

1 **JENNER & BLOCK LLP**

2 Dean N. Panos (*pro hac vice*)

3 dpanos@jenner.com

4 353 North Clark Street

5 Chicago, IL 60654

6 Phone: (312) 222-9350

7 Facsimile: (312) 527-0484

8 **JENNER & BLOCK LLP**

9 Alexander M. Smith (Cal. Bar No. 295187)

10 asmith@jenner.com

11 515 South Flower Street, Suite 3300

12 Los Angeles, CA 90071

13 Phone: (213) 239-5100

14 Facsimile: (213) 239-5199

15 Attorneys for Defendant

16 Mondelēz Global LLC

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 AVI KLAMMER, individually and on behalf of
20 all others similarly situated,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 MONDELÉZ GLOBAL LLC,

24 Defendant.

Case No. 4:22-cv-2046-JSW

The Honorable Jeffrey S. White

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO
DISMISS FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
& AUTHORITIES**

Hearing Date: September 30, 2022

Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: Remote (Zoom)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 INTRODUCTION1

3 ALLEGATIONS OF THE COMPLAINT.....2

4 ARGUMENT4

5 I. Plaintiff Has Not Plausibly Alleged That MDLZ’s Labeling Is Deceptive or Unlawful.4

6 A. Viewed in context, the phrase “high protein lentils” is not misleading or

7 unlawful.4

8 B. Plaintiff’s challenge to the back-label “protein-packed” representation also

9 fails.....7

10 C. The omission of the “corrected amount of protein” is also not actionable.10

11 II. Plaintiff’s Tag-Along Claims Fail Absent a Plausible Allegation of Consumer Deception.....13

12 III. Plaintiff Cannot Seek Equitable Relief Because He Has an Adequate Legal Remedy.14

13 CONCLUSION.....15

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

1		
2		
3	Cases	
4	<i>Adams v. Cole Haan, LLC,</i>	
5	No. 20-913, 2020 WL 5648605 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2020)	15
6	<i>Ahern v. Apple Inc.,</i>	
7	411 F. Supp. 3d 541 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	13
8	<i>Airs Aromatics, LLC v. Victoria's Secret Stores Brand Mgmt., Inc.,</i>	
9	744 F.3d 595 (9th Cir. 2014)	9
10	<i>In re Apple Processor Litig.,</i>	
11	No. 18-147, 2022 WL 2064975 (N.D. Cal. June 8, 2022)	7
12	<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal,</i>	
13	556 U.S. 662 (2009)	4, 7, 10
14	<i>Becerra v. Dr. Pepper/Seven Up, Inc.,</i>	
15	945 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2019)	4
16	<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,</i>	
17	550 U.S. 544 (2007)	4
18	<i>Brady v. Bayer Corp.,</i>	
19	26 Cal. App. 5th 1156 (2018)	9
20	<i>Brazil v. Dole Packaged Foods, LLC,</i>	
21	660 F. App'x 531 (9th Cir. 2016)	9
22	<i>Brown v. Nature's Path Foods, Inc.,</i>	
23	No. 21-5132, 2022 WL 717816 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2022)	10, 11
24	<i>Brown v. Starbucks Corp.,</i>	
25	No. 18-2286, 2019 WL 996399 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2019)	9
26	<i>Brown v. Van's Int'l Foods, Inc.,</i>	
27	No. 22-1, 2022 WL 1471454 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2022)	11, 12, 13
28	<i>Coastal Abstract Serv., Inc. v. First Am. Title Ins. Co.,</i>	
	173 F.3d 725 (9th Cir. 1998)	7
	<i>Coe v. Gen. Mills, Inc.,</i>	
	No. 15-5112, 2016 WL 4208287 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2016)	8
	<i>Consumer Advocates v. Echostar Satellite Corp.,</i>	
	113 Cal. App. 4th 1351 (2003)	8

1	<i>Cook, Perkiss & Liehe, Inc. v. N. Cal. Collection Serv., Inc.</i> , 911 F.2d 242 (9th Cir. 1990)	7
2	<i>Demetriades v. Yelp!, Inc.</i> ,	
3	228 Cal. App. 4th 294 (2014)	7
4	<i>Elias v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> ,	
5	903 F. Supp. 2d 843 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	8
6	<i>Freeman v. Time, Inc.</i> ,	
7	68 F.3d 285 (9th Cir. 1995)	5
8	<i>Gibson v. Jaguar Land Rover N. Am., LLC</i> ,	
9	No. 20-769, 2020 WL 5492990 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2020)	15
10	<i>Girard v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.</i> ,	
11	316 F. App'x 561 (9th Cir. 2008)	14
12	<i>Hill v. Roll Int'l Corp.</i> ,	
13	195 Cal. App. 4th 1295 (2011)	4
14	<i>Knowles v. ARRIS Int'l PLC</i> ,	
15	847 F. App'x 512 (9th Cir. 2021)	5
16	<i>Lacey v. Maricopa County</i> ,	
17	693 F.3d 896 (9th Cir. 2012)	9
18	<i>Lavie v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> ,	
19	105 Cal. App. 4th 496 (2003)	4
20	<i>In re MacBook Keyboard Litig.</i> ,	
21	No. 18-2813, 2020 WL 6047253 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2020)	15
22	<i>Mitchell v. Whole Foods Mkt. Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
23	No. 20-8496, 2022 WL 657044 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 4, 2022)	6
24	<i>Moore v. Trader Joe's Co.</i> ,	
25	4 F.4th 874 (9th Cir. 2021)	4, 5
26	<i>Nacarino v. Kashi Co.</i> ,	
27	--- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2022 WL 390815 (N.D. Cal. 2022)	12
28	<i>Newcal Indus., Inc. v. Ikon Office Solutions</i> ,	
	513 F.3d 1038 (9th Cir. 2008)	7
	<i>Pardini v. Unilever U.S., Inc.</i> ,	
	961 F. Supp. 2d 1048 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	10
	<i>Punian v. Gillette Co.</i> ,	
	No. 14-5028, 2016 WL 1029607 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2016)	14

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.