

1 **KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP**
Ruth M. Kwon (State Bar No. 334076)
2 350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 3800
Los Angeles, CA 90071
3 Telephone: (213) 547-4900
Facsimile: (213) 547-4901
4 RKwon@kelleydrye.com

5 *Attorneys for Defendant*
6 *Panera LLC*

7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

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

LAKEMA TATE, on behalf of herself
and all others similarly situated and the
public,

Plaintiff,

v.

PANERA LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company; KYM KANOW, an
individual; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-03007

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

[From the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles, Case No.
24STCV05676]

Action Filed: March 6, 2024
Complaint Served: March 14, 2024
Removal Date: April 12, 2024

1 TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d), 1441, 1446,
3 and 1453, Defendant Panera LLC (“Panera”) hereby removes the above-captioned
4 putative class action from the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles,
5 to the United States District Court for the Central District of California. This Court
6 has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d). In support
7 of removal, Panera states the following:

8 1. On March 6, 2024, Plaintiff filed a putative class action complaint
9 against Defendants Panera and Kym Kanow in the Superior Court of California,
10 County of Los Angeles, captioned *Lakema Tate v. Panera LLC et al.*, Case No.
11 24STCV05676 (the “State Court Action”).

12 2. A copy of the complaint in the State Court Action is attached hereto as
13 **Exhibit A** (the “Complaint”).

14 3. The Complaint alleges that Panera engaged in misleading and/or
15 deceitful advertising practices because Panera labeled its Sprouted Grain Bagel Flat
16 (the “Product”) with the words “sprouted grain,” although sprouted grains were
17 allegedly not “the primary or exclusive source of grain” in the bagel. (Compl. ¶ 2.)

18 4. Plaintiff asserts causes of action for: (1) violation of the Consumer Legal
19 Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, et seq.); (2) violation of the False Advertising
20 Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.) and (3) violation of the Unfair
21 Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.) (*Id.* ¶¶ 42-63.)

22 5. Plaintiff purports to bring the claims on behalf of a California class of
23 persons, with the following proposed membership:

24 All California residents who, within the applicable statute
25 of limitations from the date of filing this Class Complaint
26 (“Class Period”), purchased a Sprouted Grain Bagel Flat
from Panera (the “Class”).

27 (*Id.* ¶ 31.)

1 class of all other individuals of California who purchased the Product at issue.
2 (Compl. ¶ 31.)

3 15. The longest statute of limitations period applicable to Plaintiff’s claims
4 is four years. Cal Civ. Code, § 1783; Cal. Civ. Code, § 338; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code,
5 § 17208.

6 16. Panera sold the Product to more than 100 customers in the state of
7 California in the year 2023 alone. See Declaration of Mark Wooldridge, attached
8 hereto as **Exhibit B** at ¶ 4.

9 **There Is Minimal Diversity of Citizenship**

10 17. There is minimal diversity of citizenship among the parties. Minimal
11 diversity exists when “any member of a class of plaintiffs is a citizen of a State
12 different from any defendant.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A); *Arias v. Residence Inn by*
13 *Marriott*, 936 F.3d 920, 922 (9th Cir. 2019).

14 18. For diversity purposes, a person is a “citizen” of the state in which he or
15 she is domiciled. *Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co.*, 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001).
16 Plaintiff alleges that she is a resident of California residing in Los Angeles, California.
17 (Compl. ¶ 6.) Further, all Class Members would be citizens of California. (*Id.* ¶ 31.)

18 19. For CAFA removal purposes, a corporation is domiciled (1) in the state
19 in which it is incorporated, and (2) the state in which it maintains its principal place
20 of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1). The principal place of business is defined as the
21 corporation’s headquarters, “provided that the headquarters is the actual center of
22 direction, control, and coordination.” *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 93 (2010).

23 20. Here, Panera is incorporated in Delaware, (Compl. ¶ 6), and its principal
24 place of business is in St. Louis, Missouri. Panera is, therefore, a citizen of Delaware
25 and a citizen of Missouri for CAFA removal purposes and is therefore diverse from
26 Plaintiff and all Class Members.

27 21. Defendant Kym Kanow is alleged to be a resident of California. (Compl.
28

1 ¶¶ 7, 10). This does not change the fact that minimal diversity under CAFA is
2 satisfied. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A) (requiring “any member of a class of plaintiffs
3 is a citizen of a State different from any defendant”).

4 22. In any event, there is nothing in the Complaint to suggest that Kym
5 Kanow was involved in the alleged conduct that forms the basis of this action. Still
6 further, Kym Kanow was last employed by Panera in 2015, nearly ten years before
7 this action was commenced, and has had no affiliation with Panera since. *See*
8 Declaration of Kamille Howard, attached hereto as **Exhibit C** at ¶¶ 4-5.

9 23. The Action does not fall within any of exclusion to removal jurisdiction
10 recognized by 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), and the Plaintiff has the burden of proving
11 otherwise. *See Serrano v. 180 Connect, Inc.*, 478 F.3d 1018, 1021 (9th Cir. 2007)
12 (“[T]he party seeking remand bears the burden to prove an exception to CAFA’s
13 jurisdiction”).

14 **The Alleged Amount in Controversy Exceeds \$5,000,000**

15 24. The amount in controversy requirement under CAFA is satisfied if “the
16 matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest
17 and costs.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). For purposes of determining the amount in
18 controversy, CAFA expressly requires that “the claims of the individual class
19 members shall be aggregated.” *Id.* § 1332(d)(6).

20 25. The bar for establishing the amount in controversy is low — the notice
21 of removal “need include only a plausible allegation that the amount in controversy
22 exceeds the jurisdictional threshold.” *Dart Cherokee*, 574 U.S. at 89.

23 26. Panera denies the validity and merit of Plaintiff’s claim, the legal
24 theories upon which it is based, and that Plaintiff and the putative classes are entitled
25 to any alleged claim for monetary or other relief. Solely for the purposes of removal,
26 however, and without conceding that Plaintiff or the putative class is entitled to
27 damages, the aggregated claims alleged on behalf of the putative classes establish that

1 the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional minimum of \$5,000,000.

2 27. Plaintiff alleges that she and other consumers “would have paid
3 significantly less for the Product” (i.e., that a price premium should be returned), “or
4 would not have purchased it at all” (i.e. that the full purchase price should be
5 returned), absent Panera’s alleged misrepresentations. (Compl. ¶ 28.) In addition,
6 Plaintiff seeks “nominal, punitive, and statutory damages,” as well as attorney fees
7 and expenses and “pre and post-judgment interest.” (Compl., Prayer for Relief).

8 28. The longest statute of limitations period applicable to Plaintiff’s claims
9 is four years. Cal Civ. Code, § 1783; Cal. Civ. Code, § 338; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code,
10 § 17208.

11 29. In the four years preceding the filing of the Complaint, Panera sold more
12 than \$5,000,000 worth of the Product to consumers in California.

13 30. Thus, the \$5,000,000 threshold for removal under CAFA is satisfied by
14 Plaintiff’s allegations of monetary damages alone, and is further established by
15 Plaintiffs’ request for “nominal, punitive, and statutory damages,” attorney fees and
16 expenses, and “pre and post-judgment interest.” When a plaintiff “is seeking recovery
17 from a pot that Defendant has shown could exceed \$5 million,” the amount in
18 controversy is satisfied for purposes of CAFA jurisdiction. *Lewis v. Verizon*
19 *Comm’ns, Inc.*, 627 F.3d 395, 401 (9th Cir. 2010).

20 **REMOVAL IS PROCEDURALLY PROPER**

21 31. Removal is timely because Panera filed this notice within thirty days of
22 Plaintiff’s March 14, 2024 service of the Complaint on Panera. *See* 28 U.S.C.
23 § 1446(b)(1).

24 32. Removal to this Court is proper because the United States District Court
25 for the Central District of California embraces the location where the State Court
26 Action was commenced and is pending—Los Angeles, California. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§
27 89(b), 1441(a).

1 33. Panera submits with this notice a copy of all process, pleadings, and
2 orders served upon it in this action as **Exhibit D**. See 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a).

3 34. Panera will provide prompt written notice to Plaintiff, through counsel,
4 of this removal, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

5 35. Panera will promptly file a copy of this notice of removal with the Clerk
6 of the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles
7 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: April 12, 2024

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
Ruth M. Kwon

By: /s/ Ruth M. Kwon
Ruth M. Kwon

*Attorneys for Defendant
Panera LLC*

EXHIBIT C

1 David A. Baldwin (SBN 301970)
2 david@davidbaldwinlaw.com
3 LAW OFFICE OF DAVID BALDWIN
4 333 S. Grand Ave., Suite 3310
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071
6 Telephone: (323) 595-3989
7 Facsimile: (323) 417-5176

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
3/06/2024 8:51 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By J. Nunez, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

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

10 Lakema Tate, on behalf of herself and all others
11 similarly situated and the public,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 vs.

14 PANERA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability
15 company; KYM KANOW, an individual; and
16 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO.: 24STCV05676

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1. Violations of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*);
2. Violations of the False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*);
3. Violations of the Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*); and

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

22 Plaintiff Lakema Tate (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, by
23 and through their attorneys, bring this Class Action Complaint against Panera, LLC (“Defendant”
24 or “Panera”) and Kym Kanow, (collectively, “Defendants”) based upon personal knowledge, and
25 upon information, investigation, and belief of her counsel.

INTRODUCTION

- 27 1. This class action challenges Defendants’ false and deceptive practices in the

1 marketing and sale of its Sprouted Grain Bagel Flat (the “Product”).

2 2. In particular, Defendants have promoted the Product as a “sprouted grain” bagel, a
3 representation that deceives consumers by leading them to believe that sprouted grains are the
4 primary or exclusive source of grain in the Product.

5 3. Unbeknownst to consumers, however, the Product is made primarily with common
6 and less healthy, non-sprouted grains, and only contains trace amounts of sprouted grains.

7 4. Plaintiff, along with other consumers, acquired the Product and paid a premium
8 price, guided by their trust in Defendants’ representation of the Product as “sprouted grain”. If
9 Plaintiff and other consumers had been informed that the Product predominantly consisted of
10 conventional, non-sprouted grains, and only trace amounts of sprouted grains, they would have
11 refrained from purchasing the Product or would have paid substantially less for it. As a result,
12 Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered harm due to Defendants' deceptive business
13 practices.

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 5. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated
16 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. This Court has jurisdiction over this
17 matter pursuant to California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, because a case of this type is
18 not given by statute to other trial courts.

19 6. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure
20 section 395(b) because Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of Los Angeles, California, which is
21 located in this District. Venue is also proper in this Court because the transactions at issue
22 occurred in the County of Los Angeles. *See* Declaration of David A. Baldwin *re*: Venue Pursuant
23 to Cal. Civ. Code § 1780(d), filed concurrently herewith.

24 6. On information and belief, Panera is a limited liability company formed in Delaware
25 with its headquarters located in St. Louis, Missouri. Defendant operates over 150 locations in the
26 State of California, including locations in Los Angeles County. Defendant regularly and
27 systematically sells goods and provides services throughout the State of California, including in

1 this District. As such, it is subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court.

2 7. On information and belief, Kym Kanow is an individual residing in Los Angeles
3 County and is the owner and/or general manager of the West Covina Panera Bread location at
4 which Plaintiff purchased the Product.

5 **PLAINTIFFS**

6 8. Plaintiff Tate is a citizen of California and currently resides in Los Angeles,
7 California. In or around March 2023, Plaintiff Tate purchased the Product from Panera in Los
8 Angeles County, California. Relying on the in-store advertising of the Product as a “sprouted
9 grain” bagel, Plaintiff Tate had a reasonable expectation that sprouted grain constituted the
10 primary, if not exclusive, source of grain in the Product. If Plaintiff Tate had been aware that the
11 Product was primarily composed of traditional, non-sprouted grains, and only contained trace
12 amounts of sprouted grain, she would have refrained from making the purchase or would have
13 paid considerably less for it. Consequently, Plaintiff Tate has suffered direct harm due to
14 Defendants’ actions.

15 **DEFENDANTS**

16 9. Defendant, Panera, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal
17 place of business in St. Louis, Missouri. Defendant owns and operates a national bakery chain
18 with over 150 locations in California, including in Los Angeles County. Defendant sells breads,
19 sandwiches, pastries, soups, salads, and other food and beverage items, such as the Product at
20 issue herein.

21 10. Defendant, Kym Kanow is an individual residing in Los Angeles County who is the
22 Joint Venture General Manager and/or owner of the Panera Bread location in West Covina at
23 which Plaintiff purchased the Product.

24 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

25 11. Panera is a national food and beverage restaurant chain, with over 2,000 brick and
26 mortar stores in the country. Panera stores offer a variety of products, including pastries, bagels,
27 soups, salads, sandwiches, and beverages.

1 12. The Product challenged here is the Sprouted Grain Bagel Flat offered by Panera.

2 13. Regrettably, Panera has engaged in misleading and deceitful advertising practices to
3 drive up sales and enhance profits from the Product, all to the detriment of unknowing consumers.

4 14. Specifically, Panera markets the Product with online and in-store advertising
5 claiming that the Product is a Sprouted Grain Bagel Flat. *See* website image below:



15. Based on this representation, reasonable consumers purchased the Product believing that sprouted grains, such as sprouted wheat, are used as the sole, or at least primary source of grain in the Product.

16. Unbeknownst to consumers, the Product is made primarily with traditional, non-sprouted grains and contains only trace amounts of sprouted grain.

17. The ingredients of the Product are:

Sprouted Grain Bagel Flat (Water, Enriched Flour (Wheat Flour, Malted Barley Flour, Niacin, Reduced Iron, Thiamine Mononitrate, Riboflavin, Enzyme [Corn]. Folic Acid), White Whole Wheat Flour, Rolled Oats (May Contain Wheat), Honey, Brown Sugar, Vital Wheat Gluten, Canola Oil, Salt, Bread Base (Enriched Pregelatinized Wheat Flour [Niacin, Reduced Iron, Thiamine Mononitrate,

1 Riboflavin, Folic Acid]. Wheat Fiber, Wheat Gluten, Malted Wheat Flour, Ascorbic
2 Acid, Microbial Enzymes), Yeast (Yeast, Sorbitan Monostearate, Ascorbic Acid),
3 *Sprouted Grain Blend (Sprouted Wheat, Sprouted Spelt, Sprouted Rye, Sprouted*
4 *Oats)*. See website image below:
5
6

7 Detailed Ingredients

8 Sprouted Grain Bagel Flat (Water, Enriched Flour (Wheat Flour, Malted Barley Flour, Niacin, Reduced Iron, Thiamine
9 Mononitrate, Riboflavin, Enzyme [Corn], Folic Acid), White Whole Wheat Flour, Rolled Oats (May Contain Wheat),
10 Honey, Brown Sugar, Vital Wheat Gluten, Canola Oil, Salt, Bread Base (Enriched Pregelatinized Wheat Flour [Niacin,
11 Reduced Iron, Thiamine Mononitrate, Riboflavin, Folic Acid], Wheat Fiber, Wheat Gluten, Malted Wheat Flour, Ascorbic
12 Acid, Microbial Enzymes), Yeast (Yeast, Sorbitan Monostearate, Ascorbic Acid), Sprouted Grain Blend (Sprouted Wheat,
13 Sprouted Spelt, Sprouted Rye, Sprouted Oats)

14 [See Less Ingredients](#)

15 18. It is widely known and accepted in the culinary arts that all breads, including bagels,
16 consist of controlled ratios between the primary ingredients of flour, water, salt, and yeast – in
17 descending order of proportion.¹

18 19. In general, yeast constitutes 0.4% of a standard white bread dough, with ratios
19 similar in all breads, including a bagel dough.

20 20. As noted in Defendants’ ingredient list for the Product, the “*Sprouted Grain Blend*”
21 is listed last in the ingredient list, thus confirming that the Product consists of more salt and yeast
22 than actual sprouted grain flour. See 21CFR101.

23 21. Based on information and belief, the Product is likely to consist of less than 0.4% of
24 actual sprouted grains.

25 22. As such, the advertising of the Product as “sprouted grain” is false and deceptive.
26

27 ¹ A standard baker’s percentage of yeast in a white bread is 0.4%. Forkish, K., & Weiner, A. (. (2012). *Flour Water Salt Yeast: The Fundamentals*
28 of Artisan Bread and Pizza. Berkeley [Calif]., Ten Speed Press. Pg. 89.

1 23. The deceptive impression that the Product primarily relies on sprouted grains as its
 2 source of grain is crucial to consumers when making purchasing decisions. This is because
 3 sprouted grains offer a premium and more desirable quality compared to conventional non-
 4 sprouted grains. As the term suggests, sprouted grains undergo a germination process before being
 5 incorporated into bread and other food products. Consequently, sprouted grains contain fewer
 6 starches, possess a lower carbohydrate content, are easier to digest, and have a lower glycemic
 7 index when compared to regular grains. The sprouting process also results in higher levels of
 8 essential nutrients, including protein, fiber, and vitamins in the grains before their use. Moreover,
 9 sprouting effectively breaks down phytic acid, which ordinarily hinders the absorption of vitamins
 10 and minerals in the body. In contrast, the processed wheat and white flour, primarily used in the
 11 Product by Panera, is stripped of its nutritional components, including fiber, vitamins, and
 12 minerals, thus offering minimal nutritional value. Therefore, consumers place a higher value on
 13 sprouted grains compared to traditional non-sprouted grains.

14 24. The belief that the Product predominantly utilizes sprouted grains as its primary
 15 source of grain is even more justified when considering that other sprouted bread products
 16 available in the market, including sprouted bagels, primarily consist of sprouted grains. For
 17 example, Alvarado St. Bakery’s Sprouted Wheat Everything Bagel, which contains sprouted whole
 18 wheat lists sprouted organic whole wheat berries as the first and primary grain ingredient.²



Sprouted Wheat Everything Bagels

Category: Bagels

Highlights: Vegan

Ingredients: Sprouted Organic Whole Wheat Berries, Organic Unbleached Wheat Flour, Filtered Water, Organic Barley Malt, Organic Cultured Wheat Flour, Organic Minced Onion, Organic Vinegar, Yeast, Sea Salt, Organic Minced Garlic, Organic Whole Wheat Flour, Organic Poppy Seeds, Organic Flax Seeds, Organic Sunflower Seeds, Organic Rolled Oats, Organic Pumpkin Seeds, Organic White Hulled Sesame Seeds, Organic White Quinoa, Organic Black Sesame Seeds, Organic Chia Seeds, Organic Millet, Organic Red Quinoa, Organic Rye Flakes, Enzymes, Ascorbic Acid.

20v1

² <https://www.alvaradostreetbakery.com/breads/Sprouted%20Wheat%20Everything%20Bagel>

25. Another example is Bread of Heaven Sprouted Sourdough Bagel, which contains sprouted whole wheat flour as the first ingredient in the bagel.³

He... filleth thee with the finest of wheat. Psalm 147:14

Sprouted Sourdough Bagels

Made Fresh With Whole Grains
Local. Family Owned
NO Soy
NO Cholesterol
NO Artificial Flavors, Colors, or Preservatives
NO Mold Inhibitors
NO Dough Conditioners
NO Added Vital Wheat Gluten

Nutrition Facts	
12 servings per container	
Serving size	1/2 Bagel (56g)
Amount Per Serving	
Calories	130
% Daily Value*	
Total Fat 0g	0%
Saturated Fat 0g	0%
Trans Fat 0g	
Sodium 150mg	7%
Total Carbohydrate 28g	10%
Dietary Fiber 1g	4%
Total Sugars 0g	
Includes 0g Added Sugars	0%
Protein 4g	8%

Ingredients: Organic Sprouted Wheat Flour, Organic Sourdough Starter, Organic Apple Cider Vinegar, Water, Sea Salt

NO ADDED YEAST

Contains: Wheat
ORGANIC IS NON-GMO & MORE
 CRC Kasher 106258

Organic Bread of Heaven
 2700 W. 5th Ave. Gary, IN 46404
 Certified Organic by CCOF
 NET WT. 24 OZ (672 Grams)
 6 PK
breadofheaven.com

8 53598 00733 9

///

26. Further, Franz Organic Sprouted Grain Plan Bagel also contains sprouted whole wheat as the first ingredient in bagel in their sprouted grain bagel product.⁴

³ <https://ovenfreshdelivery.com/collections/all-products/products/sprouted-sourdough-bagels-6-pk/>

⁴ <https://www.safeway.com/shop/product-details.960459686.html>

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



Organic Sprouted Whole Wheat Flour, Organic Enriched Unbleached Wheat Flour (Organic Wheat Flour, Niacin, Reduced Iron, Thiamin Mononitrate, Riboflavin and Folic Acid), Water, Organic Cane Sugar, Organic Vital Wheat Gluten, Organic Soybean Oil, Contains 2% or Less of Each of the Following: Organic Distilled Vinegar, Yeast, Sea Salt, Ascorbic Acid, Cultured Wheat Flour, Enzymes.

///

27. As the party accountable for the creation, ingredients, production, marketing, and distribution of the Product, Defendants possessed knowledge or ought to have been aware of the false and deceptive nature of the Product's advertising. Furthermore, Defendants were aware or should have reasonably anticipated that Plaintiff and other consumers, when purchasing the Product, would place their trust in Defendants' marketing and the Product's nomenclature, ultimately leading to their deception.

28. As outlined above, consumers are willing to pay more for the Product based on the belief that sprouted grains are used as the sole, or at least primary, source of grain in the Product. Plaintiffs and other consumers would have paid significantly less for the Product, or would not have purchased it at all, had they known the truth about it. Thus, through the use of misleading representations, Defendants command a price that Plaintiffs and the Class would not have paid had they been fully informed. Similarly, Plaintiff and the Class purchased the Product because they are health conscious and if Defendants augmented the ingredients of the Product to contain a

1 substantial amount of sprouted grain, they would purchase it in the future.

2 29. Therefore, Plaintiffs and other consumers purchasing the Product have suffered injury
3 in fact and lost money as a result of Defendants' false and deceptive practices, as described herein.

4 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

5 30. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

6 31. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated Class
7 members pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382, in which the class is defined as
8 follows:

9 All California residents who, within the applicable statute of limitations from the
10 date of filing this Class Complaint ("Class Period"), purchased a Sprouted Grain
11 Bagel Flat from Panera (the "Class").

12 32. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, as well as their officers, employees, agents
13 or affiliates, and any judge who presides over this action, as well as all past and present
14 employees, officers and directors of Panera. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand, limit, modify,
15 or amend this class definition, including the addition of one or more subclasses, in connection
16 with their motion for class certification, or at any other time, based upon, *inter alia*, changing
17 circumstances and/or new facts obtained during discovery.

18 33. **Numerosity:** The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members
19 is impractical. While the exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, such
20 information can be ascertained through appropriate discovery from records obtained from
21 Defendants and their agents.

22 34. **Commonality:** Defendants' practices were applied uniformly to all members of the
23 Class, so that the questions of law and fact are common to all members of the Class. All members
24 of the putative Class were and are similarly affected by having purchased deceptively labeled
25 dietary supplements from Defendants, and the relief sought herein is for the benefit of Plaintiff
26 and members of the Class.

27 35. **Predominance:** The common questions of law and fact, which arise from

1 Defendants' uniform pattern and practice of prohibited conduct, predominate over any individual
2 issues affecting the members of the Class. Thus, among the questions of law and fact common to
3 the Class are as follows:

- 4 a. Whether, during the Class Period, Defendants' label representations regarding
5 supplement quantity are likely to deceive reasonable consumers;
- 6 b. Whether Defendants' representations concerning product quantity were material
7 misrepresentations;
- 8 c. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
9 practices under the laws asserted;
- 10 d. Whether Defendants engaged in false or misleading advertising;
- 11 e. Whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to damages and/or restitution and
12 the proper measure of that loss; and,
- 13 f. Whether an injunction is necessary to prevent Defendants from continuing their
14 false and deceptive practices;

15 36. All Class members, including Plaintiff, were exposed to one or more of Defendants'
16 misrepresentations of material fact regarding the quantity of sprouted grains contained in the
17 Product marketed and sold by Defendants. Due to the scope and extent of Defendants' consistent
18 misleading product, it reasonably can be inferred that such misrepresentations of material fact
19 were uniformly made to all members of the Class. In addition, it reasonably can be presumed that
20 all Class members, including Plaintiff, affirmatively acted in response to the representations
21 contained in Defendants' deceptive marketing scheme.

22 37. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and
23 efficient adjudication of this controversy because the likelihood of individual Class members
24 prosecuting separate claims is remote and individual Class members do not have a significant
25 interest in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions.

26 38. This action will promote an orderly and expeditious adjudication of the Class
27 claims, and will promote and foster the uniformity of decision.

1 47. Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7) prohibits “[r]espresenting that goods or services are of a
2 particular standard, quality, or grade, or that goods are of a particular style or model, if they are of
3 another.” By representing the Product as a “sprouted grain” bagel, Defendants have represented
4 that the Product is of a particular standard (i.e., is made solely or predominantly with sprouted grain)
5 that it does not meet. Therefore, Defendants have violated section 1770(a)(7) of the CLRA.

6 48. Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(9) prohibits “[a]dvertising goods or services with intent
7 not to sell them as advertised.” By representing the Product as a “sprouted grain” bagel, Defendants
8 have represented the Product with characteristics it intended not to provide to consumers. As such,
9 Defendants have violated section 1770(a)(9) of the CLRA.

10 49. At all relevant times, Defendants have known or reasonably should have known that
11 the “sprouted grain” representation is misleading or likely to mislead reasonable consumers, and
12 that Plaintiff Tate and other members of the Class would reasonably and justifiably rely on it when
13 purchasing the Product. Nonetheless, Defendants deceptively advertised the Product as such in
14 order to deceive consumers into believing it is a healthier, more premium bagel.

15 50. Plaintiff Tate and members of the Class have justifiably relied on Defendants’
16 misleading representation when purchasing the Product. Moreover, based on the materiality of
17 Defendants’ misleading and deceptive conduct, reliance may be presumed or inferred for Plaintiff
18 Tate and members of Class.

19 51. Plaintiff Tate and members of the Class have suffered injuries caused by Defendants
20 because they would have paid significantly less for the Product, or would not have purchased it at
21 all, had they known the truth about it.

22 51. Concurrent with filing this complaint, Plaintiff sent Defendants notice advising
23 Defendants they violated and continues to violate, Section 1770 of the CLRA (the “Notice”). The
24 Notice complies in all respects with Section 1782 of the CLRA. Plaintiff sent the Notice by
25 Certified U.S. Mail, return-receipt requested to Defendants at Defendants’ principal place of
26 business or residence. Plaintiff’s Notice advised Defendants that they must correct, repair, replace
27 or otherwise rectify its conduct alleged to be in violation of Section 1770. However, Plaintiffs
28

1 advised Defendants that if they fail to respond to Plaintiff’s demand within thirty (30) days of
2 receipt of this notice, pursuant to Sections 1782(a) and (d) of the CLRA, Plaintiff will amend this
3 complaint to also seek actual damages and punitive damages.

4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Violation of California’s False Advertising Law California Business & Professions**

6 **(“FAL”), Code § 17500, *et seq.***

7 52. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-51 above as if fully set
8 forth herein.

9 53. Plaintiff Tate brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the
10 proposed Class against Defendants.

11 54. The FAL makes it “unlawful for any person to make or disseminate or cause to be
12 made or disseminated before the public . . . in any advertising device . . . or in any other manner or
13 means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement, concerning . . . personal property or
14 services professional or otherwise, or performance or disposition thereof, which is untrue or
15 misleading and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to
16 be untrue or misleading.” Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500.

17 55. Defendants have represented to the public, including Plaintiff Tate and members of
18 the proposed Class, through its deceptive naming and advertising, that the Product is a “sprouted
19 grain” bagel. However, this representation is misleading because the Product contains primarily
20 traditional, non-sprouted grain and contains only trace amounts of sprouted grain. Because
21 Defendants have disseminated misleading information regarding the Product, and Defendants
22 knows, knew, or should have known through the exercise of reasonable care that the representation
23 is false and misleading, Defendants have violated the FAL.

24 56. As a result of Defendants’ misleading advertising, Defendants have unlawfully
25 obtained money from Plaintiff Tate and members of the Class. Plaintiff therefore requests that the
26 Court cause Defendants to restore this fraudulently obtained money to her and members of the
27 proposed Class, to disgorge the profits Defendants made on these transactions, and to enjoin

1 Defendants from violating the FAL or violating it in the same fashion in the future as discussed
2 herein. Otherwise, Plaintiff Tate and members of the proposed Class may be irreparably harmed
3 and/or denied an effective and complete remedy.

4 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”),**
6 **California Business & Professions (“FAL”), Code § 17200, *et seq.***

7 57. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-56 above as if fully set
8 forth herein.

9 58. Plaintiff Tate brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the
10 proposed Class against Defendants.

11 59. The UCL, Cal. Bus. & Prof Code § 17200, provides, in pertinent part, that “unfair
12 competition shall mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair,
13 deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising... ”

14 60. Under the UCL, a business act or practice is “unlawful” if it violates any established
15 state or federal law. Defendants’ false and misleading advertising of the Product was “unlawful”
16 because it violates the CLRA, the FAL, and other applicable laws as described herein. As a result
17 of Defendants’ unlawful business acts and practices, Defendants have unlawfully obtained money
18 from Plaintiff Tate and members of the proposed Class.

19 61. Under the UCL, a business act or practice is “unfair” if its conduct is substantially
20 injurious to consumers, offends public policy, and is immoral, unethical, oppressive, and
21 unscrupulous, as the benefits for committing such acts or practices are outweighed by the gravity
22 of the harm to the alleged victims. Defendants’ conduct was of no benefit to purchasers of the
23 Product, as it is misleading, unfair, unlawful, and injurious to consumers who rely on the naming
24 and advertising of the Product. Deceiving unsuspecting consumers into believing the Product is
25 made solely or primarily with sprouted grain is of no benefit to consumers. Therefore, the
26 Defendants’ conduct was “unfair.” As a result of Defendants’ unfair business acts and practices,
27 Defendants have unfairly obtained money from Plaintiff Tate and members of the proposed Class.

- 1 E. An award of nominal, punitive, and statutory damages;
- 2 F. An award to Plaintiff and their counsel of reasonable expenses and attorneys' fees;
- 3 G. An award to Plaintiff and the proposed Class of pre and post-judgment interest, to
- 4 the extent allowable; and
- 5 H. For such further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

6 **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

7 Plaintiff, on behalf of themselves and the proposed Class, hereby demand a jury trial for all
8 issues triable of right by jury.

9
10
11
12 Dated: March 6, 2024

LAW OFFICE OF DAVID BALDWIN

13
14 By: 

David A. Baldwin

15
16 Attorneys for Plaintiff
and the Proposed Class

1 David A. Baldwin (SBN 301970)
david@davidbaldwinlaw.com
2 LAW OFFICE OF DAVID BALDWIN
333 S. Grand Ave., Suite 3310
3 Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (323) 595-3989
4 Facsimile: (323) 417-5176

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class*

6 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
7 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

9
10 Lakema Tate, on behalf of herself and all others)
11 similarly situated and the public,)
12 Plaintiffs,)

13 vs.)

14 PANERA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability)
company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,)
15 Defendants.)
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)

CASE NO.:
DECLARATION OF DAVID A. BALDWIN
REGARDING VENUE

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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


DECLARATION OF DAVID A. BALDWIN

I, David A. Baldwin, do hereby declare and state as follows:

1. I am a Partner at Law Office of David Baldwin, counsel of record for Plaintiff Lakema Tate, and am licensed to practice before all courts in the State of California. I have personal knowledge of all of the facts stated herein, and if called to testify as a witness, I could and would competently testify to them.

2. This Court is proper for trial of this action because the transaction at issue occurred and Defendants are doing business in Los Angeles County.

I declare and state under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 6, 2024 at Los Angeles, California.

By:  _____
David A. Baldwin, Declarant

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Panera Class Action Lawsuit Claims Sprouted Grain Bagel Flats Contain Only 'Trace Amounts' of Sprouted Grains](#)
