

1 Matthew Strugar (SBN 232951)
Law Office of Matthew Strugar
2 3435 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2910
Los Angeles, CA 90010
3 (323) 696-2299
matthew@matthewstrugar.com

4 Jay R. Shooster (*pro hac vice*)
5 Richman Law & Policy
535 Mission Street
6 San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (718) 705-4579
7 Facsimile: (718) 228-8522
jshooster@richmanlawpolicy.com

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Marshall*
9 *and Proposed Class*

10
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

<p>12 Dezzi Rae Marshall, on behalf of herself and all others similarly 13 situated, 14 Plaintiff, 15 v. 16 Red Lobster Management LLC and 17 Red Lobster Hospitality LLC, 18 Defendants.</p>	<p>Case No. 2:21-cv-04786-JAK-MAR [Assigned to Hon. John A. Kronstadt]</p> <p>PLAINTIFF’S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF’S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM UPON WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 12(B)(6)</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT.....1

3 STANDARD OF REVIEW.....3

4 ARGUMENT5

5 I. PLAINTIFF MARSHALL PROPERLY STATES CLAIMS UNDER

6 THE CONSUMER-PROTECTION LAWS.....6

7 A. Plaintiff Has Satisfied the Reasonable Consumer Test.....6

8

9 B. Reasonable Restaurant Consumers Are Not Expected to Read

10 Red Lobster’s Website.....10

11 C. Plaintiff Marshall’s Allegations Meet the Heightened Pleading

12 Standard.....14

13 D. Red Lobster’s Sustainability Representations Are Not

14 Puffery.....18

15 E. Plaintiff States Claims Under the Unlawful and Unfair Prongs

16 of the UCL.....20

17 II. PLAINTIFF MARSHALL HAS STANDING TO PURSUE

18 INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.....21

19 III. PLAINTIFF MARSHALL MAY PURSUE PUNITIVE

20 DAMAGES.....23

CONCLUSION24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Annunziato v. eMachines, Inc., 402 F. Supp.2d 1133 (C.D. Cal. 2005) (Selna, J.)
19, 20

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....3, 4

Ashton v. J.M. Smucker Co., No. EDCV 20-992-JGB(SHKx), 2020 U.S. Dist.
 LEXIS 250428 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2020).....23

Becerra v. Dr Pepper/Seven Up, Inc., 945 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2019).....9

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....3, 4

Bell v. Publix Super Mkts., Inc., 982 F.3d 468 (7th Cir. 2020).....7

Beyer v. Symantec Corp., 333 F. Supp.3d 966 (N.D. Cal. 2018).19

Branch v. Tunnell, 14 F.3d 449 (9th Cir. 1994).3, 5

Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc., 637 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2011).
15

Cervantes v. City of San Diego, 5 F.3d 1273 (9th Cir. 1993).3, 5

Chacanaca v. Quaker Oats Co., 752 F. Supp.2d 1111 (N.D. Cal. 2010).4

Clark v. Westbrae Nat., Inc., No. 20-CV-03221, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78703 (N.D.
 Cal. Apr. 22, 2021).....9

Cook, Perkiss & Liehe, Inc. v. Northern Cal. Collection Serv., Inc., 911 F.2d 242
 (9th Cir.1990).19

1 *Cordes v. Boulder Brands USA, Inc.*, No. CV 18-6534-PSG(JCx), 2018 U.S. Dist.
 2 LEXIS 217534 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2018).22
 3 *Davidson v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 889 F.3d 956 (9th Cir. 2018).21, 22, 23
 4 *Flood v. Miller*, 35 Fed. Appx. 701 (9th Cir. 2002).15
 5 *FTC v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, 883 F.3d 848 (9th Cir. 2018).8
 6 *Godecke ex rel. United States v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.*, 937 F.3d 1201 (9th Cir.
 7 2019).4
 8 *Govea v. Gruma Corp.*, No. CV 20-8585-MFW(JCx), 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 9 192357 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2021).23
 10 *Hanna v. Walmart, Inc.*, No. 5:20-cv-01075-MCS-SHK, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 11 237505 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2020).22
 12 *Hardt v. Chrysler Grp. LLC*, No. SACV-14-01375-SJO(VBKx), 2015 U.S. Dist.
 13 LEXIS 187386 (C.D. Cal. June 15, 2015).24
 14 *Hill v. Roll Int’l Corp*, 195 Cal. App. 4th 1295 (2011).14
 15 *In re Coca-Cola Prods. Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig. (No. II)*, No. 20-15742, 2021
 16 U.S. App. LEXIS 26239 (9th Cir. Aug. 31, 2021).22
 17 *In re Toyota Motor Corp. Unintended Acceleration Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prod.*
 18 *Liab. Litig.*, 754 F. Supp.2d 1145 (C.D. Cal. 2010) (Selna, J.).19
 19 *Int’l Longshore & Warehouse Union, Local 40 v. Columbia Grain*, No. 313-CV-
 20 00513, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136326 (D. Ore. July 21, 2014).5

1 *Jackson v. General Mills, Inc.*, No. 18cv2634-LAB(BGS), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 2 157898 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2020).22
 3 *Kang v. P.F. Chang’s China Bistro, Inc.*, 844 F. App’x 969 (9th Cir. 2021).7
 4 *L.A. Taxi Coop., Inc. v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 114 F. Supp.3d 852 (N.D. Cal. 2015).
 519, 20
 6 *Lavigne v. Herbalife, LTD*, No. LA CV18-07480 JAK (MRWx), 2019 U.S. Dist.
 7 LEXIS 216778 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2019).16
 8 *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668 (9th Cir. 2001).3, 4
 9 *Lee, U.S. ex rel. v. Corinthian Colls.*, 655 F.3d 984 (9th Cir. 2011).....15, 18
 10 *Lorentzen v. Kroger Co.*, No. 2:20-cv-06754-SB-RAO, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 11 79931 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2021).7, 17
 12 *Marshall v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 1:17-CV-0006, 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 53935 (E.D.
 13 Cal. Apr. 7, 2017).23
 14 *Moore v. Mars Petcare US, Inc.*, 966 F.3d 1007 (9th Cir. 2020).....14
 15 *Moore v. Trader Joe’s Co.*, 4 F. 4th 874 (9th Cir. 2021).7, 12, 13
 16 *N. Star Int’l v. Ariz. Corp. Comm’n*, 720 F.2d 578 (9th Cir. 1983).5
 17 *Nayab v. Cap. One Bank (USA), N.A.*, 942 F.3d 480 (9th Cir. 2019).15, 17
 18 *Orlick v. Rawlings Sporting Goods Co.*, No. CV 12-6787-GHK (RZX), 2013 WL
 19 12139142 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2013).19
 20

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.