

1 Kevin Laukaitis*
2 Jonathan Shub (SBN 237708)
3 **SHUB LAW FIRM LLC**
4 134 Kings Highway E, 2nd Floor
5 Haddonfield, NJ 08033
6 T: 856-772-7200
7 F: 856-210-9088
8 klaukaitis@shublawyers.com
9 jshub@shublawyers.com

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class*

11 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

14 SANDRA CHACON, individually and on
15 behalf of all others similarly situated,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 CVS PHARMACY, INC.,

19 Defendant.

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1
2 Plaintiff, Sandra Chacon (“**Plaintiff**”), on behalf of herself and all others
3 similarly situated, brings this class action against Defendant, CVS Pharmacy, Inc.
4 (“**Defendant**” or “**CVS**”), and alleges on personal knowledge, investigation of her
5 counsel, and on information and belief as follows:
6

7
8 **INTRODUCTION**

9
10 1. Defendant, CVS, offers a variety of over-the-counter products
11 including transdermal products, pain relief products, and skin care products.
12 Defendant’s over-the-counter lidocaine products include a range of external pain-
13 relieving Products and creams for pain associated with or caused by ailments such
14 as arthritis, backache, muscle strains, sprains, and bruises.
15

16 2. Particularly, Defendant sells, markets, and distributes “CVS Health”
17 Maximum Strength Lidocaine Pain Relieving patches, creams, roll-ons, sprays,
18 and menthol lidocaine products (the “**Products**”).¹
19

20 3. Nearly every individual suffers muscle aches and pains and seeks
21 relief for this common problem.
22

23
24 ¹ The products include but are not limited to CVS Health-branded: Lidocaine Pain-Relieving
25 Unscented Patches, Maximum Strength Lidocaine Pain Relief Cream, Maximum Strength
26 Lidocaine Plus Spray, Maximum Strength Lidocaine Pain Relief Roll-On with Lavendar
27 Essential Oil, XL Maximum Strength Lidocaine Pain Relief Patch, Maximum Strength
28 Lidocaine Cream, and Maximum Strength Pain Relief Patch (the “**Products**”) Plaintiff reserves
the right to amend the Complaint to revise the list of products subject to this Complaint.

1 4. When consumers purchase pain-relieving products, the strength of the
2 dose is an important purchasing consideration. In fact, consumers willingly pay a
3 premium for pain-reliving products that have strong doses.²
4

5 5. Defendant takes advantage of this consumer preference for strong
6 doses and/or maximum strength by prominently representing as much the one place
7 every consumer looks when purchasing a product – the packaging and labels
8 themselves. In fact, Defendant touts its representation and claim right on the front
9 of its Products’ labels that the Products are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine
10 products.
11

12 6. Consumers including Plaintiff lack the scientific knowledge
13 necessary to determine whether the Products are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine
14 products or to ascertain the true nature of the quality or strength of the Products.
15
16 As such, reasonable consumers must and do rely on manufacturers, like Defendant,
17 to be honest and transparent and to properly disclose on the packaging all material
18 information regarding the Products and their dose and strength.
19
20
21

22 ² Defendant’s competitors sell 4% lidocaine pain reliving Products for approximately \$0.86 per
23 patch while Defendant sells the ‘maximum strength’ 4% lidocaine Products sell for \$2.25 per
24 patch. *See* [https://www.walgreens.com/store/c/walgreens-lidocaine-Products/ID=300394242-](https://www.walgreens.com/store/c/walgreens-lidocaine-Products/ID=300394242-product)
25 [product](https://www.walgreens.com/store/c/walgreens-lidocaine-Products/ID=300394242-product) (for the competitor pricing version, last accessed February 16, 2022) and
26 [https://www.cvs.com/shop/cvs-health-lidocaine-pain-relieving-uncented-Products-3-15-16-x-5-](https://www.cvs.com/shop/cvs-health-lidocaine-pain-relieving-uncented-Products-3-15-16-x-5-1-2-10-cm-x-14-cm-6-ct-prodid-371271)
27 [1-2-10-cm-x-14-cm-6-ct-prodid-371271](https://www.cvs.com/shop/cvs-health-lidocaine-pain-relieving-uncented-Products-3-15-16-x-5-1-2-10-cm-x-14-cm-6-ct-prodid-371271) (for Defendant’s ‘maximum strength’ version, last
28 accessed February 16, 2022). Plaintiff only uses the pricing in the previous paragraph as an
example to plausibly plead that Defendant does indeed charge a large premium for its Products.
The specific premium on a granular level will be determined later in the case by an expert.

1 purchasing a Lidocaine product which is at maximum strength, i.e. the highest
2 dosage they can buy.

3 10. Defendant’s knowing, multiple, and prominent systematic
4 mislabeling of the Products form a pattern of unlawful and unfair business practices
5 that deceives and harms consumers and the public.
6

7 11. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this suit on behalf of herself and
8 similarly situated consumers who purchased Defendant’s Products. Plaintiff and
9 Class Members were damaged because they would not have purchased (or would
10 not have paid a premium) for Defendant’s Products had they known the true facts
11 regarding the Products’ “Maximum Strength” representations and omissions.
12

13 12. For all the reasons set forth herein, including but not limited to
14 Defendant’s misrepresentations and omissions regarding its “Maximum Strength”
15 claims, Plaintiff seeks relief in this action individually, and as a class action on
16 behalf of similarly situated purchasers of Defendant’s Products, for: (i) violation
17 of California’s False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500 et seq.
18 (“FAL”); (ii) violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof.
19 Code §§ 17200 et seq. (“UCL”); (iii) violation of California’s Consumers Legal
20 Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750 et seq. (“CLRA”); (iv) common law fraud;
21 and (v) unjust enrichment.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE PARTIES

1
2 13. Plaintiff Sandra Chacon is a resident and citizen of California residing
3 in San Jose, California. She purchased CVS Maximum Strength Lidocaine Pain
4 Relieving Patch product on numerous occasions during all applicable statute of
5 limitations periods, most recently in January 2022. Plaintiff Chacon purchased the
6 Products at a CVS brick and mortar retail location in San Jose, California.
7

8
9 14. Defendant CVS is a Rhode Island corporation, with its principal place
10 of business and headquarters located at One CVS Drive, Woonsocket, RI 02895. As
11 such, Defendant is a resident and citizen of Rhode Island. Defendant CVS markets,
12 distributes, and sells the Products to consumers throughout the United States through
13 their brick-and-mortar locations and online through Defendant’s website.
14

15 15. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend this Complaint to add different or
16 additional defendants, including without limitation any officer, director, employee,
17 supplier, or distributor of Defendant who has knowingly and willfully aided,
18 abetted, or conspired in the false and deceptive conduct alleged herein.
19
20

21 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

22 16. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant in this matter.
23 The acts and omissions giving rise to this action occurred in the state of California.
24 Defendant has been afforded due process because it has, at all times relevant to this
25 matter, individually or through its agents, subsidiaries, officers and/or
26
27

1 representatives, operated, conducted, engaged in and carried on a business venture
2 in this state and/or maintained an office or agency in this state, and/or marketed,
3 advertised, distributed and/or sold products in this state, committed a statutory
4 violation within this state related to the allegations made herein, and caused injuries
5 to Plaintiff and putative Class Members, which arose out of the acts and omissions
6 that occurred in the state of California, during the relevant time period, at which
7 time Defendant were engaged in business activities in the state of California.
8
9

10 17. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to
11 28 U.S.C. § 1332 of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because: (i) there are 100
12 or more putative Class Members, (ii) the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds
13 \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and (iii) there is minimal diversity
14 because at least one Plaintiff and Defendant are citizens of different states. This
15 Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims pursuant to 28
16 U.S.C. § 1367.
17
18

19 18. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a), venue is proper because a substantial
20 part of the events giving rise to the claims asserted occurred in this District. Venue
21 is also proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) because Defendant conducts
22 substantial business in this District, has sufficient minimum contacts with this
23 District, and otherwise purposely avails itself of the markets in this District, through
24 the promotion, sale, and marketing of the Products in this District. Furthermore,
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiff resides in this District.

2 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

3 19. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(c-d), a substantial part of the events
4 giving rise to the claims herein arose in Santa Clara County, California and this
5 action should be assigned to the San Jose Division.
6

7 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLASS MEMBERS**

8
9 20. Lidocaine is the active ingredient in Defendant’s Products, and it
10 forms the basis for Defendant’s “Maximum Strength” misrepresentations on the
11 Products’ front labeling, omissions, and overall advertising and marketing
12 campaign.
13

14 21. “Lidocaine belongs to the family of medicines called local
15 anesthetics. This medicine prevents pain by blocking the signals at the nerve
16 endings in the skin.”⁴
17

18 22. Lidocaine is commonly used in products such as Defendant’s
19 Products to help with body soreness and pain.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ⁴[https://www.mayoclinic.org/drugs-supplements/lidocaine-topical-application-](https://www.mayoclinic.org/drugs-supplements/lidocaine-topical-application-route/description/drg-20072776)
27 [route/description/drg-20072776](https://www.mayoclinic.org/drugs-supplements/lidocaine-topical-application-route/description/drg-20072776) (last accessed February 16, 2022)

1 **A. Defendant's Products Prominently Feature the "Maximum Strength"**
2 **Misrepresentation**

3 23. At all relevant times, Defendant has marketed its Products in a
4 consistent and uniform manner nationwide. Defendant sells the Products in all 50
5 states in their brick-and-mortar stores and through their online store.
6

7 24. Aware of the consumer preference for strong and/or maximum doses
8 of lidocaine in pain-relieving products to alleviate their pain, aches, and soreness,
9 Defendant specifically advertises its Products as "Maximum Strength" lidocaine
10 products.
11

12 25. One attribute that consumers specifically value when purchasing any
13 pain-relieving product is the strength of the dose.⁵
14

15 26. Aware of this consumer preference, Defendant specifically advertises
16 its Products as "MAXIMUM STRENGTH" Lidocaine Products. For example,
17 below is an image of the CVS Health Maximum Strength Lidocaine Pain Relieving
18 Patch front label⁶:
19
20
21

22 ⁵ Strength of dose is so important that nearly every manufacturer of common pain-relieving
23 products emphasize it. See [https://www.tylenol.com/products/tylenol-extra-strength-](https://www.tylenol.com/products/tylenol-extra-strength-caplets?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=GO-USA-ENG-PS-Tylenol-BC-EX-RN-Brand-Core+EST&utm_content=Core&utm_term=extra+tylenol&gclid=Cj0KCCQjwi7yCBhDJARIsAMWFScPTqYK8J3go53nS0bag4R7EVHQZ7ogd_3MoAMUKWoVzH4FMj8sQj9kaAtbXEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds&)
24 [caplets?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=GO-USA-ENG-PS-Tylenol-](https://www.tylenol.com/products/tylenol-extra-strength-caplets?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=GO-USA-ENG-PS-Tylenol-BC-EX-RN-Brand-Core+EST&utm_content=Core&utm_term=extra+tylenol&gclid=Cj0KCCQjwi7yCBhDJARIsAMWFScPTqYK8J3go53nS0bag4R7EVHQZ7ogd_3MoAMUKWoVzH4FMj8sQj9kaAtbXEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds&)
25 [BC-EX-RN-Brand-](https://www.tylenol.com/products/tylenol-extra-strength-caplets?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=GO-USA-ENG-PS-Tylenol-BC-EX-RN-Brand-Core+EST&utm_content=Core&utm_term=extra+tylenol&gclid=Cj0KCCQjwi7yCBhDJARIsAMWFScPTqYK8J3go53nS0bag4R7EVHQZ7ogd_3MoAMUKWoVzH4FMj8sQj9kaAtbXEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds&)
26 [Core+EST&utm_content=Core&utm_term=extra+tylenol&gclid=Cj0KCCQjwi7yCBhDJARIsAM](https://www.tylenol.com/products/tylenol-extra-strength-caplets?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=GO-USA-ENG-PS-Tylenol-BC-EX-RN-Brand-Core+EST&utm_content=Core&utm_term=extra+tylenol&gclid=Cj0KCCQjwi7yCBhDJARIsAMWFScPTqYK8J3go53nS0bag4R7EVHQZ7ogd_3MoAMUKWoVzH4FMj8sQj9kaAtbXEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds&)
[WFScPTqYK8J3go53nS0bag4R7EVHQZ7ogd_3MoAMUKWoVzH4FMj8sQj9kaAtbXEALw_](https://www.tylenol.com/products/tylenol-extra-strength-caplets?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=GO-USA-ENG-PS-Tylenol-BC-EX-RN-Brand-Core+EST&utm_content=Core&utm_term=extra+tylenol&gclid=Cj0KCCQjwi7yCBhDJARIsAMWFScPTqYK8J3go53nS0bag4R7EVHQZ7ogd_3MoAMUKWoVzH4FMj8sQj9kaAtbXEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds&)
[wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds&">? \(Tylenol extra strength\); see also](https://www.tylenol.com/products/tylenol-extra-strength-caplets?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=GO-USA-ENG-PS-Tylenol-BC-EX-RN-Brand-Core+EST&utm_content=Core&utm_term=extra+tylenol&gclid=Cj0KCCQjwi7yCBhDJARIsAMWFScPTqYK8J3go53nS0bag4R7EVHQZ7ogd_3MoAMUKWoVzH4FMj8sQj9kaAtbXEALw_wcB&gclsrc=aw.ds&)

27 ⁶ The labels shown in the complaint represents the labeling present, upon information and belief,
28 of each product at the time of filing and that Plaintiff and the proposed classes read and relied on.



27. As shown above, the “MAXIMUM STRENGTH” representation is located on the very top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow lettering that contrasts with the background of the packaging, which instantly catches the eye of all reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff and Class Members.

28. Defendant, however, is well aware that its Products are not a “maximum strength” or maximum strength lidocaine products and deceives

<https://www.cvs.com/shop/cvs-health-lidocaine-pain-relieving-unscented-Products-3-15-16-x-5-1-2-10-cm-x-14-cm-6-ct-prodid-371271>; (last accessed February 16, 2022).

1 trusting reasonable consumers like Plaintiff to believe that they are in fact
2 purchasing such Products while omitting from the Products' labeling the fact that
3 there are other prescription products available in the market that contain a higher
4 percentage of lidocaine (i.e. 5%).
5

6 29. Indeed, Defendant's over-the-counter Products contain only 4%
7 lidocaine while competing prescription lidocaine products contain 5% lidocaine.⁷
8

9 30. So, consumers can obtain a stronger dose comparable lidocaine
10 product that is available in the market.

11 31. As such, Defendant's Products are not "Maximum Strength"
12 lidocaine products as advertised.
13

14 32. But rather than accurately advertise its Products through its labeling,
15 Defendant preys on consumers' desire for maximum pain relief to drive substantial
16 profits.
17

18 33. All reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff, read and relied on
19 CVS's "Maximum Strength" representations when purchasing the Products.
20

21 34. Defendant's "Maximum Strength" representation was material to
22 Plaintiff's and Class Members' decision to purchase the Products.
23
24

25 ⁷ "This article discusses lidocaine 5% patch products available by your doctor's prescription.
26 While there are similar over-the-counter varieties available, those contain a lower percentage
27 of lidocaine." See [https://www.spineuniverse.com/treatments/medication/prescription-
lidoderm-Products-may-help-relieve-back-pain](https://www.spineuniverse.com/treatments/medication/prescription-lidoderm-Products-may-help-relieve-back-pain) (last accessed February 16, 2022)

1 35. Defendant’s marketing efforts are made in order to – and do in fact –
2 induce consumers to purchase the Products at a premium because consumers
3 believe they are getting lidocaine products with “Maximum Strength.”
4

5 36. As shown throughout this Complaint, however, Defendant’s Products
6 are *not* “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products. Defendant’s representations and
7 omissions are false and misleading.
8

9 37. Defendant intended for Plaintiff and Class Members to be deceived or
10 mislead by its misrepresentations and omissions.

11 38. Defendant’s deceptive and misleading practices proximately caused
12 harm to Plaintiff and the Class.
13

14 39. Plaintiff and Class Members would not have purchased the Products
15 or would have not paid as much for the Products, had they known the truth about
16 the mislabeled and falsely advertised Products.
17

18 **PLAINTIFF CHACON’S FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19 40. Plaintiff Chacon purchased the Products in January 2022 from a CVS
20 brick and mortar store in San Jose, California for approximately \$13.49 for the
21 Products. Before purchasing the Products, Plaintiff Chacon reviewed information
22 about the Products on the Products’ labels and the fact that the Products were being
23 sold for personal use, and not resale. At the time of purchasing her Products,
24 Plaintiff Chacon also reviewed the accompanying disclosures, warranties, and
25
26
27

1 marketing materials, and understood them as representations and warranties by
2 CVS, specifically the "MAXIMUM STRENGTH" Representations. Plaintiff
3 Chacon relied on these representations and warranties in deciding to purchase
4 CVS's Products. Accordingly, these representations and warranties were part of
5 the basis of the bargain, in that she would not have purchased the Products had she
6 known these representations were not true. Here, Plaintiff did not receive the
7 benefit of her bargain because CVS's MAXIMUM STRENGTH" representations
8 are false.

9
10
11 41. As a result of CVS's concealment, Defendant's "Maximum Strength"
12 Representations and omissions, Plaintiff Chacon purchased the Products. Had
13 Plaintiff known the true nature of the Products, she would not have purchased the
14 Products.

15 16 17 **FED. R. CIV. P. 9(b) ALLEGATIONS**

18 42. Rule 9(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that "[i]n
19 alleging fraud or mistake, a party must state with particularity the circumstances
20 constituting fraud or mistake." To the extent necessary, as detailed in the
21 paragraphs above and below, Plaintiff has satisfied the requirements of Rule 9(b)
22 by establishing the following elements with sufficient particularity.

23
24
25 43. **WHO:** Defendant, CVS Pharmacy, Inc., made material
26 misrepresentations and/or omissions of fact in its labeling and marketing of the
27

1 Products by representing that the Products are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine
2 products.

3 44. **WHAT:** Defendant’s conduct here was and continues to be fraudulent
4 because it has the effect of deceiving consumers into believing that the Products
5 are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products. Defendant omitted from Plaintiff and
6 Class Members that the Products are not “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products
7 because other lidocaine products exist in the market that contain a higher amount
8 (i.e. 5%) of lidocaine. Defendant knew or should have known this information is
9 material to all reasonable consumers and impacts consumers’ purchasing
10 decisions. Yet, Defendant has and continues to represent that the Products are
11 “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products when they are not, and has omitted from
12 the Products’ labeling the fact that there are other prescription products available
13 in the market that contain a higher percentage of lidocaine (i.e. 5%).
14
15
16
17

18 45. **WHEN:** Defendant made material misrepresentations and/or
19 omissions detailed herein, including that the Products are “Maximum Strength”
20 lidocaine products, continuously throughout the applicable Class period(s).
21

22 46. **WHERE:** Defendant’s material misrepresentations and omissions,
23 that the Products are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products, were located on the
24 very top of the front label of the Products in bold yellow lettering that contrasts
25 with the background of the packaging, which instantly catches the eye of all
26
27
28

1 reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff and Class Members at the point of sale
2 in every transaction. The Products are sold in Defendant’s brick and mortar stores
3 and online store in California and nationwide.
4

5 **47. HOW:** Defendant made written misrepresentations right on the front
6 label of the Products that the Products were “Maximum Strength” lidocaine
7 products even though other stronger lidocaine products are available in the market.
8 As such, Defendant’s “Maximum Strength” representations are false and
9 misleading. Moreover, Defendant omitted from the Products’ labeling the fact that
10 there are other prescription products available in the market that contain a higher
11 percentage of lidocaine (i.e. 5%). And as discussed in detail throughout this
12 Complaint, Plaintiff and Class Members read and relied on Defendant’s
13 “Maximum Strength” representations and omissions before purchasing the
14 Products.
15
16
17

18 **48. WHY:** Defendant misrepresented its Products as being “Maximum
19 Strength” lidocaine products and omitted from the Products’ labeling the fact that
20 there are other prescription products available in the market that contain a higher
21 percentage of lidocaine (i.e. 5%) for the express purpose of inducing Plaintiff and
22 Class Members to purchase the Products at a substantial price premium. As such,
23 Defendant profited by selling the misrepresented Products to at least thousands of
24 consumers throughout the nation.
25
26
27
28

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

1
2 49. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and the following
3 Classes pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a), (b)(2) and/or (b)(3).
4 Specifically, the Classes are defined as:
5

6 **National Class:** During the fullest period allowed by
7 law, all persons in the United States who purchased the
8 Products in the United States for personal use and not
9 for resale.

10 **California Sub-Class:** During the fullest period
11 allowed by law, all persons in the State of California
12 who purchased the Products in the State of California
13 for personal use and not for resale.

14 50. Excluded from the Classes are (a) any person who purchased the
15 Products for resale and not for personal or household use, (b) any person who
16 signed a release of any Defendant in exchange for consideration, (c) any officers,
17 directors or employees, or immediate family members of the officers, directors or
18 employees, of any Defendant or any entity in which a Defendant has a controlling
19 interest, (d) any legal counsel or employee of legal counsel for any Defendant, and
20 (e) the presiding Judge in this lawsuit, as well as the Judge’s staff and their
21 immediate family members.
22

23 51. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the definition of the Classes if
24 discovery or further investigation reveals that the Classes should be expanded or
25 otherwise modified.
26
27
28

1 52. **Numerosity – Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(1).** Class
2 Members are so numerous and geographically dispersed that joinder of all Class
3 Members is impracticable. While the exact number of Class Members remains
4 unknown at this time, upon information and belief, there are thousands, if not
5 hundreds of thousands, of putative Class Members. Moreover, the number of
6 members of the Classes may be ascertained from Defendant’s books and records.
7 Class Members may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail and/or
8 electronic mail, which can be supplemented if deemed necessary or appropriate by
9 the Court with published notice.
10
11

12 53. **Predominance of Common Questions of Law and Fact – Federal**
13 **Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(2) and 23(b)(3).** Common questions of law and
14 fact exist as to all Class Members and predominate over any questions affecting
15 only individual Class Members. These common legal and factual questions
16 include, but are limited to, the following:
17
18

- 19 a. Whether Defendant made the “MAXIMUM STRENGTH”
20 Representations;
21
22 b. Whether Defendant promoted the Products with false and misleading
23 statements of fact and material omissions;
24
25 c. Whether Defendant’s “MAXIMUM STRENGTH” Representations
26 are deceptive, unfair or misleading;
27
28

- 1 d. Whether Defendant’s actions and/or omissions violate California law;
- 2 e. Whether Defendant’s conduct violates public policy;
- 3 f. Whether Defendant’s acts, omissions or misrepresentations of
- 4 material facts constitute fraud;
- 5
- 6 g. Whether Plaintiff and putative members of the Classes have suffered
- 7 an ascertainable loss of monies or property or other value as a result
- 8 of Defendant’s acts, omissions or misrepresentations of material facts;
- 9
- 10 h. Whether Defendant was unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff
- 11 and members of the putative Classes in connection with the Products;
- 12
- 13 i. Whether Plaintiff and members of the putative Classes are entitled to
- 14 monetary damages and, if so, the nature of such relief; and
- 15
- 16 j. Whether Plaintiff and members of the putative Classes are entitled to
- 17 equitable, declaratory or injunctive relief and, if so, the nature of such
- 18 relief.

19 54. Pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2), Defendant has acted or refused to act on

20 grounds generally applicable to the putative Classes, thereby making final

21 injunctive or corresponding declaratory relief appropriate with respect to the

22 putative Classes as a whole. In particular, Defendant has, marketed, advertised,

23 distributed and sold Products containing the Products’ “MAXIMUM

24 STRENGTH” Representations, which are false and misleading.

25

26

27

28

1 **55. Typicality – Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(3).** Plaintiff’s
2 claims are typical of those of the absent Class Members in that Plaintiff and the
3 Class Members each purchased and used the Products and each sustained damages
4 arising from Defendant’s wrongful conduct, as alleged more fully herein. Plaintiff
5 shares the aforementioned facts and legal claims or questions with putative
6 members of the Classes, and Plaintiff and all members of the putative Classes have
7 been similarly affected by Defendant’s common course of conduct alleged herein.
8 Plaintiff and all members of the putative Classes sustained monetary and economic
9 injuries including, but not limited to, ascertainable loss arising out of Defendant’s
10 false and deceptive Lidocaine Products “Maximum Strength” Representations, as
11 alleged herein.
12

13
14
15 **56. Adequacy – Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4).** Plaintiff will
16 fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the
17 putative Classes. Plaintiff has retained counsel with substantial experience in
18 handling complex class action litigation, including complex questions that arise in
19 this type of consumer protection litigation. Further, Plaintiff and her counsel are
20 committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action. Plaintiff does not have any
21 conflicts of interest or interests adverse to those of putative Classes.
22
23
24

25 **57. Insufficiency of Separate Actions – Federal Rule of Civil**
26 **Procedure 23(b)(1).** Absent a class action, Plaintiff and members of the Classes will
27

1 continue to suffer the harm described herein, for which they would have no remedy.
2 Even if separate actions could be brought by individual consumers, the resulting
3 multiplicity of lawsuits would cause undue burden and expense for both the Court
4 and the litigants, as well as create a risk of inconsistent rulings and adjudications that
5 might be dispositive of the interests of similarly situated consumers, substantially
6 impeding their ability to protect their interests, while establishing incompatible
7 standards of conduct for Defendant. Accordingly, the proposed Classes satisfy the
8 requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1).
9

10
11 **58. Declaratory and Injunctive Relief – Federal Rule of Civil**
12 **Procedure 23(b)(2).** Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally
13 applicable to Plaintiff and all Members of the Classes, thereby making appropriate
14 final injunctive relief and declaratory relief, as described below, with respect to the
15 members of the Classes as a whole.
16
17

18 **59. Superiority – Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3).** A class
19 action is superior to any other available methods for the fair and efficient
20 adjudication of the present controversy for at least the following reasons:
21

- 22 a. The damages suffered by each individual members of the putative
23 Classes do not justify the burden and expense of individual
24 prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessitated by
25 Defendant's conduct;
26
27

- 1 b. Even if individual members of the Classes had the resources to pursue
2 individual litigation, it would be unduly burdensome to the courts in
3 which the individual litigation would proceed;
4
- 5 c. The claims presented in this case predominate over any questions of
6 law or fact affecting individual members of the Classes;
7
- 8 d. Individual joinder of all members of the Classes is impracticable;
9
- 10 e. Absent a Class, Plaintiff and members of the putative Classes will
11 continue to suffer harm as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct;
12 and
13
- 14 f. This action presents no difficulty that would impede its management
15 by the Court as a class action, which is the best available means by
16 which Plaintiff and members of the putative Classes can seek redress
17 for the harm caused by Defendant.
18
- 19 g. In the alternative, the Classes may be certified for the following
20 reasons:
21
- 22 i. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the
23 Classes would create a risk of inconsistent or varying
24 adjudication with respect to individual members of the Classes,
25 which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for
26 Defendant;
27

1 ii. Adjudications of claims of the individual members of the Classes
2 against Defendant would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of
3 the interests of other members of the putative Classes who are
4 not parties to the adjudication and may substantially impair or
5 impede the ability of other putative Class Members to protect
6 their interests; and
7

8
9 iii. Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally
10 applicable to the members of the putative Classes, thereby
11 making appropriate final and injunctive relief with respect to the
12 putative Classes as a whole.
13

14
15 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

16 **COUNT I**

17 **California’s Unfair Competition Law**
18 **Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. (“UCL”)**
19 **(On Behalf of the California Sub-Class)**

20 60. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations
21 contained in the previous paragraphs as though set forth fully herein.

22 61. The UCL prohibits any “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or
23 practice.” Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.
24

25 62. The acts, omissions, misrepresentations, practices, and non-disclosures
26 of Defendant as alleged herein constitute business acts and practices.
27

1 63. Unlawful: The acts alleged herein are “unlawful” under the UCL in that
2 they violate at least the following laws:

- 3 a. The False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500 et seq.;
- 4 b. The Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750 et seq.;
- 5 c. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. §§ 301 et seq.;
- 6 and
- 7 d. The California Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law, Cal. Health
8 & Safety Code §§ 110100 et seq.

9 64. Unfair: Defendant’s conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising,
10 and sale of the Products was “unfair” because Defendant’s conduct was immoral,
11 unethical, unscrupulous, or substantially injurious to consumers and the utility of
12 their conduct, if any, does not outweigh the gravity of the harm to their victims.

13 65. Defendant’s conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, and sale
14 of the Products was and is also unfair because it violates public policy as declared
15 by specific constitutional, statutory or regulatory provisions, including but not
16 limited to the applicable sections of: the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, the False
17 Advertising Law, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the California
18 Sherman Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law.

19 66. Defendant’s conduct with respect to the labeling, advertising, and sale
20 of the Products was and is unfair because the consumer injury was substantial, not
21

1 outweighed by benefits to consumers or competition, and not one consumer
2 themselves could reasonably have avoided.

3 67. Fraudulent: A statement or practice is “fraudulent” under the UCL if it
4 is likely to mislead or deceive the public, applying an objective reasonable consumer
5 test.
6

7 68. As set forth herein, Defendant’s “MAXIMUM STRENGTH”
8 Representations stated on the Products’ labeling and advertising is likely to mislead
9 reasonable consumers to believe the “MAXIMUM STRENGTH” Representations
10 regarding the Products are true.
11

12 69. Defendant profited from its sale of the falsely, deceptively, and
13 unlawfully advertised Products to unwary consumers.
14

15 70. Plaintiff and Class Members are likely to continue to be damaged by
16 Defendant’s deceptive trade practices, because Defendant continues to disseminate
17 misleading information, in particular the “MAXIMUM STRENGTH”
18 Representations on the Products’ packaging. Thus, injunctive relief enjoining
19 Defendant’s deceptive practices is proper.
20

21 71. Defendant’s conduct caused and continues to cause substantial injury
22 to Plaintiff and the other Class Members. Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact as a
23 result of Defendant’s unlawful conduct.
24
25
26
27
28

1 72. In accordance with Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, Plaintiff seeks an order
2 enjoining Defendant from continuing to conduct business through unlawful, unfair,
3 and/or fraudulent acts and practices, and to commence a corrective advertising
4 campaign.
5

6 73. Plaintiff and the Class also seek an order for and restitution of all
7 monies from the sale of the Products, which were unjustly acquired through acts of
8 unlawful competition.
9

10 **COUNT II**
11 **California’s False Advertising Law**
12 **Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 (“FAL”)**
13 **(On Behalf of the California Sub-Class)**

14 74. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in the previous paragraphs
15 as if fully set forth herein.

16 75. The FAL provides that “[i]t is unlawful for any person, firm,
17 corporation or association, or any employee thereof with intent directly or indirectly
18 to dispose of real or personal property or to perform services” to disseminate any
19 statement “which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the
20 exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading.” Cal. Bus.
21 & Prof. Code § 17500.
22

23 76. It is also unlawful under the FAL to disseminate statements concerning
24 property or services that are “untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which
25 by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading.” *Id.*
26
27

1 77. As alleged herein, CVS committed acts of false and misleading
2 advertising, as defined by the FAL, by using statements to promote the sale of it's
3 the Products and making "MAXIMUM STRENGTH" Representations. CVS knew
4 or should have known that its advertising claims have not been substantiated and are
5 misleading and/or false.
6

7 78. CVS knew or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable
8 care, that its "MAXIMUM STRENGTH" Representations were false and misleading
9 and likely to deceive consumers and cause them to purchase CVS's Lidocaine
10 Products.
11

12 79. Defendant's wrongful conduct is ongoing and part of a general practice
13 that is still being perpetuated and repeated throughout the State of California and
14 nationwide.
15

16 80. Plaintiff suffered injury in fact as a result of CVS's actions as set forth
17 herein because she purchased the Products in reliance on CVS's false and misleading
18 "MAXIMUM STRENGTH" Representations.
19

20 81. CVS's business practices as alleged herein constitute deceptive, untrue,
21 and misleading advertising pursuant to the FAL because CVS has advertised the
22 Products in a manner that is untrue and misleading, which CVS knew or reasonably
23 should have known, and omitted material information from its advertising.
24
25
26
27
28

1 82. CVS profited from its sale of the falsely and deceptively advertised
2 Products to unwary consumers.

3 83. As a result, Plaintiff, the California Sub-Class members, and the general
4 public are entitled to injunctive and equitable relief, restitution, and an order for the
5 disgorgement of the funds by which Defendant was unjustly enriched.
6

7 84. Pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17535, Plaintiff, on behalf of
8 herself and the California Sub-Class, seeks an order enjoining Defendant from
9 continuing to engage in deceptive business practices, false advertising, and any other
10 act prohibited by law, including those set forth in this Complaint.
11

12
13 **COUNT III**
14 **California’s Consumer Legal Remedies Act**
15 **Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 et seq. (“CLRA”)**
16 **(On Behalf of the California Sub-Class)**

17 85. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in the previous paragraphs
18 as if fully set forth herein.

19 86. The CLRA prohibits deceptive practices in connection with the conduct
20 of a business that provides goods, property, or services primarily for personal,
21 family, or household purposes.
22

23 87. CVS’s false and misleading labeling and other policies, acts, and
24 practices were designed to, and did, induce the purchase and use of the Products for
25 personal, family, or household purposes by Plaintiff and Class Members, and
26 violated and continue to violate the following sections of the CLRA:
27

1 a. § 1770(a)(5): representing that goods have characteristics, uses, or
2 benefits which they do not have;

3 b. § 1770(a)(7): representing that goods are of a particular standard,
4 quality, or grade if they are of another;

5 c. § 1770(a)(9): advertising goods with intent not to sell them as
6 advertised; and
7

8 d. § 1770(a)(16): representing the subject of a transaction has been
9 supplied in accordance with a previous representation when it has not.
10

11 88. Defendant profited from the sale of the falsely, deceptively, and
12 unlawfully advertised Products to unwary consumers.
13

14 89. Defendant's wrongful business practices constituted, and constitute, a
15 continuing course of conduct in violation of the CLRA.
16

17 90. Pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Civ. Code § 1782(a), Plaintiff will
18 provide a letter to Defendant concurrently with the filing of this Class Action
19 Complaint or shortly thereafter with notice of its alleged violations of the CLRA,
20 demanding that Defendant correct such violations, and providing it with the
21 opportunity to correct its business practices. If Defendant does not thereafter correct
22 its business practices, Plaintiff will amend (or seek leave to amend) the complaint to
23 add claims for monetary relief, including restitution and actual damages under the
24 Consumers Legal Remedies Act.
25
26
27

1 91. Pursuant to California Civil Code § 1780, Plaintiff seeks injunctive
2 relief, her reasonable attorney fees and costs, and any other relief that the Court
3 deems proper.
4

5 **COUNT IV**
6 **Fraud**
7 **(On Behalf of the Nationwide and/or**
8 **California Sub-Class)**

9 92. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in the previous paragraphs
10 as if fully set forth herein.

11 93. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself, the Nationwide
12 Class and/or the California Class against Defendant CVS.

13 94. Rule 9(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that “[i]n
14 alleging fraud or mistake, a party must state with particularity the circumstances
15 constituting fraud or mistake.” To the extent necessary, as detailed in the
16 paragraphs above and below, Plaintiff has satisfied the requirements of Rule 9(b)
17 by establishing the following elements with sufficient particularity.
18
19

- 20
21 a. **WHO:** Defendant, CVS Pharmacy, Inc., made material
22 misrepresentations and/or omissions of fact in its labeling and
23 marketing of the Products by representing that the Products are
24 “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products.
25
26
27
28

- 1 b. **WHAT:** Defendant’s conduct here was and continues to be fraudulent
2 because it has the effect of deceiving consumers into believing that
3 the Products are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products. Defendant
4 omitted from Plaintiff and Class Members that the Products are not
5 “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products because other lidocaine
6 products exist in the market that contain a higher amount (i.e. 5%) of
7 lidocaine. Defendant knew or should have known this information is
8 material to all reasonable consumers and impacts consumers’
9 purchasing decisions. Yet, Defendant has and continues to represent
10 that the Products are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products when
11 they are not, and has omitted from the Products’ labeling the fact that
12 there are other prescription products available in the market that
13 contain a higher percentage of lidocaine (i.e. 5%).
- 14 c. **WHEN:** Defendant made material misrepresentations and/or
15 omissions detailed herein, including that the Products are “Maximum
16 Strength” lidocaine products, continuously throughout the applicable
17 Class period(s).
- 18 d. **WHERE:** Defendant’s material misrepresentations and omissions,
19 that the Products are “Maximum Strength” lidocaine products, were
20 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
21 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
22 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
23 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
24 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
25 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
26 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
27 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow
28 located on the top of the front label of the Products in bold, yellow

1 lettering that contrasts with the background of the packaging, which
2 instantly catches the eye of all reasonable consumers, including
3 Plaintiff and Class Members, at the point of sale in every transaction.
4
5 The Products are sold in Defendant’s brick and mortar stores and
6 online store nationwide.

7
8 e. **HOW:** Defendant made written misrepresentations right on the front
9 label of the Products that the Products were “Maximum Strength”
10 lidocaine products even though other stronger lidocaine products are
11 available in the market. As such, Defendant’s “Maximum Strength”
12 representations are false and misleading. Moreover, Defendant
13 omitted from the Products’ labeling the fact that there are other
14 prescription products available in the market that contain a higher
15 percentage of lidocaine (i.e. 5%). And as discussed in detail
16 throughout this Complaint, Plaintiff and Class Members read and
17 relied on Defendant’s “Maximum Strength” representations and
18 omissions before purchasing the Products.
19
20
21

22 f. **WHY:** Defendant misrepresented its Products as being “Maximum
23 Strength” lidocaine products and omitted from the Products’ labeling
24 the fact that there are other prescription products available in the
25 market that contain a higher percentage of lidocaine (i.e. 5%) for the
26
27
28

1 express purpose of inducing Plaintiff and Class Members to purchase
2 the Products at a substantial price premium. As such, Defendant
3 profited by selling the misrepresented Products to at least thousands
4 of consumers throughout the nation.
5

6 95. As alleged herein, CVS knowingly made material misrepresentations
7 and omissions regarding the Products on the Products' labeling and packaging in the
8 Products' advertisements, and/or on its website, specifically the "MAXIMUM
9 STRENGTH" Representations alleged more fully herein.
10

11 96. Defendant, CVS, made these material "MAXIMUM STRENGTH"
12 Representations and omissions in order to induce Plaintiff and putative Class
13 Members to purchase the Products.
14

15 97. Defendant, CVS, knew the "MAXIMUM STRENGTH"
16 Representations regarding the Products were false and misleading but nevertheless
17 made such representations through the marketing, advertising and on the Products'
18 labeling. In reliance on these "MAXIMUM STRENGTH" Representations, Plaintiff
19 and putative Class Members were induced to, and did, pay monies to purchase the
20 Products.
21
22

23 98. Had Plaintiff and the Class known the truth about the Products, they
24 would not have purchased the Products.
25
26
27
28

1 99. As a proximate result of the fraudulent conduct of Defendant, CVS,
2 Plaintiff and the putative Class paid monies to Defendant, through its regular retail
3 sales channels, to which Defendant is not entitled, and have been damaged in an
4 amount to be proven at trial.
5

6 **COUNT V**
7 **Unjust Enrichment**
8 **(In the Alternative, and on Behalf of the**
9 **Nationwide and/or California Sub-Class)**

10 100. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in the previous paragraphs
11 as if fully set forth herein.

12 101. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself, and the putative
13 Classes against Defendant.
14

15 102. Plaintiff and putative Class Members conferred a benefit on Defendant
16 when they purchased the Products, of which Defendant had knowledge. By its
17 wrongful acts and omissions described herein, including selling the Products
18 containing the “MAXIMUM STRENGTH” Representations and did not otherwise
19 perform as represented and for the particular purpose for which they were intended,
20 Defendant was unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff and putative Class
21 Members.
22
23

24 103. Plaintiff’s detriment and Defendant’s enrichment were related to and
25 flowed from the wrongful conduct challenged in this Complaint.
26
27
28

1 104. Defendant has profited from its unlawful, unfair, misleading, and
2 deceptive practices at the expense of Plaintiff and putative Class Members under
3 circumstances in which it would be unjust for Defendant to be permitted to retain
4 the benefit. It would be inequitable for Defendant to retain the profits, benefits, and
5 other compensation obtained from their wrongful conduct as described herein in
6 connection with selling the Products.
7

8 105. Defendant has been unjustly enriched in retaining the revenues derived
9 from Class Members' purchases of the Products, which retention of such revenues
10 under these circumstances is unjust and inequitable because Defendant marketed,
11 advertised, distributed, and sold the Products, and CVS misrepresented the nature of
12 the Products, misrepresented their benefits and attributes, and knowingly marketed
13 and promoted the Products with "MAXIMUM STRENGTH" Representations,
14 which caused injuries to Plaintiff and the Class because they would not have
15 purchased the Products based on the same representations if the true facts concerning
16 the Products had been known.
17

18 106. Plaintiff and putative Class Members have been damaged as a direct
19 and proximate result of Defendant's unjust enrichment because they would not have
20 purchased the Products on the same terms or for the same price had they known the
21 true nature of the Products and the mis-statements regarding what the Products were
22 and what they contained.
23
24
25
26
27

- 1 A. Declaring that this action is properly maintained as a class action, certifying
2 the proposed Class(es), appointing Plaintiff as Class Representative and
3 appointing Plaintiff’s counsel as Class Counsel;
- 4 B. Directing that Defendant bear the costs of any notice sent to the Class(es);
- 5 C. Declaring that Defendant must disgorge, for the benefit of the Class(es), all
6 or part of the ill-gotten profits they received from the sale of the Products, or
7 order Defendant to make full restitution to Plaintiff and the members of the
8 Class(es) except that no monetary relief is presently sought for violations of
9 the Consumers Legal Remedies Act;
- 10 D. Awarding restitution and other appropriate equitable relief;
- 11 E. Granting an injunction against Defendant to enjoin it from conducting its
12 business through the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent acts or practices set
13 forth herein;
- 14 F. Granting an Order requiring Defendant to fully and appropriately recall the
15 Products and/or to remove the claims on its website and elsewhere, including
16 ”Maximum Strength” Representations regarding the Products;
- 17 G. Ordering a jury trial and damages according to proof;
- 18 H. Awarding Plaintiff and members of the Class(es) statutory damages, as
19 provided by the applicable state consumer protection statutes invoked above,
20 except that no monetary relief is presently sought for violations of the
21 Consumers Legal Remedies Act;
- 22 I. Enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage in the unlawful and unfair
23 business acts and practices as alleged herein;
- 24 J. Awarding attorneys’ fees and litigation costs to Plaintiff and members of the
25 Class(es);
- 26 K. Awarding civil penalties, prejudgment interest and punitive damages as
27 permitted by law; and
- 28 L. Ordering such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all claims in this Complaint so triable.

Dated: February 17, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jonathan Shub

Jonathan Shub (SBN 237708)

Kevin Laukaitis*

SHUB LAW FIRM LLC

134 Kings Highway E, 2nd Floor

Haddonfield, NJ 08033

T: 856-772-7200

F: 856-210-9088

jshub@shublawyers.com

klaukaitis@shublawyers.com

Nick Suciu*

MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON

PHILLIPS GROSSMAN PLLC

6905 Telegraph Rd., Suite 115

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301

Tel: (313) 303-3472

Email: nsuciu@milberg.com

Charles E. Schaffer*

David Magagna*

LEVIN, SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP

510 Walnut Street, Suite 500

Philadelphia, PA 19106

Phone: (215) 592-1500

Fax: (215) 592-4663

cschaffer@lfsblaw.com

dmagagna@lfsblaw.com

**Pro Hac Vice* Application Forthcoming

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and Putative Class
Members*

1 **CLRA Venue Declaration Pursuant to California Civil Code Section 1780(d)**

2 I, Jonathan Shub, declare as follows:

3
4 1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of California
5 and a member of the bar of this Court. I am an attorney at Shub Law Firm LLC,
6 counsel of record for Plaintiff in this action. I have personal knowledge of the facts
7 set forth in this declaration and, if call as a witness, I could and would competently
8 testify thereto under oath.
9

10
11 2. The Complaint filed in this action is filed in the proper place for trial
12 under Civil Code Section 1780(d) in that a substantial portion of the events alleged
13 in the Complaint occurred in the Northern District of California.
14

15 I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
16 and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration
17 was executed at Haddonfield, New Jersey this 17th day of February 2022.
18

19 /s/ Jonathan Shub
20 Jonathan Shub
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-CAND 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 in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Sandra Chacon, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Santa Clara County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Jonathan Shub, Shub Law Firm LLC, 134 Kings Hwy E. Fl-2 Haddonfield, NJ 08033 (856) 772-7200

DEFENDANTS

CVS Pharmacy, Inc.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Providence County (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 2 U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship and incorporation status.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation-Transfer 8 Multidistrict Litigation-Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 USC 1332

Brief description of cause: Misrepresentation of lidocaine products

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, Fed. R. Civ. P. DEMAND \$ 5,000,000.00

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: X Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S), IF ANY (See instructions):

JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil Local Rule 3-2)

(Place an "X" in One Box Only) SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND X SAN JOSE EUREKA-MCKINLEYVILLE

DATE 02/17/2022

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Jonathan Shub

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS-CAND 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet. The JS-CAND 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 in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate 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 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), 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.
- (1) United States plaintiff. Jurisdiction based on 28 USC §§ 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 - (2) United States defendant. When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an “X” in this box.
 - (3) Federal question. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 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.
 - (4) Diversity of citizenship. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 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-CAND 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an “X” in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin.** Place an “X” in one of the six boxes.
- (1) Original Proceedings. Cases originating in the United States district courts.
 - (2) Removed from State Court. Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 USC § 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - (3) Remanded from Appellate Court. Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - (4) Reinstated or Reopened. Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 - (5) Transferred from Another District. For cases transferred under Title 28 USC § 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - (6) Multidistrict Litigation Transfer. Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 USC § 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
 - (8) Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. Check this box when a multidistrict litigation case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. Please note that there is no Origin Code 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- 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 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. 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-CAND 44 is used to identify related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- IX. Divisional Assignment.** If the Nature of Suit is under Property Rights or Prisoner Petitions or the matter is a Securities Class Action, leave this section blank. For all other cases, identify the divisional venue according to Civil Local Rule 3-2: “the county in which a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred or in which a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated.”
- Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.