

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF PHELPS COUNTY, MISSOURI

HANNAH RAMSEY- STANDAGE,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES,

Defendant.

Case No.

PETITION AND JURY DEMAND – CLASS ACTION

Plaintiff Hannah Ramsey-Standage (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, alleges the following facts and claims upon personal knowledge, investigation of counsel, and information and belief.

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. “Informed consumers are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of a free market economy. Packages . . . should enable consumers to obtain accurate information as to the quantity of the contents and should facilitate value comparisons.” 15 U.S.C.A. § 1451.

2. Plaintiff brings this class-action lawsuit against Defendant Abbott Laboratories (“Abbott” or “Defendant”) based on Defendant’s misleading, deceptive and unlawful conduct in packaging, marketing and labeling its Similac powder baby and infant formulas under the following brands: Similac Pro-Sensitive; Similac Soy Isomil; Similac Pro-Advance; Similac Sensitive; Similac Pro-Total Comfort; Similac NeoSure; Similac Total Comfort; Similac Advance; and Similac Advance OptiGROW, which are sold in a variety of sizes and collectively referred to

herein as the “Products” or a “Product”.

3. On the front label of the Products, Defendant prominently represents that the Products make a substantial number of additional bottles of formula. For example, as depicted below, the front label of the Similac Pro-Sensitive Product states “MAKES 13 MORE” 4 fluid ounce bottles.

4. In addition, on the back label of the Products, Defendant prominently represents that the Products make a certain number of fluid ounce bottles of formula when following the Mixing Guide on the Directions for Preparation and Use (the Mixing Guide representations shall be referred to individually or collectively with the front label number of bottles statement as the “Representations”).

5. Based on these Representations, reasonable consumers believe that the Products contain sufficient powder formula to make the stated number of fluid ounce bottles of formula.

6. Contrary to these Representations, however, the Products contain nowhere near enough powder formula to make the represented number of bottles of liquid formula when following the Mixing Guide on the Products’ labels.

7. Independent expert testing demonstrates that the Products contain between approximately a 6% to 15% deficiency in the total number of bottles of liquid formula that can be made when following the Mixing Guide on the Products’ labels.

8. The following is a table summarizing the deficiency in the number of scoops of powder formula and total number of bottles of liquid formula that can be made from certain tested Products:

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

Results:**Table 1 – Data Summary of Total Scoops of Similac Formula Available Per Retail Container**

Sample No:	Sample Description	Average Weight per Scoop (g)	Scoops Claimed per Can	Actual Scoops Provided	Actual Scoops Missing	Overall Product Shortage
200806007-HR	Similac Pro-Sensitive 29.8oz	9.1 +/- 0.33	106	93.5	12.5	12%
200806008-HR	Similac Soy Isomil 30.8oz	9.0 +/- 0.23	110	96.9	13.1	12%
200806009-HR	Similac Pro-Advance 30.8oz	8.6 +/- 0.25	112	101.8	10.2	9%
200806010-HR	Similac Sensitive 29.8oz	8.7 +/- 0.25	112	97.0	15.0	13%
200806011-HR	Similac Pro-Total Comfort 29.8oz	8.9 +/- 0.16	112	95.1	16.9	15%
200806012-HR	Similac NeoSure 22.8oz	9.3 +/- 0.46	74	69.5	4.5	6%
200806013-HR	Similac Total Comfort 12oz	8.4 +/- 0.14	44	40.6	3.4	8%
200821001-HR	Similac Advance 30.8oz	8.7 +/- 0.24	116	100.2	15.8	14%

Analysis based on instructions printed as 1 scoop per 2 fluid ounce of formula with the scoop provided.

9. Accordingly, in purchasing the Products, consumers were injured and were denied the benefit of the bargain between what was represented and what was received.

10. Consumers would not have purchased the Products, or would have purchased them on different terms, had they known the truth about the Products, including that they would yield fewer bottles of liquid formula than the number of bottles represented on the Products' labels.

11. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated to recover damages for Defendant's false, deceptive, and misleading conduct. As set forth below, Plaintiff seeks certification of a Nationwide Class and a Missouri Subclass. Plaintiff seeks damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendant has enjoyed from its unlawful and deceptive business practices, as detailed herein. Plaintiff makes these allegations based on her personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and observations and, otherwise,

on information and belief based on investigation of counsel.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action because the amount in controversy exceeds the minimum jurisdictional limits of the Court. Plaintiff believes and alleges that the total value of her individual claim is at most equal to the refund of the purchase price she paid for the Products.

13. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant pursuant to § 506.500, RSMo., as Defendant has had more than sufficient minimum contact with the State of Missouri and has availed itself of the privilege of conducting business in this state. Additionally, and as explained below, Defendant has committed affirmative tortious acts within the State of Missouri that give rise to civil liability, including distributing and selling the misbranded Products throughout the State of Missouri.

14. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of Missouri.

15. Venue is proper in this forum pursuant to §§ 508.010 and 407.025.1, RSMo., because the transactions complained of occurred in Phelps County, Missouri and Plaintiff was injured in Phelps County, Missouri.

PARTIES

16. Plaintiff Hannah Ramsey-Standage is a resident of Phelps County, Missouri. On multiple occasions during the Class Period, Plaintiff purchased Defendant's Products, including Similac Pro-Total Comfort Powder Baby Formula, in Rolla, Missouri, for personal, family, or household purposes. Plaintiff's claim is typical of all members of the Class in this regard. In addition, the misleading Representations on the Product purchased by Plaintiff are typical of the Representations on the Products purchased by members of the Class.

17. Defendant Abbott Laboratories is a corporation with its principal place of business in Abbott Park, Illinois, which at all times material hereto conducted business in the United States, including in Missouri, and maintained agents for the customary transaction of business in Missouri and conducted substantial and not isolated business activity within this state.

18. Defendant and its agents manufactured, labeled, promoted, marketed, and/or sold the Products at issue in this jurisdiction and in this judicial district. The unfair, unlawful, deceptive, and misleading advertising and labeling of the Products was prepared and/or approved by Defendant and its agents and was disseminated by Defendant and its agents through labeling and advertising containing the misrepresentations and omissions alleged herein.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. The Products are falsely and misleadingly labeled and advertised

19. Defendant manufactures, labels, markets, promotes, advertises, and sells the Products.

20. The back labels of the Products provide Directions for Preparation and Use, which contains a "Mixing Guide" for preparing 4 fluid ounce bottles.

21. Specifically, the Products represent that one (1) scoop of the powder baby formula should be used to make 2 fluid ounce bottles, and two (2) scoops of the powder baby formula should be used to make 4 fluid ounce bottles. In addition, the Products represent that the scoop should be comprised of unpacked level powder, using the scoop enclosed with the Product.

22. Based on this prominent labeling and the Mixing Guide, consumers of the Products reasonably believe that the Products will provide the stated number of 4 fluid ounce bottles.

23. Independent testing of the Products, however, demonstrates that the Products do not produce the represented total number of scoops of powdered baby formula when using the scoop provided with the Product, and therefore, the Products do not produce the represented

number of fluid ounce bottles of formula when following the Product directions.

24. Consumers of the Products, like Plaintiff, were and are deprived of between approximately 6% and 15% of the feedable bottles of formula that they paid to receive, and therefore sustained actual damages.

25. Additionally, upon information and belief, the labeling of many of the Products was changed during the Class Period and, prior to the change, the shortage in these Products was **greater** than the shortage identified in Plaintiff's expert testing.

26. The Representations, which are displayed on each of the Products' labels are false, misleading, and deceptive.

27. Furthermore, the Representations are uniform, consistent, and prominently displayed on the labels of the Products.

28. The Representations are untrue, misleading, and deceptive to reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff and members of the Class.

29. Based on Defendant's uniform material misrepresentations and omissions, consumers have purchased the products to their detriment.

Similac Pro-Sensitive (29.8 oz)

30. The following image depicts the front label of the Similac Pro-Sensitive (29.8 oz) Product:



31. The front label of the Similac Pro-Sensitive Product prominently states that it contains “OVER 30% MORE” and that it “MAKES 13 MORE” 4 FL OZ bottles.

