MAJERCZYK vs. MENU FOODS, INC. 07C1543

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

O7C1543

In re:	
MENU FOODS, INC. PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	MDL Docket No.

FLORIDA PLAINTIFF CHRISTINA TROIANO'S MOTION TO TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR CONSOLIDATE ACTIONS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1407

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

Paul J. Geller Stuart A. Davidson James L. Davidson

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER **RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP**

120 E. Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500 Boca Raton, FL 33432-4809

Telephone: (561) 750-3000 Facsimile: (561) 750-3364

Counsel for Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 and the Rules of Procedure on Multidistrict Litigation, plaintiff in the action styled *Christina Troiano*, *individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Menu Foods, Inc. et. al.*, Case No. 07-60428-CIV-COHN, United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida ("Troiano" or "Movant"), files this Motion and respectfully moves for an Order transferring all related pending actions against Menu Foods, Inc. and its related partners, affiliates and subsidiaries (the "Defendants"), including the actions listed on Schedule of Actions, to the Southern District of Florida.

As set forth below and in the accompanying Memorandum, Troiano believes the actions listed on the accompanying Schedule of Actions, and any future tag-along actions, satisfy the requirements for consolidation and coordination because they concern common questions of fact and law and consolidation or coordination will serve the interests of efficiency and convenience.

In support of this motion, Movants state as follows:

- 1. Movant is the plaintiff in the following case: Christina Troiano, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Menu Foods, Inc. et. al., Case No. 07-60428-CIV-COHN which is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.
- 2. Movant is currently aware of six other pending class action cases containing similar factual allegations and seeking similar relief against the Defendants. The cases are listed on the attached Schedule.
- 3. Accompanying Movant's Motion is a Rule 7.2(a)(ii) Schedule of Actions listing all related actions of which Movant is aware. True and correct copies of the complaints in Movant's action and the complaints in each of the related actions are attached to the accompanying Schedule of Actions, filed herewith

- As described in greater detail in the accompanying Memorandum, the factual allegations in each of the actions contain similar allegations regarding Defendants and their defective and ultimately deadly pet food. Each action contends that from December 3, 2006 up to and including March 6, 2007, and possibly at other times, Defendants entered into the stream of commerce pet food that was defective and, for thousands of household pets, deadly Defendants' pet food and pet food products (the "Products") were contaminated with rat poison or a related agent that contributed to the illness and/or death of thousands of dogs and cats. As a result of the defective Products, each action contends that the Plaintiffs and members of the putative Class 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.
- 5. Each action further contends that Defendants should have known or 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 pets, and on March 16, 2007, initiated a recall of some of the Products.
- 6. A centralization of all actions in the Southern District of Florida will be for the convenience of parties and witnesses under 28 U.S.C. §1407 and will save Defendants the burden of having to defend virtually identical actions in multiple states. Witnesses will also be spared the possibility of being required to testify in several locales.
- 7. Because each of these related cases arises from a virtually identical set of operative facts relating to Defendants' conduct, discovery conducted in each of the actions proposed for consolidation will be substantially similar, and will involve the same or similar documents and witnesses.

- 8. Absent transfer of all of these cases to a single forum for coordinated and consolidated proceedings, there is a substantial risk of inconsistent and conflicting pretrial rulings on discovery and other key issues, such as class certification. Coordination and consolidation will promote the just and efficient conduct of the actions, because it will allow one court to address Defendants' ongoing conduct.
- 9. Centralization in the Southern District of Florida will also promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 as more fully set forth in the attached Memorandum.
- 10. These actions have all been filed on or after March 19, 2007, and are still in their nascent stages. Movant is not aware of any discovery conducted to date, and know of no initial disclosures that have been made in any of these cases. A transfer of these related cases will result in only one judge supervising discovery and resolving any subsequent motions, including motions for class certification.
- 11. Since all actions are in the beginning stage of the litigation, no prejudice or inconvenience would result from transfer, coordination and/or consolidation.
- 12. A comparison of the relative MDL case loads of potential transferee districts demonstrates that the Southern District of Florida is a suitable forum. According to the Distribution of Pending MDL Dockets as of March 26, 2007, there is only one pending MDL proceeding in the Southern District of Florida, and numerous judges who have the experience to handle MDL's (See Distribution of Pending MDL Dockets as of March 26, 2007, Ex. A.).
- 13. For these reasons, and as set forth more fully in the accompanying memorandum, Movant respectfully requests that the Panel enter an Order consolidating and coordinating the actions

identified on the accompanying Schedule together with any related actions subsequently filed or presently unknown to Movant for proceedings in the Southern District of Florida.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: March <u>28</u>, 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. 723371
jdavidson@lerachlaw.com

