1	David S. Casey, Jr., SBN 60768	
2	dcasey@cglaw.com Frederick Schenk, SBN 86392	
3	fschenk@cglaw.com	
4	Gayle M. Blatt, SBN 122048	
4	gmb@cglaw.com	
5	Wendy M. Behan, SBN 199214	
6	wbehan@cglaw.com	
	Jason C. Evans, SBN 272932	
7	jevans@cglaw.com	
8	CASEY GERRY SCHENK	
9	FRANCAVILLA BLATT & PENFIELD LLP	•
,	110 Laurel Street	
10	San Diego, California 92101	
11	Tel: (619) 238-1811 Fax: (619) 544-9232	
10	rax. (019) 344-9232	
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
13		
14	United States	DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE $f S$ OUTHERN $f I$	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15		
16		
17	<b>Diann Kohn</b> , an individual, on behalf	CASE NO. '15CV0538 L BLM
18	of herself and all others similarly	Chist No. 100 to the Dam
10	situated,	<b>Class Action Complaint for</b>
19		Damages and Equitable Relief
20	Plaintiff,	
21	V.	
22		
23	Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., a Delaware corporation, and Does 1 through 100,	
24	corporation, and Does 1 through 100,	
	Defendants.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff, Diann Kohn, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, hereby complains and alleges as follows:

#### Introduction

- Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. ("Defendant") markets and sells 1. various herbal supplements in the United States under the "Spring Valley" brand name. These herbal supplements include Garlic, Echinacea, St. John's Wort, Ginkgo Biloba, Saw Palmetto, and others ("Supplements"). As alleged more fully below, the Supplements either do not, and during the relevant time period did not, contain the listed ingredients, or they contained unlisted ingredients in addition to or in place of the listed ingredients.
- Defendant Wal-Mart's failure to include the stated ingredients in its "Spring Valley" supplements was and is deceptive, fraudulent, misleading, illegal, and dangerous.
- 3. Likewise, Wal-Mart's inclusion of unlisted ingredients in its "Spring Valley" supplements was and is deceptive, fraudulent, misleading, illegal, and dangerous.
- 4. Defendant Wal-Mart has known for many years that its "Spring Valley" supplements either do not contain the listed ingredients or contained unlisted ingredients in addition to or in place of the listed ingredients.
- 5. On February 3, 2015, the Attorney General of New York sent letters to four major retailers, GNC, Target, Wal-Mart, and Walgreens, for allegedly selling store brand herbal supplement products that either could not be verified to contain the labeled substance, or which were found to contain ingredients not listed on the labels.
- 6. The letters were the result of DNA testing (also known as DNA barcoding), performed as part of an ongoing investigation by the New York Attorney General's Office into fraudulent or misleading business practices relating

to the sale of nutritional supplements. The testing demonstrated that just 21% of the tested products contained DNA from the plants listed on the products' labels. The remaining 79% contained no DNA related to the labeled content. Only 4% of the Wal-Mart products tested showed DNA from the plants listed on the products' labels. There was also evidence that the products contained ingredients not disclosed on the label.

7. When the producers and retailers of herbal supplements, such as Wal-Mart, fail to identify all the ingredients on a product's label, a consumer with food allergies, or who is taking medication for an unrelated illness, is taking a serious health risk every time a contaminated herbal supplement is ingested.

#### **PARTIES**

- 8. This action is brought by Plaintiff Diann Kohn on behalf of a class comprising all similarly situated consumers in the United States who purchased one or more of the Supplements from the Defendant. Plaintiff and Class members assert claims against Defendant for violations of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA"), violations of The California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), violations of The California False Advertising Law ("FAL"), Negligence, Breach of Implied Warranty, Breach of Express Warranty, Deceit by Concealment, Negligent Misrepresentation, and Intentional Misrepresentation. Plaintiff and Class Members seek restitution, damages and equitable relief, including disgorgement of profits, and appropriate attorney's fees and costs.
- 9. Plaintiff Diann Kohn is an individual who resides in San Diego County, California. Plaintiff purchased Spring Valley brand Garlic from Wal-Mart regularly over the past several years.
- 10. Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. is a Delaware corporation that has its principal place of business at 702 S.W. 8th Street, Bentonville, Arkansas.

  Defendant Wal-Mart manufactures and sells its own line of Supplements under the

"Spring Valley" brand name. Wal-Mart was and is in the business of manufacturing and selling Spring Valley Supplements in the United States. Through these actions, Wal-Mart placed the Supplements in the stream of commerce in California, and throughout the United States. Wal-Mart has received, and continues to receive, substantial benefits and income through the sales of its Supplements.

11. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise of certain manufacturers, distributors or their alter egos sued herein as DOES 1 through 100 inclusive are presently unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues these defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of this court to amend the complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that DOES 1 through 100 were authorized to do and did business in California and the United States. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon on alleges that DOES 1 through 100 were or are in some manner or way responsible for and liable to Plaintiff for the events, happening, and damages hereinafter set forth below.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 12. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the matter in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, because the proposed Class consists of 100 or more members, and because minimum diversity exists.
- 13. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Wal-Mart because it is authorized to do business and does business in this district and has sufficient minimum contacts with this district. Additionally, Defendant Wal-Mart intentionally avails itself of the markets in this state through the promotion, marketing and sale of its herbal Supplements in this district. These actions render

18

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

Venue is proper in this District because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred here and Defendant regularly does business here. Additionally, venue is proper under the CLRA under Civil Code § 1780(d), and the declaration required by that subsection is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 1.

#### FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- According to a 2007 National Health Interview Survey, 17.7 percent 15. of American adults had used a dietary supplement in the past 12 months.<sup>1</sup>
- "Dietary supplements" or "herbal supplements" such as the Spring 16. Valley brand of supplements manufactured and sold by Defendant Wal-Mart are governed by the Dietary Supplement Health Education Act ("DSHEA") rather than the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. The goal of the DSHEA was to let dietary supplement manufacturers, such as Wal-Mart, get their supplements onto store shelves and to market dietary supplements with minimal FDA regulation.
- The DSHEA exempts dietary and herbal supplements from the pre-17. market approval processes required of prescription drugs prior to FDA approval. 21 U.S.C. § 343(r)(6). The DSHEA permits the makers of dietary supplements to make claims as to how their supplement affects the structure or function of the body without first conducting clinical studies that demonstrate these claims, or without gaining prior FDA approval, so long as certain criteria are met. Under the DSHEA, however, makers of herbal supplements must provide a **complete list** of ingredients by their common or usual names, either in descending order of prominence or with the source of the dietary ingredient in the "Supplement Facts" panel following the name of the dietary ingredient.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://nccih.nih.gov/health/supplements/wiseuse.htm

18. The FDA does not verify that dietary or herbal supplements are safe
or effective, or that the structure and function claims made by the supplement
manufacturers and retailers are true. Supplements can get to the marketplace very
quickly and cheaply compared with prescription or over the counter drugs. It is
therefore imperative that manufacturers, such as Defendant Wal-Mart, use strict
quality controls in manufacturing and distribution of its Supplements and
accurately identify all ingredients in them.

19. At all relevant times herein, Defendant Wal-Mart has known that its "Spring Valley" Supplements failed to contain the stated ingredients and contained unlisted ingredients including known allergens. A study published in the journal BMC Medicine, followed a number of smaller studies that found a significant percentage of herbal products do not contain what they claim. The findings, backed by DNA testing, offer credible evidence of adulteration, contamination, and mislabeling in the herbal supplement industry, a rapidly growing area of alternative medicine that includes an estimated 29,000 herbal products and substances sold throughout North America.<sup>2</sup>

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

20. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Rule 23(a), 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of herself and the members of the following Class:

All United States residents who purchased Wal-Mart Spring Valley brand herbal or dietary supplements from the period of four years prior to the filing of this Complaint through the present ("Class Period").

Plaintiff also seeks certification of a "California subclass" comprising:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> http://www.biomedcentral.com/1741-7015/11/222/abstract

All California residents who purchased Wal-Mart Spring Valley brand herbal or dietary supplements from the period of four years prior to the filing of this Complaint through the present ("Class Period").

- 21. Collectively, these persons will be referred to as "Class members" or "the Class." Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the Class. Excluded from the Class are Defendant Wal-Mart and any entities in which Defendant or its subsidiaries or affiliates have a controlling interest, Defendant's officers, agents and employees, the judicial officer to whom this action is assigned and any member of the Court's staff and immediate families, as well as Class members' claims for personal injury, wrongful death, and emotional distress caused by Defendant's Supplements.
- 22. Well-defined, common legal and factual questions affect all Class members and predominate over any individual questions that might arise. Common questions include whether Defendant's advertising, in any medium, was unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading; whether Defendant sold the Supplements with knowledge of their defective nature, whether Defendant violated implied and express warranties of merchantability, whether Defendant was negligent in its actions, and others.
- 23. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of all Class members and Plaintiff has no interests which are antagonistic to those of Class members. Plaintiff has retained counsel with experience prosecuting consumer class action and complex litigation claims.
- 24. A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy for the following reasons:
  - a. It is economically impractical for members of the Class to prosecute individual actions:
  - b. The Class is readily definable; and

- c. Prosecution as a class action will eliminate the possibility of repetitious litigation.
- 25. A class action will allow an orderly and expeditious administration of the claims of the Class. It will also foster economies of time, effort, and expense, as well as uniformity of decisions.
- 26. Class wide relief is essential to compel Defendant Wal-Mart to comply with Federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the damages in an individual action may be small, potentially amounting to as little as the purchase price of herbal supplements.
- 27. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with the respect to the Class as a whole appropriate. Moreover, the violations complained of herein are substantially likely to continue in the future if an injunction is not entered.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# Violations of the Consumer Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, et. seq.)

- 28. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 29. Each individual Class Member qualifies as a "person" under Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(c).
- 30. The Class Members are "consumers," as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1761(d).
- 31. The CLRA prohibits "unfair or deceptive acts or practices undertaken by any person in a transaction intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services to any consumer[.]" Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a).

Defendant has engaged in unfair or deceptive acts or practices that violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, *et. seq.*, by among other things, representing that the subject supplements have characteristics, uses, benefits, and qualities which they do not have; representing that subject supplements are of a particular standard, quality, and grade when they are not; representing that subject supplements contain specifically listed ingredients when in fact they do not; and failing to disclose ingredients contained within subject supplements.

- 32. In the course of its business, Defendant willfully and/or negligently failed to disclose the specific ingredients contained in the subject Supplements. Defendant is directly liable for engaging in unfair and deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of trade or commerce in violation of the CLRA.
- 33. Defendant knew or should have known that its conduct violated the CLRA.
- 34. Defendant made material statements about the purity and ingredients in the Supplements that were either false or misleading. Defendant engaged in a deceptive trade practice when it failed to disclose material information concerning the Supplements which it knew at the time of the sale.
- 35. The Defendant owed the Class Members a duty to disclose the true contents of the Supplements. Failing to do so not only constitutes a deceptive business practice but a serious health risk due to the inclusion of known allergens within the Supplements.
- 36. The Defendant's unfair or deceptive acts or practices were likely to deceive reasonable consumers, including the Class Members, about the true safety, effectiveness, and contents of the Supplements.
- 37. At all times herein relevant, Defendant has known about the substitution or absence of listed ingredients in herbal supplements in North America.

- 10
- 12
- 14
- 15
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 21
- 22
- 25
- 26 27
- 28

- 38. By failing to disclose the substituted ingredients, failing to take corrective action when it was aware of the poor quality, and by failing to include stated ingredients, Defendant engaged in deceptive business practices prohibited by the CLRA.
- 39. All members of the Class suffered ascertainable loss caused by the Defendant's failure to disclose material information. The Class Members overpaid for the Supplements and received a product that was different than advertised and not what they intended to purchase.
- 40. The Class Members have been directly damaged by Defendant's misrepresentations, concealment, and non-disclosure of stated and unstated ingredients as well as Defendant's failure to include the advertised ingredients and inclusion of ingredients not listed on the label.
- Despite being aware of the issue, Defendant has failed to remedy the 41. situation.
- Under Cal. Civ. Code § 1780(b), the Class members seek an 42. additional award against Defendant of up to \$5,000 for each California Class member who qualifies as a "senior citizen" or "disabled person" under the CLRA. Defendant knew or should have known that their conduct was directed to one or more Class members who are senior citizens or disabled persons. Defendant's conduct caused one or more of these senior citizens or disabled persons to suffer a substantial loss of property set aside for retirement or for personal or family care and maintenance, or assets essential to the health or welfare of the senior citizen or disabled person. One or more Class members who are senior citizens or disabled persons are substantially more vulnerable to Defendants conduct because of age, poor health or infirmity, impaired understanding, restricted mobility, or disability, and each of them suffered substantial physical, emotional, or economic damage resulting from Defendant's conduct.

43. Pursuant to Civil Code § 1782, concurrently with the filing of this Complaint, Plaintiff will notify Defendants in writing by certified mail of the alleged violations of section 1770 and demand that the same be corrected. If Defendants fails to rectify or agree to rectify the problems associated with the action detailed above within 30 days of the date of written notice pursuant to Civil Code § 1782, Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to add claims for actual, punitive and statutory damages, as appropriate in accordance with Civil Code § 1782(a) & (d).

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

## Violation of The California Unfair Competition Law

#### (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, Et. Seq.)

- 44. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above.
- 45. California Business and Professions Code § 17200 prohibits acts of "unfair competition," including any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice" and "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising. . . ." Defendant engaged in conduct that violated each of this statute's three prongs.
- 46. Defendant committed an unlawful business act or practice in violation of § 17200 by violating the Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, et. seq., as set forth above.
- 47. Defendant committed unfair business acts and practices in violation of § 17200 when it improperly and illegally labeled its herbal supplements. Defendant committed unfair business acts and practices by failure to include the advertised ingredients and inclusion of ingredients not listed on the label.
- 48. Defendant also violated the unfairness prong of § 17200 by failing to remedy the situation involving adulterated, substituted, added, and missing ingredients when it first learned of the issue.

- 49. The Class has suffered injuries in fact, including economic loss.

  Defendant's representations about the contents of its Supplements were false. Had the Class members known this they would not have purchased these Supplements.
- 50. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unfair and deceptive practices, Class Members have suffered and will continue to suffer actual damages.
- 51. The Class requests that this Court enter such orders or judgments as may be necessary to enjoin Defendant from continuing its unfair, unlawful, and/or deceptive practices, as provided in Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203; and for such other relief set forth below.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

# Violation of California False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.)

- 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all allegations of the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 53. California Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 states: "It is unlawful for any ... corporation ... with intent directly or indirectly to dispose of real or personal property ... to induce the public to enter into any obligation relating thereto, to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated ... from this state before the public in any state, in any newspaper or other publication, or any advertising device, ... or in any other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement ... which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading."
- 54. Defendant Wal-Mart disseminated throughout California and the United States, via advertising, marketing, publications, and product labeling, statements that were untrue or misleading, and which were known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should have been known to the Defendant, to be untrue and misleading to Plaintiff and the other Class members. Defendant violated §

17500 because its misrepresentations and omissions regarding the contents of the Supplements were material and likely to deceive a reasonable consumer.

- 55. Plaintiff and the other Class members have suffered an injury in fact, including the loss of money or property, as a result of the Defendant's unfair, unlawful, and/or deceptive practices. In choosing to purchase the Herbal Supplements, Plaintiff and the other Class members relied on the misrepresentations and/or omissions of the Defendant with respect to the content of the Supplements. Had Plaintiff and the other Class members known the true facts, they would not have purchased the Supplements from the Defendant. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the other Class members overpaid for the Supplements (which were worth nothing) and did not receive the benefit of their bargain.
- 56. All of the wrongful conduct alleged herein occurred, and continues to occur, in the conduct of the Defendant's business. The Defendant's wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of conduct that was perpetuated and repeated, both in the State of California and nationwide.

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Breach of Implied Warranty**

- 57. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the foregoing paragraphs, inclusive, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 58. Prior to the time that Plaintiff used the Supplements, Defendant impliedly warranted to Plaintiff and Class that the Supplements were of merchantable quality and contained the ingredients as listed on the labels.
- 59. Plaintiff and other Class members were and are unskilled in the research, design, and manufacture of the Supplements and reasonably relied entirely on the skill, judgment, and implied warranty of the Defendant in using the Supplements.

- 60. The Supplements were neither as represented on the labels nor of merchantable quality, as warranted by Defendant. The Supplements did not containing the advertised ingredients or contained unlisted ingredients, contrary to law, and therefore the contents of the Supplements were misrepresented to the public.
- 61. Plaintiff and the Class are direct purchasers of the Supplements from Defendant and thus are in privity with Defendant.
- 62. As a result of Defendant's breach of warranty, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered the damages set forth above.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **Breach of Express Warranty**

- 63. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the foregoing paragraphs, inclusive, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 64. Defendant expressly warranted to Plaintiff and the Class that the Supplements were fit and proper for their intended use and contained the ingredients listed on the label and only those ingredients. Since herbal and dietary supplements are not evaluated by the FDA, consumers are only able to make informed decisions by relying on the accuracy of the ingredients as stated on the packaging of the Supplements. By failing to list all ingredients and failing to contain stated ingredients Defendant breached its express warranty.
- 65. Plaintiff and the Class relied on the skill, judgment, representations, and express warranties of Defendant when they decided to purchase and use the Supplements. In fact, these warranties and representations were false since the Supplements were not as advertised, as alleged above.
- 66. As a result of Defendant's breach of express warranty, Plaintiff and the Class have suffered the damages set forth above.

### 

# 

## 

### 

## 

### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

## 

## 

#### 

#### 

## 

#### 

#### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### Deceit by Concealment - Civil Code §§ 1709, 1710

- 67. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the foregoing paragraphs, inclusive, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 68. Defendant willfully deceived Plaintiff and the Class by concealing the true facts concerning the Supplements, which the Defendant was obligated to, and had a duty to, disclose. As set forth above, Defendant knew, in advance of Plaintiff and the Class's purchase and use of the Supplements, of the substitution of ingredients, the failure to contain stated ingredients, and the addition of unlisted ingredients.
- 69. Defendant concealed and failed to disclose those facts to Plaintiff and the Class.
- 70. As a result of the deceit by concealment by Defendant, Plaintiff and the Class suffered the injuries and damages set forth above.

#### **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Negligent Misrepresentation**

- 71. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the foregoing paragraphs, inclusive, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 72. Defendant made misrepresentations, as previously set forth herein, to Plaintiff and Class, including the misrepresentation that the Supplements contained ingredients which they in fact did not include and that the Supplements did not contain ingredients which they in fact did.
- 73. Defendant made the foregoing representations without reasonable grounds for believing them to be true. These representations were made directly by Defendant, and their authorized agents, on the Supplements' packaging and labeling and in publications and other written materials directed to the public, with the intention of inducing reliance and the purchase and use of the Supplements.

- 74. The foregoing representations by Defendant were false. The Supplements did not contain the stated ingredients or contained additional unlisted ingredients.
- 75. In reliance on the above misrepresentations by Defendant, Plaintiff and the Class were induced to purchase and to use the Supplements. If Plaintiff and the Class had known of the true facts and ingredients concealed by Defendant, they would not have purchased or used the Supplements.
- 76. Plaintiff's reliance on the misrepresentations by Defendant was justified and reasonable in that such misrepresentations were made by individuals and entities that held themselves out as reputable in the field of supplements, were in a position to know the true facts, and had a legal obligation to list all ingredients contained within the supplements.
- 77. As a result of the negligent misrepresentations by Defendant, Plaintiff and the Class suffered the injuries and damages set forth above.

#### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Intentional Misrepresentation**

- 78. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the foregoing paragraphs, inclusive, and incorporates the same as if set forth herein at length.
- 79. Defendant made misrepresentations to Plaintiff and the Class including that the Supplements contained the stated ingredients and nothing more.
- 80. Defendant conducted a sales and marketing campaign to promote the sale of the Supplements and to willfully deceive Plaintiff and the general public as to the contents of the Supplements.
- 81. Defendant made the foregoing representations knowing that they were false. These representations were made directly by Defendant and their authorized agents, in publications and other written materials directed to the public, with the intention of inducing reliance and the purchase and use of the Supplements.

- 82. The foregoing representations by Defendant were in fact false. The Supplements did not contain the stated ingredients, had other ingredients substituted for the stated ingredients, and had additional unlisted ingredients.
- 83. The foregoing representations by Defendant were made with the intention of inducing reliance and the purchase and use of the Supplements.
- 84. In reliance on the misrepresentations by Defendant, as set forth above, Plaintiff and the Class were induced to purchase and to use the Supplements. If Plaintiff and the Class had known of the true facts and the facts that Defendant concealed, they would not have purchased or used the Supplements.
- 85. Plaintiff's reliance on the intentional misrepresentations by Defendant was justified and reasonable because such misrepresentations were made and conducted by individuals and entities that were in a position to know the true facts.
- 86. As a result of the intentional misrepresentations by Defendant, Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damages set forth above.
- 87. Defendant knew when they made the aforementioned representations that the representations were false. Defendant intended that Plaintiff and the Class would reasonably rely on the representations. Plaintiff and the Class did rely on these representations and purchased and used the Supplements, to Plaintiff's detriment. In this context, the conduct of defendants constituted malice, oppression, and fraud. Plaintiff and the class are therefore entitled to recover punitive or exemplary damages.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore Plaintiff and Class members request that the Court enter an order or judgment against the Defendant for the following relief:

1. Declaring this action may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23, and for an order certifying this case as a class action and appointing Plaintiff as the Class representative;

1	2. Declaring that the Defendant's advertising and sales of its Supplements		
2	that do not contain the stated ingredients or that contain substituted or		
3	additional unlisted ingredients, was wrongful and misleading;		
4	3. Restitution of all purchases of Herbal Supplements by Plaintiff and Class		
5	members, in an amount to be determined at trial;		
6	4. Disgorgement of all ill-gotten gains Defendant's derived from their		
7	misconduct;		
8	5. Actual damages according to proof;		
9	6. Compensatory damages caused by the Defendant's unfair and deceptive		
10	practices;		
11	7. Punitive damages as to the Eighth Cause of Action only;		
12	8. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate permitted		
13	by law;		
14	9. Attorney's fees, costs, and expenses incurred related to bringing this		
15	action; and		
16	10. Any additional relief as the Court deems proper.		
17	D. (c. 1. M. c. 1. 10. 2015)		
18	Dated: March 10, 2015 Casey Gerry Schenk Francavilla Blatt & Penfield, LLP		
19			
20			
21	s/ Gayle M. Blatt  Cayle M. Blatt Face		
22	Gayle M. Blatt, Esq.  gmb@cglaw.com		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	17		

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all issues alleged above. Dated: March 10, 2015 **Casey Gerry Schenk** Francavilla Blatt & Penfield, LLP s/ Gayle M. Blatt Gayle M. Blatt, Esq. gmb@cglaw.com 

**Print** 

Save As...

### Case 3:15-cv-00538-L-BL-WL Document 1-1-Eiled 03/10/15 Page 1 of 3

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.)

purpose of initiating the civil de					974, is required for the use	of the Clerk of Court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Diann Kohn, an individua situated	I, on behalf of herself	and all others simila	arly	DEFENDANTS Wal-Mart Stores, I 100	nc., a Delaware corpo	ration, and Does 1 throu	ıgh
<b>(b)</b> County of Residence of (E2)	First Listed Plaintiff SCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	an Diego (CA)		NOTE: IN LAND CO	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE.) NDEMNATION CASES, USE OF LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A David S. Casey, Jr., Fred Jason C. Evans, Casey C 110 Laurel Street, San Di	erick Schenk, Gayle N Berry Schenk Francav	M. Blatt, Wendy M. Billa Blatt & Penfield		Attorneys (If Known)	-	'15CV0538 L B	LM
II. BASIS OF JURISDI		-	ш с	  TIZENSHID OF D	DINCIDAL DADTIE	S (Place an "X" in One Box for I	DIiti
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)			(For Diversity Cases Only) P1 en of This State	F DEF	and One Box for Defendant)  PTF  Principal Place  1 4 1	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State		nd Principal Place	₹ 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3	□ 6 □	16
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly)  DRTS	l FO	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<ul> <li>□ 110 Insurance</li> <li>□ 120 Marine</li> <li>□ 130 Miller Act</li> <li>□ 140 Negotiable Instrument</li> <li>□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment &amp; Enforcement of Judgment</li> <li>□ 151 Medicare Act</li> <li>□ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)</li> <li>□ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits</li> <li>□ 160 Stockholders' Suits</li> <li>▼ 190 Other Contract</li> <li>□ 195 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>□ 196 Franchise</li> <li>■ REAL PROPERTY</li> <li>□ 210 Land Condemnation</li> <li>□ 220 Foreclosure</li> <li>□ 230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>□ 245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>□ 290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>	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 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY    365 Personal Injury - Product Liability     367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability     368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability     370 Other Fraud     370 Other Fraud     371 Truth in Lending     380 Other Personal Property Damage     385 Property Damage Product Liability     PRISONER PETITION     463 Alien Detainee     510 Motions to Vacate Sentence     530 General     535 Death Penalty Other:     540 Mandamus & Othe     550 Civil Rights     550 Frison Condition     560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	TY	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 20 Other  LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions	□ 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 Reapportionme □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodit Exchange	l and is
	cite the U.S. Civil Star 28 USC Sec. 133	Appellate Court atute under which you ar 2(d)	Reo	nstated or 5 Transfer pened Anothe (specify)  Do not cite jurisdictional state	r District Litigati		
	Brief description of ca Consumer Class						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A <b>CLASS ACTION</b> 3, F.R.Cv.P.	) D	EMAND \$	CHECK YES on JURY DEMAN	aly if demanded in complaint:  (D: ☒ Yes ☐ No	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 03/10/2015		signature of att s/Gayle M. Blat		OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT .	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG.	JUDGE	

Reset

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

  United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included nere. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)** 

- **III. Residence** (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- **V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

  Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- **VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

**Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

#### Attachment to Civil Cover Sheet

Defendants (continued): The Anthem Companies of California, Inc., a California

corporation; Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health

Insurance Company, a California corporation; and Does

1-30

1	David S. Casey, Jr., SBN 60768	
2	dcasey@cglaw.com	
	Frederick Schenk, SBN 86392	
3	fschenk@cglaw.com	
4	Gayle M. Blatt, SBN 122048	
5	gmb@cglaw.com Wendy M. Behan, SBN 199214	
6	wbehan@cglaw.com	
and the state of t	Jason C. Evans, SBN 272932	
7 8	jevans@cglaw.com CASEY GERRY SCHENK FRANCAVILLA BLATT & PENFIELD LLP	
9	110 Laurel Street	
10	San Diego, California 92101	
4-04-04-04-04-04-04-04-04-04-04-04-04-04	Tel: (619) 238-1811 Fax: (619) 544-9232	
eddige.	,	
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
13		
14	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
15	FOR THE SOUTHERN D	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16		
17	<b>Diann Kohn</b> , an individual, on behalf of herself and all others	CASE NO. 15CV0538 L BLM
8	similarly situated,	Declaration of Diann Kohn,
9	Dlointiff	Pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code
:0	Plaintiff,	§ 1780
in the second se	V.	
2	Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., a Delaware	
3	corporation, and Does 1 through	de de la constante de la const
4	100,	
5	Defendants.	
		Parameter
6		Official
7		
8		
**************************************	Declaration of Diann Kohn	Case No.

ž.	
2	
3	I, Diann Kohn, declare:
4	
5	I purchased Spring Valley brand Garlic herbal supplements
6	from Wal-Mart in San Diego County over the past several years.
7	2. I reside in San Diego County, California.
8	
9	I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of
10	California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 6,
part l	2015, at <u>Oceauside</u> , California.
12	
13	Diann Kohn
14	
15	•
16	
17	
18	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
A more production of the second	2 .
	Declaration of Diann Kohn Case No.