

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA**

SHALLENA SPILLMAN, an individual,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Case No.
	:	
SUNBEAM PRODUCTS, INC.,	:	
a foreign for-profit corporation authorized to do	:	
business and doing business within the	:	
State of Florida,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, by and through her attorneys, **JOHNSON BECKER, PLLC**, upon information and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Defendant Sunbeam Products, Inc. (hereinafter generally referred to as “Defendant Sunbeam”) designs, manufactures, markets, imports, distributes and sells a wide-range of consumer products, including the subject “Crock-Pot Express Crock Multicooker,” which specifically includes the Model Number SCCPPC 600-V1 (referred to hereafter as “Pressure Cooker(s)”).

2. Defendant Sunbeam touts that its Pressure Cookers are designed with “safety in mind,”¹ which include supposed “safety measures”² such as “safety sensors”³ that purport to keep the lid from being opened while the unit is under pressure.

¹
² *Id.*

Join the hundreds of people holding manufacturers accountable for defective and unsafe pressure cookers by asserting your pressure cooker personal injury claim.

Pressure cooker manufacturers market their products as a quick, healthy and safe way to cook. However, the reality is that many of the pressure cookers on the market have serious design flaws that can lead to severe malfunctions. These malfunctions can cause steam and scalding hot liquids and food to explode out of the pressure cooker, burning the user and anyone nearby.

The pressure cooker litigation team at Johnson Becker is experienced at holding manufacturers responsible for defective products. Over the last four years, Johnson Becker has represented over 500 people in more than 40 states who have been burned by exploding pressure cookers. In addition, we have handled pressure cooker cases against virtually all of the major name-brand manufacturers.

Each pressure cooker lawsuit is dependent on its own unique facts, but our firm continues to successfully file lawsuits against the manufacturers of defective pressure cookers and obtain settlements for our clients. We believe that holding manufacturers responsible for our clients' injuries not only helps our clients, but prevents future injuries by forcing manufacturers to evaluate and improve the safety of their products.

What Our Clients Say About Us . . .

“Johnson Becker was so helpful and easy to work with. They were always immediately available to answer my questions and they kept me up to date every step of the way. All the staff were extremely compassionate and professional. If you need a firm to handle your litigation, I highly recommend Johnson Becker.” -*Sandy F.*

“My experience with Johnson and Becker especially working with Mr Adam and Mr Mike has been beyond explainable. They are an amazing team. Mr Adam has been in touch with me throughout the whole process, never left me wondering. This law firm has worked with me to get the best results and . . . everything they said they would do, they did it. I would highly recommend them to anyone who needs a great law firm.” -*Brenika L.*

“The service we received from Adam Kress and his team was outstanding. We came away feeling like we had a new friend. Our biggest surprise was that this company not only works on getting money for their clients, they actually care about getting unsafe products off the market. Thanks Johnson and Becker for making us feel like we helped make the world a little safer!” -*Ken C.*

Meet Our Pressure Cooker Attorneys:

Combined, they have over 55 years of experience holding manufacturers accountable when they choose to put profits over safety.


Michael Johnson

is a founding partner of Johnson Becker and the Co-Chair of its Consumer Products and Mass Tort Departments. Michael exclusively represents individuals across the country injured by defective and dangerous products, with an emphasis on consumer goods. Michael has battled major product manufacturers at trial, in the appellate courts, and all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.



Kenneth Pearson

is a partner at Johnson Becker. A graduate of Harvard Law School, Ken began his career representing product manufacturers. He now draws on that experience to exclusively represent individuals seeking recovery for product-related personal injuries in state and federal courts nationwide.



Adam Kress

began his career at Johnson Becker in 2013, and has exclusively represented plaintiffs in product liability, personal injury and wrongful death claims. Adam co-chairs the firm's Consumer Products Department.



3. Despite Defendant Sunbeam’s claims of “safety,” it designed, manufactured, marketed, imported, distributed and sold, both directly and through third-party retailers, a product that suffers from serious and dangerous defects. Said defects cause significant risk of bodily harm and injury to its consumers.

4. Specifically, said defects manifest themselves when, despite Defendant Sunbeam’s statements, the lid of the Pressure Cooker is removable with built-up pressure, heat and steam still inside the unit. When the lid is removed under such circumstances, the pressure trapped within the unit causes the scalding hot contents to be projected from the unit and into the surrounding area, including onto the unsuspecting consumers, their families and other bystanders. The Plaintiff in this case was able to remove the lid while the Pressure Cooker retained pressure, causing her serious and substantial bodily injuries and damages including, but not limited to, 2nd degree burns to her chest, face, neck and upper extremities.

