1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Richard D. McCune, State Bar No. 1321 rdm@mccunewright.com David C. Wright, State Bar No. 177468 dcw@mccunewright.com Steven A. Haskins, State Bar. No. 23886 sah@mccunewright.com Mark I. Richards, State Bar No. 321252 mir@mccunewright.com MCCUNE WRIGHT AREVALO LLP 3281 Guasti Road, Suite 100 Ontario, California 91761 Telephone: (909) 557-1250 Facsimile: (909) 557-1275					
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class					
9						
10						
11						
12	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
13	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
14						
15						
16	SEBASTIEN FRICHE on behalf of himself and all others similarly	Case No.: 8:21-cv-1324				
17 18	situated,   Plaintiff,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT				
19	V.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL				
20	HYUNDAI MOTOR CO.; HYUNDAI					
21	MOTOR AMERICA; and Does 1 through 5, inclusive,					
22	Defendants.					
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

Class Action Complaint Case No.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2				I	Page
3	I	INTF	RODUCTION		1
4	II	JURI	ISDICTION AND VENUE		
5	III	PAR	TIES		7
6		A.	Plaintiff Sebas	stien Friche	7
7		B.	Defendants		7
8		C.	Unknown Def	endants	7
9	IV	FAC'	TUAL ALLEGA	ATIONS	8
10		A.	Plaintiff-Speci	fic Allegations	8
11		B.	Class-Wide A	llegations	. 11
12	V	CLA	SS ACTION A	LLEGATIONS	. 15
13	VI	CAU	SES OF ACTIO	ON	. 18
14		A.	Claims Brough	ht on Behalf of the Nationwide Class	. 18
15			COUNT I:	VIOLATIONS OF THE MAGNUSON-MOSS	
16				WARRANTY ACT	. 18
17		B.	Claims Brough	ht on Behalf of the California Class	. 20
18			COUNT II:	VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSUMER LEGAL	
19				REMEDIES ACT ("CLRA")	. 20
20			COUNT III:	VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA UNFAIR	
21				COMPETITION LAW	. 22
22			COUNT IV:	VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA FALSE ADVERTISIN	NG
23				LAW	. 23
24			COUNT V:	BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY	. 25
25			COUNT VI:	BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY	. 26
26					
27					
28					
				-i-	

1

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)** Page COUNT VII: COMMON LAW FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT .. 27 COUNT VIII: VIOLATIONS OF THE SONG-BEVERLY ACT -BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY ...... 28 VII -ii-Class Action Complaint

Case No.

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

27 28

#### CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff SEBASTIEN FRICHE, on behalf of himself and on behalf of a class of other similarly situated individuals, complains of and alleges the following causes of action against Defendants HYUNDAI MOTOR CO., incorporated in South Korea, and HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA, a California Corporation (collectively referenced herein as "Hyundai"); and DOES 1 through 5, inclusive, as follows:

### **INTRODUCTION**

- Plaintiff Sebastien Friche brings this class action on behalf of himself 1. individually and a class of current and former owners and lessees of 2019-2021 model year Hyundai Kona EV vehicles and 2020 model year Hyundai Ioniq EV vehicles (collectively, the "Class Vehicles") marketed and sold by Hyundai with false representations regarding the safety and range of the Class Vehicles' batteries.<sup>1</sup>
- This action arises from the pervasive false advertisements disseminated by Hyundai that overstate the potential travel range of the Class Vehicles' battery packs. As it happens, the battery used in the Class Vehicles can only attain the promised range by charging the battery to a dangerous degree. Starting in October 2020, a series of fires prompted mass recalls of vehicles in Hyundai's home country of South Korea. As a part of responding to that recall, Hyundai reprogrammed the battery so that the vehicles would travel less distance than the promised range.
- 3. In 2017, Hyundai introduced a line of electric vehicles called the Ioniq. The Ioniq distinguished itself by coming in three separate levels of electrification: hybrid, plug-in hybrid, and fully electric. The electric version of the Ioniq, however, came with a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or add to the vehicle models included in the definition of Class Vehicles after conducting discovery.

relatively short travel range of 124 miles, a range notable for falling far short of other electric vehicles then in the marketplace.<sup>2</sup>

- 4. Two years later, Hyundai introduced a new plug-in, all-electric Sports Utility Vehicle (SUV) called the Hyundai Kona EV, an electrified version of its gas-powered crossover SUV Kona first introduced two years earlier. The Kona EV was Hyundai's version of an all-electric vehicle competing with emerging all-electric vehicle lines promoted by new market entrants like Tesla, Nissan, and BMW. The stakes were particularly high for Hyundai, who was attempting to vastly increase the range of its electric vehicles so as to fully compete with competitors such as Tesla, while providing an environmentally-responsible alternative to gas-guzzling SUVs. And the reviews were highly positive. One reviewer "walked away wondering how anyone could justify buying a daily gasoline driver when you can have a 258-mile electric crossover like this." 3
- 5. To successfully market an all-electric vehicle to the American buying public, increased range is critical. Because battery charging takes more time than re-filling a gasoline tank, an all-electric vehicle's usefulness is directly related to the distance the automobile can travel before needing a recharge. Therefore, electric car buyers particularly rely on manufacturer representations regarding the automobile's ability to travel a specified distance on a single charge. Indeed, price and range are two primary considerations of consumers when deciding to purchase an electric vehicle. This is particularly true for SUVs, which are preferred for longer, more out-of-the-way trips, making vehicle range significant to those that may find themselves driving in circumstances far from available vehicle chargers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Mark Phelan, Detroit Free Press, 2017 Hyundai Ioniq Electric Car Is Long On Features, Short On Range (July 12, 2017), available at <a href="https://www.freep.com/story/money/cars/mark-phelan/2017/07/13/2017-hyundai-ioniq-electric-car-review/469235001/">https://www.freep.com/story/money/cars/mark-phelan/2017/07/13/2017-hyundai-ioniq-electric-car-review/469235001/</a> (last viewed Aug. 5, 2021); Car and Driver, Driven: 2017 Hyundai Ioniq Electric (Feb. 23, 2017), available at <a href="https://www.caranddriver.com/reviews/a15099362/2017-hyundai-ioniq-electric-first-drive-review/">https://www.caranddriver.com/reviews/a15099362/2017-hyundai-ioniq-electric-first-drive-review/</a> (last viewed Aug. 5, 2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See <a href="https://cleantechnica.com/2019/02/10/hyundai-kona-ev-there-is-almost-no-reason-to-buy-a-gasoline-car-now-cleantechnica-review/">https://cleantechnica.com/2019/02/10/hyundai-kona-ev-there-is-almost-no-reason-to-buy-a-gasoline-car-now-cleantechnica-review/</a> (last viewed Aug. 5, 2021).

6. When Hyundai offered the Kona EV to the general public, it advertised that each vehicle had a travel range of 258 miles without recharging.<sup>4</sup> Hyundai has continued to make that same representation since it started marketing the Kona EV to the general public.<sup>5</sup>

- 7. The same representations were made by various certified Hyundai dealers selling the Kona EV, stating that the Kona EV could travel "up to 258 miles without needing to stop." These representations were made on the basis of direction from Hyundai regarding the Class Vehicles' range.
- 8. In 2020, Hyundai upgraded the battery in its Ioniq EV vehicles, increasing the vehicle's advertised range from 124 miles to 170 miles. While boasting a lower range than the Kona and other electric vehicles, the 2020 version of the Ioniq was a significant increase in capacity from previous versions of the automobile.
- 9. Lithium-ion batteries are a key component of electric vehicles because of their high specific energy, high power, and long lifecycle. However, safety concerns related to unexpected fires have been well documented—including several fires that have afflicted similar vehicles in South Korea, as well as other countries where Hyundai offers the Class Vehicles for sale to the public. These fires are well-known to Hyundai, and yet it continues to sell the Class Vehicles in the United States.
- 10. Hyundai is also aware of widespread reports that the same battery it uses in the Class Vehicles is also under suspicion of causing dozens of battery fires in Chevrolet Bolt electric vehicles manufactured by one of Hyundai's primary automotive rivals, General Motors.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See <a href="https://www.hyundainews.com/en-us/releases/2670">https://www.hyundainews.com/en-us/releases/2670</a> (last visited Aug. 5, 2021)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See <a href="https://www.hyundaiusa.com/us/en/vehicles/kona-electric">https://www.hyundaiusa.com/us/en/vehicles/kona-electric</a> ("With an EPA-estimated range of 258 miles with zero emissions, it has the highest of any all-electric subcompact SUV.") (last viewed Aug. 5, 2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See <a href="https://www.hyundaiofmorenovalley.com/blog/what-is-the-range-for-the-2021-hyundai-kona-electric-vehicle/">https://www.hyundaiofmorenovalley.com/blog/what-is-the-range-for-the-2021-hyundai-kona-electric-vehicle/</a> (last viewed Aug. 5, 2021).

- 11. Furthermore, in the United States, the National Transportation Safety Board reported 17 Tesla and 3 BMW i3 lithium-ion battery fires to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's Electrical Vehicle Safety International Working Group. In other words, not only are the risks of lithium-ion battery fires well-documented, there is an established and growing history of such fires regarding the battery used in the Class Vehicles.
- 12. While lithium-ion batteries provide singular advantages that meet the challenges manufacturers are trying to achieve for their electric vehicles—power and range—lithium-ion battery fires are especially dangerous because they pose fire hazards which are significantly different to other fire hazards in terms of initiation, spread, duration, toxicity, and extinction.
- 13. Significantly, the documented fires in the Class Vehicles do not appear to have resulted from any type of external abuse, but rather have resulted from an internal failure of the battery while the cars are sitting in a parked, non-operative state. This type of spontaneous ignition caused by thermal runaway has been reported to cause at least 80% of lithium-ion battery fires.
- 14. Unfortunately, it appears that Hyundai is another in the long line of automobile manufacturers to have traded safety concerns for increased range, pushing the Class Vehicles' range beyond the battery's capability in order to market the vehicle's battery range despite warnings published by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in October 2017, that overcharging lithium-ion batteries can result in one of several exothermic reactions that have the potential to initiate thermal runaway resulting in the spontaneous ignition.
- 15. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, proper management of the electrical loads (i.e., electrical balancing) among cells in a pack helps maintain overall charge and discharge performance within an acceptable range, and prevent overdischarge or overcharge conditions. Because temperature is a key indicator of cell electrical performance (e.g., hotter cells may discharge or charge more quickly

than colder cells), thermal management strategies must be integrated into the battery system design to monitor charging and discharging events and mitigate potentially problematic conditions.

- 16. Plaintiff alleges that the lithium-ion batteries and related management systems of the Class Vehicles are defective and unsafe in that they fail to prevent thermal runaway and spontaneous ignition of the batteries in the Class Vehicles.
- 17. Hyundai can no longer hide the Battery Defect from the general public, given the amount of time that has now passed since the Kona's release. Hyundai has now identified more than ten fires in South Korea traceable to the Kona's battery pack.
- 18. In light of those fires, Hyundai has announced a mass recall of the Kona vehicles sold in South Korea, citing the risk of short circuit potentially caused by the faulty battery packs installed in the vehicles. The solution to the recall was to reprogram the battery pack such that it would only charge to 90% of its promised capacity. When translated into range, this means that the Kona's range will drop approximately 26 miles—10% of the advertised 258. Hyundai has represented in South Korea that it intends to make the reprogramming a permanent fix for the problem. Nevertheless, the last fire experienced in a Kona vehicle just last month, occurred in a vehicle that had already performed the recommended reprogramming, raising questions about whether the reprogramming fix was actually a fix at all.
- 19. Unfortunately, Hyundai failed to be candid with American purchasers and has concealed that its representations regarding the Class Vehicles' battery range were false, based only on unreasonable usage of the battery to the extent that the risk of fire was vastly increased, even while the Class Vehicles are in operation. Defendant failed to disclose that the existence of the defect would diminish owners' usage of the Class Vehicles, as well as their intrinsic and resale value.
- 20. Hyundai knew or should have known that the Class Vehicles were being advertised and sold with false and misleading representations regarding the range of the Class Vehicles and the risk of fire posed by the defective batteries. Yet, notwithstanding

its knowledge, Hyundai has failed to compensate owners and lessees who purchased the Class Vehicles. Instead, Hyundai has implemented a solution reducing the range of the Class Vehicles 10% below what was advertised.

