8. Defendants Menu Foods and Wal-Mart did nothing to prevent the distribution of the contaminated pet food until weeks after the discovery occurred. This action, or lack thereof, permitted and caused additional harm to thousands of pet owners in Arkansas and throughout the country.

9. Plaintiffs owned two cats that were very healthy middle aged cats. The two cats were named "Fred" and "Grinch." Plaintiffs fed the two cats "Special Kitty" cat food which was made by Menu Foods exclusively for Wal-Mart under a private label agreement.

10. Beginning around February, 2007, Plaintiffs noticed that both cats were acting differently and had begun to lose weight. In a tragic irony, Plaintiff forced the cats to eat more of the contaminated pet food, unaware that the pet food was contaminated and the cause of the poor health.

11. On March 18, 2007, Plaintiff was finally made aware through the media that a recall had been issued for the pet food by the Defendant, Menu Foods and that the pet food could cause kidney failure and other symptoms that were being experienced by the Plaintiffs' cats. On March 19, 2007, Plaintiffs took their cats to their veterinarian for examination. That same day, the veterinarian ran some tests and informed the Plaintiffs that both cats were suffering from kidney failure due to the consumption of the contaminated pet food. The veterinarian suggested that the only chance of survival for the cats was a very expensive procedure in which the likelihood of success was very small.

12. The veterinarian diagnosed the kidney failure to be the result of the cats consumption of contaminated pet food. The veterinarian recommended that the Plaintiffs call a Menu Foods hotline number which she provided to the Plaintiffs. The hotline had been set up on or around March 17, 2007, nearly three weeks after Menu Foods had become aware of the problem. The veterinarian suggested that Menu Foods should pay for the expensive procedure.

13. The Plaintiffs called the hotline number around a hundred times to determine if Menu Foods would pay for the procedure and never reached an operator or answering machine. Finally, out of desperation the Plaintiffs called another number for Menu Foods and left a message for somebody from Menu Foods to call them. The message was never returned.

14. Around 3:30 p.m. on the afternoon of March 19, 2007, Plaintiffs made the decision that their cats could not suffer any further and euthanized the cats.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

15. Plaintiffs brings all claims as class claims pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The requirements of Rule 23 are met with respect to the Class defined below.

16. Plaintiffs bring their claims on their own behalf, and on behalf of the following Class:

> All persons in the United States who purchased contaminated pet food from Wal-Mart that was produced by Menu Foods.

17. The Class is so numerous that joinder of the individual members of the proposed Class is impracticable. The Class, upon information and belief, includes millions of members.

18. Questions of law or fact common to the Class exist as to Plaintiff and all Class Members, and these common questions predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Among the common questions of law or fact are the following:

a. Whether Defendants were negligent in allowing pet food products in the United States to be contaminated with a dangerous ingredient that was not safe for consumption.

b. Whether Defendants owed a duty to pet owners by ensuring that the pet food was not contaminated with dangerous ingredients;

c. Whether Defendants' conduct amounted to breach of such a duty;

d. Whether Defendants' conduct was a proximate cause of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' damages;

e. Whether Defendants are responsible for the contamination of the pet food;

f. Whether Defendants were negligent per se;

g. Whether Defendants are strictly liable;

h. Whether Defendants breached their warranty of merchantability.

i. Whether Defendants produced, marketed, distributed, and sold a defective product

j. Whether Defendants failed to adequately warn consumers of contaminated pet food.

k. Whether Defendants purposefully failed to adequately warn consumers of contaminated food supply for economic benefit.

l. Whether Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to damages, and, if so, the proper amount of such damages; and

m. Whether Defendants purposefully failed to adequately warn consumers of contaminated food supply for economic benefit.

COUNT I

Negligence

19. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained above.

20. Defendants owed a duty to Plaintiff to ensure that the pet food was not contaminated with dangerous and harmful ingredients.

21. Defendants breached that duty by allowing the contamination of the pet food supply with a dangerous and harmful ingredient during the approximate time of time January 2007 to March, 2007.

22. Defendants' actions proximately caused damage to Plaintiff and the Class.

23. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered damages by a loss of property, cost of medical bills, and cost of purchasing new, uncontaminated pet food.

COUNT II

Negligence Per Se

24. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained above.

25. Defendants' acts and/or omissions as described herein constitute negligence per se.

26. Defendants had a duty to ensure that their pet food was produced, transported, marketed, distributed, and sold in a manner consistent with governmental regulations.

27. Defendants breached this duty in violation of regulatory standards.

28. Such breaches directly and proximately caused damages to the Plaintiff and the Class.

29. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered damages due to Defendants failure to conform to the United States Food and Drug Administration regulations.

COUNT III

Strict Liability- Defective in Design or Manufacture

30. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained above.

31. Defendants placed into the stream of commerce an unreasonably dangerous product that is not fit for consumption and in violation of the Defendants Warranty of Merchantability owed to Plaintiff.

32. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff and the Class Members have suffered significant damages.

33. Exercise of reasonable care by the Plaintiffs and the Class members could not have eliminated the dangerous product or prevented the related injuries.

34. Plaintiff and the Class Members have been damaged enormously, and they seek injunctive relief from further contamination, compensatory damages, punitive damages for reckless and willful conduct, attorney fees and costs, and all other proper and just relief.

COUNT IV

Strict Product Liability - Failure to Warn

35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained above.

36. Defendants placed into the stream of commerce an unreasonably dangerous product that is not fit for consumption.

37. Defendant failed to warn Plaintiff or Class Members of the dangers on the Defendants' labels or through other means of advertising until after enormous damage had been suffered by the Plaintiffs and the Class Members.

38. Even after Defendant became aware of the dangerous contamination of its pet food, they still refused to warn the consumers and allowed countless other consumers to purchase the contaminated pet food and suffer great harm.

39. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff and the Class Members have suffered significant damages.

40. Exercise of reasonable care by the Plaintiffs and the Class members could not have eliminated the dangerous product or prevented the related injuries.

41. Plaintiff and the Class Members have been damaged enormously, and they seek injunctive relief from further contamination, compensatory damages, punitive damages for reckless and willful conduct, attorney fees and costs, and all other proper and just relief.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

42. Plaintiff demands a jury of twelve.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, request that he and the other Class Members have judgment entered in their favor and against Defendants, as follows:

A. An order certifying that this action, involving Plaintiff's and the Class Members' separate and distinct claims, be maintained as a nationwide class action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and appointing Plaintiff and their undersigned counsel to represent the Class;

B. An award, for Plaintiff's and each Class Members' separate and distinct claims, of compensatory damages and pre- and post-judgment interest thereon;

C. An award for Plaintiff's and the Class Members of punitive damages for reckless and wanton conduct;

D. Injunctive relief to prevent further contamination of the American pet food supply; and

E. All other appropriate and just relief.

DATED: March 23, 2007

PATTON, ROBERTS, MCWILLIAMS & CAPSHAW, L.L.P.

Jeremy Y. Hutchinson

Jeremy Y. Hutchinson
Jack Thomas Patterson II
Stephens Building
111 Center St., Suite 1315
Little Rock, AR 72201
Phone: (501) 372-3480
Fax: (501) 372-3488

Richard Adams
James C. Wyly
Sean F. Rommel
PATTON, ROBERTS, MCWILLIAMS & CAPSHAW, L.L.P.
Century Bank Plaza, Suite 400
P.O. Box 6128
Texarkana, Texas 75505-6128
Phone: (903) 334-7000
Fax: (903) 334-7007

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF


H

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,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MENU FOODS, INC. and MENU FOODS INCOME FUND,

Defendants.

/

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

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.

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.