By way of further specificity, but not by way of limitation, the **marketing** of the **DEFECTIVE CAMRY** was such that Defendants failed to adequately warn consumers (such as **NIKIA PICKNEY**) of the dangers associated with the vehicle, and further failed to adequately instruct on how to avoid those hazards.

The **defective design and defective marketing** of the **DEFECTIVE CAMRY** constituted a producing cause of the collision in question and/or the resulting injuries and damages.

V.

NEGLIGENCE AND GROSS NEGLIGENCE

TOYOTA and the **HAAS DEALERSHIP** were **negligent** in connection with the design, marketing, distribution, and sale of the **DEFECTIVE CAMRY**, and also with respect to the post-sale duties to advise, inform, warn, instruct, and/or recall the **DEFECTIVE CAMRY**.

More specifically, but not by way of limitation, **TOYOTA** failed to use ordinary care in the design of the **DEFECTIVE CAMRY** insofar as **TOYOTA** failed to incorporate a brake override and also because the design utilized an accelerator pedal that was subject to "sticking"—either mechanically, electrically or magnetically.

By way of further specificity, but not by way of limitation, **TOYOTA** and the **HAAS DEALERSHIP** were negligent in the marketing of the **DEFECTIVE CAMRY** inasmuch as they failed to adequately warn consumers (such as **NIKIA PICKNEY**) of the dangers associated with the vehicle, and further failed to adequately instruct on how to avoid those hazards.

TOYOTA's and the **HAAS DEALERSHIP's** negligence constituted a proximate cause of the collision in question.

TOY-TQ002-06-3D-00007009