UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DESTA TJOKRONOLO and JOHN DOE (NEW YORK), on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

1 4 Case 5577

JURY TRIAL DEMANDE

7 TOTAL STREET

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY and PROCTER & GAMBLE PRODUCTIONS, INC.,

- against -

Defendants.

AMON, CH.J.

Plaintiffs, DESTA TJOKRONOLO and JOHN DOE (NEW YORK) (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and other persons similarly situated, by and through their undersigned attorneys, as and for their Complaint against Defendants, allege the following based

upon personal knowledge as to themselves and their own actions, and, as to all other matters, respectfully allege, upon information and belief, as follows (Plaintiffs believe that substantial evidentiary support will exist for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity

for discovery):

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This action seeks redress on a class-wide basis for a deceptive and otherwise improper business practice that Defendants, The Procter & Gamble Company ("PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY") and Procter & Gamble Productions, Inc. ("PROCTER & GAMBLE PRODUCTIONS") (collectively, the "Defendants"), engage in with respect to the packaging of their "Gillette® Odor Shield Invisible Solid," "Old Spice® High Endurance Invisible Solid" and "Old Spice® Classic" anti-perspirants and deodorants. The Gillette® Odor Shield Invisible Solid is an anti-perspirant and deodorant available in the Cool Wave fragrance; Old Spice® High

Endurance Invisible Solid is a line of antiperspirants and deodorants available in Playmaker, Fresh, Original, Sport, Game Day, and Smooth Blast fragrances; Old Spice® Fresh Classic is a deodorant stick in Original and Fresh fragrances (collectively, the "Products"). The Products come in 2.6 ounce (the "2.6 ounce products"), 3.0 ounce (the "3.0 ounce products"), and 3.25 ounce (the "3.25 ounce products") sticks respectively and have non-functional slack-fill in violation of the federal Food Drug & Cosmetic Act ("FDCA") Section 403 (21 U.S.C. 343 (d)), Section 403(d) (21 U.S.C. 343(d)), the Code of Federal Regulations Title 21 part 100, et. seq. and New York General Business Code ("NY GBL") § 349. The size of the container in comparison to the actual deodorant stick makes it appear to the reasonable consumer that they are buying more than what is actually being sold.

- 2. The 2.6 ounce Product is sold in a container which is approximately 5 ¼" in height and approximately 2 ½" wide. The actual size of the deodorant stick of the 2.6 ounce Product is approximately 2 ½" wide and 2 ¾" long. The 3.0 ounce Product is sold in a container which is approximately 5 5/8" in height and approximately 2 5/8" wide. The actual size of the deodorant stick of the 3.0 ounce Product is approximately 2 ½" wide and 2 7/8" long. The 3.25 ounce Product is sold in a container which is approximately 5 ¾" in height and approximately 2 5/8" wide. The actual size of the deodorant stick of the 3.25 ounce Product is approximately 2 ¾" wide and 3 ½" long. Thus, the size of each of the containers has nearly 3 inches of slack-fill in height and is designed to give the false impression that there is more product than actually packaged.
 - 3. The price of the Products is \$3.29 each.
- 4. The size of the container in relation to the volume of the product contained therein gives the false impression that the consumer is buying more than they are actually receiving.

- 5. Plaintiffs and Class members viewed Defendants' misleading Product packaging, reasonably relied in substantial part on the representations and were thereby deceived in deciding to purchase the Products for a premium price.
- 6. Plaintiffs bring this proposed consumer class action on behalf of themselves and all other persons nationwide, who from the applicable limitations period up to and including the present (the "Class Period"), purchased for consumption and not resale the Products.
- 7. During the Class Period, Defendants manufactured, marketed and sold the Products throughout the United States. Defendants purposefully sold the Products with non-functional slack-fill.
- 8. Defendants' actions constitute violations of the federal FDCA Section 403 (21 U.S.C. 343 (d)), Section 403(d) (21 U.S.C. 343(d)), the Code of Federal Regulations Title 21 part 100, et. seq. and New York's Deceptive Acts or Practices NY GBL § 349, as well as those similar deceptive and unfair practices and/or consumer protection laws in other states.
- 9. Defendants violated statutes enacted in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia that are designed to protect consumers against unfair, deceptive, fraudulent and unconscionable trade and business practices and false advertising. These statutes are:
 - a. Alabama Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Ala. Statues Ann. §§ 8-19-1, et seq.;
 - b. Alaska Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act, Ak. Code § 45.50.471, et seq.;
 - c. Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, Arizona Revised Statutes, §§ 44-1521, et seq.;
 - d. Arkansas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Ark. Code § 4-88-101, et seq.;
 - e. California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, et seq., and California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof Code § 17200, et seq.;
 - f. Colorado Consumer Protection Act, Colo. Rev. Stat. § 6 1-101, et seq.;
 - g. Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act, Conn. Gen. Stat § 42-110a, et seq.;
 - h. Delaware Deceptive Trade Practices Act, 6 Del. Code § 2511, et seq.;
 - District of Columbia Consumer Protection Procedures Act, D.C. Code § 28 3901, et seq.;
 - j. Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. Ann. § 501.201, et seq.;
 - k. Georgia Fair Business Practices Act, § 10-1-390 et seq.;

- Hawaii Unfair and Deceptive Practices Act, Hawaii Revised Statues § 480 1, et seq., and Hawaii Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Hawaii Revised Statutes § 481A-1, et seq.;
- m. Idaho Consumer Protection Act, Idaho Code § 48-601, et seq.;
- n. Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, 815 ILCS § 505/1, et seq.;
- o. Indiana Deceptive Consumer Sales Act, Indiana Code Ann. §§ 24-5-0.5-0.1, et seq.;
- p. Iowa Consumer Fraud Act, Iowa Code §§ 714.16, et seq.;
- q. Kansas Consumer Protection Act, Kan. Stat. Ann §§ 50 626, et seq.;
- r. Kentucky Consumer Protection Act, Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 367.110, et seq., and the Kentucky Unfair Trade Practices Act, Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 365.020, et seq.,
- s. Louisiana Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, La. Rev. Stat. Ann. § § 51:1401, et seq.;
- t. Maine Unfair Trade Practices Act, 5 Me. Rev. Stat. § 205A, et seq., and Maine Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. 10, § 1211, et seq.,
- u. Maryland Consumer Protection Act, Md. Com. Law Code § 13-101, et seq.;
- v. Massachusetts Unfair and Deceptive Practices Act, Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A;
- w. Michigan Consumer Protection Act, § § 445.901, et seq.;
- x. Minnesota Prevention of Consumer Fraud Act, Minn. Stat §§ 325F.68, et seq.; and Minnesota Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Minn. Stat. § 325D.43, et seq.;
- y. Mississippi Consumer Protection Act, Miss. Code Ann. §§ 75-24-1, et seq.;
- z. Missouri Merchandising Practices Act, Mo. Rev. Stat. § 407.010, et seq.;
- aa. Montana Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act, Mont. Code §30-14-101, et seq.;
- bb. Nebraska Consumer Protection Act, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59 1601, et seq., and the Nebraska Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 87-301, et seq.;
- cc. Nevada Trade Regulation and Practices Act, Nev. Rev. Stat. §§ 598.0903, et seq.;
- dd. New Hampshire Consumer Protection Act, N.H. Rev. Stat. § 358-A:1, et seq.;
- ee. New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act, N.J. Stat. Ann. §§ 56:8 1, et seq.;
- ff. New Mexico Unfair Practices Act, N.M. Stat. Ann. §§ 57 12 1, et seq.;
- gg. New York Deceptive Acts and Practices Act, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §§ 349, et seq.;
- hh. North Dakota Consumer Fraud Act, N.D. Cent. Code §§ 51 15 01, et seq.;
- ii. North Carolina Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices Act, North Carolina General Statutes §§ 75-1, et seq.;
- jj. Ohio Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Ohio Rev. Code. Ann. §§ 4165.01. et seg.;
- kk. Oklahoma Consumer Protection Act, Okla. Stat. 15 § 751, et seq.;
- 11. Oregon Unfair Trade Practices Act, Rev. Stat § 646.605, et seq.;
- mm. Pennsylvania Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, 73 Penn. Stat. Ann. § § 201-1, et seq.;
- nn. Rhode Island Unfair Trade Practices And Consumer Protection Act, R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-13.1-1, et seq.;
- oo. South Carolina Unfair Trade Practices Act, S.C. Code Laws § 39-5-10, et seq.;
- pp. South Dakota's Deceptive Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, S.D. Codified Laws §§ 37 24 1, et seq.;
- qq. Tennessee Trade Practices Act, Tennessee Code Annotated §§ 47-25-101, et seq.;
- rr. Texas Stat. Ann. §§ 17.41, et seq., Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, et sep.;
- ss. Utah Unfair Practices Act, Utah Code Ann. §§ 13-5-1, et seq.;
- tt. Vermont Consumer Fraud Act, Vt. Stat. Ann. tit.9, § 2451, et seq.;
- uu. Virginia Consumer Protection Act, Virginia Code Ann. §§59.1-196, et seq.;
- vv. Washington Consumer Fraud Act, Wash. Rev, Code § 19.86.010, et seq.;

- ww. West Virginia Consumer Credit and Protection Act, West Virginia Code § 46A-6-101, et seq.;
- xx. Wisconsin Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Wis. Stat. §§ 100. 18, et seq.;
- yy. Wyoming Consumer Protection Act, Wyoming Stat. Ann. §§40-12-101, et seq.
- 10. Defendants have deceived Plaintiffs and other consumers nationwide by mischaracterizing the size of their Products. Defendants have been unjustly enriched as a result of their conduct. Through these unfair and deceptive practices, Defendants have collected millions of dollars from the sale of their Products that they would not have otherwise earned.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 11. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, because this is a class action, as defined by 28 U.S.C § 1332(d)(1)(B), in which a member of the putative class is a citizen of a different state than Defendants, and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000, excluding interest and costs. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2).
- 12. The Court has jurisdiction over the federal claims alleged herein pursuant to 28U.S.C § 1331 because it arises under the laws of the United States.
- 13. The Court has jurisdiction over the state law claims because they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.
- 14. Alternatively, the Court has jurisdiction over all claims alleged herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1332 because the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000 and is between citizens of different states.
- 15. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants because their Products are advertised, marketed, distributed and sold throughout the United States; Defendants engaged in the wrongdoing alleged in this Complaint throughout the United States, including in New York State; Defendants are authorized to do business in New York State; and Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts with New York and/or otherwise have intentionally availed

JS 44 (Rev. 1/2013)

CIVIL COVE CHE 1 4 - 5577

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 de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF TH	HIS FORM.)	,		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DESTA TJOKRONOLO a	and JOHN DOE (NEW	YORK)	PROCTER & GAM	DEFENDANTS PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY and PROCTER & GAMBLE PRODUCTIONS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Queens County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			NOTE: IN LAND CO	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Hamilton 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, A C.K. Lee, Esq., Lee Litiga 30 East 39th Street, Seco Tel: 212-465-1188	ation Group, PLLC		Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party) AMO		TF DEF (1 0 1 Incorporate FP Pri of Business in T	his State	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	3 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	p of Parties in Item III)	ENSTEIN, M.	2 Incorporate Land P of Business In A		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT				スター	3 70	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaccutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 780 Other Personal Property Damage Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage 785 Property Damage 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 531 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 550 Civil Detaince - Condition 560 Civil Detaince - Conditions of Confinement	625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other 710 Fair Labor Standards	422 Appeal 28 USC 156 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 425	375 False Claims Act 440 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 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 866 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	• •	Remanded from 4	Reinstated or	er District Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Brief description of ca) nuse:	iling (Do not cite jurisdictional sta			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	NUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 9-23-	14	SIGNATURE OF ATTO	Y OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			n 10.07	CBA MAG.JU	nge (T7)	
RECEIPT#A	G30	_ APPRITING 1FP_ 79/40			5577	

exclusiv	ve of inter	CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, rest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a e contrary is filed.
I, <u>c.</u> k.ı	Lee	counsel for Desta Tjokronolo , do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):
ıneligi	ble for	compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):
	X	monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
	X	the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
		the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason
		DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1
		Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more or its stocks:
		RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)
same ju case: (A	dge and п () involve	arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the nagistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil sidentical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power rmine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the MY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)
1.)	Is the c	civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk
2.)	If you	answered "no" above: the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk
	b) Did Distric	the events of omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern t? Yes
Suffolk	County	o question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau sty?
	(1	
		BAR ADMISSION
l am cu	rrently a	dmitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. Yes No
Are yo	u current	ly the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court? Yes (If yes, please explain) No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature:_