

BRIANNA GARDNER
SARAH WILLIAMS
Trial Attorneys
Consumer Protection Branch
U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division
PO Box 386
Washington, DC 20044-0386
202-532-4786 (Gardner)
202-616-4269 (Williams)
Fax: 202-514-8742
brianna.m.gardner@usdoj.gov
sarah.williams@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff,

v.

AFFINITYLIFESTYLES.COM, INC., and REAL
WATER, INC., corporations, and BRENT A.
JONES and BLAIN K. JONES, individuals.

Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-959

COMPLAINT FOR A PERMANENT
INJUNCTION

Plaintiff, the United States of America, on behalf of the United States Food and Drug
Administration (“FDA”) alleges:

1. This statutory injunction proceeding is brought under the Federal Food, Drug, and
Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. § 332(a), to halt the manufacture and distribution of adulterated and/or
misbranded bottled drinking water and chemical concentrate. Defendants’ bottled drinking water has
been associated with five cases of acute liver failure in children. Plaintiff seeks an injunction to restrain
and enjoin Defendants from directly or indirectly doing or causing the following acts:

1 A. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(uu), by operating a facility that manufactures,
2 processes, packs, or holds food for sale in the United States, and not doing so in compliance with the
3 hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls requirements in 21 U.S.C. § 350g;

4 B. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(a), by introducing or delivering for introduction into
5 interstate commerce articles of food that are adulterated within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(a)(4)
6 and/or misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 343(i)(2); and

7 C. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k), by causing articles of food that are held for sale
8 after shipment of one or more of their components in interstate commerce to become adulterated within
9 the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(a)(4) and/or misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 343(i)(2).

10 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and all parties to this action pursuant
12 to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337, and 1345, and 21 U.S.C. § 332(a).

13 3. Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

14 THE PARTIES

15 4. Plaintiff, the United States of America, brings this action on behalf of FDA, the agency
16 mandated to protect the public health by, among other things, ensuring the safety of the U.S. food
17 supply, including, but not limited to, bottled drinking water.

18 5. Defendant AffinityLifestyles.com, Inc. (“Affinity”) is a Nevada corporation operating
19 under Nevada Business ID, NV19981130088, and located at 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite
20 500S, Las Vegas, Nevada 89169. Affinity is the majority shareholder of Defendant Real Water, Inc.

21 6. Defendant Real Water, Inc. (“Real Water”) is a Delaware corporation, doing business in
22 Nevada, under Nevada Business ID, NV20181191189, with addresses at 3208 W. Desert Inn Rd, Las
23 Vegas, NV 89102 and 6018 E. Main Street, Mesa, Arizona 85205.

24 7. Real Water manufactures bottled drinking water and a proprietary chemical concentrate
25 (“E² Concentrate”) at 1180 Center Point Drive, Suite 200, Henderson, Nevada 89102 (the “Henderson
26 Facility”), within the jurisdiction of this Court.

8. Real Water also manufactures bottled drinking water at 6018 E. Main Street, Mesa, Arizona 85205 (the “Mesa Facility”).

9. Defendants distribute bottled drinking water from the Henderson Facility and the Mesa Facility under the brands “Re²al Water Drinking Water” and “Re²al Alkalized Water,” respectively. “Re²al Water” is used herein to refer to either brand of Defendants’ bottled drinking water.

10. Defendants repackage E² Concentrate at the Mesa Facility and distribute it under the brand “Re²al Alkalized Water Concentrate.”

11. Defendant Brent A. Jones is the President and Director of Affinity and Real Water. He is responsible for purchasing, marketing, and sales at Real Water. Brent A. Jones is a resident of Nevada, who performs his duties at the Henderson Facility, within the jurisdiction of this Court.

12. Defendant Blain K. Jones is the Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer of Real Water, and the Secretary and Treasurer of Affinity. He is responsible for manufacturing, distribution, and employee training at Real Water. Blain K. Jones is a resident of Nevada, who performs his duties at the Henderson Facility, within the jurisdiction of this Court.

13. Upon information and belief, Defendants Brent A. Jones and Blain K. Jones are the only individuals who know the formula for E² Concentrate.

14. Upon information and belief, Defendant Blain K. Jones is the sole individual responsible for manufacturing E² Concentrate.

DEFENDANTS' PRODUCTS

15. Defendants manufacture, process, prepare, bottle, pack, label, hold, and distribute articles of food within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 321(f), namely Re²al Water and E² Concentrate.

16. Defendants manufacture E² Concentrate at the Henderson Facility using materials shipped from outside Nevada, including potassium hydroxide provided by a chemical company located in Arizona.

