

1 Philip Swain (SBN 105322)
2 pcs@foleyhoag.com
3 FOLEY HOAG LLP
4 155 Seaport Boulevard
5 Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2600
6 Tel: (617) 832-1000
7 Fax: (617) 832-7000

8 August T. Horvath (*pro hac vice* motion forthcoming)
9 ahorvath@foleyhoag.com
10 FOLEY HOAG LLP
11 1301 Sixth Avenue, 25th Floor
12 New York, New York 10019
13 Tel: (646) 927-5500

14 *Attorneys for Defendant*
15 *Costco Wholesale Corporation*

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 SAN JOSE

19 ANKUSH PURI, individually, and on behalf of
20 those similarly situated,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 COSTCO WHOLESALE COPORATION,

24 Defendant.

Case No. 5:21-CV-01202-EJD

**DEFENDANT COSTCO WHOLESALE
CORPORATION'S NOTICE OF MOTION
AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

Date: August 5, 2021
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 4 (San Jose Courthouse)
Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

1. Does Plaintiff fail to plausibly allege that a reasonable consumer would be deceived by Defendant's packaging to believe that it contains less vegetable oil than it does, such that Plaintiff fails to state a claim for relief under the California consumer protection statutes?
2. Are Plaintiff's claims preempted by the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act?
3. Does Plaintiff fail to plausibly allege that the Product does not comply with relevant federal and state food laws and regulations?
4. Does Plaintiff lack standing to seek injunctive relief because he fails to plausibly allege a future injury?
5. Should Plaintiff's claim for unjust enrichment be dismissed?
6. Should Plaintiff's claims for breach of express and implied warranty be dismissed?
7. Should Plaintiff's claim for breach of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act claim be dismissed?
8. Should Plaintiff's CLRA claims for monetary damages be dismissed?

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

INTRODUCTION1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....3

ARGUMENT6

 I. Plaintiff Has Not Plausibly Alleged That the Phrase “Chocolate Almond Dipped” is Misleading6

 A. Even When Pleading Under the “Unlawful” Prong, Plaintiff Must Still Plead Plausibly that Reasonable Consumers Are Deceived6

 B. Plaintiff Has Not Plausibly Pled Reasonable Consumers Are Deceived7

 C. The Statement Is Truthful and Would Not Mislead a Reasonable Consumer.....9

 II. The Product’s Labeling Complies with Applicable Regulations.....13

 III. Plaintiff Lacks Standing to Seek Injunctive Relief.....15

 IV. Plaintiff’s Unjust Enrichment Claim Fails.....17

 V. Plaintiff Fails to State a Claim for Breach of Express Warranty, Implied Warranty of Merchantability, or the Magnuson Moss Warranty Act.....18

 VI. Plaintiff’s Fraud Claim Fails.....20

 VII. Plaintiff’s CLRA Claims for Monetary Damages Should Be Dismissed.....22

CONCLUSION.....23

Table of Authorities

Cases

Anderson v. Jamba Juice Co.,
888 F. Supp. 2d 1000 (N.D. Cal. 2012) 19

Barocio v. Bank of Am., N.A.,
No. C 11-5636 SBA, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 128617 (N.D. Cal. Sep.10, 2012)..... 17

Becerra v. Dr. Pepper/Seven Up, Inc.,
945 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2019) 7, 12

Belfiore v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
311 F.R.D. 29 (E.D.N.Y. 2015)..... 13

Bush v. Mondelez International, Inc.,
No. 16-cv-02460-RS, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 174391 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2016) 6

Campbell-Clark v. Blue Diamond Growers,
No. 1:18-cv-5577-WFK (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2019) 8

Campbell v. Freshbev LLC,
322 F. Supp. 3d 330 (E.D.N.Y. 2018) 9

Campion v. Old Republic Home Protections Co.,
861 F. Supp. 2d 1139 (S.D. Cal. 2012)..... 17

Cattie v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.,
504 F. Supp. 2d 939 (S.D. Cal. 2007)..... 17

Chapman v. Pier 1 Impos. Inc.,
631 F.3d 939 (9th Cir. 2011) 15

Clark v. Westbrae Nat., Inc.,
No. 20-cv-03221-JSC, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 224966 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 1, 2020)..... 7, 12

Clark v. Westbrae Nat., Inc.,
No. 20-cv-03221-JSC, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78703
(N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2021) 8, 12

Collins v. eMachines, Inc.,
202 Cal. App. 4th 249 (2011) 17

Cordes v. Boulder Brands USA, Inc.,
No. CV 18-6534 PSG (JCx), 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 217534 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2018)..... 16

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.