1	FRANK M. PITRE (SBN 100077) fpitre@cpmlegal.com	
2	ALISON E. CORDOVA (SBN 284942) acordova@cpmlegal.com	
3	COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLI	P
4	San Francisco Airport Office Center 840 Malcolm Road	
5	Burlingame, CA 94010	
6	Telephone: (650) 697-6000 Facsimile: (650) 697-0577	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
8		
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF 7	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	IN AND FOR THE	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
11		
12	SHERRILYN MILLER, an individual,	CASE NO.:
13	Plaintiff.	COMPLAINT FOR:
14	v.	1) NEGLIGENCE;
15	PETSMART, INC. , a Delaware Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through	2) NEGLIGENCE PER SE;
16	10, inclusive,	
17	Defendants.	3) NEGLIGENT HIRING, SUPERVISION, AND RETENTION;
18		SULER VISION, AND RETENTION,
19		4) INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
20		EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
21		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT	

1				
1		TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE NO.	
2	INTRO	INTRODUCTION		
4	II.	JURISDICTION AND VENUE		
5	III.	PARTIES	4	
6		A. Plaintiff	4	
7		B. Defendants		
8				
9		C. Other Defendants		
10		D. Agency & Concert of Action		
11	IV.	FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE CLAIMS ASSERTED	5	
12		A. Winter is a Third-Generation Emotional Support Dog	5	
13		B. Winter's Incident	6	
14		C. Petsmart Advertises Safe, Professional, and Caring	-	
15		Treatment of Pets		
16		D. Petsmart Trains Groomers at Petsmart Grooming Academy		
17		E. Petsmart Knew Groomers Were Seriously Injuring Pets and Failed to Fix the Problem	9	
18		FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE		
19				
20		SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION	17	
21		THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION		
22		FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION		
23	VI.	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
24	VII.	JURY DEMAND		
25				
26				
27				
28 LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COM	PLAINT	i	

1 Plaintiff SHERRILYN MILLER ("PLAINTIFF") brings this action, by and through 2 her attorneys, for damages against Defendants PETSMART, INC. ("PETSMART") and DOES 3 1 through 10, inclusive, (herein after, "DEFENDANTS"), and each of them. PLAINTIFF hereby complains of **DEFENDANTS**, and/or each of them, named hereinabove as follows: 4

5 **INTRODUCTION**

1. 6 This action arises out of the negligent, reckless, wrongful, and/or unlawful 7 conduct of **PETSMART**, wherein on July 23, 2019, at or around 2:00 p.m., an incompetent 8 and/or inadequately and poorly trained **PETSMART's** employee at the San Leandro PETSMART¹, secured bows to WINTER – PLAINTIFF'S two (2) year old Malshi dog and 9 10 emotional support animal – after a bath by tightly winding nude-colored rubber-bands directly 11 around WINTER'S ears, thereby cutting off blood-flow and/or circulation to WINTER'S ears, 12 nearly killing the dog and resulting in severe and debilitating injury to **WINTER**, which required 13 and continues to require on-going treatment and/or repair, including surgery immediately 14 following discovery of the injury which required the veterinarian to make several small 15 punctures all over **WINTER'S** ears with an 18g needle to allow the blood blisters that had 16 formed to drain.



LAW OFFICES COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP

2. 1 Securing bows to a dog's fur is an added service that PETSMART's promotes and 2 advertises, and for which it also charges extra for. PLAINTIFF paid extra on July 23, 2019, to 3 have PETSMART put two bows on **WINTER** after her bath. 4 3. When **PLAINTIFF** picked up **WINTER** from **PETSMART** at approximately 5 5:00 p.m. on July 23, 2019, PLAINTIFF could not visibly see any rubber-bands secured around 6 WINTER'S ears because they were very tightly wound, WINTER has long, fluffy fur, and 7 WINTER'S skin is close in color to the rubber-bands that were used. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 4. The following morning, on July 24, 2019, PLAINTIFF noticed that WINTER 23 was lethargic and that liquid seemed to be coming out of her ears onto the floor, and when 24 **PLAINTIFF** investigated further, she discovered to her shock and horror that **PETSMART** had 25 attached the bows to **WINTER** by tightly wrapping rubber-bands around both her ears. 26 5. WINTER was rushed into surgery the same day in an attempt to save her ears 27 and her life. 28

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP COMPLAINT

6. WINTER'S right and left ears were subject to significant injury and trauma. The
 bands around WINTER'S ear resulted in inadequate blood supply. Both ears were inflamed and
 had multiple hematomas. The right ear also sustained lacerations.

.

7. A managing agent of PETSMART admitted the fault of both PETSMART and
its employee afterward by telling PLAINTIFF that (1) rubber bands had been used to secure the
bows, (2) a bather had applied the bows to WINTER and a bather is not supposed to do bows,
(3) the bather who handled WINTER was a brand new bather and had only gone through
"expedited" training, (4) PETSMART had since retrained the bather, and (5) PETSMART was
willing to pay for all medical treatment WINTER required and PLAINTIFF could have two
free future grooming sessions at PETSMART.

