

1 Christin Cho (Cal Bar No. 238173)
christin@dovel.com
2 Simon Franzini (Cal. Bar No. 287631)
simon@dovel.com
3 Jonas B. Jacobson (Cal. Bar No.
269912) jonas@dovel.com
4 DOVEL & LUNER, LLP
5 201 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 600 Santa
Monica, California 90401 Telephone:
6 (310) 656-7066
Facsimile: (310) 656-7069
7

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

9
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12

13 Sandra Sherzai, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly
14 situated,

15 *Plaintiff,*

16 v.

17 LG Electronics USA, Inc.

18 *Defendant.*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Table of Contents

1

2 I. Introduction..... 1

3 II. Parties. 1

4 III. Jurisdiction and Venue..... 2

5 IV. Facts..... 2

6 A. Gas stoves produce health-harming pollutants. 3

7 B. Defendant knows of this defect..... 5

8 C. Safe alternative designs that would reduce the danger are available..... 6

9 D. Defendant should have warned of the pollutant risk. 6

10 E. Defendant overcharges millions of consumers..... 7

11 F. Plaintiff was misled and harmed by Defendant..... 8

12 G. No adequate remedy at law..... 9

13 V. Class Action Allegations. 9

14 VI. Claims. 11

15 Count I: Violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law 11

16 Count II: Violation of California’s False Advertising Law (FAL)..... 13

17 Count III: Violation of California’s Consumer Legal Remedies Act (CLRA)..... 14

18 Count IV: Breach of Implied Warranty..... 16

19 Count V: Violations of State Consumer Protection Statutes 17

20 Count VI: Breach of Implied Warranties 18

21 Count VII: Fraudulent Omission 20

22 Count VIII: Unjust Enrichment / Quasi-contract 21

23 VII. Jury Demand..... 22

24 VIII. Prayer for Relief. 22

25

26

27

28

1 **I. Introduction.**

2 1. About 40% of American households use natural gas stoves. Many households use the
3 stove daily to cook in the home. Recent studies confirm however, that gas cooking has important risks.
4 Gas stoves “emit air pollutants... at levels the EPA and World Health Organization have said are unsafe
5 and linked to respiratory illness, cardiovascular problems, cancer, and other health conditions.”¹ For
6 example, gas stoves emit nitrogen oxides, which are “gases [that] can worsen asthma and other lung
7 diseases.”² This is true for all consumers, adults and children alike, but is especially risky for children. *Id.*
8 Children living in households with gas stoves are “42% more likely to have asthma.”³

9 2. This risk is avoidable; manufacturers can reasonably design gas stoves to mitigate the risk
10 of pollutants. Manufacturers also can—and should—disclose the risk of pollutants to consumers, who
11 can then make an informed choice about whether to buy a gas stove or an electric stove (which does not
12 carry the same risk).

13 3. Defendant LG Electronics USA, Inc. makes, sells, and markets household appliances,
14 including gas stoves, ovens, and ranges.

15 4. Plaintiff purchased a gas stove made by Defendant. Plaintiff believed that the product
16 was free from defects, and she did not know that gas cooking has significant pollutant risks. Had she
17 known of the risks of pollutants from the gas stove, she would have paid less for it.

18 5. Plaintiff brings this case for herself and for other consumers who purchased Defendant’s
19 gas stoves, ovens, and range products.

20 **II. Parties.**

21 6. Plaintiff Sandra Sherzai is domiciled in Vallejo, California.

22 7. The proposed class and subclasses (identified below) includes citizens of all states.

23 8. Defendant LG Electronics USA, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of
24 business in Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

25
26 ¹ <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-01-09/us-safety-agency-to-consider-ban-on-gas-stoves-amid-health-fears>

27 ² <https://www.consumerreports.org/appliances/indoor-air-quality/is-your-gas-range-a-health-risk-a6971504915/>

28 ³ <https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/have-a-gas-stove-how-to-reduce-pollution-that-may-harm-health-202209072811>

1 9. Defendant makes, distributes, sells, and markets gas stoves, ovens, and range products,
2 including under the LG brand, and has done so throughout any applicable statute of limitations period.

3 **III. Jurisdiction and Venue.**

4 10. This Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. §
5 1332(d). The amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and
6 costs, and the matter is a class action in which one or more members of the proposed class are citizens of
7 a state different from the Defendant.

8 11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant. Defendant does business in
9 California. It advertises and sells its Products in California, and serves a market for its Products in
10 California. Due to Defendant's actions, its Products have been marketed and sold to consumers in
11 California, and harmed consumers in California. Plaintiff's claims arise out of Defendant's contacts with
12 this forum. Due to Defendant's actions, Plaintiff purchased one of Defendant's Products in California,
13 and was harmed in California.

14 12. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(d) because
15 Defendant would be subject to personal jurisdiction in this District if this District were a separate State.
16 Defendant advertises and sells its Products to customers in this District, serves a market for its Products
17 in this District, and Plaintiff's claims arise out of Defendant's contacts in this forum. Venue is also
18 proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim
19 occurred here.

20 **IV. Facts.**

21 13. About 40% of American households use natural gas stoves.⁴ Many households use the
22 stove daily to cook in the home.

23
24
25
26
27
28

⁴ https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/energy/biden-isnt-coming-for-your-gas-stove-states-are/2023/01/13/12353d1e-9353-11ed-90f8-53661ac5d9b9_story.html

1 14. Defendant makes, markets, and sells residential gas stoves, gas ranges, and gas ovens
2 (“Defendant’s Products” or “Products”), including under the LG brand. Some examples of Defendant’s
3 Products are shown below:⁵



5.8 cu. ft. Smart Wi-Fi Enabled Gas Slide-in Range with EasyClean®

LSGL5831F



6.9 cu. ft. Smart wi-fi Enabled Gas Double Oven Slide-In Range with ProBake Convection® and EasyClean®

LTG4715ST



5.8 cu. ft. Smart Wi-Fi Enabled Fan Convection Gas Slide-in Range with Air Fry & EasyClean®

LSGL5833F

13 15. Defendant sells its products specifically for home use, and markets to consumers for
14 home use. In fact, the only intended use for Defendant’s Products is for cooking inside the home.

15 **A. Gas stoves produce health-harming pollutants.**

16 16. Recent studies have confirmed that gas stoves harm the health of the households that use
17 it.⁶

18 17. Gas stoves “emit air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide and fine
19 particulate matter at levels the EPA and World Health Organization have said are unsafe and linked to
20 respiratory illness, cardiovascular problems, cancer, and other health conditions.”⁷

21 18. In particular, nitrogen oxides (sometimes written as NO_x or NO₂),⁸ are hazardous to
22 human health. “A recent study published by researchers at Stanford calculated that emission of nitrogen
23 dioxide from certain gas burners or ovens rose above the standard set for outdoors by the

24
25 ⁵ <https://www.geappliances.com/ge-appliances/kitchen/ranges/gas-ranges/>

26 ⁶ <https://www.consumerreports.org/appliances/indoor-air-quality/is-your-gas-range-a-health-risk-a6971504915/>

27 ⁷ <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-01-09/us-safety-agency-to-consider-ban-on-gas-stoves-amid-health-fears>

28 ⁸ The term NO_x is a common term for nitrogen oxides that include nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). <https://www.encyclopedia.com/earth-and-environment/ecology-and-environmentalism/environmental-studies/nox-nitrogen-oxides>

1 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) within a few minutes.”

2 19. Further, “recent EPA research also linked long-term NO₂ exposure to cardiovascular
3 effects, diabetes, poorer birth outcomes, premature mortality, and cancer.”¹⁰ It is also linked to “reduced
4 cognitive performance, especially in children.” *Id.* “[E]arly-life exposure to air pollution from indoor gas
5 appliances may be negatively associated with neuropsychological development through the first 4 years of
6 life, particularly among genetically susceptible children.” *Id.* “The gases can worsen asthma and other
7 lung diseases.”¹¹ “In short, research shows that even low levels of NO₂ exposure are dangerous, especially
8 to the vulnerable.”¹²

9 20. “Yet...homes with gas stoves have around 50 percent, ranging up to over 400 percent,
10 higher levels of NO₂ than homes with electric stoves.”¹³ Concentrations of NO₂ emissions from gas
11 stoves can exceed US outdoor pollution standards several times over when conducting common cooking
12 tasks like boiling water, baking a cake, roasting meat, and frying bacon with a gas stove. *Id.* Thus,
13 children living in households with gas stoves are “42% more likely to have asthma.”¹⁴ A recent study
14 “found that 12.7%...of current childhood asthma in the US is attributable to gas stove use.”¹⁵ This is a
15 level that is “similar to the childhood asthma burden attributed to secondhand smoke exposure.”¹⁶ Data
16 shows that, “the higher the nitrogen dioxide level, the more severe the asthma symptoms in children and
17 adults.”¹⁷

18 21. For these reasons, the American Medical Association recently adopted a resolution

19 _____
20 ⁹ <https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/have-a-gas-stove-how-to-reduce-pollution-that-may-harm-health-202209072811>

21 ¹⁰ <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2020/5/7/21247602/gas-stove-cooking-indoor-air-pollution-health-risks>

22 ¹¹ <https://www.consumerreports.org/appliances/indoor-air-quality/is-your-gas-range-a-health-risk-a6971504915/>

23 ¹² <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2020/5/7/21247602/gas-stove-cooking-indoor-air-pollution-health-risks>

24 ¹³ <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2020/5/7/21247602/gas-stove-cooking-indoor-air-pollution-health-risks>

25 ¹⁴ <https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/have-a-gas-stove-how-to-reduce-pollution-that-may-harm-health-202209072811>

26 ¹⁵ [IJERPH | Free Full-Text | Population Attributable Fraction of Gas Stoves and Childhood Asthma in the United States \(mdpi.com\)](https://www.mdpi.com/ijerph/13/11/1911)

27 ¹⁶ [IJERPH | Free Full-Text | Population Attributable Fraction of Gas Stoves and Childhood Asthma in the United States \(mdpi.com\)](https://www.mdpi.com/ijerph/13/11/1911)

28 ¹⁷ [Have a gas stove? How to reduce pollution that may harm health - Harvard Health](https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/have-a-gas-stove-how-to-reduce-pollution-that-may-harm-health-202209072811)

1 “recogniz[ing] the association between the use of gas stoves, indoor nitrogen dioxide levels and asthma,”
2 and committed to informing “members and, to the extent possible, health care providers, the public, and
3 relevant organizations that use of a gas stove increases household air pollution and the risk of childhood
4 asthma and asthma severity.”¹⁸

5 **B. Defendant knows of this defect.**

6 22. Defendant is aware that its Products emit health-harming pollutants.

7 23. Since the 1980s, the natural gas industry—of which Defendant is a constituent—has
8 worried that the US Consumer Product Safety Commission would regulate gas stove emissions due to
9 indoor air quality concerns.¹⁹

10 24. This is because “[s]cientists have long known that gas stoves emit pollutants that irritate
11 human airways and can cause or exacerbate respiratory problems.”²⁰ “[S]tudies dating back decades have
12 shown harmful effects from the NO₂ in gas cooking stoves.”²¹

13 25. In 1986, a report by the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee of the U.S.
14 Environmental Protection Agency stated, “Health effects data from epidemiological studies in gas stove
15 homes suggest that young children are at increased risk of respiratory symptom; and infection from
16 exposures to elevated concentrations of NO₂. Other groups at risk to NO₂ exposures are asthmatics and
17 bronchitics.”²² It further warned, “Human epidemiologic studies suggest that exposure to nitrogen
18 dioxide may lead to increased respiratory illness rates among children.” *Id.* at 6.

19 26. Subsequent studies have confirmed the harmful effects of pollutants from gas stoves. “In
20 a 1992 meta-analysis of studies on this topic, scientists at the EPA and Duke University found that
21 nitrogen dioxide exposure that is comparable to that from a gas stove increases the odds of children
22 developing a respiratory illness by about 20 percent.”²³ “A 2013 meta-analysis of 41 studies found that
23 gas cooking increases the risk of asthma in children and that NO₂ exposure is linked with currently

24 ¹⁸ [https://policysearch.ama-](https://policysearch.ama-assn.org/policyfinder/detail/gas%20stove?uri=%2FAMADoc%2Fdirectives.xml-D-135.964.xml)
25 [assn.org/policyfinder/detail/gas%20stove?uri=%2FAMADoc%2Fdirectives.xml-D-135.964.xml](https://policysearch.ama-assn.org/policyfinder/detail/gas%20stove?uri=%2FAMADoc%2Fdirectives.xml-D-135.964.xml);
26 <https://publicinterestnetwork.org/updates/update-ama-moves-forward-resolution-gas-stove-pollution/>

27 ¹⁹ [https://www.npr.org/2023/02/04/1149736969/gas-stove-makers-have-a-pollution-solution-](https://www.npr.org/2023/02/04/1149736969/gas-stove-makers-have-a-pollution-solution-theyre-just-not-using-it)
[theyre-just-not-using-it](https://www.npr.org/2023/02/04/1149736969/gas-stove-makers-have-a-pollution-solution-theyre-just-not-using-it); <https://www.sciencenews.org/archive/cleaner-cooking-gas>

28 ²⁰ <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-health-risks-of-gas-stoves-explained/>

²¹ <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-health-risks-of-gas-stoves-explained/>

²² Report of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, May 9, 1986, at 5.

²³ <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-health-risks-of-gas-stoves-explained/>

1 having a wheeze.” *Id.* And “[m]ost recently, a study published last December found that 12.7 percent of
2 childhood asthma cases in the U.S. can be attributed to gas stove use.” *Id.*

3 27. Like other makers of gas stoves, Defendant monitors and keeps track of research on the
4 health effects of its products. This is diligence that large companies like Defendant routinely do when
5 selling a consumer product. Defendant is aware of the fact that its Products emit harmful pollutants. It
6 is further aware that use of gas stoves increases the rates of respiratory illness in adults and children.

7 **C. Safe alternative designs that would reduce the danger are available.**

8 28. Further, the harms could have been avoided through safe, reasonable alternative designs.
9 Alternative gas stove designs that “reduce harmful emissions, without sacrificing heat, have been
10 available for decades.”²⁴ As one example, the “jet-powered infrared gas-range burner,” developed in the
11 1980s, “consumed about 40% less natural gas to reach cooking temperatures and emitted 40% less
12 nitrogen oxides.”²⁵ Another design proposed in the 1980s was the use of a flame insert, which cuts the
13 NO_x emissions “more than 40 percent” when the burner is turned on high, and even more at low burner
14 settings.²⁶

15 29. Despite this, Defendant failed to use an alternative design to avoid these harms and
16 reduce harmful pollutants from gas stoves.

17 **D. Defendant should have warned of the pollutant risk.**

18 30. While Defendant is aware of the harmful health effects of gas cooking, everyday
19 consumers are unaware of these risks. Consumers shopping for a new oven, range, or stove have very
20 little information about the health risks of gas appliances.

21 31. Consumers remain unaware because nothing on Defendant’s packaging or labels suggest
22 that the gas stoves regularly emit pollutants that are harmful to human health. Further, the labels and
23 warnings do not mention any risk of nitrogen oxides.

24 32. Defendant sold its Products for cooking inside the home, while omitting any warning of
25 the serious defect due to the harmful emissions. Defendant knew of the defect, but actively concealed it.

26 _____
27 ²⁴ <https://www.npr.org/2023/02/04/1149736969/gas-stove-makers-have-a-pollution-solution-theyre-just-not-using-it>

28 ²⁵ <https://www.npr.org/2023/02/04/1149736969/gas-stove-makers-have-a-pollution-solution-theyre-just-not-using-it>

²⁶ <https://www.sciencenews.org/archive/cleaner-cooking-gas>

1 Defendant should have, but did not, warn consumers of the fact that its Products emit harmful nitrogen
2 oxides and pollutants when used for cooking. These warnings could have been included on the
3 packaging, stickers, or instruction manual for the product. But Defendant did not include any such
4 warning.

5 33. Defendant had a duty to warn of the defect. The defect was an unreasonable safety
6 hazard. Defendant could have avoided this risk by using available design-arounds. In addition, the
7 defect was central to the gas stove's function (i.e. its safety for use cooking inside the home). Defendant
8 had exclusive knowledge of the defect. Defendant actively concealed the defect from consumers by
9 failing to disclose it. Defendant also made partial representations that are misleading because other
10 material facts were not disclosed. For example, it warned of some risks of the Product (e.g., it included
11 extensive warnings about fire), but failed to warn that the Product emits harmful pollutants like nitrogen
12 oxide. This led consumers to believe that there was no such risk.

13 **E. Defendant overcharges millions of consumers.**

14 34. If Defendant disclosed the truth— that is, that its Products emit harmful pollutants, the
15 price of its Products would fall dramatically.

16 35. For example, a recent study showed that consumer demand for gas stoves falls as
17 consumers become informed of the harms of gas stoves. Forty-six percent of gas-stove owning adults
18 were interested in replacing their gas stoves after being informed of the study showing the link between
19 gas stove pollution and childhood asthma.²⁷

20 36. If consumers knew the truth, demand for Defendant's prices would drop, and Defendant
21 could not sell their Products at current prices.

22 37. In addition, the defective design of gas stoves reduces their value. Consumers pay for a
23 stove that is safe for home cooking, but receive a less valuable stove—one with a defective design that
24 carries significant (and undisclosed) air pollution risks.

25
26
27
28

²⁷ <https://morningconsult.com/2023/01/31/natural-gas-stove-bans-remain-divisive/>

1 **F. Plaintiff was misled and harmed by Defendant.**

2 38. In October 2022, Sandra Sherzai purchased a LG gas stove from the Costco website
3 while living in Vallejo, California. The stove had the model number of LRGL5825F.²⁸



18 39. Ms. Sherzai relied on the representations on the marketing materials disclosing risks. The
19 marketing materials did not disclose or warn that the product emitted harmful pollutants, such as
20 nitrogen oxides. Thus, at the time of purchase, Plaintiff was unaware that the product emitted harmful
21 pollutants such as nitrogen oxide.

22 40. Plaintiff purchased Defendant's Product on the assumption that using the Product would
23 not expose her to a significant air pollutant risk. Plaintiff would have paid significantly less for
24 Defendant's Product had she known that it emitted harmful pollutants like nitrogen oxide.

25 41. As a result, Plaintiff suffered injury in fact when she: (a) spent money to purchase a
26 Product she would have paid less for absent Defendant's misconduct; (b) overpaid for the Product due
27 to Defendant's misconduct; and (c) paid for a defective product that, in truth, is worth less than she paid

28

²⁸ <https://www.lg.com/us/cooking-appliances/lg-lrgl5825f-gas-range>

1 for it.

2 42. Defendant's conduct is ongoing and continuing, such that prospective injunctive relief is
3 necessary. Plaintiff likes Defendant's Products, and would purchase Defendant's Products in the future if
4 the Product was redesigned to avoid emitting harmful pollutants. She faces an imminent risk of harm,
5 however, because she cannot rely on representations that the Product is safe for cooking inside the home
6 or the absence of any pollutant warning. Absent injunctive relief, Defendant may continue to advertise,
7 promote, and sell the Products while representing that it is safe, and without warning the public about
8 the health risks.

9 **G. No adequate remedy at law.**

10 43. Plaintiff seeks damages and, in the alternative, restitution. Plaintiff is permitted to seek
11 equitable remedies in the alternative because she has no adequate remedy at law.

12 44. Plaintiff's remedies at law are not equally certain as her equitable ones. Plaintiff's legal
13 remedies require additional showings not required for Plaintiff's equitable claims. For example, to obtain
14 damages under the CLRA, a plaintiff must show compliance with the CLRA's notice requirement for
15 damages. No such requirements exist to obtain restitution. Plaintiff's remedies at law are also not
16 equally prompt or efficient as their equitable ones. For example, the need to schedule a jury trial may
17 result in delay. And a jury trial will take longer, and be more expensive, than a bench trial.

18 **V. Class Action Allegations.**

19 45. Plaintiff brings certain claims on behalf of the proposed class of:

- 20 • Nationwide Class: all persons who purchased Defendant's Products while living in the
21 United States during the applicable statute of limitations (the "Nationwide Class").
22 • California Subclass: all persons who, while living in the state of California, purchased
23 Defendant's Products during the applicable statute of limitation (the "California
24 Subclass"); and
25 • Consumer Protection Subclass: all persons who, while living in certain identified states
26 (the "Consumer Protection Subclass States"), purchased Defendant's Products during the
27 applicable statute of limitations.

28 46. The Consumer Protection Subclass States are as follows: California, Connecticut, Illinois,

1 Maryland, Missouri, and New York.

2 47. The following people are excluded from the proposed Class and Subclasses: (1) any Judge
3 or Magistrate Judge presiding over this action and the members of their family; (2) Defendant,
4 Defendant's subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its
5 parents have a controlling interest and their current employees, officers, and directors; (3) persons who
6 properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the class; (4) persons whose claims in this
7 matter have been finally adjudicated on the merits or otherwise released; (5) Plaintiff's counsel and
8 Defendant's counsel, and their experts and consultants; and (6) the legal representatives, successors, and
9 assigns of any such excluded persons.

10 48. Certification of Plaintiff's claims for class-wide treatment is appropriate because Plaintiff
11 can prove the elements of her claims on a class-wide basis using the same evidence as would be used to
12 prove those elements in individual actions alleging the same claims.

13 ***Numerosity & Ascertainability.***

14 49. The proposed class contains members so numerous that separate joinder of each member
15 is impractical. There are tens or hundreds of thousands of class members. The precise number of class
16 members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time.

17 50. Members of the proposed class can be identified through public notice.

18 ***Predominance of Common Questions.***

19 51. There are questions of law and fact common to the proposed class. Common questions
20 of law and fact include, without limitation:

- 21 (1) Whether Defendant misrepresented and/or failed to disclose material facts
22 concerning the Products;
23 (2) Whether Defendant's conduct was unfair and/or deceptive;
24 (3) Whether Defendant breached an implied warranty;
25 (4) What damages are needed to compensate Plaintiff and the proposed class; and
26 (5) Whether an injunction is necessary to prevent Defendant from continuing to market
27 and sell the Products.

28 ***Typicality & Adequacy.***

1 52. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other class members' claims. Like other class
2 members, Plaintiff purchased Defendant's Product.

3 53. The interests of the members of the proposed class and subclasses will be adequately
4 protected by Plaintiff and her counsel. Plaintiff's interests are aligned with, and do not conflict with, the
5 interests of the members of the proposed class or subclasses that they seek to represent. Moreover,
6 Plaintiff has retained experienced and competent counsel to prosecute the class and subclasses' claims.

7 ***Superiority.***

8 54. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the proposed class would
9 create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudication with respect to individual members, which would
10 establish incompatible standards for the parties opposing the class. For example, individual adjudication
11 would create a risk that the same product is found unfit for its ordinary use for some proposed class
12 members, but not for others.

13 55. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions affecting only
14 individual members of the proposed class. These common legal and factual questions arise from certain
15 central issues which do not vary from class member to class member, and which may be determined
16 without reference to the individual circumstances of any particular class member.

17 56. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient
18 adjudication of this litigation because individual litigation of each claim is impractical. It would be unduly
19 burdensome to have individual litigation of millions of individual claims in separate lawsuits, every one of
20 which would present the issues presented in this lawsuit.

21 **VI. Claims.**

22 **Count I: Violation of California's Unfair Competition Law**

23 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the California Subclass)**

24 57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above
25 as though fully set forth herein.

26 58. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and members of the California
27 Subclass.

28 59. Defendant has violated California's Unfair Competition Law (UCL) by engaging in

1 unlawful, fraudulent, and unfair conduct (i.e., violating each of the three prongs of the UCL).

2 ***The Unlawful Prong***

3 60. As alleged in detail above and below, Defendant engaged in unlawful conduct by violating
4 the CLRA, FAL, and Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, as incorporated here.

5 ***The Fraudulent Prong***

6 61. As alleged in detail above, Defendant's representations and omissions concerning the
7 product's defect were misleading. Defendant's representations and omissions were likely to deceive, and
8 did deceive, Plaintiff and reasonable consumers.

9 ***The Unfair Prong***

10 62. Defendant violated established public policy by violating the CLRA, the FAL, and the
11 Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, as alleged below and incorporated here. The unfairness of this
12 practice is tethered to a legislatively declared policy (that of the CLRA, FAL, and the Song-Beverly
13 Consumer Warranty Act).

14 63. Defendant's conduct caused substantial injury to Plaintiff and Subclass members. The
15 harm to Plaintiff and the Subclass greatly outweighs the public utility of Defendant's conduct (which is
16 none). Defendant distributed household appliances that emit harmful pollutants, when reasonable
17 alternative designs exist. Defendant also omitted any warning about pollutants like nitrogen oxides.
18 These actions do not have public utility. This injury was not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to
19 consumers or competition.

20 64. Plaintiff and the Subclass could not have reasonably avoided this injury. As alleged
21 above, Defendant's representations and omissions were deceptive to reasonable consumers.

22 65. Defendant's conduct, as alleged above, was immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous,
23 and substantially injurious to consumers.

24 66. Defendant's conduct violated the public policy against misleading product labels and
25 defective products, which is tethered to the CLRA and FAL, as well as the Song-Beverly Consumer
26 Warranty Act.

27 * * *

28 67. For all prongs, Plaintiff saw and reasonably relied on Defendant's misleading

1 representations and omissions when purchasing the Product.

2 68. Defendant sold its Products specifically for cooking inside the home, while omitting any
3 warning of the serious safety defect regarding harmful emissions. Defendant knew of the defect, but
4 actively concealed it. Defendant should have, but did not, warn consumers of the risk of harmful
5 pollutants while cooking. This warning could have been included on the packaging for the product, or
6 on stickers on the product itself. But Defendant did not include any such warning.

7 69. As alleged in detail above, Defendant had a duty to warn of this defect.

8 70. As alleged in detail above, Defendant's misleading representations and omissions were
9 material. The defect would have been important to the purchase of Plaintiff and other reasonable
10 consumers. Subclass-wide reliance can be inferred because Defendant's misrepresentations were
11 material, i.e., a reasonable consumer would consider them important in deciding whether to buy
12 Defendant's Products. Defendant's misleading representations and omissions were a substantial factor in
13 Plaintiff's purchase decision and the purchase decisions of class members.

14 71. Plaintiff and Subclass members were injured as a direct and proximate result of
15 Defendant's conduct because: (a) they would not have paid the purchase price for the Product if they had
16 known of the defect, (b) they overpaid for the product because the product is sold at a price premium
17 due to Defendant's misleading representations and omissions, or (c) they received a product that was
18 defective and thus less valuable than what they paid for.

19 **Count II: Violation of California's False Advertising Law (FAL)**

20 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the California Subclass)**

21 72. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above
22 in Sections I-IV as though fully set forth herein.

23 73. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and members of the California
24 Subclass.

25 74. As alleged more fully above, Defendant has falsely advertised its Products by misleadingly
26 representing that the Products are safe and fit for cooking inside the home while omitting any warning
27 that the Products emit harmful pollutants like nitrogen oxides. Plaintiff relied on these representations
28 and omissions. The representation and omissions are misleading because the Products emit health-

1 harming pollutants. Defendant knew of this defect, but failed to include any warning about the defect.

2 75. As alleged more fully above, Defendant's representations and omissions were likely to
3 deceive, and did deceive, Plaintiff and reasonable consumers. Defendant knew, or reasonably should
4 have known, that its representations and omissions were misleading.

5 76. As alleged in detail above, Defendant's misrepresentations and omissions were material.
6 Thus, subclass-wide reliance can be inferred.

7 77. As alleged in detail above, Defendant's representations and omissions were a substantial
8 factor and proximate cause in causing damages and losses to Plaintiff and subclass members.

9 78. Plaintiff and subclass members were injured as a direct and proximate result of
10 Defendant's conduct because (a) they would not have paid the purchase price for the Product if they had
11 known of the defect, (b) they overpaid for the product because the product is sold at a price premium
12 due to Defendant's misleading representations and omissions, or (c) they received a product that was
13 defective and thus less valuable than what they paid for.

14 **Count III: Violation of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act (CLRA)**

15 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the California Subclass)**

16 70. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above
17 in Sections I-IV as though fully set forth herein.

18 80. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and members of the California
19 Subclass.

20 81. Plaintiff and the other members of the California Subclass are "consumers," as the term
21 is defined by California Civil Code § 1761(d).

22 82. Plaintiff, the other members of the California Subclass, and Defendant have engaged in
23 "transactions," as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1761(e).

24 83. The conduct alleged in this Complaint constitutes unfair methods of competition and
25 unfair and deceptive acts and practices for the purpose of the CLRA, and the conduct was undertaken by
26 Defendant in transactions intended to result in, and which did result in, the sale of goods to consumers.

27 84. As alleged more fully above, Defendant has violated the CLRA by advertising its
28 Products in a way that is misleading or is likely to deceive consumers. Defendant's statements and

1 omissions led Plaintiff and other members of the California Subclass to believe that its Products are safe
2 and fit for ordinary use when cooking in the home, when in fact, the Products emit health-harming
3 pollutants. Defendant has also violated the CLRA by failing to warn of a material defect with the
4 product.

5 85. As a result of engaging in such conduct, Defendant has violated California Civil Code §§
6 1770(a)(2), (a)(5), (a)(7), and (a)(9).

7 86. As alleged more fully above, Defendant's conduct was likely to deceive, and did deceive,
8 Plaintiff and reasonable consumers. Defendant knew that its products emitted harmful pollutants.
9 Defendant's failure to warn consumers that the Products emit harmful pollutants was deceptive.

10 87. Plaintiff saw and reasonably relied on Defendant's misleading representations and
11 omissions when purchasing the Product.

12 88. As alleged in detail above, Defendant had a duty to warn of this defect.

13 89. As alleged in detail above, Defendant's misleading representations and omissions were
14 material. Thus, subclass-wide reliance can be inferred. Defendant's misleading representations and
15 omissions were a substantial factor in Plaintiff's purchase decision and the purchase decisions of subclass
16 members.

17 90. Plaintiff and subclass members were injured as a direct and proximate result of
18 Defendant's conduct because (a) they would not have paid the purchase price for the Product if they had
19 known of the defect, (b) they overpaid for the product because the product is sold at a price premium
20 due to Defendant's misleading representations and omissions, or (c) they received a product that was
21 defective and thus less valuable than what they paid for.

22 91. Accordingly, pursuant to California Civil Code § 1780(a)(2), Plaintiff, on behalf of herself
23 and all other members of the California Subclass, seeks injunctive relief.

24 92. CLRA § 1782 NOTICE. On March 7, 2023, Plaintiff mailed a notice letter to LG
25 Electronics USA, Inc. at its Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey headquarters. This letter provided notice of
26 Defendant's violation of the CLRA and demanded that Defendant corrects the unlawful, unfair, false
27 and/or deceptive practices alleged here. If Defendant does not fully correct the problem for Plaintiff
28 and for each member of the class within 30 days of receipt, Plaintiff and the class will seek all monetary

1 relief allowed under the CLRA.

2 **Count IV: Breach of Implied Warranty**

3 **Pursuant to Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act**

4 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the California Subclass)**

5 93. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above
6 in Sections I-IV as though fully set forth herein.

7 94. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and members of the California
8 Subclass.

9 95. Plaintiff is a “buyer” within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code §1791(b).

10 96. Defendant’s Products are “consumer goods” within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code
11 §1791(a). Defendant’s Products are for use inside of the house.

12 97. Defendant is the “manufacturer” of Defendant’s Products within the meaning of Cal.
13 Civ. Code §1791(j). Defendant is in the business of manufacturing or distributing Defendant’s Products.

14 98. As alleged in detail above, Defendant is aware that the consumers purchase its Products
15 for the purpose of cooking in the home. Consumers, including the California Subclass, rely on the skill
16 and judgment of Defendant as a supplier of home appliances when selecting products suitable for home
17 use. Defendant knew that Plaintiff and class members would justifiably rely on Defendant’s particular
18 skill and knowledge of home appliances in selecting or furnishing products suitable for home cooking.
19 But the Products were not fit for this purpose.

20 99. Defendant impliedly warranted that Defendant’s Products were in merchantable
21 condition and fit for the ordinary purpose for which the Products are used (cooking inside the home)
22 under Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(a) & 1792.

23 100. As alleged in detail above, Defendant’s Products did not have the quality that a buyer
24 would reasonably accept, and therefore were not merchantable.

25 101. As alleged in detail above, Defendant’s Products would not pass without objection in the
26 home appliances trade because they emit harmful pollutants, and fail to warn of these risks.

27 102. As alleged in detail above, Defendant’s Products are not adequately labeled because they
28 fail to disclose the risk of harmful pollutants.

1 103. Defendant breached the implied warranty of merchantability and fitness by selling its
 2 Products containing defects. These defects have deprived Plaintiff and the Subclass of the benefit of the
 3 bargain, and have caused the Products to depreciate in value.

4 104. Plaintiff and subclass members were injured as a direct and proximate result of
 5 Defendant’s conduct because (a) they would not have paid the purchase price for the Product if they had
 6 known of the defect, (b) they overpaid for the product because the product is sold at a price premium
 7 due to Defendant’s misleading representations and omissions, or (c) they received a product that was
 8 defective and thus less valuable than what they paid for.

9 105. Plaintiff and Subclass members are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable
 10 relief, costs, and attorneys’ fees.

11 **Count V: Violations of State Consumer Protection Statutes**
 12 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the Consumer Protection Subclass)**

13 106. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above
 14 in Sections I-IV as though fully set forth herein.

15 107. This count is brought on behalf of Plaintiff and the Consumer Protection Subclass for
 16 violations of the following state consumer protection statutes:

State	Statute
California	Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, and the following; <i>Id.</i> §17500, and the following; Cal. Civ. Code §1750 and the following.
Connecticut	Conn. Gen Stat. Ann. § 42- 110, and the following.
Illinois	815 ILCS § 501/1, and the following.
Maryland	Md. Code Ann. Com. Law, § 13-301, and the following.
Missouri	Mo. Rev. Stat. § 407, and the following.
New York	N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349, and the following.

17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27 108. Each of these consumer protection statutes prohibits unfair, unconscionable, and/or
 28 deceptive acts or practices in the course of trade or commerce or in connection with the sales of goods

1 or services to consumers.

2 109. As alleged in detail above, Defendant's conduct, including the marketing and sale of its
3 Products to consumers, violates each statute's prohibitions.

4 110. As further alleged above, Defendant's misrepresentations and omissions were a
5 substantial factor in Plaintiff's purchase decision and the purchase decisions of Subclass members.
6 Defendant's misrepresentations and omissions were misleading to a reasonable consumer, and Plaintiff
7 and Subclass members reasonably relied on Defendant's misrepresentations.

8 111. Plaintiff and Subclass members were injured as a direct and proximate result of
9 Defendant's conduct because (a) they would not have paid the purchase price for the Defendant's
10 Products if they had known the truth, (b) they overpaid for the Products because the Products are sold at
11 a price premium due to the misrepresentation and omissions, or and/or (c) they received a product that
12 was defective and thus less valuable than what they paid for.

13 112. In this way, Plaintiff and the members of the proposed Subclass have suffered an
14 ascertainable loss, in an amount to be determined at trial.

15 **Count VI: Breach of Implied Warranties**

16 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the Nationwide Class)**

17 113. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though
18 fully set forth herein.

19 114. Plaintiff brings this count individually and for the Nationwide Class. In the alternative,
20 Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and the California Subclass.

21 ***Implied Warranty of Merchantability***

22 115. The Uniform Commercial Code § 2-314 states that "a warranty that [] goods shall be
23 merchantable is implied in a contract for their sale if the seller is a merchant with respect to goods of that
24 kind." "Merchantable" goods must be "fit for the ordinary purposes for which the goods are used."

25 116. Defendant is and was, at all relevant times, a merchant with respect to home appliances,
26 and with respect to residential Products in particular. Defendant's Products each constitutes a "good"
27 under the UCC.

28 117. Plaintiff and class members purchased Defendant's Products.

1 118. As the manufacturer of residential gas stoves, Defendant impliedly warranted to Plaintiff
2 and the class that the products were of merchantable quality and were safe for their ordinary use in home
3 cooking. In fact, as described in detail above, the products, when sold and at all times after, were not in
4 merchantable condition and were not fit for the ordinary purpose for which they are used. Specifically,
5 the Products are inherently flawed given a defect in design making them emit health-harming pollutants
6 when used to cook inside the home. The defective design makes them unfit for ordinary purposes even
7 when used correctly. In addition, Defendant's Products are not adequately labeled because they fail to
8 disclose the risk of harmful pollutants.

9 119. Thus, Defendant breached the implied warranty of merchantability in connection with
10 the sale and distribution of the Products.

11 120. Plaintiff and the class were foreseeable third-party beneficiaries of Defendant's sale of the
12 Products. Defendant sells the Products to retailers for distribution and sale to consumers such as
13 Plaintiff and class members.

14 121. Defendant's breach directly caused Plaintiff and class members harm. Plaintiff and
15 Subclass members were injured as a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct because (a) they
16 would not have paid the purchase price for Defendant's Products if they had known the truth, (b) they
17 overpaid for the Products because the Products are sold at a price premium due to the misrepresentation
18 and omissions, or and/or (c) they received a product that was defective and thus less valuable than what
19 they paid for.

20 ***Implied Warranty of Fitness***

21 122. The Uniform Commercial Code § 2-315 states that where a seller "has reason to know
22 any particular purpose for which the goods are required and that the buyer is relying on the seller's skill
23 or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods, there is unless excluded or modified under the next
24 section an implied warranty that the goods shall be fit for such purpose."

25 123. Plaintiff and class members purchased Defendant's Products for the particular purpose
26 of cooking inside the home.

27 124. As explained in detail above, Defendant knew, or had reason to know, that Plaintiff and
28 class members were purchasing the Products for the particular purpose of cooking inside the home.

1 members to purchase the Products. Plaintiff would not have paid the purchase price for the products
2 had she known of the defect. Class-wide reliance can be inferred because Defendant's omissions were
3 material, i.e., a reasonable consumer would consider them important to their purchase decision.

4 135. As alleged in detail above, Defendant had a duty to disclose the defect.

5 136. Plaintiff and class members were injured as a direct and proximate result of Defendant's
6 fraudulent omissions because (a) they would not have paid the purchase price for the product if they had
7 known it was unsafe and unfit for use; (b) they overpaid for the product because it is sold at a price
8 premium due to Defendant's misleading representations and omissions, or (c) they received a product
9 that was defective and thus less valuable than what they paid for.

10 137. Defendant's acts were done maliciously, oppressively, deliberately, with intent to defraud,
11 and in reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and well-being to enrich Defendant. Defendant's conduct
12 warrants an assessment of punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter such conduct in the future,
13 which amount is to be determined according to proof.

14 **Count VIII: Unjust Enrichment / Quasi-contract**
15 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the Nationwide Class)**

16 138. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though
17 fully set forth herein.

18 139. Plaintiff brings this count individually and for the Nationwide Class. In the alternative,
19 Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and the California Subclass.

20 140. Plaintiff and class members conferred a tangible and material economic benefit upon
21 Defendant by purchasing the Products.

22 141. In exchange for the purchase price, Defendant provided a defective product, without a
23 reasonable warning. Defendant knew and appreciated the benefit they incurred from consumers
24 purchasing Products.

25 142. Thus, Defendant is aware of, and has retained, the unjust benefit conferred upon them by
26 Plaintiff and the class members.

27 143. Defendant received a direct and unjust benefit, at Plaintiff's and the class's expense.

28 144. Plaintiff and the class seek restitution.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

VII. Jury Demand.

145. Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

VIII. Prayer for Relief.

146. Plaintiff seeks the following relief individually and for the proposed class and subclasses:

- An order certifying the asserted claims, or issues raised, as a class action;
- An order appointing Plaintiff as representative for the Nationwide Class and each Subclass, and appointing their counsel as lead counsel for the classes;
- A judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the proposed classes;
- Damages, treble damages, statutory damages, and punitive damages where applicable;
- Restitution;
- Disgorgement, and other just relief;
- An order awarding Plaintiff and all other class members damages in an amount to be determined at trial for the wrongful acts of Defendant;
- Pre- and post-judgment interest on all amounts awarded;
- Injunctive relief as pleaded or as the Court may deem proper;
- Reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, as allowed by law;
- Punitive damages; and
- Any additional relief that the Court deems reasonable and just.

Dated: March 8, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Christin Cho
Christin Cho (Cal Bar No. 238173)
christin@dovel.com
Simon Franzini (Cal. Bar No. 287631)
simon@dovel.com
Jonas B. Jacobson (Cal. Bar No.
269912) jonas@dovel.com
DOVEL & LUNER, LLP
201 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 600 Santa
Monica, California 90401

Telephone: (310) 656-7066
Facsimile: (310) 656-7069

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Christin Cho (Cal Bar No. 238173)
 christin@dovel.com
 2 Simon Franzini (Cal. Bar No. 287631)
 simon@dovel.com
 3 Jonas B. Jacobson (Cal. Bar No. 269912)
 jonas@dovel.com
 4 DOVEL & LUNER, LLP
 5 201 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 600
 Santa Monica, California 90401
 6 Telephone: (310) 656-7066
 Facsimile: (310) 656-7069
 7

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

9
 10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11
 12 Sandra Sherzai, individually
 and on behalf of all others similarly
 13 situated,

14 *Plaintiff,*

15 v.

16 LG Electronics USA, Inc.

17 *Defendant.*
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

Case No.

CLRA Venue Declaration

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CLRA Venue Declaration

I, Sandra Sherzai, declare as follows:

1. I am the named Plaintiff in this action.
2. In October 2022, I purchased a LG gas stove from the Costco website while living in Vallejo, California.
3. I understand that, because I purchased the product in Vallejo, the transaction occurred within the Eastern District of California and therefore this is a proper place to bring my California Consumer Legal Remedies Act claim.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date: 3/6/2023

By: 
39E275BD433C4D5...
Sandra Sherzai

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Sandra Sherzai

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Solano (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Christin Cho (310-656-7066)
Dovel & Luner LLP
201 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 600, Santa Monica, CA

DEFENDANTS

LG Electronics USA Inc.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
2 U.S. Government Defendant
3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- Citizen of This State
Citizen of Another State
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country
PTF DEF
1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State
2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State
3 3 Foreign Nation
4 4
5 5
6 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various legal categories like Insurance, Personal Injury, Real Estate, Labor, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding
2 Removed from State Court
3 Remanded from Appellate Court
4 Reinstated or Reopened
5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
Consumer protection laws; Jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)
Brief description of cause:
Consumer product liability case

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE Mar 8, 2023 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Christin Cho

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

Case 2:23-cv-00429-TLN-CKD Document 1-2 Filed 03/08/23 Page 2 of 2
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

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

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
 Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

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