32. The back label of the Similac Pro-Sensitive Product prominently states that “1 Can” of Product produces 56 4 fluid ounce bottles.



33. In addition, within the Directions for Preparation and Use, the back label of the Similac Pro-Sensitive Product contains a “Mixing Guide” for preparing the formula.

34. Specifically, the Mixing Guide represents that one (1) scoop of the powder baby formula should be used to make a 2 fluid ounce bottle and two (2) scoops of the powder baby formula should be used to make a 4 fluid ounce bottle.

35. The Mixing Guide further states that a scoop should be comprised of “*unpacked level powder* using enclosed scoop”.

36. Based on this prominent labeling and the Mixing Guide, consumers purchasing the Product would reasonably believe that the Product could produce 112 scoops of baby formula powder, which pursuant to the instructions, could be used to produce 56 4-fluid ounce bottles of

baby formula.

37. Contrary to the label Representations, however, the Products do not contain nearly enough powder formula to make the represented number of bottles of feedable liquid formula.

38. According to independent expert testing, the Similac Pro-Sensitive (29.8 oz) Product contains approximately a 12% deficiency in the total number of bottles that can be made when following the Product Directions.

B. Plaintiff Purchased the Misbranded Products to her Detriment

39. Plaintiff purchased the Products for personal and family use multiple times during the class period, including on January 19, 2022 when Plaintiff purchased the Similac Pro-Total Comfort (29.8 oz) Product for \$36.96 from a Walmart store located in Rolla, Missouri

40. Plaintiff purchased the Products with the reasonable belief that she was purchasing Products capable of making the represented number of bottles of liquid formula.

41. Defendant knew or should have known that reasonable consumers would consider the Representations material in deciding to purchase the Products.

42. As described herein, Defendant's Representations are false, misleading, and likely to mislead reasonable consumers. In addition, in making the Representations, Defendant omitted material information concerning the true number of bottles that could be made by the Products when following the Product Directions.

43. At the time Plaintiff purchased the Products, Plaintiff did not know, and had no reason to know, that the Product labels and advertising were misleading, deceptive, and unlawful as set forth herein.

44. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Products, or would have purchased them on different terms, if she had known the truth.

45. Plaintiff suffered injury in fact and an ascertainable loss as a result of Defendant's

unlawful conduct, including because the value of the Products as purchased was less than the value of the Products as represented.

46. It is possible, however, that Plaintiff would purchase the Products in the future if the Products were truthfully labeled and represented.

CLASS DEFINITION

47. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates the foregoing allegations as if set forth herein in their entirety.

48. Plaintiff seeks to represent the following Class and Subclass (collectively defined as the “Class”), as follows:

All citizens of the United States who purchased in the United States the Products during the Class Period for personal and household use and not for resale (“Nationwide Class”); and

All citizens of Missouri who purchased the Products during the Class Period for personal and household use and not for resale (“Missouri Subclass”).

49. Excluded from the Settlement Class are the following: (a) Persons who purchased or acquired any Products for resale; (b) the Released Parties; (c) all Persons who file a timely and valid Opt-Out; (d) Plaintiffs’ Counsel, their employees, and counsel as well as the household members of Plaintiffs’ employees and counsel; (e) Defendant’s Counsel, their employees, and counsel as well as the household members of Defendant’s employees and counsel; (e) federal, state, and local governments, political subdivisions or agencies of federal, state and local governments; and (f) the judicial officers, courtroom staff, and members of their households overseeing the Action.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

50. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates the foregoing allegations as if set forth herein in their entirety.

51. On information and belief, the Class consists of millions of purchasers dispersed throughout the United States and hundreds of thousands of purchasers in the State of Missouri. Accordingly, it would be impracticable to join all members of the Class before the Court.

