NEWPORT TRIAL GROUP A Professional Corporation Scott J. Ferrell, Bar No. 202091 2 sferrell@trialnewport.com 3 Victoria C. Knowles, Bar No. 277231 vknowles@trialnewport.com 4100 Newport Place Dr., Suite 800 4 Newport Beach, CA 92660 Tel: (949) 706-6464 5 Fax: (949) 706-6469 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 Case No.: 13CV2129 LAB WVG 11 KYLE JANOVICK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, 12 Plaintiff, CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT 13 VS. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED 14 MAXIMUM HUMAN PERFORMANCE, 15 INC.; and DOES 1-10, Inclusive, Defendants. 16 Plaintiff KYLE JANOVICK ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others 17 similarly situated, alleges the following on information and belief: 18 **INTRODUCTION** I. 19 Performance, Inc. ("Defendant") manufactures, Maximum Human 1. 20 markets, and sells "Dark Rage" as a "Next Generation Pre-Workout Formula" which 21 Defendant advertises as containing L-Arginine AKG ("AKG"). In reality, a laboratory 22 analysis conducted utilizing state-of-the-art High Pressure Liquid Chromatography 23 (HPLC) protocol shows that Dark Rage contains no AKG, and thus cannot provide the 24 results promised. Similarly, Defendant manufactures, markets, and sells "Anadrox" and 25 "Trac-Extreme" (collectively with Dark Rage, the "Products") as containing citrulline 26 malate; however, just as with Dark Rage, liquid chromatography-mass spectroscopy 27

(LCMS) testing protocol revealed that neither contains l-citrulline or citrulline malate.

28

As such, Defendant's Products have no ability to provide the results promised, cannot perform as Defendant claims, and do not contain the active ingredients promised.

2. Plaintiff brings this class action lawsuit to enjoin the ongoing deception of tens of thousands of California and United States consumers by Defendant, and to recover the money taken by this unlawful practice.

### II. THE PARTIES

#### A. Plaintiff.

3. Plaintiff is a resident of San Diego County, California and purchased Defendant's Products in 2013. Plaintiff relied on Defendant's representations regarding the ingredients and efficacy of the Products, as detailed herein, and but for those representations, Plaintiff would not have purchased or paid as much for such Products.

#### B. Defendant.

- 4. Upon such information and belief, Maximum Human Performance, Inc. is a New Jersey corporation that manufactures, markets, and sells the Products and does business in this County.
- 5. The true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.
- 6. At all relevant times, each and every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and was acting within the course and/or scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the Defendants. Each of the acts and/or omissions complained of herein were alleged and made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants (Maximum Human Performance, Inc. and DOE Defendants will hereafter collectively be referred to as "Defendant").

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

#### III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. A Court has diversity jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 as amended by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is a class action in which some members of the class are citizens of different states than the Defendant. See 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2)(A).
- 8. This Court also has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant currently does business in this state.
- 9. Venue is proper in this jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District and a substantial portion of the conduct complained of herein occurred in this District.

### IV. FACTS

- 10. Defendant manufactures, markets, and sells "Dark Rage" as a "Next Generation Pre-Workout Formula" with the ability to "Increase[] EPO¹ & NITRIC OXIDE for Insane Muscle Pumps & Vascularity", "Rapidly Fuels Your Muscles for MAXIMUM SIZE, STRENGTH, & RECOVERY", and "Triggers EXTREME ENERGY, INTENSITY & MENTAL FOCUS". (emphasis provided by Defendant).
- 11. Defendant further claims Dark Rage "sets a new scientific standard of preworkout supplementation with exclusive EPO Blood Building Technology and an amazingly powerful combination of advanced, next generation ingredients designed support your workouts for increased strength, extreme muscle growth, incredible anabolic muscle pumps and fast recovery!" Defendant claims the "next generation ingredients" "Promote Pumps and Vascularity", "Support Strength and Endurance", "Promote Muscle Growth", "Support Energy, Intensity and Mental Focus", and "Promotes Faster Recovery."
- 12. Defendant also specifically claims that Dark Rage contains AKG, an ingredient Defendant claims can "increase[] blood supply" to "not only increases the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Erythropojetin, or EPO, is a hormone with the alleged ability to promote red blood cell production and blood volume.

- 13. In reality, Dark Rage *contains no AKG* as confirmed by a recent laboratory analysis utilizing state-of-the-art High Pressure Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) protocol. Thus, all of Defendant's claims based on the ingredient's capabilities are completely false.
- 14. Similar to the ingredient claims made by Defendant about Dark Rage, Defendant also claims that two of its other products, Anadrox and Trac-Extreme, contain citrulline malate. However, a laboratory test conducted via liquid chromatography-mass spectroscopy (LCMS) protocol revealed that neither product contains l-citrulline or citrulline malate. Defendant claims Anadrox can cause "Maximum Muscle Fiber and Expansion", contains "VasoThermic Fat Loss Activators", "Enhances Pumps and Vascularity", and "Increases Strength and Energy". Defendant makes some of the same claims about Trac-Extreme but also promises it has "Timed Release Nitric Oxide/Creatine Technology" and "Rapidly Triggers Extreme Muscle Expansion"; however, just as with Dark Rage, a key ingredient claimed to be in Anadrox and Trac-Extreme is not actually present in the products. As such, all efficacy statements based thereon, such as "Formulated with clinically tested ingredients, ANADROX will get you pumped and ripped!", are completely false.
- 15. Defendant's misrepresentations regarding the Products' ingredients, and therefore the efficacy assertions of its Products were designed to, and did, lead Plaintiff

and others similarly situated (collectively the "Class") to believe that the Products contained AKG and/or citrulline-malate, and thus could cause intense muscle building. Plaintiff and members of the Class relied on Defendant's misrepresentations and would not have paid as much, if at all, for the Products but for Defendant's misrepresentations.

- 16. Defendant sells a *one-month* supply of the Products for approximately \$40.00 to \$70.00 each based on the preceding false advertising claims. As a result, Defendant has wrongfully taken millions of dollars from consumers nationwide.
- 17. Plaintiff brings this class action lawsuit to enjoin the ongoing deception of thousands of consumers by Defendant, and to recover the money taken by this unlawful practice.

#### V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

18. Plaintiff brings this class action for damages and other monetary relief on behalf of the following class:

All persons located within the United States who purchased Dark Rage, Anadrox, and/or Trac-Extreme during the four years preceding the filing of this complaint through the date of final judgment in this action (the "Class").

- 19. This action is brought and may be properly maintained as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(1)-(4) and 23(b)(1)-(3). This action satisfies the numerosity, typicality, adequacy, predominance and superiority requirements of those provisions.
- 20. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members is impractical. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). While the exact number and identities of Class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes the Class includes tens of thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that the Class may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.
  - 21. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of the Class

which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2). These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary from class member to class member, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any class member, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Whether Defendant's Products contains an active amount of AKG or citrulline malate;
- b. Whether Defendant's Products can provide the results promised;
- c. Whether Defendant's representations regarding the Products were false;
- d. Whether Defendant knew that its representations were false;
- e. Whether Defendant's conduct constitutes a violation of California's false advertising law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.);
- f. Whether Defendant's conduct constitutes an unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent business practice in violation of California's unfair competition law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.);
- g. Whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to compensatory damages, and if so, the nature of such damages;
- h. Whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to restitutionary relief; and
- i. Whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to injunctive relief.
- 22. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3). Plaintiff and all members of the Class have sustained injury and are facing irreparable harm arising out of Defendant's common course of conduct as complained of herein. The losses of each member of the Class were caused directly by Defendant's wrongful conduct as alleged herein.
  - 23. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

21

19

22 23

24

25 26

27

111 28

///

the Class. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions, including complex consumer and mass tort litigation.

- A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and efficient 24. adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Class members is impracticable. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). Even if every Class member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments, and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented herein, presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class member.
- 25. The prosecution of separate actions by thousands of individual Class members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to, among other things, the need for and the nature of proper notice, which Defendant must provide to all Class members. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1)(A).
- The prosecution of separate actions by individual class members would 26. create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party Class members to protect their interests. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1)(B).
- Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to 27. the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief with regard to the members of the Class as a whole. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2).

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# VI. <u>CAUSES OF ACTION</u>

## **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

# VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S FALSE ADVERTISING LAW (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17500, ET SEQ.)

(By Plaintiff and on Behalf of the Class Against Defendants)

- 28. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 29. Plaintiff has standing to pursue this cause of action because Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact and has lost money as a result of Defendant's actions as set forth herein. Specifically, Plaintiff purchased the Products in reliance on Defendant's false labeling, ingredient, and marketing claims.
- 30. Defendant has engaged in false advertising as it has disseminated false and/or misleading representations about the Products.
- 31. Defendant knew or should have known by exercising reasonable care that its representations were false and/or misleading. During the Class Period, Defendant engaged in false advertising in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq., by misrepresenting in its advertising and marketing of the Products to Plaintiff, Class members, and the consuming public, that its Products did not contain the ingredients claimed, or have the abilities claimed.
- 32. By disseminating and publishing these statements in connection with the sale of the Product, Defendant has engaged in and continues to engage in false advertising in violation of Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, as set forth herein, Defendant has received ill-gotten gains and/or profits, including but not limited to, money. Therefore, Defendant has been unjustly enriched. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17535, Plaintiff requests restitution and restitutionary disgorgement for all sums obtained in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief, restitution, and restitutionary disgorgement of Defendant's ill-gotten

gains as specifically provided in Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17535.

34. Plaintiff and Class members seek to enjoin Defendant from engaging in these wrongful practices, as alleged herein, in the future. There is no other adequate remedy at law and if an injunction is not ordered, Plaintiff and the Class will suffer irreparable harm and/or injury.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# UNLAWFUL, FRAUDULENT & UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, ET SEQ.)

