| 1 | Rose F. Luzon (SBN 221544) | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | Shepherd, Finkelman, Miller & Shah, LLP 401 West 'A' Street, Suite 2350 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | San Diego, CA 92101 Phone: (619) 235-2416 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Fax: (619) 234-7334 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Email: rluzon@sfmslaw.com | | | | | | | |
| 6 | (Additional Counsel on Signature Page) | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class | | | | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE | | | | | | | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION | | | | | | | |
| 10 | PATSY MURDOCK, Individually | Case No. | | | | | | |
| 11 | And On Behalf Of All Others Similarly | Cuse 110. | | | | | | |
| 12 | Situated, | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Plaintiff, | | | | | | | |
| 14 | v. | | | | | | | |
| 15 | MAYBELLINE, LLC, | CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Defendant. | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Plaintiff, Patsy Murdock ("Plaintiff"), all | eges, upon personal knowledge as to herself and | | | | | | |
| 20 | her own acts, and upon information and belief (based on the investigation of counsel) as to all | | | | | | | |
| 21 | other matters, as follows: | | | | | | | |
| 22 | JURISDICTION AND VENUE | | | | | | | |
| 23 | 1. This Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § | | | | | | | |
| 24 | 1332(d) because the matter in controversy, upon information and belief, exceeds \$5,000,000, | | | | | | | |
| 25 | exclusive of interest and costs, and this is a class action in which certain of the Class members | | | | | | | |
| 26 | and Defendant are citizens of different states. | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | |

2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because many of the acts and transactions alleged herein occurred in substantial part in this District and Plaintiff resides in this District.

NATURE OF ACTION

- 3. This action seeks to remedy the unfair, deceptive, and unlawful business practices of Defendant, Maybelline, LLC ("Defendant" or "Maybelline") with respect to the production, distribution, advertising, marketing and sales of its facial foundation makeup, SuperStayTM 24HR Makeup ("24HR Foundation") and SuperStayTM 24 Color lipstick ("24 Color") (collectively the "Product(s)"). Defendant manufactures, markets, sells, and distributes the Products using a marketing and advertising campaign that is centered around the claim that the Products will last for 24 hours on the consumer's skin, regardless of skin type, and lips, and stay perfectly flawless (the "24-hour Claim"). However, Defendant's advertising and marketing campaign and labeling claims are false and misleading because the Products do not stay on the skin and lips for 24 hours.
- 4. As explained more fully herein, Maybelline has made, and continues to make, deceptive and misleading claims and promises to consumers about the efficacy of the Products, in a pervasive, nationwide, marketing scheme that confuses and misleads consumers about the true nature of the Products. In reality, the Products do not live up to the claims made by Maybelline.
- 5. Maybelline knows this, yet designed its marketing and advertising campaign to include indicia of research of the claims, for the sole purpose of misleading and deceiving consumers. As a result, Maybelline misleads consumers with false and misleading promises of results it knows it cannot deliver, and does so with one goal in mind reaping enormous profits.
- 6. Through the marketing and sales of the Products, Defendant has worked to convey the singular message: the Products last for 24 hours. Each person who has purchased the Products has been exposed to Defendant's misleading advertising message and purchased the Products as a result of that message on the Products' labels and/or as part of the advertising.

- 7. Defendant knows that consumers are willing to pay for specialized cosmetics, and advertised the Products with the intention that consumers rely on the 24-hour Claim and representations made on the packaging. Defendant's claims are deceptive and misleading, and have been designed solely to cause consumers to buy the Products. Defendant knew or should have known, at the time it began selling the Products, that they did not last for 24 hours.
- 8. Plaintiff read and relied on the representations that Maybelline made on the Products and in the advertising, namely the 24-hour Claim, when she purchased the Products. Plaintiff and the Class (defined below) paid a premium for the Products over foundations and lipsticks that did not purport to provide 24-hour coverage.
- 9. By relying on the representations that Defendant's Products would stay on her skin for 24 hours and could, thus, do something that other foundation products and lipsticks could not do, Plaintiff and the Class have been damaged and suffered loss and damage by purchasing the Products, which are sold at an inflated price. Plaintiff did not receive the benefit of the bargain, a foundation that provided 24-hour coverage, or a lipstick that provided 24-hour coverage, when she purchased the Products. Instead, she received Products that, in direct contradiction to Defendant's representations, do not provide full 24-hour coverage.
- 10. This class action seeks to provide redress to consumers who have been harmed by the false and misleading marketing practices Defendant has engaged in with respect to the Products. Plaintiff asserts claims, on behalf of herself and the Class, pursuant to the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code § 1750, et seq. ("CLRA"); Unfair Competition Law, California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq. ("UCL"); False Advertising Law, California Business and Professions Code § 17500, et seq. ("FAL"); and breach of the express warranty created by Defendant's advertising, including the labeling of the Products.
- 11. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief, actual damages, restitution and/or disgorgement of profits, statutory damages, attorneys' fees, costs, and all other relief available to the Class as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct.

PARTIES

- 12. Plaintiff, is a resident of Susanville, Lassen County, California and, thus, is a citizen of California.
- 13. Defendant, Maybelline, is a subsidiary of L'Oreal, Inc. ("L'Oreal"), is a New York corporation, and has its principal place of business at 575 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York. Maybelline, therefore, is a citizen of New York.
- 14. All of Defendant's actions described in this Complaint are part of, and in furtherance of, the unlawful conduct alleged herein, and were authorized and/or done by Defendant's various officers, agents, employees, or other representatives while actively engaged in the management of Defendant's affairs (or that of its predecessors-in-interest) within the course and scope of their duties and employment, and/or with the actual, apparent, and/or ostensible authority of Defendant.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. Maybelline is a cosmetics company that was founded in 1915 and is based in New York. Maybelline is a part of L'Oreal, and offers skin care and makeup products.
- 16. Maybelline's products are sold at pharmacies, large retailers such as Wal-Mart and Target, or over websites, with prominent signage identifying Maybelline as the seller, and the products as Maybelline products. Maybelline products are also packaged in product containers that identify them as Maybelline products.
- 17. Regardless of where Plaintiff and the Class purchased the Products (*i.e.*, on-line, or from third-party retailers' brick and mortar store(s)), they were exposed to the deceptive and misleading advertising messages and material omissions regarding the efficacy promises of the Products.
- 18. Maybelline.com directs consumers who want to buy the Products online to the websites of Walmart, CVS, Drugstore.com, Walgreen's, RiteAid, Target and Ulta, many of which also have brick and mortar stores. Sales of cosmetics, including foundation and lipstick, by these retailers, and others, are intensely competitive.

Case 2:13-at-00095 Document 1 Filed 02/01/13 Page 5 of 20

- Such competition is, in part, characterized by claims as to product performance characteristics, which purport to reflect the benefits resulting from the intended use of the products. Product efficacy claims serve the important purpose of helping consumers make informed purchase decisions based upon product differentiation.
- 20. Customers who purchase cosmetics are heavily reliant on product efficacy claims due to diverse expectations, a large choice of product alternatives geared to consumer individuality, and rapid roll out of innovation in response to customer trends and demands.

The Products and Their Advertising

- 21. In or about 2009, Maybelline introduced a new foundation makeup named SuperStayTM 24HR Makeup. The "24HR" stands for 24 hours. Maybelline claims that, following application, the 24HR Foundation will remain flawlessly perfect and unified on the skin for a full 24 hours, without transfer or caking.
- 22. Maybelline also introduced a new lipstick makeup named SuperStayTM 24 Color lipstick. The "24HR" stands for 24 hours. Maybelline claims that, following application, the lipstick will stay on and not transfer for 24 hours.
- 23. Maybelline heavily markets the Products in print media, including the placement of advertisements in widely circulated magazines such as Glamour, Cosmopolitan, Vogue, and O- The Oprah Magazine, among others.
- 24. Maybelline uniformly repeats its pervasive 24-hour Claim on the boards or boxes in which the Products are sold, on the bottle or tube in which they are sold, and through its pervasive advertising campaign in the media and on the internet.
- 25. For example, Maybelline's proprietary website touts the 24-hour Claim. On the website, under "Product Details" with respect to the 24HR Foundation, Maybelline provides:

25 //

26 //

27 //

| 1 | Product Details | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | Why You'll Love It | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Stays comfortable and looks naturally flawless all day | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Micro-Flex formula provides 24-hour wear and no transfer | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Withstands heat, sweat and humidity | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Oil-free, dermatologist-tested, fragrance-free | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Suitable for all skin types | | | | | | | |
| 8 | For Best Results | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Apply smoothly and evenly to your face and blend with your fingertips. | | | | | | | |
| 10 | DO-IT-ALL, THROUGH-IT-ALL MAKEUP | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 24-HOUR WEAR, NO TRANSFER | | | | | | | |
| 12 | MEDIUM COVERAGE | | | | | | | |
| 13 | http://www.maybelline.com/Products/Face-Makeup/Foundation/SuperStay-24HR-Makeup.aspx. | | | | | | | |
| 14 | 26. The same claims are made on the packaging and bottle of the 24HR Foundation, | | | | | | | |
| 15 | which refers to "No Transfer" and "24HR Wear" and states that it withstands "heat, sweat and | | | | | | | |
| 16 | humidity" and is "No-Transfer: won't rub off." The bottle also states that the 24HR Foundation | | | | | | | |
| 17 | provides "flexible, breathable, all day comfort." | | | | | | | |
| 18 | 27. With respect to the 24 Color, Maybelline claims on its website that the 24 Color: | | | | | | | |
| 19 | NO OTHER LONGWEAR LASTS LONGER. Period. | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Our Micro-Flex formula glides on and looks gorgeous all day | | | | | | | |
| 21 | http://www.maybelline.com/Products/Lip-Makeup/Lip-Color/SuperStay-24-Color.aspx. | | | | | | | |
| 22 | 28. Maybelline also states: | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Meet the 24-hour lip color that stretches the limits of longwear: | | | | | | | |
| 24 | Micro-Flex formula glides on and looks gorgeous all day | | | | | | | |
| 25 | No crumbling, no caking, no fading, no feathering, no transferring | | | | | | | |
| 26 | • 2-step lipcolor in one pack | | | | | | | |
| | • 30 long-lasting shades | | | | | | | |
| 27 | For Best Results | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | |

Apply the liquid color to your clean, bare lips. Allow a full two minutes to dry, then apply ultra-conditioning balm to seal in softness. Reapply balm as needed. Remove with an oil-based makeup remover.

http://www.maybelline.com/Products/Lip-Makeup/Lip-Color/SuperStay-24-Color.aspx.

- 29. In fact, the 24-hour Claim is false and materially misleading. The Products do not perform as claimed for 24 hours or anywhere near 24 hours.
- 30. Maybelline does not publish information sufficient to validate its 24-hour Claim, because it has no such information.

Plaintiff's Experience

- 31. On May 7, 2012, Plaintiff purchased a 1-ounce bottle of the 24HR Foundation at Walgreen's in Susanville, California, for \$12.83, plus tax.
- 32. On May 7, 2012, Plaintiff purchased a SuperStay[™] 24 Color lipstick at Walgreen's in Susanville, California, for \$9.50, plus tax.
- 33. Plaintiff saw, read and relied on the Products' efficacy statements made by Maybelline in making her decision to purchase the Products. The efficacy statements relied on by Plaintiff included claims that the Products were good for 24 hours and would not transfer or rub off.
- 34. These false and misleading statements received by Plaintiff at Walgreen's in Susanville, California, were material and influenced her decision to purchase the Products. Moreover, as Maybelline also has products which advertise coverage for fewer hours (at a lesser price), Plaintiff purchased the Products in reliance on the 24-hour Claim.
- 35. Plaintiff applied the 24HR Foundation appropriately, and within 4-6 hours, the makeup began to cake, run, and decompose. Plaintiff also experienced the 24HR Foundation running into her eyes and coming off with a paper towel. Moreover, the 24 Color lipstick stayed on only for a few hours. As a result, Plaintiff did not receive the benefit of longwearing efficacy as claimed by Maybelline on the Products' packaging and in advertisements.
- 36. Similarly, consumers who cannot themselves apply makeup and need daily help (*e.g.*, nursing home and assisted living residents) to assist them in the task, have the need for

longwearing makeup, as does the person who applies makeup early in the morning but will not have an opportunity to reapply makeup prior to a dinner or other evening engagement. All of such persons, and others, reasonably seek a long-wear makeup and could reasonably be expected to purchase the Products because Defendant has represented that the Products produce, on all skin types, a freshly made-up appearance for 24 hours.

- 37. Plaintiff called Defendant's customer service representative to complain about the Products' lack of efficacy, but the customer service representatives refused to offer any assistance or corrective measures.
- 38. Additionally, there are a plethora of online reviews to the effect that, contrary to the 24-hour Claim, the Products break down, bronze, cake, require touch-up and otherwise fail to maintain affinity with the skin for more than one-half the 24-hour Claim.
- 39. Maybelline knew that the Products' promised results are not possible, *i.e.*, that neither its foundation nor its lipstick will provide the promised 24-hour, longlasting results.
- 40. In addition to its affirmative misrepresentations and false advertising, Maybelline failed (and fails) to disclose that its Products do not perform as promised.
- 41. Until such time that Maybelline ceases to engage in deceptive and misleading advertising and sale of the Products, Plaintiff and the Class will continue to be harmed.
- 42. Plaintiff and Class members suffered an ascertainable loss and damage, in the amount of the price of the Products, as a result of the improper actions described herein, because the Products do not last for 24 hours, as Defendant claims.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 43. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other persons similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
 - 44. The Class that Plaintiff seeks to represent is defined as follows:

//

//

//

//

California Class:

All persons who purchased SuperStayTM 24HR Foundation or SuperStayTM 24 Color lip stick, not for resale, within California ("Class").

Excluded from the Class are (a) Defendant, including any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest, and their representatives, officers, directors, employees, assigns and successors; (b) any person who has suffered personal injury or is alleged to have suffered personal injury as a result of using the Product; and (c) the Judge to whom this case is assigned.

- 45. <u>Numerosity/Impracticability of Joinder</u>: The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members would be impracticable. The proposed Class includes, at a minimum, thousands of members. The precise number of Class members can be ascertained by reviewing documents in Defendant's possession, custody and control or otherwise obtained through reasonable means.
- 46. <u>Commonality and Predominance</u>: There are common questions of law and fact which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. These common legal and factual questions, include, but are not limited to the following:
 - a. whether Maybelline engaged in a pattern of fraudulent, deceptive and misleading conduct targeting the public through the marketing, advertising, promotion and/or sale of the Products;
 - b. whether Maybelline's acts and omissions violated California consumer protection law and breached express warranties;
 - c. whether Maybelline made material misrepresentations of fact or omitted material facts to Plaintiff and the Class regarding the marketing, promotion, advertising and sale of the Products, which material misrepresentations or omissions operated as fraud and deceit upon Plaintiff and the Class;
 - d. whether Maybelline's false and misleading statements of fact and concealment of material facts regarding the Products were intended to deceive the public;

19

24

25

26 27

- e. whether, as a result of Maybelline's misconduct, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to equitable relief and other relief, and, if so, the nature of such relief; and
- f. whether Plaintiff and the members of the Class have sustained ascertainable loss and damages as a result of Maybelline's acts and omissions, and the proper measure thereof.
- **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class 47. she seeks to represent. Plaintiff and all Class members have been injured by the same wrongful practices in which Defendant has engaged. Plaintiff's claims arise from the same practices and course of conduct that give rise to the claims of the Class members, and are based on the same legal theories.
- 48. Adequacy: Plaintiff is a representative who will fully and adequately assert and protect the interests of the Class, and has retained Class counsel who are experienced and qualified in prosecuting class actions. Neither Plaintiff nor her attorneys have any interests which are contrary to or conflicting with the Class.
- **Superiority:** A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this lawsuit, because individual litigation of the claims of all Class members is economically unfeasible and procedurally impracticable. While the aggregate damages sustained by the Class are likely in the millions of dollars, the individual damages incurred by each Class member resulting from Defendant's wrongful conduct are too small to warrant the expense of individual suits. The likelihood of individual Class members prosecuting their own separate claims is remote, and, even if every Class member could afford individual litigation, the court system would be unduly burdened by individual litigation of such cases. Individual members of the Class do not have a significant interest in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions, and individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all of the parties and to the court system because of multiple trials of the same factual and legal issues. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty to be encountered in the management

| 1 | of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action. In addition, Maybelline has | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class and, as such, final injunctive | | | | | | | |
| 3 | relief or corresponding declaratory relief with regard to the members of the Class as a whole is | | | | | | | |
| 4 | appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 50. Plaintiff will not have any difficulty in managing this litigation as a class action. | | | | | | | |
| 6 | FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION | | | | | | | |
| 7 | For Violations of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act - Civil Code § 1750, et seq. on Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 51. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the | | | | | | | |
| 9 | paragraphs above as if fully set forth here. | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 52. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the CLRA. Plaintiff is a consumer as | | | | | | | |
| 11 | defined by California Civil Code § 1761(d). The Products are goods within the meaning of the | | | | | | | |
| 12 | CLRA. | | | | | | | |
| 13 | 53. Defendant violated and continues to violate the CLRA by engaging in the | | | | | | | |
| 14 | following practices proscribed by California Civil Code § 1770(a) in transactions with Plaintiff | | | | | | | |
| 15 | and the Class which were intended to result in, and did result in, the sale of the Products: | | | | | | | |
| 16 | (2) Misrepresenting the source, sponsorship, approval or certification of goods | | | | | | | |
| 17 | or services. | | | | | | | |
| 18 | * * * | | | | | | | |
| 19 | (5) Representing that [the Products have] characteristics, uses [or] | | | | | | | |
| 20 | benefits which they do not have | | | | | | | |
| 21 | * * * | | | | | | | |
| 22 | (7) Representing that [the Products] are of a particular standard, quality or | | | | | | | |
| 23 | grade if they are of another. | | | | | | | |
| 24 | * * * | | | | | | | |
| 25 | (9) Advertising goods with intent not to sell them as advertised. | | | | | | | |
| 26 | 54. Defendant violated the CLRA by representing, through its advertisements, the | | | | | | | |
| 27 | Products as described above when it knew, or should have known, that the representations and | | | | | | | |
| 28 | advertisements were unsubstantiated, false and misleading. | | | | | | | |

- 55. Pursuant to § 1782 of the CLRA, by letters dated September 25 and December 10, 2012, Plaintiff notified Defendant in writing by certified mail of the particular violations of § 1770 of the Act and demanded that Defendant rectify the problems associated with the actions detailed above and give notice to all affected consumers of its intent to so act. Although Defendant's counsel responded, Defendant did not rectify the problems associated with the Products as set forth herein.
- 56. Plaintiff is a consumer under Civil Code § 1761(d). Civil Code § 1780(a)(2) permits any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin practices that violate Civil Code § 1770.
- 57. Plaintiff also is entitled to recover actual or statutory compensatory/monetary damages as authorized by Civil Code § 1780(a)(1) and Civil Code § 1781(a)(1), restitution as applicable and authorized under Civil Code § 1780(a)(3), and punitive damages as authorized by Civil Code § 1780(a)(4), which are appropriate in this case in light of Defendant's knowing, intentional, malicious, fraudulent and unconscionable conduct, Defendant's reckless disregard of its legal obligations to Plaintiff and the members of Class, and/or as otherwise recoverable under Civil Code § 1780(a)(4).
- 58. Plaintiff and the members of the Class also are entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Civil Code §§ 1780 and 1781.
- 59. Under Civil Code § 1782(a), Plaintiff provided the required thirty (30) day notice before filing the Complaint in this action pursuant to Civil Code § 1782(d). Plaintiff's requisite CLRA Declaration is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

False and Misleading Advertising Violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, et seq.

- 60. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
 - 61. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and on behalf of the Class.
- 62. Beginning in or about 2012, Defendant engaged in advertising and marketing to the public and offered for sale the Products throughout the United States, including California.

 63. Defendant has engaged in the advertising and marketing alleged herein with the intent to directly or indirectly induce the purchase of the Products.

- 64. Defendant's advertisements and marketing representations regarding the characteristics of the Products, and specifically regarding the 24-hour Claim, were false, misleading, and deceptive as a result of Defendant's knowledge of the falsity regarding the Products, and the fact that the claims were false.
- 65. The false and misleading representations were intended to, and likely to, deceive a reasonable consumer.
- 66. The false advertisements and misrepresentations were material to Plaintiff and Class members in connection with their respective decisions to purchase the Products.
- 67. Plaintiff and other Class members relied on the false advertisements and misrepresentations, which played a substantial part in influencing the decision of Plaintiff (and the Class) to purchase the Products.
- 68. At the time it made and disseminated the statements alleged herein, Defendant knew, or should have known, that the statements were untrue or misleading, and acted in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, *et seq*.
- 69. At all pertinent times, Defendant actively concealed its knowledge that the Products do not function as advertised.
- 70. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and on behalf of the Class, seeks restitution, disgorgement, injunctive relief, and all other relief allowable under § 17500, *et seq*.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Business Acts and Practices in Violation of California Business and Professions Code §17200, et seq. on Behalf of Plaintiff, the General Public and the Class

- 71. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth here.
- 72. California Business and Professions Code § 17200 prohibits any "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising." For the reasons discussed above, Defendant has engaged in unfair, deceptive, untrue and misleading advertising, in violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200.

- 73. California Business & Professions Code § 17200 also prohibits any "unlawful . . . business act or practice." Defendant has violated § 17200's prohibition against engaging in unlawful acts and practices by, *inter alia*, making the misrepresentations and omissions of material facts, as set forth more fully herein, and violating California Civil Code §§ 1572, 1573, 1709, 1710, 1711, 1770, Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, § 17500, *et seq.*, California Health & Safety Code § 110765, and the common law.
- 74. Plaintiff and the Class reserve the right to allege other violations of law which constitute other unlawful business acts or practices. Such conduct is ongoing and continues to this date.
- 75. California Business & Professions Code § 17200 also prohibits any "unfair . . . business act or practice."
- 76. Defendant's acts, omissions, misrepresentations, practices and nondisclosures, as alleged herein, also constitute "unfair" business acts and practices within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, in that its conduct is substantially injurious to consumers, offends public policy, and is immoral, unethical, oppressive and unscrupulous, as the gravity of the conduct outweighs any alleged benefits attributable to such conduct.
- 77. As stated in this Complaint, Plaintiff alleges violations of consumer protection, unfair competition and truth in advertising laws in California resulting in harm to consumers. Plaintiff asserts violation of the public policy of engaging in false and misleading advertising, unfair competition and deceptive conduct towards consumers. This conduct constitutes violations of the unfair prong of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq*.
- 78. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendant's legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described of herein.
- 79. Business & Professions Code § 17200 also prohibits any "fraudulent business act or practice."
- 80. Defendant's claims, nondisclosures and misleading statements, as more fully set forth above, were false, misleading and/or likely to deceive the consuming public within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17200.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Express Warranty On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class

- 81. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth here.
- 82. Plaintiff, and each member of the Class, formed a contract with Defendant at the time they purchased the Products. The terms of that contract include the promises and affirmations of fact made by Defendant on the labels and through the marketing campaign, as alleged above. This Product labeling and advertising constitutes express warranties, became part of the basis of the bargain, and is part of a standardized contract between Plaintiff and the members of the Class, on the one hand, and Defendant on the other.
- 83. All conditions precedent to Defendant's liability under the warranty have been performed by Plaintiff and the Class.
- 84. Defendant breached the terms of the express warranty by not providing Products which could provide the benefits described above.
- 85. When Plaintiff called Defendant to complain about the Products' lack of efficacy on several occasions, the customer service representatives refused to offer any assistance or corrective measures.
- 86. As a result of Defendant's breach of warranty, Plaintiff and the Class have been damaged in the amount of the purchase price of the Products they purchased.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Class, prays for judgment against Defendant granting the following relief:

- A. An order certifying this case as a class action and appointing Plaintiff as Class representative and Plaintiff's counsel to represent the Class;
- B. Restitution and disgorgement of all amounts obtained by Maybelline as a result of its misconduct, together with interest thereon from the date of payment, to the victims of such violations;

| 1 | C. | All recoverable compensat | ory and other damages sustained by Plaintiff and the | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | Class; | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | D. | Actual and/or statutory dar | mages for injuries suffered by Plaintiff and the Class | | | | | | |
| 4 | and in the maximum amount permitted by applicable law; | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | E. An order (1) requiring Maybelline to immediately cease its wrongful conduct as | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | set forth above; (2) enjoining Maybelline from continuing to misrepresent and conceal material | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | information and conduct business via the unlawful, unfair and deceptive business acts and | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | practices complained of herein; (3) ordering Maybelline to engage in a corrective advertising | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | campaign; and (4) requiring Maybelline to pay to Plaintiff and all members of the Class the | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | amounts paid for the Products; | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | F. Statutory pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on any amounts; | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | G. Payment of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Н. | Such other relief as the Co | urt may deem just and proper. | | | | | | |
| 15 | | <u>DEMAN</u> | D FOR JURY TRIAL | | | | | | |
| 16 | Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all claims so triable. | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | DATED: Fe | bruary 1, 2013 | /s/ Rose F. Luzon | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | Rose F. Luzon (SBN 221544) SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | SHAH, LLP 401 West A Street, Suite 2350 | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | San Diego, CA 92101 | | | | | | |
| | | | (619) 235-2416 (619) 234-7334 | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | rluzon@sfmslaw.com | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | James C. Shah | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | Natalie Finkelman Bennett | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | 475 White Horse Pike Collingswood, NJ 08107 | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | Telephone: (856) 858-1770 | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | Facsimile: (856) 858-7012 | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | Email: jshah@sfmslaw.com nfinkelman@sfmslaw.com | | | | | | |

| l | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | John F. Edgar |
| 2 | EDGAR LAW FIRM LLC 1032 Pennsylvania Ave. |
| 3 | Kansas City, MO 64105 Telephone: (816) 531-0033 |
| 4 | Facsimile: (816) 531-3322 |
| 5 | Email: jfe@edgarlawfirm.com |
| 6 | Mark Schlachet |
| | 3515 Severn Road Cleveland, OH 44118 |
| 7 | Telephone: (216) 896-0714 |
| 8 | Facsimile: (216) 932-5390 Email: mschlachet@gmail.com |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

EXHIBIT A

2

4

5

6

7

Case 2:13-at-00095 Document 1 Filed 02/01/13 Page 19 of 20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3

PATSY MURDOCK, Individually And On Behalf Of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff.

Civil Action No.

MAYBELLINE, LLC,

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DECLARATION OF PATSY MURDOCK

- I, Patsy Murdock, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:
- I make this declaration based upon my personal knowledge except as to those 1. matters stated herein that are based upon information or belief, which I believe to be true.
- 2. I am an adult citizen of the State of California. I reside in Susanville, California, and I am a named Plaintiff in this litigation.
- 3. In or about May, 2012, I purchased a 1-ounce bottle of the Maybelline SuperStay™ 24HR Makeup and a Maybelline SuperStay™ 24 Color lipstick from a Walgreen's in Susanville, California.
- 4. To the best of my knowledge, information and belief, Defendant Maybelline, LLC is a New York corporation with its principal place of business and executive offices located in New York, New York,
- 5. To the best of my knowledge, information and belief, Defendant Maybelline, LLC, does business directly and/or indirectly in California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

P_.3/3

PATSY MOU

•

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information 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

| | | | | 10101 | un.) | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Patsy Murdock, Indivi | a) PLAINTIFFS Patsy Murdock, Individually And On Behalf Of All Others Similarly Situated, | | | | DEFENDANTS Maybelline, LLC | | | | | | |
| (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Lassen County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Rose F. Luzon (SBN 221544) Shepherd, Finkelman, Miller & Shah, LLP 401 West 'A' Street, Suite 2350 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 235-2416 | | | | | County of Residence of First Listed Defendant New York (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known) | | | | | | |
| II. BASIS OF JURISD | ICTION (Place an "X" in a | One Box Only) | III. C | ITI | ZENSHIP OF PR | INCI | PAL | PARTIES (Pla | ice on "Y" in One | a Roy for D | launti# |
| 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff | 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not | a Party) | ļ | (1 | or Diversity Cases Only) P | TF I | DEF | Incorporated or Pri | and One Box for incipal Place | or Defende PTF | int) DEF 4 |
| 2 U.S. Government Defendant | ■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship o | f Parties in Item III) | | | _ | | | of Business In A | | □ 5 □ | ⊠ 5 |
| | _ | | | | or Subject of a | 3 | ∐ 3 | Foreign Nation | | □ 6 | □ 6 |
| IV. NATURE OF SUIT | (Place an "X" in One Box O | nly) | | | | | | | | | |
| CONTRACT | *************************************** | | * | FO | RFEITURE/PENALTY | | BAN | KRUPTCY | OTHER | STATION | FS . |
| □ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment | rance rine PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 365 P 315 Airplane Product 315 Airplane Product 316 Airplane 367 P 315 Airplane Product 320 Assault, Libel & Senforcement of Judgment dicare Act 330 Federal Employers' 230 Assault, Libel & Senforcement of Judgment dicare Act 330 Federal Employers' 230 Assault, Libel & Senforcement of Judgment dicare Act 330 Federal Employers' 230 Assault, Libel & Senforcement of Judgment dicare Act 330 Federal Employers' 230 Assault, Libel & Senforcement of Judgment 230 Assault, Libel & Senforcement 230 Assault, Lib | | 7 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 8 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability SONAL PROPERTY 0 Other Fraud 1 Truth in Lending 0 Other Personal Property Damage 5 Property Damage Product Liability SONER PETITIONS Libeas Corpus: 3 Alien Detainee 0 Motions to Vacate Sentence 0 General 5 Death Penalty her: | | 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration Actions | | BANKRUPTCY 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 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 ODICIN (2) | 448 Education | ☐ 555 Prison Condit ☐ 560 Civil Detaine Conditions of Confinement | e - | | | | | | | | |
| V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in Manager 1 | noved from 3 Rem te Court App | anded from ellate Court | | Reop | ened Ano | | istrict | Litigatio | | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTION | Cite the U.S. Civil Statu 28 U.S.C. Section 1332 Brief description of caus Consumer class action 1 | (d)(2) se: | | | | | | | s. | | |
| VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: | CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER RULE 23, | S A CLASS ACTIO | | | EMAND \$ TBD | | C | HECK YES only URY DEMAND: | if demanded in | complai | |
| VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY | E(S) (See instructions): | JUDGE 🗸 | <u> </u> | _ | 7 | D | OCKE | T NUMBER | | | |
| DATE 2/1/13 | | SIGNATURE OF AT | TTORNE | OF F | RECORD | | | | | | |
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| RECEIPT # AN | MOUNT | APPLYING IFF | > | | JUDGE | | | MAG. JUI | OGE | | |