

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

KESHA PETERS, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

KEURIG DR PEPPER INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff Kesha Peters (“Plaintiff”) brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated against Defendant Keurig Dr Pepper Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff makes the following allegations pursuant to the investigation of her counsel and based upon information and belief, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to the Plaintiff, which are based on personal knowledge.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Defendant formulates, manufactures, advertises, and sells Snapple beverages in various varieties (the “Products”) throughout the United States, including in New York.
2. Defendant represents to consumers through its packaging that the Products are “ALL NATURAL.” Defendant makes these claims in order to capitalize on consumers’ preference for natural foods that do not contain synthetic ingredients.
3. Unbeknownst to consumers, however, Defendant’s claims are false because the Products contain synthetic citric acid.
4. Plaintiff has purchased the Products. Now, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, she asserts claims for violations of New York General Business Law §§ 349 and 350, and for breach of express warranty.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2)(a) because this case is a class action where the aggregate claims of all members of the proposed class are in excess of \$5,000,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs, there are over 100 members of the putative class, and at least one class member is a citizen of a state different than Defendant.

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because a substantial portion of the events that gave rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in New York.

7. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial portion of the events that gave rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff Kesha Peters is a citizen of New York who resides in Brooklyn, New York. Ms. Peters has purchased the Products for her personal use numerous times during the applicable statute of limitations. For example, in or around July 2025, she purchased Snapple Peach Tea from the C-Town supermarket in East Flatbush, New York for approximately \$1.49. In purchasing the Products, Ms. Peters relied on Defendant's false, misleading, and deceptive marketing of the Products as "ALL NATURAL." Ms. Peters understood these representations to mean that the Products did not contain any synthetic ingredients, but in fact, the Products that she purchased contained synthetic citric acid. Had Ms. Peters known that Defendant's representations were false and misleading, she would not have purchased the Products or would have only been willing to purchase the Products at a lesser price.

9. Defendant Keurig Dr Pepper Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located in Burlington, Massachusetts. Defendant formulates, advertises, manufactures, and/or sells the Products throughout New York and the United States.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Defendant's labeling on the Products states in large all-capital letters that they are "ALL NATURAL":



11. Defendant's labeling puts forth a straightforward, material message: the Products contain only ingredients that are natural and no synthetic ingredients.

12. Defendant makes these natural claims in an effort to capitalize on the growing market for natural products. Health-conscious consumers are willing to pay a price premium for products labeled and advertised as natural because they believe that such products are safer and/or healthier to consume.

13. But, unfortunately for consumers, the Products contain an ingredient that is not natural: synthetic citric acid.

14. Citric acid is a synthetic ingredient used to add flavor and as a preservative in foods. Although citric acid can be produced naturally, it is not economically feasible to do so and the USDA Agricultural Marketing Service has noted that natural citric acid is "no longer

commercially available.” Instead, only synthetic citric acid is used in packaged foods, including the Products.

15. Synthetic citric acid is a major industrial chemical, produced at more than two million tons per year worldwide. In industry and domestic applications, synthetic citric acid is a chelating and buffering agent used in many cleaning products and as a starting material for synthesizing citrate esters, itaconic acid, acetonedicarboxylic acid and other compounds.

16. The manufacturing process for synthetic citric acid, like the kind found in the Products, utilizes synthetic industrial chemicals to render the ingredient from mold (*Aspergillus niger*), including n- octyl alcohol, isoparaffinic petroleum hydrocarbons, calcium hydroxide and sulfuric acid. 21 C.F.R. § 173.280(a) (describing the “[s]olvent extraction process for citric acid”). While “[r]esidues of n- octyl alcohol and synthetic isoparaffinic petroleum hydrocarbons are removed,” some chemical residues inevitably remain. 21 C.F.R § 173.280(d) (“Current good manufacturing practice results in residues not exceeding 16 parts per million (ppm) n- octyl alcohol and 0.47 ppm synthetic isoparaffinic petroleum hydrocarbons in citric acid.”). These trace synthetic chemicals remain in synthetic citric acid and, as a result, end up in finished foods, including the Products that Plaintiff purchased.

17. In light of these facts, the FDA has determined that citric acid is synthetic and not natural. For instance, in an August 16, 2001 Warning Letter sent to Oak Tree Farm Dairy, Inc., the FDA wrote that the label for “OAKTREE ALL NATURAL LEMONADE” was “inappropriate” because “natural” means “nothing artificial or synthetic” and the product contained citric acid. Likewise, in an August 29, 2001 Warning Letter to the Hirzel Canning Company, the FDA wrote that chopped tomatoes should not be labeled “ALL NATURAL” because they contained citric acid.

18. Consumption of synthetic citric acid has been associated with adverse health effects including inflammation related to asthma, juvenile idiopathic arthritis, autistic spectrum disorder and fibromyalgia.

19. Defendant has profited enormously from its false and misleading representations that the Products contain only natural ingredients. The purpose of this action is to require Defendant to change its labeling claims and to provide consumers with monetary relief for its deceptive and misleading product claims.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class defined as all persons in the United States who, during the maximum period of time permitted by law, purchased the Products for personal, family, or household consumption, and not for resale (the “Nationwide Class”).

21. Plaintiff also seeks to represent a subclass defined as all person in New York who purchased the Products (the “New York Subclass”) (collectively with the Nationwide Class, the “Classes”).

22. **Numerosity Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1).** Members of the Classes are so numerous that their individual joinder herein is impracticable. On information and belief, members of the Class number in the millions. The precise number of Class members and their identities are unknown to Plaintiff at this time but may be determined through discovery. Class members may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail and/or publication through the distribution records of Defendant and third-party retailers and vendors.

23. **Commonality and Predominance (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2) and 23(b)(3)).** There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved in this case. Common questions of law and fact that exist as to all Class members and predominate over questions affecting only individual Class members include, but are not limited to:

- (a) the true nature and presence of synthetic ingredients in the Products;
- (b) whether Defendant's marketing, advertising, packaging, labeling, and other promotional materials for the Products are deceptive and misleading;
- (c) whether Plaintiff and members of the Classes have suffered damages as a result of Defendant's actions, and the amount thereof;
- (d) whether Defendant has been unjustly enriched as a result of the unlawful, fraudulent, and unfair conduct alleged in this Complaint such that it would be inequitable for Defendant to retain the benefits conferred upon Defendant by Plaintiff and the Classes; and
- (e) whether Plaintiff and members of the Classes are entitled to attorneys' fees and costs.

24. **Typicality (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)).** The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Class in that the named Plaintiff was exposed to Defendant's false and misleading marketing, purchased Defendant's Products, and suffered a loss as a result of those purchases.

25. **Adequacy (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4)).** Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Classes because her interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class members she seeks to represent, she has retained competent counsel experienced in prosecuting class actions, and she intends to prosecute this action vigorously. The interests of Class members will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiff and her counsel.

26. **Superiority (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)).** The class mechanism is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of Class members. Even if every member of the Classes could afford to pursue individual litigation, the court system could not. Individualized litigation would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous cases would proceed. Individualized litigation would also increase the delay and expense to all parties and would present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments—magnifying the delay and expense to all parties and to the court

system resulting from multiple trials of the same factual issues. In contrast, the maintenance of this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented herein, presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court on the issue of Defendant's liability. Class treatment of the liability issues would ensure that all claims and claimants are before this Court for consistent adjudication of the liability issues. Plaintiff anticipates no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

CAUSES OF ACTION
COUNT I

**Violation of the New York General Business Law § 349
(On behalf of the New York Subclass)**

27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges herein all paragraphs alleged above.

28. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and members of the New York Subclass against Defendant.

29. Plaintiff and New York Subclass members are "persons" within the meaning of the GBL § 349(h).

30. Defendant is a "person, firm, corporation or association or agent or employee thereof" within the meaning of GBL § 349(b).

31. Under GBL § 349, "[d]eceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any business, trade or commerce are unlawful."

32. Defendant made false and misleading statements by marketing the Products as "ALL NATURAL" when the Products in fact contain synthetic citric acid.

33. In doing so, Defendant engaged in deceptive acts or practices in violation of GBL § 349.

34. Defendant's deceptive acts or practices were materially misleading. Defendant's conduct was likely to and did deceive reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff, about the quality of its Products, as discussed throughout.

35. Plaintiff and New York Subclass members were unaware of, and lacked a reasonable means of discovering, the material facts that Defendant withheld.

36. Defendant's actions set forth above occurred in the conduct of trade or commerce.

37. The foregoing deceptive acts and practices were directed at consumers.

38. Defendant's misleading conduct concerns widely purchased consumer products and affects the public interest. Defendant's conduct includes unfair and misleading acts or practices that have the capacity to deceive consumers and are harmful to the public at large. Defendant's conduct is misleading in a material way because they fundamentally misrepresent the production and quality of the Products.

39. Plaintiff and New York Subclass members suffered ascertainable loss as a direct and proximate result of Defendant's GBL violations in that: (i) they would not have purchased the Products had they known the truth; and (ii) they overpaid for the Products on account of the misrepresentations and omissions, as described herein. As a result, Plaintiff and New York Subclass members have been damaged either in the full amount of the purchase price of the Products or in the difference in value between the Products as warranted and the Products as actually sold.

40. On behalf of herself and other members of the New York Subclass, Plaintiff seeks to enjoin Defendant's unlawful acts and practices described herein, to recover actual damages or \$50, whichever is greater, reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and any other just and proper relief available under GBL § 349.

COUNT II

**Violation of the New York General Business Law § 350
(On behalf of the New York Subclass)**

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges herein all paragraphs alleged above.

42. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of herself and members of the New York Subclass against Defendant.

43. GBL § 350 provides that “[f]alse advertising in the conduct of any business, trade or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state is hereby declared unlawful.”

44. Defendant’s labeling and advertisement of the Products was false and misleading in a material way. Specifically, Defendant advertised the Products as “ALL NATURAL” when the Products in fact contain synthetic citric acid.

45. This misrepresentation was consumer-oriented and was likely to mislead a reasonable consumer acting reasonably under the circumstances.

46. This misrepresentation has resulted in consumer injury or harm to the public interest.

47. As a result of this misrepresentation, Plaintiff and New York Subclass members have suffered economic injury because: (i) they would not have purchased the Product had they known the truth; and (ii) they overpaid for the Products on account of the misrepresentations and omissions, as described herein. As a result, Plaintiff and New York Subclass members have been damaged either in the full amount of the purchase price of the Products or in the difference in value between the Products as warranted and the Products as actually sold.

48. By reason of the foregoing and as a result of Defendant’s conduct, Plaintiff and New York Subclass members seek to enjoin the unlawful acts and practices described herein, to

recover their actual damages or five hundred dollars, whichever is greater, three times actual damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and any other just and proper relief available under GBL § 350.

COUNT III

Breach of Express Warranty (On behalf of the Nationwide Class and the New York Subclass)

49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above as though fully set forth herein.

50. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the Classes against Defendant.

51. Defendant, as the producer, marketer, distributor, and/or seller, expressly warranted that the Products were "ALL NATURAL."

52. Defendant's representations and warranties were part of the description of the goods and the bargain upon which the Products were offered for sale and purchased by Plaintiff and members of the Classes.

53. However, the Products do not conform to Defendant's representations and warranties because the Products contain synthetic citric acid. By falsely representing the Products in this way, Defendant breached express warranties.

54. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's breach of express warranty, Plaintiff and members of the Classes have been injured and harmed in an amount to be proven at trial. Had Plaintiff and members of the Classes known the Products in fact contained a synthetic ingredient, they would not have purchased the Products, or only would have been willing to pay substantially less for them.

55. Prior to filing the initial complaint in this action, Defendant were served via

certified mail with a pre-suit notice letter on behalf of Plaintiff that complied in all respects with U.C.C. §§ 2-313 and 2-607.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, seeks judgment against Defendant, as follows:

- (a) For an order certifying the Nationwide Class and the New York Subclass under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, naming Plaintiff as representative of the Nationwide Class and the New York Subclass, and naming Plaintiff's attorneys as Class Counsel to represent the Nationwide Class and New York Subclass;
- (b) For an order finding in favor of Plaintiff and the Classes on all counts asserted herein;
- (c) For an order finding in favor of Plaintiff, the Nationwide Class, and the New York Subclass on all counts asserted herein;
- (d) For compensatory, statutory, and punitive damages in amounts to be determined by the Court and/or jury;
- (e) For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded;
- (f) For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- (g) For an order enjoining Defendant from continuing the illegal practices detailed herein and compelling Defendant to undertake a corrective advertising campaign; and
- (h) For an order awarding Plaintiff and the Classes their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses and costs of suit.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of any and all issues in this action so triable as of right.

Dated: August 7, 2025

ARISOHN LLC

By: /s/ Joshua D. Arisohn
Joshua D. Arisohn

Joshua D. Arisohn

94 Blakeslee Rd.
Litchfield, CT 06759
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Email: josh@arisohnllc.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

CIVIL COVER SHEET

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.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Kesha Peters

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

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

Arisohn LLC, 94 Blakeslee Rd., Litchfield, CT 06759

DEFENDANTS

Keurig Dr Pepper Inc.

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.

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)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | ☒ 1 | ☐ 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | ☐ 4 | ☐ 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | ☐ 2 | ☐ 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | ☐ 5 | ☒ 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | ☐ 3 | ☐ 3 | Foreign Nation | ☐ 6 | ☐ 6 |

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

Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.](#)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 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	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 Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice PERSONAL INJURY ☒ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other LABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Management Relations ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION ☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 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 (15 USC 1681 or 1692) ☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act ☐ 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 ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement			

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 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2)(a)

Brief description of cause:

Consumer protection and warranty claims based on false labeling of product

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☒ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.DEMAND \$
\$5,000,000+

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE _____

DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

8/7/2025

/s/ Joshua D. Arisohn

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____

CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY

Local Arbitration Rule 83.7 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.

Case is Eligible for Arbitration ☐

I, Joshua D. Arisohn, counsel for Plaintiffs, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):

- ☒ monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs,
- ☒ the complaint seeks injunctive relief, or
- ☐ the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason:

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1

Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of its stocks. Add an additional page if needed.

n/a

RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)

Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 3 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 3(a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 3(a) provides that "A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case involves identical legal issues, or the same parties." Rule 3 further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (b), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court."

NEW YORK EASTERN DISTRICT DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 1(d)(3)

If you answer "Yes" to any of the questions below, this case will be designated as a Central Islip case and you must select Office Code 2.

1. Is the action being removed from a state court that is located in Nassau or Suffolk County? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Is the action—not involving real property—being brought against United States, its officers or its employees AND the majority of the plaintiffs reside in Nassau or Suffolk County? ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. If you answered "No" to all parts of Questions 1 and 2:
 - a. Did a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to claim or claims occur in Nassau or Suffolk County? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - b. Do the majority of defendants reside in Nassau or Suffolk County? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - c. Is a substantial amount of any property at issue located in Nassau or Suffolk County? ☐ Yes ☒ No
4. If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, was the offending communication received in either Nassau or Suffolk County? ☐ Yes ☒ No

(Note, a natural person is considered to reside in the county in which that person is domiciled; an entity is considered a resident of the county that is either its principal place of business or headquarters, of if there is no such county in the Eastern District, the county within the District with which it has the most significant contacts).

BAR ADMISSION

I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court.



Yes



No

Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?



Yes (If yes, please explain)



No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: Joshua D. Arisohn Digitally signed by Joshua D. Arisohn
Date: 2025.08.07 14:19:56 -04'00'

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

KESHA PETERS, individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated

Plaintiff(s)

V.

KEURIG DR PEPPER INC.

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)* Keurig Dr Pepper Inc.
53 South Avenue
Burlington, MA 01803

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff’s attorney, whose name and address are:

Joshua D. Arisohn
Arisohn LLC
94 Blakeslee Rd.
Litchfield, CT 06759

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

BRENNAN B. MAHONEY
CLERK OF COURT

Date: _____

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

☐ I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

☐ I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

☐ I returned the summons unexecuted because _____; or

☐ Other *(specify)*: _____

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ 0.00.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: