

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

United States District Court  
Central District of California

MIGUEL RODRIGUEZ, on behalf of  
himself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUST BRANDS USA, INC., JUST  
BRANDS, INC., and SSGI FINANCIAL  
SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No 2:20-CV-04829-ODW (PLAx)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
STAY [65], AND GRANTING  
MOTION TO DISMISS [63]**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff Miguel Rodriguez filed this putative class action against Defendants Just Brands USA, Inc., Just Brands, Inc., and SSGI Financial Services, Inc. (First Am. Compl. (“FAC”), ECF No. 60.) Defendants now move to (1) stay the case pending regulatory guidance from the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”), and (2) alternatively, to dismiss the FAC. (Mot. Stay (“MTS”), ECF No. 65; Mot. Dismiss (“MTD”), ECF No. 63; *see also* Opp’n MTS, ECF No. 68; Reply ISO MTS, ECF No. 70; Opp’n MTD, ECF No. 67; Reply ISO MTD, ECF No. 69.) For the following reasons, the Motion to Stay is **DENIED**, and the Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> After carefully considering the papers filed in connection with the Motions, the Court deemed the matters appropriate for decision without oral argument. Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-15.

## II. BACKGROUND

1  
2 Defendants sell cannabidiol (“CBD”) products under the brand “JustCBD,”  
3 which includes CBD-infused “compounds, tinctures, and edibles.” (FAC ¶¶ 1, 7–10.)  
4 On October 2, 2018, and March 17, 2019, Plaintiff purchased JustCBD vape  
5 cartridges, gummies, and dog treats after reviewing and relying on the “product  
6 packaging, which promised specific quantities of CBD.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 5–6.) Plaintiff claims  
7 that he later discovered, through independent lab testing commissioned by counsel,  
8 that JustCBD products contained between 10% to 100% less CBD content than  
9 promised on its labels. (*Id.* ¶ 20.) Accordingly, Plaintiff complains that he “paid a  
10 substantial premium due to the false and misleading CBD claims . . . [and] did not  
11 receive the benefit of his bargain. (*Id.* ¶ 6.)

12 Plaintiff commenced this putative class action on May 29, 2020, against  
13 Defendants collectively as the manufacturers, distributors, and sellers of JustCBD  
14 products, each responsible for its “advertising, marketing, and packaging.” (*Id.*  
15 ¶¶ 7–9.) Plaintiff asserts seven causes of action against Defendants for: (1) breach of  
16 express warranty; (2) unjust enrichment; (3) fraud; (4) violation of the California  
17 Consumers Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”), California Civil Code sections 1750, *et*  
18 *seq.*; (5) violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), California  
19 Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; (6) violation of California’s  
20 False Advertising Law (“FAL”), California Business & Professions Code sections  
21 17500, *et seq.*; and (7) violation of Florida’s Deceptive & Unfair Practices Act  
22 (“FDUTPA”), Florida Statutes Annotated sections 501.201, *et seq.* (*See generally id.*)  
23 Now, Defendants move to stay the case under the primary jurisdiction doctrine or,  
24 alternatively, to dismiss the FAC. (MTS 1; MTD 1–2.)

25

26

27

28

### III. MOTION TO STAY

1  
2 First, the Court addresses Defendants' Motion to Stay under the primary  
3 jurisdiction doctrine, pending regulatory guidance from the FDA.<sup>2</sup> (MTS 1.) "The  
4 primary jurisdiction doctrine allows courts to stay proceedings or to dismiss a  
5 complaint without prejudice pending the resolution of an issue within the special  
6 competence of an administrative agency." *Clark v. Time Warner Cable*, 523 F.3d  
7 1110, 1114 (9th Cir. 2008). This doctrine is "a prudential one," and permits the courts  
8 to stay "an otherwise cognizable claim [if it] implicates technical and policy questions  
9 that should be addressed in the first instance by the agency with regulatory authority  
10 over the relevant industry rather than by the judicial branch." *Id.* However, primary  
11 jurisdiction only "applies in a limited set of circumstances." *Id.* at 1115. The doctrine  
12 "is to be used only if a claim requires resolution of an issue of first impression, or of a  
13 particularly complicated issue that Congress has committed to a regulatory agency."  
14 *Id.* at 1114. Not all claims within an agency's purview need be decided by the  
15 agency, and the doctrine is not "intended to secure expert advice for the courts from  
16 regulatory agencies every time a court is presented with an issue conceivably within  
17 the agency's ambit." *Syntek Semiconductor Co. v. Microchip Tech. Inc.*, 307 F.3d  
18 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2002).

19 "No fixed formula exists for applying the doctrine of primary jurisdiction."  
20 *United States v. W. Pac. R.R. Co.*, 352 U.S. 59, 64 (1956). "[T]he question is a matter  
21 for the court's discretion," and the Ninth Circuit has typically invoked the doctrine  
22 where there is "(1) the need to resolve an issue that (2) has been placed by Congress  
23 within the jurisdiction of an administrative body having regulatory authority  
24 (3) pursuant to a statute that subjects an industry or activity to a comprehensive

25  
26 <sup>2</sup> The Court **GRANTS** Defendants' Request for Judicial Notice of documents published by the FDA  
27 and legislative authorities regarding the pending FDA guidelines. (Req. Judicial Not. ISO MTS,  
28 ECF No. 66.) See *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 688 (9th Cir. 2001) (granting judicial  
notice for "matters of public record" that are not "subject to reasonable dispute"); *United States v. Ritchie*, 342 F.3d 903, 909 (9th Cir. 2003) (granting judicial notice for "records and reports of administrative bodies").

1 regulatory authority that (4) requires expertise and uniformity in administration.”  
2 *Syntek*, 307 F.3d at 781 (citing *United States v. Gen. Dynamics Corp.*, 828 F.2d 1356,  
3 1362 (9th Cir. 1987)). At bottom, “efficacy is the deciding factor in whether to invoke  
4 primary jurisdiction,” and it need not be invoked “when a referral to the agency would  
5 significantly postpone a ruling that a court is otherwise competent to make.” *Astiana*  
6 *v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.*, 783 F.3d 753, 760–61 (9th Cir. 2015).

7 Here, Defendants contend that each relevant factor is met because (1) the FDA  
8 has regulatory authority over CBD products under the Agricultural Improvement Act  
9 of 2018 (“2018 Farm Bill”), Public Law No. 115–334; (2) pending FDA guidelines  
10 are necessary to resolve a material issue because the FDA is developing “validated  
11 testing . . . to support the manufacturing of safe and consistent CBD products”; and  
12 (3) there is a need for uniform application of forthcoming FDA guidelines on CBD  
13 products. (MTS 8–11.) In opposition, Plaintiff contends that the Court is competent  
14 to resolve this matter without the pending FDA guidelines. (Opp’n MTS 4.) Plaintiff  
15 is correct.

16 The heart of Plaintiff’s claim is that Defendants “overstate[d] the quantity of  
17 CBD contained in their [p]roducts.” (FAC ¶ 2.) For the FDA to have primary  
18 jurisdiction over this matter, its forthcoming guidelines must affect labeling standards  
19 for disclosing CBD content. However, the pending FDA guidelines mainly concern  
20 the sale of CBD products as medicine or dietary supplements with “unsubstantiated  
21 therapeutic claims,” which violates the law and puts patients at risk. (Not. of Public  
22 Hr’g 12970.) It is unlikely that these safety guidelines would change labeling  
23 standards such that Defendants could overstate and underfill the CBD content in their  
24 products to the extent that “some [p]roducts contained no CBD whatsoever.” (FAC  
25 ¶ 2); *see also Ballard v. Bhang Corp.*, No. EDCV 19-2329 JGB (KKx), 2020 WL  
26 6018939, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2020) (declining to stay a case for alleged  
27 underfilling of CBD in chocolates because it was unlikely “that possible FDA  
28 regulations on the safety of CBD will clarify whether [defendants’] advertising lines

1 up with its product”). Similarly, the “validated testing” that Defendants claim to be  
2 necessary for this matter focuses on testing standards for *manufacturing processes*,  
3 not CBD concentration. (Not. of Public Hr’g 12972.) At most, these guidelines might  
4 provide some “expert advice” to the courts; however, this alone is not enough to  
5 invoke the primary jurisdiction doctrine. *See Syntek*, 307 F.3d at 780. The Court is  
6 thus competent to resolve this matter without guidance from the pending FDA  
7 regulations, and primary jurisdiction does not apply. *Astiana*, 783 F.3d at 760–61.

8 Additionally, the cases upon which Defendants rely to invoke the primary  
9 jurisdiction doctrine are inapposite, as those cases involved the legality of labeling  
10 CBD products as safe for sale in the United States or for use as medicine or dietary  
11 supplements. *See, e.g., Adam Dasilva v. Infinite Prod. Co. LLC*, No. CV 16-10148-  
12 DMG (Ex), 2020 WL 900642, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2021) (alleging that defendants  
13 illegally marketed CBD products as safe for medical use); *Colette v. CV Sci. Inc.*,  
14 No. 2:19-cv-10227-VAP-JEM(x), 2020 WL 2739861, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. May 22, 2020)  
15 (claiming defendants illegally mislabeled CBD products as dietary supplements);  
16 *Glass v. Global Widget, LLC*, 2020 WL 3174688, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. June 15, 2020)  
17 (claiming defendants misrepresented that CBD was “legal to sell in the United  
18 States”). Here, in contrast, Plaintiff does not contest the legal status of JustCBD  
19 products; he simply alleges that JustCBD products contained less CBD than  
20 advertised. (FAC ¶ 2.)

21 In short, this case is not within the “limited set of circumstances” under which  
22 primary jurisdiction applies. The Court need not rely on the pending FDA guidelines  
23 to determine whether Defendants may misrepresent the CBD content in its products.  
24 *See Astiana*, 783 F.3d at 761. Thus, the Motion to Stay is **DENIED**.

#### 25 IV. MOTION TO DISMISS

26 The Court now turns to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss. Defendants move to  
27 dismiss Plaintiff’s claims for lack of standing under Rule 12(b)(1), lack of personal  
28

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.