STUART A. DAVIDSON

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 lmk@kopelblank.com 350 E. Las Olas Blvd., Suite 980 Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301 Telephone: 954/462-6855 954/462-6899 (fax)

Attorneys for Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano

G:\jdavidson\Menu Foods\Pleadings\Motion for MDL (final).doc

EXHIBIT A

DISTRIBUTION OF PENDING MDL DOCKETS (AS OF MARCH 12, 2007)

	Case 1:07-cv-01543	Document 9	Filed 04/02/200	07 Page 7	' of 31
		CAN	CAC	ARE AZ	Danka
C.J. Vaughn R. Walker D.J. James Ware D.J. James Ware D.J. Claudia Wilken D.J. Jeffrey S. White D.J. Ronald M. Whyte D.J. Ronald M. Whyte	D.J. Charles R. Breyer D.J. Jeremy D. Fogel D.J. Jeremy D. Fogel D.J. Phyllis J. Hamilton D.J. Martin J. Jenkins D.J. Marilyn Hall Patel D.J. Marilyn Hall Patel C.J. Vaughn R. Walker	Sr.J. Dickran M. Tevrizian, Jr. D.J. Stephen V. Wilson D.J. Saundra Brown Armstrong D.J. Saundra Brown Armstrong D.J. Charles R. Breyer	D.J. David O. Carter D.J. Dale S. Fischer D.J. A. Howard Matz Sr.J. Mariana R. Pfaelzer D.J. Manuel L. Real D.J. Manuel L. Real D.J. Christina A. Snyder	D.J. William R. Wilson, Jr. Sr.J. Paul G. Rosenblatt Sr.J. Roger G. Strand	Junge
MDL-1791 In re National Security Agency Telecommunications Records Litigation MDL-1527 In re Cisco Systems, Inc., Securities & Derivative Litigation MDL-1665 In re Acacia Media Technologies Corp. Patent Litigation MDL-1819 In re Static Random Access Memory (SRAM) Antitrust Litigation MDL-1761 In re Ditropan XL Antitrust Litigation MDL-1423 In re Cygnus Telecommunications Technology, LLC, Patent Litigation MDL-1754 In re Apple iPod nano Products Liability Litigation		1	MDL-1807 In re Wachovia Securities, LLC, Wage and Hour Litigation MDL-1822 In re Bluetooth Headset Products Liability Litigation MDL-1610 In re Conseco Life Insurance Co. Cost of Insurance Litigation MDL-1574 In re Paxil Products Liability Litigation MDL-1601 In re StarMed Health Personnel, Inc., Fair Labor Standards Act Litigation MDL-1737 In re American Honda Motor Co., Inc., Oil Filter Products Liability Litigation MDL-1671 In re Reformulated Gasoline (RFG) Antitrust & Patent Litigation MDL-1803 In re Banc of America Investment Services, Inc., Overtime Pay Litigation	MDL-1507 In re Prempro Products Liability Litigation MDL-1541 In re Allstate Insurance Co. Fair Labor Standards Act Litigation MDL-972 In re Diamond Benefits Life Insurance Company & American Universal Insurance Company Contracts Litigation	
22 22 6 6 8	100 1 10 42 10 10 10 4 4 53	2 22 71 2 1,520	19 14 19 39 3 5 11	3,3//	
22 22 6 30 8	101 8 10 44 13 19 48	9 22 71 2 2 1,704	19 14 21 148 6 5	5 10	Actions of

C	Case	1:07-cv-01543	Document 9	Filed 04/02/2	2007 F	Page 8 of 3	1
FLM	DE		DC	CT	СО	CAS	
D.J. Gregory M. Sleet 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	D.J. Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.		D.J. John D. Bates C.J. Thomas F. Hogan C.J. Thomas F. Hogan C.J. Thomas F. Hogan C.J. Thomas F. Hogan	Sr.J. Alfred V. Covello D.J. Alvin W. Thompson D.J. Stefan R. Underhill	D.J. Robert E. Blackburn D.J. Wiley Y. Daniel	D.J. Roger T. Benitez D.J. Napoleon A. Jones, Jr. D.J. Jeffrey T. Miller C.J. Robert H. Whaley (WAE)	
		-	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-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	MDL-1788 In re Qwest Communications International, Inc., Securities & "ERISA" Litigation (No. II) MDL-1743 In re American Family Mutual Insurance Co. Overtime Pay Litigation	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	
80 342 24 2 7	74 6	ωω 7 6 ↔	20 4 2 15	7 222 115 28 9	30	5 5	
80 342 29 2 7	74	10 18 3	20 84 14 4	18 22 15 31 9	30	10 27 5 30	Page 2

		Case 1:0)7-CV-U	1543	Docume	11 9	riied	J4/02/200) (ray	je 9	01 3	l
22	SNI	NN	ILS					ILN	IAS	GAS	GAN	FLS	
C.J. John W. Lungstrum C.J. John W. Lungstrum D.J. Kathryn H. Vratil	D.J. Sarah E. Barker D.J. David F. Hamilton D.J. John D. Tinder	D.J. Rudy J. Lozano C.J. Robert L. Miller, Jr.	C.J. G. Patrick Murphy C.J. G. Patrick Murphy	D.J. Ainy J. St. Eve D.J. James B. Zagel D.J. James B. Zagel	Sr.J. John F. Grady Sr.J. John F. Grady Sr.J. George W. Lindberg D.J. Charles R. Norgle, Sr.	Sr.J. John F. Grady	D.J. David H. Coar D.J. David H. Coar D.J. Mark R. Filip	Sr.J. Marvin E. Aspen Sr.J. Marvin E. Aspen D.J. Elaine E. Bucklo	Sr.J. Ronald E. Longstaff	C.J. William T. Moore, Jr.	D.J. Thomas W. Thrash, Jr.	D.J. Federico A. Moreno	
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	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-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-1562 In re General Motors Corp. Dex-Cool Products Liability Litigation MDL-1748 In re Profiler Products Liability Litigation		MDL-1521 In re Wireless Telephone 911 Calls Litigation MDL-1703 In re Sears, Roebuck & Co. Tools Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation MDL-1773 In re Air Crash Near Athens, Greece, on August 14, 2005 MDL-1604 In re Ocean Federal Bank FSB Mortgage Servicing Litigation MDI-1778 In re Ocean Financial Com. Prescreening Litigation		MDL-1783 In re JP Morgan Chase & Co. Securities Litigation MDL-1818 In re Citifinancial Services Incorporated Prescreened Offer Litigation MDL-1850 In re-Trans Union Corp. Privacy Litigation		MDL-1733 In re Teflon Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1677 In re NovaStar Home Mortgage Inc. Mortgage Lending Practices Litigation	MDL-1804 In re Stand 'n Seal Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1334 In re Managed Care Litigation	
63 30 7	23 35 3	3 36	6 4	2	5 5	103		11 318 10	22	ω	13	6	
68 30 7	819 35 3	3 42	4	75 3	10 7 65 5	356	15 5	11 322 10 7	22	u	13	123	

584

37 9 17

19

116

3

40

5 25

474 8,530

14 133 8 31

116 22 23 1116 2009 3 3 117 6 6 4 4 4 16 16 20 20 3 3 3 3 3 116 3

	Case 1:07-cv-01543	Document 9	9 Filed 0	04/02/2007	Page 11 of 31
	Z	NH CW	MOW	MOE	MN
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 D.J. Freda L. Wolfson	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	C.J. James A. Beary, Jr. C.J. Richard L. Voorhees D.J. Paul J. Barbadoro	D.J. Richard E. Dorr Sr.J. W. Earl Britt	D.J. Jean C. Hamilton Sr.J. Stephen N. Limbaugh D.J. Catherine D. Perry D.J. Rodney W. Sippel	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 C.J. James M. Rosenbaum
MDL-1/30 In re Hypogermic rroducts Antitudes Lingation MDL-1763 In re Human Tissue Products Liability Litigation MDL-1514 In re Electrical Carbon Products Antitrust Litigation MDL-1292 In re Cendant Corporation Securities Litigation MDL-1550 In re IDT Corp. Calling Card Terms Litigation MDL-1799 In re Vonage Initial Public Offering (IPO) Securities Litigation	In re Ford Motor Co. E-350 Van Proc In re Compensation of Managerial, P. Antitrust Litigation In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust I. In re Merck & Co., Inc., Securities, E. In re SFBC International, Inc., Securities In re Holocaust Era German Industry In re K-Dur Antitrust Litigation In re Gapabentin Patent Litigation In re Neurontin Antitrust Litigation	1 1	MDL-1786 In re H&R Block, Inc., Express IRA Marketing Litigation MDL-1132 In re Exterior Insulation Finish System (EIFS) Products Liability Litigation MDL-1622 In re Cotton Yarn Antitrust Litigation	l i	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-1328 In re Viagra Products Liability Litigation MDL-1724 In re Viagra Products Liability Litigation MDL-1726 In re Medtronic, Inc., Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litigation MDI-1396 In re St. Jude Medical, Inc., Silzone Heart Valves Products Liability Litigation
136 1 1 3 4	41 41 2 1 1 1 15 22 22	117	21 1	6 9 59 32	1,392 1,200 1 65 966
136 25 18 5	42 35 114 44 82 22	36	109	11 12 59 32	9,044 1,212 14 70 966 57

FIIEU 04/02/2007 F	age 12 of 31
NYE	N
D.J. Carol Bagley Amon D.J. Raymond J. Dearie D.J. John Gleeson D.J. John Gleeson Sr.J. Thomas C. Platt, Jr. Sr.J. Charles P. Sifton Sr.J. David G. Trager Sr.J. Jack B. Weinstein Sr.J. Jack B. Weinstein	D.J. Kent J. Dawson Sr.J. Lloyd D. George C.J. Philip M. Pro C.J. Philip M. Pro
MDL-1775 In re Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation MDL-1613 In re Nigeria Charter Flights Contract Litigation MDL-1575 In re Visa/MasterCard Antitrust Litigation MDL-1720 In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation MDL-799 In re Air Disaster at Lockerbie, Scotland, on December 21, 1988 MDL-1689 In re Air Crash Near Woodbury, Connecticut, on December 20, 2002 MDL-1738 In re Vitamin C Antitrust Litigation MDL-381 In re "Agent Orange" Products Liability Litigation MDL-1596 In re Zyprexa Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1619 In re Musha Cay Litigation MDL-1357 In re NOS Communications, Inc., Billing Practices Litigation MDL-1566 In re Western States Wholesale Natural Gas Antitrust Litigation MDL-1735 In re Wal-Mart Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation
82 13 6 51 37 8 10 4 1,720	3 7 3 23
82 14 8 51 297 8 10 627 1,722	3 8 8 30 25

	Case 1	:07-cv-01	543 Do	ocument 9	Filed 04/02/	2007 Pa	age 13 of 3	31
							NYS	
D.J. William H. Pauley III D.J. Loretta A. Preska D.J. Loretta A. Preska D.J. Jed S. Rakoff	Colleen McMahon Richard Owen Richard Owen	D.J. Gerard E. Lynch D.J. Gerard E. Lynch Sr.J. Lawrence M. McKenna D.J. Colleen McMahon	Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram Sr.J. Shirley Wohl Kram	D.J. Barbara S. Jones D.J. Lewis A. Kaplan D.J. Lewis A. Kaplan Sr.J. John F. Keenan Sr.J. John F. Keenan	D.J. George B. Daniels Sr.J. Kevin Thomas Duffy Sr.J. Thomas P. Griesa Sr.J. Thomas P. Griesa D.J. Alvin K. Hellerstein D.J. Richard J. Holwell		Sr.J. Harold Baer, Jr. D.J. Deborah A. Batts D.J. Richard A. Berman D.J. Charles L. Brieant	
MDL-1409 In re Curreity Conversion recommunity Engagement MDL-1659 In re Nortel Networks Corp. Securities Litigation MDL-1780 In re Digital Music Antitrust Litigation MDL-1598 In re Ephedra Products Liability Litigation			MDL-1495 In re Enterprise Mortgage Acceptance Co., LLC, Securities Litigation MDL-1500 In re AOL Time Warner Inc. Securities & "ERISA" Litigation MDL-1739 In re Grand Theft Auto Video Game Consumer Litigation (No. II) MDL-1744 In re Marsh & McLennan Companies, Inc., Securities Litigation	MDL-1291 In re Omeprazole Patent Litigation MDL-1348 In re Rezulin Products Liability Litigation MDL-1653 In re Parmalat Securities Litigation MDL-1484 In re Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc., Research Reports Securities Litigation MDL-1789 In re Fosamax Products Liability Litigation			MDL-1661 In re Rivastigmine Patent Litigation MDL-1714 In re Rhodia S.A. Securities Litigation MDL-1628 In re Pineapple Antitrust Litigation MDL-1368 In re High Pressure Laminate Antitrust Litigation	
28 30 625	30 24 5	5 1 71 13	57 7	991 16 22 108	3 20 1 1	22 28 2	72644	S TO S
29 30 840	30 24 34	71 71 73	72 72 70	1,865 16 176 178	3 20 25 24 11	18 23 177 2	5 4 10 37	

	Ca	ise '	1:07-cv-0154	3 Docu	ımer	nt 9	Filed	04/02/2007	Page 15	of 31
TNW	MNL	TNE	SC	PAW	PAM					PAE
D.J. J. Daniel Breen	C.J. Todd J. Campbell Sr.J. John T. Nixon	C.J. Curtis L. Collier	Sr.J. Solomon Blatt, Jr. D.J. Cameron McGowan Currie D.J. David C. Norton Sr.J. Matthew J. Perry, Jr.	C.J. Donetta W. Ambrose D.J. Gary L. Lancaster	D.J. Thomas I. Vanaskie	D.J. Timothy J. Savage D.J. Richard Barclay Surrick	Sr.J. Louis H. Pollak D.J. Timothy J. Savage	Sr.J. Jan E. DuBois Sr.J. John P. Fullam D.J. James T. Giles D.J. Bruce W. Kauffman D.J. Mary A. McLaughlin	D.J. Ronald L. Buckwalter D.J. Ronald L. Buckwalter D.J. Stewart Dalzell D.J. Stewart Dalzell	C.J. Harvey Bartle III
MDL-1551 In re Reciprocal of America (ROA) Sales Practices Litigation	MDL-1760 In re Aredia and Zometa Products Liability Litigation MDL-1537 In re Nortel Networks Corp. "ERISA" Litigation	MDL-1552 In re UnumProvident Corp. Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation	MDL-1595 In re Electrical Receptacle Products Liability Litigation MDL-1429 In re American General Life & Accident Insurance Co. Industrial Life Insurance Litigation 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)	MDL-1091 In re Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. Sales Practices Litigation MDL-1674 In re Community Bank of Northern Virginia Mortgage Lending Practices Litigation	MDL-1556 In re Pressure Sensitive Labelstock Antitrust Litigation	1	Practices Litigation MDL-1817 In re CertainTeed Corp. Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litigation MDL-1675 In re ACE Limited Securities Litigation		MDL-1014 In re Orthopedic Bone Screw Products Liability Litigation MDL-1741 In re Isolagen, Inc., Securities & Derivative Litigation MDL-1682 In re Hydrogen Peroxide Antitrust Litigation MDL-1684 In re Plastics Additives Antitrust Litigation (No. II)	MDL-1203 In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine/Fenfluramine/Dexfenfluramine) Products
13	209 6	23	1 69 113	6 6	11	18 62	4	10 6 35,378 8	0 1 5 1	2,626
13	210 6	28	9 135 114 973	148	11	18 63	9 4	20 6 111,259 14	3,085 5 33	20,006

Document 9 Filed 04					d 04/02/2007	Page	16 of 3	31
WY	SAM	WAW	YAE	UT	SXT	TXN	TXE	
C.J. William F. Downes	D.J. Joseph R. Goodwin	D.J. Barbara Jacobs Rothstein	D.J. Leonie M. Brinkema	D.J. Dale A. Kimball	D.J. Vanessa D. Gilmore D.J. Melinda Harmon D.J. Melinda Harmon D.J. Lynn N. Hughes D.J. Janis Graham Jack	C.J. A. Joe Fish D.J. Sidney A. Fitzwater	D.J. Leonard E. Davis D.J. T. John Ward	
MDL-1293 In re Natural Gas Royalties Qui Tam Litigation	MDL-1477 In re Serzone Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1407 In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation	MDL-1705 In re Xybernaut Corp. Securities Litigation	MDL-1546 In re Medical Waste Services Antitrust Litigation	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	MDL-1578 In re UICI "Association-Group" Insurance Litigation MDL-1214 In re Great Southern Life Insurance Company Sales Practices Litigation	MDL-1512 In re Electronic Data Systems Corp. Securities & "ERISA" Litigation MDL-1530 In re Fleming Companies Inc. Securities & Derivative Litigation	
75	16	402	10	1	1 1 129 1	15 1	10	
83	177	3,365	10	8	6 7 196 4 19	28 25	29 22	

Case 1:07-cv-01543

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

07c1543 Andersen

In re:		
MENU FOODS, INC. PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION		MDL Docket No.
	1	

FLORIDA PLAINTIFF CHRISTINA TROIANO'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR CONSOLIDATE ACTIONS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1407

FILED

APR - 2 2007

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

Paul J. Geller Stuart A. Davidson James L. Davidson

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP

120 E. Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500 Boca Raton, FL 33432 Telephone: 561/750-3000 561/750-3364 (fax)

Counsel for Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 and the Rules of Procedure on Multidistrict Litigation, Plaintiff in the action styled *Christina Troiano, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Menu Foods, Inc. et. al.*, CASE NO. 07-60428-CIV-COHN, United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida. Plaintiff Christina Troiano ("Troiano" or "Movant"), respectfully submits this Memorandum in Support of Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano's Motion for Transfer and Coordination or Consolidation. For the reasons set forth below, Movant's lawsuit and the related lawsuits identified in the accompanying Schedule of Actions should be transferred to and consolidated in the Southern District of Florida.

I. INTRODUCTION

Troiano brings her class action to remedy the harm caused by the defective and deadly pet food manufactured and placed into the stream of commerce by Menu Foods, Inc. and its affiliates, partners and subsidiaries (collectively, the "Menu Foods Defendants" or "Defendants"). Defendants are the leading North American private label/contract manufacturer of wet pet food products (the "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.

Defendants design, manufacture, market, advertise and warrant their pet food Products. In conjunction with each sale, Defendants market, advertise and warrant that the Products are fit for the ordinary purpose for which such goods are used – consumption by pets – and are 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 are placed in the stream of commerce and distributed and

offered for sale and sold to Troiano and purchasers in Florida and the United States and fed to their pets.

From December 3, 2006 up to and including March 6, 2007, and possibly at other times, Defendants entered into the stream of commerce pet food Products that were deadly and defective – Defendants' pet food and pet food Products were potentially contaminated with rat poison or some other agent that contributed to the illness and/or death of thousands of dogs and cats. As a result of the defective Products, Troiano and members of the putative 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.

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 pets, and on March 16, 2007, initiated a nationwide 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.

II. HISTORY OF THE PENDING LAWSUITS

The related actions, identified in the accompanying Schedule of Actions present common questions of law and fact, common defendants, and are brought on behalf of overlapping classes (i.e., all persons and entities who suffered damages due to Defendants' defective pet food and pet food Products). Transfer and consolidation of all existing actions, and all subsequently filed related cases, to the Southern District of Florida will best serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses

and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. Each related action is briefly discussed below.

On or about March 19, 2007, Tom Whaley, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, filed the class action styled *Whaley v. Menu Foods, Inc., et. al.*, Case No. 2:07-cv-00411, in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington (the "*Whaley* Action"). This complaint seeks damages and equitable relief for breach of contract, unjust enrichment, deceptive and unfair business practices, breach of warranties and negligent misrepresentation on behalf of a class of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food which was produced by the Defendants and/or has had a dog or cat become ill as a result of eating the food.

Also on March 19, 2007, Lizajean Holt, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, filed the class action styled *Holt v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, Case No. 3:07-cv-00094, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee (the "*Holt* Action"). This complaint likewise seeks damages and equitable relief for deceptive and unfair business practices, breach of warranties and negligence on behalf of a class of all persons in the United States who purchased or fed his, her, or their cat(s) or dog(s) pet food produced or manufactured by Defendants that was or will be recalled by the Defendants, including that produced fro December 3, 2006 up to and including March 6, 2007.

On or about March 20, 2007, Dawn Majerczyk, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, filed the class action styled *Majerczyk v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, Case No. 1:07-cv-01543, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (the "*Majerczyk* Action"). This complaint seeks damages and injunctive relief for breach of warranties and negligence on behalf of a class of herself and all others who purchased pet food in the United States that was ultimately subject to the March 16, 2007 Menu Foods recall.

On or about March 21, 2007, Charley Ray Sims and Pamela Sims, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, filed the class action styled Sims, et. al. v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et. al., Case No. 5:07-cv-05053, in the District Court for the Western District of Arkansas (the "Sims Action"). This complaint seeks damages for strict liability, fraud, breach of express and implied warranties and negligence on behalf of a class of (1) all persons or entities who purchased Menu Food brands at any time and disposed of or will not use the products based on publicity surrounding the safety and recall of the products; (2) all persons or entities who purchased Menu Foods products and fed products to their pets on or since December 6, 2006; and (3) all persons or entities who purchased Menu Food products from wholesale distributors on or since December 6, 2006.

On or about March 23, 2007, Jared Workman, and Mark and Mona Cohen, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, filed the class action styled *Workman*, et. al. v. Menu Foods Limited, et. al., Case No. 1:07-cv-01338, in the District Court for the District of New Jersey (the "Workman Action"). This complaint seeks damages for breach of express and implied warranties and negligence on behalf of a class 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.

Also on March 23, 2007, Richard and Barbara Widen, and Mark and Mona Cohen, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, filed the class action styled *Widen, et. al. v. Menu Foods, et. al.*, Case No. 5:07-cv-05055, in the District Court for the Western District of Arkansas (the "*Widen* Action"). This complaint seeks damages for strict liability and negligence on behalf of a class of all persons in the United States who purchased contaminated pet food from Wal-Mart that was produced by Menu Foods.

On March 26, 2007, Troiano, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, filed her Complaint against Defendants alleging claims for negligence, breach of warranties, strict liability, and unjust enrichment.

III. ARGUMENT

In view of the facts outlined above, and the jurisprudence regarding multidistrict litigation set forth below, these cases should be centralized in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida. Transfer and consolidation is essential to permit the efficient and non-duplicative handling of these cases and the Southern District of Florida is the most appropriate venue for this multidistrict litigation.

A. The Similarity of These Class Actions Warrants Coordination and Consolidation

28 U.S.C. § 1407(a) authorizes the transfer of multiple civil actions pending in various federal districts to a single federal district court when the actions involve "one or more common questions of fact..." Moreover, transfer is necessary "in order to eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent rulings on pretrial motions, including those with respect to whether the actions should proceed as [class actions]...." In re Starmed Health Personnel, Inc. Fair Labor Standards Act Litig., 317 F. Supp. 2d 1380, 1381 (J.P.M.L. 2004); see also In re Comp. of Managerial Prof'l and Tech. Employees Antitrust Litig., 206 F. Supp. 2d 1374, 1375 (J.P.M.L. 2002) (noting that centralization is "necessary in order to... prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings (especially with regard to class certification issues")).

The requirements for transfer under section 1407 are easily satisfied here. As discussed above, each of these pending cases (i) purport to represent a large class of individuals and/or entities who were damaged by defective and deadly pet food marketed, manufactured and/or distributed by the Defendants, (ii) assert the same or similar claims against the Defendants, and (iii) seek to recover

losses based upon those damages caused by the Defendants. To separately litigate each pending case (and subsequently filed related cases) would waste resources and present the danger of inconsistent pretrial rulings. Consolidation of these cases is particularly critical because these related actions seek class action status on behalf of the same class or overlapping classes and, as a result, there is a significant potential for conflicting or inconsistent rulings on class certification issues. Accordingly, centralization and consolidation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 is warranted.

The consolidation and transfer of these cases would further promote the efficient adjudication of these actions. As the class actions alleged in these related cases are similar if not identical, the discovery needed in each of these pending cases will unquestionably be duplicative. To have the parties engaged in duplicative discovery in multiple complex class actions would be singularly inefficient and an unnecessary burden on the judicial system and the parties. These factors again all weigh heavily in favor of consolidating and coordinating these cases.

B. The Southern District of Florida Is the Proper Forum for These Coordinated Proceedings

Numerous factors may be considered by the Panel in determining the most appropriate transferee forum, including "convenience of the parties and witnesses." See In re Computervision Corp. Sec. Litig., 814 F. Supp. 85, 86 (J.P.M.L. 1993). Here, the balance of relevant factors weighs strongly in favor of transferring these actions to the Southern District of Florida due to its convenient location, large concentration of putative class members, experience in handling MDL proceedings, and lack of pending MDL cases.

1. The Southern District of Florida Is as Appropriate as Any Other Forum for the Parties and Witnesses

The convenience of the parties and witnesses is a critical factor in determining to which district related actions should be transferred. See 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a) (related actions may be transferred to a district for coordinated proceedings upon a determination that the transfer "will be

for the convenience of parties and witnesses and will promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions"). In deciding whether a particular forum is convenient, the Panel examines factors such as: where the first filed and most advanced cases are pending; the location of the parties, documents and potential witnesses relative to that district; and the location where the majority of actions have been brought. See In re Baldwin-United Corp. Litig., 581 F. Supp. 739, 740 (J.P.M.L. 1984).

The Defendants in the multiple class actions are a Canadian business entity and its United States subsidiaries and/or affiliates, as well as certain other Defendant-distributors of the defective products. Each of these entities is headquartered and/or incorporated in different jurisdictions, including Canada, New Jersey, and Delaware. Of the seven lawsuits currently pending, one is pending in the Western District of Washington, one is pending in the Eastern District of Tennessee, one is pending in the Northern District of Illinois, two are pending in the Western District of Arkansas, on is pending in the District Court for the District of New Jersey, and one is pending in the Southern District of Florida. Further, upon information and belief, Defendants conduct business, and potentially have caused damages to purported class members, in all fifty states. Thus, there is no central forum that would be more convenient over any others in terms of the locations of parties, documents, and potential witnesses.

2. The Accessibility of the Southern District of Florida Warrants Transfer

While there will be a large number of class members residing in Florida, Troiano anticipates that parties to this litigation will come from all across the country and not one centralized region. Those parties residing outside of Florida will find the courthouses in the Southern District of Florida convenient and accessible by all forms of transportation. The multiple federal courthouses in the Southern District of Florida – in, among other place, Miami, Fort Lauderdale and West Palm Beach – are all in very close proximity to airports that have direct flights on many airlines to

numerous cities across the United States. Traveling from the airport to the courthouse is also simple due to the varieties of ground transportation available. See In re Comp. of Managerial, Prof'l and Tech. Employees Antitrust Litig., 206 F. Supp. 2d at 1375 (transferring cases to the District of New Jersey and noting that the District of New Jersey is an "accessible" metropolitan location that is geographically convenient for litigants and counsel). On balance, the accessibility factor favors transfer of the related actions in the Southern District of Florida.

3. The Southern District of Florida Has the Capacity and Expertise to Handle these Related Cases

A comparison of the relative MDL case loads of potential transferee districts demonstrates that the Southern District of Florida is a highly suitable forum. The judges of the Southern District of Florida have vast experience in Multidistrict litigation, having brought to termination a total of 24 cases through September 30, 2006. Yet, as of March 26, 2007, the Southern District of Florida only had only one pending MDL proceeding, which is nearly in an inactive stage. Thus, while the Southern District of Florida is well versed in the nuances of Multidistrict litigation, the Southern District would not be overburdened with similar cases if these actions were transferred there.

C. No Party Is Prejudiced by the Transfer and Consolidation of These Lawsuits

Each of the related lawsuits is in its infancy. To Movant's knowledge, no party has served discovery, filed disclosures or engaged in substantive motion practice regarding these lawsuits. Because these related cases are all in their early stages, no party will be prejudiced by the transfer to the Southern District of Florida. Furthermore, since no discovery has occurred, an Order transferring

9

Multidistrict Litigation Terminated Through September 30, 2006, available at http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/Statistics/TerminatedDocketsThroughSeptember2006.pdf, viewed on March 26, 2007.

these cases to the Southern District of Florida can truly eliminate the expenses associated with the duplicative discovery that would otherwise occur in District Courts across the country.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, the Plaintiff respectfully request that the related actions identified on the accompanying Schedule of Actions, and any tag-along actions, be transferred to and consolidated in the Southern District of Florida. Accordingly, the Plaintiff respectfully request that this Panel enter an Order transferring the related actions, and any future related actions, to the Southern District of Florida.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: March 28, 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. 723371
jdavidson@lerachlaw.com

STUART A. DAVIDSON

For

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 Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano

G:\jdavidson\Menu Foods\Pleadings\MEM Support MDL Motion (final).doc

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON **MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

In re:	
MENU FOODS, INC. PRODUCTS	MDL Docket No
LIABILITY LITIGATION	•
/	

SCHEDULE OF ACTIONS IN SUPPORT OF FLORIDA PLAINTIFF CHRISTINA TROIANO'S MOTION TO TRANSFER AND COORDINATE OR CONSOLIDATE **ACTIONS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1407**

FILED

APR - 2 2007

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

Paul J. Geller Stuart A. Davidson James L. Davidson

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER **RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP**

120 E. Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500 Boca Raton, FL 33432-4809 Telephone: (561) 750-3000

Facsimile: (561) 750-3364

Counsel for Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano

SCHEDULE OF ACTIONS

Case Caption	Date Filed	Court	Civil Action No.	Judge
Plaintiffs: Tom Whaley Defendants: Menu Foods, The Iams Company, Dog Food Producers Number 1-50, Cat Food Producers 1-40	March 19, 2007	W.D. Washington	2:07-cv- 00411	Ricardo S. Martinez
Plaintiffs: Lizajean Holt Defendants: Menu Foods, Inc.	March 19, 2007	E.D. Tennessee	3:07-cv- 00094	Thomas W. Phillips
Plaintiffs: Dawn Majerczyk Defendants: Menu Foods, Inc.	March 20, 2007	N.D. Illinois	1:07-cv- 01543	Wayne R. Anderson
Plaintiffs: Charles Ray Sims, Pamela Sims Defendants: Menu Foods Income Fund, Menu Foods Midwest Corporation, Menu Foods South Dakota Inc., Menu Foods, Inc., Menu Foods Holdings, Inc.	March 21, 2007	W.D. Arkansas	5:07-cv- 05053	Jimm Larry Hendren
Plaintiffs: Richard Scott Widen, Barbara Widen Defendants: Menu Foods, Menu Foods Income Fund, Menu Foods General Partnership Limited, Menu Foods Limited	March 23, 2007	W.D. Arkansas	5:07-cv- 05055	Robert T. Dawson

Partnership, Menu Foods Operating Partnership, Menu Foods Midwest				
Plaintiffs: Jared Workman, Mark Cohen, Mona Cohen Defendants: Menu Foods Limited, Menu Foods Inc., Menu Foods Midwest Corporation	March 23, 2007	D. New Jersey	2:07-cv- 00411	Noel L. Hillman
Plaintiffs: Christina Troiano Defendants: Menu Foods Limited, Menu Foods Inc., Menu Foods Midwest Corporation	March 26, 2007	S.D. Florida	0:07-cv- 60428	James I. Cohn

DATED: March 28, 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. 723371
jdavidson@lerachlaw.com

Page 31 of 31

STUART A. DAVIDSON

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 Florida Plaintiff Christina Troiano

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