52. There are numerous and substantial questions of law or fact common to all members of the Class that predominate over any individual issues. Included within the common questions of law or fact are:

- a. Whether Defendant made misrepresentations and false statements in violation of Missouri law;
- b. Whether Defendant engaged in unfair practices in violation of Missouri law;
- c. Whether Defendant engaged in concealment or omission of any material fact in violation of Missouri law;
- d. Whether Defendant has been unjustly enriched by the sale of the Products;
- e. Whether Defendant breached an express/and or implied warranty pursuant to the Uniform Commercial Code;
- f. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to equitable and/or injunctive relief;
- g. Whether Plaintiff and Class members have sustained damages as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct; and
- h. The proper measure of damages sustained by Plaintiff and Class members.

53. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of members of the Class, in that she shares the above-referenced facts and legal claims or questions with members of the Class, there

is a sufficient relationship between the damage to Plaintiff and Defendant's conduct affecting members of the Class, and Plaintiff has no interests adverse to the interests of other members of the Class.

54. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of members of the Class and has retained counsel experienced and competent in the prosecution of complex class actions including complex questions that arise in consumer protection litigation.

55. A class action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable and no other group method of adjudication of all claims asserted herein is more efficient and manageable for at least the following reasons:

56. The claims presented in this case predominate over any questions of law or fact, if any exists at all, affecting any individual member of the Class;

57. Absent a Class, the members of the Class will continue to suffer damage and Defendant's unlawful conduct will continue without remedy while Defendant profits from and enjoys its ill-gotten gains;

58. Given the size of individual Class members' claims, few, if any, members could afford to or would seek legal redress individually for the wrongs Defendant committed against them, and absent members have no substantial interest in individually controlling the prosecution of individual actions;

59. When the liability of Defendant has been adjudicated, claims of all members of the Class can be administered efficiently and/or determined uniformly by the Court; and

60. This action presents no difficulty that would impede its management by the Court as a class action which is the best available means by which Plaintiff and members of the Class

can seek redress for the harm caused to them by Defendant.

61. Because Plaintiff seeks relief for all members of the Class, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.

62. Further, bringing individual claims would overburden the Courts and be an inefficient method of resolving the dispute, which is the center of this litigation. Adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of other members of the Class who are not parties to the adjudication and may impair or impede their ability to protect their interests. As a consequence, class treatment is a superior method for adjudication of the issues in this case.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violation of Missouri’s Merchandising Practices Act
Misrepresentations and False Statements
(for the Missouri Subclass)

63. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

64. The MMPA “is designed to regulate the marketplace to the advantage of those traditionally thought to have unequal bargaining power as well as those who may fall victim to unfair practices.” *Huch v. Charter Commc’ns Inc.*, 290 S.W. 3d 721, 725 (Mo. banc. 2009). The MMPA provides that it is unlawful to “act, use or employ . . . 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” § 407.020.1, RSMo.

65. The MMPA applies to acts committed “before, during or after the sale,

advertisement or solicitation” of merchandise, and provides a cause of action for “any person who purchases or leases merchandise primarily for personal, family or household purposes.” Section 407.020 is intended to supplement the definitions of common law fraud to “preserve fundamental honesty, fair play and right dealings in public transactions.”

66. Defendant’s conduct as described above constitutes the act, use or employment of deception, fraud, false pretenses, false promises, misrepresentation, unfair practices and/or the concealment, suppression, or omission of any material facts in connection with the sale or advertisement of any merchandise in trade or commerce in that Defendant makes material false representations and omissions with regard to the number of bottles of liquid formula produced by the Products.

67. In violation of the MMPA, Defendant employed fraud, deception, false promise, misrepresentation and/or the knowing concealment, suppression, or omission of material facts in its manufacture, sale and advertisement of the Products.

68. Plaintiff purchased the Products for personal, family, or household purposes.

69. Plaintiff suffered an ascertainable loss as a result of Defendant’s unlawful conduct because the actual value of the Products as purchased was less than the value of the Products as represented.

70. Plaintiff is also entitled to recover attorney fees as authorized by § 407.025.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violation of Missouri’s Merchandising Practices Act
Unfair Practice, 15 CSR 60-8.020
(for the Missouri Subclass)

71. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

72. The MMPA prohibits as an unlawful practice the act, use or employment of any

“unfair practice” in connection with the sale or advertisement of any merchandise in trade or commerce. § 407.020.1, RSMo.

