	Case 3:17-cv-01152-JLS-BGS Docume	nt 1 F	=iled 06/08/1	7 PageID.1	Page 1 of 41		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CARLSON LYNCH SWEET KILPELA & CARPENTER, LLP Todd D Carpenter (CA 234464) 402 West Broadway, 29th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619-756-6994 Facsimile: 619-756-6991 tcarpenter@carlsonlynch.com MILSTEIN ADELMAN LLP Gillian L. Wade, (CA 299124) Allison R. Willett, (CA 238430) 2800 Donald Douglas Loop North Santa Monica, CA 90405						
9	Telephone: 888-835-8055 Facsimile: 310-396-9635						
10							
11							
12 13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs [Additional Counsel on Signature Page] UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
14							
15							
16							
17	PAIGE PETKEVICIUS, PETER		Case No. <u>'</u>	7CV1152 JL	BGS		
18	RIPLEY on behalf of themselves and a others similarly situated,		CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:				
19							
20	Plaintiffs,			ION OF UN FITION LAV			
21	V.		COMPETITION LAW, Business and Professions Code § 17200, <i>et</i>				
22	NBTY, Inc., a Delaware Corporation;		<i>seq.</i> ; 2. VIOLATION OF UNFAIR				
23	NATURE'S BOUNTY, INC., a New		COMPETITION LAW, Business				
24	York Corporation; REXALL SUNDOWN, INC., a Florida		and Professions Code § 17200, et				
25	Corporation,	3	 seq.; 3. VIOLATION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW, Business and Professions Code § 17200, et 				
26	Defendants.						
27							
28							
	CLASS ACT	ION CO	OMPLAINT				

	Case 3:17-cv-01152-JLS-BGS Document 1	L Filed 06/08/17 PageID.2 Page 2 of 41
1		seq.;
1		
2		4. FALSE AND MISLEADING
3		ADVERTISING, Business and
4		Professions Code § 17500, <i>et seq.</i> ; 5. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA
		LEGAL REMEDIES ACT, Civil
5		Code § 1750, <i>et seq.</i> ;
6		6. BREACH OF CALIFORNIA
7		EXPRESS WARRANTY;
		7. VIOLATION OF NEW YORK
8		GENERAL BUSINESS LAW, N.Y.
9		Gen. Bus. Law § 349;
10		8. VIOLATION OF NEW YORK GENERAL BUSINESS LAW, N.Y.
		Gen. Bus. Law § 350; and
11		9. BREACH OF CALIFORNIA
12		EXPRESS WARRANTY.
13		
		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
14		

Plaintiff Paige Petkevicius and Plaintiff Peter Ripley, individually and on 16 behalf of all others similarly situated (hereinafter collectively "Plaintiffs" or the 17 "Class"), bring this consumer class action against NBTY, Inc. ("NBTY"), Nature's 18 Bounty, Inc. ("Nature's Bounty"), and Rexall Sundown, Inc. ("Sundown") 19 (hereinafter collectively "Defendants"), for unlawful, unfair, and deceptive business 20practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200 et 21 seq., California Business & Professions Code Section 17500 et seq., California Civil 22 Code Section 1750 et seq., Breach of California Express Warranty, violation of New 23 York's General Business Law Sections 349 & 3505, and Breach of New York's 24 Express Warranty and allege as follows: 25

> CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 2 -

26

27

	Case 3:17-cv-01152-JLS-BGS Document 1 Filed 06/08/17 PageID.3 Page 3 of 41					
1	NATURE OF THE ACTION					
2	1. Defendants distribute, market and sell:					
3	a. "Nature's Bounty Double Strength Standardized Extract Ginkgo					
4	Biloba 120 mg" (100 Capsules);					
5	b. "Nature's Bounty Standardized Strength Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg"					
6	(200 Capsules);					
7	c. "Nature's Bounty Standardized Strength Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg"					
8	(60 Tablets); and					
9	d. "Nature's Bounty Whole Herb Ginkgo Biloba 400 mg plus 60					
10	mg Standardized Extract" (120 Tablets)					
11	(collectively, "Nature's Bounty Products").					
12	2. Additionally, Defendants distribute, market and sell:					
13	a. "Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg" (200 Tablets);					
14	b. "Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg" (120 Tablets); and					
15	c. "Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg" (100 Tablets).					
16	(collectively, "Sundown Naturals Products").					
17	3. Defendants represent that the primary active ingredient in the Nature's					
18	Bounty and Sundown Naturals Products (collectively, the "Ginkgo biloba					
19	Products") is Ginkgo biloba extract.					
20	4. Defendants advertise and market the Ginkgo biloba Product and their					
21	active ingredients as purportedly providing a variety of health benefits and relief					
22	from various symptoms. Specifically, through an extensive and uniform nationwide					
23	advertising campaign, Defendants make the following representations and					
24	warranties on the Ginkgo biloba Products' labels:					
25	 "Supports Healthy Brain Function and Circulation" 					
26	 "Supports Healthy Brain Function" 					
27	"Promotes Healthy Brain Function & Circulation"					
28	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 3 -					

	Case 3:17-cv-01152-JLS-BGS Document 1 Filed 06/08/17 PageID.4 Page 4 of 41						
1	• "helps support memory, especially occasional mild memory problems						
2	associated with aging"						
3	 "Clinically Studied Dosage for Brain Function" 						
4	 "Helps Support Mental Alertness" 						
5	• " Ginkgo helps improve memory, especially occasional mild memory						
6	problems associated with aging"						
7	"Promotes Healthy Brain Function" and						
8	"Helps Support Mental Alertness"						
9	See Exs. A-G.						
10	5. However, to the detriment of consumers, all available, reliable,						
11	scientific evidence demonstrates that the Ginkgo biloba Products have no efficacy						
12	at all, are ineffective in the improvement of cognitive health, and provide no benefits						
13	related to increasing the memory and healthy functioning of consumers' brains.						
14	Numerous scientifically valid studies, performed by independent researchers and						
15	published in reputable medical journals, have been conducted on the Ginkgo biloba						
16	Products, and they have universally demonstrated that the supplement has absolutely						
17	no scientific value in the improvement of brain function, treatment of memory						
18	problems or cognitive health.						
19	6. Defendants convey their uniform, deceptive message to consumers						
20	through a variety of media including their website and online promotional materials,						
21	and at the point of purchase, on the Ginkgo biloba Products' packaging/labeling,						
22	where it cannot be missed by consumers. The only reason a consumer would						
23	purchase the Ginkgo biloba Products is to obtain the advertised cognitive health						
24	benefits and brain function support, which the Ginkgo biloba Products do not						
25	provide.						
26	7. As a result of Defendants' deceptive advertising and false claims						

7. As a result of Defendants' deceptive advertising and false claims
regarding the efficacy of the Ginkgo biloba Products, Plaintiffs and the proposed

1 class have purchased products which do not perform as represented, and they have 2 been harmed in the amount they paid for the Ginkgo biloba Products.

3 8. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and other similarly 4 situated consumers who have purchased Defendants' Ginkgo biloba Products, to halt 5 the dissemination of this false, misleading and deceptive advertising message; to 6 correct the false and misleading perception Defendants have created and fostered in 7 the minds of consumers; and to obtain redress for those who have purchased 8 Defendants' Ginkgo biloba Products. Based on violations of California and New 9 York state laws and Defendants' breaches of express warranties, Plaintiffs seek 10 monetary relief for consumers who purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products.

JURISDICTION

11

25

27

28

12 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under the Class Action 13 Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. section 1332(d) in that: (1) this is a class action involving 14 more than 100 class members; (2) Plaintiff Petkevicius is a citizen of the State of 15 California, Plaintiff Ripley is a citizen of the State of New York, and Defendants are 16 citizens of the States of Delaware, New York, and Florida; and (3) the amount in 17 controversy exceeds the sum of \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

18 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because 19 Defendants conduct business in California. Defendants have marketed, promoted, 20distributed, and sold the Ginkgo biloba Products in California, and Defendants have 21 sufficient minimum contacts with this State and/or have sufficiently availed 22 themselves of the markets in this State through their promotion, sales, distribution 23 and marketing within this State to render the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court permissible. 24

VENUE

26 11. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(a) and (b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred while Plaintiff Petkevicius resided in this judicial district.

PARTIES

3 12. Plaintiff Paige Petkevicius is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an 4 individual residing in San Diego County, California. Plaintiff Petkevicius purchased 5 Nature's Bounty Products and Sundown Naturals Products in or about March 2014 6 at the CVS pharmacy located at 8813 Via La Jolla Drive, La Jolla, California 92037. 7 In doing so, Plaintiff Petkevicius relied upon Defendants' advertising and other 8 promotional materials, including information on the Products' packaging, 9 containing the misrepresentations alleged herein, including the claims that the 10 Ginkgo biloba Products will promote, improve or support improved memory and 11 brain functioning. Plaintiff Petkevicius consumed the Ginkgo biloba Products as 12 directed by Defendants and did not receive any of the advertised benefits associated 13 with the Ginkgo biloba Products. She would not have purchased the Ginkgo Biloba 14 Products had she known Defendants' representations were false.

15 13. Plaintiff Peter Ripley is, and at all times relevant hereto was, an 16 individual residing in Brooklyn, New York. Plaintiff Ripley most recently purchased Nature's Bounty Products in or about early May of 2017 from Amazon.com. In 17 18 doing so, Plaintiff Ripley relied upon advertising and other promotional materials, 19 including information on the Nature's Bounty Products' packaging, containing the 20misrepresentations alleged herein, including the claims the Nature's Bounty 21 Products will promote, improve or support improved memory and brain functioning. 22 Plaintiff Ripley consumed the Nature's Bounty Products as directed by Defendants 23 and did not receive any of the advertised benefits associated with the Nature's 24 Bounty Products. He would not have purchased the Nature's Bounty Products had 25 he known Defendants' representations were false.

26 14. Defendant NBTY, Inc. is a corporation organized under the laws of27 Delaware with its principal place of business at 2100 Smithtown Avenue,

1

Ronkonkoma, New York. NBTY manufactures vitamins and dietary supplements,
 including the Gingko Biloba Products, and markets its products under various name
 brands. NBTY created and/or authorized the false, misleading and deceptive
 advertisements and packaging of the Gingko Biloba Products. NBTY, directly and
 through its agents, has substantial contacts with and receives substantial benefits and
 income from and through the States of California and New York.

7 15. Defendant Nature's Bounty, Inc. ("Nature's Bounty") is a corporation 8 organized under the laws of New York with its principal place of business at 2100 9 Smithtown Avenue, Ronkonkoma, New York. Nature's Bounty manufactures the Nature's Bounty Products. Nature's Bounty created and/or authorized the false, 1011 misleading and deceptive advertisements and packaging of the Nature's Bounty 12 Products. Nature's Bounty, directly and through its agents, has substantial contacts 13 with and receives substantial benefits and income from and through the States of California and New York. On information and belief, Nature's Bounty is wholly 14 15 owned by Defendant NBTY, Inc.

16 Defendant Rexall Sundown, Inc. ("Sundown") is a corporation 16. 17 organized under the laws of Florida with its principal place of business at 2100 18 Smithtown Avenue, Ronkonkoma, New York. Sundown manufactures the Sundown 19 Naturals Products. Sundown created and/or authorized the false, misleading and 20deceptive advertisements and packaging of the Sundown Naturals Products. 21 Sundown, directly and through its agents, has substantial contacts with and receives 22 substantial benefits and income from and through the States of California and New 23 York. On information and belief, Sundown is wholly owned by Defendant NBTY. 24 Inc.

25 17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thus allege, that at all times
26 herein mentioned, each of the Defendants was the agent, employee, representative,
27 partner, joint venturer, and/or alter ego of the other Defendants and, in doing the

things alleged herein, was acting within the course and scope of such agency,
 employment, or representation, on behalf of such partnership or joint venture, and/or
 as such alter ego, with the authority, permission, consent, and/or ratification of the
 other Defendants.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

A. Background

5

6

7

8

9

25

26

27

28

18. Few things are more unnerving than memory lapses. According to a survey by the Marist Institute for Public Opinion, Alzheimer's is the most feared disease – more than cancer, stroke, heart disease or diabetes.¹

10 19. A growing trend in the supplement industry is single ingredient dietary
11 supplement products claiming to improve memory loss. Sales of these products have
12 exploded in recent years due in large part to media reports of "miracle" memory loss
13 and brain enhancing supplements.

14 20. Not surprisingly, this lucrative market has attracted a variety of
15 hucksters seeking to "cash in" on America's fear of memory loss by hawking an
16 array of products and services, many promising miraculous results.

17 21. Ginkgo biloba fossils date back 250 million years, and the use of
18 Ginkgo biloba leaf extract as a folk medicine dates back centuries to traditional
19 Chinese medicine. Today, Ginkgo biloba leaf extract is marketed in the United States
20 as a dietary supplement, thereby escaping the United States Food and Drug
21 Administration's ("FDA") requirement for manufacturers to test the effectiveness of
22 their products prior to their marketing and sale.

23 22. On information and belief, Defendants' market research shows that the24 number one reason consumers use Ginkgo biloba is for brain health, specifically for

¹ Marist Poll, Alzheimer's Most Feed Disease (Nov. 15, 2012), *available at* <u>http://maristpoll.marist.edu/1114-alzheimers-most-feared-disease/.</u>

1 memory and mental focus.

2 23. Defendants seek to take advantage of the public's desire for these
3 "miracle" supplements by promising to elevate mental capacities.

24. 4 Defendants manufacture, market and sell: 5 Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 120 mg (100 Capsules) a. b. Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (200 Capsules) 6 7 Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (60 Tablets) c. 8 d. Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 400 mg plus 60 mg Standardized 9 Extract (120 Tablets) Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (200 Tablets) 10 e. f. 11 Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (120 Tablets) Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (100 Tablets) 12 g. 13 25. Defendants specifically target the elderly by claiming: "Ginkgo helps 14 improve memory, especially occasional mild memory problems associated with 15 aging." See Exs. A-G.

16 26. Unfortunately, the promise of enhanced mental acuity and prevention17 of memory loss is nothing but a sham.

18 27. Unbiased, randomized, double blind clinical human studies conclude
19 that Ginkgo biloba supplements do not promote, improve, or support memory or
20 cognitive function.

21 28. Throughout the liability period, as defined below, Defendants have
22 engaged in advertising and marketing campaigns that utilize claims of improved
23 memory and cognitive ability, conveying the message to consumers the Ginkgo
24 biloba Products will provide health benefits, irrespective of whether the claims are
25 factually and scientifically accurate.

26 29. As a result of these deceptive claims, Defendants sell hundreds of27 thousands of units of the Ginkgo biloba Products through stores such as Albertsons,

Safeway, CVS Pharmacy, Walgreens, Whole Foods, and many other retail and on-1 2 line stores.

3

4

5

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

B.

Defendants' Advertising and Marketing of the Products

30. In the now ultra-competitive market for supplements, those who manufacture and sell such supplements, including Defendants, conduct extensive consumer research, upon which they base advertising claims they know will 6 differentiate their products from others in the marketplace.

8 31. Upon information and belief, Defendants have expert knowledge of the consumer market for supplements and have designed coordinated, uniform 9 advertising and marketing for the Ginkgo biloba Products using a variety of 10 deceptive claims. 11

12 32. Since launching the Ginkgo biloba Products, Defendants have 13 consistently conveyed the message to consumers throughout the United States, including California and New York, that the Ginkgo biloba Products provide 14 15 cognitive health benefits, and/or memory benefits, and/or brain functioning support.

Defendants advertise their Nature's Bounty Products will promote, 16 33. improve or support memory and cognitive ability. Specifically: 17

- Prior to 2012, the Nature's Bounty Products' labels contained the a. following representations:
 - "Promotes Healthy Brain Function & Circulation;" i.
 - "Helps Support Mental Alertness;" and ii.
 - "Ginkgo helps improve memory, especially occasional iii. mild memory problems associated with aging."
 - b. From 2012 to 2015, the Nature's Bounty Products' labels contained the following representations:
 - i. "Supports Healthy Brain Function & Circulation;"
 - ii. "Clinically Studied Dosage for Brain Function;" and

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 10 -

	Case 3:17-cv-01152	2-JLS-BGS Document 1 Filed 06/08/17 PageID.11 Page 11 of 41
1		iii. "Ginkgo helps support memory, especially occasional
2		mild memory problems associated with aging."
3	с.	In 2016, Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (200 Capsules)
4		Products' labels were changed to state, "Supports Healthy Brain
5		Function & Mental Alertness."
6	d.	In 2016, the Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 120 mg (100
7		Capsules) Products' labels were changed to state, "Supports
8		Healthy Brain Function & Circulation."
9	See Exs. A-D.	
10	34. Defer	ndants advertise their Sundown Naturals Products similarly.
11	Specifically:	
12	a.	As late as 2009, the Sundown Naturals Products' labels
13		contained the following representations:
14		i. "Promotes Healthy Brain Function;"
15		ii. "Ginkgo helps improve memory, especially occasional
16		mild memory problems associated with aging."
17	b.	From 2010 to 2015, the Sundown Naturals Products' labels
18		contained the following representations:
19		i. "Supports Healthy Brain Function;" and
20		ii. "Ginkgo helps support memory, especially occasional
21		mild memory problems associated with aging."
22	с.	In 2016, all of the Sundown Naturals Products' labels stated,
23		"Supports Healthy Brain Function," while the Sundown Naturals
24		Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (100 Tablets) also stated "Helps support
25		memory, especially occasional mild memory problems
26		associated with aging."
27	See Exs. E-G.	
28		
		CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

35. The label on the bottle for Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 120 mg (100
 Capsules) lists the sole active ingredient as "Ginkgo Biloba Extract (Ginkgo biloba)
 (leaf) (Standardized to contain 24% Ginkgo Flavone Glycosides, 28mg)." *See* Ex.
 A.

36. The label on the bottle for Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (200
Capsules) lists the sole active ingredient as "Ginkgo Biloba Extract (Ginkgo biloba)
(leaf) (Standardized to contain 24% Ginkgo Flavone Glycosides, 14.4mg)." *See* Ex.
B.

9 37. The label on the bottle for Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg (60
10 Tablets) lists the sole active ingredient as "Ginkgo Biloba Extract (Ginkgo biloba)
11 (leaf) (Standardized to contain 24% Ginkgo Flavone Glycosides, 14.4mg)." See Ex.
12 C.

38. The label on the bottle for Nature's Bounty Ginkgo Biloba 400 mg plus
60mg Standardized Extract (120 Tablets) lists the active ingredients as "Ginkgo
Biloba Extract (Ginkgo biloba) (leaf) (Standardized to contain 24% Ginkgo Flavone
Glycosides, 14.4mg)" and "Ginkgo Biloba (Ginkgo Biloba)(leaf)." *See* Ex. D.

39. The label on the bottle for Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg
(200 Tablets) lists the sole active ingredient as "Ginkgo Biloba Extract (Ginkgo
biloba) (leaf) (Standardized to contain 24% Ginkgo Flavone Glycosides, 14.4mg)."
See Ex. E.

40. The label on the bottle for Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg
(120 Tablets) lists the sole active ingredient as "Ginkgo Biloba Extract (Ginkgo
biloba) (leaf) (Standardized to contain 24% Ginkgo Flavone Glycosides, 14.4mg)." *See* Ex. F.

41. The label on the bottle for Sundown Naturals Ginkgo Biloba 60 mg
(100 Tablets) lists the sole active ingredient as "Ginkgo Biloba Extract (Ginkgo
biloba) (leaf) (Standardized to contain 24% Ginkgo Flavone Glycosides, 14.4mg)."

See Ex. G. 1

2 42. Plaintiffs and members of the Class have been, and will continue to be, 3 deceived or misled by Defendants' deceptive advertising claims. Each Class member purchased and consumed the Ginkgo biloba Products during the liability period and 4 5 in doing so, read and considered the advertising claims on the Ginkgo biloba 6 Products' labels and based their decisions to purchase the Ginkgo biloba Products 7 on the advertising claims. Defendants' advertising claims were a material factor, and 8 in fact, the <u>only</u> factor in influencing Plaintiffs' decisions to purchase and use the 9 Ginkgo biloba Products. Plaintiffs and the Class members would not have purchased 10 the Ginkgo biloba Products had they known that they did not provide the improved 11 memory and brain function support as advertised.

12 43. Unfortunately for Plaintiffs and Class members, Defendants' 13 advertising claims, in their entirety, are false and deceptive.

C. Defendants' Advertising Claims for the Ginkgo biloba Products are False and Deceptive

16 44. Despite Defendants' foregoing representations and warranties to the contrary, Ginkgo biloba does not promote, improve or support memory or mental 18 acuity.

19 45. Independent scientific studies confirm that the advertising claims that 20Defendants made on the Ginkgo biloba Products' labels, and that Plaintiffs and the 21 members of the Class relied upon in making their purchases, were false and 22 misleading. Despite knowledge of these studies, Defendants continued to make the 23 advertising claims, misleading Plaintiffs and members of the Class into believing the 24 Ginkgo biloba Products had an efficacy and would provide the benefits described in 25 their advertising.

26 46. Defendants knew or should have known that the Ginkgo biloba extract 27 present in the Ginkgo biloba Products does not provide any of the warranted benefits

28

14

15

as represented by Defendants' Ginkgo biloba Products' labels. To the contrary,
 competent and reliable scientific evidence has repeatedly demonstrated Ginkgo
 biloba supplements fail to show any improvement in mental cognition.

4 47. Three separate meta-studies on Gingko biloba published in 2002, 2007,
5 and 2012 evaluated all known published credible human scientific studies.² The
6 studies uniformly conclude Ginkgo biloba supplements have no positive effect on
7 cognitive functions in healthy individuals.³

a. In 2002, PH Canter and E. Ernst published "Ginkgo biloba: a smart drug? A systematic review of controlled trials of the cognitive effects of ginkgo biloba extracts in healthy people" in the University of Exeter Psychopharmacology Bulletin.⁴ The meta-study evaluates data in six computerized databases for placebo-controlled, double-blind trials of the effect of standardized Ginkgo biloba extracts on cognitive function in healthy subjects. The study concludes "[t]he use of Ginkgo biloba as a "smart" drug cannot be recommended on the basis of the evidence available to date, and there is a particular need for further long-term trials with healthy subjects."⁵

⁴ PH Canter & E. Ernst, *Ginkgo biloba: a smart drug? A systematic review of controlled trials of the cognitive effects of ginkgo biloba extracts in healthy people*, 36 Psychopharmacol Bulletin 108, (2002), available at

26 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12473969.

 $27 \int 5 Id.$

28

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

 ² A meta-analysis contrasts and combines results from different studies in an attempt to identify patterns among study results, sources of disagreement, and other relationships between the studies.

³ K. R. Laws et al., UK, *Is Ginkgo biloba a cognitive enhancer in healthy individuals? A meta-analysis*, 27 Human Psychopharmacology 527, (2012), available at <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hup.2259.</u>

- b. In 2007, PH Canter and E. Ernst published an update to their 2002 study titled, "Ginkgo biloba is not a smart drug: an updated systematic review of randomized clinical trials testing the nootropic effects of G. biloba extracts in healthy people."⁶ The 2007 meta-study reviews available research added to the then-existing data set from the previous 2002 meta-study. Canter and Ernst conclude; "[t]he collated evidence from 15 randomized clinical trials provides no convincing evidence that G. biloba extracts ingested either as a single dose or over a longer period has a positive effect on any aspect of cognitive performance in healthy people under the age of 60 years."⁷
- c. In 2012, K. Laws, H. Sweetnam and T. Kondel published a metastudy titled "Is Ginkgo biloba a cognitive enhancer in healthy individuals? A meta-analysis" in the journal of Human Psychopharmacology at the University of Hertfordshire, UK.⁸ This meta-study, similar to the aforementioned meta-studies of 2002 and 2007, gathered data from all relevant credible studies on Ginkgo biloba's effect as a cognitive enhancer. Here, the authors emphasize, "[g]iven that G. biloba is marketed worldwide as a memory enhancer or touted to at least 'maintain

⁶ PH Canter & E. Ernst, *Ginkgo biloba is not a smart drug: an updated systematic review of randomized clinical trials testing the nootropic effects of G. biloba extracts in healthy people*, 22 Human Psychopharmacology 265, (2007), available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hup.843.

⁷ *Id.* at 277.

⁸ Laws, et al., *supra* note 5.

memory', it is crucial to establish the validity for such claims."⁹ This meta-study concludes "[g]. biloba has no significant impact on memory, executive function or attention with all effect sizes nonsignificant and effectively at zero."¹⁰ Further, "we found no evidence that G. biloba improves memory, executive or attention functioning in healthy individuals."11

7 48. Overwhelmingly, the consensus of reliable scientific studies concludes 8 Ginkgo biloba supplements do nothing to enhance or support memory or cognitive 9 abilities in healthy adults.

10 A 2002 study conducted by P. Solomon, PhD and published in a. the Journal of the American Medical Association titled "Ginkgo 12 for Memory Enhancement," studied the effects of over-the-13 counter Ginkgo biloba products in 203 subjects in a six-week 14 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel group 15 trial.¹² Solomon and co-researchers conclude "[t]he results of this 16 6-week study indicate that ginkgo did not facilitate performance 17 on standard neuropsychological tests of learning, memory, 18 attention and concentration or naming and verbal fluency in 19 elderly adults without cognitive impairment."¹³ The authors found, "[t]he ginkgo group also did not differ from the control

28

⁹ Id.

 10 *Id*. 11 *Id*.

 13 Id

available at

1

2

3

4

5

6

11

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 16 -

¹² P. R. Solomon et al., Ginkgo for Memory Enhancement 288 JAMA 835, (2002),

http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=195207.

group in terms of self-reported memory function or global rating by spouses, friends, and relatives. These data suggest that when taken following the manufacturer's instructions, ginkgo provides no measurable benefit in memory or related cognitive function to adults with healthy cogitative function."¹⁴ Solomon notes, "[d]espite the manufacturer's claims of improved memory in healthy adults, we were unable to identify any well-controlled studies that document this claim."¹⁵ Solomon further concludes "this study does not support the manufacture's claims of the benefits of ginkgo on learning and memory."¹⁶

b. In a 2002 article on the Cleveland Clinic Center for Continuing Education Pharmacotherapy Update, titled "Ginkgo Biloba and Memory," the Department of Pharmacy observed, "[d]espite the lack of well-controlled studies to support the use of Ginkgo biloba leaf extract for prevention and treatment of memory impairment, ginkgo products continue to be heavily marketed and widely used."¹⁷ The article concludes "[t]he use of ginkgo biloba leaf extract for memory impairments marketed and targeted at the healthy adult that experiences forgetfulness. Currently, the claims that Ginkgo biloba has beneficial effects on

23 ¹⁴ *Id*.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 24 ¹⁵ *Id.*
 - $\begin{bmatrix} 16 & Id. \end{bmatrix}$

 ¹⁷ A. Popa, Pharmacology Update, *Ginkgo Biloba and Memory*, available at
 http://www.clevelandclinicmeded.com/medicalpubs/pharmacy/sepoct02/ginkgo.ht
 m (last visited Nov. 8, 2012).

learning and memory are not supported by the literature."¹⁸

- c. In 2009, the Journal of the American Medical Association published the largest study to date entitled "*Ginkgo biloba for preventing cognitive decline in older adults: a randomized trial.*"¹⁹ The 8 year study included 3069 participants aged 72-96 years. Researchers concluded that 240 mg of Ginkgo biloba extract did not result in less cognitive decline in older adults with normal cognition or with mild cognitive impairment than in the placebo control group.²⁰
- d. In the 2009 study "*Ginkgo biloba for cognitive impairment and dementia*," researchers reviewed 36 trials, nine of which were six months long (2016 participants total).²¹ In the more recent and more reliable trials, three out of four found no benefits for cognitive decline.²² Researchers concluded that while Ginkgo biloba might be safe to ingest, ". . . evidence that [it] has predictable and clinically significant benefit for people with dementia or cognitive impairment is inconsistent and unreliable."²³
 - e. In 2013, the Support Care Cancer published "The use of Ginkgo biloba for the prevention of chemotherapy-related cognitive
- 18 *Id*.

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

 20 *Id*.

²¹ Jacqueline Birks and John Grimley Evans, *Ginkgo biloba for cognitive impairment and dementia*, Cochrane Database Systematic Review, Jan. 21, 2009.
 ²² Id.
 ²³ Id.

¹⁹ B.E. Snitz et al, *Ginkgo biloba for preventing cognitive decline in older adults: a randomized trial*, 302 JAMA 2663 (2009).

dysfunction in women receiving adjuvant treatment for breast cancer."²⁴ Researchers found that in 166 women, 120 mg a day for up to 12 months did not provide any evidence that Ginkgo biloba can help prevent cognitive changes from chemotherapy.²⁵

In 2014, the authors of "Substances used and prevalence rates of enhancement healthy pharmacological cognitive among subjects" studied 176 participants who ingested 120 mg daily of Ginkgo biloba over a six-month period.²⁶ The results indicated that there was no evidence that an average dose of Ginkgo biloba extract created any benefit in mild to moderate dementia.

11 To date, although there are some studies that purportedly support the 49. 12 notion that ingestion of Ginkgo biloba can provide cognitive health benefits, those 13 studies suffer myriad fatal methodological deficiencies, including utilizing scientifically unreliable sample sizes, not utilizing scientifically sound testing 14 15 procedures, and suffering from publication bias, i.e., the funding, publication or 16 sponsorship of the study was provided by a party who stood to benefit from a positive finding. Or, alternatively, the studies used a larger supplementation of Ginkgo biloba 18 than that provided by Defendants' suggested, or recommended consumption.

19 In contrast, Plaintiffs' allegations are based upon scientifically valid 50. 20 peer-reviewed studies, which have been published in independent, reputable scientific journals, and which conclusively demonstrate that the Ginkgo biloba

23 ²⁴ Debra L. Barton et al., *The use of Ginkgo biloba for the prevention of* chemotherapy-related cognitive dysfunction in women receiving adjuvant 24 treatment for breast cancer, 21 Support Care Cancer 1185 (2013). 25 25 *Id*.

27 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

21

22

f.

²⁶ AG Franke et al., Substances used and prevalence rates of pharmacological 26 cognitive enhancement among healthy subjects, 264 Suppl 1, Eur. Arch Psychiatry Clin. Neurosci. 83-90 (2014).

Products do not provide the benefits advertised by Defendants and may even cause
 harm to consumers.

51. In addition to the lack of positive cognitive benefits, Ginkgo biloba may
have negative carcinogenic effects. The National Toxicology Program ("NTP")
studied the effects of Ginkgo biloba on rats and mice in small and large doses. In the *NTP Technical Report on the Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Ginkgo Biloba Extract in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice*, researchers concluded that
Ginkgo biloba extract causes cancers of the thyroid gland in male and female rats
and male mice and cancers of the liver in male and female mice.²⁷

52. As a result of the serious implications of the NTP study, and the lack of
scientific evidence supporting safe use and positive effects of Ginkgo biloba, the
Center for Science in the Public Interest addressed the director of the Food and Drug
Administration ("FDA"), emphasizing that claims regarding Ginkgo biloba's
supposed health benefits, including those related to memory and cognitive function,
are false and should be stopped and imploring him to issue a directive that Ginkgo
is no longer "Generally Recognized As Safe." *See* Ex. H.

17 53. The widespread popularity of Ginkgo biloba is simply a testament to
18 the power of marketing rather than to any measurable brain benefits.²⁸

25 <u>memory?utm_source=promo&utm_medium=email&utm_content=body1b&utm_ca</u>

26 mpaign=PA111812&j=2979281

 20
 6&e=wolchansky@halunenlaw.com&l=16223912_HTML&u=347687378&mid=1

 27
 48797&jb=0 (last visited Nov. 19, 2012).

²⁰
²⁷ Nat'l Inst. Of Health, *Technical Report on the Toxicology and Carcinogenesis*²¹ Studies of Ginkgo Biloba Extract in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice, NTP TR
²² 578, Publication No. 13-5920, available at

²² http://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/htdocs/lt_rpts/tr578_508.pdf.

²⁸ Kirk R. Daffner (ed.), Harvard Medical School, *Improving Memory* – *Understanding age-related memory loss*" (2012) ("Harvard Report"), at 46,

²⁴ available at http://www.health.harvard.edu/special_health_reports/improving-

54. Accordingly, Defendants' marketing is deceptive and misleading as the
 claims are specifically refuted by competent and reliable scientific evidence as set
 forth above.

4 55. As a result, Plaintiffs and the Class members have been damaged by
5 their purchases of the Ginkgo biloba Products and have been deceived into
6 purchasing a product that they believed, based on Defendants' representations,
7 provided benefits when, in fact, they did not.

8 56. Defendants have reaped enormous profits from their false marketing9 and sale of the Ginkgo biloba Products.

10

D.

The Class' Claims are Subject to Equitable Tolling

11 57. Plaintiff Petkevicius incorporates by reference and realleges all12 allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

13 58. The statute of limitations applicable to Plaintiff Petkevicius's and the
14 California Class's complaint should be tolled pursuant to the doctrine of equitable
15 tolling.

16 59. Equitable tolling is a judge-created doctrine that suspends a statute of
17 limitations to ensure fairness to litigants and avoid forfeiture of claims. The doctrine
18 also extends to unnamed class members in class actions because without it,
19 "potential class members would be induced to file protective actions to preserve their
20 claims, thus depriving class actions of their ability to secure efficiency and economy
21 of litigation." *Hatfield v. Halifax*, 564 F.3d 1177, 1187 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal
22 citations and quotations omitted).

California's equitable tolling principles apply where there has been "(1)
timely notice to the defendant in the filing of the first claim; (2) lack of prejudice to
the defendant in gathering evidence to defend against the second claim; and (3) good
faith and reasonable conduct by the plaintiff in filing the second claim." *Hatfield*,
564 F.3d at 1185.

61. Plaintiff Petkevicius filed the first lawsuit on behalf of herself and the 1 California Class on November 3, 2014, alleging false advertising claims arising from 2 3 Defendant's sale of Ginkgo Biloba. On March 24, 2017, the Court dismissed the 4 action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, namely, for failure to meet the requisite amount in controversy pursuant to CAFA. The first lawsuit, originally pursuing both 5 a California and Multi-State Classes, alleged identical claims, arose from the same 6 injury, and was based on the same facts as those alleged in the instant action. Thus, 7 8 the first lawsuit sufficiently put Defendants on notice of the substance and nature of Plaintiff Petkevicius's claims. Further, because fact discovery ended prior to 9 dismissal, there is a lack of prejudice to Defendants in gathering evidence to defend 10 11 against the instant action. Lastly, Plaintiff acted in good faith and diligently pursued 12 her claims by filing the instant lawsuit in under three months from the date of 13 dismissal of the first action.

62. Since the initial lawsuit was dismissed for lack of subject matter
jurisdiction, Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class are not attempting to relitigate an earlier adverse decision on the merits of any of their claims.

17 63. THEREFORE, to the extent equitable tolling operates to toll claims by
18 Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class against Defendants, the California
19 Class statutory period should be adjusted accordingly.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

60. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. Plaintiffs seek to represent the following classes:

A. The "California Class," which consists of: All consumers within the State of California who purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products during the applicable liability period for their personal use, rather than for resale or distribution. Excluded from the California Class are Defendants' current or former officers, directors, and employees;

	Case 3:17-cv-0115	2-JLS-I	3GS Docu	ment 1	Filed 06/08	/17 Pagell	D.23	Page 23 of 4	1
1 2					and Defend vsuit is assi		the j	udicial	
2 3 4	В.	withi	n the State	of New	which con York who the applica	purchased	the C	Ginkgo	
5 6		their Exclu	personal u ided from	ise, rath the N	er than for ew York (icers, direc	resale or Class are	distril Defer	oution. Idants'	
7 8		office	er to whom		and Defend vsuit is assi		the j	udicial	
9	(collectively the "Class").								
10	61. The because:	require	ments of F	ederal F	Rule of Civi	l Procedure	e 23 a	re satisfied	
11	A.	Num	erosity [.] Th	e memh	ers of each	class are s	o num	erous that	
12									
13	is presently unknown to Plaintiffs, based on Defendants' volume of sales, Plaintiffs								
14	· ·						5		
15	B. <u>Commonality</u> : There are questions of law and fact that are							e	
16									
17	include the follow			•			•		
18		i.	Whether	Defend	ants falsely	advertise	and	misrepresen	t
19			the benef	fits of th	e Ginkgo b	iloba Prod	ucts;		
20		ii.	Whether	Defend	ants' mass	media adv	ertisir	ng and/or th	e
21			packagin	g for th	e Ginkgo b	iloba Prod	lucts i	s misleadin	g
22			and decep	ptive;					
23		iii.	Whether	Defend	ants' labeli	ng and/or	packa	iging for th	e
24			Ginkgo b	iloba Pr	oducts is m	isleading, f	false a	nd/or illegal	l;
25		iv.	Whether	Defend	lants repres	sent to co	onsum	ers that th	e
26			Ginkgo	biloba	Products	have cha	racter	istics, uses	5,
27									
28			CIACO			T			
			CLASS	ACTION - 23	COMPLAIN	1			

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

benefits or qualities that the Ginkgo biloba Products do not have;

- Whether Defendants knew or should have known that the Ginkgo biloba Products do not have the characteristics, uses, benefits or qualities for which Defendants advertised the Ginkgo biloba Products;
- vi. Whether Defendants represented that the Ginkgo biloba Products are of a particular standard, quality, or grade, when they are of another;
- vii. Whether Defendants advertised the Ginkgo biloba Products with intent to sell them not as advertised;
- viii. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in marketing and distributing the Ginkgo biloba Products;
- ix. Whether Defendants engaged in false advertising with respect to the Ginkgo biloba Products;
- x. The nature and extent of damages and other remedies to which the wrongful conduct of Defendants entitles the Class members;
- whether Defendants' representations, concealments and non-disclosures concerning the Ginkgo biloba Products violate the CLRA, FAL and/or the UCL;
- whether Defendants' representations, concealments and non-disclosures concerning the Ginkgo biloba Products violate the N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §§ 349 & 3450;
- xiii. Whether the Class is entitled to restitution; and
- xiv. Whether Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to attorneys'

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 24 -

fees and expenses, and in what amount.

C. <u>Typicality</u>: Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the class
members because Plaintiffs suffered the same injury as the class members—*i.e.*,
Plaintiffs purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products based on Defendants' misleading
advertising claims.

D. <u>Adequacy</u>: Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and
protect the interests of the members of each class. Plaintiffs do not have any interests
that are adverse to those of the class members. Plaintiffs have retained competent
counsel experienced in class action litigation and intend to prosecute this action
vigorously.

E. 11 <u>Superiority</u>: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class action treatment will 12 permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common 13 claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary 14 15 duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would engender. Since the damages suffered by individual class members are relatively small, the 16 expense and burden of individual litigation make it virtually impossible for the class 17 members to seek redress for the wrongful conduct alleged, while an important public 18 interest will be served by addressing the matter as a class action. 19

20 62. If necessary, notice of this action may be affected to the proposed21 class through publication.

63. Unless a Class is certified, Defendants will retain monies received as a
result of its conduct that were taken from Plaintiffs and Class members.

- 25 -

24	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
25	VIOLATION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW
26	(CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200, et seq). Unlawful Business Acts and Practices
27	
28	
	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

64. Plaintiff Petkevicius incorporates by reference and realleges all
 allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

3

4

65. Plaintiff Petkevicius brings this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed California Class against Defendants.

5 66. As alleged herein, Plaintiff Petkevicius has standing to pursue this claim as Plaintiff Petkevicius has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or 6 property as a result of Defendants' actions. Specifically, Plaintiff Petkevicius 7 8 purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products for her own personal use. In so doing, Plaintiff Petkevicius relied upon the false representations that the Ginkgo biloba 9 Products would cause or assist in improved memory and brain function as referenced 10 above. Plaintiff Petkevicius used the Ginkgo biloba Products as directed and did not 11 receive any of the advertised benefits. Plaintiff Petkevicius would not have 12 purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products had she known Defendants' advertising 13 claims were false. 14

15 67. The actions of Defendants, as alleged herein, constitute illegal and
16 unlawful practices committed in violation of the Business & Professions Code
17 §17200.

18 68. Defendants have unlawfully marketed and advertised the Ginkgo biloba
19 Products because Defendants: (1) violate sections 1770(a)(5), 1770(a)(7) and
20 1770(a)(9) of the CLRA, *Civil Code* § 1750, *et seq.*; (2) violate sections 17200 *et seq.*21 and 17500 *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code; and (3) violate sections 111330
22 and 111445 of the California Health & Safety Code.

69. Moreover, Defendants' manufacturing, marketing, advertising,
packaging, labeling, distributing, and selling of the Ginkgo biloba Products violates
California's Sherman Act, Cal. Health & Safety Code §109875, *et seq*. The Sherman
Act defines a "person" as "any individual, firm, partnership, trust, corporation,
limited liability company, company, estate, public or private institution, association,

organization, group, city, county, city and county, political subdivision of this state,
 other governmental agency within the state, and any representative, agent, or agency
 of any of the foregoing." *Cal. Health & Safety Code*, §109995. Defendants are
 corporations and, therefore, are "persons" within the meaning of the Sherman Act.

70. In relevant part, a drug is misbranded if its labeling is false or
misleading in any particular way. *Cal. Health & Safety Code* §§111330, 111445.

7 71. Plaintiff Petkevicius and other California Class members were misled
8 and, because the misrepresentations were uniform and material, believed that the
9 Ginkgo biloba Products would provide cognitive benefits as advertised.

10 72. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendants11 legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein.

12 73. Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class reserve the right to allege
13 other violations of law which constitute other unlawful business acts or practices.
14 Such conduct is ongoing and continues to this date.

15 74. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Petkevicius prays for the relief as set forth16 below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200, et seq.) Unfair Business Acts and Practices

20 75. Plaintiff Petkevicius incorporates by reference and realleges all21 allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

76. Plaintiff Petkevicius brings this claim individually and on behalf of theproposed California Class against Defendants.

77. As alleged herein, Plaintiff Petkevicius has standing to pursue this
claim as Plaintiff Petkevicius has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or
property as a result of Defendants' actions. Specifically, Plaintiff Petkevicius
27

28

17

18

purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products for her own personal use. In so doing, Plaintiff
 Petkevicius relied upon the false representations that the Ginkgo biloba Products
 would cause or assist in improved memory and brain function as referenced above.
 Plaintiff Petkevicius used the Ginkgo biloba Products as directed and did not receive
 any of the advertised benefits. Plaintiff Petkevicius would not have purchased the
 Ginkgo biloba Products had she known Defendants' advertising claims were false.

7 78. California Business & Professions Code § 17200 prohibits any "unfair
8 ... business act or practice."

9 79. Defendants' acts, misrepresentations and practices as alleged herein
10 constitute "unfair" business acts and practices within the meaning of Business &
11 Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, in that their conduct is substantially injurious to
12 consumers, offends public policy, and is immoral, unethical, oppressive, and
13 unscrupulous as the gravity of the conduct outweighs any alleged benefits
14 attributable to such conduct.

15 80. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendants'16 legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein.

17 81. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Petkevicius prays for the relief as set forth18 below.

19 20

21

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17200, et seq.) Fraudulent Business Acts and Practices

83. Plaintiff Petkevicius incorporates by reference and realleges all
allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

84. Plaintiff Petkevicius brings this claim individually and on behalf of the
proposed California Class against Defendants.

85. As alleged herein, Plaintiff Petkevicius has standing to pursue this
claim as Plaintiff Petkevicius has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or

property as a result of Defendants' actions. Specifically, Plaintiff Petkevicius
purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products for her own personal use. In so doing, Plaintiff
Petkevicius relied upon the false representations that the Ginkgo biloba Products
would cause or assist in improved memory and brain function as referenced above.
Plaintiff Petkevicius used the Ginkgo biloba Products as directed and did not receive
any of the advertised benefits. Plaintiff Petkevicius would not have purchased the
Ginkgo biloba Products had she known Defendants' advertising claims were false.

8 86. California Business & Professions Code § 17200 prohibits any
9 "fraudulent business act or practice."

10 87. Defendants' claims, nondisclosures, and misleading statements with
11 respect to the Ginkgo biloba Products, as more fully set forth above, were false,
12 misleading, and/or likely to deceive the consuming public within the meaning of
13 Business & Professions Code § 17200.

14 88. Defendants' conduct caused and continues to cause injury to Plaintiff
15 Petkevicius and the other California Class members. Plaintiff Petkevicius has
16 suffered injury in fact and has lost money as a result of Defendants' deceptive
17 conduct.

18 89. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Petkevicius prays for the relief as set forth19 below.

20

21

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FALSE AND MISLEADING ADVERTISING (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 17500, et seq.)

90. Plaintiff Petkevicius incorporates by reference and realleges all
allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

Plaintiff Petkevicius brings this claim individually and on behalf of the
proposed California Class against Defendants.

As alleged herein, Plaintiff Petkevicius has standing to pursue this

26 27

28

92.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 29 -

claim as Plaintiff Petkevicius has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or 1 property as a result of Defendants' actions. Specifically, Plaintiff Petkevicius 2 3 purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products for her own personal use. In so doing, Plaintiff Petkevicius relied upon the false representations that the Ginkgo biloba Products 4 would cause or assist in improved memory and brain function as referenced above. 5 Plaintiff Petkevicius used the Ginkgo biloba Products as directed and did not receive 6 any of the advertised benefits. Plaintiff Petkevicius would not have purchased the 7 Ginkgo biloba Products had they known Defendants' advertising claims were false. 8

9 93. Defendants violated Business & Professions Code § 17500 by publicly
10 disseminating false, misleading, and unsubstantiated advertisements regarding the
11 Ginkgo biloba Products.

12 94. Defendants' false, misleading and unsubstantiated advertisements were13 disseminated to increase the sales of the Ginkgo biloba Products.

14 95. Defendants knew or should have known their advertisements for the15 Ginkgo biloba Products were false and misleading.

96. Plaintiff Petkevicius and the members of the California Class have
suffered harm as a result of these violations of the FAL because they have incurred
charges and/or paid monies for the Ginkgo biloba Products that they otherwise
would not have incurred or paid.

20 97. Defendants are aware, or by the exercise of reasonable care should have21 been aware, that the representations were untrue or misleading.

98. Plaintiff Petkevicius and the members of the California Class have
suffered injury in fact and have lost money as a result of Defendants' false
representations and false advertising.

99. Plaintiff Petkevicius and the members of the California Class seek an
order awarding Plaintiff Petkevicius and other members of the California Class
restitution of the money wrongfully acquired by Defendants by means of

responsibility attached to Defendants' failure to disclose the existence and
 significance of said misrepresentations.

100. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Petkevicius prays for the relief as set forth
below.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LEGAL REMEDIES ACT (CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750, et seq.)

101. Plaintiff Petkevicius incorporates by reference and realleges all allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

102. Plaintiff Petkevicius brings this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed California Class against Defendants.

103. As alleged herein, Plaintiff Petkevicius have standing to pursue this claim as Plaintiff Petkevicius has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of Defendants' actions. Specifically, Plaintiff Petkevicius purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products for her own personal use. In so doing, Plaintiff Petkevicius relied upon the material, false representations that the Ginkgo biloba Products would cause or assist in improved memory and brain functioning, as set forth above. Plaintiff Petkevicius used the Ginkgo biloba Products as directed and did not receive any of the advertised benefits. Plaintiff Petkevicius would not have purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products had she known Defendants' advertising claims were false.

104. Plaintiff Petkevicius has concurrently filed the declaration of venue required by Civil Code §1780(d) with this complaint.

105. Defendants have violated and continue to violate the CLRA by engaging in the following practices proscribed by California Civil Code §1770(a) in transactions with Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class, which were intended to result in, and did result in, the sale of the Ginkgo biloba Products:

§1770(a) (5) Representing that [The Ginkgo biloba Products have] ...
characteristics, ... uses [or] benefits ... which [they do] not have
§1770(a) (7) Representing that [The Ginkgo biloba Products are] of a particular standard, quality or grade ... if [they are] of another.
§1770(a) (9) Advertising goods or services with intent not to sell them as advertised.

7 106. On information and belief, Defendants' actions were willful, wanton,8 and fraudulent.

9 107. On information and belief, officers, directors, or managing agents at
10 Defendants authorized the use of the misleading statements about the Ginkgo biloba
11 Products.

108. CLRA SECTION 1782 NOTICE. On December 23, 2013, Plaintiff 12 13 Petkevicius, through counsel, sent a CLRA demand letter to Defendants that provided notice of Defendants' violation of the CLRA and demanded Defendants 14 15 correct, repair, replace, or otherwise rectify the unlawful, unfair, false, and deceptive practices complained of herein. The letter also stated that if Defendants refused to 16 do so, Plaintiff Petkevicius would file a complaint seeking damages in accordance 17 with the CLRA. Defendants failed to comply with the letter. For the foregoing 18 reasons, pursuant to Civil Code section 1780(a)(3), Plaintiff Petkevicius, 19 20individually and on behalf of all other members of the California Class, seeks 21 compensatory damages, punitive damages, and restitution of any ill-gotten gains due 22 to Defendants' acts and practices.

109. In addition, the CLRA has enhanced penalties for acts perpetrated
against senior citizens and disabled persons. If the Defendants' conduct is directed
at a class of persons who are senior citizens and/or disabled, a \$5,000.00 civil penalty
may be awarded to "each class member." Civ. Code § 1780(b). A "disabled person"
is someone who has a "physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one

1

2

3

4

5

or more major life activities." Civ. Code §1761(f), (g). Under California law,
individuals suffering from Alzheimer's are "disabled." Defendants' conduct is
clearly directed at senior citizens and the disabled (i.e., those with Alzheimer's), as
Defendants represent and warrant that the Ginkgo biloba Products treat and/or
prevent memory loss. Accordingly, the Court may award a civil penalty of up to
\$5,000 for each class member.

7 110. Plaintiff Petkevicius engaged counsel to prosecute this action and is
8 entitled to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at trial.

9 111. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Petkevicius prays for the relief as set forth10 below.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF CALIFORNIA EXPRESS WARRANTY (CAL. COMM. CODE § 2313)

110. Plaintiff Petkevicius incorporates by reference and realleges all allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

15 111. Plaintiff Petkevicius brings this claim individually and on behalf of the16 proposed California Class against Defendants.

17 112. Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class members formed a
18 contract with Defendants at the time they purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products. As
19 part of that contract, Defendants represented that the Ginkgo biloba Products would
20 cause or assist in improved memory and brain functioning, as described above.
21 These representations constitute express warranties and became part of the basis of
22 the bargain between Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class members, on the
23 one hand, and Defendants, on the other.

24 113. Defendants made the above-described representations to induce
25 Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class members to purchase the Ginkgo
26 biloba Products, and Plaintiff Petkevicius and the California Class members relied
27

28

11

12

13

on the representations in purchasing the Ginkgo biloba Products. 1

2 114. All conditions precedent to Defendants' liability under the abovereferenced contract have been performed by Plaintiff Petkevicius and the other 3 California Class members. 4

115. Defendants breached their express warranties about the Ginkgo biloba 5 Products because, as alleged above, the Ginkgo biloba Products do not cause or 6 assist in improved memory or brain functioning. Consequently, Defendants 7 breached California's warranty laws. Cal. Comm. Code section 2313. 8

116. As a result of Defendants' breaches of express warranty, Plaintiff 9 Petkevicius and the other members of the California Class were damaged in the 10amount of the purchase price they paid for the Ginkgo biloba Products, in amounts 11 to be proven at trial. 12

117. Within a reasonable time after they knew or should have known of such breach, Plaintiff Petkevicius, on behalf of herself and the other members of the California Class, placed Defendants on notice thereof.

118. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Petkevicius prays for the relief as set forth below.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION **VIOLATION OF NEW YORK GENERAL BUSINESS LAW** (N.Y. GEN. BUS. LAW § 349)

119. Plaintiff Ripley incorporates by reference and realleges all allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

120. Plaintiff Ripley brings this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed New York Class against Defendants.

121. New York General Business Law Section 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"

1 122. The conduct of Defendants alleged herein constitutes recurring,
 2 "unlawful" deceptive acts and practices in violation of New York General Business
 3 Law Section 349, and as such, Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class members
 4 seek monetary damages.

123. There is no adequate remedy at law.

6 124. Defendants misleadingly, inaccurately and deceptively market the7 Ginkgo biloba Products to consumers.

8 125. Defendants' improper consumer-oriented conduct—including labeling
9 and advertising that the Ginkgo biloba Products would cause or assist in improved
10 memory and brain functioning —is misleading in a material way in that it, *inter*11 *alia*, induced Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class to purchase and/or pay a
12 premium for Defendants' Ginkgo biloba Products and to use Ginkgo biloba
13 Products when they otherwise would not have.

14 126. Defendants made its illegal, untrue and/or misleading statements and15 representations willfully, wantonly, and with reckless disregard for the truth.

16 127. Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class have been injured inasmuch
17 as they purchased and/or paid a premium for Ginkgo biloba Products that were
18 contrary to Defendants' representations. Accordingly, Plaintiff Ripley and the New
19 York Class members received less than what they bargained and/or paid for.

20 128. Defendants' advertising and Ginkgo biloba Products' packaging and
21 labeling induced the Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class members to buy
22 Defendants' Ginkgo biloba Products and/or to pay a premium price for them.

129. Defendants' deceptive, illegal, 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 Ripley and the New York Class have
been damaged thereby.

130. As a result of Defendants' recurring, unlawful deceptive acts and

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 35 -

27 28

practices, Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class are entitled to monetary,
 compensatory, treble and punitive damages, restitution and disgorgement of all
 moneys obtained by means of Defendants' unlawful conduct, interest, and attorneys'
 fees and costs.

131. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Ripley prays for the relief as set forth below.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF NEW YORK GENERAL BUSINESS LAW (N.Y. GEN. BUS. LAW § 350)

132. Plaintiff Ripley incorporates by reference and realleges all allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

133. Plaintiff Ripley brings this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed New York Class against Defendants.

- 134. 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.
 - 135. 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 . . .

136. Defendants' labeling and advertisements contain untrue, illegal, and materially misleading statements concerning Defendants' Ginkgo biloba Products

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25
inasmuch as they misrepresent that the Ginkgo biloba Products would cause or
 assist in improved memory and brain functioning.

137. Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class have been injured inasmuch
as they relied upon the labeling, packaging and advertising and purchased and/or
paid a premium for Ginkgo biloba Products that—contrary to Defendants'
representations— do not cause or assist in improved memory and brain
functioning. Accordingly, Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class received less
than what they bargained and/or paid for.

9 138. Defendants' advertising, packaging and labeling induced Plaintiff
10 Ripley and the New York Class to buy Defendants' Ginkgo biloba Products.

11 139. Defendants made untrue and/or misleading statements and
12 representations willfully, wantonly, and with reckless disregard for the truth.

13 140. Defendants' conduct constitutes multiple, separate violations of N.Y.
14 Gen. Bus. Law § 350.

15 141. Defendants made the material misrepresentations described in this
16 Complaint in Defendants' advertising, and on the Ginkgo biloba Products'
17 packaging and labeling.

18 142. Defendants' material misrepresentations were substantially uniform in
19 content, presentation, and impact upon consumers at large. Moreover, all
20 consumers purchasing the Ginkgo biloba Products were and continue to be
21 exposed to Defendants' material misrepresentations.

143. As a result of Defendants' recurring, "unlawful" deceptive acts and
practices, Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class members are entitled to
monetary, compensatory, treble and punitive damages, restitution and disgorgement
of all moneys obtained by means of Defendants' unlawful conduct, interest, and
attorneys' fees and costs.

144. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Ripley prays for the relief as set forth below.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT - 37 -

27 28

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION BREACH OF NEW YORK EXPRESS WARRANTY (N.Y. U.C.C. LAW § 2-313)

3 145. Plaintiff Ripley incorporates by reference and realleges all allegations4 set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

5 146. Plaintiff Ripley brings this claim individually and on behalf of the6 proposed New York Class against Defendants.

147. Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class members formed a contract
with Defendants at the time they purchased the Ginkgo biloba Products. As part of
that contract, Defendants represented that the Ginkgo biloba Products would cause
or assist in improved memory and brain functioning, as described above. These
representations constitute express warranties and became part of the basis of the
bargain between Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class members, on the one hand,
and Defendants, on the other.

14 148. Defendants made the above-described representations to induce
15 Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class members to purchase the Ginkgo biloba
16 Products, and Plaintiff Ripley and the New York Class members relied on the
17 representations in purchasing the Ginkgo biloba Products.

18 149. All conditions precedent to Defendants' liability under the above19 referenced contract have been performed by Plaintiff Ripley and the other New York
20 Class members.

150. Defendants breached their express warranties about the Ginkgo biloba
Products because, as alleged above, the Ginkgo biloba Products would not cause or
assist in improved memory or brain functioning. Consequently, Defendants
breached New York's warranty laws. U.C.C. Law § 2-313.

151. As a result of Defendants' breaches of express warranty, PlaintiffRipley and the other members of the New York Class were damaged in the amount

1

2

of the purchase price and/or premium they paid for the Ginkgo biloba Products, in
 amounts to be proven at trial.

3 152. Within a reasonable time after they knew or should have known of such
4 breach, Plaintiff Ripley, on behalf of himself and the other members of the New
5 York Class, placed Defendants on notice thereof.

6

7

153. THEREFORE, Plaintiff Ripley prays for the relief as set forth below.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly9 situated, pray for judgment against Defendants as follows:

A. For an order requiring Defendants to disgorge and make restitution of
all monies Defendants acquired by means of the unlawful practices set forth above;

B. For an order declaring Defendants financially responsible for notifying
the Class members of the pendency of this suit;

14 C. For compensatory damages according to proof;

- D. For punitive damages according to proof;
- 16 E. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit;
 - F. For pre-judgment interest; and

G. For such other relief as the Court deems proper.

20 21

23

24

25

15

17

18

19

22 ///

///

111

26 27

28

Plaintiffs hereby demand trial by jury on all claims so triable.

Date: June 8, 2017 Respectfully submitted, 4 5 **CARLSON LYNCH SWEET** 6 **KILPELA & CARPENTER, LLP** 7 8 /s/Todd D. Carpenter 9 Todd D Carpenter (CA 234464) 402 West Broadway, 29th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619-756-6994 Facsimile: 619-756-6991 tcarpetner@carlsonlynch.com MILSTEIN ADELMAN LLP Gillian L. Wade, (CA 299124) Allison R. Willett, (CA 238430) 2800 Donald Douglas Loop North Santa Monica, CA 90405 Telephone: 888-835-8055 Facsimile: 310-396-9635 gwade@milsteinadelman.com awillett@milsteinadelman.com **HALUNEN & ASSOCIATES** Melissa Wolchansky (to be admitted *pro hac vice*) Christopher J. Moreland (to be admitted pro hac vice) Charles D. Moore (to be admitted pro hac vice) 1650 IDS Center 80 S 8th Street Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: 612-605-4098 Facsimile: 612-605-4099 wolchansky@halunenlaw.com moreland@halunenlaw.com moore@halunenlaw.com

PATTERSON LAW GROUP

James R. Patterson (CA 211102) 402 West Broadway, 29th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619-756-6990 Facsimile: 619-756-6991 jim@pattersonlawgroup.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17) Case 3:17-cv-01152-JLS-BGS Decument 1-1 Filed 06/08/17 PageID.42 Page 1 of 4

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.)*

L (a) PLAINTIFFS PAIGE PETKEVICIUS, F others similarly situated,	DEFENDANTS NBTY, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; NATURE'S BOUNTY, INC., a New York Corporation; REXALL SUNDOWN, INC., a Florida Corporation, County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.								
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)									
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Please see attachment.				Attorneys (If Known)			52 JLS BGS		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CI	L TIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" ir	ı One Box fe	or Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) PT Citizen of This State □		Incorporated or Pri of Business In Tl		for Defenda. PTF I 4	<i>int)</i> DEF □ 4
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)					of Business In Another State			
				en or Subject of a reign Country		U U		1 6	1 6
IV. NATURE OF SUL	UIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS			ORFEITURE/PENALTY		here for: <u>Nature o</u> KRUPTCY	f Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES		
 CONTRACT Ito Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 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 - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR BERSONAL INJUR BERSONAL INJUR BERSONAL INJUR BERSONAL Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability BERSONAL PROPEI BE	Y 0 62 0 69 1 XTY 0 71 0 72 1 72 1 75 1 75 2 75 2 75 2 75	LABOR of Property 21 USC 881 of Other LABOR Usc 881 of Pair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Act Labor/Management Relations Act Act Other Labor Litigation Therefore Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Source Security Act Maturalization Application Actions	 ↓ 422 Appe ↓ 423 With 28 U ▶ PROPEI ↓ 820 Copy ↓ 830 Paten ↓ 835 Paten ▶ 830 Paten ↓ 835 Paten ▶ 840 Trade ▶ 861 HIA ↓ 862 Black ↓ 863 DIW(↓ 864 SSID ↓ 865 RSI (▶ FEDERA ↓ 870 Taxes or Dr ↓ 871 IRS- 26 U 	al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights tt - Abbreviated Drug Application mark SECURITY (1395ff) c/DIWW (405(g)) 'Title XVI 405(g)) ML TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	 375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange \$890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 		nent g ed and ons dities/ tions ters tation weedure eeal of
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in									
	moved from \Box 3 te Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	」4 Rein Reoj	stated or D 5 Transf pened Anoth (specify)	er District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer		3 Multidist Litigation Direct Fil	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN 28 U.S.C. §1332 Brief description of ca	(d); 28 U.S.C. §133 ause:	alse an	Do not cite jurisdictional sta	ising; etc	versity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS I UNDER RULE 23		is it childs it children		EMAND \$ Exceeds 5M	IECK YES only if demanded in complaint: (RY DEMAND: X Yes □ No				
VIII. RELATED CASH IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER					
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD								
06/08/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		/s/ Todd D. Ca	rpenter						
RECEIPT # AM	AOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		

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 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 there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven 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 date.

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 – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- 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

I. (c)

CARLSON LYNCH SWEET KILPELA & CARPENTER, LLP

Todd D Carpenter (CA 234464) 402 West Broadway, 29th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619-756-6994 Facsimile: 619-756-6991 tcarpenter@carlsonlynch.com

MILSTEIN ADELMAN LLP

Gillian L. Wade, (CA 299124) Allison R. Willett, (CA 238430) 2800 Donald Douglas Loop North Santa Monica, CA 90405 Telephone: 888-835-8055 Facsimile: 310-396-9635 gwade@milsteinadelman.com awillett@milsteinadelman.com

HALUNEN & ASSOCIATES

Melissa Wolchansky (to be admitted *pro hac vice*) Christopher J. Moreland (to be admitted *pro hac vice*) Charles D. Moore (to be admitted *pro hac vice*) 1650 IDS Center 80 S 8th Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 Telephone: 612-605-4098 Facsimile: 612-605-4099 wolchansky@halunenlaw.com moreland@halunenlaw.com

PATTERSON LAW GROUP

James R. Patterson (CA 211102) 402 West Broadway, 29th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619-756-6990 Facsimile: 619-756-6991 jim@pattersonlawgroup.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

Case 3:17-cv-01152-JLS-BGS Document 1-2 Filed 06/08/17 PageID.46 Page 1 of 18

Exhibit A



Exhibit B



Exhibit C



Exhibit D



Exhibit E



Exhibit F



Exhibit G



Exhibit H



June 3, 2013

Mr. Michael M. Landa, J.D., Director Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition U.S. Food and Drug Administration 5100 Paint Branch Parkway College Park, MD 20740

Dear Mr. Landa:

Extracts of the leaves from the *Ginkgo biloba* tree ("Ginkgo") are widely used in dietary supplements, both in single-ingredient pills made by Natrol, GNC, Solaray, Now, Nature's Way, Ginsana, and others, and in combination with other ingredients in products such as Bayer One-A-Day Women's 50 Plus Advantage multivitamins. They are also used in some energy drinks, such as several Rockstar varieties, Hansen's Energy Pro, Guru, and Steven Seagal's Lightning Bolt. Yogi Tea's Ginkgo Clarity has Ginkgo, and Redco Foods adds ginkgo to its Salada "Brain Boost" green tea. Companies portray Ginkgo as a substance that improves memory or concentration, but there is little supportive evidence.¹

Claims regarding Ginkgo's *supposed* health benefits ("memory" and "supports cognitive function") are false and should be stopped, but Ginkgo hasn't been thought to pose a serious health risk. That changed in March 2013 when the National Toxicology Program ("NTP") of the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences released the results of animal studies in which *Ginkgo biloba* extracts caused cancer.

¹ "The evidence that *Ginkgo biloba* has predictable and clinically significant benefit for people with dementia or cognitive impairment is inconsistent and unreliable." Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2009 Jan 21;(1):CD003120. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD003120.pub3. Ginkgo biloba for cognitive impairment and dementia. Birks J, Grimley Evans J. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19160216

Also, "(W)e have found no convincing evidence from randomised clinical trials for a robust positive effect of G. biloba ingestion upon any aspect of cognitive function in healthy young people, after either acute or longer term administration." Hum Psychopharmacol. 2007 Jul;22(5):265-78. Ginkgo biloba is not a smart drug: an updated systematic review of randomised clinical trials testing the nootropic effects of G. biloba extracts in healthy people. Canter PH, Ernst E. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17480002

Page 2

The NTP studies found "clear evidence" that Ginkgo caused liver cancer in male and female mice and "some evidence" that Ginkgo caused thyroid cancer in male and female rats.² In the high-dose groups of mice, the ingredient was no borderline carcinogen: it caused hepatocellular carcinomas in 94 percent of male mice (compared to 44 percent of the controls) and 96 percent of female mice (compared to 34 percent of the controls). The ingredient may also have caused other tumors as well. "In some instances, the number of cancers exceeded the numbers ever seen in mice in the lab, the investigators" told *The New York Times*.³

On the basis of the NTP studies, the FDA Seattle District office has already sent a warning letter to advise a beverage maker that one of its products is adulterated (and also misbranded for other reasons). On March 28, 2013, the FDA told Stewart Brothers, Inc., which makes SuperBerry Fruit Juice Drink Blend, that it knew of no basis for considering Ginkgo to be Generally Recognized As Safe ("GRAS"), especially in light of the NTP studies.⁴ On May 23, 2012, even before there was evidence that Ginkgo caused cancer, the FDA's New Orleans district office in Nashville, Tennessee, told Rockstar, Inc., that its Roasted Coffee & Energy products were adulterated because they contained the herbal ingredient:⁵

Any substance added to a conventional food, such as your Rockstar coffee products, must be used in accordance with a food additive regulation, unless the substance is the subject of a prior sanction or is generally recognized as safe (GRAS) among qualified experts for its use in foods [21 CFR 170.30(g)]. There is no food additive regulation which authorizes the use of Ginkgo. We are not aware of any information to indicate Ginkgo is the subject of a prior sanction [see 21 CFR 181]. As explained below, we are not aware of any basis to conclude that Ginkgo is GRAS for use in conventional foods.

We urge the FDA to take actions to protect consumers from this herbal ingredient that causes cancer in animals and presumably in people. Specifically, we ask the FDA to:

• Inform the food industry that Ginkgo is not GRAS, prior sanctioned, or an approved food additive and may not be used in any food. The FDA should give companies a reasonable time, such as 30 days, to recall their products from the marketplace, after which time it should seize any remaining products.

⁵ FDA Warning Letter 2012-NOL-22.

http://www.fda.gov/ICECI/EnforcementActions/WarningLetters/ucm309080.htm; accessed April 26, 2013.

 ² NTP technical report on the toxicology and carcinogenesis studies of *Ginkgo biloba* extract (CAS no. 90045-36-6) in F344/N rats and B6C3F1/N mice. March 2013. NTP TR 578. NIH Publication No. 13-5920.
 ³ http://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/04/29/new-doubts-about-ginkgo-biloba/

⁴ FDA Warning Letter SEA 13-15.

http://www.fda.gov/ICECI/EnforcementActions/WarningLetters/2013/ucm346316.htm; accessed April 26, 2013.

Page 3

• Inform the dietary supplement industry that Ginkgo poses a substantial and unreasonable risk to consumers, provides no benefit to consumers, and must be removed from the market within a specified period of time.⁶ FDA should take legal action if companies fail to stop marketing all of their products that contain Ginkgo.

The American Botanical Council has argued that the NTP used an extract of *Ginkgo biloba* that is not representative of Ginkgo supplements sold in the United States.⁷ The Council claimed that the concentrations of three important constituents (flavonol glycosides, terpene lactones, and ginkgolic acids) of Ginkgo were significantly different in the NTP product from what is generally available in the marketplace. But the NTP maintains that the composition of the extract it tested falls within the range of what is available in the marketplace. Hence, the prudent course of action would be for the FDA to ensure that all products that contain extracts of *Ginkgo biloba* are removed from the marketplace.

Sincerely,

-that 7. Jacobs

Michael F. Jacobson, Ph.D. Executive Director

David Schardt Senior Nutritionist

⁶ The standard for removing a dietary supplement from the marketplace was established in an appellate court's decision in a case involving ephedrine alkaloid dietary supplements ("EDS"). The court ruled that: In determining that EDS pose an "unreasonable risk of illness or injury," the FDA found that the weight loss and other health benefits possible from the use of EDS were dwarfed by the potential long-term harm to the user's cardiovascular system. The agency went on to enact a complete ban on the product after making a finding that any amount of EDS had negative ramifications on the cardiovascular system and, based on the FDA's analysis, EDS provided no benefits so great as to justify such risk.

In the present case, supplements containing *Ginkgo biloba* pose a risk of cancer to consumers, and that risk is not balanced by any demonstrated health benefits.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Utah (D.C. No. 2:04-CV-00409-TC). http://www.casewatch.org/fda/court/ephedra/utah2.shtml; accessed April 26, 2013.

http://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/NTP/About_NTP/TRPanel/2012/February/PublicComm/Blumenthal20120125.pdf