

## [Blogs](#)

March 05, 2014

Food & Consumer Packaged Goods Litigation

### **New Filings for March 5, 2014**

*Shaouli v. The Hain Celestial Group, Inc.*, No. BC532667 (Cal. Super., Los Angeles County): Plaintiff claims she purchased various Hain Celestial "energy shot" beverages, and paid a premium for them, because she believed they were lower in sugar and healthier than other beverages. Plaintiff alleges the products are misbranded under California's consumer protection statutes, because they disclose "evaporated cane juice" as an ingredient instead of "sugar." [Complaint](#). *Surzyn v. Diamond Foods, Inc.*, No. 14cv0136 (N.D. Cal.): Plaintiff alleges that Tia's-brand tortilla chips are labeled "all natural" but contain synthetic and/or artificial ingredients, including maltodextrin and dextrose. [Complaint](#). *Belli v. Nestle USA, Inc.*, No. 14cv0286 (N.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs allege the labeling of defendant's "Fruit Bars" products is misleading as to the claim "All Natural" because of beet juice coloring used in the products. [Complaint](#). *Belli v. Nestle USA, Inc.*, No. 14cv0283 (N.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs allege defendant's Eskimo Pies products are misbranded because of a "no sugar added" claim on the products' labels. [Complaint](#). *Coffey v. Nestle USA*, No. 14cv0288 (N.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs allege defendant's "Juicy Juice" products are misbranded because of a "no sugar added" claim. [Complaint](#). *Koplan v. Ralphs Grocery Co.*, No. BC533846 (Cal. Super., Los Angeles Cnty.): Plaintiff alleges that Ralph's decaffeinated coffee products are misbranded because the products are labeled "Without Caffeine" but actually contain caffeine, as disclosed elsewhere on the label. [Complaint](#). *Garrison v. Whole Foods Market California, Inc.*, No. 14cv0334 (N.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs allege that Whole Foods baked goods, including muffins, cookies, and cake products, are labeled "all natural" but actually include "synthetic" ingredients including sodium acid pyrophosphate and maltodextrin. [Complaint](#). *Riva v. Pepsico, Inc.*, No. 14cv0340 (S.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs allege that Pepsi One and Diet Pepsi beverages purchased by plaintiff contained 4-methylimidazole ("4-Mel"), and was not disclosed on the products' labeling. [Complaint](#). *Langley v. Pepsico, Inc.*, No. 14cv713 (N.D. Cal.): Plaintiffs allege that Pepsi One and Diet Pepsi beverages purchased by plaintiff contained 4-Mel, and was not disclosed on the products' labeling. [Complaint](#). *Batalla v. The Hain Celestial Group, Inc.*, No. 9:14cv80246 (S.D. Fla.): Plaintiff alleges that defendant markets its Pita Bites products as "'All Natural,' when they are not, because they include synthetic, and/or artificial ingredients, including, but not limited to, corn maltodextrin and/or hydrolyzed soy and corn protein. [Complaint](#). *Bruce v. Kind LLC*, No. 2:14cv1424 (C.D. Cal.): Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's Kind Plus snack bars are labeled as "All Natural" even though they contain ascorbic acid, an allegedly artificial ingredient. [Complaint](#). *Bohlke v. The Hain Celestial Group*, No. 9:14cv80300 (S.D. Fla.): Plaintiff alleges that defendant markets its pasta as "All Natural," but contends they contain allegedly unnatural, synthetic, and/or artificial ingredients, including, but not limited to, yellow corn flour and/or yellow corn meal. [Complaint](#).

### **Explore more in**

[Food & Consumer Packaged Goods Litigation](#) [Food & Beverage](#)

Blog series

## **Food & Consumer Packaged Goods Litigation**

Food & Consumer Packaged Goods Litigation shares timely insights into litigation developments, emerging arguments and challenges facing food and consumer packaged goods manufacturers and related industries.

[View the blog](#)