

DISTRICT COURT, CITY and COUNTY of DENVER, COLORADO 1437 Bannock Street Denver, CO 80202	
<p>Plaintiffs: RICHARD BENELL and CAROL BENELL, husband and wife,</p> <p>Defendants: FRONTERA PRODUCE, LTD., a foreign corporation; PRIMUS GROUP, INC., d/b/a PRIMUS LABS, a foreign corporation; DILLON COMPANIES, INC., d/b/a “KING SOOPERS”; and JOHN DOES 1-10</p>	▲COURT USE ONLY▲
<p>Attorneys for Plaintiffs:</p> <p>Randal R. Kelly, No. 13757 Irwin & Boesen, PC 4100 E. Mississippi Avenue, Suite 1900 Denver, CO 80246-1327 Telephone: 303-999-9999 Facsimile: 303-320-1915 Email: rkelly@coloradolawyers.com</p> <p>William D. Marler <i>(Pro Hac Vice Pending)</i> Marler Clark, LLP, PS 1301 Second Ave, Suite 2800 Seattle, WA 98101 Telephone: 206-346-1888 Facsimile: 206-346-1898 Email: bmarler@marlerclark.com</p>	<p>Case No.: 2013CV033478</p> <p>Division:</p>
COMPLAINT FOR PERSONAL INJURY AND UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE TRADE PRACTICES	

COME NOW the Plaintiffs, by and through their attorneys of record, Randal R. Kelly of Irwin & Boesen, PC, and William D. Marler of Marler Clark, LLP, PS, to file this Complaint and allege as follows:

PARTIES

1. The Plaintiffs Richard Benell and Carol Benell are husband and wife. They were married at the time of the incident, described below, that gave rise to the claims asserted in this Complaint. At all times relevant hereto, the Benells were residents of El Paso County, Colorado.

2. The Defendant Frontera Produce, Ltd. (“Frontera”) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas. At all times relevant hereto, Frontera was a manufacturer, distributor and seller of agricultural products in Colorado, including cantaloupe. Frontera’s principal place of business is located in the State of Texas.

3. The Defendant Primus Group, Inc., d/b/a “Primus Labs” (“Primus”), is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in California as well. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Primus was a company that, among other things, provided auditing services for agricultural and other businesses involved in the manufacture and sale of food products, including in the State of Colorado. Primus retained the services of certain subcontractors, including a Texas company called Bio Food Safety, to provide auditing services, including the audit described in more detail at paragraph 21.

4. The Defendant Dillon Companies, Inc., d/b/a “King Soopers” (“King Soopers”), is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Kansas, with its principal place of business in Kansas as well. At all times relevant to this Complaint, King Soopers was a manufacturer, distributor and seller of food products in Colorado, including the manufacture, distribution and sale of Jensen Farms Rocky Ford brand cantaloupe.

5. Upon information and belief, the Defendants John Does 1-10 are entities who participated in the manufacture, distribution, and/or sale of the contaminated food product that was the proximate cause of the Plaintiffs’ injuries, and whose identities are not known to the Plaintiffs at this time. The Plaintiffs will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint at such time that the identities of these parties become known.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court is vested with jurisdiction over the Defendants because the Defendants conduct business within the State of Colorado.

7. Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 98(c), venue of this action is proper in the City and County of Denver because the Defendants are nonresidents who may be found in this county.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

The Outbreak

8. On September 2, 2011, the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) announced that it was investigating an outbreak of Listeriosis. On September 9, 2011, CDPHE announced that the likely source of the *Listeria* outbreak was cantaloupe. On September 12, 2011 CDPHE announced that the outbreak of *Listeria* was linked to cantaloupe from the Rocky Ford (Colorado) growing region. It was subsequently determined that contaminated cantaloupes were grown by Jensen Farms, a Colorado company, and distributed by Defendant Frontera.