11 8. The number of incidents since 2009 where pets have sustained serious injury or 12 death while in the care of **PETSMART** groomers is alarming. **PETSMART**'s directors, officers 13 and/or managing agents had knowledge that pets were sustaining serious, sometimes fatal, 14 injuries while being groomed at **PETSMART** prior to **WINTER'S** incident, but failed to take 15 the necessary measures to eliminate and/or minimize such injury and harm to pets, including but 16 not limited to, improving groomer training, supervision and/or certification. This is despite being 17 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, 18 19 using the well-known slogan: "Where pets are family," and its recent slogan: "For the love of 20 pets."

9. As a direct and foreseeable consequence of the wrongful conduct and/or
omissions of **DEFENDANTS**, and each of them, **PLAINTIFF** herself has also sustained serious
emotional injuries, as well as economic losses, as set forth below.

24 II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. This court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to California 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 **PLAINTIFF** occurred in the County of Alameda, State of California.

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP 1 11. Venue is proper in the County of Alameda because a substantial part of the
 events, acts, omissions and/or transactions complained of herein occurred in and/or originated
 from Alameda County, State of California. The amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdiction
 minimum of this court.

5 III. PARTIES

6

A. <u>Plaintiff</u>

7 12. Plaintiff SHERRILYN MILLER is a natural person who is, and at all times
8 relevant to this claim was, a resident of Alameda County. PLAINTIFF was the owner of
9 WINTER, who was an emotional support animal that PLAINTIFF has owned and relied upon
10 for emotional support since WINTER was a young puppy.

11

B. <u>Defendants</u>

12 13. Plaintiffs are inform and believe, and thereon allege, the defendant **PETSMART**, 13 **INC.** (**PETSMART**) is, and at all times relevant to this claim was, a corporation doing business 14 in the County of Alameda, State of California, organized and existing under the laws of the State 15 of Delaware, with its principle place of business located at 19601 N. 27th Avenue, Phoenix, 16 Arizona 85027. PETSMART dominates the retail pet industry, including grooming and 17 boarding services for pets, being recently named by Forbes as the forty-seventh largest privately-18 held company in the United States with 55,000 employees nationwide and reporting annual 19 revenue for 2018 of approximately \$8 billion.²

20

C. <u>Other Defendants</u>

14. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or
otherwise of the Defendants DOES 1 through DOES 10, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff who
therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §
474. Plaintiff further alleges that each of said fictitious Defendants are in some manner
responsible for the acts and occurrences hereinafter set forth. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint

- 26
- 27

to show their true names and capacities when the same are ascertained, as well as the manner in
 which each fictitious Defendant is responsible.

3

D. <u>Agency & Concert of Action</u>

12. 4 At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, hereinabove, were 5 the agents, servants, employees, partners, aiders and abettors, co-conspirators, and/or joint 6 venturers of each of the other Defendants named herein and were at all times operating and 7 acting within the purpose and scope of said agency, service, employment, partnership, enterprise, 8 conspiracy, and/or joint venture, and each Defendant has ratified and approved the acts of each 9 of the remaining Defendants. Each of the Defendants aided and abetted, encouraged, and 10 rendered substantial assistance to the other Defendants in breaching their obligations to 11 Plaintiffs, as alleged herein. In taking action to aid and abet and substantially assist the 12 commission of these wrongful acts and other wrongdoings complained of, as alleged herein, each 13 of the Defendants acted with an awareness of his/her/its primary wrongdoing and realized that 14 his/her/its conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct, 15 wrongful goals, and wrongdoing.

16

IV. FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE CLAIMS ASSERTED

17

A. Winter is a Third-Generation Emotional Support Dog

18 13. **PLAINTIFF** has diagnosed PTSD and low blood pressure, and for a long time
19 has relied upon the support and care of an emotional support animal for her health and well20 being.

14. WINTER'S grandmother was PLAINTIFF's first emotional support dog. After
WINTER'S grandmother passed, WINTER'S father became PLAINTIFF'S next emotional
support animal. WINTER'S father was bred with another Malshi with the intention of creating
another emotional support dog as he got older, and thus WINTER entered PLAINTIFF's life.

15. WINTER r began training almost immediately at 6 weeks old in order to be able
to help PLAINTIFF with her needs. For example, PLAINTIFF's low blood pressure causes her
to faint and WINTER is able to alert PLAINTIFF of her rising blood pressure so that she is
better able to regulate this and avoid episodes of fainting.

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP 1

16. **WINTER** goes everywhere with PLAINTIFF and is her companion in life.

2

B. <u>Winter's Incident</u>

3 17. On July 23, 2019, PLAINTIFF took WINTER to PETSMART in San Leandro
4 for a bath. She paid an extra 3 dollars for bows to be put in her fur. PLAINTIFF dropped
5 WINTER off at 2:00 p.m. and was back to pick her up at 5:00 p.m.

6 18. The next day, PLAINTIFF and WINTER followed their normal routine. She
7 took WINTER out for a bathroom break and brought her into her office to start her day.
8 WINTER was acting slightly out of the norm, with less energy than usual.

9 19. Slightly before noon, PLAINTIFF checked on WINTER and noticed that there
10 were liquid drops on the ground below WINTER.

20. Concerned and confused, PLAINTIFF removed WINTER from her kennel and
noticed that her ears were wet and leaking fluid. Her ears also seemed swollen and resembled big
black rocks.

PLAINTIFF rushed back to PETSMART and the Veterinary center within it.
The grooming department immediately admitted that the groomer must have improperly put the
rubber bands for the bows around WINTER'S ears instead of around the hair.

17

22. Within 20 minutes of arriving at **PETSMART**, **WINTER** was in surgery.

18 23. WINTER'S surgery required the veterinarian to make many small punctures to
19 her ears with an 18g needle to allow the blood blisters that had formed to drain.

20 24. The veterinarian noted that if a few more hours had passed, WINTER mostly
21 likely would have lost both her ears entirely. And if twenty-four (24) hours had passed,
22 WINTER likely would have died.

23 25. It took weeks for WINTER to physically recover, but WINTER is still
24 emotionally traumatized from the incident and now behaves like a traumatized dog with PTSD.

25 26. Prior to the incident, WINTER, although young, was a very independent and
26 dependable dog. She provided PLAINTIFF with the support and companionship she needed.
27 PLAINTIFF felt confident she could lean on WINTER for assistance. Since the incident, the
28 roles have changed dramatically.

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP COMPLAINT

1	27. PLAINTIFF is now the one providing emotional support to WINTER .
2	WINTER will not leave PLAINTIFF'S side and is constantly behaving in a needy and anxious
3	manner. WINTER will dive into PLAINTIFF'S lap whenever she is sitting and is constantly
4	nudging and following her to get her attention. This behavior is very out of character for the
5	trained emotional support animal.
6	28. PLAINTIFF feels more anxious and on edge as a result. Normally, she is able to
7	depend on WINTER to provide her with the support she needs, but since the incident, WINTER
8	is the one that needs someone to depend on.
9	C. <u>Petsmart Advertises Safe, Professional, and Caring Treatment of Pets</u>
10	29. The well-known slogan for PETSMART is: "Where pets are family."
11	30. PETSMART 's website advertises: "Making dogs & cats look great is our
12	passion! Our academy-trained Pet Stylists have over 800 hours of hands-on grooming
13	instruction that includes bathing, trimming & styling at least 200 dogs of all breeds & sizes
14	<u>plus annual safety certification</u> . We offer complete bath, haircut & walk-in grooming
15	services." ³ Adding: "It takes a special set of skills to help pets look and feel their best. At
16	PetSmart, our professional Pet Stylists can do just that." Id.
17	31. PETSMART 's mission statement reads: "Whether it's finding the right pet, the
18	best food or the perfect toy, signing up for training and grooming sessions, checking into a
19	PetsHotel, or taking home a newly adopted dog or cat, we have the answers. We're
20	PETSMART."
21	32. In 2015 alone, PETSMART spent \$112.9 million on measured media in the U.S.
22	promoting its brand and services. ⁴ And spent over \$100 million on media again in 2019. ⁵
23	///
24	///
25	
26	³ http://pets.PetSmart.com/services/grooming/ (accessed on 11/15/2016).
27	⁴ June 9, 2016. "Animals Go Shopping in PetSmart's 'The Secret Life of Pets' Campaign." AdvertisingAge. Retrieved from http://adage.com/article/cmo-strategy/pets-shopping-PetSmart-s-secret-life-of-pets-
28	campaign/304364/#nav-mobile. ⁵ https://advertisers.mediaradar.com/petsmart-advertising-profile#MediaSpend
ES re & LP	COMPLAINT

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP 1

D. **Petsmart Trains Groomers at Petsmart Grooming Academy**

2 33. The **PETSMART** website claims "We ensure that each professional pet stylist is 3 qualified to care for your pet. Academy-trained stylists complete over 800 hours of hands-on 4 instruction and safety certification, working with at least 200 dogs of all breeds and sizes. 5 Because we pride ourselves on having the highest safety standards in the industry, PetSmart requires every salon associate to be safety certified annually. Similar to the PetSmart's stylists, 6 7 PetSmart's Stylist Apprentices complete 33 hours of hands-on instruction and safety 8 certification, working with at least 125 dogs Grooming Salon Menu

9 during their training. The Stylist Apprentice is 10 responsible for the grooming process of dogs that do not require clipper work such as 11 12 Labradors and Boxers."⁶

13 34. Further, in response to the 14 FAQ: "How can I be sure the best services are 15 provided?", **PETSMART** website provides: "At check-in, a safety-certified salon associate 16 17 will perform a thorough Hands-On Pet Assessment to address your pet's unique 18 19 needs. During this assessment, we will check 20 your pet's skin, coat, ears, nails and teeth."

