

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

QUESADRA GOODRUM,)
and RODERICK GOODRUM,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.)
)
TRISTAR PRODUCTS, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

Civil Action File
No. _____

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND JURY TRIAL DEMAND

COME NOW QUESADRA GOODRUM and RODERICK GOODRUM,
individually, by and through undersigned counsel, and hereby file this **Complaint
for Damages and Jury Trial Demand**, respectfully showing the following:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a diversity-based action seeking recovery for substantial personal injuries and damages suffered by Plaintiff Quesadra Goodrum after a Power Pressure Cooker XL model PPC-790 pressure cooker (hereinafter the “subject Pressure Cooker”) that was designed, manufactured, marketed and sold by and through Defendant Tristar Products, Inc., exploded and caused hot steam and other contents to be discharged and severely burn her body. Plaintiff Roderick Goodrum

seeks damages for loss of consortium. The subject incident happened in Stockbridge, Henry County, Georgia, and this case is brought under the substantive product liability and negligence laws of the State of Georgia.

II. PARTIES, JURISDICTION, SERVICE AND VENUE

2. Plaintiff Quesadra Goodrum (hereinafter “Ms. Goodrum”), is an adult citizen of the State of Georgia and a resident of Henry County, Georgia. By filing this action, Ms. Goodrum avails herself of the jurisdiction and venue of this Court.

3. Plaintiff Roderick Goodrum (hereinafter “Mr. Goodrum”) is the spouse of Plaintiff Quesadra Goodrum, is an adult citizen of the State of Georgia and a resident of Henry County, Georgia. By filing this action, Mr. Goodrum avails himself of the jurisdiction and venue of this Court.

4. Defendant Tristar Products, Inc. (hereinafter “Tristar”), is a foreign corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida, principally located in Coral Springs, Florida, doing business in all fifty states, including Georgia, and deriving substantial revenue from ongoing and continuous sales of its products in the State of Georgia, including but not limited to, the sale of the subject Pressure Cooker. Tristar knew at all relevant times that its products were (and are) being sold in the State of Georgia, for use by consumers in Georgia, and its product caused harm to Plaintiffs in the State of Georgia. At all relevant times, Tristar was (and is)

actively involved in the design, manufacture, promotion and sale of the subject pressure cooker (and similar models), which failed during foreseeable use and caused Plaintiffs' injuries and damages. At all relevant times, Tristar promoted, via television, internet and otherwise, the subject Pressure Cooker (and other similar models of pressure cookers) to be sold in all fifty states, including Georgia. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Tristar because of its continuous and systematic business contacts with the State of Georgia and because its product sold in Georgia caused harm in Georgia. Defendant Tristar also maintains a registered agent for service of process in the State of Florida, CT Corporation System, located at 1200 South Pine Island Road, Plantation, Florida, 33324, where Tristar may be served with legal process in this case.¹

5. *Subject-Matter Jurisdiction.* This Court has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to diversity jurisdiction prescribed by 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs, and there is complete diversity between the parties.

6. *Venue.* Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the

¹ However, Plaintiffs' counsel will contact counsel for Tristar regarding accepting service of process of this Complaint, in which case Tristar may be served by Plaintiffs' counsel contacting counsel for Tristar regarding accepting service of process of a file-stamped copy of this Complaint, or as otherwise allowed by law.

Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 90(a)(2) and LR 3.1(B)(2)-(3), N.D.Ga., because Plaintiffs reside in Henry County (which is within this District and Division), because a substantial part of the events, acts or omissions giving rise to the claim and Plaintiffs' injuries occurred within Henry County, and because Tristar regularly conducts business in this District and Division, including the promotion, sale and distribution of the subject Pressure Cooker and other similar models of pressure cookers, among other consumer goods.

III. OPERATIVE FACTS

A. Tristar's Power Pressure Cooker XL Model Series

7. For a period of months before Ms. Goodrum purchased the subject Pressure Cooker on or about March 14, 2016, Ms. Goodrum viewed, on several different occasions, Tristar's television "infomercial" featuring "celebrity chef" Eric Theiss ("Theiss"), among other participants, wherein Tristar directly advertised and promoted for sale its "Power Pressure Cooker XL" electric pressure cooker to users and consumers across the country, specifically including the Plaintiffs in Stockbridge, Henry County, Georgia.

