## IN RE MENU FOODS PET FOOD LITIGATION

## **SERVICE LIST "B"**

CASE	CLERK
Whaley v. Menu Foods, et al.	USDC, Western District of Washington
Case No.: 2:07-cv-00411-RSM	U.S. Courthouse
USDC, Western District of Washington	700 Stewart Street
	Seattle, WA 98101
Holt v. Menu Foods, Inc.	USDC, Eastern District of Tennessee
Case No.: 3:07-cv-00094	Howard H. Baker Jr. U.S. Courthouse
USDC, Eastern District of Tennessee	800 Market Street, Suite 130
	Knoxville, TN 37902
	Trans a vivil a la company
Majerczyk v. Menu Foods, Inc	USDC, Northern District of Illinois
Case No.: 1:07-cv-01543	Everett McKinley Dirksen Building
USDC, Northern District of Illinois	219 South Dearborn Street
	Chicago, IL 60604
Simo y Many Foods Income Fund et al	LISDC Western District of Arlenges
Sims v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et al. Case No.: 5:07-cv-05053-JLH	USDC, Western District of Arkansas John Paul Hammerschmidt Federal Building
USDC, Western District of Arkansas	35 East Mountain Street, Suite 510
USDC, Western District of Arkansas	Fayetteville, AR 72701-5354
	rayettevine, AR 72701-3334
Widen v. Menu Foods, et al.	USDC, Western District of Arkansas
Case No.: 5:07-cv-05055-RTD	John Paul Hammerschmidt Federal Building
USDC, Western District of Arkansas	35 East Mountain Street, Suite 510
	Fayetteville, AR 72701-5354
Workman, et al. v. Menu Foods Limited, et al.	USDC, District of New Jersey
Case No.: 1:07-cv-01338-NLH-AMD	Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse
USDC, District of New Jersey	4th & Cooper Streets, Room 1050
	Camden, NJ 08101

G:\jdavidson\Menu Foods\Pleadings\CERT Service MDL Motion for Transfer.doc

# EXHIBIT A

Case 1:07-cv-00160-MHW

Document 6-5

Filed 04/19/2007

Page 3 of 32

	Jones			Muniber of Actions
CAS	D.J. Roger T. Benitez D.J. Napoleon A. Jones, Jr. D.J. Jeffrey T. Miller C.J. Robert H. Whaley (WAE)	MDL-1806 In re Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc., Overtime Pay Litigation (No. II) MDL-1296 In re Alliance Equipment Lease Program Securities Litigation MDL-1751 In re Jamster Marketing Litigation MDL-1405 In re California Wholesale Electricity Antitrust Litigation	10 5 5	10 27 5 30
00	D.J. Robert E. Blackburn D.J. Wiley Y. Daniel	<ul><li>MDL-1788 In re Qwest Communications International, Inc., Securities &amp; "ERISA"</li><li>Litigation (No. II)</li><li>MDL-1743 In re American Family Mutual Insurance Co. Overtime Pay Litigation</li></ul>	30	30
CT	Sr.J. Alfred V. Covello D.J. Alvin W. Thompson D.J. Stefan R. Underhill D.J. Stefan R. Underhill D.J. Stefan R. Underhill D.J. Stefan R. Underhill	MDL-1568 In re Parcel Tanker Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation MDL-1463 In re Xerox Corp. Securities Litigation MDL-1542 In re Ethylene Propylene Diene Monomer (EPDM) Antitrust Litigation MDL-1631 In re Publication Paper Antitrust Litigation MDL-1642 In re Polychloroprene Rubber (CR) Antitrust Litigation MDL-1649 In re Helicopter Crash Near Wendle Creek, British Columbia, on August 8, 2002	7 22 15 28 9	18 22 15 31 9
DC	D.J. John D. Bates C.J. Thomas F. Hogan C.J. Thomas F. Hogan C.J. Thomas F. Hogan D.J. Ellen Segal Huvelle D.J. Name Withheld D.J. Richard J. Leon D.J. Richard J. Leon D.J. Ricardo M. Urbina	MDL-1772 In re Series 7 Broker Qualification Exam Scoring Litigation MDL-1285 In re Vitamin Antitrust Litigation MDL-1290 In re Lorazepam & Clorazepate Antitrust Litigation MDL-1686 In re Iraq and Afghanistan Detainees Litigation MDL-1792 In re InPhonic, Inc., Wireless Phone Rebate Litigation MDL-1792 In re Nifedipine Antitrust Litigation MDL-1515 In re Nifedipine Antitrust Litigation MDL-1668 In re Federal National Mortgage Association Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation MDL-1796 In re Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Data Theft Litigation MDL-1798 In re Long-Distance Telephone Service Federal Excise Tax Refund Litigation	20 2 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	20 84 14 4 4 4 15 10 10 3 3
DE	D.J. Joseph J. Farnan, Jr. D.J. Gregory M. Sleet	MDL-1717 In re Intel Corp. Microprocessor Antitrust Litigation MDL-1660 In re PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc., Patent Litigation	74	74 6
FLM	D.J. Henry Lee Adams, Jr. D.J. Anne C. Conway D.J. James S. Moody, Jr. Sr.J. Harvey E. Schlesinger D.J. James D. Whittemore	MDL-1698 In re American General Life & Accident Insurance Co. Retiree Benefits  "ERISA" Litigation  MDL-1769 In re Seroquel Products Liability Litigation  MDL-1626 In re Accutane Products Liability Litigation  MDL-1624 In re GMAC Insurance Management Corp. Overtime Pay Litigation  MDL-1656 In re CP Ships Ltd. Securities Litigation	80 342 24 2 7	80 342 29 2

Case	; I.C	)7-C	v-uc	000	-MHVV	סט	cume	ווו ט-	.5	riied	1 04/19/	2007	Page 8	0 01 32	
Pater of Actions	123	13	3	22	11 322 10	7 %	5 15	356	10		5 75 3	11	3 42	819 35 3	68 30 7
	9	13	3	22	11 318 10	7 %	5 14	103	10	64	2 1 2	9	3 36	23 35 3	63 30 7
	MDL-1334 In re Managed Care Litigation	MDL-1804 In re Stand 'n Seal Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1677 In re NovaStar Home Mortgage Inc. Mortgage Lending Practices Litigation	MDL-1733 In re Teflon Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1425 In re Aimster Copyright Litigation MDL-1715 In re Ameriquest Mortgage Co. Mortgage Lending Practices Litigation MDL-1784 In re McDonald's French Fries Litigation	MDL-1536 In re Sulfuric Acid Antitrust Litigation MDL-1783 In re JP Morgan Chase & Co. Securities Litigation	In re In re	MDL-986 In re "Factor VIII or IX Concentrate Blood Products" Products Liability Litigation	In re In re	In re In re	MDL-1778 In re Ocean Financial Corp. Prescreening Litigation MDL-899 In re Mortgage Escrow Deposit Litigation MDL-1392 In re General Motors Corporation Vehicle Paint Litigation (No. III)	MDL-1562 In re General Motors Corp. Dex-Cool Products Liability Litigation MDL-1748 In re Profiler Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1767 In re H&R Block Mortgage Corp. Prescreening Litigation MDL-1700 In re FedEx Ground Package System, Inc., Employment Practices Litigation (No. II)	MDL-1373 In re Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc., Tires Products Liability Litigation MDL-1313 In re AT&T Corp. Fiber Optic Cable Installation Litigation MDL-1727 In re COBRA Tax Shelters Litigation	MDL-1468 In re Universal Service Fund Telephone Billing Practices Litigation MDL-1616 In re Urethane Antitrust Litigation MDL-1721 In re Cessna 208 Series Aircraft Products Liability Litigation
	D.J. Federico A. Moreno	D.J. Thomas W. Thrash, Jr.	C.J. William T. Moore, Jr.	Sr.J. Ronald E. Longstaff	Sr.J. Marvin E. Aspen Sr.J. Marvin E. Aspen D.J. Elaine E. Bucklo	D.J. David H. Coar D.J. David H. Coar	D.J. Mark R. Filip D.J. Robert W. Gettleman	Sr.J. John F. Grady	Sr.J. John F. Grady Sr.J. John F. Grady	Sr.J. George W. Lindberg D.J. Charles R. Norgle, Sr.	D.J. Amy J. St. Eve D.J. James B. Zagel D.J. James B. Zagel	C.J. G. Patrick Murphy C.J. G. Patrick Murphy	D.J. Rudy J. Lozano C.J. Robert L. Miller, Jr.	D.J. Sarah E. Barker D.J. David F. Hamilton D.J. John D. Tinder	C.J. John W. Lungstrum C.J. John W. Lungstrum D.J. Kathryn H. Vratil
	FLS	GAN	GAS	SVI								ILS	N	INS	KS

4	
Page	

H		THE VIEW CONTRACTOR CO		
LAE	D.J. Eldon E. Fallon D.J. Eldon E. Fallon D.J. Martin L.C. Feldman D.J. Martin L.C. Feldman D.J. Martin L.C. Feldman D.J. Sarah S. Vance	re Propulsid Products Liability Litigation re Vioxx Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation re Monumental Life Insurance Company Industrial Life Insurance Litigation re Life Insurance Co. of Georgia Industrial Life Insurance Litigation re Western & Southern Life Insurance Co. Industrial Life Insurance Litigation re Educational Testing Service PLT 7-12 Test Scoring Litigation	362 8,538 11 112 7 31	474 8,530 14 133 8
MD MD	D.J. Nancy Gertner D.J. Nancy Gertner Sr.J. Edward F. Harrington D.J. Patti B. Saris D.J. Patti B. Saris D.J. Patti B. Saris D.J. Richard G. Stearns D.J. Joseph L. Tauro D.J. Joseph L. Tauro D.J. Douglas P. Woodlock D.J. Douglas P. Woodlock D.J. Rya W. Zobel D.J. Rya W. Zobel D.J. Rya W. Zobel D.J. Rya W. Zobel D.J. Andre M. Davis D.J. Andre M. Davis D.J. Andre M. Davis D.J. J. Frederick Motz D.J. J. Frederick Motz D.J. J. Frederick Motz D.J. Andre M. Davis and D.J. Catherine C. Blake	MDL-1354 In re Citigroup, Inc., Capital Accumulation Plan Litigation MDL-1753 In re Standard Automotive Corp. Retiree Benefits "ERISA" Litigation MDL-1443 In re Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York Premium Litigation MDL-1456 In re Pharmaceutical Industry Average Wholesale Price Litigation MDL-1456 In re Pharmaceutical Industry Average Wholesale Price Litigation MDL-1629 In re Neurontin Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation MDL-1713 In re Bank of America A TM Fee Litigation MDL-1700 In re Volkswagen and Audi Warranty Extension Litigation MDL-1750 In re Webloyalty.com, Inc., Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation MDL-1743 In re Carbon Black Antitrust Litigation MDL-1743 In re Carbon Black Antitrust Litigation MDL-1741 In re Shell Oil Products Co. Dealer Franchise Litigation MDL-1461 In re Shell Oil Products Co. Dealer Franchise Litigation MDL-1451 In re Wireless Telephone Radio Frequency Emissions Products Liability Litigation MDL-1539 In re Royal Ahold N.V. Securities & "ERISA" Litigation MDL-1110 In re Second Chance Body Armor, Inc., Advertising Litigation MDL-11377 In re Allegheny Energy, Inc., Securities Litigation MDL-1387 In re Microsoft Corp. Windows Operating Systems Antitrust Litigation MDL-1387 In re Mutual Funds Investment Litigation	6 2 2 3 2 50 2 3 4 5 50 4 4 4 53 4 53 4 53 4 53 4 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	16 2 23 116 209 3 17 6 4 16 20 20 37 9 17 584 116 437
ME	D.J. D. Brock Hornby	MDL-1532 In re New Motor Vehicles Canadian Export Antitrust Litigation	30	31
MIE	C.J. Bernard A. Friedman D.J. Gerald E. Rosen D.J. Gerald E. Rosen	<ul> <li>MDL-1718 In re Ford Motor Co. Speed Control Deactivation Switch Products Liability</li> <li>Litigation</li> <li>MDL-1725 In re Delphi Corp. Securities, Derivative &amp; "ERISA" Litigation</li> <li>MDL-1749 In re General Motors Corp. Securities &amp; Derivative Litigation</li> </ul>	39 24 5	40 25 5

			717	Miniper 2
N N	D.J. Michael J. Davis D.J. Donovan W. Frank Sr.J. Paul A. Magnuson Sr.J. Paul A. Magnuson C.J. James M. Rosenbaum D.J. John R. Tunheim	MDL-1431 In re Baycol Products Liability Litigation MDL-1708 In re Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litigation MDL-1328 In re Monosodium Glutamate Antitrust Litigation MDL-1724 In re Viagra Products Liability Litigation MDL-1726 In re Medtronic, Inc., Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litigation MDL-1396 In re St. Jude Medical, Inc., Silzone Heart Valves Products Liability Litigation	1,392 1,200 1 65 966 30	9,044 1,212 14 70 966 57
MOE	D.J. Jean C. Hamilton Sr.J. Stephen N. Limbaugh D.J. Catherine D. Perry D.J. Rodney W. Sippel	MDL-1702 In re Air Crash Near Kirksville, Missouri, on October 19, 2004 MDL-1672 In re Express Scripts, Inc., Pharmacy Benefits Management Litigation MDL-1811 In re LLRice 601 Contamination Litigation MDL-1736 In re Celexa and Lexapro Products Liability Litigation	6 9 59 32	11 12 59 32
MOM	D.J. Richard E. Dorr	MDL-1786 In re H&R Block, Inc., Express IRA Marketing Litigation	21	21
NCE	Sr.J. W. Earl Britt	MDL-1132 In re Exterior Insulation Finish System (EIFS) Products Liability Litigation	-	109
NCM	C.J. James A. Beaty, Jr.	MDL-1622 In re Cotton Yarn Antitrust Litigation	6	6
NCW	C.J. Richard L. Voorhees	MDL-1516 In re Polyester Staple Antitrust Litigation	17	36
NH	D.J. Paul J. Barbadoro	MDL-1335 In re Tyco International, Ltd., Securities, Derivative and "ERISA" Litigation	13	101
Ž	Sr.J. Harold A. Ackerman C.J. Garrett E. Brown, Jr. C.J. Garrett E. Brown, Jr. D.J. Stanley R. Chesler D.J. Stanley R. Chesler Sr.J. Dickinson R. Debevoise D.J. Joseph A. Greenaway, Jr. Sr.J. John C. Lifland Sr.J. John C. Lifland D.J. Jose L. Linares D.J. Jose L. Linares D.J. William J. Martini D.J. Jerome B. Simandle Sr.J. William H. Walls D.J. Susan D. Wigenton	MDL-1687 In re Ford Motor Co. E-350 Van Products Liability Litigation (No. II)  MDL-1471 In re Compensation of Managerial, Professional and Technical Employees  Antitrust Litigation  MDL-1663 In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation  MDL-1658 In re Merck & Co., Inc., Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation  MDL-1777 In re SFBC International, Inc., Securities & Derivative Litigation  MDL-1377 In re Holocaust Era German Industry, Bank & Insurance Litigation  MDL-1384 In re Gapabentin Patent Litigation  MDL-1384 In re Human Tissue Products Antitrust Litigation  MDL-1730 In re Hypodermic Products Antitrust Litigation  MDL-1763 In re Electrical Carbon Products Antitrust Litigation  MDL-1750 In re Electrical Carbon Products Litigation  MDL-1550 In re IDT Corp. Calling Card Terms Litigation	5 4 41 2 1 1 15 22 7 7 136 1 3	5 4 42 35 35 14 17 22 8 136 25 18

Document 6-5

				Verification of the second of
NYS	Sr.J. Harold Baer, Jr.	In	4 <	۸ ۷
	D.J. Deborah A. Batts D.I. Richard A. Berman	MDL-1/14 In re Knodia S.A. Securines Lingation MDL-1628 In re Pineapple Antitrust Litigation	4 9	10
	D.J. Charles L. Brieant	In	12	37
	D.J. Charles L. Brieant	In	9	18
	D.J. Richard C. Casey	Į,	22	23
4.00	D.J. Denise Cote	l I	28	177
	D.J. Paul A. Crotty	MDL-1794 In re Novartis Wage and Hour Litigation	7 "	7 V
	D.J. George B. Dainers Sr I Kevin Thomas Duffy	<u> </u>	n m	. m
	Sr.J. Thomas P. Griesa	In	20	20
	Sr.J. Thomas P. Griesa	MDL-1644 In re Elevator and Escalator Antitrust Litigation	4	25
	D.J. Alvin K. Hellerstein	In	_	24
	D.J. Richard J. Holwell	In		
	D.J. Barbara S. Jones	In	9 ?	22
	D.J. Lewis A. Kaplan	In	166	1,865
	D.J. Lewis A. Kaplan	In	91	16
	Sr.J. John F. Keenan	In	22	176
	Sr.J. John F. Keenan	In	108	108
	Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram	In	7	13
	Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram	In	57	72
	Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram	In	7	7
	Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram	H.	2 ,	01
	D.J. Gerard E. Lynch	드,	ი <del>-</del>	68
	D.J. Gerard E. Lynch	II .	- i	ה ק
	Sr.J. Lawrence M. McKenna	In	1/	I ;
	D.J. Colleen McMahon	Ę	13 <u>-</u>	13
	D.J. Colleen McMahon	=	7	7
	Sr.J. Richard Owen	Ξ	30	30
	Sr.J. Richard Owen		24	24
	D.J. William H. Pauley III		S	34
	D.J. Loretta A. Preska	MDL-1659 In re Nortel Networks Corp. Securities Litigation	28	29
	D.J. Loretta A. Preska	MDL-1780 In re Digital Music Antitrust Littigation	30	30
	D.J. Jed S. Rakoff	MDL-1598 In re Ephedra Products Liability Litigation	C70	840

DISULT.				Vimber of Actions
NYS (cont.)	D.J. Jed S. Rakoff D.J. Shira Ann Scheindlin D.J. Shira Ann Scheindlin D.J. Shira Ann Scheindlin Sr.J. John E. Sprizzo Sr.J. John E. Sprizzo Sr.J. John E. Sprizzo D.J. Sidney H. Stein D.J. Sidney H. Stein Sr.J. Robert W. Sweet and Sr.J. John F. Keenan*	MDL-1740 In re Canon U.S.A., Inc., Digital Cameras Products Liability Litigation MDL-1358 In re Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether ("MTBE") Products Liability Litigation MDL-1428 In re Ski Train Fire in Kaprun, Austria, on November 11, 2000 MDL-1554 In re Initial Public Offering (IPO) Securities Litigation (No. II) MDL-1499 In re South African Apartheid Litigation MDL-1499 In re Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp. Securities & Derivative Litigation MDL-1603 In re OxyContin Antitrust Litigation (No. II) MDL-1604 In re Sierra Wireless, Inc., Securities Litigation MDL-1648 In re Air Crash at Belle Harbor, New York, on November 12, 2001	3 147 14 393 29 13 6 6 9 344	4 159 27 511 66 14 8 8 58 9
NHO	D.J. Peter C. Economus D.J. James S. Gwin Sr.J. David A. Katz D.J. Donald C. Nugent D.J. Kathleen McDonald O'Malley D.J. Kathleen McDonald O'Malley D.J. Kathleen McDonald O'Malley	MDL-1561 In re Travel Agent Commission Antitrust Litigation MDL-1481 In re Meridia Products Liability Litigation MDL-1742 In re Ortho Evra Products Liability Litigation MDL-1488 In re Ford Motor Co. Panther Platform/Fuel Tank Design Products Liability Litigation MDL-1401 In re Sulzer Orthopedics Inc. Hip Prosthesis and Knee Prosthesis Products Liability Litigation MDL-1490 In re Commercial Money Center, Inc., Equipment Lease Litigation MDL-1535 In re Welding Fume Products Liability Litigation	2 2 507 4 4 4 4 34 4,186	3 125 515 31 434 38 11,436
SHO	D.J. Gregory L. Frost Sr.J. James L. Graham D.J. Edmund A. Sargus, Jr.	MDL-1638 In re Foundry Resins Antitrust Litigation MDL-1565 In re National Century Financial Enterprises, Inc., Investment Litigation MDL-1315 In re SmarTalk TeleServices, Inc., Securities Litigation	14 21 21	19 22 21
OK W	D.J. Stephen P. Friot Sr.J. Robert E. Jones	MDL-1564 In re Farmers Insurance Co., Inc., FCRA Litigation  MDL-1439 In re Farmers Insurance Exchange Claims Representatives' Overtime Pay  Litigation	9	12