21 35. And a bath is considered and 22 offered as а grooming service on 23 **PETSMART'S** website:

Dog Services

hide options \land

Bath & Full Haircut

For dogs who need a bath & haircut.

service includes:

 Oxygen-infused bath with shampoo & blow...

show more \checkmark

Bath & Haircut with FURminator®

For dogs who need a bath, haircut & extra attention to their coats to help reduce...

show more ∨

Bath & Brush with FURminator[®]

For dogs who need a bath plus extra attention to their coats to help reduce shedding.

service...

show more ∨

Bath & Brush

For dogs who just need a bath to maintain a healthy-looking coat, clean ears & trimmed...

⁶ https://services.petsmart.com/content/grooming-faq COMPLAINT

LAW OFFICES COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP

24

25

26

27

28

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.

4

5

6

37. **PETSMART** only pays its groomers a mere \$8.00 to \$15.00/hour.⁷

E. <u>Petsmart Knew Groomers Were Seriously Injuring Pets and Failed to Fix the</u> <u>Problem</u>

7 38. The infliction of serious injury or death to pets in the care of **PETSMART** 8 groomers has been reported through the media and consumer protection agencies for years. The 9 incidences of serious injury or death also occur within **PETSMART** stores and under the care of 10 **PETSMART** employees, indicating **PETSMART**'s full knowledge and awareness of the 11 problem. Since **PETSMART** groomers are trained and certified through **PETSMART**, 12 **PETSMART** also has control over the means of reducing serious injury or death to pets while 13 being groomed. Despite such knowledge, awareness, and means of control, **PETSMART** failed 14 to fix and/or address the problem. Instead, **PETSMART** continued to advertise itself as a 15 company that cared about a consumer's pet like it was "family," and that all groomers were 16 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:

27

28

a. On <u>April 27, 2010</u>, 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 <u>March 16, 2011</u>, a customer reported she had to take her dog to the emergency room after her dog was cut and bruised at **PETSMART**.

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP http://www.payscale.com/research/US/Employer=PetSmart_Inc./Hourly_Rate (accessed on 11/15/2016). COMPLAINT

1	c.	On August 2, 2012, a customer reported her dog sustained a torn cruciate
2		ligament while being groomed at PETSMART .
3	d.	On August 24, 2012, a customer reported that both of her dog's ears were
4		badly cut and dripping blood after being in the care of PETSMART .
5	e.	On March 18, 2013, a customer reported witnessing a PETSMART
6		groomer drag her dog away and whack the dog's head on a swinging door
7		while another groomer roughly grab a dog's leg and slam it down on a
8		table.
9	f.	On April 1, 2014, a customer reported her dog died while getting a nail
10		trim by a groomer at PETSMART .
11	g.	On April 5, 2014, a customer reported her dog was acting erratic after
12		returning from the PETSMART groomers. A veterinarian determined the
13		dog had been "hit in the face very hard."
14	h.	On May 11, 2014, a customer reported her dog sustained an eye injury
15		while in the care of PETSMART . A veterinarian determined the injury
16		was from blunt force trauma.
17	i.	On June 22, 2014, a customer reported a PETSMART groomer shaved
18		her dog down to his skin, causing hot spots all over his body, in addition
19		to cutting his penis.
20	j.	On January 20, 2015, a customer reported her dog was nearly shaved bald,
21		could barely walk, and sustained an injury to its knees while being
22		groomed at PETSMART .
23	k.	On January 20, 2015, a customer reported that her dog was killed by
24		PETSMART groomers when receiving a haircut by two groomers who
25		were holding the dog in a head lock and suffocated the dog.
26	1.	On February 7, 2015, a customer reported witnessing her dog fall off of
27		the PETSMART grooming table and hang by the loop of the harness
28		around its neck.
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT	10

1	m.	On March 22, 2015, a customer reported that their dog died within 45
2		minutes of being left with a PETSMART groomer, who had stated "I
3		hope this dog doesn't give me a hard time, I've had a bad day" just prior to
4		taking the dog.
5	n.	On March 24, 2015, a customer reported two of her dogs were injured
6		while being groomed at PETSMART . One dog had the tip of its tongue
7		cut off, and the other sustained a cut in the corner of its eye, narrowly
8		missing the dog's eyeball.
9	0.	On March 27, 2015, a customer reported her dog received cuts to its legs
10		while being groomed at PETSMART .
11	p.	On April 8, 2015, a customer reported abusive behavior she witnessed at
12		PETSMART, including groomers swearing at dogs, yanking on them,
13		carelessly dragging them around while knocking the dogs' heads into
14		cabinets, and blowing high velocity dryers into crates to get the dogs to
15		stop barking.
16	q.	On June 5, 2015, a customer reported her dog sustained a serious cut to its
17		leg, requiring emergency treatment and three stitches. The customer
18		apparently filed a police report and contacted PETSMART corporate, but
19		never received a response.
20	r.	On June 22, 2015, a customer reported his dog's toe was broken during a
21		PETSMART grooming session.
22	s.	On July 15, 2015, a customer reported her dog's testicles were cut in two
23		places, in addition to a cut on the ear during a PETSMART grooming
24		session, requiring nine stitches on his testicles and four stitches on his ear.
25	t.	On July 25, 2015, a customer reported her dog sustained a serious cut
26		while being groomed at PETSMART .
27		
28		
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT	11

1	u.	On August 7, 2015, a customer reported her dog sustained a hairline
2		fracture of one of its toes, causing the dog to limp, while receiving a nail
3		trim by PETSMART groomers.
4	v.	On August 12, 2015, a customer reported her dog sustained cuts to its
5		chest and ear while being groomed at PETSMART .
6	w.	On August 22, 2015, a customer reported their dog sustained a strained
7		shoulder injury in the care of a PETSMART groomer. The customer
8		subsequently complained to the store manager and corporate office.
9	х.	On September 9, 2015, a customer reported her dog suffered multiple cuts
10		while being groomed at PETSMART .
11	у.	On October 8, 2015, a customer reported she witnessed a PETSMART
12		groomer berate a dog, shove it twice, and then grab the dog and pull it's
13		hair out, making the dog yelp in pain.
14	Z.	On December 19, 2015, a customer reported her dog's ear was badly cut
15		during a PETSMART grooming session and needed to be glued together.
16	aa.	On December 30, 2015, a customer reported her dog was cut during a
17		PETSMART grooming session and required stitches.
18	bb.	On January 8, 2016, a customer reported his dog was being groomed at
19		PETSMART when he sustained a bad cut to his paw, requiring surgery.
20	cc.	On March 7, 2016, a customer reported she witnessed her dog fall off of a
21		table and hang by a restraint around its neck, while being groomed at
22		PETSMART.
23	dd.	On March 21, 2016, a customer reported their dog's nails were cut so short
24		during a PETSMART grooming session that the dog bled all over the
25		backseat of the customer's vehicle on the way home.
26	ee.	On April 7, 2016, a customer reported his cat suffered a damaged trachea
27		during a PETSMART grooming session, resulting in two lost teeth.
28		
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT	12

1		ff.	On May 3, 2016, a customer reported her dog's tail was bent and broken
2			while being groomed at PETSMART .
3		gg.	On May 9, 2016, a customer reported that immediately following a
4			grooming session at PETSMART, his previously healthy dog was barely
5			able to walk, had difficulty eating, and developed a fever. The dog was
6			found dead by its owner less than two weeks later.
7		hh.	On May 17, 2016, a customer reported that a PETSMART groomer cut
8			his dog's genitalia while the dog was being groomed.
9		ii.	On May 21, 2016, a customer reported a PETSMART groomer cut her
10			dog's ear in half, lied about it, and kept her dog from her for hours as the
11			PETSMART staff allegedly tried to cover up their mistake.
12		jj.	On May 26, 2016, a customer reported a PETSMART groomer "scalped"
13			her dog, leaving it without any fur. According to a veterinarian, the dog
14			was bleeding under its skin and died from its injuries.
15		kk.	On June 25, 2016, a customer reported their dog sustained an injury to her
16			pancreas during a grooming session at PETSMART, leading to an
17			infection which spread out of control and required the dog be put down.
18		11.	On July 30, 2016, a customer reported that PETSMART groomers cut her
19			dog's neck. The veterinarian described the cut as "not deep enough to see
20			[the dog's] organs, but it's close."
21		mm.	On August 16, 2016, a customer reported witnessing a PETSMART
22			groomer roughly pulling on a dog's head, jerking it around, and yelling at
23			the dog.
24		nn.	On January 31, 2017, a customer reported picking up his dog from her
25			PETSMART grooming appointment to find that she had a laceration to
26			her head and her eye was entirely bloodshot.
27		00.	On March 3, 2017, a customer reported picking up her dogs from a
28			PETSMART grooming appointment to one unable to stand and the other
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT		1

COTCHETT, PII MCCARTHY, LLP

limping with razor burn to her skin. Within the hour, the dog who was unable to stand was dead.