8. Therein, Tristar, by and through its agent Theiss, represented and warranted to users and consumers across the country, and specifically to the Plaintiffs in Georgia, that its Power Pressure Cooker XL is, among other things,

“easy to use,” “one of the safest” pressure cookers, “dummy proof,” “not your grandmother’s pressure cooker,” has an “airtight lid that locks into place, trapping super-heated steam inside,” is designed with “on-board technology,” and is a “kitchen miracle.”

9. Reasonably relying upon Tristar’s representations and warranties regarding the safety and ease of use of Tristar’s Power Pressure Cooker XL, Ms. Goodrum placed an order with Tristar to purchase the subject Pressure Cooker in or around March of 2016. Following said purchase, Tristar directly shipped the subject Pressure Cooker to Ms. Goodrum in Stockbridge, Henry County, Georgia.

10. Moreover, following Tristar’s delivery of the subject Pressure Cooker to the Plaintiff, Ms. Goodrum viewed a YouTube video produced and released by Tristar, again featuring Tristar’s agent Theiss, in which Tristar represented and warranted, among other things, that locking Tristar’s Power Pressure Cooker XL “couldn’t be easier,” when the Pressure Cooker “is up to pressure ... the lid locks on, I couldn’t get this lid open if I wanted to, there’s no way you’re going to open it, so it’s loaded with safety features,” and “if you’ve never used a pressure cooker before, it’s one of the safest ones you can get.” Moreover, Tristar’s agent Theiss demonstrated the “quick” release of steam by using his hand to manually rotate the release valve, during which he comments that the “steam is practically harmless,”

and again grabs and shakes the lid, commenting, “even now, if I wanted to, I still can’t open the lid, because the pressure is still inside, so as the pressure releases, the pressure cooker knows that, it’s going to unlock for us automatically.” Finally, Tristar’s agent Theiss represented that, after the pressure is released, “now I can open the lid, that’s how smart the pressure cooker is, it’s that easy.”²

11. The subject Pressure Cooker purports to be a model “PPC 790,” which, according to Tristar, is the ten-quart version of Tristar’s Power Pressure Cooker XL or “PPC” line of pressure cookers.

12. At all relevant times, Tristar advertised and sold several other pressure cooker models, including the “PPC 770” (a six-quart unit), the “PPC 770-1” (also six-quarts), “PPC 780” (eight-quart unit), “PCXL/PRO6” (a/k/a “Power Pressure Cooker XL Pro”), “PC-WAL1” (a/k/a “Power Cooker”), and “PC-TRI6” (a/k/a “Power Cooker Pro”).

13. According to Tristar’s Senior Engineer, Alejandro “Alex” Lozano (“Lozano”), all pressure cookers advertised and sold by Tristar are the same or substantially the same in design and function.

14. Prior to delivering the subject Pressure Cooker to the Plaintiffs, Tristar

² Tristar’s YouTube video is publicly available at the following URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UsYE9e4nQLs&t=252s>

exercised substantial control over, and active involvement with, the design, manufacturing, testing, and quality assurance of its pressure cookers, including the subject Pressure Cooker. By way of example and not limitation, Tristar's Senior Engineer, Lozano, was at all relevant times physically located in China so that he could personally guide, oversee, supervise, and participate in all aspects of the manufacture and production of the product; and Tristar was solely responsible for approving all design changes to its pressure cookers, including the subject Pressure Cooker, and periodically made such engineering design changes to its pressure cookers, including the subject Pressure Cooker, prior to its delivery to the Plaintiffs.

15. Prior to delivering the subject Pressure Cooker to the Plaintiffs, Tristar was responsible for the content of its promotional and marketing materials, including those viewed by Ms. Goodrum, and was responsible for the content of the materials accompanying its pressure cookers, including the instructions and warnings contained in its user's manual, recipe guides, and on-product labeling.

16. Tristar represented and warranted to users and consumers, including the Plaintiffs, that its pressure cookers, including the subject Pressure Cooker, are designed with a "positive lock" system to prevent the product from pressurizing until the lid is secured in a "locked position," and to prevent the lid from being removed

until all pressure has been released.

17. According to Tristar, a Tristar pressure cooker, including the subject Pressure Cooker, is defective if the pressure cooker can achieve pressurization without being placed in the locked position, or if the pressure cooker can be opened while pressure remains inside.

18. According to Tristar, the only way a user or consumer is to know that a Tristar pressure cooker has depressurized, and thus the lid safe to be removed, is to wait until steam ceases to be seen exiting the product's manual release valve, which, according to Lozano, is incapable of clogging per Tristar's testing with the manufacturers.

19. According to Tristar, a Tristar pressure cooker is defective if the manual release valve is capable of being clogged during the cooking process.

20. According to Tristar's marketing and promotional materials, including those referenced herein (i.e., infomercial and YouTube video materials), as well as its user's manual accompanying the product, Tristar's pressure cookers, including the subject Pressure Cooker, are "the safest" and "easiest to use" because they are designed with a number of "Built-In Safety Features," including, but not limited to:

- (a) "Lid Safety Device" that "prevents pressure build-up if the lid is not closed" and "prevents lid from opening until all pressure is

released,”

- (b) “‘Clog Resistant’ Feature” that “prevents food from blocking the steam release port,” and
- (c) “‘Spring Loaded’ Safety Pressure Release” that in the event of failure of all other safety features, “will automatically lower the Inner Pot, causing it to separate automatically from the Rubber Gasket” to “enable the steam and pressure to automatically escape around the pot Lid, avoiding a dangerous condition.”

21. Moreover, the “Frequently Asked Questions” (“FAQs”) section of Tristar’s owner’s manual, including the manual which accompanied the subject Pressure Cooker, includes the question “WHY WOULD THE LID COME OFF WHEN IT SHOULDN’T?” which is answered by Tristar as follows: “**It should only come off if there was no pressure inside.**” (Emphasis added). According to Tristar, it included this FAQ and its answer because of consumer feedback received by Tristar’s customer service department.

22. Tristar’s pressure cooker, including the subject Pressure Cooker, includes a “CAUTION” sticker affixed to the product. The label includes a diagram/model of a “Pressure Valve” with instructions regarding how to manually turn it to “seal” (pressurize) and “vent” (depressurize) the unit. The label then states,

“Once the Floating Valve has dropped, the Lid may be removed.” However, neither the label nor the owner’s manual accompanying the Pressure Cooker include a diagram, description, or any other means of identifying the proper position of the “Floating Valve” when the pressure cooker is safe to be opened versus when it is unsafe due to remaining pressure.

23. Prior to the subject incident giving rise to this lawsuit, which occurred on or about December 14, 2018, Ms. Goodrum read Tristar’s user’s manual accompanying the subject Pressure Cooker, which included Tristar’s above-quoted representations regarding the Pressure Cooker’s alleged “Built-In Safety Features” and its answer to the FAQ.

24. Prior to December 14, 2018, Ms. Goodrum read Tristar’s on-product labeling.

25. Prior to December 14, 2018, Ms. Goodrum operated without incident the subject Pressure Cooker according to Tristar’s instructions for use and express warranties and representations.

B. The Subject Incident

26. On or about December 14, 2018, Ms. Goodrum endeavored to prepare food for her family at her home in Stockbridge, Henry County, Georgia, and decided to use the subject Pressure Cooker, among other things, for that purpose. Relying

upon Tristar's warranties and factual representations regarding the subject Pressure Cooker, Ms. Goodrum reasonably believed the Pressure Cooker was incapable of pressurizing without its lid being placed in a fully locked position and that the lid could not come off if pressure remained inside the product. Accordingly, Ms. Goodrum used the Pressure Cooker to prepare food items in a manner intended and directed by Tristar.

27. Despite operating the Pressure Cooker as intended and directed by Tristar, the heated contents of the Pressure Cooker suddenly and without warning exploded onto Ms. Goodrum as she attempted to remove the lid. As a result of the incident, Ms. Goodrum was caused to suffer severe, painful burns, which necessitated medical treatment. As a further result of the incident, Ms. Goodrum suffers from permanent scarring, skin discoloration, lack of sensation, and sensitivity, among other injuries and damages.

28. Unbeknownst to the Plaintiffs at the time of the subject incident, Tristar had previously received (and was contemporaneously receiving) hundreds of reports of serious personal injury (chiefly serious burns) and property damage resulting from similar incidences of Tristar's pressure cooker lids or the heated contents inside exploding from the product during normal, foreseeable, and intended use.

29. Unbeknownst to the Plaintiffs at the time of the subject incident, Tristar

had previously and was actively and substantially engaged with, supervising, and participating with the manufacturer of the subject Pressure Cooker to make a number of design changes to the product, including adding safety devices to the product, such as a magnetic lid sensor to prevent the product from achieving pressure unless and until the lid was fully locked and a pressure gauge to indicate when the product's lid was safe to be opened.

30. Unbeknownst to the Plaintiffs at the time of the subject incident, Tristar had previously learned from outside consultants that Tristar's warnings and instructions for use, including those contained within the user's manual accompanying the subject Pressure Cooker and those affixed to the product itself, were insufficient and failed to comply with applicable standards, and thus Tristar was actively and substantially engaged with, supervising, and participating with outside consultants to strengthen its defective warnings and instructions for use.

31. Unbeknownst to the Plaintiffs at the time of the subject incident, the Consumer Product Safety Commission ("CPSC") was actively investigating Tristar's pressure cookers, including the subject Pressure Cooker, had issued a recall regarding certain models, and had requested that Tristar stop selling certain other model pressure cookers due to the number of incidences of injury and property

damage resulting from such explosive events reported to Tristar.

32. Despite Tristar's knowledge of the defective condition of the subject Pressure Cooker at the time it left Tristar's control, Tristar failed to take any corrective action to prevent further harm, including the Plaintiffs' harm, but instead continued to represent and warrant the product to be safe to increase Tristar's sales and profits.

33. As detailed below, upon information and belief but without the benefit of fact discovery (and pleading in the alternative as specifically allowed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)), the subject Pressure Cooker, as designed and/or manufactured by Tristar, was negligently designed and/or manufactured, and defective in terms of its design, manufacturing and/or warnings, because as designed and manufactured by Tristar the subject Pressure Cooker's lid was capable of (and did) explode and come off in the ordinary, foreseeable, proper use of cooking food with the product, without any adequate warning to the consumer that such a failure would foreseeably occur.

34. As a direct and proximate result of the negligent design/manufacture and/or the design/manufacturing/warnings defects of the subject Pressure Cooker, Ms. Goodrum sustained severe and painful burn injuries and damages to her body for which Tristar is liable.

35. Tristar is, thus, either strictly liable and/or liable in negligence for all

injuries and damages to Plaintiffs related to this incident, in an amount well in excess of the jurisdictional minimum necessary to confer jurisdiction in this Court.

IV. LEGAL CLAIMS

COUNT ONE: DEFENDANT TRISTAR—STRICT LIABILITY

36. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs verbatim into this Count.

37. At all times material to the allegations in this Complaint, Defendant Tristar was in the business of designing, manufacturing, marketing and selling pressure cookers and did design, manufacture, market and sell the subject Pressure Cooker giving rise to the subject matter of this lawsuit.

38. Under O.C.G.A. § 51-1-11 and other applicable case law, Tristar is strictly liable to Plaintiffs for design defects because the risks inherent in the subject Pressure Cooker's design outweigh its utility, particularly given the availability of feasible, safer alternative designs that would not impair the pressure cooker's functionality. Thus, under Georgia law, the subject Pressure Cooker is defective in its design.

39. More specifically, Tristar knew at all times that as a manufacture, designer, marketer and seller of new consumer products, the subject Pressure Cooker

had to be designed, tested, manufactured and marketed so as to minimize risks versus utilities, and that with this product, there was grave risk of harm to the user if Tristar failed to implement sufficient and reliable design components, safeguards, interlocks or other mechanisms to prevent the top of the cooker and scalding hot contents of the cooker from exploding and flying out. The subject Pressure Cooker was and is defective by design because the design chosen by Tristar allows that very danger to occur, and lacks adequate safeguards to protect consumers from harm.

40. Defendant Tristar also marketed the subject Pressure Cooker in a defective manner in that Tristar failed to effectively warn or inform consumers of the unreasonably dangerous properties of the subject Pressure Cooker and methods by which consumers, such as the Plaintiffs, could guard and/or mitigate such dangers.

41. Upon information and belief, but without the benefit of fact discovery and pleading in the alternative as specifically allowed by Fed R. Civ. P. 8(d), the design and warning defects alleged above were the proximate cause of Plaintiffs' injuries and damages, but those injuries and damages were or may have also been the result of manufacturing defects in the subject Pressure Cooker which rendered the cooker unreasonably dangerous, and not reasonably safe, for its intended use, in that as fabricated and manufactured by Tristar, the lid or top of the cooker and its

adjacent or related components were made of materials, or in such dimensions, that they lost the integrity of their connection and seal so as to allow the pressurized top to explode and fly off the cooker along with the cooker's scalding hot contents

42. Tristar is strictly liable for all injuries and damages to Plaintiffs related to this incident, in an amount well in excess of the jurisdictional minimum necessary to confer jurisdiction in this Court.

COUNT TWO:
DEFENDANT TRISTAR—NEGLIGENCE

43. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs verbatim into this Count.

44. Tristar has a duty of reasonable care to design, manufacture, market, and sell non-defective pressure cookers that are reasonably safe for their intended uses. Tristar also has a duty to adequately warn of dangers posed by a product's design. These duties applied to the subject Pressure Cooker at issue in this case.

45. Defendant Tristar knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care should have known, that the subject Pressure Cooker was defective and unreasonably dangerous to those persons likely to use the product for the purpose and in the manner for which it was intended to be used. Tristar was negligent in the particulars set forth in this and the preceding Count.

46. Defendant Tristar knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care should have known, of the means of designing, manufacturing and marketing the subject pressure cooker such that the type of incident and resulting injuries and damages as described herein would be prevented. Tristar had actual knowledge of the means of designing a pressure cooker that would not be inadequate and dangerous. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Tristar failed to adequately design, equip and/or manufacture the subject Pressure Cooker.

47. Defendant Tristar was additionally negligent in that it failed to give adequate or proper warnings or instructions, and failed to make appropriate post-sale marketing efforts to prevent known incidents, such as the one detailed herein.

48. Defendant Tristar owed Plaintiffs, as well as the public at large, the duty of reasonable care in designing, manufacturing and marketing the subject Pressure Cooker. Tristar failed to act as an ordinary prudent manufacturer in manufacturing the subject Pressure Cooker and violated its duties and was negligent and said negligence includes those acts and/or omissions previously described herein.

49. Tristar is liable for its negligence for all injuries and damages to Plaintiffs related to this incident, in an amount well in excess of the jurisdictional minimum necessary to confer jurisdiction in this Court.

COUNT THREE:
DEFENDANT TRISTAR—PUNITIVE DAMAGES

50. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs verbatim into this Count.

51. Plaintiffs have learned *after* this incident that Ms. Goodrum is, regrettably, not the first person to be horrifically burned from an exploding Power Pressure Cooker XL product designed, manufactured, marketed and sold by Tristar. Indeed, after this incident, Plaintiffs became aware for the first time that there have been reports that multiple people in multiple states – well before this incident – who have endured a similar catastrophic event with this product and, even worse, *Tristar knew about these incidents before the subject incident*. Despite being on notice of other incidents substantially similar to this one involving the same or similar products and grievous harm to consumers, Tristar consciously and intentionally failed to take any proper action to warn, remedy or otherwise mitigate the risk of harm to the public generally, or Plaintiffs in particular, from the use of its product.

52. To be clear, Tristar had actual knowledge that the subject Pressure Cooker posed severe danger and threat of serious injury to consumers, but did not warn or adequately inform or educate retailers, wholesalers or the public of said dangers, and instead just kept selling the products for profit and allowing injuries to continue.

53. Tristar's knowing failure to act to protect the safety of the consumers, and its placement of focus on ongoing profit ahead of safety, despite actual knowledge of the dangers and failure to warn or attempt to inform or educate the public of said dangers, is clear and convincing evidence demonstrating willful misconduct, malice, fraud, wantonness, oppression and/or that entire want of care, which would raise the presumption of a conscious indifference to consequences, such that punitive (exemplary) damages are necessary to deter Tristar from repeating or continuing such unlawful and dangerous conduct in the future.

54. Pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 51-12-5.1, Defendant Tristar is, thus, liable to Plaintiffs for punitive (exemplary) damages in an amount to be determined by the enlightened conscience of the jury, based on the clear and convincing evidence to be presented at trial, in an amount sufficient to deter Defendant Tristar and others from future similar conduct.

COUNT FOUR:
DEFENDANT TRISTAR—LOSS OF CONSORTIUM

55. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs verbatim into this Count.

56. Plaintiff Roderick Goodrum is, and was at all material times to this action, the lawful husband of Plaintiff Quesadra Goodrum.

57. As a proximate result of Defendant's negligent acts and/or omissions, Mr. Goodrum has suffered both mental and physical injuries in that his wife, due to the debilitating effect of her own injuries, has not been able to provide the usual companionship, society and consortium of a spousal relationship.

58. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's negligent acts and/or omissions, Mr. Goodrum has suffered and continues to suffer loss of society, services and consortium of his wife, Quesadra Goodrum.

V. DAMAGES

59. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs verbatim into this count.

60. Plaintiff Quesadra Goodrum seeks damages from Defendant Tristar for past, present, and future medical bills and expenses, and other necessary expenses resulting from her incident-related injuries in amounts to be shown by the evidence adduced at trial.

61. Plaintiff Quesadra Goodrum seeks damages from Defendant Tristar for all past, present, and future pain and suffering resulting from her incident-related injuries, in an amount as determined by the enlightened conscience of the jury, including all past, present, and future mental and emotional pain and suffering

resulting from her incident-related injuries, in amounts to be determined by the enlightened conscience of the jury based upon the evidence adduced at trial.

62. Plaintiff Quesadra Goodrum seeks damages from Defendant Tristar for the loss of full enjoyment of life and disfigurement she has suffered and will continue to suffer as a proximate result of the incident and the injuries sustained therein, in an amount to be determined by the enlightened conscience of the jury based upon the evidence adduced at trial.

63. Plaintiff Roderick Goodrum seeks damages from Defendant Tristar for the loss of society, services and consortium of his wife, Quesadra Goodrum, due to the debilitating effect of her own injuries resulting from the subject incident, in an amount to be determined by the enlightened conscience of the jury based upon the evidence adduced at trial.

64. Plaintiffs seek a recovery of punitive damages from Defendant Tristar as described more fully above in an amount that will effectuate the societal function of punishing and deterring misconduct, but which comports with the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Georgia.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

65. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for judgment as follows:

- (a) That the Court issue service of process to Defendant as authorized by law;
- (b) That Defendant Answer this Complaint as provided by law;
- (c) That Plaintiffs have a trial by jury;
- (d) That Plaintiffs recover from Defendant for all damages, economic and non-economic, tangible and intangible, general and special, that are compensable under Georgia law that are sufficient to compensate fully and fairly for all losses proximately caused by the tortious acts and omissions of Defendant Tristar, to be determined by the enlightened conscience of the jury based upon the evidence adduced at trial;
- (e) That punitive damages be awarded against Defendant Tristar under O.C.G.A. § 51-12-5.1 and other applicable law, and in a manner consistent with that of the U.S. and Georgia Constitutions, as set forth above;
- (f) That all costs be taxed against Defendant; and
- (g) That the Court award such other and further relief, as it shall deem just and appropriate.

VII. JURY DEMAND

66. Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted this 2nd day of April, 2020.

CONLEY GRIGGS PARTIN LLP

/s/ Cale Conley _____

CALE CONLEY

Georgia Bar No. 181080

DAVIS POPPER

Georgia Bar No. 863530

4200 Northside Parkway, NW

Building One, Suite 300

Atlanta, Georgia 30327

(404) 467-1155

cale@conleygriggs.com

davis@conleygriggs.com

To be Admitted Pro Hac Vice:

MEYERS & FLOWERS, LLC

FRANK V. CESARONE, ESQ.

PETER J. FLOWERS, ESQ.

3 N. 2nd Street, Suite 300

St. Charles, Illinois 60174

(630) 232-6333

fvc@meyers-flowers.com

pjf@meyers-flowers.com