

FILED

EP

APR 17 2007

**BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

MICHAEL W. DOBBINS
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

_____)
_____)
IN RE: PET FOOD PRODUCTS LIABILITY)
LITIGATION)
_____)
_____)

07c/543
MDL Docket No. 1850

**RESPONSE OF PLAINTIFFS
JARED WORKMAN, MARK AND MONA COHEN, AND PEGGY SCHNEIDER IN
RESPONSE TO 3 MOTIONS FOR TRANSFER AND CENTRALIZATION
OF ALL PET FOOD PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Plaintiffs Jared Workman, Mark and Mona Cohen, and Peggy Schneider (the "Workman Group"), plaintiffs in two cases currently pending in the District Court for the District of New Jersey,¹ hereby respond to:

Motion of Plaintiff Shirley Sexton For Transfer and Coordination or Consolidation Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 in the **Central District of California**, filed on March 26, 2007;

Motion of Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano To Transfer and Coordinate or Consolidate Actions Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 in the **Southern District of Florida**, filed on March 28, 2007; and

Motion of Plaintiffs Tom Whaley et al. For Transfer and Consolidation of Related Actions To The **Western District of Washington** Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, filed on March 29, 2007.

In these three Motions, certain plaintiffs have moved the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to take jurisdiction over 24 or more actions and transfer them to one of three United States District Courts: the Central District of California, the Southern District of Florida or the Western District of

¹The cases are Workman, et al. v. Menu Foods Limited, et al., No. 07-cv-1338 (D. N.J.), filed March 22, 2007, assigned to the Honorable Noel L. Hillman; and Schneider v. Menu Foods Limited, et al., No. 07-cv-1533 (D. N.J.), filed April 2, 2007, assigned to the Honorable Noel L. Hillman. The Schneider action was filed after the three Motions For Transfer and Consolidation were filed and is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Washington, for consolidated and coordinated pretrial proceedings in a single forum. The Workman Group submits that these actions should be consolidated and transferred to the District Court for the District of New Jersey.

Accompanying this Response is the Memorandum of Plaintiffs Jared Workman, Mark and Monah Cohen, and Peggy Schneider in Opposition to 3 Motions for Transfer and Coordination, and for the Transfer and Centralization of All Pet Food Products Liability Litigation in the District of New Jersey. The Workman Group's specific responses to the averments made in each of the three Motion are as follows:

Response of Plaintiffs Jared Workman, Mark and Monah Cohen, and Peggy Schneider to Motion of Plaintiff Shirley Sexton For Transfer and Coordination or Consolidation Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 in the Central District of California, filed on March 26, 2007

1. Admitted.
2. Admitted.
3. Admitted.
4. Admitted.
5. Admitted.
6. Admitted.
7. Admitted.
8. Admitted.
9. Admitted.

10. Denied. The Workman Group believes that the District Court for the District of New Jersey is the most suitable transferee forum for all of the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum filed herewith, including the facts, inter alia that the District of New Jersey: (1) has

the strongest nexus to the litigation because one of the implicated manufacturing facilities is physically located in the District of New Jersey (in Pennsauken, New Jersey) and is incorporated under New Jersey law (under the name Menu Foods Inc.); (2) is the forum closest to critical witnesses and relevant documents which are located at defendants' manufacturing facility located in Pennsauken, New Jersey; (3) has more related complaints on file (seven) than any other district; (4) has more named plaintiffs in the complaints on file than in any other district; (5) has the expertise, experience, and resources to handle this complex case; and (6) is a forum where the federal government is currently conducting an investigation.

Response of Plaintiffs Jared Workman, Mark and Monah Cohen, and Peggy Schneider to Motion of Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano To Transfer and Coordinate or Consolidate Actions Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 in the Southern District of Florida, filed on March 28, 2007.

1. Admitted.
2. Denied in part. Movant state that she was aware of six related pending class actions at the time she filed her Motion. Since that date, other related actions have been filed. A complete list of all related actions filed to date is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
3. Denied in part. Movant states that she has listed all related actions of which she was aware at the time of filing in their Rule 7.2(a)(ii) Schedule of Actions. Since that date, other related actions have been filed. A complete list of all related actions filed to date is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
4. Admitted.
5. Admitted.
6. Admitted.
7. Admitted.

8. Admitted.

9. Denied. The Workman Group believes that the District Court for the District of New Jersey is the most suitable transferee forum for all of the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum filed herewith, including the facts, inter alia that the District of New Jersey: (1) has the strongest nexus to the litigation because one of the implicated manufacturing facilities is physically located in the District of New Jersey (in Pennsauken, New Jersey) and is incorporated under New Jersey law (under the name Menu Foods Inc.); (2) is the forum closest to critical witnesses and relevant documents which are located at defendants' manufacturing facility located in Pennsauken, New Jersey; (3) has more related complaints on file (seven) than any other district; (4) has more named plaintiffs in the complaints on file than in any other district; (5) has the expertise, experience, and resources to handle this complex case; and (6) is a forum where the federal government is currently conducting an investigation.

10. Admitted.

11. Admitted.

12. Denied. The District of New Jersey has the expertise, experience, and resources to handle this complex litigation.

13. Denied. For all of the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum filed herewith, plaintiffs and the class would be better served by having the consolidated case transferred to the District of New Jersey.

Response of Plaintiffs Jared Workman, Mark and Monah Cohen, and Peggy Schneider to Motion of Plaintiffs Tom Whaley et al. For Transfer and Consolidation of Related Actions To The Western District of Washington Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, filed on March 29, 2007.

1. Admitted.

2. Denied in part. Movants stated that they were aware of eight related pending class actions on file outside the Western District of Washington at the time they filed their Motion. Since that date, other related actions have been filed outside the Western District of Washington. A complete list of all related actions filed to date is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

3. Denied. The Workman Group believes that the District Court for the District of New Jersey is the most suitable transferee forum for all of the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum filed herewith, including the facts, inter alia that the District of New Jersey: (1) has the strongest nexus to the litigation because one of the implicated manufacturing facilities is physically located in the District of New Jersey (in Pennsauken, New Jersey) and is incorporated under New Jersey law (under the name Menu Foods Inc.); (2) is the forum closest to critical witnesses and relevant documents which are located at defendants' manufacturing facility located in Pennsauken, New Jersey; (3) has more related complaints on file (seven) than any other district; (4) has more named plaintiffs in the complaints on file than in any other district; (5) has the expertise, experience, and resources to handle this complex case; and (6) is a forum where the federal government is currently conducting an investigation.

4. Admitted.

5. Admitted.

6. Admitted.

7. Denied. For all of the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum filed herewith, plaintiffs and the class would be better served by having the consolidated case transferred to the District of New Jersey.

8. Denied in part. The District of New Jersey has the expertise, experience, and

resources to handle this complex litigation as well.


9. Admitted.

WHEREFORE, the Workman Group respectfully requests the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to take jurisdiction over the eleven or more pending private actions and any future "tag-along" actions and transfer them to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey for consolidation and coordination under 28 U.S.C. §1407.

Dated: April 9, 2007

Respectfully Submitted,

BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.



Sherrie R. Savett, Esquire (No: 17646)
Michael T. Fantini, Esquire (No: 57192)
Russell D. Paul (No. 71220)
1622 Locust Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215)875-3000

Robert A. Rovner, Esquire (No: 02322)
ROVNER, ALLEN, ROVNER, ZIMMERMAN
& NASH
175 Bustleton Pike
Feasterville, PA 19053
(215)698-1800

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Jared Workman, Mark
and Mona Cohen, and Peggy Schneider*

Exhibit A

TRUJILLO RODRIGUEZ & RICHARDS, LLC
 Lisa J. Rodriguez, Esquire
 Donna Siegel Moffa, Esquire
 8 Kings Highway West
 Haddonfield, NJ 08033
 TEL: (856)795-9002
 FAX: (856)795-9887

BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.
 Sherrie R. Savett, Esquire
 Michael T. Fantini, Esquire
 Russell D. Paul, Esquire
 1622 Locust Street
 Philadelphia, PA 19103
 TEL: (215) 875-3000
 FAX: (215)875-4636

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

Peggy Schneider, on behalf of herself and all
 others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Menu Foods Limited, Menu Foods Inc., and
 Menu Foods Midwest Corporation

Defendants,

Civil Action No. _____

**COMPLAINT - CLASS ACTION
 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

PLAINTIFF'S CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Peggy Schneider, by her attorneys, alleges upon information and belief, the following:

1. This class action is brought, and these proceedings instituted, to redress the harms resulting from the manufacture, production, and sale by Menu Foods Limited, Menu Foods Inc. and Menu Foods Midwest Corporation of contaminated dog and cat food marketed under over 90 brand

names. Plaintiff makes the following allegations, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel, based upon the investigation undertaken by Plaintiff's counsel, which included, inter alia, review and analysis of Defendant's website, press releases, news articles, and pleadings filed in other suits.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

2. Defendants manufacture and sell over 90 brands of pet food for cats and dogs, including popular labels like Iams and Eukanuba and private label brands sold at large retail chains. On March 16, 2007, the parent company of Menu Foods Limited issued a press release announcing the recall of 60 million cans of contaminated dog and cat food manufactured between December 3, 2006 and March 6, 2007. The recall covers the "cuts and gravy" style pet foods in cans and pouches manufactured at two of Menu Foods Limited's U.S. manufacturing facilities - Menu Foods, Inc. and Menu Foods Midwest Corporation, located in New Jersey and Kansas, respectively.

3. The recalled pet food that Plaintiff and Class members purchased and fed to their pets caused their pets to become ill through kidney disease, requiring veterinarians visits, medications, hospitalizations and, in some cases, burials of those pets that died due to renal failure caused by the contaminated pet food. Many pets that consumed the recalled tainted food now require ongoing monitoring of their health to ascertain the extent of the damage to their kidneys.

4. Plaintiff here seeks damages, injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, and costs against Defendants.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Schneider resides at 431 Leconey Avenue, Palmyra, New Jersey 08065. Plaintiff Schneider purchased and fed her dog the pet food that was manufactured by Defendants

during the Class Period. The dog, Jimmy, became ill with kidney failure and subsequently died.

6. Defendant Menu Foods Limited is a Canadian corporation located at 8 Falconer Dr., Mississauga, ON, L5N 1B1. Menu Foods Limited has done business throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey at all times relevant to this lawsuit.

7. Defendant Menu Foods Inc. is a New Jersey corporation, with its headquarters at 9130 Griffith Mogan Lane, Pennsauken, NJ 08110. Menu Foods Inc. has done business throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey at all times relevant to this lawsuit. Menu Foods Inc. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Menu Foods Limited and manufactures pet food for distribution in the United States.

8. Defendant Menu Foods Midwest Corporation is a Delaware corporation, with its headquarters at PO Box 1046, 1400 East Logan Ave., Emporia, KS 66801. Menu Foods Midwest Corporation has done business throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey at all times relevant to this lawsuit. Menu Foods Midwest Corporation is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Menu Foods Limited and manufactures pet food for distribution in the United States.

9. The events complained of occurred throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. This Court has original jurisdiction over this class action under 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2) because: (i) there are 100 or more class members, (ii) there is an aggregate amount in controversy of at least \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and (iii) there is minimal diversity because at least one plaintiff and one defendant are citizens of different states.

11. Venue in this Court is proper in that Defendants transacted business in this county

and the conduct complained of occurred in this district, as well as elsewhere in New Jersey.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

12. Defendants purport to be the leading North American private label/contract manufacturers of wet pet food products sold by supermarket retailers, mass merchandisers, pet specialty retailers, and other retail and wholesale outlets. In 2006, Menu Foods Limited produced more than one billion containers of pet food.

13. Defendant Menu Foods Limited is the parent company of, and wholly-owns, both Defendant Menu Foods, Inc. ("MFI"), located in Pennsauken, New Jersey, and Defendant Menu Foods Midwest Corporation ("MFMC"), located in Emporia, Kansas. MFI and MFMC are two of Menu Food Limited's manufacturing facilities in the United States.

14. At least from December 3, 2006 through March 6, 2007, Defendants failed to adhere to proper safety standards and failed to ensure that the pet food they manufactured and sold was free from contamination. More specifically, on March 16, 2007, the parent company of Menu Foods Limited issued a press release whereby it announced the recall of a portion of the dog and cat food manufactured between December 3, 2006 and March 6, 2007. The recall covers the "cuts and gravy" style pet foods in cans and pouches manufactured at two of Menu Food Limited's facilities - MFI located in Pennsauken, New Jersey and MFMC in Emporia, Kansas.

15. Reportedly, 60 million cans and pouches of the pet food were recalled.

16. On March 30, 2007, U.S. federal investigators reported that they discovered a substance used to make plastic kitchen utensils and fertilizer in samples of the recalled pet food. More specifically, investigators discovered melamine in wheat gluten, one of the ingredients of the pet food, as well as in finished wet dog and cat food in gravy, according to Stephen Sundlof, the

director of the Center for Veterinary Medicine at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Melamine is used as a fertilizer in Asia and is a durable plastic used to make plates and spoons, the FDA said.

17. The recalled pet food was sold under more than 90 brand names, including popular labels like Iams and Eukanuba and private label brands sold at large retail chains. A list of all brand names that were recalled is contained on the Company's website and is attached hereto as Addendum A. Retailers who sold the contaminated products include Ahold USA, Kroger Co., Safeway, Wal-Mart, Pet Smart, and Pet Value, among others.

18. Menu Foods Limited acknowledges receiving complaints in the United States which raised concern about pet food manufactured since early December 2006, and its impact on the renal health of the pets consuming the products. The Company has discovered that timing of the production associated with these complaints coincides with the introduction of an ingredient from a new supplier.

19. Stephen Sundlof of the Food and Drug Administration said that Menu Foods began its own taste tests of its pet food beginning February 27, 2007 in approximately 40 to 50 pets. Within a few days, animals began showing signs of sickness. In early March 2007, 7 animals died. Menu Foods announced its recall weeks later, on March 16, 2007.

20. The FDA reports that it received more than 8,000 complaints from owners of sick and deceased pets, as well as calls from veterinarians and pet food companies. The Defendants have reportedly received 300,000 calls from consumers.

21. To date, Defendants have confirmed 16 pet deaths. The Veterinary Information Network reported that more than 100 pets have died.

22. Plaintiff Schneider owned a dog named Jimmy. During March 2007, Plaintiff fed

her dog pet food manufactured by Defendants. On March 9, 2007, Jimmy began vomiting and had diarrhea. Plaintiff took Jimmy to an emergency veterinarian who treated Jimmy overnight. The veterinarian report that Jimmy was suffering from kidney failure. Jimmy was transferred from the emergency veterinarian to the family's veterinarian, who continued medical treatment to Jimmy. Despite medical treatment, Jimmy died on March 13, 2007.

23. In addition to Plaintiff Schneider suffering emotional distress from the loss of her dog, she spent approximately \$1,300 in veterinarian bills, which was not covered by insurance. In addition to these costs, Plaintiff Schneider has not received any refunds for the cost of the contaminated pet food that she initially purchased.

24. As a result of Defendants' wrongful actions, Plaintiff and Class members have sick or deceased pets, and have suffered economic damages, including, but not limited to, the costs of the recalled pet food, the costs of medical treatment for their pets, burial costs, the costs to replace their pets, and the costs to replace or clean personal property damaged as a result of their pets' illnesses.

25. In addition, their pets will require continuous medical monitoring to gauge the long-term effects of the contaminated pet food on their kidney functions and overall health. Therefore, because the precise impact on the health of class members' pets is not currently known, Plaintiff and the Class seek the cost of medical monitoring for their pets.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

26. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated.

27. The class which Plaintiff seeks to represent are composed of all persons in the United

States who purchased any of the pet food brands manufactured by Defendants during the period commencing December 3, 2006 and ending March 6, 2007 (the "Class Period") that were recalled by Defendants.

28. The Class is composed of thousands, and possible millions, of persons, the joinder of whom is not practicable. The disposition of their claims in a class action will benefit both the parties and the Court. Defendants have recalled 60 million cans of pet food that it sold throughout the United States during the Class Period, and thus the Class is sufficiently numerous to make joinder impracticable, if not impossible.

29. There are questions of fact and law which are common to all members of the class, including, *inter alia*, the following:

1. Whether Defendants breached any express or implied warranties when they manufactured and sold the recalled pet food;
2. Whether Defendants' negligently manufactured and sold the recalled pet food; and
3. Whether the Class has been damaged, and if so, the appropriate measure of damages including the nature of the equitable relief to which the class is entitled.

30. The above common issues of fact and law predominate over any arguable individualized issues.

31. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the class because Plaintiff and all of the Class members' damages arise from and were caused by having purchased and fed the recalled pet food to their pets. As a result, the evidence and the legal theories regarding Defendants' alleged wrongful conduct are identical for Plaintiff and all of the Class members.

32. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class,

and Plaintiff has no interests which are contrary to or in conflict with those of the Class they seek to represent. Plaintiff has retained competent counsel experienced in class action litigation to further ensure such protection and to prosecute this action vigorously.

33. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the class, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the party opposing the class and would lead to repetitious trials of the numerous common questions of facts and law. Plaintiff does not believe that any difficulty will be encountered in the management of this litigation that would preclude its maintenance as a class action. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that claims are small in relation to the costs of an individual suit, and a class action is the only proceeding pursuant to which Class members can, as a practical matter, recover. As a result a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

34. Proper and sufficient notice of this action may be provided to the Class members through notice published in appropriate publications.

35. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have suffered irreparable harm and damages as a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein. Absent representative action, Plaintiff and the members of the Class will continue to suffer losses, thereby allowing these violations of law to proceed without remedy.

COUNT I - BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY

36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as if they were fully set forth herein.

37. Defendants expressly warranted that the recalled brands of pet food were, in fact,

ingestible food that was safe for consumption by dogs and cats.

38. In addition, Defendants made numerous express warranties about the quality of its food and its manufacturing facilities. For example, Menu Foods touts the claim that it “manufacture[s] the private-label wet pet-food industry’s most comprehensive product program with the highest standards of quality” and it operates “state-of-the-art” manufacturing facilities in the United States and Canada.

39. Members of the Class were induced by Defendants’ labeling, advertising and marketing the recalled brands of pet food as “food” to rely upon said express warranty, and did so rely in purchasing the recalled brands of pet food and feeding them to their pets.

40. In reliance on Defendants’ untrue warranties, Plaintiffs and the Class purchased the recalled pet food and fed that food to their pets.

41. Plaintiff and members of the Class sustained damages as a proximate result of said breach of warranty.

**COUNT II - BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY
OF MERCHANTABILITY**

42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as if they were fully set forth herein.

43. Defendants are merchants pursuant to sections 2-104 and 2-314 of the Uniform Commercial Code with respect to pet foods.

44. Through Defendants’ marketing, labeling, and sales, Defendants impliedly warranted that the recalled pet food, which was sold to Plaintiff and Class members and fed to their pets, was fit for the ordinary purpose for which it was intended, namely, to safely feed and nourish pets without any resulting negative health effects, pursuant to section 2-314 of the Uniform Commercial

Code.

45. Through Defendants' marketing, labeling, and sales, Defendants knew that Plaintiff and Class members would purchase the recalled pet food at issue for the ordinary purpose of feeding their pets.

46. Defendants manufactured, labeled, advertised, sold, and distributed the recalled pet foods at issue for the ordinary purpose for which it was purchased by Plaintiff.

47. Plaintiff and Class members purchased and used the recalled pet foods for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are sold, namely feeding them to their pets.

48. Plaintiff and Class members relied upon Defendants' representations and claims in purchasing the recalled pet foods.

49. The recalled pet foods purchased by Plaintiff and Class members were unfit for their ordinary purpose when sold. In fact, such pet foods were contaminated and caused severe illness and/or death of the pets that consumed them. Therefore, Defendants breached the implied warranty of merchantability in the sale of the recalled pet foods at issue.

50. Plaintiff and members of the Class sustained damages as a proximate result of said breach of warranty.

COUNT III - NEGLIGENCE

51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as if they were fully set forth herein.

52. Defendants owed a duty to pet owners who purchased its products to ensure that their pet food was safe for pets to consume and free from contamination, such that no pets consuming these products would be injured or die as a result of such consumption.

53. Defendants breached said duty as described herein above when they failed to adhere to proper safety standards and failed to properly ensure the safety of their products when they sold contaminated pet food, proximately causing damage to Plaintiff and members of the Class.

55. As a proximate result of the Defendants' conduct described herein, Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered damages as a result and continue to suffer damages as a result.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues triable by right before a jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

THEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

1. That this Court certify this action as a Class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3), and appoint Plaintiff and her counsel to represent the Class;
2. That this Court enter judgment and award damages in favor of Plaintiff and the Class, and against Defendants under the theories alleged herein;
3. That this Court establish a fund for the medical monitoring of Class Members' pets to discover and treat the extent of kidney damage these pets have suffered as a result of consuming Defendants' recalled pet food;
4. That this Court award Plaintiff and the Class all attorneys' fees, expenses and costs of this suit;
5. That this Court award Plaintiff and the Class pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowable by law, compounded daily; and
6. That this Court grant such other, further, and different relief that the Court deems

necessary, just, and proper.

Dated: April 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

TRUJILLO RODRIGUEZ & RICHARDS, LLC

By: /s/ Donna Siegel Moffa

Donna Siegel Moffa, Esquire

Lisa J. Rodriguez, Esquire

8 Kings Highway West

Haddonfield, NJ 08033

TEL: (856)795-9002

FAX: (856)795-9887

BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.

Sherrie R. Savett, Esquire

Michael T. Fantini, Esquire

Russell D. Paul, Esquire

1622 Locust Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

TEL: (215) 875-3000

FINE, KAPLAN AND BLACK, R.P.C.

Roberta D. Liebenberg, Esquire

1835 Market Street - 28th Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19103

TEL: (215) 567-6565

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

414708

Schedule A

Recalled Menu Foods' Pet Food Brands¹

¹ http://www.menufoods.com/recall/product_cat.html, accessed March 21, 2007;
http://www.menufoods.com/recall/product_dog.html, accessed March 21, 2007.

MENU FOODS INCOME FUND



- Home
- Recall Information**
- Press Release
- Cat Product Information
- Dog Product Information

Recalled Dog Product Information Recall Information 1-866-895-2708


Menu Foods
8 Falcone
Stratfordville
Canada, VA

1. Americas Choice Preferred Pets
2. Authority
3. Award
4. Best Choice
5. Big Bet
6. Big Red
7. Bloom
8. Cadillac
9. Companion
10. Demoxles Market Basket
11. Eukanuba
12. Food Lion
13. Giant Companion
14. Great Choice
15. Hannaford
16. Hill Country Fare
17. Hy-Vee
18. Jams
19. Laura Lynn
20. Loving Meals
21. Melbers Main Choice
22. Mighty Dog Pouch
23. Mixables
24. Nutriolan
25. Nutro Max
26. Nutro Natural Choice
27. Nutro Ultra
28. Nutro
29. O'Roy Canada
30. O'Roy US
31. Paws
32. Pet Essentials
33. Pet Pride - Good n Meaty
34. Presidents Choice
35. Price Chopper
36. Priority Canada
37. Priority US

- 38. [Publix](#)
- 39. [Roche Brothers](#)
- 40. [Save-A-Lot](#)
- 41. [Schnucks](#)
- 42. [Shep Dog](#)
- 43. [Springfield Prize](#)
- 44. [Sprout](#)
- 45. [Stater Brothers](#)
- 46. [Stop & Shop Companion](#)
- 47. [Tops Companion](#)
- 48. [Wegmans Bruiser](#)
- 49. [Wells Total Pet](#)
- 50. [Western Family US](#)
- 51. [White Rose](#)
- 52. [Winn Dixie](#)
- 53. [Your Pet](#)

© Copyright 2006, Menu Foods Income Fund, All Rights Reserved.
Best viewed using Internet Explorer.

MENU FOODS INCOME FUND



- Home
- Recall Information
- Press Release
- Cat Product Information
- Dog Product Information

Recalled Cat Product Information

Recall Information 1-866-895-2708

Menu Foods
 8 Falconer
 Streetsville
 Canada L1

1. Americas Choice Preferred Pets
2. Authority
3. Best Choice
4. Companion
5. Compliments
6. Demoulas Market Basket
7. Eukanuba
8. Fine Feline Cat
9. Food Lion
10. Foodtown
11. Giant Companion
12. Hannaford
13. Hill Country Fare
14. Hy-Vee
15. Jams
16. Laura Lynn
17. Lil' Red
18. Loving Meals
19. Meljer's Main Choice
20. Nutrolan
21. Nutro Mex Gourmet Classics
22. Nutro Natural Choice
23. Paws
24. Pet Pride
25. Presidents Choice
26. Price Chopper
27. Priority US
28. Save-A-Lot
29. Schnucks
30. Science Diet Feline Savory Cuts Cans
31. Sophistacat
32. Special Kitty Canada
33. Special Kitty US
34. Springfield Prize
35. Sprout
36. Stop & Shop Companion
37. Tops Companion

- 38. Wegmans
- 39. Wels Total Pet
- 40. Western Family US
- 41. White Rose
- 42. Winn Dixie

© Copyright 2006, Menu Foods Income Fund, All Rights Reserved.
Best viewed using Internet Explorer.

Exhibit B

Simms, et al. v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et al., No. 07-5053 (W.D. Ark.);

Scott, et al. v. Menu Foods, et al., No. 07-5055 (W.D. Ark.);

Widen, et al. v. Menu Foods, et al., No. 5:07cv5055 (W.D. Ark);

Ingles v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al., No. 3:07cv1809 (Cal. Northern);

Paul Randolph Johnson et al. v. menu Foods Inc., et al., No. 2:07-1987 (C.D. Cal.);

Dawn Howe v. Menu Foods Limited et al., No 2:07-2060 (C.D. Cal.);

Sexton v. Menu Foods, Inc. et al., No. CV07-01958 GHK (AJWx) (C.D. Cal.);

Osborne v. Menu Foods, Inc., No. 07CV00469RNC (D.Conn.);

Troiano v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al., No. 07-60428 CIV-COHN (S.D. Fla.);

Waldhauer, et al. v. Menu Foods Inc., et al. No. 3:07cv131 (Fla. Northern);

Majerczyk v. Menu Goods, Inc., No. 07CV1543 (N.D. Ill.);

Klimes et al. v. Menu Foods, No. 07-160 (ID);

Brazilian v. Menu Foods, Income Fund, et al., No. 2:07cv 54 (Maine);

Berndl et al v. Menu Foods, Inc et al., No. 07-1553 (NJ);

Bonier, et al. v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al. No. 1:07cv-1477 (NJ);

Bullock v. Menu Foods Inc., et al., No. 07-1579 (NJ);

Carter v. Menu Foods Inc., et al., No. 07-1562 (NJ);

Gagliardi v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al. No 07-1522 (NJ);

Golding v. Menu Foods Limited et al., No. 07-1521 (NJ);

Hidalgo et al v. Menu Foods Income Fund et al., No. 07-1488 (NJ);

Nunez v. Menu Foods Limited et al., No. 07-1490 (NJ);

Pittsonberger v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al., No. 07-1561 (NJ);

Richard, et al. v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et al., No. 1:07cv1457 (NJ);

Schneider v. Menu Foods Limited, et al., No. 07-1533 (NJ);

Thomson, et al. v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et al., No. 2:07cv1360 (NJ);

Tinker v. Menu Foods, Inc., No. 1:07cv1468 (NJ);

Turturro v. Menu Foods, Inc et al. No. 07-1523 (NJ);

Wilson v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et al., No. 1:07cv1456 (NJ);

Workman, et al. v. Menu Foods Limited, et al., No. 07-cv-1338 (NJ);

Streczyn v. Menu Foods Inc., et al. No 3:07-cv-159 (NV);

Boehm v. Menu Foods, Inc et al. No. 07-1018 (N.D. Ohio);

Brown v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al. No. 1:07cv115 (RI);

Holt v. Menu Foods, Inc., No. 07-cv-00094 (E.D. Tenn.);

Light v. Menu Foods Income Fund, No. 3:07cv98 (E.D. Tenn.);

Tom Whaley v. Menu Foods, et al., No. C07-0411M (W.D. Wash.);

Stacey Heller, et al. v. Menu Foods, No. C07-0453JJC (W.D. Wash.);

Suzanne E. Johnson, et al. v. Menu Foods, No. C07-0455JCC (W.D. Wash.);

Audrey Kornelius, et al. v. Menu Foods, No. C07-0454MJP (W.D. Wash.); and

Michele Suggett, et al. v. Menu Foods, et al., No. C07-0457RSM (W.D. Wash.);

Johnson, Jacqueline v. the Proctor & Gamble Company, No. 07-159 (W.D. Wisc.);