CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

The Pershing Square Building

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

I.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a class action lawsuit brought on behalf of all purchasers of Go-Paks manufactured, advertised, distributed, and/or sold by Mondelez, including Mini Chips Ahoy!, Mini Oreo, Golden Oreo Mini, Nutter Butter Bites, Mini Nilla Wafers, Ritz Bits, and Teddy Grahams (the "Product(s)") (pictured below). Mondelez falsely and deceptively misrepresents the quantity of food contained in each unit of Product by way of its packaging.



2. At all relevant times, Mondelez has packaged the Products in small, cupshaped containers, the contents of which cannot be seen or felt at the time of purchase. The packaging of the Products leads the reasonable consumer to believe he or she is purchasing a container full of the advertised cookies. In reality, the Product is uniformly under-filled by 25% or more (represented by the red striped lines above).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	3.	The empty space, or "slack fill," present in the Products'	packaging is
nonfu	ınctioı	nal and therefore unlawful. This misleading practice allows	Mondelez to
save	a cons	siderable amount of money on food production costs to the	detriment of
unsus	spectir	ng consumers.	

- Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the proposed class, seeks damages, restitution and injunctive relief against Defendants for false and misleading advertising in violation of Business & Professions Code Section 17200, et seq., Business & Professions Code Section 17500, et seq., Civil Code Section 1750, et seq., breach of the implied warranty of merchantability, unjust enrichment, negligent misrepresentation, and fraud.
- By letter dated November 6, 2015, Plaintiff advised Defendants of its false and misleading claims pursuant to California <u>Civil Code</u> Section 1782(a).

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because: (i) there are 100 or more class members, (ii) there is an aggregate amount in controversy exceeding \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and (iii) there is minimal diversity because at least one plaintiff and defendant are citizens of different states. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over any state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, this Court is the proper venue for this action because a substantial part of the events, omissions, and acts giving rise to the claims herein occurred in this District. Plaintiff is a citizen of California, resides in this District, and his purchases of the Product were made in this District. Moreover, Defendants receive substantial compensation from sales in this District, and Defendants made numerous misrepresentations which had a substantial effect in this District, including, but not limited to, label, packaging, and internet advertisements, among other advertising.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

8. Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in California based upon sufficient minimum contacts which exist between Defendants and California. Defendants are authorized to do and doing business in California.

III.

PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an individual residing in San Francisco County, California, which is located in the federal judicial district for the Northern District of California. Plaintiff purchased each of the Go-Pak Products at issue, including Mini Chips Ahoy!, Mini Oreo, Nutter Butter Bites, Mini Nilla Wafers, Ritz Bits, and Teddy Grahams, within the last three (3) years. In each instance, the Product was under-filled with cookies and uniformly contained an unlawful amount of slack fill of 25% or more. In making his purchases, Plaintiff relied upon the packaging which was prepared and approved by Defendants and their agents and disseminated statewide and nationwide, containing the misrepresentations alleged herein and designed to encourage consumers to purchase the Product.
- Mondelez International, Inc. and Mondelez Global, LLC are corporations 10. headquartered in East Hanover, New Jersey. They maintain their principal places of business at 100 Deforest Ave., East Hanover, NJ 07936. They, directly and through their agents, have substantial contacts with and receive substantial benefits and income from and through the State of California. They are the owner, manufacturer, and distributor of the Product, and are the companies that created and/or authorized the false, misleading, and deceptive advertisements and/or packaging and labeling for the Product.
- The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise of certain manufacturers, distributors, and/or their alter egos sued herein as DOES 1 through 10 inclusive are presently unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues these individuals and/or entities by fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of this Court to amend the Complaint to show their true names and capacities when the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 10 were authorized to do and did business in the Northern District of California. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 10 were and/or are, in some manner or way, responsible for and liable to Plaintiff for the events, happenings, and damages hereinafter set forth below.

- 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that at all times relevant herein each of these individuals and/or entities was the agent, servant, employee, subsidiary, affiliate, partner, assignee, successor-in-interest, alter ego, or other representative of each of the remaining defendants and was acting in such capacity in doing the things herein complained of and alleged.
- 13. In committing the wrongful acts alleged herein, Defendants planned and participated in and furthered a common scheme by means of false, misleading, deceptive, and fraudulent representations to induce members of the public to purchase the Products. Defendants participated in the making of such representations in that it did disseminate or cause to be disseminated said misrepresentations.
- 14. Defendants, upon becoming involved with the manufacture, advertising, and sale of the Products, knew or should have known that the Products were being under-filled, and thus the packaging of the Product was misleading. Defendants affirmatively misrepresented the quantity of the Products' contents in order to convince the public and the Products' consumer to purchase and use the Products, resulting in profits of millions of dollars or more to Defendants, all to the damage and detriment of the consuming public.

IV.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

15. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated. The Classes which Plaintiff seeks to represent are:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

a.	All persons residing in the United States who purchased the Product for
	personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012
	through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers
	directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration
	from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement
	of the Product.

- b. All persons residing in the State of California who purchased the Product for personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012, through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers, directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement of the Product.
- 16. The Class comprises many thousands of persons throughout the United States and California, the joinder of whom is impracticable, and the disposition of their claims in a Class Action will benefit the parties and the Court. The Class is sufficiently numerous because millions of units of the Product have been sold in the United States and State of California during the time period May 5, 2012, through the present (the "Class Period").
- 17. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members. Common questions of law and fact include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. Whether Defendants' conduct is an unlawful business act or practice within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq.;

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

b.	Whether Defendants' conduct is a fraudulent business act or practice
	within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200, et
	seq.;
C.	Whether Defendants' advertising is untrue or misleading within the

- meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17500, et seq.;
- d. Whether Defendants made false and misleading representations in their advertising and packaging of the Product;
- e. Whether Defendants knew or should have known that the representations were false;
- f. Whether Defendants represented that the Product has characteristics, benefits, uses, or quantities which the Product does not have;
- Whether Defendants warranted that the Product contained an adequate amount of cookies for a container of its size;
- h. Whether Defendants warranted that the Product is legal for sale in the United States;
- Whether Defendants breached these warranties; and
- Whether Defendants committed statutory and common law fraud by doing so.
- 18. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class, and Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff has retained competent and experienced counsel in class action and other complex litigation.
- 19. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' false representations. Plaintiff purchased units of the Products under the belief that they were adequately filled with food items. Plaintiff relied on Defendants' packaging and would not have purchased the Product if he had known that the Product did not have the characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities as represented.

20. A class action is superior to other available methods for fair and efficient
adjudication of this controversy. The expense and burden of individual litigation
would make it impracticable or impossible for Class members to prosecute their
claims individually.

- 21. The trial and litigation of Plaintiff's claims are manageable. Individual litigation of the legal and factual issues raised by Defendants' conduct would increase delay and expense to all parties and the court system. The class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of a single, uniform adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.
- 22. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the entire Class, thereby making final injunctive relief and/or corresponding declaratory relief appropriate with respect to the Class as a whole. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants.
- 23. Absent a class action, Defendants will likely retain the benefits of their wrongdoing. Because of the small size of the individual Class members' claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein. Absent a representative action, the Class members will continue to suffer losses and Defendants will be allowed to continue these violations of law and to retain the proceeds of their ill-gotten gains.

V.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 24. The Product is marketed and sold at retailers across California and the United States with the packaging at issue.
- 25. Defendants routinely employed slack-filled packaging to mislead consumers into believing they were receiving more of the Product than they actually received.

S. Hill St., Suite Angeles, CA 90

- 26. Defendants lacked any lawful justification for doing so.
- 27. Plaintiff and members of the Class relied on and were deceived by Defendants' misleading slack filled packaging.
- 28. Plaintiff purchased slack-filled packages of Defendants' Products, including Mini Chips Ahoy!, Mini Oreo, Golden Oreo Mini, Nutter Butter Bites, Mini Nilla Wafers, Ritz Bits, and Teddy Grahams Go Paks.
- 29. Plaintiff did not know, and had no reason to know, that Defendants' misbranded food products were slack-filled and misbranded, given the fact that the containers are not transparent and thus give no indication as to actual quantity. Had Plaintiff known Defendants' packaging was slack-filled he would not have bought the slack-filled products. Because of Defendants' slack-fill packaging violations these products were misbranded and could not be legally held or sold.
- 30. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that during the course of the deception, Defendants have sold millions of units of the Product based upon the misleading size of the Product container.
- 31. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' unlawful slack-fill. Plaintiff paid an unwarranted premium for these products. Specifically, Plaintiff paid for Product he never received. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Product if he had known that the containers were not adequately filled.
- 32. Defendants' false and misleading packaging should be enjoined due to the false, misleading, and/or deceptive nature of Defendants' inadequately filled containers. In addition, Defendants should be compelled to provide restitution and damages to consumers who paid a premium price for the Product due to Defendant's representation that it contained an adequate amount of cookies for a container of its size.

///

///

The Pershing Square Building CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

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

VI.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FALSE AND MISLEADING ADVERTISING IN VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200, et seq.

- 33. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above, and incorporate the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 34. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., on behalf of a Class consisting of all persons who purchased the Product in the United States for personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012, through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers, directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement of the Product.
- 35. In the alternative, this cause of action is brought pursuant to <u>Business and</u> Professions Code § 17200, et seq., on behalf of a Class consisting of all persons who purchased the Product in the State of California for personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012, through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers, directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement of the Product.
- Defendant is subject to California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code 17200, et seq. The UCL provides, in pertinent part: "Unfair competition shall mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising..."
- Defendants' packaging of the Product, as alleged in the preceding 37. paragraphs, is false, deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable.
- 38. Defendants are aware that the packaging of the Product is false, deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3	39.	As	alleged	lin	the	precedin	ıg	paragr	aphs	, the	misr	epresenta	tions	by
Defenda	ants	det	ailed a	bove	con	stitutes a	an	unfair	and	fraud	ulent	business	prac	tice
within t	he r	near	ning of	Calif	forni	a <u>Busines</u>	ss &	& Profe	essio	ns Co	<u>de</u> § 1	7200.		

- 40. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendants' legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein. Defendants could have used packaging appropriate for the amount of Product contained therein.
- 41. All of the conduct alleged herein occurs and continues to occur in Defendants' business. Defendants' wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of conduct repeated on thousands of occasions daily.
- 42. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17535, Plaintiff and the members of the Class seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendants from continuing to engage, use, or employ their practice of under filling the Product's containers. Likewise, Plaintiff and the members of the Class seek an order requiring Defendants to disclose such misrepresentations, and additionally request an order awarding Plaintiff restitution of the money wrongfully acquired by Defendants by means of responsibility attached to Defendants' failure to disclose the existence and significance of said misrepresentations in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 43. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' unlawful slack-fill. Plaintiff paid an unwarranted premium for these products. Specifically, Plaintiff paid for Product her never received. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Product if he had known that the containers were not adequately filled.

VII.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FALSE AND MISLEADING ADVERTISING IN VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17500, et seq.

(By Plaintiff against all Defendants)

44. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in the preceding

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

paragraphs, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.

- 45. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., on behalf of a Class consisting of all persons who purchased the Product in the United States for personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012, through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers, directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement of the Product.
- 46. In the alternative, this cause of action is brought pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., on behalf of a Class consisting of all persons who purchased the Product in the State of California for personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012 through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers, directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement of the Product.
- 47. California's False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code 17500, et seq., makes it "unlawful for any person to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated before the public in this state, in any advertising device or in any other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement, concerning personal property or services, professional or otherwise, or performance or disposition thereof, which is untrue or misleading and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading."
- 48. Defendants committed acts of false advertising, as defined by §17500, by misrepresenting that the Product contained an adequate amount of Product for a container of its size and that the Product is legal for sale in the United States.
- Defendant knew or should have known, through the exercise of 49. reasonable care that their representations about the Product were untrue and misleading.
 - 50. Defendant's actions in violation of §17500 were false and misleading

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

such that the general public is and was likely to be deceived.

- 51. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17535, Plaintiff and the members of the Class seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendants from continuing to engage, use, or employ their practice of under filling the Product's containers. Likewise, Plaintiff and the members of the Class seek an order requiring Defendants to disclose such misrepresentations, and additionally request an order awarding Plaintiff restitution of the money wrongfully acquired by Defendants by means of responsibility attached to Defendants' failure to disclose the existence and significance of said misrepresentations in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 52. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' false representations. Plaintiff purchased the Product in reliance of the claims by Defendants that the Product was of the quality represented by Defendants' packaging and advertising. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Product if he had known that the claims and advertising as described herein were false.

VIII.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE § 1750, et seq.

- 53. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations of the previous paragraphs, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 54. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Civil Code § 1750, et seq., the Consumers Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA"), on behalf of a Class consisting of all persons who purchased the Product in the United States for personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012, through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers, directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement of the Product.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

55. In the alternative, this cause of action is brought pursuant to the CLRA on behalf of a Class consisting of all persons who purchased the Product in the State of California for personal use and not for resale during the time period May 5, 2012, through the present. Excluded from the Class are Defendants' officers, directors, and employees, and any individual who received remuneration from Defendants in connection with that individual's use or endorsement of the Product.

- 56. The Class consists of thousands of persons, the joinder of whom is impracticable.
- 57. There are questions of law and fact common to the class, which questions are substantially similar and predominate over questions affecting the individual members, including but not limited to: (a) Whether Defendants represented that the Product has characteristics, benefits, uses or quantities which it does not have; (b) Whether the existence, extent and significance of the major misrepresentations regarding the purported benefits, characteristics and efficacy of the Product violates the Act; and (c) Whether Defendants knew of the existence of these misrepresentations.
- The policies, acts, and practices heretofore described were intended to 58. result in the sale of the Product to the consuming public and violated and continue to violate § 1770(a)(5) and (9), of the CLRA, respectively, by representing that the Product: (1) has characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, and quantities which it does not have and (2) advertising the Product with intent not to sell it as advertised.
- 59. Defendants fraudulently deceived Plaintiff and the Class by representing that the Product has certain characteristics, benefits, uses, and quantities which they do not have (e.g., that the Product was adequately filled with cookies). In doing so, Defendants intentionally misrepresented and concealed material facts from Plaintiff and the Class. Said misrepresentations and concealment were done with the intention of deceiving Plaintiff and the Class and depriving them of their legal rights and money.

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

60. Defendants fraudulently deceived Plaintiff and the Class by advertising
the Product with intent not to sell it as advertised (e.g., by intentionally under-filling
the Product's containers). In doing so, Defendants intentionally misrepresented and
concealed material facts from Plaintiff and the Class. Said misrepresentations and
concealment were done with the intention of deceiving Plaintiff and the Class and
depriving them of their legal rights and money.

- 61. Defendants knew or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care that the Product's packaging was misleading.
- 62. Defendants' actions as described hereinabove were done with conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Defendants were wanton and malicious in its concealment of the same.
- 63. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' false representations in an amount to be determined at trial.

IX.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY

- 64. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations of the previous paragraphs, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 65. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed Class against Defendant.
- 66. Defendant, as the designer, manufacturer, marketer, distributor, and/or seller, impliedly warranted that the Product contained an adequate amount of cookies for a container of its size and that the Products is legal for sale in the United States.
- 67. Defendant breached the warranty implied in the contract for the sale of the Product because it could not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description, the goods were not of fair average quality within the description, and the goods were unfit for their intended and ordinary purpose because the Product does

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

not contain an adequate amount of cookies for a container of its size and is illegal for sale in the United States. As a result, Plaintiff and Class members did not receive the goods as impliedly warranted by Defendant to be merchantable.

- 68. Plaintiff and Class members purchased the Product in reliance upon Defendant's skill and judgment and the implied warranties of fitness for the purpose.
- 69. The Product was defectively designed and unfit for its intended purpose, and Plaintiff and Class members did not receive the goods as warranted.
- 70. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's breach of the implied warranty, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' false representations. Plaintiff purchased the Product in reliance of the claims by Defendants that the Product was of the quality represented by Defendants' packaging. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Product if he had known that the claims and advertising as described herein were false.

X.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION **UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

- 71. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.
- Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of 72. the proposed Class against Defendants.
- 73. Plaintiff and Class members conferred benefits on Defendants by purchasing the Product.
- 74. Defendants have been unjustly enriched in retaining the revenues derived from Plaintiff and Class members' purchases of the Product. Retention of those moneys under these circumstances is unjust and inequitable because Defendants misrepresented that the Product contained an adequate amount of cookies for a container of its size and that the Product is legal for sale in the United States. These

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

misrepresentations	caused	injuries to	Plaintiff	and	Class	members	because	they
would not have pur	chased t	he Product	if the true	facts	s were	known.		

Because Defendants' retention of the non-gratuitous benefits conferred 75. on them by Plaintiff and Class members is unjust and inequitable, Defendants must pay restitution to Plaintiff and Class members for its unjust enrichment, as ordered by the Court.

XI.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

- Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all 76. preceding paragraphs of this complaint.
- Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of 77. the proposed Class against Defendants.
- 78. As discussed above, Defendants misrepresented that the Product contained an adequate amount of cookies for a container of its size and that the Product is legal for sale in the United States. Defendants had a duty to disclose this information.
- 79. At the time Defendants made these representations, Defendants knew or should have known that these representations were false or made them without knowledge of their truth or veracity.
- At a minimum, Defendants negligently misrepresented and/or negligently 80. omitted material facts about the Product.
- 81. The negligent misrepresentations and omissions made by Defendants, upon which Plaintiff and Class members reasonably and justifiably relied, were intended to induce and actually induced Plaintiff and Class members to purchase the Product.
 - Plaintiff and Class members would not have purchased the Product if the 82.

true facts had been known.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

83. The negligent actions of Defendants caused damage to Plaintiff and Class members, who are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable relief as a result.

XII.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FRAUD

(By Plaintiff against all Defendants)

- 84. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs of this complaint.
- 85. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed Class against Defendants.
- 86. As discussed above, Defendants provided Plaintiff and Class members with false or misleading material information and failed to disclose material facts about the Product, including but not limited to the fact that it contained an adequate amount of cookies for a container of its size and that the Product is legal for sale in the United States. These misrepresentations and omissions were made with knowledge of their falsehood.
- 87. The misrepresentations and omissions made by Defendants, upon which Plaintiff and Class members reasonably and justifiably relied, were intended to induce and actually induced Plaintiff and Class members to purchase the Product.
- 88. The fraudulent actions of Defendants caused damage to Plaintiff and Class members, who are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable relief as a result.

24

25 | ///

///

26 | ///

27 || ///

28 || ///

he Pershing Square Building

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C

1

XIII.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and on behalf of the members of the Class defined herein, prays for judgment and relief on all Causes of Action as follows:

- A. An order certifying that the action may be maintained as a Class Action;
- B. An order enjoining Defendants from pursuing the policies, acts, and practices complained of herein and requiring Defendants to pay restitution to Plaintiff and all members of the Class in an amount to be determined at trial:
- C. Actual damages;
- D. Punitive damages;
- E. For pre-judgment interest from the date of filing this suit;
- F. Reasonable attorney fees;
- G. Costs of this suit; and
- H. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem necessary or appropriate.

DATED: May 5, 2016

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

Ryan J. Clarkson, Esq.

Shireen M. Clarkson, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Plaintiff Class

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all triable issues.

DATED: May 5, 2016

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

Ryan J. Clarkson, Esq.
Shireen M. Clarkson, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed
Plaintiff Class

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12) Cand rev (1/15/13)

Case 3:16-cv-024601 Decument 1 SFIEL 05/05/16 Page 1 of 1

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 ruprose of initiating the civil decket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAG	E OF THIS FO	RM.)						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, 2) CLARKSON LAW FI	of First Listed Plaintiff San Francisco XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) Address, and Telephone Number) IRM, P.C. 101, Los Angeles, CA 90013		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCA THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)						
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITI	ZENSHIP OF PRI	NCIPAL PARTIES (Pla	ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff				
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF of This State \[\begin{array}{c cccc} & And One Box for Defe & PTF &						
2 U.S. Government Defendant	Z 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2	. – –				
			en or Subject of a reign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6				
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		T.C		D A NIZDY IDECT					
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INTERV PERSONAL INT		5 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act				
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	O Insurance O Marine O Marine O Miller Act O Negotiable Instrument O Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment O Medicare Act O Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) O Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits O Other Contract O Contract Product Liability O Stockholders' Suits O Other Contract O Contract Product Liability O Contract		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 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 Italse Clallis 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				
□ 1 Original □ 2 Res	moved from 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	Reop	pened Anot (speci						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you CAFA 2005 Brief description of cause: False and Misleading Advertising Claims a			es unless diversity):					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	ON D	EMAND \$ 5,000,001	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: Yes No				
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER					
(Place an "X" in One Box On	<u> </u>		NCISCO/OAKLAN	D () SAN JOSE	() EUREKA				
DATE 05/05/2016	SIGNATURE OF AT /s/ Ryan J. Clark		RECORD						