

1 Donald S. Burris (SBN 68523)  
2 BURRIS & SCHOENBERG, LLP  
3 12121 Wilshire Boulevard  
4 Suite 504  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90025  
6 Tel: (310) 442-5559  
7 Fax: (310) 442-0353  
8 don@bslaw.net

Eugene Y. Turin (*pro hac vice to be filed*)  
McGuire Law, P.C.  
55 W. Wacker Dr., 9th Fl.  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Tel: (312) 893-7002 Ex. 3  
Fax: 312-275-7895  
eturin@mcgpc.com

9 *Counsel for Plaintiff and the Putative Class Members*

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARY O’RIORDAN, individually and ) Case No.  
on behalf of similarly situated )  
individuals ) **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**  
)  
Plaintiff, ) **1. Violation of the Magnusson-**  
) **Moss Warranty Act**  
) **2. Breach of Express Warranty**  
v. ) **3. Violation of State Consumer**  
) **Protection Laws**  
HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA, a ) **4. Unjust Enrichment**  
California corporation, )  
) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**  
)  
Defendant. )  
)  
)

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Mary O’Riordan bring this Class Action Complaint against Defendant, Hyundai Motor America (“Hyundai” or “Defendant”) on behalf of a class of other individuals who purchased Hyundai’s vehicles that had a serious defect in the vehicle’s wheels that resulted in unsightly discoloration, delamination, and peeling of the wheel surface. Despite knowledge of this defect,

1 Defendant has failed to acknowledge its existence and provide a remedy to its  
2 customers. For her class action complaint, Plaintiff alleges as follows based on  
3 personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences, and as to all  
4 other matters, on information and belief, including an investigation by her  
5 attorneys.

6 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

7 1. This case concerns Hyundai's manufacturing and sale of vehicles that  
8 had severely defective wheels. The defect on the vehicles at issue caused the wheel  
9 surface to delaminate and peel, resulting in an unsightly appearance and affects  
10 vehicle value. Defendant has failed to disclose that the defect existed at the time  
11 the vehicles were sold and has since refused to repair the defective wheels.

12 2. Like the other members of the putative Class, Plaintiff purchased a  
13 Hyundai vehicle with the wheel defect. After just three years of ownership, Plaintiff  
14 observed significant damage to the wheels on her vehicle as a result of the wheel  
15 defect and contacted one of Defendant's dealerships to have the defect repaired.  
16 However, consistent with Defendant's common practice for the vehicles with the  
17 wheel defect at issue, Plaintiff was declined any relief, even though Defendant was  
18 aware of the problem through numerous other identical complaints by vehicle  
19 owners.

20 3. Defendant's conduct in manufacturing and selling vehicles with  
21 defective wheels and refusing to repair the defect when presented with the problem  
22 is deceptive, misleading, and in violation of its own express warranty, and Plaintiff  
23 and other consumers have suffered injury-in-fact as a result of Defendant's  
24 conduct.

25 4. As such, Plaintiff Mary O'Riordan, individually and on behalf of all  
26 others similarly situated, brings this Class Action Complaint as a result of the  
27  
28

1 unlawful and deceptive actions of Defendant with respect to the defective wheels it  
2 provided on its vehicles.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
5 1332, because this is a class action, as defined by 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(1)(B), in  
6 which a member of the putative class is a citizen of a different state than  
7 Defendant, and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000,  
8 excluding interest and costs. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).

9 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant and venue is  
10 proper in this Court because Defendant is incorporated and maintains its  
11 headquarters in this District.

12 **PARTIES**

13 7. Plaintiff is a resident of New York.

14 8. Defendant Hyundai Motor America is a California corporation, with  
15 its principal place of business located in Fountain Valley, California. Defendant  
16 designs manufactures, markets, distributes, services, repairs, sells, and leases  
17 passenger vehicles, including the vehicles at issue in this suit, throughout the  
18 United States, including in this District. Defendant is the warrantor and distributor  
19 and/or seller of the vehicles purchased by Plaintiff and the other members of the  
20 Class in the United States.

21 **COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

22 9. Hyundai is one of the largest manufacturers of vehicles in the United  
23 States, selling over 600,000 vehicles in the United States annually.

24 10. Unlike tires, batteries, and engine oil, which need regular  
25 replacement, in modern vehicles the wheels are expected to remain in their original  
26 condition for the lifetime of the vehicle such that absent abuse a vehicle owner  
27  
28

1 reasonably would not expect to have to replace or repair them during the  
2 ownership of the car.

3 11. Hyundai, however, has manufactured, marketed, distributed, and sold  
4 its vehicles with defective wheels that leave vehicle owners with a vehicle whose  
5 wheels look unsightly as a result of large patches of the wheel surface peeling off.

6 12. The circumstances causing Hyundai's vehicles to have the wheel  
7 surface peel off is attributable to a defect that existed at the time of the original  
8 factory manufacture and appears to be caused by a defect that prevents the  
9 protective surface coating on the wheel from properly adhering to the underlying  
10 metal.

11 13. Due to its nature, however, the defect is a latent one that could not  
12 have been reasonably discovered by a consumer when purchasing the vehicle.  
13 Instead, consumers are first made aware of the wheel defect after they have taken  
14 delivery of the vehicle and the wheel surface begins to disintegrate over the course  
15 of their ownership of the vehicle.

16 14. This wheel defect is present across multiple models of vehicles  
17 manufactured and sold by Hyundai, including specifically 2017 and newer  
18 Hyundai Santa Fe minivans and 2017 and newer Hyundai Veloster vehicles.

19 15. The wheel defect on Hyundai's Santa Fe, Veloster, and other vehicles,  
20 is widespread. Indeed even a cursory Internet search reveals dozens of comments  
21 and complaints which detail consumers' common experiences with Hyundai's  
22 defective wheels. For example, on June 14, 2019, a user on "Veloster.org" posted a  
23 the following message and accompanying photograph regarding their Hyundai  
24 Veloster:

25  
26 These are the B-Type rims that Hyundai sells with the 2019 R-Spec in  
27 the US and the performance package in Canada. The car is about 10  
28

1 months old and they've never seen snow or salt or anything of that sort  
2 (I run a dedicated set of winter rims). Today I noticed that on two of  
3 the rims the clear coat finish is starting to delaminate. Anyone else  
4 seeing this?<sup>1</sup>



5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 16. A number of other users responding to the original post reported their  
18 own issues with their Hyundai Veloster wheels suffering from the same wheel  
19 defect despite having owned their vehicle for less than a year.

20 17. However, the wheel defect is not limited to just Hyundai's Veloster  
21 vehicles, and affects a number of other Hyundai vehicles as well, as evidenced by  
22 the below user's online comment regarding their 2020 Hyundai Santa Fe:

23 I have a 2020 Santa Fe with slightly over 6K miles & garaged... just  
24 noticed that the front, driver's side wheel is peeling in several spots. It  
25 kinda looks like plastic film that you would see when you get a new

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> [www.veloster.org/threads/clear-coat-delaminating-on-rim.89620/](http://www.veloster.org/threads/clear-coat-delaminating-on-rim.89620/).

1 appliance; I've never seen that before with other vehicles and the other  
2 3 wheels are fine.<sup>2</sup>



3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 18. The posts quoted above are just a small sampling of the dozens of  
15 consumer complaints on forums and online websites where owners of Hyundai  
16 vehicles have voiced complaints about their defective wheels over a span of  
17 multiple years, going as far back as 2017 and including prior to Plaintiff's purchase  
18 of her vehicle.

19 19. Despite its knowledge, Hyundai failed to make any disclosure about  
20 this wheel defect to unsuspecting consumers purchasing its vehicles and has failed  
21 to provide any remedy to consumers whose vehicles have manifested the defect.

22 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PLAINTIFF**

23 20. Hyundai heavily advertises that its vehicles come with "America's  
24 Best Warranty" including a 5-year/60,000-Mile new vehicle warranty.<sup>3</sup>

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> [www.hyundaiforum.com/forum/hyundai-santa-fe-20/2020-santa-fe-wheel-peeling-18987/](http://www.hyundaiforum.com/forum/hyundai-santa-fe-20/2020-santa-fe-wheel-peeling-18987/).

27 <sup>3</sup> [www.hyundaiusa.com/us/en/assurance/america-best-warranty](http://www.hyundaiusa.com/us/en/assurance/america-best-warranty).

1           21. Plaintiff was aware of Hyundai’s new vehicle warranty and relied on  
2 Hyundai’s representations that it would provide coverage for any defects that  
3 might arise within the warranty period given that it was advertised as “America’s  
4 Best” warranty when she chose to purchase a new 2017 Hyundai Veloster in June  
5 2018 from City World Hyundai, in Bronx, New York.

6           22. Just three years later, and with just 52,000 miles on her vehicle, in  
7 May 2021, Plaintiff noticed that the wheel surface on her Hyundai Veloster began  
8 to peel as pictured below.



15           23. After noticing the wheel defect on her vehicle, in June 2021 Plaintiff  
16 visited the dealership where she purchased the vehicle on two separate occasions to  
17 request that they fix the defect under warranty. On both occasions the dealership  
18 did not offer any remedy or relief to Plaintiff and did not agree to fix the defect  
19 even though Plaintiff’s vehicle was still within the 5-year/60,000 mile new vehicle  
20 warranty.

21           24. Critically, at the time that Plaintiff complained about the wheel defect  
22 to the dealership and requested a warranty repair, Hyundai and its authorized,  
23 Hyundai brand dealers already knew, but did not disclose to Plaintiff or other  
24 purchasers of its vehicles that there was a latent defect or problem with the surface  
25 finish of the wheels on its vehicles that caused the same exact issue that Plaintiff  
26 was experiencing. Hyundai has instead denied responsibility for the wheel defect  
27  
28

1 that Plaintiff and the other putative Class members have experienced on their  
2 vehicles.

3 25. The wheel defect experienced by Plaintiff and the other putative Class  
4 members who purchased Hyundai's vehicles did not conform to industry standards  
5 as the wheel surfaces on a vehicle are typically expected to last for the lifetime of  
6 the vehicle. The longevity of the wheels on Plaintiff's and the other putative Class  
7 members' vehicles, along with the other exterior surfaces of the vehicle, were a  
8 basis of the bargain for their purchases of Hyundai's vehicles, and Plaintiff and the  
9 other Class members would not have purchased Hyundai's vehicles at the prices  
10 that they paid had they known that the wheels on their vehicles would degrade and  
11 peel.

12 26. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the other putative class members  
13 reasonably expected that such a defect would be covered by Hyundai's "America's  
14 Best" warranty that provides a "5-year/60,000" mile "New Vehicle" warranty that  
15 "covers repair or replacement of any component manufactured or originally  
16 installed by Hyundai that is defective in material or factory workmanship, under  
17 normal use and maintenance."<sup>4</sup> Had Plaintiff and the other putative Class members  
18 known that Hyundai would deny warranty claims made within the "New Vehicle"  
19 warranty period they would not have purchased Hyundai's vehicles at the prices  
20 that they paid.

### 21 CLASS ALLEGATIONS

22 27. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and on behalf of a  
23 nationwide class (the "Class") defined as follows: All persons who, within the  
24 applicable statute of limitations, and as shown by Defendant's records, purchased a  
25 new or used Hyundai brand vehicle that exhibited degradation of the wheel surface  
26

27 <sup>4</sup> <https://www.hyundaiusa.com/us/en/assurance/america-best-warranty>.



1 within the new vehicle warranty period.

2 28. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests  
3 of the other Class members. Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial  
4 experience in prosecuting complex litigation and class actions. Plaintiff and her  
5 counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the other  
6 Class members, and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiff nor her  
7 counsel have any interest adverse to those of the other members of the Class.

8 29. Absent a class action, most Class members would find the cost of  
9 litigating their claims to be prohibitive and would have no effective remedy. The  
10 class treatment of common questions of law and fact is superior to multiple  
11 individual actions or piecemeal litigation in that it conserves the resources of the  
12 courts and the litigants, and promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication.

13 30. Defendant has acted and failed to act on grounds generally applicable  
14 to the Plaintiff and the Class members, requiring the Court's imposition of uniform  
15 relief to ensure compatible standards of conduct toward the Class members, and  
16 making injunctive or corresponding declaratory relief appropriate for the Class as a  
17 whole.

18 31. The factual and legal bases of Defendant's liability to Plaintiff and to  
19 the other Class members are the same, resulting in injury to the Plaintiff and to all  
20 of the other members of the Class. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class  
21 have suffered harm and damages as a result of Defendant's unlawful and wrongful  
22 conduct.

23 32. Upon information and belief, there are hundreds, if not thousands, of  
24 Class members such that joinder of all members is impracticable.

25 33. There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of  
26 Plaintiff and the other Class members, and those questions predominate over any  
27

1 questions that may affect individual members of the Class. Common questions for  
2 the Class include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 3 (a) Was there a latent defect in the wheels of the Hyundai vehicles  
4 purchased by Plaintiff and the other Class members?
- 5 (b) Did Hyundai warrant or otherwise represent that its vehicles would be  
6 free from the wheel defect experienced by Plaintiff and the other  
7 Class members?
- 8 (c) Did Hyundai knowingly fail to disclose to Plaintiff and the other Class  
9 members the existence and cause of the wheel defect they experienced  
10 on their vehicles?
- 11 (d) Did Hyundai continue to manufacture, market, distribute, supply and  
12 sell vehicles with the alleged wheel defect even after becoming aware  
13 of such defect?
- 14 (e) Did the wheel defect experienced by Plaintiff and the other Class  
15 members fall within the “New Vehicle” warranty advertised and  
16 provided by Hyundai?
- 17 (f) Did Hyundai fail to provide an adequate remedy to Plaintiff and the  
18 other Class members for the wheel defect that they experienced on  
19 their vehicles?
- 20 (g) Are Plaintiff and the other Class members entitled to monetary,  
21 restitutionary, and/or injunctive relief or other remedies, and, if so,  
22 what should be the nature of such remedies?

23 **COUNT ONE**

24 **Violation of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2301, *et seq.***  
25 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

26 34. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the above allegations by reference as  
27 though fully set forth herein.  
28

1           35. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class are “consumers” within  
2 the meaning of 15 U.S. § 2301(3).

3           36. Defendant is a “supplier” and “warrantor” within the meanings of  
4 sections 15 U.S. § 2301(4)–(5).

5           37. Hyundai’s vehicles purchased by the Class are “consumer products”  
6 within the meaning of 15 U.S. §2301(1).

7           38. 15 U.S. §2310(d)(1) provides a cause of action for any consumer who  
8 is damaged by the failure of a warrantor to comply with an express written  
9 warranty.

10           39. Plaintiff, as well as the other Class members, contracted with  
11 Defendant Hyundai, through Defendant’s agents, to purchase its vehicles, and paid  
12 significant consideration in the form of the purchase price for the vehicles.

13           40. Each vehicle purchased by Plaintiff and the other Class members  
14 came with Hyundai’s “America’s Best” 5-year/60,000 mile “new vehicle” express  
15 written warranty which provided that Hyundai would “repair or replace[] any  
16 component manufactured or originally installed by Hyundai that is defective in  
17 material or factory workmanship, under normal use and maintenance.”

18           41. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class purchased vehicles that  
19 had wheels that were “defective” in that the wheel surfaces would begin to peel  
20 and disintegrate under normal use and maintenance within the new vehicle  
21 warranty period.

22           42. However, Defendant breached its express warranty, as Defendant has  
23 failed to provide a remedy to Plaintiff and the other Class members to repair the  
24 defective wheels on their vehicles.

25           43. Plaintiff, as well as numerous other members of the Class, have  
26 specifically informed Defendant about its breach of its express warranty and  
27

1 afforded it a reasonable time to cure its breach. Under the circumstances, any  
2 requirement for the other members of the Class to afford Defendant any additional  
3 reasonable opportunity to cure its breach of its express warranty should be excused  
4 and deemed satisfied.

5 44. Defendant's breach of warranty deprived Plaintiff and the other  
6 members of the Class of the benefit of their bargain, as the quality and durability of  
7 their vehicles' wheels, and the appearance of their vehicles over their lifetime, was  
8 material to their decision to purchase the vehicle. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the  
9 other members of the Class purchased Hyundai's vehicles with the reasonable  
10 expectation that any defects such as the wheel defect they experienced would be  
11 covered and repaired under Hyundai's new vehicle warranty which thus also  
12 formed the basis of the bargain with Hyundai.

13 45. As a proximate and foreseeable result of Defendant's breach, Plaintiff  
14 and the other members of the Class have and/or will sustain damages and loss.  
15 These damages include, but are not limited to: the loss of value of the vehicle as a  
16 result of the wheel defect; expectation damages for Plaintiff and members of the  
17 Class a because they did not obtain the benefit of the bargain they struck with  
18 Defendant; and any further damages that Plaintiff and the other members of the  
19 Class have or will incur in order to remedy the wheel defect.

20 46. The amount in controversy of Plaintiff's individual claims meets or  
21 exceeds the sum or value of \$25. In addition, the amount in controversy meets or  
22 exceeds the sum or value of \$50,000 (exclusive of interest and costs) computed on  
23 the basis of all claims to be determined in this suit.

24 **COUNT TWO**  
25 **Violation of Consumer Protection Laws**  
26 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

27 47. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the above allegations by reference as  
28

1 though fully set forth herein.

2 48. The New York Deceptive Acts and Practices Act, NYGBL § 349, as  
3 well as other materially identical consumer fraud statutes enacted by states  
4 throughout the country, prohibit deceptive acts and practices in the sale of products  
5 such as Defendant's vehicles.

6 49. Defendant manufactured, marketed, and sold vehicles purchased by  
7 Plaintiff and the other members of the Class that contained a latent defect or  
8 defects in the vehicles' wheels which caused the wheel surface to delaminate, peel,  
9 and otherwise become damaged shortly after their purchase of the vehicle.

10 50. Defendant had superior knowledge of the wheel defect that existed  
11 and still exists on the vehicles purchased by Plaintiff and the other Class members,  
12 given that Defendant designed and manufactured, or directed the manufacturing, of  
13 the wheels that were installed on their vehicles, and given that Defendant was  
14 aware of a significant number of customer complaints over an extended period of  
15 time regarding the wheel defect, including complaints prior to the sale of the  
16 vehicle purchased by Plaintiff. As such, Defendant had a duty to disclose to  
17 Plaintiff and the members of the Class any material information involving the  
18 existence and extent of the wheel defect.

19 51. However, Defendant intentionally concealed, misrepresented and/or  
20 omitted material facts from Plaintiff and the members of the Class about the defect  
21 in the wheels of their vehicles in an effort to induce Plaintiff and the members of  
22 the Class to purchase the vehicles at a higher price than Plaintiff and the members  
23 of the Class would have otherwise paid had the defect been properly and  
24 appropriately disclosed.

25 52. Furthermore, Defendant advertised that the vehicles purchased by  
26 Plaintiff and the other members of the Class would come with a 5-year/60,000 mile  
27  
28

1 “America’s Best” warranty that would provide for the “repair or replacement of  
2 any component manufactured or originally installed by Hyundai that is defective in  
3 material or factory workmanship, under normal use and maintenance.”

4 53. However, Defendant has failed to honor its express warranty and has  
5 not repaired or replaced Plaintiff’s and the other Class Members’ defective wheels,  
6 has not acknowledged the wheel defect, and has not implemented any other  
7 remedy including offering any compensation.

8 54. Defendant’s conduct is in violation of NYGBL § 349 and other states’  
9 consumer protection laws, and pursuant to NYGBL § 349 and other such states’  
10 consumer protection laws, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class are entitled  
11 to damages in an amount to be proven at trial, reasonable attorney’s fees,  
12 injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant’s unfair and deceptive practices going  
13 forward, and any other penalties or awards that may be appropriate under  
14 applicable law.

15 **COUNT THREE**

16 **Breach of Express Warranty**  
17 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

18 55. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the above allegations by reference as  
19 though fully set forth herein.

20 56. At the time Plaintiff purchased her Hyundai vehicle in June 2018,  
21 Plaintiff received certain express warranties from Hyundai, including a 5-  
22 year/60,000 mile “new vehicle” warranty that promised to “repair or replace[] any  
23 component manufactured or originally installed by Hyundai that is defective in  
24 material or factory workmanship, under normal use and maintenance.”

25 57. This warranty was part of the basis of the bargain between Hyundai  
26 and Plaintiff and the other members of the Class.

27 58. Despite its knowledge of the wheel defect that Plaintiff and the other  
28

1 members of the Class experienced, Defendant did not honor its express warranty,  
2 and did not repair the defect in Plaintiff’s vehicle, or the vehicles of the other Class  
3 members.

4 59. Defendant has been provided notice of the wheel defect in the  
5 vehicles purchased by Plaintiff and the other Class members through numerous  
6 complaints made to it directly and through public postings, through Plaintiff’s  
7 commencement of this litigation and multiple visits to, and requests for repair at,  
8 the Hyundai dealership where she purchased the vehicle, and, on information and  
9 belief, internal knowledge based on testing and internal analysis.

10 60. Defendant has failed to honor its express warranty, resulting in  
11 damage to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class in an amount to be  
12 determined at trial.

13 **COUNT FOUR**  
14 **Unjust Enrichment**  
15 **(on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

16 61. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the above allegations by reference as  
17 though fully set forth herein.

18 62. Defendant knew of the wheel defect affecting Plaintiff’s and the other  
19 Class Members’ vehicles at the time the vehicles were distributed to its dealerships  
20 and sold to Plaintiff and the other Class members.

21 63. Despite having knowledge of the defect, Defendant failed to disclose  
22 the existence of the defect to Plaintiff and the other Class members at or prior to  
23 the time of the sale of the vehicles and has failed to conduct any product recall or  
24 otherwise notify purchasers or potential purchasers of the defect.

25 64. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the other members of the Class purchased  
26 Defendant’s vehicles in part based on Defendant’s representations regarding the  
27 quality and extent of its “new vehicle” warranty and its coverage for any defects in  
28

1 the vehicles they purchased.

2 65. Defendant accepted and retained non-gratuitous benefits conferred by  
3 Plaintiff and the other Class members, who, without knowledge of the wheel defect  
4 and that Defendant's warranty would not provide coverage to repair it, paid a  
5 higher price for their vehicles than their actual lower value. Plaintiff and the other  
6 Class members did not confer these benefits gratuitously, and it would be  
7 inequitable and unjust for Defendant to retain these wrongfully-obtained profits.

8 66. Plaintiff and the other Class members are therefor entitled to  
9 restitution in an amount to be determined at trial.

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Class, prays for the  
12 following relief:

- 13 1. An order certifying the Class as defined above;
  - 14 2. A declaration that Defendant breached its express warranty, both  
15 through Magnusson-Moss and through common law, to Plaintiff and  
16 the Class members;
  - 17 3. Notification to all Class members about the wheel defect;
  - 18 4. An award to Plaintiff and the Class of actual, compensatory, and  
19 punitive damages, as proven at trial;
  - 20 5. Restitution and/or disgorgement from Defendant in an amount to be  
21 determined at trial;
  - 22 4. An award of her attorneys' fees and costs;
  - 23 6. An injunction barring Defendant from continuing to distribute, supply,  
24 market, and sell its defective vehicles until Defendant has remedied  
25 the defects complained of; and
  - 26 7. Such further and other relief the Court deems reasonable and just.
- 27  
28



**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff requests trial by jury of all claims that can be so tried.

DATED: July \_\_\_\_, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

MARY O’RIORDAN, individually and on behalf of similarly situated individuals

By: /s/ \_\_\_\_\_

Donald S. Burris (SBN 68523)  
BURRIS & SCHOENBERG, LLP  
12121 Wilshire Boulevard  
Suite 800  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
Tel: (310) 442-5559  
Fax: (310) 442-0353  
don@bslaw.net

Eugene Y. Turin  
(*pro hac vice* to be filed)  
MCGUIRE LAW, P.C.  
55 W. Wacker Dr., 9th Fl.  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Tel: (312) 893-7002 Ex. 3  
Fax: 312-275-7895  
eturin@mcgpc.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff and the  
Putative Class Members*

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [‘Unsightly’: Class Action Claims Hyundai Santa Fe, Veloster Wheels Suffer from Paint-Peeling ‘Defect’](#)

---