

1 BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN  
& BALINT, P.C.  
2 PATRICIA N. SYVERSON (CA SBN 203111)  
MANFRED P. MUECKE (CA SBN 222893)  
3 600 W. Broadway, Suite 900  
San Diego, California 92101  
4 psyverson@bffb.com  
mmuecke@bffb.com  
5 Telephone: (619) 798-4593

6 BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN  
& BALINT, P.C.  
7 ELAINE A. RYAN (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
2325 E. Camelback Rd. Suite 300  
8 Phoenix, AZ 85016  
eryan@bffb.com  
9 Telephone: (602) 274-1100

10 BOODELL & DOMANSKIS, LLC  
Stewart M. Weltman (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
11 Max A. Stein (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
One North Franklin, Suite 1200  
12 Chicago, IL 60606  
sweltman@boodlaw.com  
13 mstein@boodlaw.com  
14 Telephone: (312) 938-1670

(Additional counsel appear on signature page)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

18 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

19 TATIANA KOROLSHTEYN, on  
20 behalf of herself and all others  
similarly situated,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23  
24 COSTCO WHOLESALE  
CORPORATION and NBTY, INC.,

25  
26 Defendants.

Case No.: 3:15-cv-0709-CAB-RBB

**THIRD AMENDED CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW, Business and Professions Code §17200 *et seq.*; and
2. VIOLATION OF THE CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT, Civil Code §1750 *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Tatiana Korolshteyn, by and through her attorneys, brings this action  
2 on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated consumers against Defendants  
3 Costco Wholesale Corporation and NBTY, Inc., and alleges as follows:

4 **NATURE OF ACTION**

5 1. Defendants manufacture, market, sell and distribute TruNature  
6 Ginkgo Biloba with Vinpocetine (“TruNature Ginkgo” or the “Product”).<sup>1</sup> Through  
7 an extensive, widespread, comprehensive and uniform nationwide marketing  
8 campaign, Defendants falsely represent on the front of each and every TruNature  
9 Ginkgo label that the Product “supports alertness & memory” and on the side of  
10 each and every label that “Ginkgo Biloba can help with mental clarity and memory”  
11 and “It also helps maintain healthy blood flow to the brain to assist mental clarity  
12 and memory, especially occasional mild memory problems associated with aging”  
13 (collectively “the mental clarity, memory and alertness representations”).

14 2. In truth, Defendants’ TruNature Ginkgo does not provide the  
15 represented mental clarity, memory or alertness benefits. The clear weight of the  
16 credible scientific evidence and the consensus in the scientific community among  
17 experts in the field, based upon numerous well-controlled randomized clinical trials  
18 (“RCTs”), is that ginkgo biloba and vinpocetine supplementation does not provide  
19 any mental clarity, memory or mental alertness benefits. As a result, Defendants’  
20 mental clarity, memory and alertness representations are false, misleading, and  
21 reasonably likely to deceive the public.

22 3. Defendants have employed numerous methods to convey their  
23 uniform, false, misleading, deceptive and unlawful mental clarity, memory and  
24 mental alertness representations, including the front of the Product’s packaging and  
25 labeling where it cannot be missed by consumers.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff reserves the right to add additional products upon the completion of  
discovery.

1           4. As a result of Defendants’ deceptive mental clarity, memory and  
 2 alertness representations, consumers – including Plaintiff and members of the  
 3 proposed Class – have purchased TruNature Ginkgo that does not perform as  
 4 advertised.

5           5. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and other similarly  
 6 situated consumers who have purchased TruNature Ginkgo to obtain redress for  
 7 those who have purchased the Product. Specifically, based on violations of  
 8 California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) and Consumers Legal Remedies  
 9 Act (“CLRA”) (described below), Plaintiff seeks restitutionary and monetary relief  
 10 for consumers who purchased Defendants’ TruNature Ginkgo product.

11                                 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12           6. This Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
 13 §1332(d)(2). The matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the  
 14 sum or value of \$5,000,000 and is a class action in which there are in excess of 100  
 15 class members and members of the Class are citizens of a state different from  
 16 Defendants.

17           7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because  
 18 Defendants are authorized to do and do business in California. Defendants have  
 19 marketed, promoted, distributed and sold TruNature Ginkgo in California and  
 20 Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts with this State and/or sufficiently  
 21 avail themselves of the markets in this State through their promotion, sales,  
 22 distribution and marketing within this State to render the exercise of jurisdiction by  
 23 this Court permissible.

24           8. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(a) and (b)  
 25 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff’s  
 26 claims occurred while she resided in this judicial district. Venue is also proper  
 27 under 18 U.S.C. §1965(a) because Defendants transact substantial business in this  
 28

1 District.

2 **PARTIES**

3 9. Plaintiff Korolshteyn resided in Redwood City, California and was a  
4 resident of California at all times relevant to this action. On October 29, 2014,  
5 Plaintiff was exposed to and saw Defendants’ mental clarity, memory and alertness  
6 representations by reading the front, back and sides of the TruNature Ginkgo label  
7 at a Costco in Redwood City, California. Based on the mental clarity, memory and  
8 alertness representations on the label, Plaintiff purchased TruNature Ginkgo and  
9 paid approximately \$14.69 for the bottle. As a result, Plaintiff suffered injury in  
10 fact and lost money. Had Plaintiff known the truth about Defendants’  
11 misrepresentations, she would not have purchased TruNature Ginkgo.

12 10. Defendant Costco Wholesale Corporation (“Costco”) is a public  
13 corporation incorporated under the laws of the state of Washington. Defendant  
14 Costco’s corporate headquarters is located at 999 Lake Drive, Issaquah, WA  
15 98027. Costco promotes, markets, distributes and sells TruNature Ginkgo to tens  
16 of thousands of consumers nationwide, including in California.

17 11. Defendant NBTY, Inc. (“NBTY”) is a corporation organized and  
18 existing under the laws of the state of Delaware. Defendant NBTY’s headquarters  
19 is at 2100 Smithtown Ave., Ronkonkoma, New York 11779. NBTY promotes,  
20 markets, distributes and sells TruNature Ginkgo to tens of thousands of consumers  
21 nationwide, including in California.

22 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

23 ***TruNature Ginkgo***

24 12. Defendants manufacture, distribute, market and sell TruNature  
25 Ginkgo online and in every Costco store nationwide. A 300 count bottle of  
26 TruNature Ginkgo retails for approximately \$14.00-\$16.00. A single dose of  
27

1 TruNature Ginkgo contains 120 mg of ginkgo biloba extract and 5 mg of  
2 vinpocetine.

3 13. Throughout the relevant time period, Defendants have consistently  
4 conveyed the message to consumers that the TruNature Ginkgo “supports alertness  
5 & memory;” that “Ginkgo Biloba can help with mental clarity and memory”; and  
6 “It also helps maintain healthy blood flow to the brain to assist mental clarity and  
7 memory, especially occasional mild memory problems associated with aging”. It  
8 does not. Defendants’ mental clarity, memory and alertness representations are  
9 false, misleading and deceptive.

10 14. Each and every consumer who purchases TruNature Ginkgo is  
11 exposed to these deceptive mental clarity, memory and alertness  
12 representations, which prominently appear on the front and side of each bottle.

13 **FRONT**



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**SIDE**



***Scientific Studies Confirm that TruNature Ginkgo is Not Effective***

15. Despite Defendants’ advertising claims that the Product provides

1 mental clarity, memory and alertness benefits, neither ginkgo biloba nor  
2 vinpocetine provide these benefits. The Product provides no benefit to  
3 consumers.

4 16. The scientific evidence, from RCTs, demonstrates that ginkgo  
5 biloba supplementation does not contribute to improved mental clarity, memory  
6 or alertness for anyone – no matter their age, gender or other personal  
7 characteristics – as the Product’s packaging and labeling proclaims. To the  
8 contrary, the weight of scientific evidence demonstrates that ginkgo biloba  
9 supplements do not provide any mental clarity, memory or alertness benefits.

10 17. To evaluate the overall weight of scientific evidence regarding a  
11 particular substance, experts in the field also perform systematic reviews of  
12 RCTs. They also perform what are called meta-analyses, where they combine  
13 the results of numerous RCTs to statistically evaluate the overall weight of the  
14 scientific evidence regarding a particular substance. In this regard, two  
15 systematic reviews published in 2002 and 2007, and one meta-analyses  
16 published in 2012, each concluded that ginkgo biloba supplements have no  
17 positive effect on cognitive function in healthy individuals.

18 18. For example, in a 2002 review of placebo-controlled, double blind  
19 trials of the effect of ginkgo biloba on cognitive function in healthy subjects,  
20 Canter & Ernst concluded, “[t]he use of Ginkgo biloba as a ‘smart’ drug cannot  
21 be recommended on the basis of the evidence available to date, and there is a  
22 particular need for further long-term trials with healthy subjects.” *See* Canter &  
23 Ernst, *Ginkgo biloba: a smart drug? A systematic review of controlled trials of*  
24 *the cognitive effects of ginkgo biloba extracts in healthy people*, 36 *Hum.*  
25 *Psychopharmacology Clin. Exp.* 108 (2002).

26 19. In a 2007 follow-up review of clinical studies regarding whether  
27 ginkgo biloba “boosts cognitive performance in healthy people with normal  
28

1 cognitive function,” Canter & Ernst concluded, ginkgo biloba “does not enhance  
2 cognitive function in the normal and healthy” and “[t]he collated evidence from  
3 15 randomized clinical trials provides no convincing evidence that G. biloba  
4 extracts ingested either as a single dose or over a longer period has a positive  
5 effect on any aspect of cognitive performance in healthy people under the age of  
6 60.” The evidence of a lack of a cognitive or mental benefit from ginkgo biloba  
7 was so strong that the authors concluded, “We believe that there is little to be  
8 gained from further research designed to establish whether or not there is a  
9 nootropic effect of G. biloba in healthy subjects.” *See* Canter & Ernst, *Ginkgo*  
10 *biloba is not a smart drug: an updated systematic review of randomized clinical*  
11 *trials testing nootropic effects of G. biloba extracts in healthy people*, 22 *Hum.*  
12 *Psychopharmacology Clin. Exp.* 265-275 (2007).

13 20. And, in their 2012 meta-analysis (“examining the published body of  
14 research relating to the specific cognitive enhancing properties of G. biloba in  
15 healthy individuals”), conducted “to examine whether Ginkgo biloba enhances  
16 cognitive function in healthy adults”, Laws et al. concluded, “We report that G.  
17 biloba had no ascertainable positive effects on a range of targeted cognitive  
18 functions in healthy individuals.” As the authors noted, “The key findings from  
19 this meta-analysis are that G. biloba has no significant impact on memory,  
20 executive function or attention with all effect sizes non-significant and effectively  
21 at zero” and that “Our lack of support for the nootropic qualities of G. biloba  
22 accords with the conclusions of previous systematic qualitative reviews (Canter  
23 & Ernst 2007)...” And finally, “To conclude, we found no evidence that G.  
24 biloba improves memory, executive or attentional functioning in healthy  
25 individuals.” Laws et al., *Is Ginkgo biloba a cognitive enhancer in healthy*  
26 *individuals? A meta-analysis*, 27 *Hum. Psychopharmacology Clin. Exp.* 527-  
27 533 (2012).



1           21. With respect to healthy people over the age of 60, after conducting  
2 a controlled clinical trial involving 230 subjects older than 60 years to evaluate  
3 whether ginkgo biloba “improves memory in elderly adults,” Solomon et al.  
4 concluded that the data from their study “suggest that when taken following  
5 manufacturer’s instructions, ginkgo provides no measurable benefit in memory  
6 or related cognitive function to adults with healthy cognitive function.”  
7 Solomon, et al., *Ginkgo for Memory Enhancement – A Randomized Controlled*  
8 *Trial*, 288(7) JAMA 835-40 (2002). “In summary, this does not support the  
9 manufacturer’s claims of benefits of ginkgo on learning and memory.” *Id.*

10           22. In 2002, The Cleveland Clinic Center likewise concluded that “the  
11 claims that Ginkgo biloba has beneficial effects on learning and memory are not  
12 supported by the literature.”

13           23. Plaintiff, through her counsel and her counsel’s consulting experts,  
14 has conducted a comprehensive search of the published literature on vinpocetine.  
15 No published reports of RCTs for vinpocetine, in the amounts contained in  
16 TruNature Ginkgo, were found supportive of the mental clarity, memory or  
17 alertness representations. And, a 2002 Cochrane Review concluded that the  
18 evidence does not support the clinical use of vinpocetine for cognitive health  
19 benefits. See Szatmari SZ, Whitehouse PJ: *Vinpocetine for cognitive*  
20 *impairment and dementia*, Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2003, 1:CD003119.

21 ***The Impact of Defendants’ Wrongful Conduct***

22           24. Defendants continue to unequivocally, falsely, deceptively, and  
23 misleadingly convey through their advertising and labeling one uniform message:  
24 TruNature Ginkgo provides mental clarity, memory and alertness benefits.

25           25. Plaintiff and Class members have been and will continue to be  
26 deceived or misled by Defendants’ deceptive mental clarity, memory and alertness  
27

1 representations. Plaintiff purchased TruNature Ginkgo during the Class period and  
2 in doing so, read and considered the Product's label and based her decision to  
3 purchase the Product on the mental clarity, memory and alertness representations on  
4 the Product packaging. Defendants' mental clarity, memory and alertness  
5 representations were a material factor in influencing Plaintiff's decision to  
6 purchase and consume the Product. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Product  
7 had she known that Defendants' mental clarity, memory and alertness  
8 representations were false and misleading and in contradiction of the weight of the  
9 scientific evidence, which has found that ginkgo and vinpocetine supplementation  
10 do not provide mental clarity, memory and alertness benefits.

11 26. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class members have been damaged in  
12 their purchases of the TruNature Ginkgo.

13 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

14 27. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other similarly  
15 situated consumers pursuant to Rule 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
16 Procedure and seeks certification of the following Class:

17 All consumers who, within the applicable statute of  
18 limitations period, purchased TruNature Ginkgo in  
19 California.

20 Excluded from this Class are Defendants and their  
21 officers, directors and employees and those who  
purchased TruNature Ginkgo for the purpose of resale.

22 28. Members of the Class are so numerous and geographically dispersed  
23 that joinder of all Class members is impracticable. Plaintiff is informed and  
24 believes, and on that basis alleges, that the proposed Class contains many  
25 thousands of members. The precise number of Class members is unknown to  
26 Plaintiff, but ascertainable.

27 29. Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class

1 and predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members. The  
2 common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 3
- 4 • whether the claims discussed above are true, or are misleading, or  
objectively reasonably likely to deceive;
- 5 • whether Defendants engaged in false, deceptive, or misleading  
6 conduct;
- 7 • whether Defendants' alleged conduct violates public policy;
- 8 • whether the alleged conduct constitutes violations of the laws asserted;  
and
- 9 • whether Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to appropriate  
10 remedies, including corrective advertising.

11 30. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class  
12 because, *inter alia*, all Class members were injured through the uniform  
13 misconduct described above. Plaintiff is advancing the same claims and legal  
14 theories on behalf of herself and all members of the Class.

15 31. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests  
16 of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained counsel competent and  
17 experienced in both consumer protection and class litigation.

18 32. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and  
19 efficient adjudication of this controversy. The expense and burden of individual  
20 litigation would make it impracticable or impossible for proposed Class members  
21 to prosecute their claims individually. It would thus be virtually impossible for the  
22 Class, on an individual basis, to obtain effective redress for the wrongs done to  
23 them. Furthermore, even if Class members could afford such individualized  
24 litigation, the court system could not. Individualized litigation would create the  
25 danger of inconsistent or contradictory judgments arising from the same set of  
26 facts. Individualized litigation would also increase the delay and expense to all  
27 parties and the court system from the issues raised by this action. By contrast, the

1 class action device provides the benefits of adjudication of these issues in a single  
2 proceeding, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court,  
3 and presents no unusual management difficulties under the circumstances here.

4 33. Plaintiff seeks preliminary and permanent equitable relief on behalf of  
5 the entire Class, on grounds generally applicable to the entire Class, to require  
6 Defendants to provide full restitution to Plaintiff and Class members.

7 34. Unless a Class is certified, Defendants will retain monies received as  
8 a result of their conduct that were taken from Plaintiff and Class members.

9 **COUNT I**

10 **Violation of Business & Professions Code §17200, et seq.**  
11 **Fraudulent Business Acts and Practices**

12 35. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in the  
13 paragraphs above, as if fully set forth herein.

14 36. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the Class.

15 37. As alleged herein, Plaintiff Korolshteyn has suffered injury in fact and  
16 lost money or property as a result of Defendants' conduct because she purchased  
17 TruNature Ginkgo in reliance on Defendants' claim that the Product would provide  
18 mental clarity, memory and alertness benefits, but did not receive a Product that  
19 provides these benefits.

20 38. The Unfair Competition Law, Business & Professions Code §17200,  
21 et seq. ("UCL"), and similar laws in the other Class states, prohibits any  
22 "fraudulent" business act or practice and any false or misleading advertising.

23 39. In the course of conducting business, Defendants committed  
24 "fraudulent business act[s] or practices" by, *inter alia*, making the mental clarity,  
25 memory and alertness representations (which also constitutes advertising within  
26 the meaning of §17200) regarding the Product in their advertising campaign,  
27 including the Product's packaging, as set forth more fully herein.



1 (5) Representing that [TruNature Ginkgo has] . . . approval,  
2 characteristics, . . . uses [and] benefits . . . which [it does] not  
3 have . . . .

4 \* \* \*

5 (7) Representing that [TruNature Ginkgo is] of a particular standard,  
6 quality or grade . . . if [it is] of another.

7 \* \* \*

8 (9) Advertising goods . . . with intent not to sell them as advertised.

9 \* \* \*

10 (16) Representing that [TruNature Ginkgo has] been supplied in accordance  
11 with a previous representation when [it has] not.

12 48. Defendants violated the Act by making the false, misleading and  
13 deceptive representations on each and every Product package.

14 49. As alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact and lost money  
15 or property as a result of Defendants’ conduct because she purchased TruNature  
16 Ginkgo in reliance on Defendants’ false representations.

17 50. Plaintiff and other members of the Class have in fact been deceived as  
18 a result of their reliance on Defendants’ material false representations described  
19 above. This reliance has caused harm to Plaintiff and other members of the Class  
20 who each purchased TruNature Ginkgo. Plaintiff and the other Class members  
21 have suffered injury in fact and lost money as a result of these deceptive and  
22 fraudulent practices.

23 51. Pursuant to California Civil Code §1782(d), Plaintiff and the Class  
24 seek a Court order for restitution and disgorgement.

25 52. Pursuant to §1782 of the Act, on December 15, 2014 and September  
26 30, 2016, respectively, Plaintiff notified Defendants Costco and NBTY in writing  
27 by certified mail of the particular violations of §1770 of the Act and demanded that

1 Defendants rectify the problems associated with the actions detailed above and  
2 give notice to all affected consumers of Defendants’ intent to so act.

3 53. Defendants failed to rectify or agree to rectify the problems associated  
4 with the actions detailed above and give notice to all affected consumers within 30  
5 days of the date of written notice pursuant to §1782 of the Act. Thus, Plaintiff  
6 further seeks actual, punitive and statutory damages, as appropriate.

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for a judgment:

- 9 A. Certifying the Class as requested herein;
- 10 B. Awarding restitution and disgorgement of Defendants’ revenues to  
11 Plaintiff and the proposed Class members;
- 12 C. Awarding actual, statutory and punitive damages, as appropriate;
- 13 D. Awarding attorneys’ fees and costs; and
- 14 E. Providing such further relief as may be just and proper.

15 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

16 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of her claims by jury to the extent authorized  
17 by law.

18 Dated: October 31, 2016

BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN  
& BALINT, P.C.

21 /s/ Patricia N. Syverson

22 Patricia N. Syverson (203111)  
23 Manfred P. Muecke (222893)  
24 600 W. Broadway, Suite 900  
San Diego, California 92101  
psyverson@bffb.com  
mmuecke@bffb.com  
Telephone: (619) 798-4593

25 BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN  
26 & BALINT, P.C.  
27 Elaine A. Ryan (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
2325 E. Camelback Rd., Suite 300  
28 Phoenix, AZ 85016

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

eryan@bffb.com  
Telephone: (602) 274-1100

BOODELL & DOMANSKIS, LLC  
Stewart M. Weltman (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
Max A. Stein (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
One North Franklin, Suite 1200  
Chicago, IL 60606  
sweltman@boodlaw.com  
mstein@boodlaw.com  
Telephone: (312) 938-1670

SIPRUT PC  
Joseph Siprut (*To be Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
17 North State Street  
Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Jsiprut@siprut.com  
Telephone: 312.236.0000

Attorneys for Plaintiff



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 31, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the Electronic Mail Notice List.

I certify under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on October 31, 2016 in San Diego, California.

/s/ Patricia N. Syverson  
Patricia N. Syverson (203111)  
600 W. Broadway, Suite 900  
San Diego, California 92101  
psyverson@bffb.com  
Telephone: (619) 798-4593