

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

ELIZABETH BOVA and PHILIP  
BOVA,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SUNBEAM PRODUCTS, INC.,

Defendant

CAUSE NO.

**COMPLAINT AND  
JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiffs, Elizabeth Bova and Philip Bova, by and through their counsel,  
Daniel R. Laurence of Stritmatter Kessler Koehler Moore, bring this civil action, and  
allege and state as follows:

**I. PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Elizabeth Bova resides in Bonney Lake, Pierce County,  
Washington, and is a citizen of the state of Washington.

2. Plaintiff Philip Bova resides in Bonney Lake, Pierce County, Washington,  
and is a citizen of the state of Washington.

1           3. Defendant Sunbeam Products, Inc. (“Sunbeam”) is a business entity  
2 organized and existing under the laws of the state of Delaware. At the time this action  
3 was commenced, the Principal Office Street Address of Sunbeam Products, Inc., is  
4 6655 Peachtree Dunwoody Road, Atlanta, GA 30328. Therefore, Defendant  
5 Sunbeam Products, Inc, is deemed to be a citizen of the states of Delaware and  
6 Georgia. At the time this action was commenced, Corporation Service Company,  
7 300 Deschutes Way SW, Suite 208 MC-CSC1, Tumwater, WA, 98501, was  
8 Defendant Sunbeam’s registered agent for service of process in the state of  
9 Washington. At all times pertinent to this action, Defendant Sunbeam has been  
10 registered to do business in the state of Washington under UBI number 600 370 439.  
11  
12

13                           **II.     JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14           4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a),  
15 because the parties are citizens of different states, and the amount in controversy  
16 exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

17           5. Defendant Sunbeam is subject to the *in personam* jurisdiction of this Court,  
18 because, at all times pertinent to this lawsuit, Defendant Sunbeam has done business  
19 within the state of Washington and has had continuous and systematic contacts with  
20 the state of Washington, including but not limited to the regular marketing and sale  
21 of consumer products – including but not limited to, for example, a product known  
22 as the Sunbeam Crock-Pot® 6-Quart Express Crock Multi-Cooker, Model No.  
23  
24

1 SCCPPC600-V1 [“Sunbeam CrockPot<sup>®</sup>”] – into this state, and Plaintiffs’ claims  
2 arise out of injuries caused by that product in the Western District of Washington.

3 6. Venue is proper in this federal judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
4 § 1391 (b)(2) because a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to  
5 the claim occurred in the Western District of Washington and/or pursuant to 28  
6 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(3) and (c)(2) because Defendant Sunbeam is subject to this court’s  
7 personal jurisdiction in the Western District of Washington with respect to this  
8 action, including but not limited to Pierce County, Washington.  
9

10 **III. NATURE OF THE CASE**

11 7. This civil action asserts claims for personal injuries received by Plaintiff  
12 Elizabeth Bova, when a Sunbeam Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> they purchased [“subject Pressure  
13 Cooker” or “relevant product”] designed, manufactured, branded, imported,  
14 distributed and sold by Defendant Sunbeam, malfunctioned, causing its scalding hot  
15 contents to erupt from the product and cause serious burn injuries to her.  
16

17 8. This civil action also asserts claims for personal injuries received by  
18 Plaintiff Philip Bova, when the subject Pressure Cooker malfunctioned, causing its  
19 scalding hot contents to erupt from the product and cause serious burn injuries to  
20 him.  
21

22 9. Defendant Sunbeam designed, manufactured, branded, imported,  
23 distributed, and/or sold the subject Pressure Cooker in the state of Washington.  
24



1 14. Both the plastic bottom of the subject Pressure Cooker, and one of the  
2 metal prongs of the power cord plug of the Pressure Cooker, are embossed with the  
3 code “K215JN”, which means this product was manufactured on or about the date  
4 of August 3, 2017. Photos 3 and 4 below are true and correct depictions of that  
5 embossed code on the subject Crock-Pot® Pressure Cooker:  
6



15 Photo 3



16 Photo 4

17 15. On or about November 24, 2022, while Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip  
18 Bova were using the subject Crock-Pot® Pressure Cooker in a reasonable and  
19 foreseeable way, its lid opened while the contents were under pressure. The scalding  
20 hot contents forcefully erupted, which caused Plaintiff Elizabeth Bova serious burn  
21 injuries. Photos 5 and 6 below show burns the erupting contents inflicted on her.

22 \ \ \



8 Photo 5



Photo 6

9 The Pressure Cooker also spewed its hot contents onto Plaintiff Philip Bova . Photo  
10 7 below shows burns the erupting contents inflicted on him.



18 Photo 7

19  
20 **v. ACCRUAL OF THE CAUSES OF ACTION**

21 16. Prior to the above-described eruption on November 24, 2022, Plaintiffs  
22 Elizabeth and Philip Bova had neither knowledge nor notice that there was any  
23 defect in the subject Pressure Cooker's design, manufacture, or labeling.

1 17. Prior to the above-described eruption on November 24, 2022, the Plaintiffs  
2 were unaware of any defects in the subject Pressure Cooker.

3 18. Prior to the above-described eruption on November 24, 2022, the subject  
4 Pressure Cooker had not malfunctioned.

5 19. Prior to the above-described eruption on November 24, 2022, the Plaintiffs  
6 had not suffered any injury from the use of the Pressure Cooker.

7 20. The Plaintiffs' cause of action against the Defendant Sunbeam accrued on  
8 November 24, 2022.

9  
10 **VI. “PRODUCT SELLER” AND “MANUFACTURER”**

11 21. Defendant Sunbeam is engaged in the business of selling products  
12 (including but not limited to, for example, the relevant product and other Sunbeam  
13 Crock-Pot® 6-Quart Express Crock Multi-Cookers) for resale and/or for use.

14 22. Defendant Sunbeam is a “product seller” within the meaning of RCW  
15 7.72.010(1) of the subject Pressure Cooker.

16 23. The subject Pressure Cooker, together with its packaging, warnings and/or  
17 instructions, is the “relevant product” within the meaning of RCW 7.72.010(3).

18 24. Defendant Sunbeam is a “manufacturer” within the meaning of RCW  
19 7.72.010(2) of the subject Pressure Cooker because it designed, produced, made,  
20 fabricated, constructed, or remanufactured the subject Pressure Cooker and/or  
21 component part(s) of that product, including but not limited to its User Guide, and  
22  
23  
24

1 other related packaging, warnings and/or instructions, before its sale to Plaintiffs as  
2 users and/or consumers, and/or because it holds itself out as a manufacturer of the  
3 relevant product.

4           25. The subject Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cooker was designed, manufactured,  
5 imported, introduced into interstate commerce, promoted, marketed, distributed, and  
6 sold in the state of Washington by Defendant Sunbeam directly or through third  
7 parties acting on its behalf.

8           26. On information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry and subject to  
9 discovery, Sunbeam contracted with a Chinese entity known as Jiangmen Nanguang  
10 Electrical Appliance Industrial Co., Ltd. to construct the subject Pressure Cooker for  
11 Sunbeam, to Sunbeam's specifications and requirements, and bearing Sunbeam's  
12 brand name "Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup>", a United States registered mark Sunbeam owned at the  
13 times of manufacture of the subject Pressure Cooker and its retail sale to Plaintiffs.

14           27. Neither Jiangmen Nanguang Electrical Appliance Industrial Co. Ltd. nor  
15 any other entity that may be a "manufacturer" of the subject Pressure Cooker within  
16 the meaning of RCW 7.72.010(2), with the exception of Defendant Sunbeam, is  
17 registered to do business in the state of Washington.

18           28. To the extent any entity involved in the production and/or sale of the  
19 subject Pressure Cooker did not participate in the design of that product but  
20 constructed the product in accordance with the design specifications of another  
21



1 “product seller” within the meaning of RCW 7.72.010(1), the entity is not a  
2 “manufacturer” within the meaning of RCW 7.72.010(2) for the purposes of RCW  
3 7.72.030(1)(a).

4 29. With respect to the subject Pressure Cooker, Defendant Sunbeam is a  
5 “product seller” that has the liability of a “manufacturer” within the meaning of  
6 RCW 7.72.010(2) for the purposes of RCW 7.72.030(1)(a) to Plaintiffs Elizabeth  
7 and Philip Bova because, on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry  
8 and subject to discovery:

- 9
- 10 a) No solvent manufacturer who would be liable to the Plaintiffs is subject  
11 to service of process under the laws of the state of state of Washington,  
12 which is the Plaintiffs’ domicile, RCW 7.72.040(2)(a);
- 13
- 14 b) It is highly probable that the Plaintiffs would be unable to enforce a  
15 judgment against any manufacturer, RCW 7.72.040(2)(b);
- 16
- 17 c) The product seller, Sunbeam, provided the plans or specifications for  
18 the manufacture or preparation of the product and such plans or  
19 specifications were a proximate cause of the defect in the product,  
20 RCW7.72.040(2)(d); and/or
- 21
- 22 d) The product was marketed under a trade name or brand name of the  
23 product seller, Defendant Sunbeam, RCW 7.72.040(2)(e).
- 24

1 **VII. INDUSTRY STANDARDS**

2 30. Defendant Sunbeam claims that its Crock-Pot® Pressure Cooker “has been  
3 designed with safety in mind,”<sup>1</sup> and “has various safety measures”<sup>2</sup> such as, “Once  
4 the pressure increases, the Lid cannot be opened,” and “At the end of cooking, the  
5 Lid cannot be unlocked until all the pressure is released.”<sup>3</sup>

6  
7 31. UL LLC (“UL”), formerly known as Underwriters Laboratories, is a for-  
8 profit company that, among other things, promulgates safety standards for some  
9 consumer products, performs safety tests on some such products and issues various  
10 designations such as listings and certifications to indicate conformity with its  
11 standards. UL inspects and tests consumer products, and promulgates consumer  
12 product safety standards. Those standards are widely accepted in the consumer  
13 products industry both in the United States and abroad. For example, UL's Standards  
14 Technical Panels serve as the consensus body for both American National Standards  
15 and National Standards of Canada.

16  
17 32. The subject Pressure Cooker states on its label: “UL Listed” and the  
18 information, “UL E189458 6G51”. [See Photo 2, above.]  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>1</sup> See Sunbeam Products, Inc. Crock-Pot® Express Crock Multicooker Owner’s Manual, p. 10,  
22 available at:  
[https://s7d9.scene7.com/is/content/NewellRubbermaid/DASH/S7\\_int/2020/SCCPPC600-V1-Express%20Crock%20IB.PDF](https://s7d9.scene7.com/is/content/NewellRubbermaid/DASH/S7_int/2020/SCCPPC600-V1-Express%20Crock%20IB.PDF).

23 <sup>2</sup> *Id.*

24 <sup>3</sup> *Id.*

1 33. A product seller that states the relevant product is “UL Listed” represents  
2 that UL has determined, either through its own testing or reliance on manufacturer  
3 testing, that the product meets recognized standards for safety, and is free from some  
4 foreseeable risks of electric shock or fire under some circumstances.  
5

6 34. UL Standard for Pressure Cookers, UL Standard 136 is an industry  
7 standard that applies to the Crock-Pot® 6-Quart Express Crock Multi-Cooker, Model  
8 Number SCCPPC600-V1, including but not limited to the subject Pressure Cooker.

9 35. UL Standard for Pressure Cookers, UL Standard 136, requires, in part, that  
10 when the subject Pressure Cooker is under pressure the cover [lid] should not be able  
11 to be opened by applying a rotational force of 100 pounds (445 N) or less, with the  
12 force to be applied gradually.  
13

14 36. The UL listing means, in part, that when the subject Pressure Cooker is  
15 under pressure the cover [lid] should not be able to be opened by applying a  
16 rotational force of 100 pounds (445 N) or less, with the force to be applied gradually.  
17

18 37. The UL listing means, in part, that when the subject Pressure Cooker is  
19 under pressure the cover [lid] should not open on its own.

20 38. By labeling the subject Pressure Cooker as “UL Listed”, Defendant  
21 Sunbeam represented that it complied at the time of manufacture with the UL  
22 Standard for Pressure Cookers, UL Standard 136.  
23  
24

1 39. However, the subject Pressure Cooker did *not* comply with applicable UL  
2 standards, because the lid could open on its own and/or by applying a rotational force  
3 of 100 pounds (445 N) or less while under pressure; whether because the testing  
4 failed to detect a defect in the product's design, and/or because the subject Pressure  
5 Cooker was defectively constructed.  
6

7 **VIII. NOTICE: PRIOR SIMILAR INCIDENTS**

8 40. Defendant Sunbeam, or a third party acting on its behalf, has a database of  
9 each instance in which a consumer or a retailer reported to Sunbeam that the lid of a  
10 Sunbeam Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cooker opened while the contents were under  
11 pressure.  
12

13 41. Before the subject Pressure Cooker was manufactured and/or sold, and  
14 before Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova were injured by that Pressure Cooker,  
15 Sunbeam had a database containing such reports and/or other notice of such events.

16 42. Prior to November 24, 2020, Defendant Sunbeam ignored and/or  
17 concealed from consumers and the general public Sunbeam's knowledge of the  
18 Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers' defects, and continued to generate a substantial profit  
19 from the sale of its Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers  
20

21 **IX. RECALL OF THE SUNBEAM CROCK-POT**

22 43. On November 24, 2020, Defendant Sunbeam recalled approximately  
23 914,430 of its Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> 6-Quart Express Crock Multi-Cookers, Model Number  
24

1 SCCPPC600-V1, that had been distributed in the United States, and approximately  
2 an additional 28,330 distributed in Canada, that were manufactured between the  
3 dates of July 1, 2017 and October 1, 2018.<sup>4</sup>

4 44. The CPSC stated that, as of the recall date, Defendant Sunbeam had  
5 “received 119 reports of lid detachment, resulting in 99 burn injuries ranging in  
6 severity from first-degree to third-degree burns.”<sup>5</sup>

7 45. The CPSC’s recall announcement stated, in pertinent part:

8 Hazard:

9  
10 The recalled Crock-Pot multi-cooker can pressurize when the lid is  
11 not fully locked. This can cause the lid to suddenly detach while the  
12 product is in use, posing burn risks to consumers from hot food and  
liquids ejected from the product.

