

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

GABRIELLE STUVE and JESSICA
NICODEMO, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE KRAFT HEINZ COMPANY a/k/a
KRAFT HEINZ FOODS COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:21-CV-01845

The Hon. Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF THE KRAFT HEINZ COMPANY'S
MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

JENNER & BLOCK LLP

Dean N. Panos
dpanos@jenner.com
Thomas E. Quinn
tquinn@jenner.com
353 North Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60654
Tel.: (312) 222-9350

-and-

Kate T. Spelman (*pro hac vice*)
kspelman@jenner.com
Alexander M. Smith
asmith@jenner.com
633 West 5th Street, Suite 3600
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel.: (213) 239-5100

Attorneys for Defendant
The Kraft Heinz Company

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION1

BACKGROUND2

 I. Phthalates Are Common Chemicals And Pose No Health Hazards At Trace Levels.....2

 II. Plaintiffs Challenge The Presence of Phthalates in Kraft Macaroni & Cheese.....4

ARGUMENT.....6

 I. Plaintiffs’ “Adulteration” Claims, Including Their IFDCA Claim, Are Preempted Because The FDA Permits Phthalates In Food And Regards Them As Safe.....6

 II. Plaintiffs’ Failure-to-Disclose Claims Are Fatally Flawed.11

 A. Plaintiffs’ failure-to-disclose claims are preempted because they seek to impose disclosure requirements that are not imposed by federal law.....11

 B. Plaintiffs’ failure-to-disclose claim also fails because the alleged presence of phthalates is not material to reasonable consumers.....14

 III. Plaintiffs’ Claims Based On Affirmative Misrepresentations Are Not Actionable.16

 A. “The Taste You Love” and “The Part of Parenting That’s Impossible to Mess Up” are non-actionable puffery.17

 B. The alleged presence of phthalates does not render the truthful “NO Artificial _____” statements on the packaging false or misleading.18

 C. Plaintiffs cannot challenge the statements on Kraft Heinz’s website because they do not allege that they visited or relied on that website.20

 IV. Plaintiffs’ Breach of Warranty And Unjust Enrichment Claims Also Fail.21

 V. Plaintiffs’ Request For Injunctive Relief Violates The First Amendment To The Extent It Seeks To Require Disclosures Or Warnings About Phthalates.23

CONCLUSION.....25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Adkins v. Nestle Purina Petcare Co.</i> , 973 F. Supp. 2d 905 (N.D. Ill. 2013)	17
<i>Am. Beverage Ass'n v. City & County of San Francisco</i> , 916 F.3d 749 (9th Cir. 2019)	24
<i>Am. Meat Inst. v. USDA</i> , 760 F.3d 18 (D.C. Cir. 2014)	24
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	6
<i>Ass'n Ben. Servs., Inc. v. Caremark RX, Inc.</i> , 493 F.3d 841 (7th Cir. 2007)	21
<i>Axon v. Citrus World, Inc.</i> , 354 F. Supp 3d 170 (E.D.N.Y. 2018)	19
<i>Backus v. Biscomerica Corp.</i> , 378 F. Supp. 3d 849 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	9
<i>Beasley v. Lucky Stores, Inc.</i> , 400 F. Supp. 3d 942 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	9
<i>Berry v. Budget Rent A Car Sys., Inc.</i> , 497 F. Supp. 2d 1361 (S.D. Fla. 2007)	21
<i>Bildstein v. MasterCard Int'l, Inc.</i> , 329 F. Supp. 2d 410 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).....	14
<i>In re Bisphenol-A (BPA) Polycarbonate Plastic Products Liability Litigation</i> , No. 08-1967, 2009 WL 3762965 (W.D. Mo. Nov. 9, 2009)	13
<i>Bober v. Glaxo Wellcome PLC</i> , 246 F.3d 934 (7th Cir. 2001)	10
<i>Brownmark Films, LLC v. Comedy Partners</i> , 682 F.3d 687 (7th Cir. 2012)	4
<i>Catalano v. BMW of N. Am., LLC</i> , 167 F. Supp. 3d 540 (S.D.N.Y. 2016).....	23

Chavez v. Church & Dwight Co.,
 No. 17-1948, 2018 WL 2238191 (N.D. Ill. May 16, 2018).....21

Chuang v. Dr. Pepper Snapple Grp., Inc.,
 No. 17-1875, 2017 WL 4286577 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2017)20

Cleary v. Philip Morris Inc.,
 656 F.3d 511 (7th Cir. 2011)21

Cohen v. Cowles Media Co.,
 501 U.S. 663 (1991).....23

Decker v. Mazda Motor of Am., Inc.,
 No. 11-873, 2013 WL 12129281 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2013).....15

Delacruz v. Cytosport, Inc.,
 No. 11-3532, 2012 WL 1215243 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2012).....19

Doss v. Gen. Mills, Inc.,
 816 F. App'x 312 (11th Cir. 2020)7

Geier v. Am. Honda Motor Co.,
 529 U.S. 861 (2000).....6

In re Gen. Mills Glyphosate Litig.,
 No. 16-2869, 2017 WL 2983877 (D. Minn. July 12, 2017)15, 18, 19

In re Gen. Motors Corp. Anti-Lock Brake Prods. Liab. Litig.,
 966 F. Supp. 1525 (E.D. Mo. 1997).....22

Goldemberg v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Cos.,
 8 F. Supp. 3d 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)21

Hawkins v. Kellogg Co.,
 224 F. Supp. 3d 1002 (S.D. Cal. 2016).....9

Intel Corp. v. Hamidi,
 71 P.3d 296 (Cal. 2003)24

Johnson v. Organo Gold International, Inc.,
 No. 15-390, 2016 WL 2771124 (D. Del. May 13, 2016)12, 13

Kennedy v. Covidien, LP,
 No. 18-1907, 2019 WL 1429979 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2019).....22

Kennedy v. Mondelez Global LLC,
 No. 19-302, 2020 WL 4006197 (E.D.N.Y. July 10, 2020).....21, 22

Kommer v. Bayer Consumer Health,
252 F. Supp. 3d 304 (S.D.N.Y. 2017).....16

Lateef v. Pharmavite LLC,
No. 12-5611, 2012 WL 5269619 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 24, 2012)12, 13

Lugones v. Pete & Gerry’s Organic, LLC,
440 F. Supp. 3d 226 (S.D.N.Y. 2020).....17

Manley v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.,
417 F. Supp. 3d 1114 (N.D. Ill. 2019)14, 23

Martin v. Living Essentials, LLC,
160 F. Supp. 3d 1042 (N.D. Ill. 2016)6

N.Y. Times Co. v. Sullivan,
376 U.S. 254 (1964).....23

Nat’l Inst. of Family & Life Advocates v. Becerra,
138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018).....23

National Association of Wheat Growers v. Becerra,
468 F. Supp. 3d 1247 (E.D. Cal. 2020).....24

Nemphos v. Nestle Waters North America, Inc.,
775 F.3d 616 (4th Cir. 2015)10

Notification Techs., Inc. v. Parlant Tech., Inc.,
No. 05-89, 2005 WL 8173034 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 27, 2005)17

Pappas v. Pella Corp.,
363 Ill. App. 3d 795 (2006)17

Pardini v. Unilever U.S., Inc.,
961 F. Supp. 2d 1048 (N.D. Cal. 2013)11

Parks v. Ainsworth Pet Nutrition, LLC,
377 F. Supp. 3d 241 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).....14, 15, 18, 19

In re PepsiCo, Inc. Bottled Water Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.,
588 F. Supp. 2d 527 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....12

PETA v. Whole Foods Mkt. Cal., Inc.,
No. 15-4301, 2016 WL 1642577 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2016).....17

Red v. Kraft Foods, Inc.,
No. 10-1028, 2012 WL 5504011 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2012).....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.