JS 44 (Rev 09/11)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil coversheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States inSeptember 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM)

the civil docker sheet. (best title							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS WAITZ, KEVIN and WAITZ, KAREN, H/W				DEFENDANTS DEWALT INDUSTRIAL TOOL COMPANY and HOME DEPOT, USA INC.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Monroe (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Baltimore (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys <i>(Firm Name, A</i> Richard A. Wolfe, Esquire Suite 22, Jenkintown, PA	dddress, and Telephone Number) e, Saffren & Weinberg, 19046 (215) 576-010	815 Greenwood A	Avenue,	Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff) and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			en of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government		o of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2	Another State	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	<u> </u>	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			1 FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 00 Other	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans		Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability		LABOR	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
(Excl Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice	PERSONAL PROPE 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damag Product Liability	g	10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl Ret Inc	☐ 861 HJA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act ☐ 896 Arbitration	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation☐ 220 Foreclosure☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment☐ 240 Torts to Land☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	CIVIL RIGHTS 1 440 Other Civil Rights 1 441 Voting 1 442 Employment 1 443 Housing/ Accommodations	PRISONER PETITIC □ 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpus: □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty	ate	Security Act IMMIGRATION	FEDERAL TAX SUTS 870 Taxes (U S Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 540 Mandamus & O ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Conditio ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	n 🗇 4	62 Naturalization Application 63 Habcas Corpus - Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) 65 Other Immigration Actions		:	
ĎX1 Original □ 2 Ro		Remanded from Appellate Court			ferred from G 6 Multidistrict Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	ntute under which you	are filing	(Do not cite jurisdictional st			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER FRCP 23				DEMANDS ÖVER \$75,000	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint. JURY DEMAND: Yes X No		
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions). JUDGE				DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 5 1013 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF A	ATTORNEY	7 OF RECORD			
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG JU	JDGE	

Case 2:12-cv-02681-HB Document 1 Filed 05/16/12 Page 2 of 14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. 35 East Barren Road, East Stroudsburg, PA 18302 Address of Plaintiff: 701 East Joppa Rd., Baltimore, MD 21286; 2455 Paces Ferry Road, NJ, Atlanta, Ga Address of Defendant: East Stroudsburg, PA Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? No Yes□ (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) NoXI Yes□ Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Date Terminated: Case Number: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes□ terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Not Yes□ CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: I. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2.

Airplane Personal Injury 2 D FELA 3.

Assault, Defamation 3.

Jones Act-Personal Injury 4.

Marine Personal Injury 4.

Antitrust 5.

Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. D Patent 6. D Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 6. D Labor-Management Relations 7. E Products Liability 7. D Civil Rights 8. □ Products Liability - Asbestos 8. □ Habeas Corpus 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11.

All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) RICHARD A. WOLFE , counsel of record do hereby certify: Evaluant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(e)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: 5/16/12 78944 Attorney I.D.# Attorńcy-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. 5/16/12 DATE: 78**9**44 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

Case 2:12-cv-02681-HB Document 1 Filed 05/16/12 Page 3 of 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA - DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. 35 East Barren Road, East Stroudsburg, PA 18302 Address of Plaintiff: 701 East Joppa Rd., Baltimore, MD 21286; 2455 Paces Ferry Road, NJ, Atlanta, Ga Address of Defendant: East Stroudsburg, PA Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) NoX Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? Yes□ RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Judge Case Number: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? ycs□ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously No₫ terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? No CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: 1.

Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1.

Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. D Airplane Personal Injury 2. D FELA 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury 3.

Assault, Defamation 4. □ Marine Personal Injury 4. □ Antitrust 5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5.
Patent 6.

Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 7. E Products Liability 7.

Civil Rights 8.

Products Liability — Asbestos 8.