Case 1:07-cv-00160-MHW	Document 6-5	Filed 04/19/2007	Page 11 of 32
------------------------	--------------	------------------	---------------

- 13 - 2 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Futail Number of Actions
PAE	C.J. Harvey Bartle III	MDL-1203 In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine/Fenfluramine/Dexfenfluramine) Products Liability Litigation	2,626	20,006
	D.J. Ronald L. Buckwalter		-	3,085
	D.J. Ronald L. Buckwalter	MDL-1741 In re Isolagen, Inc., Securities & Derivative Litigation MDL-1682 In re Hydrogen Perovide Antitrust Litigation	5 -	33
	D.J. Legrome D. Davis	MDL-1684 In re Plastics Additives Antitrust Litigation (No. II)	6	6
	Sr.J. Jan E. DuBois		10	20
	Sr.J. John P. Fullam D.J. James T. Giles	MDL-1/82 In re Pnarmacy Benefit Managers Antitrust Litigation MDL-875 In re Asbestos Products Liability Litigation (No. VI)	35,378	111,259
	D.J. Bruce W. Kauffman	MDL-969 In re Unisys Corp. Retiree Medical Benefit "ERISA" Litigation	∞	14
	D.J. Mary A. McLaughlin	MDL-1/12 In re American Investors Life insurance Co. Annuity Marketing and Sales Practices Uitigation	CI	CI
	Sr.J. Louis H. Pollak	MDL-1817 In re CertainTeed Corp. Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litigation	6	6
	D.J. Timothy J. Savage	MDL-1675 In re ACE Limited Securities Litigation	4	4
	D.J. Timothy J. Savage	MDL-1768 In re Methyl Methacrylate (MMA) Antitrust Litigation MDL-1426 In re Automotive Refiniching Paint Antitrust Litigation	18	8 5
DANA	P. I. Therman I. Wondelin	MIN 1555 In a December Constitute I abolitated Autitated History	1 -	-
FAIN	U.J. Hibilias I. Valiaskie	IMDE-1990 III të ftëssure gënshiye Eadelshoer Allhuusi Ehugandii	1.1	11
PAW	C.J. Donetta W. Ambrose D.J. Gary L. Lancaster	MDL-1091 In re Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. Sales Practices Litigation MDL-1674 In re Community Bank of Northern Virginia Mortgage Lending Practices Litigation	9	148
sc	Sr.J. Solomon Blatt, Jr.	MDL-1595 In re Electrical Receptacle Products Liability Litigation	1 60	9
	D.J. Callicion Procowall Carrie	Independent of American Constant of According modern of the American Discussion Income Insurance Litigation	<del></del>	
	D.J. David C. Norton Sr.J. Matthew J. Perry, Jr.	MDL-1785 In re Bausch & Lomb Inc. Contact Lens Solution Products Liability Litigation MDL-865 In re Showa Denko K.K. L-Tryptophan Products Liability Litigation (No. II)	113 1	114 973
TNE	C.J. Curtis L. Collier	MDL-1552 In re UnumProvident Corp. Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation	23	28
MNT	C.J. Todd J. Campbell	MDL-1760 In re Aredia and Zometa Products Liability Litigation	209	210
			<b>)</b>	•
TNW	D.J. J. Daniel Breen	MDL-1551 In re Reciprocal of America (ROA) Sales Practices Litigation	13	13

			A	
TXE	D.J. Leonard E. Davis D.J. T. John Ward	MDL-1512 In re Electronic Data Systems Corp. Securities & "ERISA" Litigation MDL-1530 In re Fleming Companies Inc. Securities & Derivative Litigation	10	29 22
TXN	C.J. A. Joe Fish D.J. Sidney A. Fitzwater	MDL-1578 In re UICI "Association-Group" Insurance Litigation MDL-1214 In re Great Southern Life Insurance Company Sales Practices Litigation	15	28 25
TXS	D.J. Vanessa D. Gilmore D.J. Melinda Harmon D.J. Melinda Harmon D.J. Lynn N. Hughes D.J. Lynn Scraham Jack	MDL-1646 In re Testmasters Trademark Litigation MDL-1422 In re Waste Management, Inc., Securities Litigation MDL-1446 In re Enron Corp. Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation MDL-1609 In re Service Corporation International Securities Litigation MDL-1810 In re MERSCORP Inc., et al., Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (RESPA) Litigation	1 1 129 1 19	6 7 196 4 19
E	D.J. Dale A. Kimball	MDL-1546 In re Medical Waste Services Antitrust Litigation	1	8
VAE	D.J. Leonie M. Brinkema	MDL-1705 In re Xybernaut Corp. Securities Litigation	10	10
WAW	D.J. Barbara Jacobs Rothstein	MDL-1407 In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation	402	3,365
WVS	D.J. Joseph R. Goodwin	MDL-1477 In re Serzone Products Liability Litigation	16	177
WY	C.J. William F. Downes	MDL-1293 In re Natural Gas Royalties Qui Tam Litigation	75	83

LSS

## U.S. District Court Southern District of Florida (Ft. Lauderdale) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 0:07-cv-60428-JIC

Troiano v. Menu Foods, Inc. et al Assigned to: Judge James I. Cohn

Demand: \$5,000,000

Cause: 28:1332 Diversity-Property Damage

Date Filed: 03/26/2007 Jury Demand: Plaintiff

Nature of Suit: 385 Prop. Damage Prod.

Liability

Jurisdiction: Diversity

## **Plaintiff**

Christina Troiano

## represented by James Lee Davidson

Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP 120 East Palmetto Park Road Suite 500 Boca Raton, FL 33432 561-750-3000 Fax: 561-750-3364 Email: idavidson@lerachlaw.com

LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

ATTORNET TO BE NOTICED

## Lawrence M. Kopelman Kopelman & Blankman

350 E Las Olas Boulevard Suite 980 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301 954-462-6855 Fax: 462-6899 LEAD ATTORNEY ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

## Paul Jeffrey Geller

Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins
120 E Palmetto Park Road
Suite 500
Boca Raton, FL 33432
561-750-3000
Fax: 561-750-3364
Email: pgeller@lerachlaw.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

## **Stuart Andrew Davidson**

Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins 120 East Palmetto Park Road Suite 500

Boca Raton, FL 33432 561-750-3000 Fax: 750-3364

Email: sdavidson@lerachlaw.com

LEAD ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

**Defendant** 

Menu Foods, Inc.

**Defendant** 

**Menu Foods Income Fund** 

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
03/26/2007	1	COMPLAINT against Menu Foods, Inc., Menu Foods Income Fund Filing fee \$ 350. Receipt#: 539659, filed by Christina Troiano.(ls) (Entered: 03/26/2007)
03/26/2007	2	Summons Issued as to Menu Foods, Inc (ls) (Entered: 03/26/2007)
03/26/2007	3	Summons Issued as to Menu Foods Income Fund. (ls) (Entered: 03/26/2007)

PACER Service Center  Transaction Receipt							
PACER Login:	mw0078	Client Code:	060228- 00001/91103				
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	0:07-cv-60428-JIC				
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	st: 0.08				

Case 1:07-cv-00160-MHW Document 6-5 Filed 04/19/2007 Page 15 of 32

Case 0:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 10:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 10:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 10:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 10:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 10:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 10:07-cv-60428-JIC Docket 03/26/

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case No. 07-60428

CIV-COHN

CHRISTINA TROIANO, Individually and On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff,

VS.

MENU FOODS, INC. and MENU FOODS INCOME FUND,

Defendants.

## **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Christina Troiano ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, files this Class Action Complaint against Defendants Menu Foods, Inc., a New Jersey Corporation and Menu Foods Income Fund, a foreign corporation (collectively "Defendants") and alleges as follows:

## I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. This is a class action lawsuit brought on behalf of Plaintiff and others similarly situated who purchased pet food and pet food products produced, manufactured and/or distributed by Defendants that caused injury, illness, and/or death to Plaintiff's household pets.
- 2. Defendants are the leading North American private label/contract manufacturer of wet pet food products sold by supermarket retailers, mass merchandisers, pet specialty retailers, and other wholesale and retail outlets, including Wal-Mart, Safeway, Kroger, PetSmart, Inc., Giant Food, and other large retail chains, and has provided pet food products to or for Proctor & Gamble, Inc. Defendants produce hundreds of millions of containers of pet food annually.

Case 1:07-cv-00160-MHW Document 6-5 Filed 04/19/2007 Page 16 of 32 Case 0:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 2 of 18

- 3. Defendants designed, manufactured, marketed, advertised and warranted their pet food products. In conjunction with each sale, Defendants marketed, advertised and warranted that the Products were fit for the ordinary purpose for which such goods were used consumption by household pets and were free from defects. Defendants produce the pet food products intending that consumers will purchase the pet food products, regardless of brand or label name, place of purchase, or the location where pets actually consume them. The pet food products were intended to be placed in the stream of commerce and distributed and offered for sale and sold to Plaintiff and purchasers in Florida and the United States and fed to their pets.
- 4. Plaintiff brings this action, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on her own behalf and as a representative of a class of persons consisting of all persons in the United States who purchased, or incurred damages by using pet food produced manufactured and/or distributed by Defendants that was or will be recalled by the Defendants, including that produced from December 3, 2006 up to and including March 6, 2007. The pet food products referenced in this paragraph will hereinafter be referred to as the "Products."
- 5. As a result of the defective Products, Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered damages in that they have incurred substantial veterinary bills, death of pets, and purchased and/or own pet food and pet food products that they would not otherwise have bought had they known such products were defective.
- 6. Defendants know and have admitted that certain of the Products produced by the Defendants between December 3, 2006 and March 6, 2007 are defective and causing injury and death to household pets, and on March 16, 2007, initiated a recall of some of the Products. Further, the Food and Drug Administration has reported that as many as one in six animals died in tests of the Products by Defendants last month after the Defendants received complaints the products were

poisoning pets around the country. A spokeswoman for the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets has said that rodent poison was determined to have been mixed into the Products by Defendants.

## II. PARTIES

- 7. Plaintiff is a resident of Broward County, Florida who, in early March of 2007, purchased Iams Select Bytes Cat Food from a Publix grocery store in Deerfield Beach, Florida. The Iams Select Bytes Cat Food purchased by Plaintiff is a part of the group of Products that were produced, manufactured and/or distributed by Defendants.
- 8. Defendant Menu Foods, Inc. is a New Jersey corporation with its principal place of business in the State of New Jersey, specifically located at 9130 Griffith Morgan Lane, Pennsauken NJ 08110.
- 9. Defendant Menu Foods, Inc. is ultimately owned or controlled by Defendant Menu Foods Income Fund, an unincorporated company with its principal place of business in the Province of Ontario, Canada. Some of Defendant Menu Foods, Inc.'s high managerial officers or agents with substantial authority are also high managerial officers or agents of Defendant Menu Foods Income Fund.
- 10. Plaintiff, individually and as representative of a Class of similarly situated persons more defined below, brings suit against the named Defendants for offering for sale and selling to Plaintiff and members of the Class the Products in a defective condition and thereby causing damages to Plaintiff and members of the Class.

Case 1:07-cv-00160-MHW Document 6-5 Filed 04/19/2007 Page 18 of 32 Case 0:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 Page 4 of 18

## III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 11. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 and subsection (d), and the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-2 (Feb. 18, 2005); and over supplemental state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- and/or Pub. L. 109-2 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this judicial district. In this judicial district, Plaintiff purchased the recalled pet food products made by Defendants, and her household pets ate and consumed the Products. Thousands of other consumers including other members of the Class purchased the Products in this judicial district from retailers that Defendants, their agents, affiliates, or others controlled or were in privity with. In turn, retailers or others sold the Products to the general public, including Plaintiff, and members of the Class. The Products were purchased for consumption by the pets of Plaintiff and the other members of the Class. Defendants made or caused these products to be offered for sale and sold to the public, including Plaintiff.

## IV. SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

## Defendants and their Defective Pet Food

13. Defendants are in the business of manufacturing, producing, distributing, and/or selling pet food under various brands or labels, and/or for third party firms, including: America's Choice, Preferred Pets, Authority, Best Choice, Companion, Compliments, Demoulus Market Basket, Eukanuba, Fine Feline Cat, Food Lion, Food Town, Giant Companion, Hannaford, Hill Country Fare, Hy-Vee, Iams, Laura Lynn, Li'l Red, Loving Meals, Meijer's Main Choice, Nutriplan, Nutro Max Gourmet Classics, Nutro Natural Choice, Paws, Pet Pride, President's Choice, Priority, Sav-a-Lot, Schnucks, Science Diet

Feline Savory Cuts Cans, Sophsitacat, Special Kitty US, Springfield Prize, Sprout, Total Pet, Wegmans, Western Family, White Rose, and Winn Dixie. Defendants has manufactured or produced pet food for private labels for approximately 17 of the 20 leading retailers in the United States.

- 14. Defendants' business includes manufacturing, producing, distributing, or selling dog food under various brands or labels, and/or for third party firms, including: America's Choice, Preferred Pets, Authority, Award, Best Choice, Big Bet, Big Red, Bloom, Bruiser, Cadillac, Companion, Demoulus Market Basket, Eukanuba, Food Lion, Giant Companion, Great Choice, Hannaford, Hill Country Fare, Hy-vee, Iams, Laura Lynn, Li'l Red, Loving Meals, Meijer's Main Choice, Mixables, Nutriplan, Nutro Max, Nutro Ultra, Nutro, Ol'Roy US, Paws, Pet Essentials, Pet Pride Good & Meaty, President's Choice, Price Chopper, Priority, Publix, Roche Brothers, Sav-a-Lot, Schnucks, Shep Dog, Sprout, Statler Bros, Total Pet, Western Family, White Rose, Winn Dixie, and Your Pet.
- 15. Defendants produce millions of pouches or containers of pet food products each year, a substantial portion of which are sold or offered for sale in Florida. Upon information and belief, Defendants have sold, either directly or indirectly, thousands of units of defective pet food and pet food products nationwide and in the State of Florida.
- 16. Defendants manufactured, marketed, advertised, warranted and sold, either directly or through their authorized distribution channels, the Products that caused Plaintiff's damages. Plaintiff and members of the Class have been or will be forced to pay for damages caused by the defect in Defendants' Products.

## Factual Allegations Related to Plaintiff

- 17. In early March, 2007, Plaintiff purchased Iams Select Bytes Cat Food pet food from a national chain grocery store, Publix, operating in Deerfield Beach, Florida.
- 18. Over the course of the next few weeks, Plaintiff fed the cat food to her two cats, Angel and Piescat. Towards the end of that period, Plaintiff began noticing that her cats were not eating much of the Defendants' product, and that the cats were leaving large pools of urine in their litter box with little or no bowel movements.
- 19. On or about March 16, 2007, Defendants announced a recall of approximately 42 brands of "cuts and gravy style dog food, all produced by the Defendants between December 3, 2006 and March 6, 2007." Defendants had initially received complaints from consumers as far back as February 20, 2007 indicating that certain of Defendants' pet food was causing kidney failure and death in dogs and cats. Unfortunately, Plaintiff and the Class were not made aware of this recall for several more days.
- 20. On March 20, 2007, following another few days of unusual behavior from her cats, Plaintiff took her cats to the veterinarian. The veterinarian advised Plaintiff that both of her cats were suffering from kidney failure directly and proximately caused by the cat food. One of the Plaintiff's cats, Angel, died shortly thereafter, while the other cat, Piescat, remains at a veterinary hospital receiving treatment.
- 21. Thereafter, Plaintiff learned about the recall and the potential problems that could occur from feeding the Products to her pets. Prior to the recall, Defendants never warned Plaintiff or any other member of the Class that the Products would cause their pets to have health problems. As referenced above, Defendants knew about the risks of injury or death at least one month prior to the time that Plaintiff fed the Products to her cat.

22. As a result of their purchases of the Products, as set forth above, Plaintiff and other members of the Class have suffered and will suffer damages, including consequential and incidental damages, such as the loss and disability of their household pets, costs of purchasing the Products and replacing it with a safe product, including sales tax or a similar tax, costs of making an additional trip to a retail store to purchase safe, non-contaminated pet food, the price of postage to secure a refund offered by Defendants, the cost of veterinarians, treatment, medicines and the trip(s) to make such visits for diagnosis and treatment, and otherwise.

## V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and as a Class action pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the following proposed class:

All persons in the United States who purchased, or incurred damages by using, pet food produced or manufactured by Defendants that was or will be recalled by the Defendants, including that produced from December 3, 2006 up to and including March 6, 2007.

Upon completion of discovery with respect to the scope of the Class, Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the class definition. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their parents, subsidiaries and affiliates, directors and officers, and members of their immediate families. Also excluded from the Class are the court, the Court's spouse, all persons within the third degree of relationship to the Court and its spouse, and the spouses of all such persons.<sup>1</sup>

24. <u>Numerosity</u>: The members of the Class are so numerous and geographically diverse that joinder of all of them is impracticable. While the exact number and identities of members of the Class are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate

See Canon 3.C(3)(a) of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges.

discovery, Plaintiffs believe and therefore aver that there are thousands of Class members throughout the United States.

- 25. <u>Commonality</u>: There are questions of fact and law common to members of the Class that predominate over any questions affecting any individual members including, *inter alia*, the following:
- (a) Whether Defendants sold pet food and pet food products that were recalled or subject to a recall.
- (b) Whether Defendants advertised, represented, or held itself out as producing or manufacturing a pet food product that was safe for pets of the class members.
  - (c) Whether Defendants expressly warranted these products.
  - (d) Whether Defendants purported to disclaim any express warranty.
  - (e) Whether Defendants purported to disclaim any implied warranty.
  - (f) Whether any limitation on warranty fails to meet its essential purpose.
- (g) Whether Defendants intended that the Products be purchased by Plaintiff, Class members, or others.
- (h) Whether Defendants intended or foresaw that Plaintiff, class members, or others would feed the Products to their pets.
  - (i) Whether Defendants recalled the pet food products.
- (j) Whether Defendants was negligent in manufacturing or processing the Products.
- (k) Whether using the Products as intended to feed their pets resulted in loss, injury, damage, or damages to the Class.
  - (l) Whether Defendants' negligence proximately caused loss or injury to damages.