73. “Unfair practice” is defined as “any practice which –

(A) Either

1. Offends any public policy as it has been established by the Constitution, statutes, or common law of this state, or by the Federal Trade Commission, or its interpretive decisions; or

2. Is unethical, oppressive, or unscrupulous; and

(B) Presents a risk of, or causes, substantial injury to consumers.

15 CSR 60-8.020.

74. Defendant’s actions, as alleged herein, constitute an unfair practice.

75. Plaintiff purchased the Products for personal, family, or household purposes.

76. Plaintiff suffered an ascertainable loss as a result of Defendant’s unlawful conduct because the actual value of the Products as purchased was less than the value of the Products as represented.

77. Plaintiff is also entitled to recover attorney fees as authorized by § 407.025.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violation of Missouri’s Merchandising Practices Act
Concealment or Omission of any Material Fact, 15 CSR 60-9.110
(for the Missouri Subclass)

78. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

79. The MMPA prohibits as an unlawful practice the act, use or employment of the “concealment, suppression or omission of any material fact” in connection with the sale or advertisement of any merchandise in trade or commerce. §407.020.1, RSMo.

80. A “material fact” is defined as “any fact which a reasonable consumer would likely

consider to be important in making a purchasing decision, or which would be likely to induce a person to manifest his/her assent, or which the seller knows would be likely to induce a particular consumer to manifest his/her assent, or which would be likely to induce a reasonable consumer to act, respond or change his/her behavior in any substantial manner.” 15 CSR 60- 9.010(1)(C).

81. “Concealment of a material fact” is defined as “any method, act, use or practice which operates to hide or keep material facts from consumers.” 15 CSR 60-9.110(1).

82. “Omission of a material fact” is defined as “any failure by a person to disclose material facts known to him/her, or upon reasonable inquiry would be known to him/her.” 15 CSR 60-9.110(3).

83. Defendant’s actions as alleged herein constituted the concealment and omission of material facts. Among other things, and as described herein, Defendant concealed and omitted the material fact that the Products make substantially fewer bottles of liquid formula than the number represented on the labels of the Products.

84. Plaintiff purchased the Products for personal, family, or household purposes.

85. Plaintiff suffered an ascertainable loss as a result of Defendant’s unlawful conduct because the actual value of the Products as purchased was less than the value of the Products as represented.

86. Plaintiff is also entitled to recover attorney fees as authorized by § 407.025.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Unjust Enrichment
(for the Nationwide Class, including the Missouri Subclass)

87. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

88. By purchasing the Products, Plaintiff and members of the Class conferred a benefit

on Defendant in the form of the purchase price of the Products.

89. Defendant had knowledge of such benefits.

90. Defendant appreciated the benefit because, were consumers not to purchase the Products, Defendant would not generate revenue from the sales of the Products.

91. Defendant's acceptance and retention of the benefit is inequitable and unjust because the benefit was obtained by Defendant's fraudulent and misleading representations and omissions.

92. Equity cannot in good conscience permit Defendant to be economically enriched for such actions at Plaintiff's and the Class members' expense, and therefore restitution and/or disgorgement of such economic enrichment is required.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Breach of Express Warranty Pursuant to Uniform Commercial Code
(for the Nationwide Class, including the Missouri Subclass)

93. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

94. By advertising and selling the Products at issue, Defendant made promises and affirmations of fact on the Products' packaging and labeling, as described herein. This labeling and advertising constitute express warranties and became part of the basis of the bargain between Plaintiff and members of the Class, and Defendant.

95. Defendant, through its advertising and labeling, created express warranties that the Products comport with the label representations. Specifically, Defendant created express warranties that the Products contain sufficient powder to make the number of bottles of formula represented on the labels of the Products.

96. The express warranties appear on all Product labels and specifically relate to the

goods being sold.

97. Despite Defendant's express warranties about the nature of the Products, the Products do not comport with Defendant's Representations. Thus, the Products were and are not what Defendant represented them to be.

98. Accordingly, Defendant breached express warranties about the Products and their qualities because the Products do not conform to Defendant's affirmations and promises.

99. Plaintiff provided Defendant with pre-suit notice of the breach of warranty.

100. Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased the Products.

101. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach of express warranty, Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed in the amount of the purchase price of the Products. Further, Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered and continue to suffer economic losses and other general and specific damages including, but not limited to, the amounts paid for the Products, and any interest that would have accrued on those monies, in an amount to be proven at trial.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Breach of Implied Warranty Pursuant to Uniform Commercial Code (for the Nationwide Class, including the Missouri Subclass)

102. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

103. By advertising and selling the Products at issue, Defendant made implied promises and affirmations of fact concerning the Products, as described herein. These implied warranties became part of the basis of the bargain between Plaintiff and members of the Class, and Defendant.

104. Defendant, through its advertising and labeling, impliedly warranted that the Products comport with the label Representations, that the label Representations are accurate, and

that the Products contain sufficient powder to make the stated number of bottles of formula.

105. Defendant breached the warranty implied in the contract for the sale of the Products because the Products cannot pass without objection in the trade under the contract description, the Products were not of fair average quality within the description, and the Products were not as represented. As a result, Plaintiff and Class members did not receive the goods as impliedly warranted by Defendant to be merchantable.

106. At the time of purchase, Plaintiff and members of the Class did not know, and had no reason to know, that the Products were not as they were warranted to be.

107. Defendant knew that the Products were not as they were warranted to be.

108. Plaintiff and members of the Class purchased the Products.

109. Plaintiff provided Defendant with pre-suit notice of the breach of warranty.

110. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach of implied warranty, Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed in the amount of the purchase price they paid for the Products. Further, Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered and continue to suffer economic losses and other general and specific damages including, but not limited to, the amounts paid for the Products, and any interest that would have accrued on those monies, in an amount to be proven at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, seeks judgment against Defendant, as follows:

a. For an order certifying the Class; naming Plaintiff as representative of the Nationwide Class and of the Missouri Subclass; and naming Plaintiff's attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the Class;

- b. For an order declaring that Defendant's conduct violates the statutes and laws referenced herein;
- c. For an order finding in favor of Plaintiff and the Class on all counts asserted herein;
- d. For an order awarding all compensatory damages, in an amount to be determined by the Court and/or jury;
- e. For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded;
- f. For interest on the amount of any and all economic losses, at the prevailing legal rate;
- g. For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- h. For an order requiring Defendant to cease and desist from selling its misbranded Products in violation of law; enjoining Defendant from continuing to label, market, advertise, distribute, and sell the Products in the unlawful manner described herein; and ordering Defendant to engage in corrective action;
- i. For an order awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs of suit; and
- j. For all such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated this 24th day of June, 2022.

Hannah Ramsey-Standage, Individually, and on Behalf of
All Others of Similarly Situated, Plaintiff

By: /s/ Bryce C. Crowley
David L. Steelman, #27334MO
david@sgclawfirm.com
Bryce C. Crowley, #64800MO
bryce@sgclawfirm.com
STEELMAN GAUNT CROWLEY
901 Pine Street, Suite 110

Rolla, Missouri 65401
Tel: (573) 341-8336
Fax: (573) 341-8548

Scott A. Kamber, #70534MO
skamber@kamberlaw.com
KAMBERLAW LLC
201 Milwaukee Street, Suite 200
Denver, CO 80206
Tel: (303) 222-9008
Fax: (212) 202-6364

L. DeWayne Layfield (*PHV pending*)
dewayne@layfieldlaw.com
LAW OFFICE OF L. DEWAYNE LAYFIELD, PLLC
P. O. Box 3829
Beaumont, TX 77704
Office: (409) 832-1891

Lydia Sturgis Zbrzezny (*PHV pending*)
lydia@southernatlanticlaw.com
Nicholas Zbrzezny
nick@southernatlanticlaw.com
SOUTHERN ATLANTIC LAW GROUP, PLLC
99 6th Street SW
Winter Haven, FL 33880
Office: (863) 656-6672

Joel Oster, of Counsel (*PHV pending*)
joel@joelosterlaw.com
LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD W. RUBINSTEIN, PA
1281 N. Ocean Drive
Singer Island, FL 33404
Office: (913) 206-7575

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class