Recalled Vehicles that they may result in potential death or serious bodily injury.

49. As a direct and proximate result of the fraud and deceit alleged, plaintiff and Class members were induced to purchase the Recalled Vehicles, who then used it for its intended and foreseeable purpose, and have suffered damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

50. Toyota knew, or should have known, that the design, testing, manufacture, assembly and development of the Recalled Vehicles as set forth in detail above was defective before it issued a recall, and that Toyota intended that the customers should rely on Toyota's representations that it was a reputable and reliable business, as well as Toyota's suppression of the true facts about the Recalled Vehicles, in buying the Recalled Vehicles.

51. Plaintiff and other members of the Class, in purchasing and using the Recalled Vehicles, did rely on Toyota's above representations and suppression of facts, all to their damage as hereinabove alleged. In doing these things, Toyota was guilty of malice, oppression and fraud, and plaintiff and Class members are, therefore, entitled to recover punitive damages.

52. Additionally, or in the alternative, plaintiff and other members of the class suffered actual damages, including a diminution of value of the subject vehicles (the difference in market value of the product in the condition in which it was delivered, and its market value in condition in which it should have been delivered according to contract of parties).

X. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(FRAUDULENT INDUCEMENT)

53. Plaintiff repeats and again alleges all preceding paragraphs, as if fully set forth herein.

54. Toyota was aware of the dangers associated with the Recalled Vehicles, as set forth in detail above, but continued to publicly maintain to the affected consumers that its cars were safe and