1 ALISON E. CORDOVA (SBN 284942) acordova@cpmlegal.com 2 TORIANA S. HOLMES (SBN 282600) tholmes@cpmlegal.com **ENDORSED FII** COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP 3 SAN MATEO COUNTY San Francisco Airport Office Center 4 840 Malcolm Road NOV 2 2 2016 Burlingame, CA 94010 5 Telephone: (650) 697-6000 Clerk of the Superior Court Facsimile: (650) 697-0577 By JORDAN MAXWELL 6 DEPUTY CLERK DAVID L. MARTIN (SBN 71829) 7 120 N. El Camino Real San Mateo, CA 94401 8 Telephone: (650) 868-4304 9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO 16CIV02490 12 STEFAN ZIER, an individual; and TERRIE CASE NO. 13 PEACOCK, an individual, COMPLAINT FOR: 14 Plaintiffs. 15 1) NEGLIGENCE; v. 16 PETSMART, INC., a Delaware 2) NEGLIGENCE PER SE; Corporation; JUAN ZARATE, an 17 individual; and DOES 1 through 25, 3) NEGLIGENT HIRING, inclusive. 18 SUPERVISION, AND RETENTION: Defendants. 19 4) TRESPASS TO CHATTELS; 20 5) INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF 21 **EMOTIONAL DISTRESS** 22 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED 23 24 25 26 27 28

LAW OFFICES
COTCHETT, PITRE &
MCCARTHY, LLP

COMPLAINT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 2 | I. | INTRODUCTION1 |
|----|------------------|--|
| 3 | II. | JURISDICTION AND VENUE3 |
| 4 | III. | PARTIES3 |
| 5 | | A. Plaintiffs |
| 6 | | B. Defendants |
| 7 | | C. Other Defendants |
| 8 | | D. Agency & Concert of Action |
| 9 | IV. | FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE CLAIMS ASSERTED |
| 10 | | A. ABOUT HENRY 5 |
| 11 | | B. Henry's Death5 |
| 12 | | C. PETSMART Advertises Safe, Professional, and Caring Treatment of Pets 6 |
| 13 | | D. PETSMART TRAINS GROOMERS AT PETSMART GROOMING ACADEMY |
| 14 | | E. PETSMART KNEW GROOMERS WERE SERIOUSLY INJURING PETS AND FAILED TO FIX THE |
| 15 | $ _{\mathbf{v}}$ | PROBLEM |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE |
| 18 | | SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION |
| 19 | | NEGLIGENCE PER SE |
| 20 | | THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENT HIRING, SUPERVISION, AND RETENTION |
| 21 | | FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION |
| 22 | | TRESPASS TO CHATTELS |
| 23 | | FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS |
| 24 | VI. | PRAYER FOR RELIEF |
| 25 | VII. | JURY DEMAND |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |

Plaintiffs STEFAN ZIER ("STEFAN") and TERRIE PEACOCK ("TERRIE") (hereinafter, "PLAINTIFFS") bring this action, by and through their attorneys, for damages against Defendants PETSMART, INC. ("PETSMART"), JUAN ZARATE ("ZARATE"), and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive, (hereinafter, "DEFENDANTS"), and each of them.

PLAINTIFFS hereby complain of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, as follows:

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

1. This action arises out of the negligent, reckless and/or unlawful conduct of PETSMART and the willful conduct of its employee and groomer, ZARATE, wherein ZARATE intentionally and knowingly killed a beloved one year old, long-haired, pure-bred dachshund puppy named Henry Peacock, who weighed only eleven and a half pounds and was entrusted to PETSMART and ZARATE's care for a nail trim that turned tragic within a matter of minutes when ZARATE emerged from the grooming station to where he knew Henry's owners and parents, Plaintiffs STEFAN and TERRIE, were earnestly waiting for the return of their Henry, shouting and holding Henry's limp body, which was struggling for every breath and foaming blood at the mouth. Thereafter, ZARATE took Henry to the onsite veterinary, while his parents waited in extreme agony and distress after the horror they had just witnessed. Henry died moments later on May 15, 2016 at or around 4:45 p.m. at the PETSMART store located at 3520 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, California.



