Cas	e 8:13-cv-00075-CJC-AN	01/15	5/13 Page 1 of 30 Page ID #:1				
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Michael A. Caddell (State Bar No. 249) mac@caddellchapman.com) Cynthia B. Chapman (State Bar No. 16) cbc@caddellchapman.com Cory S. Fein (State Bar No. 250758) csf@caddellchapman.com CADDELL & CHAPMAN 1331 Lamar, Suite 1070 Houston, TX 77010-3027 Telephone: (713) 751-0400 Facsimile: (713) 751-0906 Attorneys for Plaintiffs		2013 JAN 15 PM 3: 36 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES BY				
10							
11	UNITED STATES	DIST	RICT COURT				
12	CENTRAL DISTRI						
13	LINDA PALACIOS, SONIA	Case	Case Number: SANI3-00075- (JC				
14	PALACIOS, and FERNANDO PALACIOS, on behalf of themselves	CLA	ASS ACTION COMPLAINT				
15	and all others similarly situated,	(1)	Violations of California				
16	Plaintiffs, v.		Consumer Legal Remedies Act				
17 18	HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA;	(2)	Violations of Unfair Business Practices Act				
19	Defendant.	(3)	Breach of Implied Warranty				
20	·	(4)	Breach of Written Warranty				
21			Under the Magnuson-Moss				
22			Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.				
23		(5)	Breach of Express Warranty				
24			1				
25		_J					
26							
27 28							
40	Case No. Page CLASS ACTI		IPLAINT				

situated, against Defendant Hyundai Motor America ("Hyundai"), and allege as follows:

5

6 7

9

8

11

12

10

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25

26 27

28

Case No.

NATURE OF THE CASE

"Plaintiffs") bring this action, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly

Plaintiffs Linda Palacios, Sonia Palacios, and Fernando Palacios (collectively

- 1. The sunroof assembly installed in Hyundai Veloster 2012 and 2013 model year vehicles equipped with a panoramic sunroof ("Class Vehicles") suffers from one or more design and/or manufacturing defects that causes the sunroofs to explode without warning (the "Exploding Sunroof Defect"). Although defects in material, manufacturing, and workmanship are covered by Hyundai's New Vehicle Limited Warranty, Hyundai has failed to adequately repair the Exploding Sunroof Defect under warranty.
- 2. Hyundai knows of the Exploding Sunroof Defect and knows that consumers are not aware of the risk that their sunroofs could explode without Nevertheless, Hyundai refused to acknowledge that there was any warning. problem for over a year and has recently issued only a partial recall limited to 2012 Veloster vehicles manufactured from November 1, 2011 through April 17, 2012. Hyundai has still not informed current owners and lessees of other Class Vehicles about the Exploding Sunroof Defect, has not disclosed the Exploding Sunroof Defect to purchasers and lessors of 2013 model Class Vehicles, and continues to market and promote the 2013 model Class Vehicles as safe.
- The Class Vehicles present a safety hazard and are unreasonably 3. dangerous to consumers. The Exploding Sunroof Defect can cause glass to fly throughout the car at high speed and without warning, putting passengers at risk of physical injury. The explosion and flying glass can also injure or startle the driver, thereby contributing to car accidents, which can cause personal injury or death.

4.

thousands of dollars to replace the panoramic sunroof. And even if the sunroof is replaced, consumers have no assurance that it will not explode again.

5. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Hyundai knew or should have known that the Class Vehicles and their panoramic

Sunroof Defect can be exorbitant because consumers will be required to pay

In addition to these safety hazards, the cost to repair the Exploding

- Hyundai knew or should have known that the Class Vehicles and their panoramic sunroofs are defective and not fit for their intended purpose of providing consumers with safe and reliable transportation. Nevertheless, Hyundai has actively concealed and failed to disclose this defect to Plaintiffs and the Class Members at the time of purchase or lease and thereafter.
- 6. Hyundai knew and concealed the Exploding Sunroof Defect that is contained in every Class Vehicle, along with the attendant dangerous safety problems and associated repair costs, from Plaintiffs and Class Members both at the time of sale and repair and thereafter. Had Plaintiffs and the Class Members known about these defects at the time of sale or lease, Plaintiffs and the Class Members would not have purchased the Class Vehicles or would have paid less for them.
- 7. As a result of Hyundai's practices, Plaintiffs and the other members of the proposed Class have suffered injury in fact, including economic damages, and have lost money or property. Plaintiffs Linda Palacios, Sonia Palacios, and Fernando Palacios bring a claim for violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act (CLRA), CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750 et seq. Plaintiffs also bring claims for violations of the Unfair Competition Law (UCL), CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq., violations of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq., for breach of express warranty, and for breach of implied warranty.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff Linda Palacios is a citizen and resident of McAllen, Texas, located in the County of Hidalgo.

9.

- Case No.

- Page 4
- Page 4
 CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

located in the County of Hidalgo.

