

Naomi Spector (SBN 222573)  
Email: nspector@kamberlaw.com  
**KAMBERLAW, LLP**  
9404 Genesee Avenue, Suite 340  
La Jolla, California 92037  
Phone: 310.400.1053  
Fax: 212.202.6364

Counsel for Plaintiff Cory Brannon, and the  
putative Classes

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**CORY BRANNON, individually,  
and on behalf of others similarly  
situated,**

**Plaintiff,**

**vs.**

**BARLEAN’S ORGANIC OILS,  
LLC, a Washington Limited  
Liability Company,**

**Defendant.**

**CASE NO. '18CV1619 BTM MDD**

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:**

- 1. UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL  
BUSINESS ACTS AND PRACTICES  
(CAL. BUS & PROF. CODE §17200 ET  
SEQ.);**
- 2. DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING  
PRACTICES (CAL. BUS & PROF.  
CODE §§ 17500, ET SEQ.);**
- 3. CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES  
ACT (CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750, ET  
SEQ.);**
- 4. BREACH OF EXPRESS  
WARRANTY; AND**
- 5. QUASI-CONTRACT.**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff Cory Brannon on behalf of himself and others similarly situated, by and  
through his undersigned counsel, hereby files this Class Action Complaint against  
Defendant Barlean’s Organic Oils, LLC (“Defendant” and/or “Barlean’s”) and states as  
follows:

## NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This case arises out of Defendant’s unlawful merchandising practices with respect to its Barlean’s Greens Supplement Powders (collectively, the “Products”). Defendant labels and advertises the Products as, among other things, “NATURE’S PERFECT SUPERFOOD,” a “Pathway to a better life,” “Vegan Superfood,” and as containing “Antioxidant Power.” In addition, Defendant states on the label of the Products that they are a “premium superfood created to:” “Support cleansing of organs and tissues”; “Super-Boost your health and ENERGY”; “Help improve digestion”; “Aid the body’s natural detoxification”; and “Promote a healthy immune system.” Defendant also states that the Products are “superfoods designed to invigorate and nourish both your mind and body. Masterfully formulated with Nature’s most vitalizing plant-based ingredients . . . .” (collectively, “Representations”).

2. These uniform, material Representations are false and misleading because they are not substantiated, and therefore violate the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 (“DSHEA”). In addition, the Representations are false and misleading because the Products contain lead, which is harmful, rather than beneficial, to a consumer’s health.

3. In addition, the Products contain lead in amounts that exceed the .5 mcg/day allowable limit for lead under California’s Proposition 65. According to independent laboratory testing, the Products substantially exceed the .5 mcg/day allowable limit. The Product purchased by Plaintiff, for example, contained 1.43 mcg of lead per serving, or almost three times the daily limit set by Prop 65. *See* Product Test Results for Barlean’s Greens, Project ID No. 000019-001-001, attached hereto as Exhibit A. On information and belief, the directions for use suggest or previously suggested taking the Product one to three times per day; thus, the total amount of lead consumed in the Product purchased by Plaintiff, for example, could be as much as 4.29 mcg, or almost 9 times the .5 mcg/day allowable limit under Proposition 65.

4. Notably absent from the label of the Products is a “clear and reasonable

1 warning” pursuant to California’s Proposition 65 that the Products exceed the .5  
2 mcg/day allowable limit for lead under Proposition 65. *See* 27 C.C.R. 27001(c);  
3 Health & Safety Code § 25249.6. Defendant’s failure to include the required  
4 Proposition 65 warning on the Products constitutes a material misrepresentation and/or  
5 omission, in violation of California consumer protection law.

6 5. This Complaint does not allege a violation of Proposition 65. Proposition  
7 65 is relevant, however, to the extent it provides information concerning the material  
8 misrepresentations and omissions in violation of California’s Consumer Protection  
9 laws, and guidance as to a reasonable consumer’s purchasing decisions in California.  
10 Reasonable consumers purchased the Products believing, among other things, that they  
11 were in compliance with all applicable California regulations and safe according to  
12 California regulatory thresholds. Reasonable consumers would not have purchased the  
13 Products if they had known that they contained lead in excess of the California  
14 Proposition 65 limits, or would have purchased them on different terms.

15 6. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of those similarly  
16 situated and seeks to represent a National Class, and California Subclass (defined  
17 *infra.*). Plaintiff seeks damages, interest thereon, reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs,  
18 restitution, other equitable relief, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendant has  
19 enjoyed from its unlawful and/or deceptive business practices, as detailed herein. In  
20 addition, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief to stop Defendant’s unlawful conduct in the  
21 labeling and marketing of the Products. Plaintiff makes these allegations based on his  
22 personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts and observations and, otherwise, on  
23 information and belief based on investigation of counsel.

#### 24 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

25 7. This Court has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
26 § 1332(d) because this is a class action in which: (1) there are over 100 members in the  
27 proposed class; (2) members of the proposed class have a different citizenship from  
28 Defendant; and (3) the claims of the proposed class members exceed \$5,000,000 in the

1 aggregate.

2 8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Barlean's because Defendant's  
3 contacts with the forum are continuous and substantial, and Defendant intentionally  
4 availed itself of the markets within California through its sales of the Products to  
5 California consumers.

6 9. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because  
7 Defendant engages in continuous and systematic business activities within the State of  
8 California. Moreover, a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the  
9 claims alleged herein occurred in this District. *See also* Declaration of Cory Brannon  
10 Regarding Venue Pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1780(d), attached hereto as Exhibit B.

### 11 **PARTIES**

12 10. Plaintiff Cory Brannon is a resident of San Diego, California, who  
13 purchased Barlean's Greens during the class period, as described below. Plaintiff's  
14 claim is typical of all Class members in this regard. In addition, the advertising and  
15 labeling on the package of the Product purchased by Plaintiff, including the  
16 Representations and omission of any Proposition 65 warning, is typical of the  
17 advertising and labeling of the Products purchased by members of the Classes.

18 11. Defendant Barlean's Organic Oils is a Washington Limited Liability  
19 Company, with principal offices at 3660 Slater Road, Ferndale, WA 98248.

20 12. Defendant and its agents promoted, marketed and sold the Products at  
21 issue in this jurisdiction and in this judicial district. The unfair, unlawful, deceptive,  
22 and misleading advertising and labeling of the Products was prepared and/or approved  
23 by Defendant and its agents, and was disseminated by Defendant and its agents  
24 through labeling and advertising containing the misrepresentations alleged herein.

### 25 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### 26 **A. Defendant Manufactures, Labels and Advertises the Products**

27 13. Defendant manufactures, labels, markets, promotes, advertises, and sells  
28 Barlean's Greens Products.

14. Defendant markets and labels the Products with the Representations described herein. The following images depict the Products and the uniform, material Representations made on the Products:



**B. Defendant's Failure to Include the Proposition 65 Warning Is A Material Misrepresentation and Omission**

15. Absent from the label of the Products is any disclosure that the Products contain lead and a "clear and reasonable warning" pursuant to California's Proposition 65, that the Products exceed the .5 mcg/day allowable limit for lead.

16. The People of the State of California declared by initiative under Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." Proposition 65, § 1(b). To effectuate this goal, California's Proposition 65, Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*, prohibits exposing people to chemicals listed by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm above certain levels without a "clear and reasonable warning," unless the business responsible for the exposure can prove that it fits within a statutory exemption.

1           17. In 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known  
2 to cause reproductive harm, and in 1992, California officially listed lead and lead  
3 compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. One year later, in 1993, lead and lead  
4 compounds became subject to the clear and reasonable warning requirement regarding  
5 carcinogens under Proposition 65. *See* 27 C.C.R. 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §  
6 25249.6. Specifically, a Proposition 65 warning is required where a total daily intake  
7 of lead exceeds .5 mcg.

8           18. Lead is dangerous to humans, and can affect almost every organ and  
9 system in the body. Lead accumulates in the body over time, and can lead to health  
10 risks and toxicity, including inhibiting neurological function, anemia, kidney damage,  
11 seizures, and in extreme cases, comas and death. Lead can also cross the fetal barrier  
12 during pregnancy, exposing the mother and developing fetus to serious risks, including  
13 reduced growth and premature birth.

14           19. Defendant's Products exceed the Proposition 65 daily limit of .5 mcg of  
15 lead. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit A. In fact, based on independent testing, the Products exceed  
16 the allowable limit in a single serving. *Id.* The Products do not, however, contain the  
17 required Proposition 65 warning.

18           20. Defendant materially misled and failed to adequately inform consumers,  
19 including Plaintiff, that the Products contain lead in excess of the Proposition 65 limit  
20 of .5 mcg per day.

21           21. In addition, Defendant materially mislead consumers by making the  
22 Representations described herein, and failing to disclose that the Products contain lead  
23 and/or that they contain lead in excess of the Proposition 65 limits.

24           **C. Defendant's Structure/Function Claims Constitute Material**  
25           **Misrepresentations**

26           22. The Products are dietary supplements.

27           23. Defendant makes numerous claims on the Products' labels and in  
28 advertising concerning how the Products affect the structure and/or function of the

1 body, including that the Products: “Support cleansing of organs and tissues”; “Super-  
2 Boost your health and ENERGY”; “Help improve digestion”; “Aid the body’s natural  
3 detoxification”; “Promote a healthy immune system”; and “invigorate and nourish both  
4 your mind and body.” (collectively, “Structure/Function Representations”).

5 24. Dietary supplements are governed by the Dietary Supplement Health and  
6 Education Act of 1994 (“DSHEA”). Pursuant to DSHEA, a supplement manufacturer  
7 may only make claims concerning how a product affects the structure or function of  
8 the body without obtaining prior FDA approval if certain requirements are met,  
9 including that the manufacturer is able to substantiate that the claims are truthful and  
10 not misleading. 21 U.S.C. § 343(r)(6)(B).

11 25. The FDA has adopted the FTC’s substantiation standard of “competent  
12 and reliable scientific evidence” for dietary supplements.

13 26. The universally accepted form of scientific evidence recognized by  
14 experts in the field for determining whether a substance provides any human health  
15 benefit is by demonstrating its value over placebo through high-quality, well-  
16 conducted randomized controlled clinical trials (“RCTs”). *See, e.g.*, 21 CFR 314.126.  
17 Also, it is generally recognized that RCTs that are of sufficient quality to be relied  
18 upon for reaching efficacy conclusions should be subjected to a peer review process  
19 and published in a peer reviewed journal.

20 27. Competent and reliable scientific evidence is defined as: “tests, analysis,  
21 research, studies, or other evidence based on the expertise of professionals in the  
22 relevant area that has been conducted and evaluated in an objective manner by persons  
23 qualified to do so, using procedures generally accepted in the profession to yield  
24 accurate and reliable results.” *See* Guidance for Industry Substantiation for Dietary  
25 Supplement Claims Made Under Section 403(r)(6) of the Federal Food, Drug, and  
26 Cosmetic Act (Dec. 2008).

27 28. Despite this clear standard, on information and belief, Defendant has not  
28 performed any reliable or high-quality RCTs substantiating any of its

1 Structure/Function Representations about the Products, and cannot substantiate that the  
2 Structure/Function Representations are truthful and not misleading.

3 29. Defendant's Structure/Function Representations are materially false and  
4 misleading, and fail to comply with the clear standards set forth under DSHEA.

5 30. In addition, the Structure/Function Representations are materially false  
6 and misleading because the Products contain lead and contain lead in excess of the  
7 Proposition 65 limits, which directly contravenes the Structure/Function  
8 Representations.

9 31. Moreover, the fact that the Products contain a small disclaimer on the  
10 bottom of the side label, which states: "These statements have not been evaluated by  
11 the Food and Drug Administration. This product is not intended to diagnose, cure or  
12 prevent any disease" does not insulate Defendant's conduct. *See* 21 U.S.C. §  
13 343(r)(6)(B) (setting forth the labeling conditions in the conjunctive; that the  
14 manufacturer must have substantiation *and* the statement must contain a disclaimer).

15 **D. Plaintiff and Consumers Purchased the Products to Their Detriment**

16 32. Based on Defendant's uniform material misrepresentations and omissions,  
17 Plaintiff and consumers have purchased the Products to their detriment.

18 33. Plaintiff Cory Brannon purchased Barlean's Greens Organic Powder  
19 Formula from a Sprouts Farmers Market in Lemon Grove, California on or about May  
20 13, 2017 for \$41.99. Plaintiff purchased the Product for personal and family use.

21 34. Defendant labeled and sold the Products with the Structure/Function  
22 Representations, which are wholly unsubstantiated.

23 35. In addition, Defendant labeled and sold the Products with the express  
24 Representations and without any labeling information or warning indicating to  
25 consumers that they contained lead. Defendant knew or should have known that  
26 reasonable consumers would consider the Representations and presence of lead in  
27 deciding to purchase the Products. Accordingly, Defendant's Representations and  
28 omissions are false, misleading and reasonably likely to mislead reasonable consumers.

36. Defendant made the material misrepresentations and omissions with the intent to defraud consumers in that, among other things, consumers would be less likely to purchase the Products if they knew the truth, *e.g.*, that the Representations were false and/or misleading, and that the Products contained lead.

37. Plaintiff relied on the Product label and Defendant's Representations in making the decision to purchase the Product.

38. At the time Plaintiff purchased the Product, Plaintiff did not know, and had no reason to know, that the Representations were misleading, deceptive and unlawful. In addition, Plaintiff did not know, and had no reason to know that the Product contained lead. Nor did Plaintiff know, and had no reason to know, that the Product labels omitted the required Proposition 65 warning, and otherwise wholly failed to disclose the presence of lead in the Product. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Products, or would have purchased them on different terms, if he had known the truth.

39. It is possible, however, that Plaintiff would purchase the Products in the future if the Representations were truthful, and/or if the Products complied with the required California disclosure standards.

### **CLASS DEFINITION AND CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

40. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) on behalf of himself, on behalf of all others similarly situated, and as a member the Classes defined as follows (collectively, the "Class"):

All citizens of the United States who, within the relevant statute of limitations periods, purchased Defendant's Products ("Nationwide Class");

All citizens of California who, within four years prior to the filing of the initial Complaint, purchased Defendant's Products ("California Subclass");

41. Excluded from the Class are: (i) Defendant, its assigns, successors, and legal representatives; (ii) any entities in which Defendant has controlling interests; (iii) federal, state, and/or local governments, including, but not limited to, their departments, agencies, divisions, bureaus, boards, sections, groups, counsels, and/or subdivisions; (iv) all persons presently in bankruptcy proceedings or who obtained a bankruptcy discharge in the last three years; and (v) any judicial officer presiding over this matter and person within the third degree of consanguinity to such judicial officer.

42. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or otherwise alter the class definition presented to the Court at the appropriate time, or to propose or eliminate sub-classes, in response to facts learned through discovery, legal arguments advanced by Defendant, or otherwise.

43. This action is properly maintainable as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 for the reasons set forth below.

44. **Numerosity:** Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Upon information and belief, the Class consist of hundreds of thousands of purchasers dispersed throughout the United States, and the Subclass likewise consists of at least thousands of purchasers throughout the State of California. Accordingly, it would be impracticable to join all members of the Class before the Court.

45. **Common Questions Predominate:** There are numerous and substantial questions of law or fact common to all members of the Class that predominate over any individual issues. Included within the common questions of law or fact are:

- Whether the Product Representations and omissions are, or any single Representation or omission is, false, misleading and/or deceptive;
- Whether Defendant made a material misrepresentation or omission by failing to provide a Proposition 65 warning on the Products;
- Whether Defendant engaged in unlawful, unfair or deceptive business

practices by advertising and selling its Products;

- Whether Defendant violated California Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, *et seq.*; and the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, *et seq.*;
- Whether Defendant committed a breach of express warranty;
- Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to equitable and/or injunctive relief;
- Whether Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damage as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct;
- The proper measure of damages sustained by Plaintiff and the Class; and
- Whether Defendant was unjustly enriched by its unlawful practices.

46. **Typicality**: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class he seeks to represent because Plaintiff, like the Class members, purchased Defendant's misbranded Products. Defendant's unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent actions concern the same business practices described herein irrespective of where they occurred or were experienced. Plaintiff and the Class sustained similar injuries arising out of Defendant's conduct. Plaintiff's and Class Member's claims arise from the same practices and course of conduct and are based on the same legal theories.

47. **Adequacy**: Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class he seeks to represent because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the Class Plaintiff seeks to represent. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class and has retained counsel experienced and competent in the prosecution of complex class actions, including complex questions that arise in consumer protection litigation.

48. **Superiority and Substantial Benefit**: A class action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable and no other group method of

1 adjudication of all claims asserted herein is more efficient and manageable for at least  
2 the following reasons:

- 3 a. The claims presented in this case predominate over any questions of  
4 law or fact, if any exists at all, affecting any individual member of  
5 the Class;
- 6 b. Absent a Class, the members of the Class will continue to suffer  
7 damage and Defendant's unlawful conduct will continue without  
8 remedy while Defendant profits from and enjoys its ill-gotten gains;
- 9 c. Given the size of individual Class members' claims, few, if any,  
10 members could afford to or would seek legal redress individually  
11 for the wrongs Defendant committed against them, and absent  
12 members have no substantial interest in individually controlling the  
13 prosecution of individual actions;
- 14 d. When the liability of Defendant has been adjudicated, claims of all  
15 members of the Class can be administered efficiently and/or  
16 determined uniformly by the Court; and
- 17 e. This action presents no difficulty that would impede its  
18 management by the Court as a class action, which is the best  
19 available means by which Plaintiff and members of the Class can  
20 seek redress for the harm caused to them by Defendant.

21 49. Because Plaintiff seeks relief for all members of the Class, the prosecution  
22 of separate actions by individual members would create a risk of inconsistent or  
23 varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class, which would  
24 establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.

25 50. The prerequisites to maintaining a class action for injunctive or equitable  
26 relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) are met as Defendant has acted or refused to  
27 act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final  
28 injunctive or equitable relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

51. The prerequisites to maintaining a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) are also met as questions of law or fact common to Class members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.

52. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

### **CAUSES OF ACTION**

#### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Unfair and Unlawful Business Acts and Practices (Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*) (for the California Subclass)**

53. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

54. Defendant's conduct constitutes an unfair business act and practice pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL"). The UCL provides, in pertinent part: "Unfair competition shall mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising . . . ."

55. Plaintiff brings this claim seeking equitable and injunctive relief to stop Defendant's misconduct, as complained of herein, and to seek restitution of the amounts Defendant acquired through the unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices described herein.

56. Defendant's knowing conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes an "unfair" and/or "fraudulent" business practice, as set forth in California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208.

57. Defendant's conduct was and continues to be unfair and fraudulent because, directly or through its agents and employees, Defendant made uniform

1 materially false representations and omissions.

2 58. As described herein, Defendant made Structure/Function Representations,  
3 including that the Products: “Support cleansing of organs and tissues”; “Super-Boost  
4 your health and ENERGY”; “Help improve digestion”; “Aid the body’s natural  
5 detoxification”; and “Promote a healthy immune system”; and “invigorate and nourish  
6 both your mind and body.” The Structure/Function Representations do not comply  
7 with DSHEA and are false and misleading.

8 59. In addition, Defendant made materially false representations and  
9 omissions by failing to include the required Proposition 65 warning on the Products,  
10 even though the Products exceed the Proposition 65 allowable lead limits.

11 60. Defendant is aware that the representations and omissions it has made  
12 about the Products were and continue to be false and misleading.

13 61. Defendant had an improper motive—to derive financial gain at the  
14 expense of accuracy or truthfulness—in its practices related to the labeling and  
15 advertising of the Products.

16 62. There were reasonable alternatives available to Defendant to further  
17 Defendant’s legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein.

18 63. Defendant’s misrepresentations of material facts, as set forth herein, also  
19 constitute an “unlawful” practice because they violate California Civil Code §§ 1572,  
20 1573, 1709, 1710, 1711, and 1770, as well as the common law.

21 64. Defendant’s conduct in making the representations and omissions  
22 described herein constitutes a knowing failure to adopt policies in accordance with  
23 and/or adherence to applicable laws, as set forth herein, all of which are binding upon  
24 and burdensome to its competitors. This conduct engenders an unfair competitive  
25 advantage for Defendant, thereby constituting an unfair business practice under  
26 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208.

27 65. In addition, Defendant’s conduct was, and continues to be, unfair, in that  
28 its injury to countless purchasers of the Products is substantial, and is not outweighed

1 by any countervailing benefits to consumers or to competitors.

2 66. Moreover, Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass could not  
 3 have reasonably avoided such injury. Defendant's uniform, material representations  
 4 and omissions regarding the Products were likely to deceive, and Defendant knew or  
 5 should have known that its representations and omissions were untrue and misleading.  
 6 Plaintiff purchased the Products in reliance on the Representations made by Defendant,  
 7 as alleged herein, and without knowledge of Defendant's material misrepresentations  
 8 and omissions.

9 67. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass have been directly and  
 10 proximately injured by Defendant's conduct in ways including, but not limited to, the  
 11 monies paid to Defendant for the Products, interest lost on those monies, and  
 12 consumers' unwitting support of a business enterprise that promotes deception and  
 13 undue greed to the detriment of consumers, such as Plaintiff and Subclass members.

14 68. As a result of the business acts and practices described above, Plaintiff  
 15 and members of the California Subclass, pursuant to § 17203, are entitled to an Order  
 16 enjoining such future wrongful conduct on the part of Defendant and such other Orders  
 17 and judgments that may be necessary to disgorge Defendant's ill-gotten gains and to  
 18 restore to any person in interest any money paid for the Products as a result of the  
 19 wrongful conduct of Defendant.

20 69. Pursuant to Civil Code § 3287(a), Plaintiff and the California Subclass are  
 21 further entitled to pre-judgment interest as a direct and proximate result of Defendant's  
 22 unfair and fraudulent business conduct. The amount on which interest is to be  
 23 calculated is a sum certain and capable of calculation, and Plaintiff and the California  
 24 Subclass are entitled to interest in an amount according to proof.

25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 26 **Deceptive Advertising Practices**  
 27 **(California Business & Professions Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*)**  
 28 **(*for the California Subclass*)**

70. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained

1 in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

2 71. California Business & Professions Code § 17500 prohibits “unfair,  
3 deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising . . . .”

4 72. Defendant violated § 17500 when it represented, through its false and  
5 misleading Representations and omissions, that Defendant’s Products possessed  
6 characteristics and value that they did not actually have. Among other things,  
7 Defendant made Structure/Function Representations and omissions, which do not  
8 comply with the DSHEA requirements, as described herein. In addition, Defendant  
9 failed to include the required Proposition 65 warning and to disclose that the Products  
10 exceeded the allowable lead limits.

11 73. Defendant’s deceptive practices were specifically designed to induce  
12 reasonable consumers like Plaintiff to purchase the Products. Defendant’s uniform,  
13 material misrepresentations and omissions regarding the Products were likely to  
14 deceive, and Defendant knew or should have known that its uniform  
15 misrepresentations and omissions were untrue and/or misleading. Plaintiff purchased  
16 the Products in reliance on the Representations made by Defendant, as alleged herein.

17 74. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass have been directly and  
18 proximately injured by Defendant’s conduct in ways including, but not limited to, the  
19 monies paid to Defendant for the Products, interest lost on those monies, and  
20 consumers’ unwitting support of a business enterprise that promotes deception and  
21 undue greed to the detriment of consumers, such as Plaintiff and Subclass members.

22 75. The above acts of Defendant were and are likely to deceive reasonable  
23 consumers in violation of § 17500.

24 76. In making the statements and omissions alleged herein, Defendant knew  
25 or should have known that the statements and representations were untrue or  
26 misleading, and acted in violation of § 17500.

27 77. Defendant continues to engage in unlawful, unfair and deceptive practices  
28 in violation of §17500.

1           78. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unlawful conduct in  
 2 violation of § 17500, Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass, pursuant to §  
 3 17535, are entitled to an Order of this Court enjoining such future wrongful conduct on  
 4 the part of Defendant, and requiring Defendant to disclose the true nature of its  
 5 misrepresentations and omissions.

6           79. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass also request an Order  
 7 requiring Defendant to disgorge its ill-gotten gains and/or award full restitution of all  
 8 monies wrongfully acquired by Defendant by means of such acts of false advertising,  
 9 plus interests and attorneys' fees.

10                                   **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 11                                   **Consumer Legal Remedies Act**  
 12                                   **(Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, *et seq.*)**  
                                       **(for the California Subclass)**

13           80. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained  
 14 in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

15           81. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to California's Consumer Legal  
 16 Remedies Act ("CLRA"), Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, *et seq.*

17           82. The CLRA provides that "unfair methods of competition and unfair or  
 18 deceptive acts or practices undertaken by any person in a transaction intended to result  
 19 or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services to any consumer are  
 20 unlawful."

21           83. The Products are "goods," as defined by the CLRA in California Civil  
 22 Code §1761(a).

23           84. Defendant is a "person," as defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code  
 24 §1761(c).

25           85. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass are "consumers," as  
 26 defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code §1761(d).

27           86. Purchase of the Products by Plaintiff and members of the California  
 28 Subclass are "transactions," as defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code

1 §1761(e).

2 87. Defendant violated Section 1770(a)(5) by representing that the Products  
3 have “characteristics, . . . uses [or] benefits . . . which [they] do not have” in that the  
4 Products are falsely and misleadingly labeled and represented, as described herein.

5 88. Similarly, Defendant violated section 1770(a)(7) by representing that the  
6 Products “are of a particular standard, quality, or grade . . . if they are of another” by  
7 making material misrepresentations and omissions, making the Structure/Function  
8 Representations, and omitting the required Proposition 65 warning.

9 89. In addition, Defendant violated section 1770(a)(9) by advertising the  
10 Products “with intent not to sell them as advertised” in that the Products are  
11 misrepresented because they contain material misrepresentations and omissions.

12 90. Defendant’s uniform, material, misrepresentations and omissions  
13 regarding the Products were likely to deceive, and Defendant knew or should have  
14 known that its misrepresentations and omissions were untrue and misleading.

15 91. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass could not have  
16 reasonably avoided such injury. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass were  
17 unaware of the existence of facts that Defendant suppressed and failed to disclose; and,  
18 Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass would not have purchased the  
19 Products and/or would have purchased them on different terms had they known the  
20 truth.

21 92. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass have been directly and  
22 proximately injured by Defendant’s conduct. Such injury includes, but is not limited  
23 to, the purchase price of the Products and/or the price of the Products at the prices at  
24 which they were offered.

25 93. Given that Defendant’s conduct violated § 1770(a)(5), Plaintiff and  
26 members of the California Subclass are entitled to seek and seek injunctive relief to put  
27 an end to Defendant’s violations of the CLRA.  
28

1           94. Moreover, Defendant's conduct is malicious, fraudulent, and wanton in  
2 that Defendant intentionally misled and withheld material information from consumers  
3 to increase the sale of the Products.

4           95. Pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782(a), Plaintiff on his own behalf,  
5 and on behalf of members of the California Subclass, notified Defendant of the alleged  
6 violations of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act related to the fact that the Products  
7 contain lead.<sup>1</sup> Despite giving Defendant far more than 30-days from the date of the  
8 notification letter to provide appropriate relief for violations of the CLRA, Defendant  
9 has failed to provide any such relief. As such, Plaintiff also seeks compensatory,  
10 monetary and punitive damages for Plaintiff's claims that the Products contain lead, in  
11 addition to equitable and injunctive relief, and requests that this Court enter such  
12 Orders or judgments as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any  
13 money which may have been acquired by means of such unfair business practices, and  
14 for such other relief as is provided in California Civil Code § 1780 and in the Prayer  
15 for Relief.

16           96. Plaintiff further requests that the Court enjoin Defendant from continuing  
17 to employ the unlawful methods, acts, and practices alleged herein pursuant to §  
18 1780(a)(2).

19  
20                               **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
21                               **Breach of Express Warranty**  
22                               *(for the Nationwide Class and California Subclass)*

23           97. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate by reference the allegations contained  
24 in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is sending another CLRA letter to Defendant concerning the  
26 structure/function Representations alleged herein. For now, Plaintiff only seeks  
27 monetary damages under the CLRA pursuant to Plaintiff's claims related to lead and  
28 seeks injunctive relief for the claims structure/function Representations. Plaintiff will  
amend his Complaint to also seek monetary relief for the Structure/Function claims  
after the 30-day notification period has run.

1           98. By advertising and selling the Products at issue, Defendant made promises  
 2 and affirmations of fact on the Products' packaging, and through its marketing and  
 3 advertising, as described herein. This labeling and advertising constitutes express  
 4 warranties and became part of the basis of the bargain between Plaintiff and members  
 5 of the Class, and Defendant.

6           99. Defendant purports, through its advertising and labeling, to create express  
 7 warranties that the Products comport with the Product Representations, including the  
 8 Structure/Function Representations.

9           100. Despite Defendant's express warranties about the nature of the Products,  
 10 the Products do not comply with the Representations, do not meet the DSHEA  
 11 standards for the Structure/Function Representations, and exceed the allowable lead  
 12 limits, but do not contain the required Proposition 65 warning. Thus, the Products  
 13 were not what Defendant represented them to be.

14           101. Accordingly, Defendant breached express warranties about the Products  
 15 and their qualities because the Products do not conform to Defendant's affirmations  
 16 and promises.

17           102. Plaintiff and members of the Classes purchased the Products and  
 18 reasonably relied on the express warranties made by Defendant.

19           103. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach of express  
 20 warranty, Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed in the amount of the  
 21 purchase price they paid for the Products. Further, Plaintiff and members of the Class  
 22 have suffered and continue to suffer economic losses and other general and specific  
 23 damages including, but not limited to, the amounts paid for the Products, and any  
 24 interest that would have accrued on those monies, in an amount to be proven at trial.

25                           **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
 26                           **QUASI-CONTRACT**

27                           *(for the Nationwide Class and California Subclass)*

28           104. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs

1 as if fully set forth herein.

2 105. By purchasing the Products, Plaintiff and members of the Class conferred  
3 a benefit on Defendant in the form of the purchase price of the Products.

4 106. Defendant had knowledge of such benefits.

5 107. Defendant appreciated the benefit because, were consumers not to  
6 purchase the Products, Defendant would not generate revenue from the sales of the  
7 Products.

8 108. Defendant's acceptance and retention of the benefit is inequitable and  
9 unjust because the benefit was obtained by Defendant's fraudulent and misleading  
10 representations and omissions.

11 109. Equity cannot in good conscience permit Defendant to be economically  
12 enriched for such actions at the expense of Plaintiff and members of the Class, and  
13 therefore restitution and/or disgorgement of such economic enrichment is required

#### 14 **PRAYER**

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly  
16 situated, pray for judgment against Defendant as follows:

17 A. For an order certifying the Nationwide Class and the California Subclass  
18 under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; naming Plaintiff as  
19 representative of the nationwide Class and respective Subclass; and naming Plaintiff's  
20 attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the Class and Subclass;

21 B. For an order declaring that Defendant's conduct violates the statutes and  
22 laws referenced herein.

23  
24 C. For an order awarding, as appropriate, compensatory and monetary  
25 damages, restitution or disgorgement to Plaintiff and the Class for all causes of action;

26 D. For an order requiring Defendant to immediately cease and desist from  
27 selling its misbranded Products in violation of law; enjoining Defendant from  
28 continuing to label, market, advertise, distribute, and sell the Products in the unlawful

1 manner described herein; and ordering Defendant to engage in corrective action;

2 E. For an order awarding attorneys' fees and costs;

3 F. For an order awarding punitive damages;

4 G. For an order awarding pre-and post-judgment interest; and

5 H. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

6  
7  
8 DATED: July 17, 2018

**KAMBERLAW, LLP**

9 By: /s/ Naomi B. Spector  
10 Naomi B. Spector, Esq.

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and the putative Classes*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# EXHIBIT A



Project ID

000019-001-001

REDACTED

## Description

Barlean's Greens

## Sample

Receipt Date	Receipt Condition	Received By	Sample Serving Size	Lot/Batch Number	Expiration Date
12/4/2017	Sealed, new container as would be bought in store	RD	8g	29-622	12/2018

## Analysis

Tested For	Methodology Used	Result	Unit	Result	Unit	Over/Under CA Prop-65 Limits
Arsenic	AOAC 993.14	0.164	ppm	1.312	mcg/serving	Under
Lead	AOAC 993.14	0.179	ppm	1.432	mcg/serving	Over
Mercury	AOAC 993.14	<0.007	ppm	0.056	mcg/serving	Under
Cadmium	AOAC 993.14	0.1	ppm	0.8	mcg/serving	Under

## Report

Conclusions	Release Date	Released By	Signature	Authorized By	Signature
Lead levels are above the .5 mcg/day recommended by CA Prop-65.	2017-12-15	RD		NT	

# EXHIBIT B

1 Naomi Spector (SBN 222573)  
Email: nspector@kamberlaw.com  
2 Christopher D. Moon (SBN 246622)  
Email: cmoon@kamberlaw.com  
3 **KAMBERLAW, LLP**  
9404 Genesee Avenue, Suite 340  
4 La Jolla, CA 92037  
Phone: 310.400.1053  
5 Fax: 212.202.6364

6 *Counsel for Plaintiff Cory Brannon, and the*  
7 *putative Classes*

8  
9  
10  
11 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13

14  
15 CORY BRANNON, individually, and  
16 on behalf of others similarly situated,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 BARLEAN'S,

20 Defendant.  
21

**Case No.:**

**DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF  
CORY BRANNON REGARDING  
VENUE PURSUANT TO CIVIL  
CODE § 1780(d)**

1 I, Cory Brannon, hereby declare:

2 1. I am a named-plaintiff and a prospective class member in the above-entitled  
3 action.

4 2. I am an adult, over 18 years old. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated  
5 herein and could competently testify thereto if called upon to do so.

6 3. I am currently a resident of San Diego, California. The Complaint filed in this  
7 matter contains causes of action for violations of: (1) Unfair Competition Law, Cal.  
8 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* (the “UCL”); (2) False Advertising  
9 Law, Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17500 *et seq.* (the “FAL”); (3) California’s  
10 Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civil Code §§ 1750 *et seq.* (the “CLRA”); (4)  
11 Breach of Express Warranty; and (5) Quasi-Contract. These causes of action arise out  
12 of Defendant’s unlawful merchandising practices with respect to its Barlean’s Greens  
13 Supplement Powders, which Defendant falsely and deceptively labels in contravention  
14 of the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 and without disclosing  
15 that the Powders exceed the allowable limits for lead under California’s Proposition  
16 65.

17 4. Civil Code § 1780(d) provides that a plaintiff seeking to bring a claim under  
18 Section 1780(a) of the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act may commence that  
19 action “in the county in which the person against whom it is brought resides, has his or  
20 her principal place of business, or is doing business, or in the county where the  
21 transaction or any substantial portion thereof occurred.”

22 5. I purchased the Product at issue, Barlean’s Greens Organic Powder, in Lemon  
23 Grove, a city located in San Diego County, California.

24 6. Accordingly, the Complaint filed in the above-entitled action, is filed in the  
25 proper venue pursuant to Civil Code § 1780(d).

1  
2 I declare under the penalty of perjury under laws of the State of California that the  
3 foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.  
4

5 Executed on May 8, 2018, in San Diego, California.  
6

7 DocuSigned by:  
8   
9 0FE146EEEECC4E8...

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

## 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**

CORY BRANNON, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego County, CA  
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Naomi B. Spector, Esq., KamberLaw LLP  
9404 Genesee Ave., Suite 340, La Jolla, CA 92037  
Tel: (310) 400-1053

**DEFENDANTS**

BARLEAN'S ORGANIC OILS, LLC

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Whatcom County, WA  
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

**'18CV1619 BTM MDD**

Joel Matteson, Esq., General Counsel of Barlean's Organic Oils, LLC  
3660 Slater Road, Ferndale, WA 98248  
Tel: (360) 398-5810

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 3 Federal Question  
(U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☒ 4 Diversity  
(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES** (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- |   | PTF                                   | DEF                        |   | PTF                        | DEF                                   |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Citizen of This State                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State     | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4            |
| Citizen of Another State                | <input type="checkbox"/> 2            | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3            | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6            |

**IV. NATURE OF SUIT** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.](#)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice <b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other <b>LABOR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act <b>IMMIGRATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) <b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education <b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b> <b>Habeas Corpus:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <b>Other:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement			

**V. ORIGIN** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding    ☐ 2 Removed from State Court    ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court    ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened    ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)    ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer    ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION**

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

28 U.S.C. 1332

Brief description of cause:

Consumer Class Action - Unfair and Unlawful Business Acts and Practices

**VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**

☒ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

Exceeds \$5M aggregate

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes    ☐ No

**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY**

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

July 17, 2018

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

s/ Naomi B. Spector

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

## 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 cases.**)
- 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: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- 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 statute.
- 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: [Class Action Claims Barlean's Misrepresents Supplement Powders' Health Benefits, Lead Content](#)

---