FILES

DESAI LAW FIRM, P.C. Aashish Y. Desai, Esq. (SBN 187394) Adrianne De Castro, Esq. (SBN 238930)
3200 Bristol Street, Suite 650
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (949) 614-5830
Facsimile: (949) 271-4190 2014 APR 30 PM 2: 25 2 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SERVING DISTRICT COURT 3 4 aashish@desai-law.com; adrianne@desai-law.com 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff, GENEVIEVE GAMEZ, Individually 6 and on behalf of all others similarly situated 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 CASE NOV14-03336 CAS (VBKx) GENEVIEVE GAMEZ, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly 12 situated, CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT 13 FOR: Plaintiffs. 14 (1) VIOLATION OF CONSUMER 15 LEGAL REMEDIES ACT: TOM'S OF MAINE, INC., and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, 16 (2) UNFAIR BUSINESS Defendants. 17 PRACTICES: 18 (3) VIOLATIONS OF FALSE 19 ADVERTISING LAWS: AND 20 (4) FRAUD 21 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED 22 23 24 25

26

27

.

Introduction

2 | 3 | nar 4 | sit 5 | M.

Plaintiff GENEVIEVE GAMEZ, by and through her attorneys, brings this nationwide and California class action on behalf of herself, all others similarly situated and the general public ("Plaintiffs") against Defendant TOM'S OF MAINE, INC. ("TOM'S" or "Defendant"). The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's and Class Members' claims under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

#### NATURE OF THE ACTION

- Defendant TOM'S has sold and continues to sell and market Tom's
  Toothpaste ("Products") as "all natural" and boasts that it contains only "natural"
  ingredients when it does not.
- 2. TOM'S claims about its products are false, misleading, reasonably likely to deceive the public, and constitute an unfair business practice. In fact, the Products contain chemically processed ingredients like xylitol and sodium lauryl sulfate ("SLS") ingredients that are not "natural." Xylitol is produced from a complex chemical process that involves the use of charcoal, phosphoric acid, calcium oxide and sulfuric acid. SLS is also a chemically-processed ingredient that is mixed with a fatty alcohol before it is converted into its final form. Thus, neither xylitol nor SLS are "natural" ingredients.
- Based on these false claims about the contents of its ingredients,
   Defendant has profited from its false and misleading advertising.
- 4. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of herself and other similarly situated consumers nationwide, to enjoin Defendant's ongoing deceptions, correct the false and misleading perception it has created in the minds of consumers. Plaintiff also requests a California sub-class to obtain restitutionary disgorgement and/or monetary damages resulting from Defendant's false and misleading claims.

THE PARTIES

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

- 5. Plaintiff GENEVIEVE GAMEZ ("Plaintiff") is, at all relevant times, a resident of California. Plaintiff purchased Defendant's product in California from Defendant and suffered injury in fact, and lost money as a result of the unfair competition described above within the last four years.
- 6. Defendant TOM'S is a citizen of, and maintains its principal place of business in Kennebunk, Maine.
- Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities of the persons or 7. entities sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, and therefore sues such defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the DOE defendants is in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the members of the class as alleged herein. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants, including the fictitiously named defendants, were the servants, employees, joint employers, integrated employers, alter egos, successors-in-interest, subsidiaries, affiliated companies or corporations, and joint venturers of the other Defendants, and were, as such, acting within the course, scope and authority of each other Defendant. Furthermore, each of the Defendants, including the DOE defendants, acted in concert with, and with the consent of, each of other Defendants, and that each of the Defendants, and that each of the Defendants ratified or agreed to accept the benefit of the conduct of each of the Defendants. Plaintiff will set forth the true names and capacities of these defendants when they have been ascertained, as may be necessary.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). The matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000.00 and is a class action in which more than 100 members of the Class of Plaintiffs are citizens of states different from Defendants.

Further, greater than two-thirds of the Class members reside in states other than the states in which Defendants are citizens.

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 in that many of the acts and transactions giving rise to this action occurred in this district and because Defendant: (a) is authorized to conduct business in this district and has intentionally availed itself of the laws and markets within this district though the promotion, marketing, distribution and sale of its products in this district; (b) does substantial business in this district; and (c) is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district. Plaintiff has filed concurrently herewith the declaration of venue required by Civil Code Section 1780(d) for the Consumer Legal Remedies Act claims. (Exhibit A.)

