

- Drew's Roasted Garlic & Peppercorn Dressing & Quick Marinade
- Drew's Creamy Ranch Dressing & Quick Marinade
- Drew's Smoked Tomato Dressing & Quick Marinade
- Drew's Lemon Tahini Goddess Dressing & Quick Noodle Sauce
- Drew's Shiitake Ginger Dressing & Quick Marinade
- Drew's Greek Olive Dressing & Quick Marinade
- Drew's Poppy Seed Dressing & Quick Marinade
- Drew's Raspberry Dressing & Quick Marinade

2. Defendant manufactures, sells, and distributes the Products using a marketing and advertising campaign centered around claims that appeal to health conscious consumers, i.e., that its Products are "All Natural." However, Defendant's advertising and marketing campaign is false, deceptive, and misleading because the Products contain synthetic ingredients.

3. Plaintiff and those similarly situated ("Class Members") relied on Defendant's misrepresentations that the Products are "All Natural" when purchasing the Products. Plaintiff and Class Members paid a premium for the Products over and above comparable products that did not purport to be "All Natural." Given that Plaintiff and Class Members paid a premium for the Products based on Defendant's misrepresentations that they are "All Natural," Plaintiff and Class Members suffered an injury in the amount of the premium paid.

4. Defendant's conduct violated and continues to violate New York General Business Law §§ 349 and 350, and the consumer protection statutes of all 50 states. Defendant breached and continues to breach its express and implied warranties regarding the Products. Defendant has been and continues to be unjustly enriched. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this

action against Defendant on behalf of himself and Class Members who purchased the Products during the applicable class period (the “Class Period”).

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

5. Consumers have become increasingly concerned about the effects of synthetic and chemical ingredients in food, cleaning products, bath and beauty products, and everyday household products. Companies such as Defendant have capitalized on consumers’ desires for purportedly “natural products.” Indeed, consumers are willing to pay, and have paid, a premium for products branded “natural” over products that contain synthetic ingredients. In 2010, sales of natural products grew 6% to \$117 billion.¹ Reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff and Class Members, value natural products for important reasons, including the belief that they are safer and healthier than alternative products that are not represented as natural.

6. Despite the Products containing a number of synthetic ingredients, Defendant markets the Products as being “All Natural.” The Products’ labeling is depicted below:

¹ *About the Natural Products Association*, NATURAL PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION (last accessed July 3, 2015), http://www.npainfo.org/NPA/About_NPA/NPA/AboutNPA/AbouttheNaturalProductsAssociation.aspx?hkey=8d3a15ab-f44f-4473-aa6e-ba27ccebcb8; *Chemical Blessings What Rousseau Got Wrong*, THE ECONOMIST, Feb. 4, 2008, available at <http://www.economist.com/node/10633398>; see also Hunger Oatman-Stanford, *What Were We Thinking? The Top 10 Most Dangerous Ads*, COLLECTORS WEEKLY (Aug. 22, 2012), <http://www.collectorsweekly.com/articles/the-top-10-most-dangerous-ads/> (featuring advertisements for dangerous synthetic chemicals that were once marketed as safe).





Drew's All-Natural Lemon Goddess Dressing & Quick Noodle Sauce

ALL NATURAL INGREDIENTS: Expeller Pressed Canola Oil, Cider Vinegar, Water, Organic Tamari (Water, Organic Soybeans, Organic Wheat, Salt), Tahini, Dijon Mustard (Organic Grain Vinegar, Water, Mustard Seed, Salt, Spices, Turmeric), Toasted Sesame Oil, Lemon Juice Concentrate, Garlic, Toasted Sesame Seeds, Sea Salt, Black Pepper, Chives, Parsley, Xanthan Gum, Guar Gum, Sodium Alginate.

CONTAINS: SOY, WHEAT AND SESAME

NO ARTIFICIAL COLORS, FLAVORS OR PRESERVATIVES

7. Defendant's representation that the Products are "All Natural" is false, misleading, and deceptive because the Products contain multiple ingredients that are, as explained below, synthetic.

- a. **Xanthan Gum** is a polysaccharide derived from the fermentation of sugars by *anthomonas campeseri* bacterium and purification using isopropyl alcohol. It is listed as a synthetic ingredient by federal regulation and is typically used as a thickening or stabilizing agent in beverages and as emulsifiers in salad dressings. *See* 7 C.F.R. § 205.605(b). A 2012 article in the Journal of Pediatrics noted that the U.S. Food & Drug Administration issued warnings that products containing xanthan gum have been linked to illness and death in infants.^{2,3}

² Jennifer Beal, MPH et al., *Late Onset Necrotizing Enterocolitis in Infants Following Use of a Xanthan Gum-Containing Thickening Agent*, 161 THE JOURNAL OF PEDIATRICS 2, 354 (2012).

³ The following Products contain Xanthan Gum: Chipotle Ranch, Thousand Island, Rosemary Balsamic, Thai Sesame Lime, Romano Caesar, Sesame Orange, Roasted Garlic & Peppercorn, Creamy Ranch, Smoked Tomato, Lemon Tahini Goddess, Shiitake Ginger, Greek Olive, Poppy Seed, and Raspberry.

