

1 **CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.**
 Ryan J. Clarkson (SBN 257074)
 2 *rclarkson@clarksonlawfirm.com*
 Shireen M. Clarkson (SBN 237882)
 3 *sclarkson@clarksonlawfirm.com*
 Katherine A. Bruce (SBN 288694)
 4 *kbruce@clarksonlawfirm.com*
 Kelsey J. Elling (SBN 337915)
 5 *kelling@clarksonlawfirm.com*
 22525 Pacific Coast Highway
 6 Malibu, CA 90265
 Tel: (213) 788-4050
 7 Fax: (213) 788-4070

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

9
 10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 11 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12 MATTHEW SINATRO, and JESSICA
 13 PROST, individually and on behalf of all others
 similarly situated,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 vs.

16 BARILLA AMERICA, INC.

17 Defendant.

Case No.:

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1. Violation of Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)
2. Violation of False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*)
3. Violation of Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*)
4. Breach of Warranty
5. Unjust Enrichment

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Page No.

COMPLAINT 1

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. JURISDICTION 8

III. VENUE 8

IV. PARTIES 8

 A. Plaintiffs 8

 B. Defendant 10

V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS 11

 A. Consumer Demand for Authentic Italian-Made Pastas 11

 B. Defendant’s Brand Strategy and Long-Standing Marketing Campaign 14

 C. Plaintiffs and Reasonable Consumers Were Misled by the Challenged Representation
 into Buying the Products, to Their Detriment, Consistent with Defendant’s Deliberate
 Marketing Scheme to Exact a Premium for the Falsely Advertised Products 22

 D. The Products are Substantially Similar 26

 E. No Adequate Remedy at Law 27

VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS 30

VII. CAUSES OF ACTION 33

 COUNT ONE 33

 “Unfair” Prong 36

 “Fraudulent” Prong 38

 “Unlawful” Prong 39

 COUNT TWO 40

 COUNT THREE 42

 COUNT FOUR 45

 COUNT FIVE 46

VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF 48

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL50

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

COMPLAINT

1
2 1. Plaintiffs Matthew Sinatro and Jessica Prost (“**Plaintiffs**”), individually and on behalf
3 of all others similarly situated, as more fully described herein (the “**Class**” and “**Class Members**”),
4 bring this class action complaint against Defendant Barilla America, Inc. (“**Defendant**”), and
5 alleges the following based upon investigation, information, and belief, unless otherwise expressly
6 stated as based upon personal knowledge.

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 2. **Synopsis.** In an effort to increase profits and to obtain an unfair competitive advantage
9 over its lawfully acting competitors, Defendant falsely and misleadingly labels certain of its
10 Barilla® brand pastas as “**ITALY’S #1 BRAND OF PASTA®**,” deliberately leading reasonable
11 consumers, including Plaintiffs, to believe that the Products are made in Italy (hereinafter, “**Italian**
12 **Origin Representation**” or “**Challenged Representation**”). Defendant reinforces the Challenged
13 Representation on the Products by replicating Italy’s national flag’s green, white, and red colors
14 surrounding the Challenged Representation, further perpetuating the notion that the Products are
15 authentic pastas from Italy. Fair and accurate depictions of the Products’ front packaging, from each
16 of the five product lines (*Classic Blue Box*, *Collezione Artisanal*, *Gluten Free*, *Veggie*, and *Whole*
17 *Wheat*), are depicted below with the Challenged Representation circled in red.

18 (1) Barilla® *Classic Blue Box Pasta* (Angel Hair) (**Exhibit 1-1**):



28 *See also* Barilla® *Classic Blue Box Pasta* Front Packaging, **Exhibit 1-1 to 1-34**.

(2) Barilla® *Collezione Artisanal Pasta* (Bucatini) (Exhibit 1-35):



See also Barilla® *Collezione Artisanal Pasta* Front Packaging, Exhibit 1-35 to 1-40.

(3) Barilla® *Gluten Free Pasta* (Elbows) (Exhibit 1-41):



See also Barilla® *Gluten Free Pasta* Front Packaging, Exhibit 1-41 to 1-45.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

(4) Barilla® Veggie Pasta (Rotini) (Exhibit 1-46):




CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

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

See also Barilla® Veggie Pasta Front Packaging, Exhibit 1-46 to 1-47.

(5) Barilla® Whole Grain Pasta (Elbows) (Exhibit 1-48):



CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

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

See also Barilla® Whole Grain Pasta Front Packaging, Exhibit 1-48 to 1-54.

1 3. **The Deception of the Challenged Representation.** The Challenged Representation
 2 has misled reasonable consumers, including Plaintiffs, into believing that the Products are made in
 3 Italy. However, contrary to this labeling, the Products are not made in Italy, the Products’
 4 ingredients are not from Italy, and the Products are not manufactured in Italy. Rather, the Products
 5 are made and manufactured in Iowa and New York, with ingredients (such as the main ingredient,
 6 durum wheat) sourced in countries other than Italy.¹ Through falsely, misleadingly, and deceptively
 7 labeling the Products, Defendant sought to take advantage of consumers’ desire for authentic Italian
 8 pasta, while cutting costs and reaping the financial benefits of manufacturing the Products in the
 9 United States of America. Defendant has done so at the expense of unwitting consumers, as well as
 10 Defendant’s lawfully acting competitors, over whom Defendant maintains an unfair competitive
 11 advantage.

12 4. **The Products.** The Products at issue are Barilla® brand pastas sold to consumers in
 13 the United States that contain the Challenged Representation on the front labels and/or packaging,
 14 regardless of the Product’s size or variations—such as flavor, type of pasta, or type of packaging
 15 (collectively referred to herein and throughout this complaint as the “**Products**”), which include,
 16 but are not necessarily limited to, the following product lines (*Classic Blue Box, Collezione*
 17 *Artisanal, Gluten Free, Vegie, and Whole Grain*) and pastas:

- 18 a. (1) Barilla® *Classic Blue Box* Pastas, including
- 19 1. Angel Hair,
 - 20 2. Campanelle,
 - 21 3. Cellentani,
 - 22 4. Ditalini,
 - 23 5. Elbows,
 - 24 6. Farfalle,

25

26 ¹ See **Exhibit 3f** [FAQ—Company Related (Q3)] (“Barilla Pasta that is sold in the United States is
 27 made in our plants in Ames, IA and Avon, NY. . . . Barilla purchases its wheat from around the
 28 world”); YOUTUBE, Barilla US, *Barilla | Meet the Team: Greg, Wheat-Sourcing Expert (60s)*,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BK1zN2iz0dw> (accessed 6/10/2022) (link to video on Barilla
 Group’s Barilla Brand Webpage at <https://www.barillagroup.com/en/brands/barilla/> (accessed
 6/10/2022) (describing the North American company’s careful selection of durum wheat)).

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

- 1 7. Fettuccine,
- 2 8. Fideo Cut Spaghetti,
- 3 9. Gemelli,
- 4 10. Jumbo Shells,
- 5 11. Large Shells,
- 6 12. Linguine,
- 7 13. Linguine Fini,
- 8 14. Manicotti,
- 9 15. Medium Shells,
- 10 16. Mezzi Rigatoni,
- 11 17. Mini Farfalle,
- 12 18. Mini Penne,
- 13 19. Mini Wheels,
- 14 20. Mostaccioli,
- 15 21. Orzo,
- 16 22. Pastina,
- 17 23. Penne,
- 18 24. Pipette,
- 19 25. Rigatoni,
- 20 26. Rotini,
- 21 27. Spaghetti,
- 22 28. Spaghetti Rigati,
- 23 29. Thick Spaghetti,
- 24 30. Thin Spaghetti,
- 25 31. Tri-Color Penne,
- 26 32. Tri-Color Rotini,
- 27 33. Wavy Lasagne, and
- 28 34. Ziti

1 (see **Exhibit 1-1 to 1-34** [Product Images for Barilla® *Classic Blue Box*]);

2 b. (2) Barilla® *Collezione Artisanal* Pastas, including

3 35. Bucatini,

4 36. Casarecce,

5 37. Orecchiette,

6 38. Penne,

7 39. Rigatoni, and

8 40. Spaghetti

9 (see **Exhibit 1-35 to 1-40** [Product Images for Barilla® *Collezione Artisanal*]);

10 c. (3) Barilla® *Gluten Free* Pastas, including

11 41. Elbows,

12 42. Fettuccine,

13 43. Penne,

14 44. Rotini, and

15 45. Spaghetti

16 (see **Exhibit 1-41 to 1-45** [Product Images for Barilla® *Gluten Free*]);

17 d. (4) Barilla® *Veggie* Pastas, including

18 46. Rotini, and

19 47. Spaghetti

20 (see **Exhibit 1-46 to 1-47** [Product Images for Barilla® *Veggie*]); and

21 e. (5) Barilla® *Whole Grain* Pastas, including

22 48. Elbows,

23 49. Lasagne,

24 50. Linguine,

25 51. Penne,

26 52. Rotini,

27 53. Spaghetti, and

28 54. Thin Spaghetti

1 (see **Exhibit 1-48 to 1-54** [Product Images for Barilla® *Whole Grain*]).

2 **5. Primary Dual Objectives.** Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of
3 those similarly situated to represent a National Class and a California Subclass of consumers who
4 purchased the Products (defined *infra*) for dual primary objectives. Plaintiffs seek, on Plaintiffs'
5 individual behalf and on behalf of the Class, a monetary recovery of the price premium consumers
6 overpaid for the Products that comport with the Challenged Representation, as consistent with
7 permissible law (including, for example, damages, restitution, disgorgement, and any applicable
8 penalties/punitive damages solely to the extent that those causes of action permit). More
9 importantly, Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief to stop Defendant's unlawful marketing of the Products
10 as originating from Italy to avoid or mitigate the risk of the deceiving the public into believing that
11 the Products conform to the Challenged Representation, by requiring Defendant to change its
12 unlawful advertising and/or labeling practices, for the benefit of consumers, including Plaintiffs and
13 the Class.

14 **II. JURISDICTION**

15 6. This Court has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the Class Action
16 Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because the proposed Class consists of 100 or more
17 members; the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of costs and interest; and
18 minimal diversity exists. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims
19 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

20 **III. VENUE**

21 7. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of
22 the events and omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred in this District. In addition, one
23 or more Plaintiffs purchased the unlawful Products in this District, and Defendant has marketed,
24 advertised, and sold the Products within this District using the Challenged Representation.

25 **IV. PARTIES**

26 **A. Plaintiffs**

27 8. **Plaintiff Matthew Sinatro.** The following is alleged based upon Plaintiff Sinatro's
28 personal knowledge: (1) Plaintiff Sinatro is a resident of San Francisco, California. (2) Plaintiff

1 Sinatro purchased a box of the Classic Barilla Blue Box Pasta (Angel Hair) (the “**Sinatro**
2 **Purchased Product**”) for approximately \$2.00 at a grocery store in or around the City of San
3 Francisco, State of California, in or around the winter of 2021 (*see*, **Exhibit 1-1** [Exemplar Product
4 Image]). (3) In making the purchase, the Challenged Representation on the Product’s label led
5 Plaintiff Sinatro to believe that the Product was made in Italy—to wit, the Products’ ingredients are
6 from Italy and the Products are manufactured in Italy. (4) At the time of purchase, Plaintiff Sinatro
7 did not know that the aforementioned Challenged Representation was false—i.e., that the Product
8 was not made in Italy (to wit, the Product’s ingredients are not from Italy and the Product is not
9 manufactured in Italy). (5) Plaintiff Sinatro would not have purchased the Product, or would not
10 have overpaid a premium for the Product’s purported Italian origin, had he known that the
11 Challenged Representation was false. (6) Plaintiff Sinatro continues to see the Products available
12 for purchase and desires to purchase the Sinatro Purchased Product again if the Challenged
13 Representation was in fact true—i.e., the Product was made in Italy (to wit, the Product’s ingredients
14 are from Italy and the Product is manufactured in Italy). (7) Plaintiff Sinatro is not personally
15 familiar with the location from which the Products’ ingredients are sourced or the location where
16 the Products are manufactured as he does not possess any personal knowledge regarding where the
17 Products are made; and, therefore, Plaintiff Sinatro has no way of determining whether the
18 Challenged Representation on the Products is true. (8) Plaintiff Sinatro is, and continues to be,
19 unable to rely on the truth of the Challenged Representation on the Products’ labels.

20 9. **Plaintiff Jessica Prost.** The following is alleged based upon Plaintiff Prost’s personal
21 knowledge: (1) Plaintiff Prost is a resident of Los Angeles, California. (2) Plaintiff Prost purchased
22 two boxes of the Classic Barilla Blue Box Pasta (Spaghetti) (the “**Prost Purchased Products**”) for
23 approximately \$2.00 per box at a grocery store in or around the City of Los Angeles, State of
24 California, in or around the fall of 2021 (*see*, **Exhibit 1-28** [Exemplar Product Image]). (3) In
25 making the purchase, the Challenged Representation on the Product’s label led Plaintiff Prost to
26 believe that the Product was made in Italy—to wit, the Products’ ingredients are from Italy and the
27 Products are manufactured in Italy. (4) At the time of purchase, Plaintiff Prost did not know that the
28 aforementioned Challenged Representation was false—i.e., that the Product was not made in Italy

1 (to wit, the Product’s ingredients are not from Italy and the Product is not manufactured in Italy).
 2 (5) Plaintiff Prost would not have purchased the Product, or would not have overpaid a premium for
 3 the Product’s purported Italian origin, had she known that the Challenged Representation was false.
 4 (6) Plaintiff Prost continues to see the Products available for purchase and desires to purchase the
 5 Prost Purchased Product again if the Challenged Representation was in fact true—i.e., the Product
 6 was made in Italy (to wit, the Product’s ingredients are from Italy and the Product is manufactured
 7 in Italy). (7) Plaintiff Prost is not personally familiar with the location from which the Products’
 8 ingredients are sourced or the location where the Products are manufactured as she does not possess
 9 any personal knowledge regarding where the Products are made; and, therefore, Plaintiff Prost has
 10 no way of determining whether the Challenged Representation on the Products is true. (8) Plaintiff
 11 Prost is, and continues to be, unable to rely on the truth of the Challenged Representation on the
 12 Products’ labels.

13 10. **Plaintiffs’ Future Harm.** Plaintiffs would continue to purchase the Products in the
 14 future, as Defendant continues to advertise and warrant them, if the Products lived up to and
 15 conformed with the Challenged Representation. Further, Plaintiffs are average consumers
 16 who are not sophisticated in, for example, where ingredients are sourced or the location where
 17 different products are made, similar to and including the Products. Indeed, Plaintiffs do not have
 18 any personal knowledge of the sourcing of ingredients or manufacture of the Products. Since
 19 Plaintiffs would like to purchase the Products again to obtain the benefits of the Challenged
 20 Representation that Defendants continues to use—despite the fact that the Products were once
 21 marred by false advertising or warranties—Plaintiffs would likely and reasonably, but incorrectly,
 22 assume the Products are true to and conform with the Challenged Representation on their labels,
 23 packaging, and Defendant’s advertisements, including Defendant’s websites and social media
 24 platforms. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are at risk of reasonably, but incorrectly, assuming
 25 that Defendant has fixed the Products such that Plaintiffs may buy them again, believing they are
 26 no longer falsely advertised and warranted. In this regard, Plaintiffs are currently and in the future
 27 deprived of the ability to rely on the Challenged Representations to purchase the Products.

28 **B. Defendant**

11. **Defendant Barilla America, Inc. (“Defendant” or “BAI”)** is a corporation headquartered and/or maintaining a principal place of business in the State of Illinois. Defendant was doing business in the State of California at all relevant times, including the Class Period. Directly and through its agents, Defendant has substantial contacts with and receives substantial benefits and income from and through the State of California as approximately ten percent (10%) of its United States sales come from California consumers who purchase the Products in California. Defendant is one of the owners, manufacturers, marketers, and/or distributors of the Products, and is one of the companies that created, authorized, and controlled the use of the copyrighted Challenged Representation to market the Products. Defendant and its agents promoted, marketed, and sold the Products at issue throughout the United States and, in particular, within this judicial district. The unfair, unlawful, deceptive, and misleading Challenged Representations on the Products were prepared, authorized, ratified, and/or approved by Defendant and its agents, and were disseminated throughout California and the nation by Defendant and its agents to deceive and mislead consumers in the State of California and the United States into purchasing the Products.

V. **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

A. **Consumer Demand for Authentic Italian-Made Pastas**

12. **Background – Italian Products.** Generally, Country of Origin claims have “a considerable influence on [consumers regarding] the quality perception of a product.”² Relevant here, authentic Italian products, including pastas, hold a certain prestige and generally viewed as a higher quality product.³ Products “Made in Italy” are “based on creativity [and] matched with quality and design.”⁴ Indeed, the “Made in Italy” claim has evolved into a brand that distinguishes Italian products from other products, specifically in fashion, food, furniture, and mechanical

² Flavia Bonaiuto, et. al., *Italian Food? Sounds Good! Made in Italy and Italian Sounding Effects on Food Products’ Assessment by Consumers*, Front. Psychol. (Mar. 3, 2021), <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.581492/full#B62> (accessed June 10, 2022); Warren J. Bilkey and Erik Nes, *Country-of-origin effects on product evaluations*, J. Int. Business Studies 8, 89–99 (1962) doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490539 (accessed June 10, 2022).

³ See MADE IN ITALY, *Made in Italy*, <https://madeinitaly.org/en/made-in-italy/made-in-italy.php> (accessed June 10, 2022).

⁴ *Id.*

1 engineering.⁵ “Italian-Made” branding is often associated with superior quality, extreme attention
 2 to detail, elegance, and a long established tradition in manufacturing.⁶ Notably, the general
 3 “Italianness” of a product influences consumers overall evaluation of a product.⁷ Consumers seek
 4 out products that look or sound like they are from Italy because Italian products have a better
 5 reputation, and, as such, consumers willingly pay more for Italian sounding and/or looking
 6 products.⁸ Thus, Manufacturers use “Italian Sounding” descriptors—e.g., Italian-sounding names,
 7 images, shapes, and places of production typically associated with Italy—and use “[c]olors evoking
 8 the Italian flag and images of famous Italian landscapes or monuments—e.g., the gulf of Naples,
 9 the tower of Pisa—reproduced on the label and packaging” to mislead consumers into believing that
 10 products are manufactured and/or made in Italy.⁹ This is done to exploit a product’s purported Italian
 11 origin to drive sales and increase the perceived monetary value of the product, reaping the benefits
 12 of selling a premium product without incurring the costs to make it.¹⁰

13 **13. Background—Italian Pasta.** “The food industry is the second most important sector
 14 of [the] Italian economy” and Italy is the 10th greatest exporter of food worldwide.¹¹ Pasta is and
 15 has been an integral part of Italian culture since the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.¹² Today,
 16 Italy produces 3.5 million tons of pasta per year, making the country the world’s top pasta
 17 producer.¹³ Pursuant to Italian standards and law, dry “made in Italy” pasta is generally made from
 18 the drawing, rolling, and drying of dough prepared exclusively with durum wheat or semolina and
 19

20 ⁵ *Id.*

21 ⁶ *Id.*

22 ⁷ Flavia Bonaiuto, et. al., *Italian Food? Sounds Good! Made in Italy and Italian Sounding Effects*
 23 *on Food Products’ Assessment by Consumers*, Front. Psychol. (Mar. 3, 2021),
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.581492/full#B62> (accessed June 10,
 2022).

24 ⁸ *Id.*

25 ⁹ *Id.*

26 ¹⁰ *Id.*

27 ¹¹ *Id.*

28 ¹² Timothy Santonastaso, *A Brief History of Pasta*, Italics Magazine (May 29, 2020),
<https://italicsmag.com/2020/05/29/a-brief-history-of-pasta/> (accessed June 8, 2022).

¹³ INT’L PASTA ORGANISATION, *World Consumption Boom Since the Lockdown Started 1 Consumer*
Out of 4 Ate More, 25% Export Increase in 6 Months (Oct. 16, 2020),
[https://internationalpasta.org/news/pasta-world-consumption-boom-since-the-lockdown-started-1-](https://internationalpasta.org/news/pasta-world-consumption-boom-since-the-lockdown-started-1-consumer-out-of-4-ate-more-25-export-increase-in-6-months/)
consumer-out-of-4-ate-more-25-export-increase-in-6-months/ (accessed June 8, 2022).

1 water.¹⁴ Indeed, Italian pasta is one of the best and most sought after products in the global market.¹⁵
 2 Italian durum wheat is among some of the “best varieties and characterized by an elevated protein
 3 content, an high gluten quality, a golden yellow color and a low content of ashes. **Exhibit 4e** [Barilla
 4 Group We Use Only Webpage]. However, Italy’s production of local durum wheat cannot meet
 5 worldwide demands and in the past fifteen years, production of Italian durum wheat far exceeds the
 6 export of pastas.¹⁶ Since the demand for Italian durum wheat is exponentially high, it is sold at
 7 premium.¹⁷ Thus, in response to consumers’ desire for authentic Italian pastas, many companies,
 8 including Defendant, have scrambled to manufacture, market, and sell purportedly authentic
 9 ‘Italian-made’ pastas, using durum wheat that is not sourced in Italy, in an effort to gain market
 10 share and increase sales.

11 **14. Defendant’s History and Origin of United States Barilla® Brand Products.**

12 Defendant started as a bread and pasta shop in 1877 in Parma, Italy. **Exhibit 4c** [Barilla Group
 13 History of the Company Webpages]. In 1999, the first of Defendant’s United States plants opened
 14 in Ames, Iowa, and in 2008 Defendant opened a second plant in Avon, New York. *Id.* All Barilla®
 15 brand Products that are sold in the United States, with the exception of the Barilla® Tortellini and
 16 the Barilla® Oven Ready Lasagna (not at issue in this case), are made in United States plants, and
 17 not in Italy. **Exhibit 3f** [FAQ—Company Related (Q3)]. Ingredients for Barilla® pastas are not all
 18 sourced in Italy. *Id.* Therefore, the overwhelming majority of Barilla® pastas sold in the United
 19 States, including all of the Products at issue here, are not of made in Italy—be it the sourcing of
 20 ingredients (like durum wheat) or the manufacturing of the Products, despite Defendant’s labeling
 21 and advertising of the Products with the Challenged Representation. Defendant admits that it uses
 22 wheat from around the world and does not exclusively use the preeminent Italian durum wheat,
 23 despite its commitment in 2019 to use Italian durum wheat for certain classic pasta formats so long
 24 as they are sold in Italy and not the United States. **Exhibit 4e** [Barilla Group We Use Only

25
 26 ¹⁴ See MADE IN ITALY, *Pasta Made in Italy*, <http://pasta.madeinitaly.org/> (accessed June 9, 2022).

27 ¹⁵ Luca Fazio, *The pasta is ‘made in Italy.’ The wheat isn’t*, il manifesto (Nov. 24, 2017),
 28 <https://global.ilmanifesto.it/the-pasta-is-made-in-italy-the-wheat-isnt/> (accessed June 10, 2022).

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.*

1 Webpage].

2 15. **FTC Guidelines.** Manufacturers and marketers use country of origin claims to help
3 distinguish their products over other products, knowing consumers rely on the accuracy of those
4 claims in making their purchasing decisions. Thus, accurate label representations as to the source
5 of the products are extremely important. The United States Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”)
6 created standards regarding the “Made in USA” claim to help companies avoid making misleading
7 and deceptive claims.¹⁸ If a product is advertised as “Made in USA,” then “all or virtually all” of
8 the product must be made in the United States.¹⁹ Specifically, the FTC stated:

9 In connection with promoting or offering for sale any good or service, . . . it is an unfair
10 or deceptive act or practice . . . to label any product as Made in the United States unless
11 the final assembly or processing of the product occurs in the United States, all
12 significant processing that goes into the product occurs in the United States, and all or
13 virtually all ingredients or components of the product are made and sourced in the
14 United States.

15 16 C.F.R. § 323.2. Here, Defendant disregarded FTC guidelines governing “Made in USA” claims,
16 analogous to the Challenged Representation in this case, opting to manufacture the Products outside
17 of Italy, using ingredients that are not sourced from Italy (such as the main ingredient wheat durum),
18 certainly failing to satisfy the “all or virtually all” standard that requires both the Products’
19 ingredients and manufacture to originate from the claimed country of origin.

20 **B. Defendant’s Brand Strategy and Long-Standing Marketing Campaign**

21 16. **Brand Strategy/Marketing Campaign.** Defendant deliberately designed and
22 executed a decades long marketing campaign to identify the Barilla® brand, company, and Products
23 at issue in this case, as authentic, genuine Italian pastas—made from ingredients sources in Italy
24 (like durum wheat), and manufactured in Italy. Not only does Defendant label the Products’
25 packaging with the Challenged Representation—Italy’s #1 Brand of Pasta, but Defendant has also
26 heavily advertised Barilla® brand pastas as Italian for the past century. Defendant maintains several
27 Barilla websites, a recognized Barilla Historical Archive, Barilla Pasta Museum, and Barilla

28 ¹⁸ See Federal Trade Commission, *Complying with the MADE IN USA STANDARD*,
<https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/plain-language/bus03-complying-made-usa-standard.pdf>. (accessed 6/9/2022); see also generally 16 C.F.R. § 323.2—Made in USA Labeling;
62 FR 63756-01, 1997 WL 737641.

¹⁹ *Id.*

1 Academy—all designed to promote the brand and company’s Italian identity to convince consumers
2 that Barilla® brand pastas, like the Products, come from Italian ingredients, processed and
3 manufactured in Italian factories, and then exported for sale to various countries, including, in
4 particular, the United States.

5 17. **Challenged Representations on Products’ Labels.** Defendant falsely and
6 misleadingly labels the Products with the Challenged Representation: “ITALY’S #1 BRAND OF
7 PASTA,” surrounded by an artistic recreation of the Italian flag, as depicted below.



10 The Challenged Representation on the Products’ packaging is conspicuous. It is prominently placed
11 on each Product’s primary display panel of the front label or packaging. The front primary display
12 panel contains scant imagery and information about the Products, largely limited to the brand name
13 (Barilla®); identity of the product line (e.g., Classic Blue Box), type of pasta (e.g., spaghetti), and
14 a few claims about the Products’ attributes (e.g., net weight). To draw the consumers’ attention, the
15 Challenged Representation is written in all capital letters; clear, legible, and highly visible white
16 font; surrounded by an artistic recreation of the Italian flag; all of which starkly contrasts with the
17 packaging’s vast dark blue background. The Challenged Representation is also surrounded by
18 Italian flags (including colors, depicted left to right, green, white, and red) to emphasize that the
19 Product is made in Italy. Indeed, Defendant copyrighted the Challenged Representation, with the
20 Italian flags depicted on its left and right. The net-effect or net-impression on consumers is that the
21 Products are made in Italy—including the harvesting of ingredients from Italy and the manufacture
22 of the pastas in Italy. *See Exhibit 1* [Product Images].

23 18. **Barilla Website.** Defendant emphasizes the Italian-made Products’ purported
24 attribute in its advertising of the Products as part of its long-standing marketing campaign and brand
25 strategy to identify “Barilla®” pastas as Italy-made. Not only have Defendants labeled more than
26 fifty of its Products, including its decade’s old Classic Blue Box Products, with the Challenged
27 Representation, but Defendant engaged in a marketing campaign, initiated long before and
28 continuing throughout the Class Period, that likewise emphasizes Barilla®’s Italian origin.

1 Defendant's marketing campaign and brand strategy are evidenced by its www.barilla.com website.

2 For example:

- 3 a. **Home.** On the homepage of its official website, Defendant describes itself as
4 "an Italian family-owned food company" that is a "world leader in the markets
5 of pasta and ready-to-use sauces in continental Europe, bakery products in
6 Italy and crispbread in Scandinavia, the Barilla Group is recognized
7 worldwide as a symbol of Italian know-how." **Exhibit 3a** [Home Webpage]
8 (emphasis added)
- 9 b. **Classic Blue Box.** At the top of the Classic Blue Box product line webpage,
10 Defendant brags that *Italians* recognize the Barilla® brand Products merely
11 their signature dark blue box packaging and that *Italians* have favored the
12 Products for more than one hundred years, writing: "***Italians*** know the familiar
13 Blue Box means quality, perfectly al dente pasta every time. That's why Barilla
14 has been an ***Italian favorite for over 140 years***, and continues to be the ***#1***
15 ***pasta in Italy today.***" See **Exhibit 3b** [Classic Blue Box Webpage] (emphasis
16 added).
- 17 c. **Collezione Artisanal.** Similarly, at the top of the Collezione Artisanal product
18 line webpage, Defendant emphasizes the *Italian* manufacturing process for the
19 Products, writing: "Barilla® Collezione features six artisanal pasta shapes and
20 our signature tortellini. Collezione is crafted using ***traditional Italian*** bronze
21 plates for a homemade "al dente" texture that perfectly holds sauces every
22 time." See **Exhibit 3c** [Collezione Artisanal Webpage] (emphasis added).
23 Indeed, Defendant used the Italian word for "Collection" to name its artisanal
24 "Collezione" product line.
- 25 d. **Whole Green.** Likewise, at the top of the Whole Green product line webpage,
26 Defendant admits that, by brand-identity alone, consumers expect Barilla®
27 brand pastas to be *Italian-made*, writing: "Our Whole Grain pasta provides the
28 same great taste, 'al dente' texture, and quality you have come to expect from
Barilla, Italy's #1 brand pasta." **Exhibit 3d** [Whole Grain Webpage]
(emphasis added).

19 **19. Barilla Group's Website, Barilla Historic Archive, Museum, and Academy.** The
20 Barilla Group owns and controls, through various subsidiaries like Defendant, several brands of
21 pasta that are identified by particular countries of origin, such as the Italian-made pasta brands
22 Barilla®, Voiello®, and Pasta Evangelists®. **Exhibit 4a** [Barilla Group Brands Webpage]. The
23 Barilla Group maintains a website, www.barillagroup.com/en, that markets the Barilla® brand and
24 company as undeniably Italian, dedicated to the manufacturing, marketing and selling of Italian-
25 made pastas. Its website furthers Defendant's long-standing marketing campaign and brand strategy
26 to expound Barilla®'s Italian origin and cement the Barilla® brand and company's identity as
27 providing Italian-made pastas. For example:

- 28 a. **Barilla Brand Webpage.** The Barilla Group maintains a webpage dedicated

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
 22525 Pacific Coast Highway
 Malibu, CA 90265

to the Barilla.

- (1) **Blue-Box Identity.** On the dedicated Barilla® brand webpage, the company utilizes the Barilla® classic blue box design, including its content, color scheme and layout, to headline the webpage, reinforcing the brand’s Italian-made identity, and emphasizing that the quality of Barilla® pastas derives from its “Italian culture.” **Exhibit 4b** [Barilla Group Barilla Brand Webpage] (“Offering quality is one of the biggest signs of affection, especially in the Italian culture. . . . This attitude represents Barilla’s brand point of view.”).

- (2) **Iconic Italian Film and Music.** Directly below the headline, the Barilla Group posts a video that depicts families enjoying Barilla® pasta and features the artist Noa (Achionoam Nini) singing “Beautiful That Way,” a vocal version of the theme song from Roberto Benigni’s Oscar-winning, 1997 Italian film “Life is Beautiful,” set to easily-recognizable Italian folk melodies written by Italy’s foremost film composer Nicola Piovani. *Id.* (title card stating, in all capitals: “Barilla presents What Can You Say Without Words?”); *see also* YOUTUBE, Noa (Achionoam Nini), *Noa (Achionoam Nini) – Beautiful that way (La vita e bella) (The Official videoclip)*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-OyXpzd6WBk> (accessed 6/10/2022). The same video is posted on Defendant’s Barilla® website to promote the Products. *See, e.g.,* **Exhibit 3b** [Classic Blue Box Webpage] (also available at YOUTUBE, Barilla US, *Barilla | No Words | Make Barilla Pasta as a Sign of Love*, at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=laJO_KyPP38&t=7s (accessed 6/10/2022)). In this way, Defendant harnessed the notoriety of an iconic Italian movie, with an award-winning soundtrack, and easily recognizable Italian folk music melodies, to advertise Barilla® brand pastas and strengthen the association between the Products and their purported Italian origin.

- (3) **Barilla Quality Manifesto.** Beneath the video, the Barilla Group touts Defendant’s “Barilla Quality Manifesto,” describing the importance of harvesting Defendant’s “precious ingredient,” “the highest quality durum wheat,” to create the “perfect semonila blend,” through constant improvement of Defendant’s method to transform durum wheat into pasta, to provide “an *authentic* full taste,” so that families can enjoy Defendant’s “flavorful and *genuine* pasta” at home. **Exhibit 4b** [Barilla Group Barilla Brand Webpage] (emphasis added). In this way, Barilla® brand pastas are marketed as authentic and genuine Italian made pastas derived from Italian durum wheat. *Id.*

- (4) **Spotify Playlist.** Defendant utilizes music sharing platforms, like Spotify, to further associate the Barilla® brand’s identify with Italy. Approximately three-quarters of the way down Barilla Group’s Barilla® brand webpage, the Barilla Group provides a link to its Spotify “Barilla Italia” playlist, which overwhelmingly contains Italian music. **Exhibit 4b** [Barilla Group Barilla Brand Webpage] (posting link to SPOTIFY, *Barilla Italia, Public Playlists*, at <https://open.spotify.com/user/w2p1oq867ns7jele6g3lw66fk?si=38858347f5444303&nd=1> (accessed 6/10/2022)).

b. **History.** The Barilla Group chronologizes the company’s history, since its

1 founding in 1877, on several webpages demarcated by the tenure of each male
 2 family members' era in leadership. **Exhibit 4c** [Barilla Group History
 3 Webpage]. In doing so, the company heavily ties its identity to Italy. For
 4 example:

5 (1) **1877-1912.** During Peitro Barilla, Sr.'s era from 1877 to 1912, the
 6 company describes the modest beginnings of Barilla® brand pasta in
 7 opening a pasta shop in 1877, emphasizing its location in Parma, Italy.
 8 *Id.*

9 (2) **1912-1947.** During Gualtiero and Riccardo Barilla's era from 1912 to
 10 1947, the company launched a line of Barilla® brand pasta in 1937,
 11 described as "the ideal dietary food for a critical period in Italy." *Id.*

12 (3) **1947-1993.** During Gianni and Pietro Barilla's era from 1947 to 1993,
 13 the company notes the construction of various factories, emphasizing
 14 their location in Italy, including the bakery factory in Rubbiano,
 15 Parma, Italy, in 1965, and the "largest pasta production plant" in
 16 Pedrignano, Parma, Italy, in 1969, as well as the launch of several other
 17 Italian-named product lines for Barilla's sister-pastas, like Voiello in
 18 1973, and Mulino Bianco in 1975. *Id.* The company describes how, in
 19 1965 to 1970, it used an Italian media personality, Mina, to make
 20 several clips advertising Barilla® brand pasta on "Italian TV," and,
 21 similarly, in 1979, it used "famous" Italian-named directors and
 22 cartoonists to advertise Barilla® brand pasta. *Id.* The company also
 23 touts the acquisition of another brand called Novara in 1992,
 24 emphasizing its Northern Italy affiliation. *Id.*

25 (4) **1993-Today (at least 6/10/2022).** During Guido, Luca, and Paolo
 26 Barilla's era from 1993 to at least 2022, the company boasts about the
 27 2004 inauguration of Academia Barilla, "*an international project
 28 devoted to safeguarding, developing, and promoting the regional
 Italian gastronomic culture as a unique World Heritage.*" *Id.*
 (emphasis added). The company further emphasizes, in 2012, the
 opening of its first "Pasta Sauces Plant"; in 2015, the arrival of its first
 wheat transport train; and in 2020, its acquisition of the Muggia pasta
 plant, each time emphasizing their locations in Italy. *Id.*

c. **Family Company Webpage.** The Barilla Group lists its Chairman, Deputy
 Chairmen, and Chief Executive Officer on its "Family Company" webpage,
 expressly identifying each of the current company leaders being Italian born.
Exhibit 4d [Barilla Group Family Company Webpage] (expressly identifying
 each of the "heads of [its] family" as Italian born, including Chairman Guido
 Barilla, Vice-Chairmen Luca Barilla and Paolo Barilla, and Chief Executive
 Officer Claudio Colzani).

d. **We Use Only Quality Wheat Webpage.** The Barilla Group boasts on its "We
 Use Only Quality Wheats" webpage that the Barilla® brand pastas are made
 from the "best quality durum wheat in the world," emphasizing its

1 “commit[ment] to . . . purchas[e] . . . *Italian* durum” and manufacture “classic
2 pasta formats destined to the *Italian* market . . . us[ing] *100% Italian wheats*,”
3 **Exhibit 4e** [Barilla Group We Use Only Webpage] (explaining the uniqueness
4 and value Italian durum wheat provides, noting it is “selected among the best
5 varieties and characterized by an elevated protein content, a[] high gluten
6 quality, a golden yellow color and a low content of ashes.”).

7 e. **Historical Archive.** The Barilla Group provides a Historical Archive to let
8 consumers “[d]iscover the heart of [its] company” through the marketing of
9 Barilla® brand pastas, calling its past its future. **Exhibit 4f** [Barilla Group
10 Historical Archive Webpage]. Immediately below this headline, a video is
11 posted depicting: a reenactment of the company’s founder in the fields of Italy
12 harvesting wheat and examining grains; the humble beginnings of the first
13 Barilla® pasta shop opened in Italy and the first Barilla® pasta factory in Italy
14 and the craftsmanship of making pasta; imagery of families enjoying Barilla®
15 brand products throughout modern history; and a return to the company
16 founder’s beginnings on the wheat fields of Italy, explaining how the
17 company’s past, grounded in Italy and Italian culture, is its future. *Id.* (video
18 also available at YOUTUBE, Barilla Group, *Barilla – The Dream*, at
19 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oSp29neAjNk&t=45s> (accessed
20 6/10/2022); and ARCHIVIO STORICO BARILLA, Home Page,
21 <https://www.archivistoricobarilla.com/en/> (accessed 6/10/2022) (Video
22 “Dream”).

23 f. **Archivio Storico Barilla.** The Barilla Group provides a link on its Historical
24 Archive webpage to its website, www.ArchivioStoricoBarilla.com/en/, which
25 catalogues over 60,000 documents showing the history, economic activity, and
26 marketing strategy of iconic Barilla® brands, including posters, promotional
27 items, television and cinema commercials, developed in collaboration with
28 several famous Italian directors. **Exhibit 4e** [Barilla Group Historical Archive
Webpage]; *see also* **Exhibit 5g** [Archivio Storico Barilla—Archive Holds
Webpage] (categorizing extensive content); **Exhibit 5h** [Archivio Storico
Barilla—Declaration] (acknowledging the archive is maintained by a Barilla
Group subsidiary aimed at preserving and disseminating documentation of
Barilla’s heritage).

(1) **Story of the Archive.** The company describes its linked archive as “a
symbolic project,” launched in 1987, to get “back [to] the memory of
the past; preserv[e] with the most correct criteria [its] materials and []
documentation; giving them value to make them become again part of
the Company’s culture and of the wider social reality.” **Exhibit 5b**
[Archivio Storico Barilla—Story of Archive Webpage]. In doing so,
the company acknowledges, “[t]he history of Barilla has intertwined
for more than a century with that of the city and, more generally,
with the history of the Italian economy and culture,” inextricably
tethering the entire Barilla® brand and company identity to the country
and culture of Italy. *Id.* A mere perusal of the archive undeniably
identifies Barilla® as Italian. Indeed, the company admits that the
archive does not simply safeguard historical documents, but it is used

1 to market the Barilla® brand and company as belonging to Italy,
 2 stating the archive, containing thousands of promotional materials
 3 readily identifiable as Italian, “is also involved in the cultural
 4 promotion of Barilla.” *Id.*

5 (2) **Mission.** The company further explains its mission in creating the
 6 Barilla Historical Archive to “promote[] and enhance[] . . . the cultural
 7 evolution of the enterprise and the historic memory of the Company
 8 generations, documenting the social development of Italy”;
 9 deliberately “disseminat[ing] its knowledge” on an “international”
 10 level; and “promoting the presence of Barilla” on platforms and in
 11 spaces far exceeding those traditionally occupied by a food
 12 manufacturer selling its products. **Exhibit 5c** [Archivio Storico
 13 Barilla—Mission Webpage]. In this way, the company deliberately
 14 establishes its identity and the Barilla® brand as an Italian company,
 15 making Italian pastas, in Italy, on an international scale that reaches far
 16 beyond mere commercial marketing spaces into educational spaces
 17 and historical archives. *Id.*

18 (3) **Pasta Museum.** On May 10, 2014, the Barilla Group inaugurated a
 19 Barilla® brand pasta museum, located in Giarolo, Collecchio, Italy.
 20 **Exhibit 5d** [Archivio Storico Barilla—Education]. In its description
 21 of the museum, the company emphasizes its Barilla® pastas are made
 22 from durum wheat found in Sicily, Liguria, Bologna, and Naples, Italy.
 23 **Exhibit 5f** [Archivio Storico Barilla—Pasta Museum]. The museum
 24 has several sections dedicated to the wheat that makes Barilla® pastas;
 25 the evolution of the grinding and dry pasta manufacturing processes;
 26 and the historical marketing and advertising of its pastas. *Id.*

27 (4) **Academy Barilla.** In May 2004, the Barilla Group inaugurated an
 28 “international center for promotion, tutelage and development of the
 art of Italian Gastronomy.” **Exhibit 5d** [Archivio Storico Barilla—
 Education] (emphasis added). On Barilla Group’s Education webpage,
 it provides a link to the academy. *Id.*; *see also* **Exhibit 6** [Academia
 Barilla—The Academy]. The company describes the Barilla
 Academy’s “mission of discovering and disseminating the Italian
 gastronomic and cultural heritage,” “to strengthen the awareness of the
 deep roots of the Italian gastronomic tradition.” *Id.* Thus, the Barilla
 Academy’s main purpose is to tether pastas, like Barilla® brand pastas,
 among other foods, to Italy. *Id.*

(5) **Declaration.** Indeed, the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities,
 on November 30, 1999, declared the company’s archive “of
 considerable historical interest” as it “witnessed the development of
 the food industry in Parma and the evolution of customs in Italy.”
Exhibit 5h [Archivio Storico Barilla—Declaration]. The archive
 solidifies, on an international and historic scale, the undeniable,
 century’s old, and deliberately marketed identity of Barilla® brand
 pastas as authentic, genuine Italian-made pastas. *Id.*

20. **Social Media Representations.** Defendant continuously uses deceptive labeling and marketing techniques to falsely portray its Products as made in Italy, taking advantage of social media platforms like Twitter and Instagram. For example:

a. **Twitter Screenshot.** Barilla’s official Twitter biography, depicted below, is written in the Italian language, “Barilla, nata nel 1877, rappresenta oggi la pasta n1 in Italia e nel mondo,” to reinforce the brand and company’s Italian identity.²⁰ See Twitter, @Barilla, at <https://twitter.com/Barilla> (accessed 6/9/2022) (translated to English: born in 1877, today it represents the no. 1 pasta in Italy and in the world). Barilla uses its Twitter account to emphasize its geographic location in “Parma, Italy” (where the Barilla Group’s headquarters are located). *Id.*




b. **Instagram Screenshot.** Similarly, Defendant’s Instagram account for Barilla®, for example, features a video about the origins of Carbonara, an Italian pasta dish, narrated in the Italian language, and depicting iconic imagery strongly associated with Italy to reinforce the Barilla® brand image and corporate identity as a credible manufacturer of authentic Italian pastas.

²⁰

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
 22525 Pacific Coast Highway
 Malibu, CA 90265

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



C. Plaintiffs and Reasonable Consumers Were Misled by the Challenged Representation into Buying the Products, to Their Detriment, Consistent with Defendant’s Deliberate Marketing Scheme to Exact a Premium for the Falsely Advertised Products

21. **Reasonable Consumer’s Perception.** The Challenged Representation, combined with Defendant’s pervasive marketing campaign and brand strategy, lead reasonable consumers, like Plaintiffs, into believing that the Products conform to the Challenged Representation—meaning, consumers are led to believe that the Products are made in Italy, i.e., their ingredients are sourced in Italy and the finished Products are manufactured in Italy.

22. **Materiality.** The Challenged Representation is material to reasonable consumers, including Plaintiffs, in deciding to buy the Products—meaning that the Italian-made Products-attribute is important to consumers and motivates them to buy the Products.

1 23. **Reliance.** The Class, including Plaintiffs, reasonably relied on the Challenged
2 Representation in deciding to purchase the Products.

3 24. **Falsity.** The Challenged Representation is false and deceptive because the Products
4 are not made in Italy—meaning the ingredients are not sourced in Italy and/or the finished Products
5 are not manufactured in Italy. Indeed, Defendant admits that Products sold in the United States are
6 made in the United States, not Italy. **Exhibit 3f** [FAQ—Company Related (Q3)] (“Barilla Pasta that
7 is sold in the United States is made in our plants in Ames, IA and Avon, NY. . . . Barilla purchases
8 its wheat from around the world”).

9 25. **Consumers Lack Knowledge of Falsity.** The Class, including Plaintiffs, who
10 purchased the Products, do not know, and have no reason to know, at the time of purchase, that the
11 Products’ Challenged Representation is false, misleading, deceptive, and unlawful—that is because
12 the Class, including Plaintiffs, do not work for Defendant and have no personal knowledge of the
13 Country in which the Products are made—be it where the ingredients are sourced or the finished
14 Products are manufactured.

15 26. **Defendant’ Knowledge.** Defendant knew, or should have known, that the Challenged
16 Representation was false, misleading, deceptive, and unlawful, at the time that Defendant
17 manufactured, marketed, advertised, labeled, and sold the Products using the Challenged
18 Representations to Plaintiffs and the Class. Defendant intentionally and deliberately used the
19 Challenged Representation, alongside its massive marketing campaign and brand strategy, to cause
20 Plaintiffs and similarly situated consumers to buy the Products believing that the Challenged
21 representation is true.

22 a. **Knowledge of Falsity.** Defendant manufactured the Products, selecting its
23 ingredients (like wheat durum) from countries other than Italy, and
24 manufacturing the Products in factories outside of Italy, even though
25 Defendant marketed its Products as made in Italy. **Exhibit 3f** [FAQ—
26 Company Related (Q3)] (“Barilla Pasta that is sold in the United States is made
27 in our plants in Ames, IA and Avon, NY. . . . Barilla purchases its wheat from
28 around the world”); YOUTUBE, Barilla US, *Barilla | Meet the Team: Greg,*

1 *Wheat-Sourcing* *Expert* (60s),
 2 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BK1zN2iz0dw> (accessed 6/10/2022)
 3 (link to video on Barilla Group’s Barilla Brand Webpage at
 4 <https://www.barillagroup.com/en/brands/barilla/> (accessed 6/10/2022)
 5 (describing the North American company’s careful selection of durum wheat).

6 b. **Knowledge of Reasonable Consumers’ Perception.** Defendant knew or
 7 should have known that the Challenged Representation would lead reasonable
 8 consumers into believing that the Products are made in Italy—meaning that
 9 the ingredients all come from Italy and the finished Products are manufactured
 10 in Italy. Not only has Defendant utilized a long-standing brand strategy to
 11 identify the Products as Italian-made—executed through a decades-long
 12 marketing campaign described *supra*, but Defendant also has an obligation
 13 under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, codified at 15 U.S.C.
 14 §§ 45, to evaluate its marketing claims from the perspective of the reasonable
 15 consumer. That means Defendant was statutorily obligated to consider
 16 whether the Challenged Representation, be it in isolation or conjunction with
 17 its marketing campaign, would mislead reasonable consumers into believing
 18 that the Products are made in Italy. Thus, Defendant either knew the
 19 Challenged Representation is misleading before it marketed the Products to
 20 the Class, including Plaintiffs, or Defendant would have known that it is
 21 deceptive had it complied with its statutory obligations.

22 c. **Knowledge of Materiality.** Defendant knew or should have known of the
 23 Challenged Representations materiality to consumers. First, manufacturers
 24 and marketers, like Defendant, generally reserve the front primary display
 25 panel of labels or packaging on consumer products for the most important and
 26 persuasive information, which they believe will motivate consumers to buy
 27 the products. Here, the conspicuousness of the Challenged Representation on
 28 the Products’ labels and packaging demonstrates Defendant’s awareness of its

1 importance to consumers and Defendant's understanding that consumers
 2 prefer and are motivated to buy products that conform to the Challenged
 3 Representation. Second, manufacturers and marketers repeat marketing claims
 4 to emphasize and characterize a brand or product line, shaping the consumers'
 5 expectations, because they believe those repeated messages will drive
 6 consumers to buy the Product. Here, the constant, unwavering use of the
 7 Challenged Representation on countless Products, advertisements, and
 8 throughout Defendant's marketing campaign spanning decades, evidences
 9 Defendant's awareness that the falsely advertised Product-attribute is
 10 important to consumers. It also evidences Defendant's intent to convince
 11 consumers that the Products conform to the Challenged Representations and,
 12 ultimately, drive sales.

- 13 d. **Defendant's Continued Deception, Despite Its Knowledge.** Defendant, as
 14 the manufacturer and marketer of the Products, had exclusive control over the
 15 Challenged Representation's inclusion on the Products' labels, packaging, and
 16 advertisements—i.e., Defendant readily and easily could have stopped using
 17 the Challenged Representation to sell the Products. However, despite
 18 Defendant's knowledge of the Challenged Representation's falsity, and
 19 Defendant's knowledge that consumers reasonably rely on the representation
 20 in deciding to buy the Products—Italian-Made—Defendant deliberately chose
 21 to market the Products with the Challenged Representation thereby misleading
 22 consumers into buying or overpaying for the Products. Thus, Defendant knew,
 23 or should have known, at all relevant times, that the Challenged
 24 Representation misleads reasonable consumers, such as Plaintiffs, into buying
 25 the Products to attain the product-attributes that Defendant falsely advertised
 26 and warranted.

27 27. **Detriment.** Plaintiffs and similarly situated consumers would not have purchased the
 28 Products, or would not have overpaid a price premium for the Products, if they had known that the

1 Challenged Representations were false and, therefore, the Products do not have the attribute
 2 claimed, promised, warranted, advertised, and/or represented. Accordingly, based on Defendant’s
 3 material misrepresentations and omissions, reasonable consumers, including Plaintiffs, purchased
 4 the Products to their detriment.

5 **D. The Products are Substantially Similar**

6 28. As described herein, Plaintiffs purchased the Sinatro and Prost Purchased Products
 7 (collectively, the “**Purchased Products**”). The additional Products (collectively, the
 8 “**Unpurchased Products**”) are substantially similar to the Purchased Products.

- 9 a. **Defendant.** All Products are manufactured, sold, marketed, advertised,
 10 labeled, and packaged by Defendant.
- 11 b. **Brand.** All Products are sold under the same brand name: Barilla®.
- 12 c. **Purpose.** All Products are dry pastas intended for human consumption.
- 13 d. **Ingredients.** All Products are made from largely the same ingredients or types
 14 of ingredients, predominantly made from durum wheat, milled in the same or
 15 similar manner, and manufactured into the finished Products in the same or
 16 similar manner. *See Exhibit 2* [Product Webpage] (listing ingredients).
- 17 e. **Marketing Demographics.** All Products are marketed directly to consumers
 18 for personal consumption. In particular, the Products are manufactured as food
 19 to feed families.
- 20 f. **Challenged Misrepresentation.** All Products contain the same Challenged
 21 Representation (“ITALY’S #1 BRAND OF PASTA”) conspicuously and
 22 prominently placed on the primary display panel of the front label and/or
 23 packaging. In addition, Defendant reinforces the Challenged Representation
 24 on each Product by displaying images of the Italian flag surrounding the
 25 Challenged Representation. Indeed, Defendant copyrighted the Challenged
 26 Representation with the Italian flag imagery.
- 27 g. **Packaging.** All Products are packaged in similar packaging—using a dark
 28 blue background, and similar color schemes for written content. The Products

1 largely share in common the same marketing claims written on the box,
2 including brand identity (Barilla®), pasta type (e.g., spaghetti), and a few
3 product features (e.g., net weight).

- 4 h. **Misleading Effect.** The misleading effect of the Challenged Representation
5 on consumers is the same for all Products—consumers over-pay a premium
6 for Italian-made Products, but receive Products that are not Italian-made.

7 **E. No Adequate Remedy at Law**

8 29. **No Adequate Remedy at Law.** Plaintiffs and members of the Class are entitled to
9 equitable relief as no adequate remedy at law exists.

- 10 a. **Broader Statutes of Limitations.** The statutes of limitations for the causes of
11 action pled herein vary. The limitations period is four years for claims brought
12 under the UCL, which is one year longer than the statutes of limitations under
13 the FAL and CLRA. In addition, the statutes of limitations vary for certain
14 states' laws for breach of warranty and unjust enrichment/restitution, between
15 approximately 2 and 6 years. Thus, California Subclass members who
16 purchased the Products more than 3 years prior to the filing of the complaint
17 will be barred from recovery if equitable relief were not permitted under the
18 UCL. Similarly, Nationwide Class members who purchased the Products
19 prior to the furthest reach-back under the statute of limitations for breach of
20 warranty, will be barred from recovery if equitable relief were not permitted
21 for restitution/unjust enrichment.

- 22 b. **Broader Scope of Conduct.** In addition, the scope of actionable misconduct
23 under the unfair prong of the UCL is broader than the other causes of action
24 asserted herein. It includes, for example, Defendant's overall unfair marketing
25 scheme to promote and brand the Products with the Challenged
26 Representation, across a multitude of media platforms, including the Products'
27 labels and packaging, over a long period of time, in order to gain an unfair
28 advantage over competitor products and to take advantage of consumers'

1 desire for products that comport with the Challenged Representation. The
2 UCL also creates a cause of action for violations of law (such as statutory or
3 regulatory requirements and court orders related to similar representations and
4 omissions made on the type of products at issue). Thus, Plaintiffs and Class
5 members may be entitled to restitution under the UCL, while not entitled to
6 damages under other causes of action asserted herein (e.g., the FAL requires
7 actual or constructive knowledge of the falsity; the CLRA is limited to certain
8 types of plaintiffs (an individual who seeks or acquires, by purchase or lease,
9 any goods or services for personal, family, or household purposes) and other
10 statutorily enumerated conduct). Similarly, unjust enrichment/restitution is
11 broader than breach of warranty. For example, in some states, breach of
12 warranty may require privity of contract or pre-lawsuit notice, which are not
13 typically required to establish unjust enrichment/restitution. Thus, Plaintiffs
14 and Class members may be entitled to recover under unjust
15 enrichment/restitution, while not entitled to damages under breach of
16 warranty, because they purchased the products from third-party retailers or did
17 not provide adequate notice of a breach prior to the commencement of this
18 action.

19 c. **Injunctive Relief to Cease Misconduct and Dispel Misperception.**

20 Injunctive relief is appropriate on behalf of Plaintiffs and members of the Class
21 because Defendant continues to misrepresent the Products with the
22 Challenged Representation. Injunctive relief is necessary to prevent Defendant
23 from continuing to engage in the unfair, fraudulent, and/or unlawful conduct
24 described herein and to prevent future harm—none of which can be achieved
25 through available legal remedies (such as monetary damages to compensate
26 past harm). Further, injunctive relief, in the form of affirmative disclosures is
27 necessary to dispel the public misperception about the Products that has
28 resulted from years of Defendant’s unfair, fraudulent, and unlawful marketing

1 efforts. Such disclosures would include, but are not limited to, publicly
 2 disseminated statements that the Products Challenged Representation is not
 3 true and providing accurate information about the Products' true nature; and/or
 4 requiring prominent qualifications and/or disclaimers on the Products' front
 5 label concerning the Products' true nature. An injunction requiring
 6 affirmative disclosures to dispel the public's misperception, and prevent the
 7 ongoing deception and repeat purchases based thereon, is also not available
 8 through a legal remedy (such as monetary damages). In addition, Plaintiffs are
 9 *currently* unable to accurately quantify the damages caused by Defendant's
 10 future harm, because discovery and Plaintiffs' investigation have not yet
 11 completed, rendering injunctive relief all the more necessary. For example,
 12 because the court has not yet certified any class, the following remains
 13 unknown: the scope of the class, the identities of its members, their respective
 14 purchasing practices, prices of past/future Product sales, and quantities of
 15 past/future Product sales.

16 d. **Public Injunction.** Further, because a "public injunction" is available under
 17 the UCL, damages will not adequately "benefit the general public" in a manner
 18 equivalent to an injunction.

19 e. **California vs. Nationwide Class Claims.** Violation of the UCL, FAL, and
 20 CLRA are claims asserted on behalf of Plaintiffs and the California Subclass
 21 against Defendant, while breach of warranty and unjust enrichment/restoration
 22 are asserted on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Nationwide Class. Dismissal of
 23 farther-reaching claims, such as restitution, would bar recovery for non-
 24 California members of the Class. In other words, legal remedies available or
 25 adequate under the California-specific causes of action (such as the UCL,
 26 FAL, and CLRA) have no impact on this Court's jurisdiction to award
 27 equitable relief under the remaining causes of action asserted on behalf of non-
 28 California putative class members.

1 f. **Procedural Posture—Incomplete Discovery & Pre-Certification.** Lastly,
 2 this is an initial pleading in this action and discovery has not yet commenced
 3 and/or is at its initial stages. No class has been certified yet. No expert
 4 discovery has commenced and/or completed. The completion of fact/non-
 5 expert and expert discovery, as well as the certification of this case as a class
 6 action, are necessary to finalize and determine the adequacy and availability
 7 of all remedies, including legal and equitable, for Plaintiffs’ individual claims
 8 and any certified class or subclass. Plaintiffs therefore reserve their right to
 9 amend this complaint and/or assert additional facts that demonstrate this
 10 Court’s jurisdiction to order equitable remedies where no adequate legal
 11 remedies are available for either Plaintiffs and/or any certified class or
 12 subclass. Such proof, to the extent necessary, will be presented prior to the
 13 trial of any equitable claims for relief and/or the entry of an order granting
 14 equitable relief.

15 **VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

16 30. **Class Definition.** Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Federal
 17 Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) on behalf of themselves and all others similarly
 18 situated, and as members of the Classes defined as follows:

19 All residents of the United States who, within the applicable statute of limitations
 20 periods, purchased the Products, containing the Challenged Representation on the
 21 Products’ front packaging, for purposes other than resale (“**Nationwide Class**”);
 and

22 All residents of California who, within four years prior to the filing of this
 23 Complaint, purchased the Products, containing the Challenged Representation on
 the Products’ front packaging, for purposes other than resale (“**California
 Subclass**”).

24 (“Nationwide Class” and “California Subclass,” collectively, “**Class**”).

25 31. **Class Definition Exclusions.** Excluded from the Class are: (i) Defendant, its assigns,
 26 successors, and legal representatives; (ii) any entities in which Defendant has controlling interests;
 27 (iii) federal, state, and/or local governments, including, but not limited to, their departments,
 28 agencies, divisions, bureaus, boards, sections, groups, counsels, and/or subdivisions; and (iv) any

1 judicial officer presiding over this matter and person within the third degree of consanguinity to
 2 such judicial officer.

3 **32. Reservation of Rights to Amend the Class Definition.** Plaintiffs reserve the right to
 4 amend or otherwise alter the class definition presented to the Court at the appropriate time in
 5 response to facts learned through discovery, legal arguments advanced by Defendant, or otherwise.

6 **33. Numerosity:** Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is
 7 impracticable. Upon information and belief, the Nationwide Class consists of tens of thousands of
 8 purchasers (if not more) dispersed throughout the United States, and the California Subclass
 9 likewise consists of thousands of purchasers (if not more) dispersed throughout the State of
 10 California. Accordingly, it would be impracticable to join all members of the Class before the Court.

11 **34. Common Questions Predominate:** There are numerous and substantial questions of
 12 law or fact common to all members of the Class that predominate over any individual issues.
 13 Included within the common questions of law or fact are:

- 14 a. Whether Defendant engaged in unlawful, unfair or deceptive business
 15 practices by advertising and selling the Products;
- 16 b. Whether Defendant’s conduct of advertising and selling the Products Italian
 17 made when they are not constitutes an unfair method of competition, or unfair
 18 or deceptive act or practice, in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 19 c. Whether Defendant used deceptive representations in connection with the sale
 20 of the Products in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 21 d. Whether Defendant represented that the Products have characteristics or
 22 quantities that they do not have in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 23 e. Whether Defendant advertised the Products with intent not to sell them as
 24 advertised in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 25 f. Whether Defendant’s labeling and advertising of the Products are untrue or
 26 misleading in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500, *et*
 27 *seq.*;
- 28 g. Whether Defendant knew or by the exercise of reasonable care should have
 known its labeling and advertising was and is untrue or misleading in violation
 of Business and Professions Code section 17500, *et seq.*;
- h. Whether Defendant’s conduct is an unfair business practice within the
 meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- i. Whether Defendant’s conduct is a fraudulent business practice within the
 meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
 22525 Pacific Coast Highway
 Malibu, CA 90265

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

- 1 j. Whether Defendant’s conduct is an unlawful business practice within the
- 2 meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 3 k. Whether Plaintiffs and the Class paid more money for the Products than they
- 4 actually received;
- 5 l. How much more money Plaintiffs and the Class paid for the Products than
- 6 they actually received;
- 7 m. Whether Defendant’s conduct constitutes breach of warranty;
- 8 n. Whether Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to injunctive relief; and
- 9 o. Whether Defendant was unjustly enriched by their unlawful conduct.

10 35. **Typicality:** Plaintiffs’ claims are typical of the claims of the Class Members they

11 seeks to represent because Plaintiffs, like the Class Members, purchased Defendant’s misleading

12 and deceptive Products. Defendant’s unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent actions concern the same

13 business practices described herein irrespective of where they occurred or were experienced.

14 Plaintiffs and the Class sustained similar injuries arising out of Defendant’s conduct. Plaintiffs’ and

15 Class Members’ claims arise from the same practices and course of conduct and are based on the

16 same legal theories.

17 36. **Adequacy:** Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class they seek to represent

18 because their interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class Members Plaintiffs seek to

19 represent. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect Class Members’ interests and has retained

20 counsel experienced and competent in the prosecution of complex class actions, including complex

21 questions that arise in consumer protection litigation.

22 37. **Superiority and Substantial Benefit:** A class action is superior to other methods for

23 the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual joinder of all members of the

24 Class is impracticable and no other group method of adjudication of all claims asserted herein is

25 more efficient and manageable for at least the following reasons:

- 26 a. The claims presented in this case predominate over any questions of law or
 - 27 fact, if any exist at all, affecting any individual member of the Class;
 - 28 b. Absent a Class, the members of the Class will continue to suffer damage and
- Defendant’s unlawful conduct will continue without remedy while Defendant profits from and enjoy its ill-gotten gains;

- c. Given the size of individual Class Members' claims, few, if any, Class Members could afford to or would seek legal redress individually for the wrongs Defendant committed against them, and absent Class Members have no substantial interest in individually controlling the prosecution of individual actions;
- d. When the liability of Defendant has been adjudicated, claims of all members of the Class can be administered efficiently and/or determined uniformly by the Court; and
- e. This action presents no difficulty that would impede its management by the Court as a class action, which is the best available means by which Plaintiffs and Class Members can seek redress for the harm caused to them by Defendant.

38. **Inconsistent Rulings.** Because Plaintiffs seek relief for all members of the Class, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.

39. **Injunctive/Equitable Relief.** The prerequisites to maintaining a class action for injunctive or equitable relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) are met as Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive or equitable relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

40. **Manageability.** Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' counsel are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

VII. CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT ONE

Violation of California Unfair Competition Law

(Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)

(On Behalf of the California Subclass)

41. **Incorporation by Reference.** Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations contained in this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

42. **California Subclass.** This cause of action is brought pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq.*, on behalf of Plaintiffs and a California Subclass who purchased the Products within the applicable statute of limitations.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 43. **The UCL.** California Business & Professions Code, sections 17200, *et seq.* (the
2 “UCL”) prohibits unfair competition and provides, in pertinent part, that “unfair competition shall
3 mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or
4 misleading advertising.”

5 44. **False Advertising Claims.** Defendant, in its advertising and packaging of the
6 Products, made false and misleading statements and fraudulent omissions regarding the quality and
7 characteristics of the Products—specifically, the Italian Origin Representation—despite the fact the
8 Products are made in the USA. Such claims and omissions appear on the label and packaging of the
9 Products, which are sold at retail stores and point-of-purchase displays.

10 45. **Defendant’s Deliberately False and Fraudulent Marketing Scheme.** Defendant
11 does not have any reasonable basis for the claims about the Products made in Defendant’s
12 advertising and on Defendant’s packaging or labeling because the Products are not made or
13 manufactured in Italy. Defendant knew and knows that the Products are not truly made or
14 manufactured in Italy, though Defendant intentionally advertised and marketed the Products to
15 deceive reasonable consumers into believing that Products are authentic Italian pastas.

16 46. **False Advertising Claims Cause Purchase of Products.** Defendant’s labeling and
17 advertising of the Products led to, and continues to lead to, reasonable consumers, including
18 Plaintiffs, believing that the Products are made in Italy.

19 47. **Injury in Fact.** Plaintiffs and the California Subclass have suffered injury in fact and
20 have lost money or property as a result of and in reliance upon Defendant’s False Advertising
21 Claims—namely Plaintiffs and the California Subclass lost the purchase price for the Products they
22 bought from the Defendant.

23 48. **Conduct Violates the UCL.** Defendant’s conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes
24 unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices pursuant to the UCL. The UCL prohibits unfair
25 competition and provides, in pertinent part, that “unfair competition shall mean and include
26 unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading
27 advertising.” Cal. Bus & Prof. Code § 17200. In addition, Defendant’s use of various forms of
28 advertising media to advertise, call attention to, or give publicity to the sale of goods or merchandise

1 that are not as represented in any manner constitutes unfair competition, unfair, deceptive, untrue
 2 or misleading advertising, and an unlawful business practice within the meaning of Business and
 3 Professions Code Sections 17200 and 17531, which advertisements have deceived and are likely to
 4 deceive the consuming public, in violation of Business and Professions Code Section 17200.

5 49. **No Reasonably Available Alternatives/Legitimate Business Interests.** Defendant
 6 failed to avail themselves of reasonably available, lawful alternatives to further their legitimate
 7 business interests.

8 50. **Business Practice.** All of the conduct alleged herein occurred and continues to occur
 9 in Defendant's business. Defendant's wrongful conduct is part of a pattern, practice and/or
 10 generalized course of conduct, which will continue on a daily basis until Defendant voluntarily
 11 alters its conduct or Defendant is otherwise ordered to do so.

12 51. **Injunction.** Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17203 and 17535,
 13 Plaintiffs and the members of the California Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining
 14 Defendant from continuing to engage, use, or employ its practice of labeling and advertising the
 15 sale and use of the Products. Likewise, Plaintiffs and the members of the California Subclass seek
 16 an order requiring Defendant to disclose such misrepresentations, and to preclude Defendant's
 17 failure to disclose the existence and significance of said misrepresentations.

18 52. **Causation/Damages.** As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's misconduct in
 19 violation of the UCL, Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass were harmed in the amount
 20 of the purchase price they paid for the Products. Further, Plaintiffs and members of the California
 21 Subclass have suffered and continue to suffer economic losses and other damages including, but not
 22 limited to, the amounts paid for the Products, and any interest that would have accrued on those
 23 monies, in an amount to be proven at trial. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek a monetary award for
 24 violation of the UCL in damages, restitution, and/or disgorgement of ill-gotten gains to compensate
 25 Plaintiffs and the California Subclass for said monies, as well as injunctive relief to enjoin
 26 Defendant's misconduct to prevent ongoing and future harm that will result.

27 53. **Punitive Damages.** Plaintiffs seek punitive damages pursuant to this cause of action
 28 for violation of the UCL on behalf of Plaintiffs and the California Subclass. Defendant's unfair,

1 fraudulent, and unlawful conduct described herein constitutes malicious, oppressive, and/or
 2 fraudulent conduct warranting an award of punitive damages as permitted by law. Defendant's
 3 misconduct is malicious as Defendant acted with the intent to cause Plaintiffs and consumers to pay
 4 for Products that they were not, in fact, receiving. Defendant willfully and knowingly disregarded
 5 the rights of Plaintiffs and consumers as Defendant was, at all times, aware of the probable
 6 dangerous consequences of its conduct and deliberately failed to avoid misleading consumers,
 7 including Plaintiffs. Defendant's misconduct is oppressive as, at all relevant times, said conduct
 8 was so vile, base, and/or contemptible that reasonable people would look down upon it and/or
 9 otherwise would despise such corporate misconduct. Said misconduct subjected Plaintiffs and
 10 consumers to cruel and unjust hardship in knowing disregard of their rights. Defendant's
 11 misconduct is fraudulent as Defendant intentionally misrepresented and/or concealed material facts
 12 with the intent to deceive Plaintiffs and consumers. The wrongful conduct constituting malice,
 13 oppression, and/or fraud was committed, authorized, adopted, approved, and/or ratified by officers,
 14 directors, and/or managing agents of Defendant.

15 **"Unfair" Prong**

16 54. **Unfair Standard.** Under the UCL, a challenged activity is "unfair" when "any injury
 17 it causes outweighs any benefits provided to consumers and the injury is one that the consumers
 18 themselves could not reasonably avoid." *Camacho v. Auto Club of Southern California*, 142 Cal.
 19 App. 4th 1394, 1403 (2006).

20 55. **Injury.** Defendant's action of mislabeling the Products with the Challenged
 21 Representation does not confer any benefit to consumers; rather, doing so causes injuries to
 22 consumers, who do not receive products commensurate with their reasonable expectations, overpay
 23 for the Products, and receive Products of lesser standards than what they reasonably expected to
 24 receive. Consumers cannot avoid any of the injuries caused by Defendant's deceptive labeling and
 25 advertising of the Products. Accordingly, the injuries caused by Defendant's deceptive labeling and
 26 advertising outweigh any benefits.

27 56. **Balancing Test.** Some courts conduct a balancing test to decide if a challenged
 28 activity amounts to unfair conduct under California Business and Professions Code Section 17200.

1 They “weigh the utility of the defendant’s conduct against the gravity of the harm to the alleged
2 victim.” *Davis v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A.*, 691 F.3d 1152, 1169 (9th Cir. 2012).

3 57. **No Utility.** Here, Defendant’s conduct of labeling the Products with the Italian Origin
4 Representation when the Products are not made or manufactured in Italy has no utility and
5 financially harms purchasers. Thus, the utility of Defendant’s conduct is vastly outweighed by the
6 gravity of harm.

7 58. **Legislative Declared Policy.** Some courts require that “unfairness must be tethered
8 to some legislative declared policy or proof of some actual or threatened impact on competition.”
9 *Lozano v. AT&T Wireless Servs. Inc.*, 504 F. 3d 718, 735 (9th Cir. 2007).

10 59. **Unfair Conduct.** Defendant’s labeling and advertising of the Products, as alleged
11 herein, is false, deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable, and constitutes unfair conduct. Defendant
12 knew or should have known of its unfair conduct. Defendant’s misrepresentations constitute an
13 unfair business practice within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code Section
14 17200.

15 60. **Reasonably Available Alternatives.** There existed reasonably available alternatives
16 to further Defendant’s legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein.
17 Defendant could have refrained from labeling the Products with the Italian Origin Representation.

18 61. **Defendant’s Wrongful Conduct.** All of the conduct alleged herein occurs and
19 continues to occur in Defendant’s business. Defendant’s wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or
20 generalized course of conduct repeated on thousands of occasions daily.

21 62. **Injunction.** Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17203, Plaintiffs and
22 the California Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage,
23 use, or employ its practices of labeling the Products with the Italian Origin Representation.

24 63. **Causation/Damages.** Plaintiffs and the California Subclass have suffered injury in
25 fact and have lost money as a result of Defendant’s unfair conduct. Plaintiffs and the California
26 Subclass paid an unwarranted premium for these Products. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the California
27 Subclass paid for Products that ae not authentic Italian pastas. Plaintiffs and the California Subclass
28 would not have purchased the Products, or would have paid substantially less for the Products, if

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 they had known that the Products' advertising and labeling were deceptive. Accordingly, Plaintiffs
 2 seeks damages, restitution and/or disgorgement of ill-gotten gains pursuant to the UCL.

3 **"Fraudulent" Prong**

4 64. **Fraud Standard.** The UCL considers conduct fraudulent (and prohibits said conduct)
 5 if it is likely to deceive members of the public. *Bank of the West v. Superior Court*, 2 Cal. 4th 1254,
 6 1267 (1992).

7 65. **Fraudulent & Material Challenged Representations.** Defendant used the Italian
 8 Origin Representation with the intent to sell the Products to consumers, including Plaintiffs and the
 9 California Subclass. The Challenged Representation is false and Defendant knew or should have
 10 known of its falsity. The Challenged Representation is likely to deceive consumers into purchasing
 11 the Products because they are material to the average, ordinary, and reasonable consumer.

12 66. **Fraudulent Business Practice.** As alleged herein, the misrepresentations by
 13 Defendant constitute a fraudulent business practice in violation of California Business &
 14 Professions Code Section 17200.

15 67. **Reasonable and Detrimental Reliance.** Plaintiffs and the California Subclass
 16 reasonably and detrimentally relied on the material and false Challenged Representation to their
 17 detriment in that they purchased the Products.

18 68. **Reasonably Available Alternatives.** Defendant had reasonably available alternatives
 19 to further its legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein. Defendant could
 20 have refrained from labeling the Products with the Italian Origin Representation.

21 69. **Business Practice.** All of the conduct alleged herein occurs and continues to occur in
 22 Defendant's business. Defendant's wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of
 23 conduct.

24 70. **Injunction.** Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17203, Plaintiffs and
 25 the California Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage,
 26 use, or employ its practice of labeling the Products with the Italian Origin Representation.

27 71. **Causation/Damages.** Plaintiffs and the California Subclass have suffered injury in
 28 fact and have lost money as a result of Defendant's fraudulent conduct. Plaintiffs paid an

1 unwarranted premium for the Products. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the California Subclass paid for
2 products that they believed were made in Italy, when, in fact, the Products are made or manufactured
3 in the United States. Plaintiffs and the California Subclass would not have purchased the Products
4 if they had known the truth. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek damages, restitution, and/or disgorgement
5 of ill-gotten gains pursuant to the UCL.

6 **“Unlawful” Prong**

7 72. **Unlawful Standard.** The UCL identifies violations of other laws as “unlawful
8 practices that the unfair competition law makes independently actionable.” *Velazquez v. GMAC*
9 *Mortg. Corp.*, 605 F. Supp. 2d 1049, 1068 (C.D. Cal. 2008).

10 73. **Violations of CLRA and FAL.** Defendant’s labeling of the Products, as alleged
11 herein, violates California Civil Code sections 1750, *et seq.* (the “**CLRA**”) and California Business
12 and Professions Code sections 17500, *et seq.* (the “**FAL**”) as set forth below in the sections
13 regarding those causes of action.

14 74. **Additional Violations.** Defendant’s conduct in making the false representations
15 described herein constitutes a knowing failure to adopt policies in accordance with and/or adherence
16 to applicable laws, as set forth herein, all of which are binding upon and burdensome to their
17 competitors. This conduct engenders an unfair competitive advantage for Defendant, thereby
18 constituting an unfair, fraudulent and/or unlawful business practice under California Business &
19 Professions Code sections 17200-17208. Additionally, Defendant’s misrepresentations of material
20 facts, as set forth herein, violate California Civil Code sections 1572, 1573, 1709, 1710, 1711, and
21 1770, as well as the common law.

22 75. **Unlawful Conduct.** Defendant’s packaging, labeling, and advertising of the Products,
23 as alleged herein, are false, deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable, and constitute unlawful
24 conduct. Defendant knew or should have known of its unlawful conduct.

25 76. **Reasonably Available Alternatives.** Defendant had reasonably available alternatives
26 to further its legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein. Defendant could
27 have refrained from labeling the Products with the Italian Origin Representation.

28 77. **Business Practice.** All of the conduct alleged herein occurs and continues to occur in

1 Defendant's business. Defendant's wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of
2 conduct.

3 78. **Injunction.** Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17203, Plaintiffs and
4 the California Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage,
5 use, or employ its practice of false and deceptive advertising of the Products.

6 79. **Causation/Damages.** Plaintiffs and the California Subclass have suffered injury in
7 fact and have lost money as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct. Plaintiffs and the California
8 Subclass paid an unwarranted premium for the Products. Plaintiffs and the California Subclass
9 would not have purchased the Products if they had known that Defendant's purposely deceived
10 consumers into believing that the Products are truly authentic Italian pastas. Accordingly, Plaintiffs
11 seeks damages, restitution and/or disgorgement of ill-gotten gains pursuant to the UCL.

12 COUNT TWO

13 **Violation of California False Advertising Law**

14 **(Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.)**

15 **(On Behalf of the California Subclass)**

16 80. **Incorporation by reference.** Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all
17 allegations contained in this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

18 81. **California Subclass.** Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the
19 California Subclass who purchased the Products within the applicable statute of limitations.

20 82. **FAL Standard.** The False Advertising Law, codified at Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
21 section 17500, *et seq.*, prohibits "unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising[.]"

22 83. **False & Material Challenged Representations Disseminated to Public.** Defendant
23 violated section 17500 when it advertised and marketed the Products through the unfair, deceptive,
24 untrue, and misleading Italian Origin Representation disseminated to the public through the
25 Products' labeling, packaging and advertising. These representations were false because the
26 Products do not conform to them. The representations were material because they are likely to
27 mislead a reasonable consumer into purchasing the Products.

28 84. **Knowledge.** In making and disseminating the representations alleged herein,

1 Defendant knew or should have known that the representations were untrue or misleading, and acted
2 in violation of § 17500.

3 85. **Intent to sell.** Defendant's Challenged Representation was specifically designed to
4 induce reasonable consumers, like Plaintiffs and the California Subclass, to purchase the Products.

5 86. **Causation/Damages.** As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's misconduct in
6 violation of the FAL, Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass were harmed in the amount
7 of the purchase price they paid for the Products. Further, Plaintiffs and members of the Class have
8 suffered and continue to suffer economic losses and other damages including, but not limited to, the
9 amounts paid for the Products, and any interest that would have accrued on those monies, in an
10 amount to be proven at trial. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek a monetary award for violation of the FAL
11 in damages, restitution, and/or disgorgement of ill-gotten gains to compensate Plaintiffs and the
12 California Subclass for said monies, as well as injunctive relief to enjoin Defendant's misconduct
13 to prevent ongoing and future harm that will result.

14 87. **Punitive Damages.** Defendant's unfair, fraudulent, and unlawful conduct described
15 herein constitutes malicious, oppressive, and/or fraudulent conduct warranting an award of punitive
16 damages as permitted by law. Defendant's misconduct is malicious as Defendant acted with the
17 intent to cause Plaintiffs and consumers to pay for Products that they were not, in fact,
18 receiving. Defendant willfully and knowingly disregarded the rights of Plaintiffs and consumers as
19 Defendant was aware of the probable dangerous consequences of its conduct and deliberately failed
20 to avoid misleading consumers, including Plaintiffs. Defendant's misconduct is oppressive as, at
21 all relevant times, said conduct was so vile, base, and/or contemptible that reasonable people would
22 look down upon it and/or otherwise would despise such corporate misconduct. Said misconduct
23 subjected Plaintiffs and consumers to cruel and unjust hardship in knowing disregard of their
24 rights. Defendant's misconduct is fraudulent as Defendant, at all relevant times, intentionally
25 misrepresented and/or concealed material facts with the intent to deceive Plaintiffs and
26 consumers. The wrongful conduct constituting malice, oppression, and/or fraud was committed,
27 authorized, adopted, approved, and/or ratified by officers, directors, and/or managing agents of
28 Defendant.

COUNT THREE

Violation of California Consumers Legal Remedies Act

(Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, et seq.)

(On Behalf of the California Subclass)

88. **Incorporation by Reference.** Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations contained in this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

89. **California Subclass.** Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the California Subclass who purchased the Products within the applicable statute of limitations.

90. **CLRA Standard.** The CLRA provides that “unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices undertaken by any person in a transaction intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services to any consumer are unlawful.”

91. **Goods/Services.** The Products are “goods,” as defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code §1761(a).

92. **Defendant.** Defendant is a “person,” as defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code §1761(c).

93. **Consumers.** Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass are “consumers,” as defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code §1761(d).

94. **Transactions.** The purchase of the Products by Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass are “transactions” as defined by the CLRA under California Civil Code section 1761(e).

95. **Violations of the CLRA.** Defendant violated the following sections of the CLRA by selling the Products to Plaintiffs and the California Subclass through the false, misleading, deceptive, and fraudulent Challenged Representation:

- a. Section 1770(a)(5) by representing that the Products have “characteristics, . . . uses [or] benefits . . . which [they] do not have.”
- b. Section 1770(a)(7) by representing that the Products “are of a particular standard, quality, or grade . . . [when] they are of another.”
- c. Section 1770(a)(9) by advertising the Products “with [the] intent not to sell

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

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

them as advertised.”

96. **Knowledge.** Defendant’s uniform and material representations and omissions regarding the Products were likely to deceive, and Defendant knew or should have known that its representations and omissions were untrue and misleading.

97. **Malicious.** Defendant’s conduct is malicious, fraudulent, and wanton in that Defendant intentionally misled and withheld material information from consumers, including Plaintiffs, to increase the sale of the Products.

98. **Plaintiffs Could Not Have Avoided Injury.** Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass could not have reasonably avoided such injury. Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass were unaware of the existence of the facts that Defendant suppressed and failed to disclose, and Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass would not have purchased the Products and/or would have purchased them on different terms had they known the truth.

99. **Causation/Reliance/Materiality.** Plaintiffs and the California Subclass suffered harm as a result of Defendant’s violations of the CLRA because they relied on the Challenged Representation in deciding to purchase the Products. The Challenged Representation was a substantial factor. The Challenged Representation was material because a reasonable consumer would consider it important in deciding whether to purchase the Products.

100. **Section 1782(d)—Prelitigation Demand/Notice.** Pursuant to California Civil Code, section 1782, more than thirty days prior to the filing of this complaint, on or about November 20, 2021, Plaintiffs’ counsel, acting on behalf of Plaintiff Prost and all members of the Class, mailed a Demand Letter, via U.S. certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed to Defendant Barilla America, Inc. at its headquarters and principal place of business (885 Sunset Ridge Road, Northbrook, IL 60062) and its registered agent for service of process (CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service, 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833), which were delivered to those addresses on or about December 6, 2021 and December 3, 2021, respectively. *See Exhibit 7* [Pre-Lit Demand Letter].

101. **Causation/Damages.** As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s misconduct in violation of the CLRA, Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass were harmed in the

1 amount of the purchase price they paid for the Products. Further, Plaintiffs and members of the Class
2 have suffered and continue to suffer economic losses and other damages including, but not limited
3 to, the amounts paid for the Products, and any interest that would have accrued on those monies, in
4 an amount to be proven at trial. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek a monetary award for violation of this
5 Act in the form of damages, restitution, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains to compensate Plaintiffs
6 and the California Subclass for said monies.

7 **102. Injunction.** Given that Defendant's conduct violated California Civil Code section
8 1780, Plaintiffs and members of the California Subclass are entitled to seek, and do hereby seek,
9 injunctive relief to put an end to Defendant's violations of the CLRA and to dispel the public
10 misperception generated, facilitated, and fostered by Defendant's false advertising campaign.
11 Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law. Without equitable relief, Defendant's unfair and
12 deceptive practices will continue to harm Plaintiffs and the California Subclass. Accordingly,
13 Plaintiff seeks an injunction to enjoin Defendant from continuing to employ the unlawful methods,
14 acts, and practices alleged herein pursuant to section 1780(a)(2), and otherwise require Defendant
15 to take corrective action necessary to dispel the public misperception engendered, fostered, and
16 facilitated through Defendant's deceptive labeling of the Products' with the Challenged
17 Representation.

18 **103. Punitive Damages.** Defendant's unfair, fraudulent, and unlawful conduct described
19 herein constitutes malicious, oppressive, and/or fraudulent conduct warranting an award of punitive
20 damages as permitted by law. Defendant's misconduct is malicious as Defendant acted with the
21 intent to cause Plaintiffs and consumers to pay for Products that were not, in fact, receiving.
22 Defendant willfully and knowingly disregarded the rights of Plaintiffs and consumers as Defendant
23 were, at all times, aware of the probable dangerous consequences of their conduct and deliberately
24 failed to avoid misleading consumers, including Plaintiffs. Defendant's misconduct is oppressive
25 as, at all relevant times, said conduct was so vile, base, and/or contemptible that reasonable people
26 would look down upon it and/or otherwise would despise such corporate misconduct. Said
27 misconduct subjected Plaintiffs and consumers to cruel and unjust hardship in knowing disregard
28 of their rights. Defendant's misconduct is fraudulent as Defendant, at all relevant times,

1 intentionally misrepresented and/or concealed material facts with the intent to deceive Plaintiffs and
 2 consumers. The wrongful conduct constituting malice, oppression, and/or fraud was committed,
 3 authorized, adopted, approved, and/or ratified by officers, directors, and/or managing agents of
 4 Defendant. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek an award of punitive damages against Defendant.

5 **COUNT FOUR**

6 **Breach of Warranty**

7 ***(On Behalf of the Nationwide Class and California Subclass)***

8 104. **Incorporation by Reference.** Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all
 9 allegations contained in this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

10 105. **Nationwide Class & California Subclass.** Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and
 11 on behalf of the Nationwide Class and California Subclass (the Class) who purchased the Products
 12 within the applicable statute of limitations.

13 106. **Express Warranty.** By advertising and selling the Products at issue, Defendant made
 14 promises and affirmations of fact on the Products' packaging and labeling, and through its marketing
 15 and advertising, as described herein. This labeling and advertising constitute express warranties and
 16 became part of the basis of the bargain between Plaintiffs and members of the Class and Defendant.
 17 Defendant purports, through the Products' labeling and advertising, to create express warranties that
 18 the Products, among other things, conform to the Challenged Representations.

19 107. **Implied Warranty of Merchantability.** By advertising and selling the Products at
 20 issue, Defendant, a merchant of goods, made promises and affirmations of fact that the Products are
 21 merchantable and conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the Products' packaging
 22 and labeling, and through its marketing and advertising, as described herein. This labeling and
 23 advertising, combined with the implied warranty of merchantability, constitute warranties that
 24 became part of the basis of the bargain between Plaintiffs and members of the Class and Defendant--
 25 --to wit, that the Products, among other things, conform to the Challenged Representations.

26 108. **Breach of Warranty.** Contrary to Defendant's warranties, the Products do not
 27 conform to the Challenged Representations and, therefore, Defendant breached its warranties about
 28 the Products and their qualities.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

1 111. **Incorporation by Reference.** Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all
2 allegations contained in this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

3 112. **Nationwide Class & California Subclass.** Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and
4 on behalf of the Nationwide Class and California Subclass (the Class) who purchased the Products
5 within the applicable statute of limitations.

6 113. **Plaintiffs/Class Conferred a Benefit.** By purchasing the Products, Plaintiffs and
7 members of the Class conferred a benefit on Defendant in the form of the purchase price of the
8 Products.

9 114. **Defendant’s Knowledge of Conferred Benefit.** Defendant had knowledge of such
10 benefit and Defendant appreciated the benefit because, were consumers not to purchase the
11 Products, Defendant would not generate revenue from the sales of the Products.

12 115. **Defendant’s Unjust Receipt Through Deception.** Defendant’s knowing acceptance
13 and retention of the benefit is inequitable and unjust because the benefit was obtained by
14 Defendant’s fraudulent, misleading, and deceptive representations and omissions.

15 116. **Causation/Damages.** As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s unjust
16 enrichment, Plaintiffs and members of the Class were harmed in the amount of the purchase price
17 they paid for the Products. Further, Plaintiffs and members of the Class have suffered and continue
18 to suffer economic losses and other damages including, but not limited to, the amounts paid for the
19 Products, and any interest that would have accrued on those monies, in an amount to be proven at
20 trial. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seeks a monetary award for unjust enrichment in damages, restitution,
21 and/or disgorgement of ill-gotten gains to compensate Plaintiffs and the Class for said monies, as
22 well as injunctive relief to enjoin Defendant’s misconduct to prevent ongoing and future harm that
23 will result.

24 117. **Punitive Damages.** Plaintiffs seek punitive damages pursuant to this cause of action
25 for unjust enrichment on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class. Defendant’s unfair, fraudulent, and
26 unlawful conduct described herein constitutes malicious, oppressive, and/or fraudulent conduct
27 warranting an award of punitive damages as permitted by law. Defendant’s misconduct is malicious
28 as Defendant acted with the intent to cause Plaintiffs and consumers to pay for Products that they

1 were not, in fact, receiving. Defendant willfully and knowingly disregarded the rights of Plaintiffs
 2 and consumers as Defendant was aware of the probable dangerous consequences of its conduct and
 3 deliberately failed to avoid misleading consumers, including Plaintiffs. Defendant's misconduct is
 4 oppressive as, at all relevant times, said conduct was so vile, base, and/or contemptible that
 5 reasonable people would look down upon it and/or otherwise would despise such corporate
 6 misconduct. Said misconduct subjected Plaintiffs and consumers to cruel and unjust hardship in
 7 knowing disregard of their rights. Defendant's misconduct is fraudulent as Defendant, at all relevant
 8 times, intentionally misrepresented and/or concealed material facts with the intent to deceive
 9 Plaintiffs and consumers. The wrongful conduct constituting malice, oppression, and/or fraud was
 10 committed, authorized, adopted, approved, and/or ratified by officers, directors, and/or managing
 11 agents of Defendant.

12 **VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 118. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,
 14 prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 15 a. **Certification:** For an order certifying this action as a class action, appointing
 16 Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives, and appointing Plaintiffs' Counsel as
 17 Class Counsel;
- 18 b. **Declaratory Relief:** For an order declaring that Defendant's conduct violates
 19 the statutes and laws referenced herein;
- 20 c. **Injunction:** For an order requiring Defendant to immediately cease and desist
 21 from selling the unlawful Products in violation of law; enjoining Defendant
 22 from continuing to market, advertise, distribute, and sell the Products in the
 23 unlawful manner described herein; requiring Defendant to engage in an
 24 affirmative advertising campaign to dispel the public misperception of the
 25 Products resulting from Defendant's unlawful conduct; and requiring all
 26 further and just corrective action, consistent with permissible law and pursuant
 27 to only those causes of action so permitted;
- 28 d. **Damages/Restitution/Disgorgement:** For an order awarding monetary
 compensation in the form of damages, restitution, and/or disgorgement to
 Plaintiffs and the Class, consistent with permissible law and pursuant to only
 those causes of action so permitted;
- e. **Punitive Damages/Penalties:** For an order awarding punitive damages,
 statutory penalties, and/or monetary fines, consistent with permissible law and
 pursuant to only those causes of action so permitted;
- f. **Attorneys' Fees & Costs:** For an order awarding attorneys' fees and costs,
 consistent with permissible law and pursuant to only those causes of action so

permitted;

g. **Pre/Post-Judgment Interest:** For an order awarding pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, consistent with permissible law and pursuant to only those causes of action so permitted; and

h. **All Just & Proper Relief:** For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 11, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

By:

/s/ Katherine A. Bruce

RYAN J. CLARKSON

KATHERINE A. BRUCE

KELSEY J. ELLING

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

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

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues and causes of action so triable.

Dated: June 11, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.

By:

/s/ Katherine A. Bruce
RYAN J. CLARKSON
KATHERINE A. BRUCE
KELSEY J. ELLING

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265