
600 B Street, Suite 1900  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 525-3990  
Facsimile: (619) 525-3991  
E-mail: kseely@robbinsarroyo.com  
smckany@robbinsarroyo.com

GUSTAFSON GLUEK, PLLC  
DANIEL E. GUSTAFSON  
KARLA M. GLUEK  
JOSEPH C. BOURNE (308196)  
RAINA C. BORRELLI  
Canadian Pacific Plaza  
120 South 6th Street, Suite 2600  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 333-8844  
Facsimile: (612) 339-6622  
E-mail: dgustafson@gustafsongluek.com  
kgluek@gustafsongluek.com  
jbourne@gustafsongluek.com  
rborrelli@gustafsongluek.com

CUNEO GILBERT & LADUCA, LLP  
CHARLES LADUCA  
KATHERINE VAN DYCK  
4725 Wisconsin Ave NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20016  
Telephone: 202-789-3960  
Facsimile: 202-789-1813  
E-mail: kvandyck@cuneolaw.com  
charles@cuneolaw.com

LITE DEPALMA GREENBERG, LLC  
JOSEPH DEPALMA  
SUSANA CRUZ HODGE  
570 Broad Street, Suite 1201  
Newark, NJ 07102  
Telephone: (973) 623-3000  
E-mail: jdepalma@litedepalma.com  
scrzhodge@litedepalma.com

Plaintiffs' Executive Committee

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

NAPOLI SHKOLNIK PLLC  
PAUL B. MASLO  
SALVATORE C. BADALA  
360 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
Telephone: (212) 397-1000  
E-mail: [pmaslo@napolilaw.com](mailto:pmaslo@napolilaw.com)  
[sbadala@napolilaw.com](mailto:sbadala@napolilaw.com)

ANDREWS & THORNTON  
Anne Andrews  
4701 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 300  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Telephone: (949) 748-1000  
E-mail: [aa@andrewsthornton.com](mailto:aa@andrewsthornton.com)

Counsel for Plaintiff Schirripa