- b. Disodium Phosphate** is a synthetic ingredient used as a sequestrant. *See* 21 C.F.R. §182.6290.⁴
- c. Lactic Acid** is a federally-listed synthetic substance that is added to foods as a synthetic flavorant, acidity regulator, and preservative. 21 C.F.R. § 172.515(b);⁵ Although lactic acid exists naturally in some foods, it must be synthetically formulated for use as a food additive -- as is the case with the Products -- through commercial fermentation of carbohydrates or by using acetaldehyde and hydrogen cyanide to form lactronitrile, which is then chemically degraded via hydrolysis for form lactic acid. 21 C.F.R. § 184.1061(a).⁶
- d. Citric Acid** is (2-hydroxy-propane-1, 2,3-tricarboxylic acid) is a synthetic, non-natural ingredient. While the chemical's name has the word "citric" in it, citric acid is no longer extracted from the citrus fruit but industrially manufactured by fermenting certain genetically mutant strains of the black mold fungus, *Aspergillus niger*. A technical evaluation report for the substance citric acid compiled by the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service ("USDA AMS") for the National Organic Program classified citric acid as "Synthetic Allowed".^{7,8}

As one of the USDA AMS reviewers commented,

“[Citric acid] is a natural[ly] occurring substance that commercially goes through numerous chemical processes to get to [its] final usable form.

⁴ The following Products contain Disodium Phosphate: Creamy Ranch.

⁵ *See also Food Ingredients and Colors, E270, Current EU Approved Additives and their E Numbers, http://www.food.gov.uk/policy-advice/additivesbranch/enumberlist#anchor_3.*

⁶ The following Products contain Lactic Acid: Chipotle Ranch, and Creamy Ranch.

⁷ *See* Page 4, available at <http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5067876>.

⁸ The following Products contain Citric Acid: Rosemary Balsamic, Sesame Orange, Roasted Garlic & Peppercorn, Smoked Tomato, Greek Olive, and Poppy Seed.

This processing would suggest that it be classified as synthetic.” *Id.* at 3.

The report further explains, under the “How Made” question, that citric acid is made –

“Traditionally by extraction from citrus juice, no longer commercially available. It is now extracted by fermentation of a carbohydrate substrate (often molasses) by citric acid bacteria, *Aspergillus niger* (a mold) or *Candida guilliermondii* (a yeast). Citric acid is recovered from the fermentation broth by a lime and sulfuric acid process in which the citric acid is first precipitated as a calcium salt and then reacidulated with sulfuric acid.” *Id.* at 4.

8. Whether Defendant’s labeling of the Products as natural is deceptive is judged by whether it would deceive or mislead a reasonable person. To assist in ascertaining what a reasonable consumer believes the term natural means, one can look to the regulatory agencies for their guidance.

9. In 2013, the United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) issued a Draft Guidance Decision Tree for Classification of Materials as Synthetic or Nonsynthetic (Natural). In accordance with this decision tree, a substance is natural—as opposed to synthetic—if: (a) it is manufactured, produced, or extracted from a natural source (i.e. naturally occurring mineral or biological matter); (b) it has not undergone a chemical change (i.e. a process whereby a substance is transformed into one or more other distinct substances) so that it is chemically or structurally different than how it naturally occurs in the source material; or (c) the chemical change was created by a naturally occurring biological process such as composting, fermentation, or enzymatic digestion or by heating or burning biological matter. **EXHIBIT A.**

10. Congress has defined "synthetic" to mean a substance that is formulated or manufactured by a chemical process or by a process that chemically changes a substance extracted from naturally occurring plants, animals, or mineral sources 7 U.S.C. § 6502 (2.1).

11. The Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) has repeatedly stated its policy to restrict the use of the term “natural” in connection with added color, synthetic substances and flavors addressed in 21 C.F.R. §101.22.

12. 21 C.F.R. §101.22 distinguishes between artificial versus natural foods, spices, flavorings, colors and preservatives on food labels. Any coloring or preservative can preclude the use of the term “natural” even if the coloring or preservative is derived from natural sources.

13. The Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) has repeatedly affirmed its policy through guidelines that define the appropriate boundaries for using the term “natural.” According to the FDA:

"The agency will maintain its current policy ... not to restrict the use of the term 'natural' except for added color, synthetic substances, and flavors as provided in § 101.22. Additionally, the agency will maintain its policy ... regarding the use of 'natural' as meaning that nothing artificial or synthetic (including all color additives regardless of source) has been included in, or has been added to, a food that would not normally be expected to be in the food. Further ... the agency will continue to distinguish between natural and artificial flavors as outlined in § 101.22." 58 Federal Register 2302, 2407 (Jan. 6, 1993).

14. The FDA Compliance Policy Guide Sec. 587.100 further provides that:

"The use of the words 'food color added,' 'natural color,' or similar words containing the term 'food' or 'natural' may be erroneously interpreted to mean the color is a naturally occurring constituent in the food. Since all added colors result in an artificially colored food, we would object to the declaration of any added color as 'food' or 'natural.'"

15. Surveys and other market research, including expert testimony Plaintiff intends to introduce, will demonstrate that the term “natural” is misleading to a reasonable consumer because the reasonable consumer believes that the term “natural,” when used to describe goods such as the Products, means that the goods are free of synthetic ingredients. By way of example,

according to a consumer survey, “[e]ighty-six percent of consumers expect a ‘natural’ label to mean processed foods do not contain any artificial ingredients.”⁹

16. Consumers lack the meaningful ability to test or independently ascertain or verify whether a product is natural, especially at the point of sale. Consumers would not know the true nature of the ingredients merely by reading the ingredients label.

17. Discovering that the ingredients are not natural and are actually synthetic requires a scientific investigation and knowledge of chemistry beyond that of the average consumer. That is why, even though Xanthan Gum, Citric Acid, Disodium Phosphate and Lactic Acid are identified on the back of the Products’ packaging in the ingredients listed, the reasonable consumer would not understand—nor is he expected to understand—that these ingredients are synthetic.

18. Moreover, the reasonable consumer is not expected or required to scour the ingredients list on the back of the Products in order to confirm or debunk Defendant’s prominent front-of-the-Products claims, representations, and warranties that the Products are “All Natural.”

19. Defendant did not disclose that Xanthan Gum, Citric Acid, Disodium Phosphate and Lactic Acid are synthetic ingredients. A reasonable consumer understands Defendant’s “All Natural” claims to mean that the Products do not contain synthetic ingredients.

20. Defendant has thus violated, *inter alia*, NY General Business Law § 392-b by: a) putting upon an article of merchandise, bottle, wrapper, package, label or other thing, containing or covering such an article, or with which such an article is intended to be sold, or is sold, a false

⁹ Urvashi Rangan, Comments of Consumers Union on Proposed Guides for Use of Environmental Marketing Claims, 16 C.F.R. Part 260, Notice of the Federal Trade Commission (2010), *available at* www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_comments/guides-use-environmental-marketing-claims-project-no.p954501-00289%2%A000289-57072.pdf (also accessible as Comment 58 at <http://www.ftc.gov/policy/public-comments/initiative-353>).

description or other indication of or respecting the kind of such article or any part thereof; and b) selling or offering for sale an article, which to their knowledge is falsely described or indicated upon any such package, or vessel containing the same, or label thereupon, in any of the particulars specified.

21. Consumers rely on food label representations and information in making purchasing decisions.

22. The marketing of the Products as “All Natural” in a prominent location on the labels of all of the Products, throughout the Class Period, evidences Defendant’s awareness that “All Natural” claims are material to consumers.

23. Defendant’s deceptive representations and omissions are material in that a reasonable person would attach importance to such information and would be induced to act upon such information in making purchase decisions.

24. Plaintiff and the Class members reasonably relied to their detriment on Defendant’s misleading representations and omissions.

25. Defendant’s false, misleading, and deceptive misrepresentations and omissions are likely to continue to deceive and mislead reasonable consumers and the general public, as they have already deceived and misled Plaintiff and the Class members.

26. In making the false, misleading, and deceptive representations and omissions described herein, Defendant knew and intended that consumers would pay a premium for Products labeled “All Natural” over comparable products not so labeled.

27. As an immediate, direct, and proximate result of Defendant’s false, misleading, and deceptive representations and omissions, Defendant injured Plaintiff and the Class members in that they:

- a. Paid a sum of money for Products that were not what Defendant represented;
- b. Paid a premium price for Products that were not what Defendant represented;
- c. Were deprived of the benefit of the bargain because the Products they purchased were different from what Defendant warranted;
- d. Were deprived of the benefit of the bargain because the Products they purchased had less value than what Defendant represented;
- e. Ingested a substance that was of a different quality than what Defendant promised; and
- f. Were denied the benefit of the beneficial properties of the natural foods Defendant promised.

28. Had Defendant not made the false, misleading, and deceptive representations and omissions, Plaintiff and the Class members would not have been willing to pay the same amount for the Products they purchased, and, consequently, Plaintiff and the Class members would not have been willing to purchase the Products.

29. Plaintiff and the Class members paid for Products that were “All Natural” but received Products that were not “All Natural.” The Products Plaintiff and the Class members received were worth less than the Products for which they paid.

30. Based on Defendant’s misleading and deceptive representations, Defendant was able to, and did, charge a premium price for the Products over the cost of competitive products not bearing an “All Natural” label.

31. Plaintiff and the Class members all paid money for the Products. However, Plaintiff and the Class members did not obtain the full value of the advertised Products due to Defendant’s misrepresentations and omissions. Plaintiff and the Class members purchased, purchased more of, and/or paid more for, the Products than they would have had they known the

truth about the Products. Consequently, Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered injury in fact and lost money as a result of Defendant's wrongful conduct.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

32. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. section 1332(d) in that: (1) this is a class action involving more than 100 class members; (2) Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of New York and Defendant is a citizen of the States of Vermont and Delaware; and (3) the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

33. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant conducts and transacts business in the State of New York, contracts to supply goods within the State of New York, and supplies goods within the State of New York.

34. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2). A substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the classes' claims occurred in this District.

PARTIES

Plaintiff

35. Plaintiff is an individual consumer who, at all times material hereto, was a citizen of Dutchess County, New York. During the Class Period Plaintiff purchased the Products from his local Stop & Shop Supermarket in 2016. The packaging of the Products Plaintiff purchased contained the representation that they were "All Natural." Plaintiff believes that "All Natural" products do not contain synthetic ingredients. Plaintiff believes a synthetic ingredient is formulated or manufactured by a chemical process or by a process that chemically changes a substance extracted from naturally occurring plant, animal, or mineral sources. If the Products

were actually “All Natural,” as represented on the Products’ label, Plaintiff would purchase the Products in the immediate future.

36. Had Defendant not made the false, misleading, and deceptive representation that the Products were “All Natural,” Plaintiff would not have been willing to pay the same amount for the Products, and, consequently, he would not have been willing to purchase the Products. Plaintiff purchased, purchased more of, and/or paid more for, the Products than he would have had he known the truth about the Products. The Products Plaintiff received were worth less than the Products for which he paid. Plaintiff was injured in fact and lost money as a result of Defendant’s improper conduct.

Defendant

37. Defendant, is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Chester, Vermont. Defendant manufactures, markets, advertises and distributes the Products throughout the United States. Defendant created and/or authorized the false, misleading and deceptive advertisements, packaging and labeling for the Products.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

38. Plaintiff bring this matter on behalf of himself and those similarly situated. As detailed at length in this Complaint, Defendant orchestrated deceptive marketing and labeling practices. Defendant’s customers were uniformly impacted by and exposed to this misconduct. Accordingly, this Complaint is uniquely situated for class-wide resolution, including injunctive relief.

39. The Class is defined as all consumers who purchased the Products anywhere in the United States during the Class Period (the “Class”).

40. Plaintiff also seeks certification, to the extent necessary or appropriate, of a subclass of individuals who purchased the Products in the State of New York at any time during the Class Period (the “New York Subclass”).

41. The Class and New York Subclass shall be referred to collectively throughout the Complaint as the Class.

42. The Class is properly brought and should be maintained as a class action under Rule 23(a), satisfying the class action prerequisites of numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy because:

43. Numerosity: Class Members are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Plaintiff believes that there are thousands of consumers who are Class Members described above who have been damaged by Defendant’s deceptive and misleading practices.

44. Commonality: The questions of law and fact common to the Class Members which predominate over any questions which may affect individual Class Members include, but are not limited to:

- a. Whether Defendant is responsible for the conduct alleged herein which was uniformly directed at all consumers who purchased the Products;
- b. Whether Defendant’s misconduct set forth in this Complaint demonstrates that Defendant has engaged in unfair, fraudulent, or unlawful business practices with respect to the advertising, marketing, and sale of its Products;
- c. Whether Defendant made false and/or misleading statements to the Class and the public concerning the contents of its Products;
- d. Whether Defendant’s false and misleading statements concerning its Products was likely to deceive the public;

- e. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to injunctive relief;
- f. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to money damages under the same causes of action as the other Class Members.

45. Typicality: Plaintiff is a member of the Class. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of each Class Member in that every member of the Class was susceptible to the same deceptive, misleading conduct and purchased the Defendant's Products. Plaintiff is entitled to relief under the same causes of action as the other Class Members.

46. Adequacy: Plaintiff is an adequate Class representative because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class Members he seeks to represent; his consumer fraud claims are common to all members of the Class and he has a strong interest in vindicating his rights; he has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class action litigation and he intends to vigorously prosecute this action. Plaintiff has no interests which conflict with those of the Class. The Class Members' interests will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiff and his counsel. Defendant has acted in a manner generally applicable to the Class, making relief appropriate with respect to Plaintiff and the Class Members. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class Members would create a risk of inconsistent and varying adjudications.

47. The Class is properly brought and should be maintained as a class action under Rule 23(b) because a class action is superior to traditional litigation of this controversy. Pursuant to Rule 23(b)(3), common issues of law and fact predominate over any other questions affecting only individual members of the Class. The Class issues are fully predominate over any individual issue because no inquiry into individual conduct is necessary; all that is required is a narrow focus on Defendant's deceptive and misleading marketing and labeling practices. In

addition, this Class is superior to other methods for fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because, *inter alia*:

48. Superiority: A class action is superior to the other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because:

- a. The joinder of thousands of individual Class Members is impracticable, cumbersome, unduly burdensome, and a waste of judicial and/or litigation resources;
- b. The individual claims of the Class Members may be relatively modest compared with the expense of litigating the claim, thereby making it impracticable, unduly burdensome, and expensive—if not totally impossible—to justify individual actions;
- c. When Defendant's liability has been adjudicated, all Class Members' claims can be determined by the Court and administered efficiently in a manner far less burdensome and expensive than if it were attempted through filing, discovery, and trial of all individual cases;
- d. This class action will promote orderly, efficient, expeditious, and appropriate adjudication and administration of Class claims;
- e. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action;
- f. This class action will assure uniformity of decisions among Class Members;
- g. The Class is readily definable and prosecution of this action as a class action will eliminate the possibility of repetitious litigation;

- h. Class Members' interests in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions is outweighed by their interest in efficient resolution by single class action; and
- i. It would be desirable to concentrate in this single venue the litigation of all plaintiffs who were induced by Defendant's uniform false advertising to purchase their Products as being "All Natural."

49. Accordingly, this Class is properly brought and should be maintained as a class action under Rule 23(b)(3) because questions of law or fact common to Class Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and because a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating this controversy.

INJUNCTIVE CLASS RELIEF

50. Rules 23(b)(1) and (2) contemplate a class action for purposes of seeking class-wide injunctive relief. Here, Defendant has engaged in conduct resulting in misleading consumers about ingredients in its Products. Since Defendant's conduct has been uniformly directed at all consumers in the United States, and the conduct continues presently, injunctive relief on a class-wide basis is a viable and suitable solution to remedy Defendant's continuing misconduct. Plaintiff would purchase the Products again if the ingredients were changed so that they indeed were "All Natural."

51. The injunctive Class is properly brought and should be maintained as a class action under Rule 23(a), satisfying the class action prerequisites of numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy because:

- a. Numerosity: Individual joinder of the injunctive Class Members would be wholly impracticable. Defendant's Products have been purchased by thousands of people throughout the United States;
- b. Commonality: Questions of law and fact are common to members of the Class. Defendant's misconduct was uniformly directed at all consumers. Thus, all members of the Class have a common cause against Defendant to stop its misleading conduct through an injunction. Since the issues presented by this injunctive Class deal exclusively with Defendant's misconduct, resolution of these questions would necessarily be common to the entire Class. Moreover, there are common questions of law and fact inherent in the resolution of the proposed injunctive class, including, *inter alia*:
 - i. Resolution of the issues presented in the 23(b)(3) class;
 - ii. Whether members of the Class will continue to suffer harm by virtue of Defendant's deceptive product marketing and labeling; and
 - iii. Whether, on equitable grounds, Defendant should be prevented from continuing to deceptively mislabel its Products as being "All Natural."
- c. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the injunctive Class because his claims arise from the same course of conduct (i.e. Defendant's deceptive and misleading marketing, labeling, and advertising practices). Plaintiff is a typical representative of the Class because, like all members of the injunctive Class, he purchased Defendant's Products which were sold unfairly and deceptively to consumers throughout the United States.

- d. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the injunctive Class. His consumer protection claims are common to all members of the injunctive Class and he has a strong interest in vindicating his rights. In addition, Plaintiff and the Class are represented by counsel who is competent and experienced in both consumer protection and class action litigation.

52. The injunctive Class is properly brought and should be maintained as a class action under Rule 23(b)(2) because Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief on behalf of the Class Members on grounds generally applicable to the entire injunctive Class. Certification under Rule 23(b)(2) is appropriate because Defendant has acted or refused to act in a manner that applies generally to the injunctive Class (i.e. Defendant has marketed its Products using the same misleading and deceptive labeling to all of the Class Members). Any final injunctive relief or declaratory relief would benefit the entire injunctive Class as Defendant would be prevented from continuing its misleading and deceptive marketing practices and would be required to honestly disclose to consumers the nature of the contents of their Products. Plaintiff would purchase the Products again if the ingredients were changed so that they indeed were “All Natural.”

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF NEW YORK GBL § 349
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and New York Subclass Members)

53. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in all the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

54. New York General Business Law Section 349 (“GBL § 349”) declares unlawful “[d]eceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any business, trade, or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state . . .”

55. The conduct of Defendant alleged herein constitutes recurring, “unlawful” deceptive acts and practices in violation of GBL § 349, and as such, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members seek monetary damages and the entry of preliminary and permanent injunctive relief against Defendant, enjoining it from inaccurately describing, labeling, marketing, and promoting the Products.

56. There is no adequate remedy at law.

57. Defendant misleadingly, inaccurately, and deceptively present its Products to consumers.

58. Defendant’s improper consumer-oriented conduct—including labeling and advertising the Products as being “All Natural”—is misleading in a material way in that it, *inter alia*, induced Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members to purchase and pay a premium for Defendant’s Products and to use the Products when he otherwise would not have. Defendant made its untrue and/or misleading statements and representations willfully, wantonly, and with reckless disregard for the truth.

59. Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members have been injured inasmuch as they paid a premium for products that were—contrary to Defendant’s representations— not “All Natural” because they contain synthetic ingredients. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members received less than what they bargained and/or paid for.

60. Defendant's advertising and Products' packaging and labeling induced the Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members to buy Defendant's Products and to pay a premium price for them.

61. Defendant's deceptive and misleading practices constitute a deceptive act and practice in the conduct of business in violation of New York General Business Law §349(a) and Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members have been damaged thereby.

62. As a result of Defendant's recurring, "unlawful" deceptive acts and practices, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members are entitled to monetary, compensatory, treble and punitive damages, injunctive relief, restitution and disgorgement of all moneys obtained by means of Defendant's unlawful conduct, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF NEW YORK GBL § 350
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members)

63. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in all the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

64. N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350 provides, in part, as follows:

False advertising in the conduct of any business, trade or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state is hereby declared unlawful.

65. N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350a(1) provides, in part, as follows:

The term 'false advertising, including labeling, of a commodity, or of the kind, character, terms or conditions of any employment opportunity if such advertising is misleading in a material respect. In determining whether any advertising is misleading, there shall be taken into account (among other things) not only representations made by statement, word, design, device, sound or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the advertising fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations with respect to the commodity or employment to which the advertising relates under the conditions proscribed in

said advertisement, or under such conditions as are customary or usual . . .

66. Defendant's labeling and advertisements contain untrue and materially misleading statements concerning Defendant's Products inasmuch as they misrepresent that the Products are "All Natural."

67. Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members have been injured inasmuch as they relied upon the labeling, packaging and advertising and paid a premium for the Products which were—contrary to Defendant's representations—not "All Natural" because they contain synthetic ingredients. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members received less than what they bargained and/or paid for.

68. Defendant's advertising, packaging and products' labeling induced the Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members to buy Defendant's Products.

69. Defendant made its untrue and/or misleading statements and representations willfully, wantonly, and with reckless disregard for the truth.

70. Defendant's conduct constitutes multiple, separate violations of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350.

71. Defendant made the material misrepresentations described in this Complaint in Defendant's advertising, and on the Products' packaging and labeling.

72. Defendant's material misrepresentations were substantially uniform in content, presentation, and impact upon consumers at large. Moreover, all consumers purchasing the Products were and continue to be exposed to Defendant's material misrepresentations.

73. As a result of Defendant's recurring, "unlawful" deceptive acts and practices, Plaintiff and the New York Subclass Members are entitled to monetary, compensatory, treble

and punitive damages, injunctive relief, restitution and disgorgement of all moneys obtained by means of Defendant's unlawful conduct, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATION OF STATE CONSUMER PROTECTION STATUTES
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and All Class Members)

74. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in all the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

75. Plaintiff and Class Members have been injured as a result of Defendant's violations of the following state consumer protection statutes, which also provide a basis for redress to Plaintiff and Class Members based on Defendant's fraudulent, deceptive, unfair and unconscionable acts, practices and conduct.

76. Defendant's conduct as alleged herein violates the consumer protection, unfair trade practices and deceptive acts laws of each of the following jurisdictions:

- a. **Alaska:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Alaska's Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act, Alaska Stat. § 45.50.471, *et seq.*
- b. **Arizona:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Arizona's Consumer Fraud Act, Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 44-1521, *et seq.*
- c. **Arkansas:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Arkansas Code Ann. § 4-88-101, *et seq.*
- d. **California:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code § 1750, *et seq.*, and California's Unfair Competition Law, California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, and California's False Advertising Law, California Business and Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*

- e. **Colorado:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Colorado's Consumer Protection Act, Colo. Rev. Stat. §§ 61-1-101, *et seq.*
- f. **Connecticut:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Connecticut's Gen. Stat. § 42-110a, *et seq.*
- g. **Delaware:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Delaware's Consumer Fraud Act, Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2511, *et seq.* and the Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2531, *et seq.*
- h. **District of Columbia:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of the District of Columbia's Consumer Protection Act, D.C. Code § 28-3901, *et seq.*
- i. **Florida:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. Ann. § 501.201, *et seq.*
- j. **Hawaii:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of the Hawaii's Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Haw. Rev. Stat. § 481A-1, *et seq.* and Haw. Rev. Stat. § 480-2.
- k. **Idaho:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Idaho's Consumer Protection Act, Idaho Code Ann. § 48-601, *et seq.*
- l. **Illinois:** Defendant's acts and practices were and are in violation of Illinois' Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. 505/2; and Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, 815 Ill. Comp. Stat. 510/2.
- m. **Indiana:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Indiana's Deceptive Consumer Sales Act, Ind. Code Ann. § 24-5-0.5-1, *et seq.*
- n. **Kansas:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Kansas's Consumer Protection Act, Kat. Stat. Ann. § 50-623, *et seq.*

- o. **Kentucky:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Kentucky's Consumer Protection Act, Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 367.110, *et seq.*
- p. **Maine:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of the Maine Unfair Trade Practices Act, 5 Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. Tit. 5, § 205-A, *et seq.* and 10 Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 1101, *et seq.*
- q. **Maryland:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Maryland's Consumer Protection Act, Md. Code Ann. Com. Law § 13-101, *et seq.*
- r. **Massachusetts:** Defendant's practices were unfair and deceptive acts and practices in violation of Massachusetts' Consumer Protection Act, Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A, § 2.
- s. **Michigan:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Michigan's Consumer Protection Act, Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 445.901, *et seq.*
- t. **Minnesota:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Minnesota's Prevention of Consumer Fraud Act, Minn. Stat. § 325F.68, *et seq.* and the Unlawful Trade Practices law, Minn. Stat. § 325D.09, *et seq.*
- u. **Missouri:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Missouri's Merchandising Practices Act, Mo. Rev. Stat. § 407.010, *et seq.*
- v. **Nebraska:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Nebraska's Consumer Protection Act, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-1601, *et seq.* and the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, § 87-302, *et seq.*
- w. **Nevada:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Nevada's Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 598.0903 and 41.600.

- x. **New Hampshire:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of New Hampshire's Regulation of Business Practices for Consumer Protection, N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 358-A:1, *et seq.*
- y. **New Jersey:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of New Jersey's Consumer Fraud Act, N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-1, *et seq.*
- z. **New Mexico:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of New Mexico's Unfair Practices Act, N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-1, *et seq.*
- aa. **New York:** Defendant's practices were in and are in violation of New York's Gen. Bus. Law §§ 349, *et seq.*
- bb. **North Carolina:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of North Carolina's Unfair Deceptive Trade Practices Act, N.C. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 75-1, *et seq.*
- cc. **North Dakota:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of North Dakota's Unlawful Sales or Advertising Practices law, N.D. Cent. Code § 51-15-01, *et seq.*
- dd. **Ohio:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Ohio's Consumer Sales Practices Act, Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 1345.01, *et seq.* and Ohio's Deceptive Trade Practices Act. Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 4165.01, *et seq.*
- ee. **Oklahoma:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Oklahoma's Consumer Protection Act, Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 15 § 751, *et seq.*, and Oklahoma's Deceptive Trade Practices Act, Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 78 § 51, *et seq.*
- ff. **Oregon:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Oregon's Unlawful Trade Practices law, Or. Rev. Stat. § 646.605, *et seq.*

- gg. **Pennsylvania:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Pennsylvania's Unfair Trade Practice and Consumer Protection Law, 73 Pa. Stat. Ann. § 201-1, *et seq.*
- hh. **Rhode Island:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Rhode Island's Deceptive Trade Practices Act, R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-13.1-1, *et seq.*
- ii. **South Dakota:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of South Dakota's Deceptive Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act, S.D. Codified Laws § 37-24-1, *et seq.*
- jj. **Texas:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Texas' Deceptive Trade Practices Consumer Protection Act, Tex. Bus. & Com. Code Ann. § 17.41, *et seq.*
- kk. **Utah:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Utah's Consumer Sales Practices Act, Utah Code Ann. § 13-11-1, *et seq.*, and Utah's Truth in Advertising Law, Utah Code Ann. § 13-11a-1, *et seq.*
- ll. **Vermont:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Vermont's Consumer Fraud Act, Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 9 § 2451, *et seq.*
- mm. **Washington:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Washington Consumer Protection Act, Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 19.86, *et seq.*
- nn. **West Virginia:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of West Virginia's Consumer Credit and Protection Act, W. Va. Code § 46A-6-101, *et seq.*
- oo. **Wisconsin:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Wisconsin's Consumer Act, Wis. Stat. §421.101, *et seq.*

pp. **Wyoming:** Defendant's practices were and are in violation of Wyoming's Consumer Protection Act, Wyo. Stat. Ann. §40-12-101, *et seq.*

77. Defendant violated the aforementioned states' unfair and deceptive acts and practices laws by representing that the Products are "All Natural."

78. Contrary to Defendant's representations, the Products are not "All Natural" because they contain synthetic ingredients.

79. Defendant's misrepresentations were material to Plaintiff's and Class Members' decision to pay a premium for the Products.

80. Defendant made its untrue and/or misleading statements and representations willfully, wantonly, and with reckless disregard for the truth.

81. As a result of Defendant's violations of the aforementioned states' unfair and deceptive practices laws, Plaintiff and Class Members paid a premium for the Products.

82. As a result of Defendant's violations, Defendant has been unjustly enriched.

83. Pursuant to the aforementioned states' unfair and deceptive practices laws, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover compensatory damages, restitution, punitive and special damages including but not limited to treble damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and other injunctive or declaratory relief as deemed appropriate or permitted pursuant to the relevant law.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and All Class Members)

84. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

85. Defendant provided the Plaintiff and Class Members with an express warranty in the form of written affirmations of fact promising and representing that the Products are “All Natural.”

86. The above affirmations of fact were not couched as “belief” or “opinion,” and were not “generalized statements of quality not capable of proof or disproof.”

87. These affirmations of fact became part of the basis for the bargain and were material to the Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ transactions.

88. Plaintiff and Class Members reasonably relied upon the Defendant’s affirmations of fact and justifiably acted in ignorance of the material facts omitted or concealed when they decided to buy Defendant’s Products.

89. Within a reasonable time after he knew or should have known of Defendant’s breach, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and Class Members, placed Defendant on notice of its breach, giving Defendant an opportunity to cure its breach, which it refused to do.

90. Defendant breached the express warranty because the Products are not “All Natural” because they contain synthetic ingredients.

91. Defendant thereby breached the following state warranty laws:

- a. Code of Ala. § 7-2-313;
- b. Alaska Stat. § 45.02.313;
- c. A.R.S. § 47-2313;
- d. A.C.A. § 4-2-313;
- e. Cal. Comm. Code § 2313;
- f. Colo. Rev. Stat. § 4-2-313;
- g. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42a-2-313;

- h. 6 Del. C. § 2-313;
- i. D.C. Code § 28:2-313;
- j. Fla. Stat. § 672.313;
- k. O.C.G.A. § 11-2-313;
- l. H.R.S. § 490:2-313;
- m. Idaho Code § 28-2-313;
- n. 810 I.L.C.S. 5/2-313;
- o. Ind. Code § 26-1-2-313;
- p. Iowa Code § 554.2313;
- q. K.S.A. § 84-2-313;
- r. K.R.S. § 355.2-313;
- s. 11 M.R.S. § 2-313;
- t. Md. Commercial Law Code Ann. § 2-313;
- u. 106 Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. § 2-313;
- v. M.C.L.S. § 440.2313;
- w. Minn. Stat. § 336.2-313;
- x. Miss. Code Ann. § 75-2-313;
- y. R.S. Mo. § 400.2-313;
- z. Mont. Code Anno. § 30-2-313;
- aa. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 2-313;
- bb. Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 104.2313;
- cc. R.S.A. 382-A:2-313;
- dd. N.J. Stat. Ann. § 12A:2-313;

- ee. N.M. Stat. Ann. § 55-2-313;
- ff. N.Y. U.C.C. Law § 2-313;
- gg. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 25-2-313;
- hh. N.D. Cent. Code § 41-02-30;
- ii. II. O.R.C. Ann. § 1302.26;
- jj. 12A Okl. St. § 2-313;
- kk. Or. Rev. Stat. § 72-3130;
- ll. 13 Pa. Rev. Stat. § 72-3130;
- mm. R.I. Gen. Laws § 6A-2-313;
- nn. S.C. Code Ann. § 36-2-313;
- oo. S.D. Codified Laws, § 57A-2-313;
- pp. Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-2-313;
- qq. Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 2.313;
- rr. Utah Code Ann. § 70A-2-313;
- ss. 9A V.S.A. § 2-313;
- tt. Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-504.2;
- uu. Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 6A.2-313;
- vv. W. Va. Code § 46-2-313;
- ww. Wis. Stat. § 402.313;
- xx. Wyo. Stat. § 34.1-2-313.

92. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach of express warranty, Plaintiff and Class Members were damaged in the amount of the price they paid for the Products, in an amount to be proven at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FRAUD UNDER VERMONT COMMON LAW
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and All Class Members)

93. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in all the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

94. As discussed above, Defendant provided Plaintiff and the Class Members with false or misleading material information and failed to disclose material facts about the Products, including, but not limited to the claims regarding the “All Natural” quality. These misrepresentations and omissions were made with knowledge of their falsehood.

95. The misrepresentations and omissions made by Defendant, upon which Plaintiff and the Class Members reasonably and justifiably relied, were intended to induce and actually did induce Plaintiff and the Class Members to purchase the Products.

96. The fraudulent actions of Defendant caused damage to Plaintiff and the Class Members, who are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable relief as a result.

As a result of Defendant’s wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have suffered and continue to suffer economic losses and other general and specific damages, including amounts paid for the Products and any interest that would have been accrued on these monies, all in the amount to be determined at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
COMMON LAW UNJUST ENRICHMENT
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and All Class Members in the Alternative)

97. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

98. Plaintiff asserts this claim in the alternative to the above-listed claims.

99. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and consumers nationwide, brings a common law claim for unjust enrichment.

100. Defendant's conduct violated, *inter alia*, state and federal law by manufacturing, advertising, marketing, and selling its Products while misrepresenting and omitting material facts.

101. Defendant's unlawful conduct as described in this Complaint allowed Defendant to knowingly realize substantial revenues from selling its Products at the expense of, and to the detriment or impoverishment of, Plaintiff and Class Members, and to Defendant's benefit and enrichment. Defendant has thereby violated fundamental principles of justice, equity, and good conscience.

102. Plaintiff and Class Members conferred significant financial benefits and paid substantial compensation to Defendant for the Products, which were not as Defendant represented them to be.

103. Under New York's common law principles of unjust enrichment, it is inequitable for Defendant to retain the benefits conferred by Plaintiff's and Class Members' overpayments.

104. Plaintiff and Class Members seek disgorgement of all profits resulting from such overpayments and establishment of a constructive trust from which Plaintiff and Class Members may seek restitution.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, prays for judgment as follows:

- (a) Declaring this action to be a proper class action and certifying Plaintiff as the representative of the Class under Rule 23 of the FRCP;

- (b) Declaring Defendant financially responsible for notifying the Class members of the pendency of this suit;
- (c) Entering preliminary and permanent injunctive relief against Defendant, directing Defendant to correct its practices and to comply with consumer protection statutes nationwide, including New York consumer protection laws;
- (d) Awarding monetary damages, including treble damages;
- (e) Awarding punitive damages;
- (f) Awarding Plaintiff and Class Members their costs and expenses incurred in this action, including reasonable allowance of fees for Plaintiff's attorneys and experts, and reimbursement of Plaintiff's expenses; and
- (g) Granting such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: July 26, 2016

THE SULTZER LAW GROUP P.C.

Jason P. Sultzer /s/

By: _____
Jason P. Sultzer, Esq.
85 Civic Center Plaza, Suite 104
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
Tel: (845) 483-7100
Fax: (888) 749-7747
sultzerj@thesultzerlawgroup.com

HALUNEN LAW
Melissa W. Wolchansky
1650 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 605-4098
Facsimile: (612) 605-4099
wolchansky@halunenlaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class