- 21. As a result of Hyundai's unfair, deceptive and/or fraudulent business practices, owners and/or lessees of the Class Vehicles, including Plaintiff, have suffered an ascertainable loss of money and/or property and/or loss in value. Hyundai has conducted these unfair and deceptive trade practices in a manner giving rise to substantial aggravating circumstances.
- 22. Had Plaintiff and other Class members known at the time of purchase or lease of the true range of the Class Vehicles and the propensity of the batteries installed in the Class Vehicles to burst into flame, they would not have bought or leased the Class Vehicles, or would have paid substantially less for them.
- 23. As a result of the lower ratings and the monetary costs associated therewith, Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered injury in fact, incurred damages, and have otherwise been harmed by Hyundai's conduct.
- 24. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this action to redress Hyundai's multiple violations of the law with regard to the Battery Defect.

## II JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 25. This Court has diversity jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (d) because the amount in controversy for the Class exceeds \$5,000,000 and many putative class members are citizens of a different state than Defendant.
- 26. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Plaintiff because Plaintiff submits to the Court's jurisdiction. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Hyundai because it conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the District, and because it has committed the acts and omissions complained of herein in the District, including the marketing and leasing of the Class Vehicles in this District. Hyundai Motor America also has its headquarters located in this District, in the city of Fountain Valley, California.

27. Venue as to Defendant is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C § 1391 because Defendant sells a substantial number of automobiles in this District, has dealerships in this District, and many of Defendant's acts complained of herein occurred within this District, including the marketing and leasing of the Class Vehicles to Plaintiff and members of the putative Class in this district. Hyundai Motor America also has its headquarters located in this district.

## III PARTIES

### A. Plaintiff Sebastien Friche

- 28. Plaintiff Sebastien Friche is a resident and citizen of Redlands, California.
- 29. In 2019, Plaintiff purchased a new 2019 Hyundai Kona EV from Hyundai Inland Empire in California.

### B. Defendants

- 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, Defendant HYUNDAI MOTOR COMPANY is a Korean corporation with its principal place of business located 12 Heolleung-ro Seocho-gu Seoul 06797, Republic of South Korea, and was and now is authorized to do and doing business in the State of California.
- 31. Defendant HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA is a corporation which is incorporated in the state of California, and is a citizen of and has its principal place of business in the city of Fountain Valley, California.

### C. Unknown Defendants

32. The true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue such defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the defendants designated herein as DOES when such identities become known.

Kona EVs and

33. Based upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that at all times mentioned herein, each and every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants, and at all times mentioned was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge, permission, and consent of each of the other Defendants. In addition, each of the acts and/or omissions of each Defendant alleged herein were made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

### IV FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

### A. Plaintiff-Specific Allegations

- 34. Plaintiff made the decision to purchase the Hyundai Kona after considering Hyundai's representations about the vehicle, including comparisons of Hyundai's representations about the range of the vehicle when compared with other similar allelectric vehicles. Plaintiff also reviewed the "driving range" data set forth in the new vehicle Monroney sticker, when deciding whether to purchase the Kona or another vehicle. The Monroney sticker explained that when "fully charged" the Kona could travel a total of 258 miles on a single battery charge. Had Hyundai disclosed the defect in its battery causing a lower range for a single charge or the batteries propensity to burst into flame, Plaintiff would not have purchased the Kona or would have paid substantially less for it.
- 35. In October 2020, Hyundai issued a voluntary recall of approximately 6,700 Kona vehicles, claiming that "1%" may have a "high voltage battery system" that "might contain certain electrical deficiencies." These deficiencies, when present, could "increase the risk of an electrical short circuit after fully charging" the battery. At the time, Hyundai announced that it was "actively investigat[ing] this condition for identification of a specific root cause." In any event, Hyundai recognized that an electrical short in the vehicle's battery "could result in a fire."
- 36. In March 2021, Hyundai augmented the recall to include certain 2019/2020 Kona EVs and 2020 Ioniq EV sedans on the basis that the batteries in those vehicles

could short-circuit and lead to an engine fire. Hyundai has stated that the subject batteries are equipped with "battery cells manufactured in the LG Energy Solutions China (Nanjing) plant in which the Anode (Negative) tab can be folded. A folded Anode tab in the battery cell could allow the Lithium plating on the Anode tab to contact the Cathode, resulting in an electrical short. An electrical short internally within battery cell(s) increases the risk of a vehicle fire while parked, charging, and/or driving."

- 37. But Hyundai's recalls have been decidedly short of solutions, failing to resolve the problems caused by the Battery Defect. Hyundai announced that it planned to "notify owners to bring their vehicles to their nearest Hyundai dealership for inspection and replacement of the Li-ion battery, if necessary." It also stated that it would update the Class Vehicles' software "to allow for detection of abnormalities in the high-voltage battery system while parked." And in the meantime, Hyundai advised Class Vehicle owners to "park their vehicles outdoors and/or away from structures until their vehicle is remedied." These interim steps and half-measures provide very little relief to consumers who have lost the promised range on their vehicles, live in constant fear that their vehicles will spontaneously incinerate, and in some cases are not even able to drive their vehicles
- 38. Plaintiff's experience is a typical one. After Plaintiff became aware of the Hyundai recall, his wife took the Vehicle to his local certified dealer, Hyundai Moreno Valley, for service related to the recall. When the recall was completed, he was told that Hyundai had reduced the Vehicle's range by 20 percent to compensate for decreasing the risk of a potential battery malfunction. The dealer representative they spoke to told them to drive in an "economical" fashion.
- 39. In June 2021, Hyundai used a remote software download to restrict the Vehicle's battery range to 205 miles—another 10 percent drop in range capacity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See https://owners.hyundaiusa.com/us/en/resources/general-information/recall-200-information-and-implementation-plan.html