Habeas Corpus 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 9. D Securities Act(s) Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. D All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) RICHARD A. WOLFE , counsel of record do hereby certify: A Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought DATE: 5/16/12 78944 Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: 5/16/12 78944 Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

KEVIN WAITZ, ET AL	:	CIVIL ACTION				
v. DEWALT INDUSTRIAL TOOL	COMPANY, ET AL:	NO.				
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant s the plaintiff and all other par	I Justice Expense and Delay Reductionse Management Track Designation Force a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 event that a defendant does not agree shall, with its first appearance, submittries, a Case Management Track Designation of the case should be assigned.	rm in all civil cases at the time or of the plan set forth on the reverse with the plaintiff regarding said to the clerk of court and serve or	f e d n			
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CASE MANAGEMEN	T TRACKS:				
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.						
commonly referred to as	Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) three complex and that need special or inteside of this form for a detailed explana	nse management by)			
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.						
5/16/12	Richard A. Wolfe, Esquire	Plaintiffs	_			
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for				
215-576-0100	215-576-6288	rwolfe@saffwein.com				
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address				

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

KEVIN WAITZ AND KAREN WAITZ, h/w

35 East Barren Road

East Stroudsburg, PA 18302

Plaintiff,

ntitt,

vs. : CIVIL ACTION NO.

DEWALT INDUSTRIAL TOOL COMPANY

701 East Joppa Road

Baltimore, MD 21286

and

HOME DEPOT, USA INC.

2455 Paces Ferry Road, N.W.

Atlanta, GA 30339

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs, Kevin Waitz and Karen Waitz, by and through their Attorney, Richard A. Wolfe, Esquire, hereby files this Complaint against Defendants, DeWalt Industrial Tool Company and Home Depot, USA, Inc. and in support thereof, avers as follows:

PARTIES

- Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, is an adult individual residing at 35 East Barren Road, East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania and is the spouse of Plaintiff, Karen Waitz.
- 2. Plaintiff, Karen Waitz, is an adult individual residing at 35 East Barren Road, East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania and is the spouse of Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz.
- 3. Defendant, DeWalt Industrial Tool Company (hereinafter referred to as "DeWalt"). is a Maryland Corporation regularly doing business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania engaged in the marketing, manufacturing, distribution, packaging, fabricating, designing and sales of tools and industrial supplies regularly doing business in Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania with an

office for service at 701 East Joppa Road in Baltimore, Maryland.

4. Defendant, Home Depot, USA, Inc. (hereinafter "Home Depot") is a Delaware corporation, existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania engaged in the retail sale, marketing, distribution, packaging and manufacture of home improvement, tools and construction supplies regularly doing business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with a principal place of business located at 2455 Paces Ferry Road, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30339.

JURISDICTION

5. Jurisdiction is proper in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because the parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 6. Based upon information and belief, Defendant, DeWalt, designed, fabricated, modified, marketed, packaged, assembled tested and otherwise placed into the stream of commerce a 3" DeWalt Carbon Crimp Cup Brush.
- 7. Based upon information and belief, Defendant, Home Depot, marketed, advertised, sold, fabricated, packaged, distributed and otherwise placed into the stream of commerce the 3" DeWalt Carbon Crimp Cup Brush.
- 8. Defendant, DeWalt, designed, fabricated, modified, assembled tested and otherwise placed into the stream of commerce the metal/carbon wire bristles and mounting unit that comprised the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush.
- 9. On or about August 24, 2010 Plaintiff purchased the afore-described Carbon Crimp Cup Brush from Home Depot in at 150 Pocono Commons in Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania.
 - 10. On or about September 18, 2010, Plaintiff affixed the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush to a

DeWalt Heavy Duty Small Angle Grinder. Upon properly attaching the Cup Brush to the grinder Plaintiff turned on the machine whereupon one or more of the wire bristles of the Cup Brush dislodged from the cup and struck Plaintiff in the left eye piercing through the eye globe, retina and lens causing severe and permanent injuries to Plaintiff.

- 11. As a result of the negligence more fully described herein, Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, suffered grievous and life-threatening injuries including but not limited to the following: loss of vision, damage to his retina and lens and scarring; injuries to the nerves; headaches; physical trauma associated with and flowing from the above referenced injuries; emotional and psychological trauma associated with and flowing from the above-referenced injuries; severe shock to his nerves and nervous system; which injuries have caused him pain and suffering in the past and may continue to do in the future; which injuries have prevented him and may continue to prevent him from attending to his daily and usual duties; which injuries have required him to expend money for medicine and/or medical attention in an attempt to treat, cure and care for himself, injured as aforesaid; all of which has been and continues to be to his great damage and loss.
- 12. As a result of the injuries aforesaid Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, has undergone emergency and follow-up hospitalization and surgery for treatment of his injuries and may continue to require periodic hospitalization for an indefinite period of time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 13. As a result of the injuries aforesaid Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, has undergone great pain and suffering, disfigurement, limitations of use of bodily movement and functions, limitation of the ability to pursue normal occupational and social activities as well as further manifestations of suffering, some or all of which are not yet apparent.

- 14. As a result of the injuries aforesaid Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, has required therapy, both at outpatient facilities and at home and may continue to require said therapy and rehabilitation for an indefinite period of time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 15. As a result of the injuries aforesaid Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, has suffered financial setbacks, including loss of income, due to lost time from employment which financial setbacks and income losses will continue for an indefinite period of time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 16. On the date and at the time of the accident described herein-above, Plaintiff was operating the afore-described Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and grinder in a safe and reasonably foreseeable manner.

COUNT I Kevin Waitz v. DeWalt Industrial Tool Company (Strict Liability)

- 17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1. through16. as though the same were fully set forth herein.
- 18. Solely as a result of the defective and unreasonably dangerous design and manufacture of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and its Component parts as set forth in this Civil Action, the Plaintiff has sustained and will sustain the injuries and damages set forth herein, and is therefore entitled to damages under the Restatement (Second) of Torts, section 402 A and 402 B.
- 19. Defendant, DeWalt, designed, packaged, fabricated, modeled, remodeled, manufactured and distributed the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush, valves and component parts or were responsible for the manufacture and distribution thereof.
 - 20. Defendant, DeWalt's, Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and component parts contained

design defects at the time it left said Defendants' control, which defects rendered said Unit in an unreasonably dangerous, defective and unsafe condition at the time when it reached the Plaintiff.

- 21. Defendant, DeWalt's, Carbon Crimp Cup Brush, and component parts contained inadequate warnings at the time it left Defendant, DeWalt's, control, which defects rendered said unit in an unreasonably dangerous, defective and unsafe condition at the time when it reached the Plaintiff.
- 22. Defendant, DeWalt's, Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and component parts were sold and/or distributed by Defendant, DeWalt, to Plaintiff in a defective condition, which condition created a danger to intended users thereof.
- 23. The Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and component parts were designed, remodeled, manufactured and sold in a defective and dangerous manner in that it:
 - a. Failed to properly affix the bristles onto the mounting unit;
 - b. Failed to contain a safety guard so as to prevent the aforesaid accident;
 - c. Failed to contain instructions so that it could be used safely in a reasonably foreseeable manner;
 - d. Failed to contain conspicuous and adequate warnings;
 - e. Failed to contain safety features in that it could not be used in a safe and reasonably foreseeable manner;
 - f. Failed to contain adequate packaging and brochures containing warnings on the product, and otherwise warning the Plaintiffs of further actions necessary on their part to insure the safety of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush; and
 - g. Failing to comply with various codes standards, regulations, statutes and industry norms;
 - h. Failed to contain a conspicuous warning; and

- i. Was sold in defective and dangerous manner in that it was sold with unsecured bristles.
- 24. Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, was an intended user of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush.
- 25. Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, was injured while using the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush in a reasonable manner and for a purpose reasonably anticipated and foreseeable by Defendants.
- 26. The defective condition of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and its component parts were the proximate cause of Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz's injuries and losses.
- 27. The defective condition of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs' injuries and losses.
- 28. As a result of the tortuous activity herein-above described Defendant, DeWalt, is strictly liable to Plaintiff for his injuries.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, respectfully prays this Honorable Court to enter judgment in his favor, against Defendant, DeWalt Industrial Tool Company, jointly, severally and/or singularly in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00) and requests compensatory damages from each.

COUNT II Kevin Waitz v. Home Depot, USA, Inc. (Strict Liability)

- 29. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1. through 28. as though the same were fully set forth herein.
- 30. Solely as a result of the defective and unreasonably dangerous design, manufacture, sale and distribution of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and its Component parts as set forth in this Civil Action, the Plaintiff has sustained and will sustain the injuries and damages set forth herein, and is therefore entitled to damages under the Restatement (Second) of Torts, section 402 A and