- pp. On April 6, 2017, a customer reported picking up her dog from a PETSMART grooming appointment to find that his right eye was swollen shut and he was stumbling. A veterinary found multiple cuts on the dog covered by glued on pieces of hair.
 - qq. On October 24, 2017, a customer reported getting a call fromPETSMART during her grooming appointment saying that she was not breathing and needed to be put on oxygen.
- rr. On October 30, 2017, a customer reported a **PETSMART** groomer telling her that a bump on the head of her dog had "just appeared", and that maybe she bumped her head on the kennel. The following day, this customer's dog was unable to stand, walk straight and stopped getting up once she laid down. She was unresponsive and was clearly dizzy and off balance. After a trip to the vet, she was diagnosed with a concussion, one so severe it had to be the results of a blow to the head.
- S. On November 5, 2017, a customer reported witnessing her dog falling off
 the table and hanging by his neck twice when she stopped by early to pick
 up her pet from a PETSMART grooming appointment.
 - tt. On November 25, 2017, a customer reported that after a **PETSMART** grooming appointment, her dog was urinating blood which, after rigorous testing from a veterinarian, was suspected to be the result of trauma.
 - On December 14, 2017, a customer reported picking up her dog from her
 PETSMART grooming appointment to find a huge scratch and cut on her stomach.
 - vv. On December 27, 2017, a customer reported bringing his dog to **PETSMART** to be groomed only to receive a phone call hours later

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COMPLAINT

1		stating that he was injured in the cage, is bleeding and it being rushed to
2		surgery.
3	ww.	On January 2, 2018, a customer reported their dog dying after being
4		dropped off for grooming at PETSMART .
5	XX.	On April 8, 2018, a customer reported seeing their dog hanging out the
6		grooming harness by his neck in PETSMART .
7	уу.	On April 23, 2018, a customer took her dog to a PETSMART groomer
8		and received a phone call 15 minutes after leaving stating that her dog had
9		vomited blood and was not breathing. A vet concluded he was dragged by
10		his leash and collar causing this incident.
11	ZZ.	On May 15, 2018, a customer reported taking her dog to a PETSMART
12		groomer. She witnessed the groomer jerking the dog around to cut her
13		nails. He was yanking on her legs so hard that she was screaming out and
14		falling on the table.
15	aaa.	On December 11, 2018, a customer reported taking her dog to a
16		PETSMART groomer for a bath and a nail trim. After three hours, she
17		returned to pick him up and he would not stop shaking. He did not eat or
18		drink and a few days later, began to pass bloody stools. He was taken to a
19		veterinarian and had to be euthanized.
20	bbb.	On February 14, 2019, a customer reported a PETSMART groomer being
21		distracted enough to allow her dog to fall off the table and hang by his
22		throat.
23	ccc.	On March 7, 2019, a customer reported that after taking her dog to
24		PETSMART for a bath and nail trim, he was barely able to walk and had
25		to be carried into the car.
26	ddd.	On April 26, 2019, a customer reported that after PETSMART grooming
27		appointment, her dog had razon burn in various areas of her body and
28		multiple cuts.
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT	15

1	eee.	On June 29, 2019, a customer reported picking up his dog from a
2		PETSMART groomer to find that her perianal region was razor burned,
3		red and bloody.
4	fff.	On July 12, 2019, a customer reported taking their dogs to PETSMART
5		to be groomed. When she returned to pick the dogs up, one of them had a
6		bloody eye.
7	ggg.	On July 22, 2019, a customer reported witnesses a PETSMART groomer
8		hitting a on a grooming table.
9	hhh.	On January 20, 2020, a customer reported that her pet incurred an injury to
10		her right eye during a stay in the PETSMART pet hotel. This injury was
11		ignored during the duration of her stay and resulted in an eye infection.
12	iii.	On February 28, 2020, a customer reported that a PETSMART groomer
13		cut his dogs ear.
14	41. There	have also been at least 47 instances reported by the press, dating back to
15	2009, where pets wer	e allegedly killed by PETSMART groomers. ⁸
16	///	
17	///	
18		
19	Trim." Inquisitr. Retriev	4, 2015). "PetSmart Dog Death: Bulldog 'Bubba' Chokes to Death During Routine Nail ved from http://www.inquisitr.com/1924027/PetSmart-dog-death-bubba-chokes-to-death-
20		2015). "Family says pug died after trip to PetSmart for grooming." Lehigh Valley News.
21	PETSMART-for-grooming	
22	http://www.care2.com/ne	uble at PetSmartMysterious Death of Beloved Dog at Pet Store Chain." Retrieved from ws/member/443892238/3601174; 2012). "Puppy Strangled at PetSmart, LA. Lawsuit Alleges: PHOTOS." <i>LA. Weekly</i> .
23	Retrieved from http://ww	w.laweekly.com/news/puppy-strangled-at-PetSmart-la-lawsuit-alleges-photos-2398739; 009) "Dog Dies After PetSmart Grooming." Fetch The Paper. Retrieved from
24	http://www.krislarsonwri	ting.com/i/archives/Kris_Larson_PetSmart_Death.pdf); wher sues PetSmart after grooming incident." Roanoke Times. Retrieved from
25		/news/dog-owner-sues-PetSmart-after-grooming-incident-article_26d74475-efcb-5c6f-
26	[7] O'Kane, (September 2	26, 2018) "Investigation Finds 47 Dogs Died After Grooming at PetSmart Over Past ieved from https://www.cbsnews.com/news/investigation-47-dogs-died-after-grooming-at-
27	petsmart-over-past -	120finds204720dogs20died20after20grooming20at20PetSmart20over20past20decade-
28	By20Caitlin20OtextOver	20the20past20decade2C2047NJcom2C20has20found
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT	16

1 2	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE (Against All Defendants)
3	2. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every paragraph
4	above as though fully set forth herein.
5	3. DEFENDANTS , and/or each of them, negligently, carelessly, recklessly, and/or
6	unlawfully groomed, styled, and/or applied bows, so as to cause the strangulation of blood flow
7	to WINTER'S ears, nearly killing WINTER and resulting in severe and debilitating damage to
8	WINTER, i.e. PLAINTIFF'S personal and unique property.
9	4. DEFENDANTS , and/or each of them, also negligently, carelessly, recklessly,
10	and/or unlawfully caused PLAINTIFF to perceive the horrific injury to her beloved pet and
11	emotional support animal.
12	5. As a direct and legal result of the said wrongful conduct and/or omissions of
13	DEFENDANTS, and/or each of them, PLAINTIFF has sustained severe mental and emotional
14	distress, nervousness, pain and suffering, which continues to this day. PLAINTIFF is informed
15	and believes, and upon such information and belief alleges, that such injuries have resulted in
16	debilitating injuries, all to her general damage in a sum according to proof.
17	6. As a direct and legal result of the said wrongful conduct and/or omissions of
18	DEFENDANTS, and/or each of them, PLAINTIFF was required to, and continues to, employ
19	physicians and other health care providers to examine, treat and care for her and/or WINTER'S
20	injuries, and have incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and incidental expenses for such
21	examination, treatment rehabilitation and care in an amount according to proof.
22	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
23	NEGLIGENCE PER SE (Against All Defendants)
24	7. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every paragraph
25	above as though fully set forth herein.
26	
27	8. DEFENDANTS , and/or each of them, at all times mentioned, were under a
28	statutory duty to comply with California Penal Code §597(b), which states: "whoever, having the
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT 17

1	charge or custody of any animal, either as owner or otherwise, subjects any animal to needless
2	suffering, or inflicts unnecessary cruelty upon the animal, or in any manner abuses any animal,
3	or fails to provide the animal with proper food, drink, or shelter or protection from the weather,
4	or who drives, rides, or otherwise uses the animal when unfit for labor, is, for each offense,
5	guilty of a crime punishable pursuant to subdivision (d)." DEFENDANTS , and/or each of them,
6	violated this statute when Defendants, and/or each of them, negligently, carelessly, recklessly,
7	and/or unlawfully groomed, styled, and/or applied bows, so as to cause the strangulation of blood
8	flow to WINTER'S ears, nearly killing WINTER and resulting in severe and debilitating
9	damage to WINTER, i.e. PLAINTIFF'S personal and unique property.
10	9. As a direct and legal result of said violation, PLAINTIFF suffered the harm
11	hereinabove set forth.
12	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENT HIRING, SUPERVISION, AND RETENTION
13	(Against Defendant PETSMART, INC. and DOES 5-10, inclusive)
14	10. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every paragraph
15	above as though fully set forth herein.
16	11. Upon information and belief, Defendant PETSMART hires, trains, supervises,
17	and/or certifies employees to groom pets.
18	12. The PETSMART employee who groomed, styled, and/or applied the bows to
19	WINTER (and whose identity is unknown at this time, but who will be DOE-ed in when
20	discovered) was unfit and/or incompetent to perform the work for which he/she was hired,
21	trained, supervised, and/or certified, and Defendant PETSMART knew and/or should have
22	known the employee was unfit and/or incompetent and that this unfitness and/or incompetence
23	created a risk of harm to the personal property of its consumers, including but not limited to, the
24	beloved pets of those consumers, which foreseeable include emotional support animals.
25	13. As a direct and legal result of the said wrongful conduct and/or omissions of
26	Defendants PETSMART, PLAINTIFF suffered, and continues to suffer, the damages
27	hereinabove set forth.
28	
c	COMPLAINT

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP

COMPLAINT

14. 1 The officers, directors and/or managing agents of **PETSMART** had advanced 2 knowledge that **PETSMART** groomers were causing serious harm to pets at alarming rates 3 during the administration of grooming services and/or while the pet was in the care of 4 **PETSMART** for grooming services. The officers, directors and/or managing agents of 5 **PETSMART**, and each of them, also had advanced knowledge that a failure to fix the problem 6 would result in the probability of a catastrophic event, which foreseeably would lead to harm 7 and/or injuries to **PLAINTFFS**, and to consumers generally, wherein consumers and/or 8 **PLAINTIFFS** would suffer the loss of a well-loved pet and/or be forced to perceive and/or 9 witness the infliction of serious injury and/or death to a well-loved pet. The officers, directors 10 and/or managing agents of **PETSMART** had complete control over groomer training, 11 supervision, retention, and safety certification, including but not limited to, the number of 12 training hours required, the type of training (whether it be hands-on or classroom based), the 13 curriculum for training, who administers the training, evaluation and/or testing during the 14 training process, the rubric for determining aptitude, the process to obtain annual safety 15 certification, the requirements to be certified, evaluation of whether an employee meets those 16 requirements, and/or whether an employee is certified. Despite having this complete control, the 17 officers, directors, and/or managing agents of **PETSMART** intentionally chose to not spend 18 necessary funds for assessing, evaluating, fixing, addressing and/or improving the way grooming 19 services are provided so as to eliminate the problem, including but not limited to improving 20 training, supervision, retention, and/or safety certification of groomers. Instead, **PETSMART** 21 chose to spend funds on marketing itself as a company that exercises the utmost care and safety 22 when servicing the beloved pets of consumers. The failure not to fix the problem foreseeably and 23 predictably led to well-loved pets being severely injured and/or killed, in addition to pet owners 24 and consumers being forced to perceive and/or witness the infliction of serious injury and/or 25 death to a pet. The wrongful acts and/or omissions of **PETSMART**, as herein set forth, were 26 made, adopted, approved, authorized, endorsed and/or ratified by their officers, directors or 27 managing agents, and were done maliciously, oppressively, fraudulently and/or with a willful 28 and knowing disregard of the probable dangerous consequences for the health and safety of

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP COMPLAINT

1 **PLAINTIFFS** and their community. Such action was done with malice, oppression and/or fraud 2 and was and is despicable, shocking and offensive and entitles the **PLAINTIFFS** to an award of 3 punitive damages against **PETSMART** in an amount to be determined at trial. 4 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS 5 (Against All Defendants) 15. **PLAINTIFF** re-alleges and incorporates by reference each and every paragraph 6 7 above as though fully set forth herein. 8 16. As set forth above, the action of **DEFENDANTS**, and/or each of them, was 9 outrageous and demonstrated complete disregard for **PLAINTIFF's** emotional support dog. 10 17. **DEFENDANTS**, and/or each of them, inflicted serious injury to a dog when 11 applying bows to **WINTER**, which is a routine grooming and/or styling service that 12 **DEFENDANTS**, and/or each of them, provide and for which **DEFENDANT** charged 13 PLAINTIFF additional money to have such service done. Instead of securing the bows to 14 WINTER'S fur, as is the widely known industry standard for how to apply bows to a dog's fur, 15 **DEFENDANTS**, and/or each of them, secured the bows by tightly winding a skin-colored 16 rubberband around each of WINTER'S ears, strangling the bloodflow to WINTER'S ears in a 17 manner that was concealed from her owner and which was against all industry standards of care 18 and reasonability. 19 18. **DEFENDANTS**, and/or each of them, acted with intent to cause severe, 20 emotional distress to **PLAINTIFF**, and/or acted in conscious disregard of the probability that 21 **PLAINTIFF** would suffer severe emotional distress, especially considering that **WINTER** was 22 an emotional support dog for **PLAINTIFF**. The conduct of **DEFENDANTS**, and/or each of 23 them, was so extreme as to go beyond the bounds of decency and be regarded as intolerable in a

24 civilized society.

19. As a direct and legal result of the wrongful conduct and/or omissions of
DEFENDANTS, and/or each of them, PLAINTIFF suffered, and continues to suffer, the
injuries and damages hereinabove set forth.

LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre &

MCCARTHY, LLP

28

COMPLAINT

1	20. In doing the wrongful and intentional act as herein alleged, DEFENDANTS,
2	and/or each of them, acted with oppression, fraud, and malice and with conscious and willful
3	disregard for the health, safety and general welfare and rights of PLAINTIFF. Such action was
4	done with malice, oppression and/or fraud and was and is despicable, shocking and offensive and
5	entitles PLAINTIFF to an award of punitive damages against DEFENDANTS, and/or each of
6	them, in an amount to be determined at trial.
7	VI. <u>PRAYER FOR RELIEF</u>
8	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court enter judgment in their favor on every
9	claim for relief set forth above and award them relief including, but not limited to, the following:
10	1. For general damages in an amount according to proof at trial, and beyond the
11	jurisdictional minimum of this Court;
12	2. For economic losses, in an amount according to proof at trial;
13	3. For repair, depreciation, and/or replacement of damaged, destroyed, and/or lost
14	personal property;
15	4. For interest upon any judgment entered as provided by law;
16	5. For costs of suit herein included;
17	6. For punitive/exemplary damages; and
18	7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
19	
20	Dated: July 1, 2020 COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP
21	By:
22	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
23	VII. <u>JURY DEMAND</u>
24	Plaintiff demand trial by jury on all issues so triable.
25	
26	Dated: July 1, 2020 COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP
27	By:
28	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
LAW OFFICES Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	COMPLAINT 21