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 10. TOM's claims to be a good corporate citizen. Indeed, this is the major thrust of its marketing campaign: "It's a worthwhile challenge to run a responsible business. Our Reason for Being and our Stewardship Model work together to keep us focused on what really matters serving your personal care needs and the needs of your community." See www.tomsofmaine.com.
- 11. TOM'S liberal use of the word "natural" in both its name and content is deliberate. "When we first started out this brand-new idea of natural products and sustainable companies seemed a little crazy to some. In the years since, though, more and more people have begun to believe, like we do, that nature can provide many of the health benefits we need and that companies should minimize their environmental impact while working towards positive change in our communities. Together, we've really started to make a difference!" Tom and Kate Chappell, Co-Founders.
- 12. TOMS's goes on to state that "our reason for being" is to serve its customers with "imaginative science from plants and minerals." See <a href="https://www.tomsofmain.com">www.tomsofmain.com</a>. In other words, TOMS's sells a lifestyle as much as

anything else. It relies upon its value system of producing and selling only "natural" products. And its customers certainly rely upon this representation.

13. TOM'S manufactures, markets and advertises that its Toothpaste is all natural; however its Toothpaste actually contains chemically-processed ingredients.

14. The word "natural" is prominently displayed on the front of the label and is clearly intended to induce customers to not only rely upon this representation but also used to separate its product from the competition. Thus, Defendant's product creates the impression that it is all natural when it is not.

15. Plaintiff relied upon this representation. She would not have bought this product nor would she have paid the supra-competative price if she had known that Defendant's "natural" representation was false and misleading.

16. Defendant's webiste also makes similar misrepresentations. For example, it states that "[w]e do not use any synthetic flavors or fragrances. Our customers prefer the fresh, natural tast and smell of herbs, fruits and flowers (or no fragrance at all!)." But xylitol and SLS are not natural.

17. Plaintiff purchased and used Defendant's Toothpaste in reliance on the "natural" claims. She would not have purchased this product had she known the truth regarding Defendant's claims. Plaintiff has thus suffered injury-in-fact and damage, including but not limited to, the purchase price of the product.

18. Defendant sells its toothpaste for approximately \$3.99 to \$4.99 per tube based on the preceding false and/or misleading claims. As a result, Defendant has wrongfully made and retained millions of dollars in profits from California consumers alone.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

19. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit on behalf of the proposed Class Members under Rule 23(b)(2) and (3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Specifically, Plaintiffs bring a nationwide Rule 23(b)(2) fraud class for injunctive relief; and a California Rule 23(b)(3) class for the remaining counts.

The proposed nationwide 23(b)(2) Class consists of:

All persons who purchased Tom's of Maine Toothpaste in the United States for personal use (the

#### Plaintiff requests a subclass:

"Class").

All persons who purchased in California Tom's of Maine Toothpaste for personal use at any time during the four years preceding the filing of this Complaint (the "Sub-Class").

- 20. Excluded from the Classes are governmental entities, Defendant, any entity in which defendant has a controlling interest, and Defendant's officers, directors, affiliates, legal representatives, employees, co-conspirators, successors, subsidiaries, and assigns. Also excluded from the Class is any judge, justice, or judicial officer presiding over this matter and the members of their immediate families and judicial staff.
- 21. Numerosity: The proposed Class and Sub-Class comprise many tens of thousands of consumers throughout California and the United States, and, therefore, is so numerous that individual joinder of all its members is impracticable. While the exact number and identities of the Class Members are unknown at this time, such information can be ascertained through appropriate investigation and discovery. The disposition of the claims of the Class members in a single class action will provide substantial benefits to all parties and to the Court.
- 22. Common Questions of Law and Fact: There are questions of law and fact common to the Class and Sub-Class. The common questions include:
  - a. Whether Defendant's toothpaste is natural;
  - b. Whether Defendant omitted material facts surrounding its toothpaste;
  - c. Whether the false statements were intended to deceive the public;