- (m) Whether Class members suffered direct losses or damages,
- (n) Whether Class members suffered indirect losses or damages.
- (o) Whether Defendants' acts or practices violated the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Acts.
- 26. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the Class in that all such claims arise out of Defendants' conduct in manufacturing, producing and entering into the stream of commerce defective pet food and pet food products, Defendants' conduct surrounding the recall of its product, and Plaintiff's and Class Members' purchase and use of Defendants' products. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class seek identical remedies under identical legal theories, and there is no antagonism or material factual variation between Plaintiff's claims and those of the Class.
- 27. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's claims are coextensive with, and not antagonistic to, the claims of the other members of the Class. Plaintiff is willing and able to vigorously prosecute this action on behalf of the Class, and Plaintiff has retained competent counsel experienced in litigation of this nature.
- 28. Plaintiff brings this action under Rule 23(b)(3) because common questions of law and fact (identified in paragraph 25 above) predominate over questions of law and fact affecting individual members of the Class. Indeed, the predominant issue in this action is whether Defendants' pet food and pet food products are defective and have caused damages to Plaintiff and the members of the Class. In addition, the expense of litigating each Class member's claim individually would be so cost prohibitive as to deny Class members a viable remedy. Certification under Rule 23(b)(3) is appropriate because a class action is superior to the other available methods

for the fair and efficient adjudication of this action, and Plaintiff envisions no unusual difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

- 29. The undersigned counsel for Plaintiff and the Class request that the Court appoint them to serve as class counsel first on an interim basis and then on a permanent basis. Undersigned counsel will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class, have identified or investigated the Class's potential claims, are experienced in handling class actions, other complex litigation, and consumer claims of the type asserted in the action, know the applicable law, will commit sufficient resources to represent the class, and are best able to represent the Class.
- 30. Plaintiff requests this Court to certify this Class in accordance with Rule 23 and the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005.

## VI. <u>CAUSES OF ACTION</u>

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **Breach of Implied Warranty**

- 31. Plaintiff hereby adopts and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-30 as if more fully set forth herein.
  - 32. Defendants manufactured, marketed, sold and distributed the Products.
- 33. At the time that Defendants marketed, sold, and distributed the Products, Defendants knew of the purpose for which the Products were intended and impliedly warranted that the Products were of merchantable quality and safe and fit fur such use.
- 34. Plaintiff reasonably relied upon the skill, superior knowledge and judgment of the Defendants as to whether the Products were of merchantable quality and safe and fit for its intended use.

- 35. Due to Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff could not have known about the risks and side effects associated with the Products until after ingestion by Plaintiff's cats.
- 36. Contrary to such implied warranty, the Products were not of merchantable quality and were not safe or fit for their intended use.
- 37. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach of implied warranty, Plaintiff suffered damages as alleged herein.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) For an order certifying the Class under the appropriate provisions of Rule 23, as well as any appropriate subclasses, and appointing Plaintiff and their legal counsel to represent the Class;
  - (b) Awarding actual and consequential damages;
  - (c) Granting injunctive relief;
  - (d) For pre- and post-judgment interest to the Class, as allowed by law;
- (e) For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to counsel for the Class if and when pecuniary and non-pecuniary benefits are obtained on behalf of the Class; and
  - (f) Granting such other and further relief as is just and proper.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

## **Breach of Express Warranty**

- 38. Plaintiff hereby adopts and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-30 as if more fully set forth herein.
  - 39. Defendants expressly warranted that the Products were safe for consumption by pets.

- 40. The Products did not conform to these express representations because the Products are not safe and cause serious side effects in pets, including death.
- 41. As a direct and proximate result of the breach of said warranties, and as the direct and legal result of the defective condition of the Products as manufactured and/or supplied by Defendants, and other wrongdoing of Defendants described herein, Plaintiff was caused to suffer damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) For an order certifying the Class under the appropriate provisions of Rule 23, as well as any appropriate subclasses, and appointing Plaintiff and their legal counsel to represent the Class;
  - (b) Awarding actual and consequential damages;
  - (c) Granting injunctive relief;
  - (d) For pre- and post-judgment interest to the Class, as allowed by law;
- (e) For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to counsel for the Class if and when pecuniary and non-pecuniary benefits are obtained on behalf of the Class; and
  - (f) Granting such other and further relief as is just and proper.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

#### Negligence

- 42. Plaintiff hereby adopts and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-30 as if more fully set forth herein.
- 43. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty to only offer safe, non-contaminated products for consumption by household pets.

- 44. Through its failure to exercise the due care, Defendants breached this duty by producing, processing, manufacturing, and offering for sale the Products in a defective condition that was unhealthy to the Plaintiff's pets.
- 45. Additionally, Defendants breached their duty of care to Plaintiff by failing to use sufficient quality control, perform adequate testing, proper manufacturing, production, or processing, and failing to take sufficient measures to prevent the Products from being offered for sale, sold, or fed to pets.
- 46. Defendants knew or, in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that the Products presented an unacceptable risk to the pets of the Plaintiff, and would result in damage that was foreseeable and reasonably avoidable.
- 47. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' above-referenced negligence, Plaintiff and has suffered loss and damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) For an order certifying the Class under the appropriate provisions of Rule 23, as well as any appropriate subclasses, and appointing Plaintiff and their legal counsel to represent the Class;
  - (b) Awarding actual and consequential damages;
  - (c) Granting injunctive relief;
  - (d) For pre- and post-judgment interest to the Class, as allowed by law;
- (e) For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to counsel for the Class if and when pecuniary and non-pecuniary benefits are obtained on behalf of the Class; and
  - (f) Granting such other and further relief as is just and proper.

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## Strict Product Liability

- 48. Plaintiff hereby adopts and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-30 as if more fully set forth herein.
  - 49. Defendants are producers, manufacturers and/or distributors of the Products.
- 50. The Products produced, manufactured and/or distributed by Defendants were defective in design or formulation in that, when the Products left the hands of the Defendants, the foreseeable risks exceeded the benefits associated with the design or formulation.
- 51. Defendants' Products were expected to and did reach the Plaintiff without substantial change in condition.
- 52. Alternatively, the Products manufactured and/or supplied by Defendants were defective in design or formulation, in that, when they left the hands of the Defendants, they were unreasonably dangerous, more dangerous than an ordinary consumer would expect, and more dangerous than other pet food products without concomitant accurate information and warnings accompanying the product for the Plaintiff to rely upon.
- 53. The Products produced, manufactured and/or distributed by Defendants were defective due to inadequate warning and/or inadequate testing and study, and inadequate reporting regarding the results of same.
- 54. The Products produced, manufactured and/or distributed by Defendants were defective due to inadequate post-marketing warning or instruction because, after Defendants knew or should have known of the risk of injury from the Products, Defendants failed to immediately provide adequate warnings to the Plaintiff and the public.

55. As the direct and legal result of the defective condition of the Products as produced, manufactured and/or distributed by Defendants, and of the negligence, carelessness, other wrongdoing and actions of Defendants described herein, Plaintiff suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) For an order certifying the Class under the appropriate provisions of Rule 23, as well as any appropriate subclasses, and appointing Plaintiff and their legal counsel to represent the Class;
  - (b) Awarding actual and consequential damages;
  - (c) Granting injunctive relief;
  - (d) For pre- and post-judgment interest to the Class, as allowed by law;
- (e) For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to counsel for the Class if and when pecuniary and non-pecuniary benefits are obtained on behalf of the Class; and
  - (f) Granting such other and further relief as is just and proper.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### Unjust Enrichment

- 56. Plaintiff hereby adopts and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-30 as if more fully set forth herein.
- 57. As a direct, proximate, and foreseeable result of Defendants' acts and otherwise wrongful conduct, Plaintiff suffered damages. Defendants profited and benefited form the sale of the Products, even as the Products caused Plaintiff to incur damages.
- 58. Defendants have voluntarily accepted and retained these profits and benefits, derived from consumers, including Plaintiff, with full knowledge and awareness that, as a result of

Defendants' unconscionable wrongdoing, consumers, including Plaintiff, were not receiving products of the quality, nature, fitness, or value that had been represented by Defendants or that reasonable consumers expected. Plaintiff purchased pet food that she expected would be safe and healthy for her cats and instead has had to now endure the death of one of her beloved pets and the hospitalization of the other.

59. By virtue of the conscious wrongdoing alleged in this Complaint, Defendants have been unjustly enriched at the expense of the Plaintiff who is entitled to, and hereby seeks, the disgorgement and restitution of Defendants' wrongful profits, revenue, and benefits, to the extent, and in the amount, deemed appropriate by the Court; and such other relief as the Court deems just and proper to remedy Defendants' unjust enrichment.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) For an order certifying the Class under the appropriate provisions of Rule 23, as well as any appropriate subclasses, and appointing Plaintiff and her legal counsel to represent the Class;
- (b) Awarding reimbursement, restitution and disgorgement from Defendants of the benefits conferred by Plaintiff and the Class;
  - (c) For pre- and post-judgment interest to the Class, as allowed by law;
- (d) For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to counsel for the Class if and when pecuniary benefits are obtained on behalf of the Class; and
  - (e) Granting such other and further relief as is just and proper.

#### **JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff and the Class demands a jury trial on all issues triable by a jury.

DATED: March 26, 2007

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER
RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP
PAUL J. GELLER
Florida Bar No. 984795
pgeller@lerachlaw.com
STUART A. DAVIDSON
Florida Bar No. 84824
sdavidson@lerachlaw.com
JAMES L. DAVIDSON
Florida Bar No. 072371
jdavidson@lerachlaw.com

120 E. Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500

Boca Raton, FL 33432-4809 Telephone: 561/750-3000

561/750-3364 (fax)

KOPELMAN & BLANKMAN LAWRENCE KOPELMAN Florida Bar No. 288845 Imk@kopelblank.com 350 E. Las Olas Blvd., Suite 980 Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301 Telephone: 954/462-6855 954/462-6899 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

I:\Pot Lit 2007\Menu Foods\Complaint FINAL.doc

Page 18 of 18

Case 0:07-cv-60428-JIC Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 03/26/2007 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.

				or ruoicate till rec illea c	ases Delotti		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	······································			
CHRISTINA TROIANG	O, Individually and on	Behalf of all Other	MENU FOODS,	INC. and MENU FOOD	S INCOME FUND		
Similarly Situated		0111	'OHIV more				
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	Broward V	NORF INLANC	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	Camdon		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Ad	idress, and Telephone Number)	MAGI	" NO.15" WOLL		E THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT		
LERACH COUGHLIN S	TOIA GELLER RUD		LAND I	NVOLVED.	A S		
120 E. Palmetto Park Roa			Attorneys (If Known)	A O MEZ	2 /		
Boca Raton, FL 33432-4	809 (Phone: 561-750-	3000)	07 - 60	142800	6		
(d) Check County Where Actio	n Arose: O MIAML DADE	☐ MONROE . Ø BROV	WARD O PALM BEACH O'MA	PTIN TO ST LINGUES OF MIN	N RIVER CI OKEECHOBEE		
					HIGHLANDS		
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIC Place are "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only)  and one Box for Defendant)							
D 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question	Non a Dawn	P	TF DEF	PTF DEF		
1 mainti	(U.S. Government	ivot a Party)	Citizen of This State (7	I I Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi			
1 2 U.S. Government	✓ 4 Diversity		Citizen of Another State	2 D 2 Incorporated and I			
Defendant A	Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)		of Business In	Another State		
0-010	N (00428	-U/C-	Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	0 6 0 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)							
CONTRACT  D 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJUR	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
120 Marine	310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury		1 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 1 423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust		
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractice  365 Personal Injury		28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking		
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liability	of Property 21 USC 881  630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation		
& Enforcement of Judgment  D 151 Medicare Act	I .	368 Asbestos Persona		O 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and		
152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Injury Product Liability	650 Airline Regs.	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  480 Consumer Credit		
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPER	TY Safety/Health		1 490 Cable/Sat TV		
(Excl. Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	<ul><li>370 Other Fraud</li><li>371 Truth in Lending</li></ul>	D 690 Other LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	810 Selective Service		
of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	380 Other Personal	O 710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/     Exchange		
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	Property Damage		☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge		
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability  360 Other Personal	385 Property Damage Product Liability	720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions		
196 Franchise	Injury	7700001 2/120111.)	& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts		
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION  510 Motions to Vacal		FEDERAL TAX SUITS	892 Economic Stabilization Act		
220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	Sentence	790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	893 Environmental Matters     894 Energy Allocation Act		
🗇 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/	Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	895 Freedom of Information		
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations  O 444 Welfare	530 General 535 Death Penalty	İ	26 USC 7609	Act		
290 All Other Real Property	1 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Otl	her		900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access		
	Employment	550 Civil Rights			to Justice		
	Other	☐ 555 Prison Condition			950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
	1 440 Other Civil Rights	<u> </u>					
V. ORIGIN  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Original Proceeding  Original State Court  Original State Court  Original Proceeding  Original State Court  Ori							
		a) Re-filed Case []	YES Z NO b) Rela	ted Cases  YES  NO			
VI. RELATED/RE-FIL	ED (See instructions	,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•			
CASE(S).	second page):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER			
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you are	filing and Write a Brief Stateme	nt of Cause (Do not cite jurise	dictional statutes unless		
VII. CAUSE OF	diversity):						
ACTION	28 USC §1332 ar	nd subsection (d); C	lass Action Fairness Act of	f 2005; 28 USC §1367 a	nd 1391		
	LENGTH OF TRIAL	via 5 davs estimat	ed (for both sides to try entire cas	a)			
VIII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND S	<del> </del>	if demanded in complaint:		
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.		5,000,000.00	JURY DEMAND:	· · ·		
ABOVE INFORMATION IS TRUE & CORRECT TO SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF AT							
THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE SULLAND 3/26/07							
		- was		FICE USE ONLY	-201654		
	_	(	$\checkmark$ AMOUNT $Z$	PECEIPT # 7	クリルノロノ		