Case: 4:16-cv-00257 Doc. #: 1 Filed: 02/25/16 Page: 1 of 13 PageID #: 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

and all others similarly situated,)
Plaintiffs, v.)) CASE NO.:
KRAFT HEINZ FOODS COMPANY, Defendant.)) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)
)))

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff RICHARD EVANS, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated and for his Class Action Complaint alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. Defendant Kraft Heinz Foods Company has advertised and sold millions of containers of its "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" products as "100%" Parmesan cheese. Independent laboratory testing shows, however, that such products are not in fact "100%" Parmesan, but rather contain significant amounts of adulterants and fillers. In fact, testing shows that at least 3.8 percent of the purportedly "100%" Parmesan consists of cellulose, a filler and anticlumping agent derived from wood pulp.
- 2. Plaintiff and the members of the Class, as defined herein, purchased Kraft's "100%" Parmesan cheese products because they were deceived into believing that the products were 100% Parmesan cheese. Because Kraft's "100%" Parmesan cheese products contain a substantial amount of fillers and are not "100%" Parmesan cheese, Plaintiff and members of the

Class have been injured and have suffered an ascertainable loss.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

- 3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A) because this case is a class action where the aggregate claims of all Members of the putative Classes are in excess of \$5,000,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs, and many of the Members of the putative Classes are citizens of different states than Defendant. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d).
- 4. Venue is properly set in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) since Defendant transacts business within this judicial district. Likewise, a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred within this judicial district.
- 5. Consistent with the Due Process Clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, the Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, because Defendant is present in the State of Missouri, such that requiring an appearance does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 6. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant pursuant to and consistent with the Constitutional requirements of Due Process in that Defendant, acting through its agents or apparent agents, committed one or more of the following:
 - a. The transaction of any business within the state;
 - b. The making of any contract within the state;
 - c. The commission of a tortious act within this state; and
 - d. The ownership, use, or possession of any real estate situated within this state.
 - 7. Requiring Defendant to litigate these claims in Missouri does not offend traditional

notions of fair play and substantial justice and is permitted by the United States Constitution. All Plaintiff and Class Members' claims arise in part from conduct Defendant purposefully directed to Missouri. On information and belief, Defendant's "100%" Parmesan cheese products are sold at hundreds of local and national retailers, including, but not limited to Wal-Mart, Target, Schnuck's and Dierberg's, throughout the State of Missouri. On information and belief, Defendant avails itself of numerous advertising and promotional materials regarding its defective products specifically intended to reach consumers in Missouri, including but not limited to advertisements on local Missouri television programs, advertisements on local Missouri radio broadcasts, advertisements on billboards in Missouri and advertisements in print publications delivered to consumers in the State of Missouri.

- 8. Plaintiff and Class Members' claims arise out of Defendant's design, marketing and sale of "100%" Parmesan cheese products in the State of Missouri.
- 9. Defendant regularly conducts or solicits business and derives substantial revenue from goods used or consumed in, inter alia, the State of Missouri.
- 10. Defendant Kraft Heinz Foods Company is a Pennsylvania corporation with headquarters in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Chicago, Illinois. Defendant Kraft Heinz Foods Company maintains an agent for service of process at 120 South Central Ave., St. Louis, Missouri 63105.
- 11. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Kraft Heinz Foods Company was engaged in the business of designing, developing, manufacturing, testing, packaging, promoting, marketing, distributing, labeling, and/or selling "100%" Parmesan cheese products.
- 12. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Defendant Kraft Heinz Foods Company was present and doing business in the State of Missouri.

- 13. At all relevant times, Defendant Kraft Heinz Foods Company, transacted, solicited, and conducted business in the State of Missouri and derived substantial revenue from such business.
- 14. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Kraft Heinz Foods Company expected or should have expected that its acts would have consequences within the United States of America, and the State of Missouri in particular.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Kraft's grated Parmesan cheese products are advertised as consisting of only one, simple ingredient "100%" Parmesan cheese.
- 16. Kraft makes only one marketing representation on the label: the Product is "100%" Grated Parmesan Cheese. Consumers, including Plaintiff, reasonably rely on the label and believe Kraft's statement that the Product consists of "100%" Parmesan cheese means that no substitutes or fillers are present in the container. Because the Product does in fact contain fillers and substitutes, the "100%" Parmesan claim is literally false and is also misleading to consumers, including Plaintiff.
- 17. Independent testing shows that at least 3.8 percent of the Product is not Parmesan cheese. Indeed, at least 3.8 percent of the Product is not even cheese of any kind, but is rather fillers and additives. In fact, at least 3.8 percent of the Product is cellulose, an anti-clumping agent derived from wood chips.
- 18. Kraft has been falsely and misleadingly touting that its Grated Parmesan Cheese Products are "100%" Parmesan for decades. In the past, Kraft directly chastised its competitors as having Parmesan made with "fats and fillers," while Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" was advertised as the superior Parmesan product because it is "100% grated cheese" and "100% grated