17. To manufacture E² Concentrate, Defendants first process municipal tap water by carbon filtration, reverse osmosis filtration, ultraviolet light filtration, and ozone filtration, and then Defendants mix this processed water with potassium hydroxide, potassium bicarbonate, and magnesium chloride.

1 Next, Defendants claim to use a proprietary “ionizer” apparatus to apply an electrical current to this
2 mixture, which allegedly creates positively-charged and negatively-charged solutions. Defendants then
3 discard the positively-charged solution and store the negatively-charged solution as E² Concentrate.

4 18. Defendants use E² Concentrate for manufacturing Re²al Water at the Henderson Facility.
5 Defendants also send E² Concentrate to the Mesa Facility for manufacturing Re²al Water there, and for
6 repackaging the E² Concentrate into retail bottles.

7 19. Defendants manufacture Re²al Water by adding E² Concentrate and potassium hydroxide
8 to municipal tap water that has been processed as described in paragraph 17. Defendants mix these
9 ingredients in a large tank, and then fill containers with this mixture for distribution as Re²al Water.

10 20. Defendants distribute 5-gallon containers of Re²al Water from the Henderson Facility
11 both to customers within Nevada and to customers located outside of Nevada, including Arizona and
12 California. Defendants distribute 500-milliliter (mL), 1-liter (L), 1.5-L, and 1-gallon containers of Re²al
13 Water from the Mesa Facility to distributors in Arizona, California, and Nevada. Defendants distribute
14 4-ounce (oz) bottles of E² Concentrate from the Mesa Facility to online consumers throughout the
15 United States.

16 21. Defendants market Re²al Water as “premium” drinking water that is a “clean,” “healthy”
17 alternative to tap water.

18 22. Defendants market E² Concentrate as a taste enhancer that consumers can add to liquids,
19 including, but not limited to, tea, coffee, and wine.

20 23. Defendants intend for Re²al Water and E² Concentrate to be consumed with no further
21 processing. It is therefore crucial for Defendants to properly manufacture, process, prepare, bottle, pack,
22 hold, and distribute Re²al Water and E² Concentrate to minimize the potential for chemical and
23 microbial contamination and reduce the risk of illness to consumers.

24 PREVENTIVE CONTROLS REQUIREMENTS

25 24. The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requires that the owner, operator, or agent in
26 charge of a facility evaluate the hazards that could affect food manufactured, processed, packed, or held
27 by such facility, and identify and implement preventive controls to significantly minimize or prevent the
28

1 occurrence of those hazards and provide assurances that such food is not adulterated. See 21 U.S.C.
2 § 350g (Hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls).

3 25. The hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls requirements set forth at 21
4 C.F.R. Part 117, Subpart C (“Human Food Preventive Control Regulations”), implement 21 U.S.C.
5 § 350g, and were promulgated to better protect the public health by, among other things, ensuring the
6 production of safe and sanitary food through hazard analysis and risk-based preventive controls. See 21
7 U.S.C. § 350g(n)(1)(A). Failure to comply with the Human Food Preventive Control Regulations
8 violates the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. See 21 U.S.C. § 331(uu) and 21 C.F.R. § 117.1(b);
9 see also Final Rule, Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive
10 Controls in Human Food, 80 Fed. Reg. 55,908 (Sept. 17, 2015).

11 26. The hazard analysis requirements require the owner, operator, or agent in charge of a
12 food facility to “conduct a hazard analysis to identify . . . known or reasonably foreseeable hazards . . .
13 to determine whether there are any hazards requiring a preventive control” for each type of food
14 manufactured, processed, packed, or held at the facility. 21 C.F.R. § 117.130(a) (Requirement for a
15 hazard analysis); 21 U.S.C. § 350g(b). Hazards can be biological, chemical, or physical, and they can be
16 naturally occurring, unintentionally introduced, or intentionally introduced for purposes of economic
17 gain. See 21 U.S.C. § 350g(b); 21 C.F.R. § 117.130(b) (Hazard identification).

18 27. The owner, operator, or agent in charge of a food facility must, among other things,
19 identify and implement preventive controls to provide assurances that any hazards requiring a preventive
20 control are significantly minimized or prevented, and the food manufactured, processed, packed, or held
21 by a facility is not adulterated under 21 U.S.C. § 342. See 21 U.S.C. § 350g(c); 21 C.F.R. § 117.135
22 (Preventive controls).

23 28. Preventive controls include, as appropriate to the food and facility, process controls,
24 sanitation controls, supply-chain controls, a recall plan, as well as any other controls necessary to
25 provide assurances that the food is not adulterated under 21 U.S.C. § 342. 21 U.S.C. § 350g(c); 21
26 C.F.R. § 117.135(c).

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.