

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

DAYINTA DYAH ANGGANA,
Administrator of the Estate of
NURUL DYAH AYU SITHARESMI,
Deceased,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOEING COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. _____

Hon. _____

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT AT LAW

Plaintiff DAYINTA DYAH ANGGANA (“Plaintiff”), surviving heir and personal representative of Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi, deceased, alleges as follows for her causes of action against Defendant, THE BOEING COMPANY (“Boeing”), pursuant to the Illinois Wrongful Death Act, 740 ILCS 180/1, et seq.:

THE PARTIES

1. At all times herein mentioned, the decedent Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi was an individual residing in Indonesia.
2. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff DAYINTA DYAH ANGGANA was and is an individual residing in Indonesia.
3. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant The Boeing Company was and is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its worldwide headquarters and principal place of business in Chicago, Illinois.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over the entire action by virtue of the fact that this is a civil action wherein the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the jurisdictional minimum of this Court. Additionally, this Court has specific jurisdiction over this action by virtue of the fact that Defendant Boeing's worldwide headquarters and principal place of business is in Chicago, Illinois.

5. Venue is proper in this county pursuant to section 5/2-101 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure because Defendant Boeing resides in this county, is authorized to transact business in this county and is doing business in this county.

6. To the extent applicable, Plaintiff elects to pursue all maritime claims in this Court under the Savings-to-Suitors Clause, 28 U.S.C. § 1333(1).

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

7. The 737 MAX 8 is the newest generation of Boeing's 737 series of aircraft.

8. At all relevant times herein, Boeing manufactured the 737 MAX 8 model aircraft in the United States.

9. In or around August 2018, Boeing delivered a newly manufactured 737 MAX 8 aircraft with tail number "PK-LQP" (the "subject aircraft") to Lion Air in Indonesia.

10. Prior to October 29, 2018, Defendant Boeing designed, manufactured, assembled and sold the subject aircraft and prepared, published, and provided to Lion Air information including, but not limited to, a 737 MAX 8 flight operations manual ("FOM") regarding the operation of the subject aircraft.

11. At the time the subject aircraft and its FOM left the custody and control of Defendant Boeing, they were defective and unreasonably dangerous in one or more of the

following respects, among other defects:

- a. The subject aircraft's defective anti-stall system, the maneuvering characteristics augmentation system (MCAS), caused the aircraft's nose to suddenly, without warning, drop and dive steeply, and said event could occur even while under manual control when a pilot would not reasonably expect a flight computer to override one's actions;
 - b. The scenario described in (a) above was not covered in the defective FOM, and Defendant Boeing did not disclose the foregoing or how to recover the plane from the foregoing to Lion Air pilots when Lion Air purchased the subject aircraft;
 - c. The subject aircraft received "erroneous input" from one its defective angle of attack ("AOA") sensors;
 - d. The scenario described in (c) above was not covered in the defective FOM, and Defendant Boeing did not disclose how to recover the plane from the foregoing to Lion Air pilots when Lion Air purchased the subject aircraft;
 - e. The subject aircraft and FOM lacked proper and adequate instructions and warnings regarding the design and functions of its MCAS system; and
 - f. The subject aircraft and FOM lacked proper and adequate instructions and warnings regarding how to correct a malfunctioning MCAS system.
12. On or about October 29, 2018, Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi, was a passenger on board the subject aircraft operated by Lion Air as Flight JT 610. The flight was scheduled to depart from Jakarta to Pangkal Pinang, a provincial capital of a small island in the Java Sea.
13. On the morning of Monday, October 29, 2018, the subject aircraft departed from Jakarta's Soekarno – Hatta International Airport at or around 6:21 a.m. Shortly after takeoff, the

crew contacted air traffic controllers and requested a return to Jakarta.

14. The subject aircraft received authorization to return, but it did not manage a turnaround. Witnesses saw the subject aircraft banking left, making significant altitude shifts, and then dropping sharply. According to data from flight radars, the plane was at an altitude of about 5,000 feet when its final descent began. The subject aircraft plummeted into the sea and disintegrated upon impact. The crew and passengers would have suffered unspeakable horror, pain, terror and injury as they plummeted to their deaths.

15. Since the crash, on November 7, 2018, the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) sent an emergency directive to all MAX 8 operators which detailed that pilots can stop a malfunctioning MCAS on those planes by merely pressing two buttons. The bulletin further details: “This condition, if not addressed, could cause the flight crew to have difficulty controlling the airplane, and lead to excessive nose-down attitude, significant altitude loss, and possible impact with terrain.”¹

16. As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the above-described defective and dangerous conditions in the subject aircraft which caused it to crash into the sea as described above, Plaintiff has suffered injuries in the form of unspeakable pain, suffering, loss of companionship, and loss of earnings and support, among other damages.

COUNT I
STRICT PRODUCTS LIABILITY
(Pursuant to the Illinois Wrongful Death Act, 740 ILCS 180/1, et seq.)

17. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

18. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Boeing did design, manufacture,

¹ <https://www.cnn.com/2018/11/18/americas/lion-air-boeing-safety-intl/index.html>

assemble, inspect, repair, endorse, draft, test, franchise, market, promote, advertise, supply, lease, distribute, and place into the stream of commerce the subject aircraft and FOM.

19. At the time the subject aircraft and FOM left the hands of Defendant Boeing, the subject aircraft, FOM, and the components alleged above, were defective and unsafe in manufacture, design and warnings.

20. On or about October 29, 2018, Lion Air and its officers, directors, employees, and/or agents and decedent Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi were using the subject aircraft and FOM in a reasonable and foreseeable manner. Lion Air and its officers, directors, employees, and/or agents and decedent Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi were unaware that said products were unsafe for their intended use. The defective and unsafe conditions of aforesaid products caused the subject aircraft to plummet into an uncontrollable nosedive and crash into the sea. The decedent Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi was killed as a direct and legal result of the defective and unsafe conditions of said products and the component parts thereof.

21. Defendant Boeing knew or should have known of the defects in the design and manufacture of the aforesaid products, which constitutes a hazard for those coming into contact with the aforesaid products and the component parts, and Defendant Boeing failed to notify, warn, and protect those coming into contact with the aforesaid products of the MCAS system, and such failure to warn was one of the legal causes of the incident and death of Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi.

22. The aforesaid products failed to perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected when the subject aircraft plummeted into an uncontrollable nose dive and crashed into the sea.

23. As a direct and legal result of the acts and omissions of Defendant Boeing, Plaintiff has been deprived of the love, care, society, comfort, assistance, protection, affection,

companionship, guidance, solace, services and support of said decedent, and has thereby sustained, and will continue to sustain, pecuniary loss in a sum as yet unascertained.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this Court grant judgment in its favor and against Defendant on Count I and award Plaintiff the following relief:

- (1) Award Plaintiff all damages available under the law in an amount to be determined at trial;
- (2) Award Plaintiff interest in an amount to be determined by the Court;
- (3) Award Plaintiff court costs in an amount to be determined by the Court; and
- (4) Grant such other relief as this Court deems appropriate and just.

COUNT II
NEGLIGENT PRODUCTS LIABILITY
(Pursuant to the Illinois Wrongful Death Act, 740 ILCS 180/1, et seq.)

24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

25. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Boeing so negligently, carelessly, recklessly, and with gross negligence, designed, manufactured, assembled, inspected, repaired, maintained, endorsed, drafted, tested, franchised, supplied, sold, leased, distributed, and placed into the stream of commercial the subject aircraft and FOM, and negligently failed to warn relative to the said products and the components alleged above, and otherwise so negligently conducted itself, so as to directly and legally cause the injuries and damages described herein to Plaintiff.

26. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Boeing knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, that the subject aircraft, the FOM and the components alleged above, were defectively and negligently manufactured, designed, assembled, tested, inspected, fabricated, constructed, distributed, marketed and sold. Defendant Boeing failed to take reasonable

steps to avoid exposing consumers, including Plaintiff's decedent, Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi, to the dangerous condition of such products, failed to disclose the products' known defects, failed to warn, failed to recall, failed to provide or send subsequent warnings after distribution to consumers, failed to warn Lion Air of the MCAS system, and otherwise so negligently conducted itself, so as to directly and legally cause the injuries and damages described herein to Plaintiff.

27. On or about October 29, 2018, Lion Air and its officers, directors, employees, and/or agents and decedent Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi were using the subject aircraft and FOM in a reasonable and foreseeable manner. Lion Air and its officers, directors, employees, and/or agents and decedent Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi were unaware that said products were unsafe for their intended use. The defective and unsafe conditions of the foregoing products caused the subject aircraft to fall into an uncontrollable nosedive and crash into the sea. The decedent Nurul Dyah Ayu Sitharesmi was killed as a result of the defective nature of the subject aircraft and FOM.

28. Defendant Boeing had a duty, as a designer and manufacturer of goods, to manufacture, design, inspect and test the subject aircraft and FOM to ensure they were safe for use by ordinary consumers.

29. From the time the subject aircraft and FOM were delivered to Lion Air to the time of the crash, the aforesaid products were only used for their intended purpose and were not modified, upgraded, altered, damaged, or substantially changed in any way.

30. As a direct and legal result of the acts and omissions of Defendant Boeing, Plaintiff has been deprived of the love, care, society, comfort, assistance, protection, affection, companionship, guidance, solace, services, and support of said decedent, and has thereby sustained, and will continue to sustain pecuniary loss in a sum as yet unascertained.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this Court grant judgment in its favor and against

Defendant on Count II and award Plaintiff the following relief:

- (1) Award Plaintiff all damages available under the law in an amount to be determined at trial;
- (2) Award Plaintiff interest in an amount to be determined by the Court;
- (3) Award Plaintiff court costs in an amount to be determined by the Court; and
- (4) Grant such other relief as this Court deems appropriate and just.

Dated: November 21, 2018

HART MCLAUGHLIN & ELDRIDGE, LLC

By: /s/ Steven A. Hart
 Steven A. Hart
Attorneys for Plaintiff DAYINTA DYAH
ANGGANA

Steven A. Hart
 HART MCLAUGHLIN & ELDRIDGE, LLC
 22 West Washington Street
 Suite 1600
 Chicago, IL 60602
 Phone: (312) 955-0545
 Fax: (312) 971-9243
 Firm No. 59648
 shart@hmelegal.com

Dated: November 21, 2018

KABATECK LLP

By: /s/ Brian S. Kabateck
 Brian S. Kabateck (*pro hac vice* pending)
 Christopher B. Noyes (*pro hac vice* pending)
Attorneys for Plaintiff DAYINTA DYAH
ANGGANA

Brian S. Kabateck (*pro hac vice* pending)
 Christopher B. Noyes (*pro hac vice* pending)
 KABATECK LLP
 633 West 5th Street, Suite 3200
 Los Angeles, California 90071
 Phone: (213) 217-5000
 Fax: (213) 217-5010
 bsk@kbklawyers.com
 cn@kbklawyers.com

Dated: November 21, 2018

SANJIV N. SINGH, APLC

Sanjiv N. Singh (*pro hac vice* pending)
SANJIV N. SINGH, APLC
1650 South Amphlett Blvd. Suite 220
San Mateo CA 94402
Phone: (650) 389-2255
Fax: (415) 358-4006
ssingh@sanjivnsingh.com

By: /s/ Sanjiv N. Singh
Sanjiv N. Singh (*pro hac vice* pending)
Attorneys for Plaintiff DAYINTA DYAH
ANGGANA

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

2018L012613

DAYINTA DYAH ANGGANA,
Administrator of the Estate of
NURUL DYAH AYU SITHARESMI,
Deceased,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOEING COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. _____

Hon. _____

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

AFFIDAVIT PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 222(b)

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 222(b), counsel for the above-named plaintiff certifies that Plaintiff is seeking money damages in excess of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000.00).

Dated: November 21, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

HART MCLAUGHLIN & ELDRIDGE, LLC

/s/ Steven A. Hart

One of the Attorneys for Plaintiff

Steven A. Hart
HART MCLAUGHLIN & ELDRIDGE, LLC
22 West Washington Street
Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60602
Phone: (312) 955-0545
Fax: (312) 971-9243
Firm No. 59648
shart@hmelegal.com