13 This recall included the subject Pressure Cooker.<sup>6</sup>

14 46. Plaintiffs did not receive a recall notice. Plaintiffs were not aware of the  
15 recall before the incident that gives rise to this lawsuit occurred.

16  
17 47. The CPSC stated that the recalled Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> 6-Quart Express Crock  
18 Multi-Cookers, Model Number SCCPPC600-V1, had been sold at “Walmart, Target

19  
20  
21  
22 <sup>4</sup> [https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2020/crock-pot-6-quart-express-crock-multi-cookers-recalled-  
by-sunbeam-products-due-to-burn](https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2020/crock-pot-6-quart-express-crock-multi-cookers-recalled-by-sunbeam-products-due-to-burn).

23 <sup>5</sup> *Id.*

24 <sup>6</sup> *Id.*

1 and other retail stores nationwide and online at Amazon and other online retailers  
2 from July 2017 through November 2020 for between \$70 to \$100.”<sup>7</sup>

3 48. Even after Defendant Sunbeam knew and/or reasonably should have  
4 known of these Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cooker defects, it continued to manufacture  
5 and sell its defective Pressure Cookers to consumers, among them Plaintiffs  
6 Elizabeth and Philip Bova.  
7

8 **X. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:**  
9 **DESIGN DEFECT – RCW 7.72.030(1)(A)**

10 49. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations.

11 50. Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova used the subject Pressure Cooker for  
12 its intended purpose of preparing meals for themselves and their family and did so  
13 in a reasonable manner that was foreseeable by Defendant Sunbeam and any other  
14 manufacturer and seller of the product.

15 51. Under foreseeable use, the subject Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cooker’s lid could  
16 open while the unit was pressurized, causing its scalding hot contents and steam to  
17 erupt from the pot and onto its users and/or others nearby.  
18

19 52. Defendant Sunbeam’s Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers, including but not  
20 limited to the subject Pressure Cooker, have design defects that make them  
21

22  
23  
24 <sup>7</sup> *Id.*

1 unreasonably dangerous for their intended use by consumers. Specifically, because  
2 of those defects:

- 3 a) The lid of the subject Pressure Cooker can open while the unit remains  
4 pressurized.
- 5 b) The lid of the subject Pressure Cooker can be incorrectly placed on the  
6 product, and the product will operate as if the lid were correctly placed  
7 on the product, heat, and pressurize, even though the lid was not in the  
8 fully locked position.
- 9 c) The subject Pressure Cooker was designed in such a way that the lid  
10 could be opened by applying a rotational force of 100 pounds (445 N)  
11 or less, with the force to be applied gradually while still under pressure,  
12 causing scalding hot contents to erupt from the pot when opened;
- 13 d) The subject Pressure Cooker was designed in such a way that the  
14 product could indicate that the contents were not under pressure, when  
15 in fact they were under pressure, causing scalding hot contents to erupt  
16 from the pot when the lid was opened;
- 17 e) The subject Pressure Cooker was designed in such a way that the lid of  
18 the product could be placed on the product in an incorrect position, or  
19 not fully engaged, the product would not recognize the incorrect  
20 placement of the lid, and would operate as if the lid were properly  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 positioned, allowing the lid to spontaneously detach, or be opened with  
2 little effort, causing scalding hot contents to erupt from the pot when  
3 the lid was opened;

4 f) The subject Pressure Cooker did not comply with UL Standard 136;

5 g) The subject Pressure Cooker's instructions and warnings did not warn  
6 that in spite of the various features incorporated into the product the lid  
7 could be opened when the contents were under pressure;

8 h) The subject Pressure Cooker's Owner's Guide states, "Once the  
9 pressure increases, the Lid cannot be opened,"<sup>8</sup> although that statement  
10 is not true because the lid could be opened under pressure , causing  
11 scalding hot contents to erupt from the pot when the lid was opened;  
12 and/or

13 i) The subject Pressure Cooker was designed in such a way that Steam  
14 Release Valve and/or the Bobber Valve, both intended safety features,  
15 intended to seal in pressure while cooking and allow the release of  
16 pressure upon finishing cooking, as well as to discourage the user from  
17 opening the lid when the device was under pressure by steam was  
18  
19  
20  
21

---

22 <sup>8</sup> See Sunbeam Products, Inc. Crock-Pot® Express Crock Multicooker Owner's Manual, p. 10,  
23 available at:  
24 [https://s7d9.scene7.com/is/content/NewellRubbermaid/DASH/S7\\_int/2020/SCCPPC600-V1-Express%20Crock%20IB.PDF](https://s7d9.scene7.com/is/content/NewellRubbermaid/DASH/S7_int/2020/SCCPPC600-V1-Express%20Crock%20IB.PDF).