5. Moreover, on November 24, 2020, the Consumer Products Safety Commission (“CPSC”) announced a recall of more than 900,000 of Defendant Sunbeam’s SCCPPC600-V1 pressure cookers, which includes the subject pressure cooker, after receiving “**119 reports of lid detachment, resulting in 99 burn injuries ranging in severity from first-degree to third-degree burns.**”⁴

6. Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known of these defects but has nevertheless put profit ahead of safety by continuing to sell its Pressure Cookers to consumers, failing to warn said consumers of the serious risks posed by the defects, and failing to recall the

³ *Id.*

⁴ See the CPSC Recall notice from November 24, 2020 (<https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2020/crock-pot-6-quart-express-crock-multi-cookers-recalled-by-sunbeam-products-due-to-burn#>), a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

dangerously defective Pressure Cookers regardless of the risk of significant injuries to Plaintiff and consumers like her.

7. Defendant Sunbeam ignored and/or concealed its knowledge of these defects in its Pressure Cookers from the Plaintiff in this case, as well as the public in general, in order to continue generating a profit from the sale of said Pressure Cookers, demonstrating a callous, reckless, willful, depraved indifference to the health, safety and welfare of Plaintiff and consumers like her.

8. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Sunbeam's conduct, the Plaintiff in this case incurred significant and painful bodily injuries, medical expenses, physical pain, mental anguish, and diminished enjoyment of life.

PLAINTIFF SHALLENA SPILLMAN

9. Plaintiff Shallena Spillman is a resident and citizen of the city of Lebanon, County of Wilson, State of Tennessee. At the time of the incident, Plaintiff was a resident and citizen of the city of Detroit, County of Wayne, State of Michigan

10. On or about May 10, 2018, Plaintiff purchased a new Pressure Cooker, Model No. SCCPPC 600-V1.

11. On or about January 26, 2018, Plaintiff suffered serious and substantial burn injuries as the direct and proximate result of the Pressure Cooker's lid being able to be rotated and opened while the Pressure Cooker was still under pressure, during the normal, directed use of the Pressure Cooker, allowing its scalding hot contents to be forcefully ejected from the Pressure Cooker and onto Plaintiff. The incident occurred as a result of the failure of the Pressure Cooker's supposed "safety measures," which purport to keep the consumer safe while using the

Pressure Cooker. In addition, the incident occurred as the result of Defendant Sunbeam's failure to redesign the Pressure Cooker, despite the existence of economical, safer alternative designs.

DEFENDANT SUNBEAM PRODUCTS, INC.

12. Defendant Sunbeam designs, manufacturers, markets, imports, distributes and sells a variety of consumer products⁵ including pressure cookers, toasters, panini makers, and mixers, amongst others.

13. Defendant Sunbeam claims that through its "cutting-edge innovation and intelligent design"⁶ it has been "simplifying the lives of everyday people"⁷ for "over 100 years".⁸

14. Defendant Sunbeam is a Delaware Corporation with its registered place of business at 1293 North University Drive, #322 City of Coral Springs, Broward County, Florida 33071, and its principal place of business located at 2381 Executive Center Drive, Boca Raton, Florida 33431.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Sunbeam pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 48.193 in that Defendant Sunbeam operates, conducts, engages in, or carries on a business or business venture within this State, and/or committed a tortious act within this State.

16. Venue in this Court is pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 47.011 in that Defendant Sunbeam resides in Palm Beach County.

17. The amount in controversy exceeds the sum of fifteen thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars, exclusive of interest and costs.

⁵ See generally, <https://www.sunbeam.com/> (last accessed December 11, 2020).

⁶ See, <https://www.newellbrands.com/our-brands/sunbeam> (last accessed December 11, 2020).

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

18. Defendant Sunbeam is engaged in the business of designing, manufacturing, warranting, marketing, importing, distributing and selling the Pressure Cookers at issue in this litigation.

