1	ROBBINS ARROYO LLP							
2	BRIAN J. ROBBINS (190264)							
2	KEVIN A. SEELY (199982)							
3	ASHLEY R. RIFKIN (246602)							
4	LEONID KANDINOV (279650)							
4	600 B Street, Suite 1900							
5	San Diego, CA 92101							
J	Telephone: (619) 525-3990							
6	Facsimile: (619) 525-3991							
7	E-mail: brobbins@robbinsarroyo.com							
7	kseely@robbinsarroyo.com							
8	arifkin@robbinsarroyo.com							
Ŭ	lkandinov@robbinsarroyo.com							
9	LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.	IID						
10	REBECCA A. PETERSON (241858)	L.L.I .						
10	ROBERT SHELQUIST							
11	100 Washington Avenue South, Suite	2200						
	Minneapolis, MN 55401	2200						
12	Telephone: (612) 339-6900							
13	Facsimile: (612) 339-0981							
13	E-mail: rapeterson@locklaw.com							
14	rshelquist@locklaw.com							
15								
13	[Additional counsel on signature page]							
16	Attorneys for Plaintiff							
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
1.0	COLUEITEDA DICI							
18	SOUTHERN DIST	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
19	SCHUYLER WHITE, Individually) Case No.: '16CV2808 L NLS						
20	and on Behalf of All Others)						
	Similarly Situated,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT						
21	Plaintiff,	(
22		ý)						
	v. ()						
23)						
24	COLGATE-PALMOLIVE)						
24	COMPANY, and TOM'S OF)						
25	MAINE, INC.,							
	Defendants.))						
26	Defendants.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL						
27								
28								

Plaintiff Schuyler White ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby brings this action against defendants Colgate-Palmolive Company ("Colgate") and Colgate's incorporated subsidiary, Tom's of Maine, Inc. ("Tom's" or the "Company") (collectively "Defendants"). Plaintiff alleges the following upon his own knowledge, or where he lacks personal knowledge, upon information and belief, including the investigation of his counsel.

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Defendants manufacture, market, sell, and distribute personal care products ("Tom's Products" or the "Products")¹ using a marketing, advertising, and labeling campaign that centers on representations that are intended to, and do, convey to consumers that the Products are natural. This labeling and marketing campaign heavily focuses on touting the Products as "natural," "naturally sourced," "naturally derived," "originat[ing] from nature," containing only "natural" ingredients, and/or working "naturally" (the "Natural Claims"). The Natural Claims are repeatedly reinforced by representations plastered on product packaging, the Company's website, and in various advertising mediums.
- 2. Tom's Products are anything but "natural." Instead, the Products contain a laundry list of artificial, synthetic, and/or highly chemically processed ingredients, including: aluminum chlorohydrate, ascorbic acid, glycerin, potassium nitrate, propanediol, propylene glycol, sodium cocoyl glutamate, sodium gluconate, sodium hydroxide, sodium lauryl sulfate, sodium stearate, sorbitol, xanthan gum, and xylitol (collectively, the "Chemicals").
- 3. Defendants' advertising campaign wrongfully utilized the Natural Claims to convince Plaintiff and other customers that Tom's Products are better

¹ A full list of the Products at issue here are provided *supra*.

2 3 4

than competing products and also induce them into purchasing the Products at premium price. In reality, the Natural Claims are contradicted by the actual unnatural ingredients found in Tom's Products. Accordingly, Defendants are negligently, recklessly, and/or unfairly misleading consumers on the true nature and safety of the Products.

- 4. Defendants have long been well aware that the Company's "natural" labeling wrongfully misleads customers. In fact, in 2015, the Company paid \$4.5 million to settle a consumer class action suit alleging similar claims over the Company's deceptive product labeling (the "2015 Settlement"). The 2015 Settlement released claims based on the Company's "natural" labeling statements through September 23, 2015, and Tom's subsequently added some new language to the Company's website concerning "the role of natural ingredients in [Tom's] products," with a link to additional details concerning "use [of] the terms 'sourced' and 'derived' as classifications for how much the ingredient has changed from how it is found in the source plant or mineral." Nonetheless, the Company continues to brazenly mislabel its Products, including through various ads and by continuing to plaster the Product packaging with the Natural Claims.
- 5. Defendants have grossly profited using this deceptive and misleading marketing. In 2006, Colgate purchased a controlling 84% stake of Tom's for \$100 million. At the time, Tom's annual revenues were nearly \$50 million, and are believed to have significantly increased in the following years.
- 6. Defendants' deceiving marketing and labeling campaign has and continues to harm consumers by inducing them to purchase and consume the Products on false premises and by implicitly promising that the Products are marketed, labeled, and sold based on transparency to the consumer.
- 7. Plaintiff, California consumers, and consumers throughout the United States were misled by Defendants' statements regarding the true nature of the ingredients in Tom's "natural" Products, and bought these Products (while paying a

premium) based on these false, misleading, and deceptive representations.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class (as defined herein) have suffered injury as a result of Defendants' false advertising, warranty breaches, misbranding, and unlawful marketing, and bring this class action to remedy Defendants' unlawful

acts.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has original jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein under the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2), because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs and more than two-thirds of the Class reside in states other than the states in which Defendants are citizens.

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391, because Plaintiff resides and suffered injury as a result of Defendants' acts in this district, many of the acts and transactions giving rise to this action occurred in this district, Defendants conduct substantial business in this district, Defendants have intentionally availed themselves of the laws and markets of this district, and Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

THE PARTIES

- 10. Plaintiff is a citizen of California and an individual consumer.
- 11. Plaintiff purchased Defendants' Products for the first time in 2016, specifically the Company's Children's Toothpaste, because he wanted natural personal care products that would be safer for his children. He relied on Defendants' misleading marketing and labeling that the Products were "natural" and contain only "natural" ingredients. Plaintiff would not have purchased these Products had he understood that the Products were not natural and instead contained any of the Chemicals and that such Chemicals are not natural. In addition, Plaintiff paid a premium for Defendants' Products due to their representations that these Products were "natural" and contain only "natural"

9 10

12

13

11

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

28

ingredients. Plaintiff purchased Tom's Products at a Target Corporation store in San Diego, California.

- 12. Defendant Colgate is a Delaware corporation with principal offices at 300 Park Avenue, New York, New York. Defendant Colgate (together with its subsidiaries) is a consumer products company whose products are marketed in over 200 countries and territories throughout the world. Defendant Colgate is engaged in the business of manufacturing, mass marketing, and distributing Tom's Products throughout the United States. Defendant Colgate operates in two product segments: Oral, Personal, and Home Care; and Pet Nutrition. As of December 31, 2015, defendant Colgate employed approximately 37,900 employees.
- 13. Defendant Tom's is a Maine incorporated subsidiary of defendant Colgate with principal offices at 302 Lafayette Center, Kennebunk, Maine. Defendant Colgate purchased the majority of Tom's in 2006 for \$100 million and currently owns 84% of Tom's. Defendant Tom's manufactures "natural and environmentally-friendly" oral and personal products. In combination with defendant Colgate, defendant Tom's sells and markets natural oral and personal care products.

DEFENDANTS' LONG-TERM DECEPTIVE, MISLEADING, AND UNFAIR MARKETING AND LABELING OF THEIR PRODUCTS

- 14. For years, Defendants have represented that the following Products are "natural," "naturally sourced," "naturally derived," "originate from nature," contain only "natural" ingredients, and/or work "naturally:"
- Oral Care Products: Fluoride-Free Rapid Relief Sensitive Toothpaste, Fluoride-Free Botanically Bright Toothpaste, Whole Care Toothpaste, Whole Care Toothpaste Gel, Fluoride-Free Antiplaque & Whitening Toothpaste, Fluoride-Free Antiplaque & Whitening Toothpaste Gel, Simply White Toothpaste, Simply White Toothpaste Gel, Children's Toothpaste, Fluoride-Free Children's Toothpaste, Wicked Cool! Toothpaste, Fluoride-Free Wicked Cool! Toothpaste,

Fluoride-Free Toddler Training Toothpaste, Wicked Fresh! Toothpaste, Enamel Strength Toothpaste, Cavity Protection Toothpaste, Luminous White Toothpaste, Botanically Fresh Toothpaste, Travel Natural Toothpaste, Fluoride-Free Travel Natural Toothpaste, Fluoride-Free Propolis & Myrrh Toothpaste, Maximum Strength Sensitive Toothpaste, Fluoride-Free Sensitive Toothpaste, Wicked Fresh! Mouthwash, and Children's Anticavity Fluoride Rinse.

- (b) **Body Care Products:** Wicked Cool Kids Deodorant, Long Lasting Deodorant, Men's Long Lasting Wide Stick Deodorant, Men's Naturally Dry Antiperspirant, Original Care Deodorant, Mineral Confidence Deodorant Crystal Roll-On, Body Lotion, Daily Moisturizing Hand Cream, Body Wash, Natural Beauty Bar Daily Moisture, Natural Beauty Bar Relaxing, Natural Beauty Bar Sensitive, and Natural Beauty Bar Deodorant.
- (c) **Baby Care Products:** Baby Shampoo & Wash, Baby Moisturizing Lotion, Baby Sunscreen, and Baby Diaper Cream.
- (d) **Lip Care Products:** Lip Gloss, Lip Shimmer, and Organic Moisturizing Lip Balm.
- 15. Below is a sample of Tom's Product packaging, with examples from each of the above categories. All images were taken directly from Tom's website at www.tomsofmaine.com, last visited on November 9, 2016.































Defendants spend millions of dollars each year on marketing,

1 including advertising for Tom's purportedly "natural" products. This advertising and marketing campaign has been carried out through multiple forms, and 3 disseminated through all forms of media, including print, television advertisements and appearances, social media (e.g., Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, and Pinterest), 5 Tom's website, and multiple third-party websites. 6

7

8

9

16.

17. For instance, Tom's Twitter account alone has nearly 22,000 followers, and is used to consistently tout the Company's so-called "natural" products:

10 11

Tom's of Maine @TomsofMaine - 19h Our #natural Baby Shampoo & Wash is tear-free and gentle enough to use everyday! Learn more: bit.ly/1G313Xo #parenting #naturalbaby

15

12

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27



18. Similarly, Tom's Facebook account has been "liked" by nearly 500,000 people, and is also used to consistently tout the Company's so-called "natural" products:

Tom's Of Maine
November 2 at 11:18am · 🚱

Every minute you spend taking care of yourself is one spent setting a good example for your family. Visit our Good Matters blog to learn four simple tips from Quirky Inspired by Ash Sears to pamper yourself naturally, and frugally! http://bit.ly/2e2JNdm



- 19. Defendants' marketing and advertising campaign has been sufficiently lengthy in duration, and widespread in dissemination, that it would be unrealistic to require Plaintiff to plead relying upon each advertised misrepresentation.
- 20. Defendants have engaged in this long-term advertising campaign to convince potential customers, first, that Tom's Products are natural and second, that the Company is a trustworthy and socially responsible company that seeks to empower consumers through transparency.

- 21. Defendants amplify their representations that the Products are "natural" or "naturally derived," yet fail to disclose at the same time that every single Product contains at least one or more ingredient that is artificial, synthetic, and/or highly chemically processed.
- 22. Each Product contains the following artificial, synthetic, and/or highly processed ingredients:
- (a) All of Tom's toothpastes contain the following chemical ingredients: sodium lauryl sulfate and glycerin. Most contain additional chemicals, including: potassium nitrate, sorbitol, xanthan gum, xylitol, sodium hydroxide, and/or sodium cocoyl glutamate.
- (b) All of Tom's mouthwashes contain the following chemical ingredients: propanediol, xylitol, and glycerin. Most also contain the chemical sorbitol.
- (c) All of Tom's deodorants contain at least one or more of the following chemical ingredients: aluminum chlorohydrate, propylene glycol, ascorbic acid, xanthan gum, and/or glycerin.
- (d) All of Tom's lotions, creams, and body washes contain both of the following chemical ingredients: glycerin and xanthan gum.
- (e) All of Tom's so-called Natural Beauty Bars contain both of the following chemical ingredients: sodium gluconate and glycerin.
- (f) All of Tom's baby shampoos and washes contain all of the following chemical ingredients: sodium gluconate, glycerin, and xanthan gum.
- (g) All of Tom's baby lotions contain all of the following chemical ingredients: sodium hydroxide, glycerin, and xanthan gum.
- 23. On September 20, 2016, the National Advertising Division ("NAD") of the Council of Better Business Bureaus published a recommendation that Colgate "discontinue 'Natural' and 'Naturally' claims," specifically for its "Tom's of Maine 'Naturally Dry' Antiperspirants." As noted by the NAD, the *sole* "active

ingredient in the product, aluminum chlorohydrate, is not natural," in direct contradiction to the Company's product packaging claim that Naturally Dry contains "natural powder" and that "[i]t really works. Naturally." NAD further concluded that that the product name, Naturally Dry, "as it appears both in Tom's advertising and product packaging conveys an express message that natural ingredients are responsible for the dryness provided by this antiperspirant, a message that is not supported." Tom's subsequently appealed the NAD's recommendation to the National Advertising Review Board, and the appeal is currently pending. Importantly, Tom's does not argue that Naturally Dry is actually natural or actually works naturally. Instead, Tom's only argues that NAD lacks jurisdiction as a result of 2015 Settlement.

PLAINTIFF'S RELIANCE WAS REASONABLE AND FORESEEN BY DEFENDANTS

- 24. Plaintiff reasonably relied on Defendants' own statements, misrepresentations, and advertising concerning the particular qualities and benefits of the Products.
- 25. Plaintiff read and relied upon the labels on the Products in making his purchasing decisions, along with viewing the statements, misrepresentations, and advertising on Tom's website and elsewhere on the Internet.
- 26. A reasonable consumer would consider the ingredients and physical properties when looking to purchase a natural or organic product. Here, Plaintiff relied on the specific statements and misrepresentations by Defendants that the Products were natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally.
- 27. Tom's specifically acknowledges that its customers seek out natural products and purchase products specifically because they are touted as being natural. For example, the Company's website notes that "more and more people have begun to believe, like we do, that nature can provide many of the health

1
 2
 3

benefits we need" and that Tom's "listen[s] to what [its] customers want (and don't want) in their products," "learn[s] how it can be done," and "respond[s] with effective natural, sustainable and responsible solutions."

4

5 6

7

9

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

1920

2122

23

24

25

26

2728

DEFENDANTS' KNOWLEDGE AND NOTICE OF THEIR BREACHES OF THEIR EXPRESS AND IMPLIED WARRANTIES

- 28. Defendants had sufficient notice of their breaches of their express and implied warranties. Defendants had and have exclusive knowledge of the physical and chemical make-up of their Products.
- 29. Defendants were also notified of the defective nature of the Products through consumer contacts, lawsuits, complaints, news related articles, and the 2015 Settlement.

PRIVITY EXISTS WITH PLAINTIFF AND THE PROPOSED CLASS

- 30. Defendants knew that consumers such as Plaintiff and the proposed Class would be the ultimate users of the Products and target of their advertising and statements.
- 31. Defendants intended that their statements and representations would be considered by the end-users of the Products, including Plaintiff and the proposed Class.
- 32. Defendants directly marketed to Plaintiff through statements on their websites, social media, television, labeling, and packaging.
- 33. Plaintiff and the Class are the intended beneficiaries of the express and implied warranties.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

34. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of the following class pursuant to Rule 23(a) and 23(b)(2) and (3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:

All United States residents who, from September 24, 2015 to the present, purchased the Products for personal, family, or household use, and not for resale (the "Nationwide Class").

35. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of the following sub-class pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382:

All California residents who, from September 24, 2015 to the present, purchased the Products for personal, family, or household use, and not for resale (the "California Sub-Class").

- 36. Excluded from the Nationwide Class and California Sub-Class (collectively the "Class") are members of the 2015 Settlement class that received any portion of that settlement fund, the Defendants, any of their parent companies, subsidiaries, and/or affiliates, officers, directors, legal representatives, employees, co-conspirators, all governmental entities, and any judge, justice, or judicial officer presiding over this matter.
- 37. This action is brought and may be properly maintained as a class action. There is a well-defined community of interests in this litigation and the members of the Class are easily ascertainable.
- 38. The members in the proposed Class are so numerous that individual joinder of all members is impracticable, and the disposition of the claims of all Class members in a single action will provide substantial benefits to the parties and Court.
- 39. Questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and the Class include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - (a) whether Defendants owed a duty of care to the Class;
- (b) whether Defendants represented and continues to represent that the Products are natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally;
- (c) whether Defendants' representations in advertising and/or labeling are false, deceptive, and misleading;

those

and

and

legal rights sought to be enforced by Plaintiff individually and on behalf of the

other members of the Class. Identical statutory violations and business practices

27

and harms are involved. Individual questions, if any, are not prevalent in comparison to the numerous common questions that dominate this action.

- 41. Plaintiff's claims are typical of Class members' claims in that they are based on the same underlying facts, events, and circumstances relating to Defendants' conduct.
- 42. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class, has no interests incompatible with the interests of the Class, and has retained counsel competent and experienced in class action, consumer protection, and false advertising litigation.
- 43. Class treatment is superior to other options for resolution of the controversy because the relief sought for each Class member is small such that, absent representative litigation, it would be infeasible for Class members to redress the wrongs done to them.
- 44. Questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members.
 - 45. As a result of the foregoing, Class treatment is appropriate.

COUNT I

(Negligent Misrepresentation Against Defendants)

- 46. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 47. Plaintiff reasonably placed his trust and reliance in Defendants that the Products marketed and advertised to him and the Class were natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally.
- 48. Because of the relationship between the parties, the Defendants owed a duty to use reasonable care to impart correct and reliable disclosures concerning the Chemicals used to make the Products, including whether they are natural.

- 49. Defendants breached their duty to Plaintiff and the Class by providing false, misleading, and/or deceptive information regarding the nature of the Products.
- 50. Plaintiff and the Class reasonably and justifiably relied upon the information supplied to them by the Defendants. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class purchased the Products at a premium.
- 51. Defendants failed to use reasonable care in their communications and representations to Plaintiff and Class.
- 52. By virtue of Defendants' negligent misrepresentations, Plaintiff and the Class have been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial or alternatively, seek rescission and disgorgement under this cause of action.

COUNT II

(Violations of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code §§1750, Et Seq., Against Defendants on Behalf of the California Sub-Class)

- 53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 54. Plaintiff and each proposed Class member is a "consumer," as that term is defined in California Civil Code section 1761(d).
- 55. The Products are "goods," as that term is defined in California Civil Code section 1761(a).
- 56. Defendants are "person[s]" as that term is defined in California Civil Code section 1761(c).
- 57. Plaintiff and each proposed California Sub-Class member's purchase of Defendants' products constituted a "transaction," as that term is defined in California Civil Code section 1761(e).
- 58. Defendants' conduct alleged herein violates the following provisions of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act (the "CLRA"):

- California Civil Code section 1770(a)(5), by representing that (a) the Products contain only natural ingredients and/or work naturally;
- California Civil Code section 1770(a)(7), by representing that (b) the Products were of a particular standard, quality, or grade, when they were of another;
- California Civil Code section 1770(a)(9), by advertising the (c) Products with intent not to sell them as advertised; and
- California Civil Code section 1770(a)(16), by representing that (d) the Products have been supplied in accordance with previous representations when they have not.
- 59. As a direct and proximate result of these violations, Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class have been harmed, and that harm will continue unless Defendants are enjoined from using the misleading marketing described herein in any manner in connection with the advertising and sale of the Products.
- 60. On November 14, 2016, counsel for Plaintiff and the proposed California Sub-Class provided Defendants with written notice (via U.S. certified mail, return receipt requested) that their conduct is in violation of the CLRA. Thus, pursuant to California Civil Code section 1782, Plaintiff intends to amend this Complaint to bring a claim for actual damages after the passing of the statutory notice period.
- 61. Plaintiff seeks an award of attorney's fees pursuant to, inter alia, California Civil Code section 1780(e) and California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

COUNT III

(Violations of California False Advertising Law, California Business & Professions Code §§17500, Et Seq., Against Defendants on Behalf of the California Sub-Class)

- 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 63. California's False Advertising Law prohibits any statement in connection with the sale of goods "which is untrue or misleading." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17500.
- 64. As set forth herein, Defendants' claims that the Products are natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally are literally false and likely to deceive the public.
- 65. Defendants' claims that the Products are natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally are untrue or misleading.
- 66. Defendants knew, or reasonably should have known, that these claims were untrue or misleading.
- 67. Defendants' conduct is ongoing and continuing, such that prospective injunctive relief is necessary, especially given Plaintiff's desire to purchase these Products in the future if he can be assured that, so long as the Products are advertised as natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originated from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally, they truly are natural.
- 68. Plaintiff and members of the California Sub-Class are entitled to injunctive and equitable relief, and restitution in the amount they spent on the Products.

COUNT IV

(Violations of the Unfair Competition Law, California Business & Professions Code §§17200, *Et Seq.*, Against Defendants on Behalf of the California Sub-Class)

- 69. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 70. The Unfair Competition Law prohibits any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200.

Fraudulent

71. Defendants' statements that the Products are natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally as set forth herein, are literally false and likely to deceive the public.

Unlawful

- 72. As alleged herein, Defendants have advertised the Products with false or misleading claims, such that Defendants' actions as alleged herein violate at least the following laws:
- The CLRA, California Business & Professions Code sections 1750, *et seq.*; and
- The False Advertising Law, California Business & Professions Code sections 17500, *et seq.*

Unfair

- 73. Defendants' conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, and sale of the Products is unfair because Defendants' conduct was immoral, unethical, unscrupulous, or substantially injurious to consumers and the utility of their conduct, if any, does not outweigh the gravity of the harm to their victims.
- 74. Defendants' conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, and sale of the Products is also unfair because it violates public policy as declared by

specific constitutional, statutory, or regulatory provisions, including, but not limited to, the False Advertising Law and the CLRA.

- 75. Defendants' conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, and sale of the Products is also unfair because the consumer injury is substantial, not outweighed by benefits to consumers or competition, and not one consumers themselves can reasonably avoid.
- 76. In accordance with California Business & Professions Code section 17203, Plaintiff seeks an order enjoining Defendants from continuing to conduct business through fraudulent or unlawful acts and practices and to commence a corrective advertising campaign. Defendants' conduct is ongoing and continuing, such that prospective injunctive relief is necessary.
- 77. On behalf of himself and the California Sub-Class, Plaintiff also seeks an order for the restitution of all monies from the sale the Products, which were unjustly acquired through acts of fraudulent, unfair, or unlawful competition.

COUNT V

(Breach of Express Warranty, California Commercial Code §2313 Against Defendants on Behalf of the California Sub-Class)

- 78. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 79. As set forth herein, Defendants made express representations to Plaintiff and the Class that the Products were natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally.
- 80. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus constituted express warranties.
- 81. There was a sale of goods from Defendants to Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class members.
 - 82. On the basis of these express warranties, Defendants sold to Plaintiff

12

13 14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

and the California Sub-Class the Products.

- Defendants knowingly breached the express warranties by including 83. one or more of the Chemicals in the Products.
- 84. Defendants were on notice of this breach as they were aware of the included Chemicals in the Products.
- 85. Privity exists because Defendants expressly warranted to Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class that the Products were natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally through the marketing and labeling.
- Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class reasonably relied on the express 86. warranties by Defendants.
- As a result of Defendants' breaches of their express warranties, Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class were sustained damages as they paid money for the Products that were not what Defendants represented.
- 88. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the California Sub-Class, seeks actual damages for Defendants' breach of warranty.

COUNT VI

(Breach of Implied Warranty, California Commercial **Code §2314 Against Defendants on Behalf of the California Sub-Class)**

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 90. As set forth herein, Defendants made affirmations of fact on the Products' labels to Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class that the Products were natural, naturally derived, non-toxic, and/or plant-based.
- 91. The Products did not conform to these affirmations and promises as they contained the Chemicals.
- 92. These promises became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus constituted express warranties.

93.

and the California Sub-Class.

94. There was a sale of goods from Defendants to Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class members.

Defendants are merchants engaging in the sale of goods to Plaintiff

- 95. Defendants breached the implied warranties by selling the Products that failed to conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label as each Product contained one or more of the Chemicals.
- 96. Defendants were on notice of this breach as they were aware of the included Chemicals in the Products.
- 97. Privity exists because Defendants expressly warranted to Plaintiff and the Class that the Products were natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally through the marketing and labeling.
- 98. As a result of Defendants' breaches of their implied warranties of merchantability, Plaintiff and the California Sub-Class were sustained damages as they paid money for the Products that were not what Defendants represented.
- 99. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the California Sub-Class, seeks actual damages for Defendants' breach of warranty.

COUNT VII

(Quasi-Contract)

- 100. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 101. Defendants unjustly retained a benefit at the expense of Plaintiff and the members of the Class in the form of substantial revenues and payments from Plaintiff and the members of the Class for the Products and from Defendants' conduct in misrepresenting the these Products in labels and advertisements.
- 102. Based on the mistake, Plaintiff and the members of the Class paid for Tom's Products.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, prays for judgment against Defendants as to each and every cause of action, including:

- A. An order declaring this action to be a proper class action, appointing Plaintiff and his counsel to represent the Class, and requiring Defendants to bear the costs of class notice;
- B. An order enjoining Defendants from selling the Products in any manner suggesting or implying that they are natural, naturally sourced, naturally derived, originate from nature, contain only natural ingredients, and/or work naturally;
- C. An order requiring Defendants to engage in a corrective advertising campaign and engage in any further necessary affirmative injunctive relief, such as recalling existing products;
- D. An order awarding declaratory relief, and any further retrospective or prospective injunctive relief permitted by law or equity, including enjoining Defendants from continuing the unlawful practices alleged herein, and injunctive relief to remedy Defendants' past conduct;
- E. An order requiring Defendants to pay restitution to restore all funds acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be an unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice, untrue or misleading advertising, or a violation of the Unfair Competition Law, False Advertising Law, or CLRA, plus pre- and post-judgment interest thereon;
- F. An order requiring Defendants to disgorge or return all monies, revenues, and profits obtained by means of any wrongful or unlawful act or practice;
- G. An order requiring Defendants to pay all actual and statutory damages permitted under the causes of action alleged herein;

1	H.	H. An order requiring Defendants to pay punitive damages on any cause				
2	of action so allowable;					
3	I.	I. An order awarding attorneys' fees and costs to Plaintiff and the Class;				
4	and					
5	J.	An order providing for all other such equitable relief as may be just				
6	and proper.					
7	JURY DEMAND					
8	Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.					
9	Dated: November 15, 2016 ROBBINS ARROYO LLP					
10			BRIAN J. ROBBINS KEVIN A. SEELY			
11			ASHLEY R. RIFKIN LEONID KANDINOV			
12			ELOND MINDING V			
13			/s/Brian J. Robbins			
14			BRIAN J. ROBBINS			
15			600 B Street, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101			
16			Telephone: (619) 525-3990			
17			Facsimile: (619) 525-3991 E-mail: brobbins@robbinsarroyo.com			
18			kseely@robbinsarroyo.com arifkin@robbinsarroyo.com			
19			lkandinov@robbinsarroyo.com			
20			LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.			
21			REBECCA A. PETERSON (SB 241858) ROBERT SHELQUIST			
22			100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200 Minneapolis, MN 55401			
23			Telephone: (612) 339-6900			
24			Facsimile: (612) 339-0981 E-mail: rapeterson@locklaw.com			
25			rshelquist@locklaw.com			
26			THE PRIDE LAW FIRM JESSICA A. PRIDE			
27			2534 State Street, Suite 411			
28			San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 516-8166			

Case 3:16-cv-02808-L-NLS Document 1 Filed 11/15/16 Page 28 of 28

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Schuyler White, Individual Situated	illy and on Behalf of A	ll Others Similarly	DEFENDANTS Colgate-Palmolive	DEFENDANTS Colgate-Palmolive Company and Tom's of Maine, Inc.				
(b) County of Residence of	First Listed Plaintiff S CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	an Diego County, CA (SES)	NOTE: IN LAND CO	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, 2) Robbins Arroyo LLP 600 B Street, Suite 1900, (619) 525-3990	-	,	Attorneys (If Known)	Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti,			
☐ 1 U.S. Government ☐ 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) P7 Citizen of This State					
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizen of Another State	2				
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3				
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		orts	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES			
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 700 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes			
V. ODYGVA	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions					
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 2 Removed from								
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. §1332 Brief description of cause: Violations of Cal. CLRA, Cal. UCL, Cal. FAL; Negligent Misrepresentation; Breach of Implied Warranty								
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			DEMAND \$	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes □ No				
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER				
DATE 11/15/2016		SIGNATURE OF ATTOR /s/Brian J. Robbin						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY								
RECEIPT # AN	1OUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUD	GE .			

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Class Action Filed Over Tom's of Maine Product Labels</u>