1 emitting through those valves, was or were not effective or sufficient,  
2 and so allowed the lid to be opened when the Pressure Cooker was  
3 pressurized, and causing scalding hot contents to erupt from the subject  
4 Pressure Cooker when the lid was opened under normal and foreseeable  
5 use.

6  
7 j) The subject Pressure Cooker was designed and sold to Plaintiffs  
8 without a visible, reliable accurate and redundant mechanical or  
9 electronic indicator that would assure the user that the vessel's pressure  
10 had been reduced to a level at which the user could safely open the  
11 Pressure Cooker Lid without relying solely on whether steam was not  
12 escaping from the Steam Release Valve and/or the Bobber Valve.

13  
14 53. At the time of manufacture, the likelihood that the subject Pressure Cooker  
15 would cause Plaintiff Elizabeth and Philip Bova's injuries or similar harms, and the  
16 seriousness of those harms, outweighed the burden on Defendant Sunbeam and any  
17 other manufacturer of the subject Pressure Cooker to design a similar product that  
18 would have prevented those harms without a materially adverse effect that an  
19 alternative design that was practical and feasible would have on the usefulness of  
20 that product.

21  
22 54. Defendant Sunbeam knew or reasonably should have known (assuming  
23 Sunbeam had adequately designed and/or tested the subject Pressure Cooker) that:  
24

- 1 a) the lid could be opened when the subject Pressure  
2 Cooker is still under pressure;
- 3 b) the safety devices were inadequate to prevent the lid  
4 from being opened when subject Pressure Cooker is  
5 still pressurized;
- 6  
7 c) the safety devices of subject Pressure Cooker, at times,  
8 would indicate that there is no pressure in the subject  
9 Pressure Cooker, when in fact there is pressure in the  
10 pot;
- 11  
12 d) that the lid could be put on incorrectly, and the product  
13 would operate, heat, and pressurize, while the lid is not  
14 in the fully locked position; and,
- 15  
16 e) that when the lid of the subject Pressure Cooker is  
17 opened under pressure, steam and the contents could  
18 erupt from the pot and cause severe scalding injuries to  
19 the consumer opening the subject Pressure Cooker, and  
20 anyone near it.

21 55. The subject Pressure Cooker at the time of its manufacture and thereafter  
22 was dangerous to an extent beyond which would be contemplated by the ordinary  
23 consumer for the reasons identified above.

1 56. Economical and safer alternative designs were available at the time of the  
2 subject Pressure Cooker's manufacture that could have prevented the defects  
3 identified above.

4 57. Economical and safer alternative designs were available at the time of the  
5 subject Pressure Cooker's manufacture that could have prevented the defect  
6 identified above.  
7

8 **XI. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:**  
9 **CONSTRUCTION DEFECT – RCW 7.72.030(2)(A)**

10 58. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations.

11 59. The Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova used the subject Pressure Cooker  
12 for its intended purpose of preparing meals for themselves and their family and did  
13 so in a reasonable manner that was foreseeable by Defendant Sunbeam.

14 60. However, even if the subject Pressure Cooker was not defective in design,  
15 it was, in the alternative, defectively constructed, because, on the basis of  
16 information and belief formed after reasonable investigation and subject to  
17 discovery, that Pressure Cooker deviated in some material way from the design  
18 specifications and/or performance standards of the manufacturer, and/or deviated in  
19 some material way from otherwise identical units of the same product line. The  
20 deviation(s) included, but may not have been limited to, the subject Pressure  
21 Cooker's failure to comply with UL Standard 136.  
22  
23  
24

1           61. The construction defect in the subject Pressure Cooker failed to prevent  
2 the lid from opening while the unit remained pressurized, during the ordinary,  
3 foreseeable, and proper use of cooking food, placing the Plaintiffs, any other  
4 potential users of subject Pressure Cooker, and consumers of similar Sunbeam  
5 CrockPot® Pressure Cookers in unreasonable danger while using them, and causing  
6 Plaintiffs' injuries and damages.  
7

8           62. The construction defects in Defendant Sunbeam's Crock-Pot® Pressure  
9 Cookers, including but not limited to the subject Pressure Cooker, make them unsafe  
10 to an extent beyond that which would be contemplated by the ordinary consumer;  
11 specifically, because the product will open under normal and foreseeable use while  
12 pressurized.  
13

14                           **XII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:**  
15                           **FAILURE TO WARN AND/OR INSTRUCT - RCW 7.72.030(1)(B)**

16           63. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations.

17           64. Defendant Sunbeam failed to provide Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova  
18 adequate warnings or instructions with the subject Pressure Cooker. At the time of  
19 manufacture, the likelihood that the product would cause Plaintiffs' harms or similar  
20 harms, and the seriousness of those harms, rendered the warnings or instructions of  
21 the manufacturer inadequate and the manufacturer could have provided the warnings  
22 or instructions that would have been adequate; specifically, specifically conspicuous  
23 notice, in advertising, on the exterior and interior packaging and in the instructions  
24

1 provided with the Pressure Cooker, and on the Pressure Cooker itself, stating that  
2 that the lid could be placed incorrectly on the product and nevertheless the pot could  
3 pressurize and that the lid could open under pressure so as to scald or burn users, the  
4 conditions under which those dangers could occur and the means to avoid them.

5  
6 65. Neither Defendant Sunbeam nor the subject Pressure Cooker, its  
7 packaging or instructions warned Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova that the lid  
8 could be opened when the cooker's contents were under pressure, and that serious  
9 injury could result from opening it under pressure;

10  
11 66. Neither Defendant Sunbeam nor the subject Pressure Cooker, its  
12 packaging or instructions warned Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova that even if  
13 steam was not escaping from the Steam Release Valve or the Bobber Valve,  
14 suggesting as described in the Pressure Cooker's User Guide that the pressure had  
15 been released, the cooker's contents may still be under pressure, and that serious  
16 injury could result from opening the lid under pressure.

17  
18 67. Defendant Sunbeam's marketing, instructions, warnings, and packaging,  
19 misrepresented the subject Pressure Cooker's safety characteristics and the inability  
20 of the lid to open when the subject Pressure Cooker's contents were under pressure,  
21 because in fact the lid could open under pressure under normal and foreseeable use.

22 \\ \\  
23  
24

1                                   **XIII. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:**  
2                                   **POST-MANUFACTURE FAILURE TO WARN - RCW 7.72.030(1)(C)**

3                   68. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations.

4                   69. Even after Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known of the Crock-  
5 Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cooker defects and danger described above, it failed to warn its  
6 consumers, among them Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova, of the serious risks  
7 posed by these defects. Defendant Sunbeam failed to provide Plaintiffs adequate  
8 warnings or instructions after the product was manufactured even if Defendant  
9 Sunbeam learned and/or a reasonably prudent manufacturer should have learned  
10 about the above-described defects and resulting danger *after* the subject Pressure  
11 Cooker was manufactured. Under those circumstances, Defendant Sunbeam was  
12 under a duty to act with regard to issuing warnings or instructions concerning the  
13 danger in the manner that a reasonably prudent manufacturer would act in the same  
14 or similar circumstances. This duty was not satisfied because Defendant Sunbeam  
15 failed to exercise reasonable care to inform product users, including Plaintiffs  
16 Elizabeth and Philip Bova, of the defects and resulting danger described above.

17                                   **XIV. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: ORDINARY NEGLIGENCE**

18                   70. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations.

19                   71. Defendant Sunbeam had a duty of reasonable care to Plaintiffs not to sell  
20 consumer products that Sunbeam knew or reasonably should have known to be  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 unreasonably dangerous; whether those products were defective within the meaning  
2 of Chapter 7.72 RCW or not.

3 72. Despite Defendant Sunbeam’s claims of “safety”, it imported, distributed,  
4 and sold to consumers, either directly itself, or through third-parties, Crock-Pot®  
5 Pressure Cookers that presented unreasonable and significant risks of causing burns  
6 to their users, and that in fact caused burns to some of their users. Specifically, these  
7 defects caused the lid of at least some of those Pressure Cookers to open while the  
8 product was under pressure, with the contents heated in excess of 100°C [212°F],  
9 and steam inside the unit. When the lid opens or is removed under such  
10 circumstances, the pressure within the unit causes the scalding hot contents to erupt  
11 from the unit and into the surrounding area, including onto persons nearby.  
12

13  
14 73. Defendant Sunbeam knew or reasonably knew that the subject Pressure  
15 Cooker was dangerous before the pressure cooker was sold to Plaintiffs.

16 74. After Defendant received notice and/or actual knowledge that Sunbeam  
17 CrockPot® products were being opened when the device was under pressure  
18 Defendant Sunbeam:

- 19
- 20 a) Failed to prevent the sale of the subject Pressure Cooker to Plaintiffs.
  - 21 b) Failed to stop selling the products until after the design defect could be  
22 solved;
- 23

- 1 c) Failed to stop selling the products until after any construction defect
- 2 issue could be solved;
- 3 d) Failed to stop selling the products until after proper warnings and
- 4 instructions could be disseminated to product owners;
- 5 e) Failed to recall timely and effectively the products sold to consumers
- 6 and/or remaining in retail inventory; and
- 7 f) Failed to exercise reasonable diligence in locating owners of the
- 8 products.
- 9

10 75. Defendant Sunbeam received revenue from the distribution transaction(s)

11 resulting in sale of the subject Pressure Cooker to Plaintiffs.

12

13 76. Defendant Sunbeam had duties to Plaintiffs to notify them timely of the

14 hazards and defects associated with that product and described above, and/or, if

15 Sunbeam were to recall the product, then to do so using reasonable care.

16 77. On information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, and subject to

17 discovery, Defendant Sunbeam breached its duties of care to Plaintiffs by failing to

18 exercise reasonable diligence to identify them as the purchasers of the subject

19 Pressure Cooker, and to notify them timely of the hazards and defects associated

20 with that product and described above and of Sunbeam's recall.

21

22 \\ \

23

24





1 b) complied with applicable UL Standard 136, when those products did  
2 not.

3 83. Defendant Sunbeam's unfair and deceptive acts and practices occurred in  
4 trade and commerce.

5  
6 84. Defendant Sunbeam's unfair and deceptive acts and practices affect the  
7 public interest as demonstrated by the hazards the Sunbeam Crock-Pot® 6-Quart  
8 Express Crock Multi-Cooker, Model Number SCCPPC600-V1 presented to its users,  
9 the injuries it caused many of them, and the product recall described above.

10 85. Defendant Sunbeam's unfair and deceptive acts and practices were causes  
11 in fact and legal causes of Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova to suffer injury to  
12 their property in the form of the cost of the defective subject Pressure Cooker, the  
13 fact that it can no longer be used, and their medical expenses caused by the injuries  
14 that product inflicted upon them.

15  
16 **XVI. PUNITIVE DAMAGES**

17 86. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations.

18 87. The misconduct of Defendant Sunbeam, as set forth in this complaint,  
19 demonstrates a callous, reckless, and willful, indifference to the health, safety and  
20 welfare of consumers and users of the Sunbeam Crock-Pot® 6-Quart Express Crock  
21 Multi-Cooker, Model Number SCCPPC600-V1, including but not limited to  
22  
23  
24

1 Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova and others similarly injured by that make and  
2 model product.

3 88. Defendant Sunbeam's representations about "safety" are not just  
4 misleading, they are false, wrong, deceptive, and put innocent consumers like the  
5 Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova directly in harm's way and at risk of serious  
6 injury.  
7

8 89. Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known that its Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup>  
9 Pressure Cookers possessed defects that posed a serious safety risk to the Plaintiffs,  
10 and other users of these products.  
11

12 90. After Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known of these defects it  
13 failed to timely and effectively announce its recall of these dangerous and defective  
14 Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers.

15 91. Even after Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known of these  
16 defects, and the risk of serious burn injuries to Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cooker users,  
17 Sunbeam prioritized profit over the safety of consumers, and continued to distribute  
18 and profit from sale of these products.  
19

20 92. Defendant Sunbeam ignored and concealed its knowledge of these defects  
21 in its Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers from consumers, the United States Consumer  
22 Product Safety Commission [CPSC], and the public in general, and in fact not only  
23 emphasized to the public that its Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers were useful, but  
24

1 assured the public these Pressure Cookers were safe, in order to continue to profit  
2 from their sale. On Defendant Sunbeam’s internet website in the years 2019 and  
3 2020, the company claimed, “Through cutting-edge innovation and intelligent  
4 design . . . [f]or over 100 years, Sunbeam has been simplifying the lives of everyday  
5 people.”<sup>9</sup>  
6

7 93. Defendant Sunbeam warranted, marketed, advertised, and sold its Crock-  
8 Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers as “an all-in-one appliance that’s always ready when you  
9 are,”<sup>10</sup> allowing consumers to cook “instant, healthy, home-cooked dish in under an  
10 hour. . . .”<sup>11</sup>  
11

12 94. According to the Owner’s Manual accompanying each unit sold, the  
13 Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure Cookers purport to be designed with “safety in mind and has  
14 various safety measures.”<sup>12</sup>  
15

16 95. For instance, Defendant Sunbeam claims that its Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Pressure  
17 Cookers include “safety sensors”<sup>13</sup> to keep the lid from being opened while the unit  
18  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>9</sup> <https://www.newellbrands.com/our-brands/sunbeam/> (June 9, 2019 and Sept 25, 2020).

22 <sup>10</sup> <https://www.crock-pot.com/pressure-and-multi-cookers/multi-cookers/express-crock/crock-pot-6-quart-express-crock-pressure-cooker/SCCPPC600-V1.html/> (May 24, 2020).

23 <sup>11</sup> *Id.*

24 <sup>12</sup> Sunbeam Products, Inc. Crock-Pot<sup>®</sup> Express Crock Multicooker Owner’s Manual, *Supra.*, p. 10.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

1 is under pressure; “Pressure will not build if the Lid is not shut correctly and has not  
2 sealed”<sup>14</sup>; and, “Once the pressure increases, the Lid cannot be opened.”<sup>15</sup>

3 96. In addition to the “safety measures” listed in the manual, Defendant  
4 Sunbeam’s Crock-Pot® website claimed that consumers “cook with confidence”  
5 because the “Airtight locking lid stays sealed under pressure for added safety.”<sup>16</sup>  
6

7 97. The Plaintiffs used the subject Pressure Cooker with the reasonable  
8 expectation that it was properly designed and manufactured, free from defects of any  
9 kind, and that it was safe for its intended, foreseeable use of cooking.

10 98. Defendant Sunbeam’s actions and omissions as described above  
11 demonstrate that the foregoing representations were fraudulent, and Defendant  
12 Sunbeam’s callous, reckless, and willful indifference to the health, safety and  
13 welfare of the Plaintiffs and consumers like them.  
14

15 99. Defendant Sunbeam is liable to Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bova for  
16 punitive damages under the laws of the State of Delaware.

17 **XVII. PLAINTIFFS’ INJURIES AND DAMAGES**

18 100. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing allegations.  
19  
20  
21

---

22 <sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*

23 <sup>16</sup> <https://www.crock-pot.com/pressure-and-multi-cookers/multi-cookers/express-crock/crock-pot-6-quart-express-crock-pressure-cooker-black-stainless/SCCPPC600-V1-DS.html/>  
24 (September 23, 2020).

1           101. Defendant Sunbeam’s wrongful acts and the defects in the subject  
2 Pressure Cooker described above were individually and in combination causes in  
3 fact and legal causes of Plaintiffs Elizabeth and Philip Bovas’ serious bodily injuries  
4 and other economic and non-economic harms and damages, including, but not  
5 limited to:  
6

7           (a) Severe burns to Elizabeth Bova’s face, neck, chest,  
8           breasts, right hand, left shoulder, and left arm;

9           (b) Severe burns to Philip Bova’s right arm;

10           (c) Physical and mental pain, suffering, and anguish, past and  
11           future;

12           (d) Emotional distress, past and future;

13           (e) Health care expenses, past and future;

14           (f) Lost household services, past and future;

15           (g) Lost enjoyment of life, past and future;

16           (h) Disfigurement, past and future;

17           (i) Disability, past and future;

18           (j) Loss of spousal consortium, past and future;

19           (k) Actual and treble damages for Plaintiffs’ actual damages  
20           resulting from injury to Plaintiff’s property. and costs of  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to  
2 Chapter 19.86 RCW; and

3 (l) Punitive damages under Delaware law.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Elizabeth Bova and Philip Bova demand judgment  
6 against Defendant Sunbeam Products, Inc., in an amount to be determined by a jury,  
7 to include:  
8

- 9 a) the monetary value of their special and general damages;  
10 b) treble damages pursuant to RCW 19.86.090;  
11 c) punitive damages pursuant to Delaware law;  
12 d) prejudgment interest to the extent allowed by applicable law;  
13 e) post-judgment interest;  
14 f) taxable costs, and  
15 g) reasonable attorney fees to the extent allowed by Washington law; and  
16 h) All other relief available under the law to fully compensate the  
17 Plaintiffs for their injuries and damages.  
18

19 **PLAINTIFFS DEMAND A TRIAL BY JURY**

20  
21 \ \ \

22 \ \ \

23 \ \ \

1 DATED this 7th day of March, 2024.

2 STRITMATTER KESSLER KOEHLER MOORE

3 By: s/ Daniel R. Laurence

4 Daniel R. Laurence, WSBA #19697

5 3600 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. West, Ste. 300

6 Seattle, WA 98119

7 Telephone (206) 448-1777

8 Facsimile: (206) 728-2131

9 Email: dan@stritmatter.com

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*