19. Defendant Sunbeam aggressively warrants, markets, advertises and sells its Pressure Cookers as “an all-in-one appliance that’s always ready when you are,”⁹ allowing consumers to cook “instant, healthy, home-cooked dish in under an hour.”¹⁰

20. According to the Owner’s Manual¹¹ accompanying each individual unit sold, the Pressure Cookers purport to be designed with “safety in mind and has various safety measures.”¹²

21. For instances, the Defendant Sunbeam claims that it’s pressure cookers include “safety sensors”¹³ to keep the lid from being opened while the unit is under pressure; that “[p]ressure will not build if the Lid is not shut correctly and has not sealed”¹⁴; and that “[o]nce the pressure increases, the Lid cannot be opened.”¹⁵

22. In addition to the “safety measures” listed in the manual, Defendant Sunbeam’s Crock-Pot website claims that consumers can “cook with confidence” because the “airtight locking lid remains locked while pressure is inside the unit.”¹⁶

⁹ See <https://www.crock-pot.com/multi-cookers/express-crock/crock-pot-6-quart-express-crock-multi-cooker/SCCPPC600-V1.html> (last accessed December 11, 2020).

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ See Sunbeam Products, Inc. Crock-Pot Express Crock Multicooker Owner’s Manual (“Exhibit A”), pg. 10.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ See <https://www.crock-pot.com/multi-cookers/express-crock/crock-pot-6-quart-express-crock-multi-cooker/SCCPPC600-V1.html> (last accessed December 11, 2020).

23. On November 24, 2020, the Consumer Products Safety Commission (“CPSC”) announced a recall of more than 900,000 of Defendant Sunbeam’s SCCPPC600-V1 pressure cookers, which includes the subject pressure cooker, after receiving “**119 reports of lid detachment, resulting in 99 burn injuries ranging in severity from first-degree to third-degree burns.**”¹⁷

24. By reason of the forgoing acts or omissions, the above-named Plaintiff and/or her family purchased their Pressure Cooker with the reasonable expectation that it was properly designed and manufactured, free from defects of any kind, and that it was safe for its intended, foreseeable use of cooking.

25. Plaintiff used her Pressure Cooker for its intended purpose of preparing meals for herself and/or family and did so in a manner that was reasonable and foreseeable by Defendant Sunbeam.

26. However, the aforementioned Pressure Cooker was defectively designed and manufactured by Defendant Sunbeam in that it failed to properly function as to prevent the lid from being removed with normal force while the unit remained pressurized, despite the appearance that all the pressure had been released, during the ordinary, foreseeable and proper use of cooking food with the product; placing the Plaintiff, her family, and similar consumers in danger while using the Pressure Cookers.

27. Defendant Sunbeam’s Pressure Cookers possess defects that make them unreasonably dangerous for their intended use by consumers because the lid can be rotated and opened while the unit remains pressurized.

¹⁷ See Exhibit B.

28. Further, Defendant Sunbeam's representations about "safety" are not just misleading, they are flatly wrong, and put innocent consumers like Plaintiff directly in harm's way.

29. Economic, safer alternative designs were available that could have prevented the Pressure Cooker's lid from being rotated and opened while pressurized.

30. Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known that its Pressure Cookers possessed defects that pose a serious safety risk to Plaintiff and the public. Nevertheless, Defendant Sunbeam continues to ignore and/or conceal its knowledge of the Pressure Cookers' defects from the general public and continues to generate a substantial profit from the sale of its Pressure Cookers, demonstrating a callous, reckless, willful, depraved indifference to the health, safety and welfare of Plaintiff and consumers like her.

31. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Sunbeam's intentional concealment of such defects, its failure to warn consumers of such defects, its negligent misrepresentations, its failure to remove a product with such defects from the stream of commerce, and its negligent design of such products, Plaintiff used an unreasonably dangerous Pressure Cooker, which resulted in significant and painful bodily injuries upon Plaintiff's simple removal of the lid of the Pressure Cooker.

32. Consequently, the Plaintiff in this case seeks compensatory damages resulting from the use of Defendant Sunbeam's Pressure Cooker as described above, which has caused the Plaintiff to suffer from serious bodily injuries, medical expenses, physical pain, mental anguish, diminished enjoyment of life, and other damages.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I **STRICT LIABILITY**

33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

34. At the time of Plaintiff's injuries, Defendant Sunbeam's Pressure Cookers were defective and unreasonably dangerous for use by foreseeable consumers, including Plaintiff.

35. Defendant Sunbeam's Pressure Cookers were in the same or substantially similar condition as when they left the possession of Defendant Sunbeam.

36. Plaintiff did not misuse or materially alter the Pressure Cooker.

37. The Pressure Cookers did not perform as safely as an ordinary consumer would have expected them to perform when used in a reasonably foreseeable way.

38. Further, a reasonable person would conclude that the possibility and seriousness of harm outweighs the burden or cost of making the Pressure Cookers safe. Specifically:

- a. The Pressure Cookers designed, manufactured, sold, and supplied by Defendant Sunbeam were defectively designed and placed into the stream of commerce in a defective and unreasonably dangerous condition for consumers;
- b. The seriousness of the potential burn injuries resulting from the product drastically outweighs any benefit that could be derived from its normal, intended use;
- c. Defendant Sunbeam failed to properly market, design, manufacture, distribute, supply, and sell the Pressure Cookers, despite having extensive knowledge that the aforementioned injuries could and did occur;
- d. Defendant Sunbeam failed to warn and place adequate warnings and instructions on the Pressure Cookers;
- e. Defendant Sunbeam failed to adequately test the Pressure Cookers; and

f. Defendant Sunbeam failed to market an economically feasible alternative design, despite the existence of the aforementioned economical, safer alternatives, that could have prevented the Plaintiff' injuries and damages.

39. Defendant Sunbeam's actions and omissions were the direct and proximate cause of the Plaintiff's injuries and damages.

40. Defendant Sunbeam risked the safety and well-being of the consumers and users of its Pressure Cookers, including the Plaintiff to this action, with the knowledge of the safety and efficacy problems and suppressed this knowledge from the public. Defendant Sunbeam made conscious decisions not to redesign, warn or inform the unsuspecting consuming public.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant Sunbeam for damages, together with interest, costs of suit, attorneys' fees, and all such other relief as the Court deems proper.

COUNT II
NEGLIGENCE

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

42. Defendant Sunbeam has a duty of reasonable care to design, manufacture, market, and sell non-defective Pressure Cookers that are reasonably safe for their intended uses by consumers, such as Plaintiff and her family.

43. Defendant Sunbeam failed to exercise ordinary care in the manufacture, sale, warnings, quality assurance, quality control, distribution, advertising, promotion, sale and marketing of its Pressure Cookers in that Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known that said Pressure Cookers created a high risk of unreasonable harm to the Plaintiff and consumers alike.

44. Defendant Sunbeam was negligent in the design, manufacture, advertising, warning, marketing and sale of its Pressure Cookers in that, among other things, it:

- a. Failed to use due care in designing and manufacturing the Pressure Cookers to avoid the aforementioned risks to individuals;
- b. Placed an unsafe product into the stream of commerce;
- c. Aggressively over-promoted and marketed its Pressure Cookers through television, social media, and other advertising outlets; and
- d. Were otherwise careless or negligent.

45. Despite the fact that Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known that consumers were able to remove the lid while the Pressure Cookers were still pressurized, Defendant Sunbeam continued to market (and continues to do so) its Pressure Cookers to the general public.

46. Defendant Sunbeam risked the safety and well-being of the consumers and users of its Pressure Cookers, including the Plaintiff to this action, with the knowledge of the safety and efficacy problems and suppressed this knowledge from the public. Defendant Sunbeam made conscious decisions not to redesign, warn or inform the unsuspecting consuming public.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant Sunbeam for damages, together with interest, costs of suit, attorneys' fees, and all such other relief as the Court deems proper.

COUNT III
STRICT LIABILITY - DESIGN DEFECT

47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully at length herein.

48. Defendant Sunbeam is the manufacturer, seller, distributor, marketer, and supplier of the subject Pressure Cookers, which were negligently designed.

49. Defendant Sunbeam failed to exercise reasonable care in designing, developing, manufacturing, inspecting, testing, packaging, selling, distributing, labeling, marketing, and promoting its Pressure Cookers, which were defective and presented an unreasonable risk of harm to consumers, such as the Plaintiff.

50. As a result, the subject Pressure Cookers, including Plaintiff's Pressure Cooker, contain defects in their design which render them unreasonably dangerous to consumers, such as the Plaintiff, when used as intended or as reasonably foreseeable to Defendant Sunbeam. The defect in the design allows consumers such as Plaintiff to open the lid while the unit remains pressurized, despite the appearance that all the pressure has been released from the unit, and causes an unreasonable increased risk of injury, including, but not limited to, first, second and third-degree scald burns.

51. Plaintiff in this case used her Pressure Cooker in a reasonably foreseeable manner and did so as substantially intended by Defendant Sunbeam.

52. The subject Pressure Cooker was not materially altered or modified after being manufactured by Defendant Sunbeam and before being used by Plaintiff.

53. The design defects allowing the lid to open while the unit was still pressurized directly rendered the Pressure Cookers defective and were the direct and proximate result of Defendant Sunbeam's negligence and failure to use reasonable care in designing, testing, manufacturing, and promoting the Pressure Cookers.

54. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Sunbeam's negligent design of its Pressure Cookers, the Plaintiff in this case suffered injuries and damages described herein.

55. Despite the fact that Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known that the Plaintiff and consumers like her were able to remove the lid while the Pressure Cookers were

still pressurized, Defendant Sunbeam continued to market its Pressure Cookers to the general public (and continues to do so).

56. Defendant Sunbeam risked the safety and well-being of the consumers and users of its Pressure Cookers, including the Plaintiff to this action, with the knowledge of the safety and efficacy problems and suppressed this knowledge from the public. Defendant Sunbeam made conscious decisions not to redesign, warn or inform the unsuspecting consuming public.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant Sunbeam for damages, together with interest, costs of suit, attorneys' fees, and all such other relief as the Court deems proper.

COUNT IV
STRICT LIABILITY - FAILURE TO WARN

57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each preceding and succeeding paragraph as though set forth fully herein.

58. At the time in which the Pressure Cooker was purchased, up through the time Plaintiff was injured, Defendant Sunbeam knew or had reason to know that its Pressure Cookers were dangerous and created an unreasonable risk of harm to consumers.

59. Defendant Sunbeam had a duty to exercise reasonable care to warn consumers of the dangerous conditions or the facts that made its Pressure Cookers likely to be dangerous.

60. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Sunbeam's failure to warn of the dangers of its Pressure Cookers, the Plaintiff in this case suffered injuries and damages described herein.

61. Despite the fact that Defendant Sunbeam knew or should have known that consumers were able to remove the lid while the Pressure Cookers were still pressurized, Defendant Sunbeam continued to market its Pressure Cookers to the general public (and

continues to do so).

62. Defendant Sunbeam risked the safety and well-being of the consumers and users of its Pressure Cookers, including the Plaintiff to this action, with the knowledge of the safety and efficacy problems and suppressed this knowledge from the public. Defendant Sunbeam made conscious decisions not to redesign, warn or inform the unsuspecting consuming public.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant Sunbeam for damages, together with interest, costs of suit, attorneys' fees, and all such other relief as the Court deems proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands that all issues of fact of this case be tried to a properly impaneled jury to the extent permitted under the law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendant Sunbeam for damages, including exemplary damages if applicable, to which they entitled by law, as well as all costs of this action, interest and attorneys' fees, to the full extent of the law, whether arising under the common law and/or statutory law, including:

- a. judgment for Plaintiff and against Defendant Sunbeam;
- b. damages to compensate Plaintiff for her injuries, economic losses and pain and suffering sustained as a result of the use of the Defendant Sunbeam's Pressure Cookers;
- c. pre and post judgment interest at the lawful rate;
- d. a trial by jury on all issues of the case;
- e. an award of attorneys' fees; and
- f. for any other relief as this Court may deem equitable and just, or that may be available under the law of another forum to the extent the law of another forum is

applied, including but not limited to all reliefs prayed for in this Complaint and in the foregoing Prayer for Relief.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHNSON BECKER, PLLC

Date: December 14, 2020

/s/ Lisa A. Gorshe, Esq.

Lisa A. Gorshe, Esq. (FL #122180)

Michael K. Johnson, Esq. (MN ID #0258696)

Pro Hac Vice to be filed

Kenneth W. Pearson, Esq. (MN ID #016088X)

Pro Hac Vice to be filed

Adam J. Kress, Esq. (MN #0397289)

Pro Hac Vice to be filed

444 Cedar Street, Suite 1800

(612) 436-1800 / (612) 436-1801 (fax)

lgorsche@johnsonbecker.com

mjohnson@johnsonbecker.com

kpearson@johnsonbecker.com

akress@johnsonbecker.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff