IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS - EASTERN DIVISION

Stephanie Williams, Georgina Gomes, and Krista Gillette,) individually and on behalf of themselves and all other similarly) situated persons, known and unknown,) Plaintiffs.) v.) Mielle Organics LLC and The Procter & Gamble Company,) Defendants.)

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Now comes Plaintiffs Stephanie Williams, Georgina Gomes and Krista Gillette ("Plaintiffs") individually and on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated persons, known and unknown, by her attorneys, and in complaining of the Defendants Mielle Organics LLC ("Mielle") and The Procter & Gamble Company ("P&G") (collectively, "Defendants"), states as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a class action lawsuit regarding Defendants' manufacturing, distribution, and sale of Mielle Organics Rosemary Mint Scalp & Strengthening Hair Oil, Mielle Organics Rosemary Mint Strengthening Conditioner, and Mielle Organics Rosemary Mint Strengthening Conditioner, and Mielle Organics Rosemary Mint Strengthening Shampoo (the "Products").

2. The Products contains ingredients that cause and have caused hair loss and other injuries in its users, including Plaintiffs and those in the Proposed Class Members. In addition, Plaintiffs and/or proposed Class Members have suffered scalp issues, blistering, and/or sores where they used the Products.

3. Defendants have misrepresented that the Products are safe; Defendants have failed to disclose that the Products may cause hair loss and other injuries in its users.

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 2 of 14 PageID #:2

3. Defendants did not adequately disclose the risks in their Products of hair loss and other injuries on the Products' labeling, advertising, marketing, or sale of the Products.

4. Plaintiffs and proposed Class Members would not have purchased the Products, or would have paid substantially less for the Products, had Defendants disclosed that the Products contained ingredients that would cause hair loss and other injuries if used.

5. As a manufacturer, distributor, and seller of cosmetics Products, Defendants have a duty to ensure its Products did not contain ingredients that would cause hair loss and other injuries n their consumers. Defendants made no reasonable effort to test its Products to ensure that the Products would not cause hair loss or other injuries.

6. Defendants did not disclose to Plaintiffs or proposed Class Members in any advertising, labeling, packaging, or marketing that its Products carried risks of causing hair loss or other injuries.

7. To the contrary, Defendants represented and warranted, expressly and impliedly, that the Products was safe and effective for their intended use, were of merchantable quality, and complied with federal and state law.

8. If Defendants had fulfilled their quality assurance obligations, Defendants would have identified the presence of ingredients in the Products that caused hair loss and other injuries in its users.

9. If Defendants adequately tested the Products, they would have discovered the Products contained ingredients that cause hair loss, making the Products ineligible for distribution, marketing, and sale.

10. Accordingly, Defendants knowingly, or at least negligently, introduced harmful and/or misbranded Products into the U.S. market.

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 3 of 14 PageID #:3

11. When Plaintiffs purchased Defendants' Products, Plaintiffs did not know, and had no reason to know, that Defendants' Products were harmful and misbranded and thus improper to sell as set forth herein.

12. Plaintiffs would not have purchased Defendants' Products at all had they known the Products contained ingredients causing hair loss and other injuries or risked causing hair loss or other injuries.

13. No reasonable consumer would have paid any amount for cosmetic Products that contained ingredients causing hair loss and other injuries or containing a high risk of causing hair loss or other injuries.

14. Thus, if Plaintiffs and Class Members had been informed that Defendants' Products contained ingredients causing hair loss and other injuries or risked causing hair loss or other injuries, they would not have purchased or used the Products at all, or would have paid significantly less for the Products, making such omitted facts material to them.

15. Plaintiffs and Class Members were injured by the full purchase price of the Products because the Products are worthless, as they contained ingredients causing hair loss and other injuries or risked causing hair loss and/or other injuries.

16. Further, Plaintiffs and Class Members bargained for Products free of ingredients causing hair loss and other injuries or risked causing hair loss or other injuries. They were deprived the basis of their bargain when Defendants manufactured and sold them the Products containing or at risk of containing ingredients causing hair loss and other injuries or risked causing hair loss or other injuries.

17. Had Defendants not misrepresented that the Products were safe and/or had Defendants not failed to disclose that the Products contained or were at risk of causing hair loss and other injuries or risked causing such injuries, Plaintiffs and Class Members would not have purchased

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 4 of 14 PageID #:4

the Products or would not have paid as much for the Products based on these misrepresentations or omissions.

18. Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to damages for the monies paid to purchase the Products, both economic and non-economic, statutory and punitive damages, attorneys' fees and costs, and injunctive relief.

19. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the Class Members for equitable relief and to recover damages and restitution for: (i) fraud; (ii) unjust enrichment, and (iii) violations of state consumer fraud acts.

PARTIES

20. Plaintiff Stephanie Williams is a resident of Chicago, Illinois, and is a citizen of Illinois. She purchased and used the Products for personal use from stores in this District, in Illinois.

21. Plaintiff Georgina Gomes is a resident of Stoughton, Massachusetts, and is a citizen of Massachusetts. She purchased and used the Products for personal use in Massachusetts.

22. Plaintiff Krista Gillette is a resident of San Francisco, California, and is a citizen of California. She purchased and used the Products for personal use from stores in California.

23. When purchasing the Products, Plaintiffs reviewed the accompanying labels and disclosures, and understood them as representations and warranties by Defendants that the Products were properly manufactured, free from defects, and safe for their intended use.

24. Plaintiffs relied on these representations and warranties in deciding to purchase the Products manufactured and sold by Defendants, and these representations and warranties were part of the basis of the bargain, in that they would not have purchased the Products from Defendants if they had known that they were not, in fact, properly manufactured, free from defects, and safe for their intended use.

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 5 of 14 PageID #:5

25. The Products Plaintiffs purchased were in fact improperly manufactured, defective, and /or not safe for its intended use.

26. Plaintiffs were injured in that they purchased the unsafe Products, causing hair loss and/or other injuries, and therefore the Products was worthless.

27. Plaintiffs were deceived by Defendants' representations and omissions regarding the safety and utility of the Products.

28. Defendant Mielle is a Delaware limited liability company. Defendant Mielle manufactures, markets, and sells the Products throughout the State of Illinois and the United States, including in both retail establishments and online.

29. Defendant P&G is an Ohio corporation with its principal place of business located in Ohio. In 2023, Defendant P&G purchased Defendant Mielle and began to manufacture, market, and sell the Products throughout the State of Illinois and the United States, including in both retail establishments and online.

JURISIDICTION AND VENUE

30. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A), as modified by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, because at least one member of the Class, as defined below, is a citizen of a different state than Defendants, there are more than 100 members of the Class, and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs.

31. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants in that they sell and market the Products in this District. Plaintiff Stephanie Williams purchased one or more of the Products in this District and was injured as a result of using one or more of the Products in this District.

32. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred within this District, Defendants have

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 6 of 14 PageID #:6

marketed, advertised, and sold the Products in this District, and Defendants have caused harm to Plaintiff Stephanie Williams and Class Members in this District.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

33. Plaintiffs seek to represent a class defined as all persons in the United States who purchased the Products for personal or household use within any applicable limitations period (the "Class").

34. Plaintiffs also seek to represent a subclass of all Class Members who purchased the Products for personal or household use in California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, or Washington within any applicable limitations period (the "Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass").¹

35. The Class and Subclasses are collectively referred to as the "Classes."

36. Subject to additional information obtained through further investigation and discovery, the foregoing definitions of the Classes may be expanded or narrowed by amendment to the complaint or narrowed at class certification.

¹While discovery may alter the following, the states in the Consumer Fraud Multi-State Class are limited to those states with similar consumer fraud laws under the facts of this case: California (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.); Florida (Fla. Stat. § 501.201, et seq.); Illinois (815 Ill. Comp. Stat. 505/1, et seq.); Massachusetts (Mass. Gen. Laws Ch. 93A, et seq.); Michigan (Mich. Comp. Laws § 445.901, et seq.); Minnesota (Minn. Stat. § 325F.67, et seq.); Missouri (Mo. Rev. Stat. § 407.010, et seq.); New Jersey (N.J. Stat. § 56:8-1, et seq.); New York (N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §§ 349 and 350); and Washington (Wash. Rev. Code § 19.86.010, et seq.).

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 7 of 14 PageID #:7

37. Specifically excluded from the Classes are Defendants, Defendants' officers, directors, agents, trustees, parents, children, corporations, trusts, representatives, employees, principals, servants, partners, joint ventures, or entities controlled by Defendants, and their heirs, successors, assigns, or other persons or entities related to or affiliated with Defendants and/or Defendants' officers and/or directors, the judge assigned to this action, and any member of the judge's immediate family.

38. **Numerosity.** The members of the proposed Classes are geographically dispersed throughout the United States and are so numerous that individual joinder is impracticable. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs reasonably estimate that there are thousands of individuals that are members of the proposed Classes. Although the precise number of proposed members are unknown to Plaintiffs, the true number of members of the Classes are known by Defendants. Members of the Classes may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail and/or publication through the distribution and sales records of Defendants and third-party retailers and vendors.

39. **Typicality.** The claims of the representative Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Classes in that the representative Plaintiffs, like all members of the Classes, purchased the Products, which were worthless due to their unsafe nature. The representative Plaintiffs, like all members of the Classes, have been damaged by Defendants' misconduct in the very same way as the members of the Classes. Further, the factual bases of Defendants' misconduct are common to all members of the Classes and represent a common thread of misconduct resulting in injury to all members of the Classes.

40. **Existence and predominance of common questions of law and fact.** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Classes and predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Classes. These common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 8 of 14 PageID #:8

(a) whether Defendants knew or should have known the Products caused or were at risk of causing hair loss and other injuries prior to selling them, thereby constituting fraud and/or fraudulent concealment;

(b) whether Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs and the Classes for unjust enrichment;

(c) whether Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs and the Classes for fraud;

(d) whether Plaintiffs and the Classes have sustained monetary loss and the proper measure of that loss;

(e) whether Plaintiffs and the Classes are entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief;

(f) whether Plaintiffs and the Classes are entitled to restitution and disgorgement from Defendants; and

(g) whether the marketing, advertising, packaging, labeling, and other promotional materials for the Products are deceptive.

(h) whether the Products causes hair loss and other injuries in its users.

41. **Adequacy of Representation**. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Classes. Plaintiffs have retained counsel who are highly experienced in consumer class action litigation, and Plaintiffs intend to vigorously prosecute this action on behalf of the Classes. Plaintiffs have no interests that are antagonistic to those of the Classes.

42. **Superiority**. A class action is superior to all other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The damages or other financial detriment suffered by members of the Classes are relatively small compared to the burden and expense of individual litigation of their claims against Defendants. It would, thus, be virtually impossible for members of the Classes, on an individual basis, to obtain effective redress for the wrongs committed against them. Furthermore, even if members of the Classes could afford such individualized litigation, the court system could not. Individualized litigation would create the danger of inconsistent or

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 9 of 14 PageID #:9

contradictory judgments arising from the same set of facts. Individualized litigation would also increase the delay and expense to all parties and the court system from the issues raised by this action. By contrast, the class action device provides the benefits of adjudication of these issues in a single proceeding, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court, and presents no unusual management difficulties under the circumstances.

43. In the alternative, the Classes may be certified because:

(a) the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Classes would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudication with respect to individual members of the Classes that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendants;

(b) the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Classes would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members of the Classes not parties to the adjudications, or substantially impair or impede her ability to protect her interests; and/or

(c) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes as a whole, thereby making appropriate final declaratory and/or injunctive relief with respect to the members of the Class as a whole.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I - Fraud - (On Behalf of Plaintiffs and the Classes)

44. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.

45. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the Classes against Defendants.

46. Defendants made fraudulent misrepresentations and/or omissions to Plaintiffs and members of the Classes regarding the Products, specifically that the Products were safe for their

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 10 of 14 PageID #:10

intended use, and not harmful. Defendants also materially omitted facts from Plaintiffs and members of the Classes, including that the Products in fact would cause hair loss and other injuries or carried a significant risk that hair loss and other injuries would occur.

47. Defendants had a duty to disclose material facts to Plaintiffs and the Classes given that Plaintiffs and the Classes were the intended users of the Products. Defendants also had a duty to disclose material facts to Plaintiffs and the Classes, namely that it was in fact manufacturing, distributing, and selling harmful Products unfit for human use, because Defendants had superior knowledge such that the transactions without the disclosure were rendered inherently unfair.

48. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained ingredients that would cause hair loss and other injuries or carried a risk that the Products would cause hair loss or other injuries, but continued to manufacture, distribute, and sell them nonetheless. During this time, Plaintiffs and Class Members were using the Products without knowledge that the Products contained ingredients that would cause hair loss and/or other injuries or carried a risk that the Products would cause hair loss or other injuries.

49. Defendants failed to discharge their duty to disclose these material facts.

50. In so failing to disclose these material facts to Plaintiffs and the Classes, Defendants intended to hide from Plaintiffs and the Classes that they were purchasing and using the Products with harmful defects that were unsafe, and thus acted with scienter and/or an intent to defraud. 51. Plaintiffs and the Class Members reasonably relied on Defendants' failure to disclose insofar as they would not have purchased the defective Products manufactured and sold by Defendants had they known the Products were unsafe.

52. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' fraudulent concealment, Plaintiffs and the Classes suffered damages in the amount of monies paid for the defective Products.

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 11 of 14 PageID #:11

53. As a result of Defendants' willful and malicious conduct, punitive damages are warranted.

COUNT II - Unjust Enrichment - (On Behalf of Plaintiffs and the Classes)

54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.

55. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the Class Members against Defendants.

56. Plaintiffs and the Class Members conferred a benefit on Defendants in the form of monies paid to purchase Defendants' defective Products.

57. Defendants voluntarily accepted and retained this benefit.

58. Because this benefit was obtained unlawfully, namely by selling and accepting compensation for Products unfit for safe use, it would be unjust and inequitable for Defendants to retain the benefit without paying the value thereof.

COUNT III - Violation of State Consumer Fraud Acts

(On Behalf of Plaintiffs and the Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass)

59. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.

60. Plaintiffs brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass against Defendants.

61. The Consumer Fraud Acts of the States in the Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass prohibit the use of unfair or deceptive business practices in the conduct of trade or commerce.

62. Plaintiffs and Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass Members have standing to pursue a cause of action for violation of the Consumer Fraud Acts of the states in the Consumer Fraud

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 12 of 14 PageID #:12

Multi-State Subclass because Plaintiffs and Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass Members have suffered an injury in fact and lost money as a result of Defendants' actions set forth herein.

63. Defendants engaged in unfair conduct, including but not limited to selling the Products while knowing or while being on notice that the Products was unsafe.

64. Defendants engaged in deceptive conduct, including but not limited to, misrepresenting that the Products did not caused hair loss and other injuries or did not risk causing hair loss or other injuries.

65. Defendants intended that Plaintiffs and Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass Members would rely upon their unfair and deceptive conduct and a reasonable person would in fact be misled by the deceptive conduct described above.

66. Given Defendants' position in the health and beauty market as an industry leader, Plaintiffs and reasonable consumers trusted and relied on Defendants' representations and omissions regarding the safety of the Products.

67. As a result of Defendants' use or employment of unfair or deceptive acts or business practices, Plaintiffs and Consumer Fraud Multi-State Subclass Members have sustained damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

68. In addition, Defendants' conduct violates numerous public policies, including but not limited to prohibitions on false or misleading advertising and labeling of consumer products.

69. Defendants' conduct is immoral, unethical, oppressive, or unscrupulous because they are profiting off of Plaintiffs, members of the proposed class, and other consumers, through false or misleading advertising and labeling of their products.

70. Defendants' conduct has caused substantial injury to Plaintiffs, including the loss of monies paid for products that were gained through deceptive or unfair advertising or labeling of Defendants' products.

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 13 of 14 PageID #:13

71. In addition, Defendants' conduct showed malice, motive, and the reckless disregard of the truth such that an award of punitive damages is appropriate.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully requests, individually and on behalf of the alleged Class Members, that the Court enter judgment in their favor and against Defendants as follows:

(a) For an order certifying the Classes under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,
 naming Plaintiffs as the representative for the Classes, and naming Plaintiffs' attorneys as Class
 Counsel to represent the Classes;

(b) For an order declaring that Defendants' conduct violates the causes of action referenced herein;

(c) For an order finding in favor of Plaintiffs and the Classes on all counts asserted herein;

(d) For compensatory, statutory, and punitive damages in amounts to be determined by the Court and/or jury;

(e) For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded;

(f) For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;

(g) For injunctive relief as pleaded or as the Court may deem proper; and

(h) For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the Classes her reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses and costs of suit.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury of any and all issues in this action so triable as of right.

s/ James M. Dore

James M. Dore/ Dore Law Offices LLC (ARDC# 6296265) Daniel I. Schlade (ARDC No. 6273008)

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1 Filed: 12/12/24 Page 14 of 14 PageID #:14

Attorneys for Plaintiffs 6232 N. Pulaski Avenue, #300 Chicago, IL. 60646 P: 773-415-4898 E: james@dorelawoffices.com; <u>danschlade@gmail.com</u>

Case: 1:24-cv-12763 Document #: 1-1 Eiled: 12/12/24 Page 1 of 2 PageID #:15 ILND 44 (Rev. 09/07/18) CIVIL COVER SHEET

The ILND 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	DEFENDANTS									
 (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				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 IURISD	ICTION (Charle and hor a			IZENSHIP OF P	PRINCI	PALI	PARTIES (For)	Diversity Cases	Only)	
				ck <u>on</u> e box, only for plaint <u>i</u> j	iff and <u>one</u>	box for a		Siversity Cases		
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government not)	Citiz	en of This State	PTF 1					DEF □4	
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant				en of Another State	2	□ 2	Incorporated and Proof Business in Anot		□ 5	□5
				en or Subject of a oreign Country	3	3	Foreign Nation		6	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Check <u>on</u> e box, only.)	DTC		PRISONER PETITIONS	2			OTHER	STATIC	FS
Itol Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 530 General 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Product Liability 2368 Asbestos Personal Product Liability PERSONAL PROPE 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTC 422 Appeal 28 USC 423 Withdrawal 28 U IMMIGRATIO 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus - Detainee (Prisoner 465 Other Immigratic Actions	Y	Source Contract Contrect Contract Contract Contract Contract Contract Contract Contract		LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act 830 Patent 835 Patent – Abbreviated New Drug Application 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAXES 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 970 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 970 LitRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609		OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729 (a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 480 Consumer Credit 480 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
	moved from 3 Rem te Court Appe	ellate Court	Reop Id VII. case m	bened A	sociated ba	District	TTERS (For nature	L E re of suit 422 ar	,	er the
VIII. REQUESTED IN Check if this is a class action Under rule 2 COMPLAINT: F.R.CV.P. IX RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions)				Demand \$ Check Yes only if demanded in complaint. Jury Demand: Yes No						
IX. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY		Case N	umber							
X. Is this a previously dism Date		e? Yes contactor of attorney of record	-	es, Case # Na 24-cv.12019	ame of	Judge	Cummings			

Case: 1:234 Example 2 Company #: Company #: Company Elephic 12/12/24 Example 2 Photo #: 16

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 the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

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

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

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

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

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

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VII. **Previous Bankruptcy Matters** For nature of suit 422 and 423 enter the case number and judge for any associated bankruptcy matter previously adjudicated by a judge of this court. Use a separate attachment if necessary.

VIII. 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.

IX. 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.

X. Refiling Information. Place an "X" in the Yes box if the case is being refiled or if it is a remanded case, and indicate the case number and name of judge. If this case is not being refiled or has not been remanded, place an "X" in the No box.

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