

# EXHIBIT I

FILED ENTERED  
LODGED RECEIVED

APR 26 2007 DB

AT SEATTLE  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

DANIEL RAY REEVES, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MENU FOODS, a foreign corporation,

Defendant.

**CV 07-0634** JCC  
No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT



07-CV-00634-CMP

SEA 8931 NO SUMMONS

Plaintiff Daniel Ray Reeves ("Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned attorneys, bring this civil action for damages on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated against the above-named Defendant and complain and allege as follows:

**I. NATURE OF ACTION**

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a Class Action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by defendant Menu Foods and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food.

2. The Defendant is a producer of, *inter alia*, dog and cat food. Menu Foods produces dog and cat food sold under familiar brand names such as Iams, Eukanuba and Science Diet. Menu Foods distributes its dog and cat food throughout the United States to retailers such as Wal-Mart, Kroger and Safeway.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - I  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

13011 NH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 423-7797 • FACSIMILE (206) 423-0594

ORIGINAL

1 3. Dog and cat food that the Defendant produced caused an unknown number of  
2 dogs and cats to become ill, and many of them to die.

3 4. To date, Menu Foods has recalled 50 brands of dog food and 40 brands of cat  
4 food that have sickened and killed dogs and cats. All recalled food to date is of the "cuts and  
5 gravy wet" style.

6 5. As a result of the Defendant's actions, Plaintiff and other Class members have  
7 suffered economic damage.

8 **II. PARTIES**

9 6. Plaintiff Daniel Ray Reeves has at all material times been a resident of Federal  
10 Way, Washington. Mr.Reeves had a pet that became sick and died after eating Defendant's pet  
11 food.

12 7. Defendant Menu Foods is, upon information and belief, a corporation organized  
13 under the laws of Canada that transacts business in Washington State.

14 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 8. Subject-matter jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because the  
16 Plaintiffs and Defendant are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds  
17 \$75,000.00. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims under 28 U.S.C.  
18 § 1367.

19 9. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) because the  
20 Defendant systematically and continuously sold its product within this district and Defendant  
21 transacts business within this district.

22 **IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATION**

23 10. Plaintiffs bring this suit as a class action under Rules 23(a), (b)(1), (b)(2) and  
24 (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of themselves and a Plaintiff Class (the  
25 "Class") composed of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by the  
26

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 2  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623 7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 Defendant and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food. Plaintiff  
2 reserves the right to modify this class definition before moving for class certification.

3 11. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest  
4 among the members of the Class.

5 12. Membership in the Class is so numerous as to make it impractical to bring all  
6 Class members before the Court. The identity and exact number of Class members is unknown  
7 but is estimated to be at least in the hundreds, if not thousands considering the fact that Menu  
8 Foods has identified 50 dog foods and 40 cat foods that may be causing harm to pets.

9 13. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class members, all of whom have  
10 suffered harm due to Defendant's uniform course of conduct.

11 14. Plaintiff is a member of the Class.

12 15. There are numerous and substantial questions of law and fact common to all of  
13 the members of the Class that control this litigation and predominate over any questions affecting  
14 only individual members of the Class. The common issues include, but are not limited to, the  
15 following:

16 (a) Was the Defendant's dog and cat food materially defective, and unfit for  
17 use as dog or cat food?

18 (b) Whether Defendant breached any contract, implied contract or warranties  
19 related to the sale of the dog and cat food?

20 (c) Did the Defendant's dog and cat food cause Plaintiff's and other Class  
21 members' pets to become ill?

22 (d) Were Plaintiff and other Class members damaged, and, if so, what is the  
23 proper measure thereof?

24 (e) The appropriate form of injunctive, declaratory and other relief.

25 16. The prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create a risk  
26 of establishing incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant – for example, one court

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 3  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 First Avenue, Suite 2900 • Seattle, WA 98101

TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 might decide that the Defendant is obligated under the law to pay damages to Class members,  
2 and another might decide that the Defendant is not so obligated. Individual actions may, as a  
3 practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the Class.

4 17. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class in that he has  
5 no interests that are antagonistic to other members of the Class and has retained counsel  
6 competent in the prosecution of class actions to represent himself and the Class.

7 18. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
8 adjudication of this controversy. Given (i) the substantive complexity of this litigation; (ii) the  
9 size of individual Class members' claims; and (iii) the limited resources of the Class members,  
10 few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress individually for the wrongs  
11 Defendant has committed against them.

12 19. Without a class action, the Class will continue to suffer damage, Defendant's  
13 violations of the law or laws will continue without remedy, and Defendant will continue to enjoy  
14 the fruits and proceeds of its unlawful misconduct.

15 20. This action will foster an orderly and expeditious administration of Class claims,  
16 economies of time, effort and expense, and uniformity of decision.

17 21. Inferences and presumptions of materiality and reliance are available to obtain  
18 class-wide determinations of those elements within the Class claims, as are accepted  
19 methodologies for class-wide proof of damages; alternatively, upon adjudication of Defendant's  
20 common liability, the Court can efficiently determine the claims of the individual Class  
21 members.

22 22. This action presents no difficulty that would impede the Court's management of it  
23 as a class action, and a class action is the best (if not the only) available means by which  
24 members of the Class can seek legal redress for the harm caused them by Defendant.

25 23. In the absence of a class action, Defendant would be unjustly enriched because it  
26 would be able to retain the benefits and fruits of its wrongful conduct.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 4  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 • Seattle, WA 98101

TELEPHONE (206) 423-7222 • FACSIMILE (206) 423-0594

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

24. The Claims in this case are also properly certifiable under applicable law.

**V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

25. Plaintiff Daniel Ray Reeves was the owner of a male dog named Irish.

26. Mr. Reeves purchased Natures Choice from Pet Smart for Irish to consume.

27. Irish became extremely ill during the week of March 12, 2007. Mr. Reeves took Irish to a veterinarian, who informed him that Irish had suffered kidney failure, also known as acute renal failure. Irish had to be euthanized as his kidneys would no longer function.

28. In March 2007, Menu Foods recalled 50 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style dog food and 40 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style cat food that had caused dogs and pets to become ill. One common symptom in the sick animals was kidney failure.

29. The Natures Choice food from Pet Smart that Irish consumed for several years before his death is one of the brands that Menu Foods recalled.

30. As a result of Defendant's acts and omissions Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered economic damage.

**VI. BREACH OF CONTRACT**

31. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

32. Plaintiff and Class members purchased pet food produced by the Defendant based on the understanding that the food was safe for their pets to consume.

33. The pet food produced by the Defendant was not safe for pets to consume and caused dogs and cats to become ill. The unsafe nature of the pet food constituted a breach of contract.

34. As a result of the breach Plaintiff and Class members suffered damages that may fairly and reasonably be considered as arising naturally from the breach or may reasonably be supposed to have been in the contemplation of the parties, at the time they made the contract, as the probable result of the breach of it.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 5  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FINCH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101

TELEPHONE (206) 423-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 423-0594

**VII. UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

35. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

36. Defendant was and continues to be unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff and other Class members.

37. Defendant should be required to disgorge this unjust enrichment.

**VIII. UNLAWFUL, DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES**

38. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

39. Defendant's sale of tainted pet food constitutes an unlawful, deceptive and unfair business act within the meaning of the Washington Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86 *et seq.*, and similar statutory enactments of other states (including consumer protection and consumer sales practice acts).

40. Defendant's sale of hazardous pet food has the capacity to deceive a substantial portion of the public and to affect the public interest.

41. As a result of Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices, Plaintiff and other Class members suffered injuries in an amount to be proven at trial.

**IX. BREACH OF WARRANTIES**

42. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

43. Cat food and dog food produced by Menu Foods are "goods" within the meaning of Uniform Commercial Code Article 2.

44. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied or express warranty of affirmation.

45. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied warranty of merchantability.

46. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose.



1 48. As a proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct and breach,  
2 Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.  
3 Defendant had actual or constructive notice of such damages.

4 **X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Class members request that the Court enter an order of  
6 judgment against Defendant including the following:

7 Certification of the action as a class action under Rule 23(b)(1) - (3) of the Federal Rules  
8 of Civil Procedure with respect to the claims for damages, and appointment of Plaintiff as Class  
9 Representative and his counsel of record as Class Counsel;

10 Actual damages (including all general, special, incidental, and consequential damages),  
11 statutory damages (including treble damages), punitive damages (as allowed by the law(s) of the  
12 states having a legally sufficient connection with Defendant and its acts or omissions) and such  
13 other relief as provided by the statutes cited herein;

14 Prejudgment and post-judgment interest on such monetary relief;

15 Equitable relief in the form of restitution and/or disgorgement of all unlawful or illegal  
16 profits received by Defendant as a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or deceptive conduct alleged  
17 herein;

18 Other appropriate injunctive relief;

19 The costs of bringing this suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees; and

20 Such other relief as this Court may deem just, equitable and proper.

21 DATED this 26th day of April, 2007.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 7  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOROL SHAPIRO LLP


1301 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101

TELEPHONE (206) 423-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 423-0594



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

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By:   
Steve W. Berman, WSBA #12536  
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292  
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
E-mail: [steve@hbsslw.com](mailto:steve@hbsslw.com)

MYERS & COMPANY, P.L.L.C.  
Michael David Myers  
1809 Seventh Avenue, Suite 700  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 398-1188  
Facsimile: (206) 400-1112  
E-mail: [mmyers@myers-company.com](mailto:mmyers@myers-company.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 8  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

**EXHIBIT J**

FILED \_\_\_\_\_ ENTERED \_\_\_\_\_  
LODGED \_\_\_\_\_ RECEIVED \_\_\_\_\_  
★ APR 26 2007 ★  
AT SEATTLE  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
BY WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JEFF RUSIECKI, individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MENU FOODS, a foreign corporation,

Defendant.

CV 07-5204 RJB

No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Jeff Rusiecki ("Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned attorneys, bring this civil action for damages on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated against the above-named Defendant and complain and allege as follows:

I. NATURE OF ACTION

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a Class Action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by defendant Menu Foods and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food.

2. The Defendant is a producer of, *inter alia*, dog and cat food. Menu Foods produces dog and cat food sold under familiar brand names such as Iams, Eukanuba and Science Diet. Menu Foods distributes its dog and cat food throughout the United States to retailers such as Wal-Mart, Kroger and Safeway.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 1  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

COPY

1 3. Dog and cat food that the Defendant produced caused an unknown number of  
2 dogs and cats to become ill, and many of them to die.

3 4. To date, Menu Foods has recalled 50 brands of dog food and 40 brands of cat  
4 food that have sickened and killed dogs and cats. All recalled food to date is of the “cuts and  
5 gravy wet” style.

6 5. As a result of the Defendant’s actions, Plaintiff and other Class members have  
7 suffered economic damage.

8 **II. PARTIES**

9 6. Plaintiff Rusiecki has at all material times been a resident of Ilwaco, Washington.  
10 Mr. Rusiecki had a pet that became sick and died after eating Defendant’s pet food.

11 7. Defendant Menu Foods is, upon information and belief, a corporation organized  
12 under the laws of Canada that transacts business in Washington State.

13 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 8. Subject-matter jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because the  
15 Plaintiffs and Defendant are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds  
16 \$75,000.00. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims under 28 U.S.C.  
17 § 1367.

18 9. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) because the  
19 Defendant systematically and continuously sold its product within this district and Defendant  
20 transacts business within this district.

21 **IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATION**

22 10. Plaintiffs bring this suit as a class action under Rules 23(a), (b)(1), (b)(2) and  
23 (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of themselves and a Plaintiff Class (the  
24 “Class”) composed of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by the  
25 Defendant and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food. Plaintiff  
26 reserves the right to modify this class definition before moving for class certification.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 2  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 11. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest  
2 among the members of the Class.

3 12. Membership in the Class is so numerous as to make it impractical to bring all  
4 Class members before the Court. The identity and exact number of Class members is unknown  
5 but is estimated to be at least in the hundreds, if not thousands considering the fact that Menu  
6 Foods has identified 50 dog foods and 40 cat foods that may be causing harm to pets.

7 13. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class members, all of whom have  
8 suffered harm due to Defendant's uniform course of conduct.

9 14. Plaintiff is a member of the Class.

10 15. There are numerous and substantial questions of law and fact common to all of  
11 the members of the Class that control this litigation and predominate over any questions affecting  
12 only individual members of the Class. The common issues include, but are not limited to, the  
13 following:

14 (a) Was the Defendant's dog and cat food materially defective, and unfit for  
15 use as dog or cat food?

16 (b) Whether Defendant breached any contract, implied contract or warranties  
17 related to the sale of the dog and cat food?

18 (c) Did the Defendant's dog and cat food cause Plaintiff's and other Class  
19 members' pets to become ill?

20 (d) Were Plaintiff and other Class members damaged, and, if so, what is the  
21 proper measure thereof?

22 (e) The appropriate form of injunctive, declaratory and other relief.

23 16. The prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create a risk  
24 of establishing incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant – for example, one court  
25 might decide that the Defendant is obligated under the law to pay damages to Class members,  
26

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 3  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101

TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 and another might decide that the Defendant is not so obligated. Individual actions may, as a  
2 practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the Class.

3 17. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class in that he has  
4 no interests that are antagonistic to other members of the Class and has retained counsel  
5 competent in the prosecution of class actions to represent himself and the Class.

6 18. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
7 adjudication of this controversy. Given (i) the substantive complexity of this litigation; (ii) the  
8 size of individual Class members' claims; and (iii) the limited resources of the Class members,  
9 few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress individually for the wrongs  
10 Defendant has committed against them.

11 19. Without a class action, the Class will continue to suffer damage, Defendant's  
12 violations of the law or laws will continue without remedy, and Defendant will continue to enjoy  
13 the fruits and proceeds of its unlawful misconduct.

14 20. This action will foster an orderly and expeditious administration of Class claims,  
15 economies of time, effort and expense, and uniformity of decision.

16 21. Inferences and presumptions of materiality and reliance are available to obtain  
17 class-wide determinations of those elements within the Class claims, as are accepted  
18 methodologies for class-wide proof of damages; alternatively, upon adjudication of Defendant's  
19 common liability, the Court can efficiently determine the claims of the individual Class  
20 members.

21 22. This action presents no difficulty that would impede the Court's management of it  
22 as a class action, and a class action is the best (if not the only) available means by which  
23 members of the Class can seek legal redress for the harm caused them by Defendant.

24 23. In the absence of a class action, Defendant would be unjustly enriched because it  
25 would be able to retain the benefits and fruits of its wrongful conduct.

26 24. The Claims in this case are also properly certifiable under applicable law.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 4  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

**V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

25. Plaintiff Jeff Rusiecki was the owner of a female Labrador Retriever.

26. Mr. Rusiecki purchased Alpo for his dog to consume.

27. The dog ate the Alpo brand dog food mixed with dry food before her death.

28. The retriever became extremely ill after eating the Alpo dog food. Mr. Rusiecki took his dog to a veterinarian, who informed him that the dog had suffered kidney failure, also known as acute renal failure. Mr. Rusiecki's dog died a very distressing death, even with the intervention of a veterinarian.

29. In March 2007, Menu Foods recalled 50 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style dog food and 40 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style cat food that had caused dogs and pets to become ill. One common symptom in the sick animals was kidney failure.

30. The Alpo dog food Mr. Rusiecki's dog consumed before her death is one of the brands that Menu Foods recalled.

31. As a result of Defendant's acts and omissions Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered economic damage.

**VI. BREACH OF CONTRACT**

32. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

33. Plaintiff and Class members purchased pet food produced by the Defendant based on the understanding that the food was safe for their pets to consume.

34. The pet food produced by the Defendant was not safe for pets to consume and caused dogs and cats to become ill. The unsafe nature of the pet food constituted a breach of contract.

35. As a result of the breach Plaintiff and Class members suffered damages that may fairly and reasonably be considered as arising naturally from the breach or may reasonably be supposed to have been in the contemplation of the parties, at the time they made the contract, as the probable result of the breach of it.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 5  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

**VII. UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

36. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

37. Defendant was and continues to be unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff and other Class members.

38. Defendant should be required to disgorge this unjust enrichment.

**VIII. UNLAWFUL, DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES**

39. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

40. Defendant's sale of tainted pet food constitutes an unlawful, deceptive and unfair business act within the meaning of the Washington Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86 *et seq.*, and similar statutory enactments of other states (including consumer protection and consumer sales practice acts).

41. Defendant's sale of hazardous pet food has the capacity to deceive a substantial portion of the public and to affect the public interest.

42. As a result of Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices, Plaintiff and other Class members suffered injuries in an amount to be proven at trial.

**IX. BREACH OF WARRANTIES**

43. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

44. Cat food and dog food produced by Menu Foods are "goods" within the meaning of Uniform Commercial Code Article 2.

45. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied or express warranty of affirmation.

46. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied warranty of merchantability.

47. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose.





1 47. As a proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct and breach,  
2 Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.  
3 Defendant had actual or constructive notice of such damages.

4 **X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Class members request that the Court enter an order of  
6 judgment against Defendant including the following:

7 Certification of the action as a class action under Rule 23(b)(1) - (3) of the Federal Rules  
8 of Civil Procedure with respect to the claims for damages, and appointment of Plaintiff as Class  
9 Representative and his counsel of record as Class Counsel;

10 Actual damages (including all general, special, incidental, and consequential damages),  
11 statutory damages (including treble damages), punitive damages (as allowed by the law(s) of the  
12 states having a legally sufficient connection with Defendant and its acts or omissions) and such  
13 other relief as provided by the statutes cited herein;

14 Prejudgment and post-judgment interest on such monetary relief;

15 Equitable relief in the form of restitution and/or disgorgement of all unlawful or illegal  
16 profits received by Defendant as a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or deceptive conduct alleged  
17 herein;

18 Other appropriate injunctive relief;

19 The costs of bringing this suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees; and

20 Such other relief as this Court may deem just, equitable and proper.

21 DATED this 26th day of April, 2007.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 7  
Case No.




HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101

TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

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

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By:   
Steve W. Berman, WSBA #12536  
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292  
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
E-mail: [steve@hbsslw.com](mailto:steve@hbsslw.com)

MYERS & COMPANY, P.L.L.C.  
Michael David Myers  
1809 Seventh Avenue, Suite 700  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 398-1188  
Facsimile: (206) 400-1112  
E-mail: [mmyers@myers-company.com](mailto:mmyers@myers-company.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 8  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

**EXHIBIT K**

FILED ENTERED  
LODGED RECEIVED  
★ (APR 26 2007) ★  
AT SEATTLE  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
BY DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

NANCY GUTHRIE, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
MENU FOODS, a foreign corporation,  
  
Defendant.