## (By Plaintiff and on Behalf of the Class Against Defendants)

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the allegations contained in the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 36. Plaintiff has standing to pursue this cause of action because Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact and has lost money as a result of Defendant's actions as set forth herein. Specifically, Plaintiff purchased the Products in reliance on Defendant's marketing and ingredient claims. Plaintiff used the Products as directed, but it did not work as advertised and was not of the standard, quality and grade advertised.
- 37. Defendant's actions as alleged in this Complaint constitute an unfair or deceptive business practice within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., in that Defendant's actions are unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent, and because Defendant has made unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading statements in advertising media, including the Internet, within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.
- 38. Defendant knew or should have known by exercising reasonable care that its representations were false and/or misleading. During the Class Period, Defendant engaged in unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq., by misrepresenting in its advertising and marketing of the Products to Plaintiff, Class members, and the consuming public that, the Product was effective and contained the ingredients claimed.

39.

false and misleading because the Products are not of the standard, quality or grade advertised.

Each of the aforementioned representations alleged in this Complaint was

- 40. Defendant's business practices, as alleged herein, are unfair because they offend established public policy and/or are immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, and/or substantially injurious to consumers in that consumers are misled by the claims made with respect to the Products as set forth herein.
- 41. Defendant's business practices, as alleged herein, are unlawful because they violate the False Advertising Law.
- 42. Defendant's business practices, as alleged herein, are fraudulent because they are likely to, and did, deceive customers—including Plaintiff and members of the Class—into believing that the Products have characteristics, ingredients, and benefits they do not have.
- 43. Defendant's wrongful business practices constituted, and constitute, a continuing course of conduct of unfair competition since Defendant is marketing and selling its Products in a manner likely to deceive the public.
- 44. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's wrongful business practices in violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered economic injury by losing money as a result of purchasing the Products. Plaintiff and members of the Class would not have purchased or would have paid less for the Products had they known that they were not as represented.
- 45. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff and the Class seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage in unlawful, unfair, or deceptive business practices and any other act prohibited by law, including those set forth in the Complaint. Plaintiff and the Class also seek an order requiring Defendant to make full restitution of all moneys they wrongfully obtained from Plaintiff and the Class.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF 1 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and members of the Class request that the Court enter 2 an order or judgment against Defendants, and each of them as named in the future, as 3 follows: 4 For an order certifying the Class, appointing Plaintiff and his counsel to 1. 5 represent the Class, and notice to the Class to be paid by Defendants; 6 2. For damages suffered by Plaintiff and Class members; 7 For restitution to Plaintiff and Class members of all monies wrongfully 3. 8 obtained by Defendants; 9 4. For an injunction ordering Defendants to cease and desist from engaging in 10 the unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent practices alleged in the Complaint; 11 For both pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum 5. 12 allowable rate on any amounts awarded; 13 For Plaintiff's costs of the proceedings herein; 6. 14 For reasonable attorneys' fees as allowed by statute; and 7. 15 For any and all such other and further relief that this Court may deem just 8. 16 and proper. 17 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 18 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all claims and causes of action so 19 triable in this lawsuit. 20 21 NEWPORT TRIAL GROUP Dated: September 11, 2013 22 A Professional Corporation Scott J. Ferrell 23 24 25 By: 26 Scott J. Ferrell Attorney for Plaintiff and the Class 27 28

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

#### CIVIL COVER SHEET

#### '13CV2129 LAB WVG

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

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS KYLE JANOVICK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated				DEFENDANTS MAXIMUM HUMAN PERFORMANCE, INC.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Essex County  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Scott J Ferrell/Victoria C. Knowles Newport Trial Group 4100 Newport Place, Suite 800, Newport Beach, CA 92660				Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI			III. CI	I TIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place 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) PT en of This State		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizen of Another State			
				en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			I FC	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/	Y 🗆 62	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment  ☑ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans		Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	ı		820 Copyrights	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit
(Excludes Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits  190 Other Contract  195 Contract Product Liability  196 Franchise	□ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice		□ 72 □ 74 □ 75	LABOR  0 Fair Labor Standards Act  0 Labor/Management Relations  0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act  0 Other Labor Litigation		490 Cable/Sat TV     850 Securities/Commodities/
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS 🗆 79	1 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General		Income Security Act	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision  950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
□ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Oth ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee- Conditions of Confinement		IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions		151
	moved from	Appellate Court		pened Anothe (specify)	r District Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON 28 USC §§1332 Brief description of ca	15:2 - Ai	ntitr	Do not cite jurisdictional state Cust Litiga of. Code §§17200 ar	tion (cxl)	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	rif demanded in complaint: : 🕱 Yes □ No
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE	ï	-	DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 9/11/3		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY (	OF RECORD	5	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	AOLINE.	ADDI VINCIUD		HIDGE	MAG III	IDGE