Henry



Henry (middle) with his brother, Tony, and his sister, Bella

- 2. The number of incidents since 2009 where pets have sustained serious injury or death while in the care of **PETSMART** groomers is alarming. **PETSMART**'s directors, officers, and/or managing agents had knowledge that pets were sustaining serious, sometimes fatal, injuries while being groomed at **PETSMART** prior to Henry's death, but failed to take measures to eliminate and/or minimize such injury and harm to pets, including but not limited to, improving groomer training, supervision, and/or certification. This is despite being the sole trainer, supervisor, and "safety certifier" of its own groomers. In the meantime, **PETSMART** spent millions of dollars advertising itself as a company that cares deeply for pets, using the well-known slogan: "Where pets are family."
- 3. As a direct and foreseeable consequence of the wrongful conduct and/or omissions of **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, **PLAINTIFFS** sustained serious emotional injuries, as well as economic losses, as set forth below.

II.

3 4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §395, because, at all times relevant, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, resided in and/or did business in the State of California and the events which combined to produce the injuries sustained by PLAINTIFFS occurred in the County of San Mateo, State of California.

Venue is proper in the County of San Mateo because a substantial part of the events, 5. acts, omissions, and/or transactions complained of herein occurred in and/or originated from San Mateo County, State of California. The amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdiction minimum of this court.

III. **PARTIES**

A. **Plaintiffs**

- Plaintiff STEFAN ZIER ("STEFAN") is a natural person who is, and at all times 6. relevant to this claim was, a resident of Capitola, California. STEFAN was the co-owner of Henry, who he acquired in California, and he also suffered the injuries and damage complained of herein in California.
- 7. Plaintiff TERRIE PEACOCK ("TERRIE") is a natural person who is, and at all times relevant to this claim was, a resident of the City of San Mateo, California. TERRIE was the co-owner of Henry, who she acquired in California, and she also suffered the injuries and damage complained of herein in California.

B. **Defendants**

8. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendant PETSMART, INC. ("PETSMART") is, and at all times relevant to this claim was, a corporation doing business in the County of San Mateo, State of California, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business located at 19601 N. 27th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85027. **PETSMART** dominates the retail pet industry, including grooming and boarding services for pets, being recently named by Forbes as the forty-eighth largest privately-held company in the

¹ "America's Largest Private Companies: #48 PetSmart", Forbes.com (2016) available at: http://www.forbes.com/companies/PetSmart/.

9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendant JUAN ZARATE ("ZARATE") is, and at all times relevant to this claim was, an individual who resided in San Francisco, California. At all times relevant to this claim, ZARATE was employed by PETSMART and serving as an agent, representative, employee, and/or joint venture with PETSMART.

C. Other Defendants

10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise of the Defendants **DOES** 1 through **DOES** 25, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs who therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 474; Plaintiffs further allege that each of said fictitious Defendants is in some manner responsible for the acts and occurrences hereinafter set forth. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same are ascertained, as well as the manner in which each fictitious Defendant is responsible.

D. Agency & Concert of Action

11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, hereinabove, were the agents, servants, employees, partners, aiders and abettors, co-conspirators, and/or joint venturers of each of the other Defendants named herein and were at all times operating and acting within the purpose and scope of said agency, service, employment, partnership, enterprise, conspiracy, and/or joint venture, and each Defendant has ratified and approved the acts of each of the remaining Defendants. Each of the Defendants aided and abetted, encouraged, and rendered substantial assistance to the other Defendants in breaching their obligations to Plaintiffs, as alleged herein. In taking action to aid and abet and substantially assist the commission of these wrongful acts and other wrongdoings complained of, as alleged herein, each of the Defendants acted with an awareness of

McCarthy, LLP

5

6

8

9

7

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COMPLAINT

his/her/its primary wrongdoing and realized that his/her/its conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct, wrongful goals, and wrongdoing.

IV. FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE CLAIMS ASSERTED

A. **ABOUT HENRY**

- 12. TERRIE and STEFAN owned three dachshunds prior to Henry's unfortunate death—all chestnut colored, pure-bred dachshunds. Bella was the eldest at seven years of age. Tony was the middle pet at six years old, and Henry was the youngest, being just one years old.
- 13. Without children together, TERRIE and STEFAN cared for and loved their three dachshunds as children.
- 14. The bond between Henry and TERRIE was especially close because Henry suffered from pneumonia as a newborn, and TERRIE spent countless loving hours nursing him back to health.

В. HENRY'S DEATH

- 15. On Sunday, May 15, 2016, at or around 4:45 p.m., STEFAN entered the PETSMART location at 1320 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, California, with Tony and Henry on leashes. TERRIE had run home with the couple's third dog, Bella, to quickly drop off items and then meet STEFAN at PETSMART.
- 16. STEFAN requested a nail trim for each of the dogs. Before allowing any of the dogs to be serviced by a **PETSMART** groomer, **STEFAN** inquired as to how the groomer would trim the nails, showing obvious concern for the care and treatment of his pets. ZARATE, the assigned **PETSMART** groomer, strongly recommended that the dogs' nails be filed with a dremel tool.
- 17. **ZARATE** first took Tony, the middle dachshund, for a nail trim. After five minutes, ZARATE emerged, showing signs of agitation, and retorted, "He was a feisty one!" ZARATE then mentioned how Tony was "all-over the place," had nipped at ZARATE and urinated on him, which was out of character for Tony who was known to be a docile and friendly dog with no known prior instances of violent or biting conduct.

- 18. Next up was Henry. At or around the same time, **TERRIE** arrived with Bella and witnessed **STEFAN** and **ZARATE** exchanging dogs. **ZARATE** marched off to the groomer station with Henry to trim his nails.
- 19. Approximately three minutes later, **STEFAN** and **TERRIE** heard a shout come from the direction of the grooming station, and **ZARATE** emerged carrying a limp Henry resting on his forearm and shouting, "Medical emergency we have a medical emergency!"
- 20. Instead of taking Henry directly from the grooming station to Banfield Pet Hospital ("Banfield"), which is located inside **PETSMART**, **ZARATE** brought Henry to **STEFAN** and **TERRIE**, holding Henry in front of them. Henry's body was limp with blood foaming out of his mouth as he struggled for every breath. With each breath, more bright red foamy blood escaped from the corners of his mouth, all to the fright and horror of his parents.
- 21. Without speaking any words to **STEFAN** or **TERRIE**, **ZARATE** then walked Henry over to Banfield.
- 22. The receptionist at Banfield informed **STEFAN** and **TERRIE** that the veterinarian was going to attempt a procedure to remove blood from Henry's lungs, but soon thereafter, Henry died.
- 23. Based on the Banfield veterinarian's report, Henry suffered two broken ribs and a punctured lung as a result of **ZARATE**'s mistreatment.
 - 24. **ZARATE** was arrested that same day for felony animal abuse.
- 25. Following the incident, **STEFAN** and **TERRIE** have been at a complete loss, suffering severe emotional distress as result of being present and seeing Henry's injury—his body limp, foaming blood from the mouth, and struggling to stay alive, all of which **ZARATE** forced them to witness.
 - C. <u>PETSMART ADVERTISES SAFE, PROFESSIONAL, AND CARING TREATMENT OF PETS</u>
 - 26. The well-known slogan for PETSMART is: "Where pets are family."
- 27. PETSMART's website advertises: "PETSMART grooming salon professional, academy-trained pet stylists at your service. At our Grooming Salon, dogs and cats receive

COMPLAINT

hands-on care from academy-trained, safety-certified pet stylists dedicated to making them look good and feel great." Adding: "Our groomers – qualified to pamper. Dedicated to pets. Your pet is in great, caring hands at our salons." Id.

- 28. PETSMART's website advertises: "Hands-On Care For Dogs & Cats. At PETSMART, we provide the best in pet services. Our trained, pet-loving associates are devoted to the well-being of all pets."
- 29. The **PETSMART** website homepage also has a "lives saved" count in the upper right hand corner, and of course the "lives" it is referring to is the lives of pets, like Henry.
- 30. **PETSMART**'s mission statement reads: "Whether it's finding the right pet, the best food or the perfect toy, signing up for training and grooming sessions, checking into a PetsHotel, or taking home a newly adopted dog or cat, we have the answers. We're **PETSMART**."
- 31. In 2015 alone, **PETSMART** spent \$112.9 million on measured media in the U.S. promoting its brand and services.⁴
 - D. PETSMART TRAINS GROOMERS AT PETSMART GROOMING ACADEMY
- 32. According to the job description on the PETSMART website, a pet stylist is "an integral part of our grooming salons, <u>our Pet Stylists (Groomers) work with Pet Parents to provide expert styling services to keep pets healthy</u>, happy, and looking great!"⁵
- 33. Further, **PETSMART** trains it groomers: "Pet Stylists <u>undergo extensive training</u> in our <u>Grooming Academy</u>, where they learn proper styling techniques and how to select appropriate services for each pet." (*Id.*)
- 34. The PETSMART website claims "we ensure that each professional pet stylist is qualified to care for your pet. Academy-trained stylists complete over 800 hours of hands-on

COMPLAINT

I.AW OFFICES
COTCHETT, PITRE &
MCCARTHY, LLP

² http://pets.PetSmart.com/services/grooming/ (accessed on 11/15/2016).

³http://pets.PetSmart.com/services/?ab=us_hp_services_0531&_ga=1.115849218.503473502.1466288601 (accessed on 11/15/2016).

⁴ June 9, 2016. "Animals Go Shopping in PetSmart's 'The Secret Life of Pets' Campaign." Advertising Age. Retrieved from http://adage.com/article/cmo-strategy/pets-shopping-PetSmart-s-secret-life-of-pets-

campaign/304364/#nav-mobile.

⁵ PetSmart job board available at: https://wfa.kronostm.com/index.jsp?seq=allLocations&applicationName=PetSmartNonReqExt&locale=en_US&show AllLocations=true&EVENT=com.deploy.application.hourly.plugin.LocationSearch.doSearch (accessed on 11/15/2016).

<u>instruction and safety certification</u>, working with at least 200 dogs of all breeds and sizes. Because <u>we pride ourselves on having the highest safety standards in the industry</u>, PETSMART requires every salon associate to be safety certified annually."⁶

35. The **PETSMART** career website, where a job seeker can look for a job as a pet groomer a.k.a. "stylist" reads fairly similar, except the number of training hours is only half what is represented to consumers on the "services" portion of the website:

Our PETSMART Grooming Academy ensures each PetStylist is qualified to care for pets. When you sign up for our Grooming Academy, you'll complete a 12-week course that includes over 400 hours of supervised technical and safety training. Because we pride ourselves on having the highest safety standards in the industry, PETSMART requires every dog and cat groomer to be safety certified every year. After completing the academy, you'll emerge as a qualified groomer with knowledge in:

Canine anatomy

Proper tool usage

Breed profiling and breed standards

Body Contour Trims including Guard Combs

Sporting Trims

Hand-scissor Trims

Terriers: Short/Long-legged Trims⁷

- 36. There is no government agency or regulatory body that administers an annual safety certification of pet groomers, and therefore, on information and belief, **PETSMART** creates, administers, and/or implements the safety certification of its groomers.
 - 37. **PETSMART** only pays its groomers a mere \$8.00 to \$15.00/hour.⁸

E. <u>PETSMART KNEW GROOMERS WERE SERIOUSLY INJURING PETS AND FAILED TO FIX THE PROBLEM</u>

38. The infliction of serious injury or death to pets in the care of **PETSMART** groomers has been reported through the media and consumer protection agencies for years. The incidences of serious injury or death also occur within **PETSMART** stores and under the care of **PETSMART** employees, indicating **PETSMART**'s full knowledge and awareness of the problem. Since **PETSMART** groomers are trained and certified through **PETSMART**, **PETSMART** also has

28 | http://careers.P

24

25

26

27

⁶ http://www.petsmart.com/pet-services/faqs/grooming-

faqs.html#page_name=grooming&link_section=faq&link_name=read&start_date=10-3-2016&end_date (accessed on 11/15/2016).

⁷ https://careers.PetSmart.com/career-opportunities/ (accessed on 11/11/2016).

⁸ http://www.payscale.com/research/US/Employer=PetSmart_Inc./Hourly_Rate (accessed on 11/15/2016).

control over the means of reducing serious injury or death to pets while being groomed. Despite such knowledge, awareness, and means of control, **PETSMART** failed to fix and/or address the problem. Instead, **PETSMART** continued to advertise itself as a company that cared about a consumer's pet like it was "family," and that all groomers were extensively and adequately trained and certified to provide professional and safe care to pets.

- 39. Consumeraffairs.com has recorded numerous reports of pets being seriously injured and/or killed while in the care of **PETSMART**. The reports span **PETSMART** locations around the country and date back to 2010—approximately six years before Henry's death.
- 40. Consumer reports to Consumeraffairs.com regarding injury and/or death include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. On April 27, 2010, a customer reported witnessing a groomer slap and yell at her dog after the dog yelped from having its nails cut too short.
 - b. On March 16, 2011, a customer reported she had to take her dog to the emergency room after her dog was cut and bruised at PETSMART.
 - c. On <u>August 2, 2012</u>, a customer reported her dog sustained a torn cruciate ligament while being groomed at **PETSMART**.
 - d. On <u>August 24, 2012</u>, a customer reported that both of her dog's ears were badly cut and dripping blood after being in the care of **PETSMART**.
 - e. On March 18, 2013, a customer reported witnessing a PETSMART groomer drag her dog away and whack the dog's head on a swinging door while another groomer roughly grab a dog's leg and slam it down on a table.
 - f. On April 1, 2014, a customer reported her dog died while getting a nail trim by a groomer at PETSMART.
 - g. On April 5, 2014, a customer reported her dog was acting erratic after returning from the PETSMART groomers. A veterinarian determined the dog had been "hit in the face very hard."

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

| h. | On May 11, 2014, a customer reported her dog sustained an eye injury while in | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | the care of PETSMART. A veterinarian determined the injury was from b | lun | | | | | |
| | force trauma. | | | | | | |

- i. On <u>June 22, 2014</u>, a customer reported a **PETSMART** groomer shaved her dog down to his skin, causing hot spots all over his body, in addition to cutting his penis.
- j. On <u>January 20, 2015</u>, a customer reported her dog was nearly shaved bald, could barely walk, and sustained an injury to its knees while being groomed at PETSMART.
- k. On <u>January 20, 2015</u>, a customer reported that her dog was killed by **PETSMART** groomers when receiving a haircut by two groomers who were holding the dog in a head lock and suffocated the dog.
- 1. On <u>February 7, 2015</u>, a customer reported witnessing her dog fall off of the **PETSMART** grooming table and hang by the loop of the harness around its neck.
- m. On March 22, 2015, a customer reported that their dog died within 45 minutes of being left with a **PETSMART** groomer, who had stated "I hope this dog doesn't give me a hard time, I've had a bad day" just prior to taking the dog.
- n. On March 24, 2015, a customer reported two of her dogs were injured while being groomed at PETSMART. One dog had the tip of its tongue cut off, and the other sustained a cut in the corner of its eye, narrowly missing the dog's eyeball.
- o. On March 27, 2015, a customer reported her dog received cuts to its legs while being groomed at PETSMART.
- p. On April 8, 2015, a customer reported abusive behavior she witnessed at **PETSMART**, including groomers swearing at dogs, yanking on them, carelessly dragging them around while knocking the dogs' heads into cabinets, and blowing high velocity dryers into crates to get the dogs to stop barking.
- q. On <u>June 5, 2015</u>, a customer reported her dog sustained a serious cut to its leg, requiring emergency treatment and three stitches. The customer apparently filed

| ; | COMPLAINT | 11 |
|-----|-----------|--|
| 28 | | PETSMART when he sustained a bad cut to his paw, requiring surgery. |
| 27 | bb. | On January 8, 2016, a customer reported his dog was being groomed at |
| 26 | | PETSMART grooming session and required stitches. |
| 25 | aa. | On December 30, 2015, a customer reported her dog was cut during a |
| 24 | | PETSMART grooming session and needed to be glued together. |
| 23 | z. | On <u>December 19, 2015</u> , a customer reported her dog's ear was badly cut during a |
| 22 | | the dog yelp in pain. |
| 21 | | berate a dog, shove it twice, and then grab the dog and pull it's hair out, making |
| 20 | y. | On October 8, 2015, a customer reported she witnessed a PETSMART groomer |
| 19 | | being groomed at PETSMART. |
| 18 | x. | On September 9, 2015, a customer reported her dog suffered multiple cuts while |
| 17 | | complained to the store manager and corporate office. |
| 16 | | injury in the care of a PETSMART groomer. The customer subsequently |
| 15 | w. | On August 22, 2015, a customer reported their dog sustained a strained shoulder |
| 14 | | ear while being groomed at PETSMART. |
| 13 | v. | On August 12, 2015, a customer reported her dog sustained cuts to its chest and |
| 12 | | PETSMART groomers. |
| 11 | | one of its toes, causing the dog to limp, while receiving a nail trim by |
| 10 | u. | On August 7, 2015, a customer reported her dog sustained a hairline fracture of |
| 9 | | groomed at PETSMART. |
| 8 | t. | On July 25, 2015, a customer reported her dog sustained a serious cut while being |
| 7 | | nine stitches on his testicles and four stitches on his ear. |
| 6 | | in addition to a cut on the ear during a PETSMART grooming session, requiring |
| 5 | S. | On July 15, 2015, a customer reported her dog's testicles were cut in two places, |
| 4 | | PETSMART grooming session. |
| 3 | r. | On June 22, 2015, a customer reported his dog's toe was broken during a |
| 2 | | response. |
| 1 | | a police report and contacted PETSMART corporate, but never received a |
| 1 I | ŀ | a police report and contacted DETEMADT corporate but navior received a |

| ŀ | | |
|----|-------|--|
| 1 | cc. | On March 7, 2016, a customer reported she witnessed her dog fall off of a table |
| 2 | | and hang by a restraint around its neck, while being groomed at PETSMART. |
| 3. | dd. | On March 21, 2016, a customer reported their dog's nails were cut so short during |
| 4 | | a PETSMART grooming session that the dog bled all over the backseat of the |
| 5 | | customer's vehicle on the way home. |
| 6 | ee. | On April 7, 2016, a customer reported his cat suffered a damaged trachea during |
| 7 | | a PETSMART grooming session, resulting in two lost teeth. |
| 8 | ff. | On May 3, 2016, a customer reported her dog's tail was bent and broken while |
| 9 | | being groomed at PETSMART. |
| 10 | . gg. | On May 9, 2016, a customer reported that immediately following a grooming |
| 11 | | session at PETSMART, his previously healthy dog was barely able to walk, had |
| 12 | | difficulty eating, and developed a fever. The dog was found dead by its owner |
| 13 | | less than two weeks later. |
| 14 | hh. | On May 17, 2016, a customer reported that a PETSMART groomer cut his dog's |
| 15 | | genitalia while the dog was being groomed. |
| 16 | ii. | On May 21, 2016, a customer reported a PETSMART groomer cut her dog's ear |
| 17 | | in half, lied about it, and kept her dog from her for hours as the PETSMART |
| 18 | | staff allegedly tried to cover up their mistake. |
| 19 | jj. | On May 26, 2016, a customer reported a PETSMART groomer "scalped" her |
| 20 | | dog, leaving it without any fur. According to a veterinarian, the dog was bleeding |
| 21 | | under its skin and died from its injuries. |
| 22 | kk. | On June 25, 2016, a customer reported their dog sustained an injury to her |
| 23 | | pancreas during a grooming session at PETSMART, leading to an infection |
| 24 | | which spread out of control and required the dog be put down. |
| 25 | 11. | On July 30, 2016, a customer reported PETSMART groomers cut her dog's |
| 26 | | neck. The veterinarian described the cut as "not deep enough to see [the dog's] |
| 27 | | organs, but it's close." |
| 28 | | |

On August 16, 2016, a customer reported witnessing a PETSMART groomer

COMPLAINT

1

mm.

| | 46. | Defendant | ZARATE | also | negligently, | carelessly, | recklessly, | and/or | unlawfully |
|--------|---------|---------------|--------------|--------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| caused | PLAI | NTIFFS to | perceive th | e hor | rific injury t | o their belo | ved pet wh | en he in | nmediately |
| brough | t Henry | s limp and | broken bo | dy to | where he kn | ew Henry's | parents we | re waitir | ng, making |
| them s | ee Henr | y struggle fo | or every bre | ath, b | lood foaming | g at the mou | th. | | |

- 47. As a direct and legal result of the said wrongful conduct and/or omissions of **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, **PLAINTIFFS** have sustained the loss of their beloved Henry, who had fair market value as a pure-bred dachshund with beautiful long fur and only one year in age. Henry also had peculiar value because he was like a son to his owners who did not have children of their own together. As **PETSMART** says, they were "Pet Parents"—not just owners of property.
- 48. As a further direct and legal result of said wrongful conduct and/or omissions of **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, **PLAINTIFFS** have suffered severe mental and emotional distress, pain and suffering, which continues to this day.
- 49. As a further direct legal result of said wrongful conduct and/or omissions of **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, **PLAINTIFFS** have incurred incidental expenses for the cremation of Henry in an amount according to proof.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE PER SE (Against All Defendants)

- 50. **PLAINTIFFS** re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.
- 51. **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, at all times mentioned, were under a statutory duty to comply with California Penal Code §597(a).
- 52. On or around May 15, 2016, Defendant **ZARATE** violated California Penal Code §597(a) in that he maliciously and intentionally killed a living animal.
- 53. As a direct and legal result of said violation, **PLAINTIFFS** suffered the harm hereinabove set forth.

LAW OFFICES COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP

54. In doing the wrongful and intentional act as herein alleged, Defendant ZARATE, acted with oppression, fraud, and malice and with conscious and willful disregard for the health, safety and general welfare and rights of PLAINTIFFS. Such action was done with malice, oppression and/or fraud and was and is despicable, shocking and offensive and entitles PLAINTIFFS to an award of punitive damages against Defendant ZARATE in an amount to be determined at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENT HIRING, SUPERVISION, AND RETENTION (Against Defendant PETSMART, INC. and DOES 12-25, inclusive)

- 55. **PLAINTIFFS** re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.
- 56. Upon information and belief, Defendant **PETSMART** hires, trains, supervises, and/or certifies employees to groom pets, including but not limited to Defendant **ZARATE**.
- 57. Defendant ZARATE was unfit and/or incompetent to perform the work for which he was hired, trained, supervised, and/or certified, and Defendant PETSMART knew and/or should have known that Defendant ZARATE was unfit and/or incompetent and that this unfitness and/or incompetence created a risk of harm to the personal property of its consumers, including but not limited to, the beloved pets of those consumers.
- 58. As a direct and legal result of the said wrongful conduct and/or omissions of Defendants PETSMART and DOES 12 through 25, and each of them, PLAINTIFFS suffered, and continue to suffer, the damages hereinabove set forth.
- 59. The officers, directors and/or managing agents of **PETSMART** had advanced knowledge that **PETSMART** groomers were causing serious harm to pets at alarming rates during the administration of grooming services and/or while the pet was in the care of **PETSMART** for grooming services. The officers, directors and/or managing agents of **PETSMART**, and each of them, also had advanced knowledge that a failure to fix the problem would result in the probability of a catastrophic event, which foreseeably would lead to harm and/or injuries to **PLAINTFFS**, and to consumers generally, wherein consumers and/or **PLAINTIFFS** would suffer the loss of a well-

2324

25

2627

28

LAW OFFICES OTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP COMPLAINT

loved pet and/or be forced to perceive and/or witness the infliction of serious injury and/or death to a well-loved pet. The officers, directors and/or managing agents of PETSMART had complete control over groomer training, supervision, retention, and safety certification, including but not limited to, the number of training hours required, the type of training (whether it be hands-on or classroom based), the curriculum for training, who administers the training, evaluation and/or testing during the training process, the rubric for determining aptitude, the process to obtain annual safety certification, the requirements to be certified, evaluation of whether an employee meets those requirements, and/or whether an employee is certified. Despite having this complete control, the officers, directors, and/or managing agents of PETSMART intentionally chose to not spend necessary funds for assessing, evaluating, fixing, addressing and/or improving the way grooming services are provided so as to eliminate the problem, including but not limited to improving training, supervision, retention, and/or safety certification of groomers. Instead, PETSMART chose to spend funds on marketing itself as a company that exercises the utmost care and safety when servicing the beloved pets of consumers. The failure not to fix the problem foreseeably and predictably led to well-loved pets being severely injured and/or killed, in addition to pet owners and consumers being forced to perceive and/or witness the infliction of serious injury and/or death to a pet. The wrongful acts and/or omissions of PETSMART, as herein set forth, were made, adopted, approved, authorized, endorsed and/or ratified by their officers, directors or managing agents, and were done maliciously, oppressively, fraudulently and/or with a willful and knowing disregard of the probable dangerous consequences for the health and safety of PLAINTIFFS and their community. Such action was done with malice, oppression and/or fraud and was and is despicable, shocking and offensive and entitles the PLAINTIFFS to an award of punitive damages against PETSMART in an amount to be determined at trial.

> FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION TRESPASS TO CHATTELS (Against All Defendants)

60. **PLAINTIFFS** re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.

- 61. On or around May 15, 2016, Defendant **ZARATE** intentionally and substantially damaged **PLAINTIFFS**' one-year-old dachshund Henry without **PLAINTIFFS**' consent.
- 62. As a direct and legal cause of the wrongful conduct and/or omissions of **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, **PLAINTIFFS** suffered, and continue to suffer, the injuries and damages hereinabove set forth.
- 63. In doing the wrongful and intentional act as herein alleged, Defendant ZARATE, acted with oppression, fraud, and malice and with conscious and willful disregard for the health, safety and general welfare and rights of PLAINTIFFS. Such action was done with malice, oppression and/or fraud and was and is despicable, shocking and offensive and entitles PLAINTIFFS to an award of punitive damages against Defendant ZARATE in an amount to be determined at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS (Against All Defendants)

- 64. **PLAINTIFFS** re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every paragraph above as though fully set forth herein.
- 65. As set forth above, the action of Defendant **ZARATE** was outrageous and demonstrated **ZARATE**'s complete disregard for **PLAINTIFFS**.
- dog to where he knew the dog's owners were waiting, paraded their severely injured pet in front of them, and only after this, did **ZARATE** finally take the dog to the on-site veterinary hospital where attempts to save the dog's life could be made, all showing **ZARATE** acted with intent to cause severe, emotional distress to **PLAINTIFFS** and/or acted in conscious disregard of the probability that **PLAINTIFFS** would suffer severe emotional distress. Defendant **ZARATE**'s conduct was so extreme as to go beyond the bounds of decency and be regarded as intolerable in a civilized society.

67. As a direct and legal result of the wrongful conduct and/or omissions of **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, **PLAINTIFFS** suffered, and continue to suffer, the injuries and damages hereinabove set forth.

68. In doing the wrongful and intentional act as herein alleged, Defendant ZARATE, acted with oppression, fraud, and malice and with conscious and willful disregard for the health, safety and general welfare and rights of PLAINTIFFS. Such action was done with malice, oppression and/or fraud and was and is despicable, shocking and offensive and entitles PLAINTIFFS to an award of punitive damages against Defendant ZARATE in an amount to be determined at trial.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court enter judgment in their favor on every claim for relief set forth above and award them relief including, but not limited to, the following:

- 1. For general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, and beyond the jurisdictional minimum of this Court;
- 2. For economic losses, in an amount according to proof at trial;
- For repair, depreciation, and/or replacement of damaged, destroyed, and/or lost personal property;
- 4. For interest upon any judgment entered as provided by law;
- 5. For costs of suit herein included;
- 6. For punitive/exemplary damages; and
- 7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: November 21, 2016

COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP

By: ALISO

ALISON E. CORDOVA Attorneys for Plaintiffs

VII. <u>JURY DEMAND</u>

Plaintiff demand trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: November 21, 2016

COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP

3y: <u>_(_</u>

ALISON E. CORDOVA Attorneys for Plaintiffs

LAW OFFICES
COTCHETT, PITRE &

McCarthy, LLP

COMPLAINT