- 40. On July 20, 2021, Plaintiff's wife returned the Vehicle to the dealer to fix a tire. The service advisor checked the vehicle inspection number and told her the dealer would have to impound the vehicle until Hyundai could replace the battery. The service advisor told her that the seizure would occur for an unspecified amount of time, but potentially up to six months (or even longer). The dealer explained that because of the fire risk posed by the vehicle, it could not release the car to her. The service representative made various representations to Plaintiff's wife while seizing the vehicle, including asserting that "if anything happens, your insurance will not cover anything." Hyundai also refused to provide her with a loaner automobile, though it finally helped her procure a rental. The rental, however, does not replace the Vehicle's services because it (1) uses gasoline, creating additional cost the Friches sought to avoid by purchasing the Kona in the first place and (2) the Friches' two driving-age children cannot drive the rental car. Furthermore, the rental vehicle does not have carpool privileges or Fast Trak discount rates like the Vehicle does.
- 41. At all relevant times herein, the Vehicle was covered by Hyundai's new vehicle limited warranty, including the vehicle's 5-year/60,000-mile New Vehicle Limited Warranty, its 10-Year/100,000-Mile Powertrain Limited Warranty, and its lifetime electric battery warranty. In particular, Hyundai represents that if the "lithiumion polymer battery fails, Hyundai will replace the battery and cover recycling costs for the old battery free of charge to the original owner."
- 42. Since Hyundai seized the Vehicle, Plaintiff has continued to contact Hyundai to determine when it will be released. Hyundai has not told Plaintiff when it plans to replace the battery, how it plans to replace the battery, or when it will ever release the Vehicle. Hyundai has told Plaintiff that even after it replaces the battery, the battery will be covered by a different warranty with a term that lasts only ten years. Hyundai now refuses to communicate with Plaintiff, stating that there is nothing it can do but impound the Vehicle.

# **B.** Class-Wide Allegations

- 43. Under regulations issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, every new car and truck or SUV up to 10,000 pounds sold in the United States must have a fuel economy label or window sticker that contains certain information about the vehicles. Included among this information for electric vehicles is a vehicle's milesper-gallon ("MPG") equivalent estimates, which converts the range of the vehicle's battery into an equivalent mileage as measured by miles per gallon. These ratings have been given to consumers since the 1970s and are posted for the customers' benefit to help them make valid comparisons between vehicles' MPGs when shopping for a new vehicle. This is particularly important for electric vehicles, as consumers generally pay a premium for electric vehicles as compared to gasoline-powered vehicles, and one reason for that premium is the accrued savings over time of driving an electric-powered over a gasoline-powered vehicle.
- 44. Automobile manufacturers are required by law to prominently affix a label called a "Monroney sticker" to each new vehicle sold. The Monroney sticker sets forth, the vehicle's fuel economy (expressed in MPGe for electric vehicles), the driving range, estimated annual fuel costs, the fuel economy range of similar vehicles, and a statement that a booklet is available at the dealership to assist in comparing the fuel economy of vehicles from all manufacturers for that model year, along with pricing and other information.
- 45. Hyundai advertised the Class Vehicles' driving range as being 258 miles (for the Kona EV) and 170 miles (for the Ioniq EV) in order to compete in the electric vehicle market. Hyundai had spent millions of dollars designing and manufacturing the Class Vehicles as a competitor to other electric vehicles in the marketplace, and one of the ways that Hyundai decided to distinguish the Class Vehicles from other vehicles was their driving range.
- 46. Now, of course, Hyundai has put Class Vehicle owners in a conundrum. Hyundai's purported software fix will decrease the range of the vehicle such that owners

will not be able to drive as far without recharging their battery, thus incurring extra time and cost to recharge their vehicle than promised when they purchased it. And Class Vehicles owners have no assurances that the "software fix" actually fixes the problem, given recent reports coming out of South Korea. They are instead required to continue using the same batteries that caused the fires alleged in this complaint, with replacements only promised sometime far off in the future, if at all.

- 47. Hyundai has stated that the recall covers thousands of the Class Vehicles. As a result, each and every one of the Class Vehicles—including Plaintiff's vehicle—will lose 10% more of its driving range.
- 48. Plaintiff, as well as members of the putative Class, reasonably relied on Hyundai's material, yet false, representations regarding the Class Vehicles' range and equivalent miles per gallon.
- 49. A reasonable consumer would expect and rely on Hyundai's advertisements, including the new vehicle Monroney stickers, to truthfully and accurately reflect the Class Vehicles' driving range. Further, a reasonable consumer in today's market attaches material importance to the advertisements of electric mileage, as energy efficiency is one of the most, if not the most, important considerations in making a purchase or lease decision for most consumers.
- 50. Hyundai manufactures automobiles, but Hyundai does not sell vehicles directly to consumers; instead, those vehicles are sold exclusively to authorized Hyundai dealerships who, in turn, re-sell them to consumers.
- 51. Persons or entities seeking to become an authorized Hyundai dealership must complete and submit a Hyundai dealer application form provided by Hyundai Motor America. Authorized Hyundai dealerships in the United States are governed by a detailed Hyundai Motor America Dealer Sales and Service Agreement. (*See* Hyundai Motor America Dealer Sales and Service Agreement, Ex. 1.) This agreement provides that:

DEALER is an integral part of a network of authorized Hyundai Dealers dedicated to the vigorous and effective

promotion and sale of Hyundai Products. Accordingly, DEALER agrees to use its best efforts to effectively promote and sell Hyundai Products to Customers in DEALER's primary market area.

. . .

HMA and DEALER recognize the benefits which may be derived from a comprehensive joint advertising effort by Hyundai Dealers. Accordingly, HMA agrees to assist Hyundai Dealers, including DEALER, in the establishment of a cooperative advertising association. DEALER agrees to cooperate with HMA in the formation of such association and, once it is established, to participate actively and to contribute to it in accordance with the by-laws of the association.