No. **CV07-5205** KJR  
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Nancy Guthrie ("Plaintiff"), by and through her undersigned attorneys, bring this civil action for damages on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated against the above-named Defendant and complain and allege as follows:

**I. NATURE OF ACTION**

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a Class Action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by defendant Menu Foods and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food.

2. The Defendant is a producer of, *inter alia*, dog and cat food. Menu Foods produces dog and cat food sold under familiar brand names such as Iams, Eukanuba and Science Diet. Menu Foods distributes its dog and cat food throughout the United States to retailers such as Wal-Mart, Kroger and Safeway.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 1  
Case No.

COPY



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 3. Dog and cat food that the Defendant produced caused an unknown number of  
2 dogs and cats to become ill, and many of them to die.

3 4. To date, Menu Foods has recalled 50 brands of dog food and 40 brands of cat  
4 food that have sickened and killed dogs and cats. All recalled food to date is of the “cuts and  
5 gravy wet” style.

6 5. As a result of the Defendant’s actions, Plaintiff and other Class members have  
7 suffered economic damage.

8 **II. PARTIES**

9 6. Plaintiff Guthrie has at all material times been a resident of Tacoma, Washington.  
10 Ms. Guthrie had a pet that became sick and died after eating Defendant’s pet food.

11 7. Defendant Menu Foods is, upon information and belief, a corporation organized  
12 under the laws of Canada that transacts business in Washington State.

13 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 8. Subject-matter jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because the  
15 Plaintiffs and Defendant are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds  
16 \$75,000.00. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims under 28 U.S.C.  
17 § 1367.

18 9. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) because the  
19 Defendant systematically and continuously sold its product within this district and Defendant  
20 transacts business within this district.

21 **IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATION**

22 10. Plaintiffs bring this suit as a class action under Rules 23(a), (b)(1), (b)(2) and  
23 (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of themselves and a Plaintiff Class (the  
24 “Class”) composed of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by the  
25 Defendant and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food. Plaintiff  
26 reserves the right to modify this class definition before moving for class certification.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 2  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 11. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest  
2 among the members of the Class.

3 12. Membership in the Class is so numerous as to make it impractical to bring all  
4 Class members before the Court. The identity and exact number of Class members is unknown  
5 but is estimated to be at least in the hundreds, if not thousands considering the fact that Menu  
6 Foods has identified 50 dog foods and 40 cat foods that may be causing harm to pets.

7 13. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class members, all of whom have  
8 suffered harm due to Defendant's uniform course of conduct.

9 14. Plaintiff is a member of the Class.

10 15. There are numerous and substantial questions of law and fact common to all of  
11 the members of the Class that control this litigation and predominate over any questions affecting  
12 only individual members of the Class. The common issues include, but are not limited to, the  
13 following:

14 (a) Was the Defendant's dog and cat food materially defective, and unfit for  
15 use as dog or cat food?

16 (b) Whether Defendant breached any contract, implied contract or warranties  
17 related to the sale of the dog and cat food?

18 (c) Did the Defendant's dog and cat food cause Plaintiff's and other Class  
19 members' pets to become ill?

20 (d) Were Plaintiff and other Class members damaged, and, if so, what is the  
21 proper measure thereof?

22 (e) The appropriate form of injunctive, declaratory and other relief.

23 16. The prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create a risk  
24 of establishing incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant – for example, one court  
25 might decide that the Defendant is obligated under the law to pay damages to Class members,  
26

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 3  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101

TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 and another might decide that the Defendant is not so obligated. Individual actions may, as a  
2 practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the Class.

3 17. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class in that she has  
4 no interests that are antagonistic to other members of the Class and has retained counsel  
5 competent in the prosecution of class actions to represent herself and the Class.

6 18. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
7 adjudication of this controversy. Given (i) the substantive complexity of this litigation; (ii) the  
8 size of individual Class members' claims; and (iii) the limited resources of the Class members,  
9 few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress individually for the wrongs  
10 Defendant has committed against them.

11 19. Without a class action, the Class will continue to suffer damage, Defendant's  
12 violations of the law or laws will continue without remedy, and Defendant will continue to enjoy  
13 the fruits and proceeds of its unlawful misconduct.

14 20. This action will foster an orderly and expeditious administration of Class claims,  
15 economies of time, effort and expense, and uniformity of decision.

16 21. Inferences and presumptions of materiality and reliance are available to obtain  
17 class-wide determinations of those elements within the Class claims, as are accepted  
18 methodologies for class-wide proof of damages; alternatively, upon adjudication of Defendant's  
19 common liability, the Court can efficiently determine the claims of the individual Class  
20 members.

21 22. This action presents no difficulty that would impede the Court's management of it  
22 as a class action, and a class action is the best (if not the only) available means by which  
23 members of the Class can seek legal redress for the harm caused them by Defendant.

24 23. In the absence of a class action, Defendant would be unjustly enriched because it  
25 would be able to retain the benefits and fruits of its wrongful conduct.

26 24. The Claims in this case are also properly certifiable under applicable law.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 4  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

**V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

25. Plaintiff Nancy Guthrie was the owner of a cat named NikkiCat.

26. Ms. Guthrie purchased Science Diet Cuts Chicken and Gravy cat food from Pet Smart for NikkiCat to consume.

27. NikkiCat ate the Science Diet brand cat food before her death.

28. NikkiCat became extremely ill during the week of December 2, 2006 and required two days of hospitalization. NikkiCat became ill again on December 17, 2006 and had to be euthanized on December 19, 2006.

29. In March 2007, Menu Foods recalled 50 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style dog food and 40 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style cat food that had caused dogs and pets to become ill. One common symptom in the sick animals was kidney failure.

30. The Science Diet food from Pet Smart that NikkiCat consumed before her death is one of the brands that Menu Foods recalled.

31. As a result of Defendant's acts and omissions Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered economic damage.

**VI. BREACH OF CONTRACT**

32. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

33. Plaintiff and Class members purchased pet food produced by the Defendant based on the understanding that the food was safe for their pets to consume.

34. The pet food produced by the Defendant was not safe for pets to consume and caused dogs and cats to become ill. The unsafe nature of the pet food constituted a breach of contract.

35. As a result of the breach Plaintiff and Class members suffered damages that may fairly and reasonably be considered as arising naturally from the breach or may reasonably be supposed to have been in the contemplation of the parties, at the time they made the contract, as the probable result of the breach of it.





**VII. UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

36. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

37. Defendant was and continues to be unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff and other Class members.

38. Defendant should be required to disgorge this unjust enrichment.

**VIII. UNLAWFUL, DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES**

39. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

40. Defendant's sale of tainted pet food constitutes an unlawful, deceptive and unfair business act within the meaning of the Washington Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86 *et seq.*, and similar statutory enactments of other states (including consumer protection and consumer sales practice acts).

41. Defendant's sale of hazardous pet food has the capacity to deceive a substantial portion of the public and to affect the public interest.

42. As a result of Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices, Plaintiff and other Class members suffered injuries in an amount to be proven at trial.

**IX. BREACH OF WARRANTIES**

43. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

44. Cat food and dog food produced by Menu Foods are "goods" within the meaning of Uniform Commercial Code Article 2.

45. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied or express warranty of affirmation.

46. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied warranty of merchantability.

47. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose.



1 48. As a proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct and breach,  
2 Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.  
3 Defendant had actual or constructive notice of such damages.

4 **X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Class members request that the Court enter an order of  
6 judgment against Defendant including the following:

7 Certification of the action as a class action under Rule 23(b)(1) - (3) of the Federal Rules  
8 of Civil Procedure with respect to the claims for damages, and appointment of Plaintiff as Class  
9 Representative and her counsel of record as Class Counsel;

10 Actual damages (including all general, special, incidental, and consequential damages),  
11 statutory damages (including treble damages), punitive damages (as allowed by the law(s) of the  
12 states having a legally sufficient connection with Defendant and its acts or omissions) and such  
13 other relief as provided by the statutes cited herein;

14 Prejudgment and post-judgment interest on such monetary relief;

15 Equitable relief in the form of restitution and/or disgorgement of all unlawful or illegal  
16 profits received by Defendant as a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or deceptive conduct alleged  
17 herein;

18 Other appropriate injunctive relief;

19 The costs of bringing this suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees; and

20 Such other relief as this Court may deem just, equitable and proper.

21 DATED this 26th day of April, 2007.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 7  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Steve W. Berman, WSBA #12536  
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292  
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
E-mail: [steve@hbsslw.com](mailto:steve@hbsslw.com)

MYERS & COMPANY, P.L.L.C.  
Michael David Myers  
1809 Seventh Avenue, Suite 700  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 398-1188  
Facsimile: (206) 400-1112  
E-mail: [mmyers@myers-company.com](mailto:mmyers@myers-company.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 8  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

**EXHIBIT L**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

SHEREE A. ROBINSON, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MENU FOODS, a foreign corporation,

Defendant.

No. **07-0666** *RSZ*

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

FILED ENTERED  
LODGED RECEIVED

★ MAY 01 2007 ★

AT SEATTLE  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
BY DEPUTY

Plaintiff Sheree Robinson ("Plaintiff"), by and through her undersigned attorneys, brings this civil action for damages on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated against the above-named Defendant and complain and allege as follows:

**I. NATURE OF ACTION**

1. Plaintiff brings this action as a Class Action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by defendant Menu Foods and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food.

2. The Defendant is a producer of, *inter alia*, dog and cat food. Menu Foods produces dog and cat food sold under familiar brand names such as Iams, Eukanuba and Science Diet. Menu Foods distributes its dog and cat food throughout the United States to retailers such as Wal-Mart, Kroger and Safeway.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 1  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

COPY

1 3. Dog and cat food that the Defendant produced caused an unknown number of  
2 dogs and cats to become ill, and many of them to die.

3 4. To date, Menu Foods has recalled 50 brands of dog food and 40 brands of cat  
4 food that have sickened and killed dogs and cats. All recalled food to date is of the “cuts and  
5 gravy wet” style.

6 5. As a result of the Defendant’s actions, Plaintiff and other Class members have  
7 suffered economic damage.

## 8 II. PARTIES

9 6. Plaintiff Robinson has at all material times been a resident of Seattle, Washington.  
10 Ms. Robinson had a pet that became sick and died after eating Defendant’s pet food.

11 7. Defendant Menu Foods is, upon information and belief, a corporation organized  
12 under the laws of Canada that transacts business in Washington State.

## 13 III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14 8. Subject-matter jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because the  
15 Plaintiffs and Defendant are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds  
16 \$75,000.00. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims under 28 U.S.C.  
17 § 1367.

18 9. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) because the  
19 Defendant systematically and continuously sold its product within this district and Defendant  
20 transacts business within this district.

## 21 IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATION

22 10. Plaintiffs bring this suit as a class action under Rules 23(a), (b)(1), (b)(2) and  
23 (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of themselves and a Plaintiff Class (the  
24 “Class”) composed of all persons who purchased any dog or cat food that was produced by the  
25 Defendant and/or has had a dog or cat become ill or die as a result of eating the food. Plaintiff  
26 reserves the right to modify this class definition before moving for class certification.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 2  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 11. The Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest  
2 among the members of the Class.

3 12. Membership in the Class is so numerous as to make it impractical to bring all  
4 Class members before the Court. The identity and exact number of Class members is unknown  
5 but is estimated to be at least in the hundreds, if not thousands considering the fact that Menu  
6 Foods has identified 50 dog foods and 40 cat foods that may be causing harm to pets.

7 13. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class members, all of whom have  
8 suffered harm due to Defendant's uniform course of conduct.

9 14. Plaintiff is a member of the Class.

10 15. There are numerous and substantial questions of law and fact common to all of  
11 the members of the Class that control this litigation and predominate over any questions affecting  
12 only individual members of the Class. The common issues include, but are not limited to, the  
13 following:

14 (a) Was the Defendant's dog and cat food materially defective, and unfit for  
15 use as dog or cat food?

16 (b) Whether Defendant breached any contract, implied contract or warranties  
17 related to the sale of the dog and cat food?

18 (c) Did the Defendant's dog and cat food cause Plaintiff's and other Class  
19 members' pets to become ill?

20 (d) Were Plaintiff and other Class members damaged, and, if so, what is the  
21 proper measure thereof?

22 (e) The appropriate form of injunctive, declaratory and other relief.

23 16. The prosecution of separate actions by members of the Class would create a risk  
24 of establishing incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant – for example, one court  
25 might decide that the Defendant is obligated under the law to pay damages to Class members,  
26

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 3  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 and another might decide that the Defendant is not so obligated. Individual actions may, as a  
2 practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the Class.

3 17. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class in that she has  
4 no interests that are antagonistic to other members of the Class and has retained counsel  
5 competent in the prosecution of class actions to represent herself and the Class.

6 18. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
7 adjudication of this controversy. Given (i) the substantive complexity of this litigation; (ii) the  
8 size of individual Class members' claims; and (iii) the limited resources of the Class members,  
9 few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress individually for the wrongs  
10 Defendant has committed against them.

11 19. Without a class action, the Class will continue to suffer damage, Defendant's  
12 violations of the law or laws will continue without remedy, and Defendant will continue to enjoy  
13 the fruits and proceeds of its unlawful misconduct.

14 20. This action will foster an orderly and expeditious administration of Class claims,  
15 economies of time, effort and expense, and uniformity of decision.

16 21. Inferences and presumptions of materiality and reliance are available to obtain  
17 class-wide determinations of those elements within the Class claims, as are accepted  
18 methodologies for class-wide proof of damages; alternatively, upon adjudication of Defendant's  
19 common liability, the Court can efficiently determine the claims of the individual Class  
20 members.

21 22. This action presents no difficulty that would impede the Court's management of it  
22 as a class action, and a class action is the best (if not the only) available means by which  
23 members of the Class can seek legal redress for the harm caused them by Defendant.

24 23. In the absence of a class action, Defendant would be unjustly enriched because it  
25 would be able to retain the benefits and fruits of its wrongful conduct.

26 24. The Claims in this case are also properly certifiable under applicable law.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 4  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594



**V. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

25. Plaintiff Sheree Robinson is the owner of a female cat named, Alanna.

26. Ms. Robinson purchased Nutro Moist Pouches at Pet Smart for Alanna to consume.

27. Alanna ate the Nutro brand cat food all her life before she became ill.

28. The cat became extremely ill after eating the Nutro Moist Pouches food. Ms. Robinson took Alanna to a veterinarian, who informed her that Alanna suffered from kidney failure, also known as acute renal failure. Alanna will not recover from the kidney failure because of her extremely small size.

29. In March 2007, Menu Foods recalled 50 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style dog food and 40 brands of cuts and gravy wet-style cat food that had caused dogs and pets to become ill. One common symptom in the sick animals was kidney failure.

30. The Nutro Moist Pouches food Alanna consumed before developing kidney failure is one of the brands that Menu Foods recalled.

31. As a result of Defendant's acts and omissions Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered economic damage.

**VI. BREACH OF CONTRACT**

32. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

33. Plaintiff and Class members purchased pet food produced by the Defendant based on the understanding that the food was safe for their pets to consume.

34. The pet food produced by the Defendant was not safe for pets to consume and caused dogs and cats to become ill. The unsafe nature of the pet food constituted a breach of contract.

35. As a result of the breach Plaintiff and Class members suffered damages that may fairly and reasonably be considered as arising naturally from the breach or may reasonably be



1 supposed to have been in the contemplation of the parties, at the time they made the contract, as  
2 the probable result of the breach of it.

3 **VII. UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

4 36. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

5 37. Defendant was and continues to be unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff  
6 and other Class members.

7 38. Defendant should be required to disgorge this unjust enrichment.

8 **VIII. UNLAWFUL, DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES**

9 39. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

10 40. Defendant's sale of tainted pet food constitutes an unlawful, deceptive and unfair  
11 business act within the meaning of the Washington Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86 *et*  
12 *seq.*, and similar statutory enactments of other states (including consumer protection and  
13 consumer sales practice acts).

14 41. Defendant's sale of hazardous pet food has the capacity to deceive a substantial  
15 portion of the public and to affect the public interest.

16 42. As a result of Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices, Plaintiff and other  
17 Class members suffered injuries in an amount to be proven at trial.

18 **IX. BREACH OF WARRANTIES**

19 43. Plaintiff realleges all prior allegations as though fully stated herein.

20 44. Cat food and dog food produced by Menu Foods are "goods" within the meaning  
21 of Uniform Commercial Code Article 2.

22 45. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied or  
23 express warranty of affirmation.

24 46. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied  
25 warranty of merchantability.

26  
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 6  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

1 47. Defendant's conduct as described herein constitutes breach of an implied  
2 warranty of fitness for a particular purpose.

3 48. As a proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct and breach,  
4 Plaintiff and other Class members have suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.  
5 Defendant had actual or constructive notice of such damages.

6 **X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Class members request that the Court enter an order of  
8 judgment against Defendant including the following:

9 Certification of the action as a class action under Rule 23(b)(1) - (3) of the Federal Rules  
10 of Civil Procedure with respect to the claims for damages, and appointment of Plaintiff as Class  
11 Representative and her counsel of record as Class Counsel;

12 Actual damages (including all general, special, incidental, and consequential damages),  
13 statutory damages (including treble damages), punitive damages (as allowed by the law(s) of the  
14 states having a legally sufficient connection with Defendant and its acts or omissions) and such  
15 other relief as provided by the statutes cited herein;

16 Prejudgment and post-judgment interest on such monetary relief;

17 Equitable relief in the form of restitution and/or disgorgement of all unlawful or illegal  
18 profits received by Defendant as a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or deceptive conduct alleged  
19 herein;

20 Other appropriate injunctive relief;

21 The costs of bringing this suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees; and

22 Such other relief as this Court may deem just, equitable and proper.

23 DATED this 1st day of May, 2007.  
24  
25  
26


CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 7  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By:   
Steve W. Berman, WSBA #12536  
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292  
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
E-mail: [steve@hbsslaw.com](mailto:steve@hbsslaw.com)

MYERS & COMPANY, P.L.L.C.  
Michael David Myers  
1809 Seventh Avenue, Suite 700  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 398-1188  
Facsimile: (206) 400-1112  
E-mail: [mmyers@myers-company.com](mailto:mmyers@myers-company.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

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

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 8  
Case No.



HAGENS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

1301 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900 • SEATTLE, WA 98101  
TELEPHONE (206) 623-7292 • FACSIMILE (206) 623-0594