

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK**

Michael Nemirovsky, individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Reneotech, Inc.,

Defendant.

x

:

:

Case No.

:

:

:

:

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

:

:

:

:

:

x

Plaintiff, Michael Nemirovsky (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by his attorneys, alleges the following upon information and belief, except for those allegations pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based on personal knowledge:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This action seeks to remedy the deceptive and misleading business practices of Reneotech, Inc. (hereinafter “Defendant”) with respect to the marketing and sales of Defendant’s EcoRaider / EcoVenger products throughout the state of New York and throughout the country.

The EcoRaider / EcoVenger products include the following (hereinafter the “Products”):

- EcoRaider / EcoVenger Bed Bug Killer;
- EcoRaider / EcoVenger Mosquito-Go;
- EcoRaider / EcoVenger Ant & Crawling Insect Killer.

2. Defendant manufactures, sells, and distributes the Products using a marketing and advertising campaign centered around claims that appeal to health-conscious consumers, i.e., that

its Products are “Natural;” however, Defendant's advertising and marketing campaign is false, deceptive, and misleading because the Products contain non-natural, synthetic ingredients.

3. Plaintiff and those similarly situated (“Class Members”) relied on Defendant's misrepresentations that the Products are “Natural” when purchasing the Products. Plaintiff and Class Members paid a premium for the Products based upon their “Natural” representation. Given that Plaintiff and Class Members paid a premium for the Products based on Defendant's misrepresentations, Plaintiff and Class Members suffered an injury in the amount of the premium paid.

4. Defendant’s conduct violated and continues to violate, *inter alia*, New York General Business Law §§ 349 and 350. Defendant breached and continues to breach its warranties regarding the Products. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant on behalf of himself and Class Members who purchased the Products during the applicable statute of limitations period (the “Class Period”).

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

5. Consumers have become increasingly concerned about the effects of synthetic and chemical ingredients in food, cleaning products, bath and beauty products and everyday household products. Companies such as the Defendant have capitalized on consumers’ desire for purportedly “natural products.” Indeed, consumers are willing to pay, and have paid, a premium for products branded “natural” over products that contain synthetic ingredients. In 2015, sales of natural products grew 9.5% to \$180 billion.<sup>1</sup> Reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Natural Products Industry Sales up 9.5% to \$180bn Says NBJ*, FOOD NAVIGATOR, [http://www.foodnavigator-usa.com/Markets/EXPO-WEST-trendspotting-organics-natural-claims/\(page\)/6](http://www.foodnavigator-usa.com/Markets/EXPO-WEST-trendspotting-organics-natural-claims/(page)/6); *see also* Shoshanna Delventhal, *Study Shows Surge in Demand for “Natural” Products*, INVESTOPEDIA (February 22, 2017), <http://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/022217/study-shows-surge-demand-natural-products.asp> (Study by Kline Research indicated that in 2016, the personal care market reached 9% growth in the U.S. and 8% in the U.K. The trend-driven natural and organic personal care industry is on track to be worth \$25.1 million by 2025); *Natural*

Class Members, value natural products for important reasons, including the belief that they are safer and healthier than alternative products that are not represented as natural.

6. Despite the Products containing synthetic ingredients, Defendant markets the Products as being “Natural.” The Products’ labeling are depicted below:

---

*living: The next frontier for growth? [NEXT Forecast 2017]*, NEW HOPE NETWORK (December 20, 2016), <http://www.newhope.com/beauty-and-lifestyle/natural-living-next-frontier-growth-next-forecast-2017>.

### EcoRaider / EcoVenger Bed Bug Killer



#### Synthetic Ingredients:

- Geraniol
- Sodium Lauryl Sulfate
- Glycerol Monooleate
- Silica Hydrate

EcoRaider / EcoVenger Mosquito-Go



Synthetic Ingredients:

- Geraniol
- Sodium Lauryl Sulfate
- Glycerol Monooleate
- Silica Hydrate

**EcoRaider / EcoVenger Ant & Crawling Insect Killer**



**Synthetic Ingredients:**

- Geraniol
- Sodium Lauryl Sulfate

7. Defendant's representations that the Products are "Natural" are false, misleading, and deceptive because the Products contain multiple ingredients that are, as explained below, synthetic.

- a. **Geraniol** is a synthetic substance and adjuvant. *See* 21 C.F.R. § 182.60.
- b. **Sodium Laureth Sulfate** is a multipurpose additive. *See* 21 C.F.R. §172.822.
- c. **Silica** is also known as **Silicon Dioxide** and is an anticaking agent. *See* 21 C.F.R. §172.480.
- d. **Glycerol Monooleate** (Glyceryl Monooleate) is prepared by esterification of commercial oleic acid that is derived either from edible sources or from tall oil fatty acids meeting the requirements of § 172.862 of this chapter. *See* 21 C.F.R. § 184.1323.

8. Whether Defendant's labeling of the Products as "Natural" is deceptive is judged by whether it would deceive or mislead a reasonable person, which is a question for determination by a finder of fact. To assist in ascertaining what a reasonable consumer believes the term natural means, one can look to the regulatory agencies for their guidance.

9. In 2013, the United States Department of Agriculture ("USDA") issued a Draft Guidance Decision Tree for Classification of Materials as Synthetic or Nonsynthetic (Natural). In accordance with this decision tree, a substance is natural (as opposed to synthetic) if: (a) it is manufactured, produced, or extracted from a natural source (i.e. naturally occurring mineral or biological matter); (b) it has not undergone a chemical change (i.e. a process whereby a substance is transformed into one or more other distinct substances) so that it is chemically or structurally different than how it naturally occurs in the source material; or (c) the chemical

change was created by a naturally occurring biological process such as composting, fermentation, or enzymatic digestion or by heating or burning biological matter. **(Exhibit A).**

10. Congress has defined "synthetic" to mean "a substance that is formulated or manufactured by a chemical process or by a process that chemically changes a substance extracted from naturally occurring plants, animals, or mineral sources . . . ." 7 U.S.C. § 6502 (2.1).

11. Consumers lack the meaningful ability to test or independently ascertain or verify whether a product is natural, especially at the point of sale. Consumers would not know the true nature of the ingredients merely by reading the ingredients label.

12. Discovering that the ingredients are not natural and are actually synthetic requires a scientific investigation and knowledge of chemistry beyond that of the average consumer. This is why, even though the ingredients listed above are identified on the Products' packaging in the ingredients listed, the reasonable consumer would not understand (nor are they expected to understand) that these ingredients are synthetic.

13. Moreover, the reasonable consumer is not expected or required to scour the ingredients list on the Products in order to confirm or debunk Defendant's prominent claims, representations, and warranties that the Products are "Natural."

14. Defendant did not disclose that the above listed ingredients are synthetic ingredients. A reasonable consumer understands Defendant's "Natural" claim to mean that the Products are "Natural" and do not contain synthetic ingredients.

15. Defendant has thus violated, *inter alia*, NY General Business Law § 392-b by: a) putting upon an article of merchandise, bottle, wrapper, package, label or other thing, containing or covering such an article, or with which such an article is intended to be sold, or is sold, a false



description or other indication of or respecting the kind of such article or any part thereof; and b) selling or offering for sale an article which, to its knowledge, is falsely described or indicated upon any such package, or vessel containing the same, or label thereupon, in any of the particulars specified.

16. Consumers rely on label representations and information in making purchasing decisions.

17. The marketing of the Products as “Natural” in a prominent location on the label of the Products, throughout the Class Period, evidences Defendant’s awareness that “Natural” claims are material to consumers.

18. Defendant’s deceptive representations and omissions are material in that a reasonable person would attach importance to such information and would be induced to act upon such information in making purchase decisions.

19. Plaintiff and the Class Members reasonably relied to their detriment on Defendant’s misleading representations and omissions.

20. Defendant’s false, misleading, and deceptive misrepresentations and omissions are likely to continue to deceive and mislead reasonable consumers and the general public, as they have already deceived and misled Plaintiff and the Class Members.

21. In making the false, misleading, and deceptive representations and omissions described herein, Defendant knew and intended that consumers would pay a premium for a Products labeled “Natural” over comparable products not so labeled.

22. As an immediate, direct, and proximate result of Defendant’s false, misleading, and deceptive representations and omissions, Defendant injured Plaintiff and the Class Members in that they:

- a. Paid a sum of money for Products that were not what Defendant represented;
  - b. Paid a premium price for Products that were not what Defendant represented;
  - c. Were deprived of the benefit of the bargain because the Products they purchased was different from what Defendant warranted;
  - d. Were deprived of the benefit of the bargain because the Products they purchased had less value than what Defendant represented;
  - e. Used Products that were of a different quality than what Defendant promised; and
  - f. Were denied the benefit of the beneficial properties of the natural product Defendant promised.
23. Had Defendant not made the false, misleading, and deceptive representations and omissions, Plaintiff and the Class Members would not have been willing to pay the same amount for the Products they purchased, and, consequently, Plaintiff and the Class Members would not have been willing to purchase the Products.
24. Plaintiff and the Class Members paid for Products that were “Natural” but received Products that were not “Natural.” The Products Plaintiff and the Class Members received were worth less than the Products for which they paid.
25. Based on Defendant’s misleading and deceptive representations, Defendant was able to, and did, charge a premium price for the Products over the cost of competitive products not bearing an “Natural” label.
26. Plaintiff and the Class Members all paid money for the Products; however, Plaintiff and the Class Members did not obtain the full value of the advertised Products due to Defendant’s misrepresentations and omissions. Plaintiff and the Class Members purchased, purchased more of, and/or paid more for, the Products than they would have had they known the

truth about the Products. Consequently, Plaintiff and the Class Members have suffered injury in fact and lost money as a result of Defendant's wrongful conduct.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27. Jurisdiction is proper pursuant to New York Civil Practice Law and Rules ("CPLR") §§ 301 & 302 and venue is proper pursuant to CPLR § 503.

28. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant conducts and transacts business in the state of New York, contracts to supply goods within the state of New York, and supplies goods within the state of New York.

29. Venue is proper because Plaintiff and many Class Members reside in New York County in the state of New York, and throughout the state of New York. A substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the Classes' claims occurred in this county.

### **PARTIES**

#### **Plaintiff**

30. Plaintiff is an individual consumer who, at all times material hereto, was a citizen of New York State. Plaintiff purchased the Product during the Class Period. Plaintiff purchased Defendant's Bed Bug Killer for his personal use on June 10, 2022 for a purchase price of \$21.72 on Amazon.com. Plaintiff purchased the Product in the state of New York and had the product shipped to his home in the state of New York. The Product purchased by the Plaintiff is substantially and sufficiently similar to the Products that Plaintiff did not purchase (i.e. each of Defendant's Products set forth herein in paragraph 1).

31. The packaging of the Product Plaintiff purchased contained the representation that it is "Natural." Plaintiff believes that a product that is labeled as "Natural" does not contain synthetic ingredients. Plaintiff believes synthetic ingredients are formulated or manufactured by

a chemical process or by a process that chemically changes a substance extracted from naturally occurring plant, animal, or mineral sources. If the Products actually were “Natural,” as represented on the Products’ labels, Plaintiff would purchase the Products in the immediate future.

32. Had Defendant not made the false, misleading, and deceptive representation that the Products were “Natural,” Plaintiff would not have been willing to pay the same amount for the Product, and, consequently, would not have been willing to purchase the Product. Plaintiff purchased, purchased more of, and/or paid more for the Products than he would have had he known the truth about the Products. The Product Plaintiff received was worth less than the Product for which he paid. Plaintiff was injured in fact and lost money as a result of Defendant's improper conduct.

### **Defendant**

33. Defendant Reneotech, Inc. is a corporation with its principal place of business in North Bergen, New Jersey. Defendant manufactures, markets, advertises, and distributes the Products throughout the United States. Defendant created and/or authorized the false, misleading, and deceptive advertisements, packaging, and labeling for the Products.

### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

34. Plaintiff brings this matter on behalf of himself and those similarly situated. As detailed at length in this Complaint, Defendant orchestrated deceptive marketing and labeling practices. Defendant’s customers were uniformly impacted by and exposed to this misconduct. Accordingly, this Complaint is uniquely situated for class-wide resolution.

35. The Class is defined as all consumers who purchased the Products anywhere in the United States during the Class Period (the “Class”).

36. Plaintiff also seeks certification, to the extent necessary or appropriate, of a subclass of individuals who purchased the Products in the state of New York at any time during the Class Period (the “New York Subclass”).

37. The Class and New York Subclass shall be referred to collectively throughout the Complaint as the “Class.”

38. The Class is properly brought and should be maintained as a class action under Article 9 of the CPLR, satisfying the class action prerequisites of numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, and superiority because:

39. Numerosity: Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Plaintiff believes that there are thousands of consumers who are Class Members described above who have been damaged by Defendant’s deceptive and misleading practices.

40. Commonality: The questions of law and fact common to the Class Members which predominate over any questions which may affect individual Class Members include, but are not limited to:

- a. Whether Defendant is responsible for the conduct alleged herein which was uniformly directed at all consumers who purchased the Products;
- b. Whether Defendant’s misconduct set forth in this Complaint demonstrates that Defendant has engaged in unfair, fraudulent, or unlawful business practices with respect to the advertising, marketing, and sale of its Products;
- c. Whether Defendant made false and/or misleading statements to the Class and the public concerning the contents of its Products;
- d. Whether Defendant’s false and misleading statements concerning its Products were likely to deceive the public; and

- e. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to money damages under the same causes of action as the other Class Members?

These issues predominate over individual issues. This controversy will largely turn on Defendant's uniform behavior in misrepresenting the Products to the Class which will be evaluated under an objective "reasonable person" standard. Individual inquiries into the conduct of members of the Class will not be necessary.

41. Typicality: Plaintiff is a member of the Class. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of each Class Member in that every member of the Class was susceptible to the same deceptive, misleading conduct and purchased the Defendant's Products. Plaintiff is entitled to relief under the same causes of action as the other Class Members.

42. Adequacy: Plaintiff is an adequate Class representative because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class Members he seeks to represent; his consumer fraud claims are common to all members of the Class and he has a strong interest in vindicating his rights; he has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class action litigation, and they intend to vigorously prosecute this action.

43. Superiority: A class action is superior to the other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because:

- a. The joinder of thousands of individual Class Members is impracticable, cumbersome, unduly burdensome, and a waste of judicial and/or litigation resources;
- b. The individual claims of the Class Members may be relatively modest compared with the expense of litigating the claim, thereby making it impracticable, unduly

burdensome, and expensive (if not totally impossible) to justify individual actions;

- c. When Defendant's liability has been adjudicated, all Class Members' claims can be determined by the Court and administered efficiently in a manner far less burdensome and expensive than if it were attempted through filing, discovery, and trial of all individual cases;
- d. This class action will promote orderly, efficient, expeditious, and appropriate adjudication and administration of Class claims;
- e. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action;
- f. This class action will assure uniformity of decisions among Class Members;
- g. The Class is readily definable and prosecution of this action as a class action will eliminate the possibility of repetitious litigation;
- h. Class Members' interests in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions is outweighed by their interest in efficient resolution by single class action; and
- i. It would be desirable to concentrate in this single venue the litigation of all plaintiffs who were induced by Defendant's uniform false advertising to purchase its Products as being "Natural."

44. Accordingly, this Class is properly brought and should be maintained as a class action under Article 9 of the CPLR.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF NEW YORK GBL § 349**  
**(On Behalf of Plaintiff and New York Subclass Members)**

45. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in all the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

46. New York General Business Law Section 349 (“GBL § 349”) declares unlawful “[d]eceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any business, trade, or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state . . .”

47. The conduct of Defendant alleged herein constitutes recurring, “unlawful” deceptive acts and practices in violation of GBL § 349, and as such, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members seek monetary damages against Defendant.

48. There is no adequate remedy at law.

49. Defendant misleadingly, inaccurately, and deceptively presents its Products to consumers.

50. Defendant’s improper consumer-oriented conduct (including labeling and advertising the Products as being “Natural”) is misleading in a material way in that it, *inter alia*, induced Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members to purchase and pay a premium for Defendant’s Products and to use the Products when they otherwise would not have. Defendant made its untrue and/or misleading statements and representations willfully, wantonly, and with reckless disregard for the truth.

51. Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members have been injured inasmuch as they paid a premium for a product that was (contrary to Defendant’s representations) not “Natural.” Accordingly, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members received less than what they bargained and/or paid for.



52. Defendant’s advertising and Products’ packaging and labeling induced the Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members to buy Defendant’s Products and to pay a premium price for them.

53. Defendant’s deceptive and misleading practices constitute a deceptive act and practice in the conduct of business in violation of New York General Business Law §349(a) and Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members have been damaged thereby.

54. As a result of Defendant’s recurring, “unlawful” deceptive acts and practices, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members are entitled to monetary, compensatory, restitution, and disgorgement of all moneys obtained by means of Defendant’s unlawful conduct, interest, and attorneys’ fees and costs.

55. Plaintiff and Class Members seek actual damages under GBL § 349, and expressly waive any right to recover minimum, punitive, treble, and/or statutory damages pursuant to GBL § 349.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF NEW YORK GBL § 350**  
**(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members)**

56. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in all the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

57. N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350 provides, in part, as follows:

False advertising in the conduct of any business, trade, or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state is hereby declared unlawful.

58. N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350a(1) provides, in part, as follows:

The term ‘false advertising, including labeling, of a commodity, or of the kind, character, terms or conditions of any employment opportunity if such advertising is misleading in a material respect. In determining whether any advertising is misleading, there shall

be taken into account (among other things) not only representations made by statement, word, design, device, sound or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the advertising fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations with respect to the commodity or employment to which the advertising relates under the conditions proscribed in said advertisement, or under such conditions as are customary or usual . . .

59. Defendant’s labeling and advertisements contain untrue and materially misleading statements concerning Defendant’s Products inasmuch as they misrepresent that the Products are “Natural.”

60. Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members have been injured inasmuch as they relied upon the labeling, packaging, and advertising and paid a premium for the Products which was (contrary to Defendant’s representations) not “Natural.” Accordingly, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members received less than what they bargained and/or paid for.

61. Defendant’s advertising, packaging, and Products’ labeling induced the Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members to buy Defendant’s Products.

62. Defendant made its untrue and/or misleading statements and representations willfully, wantonly, and with reckless disregard for the truth.

63. Defendant’s conduct constitutes multiple, separate violations of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350.

64. Defendant made the material misrepresentations described in this Complaint in Defendant’s advertising, and on the Products’ packaging and labeling.

65. Defendant’s material misrepresentations were substantially uniform in content, presentation, and impact upon consumers at large. Moreover, all consumers purchasing the Products were and continue to be exposed to Defendant’s material misrepresentations.

66. As a result of Defendant's recurring, "unlawful" deceptive acts and practices, Plaintiff and New York Subclass Members are entitled to monetary, compensatory, restitution, and disgorgement of all moneys obtained by means of Defendant's unlawful conduct, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

67. Plaintiff and Class Members seek actual damages under GBL § 350, and expressly waive any right to recover minimum, punitive, or treble, and/or statutory damages pursuant to GBL § 350.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY**  
**(On Behalf of Plaintiff and All Class Members)**

68. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

69. Defendant provided the Plaintiff and Class Members with an express warranty in the form of written affirmations of fact promising and representing that the Products are "Natural."

70. The above affirmations of fact were not couched as "belief" or "opinion," and were not "generalized statements of quality not capable of proof or disproof."

71. These affirmations of fact became part of the basis for the bargain and were material to the Plaintiff's and Class Members' transactions.

72. Plaintiff and Class Members reasonably relied upon the Defendant's affirmations of fact and justifiably acted in ignorance of the material facts omitted or concealed when they decided to buy Defendant's Products.

73. Within a reasonable time after they knew or should have known of Defendant's breach, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and Class Members, placed Defendant on notice of its

breach by mailing Defendant a pre-suit letter on July 14, 2022, giving Defendant an opportunity to cure its breach, which it refused to do.

74. Defendant thereby breached the following state warranty laws:

- a. Code of Ala. § 7-2-313;
- b. Alaska Stat. § 45.02.313;
- c. A.R.S. § 47-2313;
- d. A.C.A. § 4-2-313;
- e. Cal. Comm. Code § 2313;
- f. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 4-2-313;
- g. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42a-2-313;
- h. 6 Del. C. § 2-313;
- i. D.C. Code § 28:2-313;
- j. Fla. Stat. § 672.313;
- k. O.C.G.A. § 11-2-313;
- l. H.R.S. § 490:2-313;
- m. Idaho Code § 28-2-313;
- n. 810 I.L.C.S. 5/2-313;
- o. Ind. Code § 26-1-2-313;
- p. Iowa Code § 554.2313;
- q. K.S.A. § 84-2-313;
- r. K.R.S. § 355.2-313;
- s. 11 M.R.S. § 2-313;
- t. Md. Commercial Law Code Ann. § 2-313;

- u. 106 Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. § 2-313;
- v. M.C.L.S. § 440.2313;
- w. Minn. Stat. § 336.2-313;
- x. Miss. Code Ann. § 75-2-313;
- y. R.S. Mo. § 400.2-313;
- z. Mont. Code Anno. § 30-2-313;
- aa. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 2-313;
- bb. Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 104.2313;
- cc. R.S.A. 382-A:2-313;
- dd. N.J. Stat. Ann. § 12A:2-313;
- ee. N.M. Stat. Ann. § 55-2-313;
- ff. N.Y. U.C.C. Law § 2-313;
- gg. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 25-2-313;
- hh. N.D. Cent. Code § 41-02-30;
- ii. II. O.R.C. Ann. § 1302.26;
- jj. 12A Okl. St. § 2-313;
- kk. Or. Rev. Stat. § 72-3130;
- ll. 13 Pa. Rev. Stat. § 72-3130;
- mm. R.I. Gen. Laws § 6A-2-313;
- nn. S.C. Code Ann. § 36-2-313;
- oo. S.D. Codified Laws, § 57A-2-313;
- pp. Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-2-313;
- qq. Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 2.313;

- rr. Utah Code Ann. § 70A-2-313;
- ss. 9A V.S.A. § 2-313;
- tt. Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-504.2;
- uu. Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 6A.2-313;
- vv. W. Va. Code § 46-2-313;
- ww. Wis. Stat. § 402.313;
- xx. Wyo. Stat. § 34.1-2-313.

75. Defendant breached the express warranty because the Products are not “Natural” because they contain synthetic ingredients.

76. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s breach of the express warranty, Plaintiff and Class Members were damaged in the amount of the price they paid for the Products, in an amount to be proven at trial.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, pray for judgment as follows:

- (a) Declaring this action to be a proper class action and certifying Plaintiff as the representative of the Class under Article 9 of the CPLR;
- (b) Awarding monetary damages, excluding treble and/or punitive damages as being consistent with New York State Class Action jurisprudence, pursuant to GBL § 349 and GBL § 350;
- (c) Awarding Plaintiff and Class Members their costs and expenses incurred in this action, including reasonable allowance of fees for Plaintiff’s attorneys and experts, and reimbursement of Plaintiff’s expenses; and

(d) Granting such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: February 8, 2023

**THE SULTZER LAW GROUP P.C.**

Jason P. Sultzer /s/

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Jason P. Sultzer, Esq.  
Daniel Markowitz, Esq.  
85 Civic Center Plaza, Suite 200  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601  
Tel: (845) 483-7100  
Fax: (888) 749-7747  
sultzerj@thesultzerlawgroup.com  
markowitzd@thesultzerlawgroup.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class*

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [EcoRaider, EcoVenger Insecticides Falsely Advertised as 'Natural,' Class Action Claims](#)

---