

1 Mark A. Neubauer (SBN 73728)
2 *mneubauer@carltonfields.com*
3 Steven B. Weisburd (SBN 171490)
4 *sweisburd@carltonfields.com*
5 Stephanie Chau (SBN 292699)
6 *schau@carltonfields.com*
7 CARLTON FIELDS, LLP
8 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1200
9 Los Angeles, CA 90067-2913
10 Telephone: (310) 843-6300
11 Facsimile: (310) 843-6301

12 Attorneys for Defendant JOHNSON & JOHNSON
13 CONSUMER INC., f/k/a and Successor
14 in Interest to NEUTROGENA CORPORATION

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 JAIMIE POTTS, individually and on
14 behalf of all others similarly situated,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 vs.

17 NEUTROGENA CORPORATION, a
18 Delaware corporation and DOES 1-50,
19 inclusive,

20 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:20-cv-06323

(Los Angeles County Superior Court
Case No. 20STCV15638)

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF
ACTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
SECTIONS 1332, 1441, 1446 AND
1453**

(28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(D), 1441, 1453)

[Declarations of Tina S. French and
Lisa Hillier filed concurrently]

**TO THE CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441, 1446, and 1453, Defendant Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc., formerly known as, and Successor in Interest to Neutrogena Corporation (“Defendant”), hereby removes this action from the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, to the United States District Court for the Central District of California, being the federal district embracing the place where the case is pending. Removal is proper because this is a putative nationwide class action “brought in a State court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction.” 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a) & 1453(b). Specifically, this action satisfies the jurisdictional prerequisites of the Class Action Fairness Act (“CAFA”). Minimal diversity exists because Defendant is at all times relevant herein a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, with its principal place of business in Skillman, New Jersey, and therefore a citizen of New Jersey, and the putative nationwide class includes citizens of other states who purchased the Neutrogena products at issue in this action. Additionally, the amount in controversy exceeds CAFA’s \$5 million jurisdictional minimum. This removal is timely because it has been filed within thirty days of the date that there was a defective attempt to serve Defendant with the summons and complaint. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1446(b).

I. BACKGROUND

A. Timeliness of Removal

On April 22, 2020, Jaimie Potts commenced this action by filing a Class Action Complaint (“Complaint”) in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, entitled *Jaimie Potts v. Neutrogena Corporation*, No. 20-STCV15638. On June 19, 2020, a First Amended Class Action Complaint (“First Amended Complaint”) was then filed in the Superior Court of the State of

1 California, County of Los Angeles, similarly entitled *Jaimie Potts v. Neutrogena*
 2 *Corporation*, No. 20-STCV15638, even though it purported to add new claims as
 3 well as three additional named plaintiffs and putative class representatives, Kim
 4 Mieszko, Christina Luka, and Rebeca Gonzalez. *See* First Amended Complaint, at
 5 p.1.¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), the Complaint and the First Amended
 6 Complaint are attached hereto respectively as Exhibits A and B, and copies of all
 7 other process, pleadings, and orders purportedly served upon Defendant in this
 8 action, along with other documents in the state court file, are attached as Exhibit C.

9 As used herein, “Plaintiffs” refers to Jaimie Potts, Kim Mieszko, Christina
 10 Luka, and Rebeca Gonzalez. A true and correct copy of the Summons and
 11 Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit A. A true and correct copy of the First
 12 Amended Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit B. Like the original Complaint,
 13 the First Amended Complaint erroneously names Neutrogena Corporation as
 14 defendant even though that corporation was merged into Johnson & Johnson
 15 Consumer Inc., which is successor in interest and therefore the proper party
 16 defendant in the action.

17 On June 18, 2020, Plaintiffs attempted to serve “Neutrogena Corporation”
 18 by delivering a copy of the Summons and First Amended Complaint to its former
 19 agent for service, which refused the service. This Notice is timely because it was
 20 filed within thirty days of attempted service of process on Defendant. 28 U.S.C.
 21 § 1446(b); *see also* *Murphy Bros., Inc. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc.*, 526 U.S.

22
 23
 24 ¹ Plaintiffs’ caption in the removed state-court action is erroneous in several
 25 respects. First, the caption to the First Amended Complaint lists only Plaintiff
 26 Jaimie Potts, and omits the added Plaintiffs Kim Mieszko, Christina Luka, and
 27 Rebeca Gonzalez. Second, the First Amended Complaint’s caption also
 28 erroneously lists as the Defendant “Neutrogena Corporation,” which, as alleged
 herein, was merged into Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. For removal purposes
 only, the caption of the instant removal petition tracks Plaintiffs’ caption in the
 removed state court action.

1 344, 347-48 (1999) (holding “that a named defendant’s time to remove is triggered
 2 by simultaneous service of the summons and complaint, or receipt of the
 3 complaint, ‘through service or otherwise,’ after and apart from the service of the
 4 summons, but not by mere receipt of the complaint unattended by any formal
 5 service”).

6 Written notice of the filing of this Notice of Removal and the removal of the
 7 state court action is being served on Plaintiffs through their counsel of record, the
 8 law firm of Finkelstein & Krinsk, LLP. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), a copy of
 9 this Notice of Removal is being promptly filed with the Clerk of the Superior
 10 Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

11 **B. The Parties**

12 Plaintiffs are residents and citizens of the states of California, New Jersey,
 13 New York, and Florida. *See* First Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 12-15. Plaintiff Jaimie
 14 Potts is a resident of Los Angeles County and a citizen of the State of California.
 15 *Id.*, ¶ 12. Plaintiff Christina Luka is a resident of Burlington County and a citizen
 16 of the State of New Jersey. *Id.*, ¶ 13. Plaintiff Kim Mileszko is a resident of Erie
 17 County and a citizen of the State of New York. *Id.*, ¶ 14. Plaintiff Rebeca
 18 Gonzalez is a resident of Broward County and a citizen of the State of Florida. *Id.*,
 19 ¶ 15. In their First Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs seek certification of a
 20 “Nationwide Class” as well as a “California Subclass,” a “New Jersey Subclass,” a
 21 “New York Subclass,” and a “Florida Subclass.” *Id.*, ¶ 45. Thus, for purposes of
 22 the minimal diversity requirement under the Class Action Fairness Act, the
 23 citizenship of Plaintiffs and all putative class members necessarily includes
 24 citizens of all 50 States. *Id.*

25 Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. is the successor in interest to Neutrogena
 26 Corporation, by virtue of a merger. As reflected in the attached Declaration of
 27 Tina S. French (“French Decl.”) filed concurrently with this Notice, Neutrogena
 28 Corporation was converted into an LLC and thereupon was merged into the

predecessor of Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. in 2015, and surrendered its right to transact business in California that same year. *See* French Decl., ¶ 4, Exhibits 1-5. Although the original Complaint and the First Amended Complaint both incorrectly name Neutrogena Corporation as the defendant party in this action, Neutrogena Corporation does not presently exist and, instead, is part of Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. The First Amended Complaint alleges that Neutrogena Corporation “is a subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson” with its principal place of business located in Los Angeles, California. First Amended Complaint, ¶ 9. In actuality, the proper party defendant in this action is Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc., which is incorporated in the State of New Jersey and has its principal place of business located in Skillman, New Jersey. *See* French Decl., ¶ 5 & Exhibit 6. Accordingly, for purposes of minimal diversity under the Class Action Fairness Act, Defendant is a citizen of New Jersey for purposes of this Notice of Removal. But even assuming *arguendo* that Neutrogena Corporation still existed as a California corporation, the Class Action Fairness Act’s minimal diversity requirement still would be satisfied, as alleged below.

C. Plaintiffs’ Putative Nationwide Class Action Complaint

In their First Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant engaged in misleading business practices with respect to the labeling and advertising of seven “makeup remover cleansing towelettes sold by Neutrogena,” First Amended Complaint, ¶ 2, which shall be referred to herein as the “Products.”²

² As used herein, “Products” refers to the seven cleansing towelette products identified by Plaintiffs in the First Amended Complaint. These seven Products are identified as: “Ultra-Soft Makeup Remover Wipes for Waterproof Makeup”; “Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes – Fragrance Free”; “Neutrogena Naturals Purifying Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes”; “Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes-Night Calming”; “Deep Clean Oil-Free Makeup Remover Cleansing Wipes”; “Deep Clean Purifying Micellar Cleansing Towelettes”; and “Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes-Hydrating.” First Amended Complaint, ¶ 2.

1 Plaintiff Potts alleges that she purchased one or more of the Products at a
2 local Costco store “for her daughter,” which when used allegedly caused her
3 daughter to develop “adverse skin reactions,” including a rash and skin irritation.
4 First Amended Complaint, ¶ 12. Plaintiff Mieszko alleges that she purchased one
5 or more of the Products for her daughter, who developed dry skin, bumps, and
6 adverse skin reactions around the areas she used the Product. *Id.*, ¶ 13. Plaintiff
7 Luka alleges that she wears contact lenses and purchased the “Ultra Soft” Product
8 from her local Target store, but then claims to have suffered adverse skin reactions
9 in the areas she used the Product. *Id.*, ¶ 14. Plaintiff Gonzalez alleges that she
10 purchased one of the Products at her local Costco but experienced adverse skin
11 reactions in the areas in which she used the Product. *Id.*, ¶ 15.

12 Plaintiffs allege that the Products’ labels and marketing were misleading
13 because they failed to contain adequate warnings of the potential for adverse skin
14 interactions. *Id.*, ¶¶ 16, 21-29, 36-38, 40-44. Despite the alleged adverse skin
15 reactions, Plaintiffs allege that they would consider purchasing the Products again
16 if Defendant “warned that the [Products] were not suitable for all skin types, a pre-
17 use patch test was recommended, and consumers were advised to cease use and
18 consult a physician if the [sic] experienced adverse skin conditions after using the
19 [Products].” *Id.*, ¶ 16.

20 Plaintiffs also variously allege that certain representations on the Products’
21 labeling, or in product marketing, were misleading or deceptive. *Id.*, ¶¶ 1, 18-20,
22 22, 30-35. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant knew of customer complaints about
23 adverse reactions and skin irritation, but failed to include adequate warnings of
24 those risks on the Products’ labeling. *Id.*, ¶¶ 25-27, 37-39. According to
25 Plaintiffs’ allegations, “a substantial number of users will be harmed by using the
26 [Products]” in the absence of the warnings Plaintiffs say should be given, *id.*, ¶ 37;
27 “a significant percentage of consumers will have a harmful reaction” without a
28 warning that they “undergo a proper preliminary skin test” to “determine the

1 suitability” of the Products for them before use *id.*, ¶ 41; and “the Cleansing
2 Towelette products cause an unacceptable and unreasonable rate of adverse
3 reactions amongst the general population,” *id.*, ¶ 42.

4 The First Amended Complaint alleges that, in the absence of the claimed
5 misstatements and omissions, Plaintiffs and putative class members “would not
6 have been misled into purchasing [the] products or would have paid significantly
7 less for them.” *Id.*, ¶ 67; *see also id.*, ¶¶ 92, 107, 117, 141, 144, 174. Plaintiffs
8 also seek “restitution” with respect to the amount that Plaintiffs and all putative
9 class members paid to purchase the products. *Id.*, ¶¶ 78, 95, 109, 118.

10 The First Amended Complaint asserts ten claims, including: (1) violation of
11 California’s Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*
12 (“CLRA”); (2) violation of California’s False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof.
13 Code §§ 17500, *et seq.* (“FAL”); (3) violation of the unlawful prong of California’s
14 Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (“UCL”); (4)
15 violation of the unfair prong of California’s Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. &
16 Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (“UCL”); (5) violation of the fraudulent prong of
17 California’s Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*
18 (“UCL”); (6) violation of New York General Business Law §§ 349, *et seq.*; (7)
19 violation of New Jersey Revised Statutes §§ 56:8-1, *et seq.*; (8) violation of Florida
20 Statutes §§ 501.201, *et seq.*; (9) negligent omission; and (10) unjust enrichment.
21 *See* First Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 55-179.

22 Plaintiffs propose to serve as class representatives of (a) a “Nationwide
23 Class,” comprised of all persons “nationwide” who purchased the products for
24 personal use; and/or (b) Subclasses in California, New Jersey, New York, and
25 Florida, comprised of all persons in those states who purchased the Products for
26 personal use. *Id.*, ¶ 45. In connection with its allegations seeking certification of a
27 putative nationwide class, the First Amended Complaint alleges that its proposed
28 class is so numerous that it perhaps includes “millions” of persons across the

1 country who have purchased the Products. *Id.*, ¶ 46 (“thousands, perhaps millions,
2 of consumers have purchased Neutrogena Cleansing Towelette products”).

3 In its Prayer for Relief, the Complaint seeks, *inter alia*, certification of its
4 proposed Nationwide Class and/or California, New Jersey, New York, and Florida
5 Subclasses; an award to Plaintiffs and all putative class members of “actual
6 damages, punitive and exemplary damages, restitution, and/or disgorgement, to the
7 extent allowed under law”; injunctive relief; pre- and post-judgment interest; and
8 an award of “attorneys’ fees” and costs of suit. *Id.*, Prayer for Relief, at pp. 36-37.

9 **II. CAFA JURISDICTION**

10 This action is removable to this Court because federal jurisdiction exists
11 over Plaintiffs’ claims pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act. Federal diversity
12 jurisdiction exists over Plaintiffs’ claims pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act
13 of 2005, Pub. L. 109-2, 119 Stat. 4 (2005) (“CAFA”), codified in various sections
14 of Title 28 of the United States Code, including 28 U.S.C. sections 1332(d) and
15 1453. CAFA became effective on February 18, 2005, and applies to civil actions
16 commenced on or after that date, including this action.

17 CAFA was enacted to enlarge federal jurisdiction over proposed class
18 actions, including specifically putative nationwide class actions, such as this
19 action. *See, e.g., Broadway Grill, Inc. v. Visa Inc.*, 856 F.3d 1274, 1276 (9th Cir.
20 2017) (Congress enacted CAFA’s provisions “to ensure that large class action
21 cases are heard in federal court”).

22 CAFA provides that a class action against a non-governmental entity may be
23 removed if: (1) the number of proposed class members is not less than 100; (2)
24 there is requisite “minimal” diversity of citizenship among the parties; and (3) the
25 aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5 million, exclusive of interest and
26 costs. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d)(2), 1332(d)(5) & 1453(b). All of CAFA’s removal
27 requirements are satisfied in this case.

28 As confirmed by U.S. Supreme Court precedent and CAFA’s legislative

1 history, any doubts should be resolved in favor of federal removal jurisdiction.
 2 *See, e.g., Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co. v. Owens*, 574 U.S. 81, 89 (2014)
 3 (holding that “no antiremoval presumption attends cases invoking CAFA, which
 4 Congress enacted to facilitate adjudication of certain class actions in federal
 5 court”); S. Rep. 109-14, at 43 (2005) (“Overall, [CAFA] is intended to expand
 6 substantially federal court jurisdiction over class actions. Its provisions should be
 7 read broadly, with a strong preference that interstate class actions should be heard
 8 in a federal court if properly removed by any defendant.”); *id.* at 35 (explaining
 9 that the intent of CAFA “is to strongly favor the exercise of federal diversity
 10 jurisdiction over class actions with interstate ramifications”). Indeed, the Ninth
 11 Circuit has recognized that, in light of the Supreme Court’s holding in *Dart*
 12 *Cherokee Basin Operating Co.*, there no longer exists any presumption against
 13 federal jurisdiction or in favor of remand when courts decide CAFA jurisdictional
 14 questions. *Arias v. Residence Inn by Marriott*, 936 F.3d 920, 922 (9th Cir. 2019).
 15 Moreover, the Ninth Circuit has repeatedly confirmed that the “removing
 16 defendant’s notice of removal ‘need not contain evidentiary submissions’ but only
 17 plausible allegations of the jurisdictional elements.” *Id.* (quoting *Ibarra v.*
 18 *Manheim Investments, Inc.*, 775 F.3d 1193, 1197 (9th Cir. 2015)).

19 **A. The Putative Classes, Including Plaintiffs’ Proposed Nationwide**
 20 **Class, Involve Over 100 Class Members.**

21 As noted above, Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint proposes a Nationwide
 22 Class as well as California, New York, New Jersey, and Florida Subclasses. *See*
 23 First Amended Complaint, ¶ 45. Although Defendant does not concede that
 24 Plaintiffs have defined any proper classes or that any such classes can be certified,
 25 the number of members of the class proposed by Plaintiffs is not less than 100.
 26 Indeed, the First Amended Complaint alleges that membership in Plaintiffs’
 27 proposed classes includes the “thousands, perhaps millions, of consumers [who]
 28 have purchased Neutrogena Cleansing Towelette Products.” Complaint, ¶ 45.

1 Accordingly, the classes proposed by Plaintiffs in the First Amended Complaint
 2 exceed 100 members, and the first requirement to CAFA removal is satisfied. *See*
 3 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(5)(B).

4 **B. CAFA’s Minimal Diversity of Citizenship Requirement Is Met.**

5 CAFA’s second requirement – minimal diversity – is also readily satisfied in
 6 this putative nationwide class action. This requirement is met if “any member of a
 7 class of plaintiffs is a citizen of a State different from any defendant.” 28 U.S.C. §
 8 1332(d)(2)(A); *see also Broadway Grill, Inc. v. Visa Inc.*, 856 F.3d 1274, 1276
 9 (9th Cir. 2017) (“Under CAFA there is sufficient diversity to establish federal
 10 diversity jurisdiction so long as one class member has citizenship diverse from that
 11 of one defendant.”).

12 Defendant is a citizen of New Jersey, which should control for purposes of
 13 CAFA removal. The Complaint, however, erroneously alleges that Neutrogena has
 14 its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California. For CAFA removal
 15 purposes, minimal diversity is established assuming *arguendo* that Defendant’s
 16 citizenship includes New Jersey and California. While Plaintiffs allege that they
 17 are citizens of California, New Jersey, New York, and Florida, their proposed
 18 nationwide class necessarily includes citizens of all 50 states. Accordingly, the
 19 proposed nationwide class includes persons who are citizens of States that are
 20 different from Defendant’s citizenship, whether that citizenship is New Jersey
 21 and/or California. As a result, CAFA’s minimal diversity requirement is satisfied.³

22
 23 ³ CAFA contains a number of exceptions which, when applicable, prevent the
 24 exercise of jurisdiction over a class action, even where that class action meets
 25 CAFA’s threshold requirements triggering diversity jurisdiction. It is the
 26 plaintiff’s burden, however, to demonstrate that an exception applies. *See, e.g.,*
 27 *Serrano v. 180 Connect, Inc.*, 478 F.3d 1018, 1023-24 (9th Cir. 2007) (requiring
 28 party seeking remand to demonstrate applicability of the “home state” and “local
 controversy” exceptions to CAFA). Both the home state and local controversy
 exceptions require that at least two-thirds of the putative class members be citizens
 of the same state as the defendant. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d)(4)(A) (local

C. The Amount In Controversy Exceeds \$5 Million

CAFA’s third and final requirement is satisfied because “the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interests and costs.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). Although Defendant disputes liability and damages as well as the propriety of class certification in this case, Plaintiffs’ allegations and prayer for relief, irrespective of their merits, place in controversy an aggregate amount greater than CAFA’s \$5 million jurisdictional threshold. *See Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co.*, 574 U.S. at 89 (holding that “a defendant’s notice of removal need include only a plausible allegation that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold”).

The First Amended Complaint does not include a demand for any specific sum of monetary relief. But, on behalf of its proposed nationwide class and/or its proposed California, New Jersey, New York, and Florida Subclasses, it does seek “an order awarding Plaintiffs and the members of the Class actual damages, restitution and/or disgorgement.” First Amended Complaint, Prayer for Relief, ¶ C, at p. 36. As set forth below, the sum or value of the monetary and equitable relief sought by Plaintiffs for themselves and the putative class members exceeds \$5 million, exclusive of interest and costs.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that “a defendant’s notice of removal need include only a plausible allegation that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold.” *Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co.*, 574 U.S. at 89.

The amount in controversy is the “amount at stake in the underlying litigation.” *Fritsch v. Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLC*, 899 F.3d 785,

controversy), 1332(d)(4)(B) (home state). Here, Plaintiffs have not alleged, and cannot establish, that any particular percentage of the members of the proposed nationwide class are California citizens. Because the products at issue in this action were sold throughout the United States, the putative nationwide class is not primarily comprised of California citizens and no exception to CAFA applies here.

1 793 (9th Cir. 2018) (citation omitted). It “is determined by the complaint operative
2 at the time of removal and encompasses all relief a court may grant on that
3 complaint if the plaintiff is victorious.” *Chavez v. JPMorgan Chase & Co.*, 888
4 F.3d 413, 417-18 (9th Cir. 2018). As the Ninth Circuit has held, “a court must
5 include future attorneys’ fees recoverable by statute or contract when assessing
6 whether the amount-in-controversy requirement is met.” *Fritsch*, 899 F.3d at 794
7 (citing cases); *accord*, *Arias*, 936 F.3d at 922.

8 Courts focus on “the reality of what is at stake in the litigation,” and
9 defendants may use “reasonable assumptions” in their amount-in-controversy
10 allegations and proof under any “theory of damages exposure.” *Ibarra v. Manheim*
11 *Investments, Inc.*, 775 F.3d 1193, 1197-98 (9th Cir. 2015) (defendants may proffer
12 “evidence combined with reasonable deductions, reasonable inferences, or other
13 reasonable extrapolations”; in contrast, “mere speculation and conjecture, with
14 unreasonable assumptions,” will not suffice); *see also Scott v. Cricket Commc’ns,*
15 *LLC*, 865 F.3d 189, 196 (4th Cir. 2017) (allegations in defendant’s removal
16 petition may appropriately rely on “reasonable estimates, inferences, and
17 deductions” in satisfying CAFA’s amount-in-controversy requirement).

18 Here, there can be no genuine dispute that CAFA’s \$5 million amount-in-
19 controversy requirement is satisfied. Indeed, Plaintiffs’ demand for restitution on
20 behalf of the First Amended Complaint’s proposed Nationwide Class and
21 California, New Jersey, New York, and/or Florida Subclasses, in itself, exceeds
22 CAFA’s \$5 million threshold. The Complaint asserts three UCL claims under
23 California Business and Professions Code sections 17200 *et seq.*, which have a
24 four-year statute of limitations. *See* Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17208. On these
25 claims, the First Amended Complaint seeks an award of “restitution,” including an
26 award of “the full purchase price paid by customers” both in California and
27 “Nationwide.” First Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 80, 93-94, 97, 109, 111, 118.

1 As set forth in the Declaration of Lisa Hillier (“Hillier Decl.”), filed
2 concurrently herewith, total nationwide retail sales since April 22, 2017 of the
3 seven Products at issue in this action, in the aggregate, substantially exceed the
4 jurisdictional threshold of \$5 million. Hillier Decl., ¶ 11. In the aggregate, the
5 revenue to Defendant for the total number of these products sold in fiscal 2018 and
6 2019 alone exceeds \$100 million nationwide. *Id.* Accordingly, CAFA’s \$5
7 million jurisdictional threshold is met. The aggregated value of the “claims of the
8 individual class members” in the Complaint, and relief sought therein, “exceed the
9 sum or value of \$5,000,000.00.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).

10 **III. VENUE**

11 Plaintiffs’ state court action was commenced in the Superior Court of the
12 State of California for the County of Los Angeles, and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§
13 84(c), 1441(a), 1446(a) and (b), and 1453(b), may be removed to this United States
14 District Court for the Central District of California, which embraces Los Angeles
15 County within its jurisdiction.

16 **IV. NOTICE**

17 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), a copy of this Notice of Removal is being
18 contemporaneously filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court for the State of
19 California for the County of Los Angeles and served upon Plaintiff.

20 **V. CONCLUSION**

21 For the foregoing reasons, this Court has removal jurisdiction over this
22 action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a) and 1453(b) because minimal diversity exists,
23 the amount in controversy exceeds \$5 million, and this Notice has been filed
24 within thirty days of Plaintiffs’ attempt to serve Defendant with the Complaint.
25 *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b). As such, Defendant, the sole named defendant in the
26 above-titled action, respectfully removes this action from the Superior Court of the
27 State of California, County of Los Angeles (LASC Case No. 20STCV15638), to
28

1 this United States District Court for the Central District of California, pursuant to
2 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441, 1446 and 1453.

3
4 Dated: July 16, 2020

CARLTON FIELDS, LLP
Mark A. Neubauer
Steven B. Weisburd
Stephanie Chau

7 By: /s/ Mark A. Neubauer
8 MARK A. NEUBAUER

9 *Attorneys for Defendant JOHNSON &*
10 *JOHNSON CONSUMER INC., f/k/a and*
11 *Successor in Interest to NEUTROGENA*
12 *CORPORATION*
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT B

RECEIVED

JUN 19 2020

Filing Window

FILEDSuperior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

JUN 19 2020

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court

By Tanya Herrera Deputy
Tanya Herrera

FINKELSTEIN & KRINSK LLP
 Jeffrey R. Krinsk, Esq. (SBN 109234)
 jrk@classactionlaw.com
 John J. Nelson, Esq. (SBN 317598)
 jjn@classactionlaw.com
 501 West Broadway, Suite 1260
 San Diego, California 92101
 Telephone: (619) 238-1333
 Facsimile: (619) 238-5425

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 and the putative classes

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

JAIMIE POTTS individually and on behalf of all
 others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NEUTROGENA CORPORATION., a Delaware
 corporation and DOES 1-50, Inclusive

Defendants.

Case No: 20STCV15638

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
 COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. VIOLATION OF CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1750, *et seq.*;
2. VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17500, *et seq.*;
3. VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
4. VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
5. VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
6. VIOLATION OF N.Y. GEN. BUS. LAW §§ 349, *et seq.*;
7. VIOLATION OF N.J. REV. STAT. §§ 56:8-1, *et seq.*;
8. VIOLATION OF FL. STAT. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*;
9. NEGLIGENT OMISSION;
10. UNJUST ENRICHMENT.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

///

///

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Jaimie Potts, Kim Mileszko, Christina Luka, and Rebeca Gonzalez (collectively “Plaintiffs”) on behalf of their individual selves and all others similarly situated, allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Defendant Neutrogena Corporation (“Defendant” or “Neutrogena” and collectively with Doe defendants, “Defendants”) is a world-renowned cosmetic and skincare brand that promotes itself as the “#1 Dermatologist Recommended Skincare brand.” Neutrogena sells a range of cosmetic, beauty, and skincare products, many of which Defendants advertise as ideal for sensitive skin. The brand prominently advertises and promotes its commitment to healthy skin and skin-safe products, assuring consumers that its products are safe and effective. Unfortunately for Plaintiffs and the putative classes, many of those claims are misleading and improperly create an impression in the minds of consumers that Neutrogena products are rigorously tested and approved for use on even the most sensitive skin.

2. This is an action for damages and injunctive relief for harm suffered by Plaintiffs and putative class members as a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ negligent, willful, and wrongful conduct in connection with the design, development, manufacture, testing, packaging, promotion, marketing, distribution, labeling, and/or sale of the makeup remover cleansing towelettes sold by Neutrogena, collectively referred to herein as “Cleansing Towelettes” or the “Class Products”. The Class Products at issue in this action include, but are not limited to:

- Ultra-Soft Makeup Remover Wipes for Waterproof Makeup;
- Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes - Fragrance Free;
- Neutrogena Naturals Purifying Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes;
- Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes-Night Calming;
- Deep Clean Oil-Free Makeup Remover Cleansing Wipes;
- Deep Clean Purifying Micellar Cleansing Towelettes; and
- Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes-Hydrating.

3. At all times relevant hereto, the Class Products were designed, developed, manufactured, tested, packaged, promoted, marketed, distributed, labeled, and/or sold by the Neutrogena Corporation.

- 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

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article 6, § 10 of the California

5. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because it is headquartered in California

6. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395 because

7. Defendant's Class Products are sold at hundreds of local and national retailers,

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

8. Plaintiffs and putative class and subclass members' claims arise out of Defendants'

III

1 9. Defendant Neutrogena Corporation is a subsidiary of Johnson and Johnson with its
2 principle place of business at 5760 West 96th Street in Los Angeles, California 90045. At all times
3 relevant hereto, Defendants, including Neutrogena Corporation, were engaged in the business of
4 designing, developing, manufacturing, producing, testing, packaging, promoting, marketing,
5 distributing, labeling, and/or selling the Class Products.
6

7 10. At all relevant times, Defendant Neutrogena Corporation was present and doing
8 business within the State of California and sold its products throughout California and in each state
9 of the United States. Defendant Neutrogena Corporation expected, knew, or should have been aware
10 that its conduct would have adverse consequences within the State of California and in each state
11 where it sold its products.
12

13 11. Plaintiffs do not know the true names of Doe defendants 1 through 50 inclusive
14 (collectively with Neutrogena, "Defendants") and therefore sues them by those fictitious names.
15 Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on the basis of that information and belief, allege, that each
16 of the doe defendants are in some manner proximately responsible for the events and happenings
17 alleged in this complaint and for Plaintiffs' injuries, damages, restitution and equitable remedies
18 prayed for herein.
19

20 12. Plaintiff Jaimie Potts is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a resident of Los Angeles
21 County and a citizen of California. Throughout and within the Class Period, Ms. Potts purchased a
22 variety of Cleansing Towelette products at her local Costco store and her venue declaration is
23 attached here to as Exhibit A, as though fully incorporated herein. Ms. Potts purchased the Class
24 Products for her daughter after viewing the Class Product labels. Ms. Potts concluded that the Class
25 Products, based on the representations of the labels, would be safe and suitable for her family. After
26 using the Cleansing Towelettes in a manner consistent with Defendant's directions, Ms. Pott's
27 daughter soon began to develop a rash, peeling skin and even burning. Initially, neither Plaintiff nor
28

1 Plaintiff's daughter realized that the skin damage and irritation resulted from the Cleansing
2 Towelettes because neither the Class Product labels nor any of Defendant's publicly disseminated
3 representations indicated that the Class Products were anything but safe for all skin types. In fact,
4 Defendant even disavowed, through its website and other means, that the Class Products would cause
5 such adverse skin reactions. Ms. Potts relied on the Class Product labels when determining what
6 skincare products she should purchase for her family. Those representations contained no warning
7 about known or anticipated adverse skin reactions, no recommendation to conduct a preliminary skin
8 test, and, to the contrary, contained representations that led Plaintiff to believe that the Class Products
9 were safe for all skin types, including particularly sensitive skin.
10

11 13. Plaintiff Kim Mileszko is and, at all times relevant hereto, was a resident of the county
12 of Burlington and the state of New Jersey. Plaintiff Mileszko purchased the Class Products for her
13 daughter as a stocking stuffer for Christmas 2017 after viewing the Class Product labels. Ms.
14 Mileszko relied on the representations contained on the labels and concluded that the Class Products
15 would be safe and suitable for her family. Ms. Mileszko's daughter used the wipes as directed by the
16 product label but began to develop dry skin around the areas she applied the wipes. Unaware that the
17 Class Products were causing her skin issues, she continued to use the wipes between Christmas 2017
18 and mid-February 2018. During this time, the dry areas of her skin developed into visibly raised
19 bumps which in turn lead to burning and discomfort in the afflicted areas. Ultimately, Ms. Mileszko's
20 daughter's skin began to harden and peel, much like a chemical burn. The adversely affected areas
21 began to radiate from the areas where she applied the wipes and spread to her scalp and back area. It
22 was in mid-February 2018, after Plaintiff Mileszko took her daughter to a pediatrician due to the
23 persistent skin issues that her daughter ceased use of the products entirely. Despite this, her skin
24 issues persisted for a period of months without abatement. Ultimately, some six months after
25
26
27
28

1 completely ceasing use of the product, Ms. Mileszko's daughter's skin began to return to the
2 condition it was in before using the Class Products.

3 14. Plaintiff Christina Luka is and, at all times relevant hereto, was a resident of the Erie
4 County and the state of New York. Ms. Luka, a contact lens wearer, purchased the Ultra Soft variety
5 of the Class Products at her local Target in approximately January of 2020. Prior to purchasing the
6 Class Product she examined the labels and those of similar products. Ultimately, after reading the
7 phrase, "Gentle enough to use around sensitive eye area, even for contact lens wearers," and other
8 representations thereon, Ms. Luka concluded that the wipes were appropriate for her needs and
9 purchased them. Ms. Luka used the Class Product sporadically without issue for several weeks. One
10 evening, Ms. Luka applied the product to the areas around her eyes and cheeks to remove her
11 makeup. Ms. Luka followed the directions on the label and did not rinse the product before going to
12 bed for the evening. When Ms. Luka awoke the following morning, she discovered that the area
13 around her eyes was inflamed and itchy and she felt a strong burning sensation in the areas where
14 she had removed her makeup. The areas around her eyes, where she had removed her mascara, were
15 swollen, red, and burning. In fact, the areas around her eyes were so swollen and painful that she was
16 unable to even put in her contacts that morning. Ms. Luka, not suspecting that makeup removing
17 wipes could cause such a reaction suspected she may have pinkeye or some other eye infection. The
18 swelling was so bad that her coworkers urged her to see a doctor when she arrived at work. Over
19 several days, the irritation and swelling diminished. Weeks later, still unaware that the Cleansing
20 Towelettes were causing her skin issues, Ms. Luka used the product again and again suffered from
21 burning, swelling, and irritation in the areas she had applied the wipes. After this second incident,
22 Ms. Luka ceased using the Cleansing Towelettes and, since then, has not suffered any adverse skin
23 reaction.
24
25
26
27
28

1 15. Plaintiff Rebeca Gonzalez is and, at all times relevant hereto, was a resident of
2 Broward County and the state of Florida. Ms. Gonzalez purchased the Cleansing Towelettes at her
3 local Costco for her personal use within the class period. Before purchasing the Cleansing Towelettes
4 Ms. Gonzalez evaluated similar products but, upon viewing the representations on the Class Product
5 labels, she concluded that the Class Products were best suited for her sensitive skin. Ms. Gonzalez
6 used the Cleansing Towelettes as directed by the product's label and, the next morning, she awoke
7 and immediately felt itchiness and burning. When she examined the areas where she applied the
8 Cleansing Towelettes, she noticed that those areas of her skin were red and inflamed, as if she had
9 developed a rash. Ms. Gonzalez was unsure as to whether the wipes were responsible and waited
10 some time before using them again. When she did use the wipes again, she noticed the itchiness,
11 burning, and redness returned. Ms. Gonzalez stopped using he wipes and gave them to her daughter
12 to use. However, like Ms. Gonzalez, Ms. Gonzalez's daughter suffered from the same reaction and,
13 concluding the wipes were responsible, she stopped using them and neither woman has experienced
14 the adverse skin condition since.

15
16
17 16. Each plaintiff would consider purchasing the Class Products in the future if they could
18 be made to conform with the affirmative representations on the Class Product labels and in
19 Defendants' marketing. Plaintiffs would consider purchasing the Class Products for others if, Class
20 Product chemical composition unchanged, the labels and marketing representations warned that the
21 Class Products were not suitable for all skin types, a pre-use patch test was recommended, and
22 consumers were advised to cease use and consult a physician if the experienced adverse skin
23 conditions after using the Class Products.

24
25 17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and allege thereon, that Defendants, and each of
26 them, are proximately responsible for the events, occurrences and omissions alleged in this complaint
27 as they pertain to Plaintiffs and the putative Class members' injuries.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

18. Neutrogena Cleansing Towelettes are a cosmetic makeup removing product intended to act as a gentle cleanser that does not irritate the skin but quickly and effortlessly removes makeup from the face and eyes. Neutrogena advertises on each Cleansing Towelette product label that the wipes are “Ophthalmologist tested,” “Dermatologist tested,” and “Allergy tested,” creating the impression in the minds of consumers that the Class Products are ophthalmologist and dermatologist approved, without qualification, and allergen free. Further still, in large bolded letters, Neutrogena proclaims that the Cleansing Towelettes are, “Gentle enough to use around sensitive eye area, even for contact lens wearers.”

19. The Class Product labels include a set of instructions that read as follows:

Directions: Gently wipe face with towelette, removing dirt and all traces of face and eye makeup. There is no need to rinse. Dispose of the towelette in trash receptacle (do not flush). After removing towelette, reseal refill pack. If stored in vanity case, secure lid.



1 20. A reasonable consumer, upon reading the Class Product labels, would conclude that
2 the Class Products are as benign as water. Neutrogena affirms as much when it instructs the user that
3 the Class Products, "Gently and effectively dissolve[] all traces of dirt..." Leave[] skin thoroughly
4 clean with no heavy residue, so there's no need to rinse," and that they are "Gentle enough to use
5 around sensitive eye areas, even for contact lens wearers."

6 21. While using the Cleansing Towelettes as directed many consumers have experienced
7 adverse reactions ranging from irritation and discomfort to peeling, burning, and temporary or
8 permanent facial scarring. Despite receiving a significant number of reports from consumers regarding
9 the propensity of the Cleansing Towelettes to injure consumers, Defendants not only fail to warn
10 consumers of potential adverse reactions, they assure them the product is safe for even the most
11 sensitive skin.

12 22. Neutrogena, a world renowned and recognized cosmetic brand that promotes itself as
13 "the #1 Dermatologist Recommended skincare brand," knew (or were negligent in not knowing) that
14 using Neutrogena Cleansing Towelette Products created a significant risk of harm, including
15 persistent injury as described above. Defendants failed to disclose material information to consumers
16 (including Plaintiff and putative Nationwide Class and state Subclass members), that revealed a
17 significant risk of injury and/or adverse reactions by using Defendants' products.

18 23. Defendants were aware, knew, and were noticed that the Cleansing Towelettes
19 created a substantial risk of skin irritation, rashes, burns, scarring, allergic reactions, disfigurement,
20 and other injuries. Despite Defendants' awareness of the risk of injury to consumers who use the
21 product as directed, there is no warning that some users may experience adverse reactions after using
22 the Class Products. Defendants do not instruct consumers to test a small amount of the product on
23 their skin before applying it to the face to assess the Class Product's suitability for their skin.
24 Defendants do not even admonish consumers to cease use of the product if they experience irritation,
25 discomfort, burning peeling, or other harm or injury.

26 24. In omitting and/or concealing known material information and inadequately
27 providing safety information pertaining to the Class Products, Defendants intended to induce
28

1 consumers to rely on incomplete information when deciding whether to purchase and use the Class
2 Products. By so doing, Defendants engaged in conduct likely to mislead a reasonable consumer,
3 including Plaintiff and putative Class members. As a consequence, Plaintiffs and the putative classes
4 were unable to reasonably avoid the harm resulting from Defendants' omissions and
5 misrepresentations.

6 25. Defendants not only knew of reports that consumers were experiencing adverse
7 reactions when using the Cleansing Towelettes as directed, they also interacted with adversely
8 affected consumers and sought to elicit further information from complainants regarding their
9 experience with the Class Products.

10 26. Neutrogena's own website contains a litany of consumer complaints regarding skin
11 irritation, rashes, chemical burns, peeling, facial disfigurement, and other injuries from using the
12 Cleansing Towelettes. Neutrogena is clearly aware of these complaints as they respond to each
13 negative review with a request for further information. These consumer complaints and responses
14 from Neutrogena date back at least three years.



24 27. Despite Neutrogena's awareness of the issue, neither the Class Product labels nor the
25 Cleansing Towelette webpage has been modified to warn consumers of the potential consequences
26 of using the Products. In fact, the Class Product labels, dating from as far back as 2014 or earlier,
27 lack any warning or caution regarding potential adverse skin reactions. Since debuting the Class
28

1 Products, Defendants have made no effort to conform the labeling to the known qualities and risks
2 associated with use of the Class Products. Defendants' failure to affix a warning statement to the
3 Class Product labels is a violation of 21 CFR § 704.1.

4 28. Defendants knew or should have known that the chemicals and/or chemical
5 formulation in the Cleansing Towelettes was causing serious and harmful consequences to many
6 consumers and, at a minimum, disclosed this potential harm to consumers to allow them to make a
7 reasonably informed decision as to whether to assume the risk of using the product. Indeed, 21 Code
8 of Federal Regulations § 740.1 requires Defendants to affix to product labels, "a warning statement
9 whenever necessary or appropriate to prevent a health hazard that may be associated with the product.
10 Instead, Defendants chose to pursue sales over safety and abrogated their duty to relay material
11 information to its customers to maximize sales of the Class Products without regard to consumer
12 safety.

13 29. In fact, Neutrogena recognizes that consumers are entitled to the information necessary
14 to allow them to make informed decisions. Neutrogena proclaims on its website, "We want you to
15 feel good about how we make Neutrogena products. You can only do that if you have the facts."¹
16 Curiously, Neutrogena omits essential facts regarding the potential for its Cleansing Towelettes to
17 irritate, disfigure, injure, or otherwise harm the skin of its customers.

18 30. The labels of Neutrogena Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes promote the
19 product to consumers as being gentle on the skin and that they can be used on the bodies' most
20 sensitive areas, even the areas around the eyes. Under the directions section of the back label,
21 Defendant even assures consumers that the product need not even be rinsed from their face after use,
22 further entrenching in users the impression that the Cleansing Towelettes will not harm the skin.

23 31. A reasonable consumer who was exposed to the Class Product labels would conclude
24 that the Class Products can be applied to the skin without consequence. After all, the label assures
25 purchasers that the contents have been tested by dermatologists and ophthalmologists, specialists in
26 their respective fields, and are allergen free. Because the package repeatedly assures consumers that

27
28 ¹ <https://www.neutrogena.com/producttesting.html>

the Class Products are gentle and safe, and contains no warning to the contrary, a reasonable consumer would infer that there is no possibility of adverse consequences associated with using the Cleansing Towelettes.

32. Neutrogena doesn't just allow consumers to infer that the products are safe, it expressly warrants as much. Under the Skin Care tab of the Neutrogena website, visitors can visit a section titled "Sensitive Skin Concern." The first thing consumers see on that page assures consumers that the featured products are "Gentle yet effective cleansers, moisturizers and treatments that won't irritate skin." Three products are highlighted next to the statement, one of which is the Neutrogena Fragrance Free Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes.²

Sensitive Skin
Solutions

Gentle yet effective cleansers, moisturizers and treatments that won't irritate skin.



33. Such representations by Neutrogena directly conflict with their knowledge of the Class Products propensity to irritate and damage some skin types.

34. Defendants know that some population of consumers are harmed by using the Class Products as directed. Further still, the harm that arises from use of the Cleansing Towelettes is not one that would be reasonably anticipated by consumers. Not only do the Class Product labels assure consumers that the product is safe for sensitive skin but rashes, chemical burns, peeling, and similar injuries are not typically associated with the use of over-the-counter makeup remover and it is certainly not associated with the "#1 Dermatologist Recommended skincare brand" Class Products that Neutrogena assures are "Ophthalmologist tested," "Dermatologist tested," and "Allergy tested."

35. The statement "Allergy tested," absent qualification, suggests to a reasonable consumer that the product was tested for allergens and found to be free of them. These statements, read objectively, reinforce the perception that the product is universally safe, and that the consumer need anticipate no risk. While the claim that the products are "Dermatologist tested" and "Allergy

² <https://www.neutrogena.com/skin/skin-sensitive>

1 tested” may literally be true, because Defendants do not include the results from such testing, a
2 reasonable consumer would infer that the product was tested and found to be safe and without any
3 potential for adverse consequences.

4 36. Defendants did have the foresight to include a warning on packages of the Cleansing
5 Towelettes but that warning simply directs the user not to flush the wipes. The packaging contains
6 no warning about possible skin irritation or injury and the positive representations included on the
7 package are not qualified in any way.

8 37. Defendants have the information necessary to conclude that a substantial number of
9 users will be harmed by using the Class Products as directed but includes neither a warning that the
10 Cleansing Towelettes will adversely affect some people nor does it caution users to test a small
11 amount of the product on their skin before applying the wipes to their face and sensitive eye areas.

12 38. Defendants convey no restrictions concerning cumulative or repeated use of their
13 products and the potential for sensitization or cross-sensitization. Some consumers have reported
14 using the Cleansing Towelettes for prolonged periods without issue before they suddenly began to
15 suffer from irritated skin, discomfort, peeling, burning, and other associated harm. Accordingly, if
16 the Cleansing Towelettes have a tendency to sensitize the skin with repeated use, it follows that
17 Neutrogena has a duty to warn consumers of the potential for sensitization and consequential injury.

18 39. Defendants knew or should have known that the Class Product labels were inadequate
19 and incomplete and would foster misleading inferences in the minds of consumers.

20 40. Defendants failed to properly, suitably, or effectively warn consumers, on the Class
21 Product labels, inserts, marketing materials, or otherwise, that the use of Cleansing Towelettes can
22 cause skin irritation, burning, peeling, disfigurement and other harms and associated injuries. Further
23 still, Defendants represented that the Class Products were safe and effective when used as directed
24 when they were not.

25 41. Defendants independently knew, or should have known, that a significant percentage
26 of consumers will have a harmful reaction to their products but they failed to advise consumers on a
27
28

1 factual basis or to advise them directly to undergo a proper preliminary skin test, or any test, to
2 determine the suitability of the product before application of the Cleansing Towelettes.

3 42. Contrary to Neutrogena's representations, the Cleansing Towelette products cause an
4 unacceptable and unreasonable rate of adverse reactions amongst the general population. Defendants
5 knew or should have known that consumers were at a great risk of suffering adverse reactions when
6 using Neutrogena's Cleansing Towelettes compared to other comparable products.

7 43. Defendants have a duty to monitor and maintain the safety of their products and it is
8 reasonable for them to conduct clinical trials and/or studies to ascertain the safety of the Class
9 Products upon receipt of information suggesting that some people were being harmed. Whether they
10 did so or not is immaterial if Defendants obscured the results to induce consumers to rely on impartial
11 or outright false information.

12 44. Because Defendants omit material information regarding the propensity of the
13 Cleansing Towelettes to harm the skin of some users, and because they reinforce the consumers
14 perception that the product is universally safe, a reasonable consumer could not have avoided the
15 harm associated with use of the Class Products. Consumers who purchased the Class Products
16 without knowledge of the true qualities and characteristics of the Class Products were denied the
17 right to make informed choices about what they purchase and what they put on their skin. As a result,
18 all consumers suffered an economic injury and some consumers suffered actual physical harm.

19 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

20 45. Plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalves and, pursuant to California Code of
21 Civil Procedure § 378, on behalf of the following classes: (collectively "the Nationwide Class and
22 state Subclasses"):

23 **The Nationwide Class:** All persons nationwide who purchased a Neutrogena Cleansing
24 Towelette Product for personal use within the applicable statute of limitations. Excluded from
25 the Class are Defendants and its affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, employees, officers, agents, and
26 directors. Also excluded is any trial judge who may preside over this cause.

1 **The California Subclass:** All persons within California who purchased a Neutrogena
 2 Cleansing Towelette product for personal use within the applicable statute of limitations.
 3 Excluded from the Class are Defendants and its affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, employees,
 4 officers, agents, and directors. Also excluded is any trial judge who may preside over this cause.

5 **The New Jersey Subclass:** All persons within New Jersey who purchased a Neutrogena
 6 Cleansing Towelette product for personal use within the applicable statute of limitations.
 7 Excluded from the Class are Defendants and its affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, employees,
 8 officers, agents, and directors. Also excluded is any trial judge who may preside over this cause.

9 **The New York Subclass:** All persons within New York who purchased a Neutrogena
 10 Cleansing Towelette product for personal use within the applicable statute of limitations.
 11 Excluded from the Class are Defendants and its affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, employees,
 12 officers, agents, and directors. Also excluded is any trial judge who may preside over this cause.

13 **The Florida Subclass:** All persons within Florida who purchased a Neutrogena Cleansing
 14 Towelette product for personal use within the applicable statute of limitations. Excluded from
 15 the Class are Defendants and its affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, employees, officers, agents, and
 16 directors. Also excluded is any trial judge who may preside over this cause.
 17

18
 19 46. The members of the classes are so numerous that joinder of all prospective Members
 20 is impracticable. On information and belief, thousands, perhaps millions, of consumers have
 21 purchased Neutrogena Cleansing Towelette products. As such, the proper disposition of many claims
 22 of the proposed classes in a class action will provide substantial benefits to the parties and the Court.

23 47. The rights of each member of the proposed classes were violated in a similar manner
 24 based on Defendants' consistent wrongful and deceitful actions.

25 48. The following questions of law and fact are common to each proposed class member
 26 and predominate over questions that may affect individual class members:
 27
 28

- 1 a. Whether Defendants engaged in marketing and promotional activities which were
likely to deceive consumers by omitting, suppressing, and/or concealing the true
2 efficacy and safety of the Class Products;
- 3 b. Whether Defendants omitted, suppressed, and/or concealed material facts
concerning the Class Products from consumers;
- 4 c. What the fair market value of the Class Products is at times within
5 the class period but for Defendants' (their employees', agents', apparent agents',
independent contractors', sales representatives') omissions, suppression, and/or
6 concealments concerning the true efficacy and safety of the Class Products;
- 7 d. Whether the retail cost of the Class Products was inflated within the class period by
Defendants' omissions, suppressions, and/or the concealment of material
8 information;
- 9 e. Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses
were deprived of the benefit of the bargain upon purchasing the Class Products;
- 10 f. Whether Defendants' conduct was unconscionable, deceptive, and deceitful;
- 11 g. Whether Defendants' omissions of related facts, suppressions of related truths,
12 and/or concealments of the safety hazards of the Class Products allowed
Defendants to unjustly earn money from sales tainted with deceit;
- 13 h. Whether Defendants' conduct violates the California Consumer Legal Remedies
14 Act ("CLRA") (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*) through their course of unfair
and/or deceptive conduct as alleged herein;
- 15 i. Whether Defendants' conduct violates the False Advertising Law ("FAL") (Cal.
16 Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*) through their course of unfair and/or
deceptive conduct as alleged herein;
- 17 j. Whether the conduct and/or activities of Defendants allowed for an inflated price
18 of the Class Products and constituted unfair acts or practices in violation of the
California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL") (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200,
19 *et seq.*);
- 20 k. Whether Defendants' conduct violates the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act (N.J.
Stat. Ann. §§ 56:8-1, *et seq.*) through their course of unfair and/or deceptive
21 conduct as alleged herein;
- 22 l. Whether Defendants' conduct violates the New York General Business Law
(N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §§ 349, *et seq.*) through their course of unfair and/or
23 deceptive conduct as alleged herein;
- 24 m. Whether Defendants' conduct violates the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade
Practices Act (Fl. Stat. § 501.201, *et seq.*) through their course of unfair and/or
25 deceptive conduct as alleged herein;
- 26 n. Whether Defendants were unjustly enriched at the expense of the Class members;
- 27 o. Whether Lead Plaintiffs and Class Counsel should be awarded expenses,
attorneys' fees and costs for Defendants' violation of, *inter alia*, the FAL, UCL,
28 CLRA, CFA, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law and the FDUTPAT;

1 p. The extent of damages suffered by the classes; and

2 q. Whether Plaintiffs and the putative classes are entitled to injunctive relief
3 regarding Defendant's labeling and promotional activities.

4 49. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of all members of their respective putative
5 classes. If brought individually, the claims of each putative class and subclass member would require
6 proof of the same material and substantive facts and would seek essentially the same remedies.

7 50. Plaintiffs are willing, qualified, and prepared to serve as the class representatives for
8 their respective classes. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the Nationwide
9 Class and state Subclasses and have no interests adverse to, or which directly and irrevocably conflict
10 with, the interests of other members of the putative Nationwide Class and state Subclasses. Further,
11 Plaintiffs have retained counsel experienced in prosecuting complex class action litigation.

12 51. Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to all
13 members of the putative the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses.

14 52. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
15 adjudication of this controversy because individual claims by the Nationwide Class and state
16 Subclass members are impractical because the costs of case prosecution will exceed what a putative
17 class member has at stake.

18 53. Members of the putative Nationwide Class and state Subclasses are readily
19 ascertainable through Defendants' records and files possessed at other places.

20 54. Prosecuting separate actions by individual putative Nationwide Class and state
21 Subclass members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications that would establish
22 inharmonious standards of conduct for Defendants.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSUMER LEGAL REMEDIES ACT (CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1750, *et seq.*)**

25 55. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding
26 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

27 56. Plaintiff Potts brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and all similarly situated
28 residents of the state of California for violations of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act

1 (“CLRA”), which prohibits misrepresentations in commerce and unfair or deceptive business
2 practices.

3 57. The Class Products are “goods” as defined by California Civil Code § 1761(a).

4 58. Defendants are “persons” as defined by California Civil Code section 1761(c).

5 59. Plaintiff Potts and Class members are “consumers” within the meaning of California
6 Civil Code § 1761(d) because they purchased the Class Products for personal, family, or household
7 use.

8 60. The sale of the Class Products to Plaintiff and the putative Class members is a
9 “transaction” as defined by California Civil Code § 1761(e).

10 61. Defendants’ acts and practices, which were intended to result, and which did result,
11 in the sale of the Class Products, violate the Consumer Legal Remedies Act for at least the following
12 reasons:

13 a. Defendants represented that the Cleansing Towelettes have characteristics, uses or
14 benefits which they do not have;

15 b. Defendants advertised their goods with intent to not sell them as advertised;

16 c. Defendants represented that their products are of a particular standard, quality, or
17 grade when they are not; and

18 d. Defendants represented that their goods have been supplied in accordance with a
19 previous representation when they have not.

20 62. As described above, Defendants knew that the Class Products have a propensity to
21 cause severe, unanticipated, and harmful reactions when applied as directed, but concealed and failed
22 to adequately disclose this fact to consumers at the point of sale, on the product label, through
23 promotional efforts, or otherwise. Defendants intended that Plaintiff Potts and the members of the
24 proposed Class rely on the omission of these material facts in deciding to purchase the Cleansing
25 Towelettes.

26 ///

27 ///

28

1 63. By deceptively omitting material information regarding the propensity of the Class
2 Products to cause sudden and severe reactions to consumers' skin, Defendants violated California
3 Civil Code sections 1770(a)(5), (7), (9), and (16).

4 64. In failing to disclose the nonconformity of the Class Products to their labels and/or
5 propensity of the Class Products to harm, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally concealed
6 material facts and breached their duty not to do so.

7 65. The facts concealed or not disclosed by Defendants to Plaintiff Potts and the Class
8 are material in that a reasonable consumer would have considered them to be important in deciding
9 whether to purchase Defendants' products rather than that of a competitor, or pay a lesser price for
10 the products.

11 66. Defendants made unambiguous representations as to the safety of the Products while
12 suppressing some material facts regarding the severity and frequency of the skin reactions caused by
13 the Class Products.

14 67. Plaintiff Potts and the Class members were harmed and suffered actual damages as a
15 result of Defendants' unfair competition and deceptive acts and practices. Had Defendants disclosed
16 the true nature and/or danger inherent in its products, Plaintiff Potts and members of the Class would
17 not have been misled into purchasing Defendants' products or would have paid significantly less for
18 them.

19 68. Plaintiff Potts, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated California
20 consumers, and as appropriate, on behalf of the general public of the State of California, seeks
21 injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants continuing these unlawful practices pursuant to California
22 Civil Code § 1782(a)(2).

23 69. Plaintiff Potts provided Defendants with notice of its alleged violations of the CLRA
24 pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782(a) via certified mail, demanding that Defendants correct
25 such violations. Should Defendants fail to adequately respond to Plaintiff's notice within 30 days,
26 Plaintiff will amend this complaint and seek all available damages under the CLRA for all violations
27 complained of herein, including, but not limited to, statutory damages, punitive damages, attorney's
28

1 fees and costs and any other relief that the Court deems proper.

2 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
 3 **VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S FALSE ADVERTISING LAW**
 4 **(CAL. BUS. & PRO. CODE §§ 17500, *et seq.*)**

5 70. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding
 6 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

7 71. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated
 8 consumers of the Nationwide Class, the California Subclass, the New Jersey Subclass, the Florida
 9 Subclass for violations of California's False Advertising Law ("FAL").

10 72. California's FAL prohibits any statement in connection with the sale of goods "which
 11 is untrue or misleading." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17500.

12 73. The FAL further prohibits disseminating within or from California, or any state, any
 13 statement which is untrue, or misleading, and which the disseminator knows, or should know, to be
 14 untrue or misleading, in connection with commercial advertisements.

15 74. As set forth herein, Defendants' claims regarding the safety and efficacy of the Class
 16 Products, including but not limited to claims that they are "[g]entle enough to use around sensitive
 17 eye areas, even for contact lens wearers," they "won't irritate skin," "[g]ently and effectively
 18 dissolves all traces of dirt," and "[t]here is no need to rinse" are literally false and likely to deceive
 19 the public. Absent qualification, these claims are false and misleading because the Class Products do
 20 harm a significant number of users and the representations as to the safety and gentleness of the
 21 product are contrary to the known hazards associated with the Class Products.

22 75. Defendants know, or should know, of a not insignificant number of reports from
 23 afflicted consumers that the Class Products are harming their users and that the Class Labels are
 24 inadequate, misleading, and false. Defendant receive information pertaining to injuries associated
 25 with use of the Class Products through call-in lines, website reviews, consumer complaints generally,
 26 and have received and compiled these complaints from the United States and other parts of the world
 27 where Defendants sell the Class Products.
 28

76. Defendants' claims that the Class Products are "ophthalmologist tested," "dermatologist tested," and "allergy tested" and that the Class Products are "safe," "gentle," and "effective" are misleading and/or untrue. Such claims cause consumers to believe that the Class Products have been tested by specialists for allergens and that those specialists have concluded, without qualification, that the class products are safe, for all, to use "even around the sensitive eye area, even for contact lens wearers." Clearly, these claims are misleading as they tend to obscure any inference that the Class Products are anything but safe. Defendants knew, or reasonably should have known, that these claims were untrue or misleading.

77. Defendants' conduct is ongoing and continuing and the threat of imminent harm to uninformed consumers is substantial, such that prospective injunctive relief is necessary. Such injunctive relief is necessary to prevent consumers who rely on the Class Product labels from being harmed by unanticipated adverse skin reactions. Injunctive relief would prevent future harm by requiring Defendants to disclose known hazards and admonishing consumers to conduct a preliminary skin test to determine the Class Product's suitability for their particular skin. Further, Plaintiff and putative class members desire to purchase the Class Products in the future if the products could be made to conform with the representations of the Class Product labels.

78. Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to injunctive and equitable relief, and restitution in the amount they spent on the Class Products.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
**VIOLATION OF THE UNLAWFUL PRONG OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR
 COMPETITION LAW**
(CAL. BUS. & PRO. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

79. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

80. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated consumers of the Nationwide Class, the California Subclass, the New Jersey Subclass, the Florida Subclass for violations of the unlawful prong of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL").

III

1 81. Defendants have violated and continue to violate California's Unfair Competition
2 Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq., which prohibits unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent
3 business acts or practices.

4 82. Defendants' acts or practices, as alleged in this complaint, constitute unlawful, unfair,
5 and fraudulent business practices, in violation of the Unfair Competition Law. In connection with
6 the sale of the Class Products to Plaintiff and the Class Members, Defendants failed to disclose, on
7 the Class Product labels or otherwise, material information about the Class Products. Defendants
8 failed to disclose, and/or concealed, that the chemicals and/or formulations used in the Class Products
9 pose a safety hazard to a substantial number of consumers.

10 83. Defendants' knew their Neutrogena Cleansing Towelette products would harm
11 potential and actual consumers, did not meet consumer expectations regarding the anticipated risks
12 associated with using makeup remover products, and lacked the necessary disclosures to allow
13 consumers to make reasonably informed decisions about whether to purchase or use the Class
14 Products.

15 84. Defendants made unambiguous representations to consumers to ensure them that the
16 Class Products are safe for even the most sensitive skin while suppressing some material facts
17 regarding the severity and frequency of the adverse skin reactions caused by the Class Products.

18 85. Defendants' practice of marketing the Class Products as being of a particular standard
19 and quality, and omitting material information regarding the defective nature of the formula used in
20 the Class Products is prohibited by Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1770(a)(5), (7), (9), and (16), and is therefore
21 an "unlawful" business practice in violation of the UCL.

22 86. Defendants' deceptive business acts and practices regarding the sale of the Class
23 Products and/or omissions regarding the propensity of the formula used in the Class Products to harm
24 consumers violate Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq., and are therefore "unlawful" business
25 practices.

26 87. Defendants' deceptive business acts and practices regarding the sale of the Class
27 Products and/or omissions regarding the propensity of the formula used in the Class Products to harm
28

1 consumers violate the New York General Business Law, and are therefore “unlawful” business
2 practices.

3 88. Defendants’ deceptive business acts and practices regarding the sale of the Class
4 Products and/or omissions regarding the propensity of the formula used in the Class Products to harm
5 consumers violate New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act and are therefore “unlawful” business practices.

6 89. Defendants’ deceptive business acts and practices regarding the sale of the Class
7 Products and/or omissions regarding the propensity of the formula used in the Class Products to harm
8 consumers violate Florida’s Deceptive and Unfair Business Practices Act and are therefore
9 “unlawful” business practices.

10 90. Defendants failure to affix a warning to the Class Product labels is a violation of 21
11 CFR § 701.1 and is therefor an unlawful business practice.

12 91. These deceptive business acts and practices, including the misleading materials,
13 advertisements and other inducements were directed at consumers in the State of California, and
14 nationwide, by Defendants.

15 92. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ “unlawful” business practices as
16 alleged herein, Plaintiff and each Class member have been wrongfully deprived of money and/or
17 property. Plaintiff and each Class member suffered an injury-in-fact as a result of Defendants’
18 misleading and deceptive advertising, and omissions of material facts regarding the propensity of the
19 formula used in the Class Products to harm consumers. Had Defendants not falsely represented the
20 Class Products as being of a particular standard and quality that they in fact were not, Plaintiff and
21 members of the Class would not have purchased the Class Products, or they would have paid
22 significantly less.

23 93. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ unfair and deceptive practices,
24 Plaintiff and putative Class Members have suffered and will continue to suffer actual damages.

25 94. Accordingly, Defendants received and are in possession of excessive and unjust
26 revenues and profits, and/or have caused Plaintiff and other Class members to lose money or property
27 directly as a result of Defendants’ wrongful acts and practices.

95. As a result of the above unlawful acts and practices of Defendants, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, and as appropriate, on behalf of the general public of the state of California, seeks injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant from continuing these wrongful practices and ordering Defendant to disclose all material information concerning the Class Products to past and prospective consumers, and such other equitable relief, including restitution of either (1) the full purchase paid by customers who purchased Class Products, or (2) a portion of the purchase price paid by customers who purchased Class Products reflecting the difference in value between what Defendant represented to consumers and the product that Defendant actually delivered to consumers, to the fullest extent permitted by law.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR PRONG OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR
COMPETITION LAW
(CAL. BUS & PRO. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

96. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

97. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated consumers of the Nationwide Class, the California Subclass, the New Jersey Subclass, the Florida Subclass for violations of the unfair prong of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL").

98. Defendants have violated and continue to violate California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*, which prohibits acts of "unfair competition," including any "unlawful... business act[s] or practice[s]."

99. Plaintiff and the Class members reasonably expected the product formula to be of a certain quality and standard, and that the Class Products would not create a sudden and severe skin reaction, given that they are marketed and priced as a safe and trusted product. This is the reasonable and objective consumer expectation for makeup remover advertised as Defendant advertised the Class Products.

100. Defendants knew that the Class Products were inherently dangerous and had a propensity to cause sudden and severe adverse skin reactions. Defendants made unambiguous

1 representations as to the safety of the Class Products while suppressing some material facts regarding
2 the severity and frequency of the skin reactions caused by the Class Products.

3 101. By failing to disclose the defective nature of the Cleansing Towelettes, Defendants
4 have knowingly and intentionally concealed material facts and breached its duty not to do so.

5 102. Defendants' unfair and deceptive acts or practices occurred repeatedly in Defendants'
6 trade or business and were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the purchasing public.

7 103. Defendants' marketing practices and omission of material facts regarding the inferior
8 quality and propensity of their Cleansing Towelettes to harm is immoral, unethical, oppressive,
9 unscrupulous, and substantially injurious to consumers.

10 104. Plaintiff and Class members who purchased the Class Products had no way of
11 reasonably knowing that the Cleansing Towelettes were defective and posed safety risks due to
12 Defendants' deceptive marketing, advertising, and/or omission of material information. Thus,
13 Plaintiff and Class members could not have reasonably avoided the injury they suffered.

14 105. The gravity of harm to Plaintiff and the Class greatly outweighs any countervailing
15 benefits to Defendants or to competition.

16 106. Defendants' actions alleged herein violate the laws and public policies of California,
17 as set out throughout this Complaint.

18 107. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' "unfair" business practices as alleged
19 herein, Plaintiff and each Class member have been wrongfully deprived of money and/or property.
20 Plaintiff and each Class member suffered injury-in-fact as a result of Defendants' misleading and
21 deceptive advertising, and omissions of material facts regarding the inferior quality and defective
22 nature of the Class Products. Had Defendants not falsely represented their Cleansing Towelettes as
23 being of a particular standard and quality that they were in fact not, Plaintiff and members of the
24 Class would not have purchased the Class Products, or they would have paid significantly less.

25 108. Accordingly, Defendants received and are in possession of excessive and unjust
26 revenues and profits, and/or have caused Plaintiff and other Class members to lose money or property
27 (by overpaying) directly as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts and practices.
28

109. As a result of the above unfair acts and practices of Defendants, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, and as appropriate, on behalf of the general public of the state of California, seeks injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant from continuing these wrongful practices and ordering Defendant to disclose all material information concerning the Class Products to past and prospective consumers, and such other equitable relief, including restitution of either (1) the full purchase paid by customers who purchased Class Products, or (2) a portion of the purchase price paid by customers who purchased Class Products reflecting the difference in value between what Defendant represented to consumers and the product that Defendant actually delivered to consumers, to the fullest extent permitted by law.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF THE FRAUDULENT PRONG OF CALIFORNIA'S UNFAIR
COMPETITION LAW
(CAL. BUS. & PRO. CODE §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

110. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

111. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated consumers of the Nationwide Class, the California Subclass, the New Jersey Subclass, the Florida Subclass for violations of the fraudulent prong of California's Unfair Competition Law ("UCL").

112. California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* prohibits acts of unfair competition which includes "fraudulent business act[s] or practice[s]."

113. As more fully described above, Defendants misrepresented the standard, quality and performance capability of the formulas used in the Class Products.

114. Defendants' misleading marketing and advertising practices, including omission of material facts regarding the propensity of the Class Products to harm consumers, are likely to, and do, deceive reasonable consumers. Indeed, Plaintiff and other members of the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses relied on Defendants' marketing and were deceived about the quality, safety, and characteristics of the Class Products as a result of that reliance. Defendants' marketing and advertising failed to disclose to consumers that the Cleansing Towelettes had a propensity to create

1 sudden and severe skin reactions when used as directed, an unanticipated resulting in a great safety
2 hazard to the consumer. Said acts/omissions are therefore fraudulent business practices.

3 115. Defendants' misleading and deceptive practices caused, and were intended to cause,
4 Plaintiff and other Class members to purchase the Class Products, which had, and have, a propensity
5 to harm the consumer when the Class Products are used as directed.

6 116. Defendants made unambiguous representations as to the safety of the product while
7 suppressing material facts regarding the severity and frequency of the skin reactions caused by the
8 Class Products.

9 117. Plaintiffs and other class members were harmed and suffered injury as a result of
10 Defendants' violations of the Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et. seq.* Defendants have been
11 unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff and the members of the Class. Had Defendants not
12 falsely represented their Cleansing Towelettes as being of a certain standard and quality that they
13 were in fact not, Plaintiff and members of the Class would not have purchased the Class Products,
14 or they would have paid significantly less.

15 118. Accordingly, a result of the above unfair acts and practices of Defendants, Plaintiffs,
16 on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, and as appropriate, on behalf of the general
17 public of the state of California, seeks injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant from continuing these
18 wrongful practices and ordering Defendant to disclose all material information concerning the Class
19 Products to consumers, and such other equitable relief, including restitution of either (1) the full
20 purchase paid by customers who purchased Class Products, or (2) a portion of the purchase price
21 paid by customers who purchased Class Products reflecting the difference in value between what
22 Defendant represented to consumers and the product that Defendant actually delivered to consumers,
23 to the fullest extent permitted by law. Omitting material facts regarding the inferior quality, and
24 potential hazards, of the Class Products is deceptive and unconscionable and purchasers of the Class
25 Products are entitled to restitution and all other relief afforded by law.

26 ///

27 ///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF NEW JERSEY'S CONSUMER FRAUD ACT
(N.J. STAT. ANN. § 56:8-1, *et seq.*)

119. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

120. Plaintiff Mileszko brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and all similarly situated residents of the state of New Jersey for violations of New Jersey's Consumer Fraud Act.

121. Defendants and Plaintiff are "persons" within the meaning of N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1(d). 1179. Defendants engaged in "sales" of "merchandise" within the meaning of N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1(c), (d). 1180.

122. The New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act, N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1, *et seq.* ("N.J. CFA"), makes unlawful "[t]he act, use or employment by any person of any unconscionable commercial practice, deception, fraud, false pretense, false promise, misrepresentations, or the knowing concealment, suppression or omission, in connection with the sale or advertisement of any merchandise or real estate, or with the subsequent performance of such person as aforesaid, whether or not any person has in fact been misled, deceived or damaged thereby." N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-2. Defendants engaged in unconscionable commercial practice or deceptive acts or practices that violated the New Jersey CFA as described above, and below, and did so with the intent that Plaintiff rely upon their acts of concealment, suppression, and/or omission.

123. Defendants' deceptive acts and practices, and/or misrepresentations and omissions, have deceived Plaintiffs, and those same business practices have deceived or are likely to deceive members of the consuming public and the other members of the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses.

124. Defendants' actions impact the public interest because Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have been injured in exactly the same way as millions of other consumers by Defendants' deceptive acts and practices as described herein

125. Defendants' conduct proximately caused injuries to Plaintiff and the other New Jersey Subclass members.

126. Defendants intentionally, affirmatively, and knowingly misrepresented material facts regarding the Class Products with intent to mislead Plaintiff and the New Jersey Subclass.

127. Defendants knew or should have known that its conduct violated the New Jersey CFA.

128. Plaintiff and the other New Jersey Subclass members were injured and suffered ascertainable loss, injury in fact, and/or actual damage as a proximate result of Defendants' conduct in that Plaintiff and the other New Jersey Subclass members overpaid for their Class Products and did not receive the benefit of their bargain. These injuries are the direct and natural consequence of Defendants' misrepresentations, fraud, deceptive practices, and omissions.

129. Defendants' violations present a continuing risk to Plaintiff as well as to the general public. Defendants' unlawful acts and practices complained of herein affect the public interest.

130. Pursuant to N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-19, Plaintiff and the New Jersey Class members seek an order enjoining Defendants' unlawful conduct, actual damages, treble damages, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other just and proper relief available under the New Jersey CPA.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF NEW YORK'S GENERAL BUSINESS LAW
(N.Y. GEN. BUS. LAW §§ 349, *et seq.*)

131. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

132. Plaintiff Luka brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and all similarly situated residents of the state of New York for violations of New York General Business Law § 349 ("GBL § 349").

133. GBL § 349(h) provides that "any person who has been injured by reason of any violation of this section may bring . . . an action to recover h[er] actual damages or fifty dollars, whichever is greater."

134. GBL § 349(h) further provides that "[t]he court may, in its discretion, increase the award of damages to an amount not to exceed three times the actual damages up to one thousand

1 dollars, if the court finds the defendant willfully or knowingly violated this section,” and that “[t]he
2 court may award reasonable attorney’s fees to a prevailing Plaintiffs.”

3 135. Defendants’ design, testing, manufacture, distribution, marketing, advertising,
4 labeling, and sale of the Class Products constitutes “business, trade or commerce” under GBL §
5 349(a).

6 136. Defendants’ conduct violates GBL § 349 because Defendants engaged in the deceptive
7 acts and practices described above.

8 137. Defendants’ deceptive conduct and its false and misleading labeling and statements
9 regarding the Class Products’ safety and efficacy for all consumers and omissions regarding the
10 propensity of the Class Products to harm, are facts that a reasonable person would have considered
11 material in deciding whether or not to purchase, or how much they were willing to pay to purchase,
12 the Class Products.

13 138. Defendants’ acts and practices described above were likely to mislead a reasonable
14 consumer acting reasonably under the circumstances, including Plaintiffs and members of the Class.

15 139. Plaintiffs and the other Class members justifiably acted or relied to their detriment
16 upon Defendants’ misrepresentations and omissions of fact, as evidenced by Plaintiffs and the other
17 Class members’ purchasing of Class Products.

18 140. Defendants’ materially misleading statements and deceptive acts and practices were
19 directed at the public at large, including Plaintiffs and members of the New York Subclass.

20 141. Had Defendants disclosed all material information regarding the Class Products to
21 Plaintiffs and the other New York Subclass members, Plaintiffs and the other Class members would
22 not have purchased the Class Products or would have paid less to do so.

23 142. Defendants’ deceptive acts and practices, and/or misrepresentations and omissions,
24 have deceived Plaintiffs, and those same business practices have deceived or are likely to deceive
25 members of the consuming public and the other members of the Nationwide Class and state
26 Subclasses.

27 ///

1 143. Defendants' actions impact the public interest because Plaintiffs and the members of
2 the Class have been injured in exactly the same way as millions of other consumers by Defendants'
3 deceptive acts and practices as described herein.

4 144. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' deceptive trade practices, Plaintiffs
5 and the other Class members have suffered ascertainable loss and actual damages. Plaintiffs and the
6 other Class members would not have purchased the Class Products or would have paid less for them
7 had Defendants disclosed the truth about the dangers associated with the Class Products.

8 145. Defendants' violation of GBL § 349 was willful and knowing. Defendants knowingly
9 and willfully marketed the Class Products as safe and gentle all the while knowing they were not.
10 Defendants, through their willful and knowing deceptive acts and practices, as detailed above, have
11 willfully and knowingly exposed Plaintiffs and the Class to the risk of serious injury, and continue
12 to do so by virtue of having mislabeled Class Products despite possessing information that
13 controverts the Class Product labels.

14 146. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct in violation of GBL § 349,
15 Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have been injured in an amount to be proven at trial, with a
16 statutory minimum of fifty dollars per Class member. Because Defendants' violation was knowing
17 and willful, Plaintiffs is entitled to treble damages under GBL § 349(h).

18 147. Plaintiffs also seek injunctive relief, including requiring Neutrogena to engage in a
19 notice program to notify purchasers of the Class Products of the potential for adverse skin reactions,
20 to stop using the Class Products if they suffer an adverse reaction and to instruct future and current
21 users to conduct a skin patch test before use of the Class Products on sensitive areas like the face.
22 Or, alternatively, to have Neutrogena conform the contents of the Class Products to the current
23 product labeling.

24 148. Additionally, pursuant to GBL § 349, Plaintiffs and the Class seek attorneys' fees and
25 costs.

26 ///

27 ///

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF FLORIDA'S DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES
ACT
(FL. STAT. § 501.201, *et seq.*)

149. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

150. Plaintiff Gonzalez brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated residents of the state of Florida for violations of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA").

151. The FDUTPA prohibits unfair methods of competition, unconscionable acts or practices, and unfair acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce.

152. Defendants, at all times relevant hereto, solicited, advertised, promoted, offered, and distributed the Class Products in the State of Florida and were thus engaged in trade or commerce as defined by Fl. Stat. § 501.203(8).

153. Plaintiff Rebeca Gonzalez, all other similarly situated, and members of the Florida Class were, at all times relevant hereto, consumers under Fl. Stat. § 501.203(7) and are each entitled to the relief afforded by FDUTPA.

154. Defendants' labeling and marketing of the Class Products as "gentle," "effective," "Gentle enough for use around the sensitive eye area, even for contact lens wearers," and that the Class Products are "ophthalmologist tested, dermatologist tested, and allergy tested is misleading and/or false and omits material information upon which a reasonable consumer would rely when deciding whether to purchase the Class Products. The misleading affirmative representations and material omissions of the Class Product labels and marketing are deceptive acts under FDUTPA.

155. As more fully set forth throughout this Complaint, Defendants' labeling and marketing of the Class Products is false, deceptive, and misleading because material information, i.e., the propensity of the Class Products to elicit an adverse skin reaction, or likelihood of an adverse skin reaction, is omitted and concealed from consumers despite Neutrogena's knowledge of adverse skin reactions amongst users of the Class Products. Further still, Neutrogena makes affirmative

1 representations as to the products gentleness and appropriateness for sensitive skin which are
2 contrary to its knowledge and understanding of consumer reports and the products generally.

3 156. Defendants' deceptive acts and practices, and/or misrepresentations and omissions,
4 have deceived Plaintiffs, and those same business practices have deceived or are likely to deceive
5 members of the consuming public and the other members of the Nationwide Class and state
6 Subclasses.

7 157. Defendants' actions impact the public interest because Plaintiffs and the members of
8 the Class have been injured in exactly the same way as millions of other consumers by Defendants'
9 deceptive acts and practices as described herein.

10 158. Defendants designed, used, and distributed the false, misleading, and deceptive
11 packaging labels and other representations intending that consumers rely on those statements and
12 omissions when deciding whether to purchase the Class Products in order to increase sales of the
13 Class Products.

14 159. Defendants' violation of the FDUTPA caused Plaintiff Rebecca Gonzalez, and
15 members of the putative Florida Class to suffer actual damages and ascertainable losses.

16 160. Pursuant to § 501.211(2), Fl. Stat., Plaintiff is authorized to bring a civil action to
17 recover Plaintiff's actual damages, attorneys' fees and court costs under Fl. Stat. § 501.2105(1)(3),
18 and for injunctive and declaratory relief under Fl. Stat. § 501.211(1)

19
20 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
NEGLIGENT OMISSION

21 161. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding
22 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

23 162. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated
24 consumers of the Nationwide Class, the California Subclass, the New Jersey Subclass, the Florida
25 Subclass for Negligent Omission.

26 162. Defendants negligently and recklessly omitted and/or misrepresented material facts
27 pertaining to the Class Products' safety and suitability, prospective and potential harm to consumers,
28

1 resulting injuries, and damages to Plaintiffs and members of the putative Nationwide Class and state
2 Subclasses. Such omission or concealment of these material facts subjects Plaintiffs, and the public
3 at large, to resulting harm from the use of Defendants' Neutrogena Cleansing Towelette Products
4 without proper, suitable, adequate, and/or proper warning and/or instruction related to purchasing
5 and using the Class Products by Plaintiff and putative Nationwide Class and state Subclass members.

6 163. Defendant represented to consumers, via its labeling and packaging, its promotional
7 material, and its branding, that the Class Products were safe to use on even the most sensitive areas
8 of the skin and created the impression in the minds of consumers that the products were "Allergy
9 tested," "Ophthalmologist tested," and "Dermatologist tested," and, as such, would be safe even if it
10 came into contact with sensitive skin or even the eyes.

11 164. Defendant's representations were untrue as the Class Products have a propensity to
12 cause irritation, peeling, blistering, burning, and other harmful and lasting injuries and are not
13 suitable for sensitive skin or for contact lens wearers.

14 165. Regardless of whether Defendants honestly believed the representations or not,
15 Defendants have been aware of the propensity for harm resulting from the use of its Class Products,
16 Defendants have known, and currently know, of a significant number of complaints and reports
17 regarding the Cleansing Towelettes when used as directed by Defendants.

18 166. When making these representations as to the Class Product's safety and when
19 omitting the information regarding the propensity of the products to harm users, Defendants intended
20 that consumers would rely on this information, or lack thereof, when deciding whether to purchase
21 the Class Products.

22 167. Defendants negligently and recklessly misrepresented or omitted facts pertaining to
23 the sale and benefits to Plaintiff and putative Class members by representing and withholding
24 relevant information that would alert Plaintiff and prospective purchasers to the risk and degree of
25 harm resulting from Plaintiff and putative Class members' purchases and use of Defendants' Class
26 Products.

27 ///

1 168. Because of the inadequacy of the disclosures and factual information concerning
2 health consequences of using Defendants' Class Products, Defendants knew or should have known
3 that their representations were inadequate, insufficient, and/or untrue.

4 169. In reliance on Defendants' misrepresentations and/or omissions of material fact
5 and/or failed disclosure of known health issues, Plaintiff and putative Class members, both directly
6 and indirectly, purchased Defendants' Class Products.

7 170. Had Plaintiff and putative Class members, as reasonable persons, known that the
8 Class Products had inadequate disclosures, the degree of danger to health presented, the flawed
9 testing protocol, or that the Class Products were failing to comply with the requirements of law
10 pertaining to the information and disclosure of health and safety risks of said products, Plaintiff and
11 putative Class members would not have purchased Defendants' product as advertised or at the price
12 demanded.

13 171. As direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' negligent misrepresentation
14 and/or omissions, Plaintiffs and members of the the Nationwide Class, the California Subclass, the
15 New Jersey Subclass, the New York Subclass, and the Florida Subclass have suffered the injuries,
16 losses, costs, damages, and expenses alleged herein.

17 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

19 172. Plaintiffs restate and reallege, and incorporate herein by reference, the preceding
20 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein and further alleges as follows:

21 173. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated
22 consumers of the Nationwide Class, the California Subclass, the New Jersey Subclass, the Florida
23 Subclass for Unjust Enrichment.

24 174. Defendants have benefitted from selling, at an unjust profit, mislabeled and dangerous
25 Class Products that had artificially inflated prices due to Defendants' concealment of the potential
26 for serious injury when consumers use the Class Products as directed by Defendants and Plaintiffs
27
28

1 and the other members of the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses have overpaid for the Class
2 Products.

3 175. Defendants have received and retained unjust benefits from Plaintiffs and the other
4 members of the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses, and inequity has resulted.

5 176. It is inequitable and unconscionable for Defendants to retain these benefits.

6 177. Because Defendants concealed their misrepresentations, fraud, and deception,
7 Plaintiffs and the other members of the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses were not aware of the
8 true facts concerning the Class Products and did not benefit from Defendants' misconduct.

9 178. Defendants knowingly accepted the unjust benefits of its wrongful conduct.

10 179. As a result of Defendants' misconduct, the amount of its unjust enrichment should be
11 disgorged and returned to Plaintiffs and the other members of the Nationwide Class and state
12 Subclasses in an amount to be proven at trial.

13 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the putative Nationwide Class and state Subclasses members
14 pray for Judgment in their favor and against Defendant; for actual and compensatory damages; for
15 punitive or exemplary damages; for costs, expenses, and attorney fees as allowed by law; for
16 injunctive relief; and for such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

17 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses pray for relief and
19 judgment as follows:

20 A. For an order declaring that this action is properly maintained as a class action and
21 appointing Plaintiffs as representatives for the Nationwide Class and state Subclasses, and appointing
22 Plaintiffs' counsel as Class counsel;

23 B. That Defendants bear the costs of any notice sent to the Class;

24 C. For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the members of the Nationwide Class and state
25 Subclasses actual damages, punitive and exemplary damages, restitution, and/or disgorgement, to
26 the extent allowed under the law;

27 D. For an order enjoining Defendants from continuing to engage in the unlawful and
28

06/26/2020

1 unfair business acts and practices as alleged herein;

2 E. For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the members of the Nationwide Class and state
3 Subclasses pre- and post-judgment interest;

4 F. For an order awarding attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert witnesses'
5 fees as permitted by law; and

6 G. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

7 **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

8 Plaintiffs and the putative Nationwide Class and state Subclasses members demand a trial by
9 jury for all of the claims asserted in this Complaint so triable.

10
11 Dated: June 19, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

12
13 FINKELSTEIN & KRINSK LLP

14
15 By: 

16 John J. Nelson
17 Attorneys for Plaintiff
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

06/26/2020

06/26/2020

EXHIBIT A

AFFIDAVIT OF VENUE

I, Jaimie Potts, declare that:

1. I have personal knowledge of the facts cited in this declaration and if called as a witness I would competently testify thereto.

2. I am a named plaintiff in this case.

3. I purchased Neutrogena brand Makeup Remover Cleansing Towelettes, which are the subject of this case, in Los Angeles County, California as described in paragraph 12 of the complaint.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America that the foregoing declaration is true and correct, and was executed by me in the City of Glendora, Los Angeles County, California on April 13th, 2020.

By: 

Jaimie Potts
Declarant