402 B.

- 31. Defendant, Home Depot, packaged, displayed, fabricated, marketed, advertised, sold and distributed the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and component parts or were responsible for the packaging, displaying, marketing, sale, advertisement and distribution thereof.
- 32. The DeWalt Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and component parts sold by Defendant, Home Depot contained design defects at the time it left said Defendant, Home Depot's control, which defects rendered said Unit in an unreasonably dangerous, defective and unsafe condition at the time when it reached the Plaintiff.
- 33. The DeWalt Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and component parts sold by Defendant, Home Depot, contained design defects at the time it left Defendant, Home Depot's, control, which defects rendered said Unit in an unreasonably dangerous, defective and unsafe condition at the time when it reached the Plaintiff.
- 34. Defendant, DeWalt's, Carbon Crimp Cup Brush was sold and/or distributed and/or provided by Defendant, Home Depot, to Plaintiff in a defective condition, which condition created a danger to intended users thereof.
- 35. The Carbon Crimp Cup Brush was fabricated, displayed, packaged, designed, remodeled, manufactured and sold in a defective and dangerous manner in that it:
 - a. Failed to properly affix the bristles onto the mounting unit;
 - b. Failed to contain a safety guard so as to prevent the aforesaid accident;
 - c. Failed to contain instructions so that it could be used safely in a reasonably foreseeable manner;
 - d. Failed to contain conspicuous and adequate warnings;
 - e. Failed to contain safety features in that it could not be used in a safe and

reasonably foreseeable manner;

- f. Failed to contain adequate packaging and brochures containing warnings on the product, and otherwise warning the Plaintiffs of further actions necessary on their part to insure the safety of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush; and
- g. Failing to comply with various codes standards, regulations, statutes and industry norms;
- h. Failed to contain a conspicuous warning; and
- i. Was sold in defective and dangerous manner in that it was sold with unsecured bristles.
- 36. Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, was an intended user of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush.
- 37. Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, was injured while using the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush in a reasonable manner and for a purpose reasonably anticipated and foreseeable by Defendants.
- 38. The defective condition of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush and its component parts were the proximate cause of Plaintiffs' injuries and losses.
- 39. The defective condition of the Carbon Crimp Cup Brush was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs' injuries and losses.
- 40. As a result of the tortuous activity hereinabove described Defendant, Home Depot, is strictly liable to Plaintiff for his injuries.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, respectfully prays this Honorable Court to enter judgment in his favor, against Defendant, Home Depot, USA, Inc., jointly, severally and/or singularly in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00) and requests compensatory damages from each.

COUNT III Kevin Waitz v. DeWalt Industrial Tool Company (Breach of Warranty)

- 41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1. through 40. as though the same were fully set forth herein.
- 42. Defendant, DeWalt, breached the implied warranty of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.
 - 43. Defendant, DeWalt, breached the implied warranty of safety for intended use.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, respectfully prays this Honorable Court to enter judgment in his favor, against Defendant, DeWalt Industrial Tool Company, jointly, severally and/or singularly in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00) and requests compensatory damages from each.

COUNT IV Kevin Waitz v. Home Depot, USA, Inc. (Breach of Warranty)

- 44. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1. through 43. as though the same were fully set forth herein.
- 45. Defendant, Home Depot, breached the implied warranty of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.
- 46. Defendant, Home Depot, breached the implied warranty of safety for intended use. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, respectfully prays this Honorable Court to enter judgment in his favor, against Defendant, Home Depot, USA, Inc. jointly, severally and/or singularly in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00) and requests compensatory damages from each.

COUNT V

Karen Waitz v. DeWalt Industrial Tool Company and Home Depot, USA, Inc. (Loss of Consortium)

- 47. Plaintiff, Karen Waitz, incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1. through 46. as though the same were fully set forth herein.
- 48. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff, Karen Waitz, was the wife of Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz, and was lawfully entitled to the society, companionship, services and consortium of Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz.
- 49. As a direct and proximate result of the breach of Warranty and Strict Liability of Defendants, DeWalt Industrial Tool Company and/or Home Depot, jointly, severally and/or individually Plaintiff Karen Waitz suffered a loss of the society, companionship, services and consortium of Plaintiff, Kevin Waitz.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Karen Waitz, respectfully prays this Honorable Court to enter judgment in her favor, against Defendants, DeWalt Industrial Tool Company and/or Home Depot, USA, Inc. jointly, severally and/or singularly in an amount in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00) and requests compensatory damages from each.

Respectfully submitted,

SAFFREN & WEINBERG

Bv

RICHARD A. WOLFE, ESQ. (PA I.D. No. 78944)

815 Greenwood Avenue, Suite 22

Jenkintown, PA 19046

215-576-0100 - phone

215-576-6288 - fax

<u>rwolfe@saffwein.com</u> - email

Attorney for Plaintiffs,

Kevin Waitz and Karen Waitz

Dated: May 16, 2012