UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

JAMES BOYLE,	§				
	§				
Plaintiff,					
	§				
ν.	§				
	§				
BLACK & DECKER (U.S.) INC. and THE	§				
BLACK & DECKER CORPORATION,	§				
	§				
Defendants	8				

Case No.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff JAMES BOYLE hereby files the instant Complaint against Defendants BLACK & DECKER (U.S.) INC. and THE BLACK & DECKER CORPORATION and states as follows:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff James Boyle is a citizen and resident of Illinois, who lives at 15367 Natalie Drive. Oak Forest, Illinois 60452.

2. Defendant Black and Decker (U.S.) Inc. is a Maryland corporation maintaining its principal place of business at 701 E. Joppa Road, Towson, Maryland 21286.

3. Defendant The Black & Decker Corporation is a Maryland corporation maintaining its principal place of business at 701 E. Joppa Road, Towson, Maryland 21286.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1332. The amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs. The Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, at all relevant times, they designed, manufactured, sold, distributed, promoted and place into the stream of commerce in Illinois numerous power tools including table saws. Defendants also conducted business in the State of

Case: 1:15-cv-03219 Document #: 1 Filed: 04/10/15 Page 2 of 6 PageID #:2

Illinois and the causes of action asserted herein arose from and are connected to purposeful acts taken by Defendants in Illinois. Defendants' contacts with Illinois were continuous and systematic. Venue is proper in this Court because Plaintiff resides in this District and the incident that is the basis of this Complaint occurred in this District.

FACTS

5. This suit arises out of the serious and permanent personal injuries suffered by Plaintiff due to the wrongful conduct of Defendants in designing, manufacturing, distributing and selling a DeWalt table saw, Model DW745, serial number 201026-CT064907 (the "DeWalt Saw").

6. For many years technology has been available that would have eliminated or reduced Plaintiff's injury. Such technology, known as SawStop, stops the spinning saw blade almost instantly upon contact with human skin.

7. In or around November 2000, at a meeting of the Power Tool Institute ("PTI") of which Defendants were members, Defendants were made aware of flesh-sensing technology that stops a spinning table saw blade almost instantly upon contact with human skin. At the time of the meeting, Stephen Gass, the inventor of the SawStop technology, offered to make the technology available to Defendants through a licensing agreement. The technology was feasible for incorporation into the DeWalt Saw.

8. Defendants, and other table saw manufacturers, failed to pursue a license of the available SawStop technology or to incorporate similar technology into the DeWalt Saw. As a result, the DeWalt Saw had no flesh-detecting technology or other similar technology that would stop a spinning saw blade upon contact with human skin. Because it lacked such technology, the DeWalt Saw was unreasonably dangerous as designed and manufactured.

Case: 1:15-cv-03219 Document #: 1 Filed: 04/10/15 Page 3 of 6 PageID #:3

9. On or about April 12, 2015, while using the DeWalt Saw in the reasonable, foreseeable and intended manner, Plaintiff suffered severe and permanent personal injuries caused by contact between his left thumb and the saw's rotating blade. At the time of his injury, Plaintiff was acting reasonably and was exercising all due care for his own safety.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION -- STRICT PRODUCT LIABILITY

10. Plaintiff re-alleges Paragraphs 1 through 9 and incorporates them herein by reference.

11. Defendants are liable under the theory of product liability as set forth in §§402A and 402B of the Restatement of Torts 2d. Defendants at all times material hereto engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, assembling, selling, marketing, and/or supplying the DeWalt Saw. The DeWalt Saw was in a defective condition at the time that it was designed, manufactured, sold, and/or marketed by Defendants and at the time it left Defendants' possession. The DeWalt Saw was expected to and reached Plaintiff without any substantial change in its condition and the DeWalt Saw was in the possession of Defendants at the time the defect occurred.

12. The condition of the DeWalt Saw made it unreasonably dangerous for its intended use. Plaintiff was a user of the DeWalt Saw and was unaware of the defect and used the DeWalt Saw in a reasonable, foreseeable and intended manner. The injury suffered by Plaintiff was the exact type of injury that can be caused by a defective table saw.

13. The DeWalt Saw failed to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer, such as Plaintiff, would expect when used in an intended or reasonably foreseeable manner. The benefits of the design of the DeWalt Saw do not outweigh the risk of danger inherent in such design.

Case: 1:15-cv-03219 Document #: 1 Filed: 04/10/15 Page 4 of 6 PageID #:4

Moreover, Defendants could have provided a safer alternative design into the DeWalt Saw. Such a safer alternative design existed at the time the DeWalt Saw was manufactured, and it would not have substantially impaired the DeWalt Saw's utility. Such safer alternative design was economically and technologically feasible at the time the product left the control of Defendants by the application of existing or reasonably achievable scientific knowledge. The DeWalt Saw's defective design was a proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries and damages.

14. The defective condition of the DeWalt Saw was a legal cause and proximate cause of Plaintiff's injury and of his resulting physical pain, mental anguish, physical disfigurement, physical impairment, medical care and treatment, lost wages and loss of his ability to engage in usual and normal activities.

15. For these reasons, Defendants are strictly liable under Illinois product liability law without regard to proof of negligence or gross negligence.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION -- NEGLIGENCE

16. Plaintiff re-alleges the consistent allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 9 and incorporates them herein by reference.

17. Defendants had a duty to exercise reasonable care in the design, manufacture, marketing, testing, approval, application for approval, inspection, sale and distribution of the DeWalt Saw into the stream of commerce.

18. Defendants failed to exercise ordinary, and deviated from the then-existing standards of care, in the design, manufacture, marketing, testing, inspection, sale and/or distribution of the DeWalt Saw into interstate commerce. Thus, Defendants were negligent in all of these areas.