9. A total of 147 persons infected with any of the five outbreak-associated strains of *Listeria monocytogenes* were reported to CDC from 28 states. The number of infected persons identified in each state was as follows: Alabama (1), Arkansas (1), California (4), Colorado (40), Idaho (2), Illinois (4), Indiana (3), Iowa (1), Kansas (11), Louisiana (2), Maryland (1), Missouri (7), Montana (2), Nebraska (6), Nevada (1), New Mexico (15), New York (2), North Dakota (2), Oklahoma (12), Oregon (1), Pennsylvania (1), South Dakota (1), Texas (18), Utah (1), Virginia (1), West Virginia (1), Wisconsin (2), and Wyoming (4).

10. Among persons for whom information was available, reported illness onset ranged from July 31, 2011 through October 27, 2011. Ages ranged from <1 to 96 years, with a median age of 77 years. Most cases were over 60 years old. Fifty-eight percent of cases were female. Among the 144 ill persons with available information on whether they were hospitalized, 142 (99%) were hospitalized.

11. Thirty three deaths were reported. Among persons who died, ages ranged from 48 to 96 years, with a median age of 82.5 years. In addition, one woman pregnant at the time of illness had a miscarriage. Seven of the illnesses were related to a pregnancy; three were diagnosed in newborns and four were diagnosed in pregnant women.

12. On or about September 19, 2011, the Food and Drug Administration announced that it found *Listeria monocytogenes* in samples of Jensen Farms' Rocky Ford-brand cantaloupe taken from a Denver-area store and on samples taken from equipment and cantaloupe at the Jensen Farms' packing facility. Tests confirmed that the *Listeria monocytogenes* found in the samples matches one of the multiple different strains of *Listeria monocytogenes* associated with the multi-state outbreak of listeriosis.

13. Jensen Farms recalled its Rocky Ford-brand cantaloupes on September 14, 2011 in response to the multi-state outbreak of listeriosis.

The July 25, 2011 Audit of Jensen Farms

14. Prior to the outbreak described in paragraphs 8 through 13, Jensen Farms or Frontera, or both of them, contracted with Defendant Primus to conduct an audit of Jensen Farms' ranchlands and packing house.

15. It was the intent of these contracting parties—i.e. Jensen Farms or Frontera, or both of them, and Primus—to ensure that the facilities, premises, and procedures used by Jensen Farms in the production of cantaloupes met or exceeded applicable standards of care related to the production of cantaloupe, including, but not limited to, good agricultural and manufacturing practices, industry standards, and relevant FDA industry guidance. It was further the intent of these contracting parties to ensure that the food products that Jensen Farms produced, and that Frontera distributed, would be of high quality for consumers, and would not be contaminated by potentially lethal pathogens, like *Listeria*.

16. Prior to the formation of the contract described at paragraph 14, Frontera represented to the public generally, and specifically to the retail sellers of its produce products, including cantaloupes, that its various products were “Primus Certified.”

17. It was Frontera's intent and expectation that the representation set forth in the preceding paragraph would serve as an inducement for the purchase of its various products, including cantaloupes, and that consumers, ultimate retailers, and itself would all benefit from Primus's audit and certification by having a high quality product.

18. After the formation of the contract described at paragraph 14, Primus selected and hired Bio Food Safety, a Texas-based auditing company, to conduct the audit of Jensen Farms. Bio Food Safety thereby became Primus's subcontractor, and agent, for the limited purpose of auditing Jensen Farms.

19. Defendant Primus held itself out as an expert in the field of food safety, including specifically, though not exclusively, in the analysis and assessment of food safety procedures, facility design and maintenance, and Good Agricultural and Manufacturing Practices, and other applicable standards of care incumbent on producers of agricultural products, including cantaloupes.

20. By auditing companies involved in the production and distribution of food products, Primus intended to aid such companies in ensuring that the food products produced were of high quality, were fit for human consumption, and were not contaminated by a potentially lethal pathogen, like *Listeria*.

21. Bio Food Safety auditor James Dilorio conducted an audit at Jensen Farms' ranchlands and packing facility on or about July 25, 2011, roughly one week before the CDC identified the first victim of the cantaloupe *Listeria* outbreak. Mr. Dilorio, as employee and agent of Bio Food Safety, and as agent of Primus, gave the Jensen Farms packing house a “superior” rating, and a score of 96%.

22. On or about September 10, 2011, officials from both FDA and Colorado, conducted an inspection at Jensen Farms during which FDA collected multiple samples, including whole cantaloupes and environmental (non-product) samples from within the facility, for purposes of laboratory testing.

23. Of the 39 environmental samples collected from within the facility, 13 were confirmed positive for *Listeria monocytogenes* with pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) pattern combinations that were indistinguishable from at least three of the five outbreak strains collected from outbreak cases. Cantaloupe collected from the firm's cold storage during the inspection also tested positive for *Listeria monocytogenes* with PFGE pattern combinations that were indistinguishable from at least two of the five outbreak strains.

24. After isolating at least three of the five outbreak strains of *Listeria monocytogenes* from Jensen Farms' packing house and whole cantaloupes collected from cold storage, the FDA initiated an environmental assessment at Jensen Farms, in which the FDA was assisted by Colorado state and local officials.

25. The environmental assessment at Jensen Farms occurred on September 22-23, 2011. Findings from this assessment, set forth in the FDA's report dated October 19, 2011, included, but were not limited to, the following:

a. **Facility Design:** Certain aspects of the packing facility, including the location of a refrigeration unit drain line, allowed for water to pool on the packing facility floor in areas adjacent to packing facility equipment. Wet environments are known to be potential reservoirs for *Listeria monocytogenes* and the pooling of water in close proximity to packing equipment, including conveyors, may have extended and spread the pathogen to food contact surfaces. Samples collected from areas where pooled water had gathered tested positive for an outbreak strain of *Listeria monocytogenes*. Therefore, this aspect of facility design is a factor that may have contributed to the introduction, growth, or spread of *Listeria monocytogenes*. This pathogen is likely to establish niches and harborages in refrigeration units and other areas where water pools or accumulates.

Further, the packing facility floor where water pooled was directly under the packing facility equipment from which FDA collected environmental samples that tested positive for *Listeria monocytogenes* with PFGE pattern combinations that were indistinguishable from outbreak strains. The packing facility floor was constructed in a manner that was not easily cleanable. Specifically, the trench drain was not accessible for adequate cleaning. This may have served as a harborage site for *Listeria monocytogenes* and, therefore, is a factor that may have contributed to the introduction, growth, or spread of the pathogen.

b. **Equipment Design:** FDA evaluated the design of the equipment used in the packing facility to identify factors that may have contributed to the growth or spread of *Listeria monocytogenes*. In July 2011, the firm purchased and installed equipment for its

packing facility that had been previously used at a firm producing a different raw agricultural commodity.

The design of the packing facility equipment, including equipment used to wash and dry the cantaloupe, did not lend itself to be easily or routinely cleaned and sanitized. Several areas on both the washing and drying equipment appeared to be un-cleanable, and dirt and product buildup was visible on some areas of the equipment, even after it had been disassembled, cleaned, and sanitized. Corrosion was also visible on some parts of the equipment. Further, because the equipment is not easily cleanable and was previously used for handling another raw agricultural commodity with different washing and drying requirements, *Listeria monocytogenes* could have been introduced as a result of past use of the equipment.

The design of the packing facility equipment, especially that it was not easily amenable to cleaning and sanitizing and that it contained visible product buildup, is a factor that likely contributed to the introduction, growth, or spread of *Listeria monocytogenes*. Cantaloupe that is washed, dried, and packed on unsanitary food contact surfaces could be contaminated with *Listeria monocytogenes* or could collect nutrients for *Listeria monocytogenes* growth on the cantaloupe rind.

c. **Postharvest Practices:** In addition, free moisture or increased water activity of the cantaloupe rind from postharvest washing procedures may have facilitated *Listeria monocytogenes* survival and growth. After harvest, the cantaloupes were placed in cold storage. The cantaloupes were not pre-cooled to remove field heat before cold storage. Warm fruit with field heat potentially created conditions that would allow the formation of condensation, which is an environment ideal for *Listeria monocytogenes* growth.

The combined factors of the availability of nutrients on the cantaloupe rind, increased rind water activity, and lack of pre-cooling before cold storage may have provided ideal conditions for *Listeria monocytogenes* to grow and out compete background microflora during cold storage. Samples of cantaloupe collected from refrigerated cold storage tested positive for *Listeria monocytogenes* with PFGE pattern combinations that were indistinguishable from two of the four outbreak strains.

26. In October and December 2011, FDA officials participated in briefings with the House Committee on Energy and Commerce that were held to further investigate the likely causes of the *Listeria* outbreak that is the subject of this action. At these briefings, FDA officials cited multiple failures at Jensen Farms, which, according to a report issued by the Committee, “reflected a general lack of awareness of food safety principles.” Those failures included:

26.1 Condensation from cooling systems draining directly onto the floor;

26.2 Poor drainage resulting in water pooling around the food processing equipment;

26.3 Inappropriate food processing equipment which was difficult to clean (i.e., *Listeria* found on the felt roller brushes);

26.4 No antimicrobial solution, such as chlorine, in the water used to wash the cantaloupes; and

26.5 No equipment to remove field heat from the cantaloupes before they were placed into cold storage.

27. The audit conducted by Mr. Dilorio on or about July 25, 2011, on behalf of Defendant Primus, found many aspects of Jensen Farms' facility, equipment and procedures that the FDA heavily criticized to be in "total compliance."

28. Further, during the July 25, 2011 packing house audit conducted by Bio Food Safety, as agent for Primus, Mr. Dilorio failed to observe, or properly downscore or consider, multiple conditions or practices that were in violation of Primus's audit standards applicable to cantaloupe packing houses, industry standards, and applicable FDA industry guidance. The true and actual state of these conditions and practices was inconsistent and irreconcilable with the "superior" rating, and 96% score, that Mr. Dilorio ultimately gave to Jensen Farms packing house.

29. These conditions or practices included, but were not limited to:

29.1 Jensen Farms' inability to control pests;

29.2 Jensen Farms' use of equipment that was inappropriate for the processing of cantaloupes;

29.3 Jensen Farms' failure to use an antimicrobial in its wash system, or in the solution used to sanitize processing equipment;

29.4 Jensen Farms' failure to ensure the appropriate antimicrobial concentration in its wash water, which, as alleged at paragraph 26.4, did not contain any antimicrobial at all;

29.5 Jensen Farms' failure to have hot water available for purposes of handwashing;

29.6 The design of Jensen Farms' packing house caused water to pool, creating a harborage site for bacteria; and

29.7 Jensen Farms' failure to precool cantaloupes prior to processing.

30. Many of the conditions and practices cited in the preceding paragraph, and others, should have caused Jensen Farms to receive a score that would have caused its packing house to fail the July 25, 2011 audit.

31. In addition, Mr. Dilorio misrepresented the conditions and practices at Jensen Farms' packing house by giving it a "superior" rating and a score of 96%, despite the existence of conditions and practices that should have caused him to fail the facility. Mr. Dilorio made other material misrepresentations—including, but not limited to, statements about the suitability of equipment in place at the packing house for the processing of cantaloupes—all of which were relied on by Jensen Farms as justification for continuing to use, rather than changing or improving, the various conditions, practices, and equipment for its processing of cantaloupes.

32. Had the Jensen Farms' packing house failed the July 25, 2011 audit, the cantaloupe that caused the Plaintiff Richard Bennell's Listeriosis illness would not have been distributed by Jensen Farms and Frontera. Further, had the Jensen Farms packing house failed the July 25, 2011 audit, production would not have continued without Jensen Farms first correcting the various conditions and practices that (a) should have caused the packing house to fail the July 25 audit and (b) were proximate causes of the outbreak that is the subject of this action.

Listeriosis

33. Listeriosis is a serious illness that is caused by eating food contaminated with the bacterium *Listeria monocytogenes*. Although there are other types of *Listeria*, most cases of listeriosis are caused by *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Listeria* is found in soil and water. Vegetables can become contaminated from the soil or from manure used as fertilizer. Animals can carry the bacterium without appearing ill and can contaminate foods of animal origin, such as meats and dairy products. *Listeria* has been found in a variety of raw foods, such as uncooked meats and unpasteurized (raw) milk or foods made from unpasteurized milk. *Listeria* is killed by pasteurization and cooking; however, in certain ready-to-eat foods, like hot dogs and cold cuts from the deli counter, contamination may occur after cooking but before packaging.

34. Although healthy persons may consume contaminated foods without becoming ill, those at increased risk for infection may become ill with listeriosis after eating food contaminated with even a few bacteria.

35. A person with listeriosis may develop fever, muscle aches, and sometimes gastrointestinal symptoms such as nausea or diarrhea. If infection spreads to the nervous system, symptoms such as headache, stiff neck, confusion, loss of balance, or convulsions can occur. In immune-deficient individuals, *Listeria* can invade the central nervous system, causing meningitis and/or encephalitis (brain infection). Infected pregnant women ordinarily experience only a mild, flu-like illness; however, infection during pregnancy can lead to miscarriage, infection of the newborn or even stillbirth. The most recent data suggest that about 2,500 illnesses and 500 deaths are attributed to listeriosis in the United States annually.

Richard Benell's *Listeria* Illness

36. On or about August 2 and 6, 2011, Mr. Benell purchased *Listeria*-contaminated cantaloupe at King Soopers located at 3250 Centennial Boulevard in Colorado Springs. These cantaloupes were manufactured and sold by Jensen Farms and Defendant Frontera.

37. Onset of symptoms for Mr. Benell began slowly throughout late August, finally culminating in the onset of severe illness on approximately September 6, 2011. A blood specimen collected the next day tested positive for *Listeria Monocytogenes*. The Public Health Laboratory at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) conducted Pulsed Field Gel Electrophoresis (PFGE) of the isolate cultured from his blood (CDPHE Specimen ID Number HUM-2011024909). Results showed that Mr. Benell had been infected by CDPHE strain "11-D," which is one of the strains of *Listeria Monocytogenes* associated with illness in this outbreak.

38. Mr. Benell was hospitalized from September 8 through 13, 2011, due to severe illness caused by his *Listeria Monocytogenes* infection. After being discharged, he continued for many weeks to suffer symptoms of his illness, and required additional medical care.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Strict Product Liability)

39. The Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 2 through 38 by this reference as if each paragraph was set forth herein in its entirety.

40. The Defendants Frontera and King Soopers are product manufacturers and sellers within the meaning of the Colorado Product Liability Act, C.R.S. §13-21-401 *et seq.* These Defendants manufactured, distributed and/or sold the food that was the source of the Plaintiffs' injuries. The *Listeria*-contaminated food that was the source of the Plaintiffs' injuries was a product within the meaning of the Act.

41. The food product that was the source of the Plaintiff Richard Benell's illness and injuries was defective, and was unreasonably dangerous to the consumer, because it was contaminated and adulterated with *Listeria*, a potentially deadly pathogen.

42. The food product manufactured and distributed by Frontera and King Soopers reached the Plaintiffs without substantial change in the condition in which it was sold.

43. Frontera and King Soopers' defective, *Listeria* contaminated food product caused the Plaintiff Richard Benell's *Listeria* infection and related damages.

44. Frontera and King Soopers were the sellers of the defective *Listeria*-contaminated food product.

45. Frontera and King Soopers were engaged in the business of selling food products.

46. Because the Defendants Frontera and King Soopers manufactured and sold the food product that was the source of the Plaintiff Richard Benell's injuries and losses, which food was defective and not reasonably safe due to *Listeria* contamination, Frontera and King Soopers are strictly liable to the Plaintiffs for the harm proximately caused by their sale of defective food.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Breach of Warranties)

47. The Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1 through 46 by this reference as if each paragraph was set forth herein in its entirety.

48. The Defendants Frontera and King Soopers owed a duty to the Plaintiffs to manufacture and sell a food product that conformed to their express and implied warranties, including, but not limited to, the implied warranty of merchantability and the implied warranty of fitness for a particular use or purpose.

49. The food product manufactured and sold by the Defendants Frontera and King Soopers was contaminated with the *Listeria* bacteria. Such contaminated food products would not pass without exception in the trade, and the sale of such food products was thus in breach of the implied warranty of merchantability.

50. The food product manufactured and sold by the Defendants Frontera and King Soopers was contaminated with the *Listeria* bacteria, and was not fit for the uses and purposes intended by either the Plaintiffs or the Defendants, *i.e.*, human consumption. The sale was thus a breach of the implied warranty of fitness for its intended use.

51. Because the Defendants Frontera and King Soopers manufactured and sold food that was in breach of their express and implied warranties, these Defendants are liable to the Plaintiffs for the harm proximately caused by their sale of contaminated food.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Negligence and Negligence *per se*)

52. The Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1 through 51 by this reference as if each paragraph was set forth herein in its entirety.

53. The Defendants Frontera and King Soopers negligently manufactured, distributed and sold a food product that was not reasonably safe.

54. The Defendants Frontera and King Soopers were negligent in manufacturing, distributing and selling a product that was not reasonably safe because adequate warnings or instructions were not provided, including, but not limited to, the warning that their product may contain *Listeria*, and thus should not be given to, or eaten by, people.

55. The Defendants Frontera and King Soopers had a duty to comply with all statutory and regulatory provisions that pertained or applied to the manufacture, distribution, storage, labeling, and sale of their food products, including, but not limited to, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, which bans the manufacture, sale and distribution of any “adulterated” food, but failed to do so.

56. In the manufacture and production of their finished product, the Defendants Frontera and King Soopers owed to the Plaintiffs a duty to use supplies and raw materials that were in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, ordinances and regulations; that were from safe and reliable sources; and that were clean, wholesome, free from spoilage and adulteration, and safe for human consumption, but failed to do so.

57. Plaintiff Richard Benell is among the class of persons designed to be protected by the statutory and regulatory provisions pertaining to the Defendants Frontera and King Soopers’ manufacture, distribution, storage, labeling, and sale of food.

58. As a result of the negligent acts and omissions of Defendants Frontera and King Soopers, and as a result of their violation of statutes designed to protect the Plaintiffs from contaminated foods, these Defendants are liable to the Plaintiff Richard Benell for his *Listeria* illness and for associated injuries and losses.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Negligence against Defendant Primus)

59. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 58, above, as though set forth fully herein.

60. Defendant Primus, as principal in the agency relationship between itself and Bio Food Safety, the auditor that conducted the audit of Jensen Farms ranchlands and packing house described at paragraph 21, is bound by, and liable for, the acts and omissions of negligence of Bio Food Safety and its employees.

61. As the primary contractor for the Jensen Farms audit in July 2011, Primus owed a duty to those people that it knew, or had reason to know, would be the ultimate consumers of Jensen Farms products, including the Plaintiffs, to act with reasonable care in the selection, approval, and monitoring of subcontractors. Primus breached this duty.

62. The audit done by James Dilorio on July 25, 2011 was not done with reasonable care, and constituted a breach of the duty of reasonable care that Primus owed to the consumers of Jensen Farms/Frontera cantaloupes. Mr. Dilorio’s various acts and omissions of negligence in the conduct of the audit include specifically, but not exclusively, those acts and omissions set forth at paragraphs 27 through 32.

63. Mr. Dilorio’s various acts and omissions of negligence, in conjunction with the negligence of Primus in selecting, approving, and monitoring Bio Food Safety as auditor of

Jensen Farms' facility, and with Bio Food Safety's negligence in hiring, training, and supervising Mr. Dilorio as auditor, constituted a proximate cause of the Plaintiff Richard Benell's Listeriosis infection and related illness, and the Plaintiffs' associated injuries and damages.

64. Because Bio Food Safety was an agent of Primus for purposes of Mr. Dilorio's negligently conducted audit of Jensen Farms on July 25, 2011, and because Primus committed acts and omissions of negligence that constituted a proximate cause of the Plaintiffs' injuries and damages, Defendant Primus is liable to the Plaintiffs for his injuries, damages and losses.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Loss of Consortium)

65. The Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1 through 64 by this reference as if each paragraph was set forth herein in its entirety.

66. Plaintiff Carol Benell was, at the time that Richard Benell was sickened as described above by the Defendants' tortious conduct, married to Richard Benell.

67. As a result of Defendants' tortious conduct, as described in the First, Second, Third and Fourth Claims for Relief, the Plaintiff Carol Benell suffered a loss of her rights of consortium, including, but not limited to, loss of affection, society, companionship, and aid and comfort of her spouse, as well as other economic damages. The Plaintiff Carol Benell suffered these losses as a direct and proximate result of the tortious injury to her husband, Richard Benell.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices - C.R.S. 6-1-101, et seq.)

68. The Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1 through 67 by this reference as if each paragraph was set forth herein in its entirety.

69. At all times material hereto, the Defendants were "persons" as defined at Subsection 6-1-105(1) of the Colorado Consumer Protection Act ("Act").

70. At all times material hereto, the Plaintiffs were actual or potential consumers of the Defendants' goods or services, and were injured as a result of the deceptive trade practices alleged herein.

71. The Defendants, in the course of their business, have engaged in, or have caused another to engage in, one or more of the following deceptive practices, as set forth at Subsection 6-1-105 (b), (e) and (g) of the Act:

- Knowingly making a false representation as to the source, sponsorship, approval, or certification of goods, services, or property;

- Knowingly making a false representation as to the characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, alterations, or quantities of goods, food, services, or property or a false representation as to the sponsorship, approval, status, affiliation, or connection of a person therewith, or;
- Representing that goods, food, services, or property are of a particular standard, quality, or grade, or that goods are of a particular style or model, when they knew or should know that they are of another.

72. Pursuant to Subsection 6-1-105(3) of the Act, the deceptive trade practices complained of herein are in addition to and do not limit the types of Plaintiffs' other claims actionable at common law or under other Colorado statutes.

73. The deceptive trade practices complained of herein directly involved the general public and significantly impacted the public as actual or potential customers of Defendants' goods or services, including the Plaintiffs and numerous other Colorado families.

74. The Defendants acquired substantial money as a result of engaging in the above described deceptive trade practices.

75. As a direct and proximate result of the above described deceptive trade practices, the Plaintiffs have suffered, and will continue to suffer injuries, damages, and losses as described in this Complaint.

76. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' deceptive trade practices, Plaintiffs have incurred expenses which will be proven at trial.

77. Pursuant to Section 6-1-113, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover all actual damages and his attorneys fees.

78. Pursuant to Section 6-11-113, Plaintiffs are also entitled to an amount equal to three times the amount of his actual damages sustained to redress the Defendants' bad faith conduct, as defined by the Act to include fraudulent, willful, knowing, or intentional conduct that caused the injuries complained of herein.

DAMAGES

79. The Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1 through 78 by this reference as if each paragraph was set forth herein in its entirety.

80. The Plaintiffs have suffered general and special, economic and noneconomic, and incidental and consequential damages as the direct and proximate result of the acts and omissions of the Defendants, which damages shall be fully proven at the time of trial. Such damages

include, but not limited to, damages for loss of enjoyment of life, mental anguish, and pain and suffering, both past and future; medical and medical related expenses, both past and future; travel and travel-related expenses, past and future; emotional distress and future emotional distress; pharmaceutical expenses, past and future; wage loss; loss of consortium; and other ordinary, incidental and consequential damages as would be anticipated to arise under the circumstances.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs pray:

A. That the Court award the Plaintiffs judgment against the Defendants in such sums as shall be determined to fully and fairly compensate the Plaintiffs for all general, special, economic, noneconomic, incidental and consequential damages incurred, or to be incurred, by the Plaintiffs as the direct and proximate result of the acts and omissions and deceptive trade practices of the Defendants;

B. That the Court award the Plaintiffs their costs, including experts fees, and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred, and prejudgment interest at the statutory rate;

C. That the Court award the Plaintiffs treble damages, and;

D. That the Court award such other and further relief as it deems necessary and proper in the circumstances.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury as guaranteed by the Constitution of the State of Colorado.

DATED: August 7, 2013.

IRWIN & BOESEN, PC

Original Signature on file at Irwin & Boesen, P.C.

Randal R. Kelly, No. 13757

and

William D. Marler
(*Pro Hac Vice Pending*)
Marler Clark, LLP, PS

Plaintiffs' address:

Richard Benell and Carol Benell
2436 N. Wasatch
Colorado Springs, CO 80907