(Case 3:18-cv-02576-CAB-BGS Document 1 F	Filed 11/09/18 PageID.1 Page 1 of 28						
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Case 3:18-cv-02576-CAB-BGS Document 1 F LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARR RONALD A. MARRON (SBN 175650) ron@consumersadvocates.com MICHAEL T. HOUCHIN (SBN 305541) mike@consumersadvocates.com TANIA BABAIE (320417) tania@consumersadvocates.com 651 Arroyo Drive San Diego, CA 92103 Tel: (619) 696-9006 Fax: (619) 564-6665 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class							
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
10								
11								
12	JESSICA AUGUSTINE and TERRI	Case No: '18CV2576 CAB BGS						
13 14	GARFINKEL, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, and the general public,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT						
15	Plaintiffs,							
16	V.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL						
17	TALKING RAIN BEVERAGE COMPANY, INC., a Washington							
18	corporation;							
19	Defendant.							
20								
21								
22 23								
23 24								
24								
26								
27								
28								

Plaintiffs Jessica Augustine and Terri Garfinkel ("Plaintiffs"), hereby bring this Action against Defendant Talking Rain Beverage Company, Inc. ("Defendant"), alleging 2 that certain products manufactured, packaged, labeled, advertised, distributed and sold 3 by Defendant are misbranded and falsely advertised and otherwise violates consumer 4 protection laws, and upon information and belief and investigation of counsel alleges as 5 follows: 6

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over this action under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). The Defendant is a citizen of a state different from that of the Plaintiff, the putative class size is greater than 100 persons, and the amount in controversy in the aggregate for the putative Class exceeds the sum or value of \$5 million exclusive of interest and costs.

2. This Court has both general and specific personal jurisdiction over the 13 Defendant because Defendant has conducted and continues to conduct substantial 14 business in the State of California and County of San Diego. Talking Rain Beverage 15 Company is registered with the California Secretary of State under entity number 16 C2157728. 17

3. This Court has specific personal jurisdiction arising from Defendant's decision to advertise and sell the Products in California. Defendant has sufficient minimum contacts with this State and sufficiently avails itself to the markets of this State through its manufacture, promotion, sales, and marketing of the Products to consumers within the State to render the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court reasonable.

Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District 4. 23 of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events 24 giving rise to the claims occurred within this judicial district, Defendant has marketed 25 and sold the Sparkling Ice Products at issue in this action in this judicial district, and it 26 conducts business within this judicial district. 27

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

20

21

NATURE OF THE ACTION

5. This is a consumer class action for violations of warranty, negligent and intentional misrepresentations/omissions and consumer protection laws, with a nationwide and California class for violation of consumer protection laws.

6. Defendant manufactures, distributes, advertises, markets and sells a variety of purportedly natural fruit flavored products known as Sparkling Ice beverage products, including, without limitation, the Sparkling Ice Black Raspberry, Sparkling Ice Peach Nectarine, and Sparkling Ice Crisp Apple products (collectively, the "Products").

7. The labeling of the Products is false and misleading and the Products thus are misbranded under California consumer protection laws. Specifically, the Products are labeled as if they are flavored only with natural ingredients when they in fact contain an undisclosed artificial flavor, malic acid, in violation of state and federal law.

8. Defendant's packaging, labeling, and advertising scheme is intended to give
consumers the impression that they are buying premium, all-natural products with only
natural flavoring ingredients instead of products that contain artificial chemicals and that
are artificially flavored.

9. Plaintiffs, who were deceived by Defendant's unlawful conduct and
purchased the Products in California, bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf
of California consumers to remedy Defendant's unlawful actions.

On behalf of the Class as defined herein, Plaintiffs seek an Order compelling 10. 20 Defendant to, among other things: (1) cease packaging, distributing, advertising and 21 selling the Sparkling Ice beverage products in violation of U.S. FDA regulations and 22 California consumer protection laws and state common laws; (2) re-label or recall all 23 existing deceptively packaged Sparkling Ice beverage products; (3) conduct a corrective 24 advertising campaign to inform consumers fully; (4) award Plaintiffs and other Class 25 members restitution, actual damages, and punitive damages; and (5) pay all costs of suit, 26 expenses, and attorneys' fees.

27 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- 3 -CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT PARTIES

2 11. Plaintiff Jessica Augustine is a citizen of the State of California and resides
3 in San Diego, California.

4 12. Plaintiff Augustine purchased the Sparkling Ice products for personal
5 consumption since 2017 in the State of California.

13. Plaintiff Terri Garfinkel is a citizen of the State of California and resides in
Los Angeles, California.

8 14. Plaintiff Garfinkel purchased the Sparkling Ice products for personal
9 consumption since 2016 in the State of California.

10 15. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and upon such information and belief
allege, that Defendant Talking Rain is a Washington corporation with its principal place
of business located in Preston, Washington. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and upon
such information and belief allege, that Defendant, at all times relevant, conducted
business in the State of California and in the County of San Diego.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

16

15

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

Defendant Does Not Disclose That The Products Are Artificially Flavored.

16. Defendant's labeling and advertising scheme is deliberately intended to give
consumers the false impression that the Products are composed only of natural flavors
and contain no artificial colors or flavors.

17. The image below is a true and accurate reproduction of the Sparkling Ice Black Raspberry product.



18. As depicted, the Product's front label prominently displays a "naturally flavored" designation. Defendant painstakingly and intentionally designed this Product label and the other labels for its Products to deceive consumers into believing that there are no artificial ingredients, including artificial flavoring agents or artificial chemicals contained in the Products.

19. All of the Products, however, contain a synthetic chemical flavoring compound identified as "malic acid." Specifically, the Black Raspberry Product's back label states that the ingredients include: "Carbonated water, natural flavors, **malic acid**, vegetable juice, blackberry juice concentrate, potassium benzoate, sucralose, gum arabic, green tea extra."

20. This "malic acid" is an inexpensive synthetic chemical used in processed 1 2 food products to make the taste like tangy fresh fruits – like blueberries, lemons, mangos, or cherries, and in the Products Plaintiff purchased, like the "black raspberry" flavor 3 advertised. 4

21. Under these circumstances, the labels of the Sparkling Ice Products violate California and federal statutes and state common law in multiple respects.

5

6

11

20

21

22

23

First, because each of the Products contains additional flavoring ingredients 7 22. that simulate and reinforce the characterizing flavor, the front label is required by law to 8 disclose those additional flavors rather than misleadingly suggest that the product is 9 flavored only by natural fruit juices. (California Health & Safety Code § 109875 et seq., 10 (Sherman Law), incorporating 21 C.F.R. § 101.22.)¹

Second, the Products' ingredient lists violate federal and state law because 23. 12 they identify, misleadingly, the malic acid flavoring only as the general "malic acid" 13 instead of using the specific, non-generic name of the ingredient. (See 21 C.F.R. § 14 101.4(a)(1).)15

Even more deceptive, however, is the fact that the Products, rather than 24 16 being flavored only with natural juices and flavors as the labels suggest, contain an 17 18 undisclosed artificial flavor made from petrochemicals. Defendant conceals this from consumers. 19

25. There is a different, naturally-occurring form of malic acid found in some fruits and vegetables. Defendant does not use this type of malic acid; it instead adds a

24 ¹ California's Sherman Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, California Health & Safety Code § 109875 et seq., incorporates into California law all regulations enacted pursuant to the 25 U.S. Food Drug and Cosmetic Act. An act or omission that would violate an FDCA 26 regulation necessarily violates California's Sherman Law. (Health & Safety Code, § 110100.) Regulatory citations in the text are to California's Sherman Law and reference 27 the corresponding federal regulation for convenience. 28

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

22

23

28

synthetic industrial chemical called d-1 malic acid,² in the form of a racemic mixture of 1 d- and 1-isomers, to flavor the Products and make them taste like fresh fruit. 2

This type of "malic acid" is not naturally-occurring but is in fact 26. manufactured in petrochemical plants from benzene or butane – components of gasoline and lighter fluid, respectively – through a series of chemical reactions, some of which involve highly toxic chemical precursors and byproducts.

Both the natural and unnatural forms of malic acid are considered "GRAS" 27. (generally recognized as safe) for use as flavorings in foods marketed to adults³; the dmalic acid form, however, has never been extensively studied for its health effects in human beings. Both forms confer a "tart, fruity" flavor to food products.⁴

28. Defendant uses this artificial petrochemical, d-1 malic acid, in its Products but pretends otherwise, conflating the natural and artificial flavorings and deceiving 12 consumers. 13

29. Because they contain artificial flavor, both federal and state law require the 14 Products to display both front- and back-label disclosures to inform consumer that they 15 are artificially flavored. (21 C.F.R. § 101.22.) 16

These Products have neither front-label nor back-label disclosures. 30 17 Defendant intentionally designed these Product labels without the required disclosure of 18 "Artificial Flavoring" on the front or back of the label for the purpose of deceiving 19 consumers into believing that there are no artificial ingredients, artificial flavoring agents 20 or artificial chemicals contained in the Products. It is currently unknown whether the 21

24 ² D-malic acid is also called d-hydroxybutanedioic acid or (R)-(+)-2-Hydroxysuccinic acid. 25

https://thechemco.com/chemical/malic-acid/ (last visited April 30, 2018).

²⁶ ³ The d-l form of malic acid, the one used by Defendant, is forbidden for use in baby foods out of health concerns if consumed by infants. 27

Products are also contaminated with precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of d-1 1 malic acid. 2

31. California law, incorporating and identically mirroring U.S. Food, Drug and 3 Cosmetic Act regulations by reference, requires that a food's label accurately describe 4 the nature of the food product and its characterizing flavors. (21 C.F.R. § 102.5(a).) 5

Under FDA regulations, a recognizable primary flavor identified on the 32. 6 front label of a food product is referred to as a "characterizing flavor." (21 C.F.R. § 7 101.22.) 8

FDA regulations and California law establish that if "the label, labeling, or 33. 9 advertising of a food makes any direct or indirect representations with respect to the 10 primary recognizable flavors by word, vignette, e.g., description of a fruit, or other means" then "such flavor shall be considered the characterizing flavor." (California's 12 Sherman Law, incorporating 21 C.F.R. § 101.22(i).) 13

"Pomegranate", "Strawberry Watermelon", "Peach Nectarine" are primary 34. 14 recognizable flavors identified on the Sparkling Ice beverage Products' front labels. 15 These are characterizing flavors under California and federal regulations. 16

If a product's characterizing flavor is not created exclusively by the 35 17 characterizing flavor ingredient, the product's front label must state that the product's 18 flavor was simulated or reinforced with either or both of natural or artificial flavorings. 19 If any artificial flavor is present which "simulates, resembles or reinforces" the 20 characterizing flavor, the food must be prominently labeled as "Artificially Flavored." (California's Sherman Law, incorporating 21 C.F.R. § 101.22(i)(3), (4).) 22

36. A food product's label also must include a statement of the "presence or 23 absence of any characterizing ingredient(s) or component(s) ... when the presence or 24 absence of such ingredient(s) or component(s) in the food has a material bearing on price 25 or consumer acceptance ... and consumers may otherwise be misled about the presence 26 or absence of the ingredient(s) or component(s) in the food." (California's Sherman Law, 27

21

incorporating 21 C.F.R. § 102.5(c).) Such statements must be in boldface print on the
 front display panel and of sufficient size for an average consumer to notice. (*Id.*)

3 37. The synthetic d-l malic acid in the Products simulates, resembles, and 4 reinforces the characterizing fruit flavors for the Products. Under these regulations, 5 Defendant was required to place prominently on the Products' front labels a notice 6 sufficient to allow California consumers to understand that the Products contained 7 artificial flavorings.

38. Defendant failed to do so, deceiving consumers and violating California law, federal law, and corresponding state common laws.

39. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class were unaware that the Products contained artificial flavoring when they purchased them.

40. When purchasing the Products, Plaintiff and Class Members were seeking
products of particular qualities that were flavored only with the natural ingredients
claimed on the label and which did not contain artificial flavoring.

41. Plaintiff is not alone in these purchasing preferences. As reported in Forbes 15 Magazine, 88% of consumers polled recently indicated they would pay more for foods 16 perceived as natural or healthy. "All demographics [of consumers] – from Generation Z 17 to Baby Boomers – say they would pay more" for such products, specifically including 18 foods with no artificial flavors.⁵ Forty-one percent (41%) of consumers rated the absence 19 of artificial flavors in food products as "Very Important," and eighty percent (80%) of 20 North American consumers are willing to pay a premium for foods with no artificial 21 ingredients.⁶ 22

23

27

8

9

10

11

²⁶ https://www.forbes.com/sites/nancygagliardi/2015/02/18/consumers-want-healthy-foods-and-will-pay-more-for-them/#4b8a6b4b75c5; (last visited March 22, 2018).

²⁸⁶ The Nielsen Company, Global Health and Wellness Survey, "Healthy Eating Habits Around the World," 2015; https://www.nielsen.com/content/dam/nielsenglobal/eu/

²⁴ ⁵ Consumers Want Healthy Foods - And Will Pay More For Them"; Forbes Magazine,
²⁵ February 15, 2015.

42. John Compton, the CEO of a beverage manufacturer, spoke to investors at 1 the Morgan Stanley Consumer & Retail Conference, stating: "We have talked extensively 2 to consumers about this idea, and they come back and tell us the number one motivation 3 for purchase is products that claim to be natural." 4

Defendant's labeling and advertising reflect these consumer preferences -43. 5 not by making the Products solely with natural ingredients, but instead by concealing the 6 fact that the Products are artificially flavored. 7

44. Table 1, below, lists the Products included in this Action.							
Sparkling Ice Pomegranate Blueberry	Sparkling Ice Strawberry Watermelon						
Sparkling Ice Strawberry Lemonade	Sparkling Ice Pink Grapefruit						
Sparkling Ice Peach Nectarine	Sparkline Ice Orange Mango						
Sparkling Ice Crisp Apple	Sparkling Ice Coconut Pineapple						
Sparkling Ice Ginger Lime	Sparkling Ice Classic Lemonade						
Sparkling Ice Lemon Lime	Sparkling Ice Grape RaspberrySparkling Ice Pomegranate BlueberrySparkling Ice Kiwi Strawberry						
Sparkling Ice Black Cherry							
Sparkling Ice Cherry Limeade							
	Sparkling Ice Pomegranate BlueberrySparkling Ice Strawberry LemonadeSparkling Ice Peach NectarineSparkling Ice Crisp AppleSparkling Ice Ginger LimeSparkling Ice Lemon LimeSparkling Ice Black Cherry						

17

18

19

20

California's Health & Safety Code states that "[a]ny food is misbranded it 45. is bears or contains any artificial flavoring, artificial coloring, or chemical preservative, unless its labelling states that fact." (California Health & Safety Code, § 110740.)

California law requires Defendant to include sufficient notice on the 21 46. 22 Products' labels to alert California consumers that the Products are artificially flavored. Defendant failed to do so. Accordingly, Defendant's Products were misbranded and 23 illegal to distribute or sell in California. (California Health & Safety Code, §§ 110740, 24 110760, 110765.) 25

26

27

nielseninsights/pdfs/Nielsen%20Global%20Health%20and%20Wellness%20Report%2 28 0-%20January%202015.pdf; (last visited March 22, 2018)

47. Because the Products violated California law, they were misbranded when 1 offered for sale in California. 2

Plaintiff and the Class lost money as a result of Defendant's conduct because 48 3 they purchased Products that contained undisclosed artificial flavors and were illegal to 4 sell. 5

Plaintiff's Purchase Of The Sparkling Ice Products 6

9

10

11

12

21

49. Plaintiff Terri Garfinkel purchased the Sparkling Ice Products several times 7 since 2016 in Los Angeles, California during the Class Period defined herein. 8

50. Plaintiff Garfinkel's most recent purchase was in 2018 at Ralph's located on 1233 N. La Brea Avenue, Los Angeles, CA.

Plaintiff Jessica Augustine purchased the Sparkling Ice Products several 51. times since 2017 in San Diego, California during the Class Period defined herein.

52. Plaintiff Augustine's most recent purchase was in 2018 at Ralph's located 13 on 1020 University Avenue, San Diego, CA, 92103 14

Plaintiffs subsequently discovered Defendant's unlawful acts as described 53. 15 herein, when they learned that the Sparkling beverage Products' characterizing flavors 16 were deceptively created or reinforced using artificial flavoring even though Defendant 17 failed to disclose that fact on the Sparkling Ice labels. 18

54. Plaintiffs were deceived by and relied upon the Products' deceptive labeling, 19 and specifically the omission of the legally-required notice that it contained artificial 20 flavorings. Plaintiffs purchased the Sparkling Ice Products believing it was naturally flavored, based on the Products' deceptive labelling and failure to disclose that it was 22 artificially flavored. 23

55. Plaintiffs, as a reasonable consumers, are not required to subject consumer 24 food products to laboratory analysis, to scrutinize the back of the label to discover that 25 the products' front label are false and misleading, or to search the label for information 26 that federal regulations require be displayed prominently on the front – and, in fact, under 27 state law are entitled to rely on statements that Defendant deliberately places on the 28

- 11 -

Sparkling Ice Products' labelling. Defendant, but not Plaintiffs, knew or should have
 known that this labelling was in violation of federal regulations and state law.

56. Because Plaintiffs reasonably assumed that the Sparkling Ice Products would be free of artificial flavoring, based on the Products' labels, when it was not, they did not receive the benefit of their purchase. Instead of receiving the benefit of products free of artificial flavoring, she received Products that were unlawfully labeled to deceive the consumer into believing that they were exclusively naturally flavored and contained no artificial flavoring, in violation of federal and state labelling regulations.

57. Plaintiffs would not have purchased the Products in the absence of Defendant's misrepresentations and omissions. Had Defendant not violated California law, Plaintiffs would not have been injured.

58. The Sparkling Ice Products were worth less than what Plaintiffs paid for and
Class members would not have paid as much as they have for the Products absent
Defendant's false and misleading statements and omissions.

59. Plaintiffs and the Class therefore lost money as a result of Defendant's unlawful behavior. Plaintiffs and the Class altered their position to their detriment and suffered loss in an amount equal to the amounts they paid for the Products.

60. Plaintiffs intend to, seek to, and will purchase the Sparkling Ice Products again when they can do so with the assurance that the Products' labels, which indicates that the Products are naturally flavored, is lawful and consistent with the Products' ingredients.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

61. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly
situated (the "Class") pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a), 23(b)(2), and
23(b)(3).

62. The nationwide Class is defined as follows:

All U.S. citizens who purchased the Products in their respective state of citizenship on or after January 1, 2012 and until the Class is certified, for

personal use and not for resale, excluding Defendant and Defendant's officers, directors, employees, agents and affiliates, and the Court and its staff.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

63. The California Class is defined as follows:

All California citizens who made retail purchases of the Products in California on or after January 1, 2012 and until the Class is certified, for personal use and not for resale, excluding Defendant and Defendant's officers, directors, employees, agents and affiliates, and the Court and its staff.

64. During the Class Period, the Products unlawfully contained the undisclosed artificial flavors d-malic acid or d-l malic acid and were otherwise improperly labeled.Defendant failed to label the Products as required by California law.

65. During the Class Period, Class members purchased the misbranded Products, paying a price premium for those Products compared to similar products lawfully labeled.

66. The proposed Class meets all criteria for a class action, including numerosity, commonality, typicality, predominance, superiority, and adequacy of representation.

67. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action against Defendant. While the exact number and identities of other Class Members are unknown to Plaintiffs at this time, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that there are hundreds of thousands of Members in the Class. The Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all Members is impracticable and the disposition of their claims in a class action rather than in individual actions will benefit the parties and the courts.

68. The proposed Class satisfies typicality. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of and
are not antagonistic to the claims of other Class members. Plaintiffs and the Class
members all purchased the Products, were deceived by the false and deceptive labeling,
and lost money as a result, purchasing Products that were illegal to sell in California.

69. The proposed Class satisfies superiority. A class action is superior to any
 other means for adjudication of the Class members' claims because each Class member's
 claim is modest, based on the Products' retail purchase prices which are generally under
 \$5.00 per unit. It would be impractical for individual Class members to bring individual
 lawsuits to vindicate their claims.

70. Because Defendant's misrepresentations were made on the label of the
Products, all Class members including Plaintiffs were exposed to and continue to be
exposed to the omissions and affirmative misrepresentations. If this action is not brought
as a class action, Defendant can continue to deceive consumers and violate California
law with impunity.

The proposed Class representative satisfies adequacy of representation.
Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class as they seek relief for the Class, their
interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class members, and they have no
interests antagonistic to those of other Class members. Plaintiffs have retained counsel
competent in the prosecution of consumer fraud and class action litigation.

72. There is a well-defined community of interest in questions of law and fact
common to the Class, and these predominate over any individual questions affecting
individual Class members in this action.

19 ||

20

21

22

23

28

73. Questions of law and fact common to Plaintiffs and the Class include:

a. Whether Defendant failed to disclose the presence of the artificial flavoring ingredient d-l malic acid in the Products;

b. Whether Defendant's labeling omissions and representations constituted false advertising under California law;

c. Whether Defendant's conduct constituted a violation of California's Unfair
Competition Law;

26 d. Whether Defendant's conduct constituted a violation of California's
27 Consumer Legal Remedies Act;

Whether Defendant's label statements claiming solely natural flavorings e. 1 was an affirmative representation of the Products' composition and conveyed an express 2 warranty; 3

f. Whether Defendant's conduct constitutes a breach of implied warranties 4 under California's Commercial Code; 5

g.

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

21

22

23

24

Whether the statute of limitations should be tolled on behalf of the Class;

Whether the Class is entitled to restitution, rescission, actual damages, h. punitive damages, attorney fees and costs of suit, and injunctive relief; and

Whether members of the Class are entitled to any such further relief as the i 9 Court deems appropriate. 10

Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class, has no 74. interests that are incompatible with the interests of the Class, and have retained counsel competent and experienced in class litigation.

75. Defendant has acted on grounds applicable to the entire Class, making final injunctive relief or declaratory relief appropriate for the Class as a whole.

16

Class treatment is therefore appropriate under California law. 76

Class damages will be adduced at trial through expert testimony and other 77. 17 competent evidence. 18

78 California law holds that the price-premium consumers paid for the falsely-19 advertised Products, as a percentage of the Products' retail prices, is a proper measure of 20 Class damages.

79. Food-industry consumer research is consistent and readily supports such estimates of that price-premium, as consumers quantitatively report that they seek out, value, and are willing to pay a premium for food products with no artificial flavors.

On information and belief, based on publicly-available information, 80 25 Plaintiffs allege that the total amount in controversy exclusive of fees, costs, and interest, 26 based on the estimated price premium and Product revenues for sales to the Class in 27 California during the proposed Class Period, exceeds \$5 million. 28

- 15 -

<u>CAUSES OF ACTION</u> <u>FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION</u> FRAUD BY OMISSION, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1709-1710 and the common law of all states

(on behalf of the Nationwide Class and the California Class)

81. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations made elsewhere in the Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

82. Plaintiffs bring this claim for fraud by omission pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 1709-1710, *et seq.* and the common law of all states. The elements of fraud are substantially similar from state to state, thus making nationwide class certification appropriate.

83. Defendant actively concealed material facts, in whole or in part, with the intent to induce Plaintiffs and members of the Class to purchase the Products. Specifically, Defendant actively concealed the truth about the Products by not disclosing the existence of artificial flavoring ingredients on the front label of the Products as is required by California and federal law.

84. Plaintiffs and the Class were unaware of these omitted material facts and would not have purchased the Products, or would have paid less for the Products, if they had known of the concealed facts.

85. Plaintiff and the Class suffered injuries that were proximately caused by Defendant's active concealments and omissions of material facts.

86. Defendant's fraudulent concealments and omissions were a substantial factor in causing the harm suffered by Plaintiffs and the Class members as they would not have purchased the products at all if all material facts were properly disclosed.

- 16 -CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

//

//

<u>SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION</u> NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1709-1710 and the common law of all states

(on behalf of the Nationwide Class and the California Class)

87. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations made elsewhere in the Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

88. Plaintiffs bring this claim for negligent misrepresentation pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 1709-1710, *et seq.* and the common law of all states. The elements of negligent misrepresentation are substantially similar from state to state, thus making nationwide class certification appropriate.

89. Defendant had a duty to disclose to Plaintiffs and the Class members the existence of artificial flavoring ingredients on the front labels of the Products pursuant to California and federal law. Defendant was in a superior position than Plaintiffs and the Class members such that reliance by Plaintiffs and the Class members was justified. Defendant possessed the skills and expertise to know the type of information that would influence a consumer's purchasing decision.

90. During the applicable Class period, Defendant negligently or carelessly misrepresented, omitted, and concealed from consumers material facts regarding the Products, including the existence of artificial flavoring ingredients.

91. Defendant was careless in ascertaining the truth of their representations in that it knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the Class members would not have realized the true existence of artificial flavoring ingredients in the Products.

92. Plaintiffs and the Class members was unaware of the falsity of Defendant's misrepresentations and omissions and, as a result, justifiably relied on them when making the decision to purchase the Products.

93. Plaintiffs and the Class members would not have purchased the Products, or would have paid less for the Products, if the true facts had been known.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT,

CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1750, et seq.

(on behalf of the California Class)

94. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs, and further allege as follows:

95. The California Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 *et seq.* ("CLRA") prohibits any unfair, deceptive and unlawful practices, and unconscionable commercial practices in connection with the sale of any goods or services to consumers.

96. Plaintiffs and the Class are "consumers" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(d). The Products are a "good" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1761.

97. Defendant's failure to label the Products in compliance with federal and state labeling regulations, was an unfair, deceptive, unlawful, and unconscionable commercial practice.

98. Defendant's conduct violates the CLRA, including but not limited to, the following provisions:

- § 1770(a)(5): representing that goods have characteristics, uses, or benefits which they do not have.
- § 1770(a)(7): representing that goods are of a particular standard, quality, or grade if they are of another.

§ 1770(a)(9): advertising goods with intent not to sell them as advertised.

§ 1770(a)(16): representing the subject of a transaction has been supplied in accordance with a previous representation when it has not.

99. As a result of Defendant's violations, Plaintiffs and the Class suffered ascertainable losses in the form of the price premiums they paid for the deceptively labeled and marketed Products, which they would not have paid had these Products been labeled truthfully, and in the form of the reduced value of the Products purchased compared to the Products as labeled and advertised.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

100. On or about November 1, 2018, prior to filing this action, Plaintiffs sent a CLRA notice letter to Defendant which complies with California Civil Code § 1782(a). Plaintiffs sent Defendant, individually and on behalf of the proposed Class, a letter via Certified Mail, advising Defendant that it is in violation of the CLRA and demanding that it cease and desist from such violations and make full restitution by refunding the monies received therefrom.

101. Wherefore, Plaintiffs seeks injunctive relief for Defendant's violations of the CLRA. If Defendant fails to take the corrective action detailed in Plaintiffs' CLRA letter within thirty days of the date of the letter, then Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend their complaint to add a claim for damages under the CLRA.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW, (UNLAWFUL PRONG)

CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, et seq.

(on behalf of the California Class)

102. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained elsewhere in this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

103. Section 17200 of the California Business & Professions Code ("Unfair Competition Law" or "UCL") prohibits any "unlawful," "unfair" and "fraudulent" business practice. Section 17200 specifically prohibits any "unlawful . . . business act or practice."

104. The UCL borrows violations of other laws and statutes and considers those violations also to constitute violations of California law.

105. Defendant's practices as described herein were at all times during the Class Period and continue to be unlawful under, *inter alia*, FDA regulations and California's Sherman Law.

106. Among other violations, Defendant's conduct in unlawfully packaging and labeling and distributing the Products in commerce in California violated U.S. FDA and California packaging and labeling regulations.

107. The Products' front labels fail to disclose that they contain synthetic artificial flavoring and are not flavored with and do not contain any or all of the natural fruits named on the labels, in violation of 21 C.F.R. § 101.22 and California's Sherman Law.

108. The "Sparkling Ice Black Raspberry" Product, for example, contains the synthetic dl-malic acid flavoring ingredient.

109. The dl-malic acid is a synthetic flavoring material which creates, simulates, or reinforces the characterizing "Black Raspberry" flavor of the Product.

110. The dl-malic acid in the Sparkling Ice Products are not derived from any natural material as defined in the applicable state regulations and is therefore, by law, an artificial flavoring.

111. Defendant fails to inform consumers of the presence of artificial flavors in the Products on the front label as required by law.

112. Defendant's packaging, labeling, advertising, and marketing of high-sugar juice beverages are intentionally designed to give consumers the impression that they are buying an all-natural product instead of a product that contains artificial flavors and large amounts of added sugar, and are therefore likely to deceive reasonable consumers.

113. Defendant's conduct further violates other applicable California and federal regulations as alleged herein.

114. Defendant's practices are therefore unlawful under Section 17200 *et seq*. of the California Civil Code.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW (UNFAIR PRONG), CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, et seq.

(on behalf of the California Class)

115. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained elsewhere in this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

116. Section 17200 of the California Business & Professions Code ("Unfair Competition Law" or "UCL") prohibits any "unfair . . . business act or practice."

Defendant's practices violate the Unfair Competition Law "unfair" prong as well.

117. Defendant's practices as described herein are "unfair" within the meaning of the California Unfair Competition Law because the conduct is unethical and injurious to California residents and the utility of the conduct to Defendant does not outweigh the gravity of the harm to consumers.

118. While Defendant's decision to label the Products deceptively and in violation of California law may have some utility to Defendant in that it allows Defendant to sell the Products to consumers who otherwise would not purchase an artificially-flavored food product at the premium retail price, or at all, if it were labeled correctly, and to realize higher profit margins than if they formulated or labeled the Products lawfully, this utility is small and far outweighed by the gravity of the harm inflicted on California consumers.

119. Defendant's conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, and sale of Defendant's high-sugar juice beverages was also unfair to consumers because it allows Defendant to sell the Products to consumers who otherwise would not purchase a product high in added sugars that contributes to excessive sugar consumption. The consumer injury was substantial, not outweighed by benefits to consumers or competition, and not one that consumers themselves could reasonably have avoided.

120. Defendant's conduct also injures competing food product manufacturers, distributors, and sellers, that do not engage in the same unfair and unethical behavior.

121. Moreover, Defendant's practices violate public policy expressed by specific constitutional, statutory, or regulatory provisions, including the Sherman Law, the False Advertising Law, and the FDA regulations cited herein.

122. Plaintiffs' purchases and all Class members' purchases of the Products all took place in California.

123. Defendant labeled the Products in violation of federal regulations and California law requiring truth in labeling.

124. Defendant consciously failed to disclose material facts to Plaintiffs and the Class in Defendant's advertising and marketing of the Products.

125. Defendant's conduct is unconscionable because, among other reasons, it violates 21 C.F.R. § 101.22(c), which requires all foods containing artificial flavoring to include:

A statement of artificial flavoring . . . [which] shall be placed on the food or on its container or wrapper, or on any two or all three of these, as may be necessary to render such a statement likely to be read by the ordinary person under customary conditions of purchase and use of such food.

126. Defendant's conduct is also "unconscionable" because it violates, *inter alia*, 21 C.F.R. § 101.22, which requires all food products for which artificial flavoring provides a characterizing flavor to disclose this fact prominently on the product's front label.

127. Defendant intended that Plaintiffs and the Class rely on Defendant's acts and omissions to induce them to purchase the Products.

128. Had Defendant disclosed all material information regarding the Products, Plaintiffs and the Class would not have purchased the Products or would only have been willing to pay less for the Products than they did.

129. Plaintiffs suffered injury in fact and lost money or property as a result of Defendant's deceptive advertising: she was denied the benefit of the bargain when she purchased the Products based on Defendant's violation of the applicable laws and regulations, and purchased the Products in favor of competitors' products, which are less expensive, contain no artificial flavoring, or are lawfully labeled.

130. The acts, omissions, and practices of Defendant detailed herein proximately caused Plaintiffs and other members of the Class to suffer an ascertainable loss in the form of, *inter alia*, the price premium of monies spent to purchase the Products they otherwise would not have, and she is entitled to recover such damages, together with appropriate penalties, including restitution, damages, attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

131. Section 17200 also prohibits any "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising." For the reasons set forth above, Defendant engaged in unfair, deceptive, untrue and misleading advertising in violation of California Business & Professions

Code § 17200.

132. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiffs seek an order requiring Defendant to immediately cease such acts of unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices and requiring Defendant to return to the Class the amount of money improperly collected.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S FALSE ADVERTISING LAW,

CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17500, et seq.

(on behalf of the California Class)

133. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained elsewhere in this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

134. Defendant made and distributed, in California and in interstate commerce, Products that unlawfully fail to disclose the presence of artificial flavoring as required by federal and state food labeling regulations.

135. The Products' labeling and advertising in California presents the Products as if they were solely naturally-flavored and contain the natural fruit(s) shown on the labels.

136. Under California's False Advertising Law ("FAL"), Business and Professions Code § 17500 *et seq.*,

"It is unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or association, or any employee thereof with intent directly or indirectly to dispose of real or personal property . . . to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated before the public in this state, or to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated from this state before the public in any state, in any newspaper or other publication, or any advertising device . . . any statement, concerning that real or personal property . . . which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading. . . ." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500.

137. Defendant's labeling and advertising statements on the Products' labels and

in advertising and marketing materials are "advertising device[s]" under the FAL.

138. Defendant's labeling and advertising statements, which communicated to consumers that the Products contain the identified natural fruit(s) and concealed the fact that they contain synthetic artificial flavor, were untrue and misleading, and Defendant at a minimum by the exercise of reasonable care should have known those actions were false or misleading.

139. Defendant's labeling and advertising for Products as natural fruit juice beverages which actually contain substantial amounts of added sugar is deceptive in light of the strong evidence that excessive sugar consumption greatly increases risk of chronic disease.

140. Defendant's conduct violated California's False Advertising Law.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTIES,

CAL. COMM. CODE § 2313

(on behalf of the California Class and all states with substantially similar laws)

141. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained elsewhere in this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

142. The Products' front label representations misleadingly suggest that the Products are flavored only with natural fruits such as watermelon or peaches and contain no artificial flavors.

143. Defendant's front label statement of contents, for example, "Strawberry Watermelon", was an affirmative representation of the Product's composition creating an express warranty.

144. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus constituted an express warranty, which Defendant breached: The Products are artificially flavored.

145. Defendant sold the goods to Plaintiffs and the other Class members who bought the goods from Defendant.

146. Plaintiffs and the Class did not receive goods as warranted by Defendant.

1

2

- 24 -

147. Within a reasonable amount of time after Plaintiffs discovered that the
 Products contained synthetic flavorings, Plaintiffs notified Defendant of such breach.

148. As a proximate result of this breach of warranty by Defendant, Plaintiffs and the Class have been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

EIGHT CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTIES,

CAL. COMM. CODE § 2314

(on behalf of the California Class and all states with substantially similar laws)

149. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations made elsewhere in the Complaint as if set forth in full herein.

150. Defendant's label representations also created implied warranties that the Products were suitable for a particular purpose, specifically as an exclusively naturally-flavored food product containing the advertised fruit juice(s). Defendant breached this warranty.

151. The Products' front labels misleadingly imply that they are flavored only with the natural ingredients comprising the characterizing flavors.

16 152. The Products also made representations that the products are natural and17 healthy and not filled with added sugars.

153. As alleged in detail above, at the time of purchase Defendant had reason to know that Plaintiffs, as well as all members of the Class, intended to use the Products as naturally-flavored food products.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

154. This became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties.

155. Based on that implied warranty, Defendant sold the goods to Plaintiffs and other Class members who bought the goods from Defendant.

156. At the time of purchase, Defendant knew or had reason to know that Plaintiffs and the Class members were relying on Defendant's skill and judgment to select or furnish a product that was suitable for this particular purpose, and Plaintiffs and the Class justifiably relied on Defendant's skill and judgment.

157. The Products were not suitable for this purpose.

158. Plaintiffs purchased the Products believing they had the qualities Plaintiffs sought, based on the deceptive advertising and labeling, but the Products were actually unsatisfactory to Plaintiffs for the reasons described herein.

159. The Products were not merchantable in California, as they were not of the same quality as other products in the category generally acceptable in the trade.

160. The Products would not pass without objection in the trade when packaged with the existing labels, because the Products were misbranded and illegal to sell in California. Cal. Comm. Code 2314(2)(a).

161. The Products also were not acceptable commercially and breached the implied warranty because they were not adequately packaged and labeled as required. Cal. Comm. Code 2314(2)(e).

162. The Products also were not acceptable commercially and breached the implied warranty because they did not conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label, Cal. Comm. Code 2314(2)(f), and other grounds as set forth in Commercial Code section 2314(2).

163. By offering the Products for sale and distributing the Products in California, Defendant also warranted that the Products were not misbranded and were legal to purchase in California. Because the Products were misbranded in several regards and were therefore illegal to sell or offer for sale in California, Defendant breached this warranty as well.

164. As a result of this breach, Plaintiffs and the other California consumers in the Class did not receive goods as impliedly warranted by Defendant.

165. Within a reasonable amount of time after the Plaintiffs discovered that the Products breached these warranties, Plaintiffs notified Defendant of such breach.

166. As a proximate result of this breach of warranty, Plaintiffs and other California consumers have been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

167. As a result, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the general public are entitled to injunctive and equitable relief, restitution, and an order for the disgorgement of the funds by which Defendant was unjustly enriched.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves, all others similarly situated in California, and the general public, pray for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- A. An order confirming that this action is properly maintainable as a class action as defined above;
 - B. An order appointing Plaintiffs as class representatives and The Law Office of Ronald A. Marron as counsel for the Class;
 - C. An order requiring Defendant to bear the cost of Class notice;
- D. An order declaring that the conduct complained of herein violates the CLRA;
 - E. An order declaring that the conduct complained of herein violates the UCL;
 - F. An order declaring that the conduct complained of herein violates the FAL;
- G. An order declaring that the conduct complained of herein breached express warranties, implied warranties, or both;
- H. An order requiring Defendant to disgorge any benefits received from Plaintiffs and any unjust enrichment realized as a result of the improper and misleading labeling, advertising, and marketing of the Products;
- I. An order requiring Defendant to pay restitution and damages to Plaintiffs and Class members so that they may be restored any money which was acquired by means of any unfair, deceptive, unconscionable or negligent acts;
 - J. An award of punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
 - K. An order enjoining Defendant's deceptive and unfair practices;
 - L. An order requiring Defendant to conduct corrective advertising;
 - M. An award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
 - N. An award of attorney fees and costs; and

O. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, equitable, or proper.

1	JURY DEMAND						
2	Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all claims for damages. Plaintiffs do not seek a						
3	jury trial for claims sounding in equity.						
4							
5	DATED: November 9, 2018	Respectfully Submitted,					
6							
7		/s/ Ronald A. Marron					
8		Ronald A. Marron					
9		LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON					
10		Ronald A. Marron ron@consumersadvocates.com					
11		Michael T. Houchin					
12		<i>mike@consumersadvocates.com</i> Tania Babaie					
13		tania@consumersadvocates.com					
14		651 Arroyo Drive San Diego, CA 92103					
15		Telephone: (619) 696-9006 Fax: (619) 564-6665					
16		Counsel for Plaintiffs and the					
17		Proposed Class					
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25 26							
26 27							
27							
20		- 28 -					

Case 3:18-cv-02576-CAB-BGS Document 1-1 Filed 11/09/18 PageID.29 Page 1 of 2

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT	`S				
Jessica Augustine and Terri Garfinkel				Talking Rain Beverage Company, Inc.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant King County, WA (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) The Law Offices of Ronald A. Marron 651 Arroyo Drive San Diego, CA 92103				Attorneys (If Known	,	AB BGS	•		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	L TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box f	or Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	□ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government i	Not a Party)			// PTF DEF (XX 1 口 1	Incorporated or P of Business In		or Defendo PTF D 4	ant) DEF D 4
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	X 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh.	ip of Parties in Item III)				Incorporated and of Business In		0 5	X 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country		Foreign Nation		06	0 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ily) DRTS	1	RFEITURE/PENALTY		here for: Nature	of Suit Code De		
 Ito Insurance Ito Insurance I20 Marine I30 Miller Act I40 Negotiable Instrument I50 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment I51 Medicare Act I52 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) I53 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits I60 Stockholders' Suits I90 Other Contract I95 Contract Product Liability I96 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	PERSONAL INJURY 0" 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 448 Education	 PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 988 Asbestos Personal 371 Truth in Lending 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacator Sentence 533 Death Penalty Other: 	Y 0 62 0 69 KTY 0 71 0 72 0 74 0 75 3 NS 0 75 3 2 46	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other Content Co	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U PROPEI □ 820 Copy □ 830 Paten □ 835 Paten □ 835 Paten □ 861 HIA □ 861 HIA □ 861 HIA □ 861 SID □ 863 SII □ 864 SSID □ 865 RSI (□ FEDER/ □ 870 Taxe or D □ 871 IRS- 26 U	al 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights tt t - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) < Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	 375 False CI 376 Qui Tan 3729(a) 400 State Re 410 Antitrus 430 Banks ai 450 Commen 460 Deporta 470 Rackete Corrupt 480 Consum 490 Cable/Si 850 Securitic Exchany 891 Agricult 893 Environi 895 Freedon Act 896 Arbitrat 899 Adminis Act/Rev 	aims Act (31 USC) apportiont t apportiont t and Bankin, ce er Influence or Influence er Credit at TV es/Commo ge atutory Act ural Acts mental Mat t of Inform ion trative Pre- iew or App Decision tionality o	ment g ced and ions diffies/ ctions tters nation pcedure peal of
	moved from 🗖 3		□ 4 Rein	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	sferred from	🗖 6 Multidis		Multidis	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1 Brief description of ca		re filing (1	(spec Do not cite jurisdictional s		Litigatio Transfer <i>versity)</i> :		Litigatic Direct Fi	le
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$ 5,000,000.00		HECK YES only URY DEMAND		complai □No	nt:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 11/09/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF AT		OF RECORD					
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JU	DGE		

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 06/17)

cases.)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below. United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box. Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked. Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Talking Rain Beverage Company Hit with Class Action Over Allegedly Undisclosed Malic Acid in</u> <u>'Naturally Flavored' Drinks</u>