Case: 1:15-cv-03219 Document #: 1 Filed: 04/10/15 Page 5 of 6 PageID #:5

19. As a direct and proximate cause of the failure to exercise due care and of the breach of the standard of care, the plaintiff was injured as described with particularity above and suffered physical pain, mental anguish, physical disfigurement, physical impairment, medical care and treatment, lost wages and the loss of his ability to engage in usual and normal activities.

20. Had Defendants exercised due care and complied with the standard of care, the Plaintiff would not have been injured as set forth above.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION -- BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF FITNESS

21. Plaintiff re-alleges the consistent allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 9 and incorporates them herein by reference.

22. Defendants had reason to know that the particular purpose for which the DeWalt Saw was to be used. Defendants had reason to know that the buyer or supplier was relying on the skill and judgment of Defendants to select or furnish suitable products. The product supplied by Defendants was unfit for the particular purpose for which it was purchased. This lack of fitness for the product's purpose was a legal cause and proximate cause of Plaintiff's injury and of his resulting physical pain, mental anguish, physical disfigurement, physical impairment, medical care and treatment, lost wages and loss of his ability to engage in usual and normal activities. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff for breach of the implied warranty of fitness.

DAMAGES

23. The wrongful acts of Defendants set forth above were a legal cause of Plaintiff's injuries and damages. Plaintiff seeks all actual damages available under Illinois law including, without limitation: (a) damages for physical pain, mental anguish, physical disfigurement, and physical impairment; (b) damages for medical care and treatment; (c) damages for lost wages;

Case: 1:15-cv-03219 Document #: 1 Filed: 04/10/15 Page 6 of 6 PageID #:6

and (d) damages for Plaintiff's ability to engage in usual and normal activities; and (e) other damages as provided by law.

31. All conditions precedent to Plaintiff's recovery under the foregoing claims have

been performed, have occurred or have been excused.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the Court enter judgment against Defendants for the damages set forth herein as well as pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs of suit and that the Court grant Plaintiff such other and further relief to which she may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Eric D. Pearson Eric D. Pearson, Esq. Illinois ARDC No. 6315124 **HEYGOOD, ORR & PEARSON** 2331 West Northwest Highway, 2nd Floor Dallas, TX 75220 Telephone No.: (214) 237-9001 Facsimile No.: (214) 237-9002

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

Admissions pro hac vice will be sought for:

SULLIVAN & SULLIVAN LLP

Richard Sullivan Ernest Palazzolo 83 Walnut Street Wellesley, MA 02481 Telephone: 781-263-9400 Facsimile: 781-239-1360

Case: 1:15-cv-03219 Document #: 1-1 Filed: 04/10/15 Page 1 of 1 PageID #:7

JS 44 (Rev. 3/13)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and provided by local rules of court purpose of initiating the civil do	 This form, approved by the J 	Judicial Conference	ce of the Uni	ited States in September 1	e of pleadings 974, is require	or other papers a ed for the use of t	s required by law, except as he Clerk of Court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS				
JAMES BOYLE				BLACK & DECKER (U.S.) INC. and THE BLACK & DECKER CORPORATION				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Cook, IL (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Baltimore, MD (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, 2	Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Known)				
	leygood Orr & Pears nd Floor, Dallas, TX		V.					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One	e Box Only)	III. CIT	ZENSHIP OF PRI	NCIPAL I	PARTIES (Pla	ce an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
1 U.S. Government 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State \checkmark 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State					
2 U.S. Government Defendant	✓ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Pa	arties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 2	Incorporated and Pr of Business In A		
				en or Subject of a preign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT								
CONTRACT	TORTS			ORFEITURE/PENAL/TY	1	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 345 Marine Product 355 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Droduct Liability 9 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 9 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ A445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment 0 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other 0 448 Education	PERSONAL INJ 365 Personal Injur Product Liabi 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutica Personal Injury Product Liabil 368 Asbestos Pers Injury Produc Liability PERSONAL PROF 370 Other Persona 370 Other Persona 370 Other Persona 385 Property Dam Product Liabil RISONER PETIT 510 Motions to Va Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditi 560 Civil Rights	y - lity 69 y lity onal t PERTY 7, ing 7,	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other LABOR LABOR LABOR Labor Standards Act Act Labor/Management Relations Act Act Act Act Other Labor Litigation Definition Security Act IMMIGRATION Security Act IMMIGRATION So Naturalization Application So Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) So Other Immigration Actions	 820 Copyri 830 Patent 840 Trader 840 Trader 861 HIA (1 862 Black 863 DIWC 864 SSID 7 865 RSI (4 870 Taxes or Def 871 IRS— 26 US 	rawal C 157 TY RIGHTS ights nark SECURITY (395 ff) Lung (923) /DIWW (405(g)) Fitle XVI 05(g)) LTAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff" fendant)	 375 False Claims Act 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 897 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 	
I Original Proceeding Z Ren Stat VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO write a brief statement of cause.) 28 U.S.C. Section 1332; Plaintiff was inj	e Court Appellate N (Enter U.S. Civil Statute under	e Court which you are filing	g and Use a	Anot (spece)	tcy Matte	Litigation rs (For nature of su		
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:□CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			DN D	EMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Z Yes No				
IX. RELATED CASE(S IF ANY	(See instructions):	IDGE		۰. ۲	DOCKET	NUMBER		
X. This case (check one box)	Is not a refiling of a previou	usly dismissed action	on 🗆	is a refiling of case number		previously dismisse	ed by Judge	
DATE 04/10/2015	SI	GNATURE OF A	TTORNEY O	of record /s/ Eric	c D. Pe	earson		