1 2	JEFFREY F. ROSEN, SBN 163589 District Attorney of Santa Clara County TAMALCA HARRIS, SBN 245333 Deputy District Attorney	E-FILED 8/6/2025 3:00 PM Clerk of Court Superior Court of CA, County of Santa Clara 25CV472270
3 4	70 West Hedding Street, West Wing San Jose, California 95110 Telephone: (408) 808-3771	Reviewed By: A. Hernandez
5	Email: tharris@dao.sccgov.org	
6	NATHAN J. HOCHMAN, SBN 139137 District Attorney of Los Angeles County GINA SATRIANO, SBN 161653	
7	Head Deputy District Attorney DUKE CHAU, SBN 174498	
8	Deputy District Attorney Consumer Protection Division 211 West Temple Street, 10th Floor	
10	Los Angeles, Ĉalifornia 90012 Telephone: (213) 257-2450	
11	Email: gsatriano@da.lacounty.gov dchau@da.lacounty.gov	
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
13	See Appendix for additional Plaintiff's counsel	
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE ST	ATE OF CALIFORNIA
15	FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA	
16		
17 18	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	CASE NO.: 25CV472270
19	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION, CIVIL PENALTIES, AND OTHER
20	VS.	RELIEF
21	GROCERY DELIVERY E-SERVICE USA INC., dba HELLOFRESH, a Delaware Corporation,	UNLIMITED CIVIL COMPLAINT OVER \$35,000
22	Defendants.	
23	Plaintiff, the People of the State of California,	represented by Jeffrey F. Rosen, District
24	Attorney of Santa Clara County, by Tamalca Harris, Deputy District Attorney; Nathan J.	
25	Hochman, District Attorney of Los Angeles County, by Duke Chau, Deputy District Attorney;	
26 27	Summer Stephan, District Attorney of San Diego County, by Stephen M. Spinella, Deputy District	
7.1	Summer Stephan, District Attorney of San Diego Cou	nty, by Stephen M. Spinella, Deputy District
28	Summer Stephan, District Attorney of San Diego Coul Attorney; John T. Savrnoch, District Attorney of Santa	

28

Deputy District Attorney; Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney of Santa Cruz County, by Douglas B. Allen, Assistant District Attorney; and Douglas T. Sloan, City Attorney of Santa Monica by Jonathan Erwin-Frank, Deputy City Attorney (hereinafter "Plaintiff") hereby alleges the following upon information and belief:

## **PARTIES AND VENUE**

- 1. Plaintiff, acting to protect the public from unfair business practices, brings this action pursuant to California Business and Profession Code sections 17200 *et seq.*, 17500 *et seq.*, 17600 *et seq.*, including sections 17203, 17204, 17206, 17535, and 17536.
- 2. Defendant Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc., dba HelloFresh, (hereinafter "Defendant") is a Delaware corporation with its headquarters located in New York, New York.
- 3. Defendant is the largest meal kit delivery company in the United States that serves as an alternative to traditional grocery store shopping and sells pre-portioned food ingredients and recipes to consumers via the internet.
- 4. At all relevant times, Defendant has transacted business within and from the County of Santa Clara and throughout the State of California.
- 5. Whenever in this Complaint reference is made to any act and omission of Defendant, such reference shall be deemed to mean that Defendant did the alleged acts and omissions through its directors, officers, employees, agents, partners, and/or representatives while they were acting within the actual or ostensible scope of their authority.
- 6. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Article 6, section 10 of the California Constitution and section 393 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.
- 7. Venue is proper in this county pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17204, in that the violations alleged in this Complaint occurred in the County of Santa Clara, as well as throughout the state of California.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

8. Defendant engaged in acts and practices alleged in this Complaint on a regular basis since on or about January 1, 2019. The relevant statutes of limitation have been tolled by agreement of the parties effective January 1, 2023.

- 9. Defendant operates an automatic renewal subscription program wherein consumers purchase products to be delivered on a recurring basis. When consumers subscribed to Defendant's service and products on its website, Defendant automatically charged their credit cards repeatedly for subsequent service and products until cancelled by the consumers.
- 10. Defendant did not properly disclose the material terms and conditions of its automatic renewal plans clearly and conspicuously on its website.
- 11. Defendant's alleged conduct violated California's Automatic Purchase Renewal Law pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17600 *et seq.* as follows:
  - Defendant failed to clearly and conspicuously disclose the legally required terms of the automatic renewal plans in visual proximity to a request for the consumer's consent to the plans;
  - b. Defendant failed to obtain the consumer's affirmative and express informed consent to the above terms before obtaining the consumer's billing information and payment;
  - c. Defendant failed to provide a post-payment acknowledgment that included the clear and conspicuous disclosure of the above terms;
  - d. Defendant failed to provide a simple online mechanism for consumers to stop recurring charges under the automatic renewal plans; and
  - e. When offering free gifts and trials, Defendant failed to include a clear and conspicuous explanation of the price that would be charged after the trial ended or the manner in which the subscription or purchasing agreement pricing would change upon conclusion of the trial.
- 12. Defendant, with the intent to induce the general public to purchase its products on and from its websites, made or caused to be made written and oral statements throughout the State of California that were untrue and misleading. They include, but are not limited to, the following written and oral claims and statements that appeared on the Defendant's website, television advertisements, internet advertisements, and print advertisements:

- a. When advertising free meals, surprise gifts, and free shipping offers, Defendant did not properly disclose the material terms and conditions of the free meals, surprise gifts, and free shipping offers clearly and conspicuously on their website.
- b. Defendant failed to clearly and conspicuously disclose that the free meals were not free but were discounts to be applied to subsequent purchases.
   The total discount for the advertised free meals was less than the total price of the advertised free meals.
- c. Defendant failed to clearly and conspicuously disclose that surprise gifts were only provided after several subsequent purchases.
- d. Defendant misled consumers to believe the shipping for their deliveries was free when only the first delivery was free.
- e. When consumers clicked on the Terms and Condition hyperlink on

  Defendant's payment page to obtain more information about the transaction
  before paying, a countdown timer appeared stating the offer would expire in
  five minutes. However, the offer did not expire when the timer ran out.

  The timer was simply a tactic to rush consumers through the checkout
  process by creating a sense of urgency to skip a review of the terms and
  conditions before the purchase.
- f. When advertising its service and products on its website, Defendant misled consumers about the savings resulting from the purchase of its automatic renewal subscription plans when compared to purchasing groceries from other sources.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

(False Advertising Law – California Business and Professions Code section 17500)

13. Plaintiff restates and incorporates the allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

- 14. Defendant's practice of failing to disclose its automatic renewal terms in a clear and conspicuous manner before automatically and repeatedly charging consumers was misleading when made and was known, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have been known, to be misleading.
- 15. Defendant's practice of failing to disclose the material terms and conditions of the free meals, surprise gifts, and free shipping in a clear and conspicuous manner before automatically and repeatedly charging consumers was misleading when made and was known, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have been known, to be misleading.
- 16. Defendant's practice of displaying a countdown timer on its website before automatically and repeatedly charging consumers was misleading when made and was known, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have been known, to be misleading.
- 17. Defendant's practice of advertising the savings resulting from the purchase of its automatic renewal subscription plans before automatically and repeatedly charging consumers was misleading when made and was known, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have been known, to be misleading.
  - 18. Each of the aforementioned failures violated section 17500 et seq.
- 19. Unless enjoined by the Court, Defendant will continue to make misleading statements in violation of section 17500.
- 20. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17536, Defendant is liable for a civil penalty of \$2,500 for each violation of section 17500.

### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

(Unfair Competition Law – California Business and Professions Code section 17200)

- 21. Plaintiff restates and incorporates the allegations of the preceding paragraphs.
- 22. Defendant has committed acts of unfair competition as defined by section 17200 by engaging in unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent acts and practices.
- 23. The acts and practices were "unlawful" pursuant to section 17200 in that they violated the respective laws described above.
  - 24. The acts were "unfair" pursuant to section 17200, as defined by law, both to COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION, CIVIL PENALTIES, AND OTHER RELIEF UNLIMITED CIVIL COMPLAINT OVER \$35,000

28

Defendant's consumers and to its competitors.

- 25. The acts were "fraudulent" pursuant to section 17200 in that they were likely to deceive members of the public and were performed with that intent.
  - 26. Unless enjoined by the Court, Defendant will continue its wrongful practices.
- 27. Pursuant to California Business and Profession Code section 17203 and the Court's equitable powers, the Court may issue a permanent injunction and such other orders as may be necessary to prevent future acts of unfair competition by Defendant.
- 28. Pursuant to section 17203 and the Court's equitable powers, the Court may make such orders as may be necessary to restore to any person any interest in money which may have been acquired through Defendant's unfair competition.
- 29. Pursuant to California Business and Profession Code section 17206, the Court must assess a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 for each act of unfair competition.

# **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535 and the Court's inherent equitable powers, Defendant, its subsidiaries; their successors and the assigns; their directors, officers, employees, agents, and representatives of each of them; and all persons and entities acting in concert or in participation with Defendant, be permanently restrained and enjoined from:
  - (a) Making, disseminating, or causing to be made or disseminated, any misleading and/or deceptive statements in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17500, including but not limited to, the misleading statements alleged in the First Cause of Action of this Complaint; and
  - (b) Engaging in any acts of unfair competition in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, including but not limited to the unlawful business acts and practices alleged in the Second Cause of Action of this Complaint.
  - Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17536, Defendant be COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION, CIVIL PENALTIES, AND OTHER RELIEF UNLIMITED CIVIL COMPLAINT OVER \$35,000

1	Appendix
2	SUMMER STEPHAN District Attorney of San Diego County
3	Stephen M. Spinella, SBN 144732
4	Colleen Huschke, SBN 191402
5	Deputy District Attorneys 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, California 92101
6	Telephone: (619) 531-3971
7	JOHN T. SAVRNOCH
8	District Attorney of Santa Barbara County Christopher B. Dalbey, SBN 285562
9	Morgan S. Lucas, SBN 288401
0	Senior Deputy District Attorneys 1112 Santa Barbara Street
	Santa Barbara, California 93101
1	Telephone: (805) 568-2400
2	JEFFREY S. ROSELL
3	District Attorney of Santa Cruz County
4	Douglas B. Allen, SBN 99329 Francisca Allen, SBN 99402
5	Assistant District Attorneys
	701 Ocean Street, Suite 200 Santa Cruz, California 95060
6	Telephone: (831) 454-2930
7	DOUGLAS T. SLOAN
8	Santa Monica City Attorney
9	Andrew Braver, SBN 326275 Jonathan Erwin-Frank, SBN 308584
20	Deputy City Attorneys
	1685 Main Street, Room 310
21	Santa Monica, California 90401 Telephone: (310) 458-4928
22	
23	Attorneys for Plaintiff
24	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
25	
26	
,,	