- 52. Additionally, after the initial point of sale, Hyundai also contemplates that its agents and other dealers will purchase the vehicles and resell them to consumers.
- 53. As set forth above, Hyundai Dealers are contractually obligated to use "best efforts to effectively promote and sell Hyundai Products to Customers in DEALER's primary market area" and "to take all reasonable steps to provide service and parts for all Hyundai Motor Vehicles, regardless of where purchased, and whether or not under warranty; to ensure that necessary repairs on Customer vehicles are accurately diagnosed and performed in accordance with the highest professional standards; to advise the Customer and obtain his or her consent prior to the initiation of any repairs; and, to treat the Customer courteously and fairly at all times." This is true for both new and used Hyundai vehicles. Even though these warranties are issued by the manufacturer and run with vehicles when Hyundai sells the vehicles to the dealers, they are intended by both Hyundai and the dealers to benefit the consumer that ultimately purchases the Hyundai vehicles.
- 54. All new Hyundai vehicles are sold to the public with factory warranties issued by Hyundai, including a New Vehicle Limited Warranty. Corrosion, powertrain, and state and federal emissions warranties. Hyundai's warranties were not intended to benefit the initial dealer that it is in privity of contract with; instead, they were intended to benefit the ultimate consumer of the vehicle and purchasers of the vehicles—whether used or new—are third-party beneficiaries of these contractual warranties.

55. The Hyundai Warranty Manual for the Class Vehicles expressly provides:

#### WARRANTOR

Hyundai Motor America (HMA) warrants your new 2019 Hyundai vehicle pursuant to the limited warranties described in this Owner's Handbook.

#### **APPLICABILITY**

. .

The New Vehicle Limited, Anti-Perforation Limited, Federal Emission Performance, Federal Emission Design and Defect, California Emission Control Systems, and Replacement Parts and Accessories Limited warranty coverage described in this handbook apply to the vehicle regardless of a change in ownership, and are transferable to subsequent owners.

The 10 years/100,000 miles Powertrain Limited Warranty is not transferable and applies only to the original owner, as defined under "Original Owner" included in the Powertrain Limited Warranty (Original Owner) section of this Owner's Handbook.

- 56. For their part, the authorized Hyundai Dealers agree and are obligated to "perform warranty service on each Hyundai Motor Vehicle at the time of predelivery service and when requested by the owner according to the requirements of the Hyundai Warranty Policies and Procedures Manual."
- 57. Finally, the Hyundai Motor America Dealer Sales and Service Agreement's provision on "Warranties" makes it clear that the warranties Hyundai issues with its vehicles are intended for the benefit of the ultimate consumers:

### WARRANTIES ON HYUNDAI PRODUCTS

DEALER understands and agrees that the only warranties that will be applicable to each new Hyundai Product sold to DEALER by HMA will be the written limited warranty or warranties expressly furnished by FACTORY or HMA or as stated in the Hyundai Warranty Policies and Procedures Manual, as it may be revised from time to time. With respect to DEALER, such limited warranties are in lieu of all other warranties, express or implied, including any implied warranty of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose or any liability for commercial losses based on negligence or strict liability. Except for its limited liability under such written warranty or warranties, neither FACTORY nor HMA assumes any other warranty obligation or liability. DEALER is not authorized to assume any additional warranty obligations or

liabilities on behalf of HMA or FACTORY. Any such additional obligations or liabilities assumed by DEALER will be solely the responsibility of DEALER.

58. Because the sale of Hyundai vehicles from Hyundai to its authorized dealers is meant for the sole purpose of facilitating the sale of these vehicles to the public, including Plaintiff, and because the ultimate purchasers of the Hyundai vehicles are the intended beneficiaries of the warranties issued by Hyundai that run with the vehicles, Plaintiff and the Class Members are intended third-party beneficiaries to the sale of these vehicles by Hyundai to its authorized dealers and, therefore, are entitled to the application of the third-party beneficiary exception to the privity requirement for the assertion of express and implied warranty claims asserted herein.

## V <u>CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS</u>

59. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf, and on behalf of a nationwide class pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(a), 23(b)(2), and/or 23(b)(3) defined as follows:

### **Nationwide Class:**

All persons or entities in the United States who are current or former owners and/or lessees of a Class Vehicle.

60. Alternatively, Plaintiff seeks to represent the following class of California consumers:

# California Class:

All persons or entities in the state of California who purchased or leased a Class Vehicle.

61. Together, the Nationwide Class and the described statewide classes shall be collectively referred to herein as the "Class." Excluded from the Class are Hyundai, its affiliates, employees, officers and directors, persons or entities that purchased the Class Vehicles for resale, and the Judge(s) assigned to this case. Plaintiff reserves the right to modify, change, or expand the Class definitions based on discovery and further investigation.

- 62. <u>Numerosity</u>: Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. While the exact number and identities of individual members of the Class are unknown at this time, such information being in the Hyundai's sole possession and obtainable by Plaintiff only through the discovery process, Plaintiff believes, and on that basis alleges, that thousands of Class Vehicles have been sold and leased in states that are the subject of the Class.
- 63. Existence and Predominance of Common Questions of Fact and Law:
  Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class. These questions predominate over the questions affecting individual Class members. These common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to, whether:
  - a. the Class Vehicles were sold with the existing Battery Defect;
  - b. Hyundai knew about the Battery Defect but failed to disclose it and its consequences to Hyundai customers;
  - c. a reasonable consumer would consider the defect or its consequences to be material;
  - d. Hyundai should have disclosed the Battery Defect's existence and its consequences; and
  - e. Hyundai's conduct violates the laws and statutes described herein.
- 64. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims related to the alleged software reprogramming and resulting limitation of the Class Vehicles' driving range are typical of the claims of the Class because Plaintiff purchased his vehicles with the same battery defect as other Class members, and each vehicle must receive the alleged software reprogramming. Furthermore, Plaintiff and all members of the Class sustained monetary and economic injuries including, but not limited to, ascertainable losses arising out of Hyundai's wrongful conduct by limiting the Class Vehicles' driving range below the advertised distance. Plaintiff advances these same claims and legal theories on behalf of himself and all absent Class Members.

- 65. Adequacy: Plaintiff adequately represents the Class because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class he seeks to represent, he has retained counsel who are competent and highly experienced in complex class action litigation, and he intends to prosecute this action vigorously. Plaintiff and his counsel are well-suited to fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.
- Superiority: A class action is superior to all other available means of fairly 66. and efficiently adjudicating the claims brought by Plaintiff and the Class. The injury suffered by each individual Class member is relatively small in comparison to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessitated by Hyundai's conduct. It would be virtually impossible for Class members on an individual basis to effectively redress the wrongs done to them. Even if Class members could afford such individual litigation, the courts cannot. Individualized litigation presents a potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system, particularly where the subject matter of the case may be technically complex. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties, and provides the benefits of single adjudication, an economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Upon information and belief, individual Class members can be readily identified and notified based on, inter alia, Hyundai's vehicle identification numbers, warranty claims, registration records, and database of complaints.
- Hyundai has acted, and refused to act, on grounds generally applicable to the 67. Class, thereby making appropriate final equitable relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

27

28

**CAUSES OF ACTION** VI 1 Claims Brought on Behalf of the Nationwide Class 2 Α. 3 **COUNT I** VIOLATIONS OF THE MAGNUSON-MOSS WARRANTY ACT 4 5 (15 U.S.C. § 2301, et seq.) (By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, 6 the California Class) 7 Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and 8 68. succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein. 9 10 Plaintiff brings this claim on behalf of himself and on behalf of the 69. Nationwide Class or, alternatively, on behalf of the California Class. 11 Plaintiff and the Class members are "consumers" within the meaning of the 12 70. Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3). 13 14 71. Hyundai is a supplier and warrantor within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. §§ 2301(4)-(5). 15 16 72. The Class Vehicles, including Plaintiff's vehicle, are "consumer products" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 2301(1). 17 Hyundai's 5-year/60,000-mile new vehicle limited warranty is a "written 18 73. 19 warranty" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6). 20 74. Hyundai's 10-year/100,000-mile powertrain limited warranty is a "written warranty" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6). 21 Hyundai's lifetime electric battery warranty is a "written warranty" within 22 75. the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6). 23 Hyundai breached its express warranties by: 24 76. selling and leasing Class Vehicles with a battery that was defective in 25 a. 26 materials and/or workmanship, requiring repair or replacement within 27 the warranty period; and 28 -18-

- b. refusing and/or failing to honor the express warranties by repairing or replacing the battery without leaving the Class Vehicles with the same capability as advertised to the purchasers.
- 77. Plaintiff and the other Class members relied on the existence and length of the express warranties in deciding whether to purchase or lease the Class Vehicles.
- 78. Hyundai's breach of its express warranties has deprived Plaintiff and the other Class Members of the benefit of their bargain.
- 79. The amount in controversy of Plaintiff's individual claims meets or exceeds the sum or value of \$25.00. In addition, the amount in controversy meets or exceeds the sum or value of \$50,000 (exclusive of interests and costs) computed on the basis of all claims to be determined in this suit.
- 80. Hyundai has been given reasonable opportunity to cure its breach of the written warranties. Alternatively, Plaintiff and the other Class members are not required to do so because affording Defendant a reasonable opportunity to cure its breach of written warranties was, and is, futile.
- 81. As a direct and proximate cause of Hyundai's breach of the written warranties, Plaintiff and the other Class members sustained damages and other losses in an amount to be determined at trial. Hyundai's conduct damaged Plaintiff and the other Class Members, who are entitled to recover actual damages, consequential damages, specific performance, diminution in value, costs, including statutory attorney fees and/or other relief as deemed appropriate.

-19-

# B. Claims Brought on Behalf of the California Class

### **COUNT II**

## VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES ACT ("CLRA")

(Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, et seq.)

# (By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, the California Class)

- 82. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 83. Hyundai is a "person" as that term is defined in California Civil Code § 1761(c).
- 84. Plaintiff and the Class members are "consumers" as that term is defined in California Civil Code §1761(d).
- 85. Hyundai engaged in unfair and deceptive acts in violation of the CLRA by the practices described above, and by knowingly and intentionally concealing from Plaintiff and Class members that the Class Vehicles suffer from a defect(s) (and the costs, risks, and diminished value of the vehicles as a result of this problem). These acts and practices violate, at a minimum, the following sections of the CLRA:
  - (a)(5) Representing that goods or services have sponsorships, characteristics, uses, benefits or quantities which they do not have, or that a person has a sponsorship, approval, status, affiliation or connection which he or she does not have;
  - (a)(7) Representing that goods or services are of a particular standard, quality, or grade, or that goods are of a particular style or model, if they are of another; and
  - (a)(9) Advertising goods and services with the intent not to sell them as advertised.

12

10

1314

1516

17

18 19

21

22

23

20

24

252627

28

- 86. Hyundai's unfair or deceptive acts or practices occurred repeatedly in its trade or business, were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the purchasing public, and imposed a serious safety risk on the public.
- 87. Hyundai knew that the Class Vehicles' battery was defectively designed or manufactured, would create risks of fire and premature failure, and were not suitable for their intended use.
- 88. Hyundai had the duty to Plaintiff and the Class members to disclose the Battery Defect and the defective nature of the Class Vehicles because:
  - a. Hyundai was in a superior position to know the true state of facts about the Battery Defect and associated repair costs in the Class Vehicles;
  - Plaintiff and the Class members could not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover that the Class Vehicles had dangerous defects until manifestation of the defects;
  - Hyundai knew that Plaintiff and the Class members could not reasonably have been expected to learn about or discover the Battery Defect and its associated repair costs; and
  - d. Hyundai actively concealed the Battery Defect, its causes, and resulting effects.
- 89. In failing to disclose the Battery Defect and the associated safety risks and repair costs resulting from it, Hyundai has knowingly and intentionally concealed material facts and breached its duty to disclose.
- 90. The facts Hyundai concealed or did not disclose to Plaintiff and the Class members are material in that a reasonable consumer would have considered them to be important in deciding whether to purchase the Class Vehicles or pay a lesser price. Had Plaintiff and the Class known the Class Vehicles were defective, they would not have purchased the Class Vehicles or would have paid less for them.

- 91. Plaintiff provided Hyundai with notice of its CLRA violations pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782(a) on August 4, 2021, and currently seeks injunctive relief. After the 30-day notice period expires, Plaintiff will amend this complaint to seek monetary damages under the CLRA.
- 92. Hyundai's fraudulent and deceptive business practices proximately caused injuries to Plaintiff and the other Class members.
- 93. Therefore, Plaintiff and the other Class members seek equitable relief under the CLRA.

### **COUNT III**

# VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200)

(By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, the California Class)

- 94. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 95. The California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") prohibits acts of "unfair competition," including any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice" and "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.
- 96. Hyundai has engaged in unfair competition and unfair, unlawful, or fraudulent business practices by the conduct, statements, and omissions described above, and by knowingly and intentionally concealing from Plaintiff and other Class members that the Class Vehicles suffer from the Battery Defect (and the costs, safety risks, and diminished value of the vehicles as a result of these problems). Hyundai should have disclosed this information because it was in a superior position to know the true facts related to the Battery Defect, and Plaintiff and Class members could not have been reasonably expected to learn or discover these true facts.
- 97. The Battery Defect constitutes a safety issue triggering Hyundai's duty to disclose.

- 98. By its acts and practices, Hyundai has deceived Plaintiff and is likely to have deceived the public. By failing to disclose the Battery Defect and suppressing other material facts from Plaintiff and other Class members, Hyundai breached its duty to disclose these facts, violated the UCL, and caused injuries to Plaintiff and the Class members. Hyundai's omissions and acts of concealment pertained to information material to Plaintiff and other Class members, as it would have been to all reasonable consumers.
- 99. The injuries Plaintiff and the Class members suffered greatly outweigh any potential countervailing benefit to consumers or to competition, and they are not injuries that Plaintiff and the Class members could or should have reasonably avoided.
- 100. Hyundai's acts and practices are unlawful because they violate California Civil Code §§ 1668, 1709, 1710, and 1750 *et seq.*, and California Commercial Code § 2313.
- 101. Plaintiff seeks to enjoin Hyundai from further unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent acts or practices, to obtain restitutionary disgorgement of all monies and revenues Hyundai has generated as a result of such practices, and all other relief allowed under California Business & Professions Code § 17200.

### **COUNT IV**

## VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA FALSE ADVERTISING LAW

(Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, et seq.)

# (By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, the California Class)

- 102. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 103. California Business & Professions Code § 17500 states: "It is unlawful for any . . . corporation . . . with intent directly or indirectly to dispose of real or personal property . . . to induce the public to enter into any obligation relating thereto, to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated . . . from this state before the public in any state, in any newspaper or other publication, or any advertising device, . . . or in any

other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement . . . which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading.

- 104. Hyundai caused to be made or disseminated through California and the United States, through advertising, marketing, and other publications, statements that were untrue or misleading, and which were known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care Hyundai should have known to be untrue and misleading to consumers, including Plaintiff and other Class members.
- 105. Hyundai has violated section 17500 because its misrepresentations and omissions regarding the safety, reliability, and functionality of the Class Vehicles were material and likely to deceive a reasonable consumer.
- 106. Plaintiff and the other Class members have suffered injuries in fact, including the loss of money or property, resulting from Hyundai's unfair, unlawful, and/or deceptive practices. In purchasing or leasing their Class Vehicles, Plaintiff and the other Class members relied on Hyundai's misrepresentations and/or omissions with respect to the Class Vehicles' safety and reliability. Hyundai's representations were untrue because it distributed the Class Vehicles with the Defect. Had Plaintiff and the other Class members known this, they would not have purchased or leased the Class Vehicles, or would not have paid as much for them. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the other Class members did not receive the benefit of their bargain.
- 107. All of the wrongful conduct alleged herein occurred, and continues to occur, in the conduct of Hyundai's business. Hyundai's wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of conduct that is still perpetuated and repeated, both in the state of California and nationwide.
- 108. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the other Class members, requests that the Court enter such orders or judgments as may be necessary to enjoin Hyundai from continuing its unfair, unlawful, and/or deceptive practices, and restore to Plaintiff and the other Class members any money Hyundai acquired by unfair competition,

11

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

26

25

27 28 including restitution and/or restitutionary disgorgement, and for such other relief set forth below.

### **COUNT V:**

### **BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY**

(Based on California Law)

# (By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, the California Class)

- 109. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 110. Hyundai provided all purchasers and lessees of the Class Vehicles with the express warranties described herein, which became part of the basis of the parties' bargain. Accordingly, Hyundai's warranties are express warranties under state law.
- 111. Hyundai distributed the defective parts causing the Battery Defect in the Class Vehicles, and said parts are covered by Hyundai's warranties granted to all Class Vehicle purchasers and lessors.
- 112. Hyundai breached these warranties by selling and leasing Class Vehicles with the Defect, requiring repair or replacement within the applicable warranty periods, and refusing to honor the warranties by providing free repairs or replacements during the applicable warranty periods.
- 113. Plaintiff notified Hyundai of its breach within a reasonable time, and/or was not required to do so because affording Hyundai a reasonable opportunity to cure its breaches would have been futile. Hyundai also knew about the Battery Defect but chose instead to conceal the Battery Defect as a means of avoiding compliance with its warranty obligations.
- 114. As a direct and proximate cause of Hyundai's breach, Plaintiff and the other Class members bought or leased Class Vehicles they otherwise would not have, overpaid for their vehicles, did not receive the benefit of their bargain, and their Class Vehicles

suffered a diminution in value. Plaintiff and the Class members have incurred and will continue to incur costs related to the Battery Defect's diagnosis and repair.

- 115. Any attempt to disclaim or limit these express warranties vis-à-vis consumers is unconscionable and unenforceable under the circumstances here.

  Specifically, Hyundai's warranty limitations are unenforceable because it knowingly sold a defective product without giving notice of the Battery Defect to Plaintiff or the Class.
- 116. The time limits contained in Hyundai's warranty period were also unconscionable and inadequate to protect Plaintiff and Class members. Among other things, Plaintiff and Class members had no meaningful choice in determining these time limitations, the terms of which unreasonably favored Hyundai. A gross disparity in bargaining power existed between Hyundai and the Class members because Hyundai knew or should have known that the Class Vehicles were defective at the time of sale and would fail well before their useful lives.
- 117. Plaintiff and Class members have complied with all obligations under the warranty, or otherwise have been excused from performance of said obligations as a result of Hyundai's conduct.

### **COUNT VI**

### BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY

(Based on California Law)

# (By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, the California Class)

- 118. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 119. Hyundai was at all relevant times the manufacturer, distributor, warrantor, and/or seller of the Class Vehicles. Hyundai knew or had reason to know of the specific use for which the Class Vehicles were purchased.
- 120. Hyundai provided Plaintiff and Class members with an implied warranty that the Class Vehicles and any parts thereof are merchantable and fit for the ordinary

purposes for which they were sold. However, the Class Vehicles are not fit for their ordinary purpose of providing reasonably reliable and safe transportation at the time of sale or thereafter because, inter alia, the Class Vehicles suffered from a Battery Defect at the time of sale. Therefore, the Class Vehicles are not fit for their particular purpose of providing safe and reliable transportation.

- 121. Hyundai impliedly warranted that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable quality and fit for such use. This implied warranty included, among other things: (i) a warranty that the Class Vehicles and battery packs manufactured, supplied, distributed, and/or sold by Hyundai were safe and reliable for the purpose for which they were installed; and (ii) a warranty that the Class Vehicles would be fit for their intended use.
- 122. Contrary to the applicable implied warranties, the Class Vehicles at the time of sale and thereafter were not fit for their ordinary and intended purpose of providing Plaintiff and the other Class members with reliable, durable, and safe transportation. Instead, the Class Vehicles suffer from a defective design(s) and/or manufacturing defect(s).
- 123. Hyundai's actions, as complained of herein, breached the implied warranty that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable quality and fit for such use.

### **COUNT VII**

### COMMON LAW FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT

(Based on California Law)

# (By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, the California Class)

- 124. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 125. Hyundai made material omissions concerning a presently existing or past fact. For example, Hyundai did not fully and truthfully disclose to its customers the true nature of the Defect, which was not readily discoverable until years later. As a result,

6

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

Plaintiff and the other Class members were fraudulently induced to lease and/or purchase the Class Vehicles with the said Battery Defect and all problems resulting from it.

- 126. Hyundai made these statements with knowledge of their falsity, intending that Plaintiff and the Class members rely on them.
- 127. As a result of these omissions and concealments, Plaintiff and the Class members incurred damages including loss of intrinsic value and out-of-pocket costs related to repair of the systems.
- 128. Plaintiff and the Class members reasonably relied on these omissions and suffered damages as a result.

#### **COUNT VIII**

# VIOLATIONS OF THE SONG-BEVERLY ACT – BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY

(Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1792, 1791.1, et seq.)

# (By Plaintiff on behalf of the Nationwide Class, or alternatively, the California Class)

- 129. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 130. At all relevant times hereto, Hyundai was the manufacturer, distributor, warrantor, and/or seller of the Class Vehicles. Hyundai knew or should have known of the specific use for which the Class Vehicles were purchased.
- 131. Hyundai provided Plaintiff and the Class members with an implied warranty that the Class Vehicles, and any parts thereof, are merchantable and fit for the ordinary purposes for which they were sold. The Class Vehicles, however, are not fit for their ordinary purpose because, inter alia, the Class Vehicles suffered from an inherent defect at the time of sale.
- 132. The Class Vehicles are not fit for the purpose of providing safe and reliable transportation because of the Battery Defect.

133. Hyundai impliedly warranted that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable					
quality and fit for such use. This implied warranty included, inter alia, the following: (i)					
warranty that the Class Vehicles were manufactured, supplied, distributed, and/or sold by					
Hyundai were safe and reliable for providing transportation; and (ii) a warranty that the					
Class Vehicles would be fit for their intended use – providing safe and reliable					
transportation – while the Class Vehicles were being operated.					

- 134. Contrary to the applicable implied warranties, the Class Vehicles were not fit for their ordinary and intended purpose. Instead, the Class Vehicles are defective, including, but not limited to, the Battery Defect.
- 135. Hyundai's actions, as complained of herein, breached the implied warranty that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable quality and fit for such use in violation of California Civil Code §§ 1792 and 1791.1.

## VII PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class pray for judgment as follows:

- A. for an order certifying this action as a class action;
- B. for an order appointing Sebastien Friche as representative of the Class and counsel of record McCune Wright Arevalo LLP as class counsel;
- C. for an award of actual, general, special, incidental, statutory, compensatory and consequential damages on claims for fraud and in an amount to be proven at trial;
- D. for an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
- E. for an order enjoining the wrongful conduct alleged herein;
- F. for costs;
- G. for attorneys' fees;
- H. for interest; and
- I. for such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

1	1 Dated: August 9, 2021 Respectfully submi	itted		
2				
3		ARD VIEW EEI		
4	By: /s/ David C.			
5	Richard D. Mc	Cune		
6	Mark I. Richard	ds IGHT AREVALO LLP		
7	7 3281 E. Guasti	ds IGHT AREVALO, LLP , Road, Suite 100 rnia 91761 909-557-1250 909-557-1275		
8	Telephone:	909-557-1250 909-557-1275		
9	Email: dew@n	nccunewright.com		
10	Email: sah@me Email: mir@m	nccunewright.com nccunewright.com ccunewright.com ccunewright.com claintiff and the Putative Class		
11	Attorneys for P	Plaintiff and the Putative Class		
12	JURY DEMAND			
13	Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the putative Class, demand a trial by jury on al			
14	14 issues so triable.			
15	15 MCCUNE WE	RIGHT AREVALO LLP		
16	By: /s/ David C.	By:/s/ David C. Wright		
17	David C. Wright Pichard D. McCune			
18	Steven A. Hask Mark I. Richard	David C. Wright Richard D. McCune Steven A. Haskins		
19	19 MCCUNE WR	IGHT AREVALO, LLP		
20	20 Ontario, Califo Telephone: Facsimile:	rnia 91761 909-557-1250		
21	Facsimile:	909-557-1275 accunewright.com		
22	22    Email: rdm( <i>a</i> )rr	nccunewright.com ccunewright.com		
23	Email: mir@m	ccunewright.com		
24	24 Attorneys for P	Plaintiff and the Putative Class		
25	25			
26	26			
27	27			
28	28			
	-30-			
	Class Action Complaint			

Class Action Complaint Case No.