Whether the class is entitled to injunctive relief; d. 1 Whether Defendant had any support for its claims prior to making 2 e. them: 3 f. Whether the claims are true, misleading, or reasonably likely to 4 deceive; 5 Whether Defendant falsely represented that its product has 6 g. characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities that it does not 7 8 have; Whether Defendant labeled its product in a way that is misleading, or h. 9 likely to mislead, in a material respect; 10 Whether Defendant fraudulently induced customers to purchase its i. 11 toothpaste; 12 Whether Defendants continued to sell its toothpaste after knowing the j. 13 14 preceding facts; k. Whether Plaintiff, Class, and Sub-Class have sustained monetary loss 15 and the proper measure of that loss; 16 1. Whether the Class and Sub-Class members are entitled to declaratory 17 and injunctive relief. 18 Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members 23. 19 of the Class and Sub-Class. Plaintiff and all members of the Class and Sub-Class 20 have been similarly affected by Defendant's common course of conduct since they 21 22 all were subject to the common advertising campaign and reasonably relied on Defendant's representations (and are presumed to have relied upon the 23 material omissions) concerning its product, and, in fact, purchased the product 24 based on those representations. 25 Adequacy of Representation: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately 24. 26 27 represent and protect the interests of the Class and Sub-Class. Plaintiff has retained

counsel with substantial experience in handling complex class action litigation.

Plaintiff and his counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class and Sub-Class and have the financial resources to do so.

- Superiority of Class Action: Plaintiff and the members of the Class 25. and Sub-Class suffered, and will continue to suffer, harm as a result of Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the present controversy. Individual joinder of all members of the class is impracticable. Even if individual class members had the resources to pursue individual litigation, it would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which the individual litigation would proceed. Individual litigation magnifies the delay and expense to all parties in the court system of resolving the controversies engendered by Defendants' common course of conduct. The class action device allows a single court to provide the benefits of unitary adjudication, judicial economy, and the fair and efficient handling of all class members' claims in a single forum. The conduct of this action as a class action conserves the resources of the parties and of the judicial system and protects the rights of the class members. Furthermore, for many, if not most, a class action is the only feasible mechanism that allows an opportunity for legal redress and justice.
- 26. Adjudication of individual Class Members' claims with respect to the Defendant would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudication, and could substantially impair or impede the ability of other class members to protect their interests.
- 27. Unless a class is certified, Defendant will retain monies received as a result of their conduct that was taken from tens of thousands of consumers throughout the United States. Unless a classwide injunction is issued, Defendant will continue to commit the violations alleged, and the members of the Class, Sub-Class, and the general public will continue to be misled.

27

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

e	2
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	

27

28

28.	Defendant has acted and refused to act on grounds generally applicable
to the Class	and Sub-Class, making appropriate final injunctive relief with respec
to the Class	and Sub-Class as a whole.

#### COUNT ONE

## VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT (California Sub-Class)

- 29. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the proceeding allegations as if fully set forth herein and, to the extent necessary, pleads this cause of action in the alternative.
- 30. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code § 1750, et seq. (the "Act"). Plaintiff is a consumer as defined by California Civil Code § 1781(d). The product is a good within the meaning of the Act.
- 31. Defendant violated and continues to violate the Act by engaging in the following practices proscribed by California Civil Code § 1770(a) in transactions with Plaintiff and the Sub-Class which were intended to result in, and did result in, the sale of its Product:
  - (5) Representing that it has ... characteristics ... uses [or] benefits ... which it does not have ....
  - (7) Representing that it is of a particular standard, quality or grade ... if it is of another.
  - (9) Advertising goods ... with intent not to sell them as advertised.
  - (16) Representing that the product has been supplied in accordance with a previous representation when [it has] not.
- 32. Defendant violated the Act by making claims, through its advertisements, about its Product that it knew, or should have known, were unsubstantiated, false and misleading.

- 33. Pursuant to § 1782 of the Act, Plaintiff has notified the Defendant in writing by certified mail of the particular violations of § 1770 of the Act and demand that Defendant rectify the problems associated with the actions detailed above and give notice to all affected consumers of its intent to act.
- 34. Pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782(d), Plaintiff and the Sub-Class seek an order enjoining the above-described wrongful acts and practices of the Defendant and for restitution and disgorgement.
- 35. If Defendant fails to rectify or does not agree to rectify the problems associated with the actions detailed above and give notice to all affected consumers within thirty days of the written notice pursuant to § 1782 of the Act, Plaintiff will seek to amend his claims to seek actual, punitive and statutory damages, as appropriate. Defendant's conduct is malicious, fraudulent and wanton and provides misleading information to the Plaintiff, Sub-Class members and the general public.

#### **COUNT TWO**

# VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, et seq.

#### (On Behalf Of The California Sub-Class)

- 36. Plaintiffs incorporate by this reference the proceeding allegations as if fully set forth herein and, to the extent necessary, plead this cause of action in the alternative.
- 37. California Business & 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.
- 38. California Business & Professions Code § 17200 also prohibits any "unlawful ... business act or practice." Defendant has violated § 17200's probation against engaging in unlawful acts and practices by, *inter alia*, making the

- representations 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., 21 U.S.C. § 343, and the common law.
- 39. Plaintiff and the Sub-Class reserve the right to allege other violations of law that constitute other unlawful business acts or practices. Defendant's conduct, specifically its false and misleading advertising and marketing of Complete Care, is ongoing and continues to this date.
- 40. 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 to gravity of conduct that outweighs any alleged benefits attributable to such conduct.
- 41. As stated in this Complaint, Plaintiff alleges violations of consumer protection, unfair competition and truth in advertising laws in California and other states 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 of violations of the unfair prong of California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.
- 42. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendant's legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein.
- 43. Business & Professions Code § 17200 also prohibits any "fraudulent business act or practice."
- 44. Defendants' 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.

- 45. Defendant's conduct caused and continues to cause substantial injury to Plaintiff and the other Sub-Class members. Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact and has lost money as a result of the Defendant's unfair conduct.
- 46. Defendant has thus engaged in unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts and practices and false advertising, entitling Plaintiff to judgment and equitable relief against Defendant as set forth in the Prayer for Relief.
- 47. Additionally, pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff seeks an order requiring Defendant to immediately cease such acts of unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business practices and requiring Defendant to engage in a corrective advertising campaign.

#### COUNT THREE

## VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17500, et seq.

#### (On Behalf Of The California Sub-Class)

- 48. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the proceeding allegations as if fully set forth herein and, to the extent necessary, pleads this cause of action in the alternative.
- 49. Business & Professions Code § 17500 provides that it is unlawful for any person, firm, corporation, or association, or any employee thereof to intentionally directly, or indirectly perform services, professional or otherwise, or to induce the public to enter into any obligation relating thereto, to make or disseminate in any manner any statement which is untrue or misleading, or which, by the exercise of reasonable care should be known to be untrue or misleading.
- 50. Throughout the time Defendant marketed and sold its Product, Defendant has committed acts of untrue and misleading advertising as defined by Business and Professions Code § 17500, by claiming that its Product is all natural when it is not. Defendant made these statements and claims with the intent to

51.

induce members of the public to purchase its Product. Indeed, these statements have a "tendency to deceive" a reasonable person from an objective standpoint.

These acts of untrue and misleading advertising by Defendant present

4 5

6

3

a continuing threat to members of the public in that they mislead, and are likely to mislead, the public into believing that its toothpaste is all natural and does not contain chemically-processed ingredients.

7 8

9

10

Defendant's conduct was unfair, unlawful, or fraudulent, as described 52. herein, and presents a continuing threat to members of the public in that its toothpaste is not all natural and in fact contains ingredients that are synthetically produced. Thus, consumers are paying for a product that is not as advertised. Plaintiff has no other adequate remedy of law to correct this misleading advertising.

11 12

53. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for the relief as set forth hereinafter.

13

#### **COUNT FOUR**

14

#### FRAUD

15 16

17

#### (Nationwide for Injunctive Relief Only)

18 19

Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the proceeding allegations as if 54. fully set forth herein and, to the extent necessary, plead this cause of action in the alternative.

20 21

As alleged herein, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant has made at least the following uniform material misrepresentations to Plaintiff and the Class: Defendant claims that its Product is all natural and does not contain synthetic ingredients.

23

24

25

26

22

56. Defendant acted fraudulently and deceitfully with knowledge that Plaintiffs and the Class would rely on their actions and omissions. Defendant made the material representations and/or concealed material facts to induce the Plaintiff and the Class to act in reliance on the misrepresentations and statements.

27

- 57. In purchasing the Defendant's product, Plaintiff and the Class Members relied on the representations of the Defendants and had no reason to doubt or dispute those representations. Indeed, due to the uniformity of the representations to all Class Members, Plaintiff and the Class at all times are presumed to have reasonably and justifiably relied both directly and indirectly on the actions and representations of the Defendant.
- 58. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's fraud, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered actual damages in an amount not presently known, but has acted on grounds applicable to all purchasers of all relevant products.
- 59. Pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2), the Defendant has adopted a pattern and policy that is likely to be the same as to all Class Members because its misrepresentations on its Product's labels and advertising are made to the Class Members who are all purchasers of the product.
- 60. The driving force behind this class action is a desire to enjoin the Defendant's false and misleading advertising. Given that it is unlikely that any named Plaintiff or Class Member will recover more than a few dollars, the Court may presume that the Plaintiffs are primarily interested in injunctive relief. Furthermore, it is proper to apply the laws of 50 states to the nationwide Rule 23(b)(2) fraud class. Although manageability concerns may preclude a nationwide Rule 23(b)(3) fraud class, the Ninth Circuit has held that Rule 23(b)(2) does not require a determination of manageability.
- 61. Moreover, there are fewer manageability issues when the Court, rather than the jury, applies differing legal standards. The Court, rather than the jury, will apply the laws of the 50 states in this claim for injunctive relief. Similarly, there is no requirement that common issues predominate for a Rule 23(b)(2) class. It is sufficient if class members complain of a pattern or practice, as here, that is generally applicable to the class as a whole.

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

111

111

PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff and members of the Class and Sub-Class request that the Court enter an order or judgment against Defendant as follows: Certification of a nationwide Rule 23(b)(2) fraud Class for injunctive relief; Certification of a California Rule 23(b)(3) for all other claims; 2. Awarding Plaintiff and the proposed Sub-Class members damages; 3. Awarding restitution and disgorgement of Defendant's revenues to 4. Plaintiff and the proposed Sub-Class members; Awarding declaratory and injunctive relief as permitted by law or 5. equity, including: enjoining Defendant from continuing the unlawful practices as set forth herein, and directing the Defendant to identify, with Court supervision, victims of its conduct and pay them restitution and disgorgement of all monies acquired by Defendant by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be wrongful; 6. For compensatory, general, statutory, exemplary, and any other damages legally available according to proof on certain causes of action; 7. For both pre- and post-judgment interest at the maximum allowable rate on any amounts recovered; 8. For litigation costs of the proceedings herein; Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and 9. 10. Providing such further relief as may be just and proper. 111

1	Date: April 29, 2014	DESAI LAW FIRM, P.O.
2		Ву
3		Aashish Y. Desai, Esq.
4		M. Adrianne De Castro, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Individually
5		and on behalf of all others similarly
6		situated
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
20		

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury of all claims and causes of action in this lawsuit to the extent authorized by law. Date: April 29, 2014 DESAI LAW FIRM, P.C. By Aashish V. Desai, Esq. M. Adrianne De Castro, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated 

## EXHIBIT A

1	I, Genevieve Gamez, declare as follows:
2	1. I am a Plaintiff in this action, and am a citizen of the State of California. I have
3	personal knowledge of the facts herein and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify
4	competently thereto.
5	
6	2. The Complaint in this action, filed concurrently with this Declaration, is filed in the
7	proper place for trial under Civil Code Section 1780(d) in that Los Angeles County is a county in
8	which Defendants are doing business.
9	
10	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
11	true and correct.
12	
13	Genevieve Gamez
14	Genevieve Gamez
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES JUDGES

This case has been assig	gned to District Judge	Christina A. Snyder	and to					
Magistrate Judge	Victor B. Kenton							
The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:								
CV14-03336 CAS (VBKx)								
California, the assigned	d Magistrate Judge has been d	es District Court for the Centr lesignated to hear discovery-r noticed on the calendar of the	elated					
		Clerk, U. S. District Cour	T					
April 30, 2014		By Lori Wagers						
Date	_	Deputy Clerk						

#### **ATTENTION**

A copy of this Notice must be served on all parties served with the Summons and Complaint (or, in cases removed from state court, on all parties served with the Notice of Removal) by the party who filed the Complaint (or Notice of Removal).

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

		CIVIL	COVERSHEET				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS ( Ch	eck box if you are rep	resenting yourself 🔲 )	DEFENDANTS	( Check box if you are re	epresenting yourself [] )		
GENEVIEVE GAMEZ, individ	ually, and on behalf of a	l others similarly situated	TOM'S OF MAINE, IN	TOM'S OF MAINE, INC., and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive			
(b) County of Residence	e of First Listed Pla	ntiff Los Angeles	County of Resid	ence of First Listed Defe	ndant York		
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	SES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	SES ONLY)			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Nam representing yourself, pr Aashish Y. Desai, Esq. (SBN	ovide the same inforr	nation.		Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are representing yourself, provide the same information.			
Desal Law Firm, P.C. 3200 Bristol Street, Ste. 650 Costa Mesa, CA 92626; Tel	e: (949) 614-5830						
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	TION (Place an X in	one box only.)	CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES-For I	Diversity Cases Only		
[ ] 1. U.S. Government	Foderal (	Question (U.S.	p	ox for plaintiff and one for o	pr Principal Place PTF DEF		
Plaintiff		nt Not a Party)	zen of This State	of Business in t			
		Citi	zen of Another State	2 2 Incorporated a of Business in A	nd Principal Place 5 🕱 5		
2. U.S. Government Defendant	4. Diversity of Parties in		zen or Subject of a eign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation			
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X	in one box only)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</del>	<del></del>		
1. Original 2.	Removed from State Court	3. Remanded from Appellate Court 4		ansferred from Another	i. Multi- District itigation		
V. REQUESTED IN CO	MPLAINT: JURY DI	MAND: X Yes	No (Check "Yes" o	nly if demanded in com	plaint.)		
CLASS ACTION under	F.R.Cv.P. 23: 💢	Yes No	▼ MONEY DEMA	NDED IN COMPLAINT:	\$		
****					ictional statutes unless diversity.)		
		False Advertising Act (Bus. &			and stated direct and states and		
VII. NATURE OF SUIT							
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT	IMMIGRATION	PRISONER PETITIONS	PROPERTY RIGHTS		
375 False Claims Act 400 State	110 Insurance	240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product	462 Naturalization Application	Habeas Corpus:	820 Copyrights		
Reapportionment	120 Marine	Liability	- 465 Other	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate	830 Patent		
410 Antitrust	130 Miller Act	290 All Other Real Property	Immigration Actions TORTS	Sentence 530 General	840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY		
430 Banks and Banking	140 Negotiable Instrument	TORTS	PERSONAL PROPERTY	535 Death Penalty	861 HIA (1395ff)		
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc.	150 Recovery of Overpayment &	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	370 Other Fraud	Other:	862 Black Lung (923)		
460 Deportation	Enforcement of Judgment	315 Airplane	371 Truth in Lending	540 Mandamus/Other	863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g))		
470 Racketeer Influ-	151 Medicare Act	Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	380 Other Personal Property Damage	550 Civil Rights	864 SSID Title XVI		
enced & Corrupt Org. 480 Consumer Credit	152 Recovery of	L Slander	- 385 Property Damage	555 Prison Condition	865 RSI (405 (g))		
490 Cable/Sat TV	Defaulted Student	330 Fed. Employers' Liability	Product Liability	Conditions of	FEDERAL TAX SUITS		
850 Securities/Com-	Loan (Excl. Vet.)	340 Marine	BANKRUPTCY	Confinement FORFEITURE/PENALTY	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)		
modities/Exchange	153 Recovery of Overpayment of	345 Marine Product [	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	625 Drug Related	871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC		
890 Other Statutory Actions	Vet. Benefits		423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	7609		
891 Agricultural Acts	☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	CIVIL RIGHTS	690 Other			
893 Environmental	190 Other	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	440 Other Civil Rights				
895 Freedom of Info.	Contract		441 Voting	710 Fair Labor Standards Act			
LJ Act	195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 362 Personal Injury- ☐ Med Malpratice	442 Employment	720 Labor/Mgmt.			
896 Arbitration	196 Franchise	365 Personal Injury-	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Relations			
899 Admin, Procedures	REAL PROPERTY	367 Health Care/	445 American with	740 Railway Labor Act			
Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision	210 Land Condemnation	Pharmaceutical L	Disabilities- Employment	Leave Act			
	220 Foreclosure	Product Liability 368 Asbestos	446 American with Disabilities-Other	790 Other Labor Litigation			
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	Personal Injury	448 Education	791 Employee Ret. Inc.			
	Ligocoment	Product Liability			<u></u>		

CV-71 (11/13)

CV14-03336 CAS (VBKx)

#### Case 2:14-cv-03336-CAS-VBK Document 1-1 Filed 04/30/14 Page 2 of 3 Page ID #:30

1

CV-71 (11/13)

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII. VENUE: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will most likely be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Question A: Was this case removed state court?	from	STATE CASE WAS P	NDING IN	THEC	OUNTY OF:	IN	TIAL DIVISION IN CA	(CD IS:	
☐ Yes 🗷 No		Los Angeles			Western				
If "no, " go to Question B. If "yes," check the		Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San	Luis Obisp	Q.		Western			
box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to		Orange	<del></del>			<del></del>	Southern		
Question D, below, and skip to Section	' <sup>IX.</sup>	Riverside or San Bernardino	wildering	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Eastern			
Question B: Is the United States, or	one of								
its agencies or employees, a party to action?		If the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, is a party, is it			INITIAL				
action:		A PLAINTIFF?			A DEFENDANT?		DIVISION IN CACD IS:		
Yes 🔀 No	т	hen check the box below for the co which the majority of DEFENDANT	unty in		nen check the box below for the which the majority of PLAINTIFF		ounty in		
If "no, " go to Question C. If "yes," chec		Los Angeles	s teside.	-	os Angeles	riesiue.	West	ern	
box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to	ım	Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Obispo	Luis	s Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo		n Luis	Western		
Question D, below, and skip to Section	IX. —	Orange	<del></del>		Orange	<del>, , ,,, ,,, ,</del>	South	ern	
		Riverside or San Bernardino	<del></del>	□ f	Riverside or San Bernardino	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Easte	ern	
		Other			Other		Western		
	Ä	ß			T D		F.	F.	
Question C: Location of plaintiffs, defendants, and claims? (Make only one selection per row)	Los Angele County	Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties	Orange (	ounty	Riverside or San Bernardino Counties	74 / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /	de the Central ct of California	Other	
Indicate the location in which a majority of plaintiffs reside:	X			]					
Indicate the location in which a majority of defendants reside:									
Indicate the location in which a majority of claims arose:	X			]		V			
			*						
C.1. Is either of the following true?	If so, check	the one that applies:	C.2. Is	either	of the following true? If so	, check the	one that applies:		
2 or more answers in Colum	n C		2 or more answers in Column D						
only 1 answer in Column C a	nd no answ	ers in Column D	only 1 answer in Column D and no answers in Column C						
Your case will initia	ally be assign	ned to the	Your case will initially be assigned to the						
SOUTHEI Enter "Southern" in resp	RN DIVISION conse to Que		EASTERN DIVISION. Enter "Eastern" in response to Question D, below.						
If none applies, answe	r question C	2 to the right.	If none applies, go to the box below.						
The second secon		Your case will i	nitially be a	assign	ed to the			- Andrews Charles	
		WES Enter "Western" in i			tion D below.				
		the state of the s							
Question D: Initial Division?					INITIAL DIVI	SION IN CAC	.p		
Enter the initial division determined by	/ Question À	, B, or C above:			WES	TERN			
	<del></del>	:		<del></del>			<del></del>		

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 2 of 3

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

t 4 1 1 9		CIVIL COVER SHEET				
IX(a). IDENTICAL CA	<b>SES:</b> Has this ac	tion been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed?	X NO	☐ YES		
If yes, list case num	ber(s):					
IX(b). RELATED CASE	S: Have any cas	es been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case?	X NO	YES		
If yes, list case num	ber(s):					
Civil cases are deemed	related if a previo	ously filed case and the present case:				
(Check all boxes that app	oly) A. Arise	from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or				
	B. Call fo	or determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact;	or			
	C, For ot	ther reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or				
	D. Invol	ve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a,	b or c also is pre	esent.		
OR SELF-REPRESENT  Notice to Counsel/Parties: other papers as required by but is used by the Clerk of the Country to Statistical codes related to the Coun	The CV-71 (JS-44) law. This form, ap he Court for the pu	Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement proved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instruc	the filing and se pursuant to Local tions, see separa	ervice of pleadings or Rule 3-1 is not filed the instructions sheet),		
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action				
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))				
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part $\beta$ , of the Federal Coal Mine Heal 923)	lth and Safety Ac	t of 1969. (30 U.S.C.		
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	Social Security	Act, as amended; plus		
863	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U,S.C. 405 (g))					
864 SSID All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.						
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Se (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	curity Act, as am	ended.		