

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MICHELLE WALLS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated; and N.W., a minor child, by his parent and general guardian Michelle Walls, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated;

Plaintiffs,

v.

BEECH-NUT NUTRITION COMPANY;  
THE HAIN CELESTIAL GROUP, INC.;  
NURTURE, INC. D/B/A HAPPY FAMILY  
ORGANICS; GERBER PRODUCTS  
COMPANY; and PLUM PBC.;

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: 1:21-cv-00870

**PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO  
STEWART PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE**

POLLOCK COHEN LLP  
60 Broad St., 24th Fl.  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 337-5361

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and Proposed Class  
Representatives Michelle Walls and N.W.*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Introduction..... 1**

**Statement of Facts ..... 2**

    I.    The *Walls* Complaint..... 2

    II.   The *Stewart* Complaint and Instant Motion..... 3

    III.  The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation’s Pending Motion to Transfer and Consolidate the *Stewart* and *Walls* cases, among others, to this Court..... 4

**Standard of Review ..... 4**

**Argument ..... 5**

    I.    Judicial economy dictates that this Court refrain from ruling on the *Stewart* Plaintiffs’ Motion until the Panel on Multidistrict Litigation has ruled..... 5

    II.   The *Stewart* Plaintiffs fail to meet their burden in showing why consolidation is appropriate. .... 6

        A.    *The Stewart Plaintiffs fail to demonstrate that common questions sufficiently justify the proposed consolidation.* .... 6

        B.    *The potential benefits of consolidation are limited and outweighed by the potential prejudice to the Walls Plaintiffs.*..... 8

**Conclusion..... 10**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Banacki v. OneWest Bank, FSB*,  
276 F.R.D. 567 (E.D. Mich. 2011).....8

*Decoteau v. Raemisch*,  
304 F.R.D. 683 (D. Colo. 2014) .....8

*Devlin v. Transportation Commc’ns Int’l Union*,  
175 F.3d 121 (2d Cir. 1999) .....4

*Doug Brady, Inc. v. New Jersey Bldg. Laborers Statewide Funds*,  
250 F.R.D. 171 (D. N.J. 2008).....9

*In re Repetitive Stress Injury Litig.*,  
11 F.3d 368 (2d Cir. 1993) .....5

*Johnson v. Celotext Corp.*,  
899 F.2d 1281 (2d Cir. 1990) .....5

*KGK Jewelry LLC v. ESDNetwork*,  
No. 11-cv-9236-LTS-RLE, 2014 WL 7333291 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 24, 2014).....5, 9

*Pac. Recovery Sols. v. Cigna Behav. Health, Inc.*,  
No. 5:20-CV-02251-EJD, 2021 WL 577394 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2021).....8

*Parker v. Hyperdynamics Corp.*,  
126 F. Supp. 3d 830 (S.D. Tex. 2015).....9

*Smith v. Everson*,  
No. 06-cv-0791-SJF, 2007 WL 2294320 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 6, 2007).....5

**Statutes**

Fla. Stat. Ann. § 501 .....7

New York Gen. Bus. Law § 349 .....6

New York Gen. Bus. Law § 350 .....6

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2 .....1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 42 .....4

## INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs Michelle Walls and N.W.<sup>1</sup> (by his mother and general guardian Michelle Walls) (“*Walls* Plaintiffs”), respectfully oppose movants Nicole Stewart, Elizabeth Agramonte, and Summer Apicella’s (the “*Stewart* Plaintiffs”) motion for consolidation and to set deadlines, *see Stewart* Mot. to Consolidate (ECF No. 6). The *Walls* Plaintiffs recognize, and are in no way opposed, to the courts imposing some order over the now 43 lawsuits, including 38 class actions, filed in 12 jurisdictions, against several different baby-food manufacturers who only recently disclosed to Congress that their products contain dangerously high levels of four heavy metals: arsenic, lead, cadmium, and mercury. The issue, rather, is that the *Stewart* Plaintiffs’ request, which is limited to only the 12 lawsuits currently pending in the Eastern District of New York, has been usurped by the since-filed motion to transfer and consolidate all 43 cases—including the *Stewart* and *Walls* cases—currently pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. *See In re: Baby Food Marketing, Sales Practices and Production Liability Litig.*, No. 2997, ECF No. 1 (J.P.M.L. Mar. 8, 2021). Briefing on that motion will be completed April 6, 2021, and there will be little prejudice, if any, to the *Stewart* Plaintiffs if this Court were to wait for a decision from the Panel.

Even were it not for this pending decision from the Panel, when considering the merits of the *Stewart* Plaintiffs’ motion, a review of the two cases’ allegations and claims shows that consolidation is inappropriate. The *Stewart* Plaintiffs have sued a single defendant, Hain Celestial Group, Inc. (“Hain”); alleged four causes of action based around a single legal theory; and sought to represent a class of purchasers of Hain baby food products only. In contrast, the *Wells*

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff N.W. is a minor and is identified here by his initials. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2.

Plaintiffs have sued five defendant baby food manufacturers—i.e., Beech-Nut Nutrition Co., Hain, Gerber Products Co., Nurture Inc., and Plum PBC; alleged 11 claims against each Defendant; and seek to represent both a purchaser class and a consumer class of each Defendant’s products.

In short, the *Stewart* Plaintiffs’ motion fails to show why consolidation is appropriate in light of the Panel’s anticipated decision, or as between the *Walls* and *Stewart* cases. Accordingly, this Court should deny (or at a minimum refrain from ruling on) the *Stewart* Plaintiffs’ motion at this time.

### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

#### **I. The *Walls* Complaint.**

The *Walls* Plaintiffs are Michelle Walls, a resident of Staten Island, and her infant son N.W. *Walls et al. v. Beech-Nut Nutrition Co. et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-00870, ECF No. 1 (“*Walls* Compl.”), ¶¶ 10–11 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 2021). The *Walls* Complaint alleges 11 causes of action against five defendants—Beech-Nut, Hain, Gerber, Nurture, and Plum. *Id.* ¶¶ 12–16. These allegations are based on the *Walls* Plaintiffs own purchases and/or consumption of the *Walls* Defendants’ baby food products, the revelations of a Report published by the U.S. House of Representatives’ Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy (“House Subcommittee Report”), as well as independent research into representations made by the *Walls* Defendants in their product labeling, advertising, communications, and websites. *See id.* ¶¶ 19–45.

The *Walls* Plaintiffs allege the following theories of liability across their claims: (1) the *Walls* Defendants engaged in deceptive, fraudulent, and/or misrepresentative practices by advertising and selling baby food products that represented (a) they were healthy, (b) that they were safe, (c) that they were appropriate to feed to children, (d) that the *Walls* Defendants’ testing protocols excluded dangerous ingredients with elevated toxic heavy metals levels, and/or (e) that

# 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.