Parmesan."

- 19. Likewise, Kraft's commercials claim that "If you won't settle for Parmesan cheese that isn't 100 percent Parmesan ... make sure you get one that is! Kraft Parmesan, it's always 100 percent Parmesan, no fillers Real Italian meals don't begin without Kraft 100 percent grated Parmesan cheese. Now, you can eat."
- 20. Kraft's misleading labeling and marketing of its Grated Parmesan Cheese products as consisting of "100%" Parmesan have been identical for decades.
- 21. Indeed, Kraft's uniform marketing and labeling campaign advertising that its "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" literally contains 100% Parmesan stretches back even before the 1990's. For example, in a 1984 advertisement, a "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" wrapper surrounds what appears to be an actual cylinder of Parmesan cheese.
- 22. Kraft's labels for its Grated Parmesan Cheese products in Canada likewise explain that the "100%" representation is a crucial attribute of Kraft's overall marketing message. Like with Kraft's United States labels depicted above, "The label doesn't just say Parmesan, it says 100% Parmesan."
- 23. Defendant has made, and continues to make, unlawful, false, fraudulent, and misleading claims on the food labels of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products.

PLAINTIFFS' USE OF KRAFT'S "100%" PARMESAN CHEESE PRODUCTS

- 24. Plaintiff Richard Evans is and was at all times alleged herein a citizen of the State of Missouri and currently resides in St. Louis, Missouri.
- 25. Plaintiff Richard Evans purchased Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products on numerous occasions, including but not limited to, in or about 2015 within St. Louis,

Missouri. Plaintiff Richard Evans consumed Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products in or about 2015 within St. Louis, Missouri.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

26. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of the following class:

All persons who purchased Kraft "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products in the State of Missouri for personal use.

Excluded from the Class are Defendant and its affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, employees, officers, agents, and directors. Also excluded is any trial judge who may preside over this cause.

- 27. The Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all Members is impracticable. On information and belief, hundreds of thousands of consumers have purchased Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products. Disposition of the claims of the proposed Class in a class action will provide substantial benefits to both the parties and the Court.
- 28. The rights of each member of the proposed Class were violated in a similar fashion based upon Defendants' uniform wrongful actions and/or inaction.
- 29. The following questions of law and fact are common to each proposed Class Member and predominate over questions that may affect individual Class Members:
 - a. Whether Defendant engaged in marketing and promotional activities which were likely to deceive consumers by omitting, suppressing, and/or concealing the true content of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products;
 - b. Whether Defendant omitted, suppressed, and/or concealed material facts concerning Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products from consumers;
 - c. What the fair market value of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products would have been throughout the class period but for Defendant's, its employees', agents', apparent agents', independent contractors', sales representatives', and/or liaisons', omissions, suppressions, and/or concealments concerning the true content of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products:

- d. Whether the prices which Defendant charged for Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products throughout the class period exceeded the fair market value Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products would have had but for Defendant's omissions, suppressions, and/or concealments;
- e. Whether Plaintiff and the Class were deprived of the benefit of the bargain in purchasing Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products;
- f. Whether the excessive prices that Defendant charged for Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products constituted unfair acts or practices in violation of the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act;
- g. Whether Defendant's unconscionable actions occurred in connection with the Defendant's conduct of trade and commerce;
- h. Whether Defendant's omissions, suppressions, and/or concealments of the content of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products enabled Defendant to charge unfair or unconscionable prices for Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products;
- i. Whether Defendant violated the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act through its course of unfair and/or deceptive conduct as alleged herein;
- j. Whether Defendant was unjustly enriched at the expense of the Class members;
- k. Whether Defendant's conduct in violation of the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act was willful and wanton; and
- 1. Whether the Class has been damaged and, if so, the extent of such damages.
- 30. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of absent Class Members. If brought individually, the claims of each Class Member would necessarily require proof of the same material and substantive facts, and seek the same remedies.
- 31. Plaintiff is willing and prepared to serve the Court and the proposed Class in a representative capacity. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the Class and have no interests adverse to, or which directly and irrevocably conflicts with, the interests of other Members of the Class. Further, Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in prosecuting complex class action litigation.

- 32. Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the proposed Class, thereby making appropriate equitable relief with respect to the Class.
- 33. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because individual claims by the Class Members are impractical, as the costs of prosecution may exceed what any Class Member has at stake.
- 34. Members of the Class are readily ascertainable through Defendant's records and files and from other sources.
- 35. Prosecuting separate actions by individual Class Members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications that would establish incomparable standards of conduct for Defendant. Moreover, adjudications with respect to individual Class Members would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other Class Members.

TOLLING OF THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

- 36. The filing of this Class Action Complaint serves to toll and preserve the claims of the Class and other purchasers who were defrauded and injured by Defendant's wrongful and unlawful acts, and the commencement of this action suspends the applicable statute of limitations as to all asserted members of the Class who would have been parties had the suit been permitted to continue as a class action until a district judge declines to certify a class, or certifies a class that excludes particular persons.
- 37. Defendant at all relevant times knew or should have known of the problems and defects with Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products, and the falsity and misleading nature of Defendants' statements, representations and warranties with respect to Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products. Defendant concealed and failed to notify Plaintiff, the Class members, and the public of such defects.

38. Any applicable statute of limitation has therefore been tolled by Defendant's knowledge, active concealment and denial of the facts alleged herein, which behavior is ongoing.

<u>COUNT I</u> Missouri Merchandising Practices Act

- 39. Plaintiff and Class Members incorporate by reference each and every paragraph of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows.
- 40. This Count is brought pursuant to the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act, \$407.010 et seq.
- 41. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff, the Class and Defendant, were persons within the meaning of Mo. Rev. Stat. §407.010(5).
- 42. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff and Class Members were purchasers within the meaning of Mo. Rev. Stat. §407.025.1.
- 43. At all times material hereto, Defendant conducted trade and commerce within the meaning of Mo. Rev. Stat. §407.010(7).
- 44. The Missouri Merchandising Practices Act, §407.020.1 et seq., provides in pertinent part that:

The act, use or employment by any person of any deception, fraud, false pretense, false promise, misrepresentation, unfair practice or the concealment, suppression, or omission of any material fact in connection with the sale or advertisement of any merchandise in trade or commerce....in or from the state of Missouri, is declared to be an unlawful practice....Any act, use or employment declared unlawful by this subsection violates this subsection whether committed before, during or after the sale, advertisement or solicitation.

45. Beginning the first date Defendant placed its Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products into the stream of commerce in Missouri and continuing through the present, Defendant, by and through its employees, agents, apparent agents, and/or sales representatives, engaged in concealment, suppressions, and/or omissions,

misrepresentations, unlawful schemes and courses of conduct intended to induce Plaintiff and members of the Class to purchase Defendant's Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products through one or more of the following unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or practices:

- a. Knowingly, intentionally, and/or recklessly omitted, suppressed, and/ or concealed the content of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products;
- b. Knowingly, intentionally, and/or recklessly omitted, suppressed, and/or concealed the true nutritional value of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products;
- c. Knowingly, intentionally, recklessly, or negligently omitted proper labels from being placed on its packaging, or otherwise calling attention to the actual ingredients in Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products;
- d. Omitted, suppressed, and/or concealed the content of the Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products it manufactured, marketed, promoted, distributed, and/or sold.
- 46. The facts which Defendant omitted, suppressed, and/or concealed as alleged in the preceding paragraph were material in that they concerned facts that would have been important to a reasonable consumer in making a decision whether to purchase Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products.
- 47. Defendants' conduct as alleged in the preceding paragraphs was unfair in that it (1) offended public policy; (2) it was immoral, unethical, oppressive, and/or unscrupulous; and/or (3) it caused substantial economic injury to consumers, namely Plaintiff and members of the Class.
- 48. Defendant's unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or practices alleged in the preceding paragraph occurred in connection with Defendant's conduct of trade and commerce in Missouri.
- 49. Defendant intended for Plaintiff and members of the Class to purchase Defendant's Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products in reliance upon Defendant's

unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or practices in the marketing, promotion, and sale of its Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products.

- 50. Defendant's unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or practices were committed with willful and wanton disregard for whether or not Plaintiff and members of the Class would actually receive an appropriate product.
- 51. Defendant's unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or practices violate the Missouri Merchandising Practices Act, § 407.020.1.
- 52. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unfair and/or deceptive acts and/or practices, Plaintiff and members of the Class did not receive a safe and/or effective product when they purchased Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products.
- 53. Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered actual damages in an amount to be proven at trial, including all compensatory damages, punitive damages, attorney's fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class pray for Judgment in their favor and against Defendant on this Count I of their Complaint; for actual and compensatory damages; for punitive or exemplary damages; for costs, expenses and attorney fees as allowed by law; and for such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT II UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- 54. Plaintiff and Class Members incorporate by reference each and every paragraph of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows.
- 55. As stated with more particularity above, Defendant embarked on and carried out a common scheme of marketing and selling Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products by omitting, suppressing, and/or concealing the true content of Kraft's "100% Grated

Parmesan Cheese" Products.

- 56. Defendant's practices were designed to result in Plaintiff and members of the Class purchasing Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products.
- 57. Defendant's practices further resulted in Plaintiff and members of the Class purchasing Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products without understanding the true content of Defendant's products or Defendant's omissions, suppressions, and/or concealment of material terms to increase its own ill-gotten profits.
- 58. The monies paid by Plaintiff and the Class Members to Defendant in the purchase of Kraft's "100% Grated Parmesan Cheese" Products conferred substantial benefits upon Defendant. Defendant knew of and appreciated the benefits conferred upon it by Plaintiff and the Class and accepted and retained these benefits, which, in justice and fairness, should be refunded and paid over to Plaintiff and the Class in an amount to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class pray for Judgment in their favor and against Defendant on this Count II of their Complaint; for actual and compensatory damages; for punitive or exemplary damages; for costs, expenses and attorney fees as allowed by law; and for such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff and Class Members demand a jury trial as to all claims and issues triable of right by a jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Members of the proposed Class pray that this Honorable Court do the following:

- A. Certify the matter as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and order that notice be provided to all Class Members;
- B. Designate Plaintiff as representative of the Class and the undersigned counsel as Class Counsel;
- C. Award Plaintiff and the Class compensatory and punitive damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact;
 - D. Award Plaintiff and the Class statutory interest and penalties;
 - E. Award Plaintiff and the Class appropriate injunctive and/or declaratory relief;
- F. Award Plaintiff and the Class their costs, prejudgment interest, and attorney fees; and
 - G. Grant such other relief as is just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DRISCOLL FIRM, P.C.

By: ____/s/John J. Driscoll_ JOHN J. DRISCOLL, #54729 PHILIP SHOLTZ, #57375 211 N. Broadway, 40th Floor St. Louis, Missouri 63102 314-932-3232 telephone 314-932-3233 facsimile john@thedriscollfirm.com phil@thedriscollfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

	,)))		
	Plaintiff,)		
	v.) Case N	No.	
	,)		
	Defendant,)		
	ODICINA		NPW	
		L FILING FO		
	FORM MUST BE COMPLETED AND VER NINITIATING A NEW CASE.	IFIED BY TH	HE FILING PARTY	
	THIS SAME CAUSE, OR A SUBSTANTIAL	LLY EQUIVA	LENT COMPLAINT, WAS	
PREVI	OUSLY FILED IN THIS COURT AS CASE N	UMBER		
AND A	ASSIGNED TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE _		·	
	THIS CALLSE IS DELATED DUT IS NOT S		LLV EQUIVALENT TO ANY	
	THIS CAUSE IS RELATED, BUT IS NOT S		-	
	OUSLY FILED COMPLAINT. THE RELATE			
THAT	CASE WAS ASSIGNED TO THE HONORAE	SLE	THIS CASE MAY,	
THERE	EFORE, BE OPENED AS AN ORIGINAL PRO	OCEEDING.		
	NEITHER THIS SAME CAUSE, NOR A SU	BSTANTIALI	LY EQUIVALENT	
COMP	LAINT, HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY FILED IN		-	
			I, AND THEREFORE	
WAYE	BE OPENED AS AN ORIGINAL PROCEEDIN	NU.		
The un	ndersigned affirms that the information provi	ded above is t	true and correct.	
	•			
Date:				
			ture of Filing Party	

MOED-0001 Case: 4:16-cv-00257 Doc. #: 1-2 Filed: 02/25/16 Page: 1 of 1 PageID #: 15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

	Plaintiff	(c))))	
	vs.	(0),	Case No.	
	Defenda	ant(s).)))	
		DISCLOSURE O	F ORGANIZATIONAL INTERESTS CERTIFICATE	
Missour	i and Fed		s of the United States District Court for the Eastern District 1, Counsel of record for hereby	
1.	If the su	bject organization is a corporati	ion,	
	a.	Its parent companies or corpor	rations (if none, state "none"):	
	b.	Its subsidiaries not wholly own	ned by the subject corporation (if none, state "none"):	
	c.	Any publicly held company or of the subject corporation's sto	corporation that owns ten percent (10%) or more ock (if none, state "none"):	
2.		bject organization is a limited li mber's state of citizenship:	iability company or a limited liability partnership, its memb	ers and
			Signature (Counsel for Plaintiff/Defendant) Print Name: Address: City/State/Zip: Phone:	
		,		
mail, by	hand del		Certificate of Service Disclosure of Organizational Interests Certificate was serve on all parties on:	ed (by
			Signature	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

)
Plaintiff (s),)
)
V.) Case No.
)
)
)
Defendant(s).)
	NOTICE OF INTENT TO USE
	PROCESS SERVER
Comos now	and notifies the court of the intent to use
(Plaintiff or Defe	
(Fidilitii) of Dele	induity
(name and address of	f process server)
To serve:	
	in the
(name of defendants	to be served by this process server)
•	,
above-styled cause. The pro-	ocess server listed above possesses the
requirements as stated in R	ule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
TT1 1 1 CC .1	
The undersigned affirms the	e information provided above is true and correct.
(date)	(attorney for Plaintiff)
(uate)	(accorney for Framitin)
	(attorney for Defendant)

Case: 4:16-cv-00257 Doc. #: 1-4 Filed: 02/25/16 Page: 1 of 2 PageID #: 17

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action	
UNITED STATES D	
District	of
Plaintiff	Civil Action No.
SUMMONS IN A C	IVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
•	to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be enter You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	red against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

Date:

CLERK OF COURT

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (nan	ne of individual and title, if any)			
was re	ceived by me on (date)		<u>.</u>		
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individ	dual at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence	e or usual place of abode with (name)		
		, a per	rson of suitable age and discretion who resid	les there	,
	on (date)	, and mailed a cop	y to the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)			, who is
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on	behalf of (name of organization)		_
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the summ	mons unexecuted because			; or
	☐ Other (<i>specify</i>):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$		
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this informa	ation is true.		
Date:			Server's signature		
			Server's signature		
			Printed name and title		
			Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

Case: 4:16-cv-00257 Doc #: 12-5 July 1-5 Over 1: 19

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

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	RM.)			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CI	<u> </u> TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintij
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) P1 en of This State		Incorporated <i>or</i> Pri	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A	Principal Place
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly)	FC	DEFITUDE/DENALTV	RAN	NKDIIPTCV	OTHER STATUTES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other:	1	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe 423 With 28 U 424 With 28 U 425 With 28 U 426 With 28 U 426 With 28 U 426 With 28 U 426 With 28 With	RTY RIGHTS vrights nt emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	moved from 3 tte Court Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	Appellate Court	•		r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$		CHECK YES only URY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: Yes No
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY (OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPI VING IFP		IUDGE		MAG IIII	

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included nere. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)**

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- **V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

Civil Cover Sheet Richard Evans, et al. v. Kraft Heinz Food Company

I. (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone number) - attachment

John J. Driscoll, #54729 Philip Sholtz, #57375 THE DRISCOLL FIRM, P.C. 211 N. Broadway, 40th Floor St. Louis, Missouri 63102 314-932-3232 telephone 314-932-3233 facsimile john@thedriscollfirm.com phil@thedriscollfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs