is subject to all claims and defenses which plaintiffs have against the Dealer, as are alleged more specifically below, and defendant Financier is not a holder in due course of any instrument signed by plaintiffs.

19. At all times relevant, the Manufacturer was a corporation and a supplier[9] and merchant[10].

20. At all times relevant, the Dealer and the Manufacturer were engaged in the business of selling and servicing new motor vehicles within the jurisdiction of this Court.

21. On or about January 25, 2010 the parties entered into a consumer transaction[11], in that Plaintiffs agreed to purchase from the Dealer, the Dealer agreed to sell to Plaintiffs, and as part of the deal the Dealer led plaintiffs to believe that the vehicle was well-designed and reliable, and it agreed to arrange, and did so arrange, for the Financier to extend credit to plaintiffs and to finance the transaction, and the Manufacturer agreed to warrant the vehicle to be free from malfunctions, the vehicle being a certain 2010 Toyota Camry motor vehicle, which cost $23,927.82.

22. The goods[12] which were the subject of the 2010 agreement included a motor

---

[9]Within the meaning of R.C. 1345.01(C).

[10]Within the meaning of R.C. 1302.01(A)(5).

[11]Within the meaning of R.C. 1345.01(A).

[12]Within the meaning of R.C. 1310.01(A)(8).

TOY-TQ002-06-3D-00002054