10. Plaintiff Fernando Palacios is a citizen and resident of McAller

Plaintiff Sonia Palacios is a citizen and resident of McAllen, Texas,

- 10. Plaintiff Fernando Palacios is a citizen and resident of McAllen, Texas, located in the County of Hidalgo.
- 11. Defendant, Hyundai Motor America, is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California and has its principal place of business at 10550 Talbert Ave., Fountain Valley, California 92708. Hyundai Motor America is the U.S. sales, marketing, and distribution subsidiary of its Korean parent company, Hyundai Motor Co. Hyundai Motor America is responsible for importing, marketing, advertising, distributing, selling, leasing, warranting, and servicing Hyundai vehicles in the United States. Hyundai Motor America may be served through its registered agent, National Registered Agents, Inc., at 2975 Michelle Drive, Suite 100, Irvine, California 92606.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 12. This is a class action.
- 13. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). The aggregated claims of the individual Class members exceed the sum or value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interests and costs, and this is a class action in which Plaintiffs and members of the class, on the one hand, and Hyundai, on the other, are citizens of different states.
- 14. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because Hyundai maintains its principal headquarters in California, is registered to conduct business in California, and has sufficient minimum contacts in California. Defendant intentionally avails itself of the California consumer market through the promotion, sale, marketing, and distribution of its vehicles to California residents. As a result, jurisdiction in this court is proper and necessary. Moreover, Defendant's wrongful conduct, as described herein, emanates from California and foreseeably affects

 of below occurred in or emanated from Hyundai's corporate headquarters located in Fountain Valley, California. Plaintiffs' counsel's Declaration, as required under California Civil Code section 1780(d), is attached as Exhibit 1.

15. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (a)-(c) because inter alia substantial parts of the events or omissions giving rise to the

consumers in California and nationwide. Most, if not all, of the events complained

15. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (a)-(c) because, inter alia, substantial parts of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in the District and/or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated in the District.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Since at least 2011, Hyundai has designed, manufactured, distributed, sold, and leased the Class Vehicles. Upon information and belief, it has sold, directly or indirectly through dealers and other retail outlets, thousands of Class Vehicles in California and nationwide.
- 17. The Class Vehicles come equipped with a panoramic sunroof assembly, a premium option available as part of a package costing approximately \$2,000.
- 18. Hyundai widely advertises the Class Vehicles as safe. For example, on December 20, 2012, Hyundai's website touted that "We loaded Veloster with safety inside and out."
- 19. Hyundai provides owners and lessees of Class Vehicles with a New Vehicle Limited ("NVL") Warranty. The NVL Warranty states that Hyundai will repair or replace, free of charge, any part that is defective in material or workmanship under normal use for 5 years or 60,000 miles, whichever comes first.
- 20. The Exploding Sunroof Defect could cause the panoramic sunroof to explode at any time, showering the car and its occupants with glass. Drivers and passengers have no warning, putting them at serious risk of personal injury or death.

- 21. Numerous consumer complaints concerning the Exploding Sunroof Defect in Class Vehicles have been lodged with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration ("NHTSA"). One woman explained: "All of the sudden there was a loud bang like a gunshot, and I heard something raining down on my car... I looked in the mirror and saw glass flying everywhere... The glass was in my hair, down the back of my shirt and my pants." Numerous complaints concerned explosions that occurred while the vehicles were in motion, including at highway speeds, putting the drivers and passengers at risk of injury or collision and endangering the drivers and passengers of other vehicles as well. These complaints reflect the sudden, dangerous nature of the Exploding Sunroof Defect and Hyundai's refusal to honor its warranty or to take responsibility for the Exploding Sunroof Defect. The complaints also demonstrate Hyundai's awareness of the defect and how potentially dangerous the defective condition is.
- 22. On or about December 20, 2012, the NHTSA reported that Hyundai is recalling 2012 model year Veloster vehicles manufactured between November 1, 2011 and April 17, 2012 with panoramic sunroof assemblies because "the panoramic glass panel may break while the vehicle is in motion leading to personal injury or a vehicle crash." The recall, however, does not apply to 2013 model year Veloster vehicles or 2012 model year Veloster vehicles manufactured outside the recall window.
- 23. Hyundai's only purported "solution" to the problem is to replace the exploded sunroof with an identical one. Hyundai offers customers no assurance that the sunroof will not explode again, leaving customers and their passengers potentially in danger every time they drive.
- 24. Because the Exploding Sunroof Defect is caused by defects in material and/or workmanship, Huyndai is obligated to cover repairs to the panoramic sunroof during the NVL Warranty period. Hyundai, however, refuses to adequately

repair consumers' vehicles under the NVL Warranty. Until recently, Hyundai refused to publicly acknowledge that the Exploding Sunroof Defect even existed. Hyundai's recent recall still refuses to acknowledge the defect in 2013 model Velosters and 2012 model Velosters manufactured before November 1, 2011 or after April 17, 2012. Hyundai's refusal to honor the warranty harms the Plaintiffs and Class members by forcing them to incur out-of-pocket costs on covered repairs and by depriving them of the safe transportation they believed they had purchased.

- 25. Hyundai has long known that the Class vehicles have an Exploding Sunroof Defect. Hyundai has exclusive access to information about the Exploding Sunroof Defect through its dealerships, pre-release testing data, warranty data, customer complaint data, and replacement part sales data, among other sources of aggregate information about the problem. In contrast, the Exploding Sunroof Defect was not known or reasonably discoverable by Plaintiffs and Class members prior to purchase and without experiencing the defect first hand and exposing themselves to an unreasonable safety risk.
- 26. Hyundai has actively concealed the Exploding Sunroof Defect from consumers. Even when vehicle owners present their cars after the sunroof has exploded, Hyundai's policy is to simply replace it with an identical, defective part, act as if the problem had been solved, and continue concealing the Exploding Sunroof Defect from prospective Veloster purchasers or lessees. Hyundai knew that potential car buyers and lessees would deem the Exploding Sunroof Defect to be material such that reasonable consumers who knew of the defect either would have paid less for the Class Vehicles or would not have purchased or leased a Class Vehicle at all.
- 27. Hyundai has a duty to disclose the Exploding Sunroof Defect and the associated repair costs to Class Vehicles owners, among other reasons, because the defect poses an unreasonable safety hazard; because Hyundai has exclusive

Case No. Page 7
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

knowledge or access to material facts about the Class Vehicles and their panoramic sunroof assembly that are not known or reasonably discoverable by Plaintiffs and Class Members; and because Hyundai has actively concealed the Exploding Sunroof Defect from its customers.

28. As a result of Hyundai's practices, Plaintiffs and Class members purchased vehicles they otherwise would not have purchased, paid more for those vehicles than they would have paid, were subjected to an unreasonable risk to their safety, and unnecessarily paid, and will continue to pay, excessive, unreasonable, and unforeseeable repair costs as a result of the Exploding Sunroof Defect.

PLAINTIFFS LINDA, SONIA, AND FERNANDO PALACIOS

- 29. On or about October 19, 2012, Plaintiffs Fernando Palacios and Sonia Palacios purchased a new 2013 Hyundai Veloster from Frank Smith Hyundai in Pharr, Texas, for their mother, Plaintiff Linda Palacios. The vehicle came equipped with the panoramic sunroom assembly. Hyundai did not inform the Palacioses before their purchase that the Veloster's panoramic sunroof assembly was defective or that the sunroof might explode without warning. Like all class members, the Palacioses would not have purchased the vehicle had they known these material facts, or would have paid less for it.
- 30. On or about December 4, 2012, the sunroof exploded while Linda Palacios was parked. The explosion sent shattered glass all over the car, damaging the seats. The force of the explosion was so great that it bent the metal frame surrounding the sunroof assembly. By fortunate chance, Mrs. Palacios was not in the car when the sunroof exploded.
- 31. Mrs. Palacios took the car to Frank Smith Hyundai for repair. At first, the dealership denied that there was any known issue with the Veloster sunroof and told her that the repair might not be covered under warranty. Later, the dealership offered to replace the sunroof but only with an identical part, presumably

Case No. Page 8
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

- containing the identical dangerous defect. The dealership could give Mrs. Palacios no assurance that the sunroof would not explode again. The dealership did not offer to repair the seats damaged by the exploding glass.
- 32. Mrs. Palacios reasonably feared driving in a vehicle whose sunroof could explode at any time. She informed the dealership that she did not consider the offered repair adequate.
- 33. As a result of the dealership's failure to offer an adequate repair, Mrs. Palacios was deprived of the use of her vehicle.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

34. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit as a class action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated as members of the proposed Class pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23 (b)(3), (b)(1), a nd/or (b)(2). This action satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and superiority requirements of those provisions, and is defined as follows:

All current and former owners or lessees in the United States (including its territories and the District of Columbia) of a 2012 or 2013 Model Year Hyundai Veloster vehicle with a panoramic sunroof assembly (the "Class").

- 35. Excluded from the Class are Hyundai; any affiliate, parent, or subsidiary of Hyundai; any entity in which Hyundai has a controlling interest; any officer or director of Hyundai; any successor or assign of Hyundai; and any Judge to whom this case is assigned as well as his or her immediate family and staff.
- 36. Plaintiffs also reserve the right to amend the Class definition if discovery and further investigation reveal that the Class should be expanded or otherwise limited.

Case No.

Page 9

- 37. <u>Ascertainability:</u> The class definition is sufficiently objective such that membership in the class can be readily determined by reference to objective criteria, that being ownership or leasing of a Class Vehicle.
- 38. <u>Numerosity:</u> Members of the Class are so numerous that their individual joinder herein is impracticable. Thousands of Class Vehicles have been sold or leased in the United States. Class members may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail, supplemented (if deemed necessary or appropriate by the Court) by published notice.
- 39. Existence and predominance of common questions: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions include the following:
 - a. Whether Hyundai provided Plaintiffs and Class members with a vehicle installed with a defective sunroof assembly;
 - b. Whether the fact that the sunroof assembly is defective would be considered material by a reasonable consumer;
 - c. Whether Hyundai has a duty to disclose the Exploding Sunroof Defect to Plaintiffs and other Class members;
 - d. Whether Hyundai has violated the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750 et seq., as alleged in this complaint;
 - e. Whether Hyundai has engaged in unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq., as alleged in this complaint;
 - f. Whether Hyundai's refusal to adequately repair the Exploding Sunroof Defect breached the express warranty;

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

21

22

20

23

24

25

26

27 28

- Whether the replacement of the sunroof assembly with an g. identical part, without addressing the defect that caused the sunroof to explode, fulfills Hyundai's obligations under its express warranty;
- Whether Plaintiffs and the other Class members are entitled to h. equitable relief, including but not limited to restitution or a preliminary and/or permanent injunction;
- i. Whether Plaintiffs and the other Class members are entitled to damages and other monetary relief; and
- į, Whether Hyundai breached the express warranty and implied warranty of merchantability.
- Typicality: Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class, 40. because, among other things, Plaintiffs purchased a Class Vehicle, which contains the same defective sunroof assembly found in all other Class Vehicles.
- 41. Adequacy: Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class because their interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the Class they seek to represent. Plaintiffs have retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class action litigation, and Plaintiffs intend to prosecute this action vigorously. The interests of the members of the Class will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiffs and their counsel.
- Superiority: The class action is superior to other available means for 42. the fair and efficient adjudication of this dispute. The injury suffered by each Class member, while meaningful on an individual basis, is not of such magnitude as to make the prosecution of individual actions against Hyundai economically feasible. Even if Class members themselves could afford such individualized litigation, it would place an excessive and unnecessary burden on the court system. In addition to the burden and expense of managing myriad actions arising from the Exploding

Sunroof Defect, individualized litigation presents a potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties and the court system presented by the legal and factual issues of the case. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

- 43. In the alternative, the Class may be certified under Rule 23(b)(1) and 23(b)(2) because:
 - a. The prosecution of separate actions by the individual members of the Class would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudication with respect to individual Class members which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Hyundai;
 - b. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other Class members not parties to the adjudications, or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests; and
 - c. Hyundai has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with respect to the members of the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750, et seq.)

- 44. On behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs reallege as if fully set forth, each and every allegation set forth herein.
- 45. Hyundai is a "person" under CAL. CIV. CODE §1761(c). Case No. Page 12

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

5

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Plaintiffs and the other Class members are "consumers" under CAL. 46. CIV. CODE §1761(d).
- Plaintiffs and the other Class members engaged in "transactions" under 47. CAL. CIV. CODE §1761(e), including the purchase or lease of Class Vehicles and the presentation of Class Vehicles for repair or replacement of the sunroof assembly to Hyundai dealerships.
- As set forth herein, Hyundai's acts, policies, and practices undertaken 48. in transactions intended to result and which did result in the sale or lease of Class Vehicles, violate sections 1770(a)(5), (a)(7), (a)(9), (a)(14), and (a)(16) of the CLRA in that: (a) Hyundai represents that its goods have sponsorship, approval, characteristics, uses, or benefits which they do not have; (b) Hyundai represents that its goods are of a particular standard, quality, or grade, but are of another; (c) Hyundai advertises its goods with intent not to sell them as advertised; and (e) Hyundai represents that its goods have been supplied in accordance with a previous representation when they have not.
 - The existence of the Exploding Sunroof Defect is a material fact. 49.
- 50. Plaintiffs and other Class members were unaware of the defective sunroof assembly when they purchased the Class Vehicles. Consumers value reliability and dependability of automobiles and automobile parts, especially concerning vital safety issues such as the dangerous sunroof assembly in the Class Vehicles. Had they known that the sunroof assembly was defective, Plaintiffs and other Class members would not have purchased or leased the Class Vehicles, or would have done so at lower prices.
 - Reasonable consumers expect, among other things: 51.
 - That new vehicles, including Class Vehicles, would be equipped a. with safe and reliable parts and would not be sold with undisclosed safety defects;

Case No. CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1.10

c. Hyundai knew that Plaintiffs and the Class Members could not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover the safety defect and the associated damages that it causes.

7 8

9

6

54. In failing to disclose the Exploding Sunroof Defect and the associated repair costs, Hyundai has knowingly and intentionally concealed material facts and breached its duty not to do so.

10 11

12

13

14

55. The facts concealed or not disclosed by Hyundai to Plaintiffs and the Class are material in that a reasonable consumer would have considered them to be important in deciding whether to purchase Defendant's Class Vehicles or pay a lesser price. Had Plaintiffs and the Class known the defective nature of the Class Vehicles, they would not have purchased the Class Vehicle or would have paid less for it.

1516

56. As a result of Hyundai's practices, Plaintiffs and the other Class members have suffered harm.

18 19

20

21

17

57. Pursuant to the provisions of CAL. CIV. CODE § 1780, Plaintiffs seek an order enjoining Hyundai from the unlawful practices described herein, a declaration that Hyundai's conduct violates the CLRA, and attorneys' fees and costs of litigation.

2223

24

25

58. Plaintiffs have provided Hyundai with notice of its alleged violations of the CLRA pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782(a). If, within 30 days of the date of the notification letter, Defendant fails to provide appropriate relief for its violation of the CLRA, Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to seek monetary,

2627

28 Case No.

Page 15

relief that Plaintiffs seek now.

Case No.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

compensatory, and punitive damages, in addition to the injunctive and equitable

(For unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices under California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.)

- 59. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, reallege, as if fully set forth, each and every allegation set forth herein.
- 60. Hyundai's acts and practices, as alleged in this complaint, constitute unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent business practices, in violation of the Unfair Competition Law, CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.
- 61. The business practices engaged in by Hyundai that violate the Unfair Competition Law include failing to disclose at the point of sale, the point of repair, or otherwise, that the sunroof assembly is defective.
- 62. Hyundai engaged in unlawful business practices by violating the Consumer Legal Remedies Act, CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750 et seq.; the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, U. S.C. § 2301 et seq.; and by engaging in conduct, as alleged herein, that breaches the express and implied warranties.
 - 63. Hyundai engaged in unfair business practices by, among other things:
 - a. Engaging in conduct that is immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, or substantially injurious to Plaintiffs and other members of the Class;
 - b. Engaging in conduct that undermines or violates the stated policies underlying the CLRA and the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, each of which seeks to protect consumers against unfair and sharp business practices and to promote a basic level of honesty and reliability in the marketplace; and
 - c. Engaging in conduct that causes a substantial injury to consumers, not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to

Criss Agreement

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

4

3

5. 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

26

25

27 28 consumers or to competition, which the consumers could not have reasonably avoided.

- 64. Hyundai engaged in fraudulent business practices by engaging in conduct that was and is likely to deceive consumers acting reasonably under the circumstances.
- As a direct and proximate result of Hyundai's unfair and fraudulent 65. business practices as alleged herein, Plaintiffs suffered injury in fact and lost money or property, in that they purchased a vehicle they otherwise would not have purchased, paid for sunroof assembly diagnoses, repairs, and replacements, and are left with Class Vehicles of diminished value and utility because of the defective sunroof assembly. Meanwhile, Hyundai has sold and leased more Class Vehicles and sunroof assembly parts than it otherwise could have and charged inflated prices for Class Vehicles, unjustly enriching itself thereby.
- Plaintiffs and Class members are entitled to equitable relief including 66. restitution of all fees, restitutionary disgorgement of all profits accruing to Hyundai because of its unfair, fraudulent, and deceptive practices, attorneys' fees and costs, declaratory relief, and a permanent injunction enjoining Hyundai from its unfair, fraudulent, and deceitful activity.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (For Breach of Written Warranty Under the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.)

- Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, re-67. alleges, as if fully set forth, each and every allegation set forth herein.
- Plaintiffs and the other Class members are "consumers" within the 68. meaning of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3).
- Hyundai is a "supplier" and "warrantor" within the meaning of 69. sections 2301(4)-(5).

- 70. The Class Vehicles are "consumer products" within the meaning of section 2301(1).
- 71. Hyundai's express warranty is a "written warranty" within the meaning of section 2301(6).
 - 72. Hyundai breached the express warranty by:
 - a. Extending a 5 year/60,000 mile New Vehicle Limited Warranty with the purchase or lease of the Class Vehicles, thereby warranting to repair or replace any part defective in material or workmanship at no cost to the owner or lessee;
 - b. Selling and leasing Class Vehicles with sunroof assembly that were defective in material and workmanship, requiring repair or replacement within the warranty period; and
 - c. Refusing to honor the express warranty by adequately repairing the sunroof assembly and instead charging for repair and replacement parts or replacing the sunroof assembly only with an identically defective part.
- 73. Hyundai's breach of the express warranty has deprived the Plaintiffs and the other Class members of the benefit of their bargain.
- 74. The amount in controversy of the Plaintiffs' individual claims meet or exceeds the sum or value of \$25. In addition, the amount in controversy meets or exceeds the sum or value of \$50,000 (exclusive of interests and costs) computed on the basis of all claims to be determined in this suit.
- 75. Hyundai has been afforded a reasonable opportunity to cure its breach of written warranty, including when Plaintiffs and other Class members brought their vehicles in for diagnoses and repair of their sunroof assemblies.
- 76. As a direct and proximate cause of Hyundai's breach of written warranty, Plaintiffs and Class members sustained damages and other losses in an

Case No.

amount to be determined at trial. Hyundai's conduct damaged Plaintiffs and Class members, who are entitled to recover actual damages, consequential damages, specific performance, diminution in value, costs, attorneys' fees, rescission, and/or other relief as appropriate.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (For Breach of Express Warranty)

- 77. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, reallege, as if fully set forth, each and every allegation set forth herein.
- 78. Hyundai provided all purchasers and lessees of the Class Vehicles with the express warranty described herein, which became a material part of the bargain.
- 79. The sunroof assembly and its component parts were manufactured and/or installed by Hyundai in the Class Vehicles and are covered by the express warranty.
 - 80. Hyundai breached the express warranty by:
 - a. Extending a 5 year/60,000 mile New Vehicle Limited Warranty with the purchase or lease of the Class Vehicles, thereby warranting to repair or replace any part defective in material or workmanship at no cost to the owner or lessee;
 - b. Selling and leasing Class Vehicles with sunroof assemblies that were defective in material and workmanship, requiring repair or replacement within the warranty period; and
 - c. Refusing to honor the express warranty by adequately repairing the sunroof assembly and instead charging for repair and replacement parts or replacing the sunroof assembly only with an identically defective part.
- 81. Plaintiffs notified Hyundai of the breach within a reasonable time and/or was not required to do so because affording Hyundai a reasonable

opportunity to cure its breach of written warranty would have been futile. Hyundai was also on notice of the defect from the complaints and service requests it received from Class members, from repairs and/or replacements of the sunroof assemblies, complaints to the NHTSA, and through its own maintenance records and other internal data.

- 82. As a direct and proximate cause of Hyundai's breach, Plaintiffs and the other Class members have suffered damages and continue to suffer damages, including economic damages at the point of sale or lease, that is, the difference between the value of the vehicle as promised and the value of the vehicle as delivered. Additionally, Plaintiffs and the other Class members either have incurred or will incur economic damages at the point of repair in the form of the cost of repair.
- 83. Plaintiffs and the other Class members are entitled to legal and equitable relief against Hyundai, including actual damages, consequential damages, specific performance, rescission, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other relief as appropriate.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (For Breach of Implied Warranty)

- 84. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, reallege, as if fully set forth, each and every allegation set forth herein.
- 85. Hyundai was at all relevant times the manufacturer, distributor, warrantor, and/or seller of the Class Vehicles. Defendant knew or had reason to know of the specific use for which the Class Vehicles were purchased.
- 86. Hyundai provided Plaintiffs and Class Members with an implied warranty that the Class Vehicles and any parts thereof are merchantable and fit for the ordinary purposes for which they were sold. However, the Class Vehicles are not fit for their ordinary purpose of providing reasonably reliable and safe

Case No. Page 20

4 5

7

6

9

8

11

12

10

13

15

14

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

transportation because the Class Vehicles have a defect in the sunroof assembly that can put the lives of its occupants and other drivers who share the road with them at risk.

- 87. Hyundai impliedly warranted that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable quality and fit for such use. This implied warranty included, among other things, a warranty that the Class Vehicles and their sunroof assemblies would be fit for their intended use while the Class Vehicles were being operated.
- Contrary to the applicable implied warranties, the Class Vehicles and 88. their sunroof assemblies at time of sale and thereafter were not fit for their ordinary and intended purpose of providing Plaintiffs and the Class Members with reliable and safe transportation. Instead, the Class Vehicles are defective, including but not limited to the Class Vehicles having a defect in their sunroof assemblies.
- Hyundai's actions, as complained of herein, breached the implied warranty that the Class Vehicles were of merchantable quality and fit for such use.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on Plaintiffs' own behalf and on behalf of the Class, prays for judgment as follows:

- For an order certifying the Class and appointing Plaintiffs and a. their counsel to represent the Class;
- For a declaration that Defendant is financially responsible for b. notifying all Class Members about the defective nature of the Class Vehicles and the Exploding Sunroof Defect;
- For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the members of the Class c. actual damages, consequential damages, specific performance, and/or rescission, except that for now, Plaintiffs seek only equitable and injunctive relief with respect to their claims under

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

•	Case	8:13-cv-00075-CJC-AN Document 1	Filed 01/15/13 Page 23 of 30 Page ID #:23
	1	Dated: January 11, 2013 Res	spectfully submitted,
	2		
ene en de	3		CADDELL & CHAPMAN
e diskladige	4	By	· Courter months
	5	Dy	Michael A. Caddell (State Bar No. 249469)
	6	·	Michael A. Caddell (State Bar No. 249469) mac@caddellchapman.com) Cynthia B. Chapman (State Bar No. 164471) cbc@caddellchapman.com Cory S. Fein (State Bar No. 250758) csf@caddellchapman.com
	7		Cory S. Fein (State Bar No. 250758)
	8		\$ \(\text{A}\)
	9		1331 Lamar, Suite 1070 Houston TX 77010-3027 Telephone: (713) 751-0400
	10	·	Telephone: (713) 751-0400 Facsimile: (713) 751-0906
,	11		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
	12		
	13		
	14		
	15		· •
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		·
	21		·
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25		
	26		
	27		
	28	Case No.	Page 23
	į	CLASS	Page 23 ACTION COMPLAINT

3

4

6 7

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

Case No.

except those matters that are stated to be upon information and belief. As to such

of California. All of the matters set forth herein are within my personal knowledge.

I am admitted, in good standing, to practice as an attorney in the State

matters, I believe them to be true.

I, Cory S. Fein, declare:

1.

- Pursuant to CAL. CIV. CODE § 1780(d), this Declaration is submitted in 2. support of Plaintiff's selection of forum for trial of Plaintiff's cause of action alleging violation of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act.
- On information and belief, Defendant Hyundai Motor America 3. ("Hyundai") is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Fountain Valley, Orange County, California.
- 4. Hyundai, through its business of distributing, selling, and leasing vehicles, has established sufficient contacts in this district such that personal jurisdiction is appropriate. Hyundai is deemed to reside in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a).
- In addition, a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to 5. Plaintiff's claims and a substantial part of the property that is the subject of this action are in this district. Accordingly, venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a).

Based on the facts set forth herein, this Court is a proper venue for the 6. prosecution of Plaintiff's cause of action alleging violation of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act. See CAL. CIV. CODE § 1780(d). I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed by me on this 11th day of January, 2013, at Houston, Texas. Case No.

Case 8:13-cv-00075-CJC-AN Document 1 Filed 01/15/13 Page 25 of 30 Page ID #:25



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Cormac J. Carney and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Arthur Nakazato.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV13- 75 CJC (ANx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

	Western Division							
L	312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8							
	Los Angeles, CA 90012							



l	Eastern Division						
_	3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134						
	Riverside, CA 92501						

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California

)))
Civil Action No. 5ACV 13-00075- CTC
)
)

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA, P.O. Box 20850, Fountain Valley, CA 92728-0580, through its registered agent for service in California:

National Registered Agents, Inc. 2875 Michelle Drive, Suite 100 Irvine, CA 92606

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Cory S. Fein

Caddell & Chapman 1331 Lamar St., Suite 1070 Houston, TX 77010 713-751-0400

csf@caddellchapman.com

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Date:JAN 1 5 2013	Mauly Lun Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk
-------------------	--

CLERK OF COURT

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

	This summons for (nam	ne of individual and title, if any)			
vas re	ceived by me on (date)	•			
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at	(place)		
			on (date)		
	☐ I left the summons a	at the individual's residence or us			
		, a person	of suitable age and discretion who re	sides there,	
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to th	e individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summo	ns on (name of individual)		, wł	ho is
	designated by law to a	eccept service of process on behalf			
			on (date)	_ ; or	
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because			; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00	
	L declare under nepalty	of perjury that this information is	true		
	· ·	·			
ate:					
			Server's signature		
		· · · ·	Printed name and title		
			Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 8:13-cv-000750 STATES OF STRUCTED BUSINESS OF

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) Linda Palacios, Sonia Palacios, and Fernando Palacios, on behalf of and all others similarly situated,			of themselves	DEFEND Hyund	OANTS ai Motor Ame	erica							
	Attorneys (Firm Name, Ac ourself, provide same.)	ldress ar	nd Telephone Number. If y	you are	representing	Attorneys	(If Known)	<u> </u>		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>			····
•	Caddell & Chapman 1331 Lamar St., Suite 107 713-751-0400	'0, Hous	ton, TX 77010								n = po Podra		
II. BA	SIS OF JURISDICTIO	N (Place	an X in one box only.)				PRINCIPAL ox for plaintiff			For Diversity Cases efendant.)	s Only		
□ I U	S. Government Plaintiff	3	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This	tizen of This State PTF DEF Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State			PTF □4	DEF W4			
□ 2 U.	S. Government Defendan	t 156/4	Diversity (Indicate Citize of Parties in Item III)	enship	Citizen of Ano	ther State		№ 2	□ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 of Business in Another State			
					Citizen or Subj	ject of a For	eign Country	□3	□ 3	Foreign Nation		□6	□6
IV. O	RIGIN (Place an X in on	e box or	nly.)	•									.,
1	riginal 2 Remove roceeding State Co		☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court		einstated or 🔲 copened	5 Transfer	red from anoti	her dist	rict (sp	Distr	rict Jud	peal to I ge from gistrate	1
V. RE	QUESTED IN COMPL	AINT:	JURY DEMAND: 1	Yes □	No (Check 'Ye	s' only if do	emanded in co	mplain	t.)				-
CLAS	S ACTION under F.R.C	.P. 23:	Yes □ No			MONEY I	DEMANDED	IN CC	MPLA	AINT: \$	· · · ·		
	AUSE OF ACTION (Cite 5 U.S.C. §2301 et seq.; 2			ch you a	are filing and w	rite a brief s	tatement of ca	use. D	o not c	ite jurisdictional st	atutes unless div	ersity.)	
VII. N	ATURE OF SUIT (Plac	e an X i	n one box only.)										•
The second second second	THER STATUTES	□ 110	CONTRACT AND IN	PBF	TORTS RSONAL INJUR	Y REAL	TORTS PERSONAL	57356717573	122 CHO 12	PRISONER PETITIONS	☐ 710 Fair La	yayatı	ndards
	Antitrust Banks and Banking		Marine Miller Act		Airplane Airplane Produ	et [-1376	PROPERTY Other Frauc		□ 5 10	Motions to Vacate Sentence	Act ☐ 720 Labor/	Mamt	
	Commerce/ICC		Negotiable Instrument	1	Liability	□ 371	Truth in Le	nding		Habeas Corpus	Relatio	_	
D 460	Rates/etc.	□ 150	Recovery of	□ 320	Assault, Libel a Slander	& □ 380	Other Perso			General Death Penalty	□ 730 Labor/		
	Deportation Racketeer Influenced		Overpayment & Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed. Employer	s' 😿 385	Property Da				Report Disclos	ing & sure Ac	t
	and Corrupt		Judgment	C 340	Liability Marine		Product Lia	bility		Other	□ 740 Railwa	y Labo	
□ 400	Organizations Consumer Credit		Medicare Act Recovery of Defaulted		Marine Produc		ANKRUPTC Appeal 28 t			Civil Rights Prison Condition	□ 790 Other I		
	Cable/Sat TV	L 132	Student Loan (Excl.	D 250	Liability		158	OBC		PRETURE!	Litigati □ 791 Empl. i		:.
	Selective Service		Veterans)		Motor Vehicle Motor Vehicle		3 Withdrawal			PENALTY	Securit	y Act	
□ 850	Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	D 153	Recovery of Overpayment of		Product Liabili	ty 🍦 😹	USC 157 IVIL RIGHT			Agriculture Other Food &	PROPERT □ 820 Copyri		ITS .
□ 875	Customer Challenge 12		Veteran's Benefits	□ 360	Other Personal Injury		Voting			Drug	□ 830 Patent		
	USC 3410		Stockholders' Suits	□ 362	Personal Injury	I	2 Employmer		□ 625	Drug Related	□ 840 Traden		۰۰ باشت
☐ 890 ☐ 891	Other Statutory Actions Agricultural Act	1	Other Contract Contract Product	D 166	Med Malpracti		Housing/Ac mmodation:			Seizure of Property 21 USC	SOCIAL S		TY:
	Economic Stabilization	L 177	Liability	303	Personal Injury Product Liabili		Welfare			881	□ 862 Black I	-	23)
C 000	Act		Franchise	□ 368	Asbestos Perso	nal 🗆 445	American w			Liquor Laws	□ 863 DIWC/		•
	Environmental Matters Energy Allocation Act		EAL PROPERTY Land Condemnation		Injury Product Liability		Disabilities Employmer			R.R. & Truck Airline Regs	(405(g) □ 864 SSID T		/I
	-		Foreclosure		MMIGRATION	ं 📑 🗖 446	American w			Occupational	□ 865 RSI (40		•
□ 900			Rent Lease & Ejectment	□ 462	Naturalization Application		Disabilities		E1 /00	Safety /Health	FEDERAL T		
			Torts to Land Tort Product Liability	□ 463	Habeas Corpus	- 111440	Other Other Civil		□ 690	Other	□ 870 Taxes ((O.S. Pi endant)	
□ 950	Constitutionality of State Statutes		All Other Real Property		Alien Detainee Other Immigra Actions	- ' '	Rights				□ 871 IRS-TH USC 76	ird Par	
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>							<u> </u>		
			$C \wedge c$	011	2 BA1	ハコク		•		· ·	·		

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CV-71 (05/08)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Case 8:13-cv4000FB-STACEAINIS DRICTIONNET, CENERALIDISTRICT PEGABOTORSON Page ID #:30 civil cover sheet

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has If yes, list case number(s):	s this action been pro	viously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? ☑ No ☐ Yes					
10 10	e any cases been pre	iously filed in this court that are related to the present case? MNo Pes					
□ B. □ C.	Arise from the same Call for determination For other reasons we	and the present case: or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or n of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or uld entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or ent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present					
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	following informati	n, use an additional sheet if necessary.)					
		tside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH nam ees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).	ed plaintiff resides.				
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California	ornia; or Foreign Country				
		Linda Palacios - Texas Sonia Palacios - Texas Fernando Palacios - Texas	Sonia Palacios - Texas				
		iside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH namees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).	ed defendant resides.				
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California	omia; or Foreign Country				
Orange							
(c) List the County in this District; (Note: In land condemnation ca		side of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim of the tract of land involved.	n arose.				
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California	omia; or Foreign Country				
Orange							
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us		ntura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties ractof land involved					
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER):	Date January 11, 2013					
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by law but is used by the Clerk of the Co	e CV-71 (JS-44) Ci v. This form, approvourt for the purpose	il Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing d by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to L f statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see sep	ocal Rule 3-1 is not filed				
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	•						
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action					
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Sec Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as provided program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))					
862	BL All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. 923)						
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Soc amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C.					
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))	2 of the Social Security				
864 SSID All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.							

CV-71 (05/08)

865

RSI

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))