### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

ANGELA LEYVA and ANDREA FAHEY, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Case No.

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY,

Defendant.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT** 

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiffs Angela Leyva and Andrea Fahey ("Plaintiffs") bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated against Defendant The Procter & Gamble Company ("P&G" or "Defendant"). Plaintiffs make the following allegations pursuant to the investigation of their counsel and based upon information and belief, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to themselves, which are based on personal knowledge.

### NATURE OF THE ACTION AND FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS

1. This is a class action lawsuit regarding Defendant's manufacturing, distribution, and sale of Secret antiperspirant aerosol and spray products (the "Products") that contain dangerously high levels of benzene, a carcinogenic impurity that has been linked to leukemia and other cancers.

2. Secret is a brand of antiperspirants manufactured, distributed, and sold by Defendant. The Products discussed herein contain benzene, a carcinogenic chemical impurity that has been linked to leukemia and other cancers. The Products are not designed to contain benzene, and in fact no amount of benzene is acceptable in antiperspirant sprays such as the Products manufactured by Defendant. The presence of benzene in the Products renders them

adulterated and misbranded, and therefore illegal to sell under both federal and state law. As a result, the Products are unsafe and illegal to sell under federal law, and therefore worthless. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 331(a), 352; *see also Debernardis v. IQ Formulations, LLC*, 942 F.3d 1076, 1085 (11th Cir. 2019); *In re Valsartan, Losartan, & Irbesartan Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 2021 WL 222776, at \*16 (D.N.J. Jan. 22, 2021).

3. Benzene is a component of crude oil, gasoline, and cigarette smoke, and is one of the elementary petrochemicals. The Department of Health and Human Services has determined that benzene causes cancer in humans. Likewise, the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") lists benzene as a "Class 1 solvent" that "should not be employed in the manufacture of drug substances, excipients, and drug products because of [its] unacceptable toxicity." Benzene is associated with blood cancers such as leukemia.<sup>1</sup> A study from 1939 on benzene stated that "exposure over a long period of time to any concentration of benzene greater than zero is not safe,"<sup>2</sup> which is a comment reiterated in a 2010 review of benzene research specifically stating: "There is probably no safe level of exposure to benzene, and all exposures constitute some risk in a linear, if not supralinear, and additive fashion."<sup>3</sup>

4. According to the American Cancer Society:

IARC classifies benzene as "carcinogenic to humans," based on sufficient evidence that benzene causes acute myeloid leukemia (AML). IARC also notes that benzene exposure has been linked with acute

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> National Cancer Institute, Cancer-Causing Substances, Benzene. https:// www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/causes-prevention/risk/substances/benzene.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Hunter, F.T. (1939). Chronic Exposure to Benzene (Benzol). II. The Clinical Effects. *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*. 1939 Vol.21 pp.331-54 (https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/19402700388)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Smith, Martyn T. (2010). Advances in Understanding Benzene Health Effects and Susceptibility. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2010 Vol. 31:133-148 (https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.012809.103646)

lymphocytic leukemia (ALL), chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL), multiple myeloma, and non-Hodgkin lymphoma.<sup>4</sup>

5. Moreover, "[d]irect exposure of the eyes, skin, or lungs to benzene can cause tissue injury and irritation."<sup>5</sup>

6. According to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, humans can become exposed to benzene through "inhalation, <u>skin absorption</u>, ingestion, <u>skin</u> and/or eye contact."<sup>6</sup> Skin absorption is particularly concerning as there have been multiple FDA studies showing that structurally similar chemicals in sunscreen products are found in the blood at high levels after application to exposed skin.

7. On November 3, 2021, Valisure, an online pharmacy registered with the FDA, "detected high levels of benzene and other contaminants in specific batches of body spray products, some of which contain active pharmaceutical ingredients aluminum chlorohydrate or aluminum sesquichlorohydrate."<sup>7</sup>

8. Valisure tested the Secret Products manufactured by Defendant, which were found to contain as much as 16.2 parts per million of benzene<sup>8</sup>:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> American Cancer Society. Benzene and Cancer Risk (January 5, 2016) (https://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancer-causes/benzene.html)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Facts About Benzene, https://emergency.cdc.gov/agent/benzene/basics/facts.asp.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Benzene, https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npg/npgd0049.html.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> VALISURE, VALISURE CITIZEN PETITION ON BENZENE IN BODY SPRAY PRODUCTS, Nov. 3, 2021, https://www.valisure.com/wp-content/uploads/Valisure-FDA-Citizen-Petition-on-Body-Spray-v4.0-3.pdf (the "Valisure Petition"), at 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 12-14.

Brand	UPC	Lot	Expiration	Description	Average ppm
Secret	037000711087	11721458SG	06/2023	Powder Fresh, 24 HR Aerosol	16.2
Secret	037000711087	11701458SH	06/2023	24 Hour Protection, Powder, Aerosol	16.1
Secret	037000711094	12181458SD	08/2023	24 Hour Protection, Powder, Aerosol	12.5
Secret	037000798842	11091458SN	08/2023	Cool Light & Airy Smooth Feel, Dry Spray, 48 Hour Freshness, Rose	4.85
Secret	037000798842	11991458SR	07/2023	Cool Light & Airy Smooth Feel, Dry Spray, 48 Hour Freshness, Rose	2.58
Secret	037000729921	11101458SN	04/2023	Cool Light & Airy Smooth Feel, Dry Spray, 48 Hour Freshness, Light Essentials	1.64

Brand	UPC	Lot	Expiration	Description	Average ppm
Secret	037000729914	12151458FC	08/2023	Cool Light & Airy Smooth Feel, Dry Spray, 48 Hour Freshness, Waterlily	1.35
Secret	037000747727	12141458FB	08/2023	Out Last, Protecting Powder, 48 HR Sweat & Odor, Protection, Dry Spray	1.24

9. The FDA does state that if the use of benzene is "<u>unavoidable</u> in order to produce a drug product with a significant therapeutic advance," then the drug product may contain up to 2 ppm of benzene.<sup>9</sup> However, many of Defendant's Products that were tested contain levels of benzene above this amount. Regardless, according to Valisure, "[b]ecause many of the body spray products Valisure tested did not contain detectable levels of benzene, it does not appear that benzene use is unavoidable for their manufacture, and considering the long history and widespread use of these products, it also does not appear that they currently constitute a significant therapeutic advance."<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, <u>any</u> level of benzene in Defendant's Products is unacceptable and therefore renders the Products adulterated, misbranded, unsafe, and worthless.

10. Defendant did not disclose the actual or potential presence of benzene in its antiperspirant products on the Products' labeling, or in any advertising or website promoting the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 1 (emphasis added).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 1-2.

Products. Defendant did not disclose the presence of benzene in the Products to Plaintiffs or Class members at the point of sale or at any time before the point of sale.

11. Antiperspirant body sprays are considered over-the-counter ("OTC") drugs that are regulated by the United States Food & Drug Administration ("FDA") pursuant to the federal Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act ("FDCA"), 21 U.S.C. § 301 *et seq.*, as well as analogous state statutes and regulations.

12. As OTC drug products regulated by the FDA, the Products must be both safe and effective and are subject to federal current Good Manufacturing Practices ("cGMP") regulations and the FDCA's state-law analogues. These cGMP regulations require OTC medications like the Products to meet safety, quality, purity, identity, and strength standards. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 51(a)(2)(B). Federal and state regulatory regimes require that labeling for OTC products identify each active and inactive ingredient.<sup>11</sup> 21 C.F.R. 201.66 establishes labeling requirements for OTC products and defines an inactive ingredient as "any component other than an active ingredient." An "active ingredient" is "any component that is intended to furnish pharmacological activity or other direct effect in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease, or to affect the structure or any function of the body of humans. <u>The term includes those components that may undergo chemical change in the manufacture of the drug product and be present in the drug product in a modified form intended to furnish the specified activity or effect." (Emphasis added).</u>

13. 21 C.F.R. § 210.1(a) states that the cGMPs establish "minimum current good manufacturing practice for methods to be used in, and the facilities or controls to be used for, the manufacture, processing, packing, or holding of a drug to assure that such drug meets the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> https://www.fda.gov/media/72250/download.

requirements of the act as to safety, and has the identity and strength and meets the quality and purity characteristics that it purports or is represented to possess." In other words, entities at all phases of the design, manufacture, and distribution chain are bound by these requirements.

14. The FDA's cGMP regulations are found in 21 C.F.R. Parts 210 and 211. These detailed regulations set forth minimum standards regarding: organization and personnel (Subpart B); buildings and facilities (Subpart C); equipment (Subpart D); control of components and drug product containers and closures (Subpart E); production and process controls (Subpart F); packaging and label controls (Subpart G); holding and distribution (Subpart H); laboratory controls (Subpart I); records and reports (Subpart J); and returned and salvaged drug products (Subpart K). The FDA has worldwide jurisdiction to enforce these regulations if the facility is making drugs intended to be distributed in the United States.

15. Any drug product not manufactured in accordance with cGMPs is deemed "adulterated" or "misbranded" and may not be distributed or sold in the United States. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 331(a), 351(a)(2)(B). States have enacted laws adopting or mirroring these federal standards.

16. FDA regulations require a drug product manufacturer to have "written procedures for production and process control designed to assure that the drug products have the identity, strength, quality, and purity they purport or are represented to possess." 21 C.F.R. § 211.100.

17. A drug product manufacturer's "[l]aboratory controls shall include the establishment of scientifically sound and appropriate specifications, standards, sampling plans, and test procedures designed to assure that components, drug product containers, closures, in-process materials, labeling, and drug products conform to appropriate standards of identity, strength, quality, and purity." 21 C.F.R. § 211.160.

18. "Laboratory records shall include complete data derived from all tests necessary to assure compliance with established specifications and standards, including examinations and assays" and a "statement of the results of tests and how the results compare with established standards of identity, strength, quality, and purity for the component, drug product container, closure, in-process material, or drug product tested." 21 C.F.R. § 211.194.

19. Defendant disregarded the cGMPs outlined above. As a manufacturer, distributor, and seller of an OTC drug product, Defendant had and has a duty to ensure that its Products did not contain excessive (or any) levels of benzene, including through regular testing. But based on Valisure's testing results set forth above, Defendant made no reasonable effort to test its Products for benzene or other impurities. Nor did it disclose to Plaintiffs or any other consumers in any product advertising, labeling, packaging, or marketing that its antiperspirant products contained benzene, let alone at levels that are many multiples of the emergency, interim limit set by the FDA. To the contrary, Defendant represented and warranted, expressly and impliedly, that the Products were of merchantable quality, complied with federal and state law, and did not contain carcinogens, reproductive toxins, or other impurities such as benzene.

20. If Defendant had not routinely disregarded the FDA's cGMPs, or had fulfilled their quality assurance obligations, Defendant would have identified the presence of the benzene contaminant almost immediately.

21. Further, had Defendant adequately tested its Products for benzene and other carcinogens, reproductive toxins, and impurities, it would have discovered that its Products contained benzene at levels above the FDA's limit (to the extent even applicable), making those products ineligible for distribution, marketing, and sale.

22. Accordingly, Defendant knowingly, or at least negligently, introduced contaminated, adulterated, and/or misbranded Products containing dangerous amounts of benzene into the U.S. market.

23. Defendant also knew or should have known about the carcinogenic potential of benzene because it is classified as a Group 1 compound by the World Health Organization and the International Agency for Research on Cancer, meaning that it is "carcinogenic to humans."

24. Ironically, Defendant actually touts that consumers' "safety and the safety of [their] world has been at the heart of what we do. That's why we have a team of more than 500 scientists and professionals and a rigorous safety process to analyze every ingredient—before we ever consider putting it in one of our products."<sup>12</sup> Indeed, Defendant claims it "evaluate[s] all ingredients in the product to ensure they are safe when used." Based on the foregoing, however, these representations are false. Defendant has not ensured compliance with applicable laws (or any "rigorous safety process to analyze every ingredient" it claims to maintain) because its failure to comply with cGMPs resulted in the contamination of its Products with benzene.

25. The presence of benzene—and Defendant's failure to comply with cGMPs renders the Products both adulterated and misbranded under the FDCA. The Products are adulterated because they are "drug[s] and the methods used in, or the facilities or controls used for, its manufacture, processing, packing, or holding do not conform to or are not operated or administered in conformity with current good manufacturing practice to assure that such drug meets the requirements of this chapter as to safety and has the identity and strength, and meets the quality and purity characteristics, which it purports or is represented to possess." 21 U.S.C. § 351(a)(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> https://us.pg.com/product-safety/.

26. The Products are misbranded because their labeling is "false" and "misleading" because it does not disclose the presence of benzene. 21 U.S.C.

§ 352(a)(1).

27. Under federal law, a product that is "adulterated" or "misbranded" cannot legally be manufactured, advertised, distributed, or sold. 21 U.S.C.

§ 331(a). Adulterated and misbranded products thus have no economic value and are legally worthless.

28. When Plaintiffs purchased Defendant's Products, Plaintiffs did not know, and had no reason to know, that Defendant's Products were adulterated and misbranded and thus unlawful to sell or purchase as set forth herein. Not only would Plaintiffs not have purchased Defendant's Products at all had they known the Products contained benzene, they would not have been capable of purchasing them if Defendant had done as the law required and tested those products for benzene and other carcinogens, reproductive toxins, and impurities.

29. Moreover, no reasonable consumer would have paid any amount for products containing benzene, a known carcinogen and reproductive toxin, much less above the limits set by the FDA (even assuming those allowances apply to Defendant's products).

30. Thus, if Plaintiffs and Class members had been informed that Defendant's Products contained or may contain benzene, they would not have purchased or used the Products at all, or would have paid significantly less for the Products, making such omitted facts material to them.

31. Plaintiffs and Class members were injured by the full purchase price of the Products because the Products are worthless, as they are adulterated and contain harmful levels of benzene, and Defendant has failed to warn consumers of this fact. Such illegally sold

products are worthless and have no value. *See Debernardis v. IQ Formulations, LLC*, 942 F.3d 1076, 1085 (11th Cir. 2019); *see also In re Valsartan, Losartan, & Irbesartan Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 2021 WL 222776, at \*16 (D.N.J. Jan. 22, 2021) ("This Court finds that contaminated drugs are economically worthless at the point of sale by virtue of the dangerousness caused by their contamination, regardless whether the sold VCDs actually achieved the medical purpose of lowering blood pressure. Put differently, contaminated drugs, even if medically efficacious for their purpose, cannot create a benefit of the bargain because the contaminants, and their dangerous effects, were never bargained for.").

32. Plaintiffs and Class members bargained for an antiperspirant product free of contaminants and dangerous substances, and were deprived the basis of their bargain when Defendant sold them products containing the dangerous substance benzene, which rendered the Products unmerchantable and unfit for use.

33. Plaintiffs and Class members are further entitled to damages for the monies paid to purchase the Products, statutory and punitive damages, attorneys' fees and costs,, and injunctive relief.

34. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the Class for equitable relief and to recover damages and restitution for: (i) breach of express warranty; (ii) breach of implied warranty; (iii) violation of Florida's Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA"), Fla. Stat. §§ 501.201 *et seq.*; (iv) fraud; and (v) unjust enrichment.

#### PARTIES

35. Plaintiff Angela Leyva is a resident of Key Largo, Florida and has an intent to remain there, and is therefore a domiciliary of Florida. In or about October 2021, Ms. Leyva purchased a canister of Defendant's Secret Out Last, Protecting Powder from a Walmart in

Florida. When purchasing the Product, Ms. Leyva reviewed the accompanying labels and disclosures, and understood them as representations and warranties by the manufacturer that the Secret Product was properly manufactured, free from defects, safe for its intended use, not adulterated or misbranded, and legal to sell. Ms. Leyva relied on these representations and warranties in deciding to purchase the Secret Product manufactured by Defendant, and these representations and warranties were part of the basis of the bargain, in that they would not have purchased the Secret Product from Defendant if they had known that it was not, in fact, properly manufactured, free from defects, safe for its intended use, adulterated and misbranded, and legal to sell. Ms. Leyva's Secret Product was contaminated with benzene, therefore rendering it improperly manufactured, defective, not safe for its intended use, adulterated and misbranded, and illegal to sell.

36. Plaintiff Andrea Fahey is a resident of Sebastian, Florida and has an intent to remain there, and is therefore a domiciliary of Florida. In or about September 2021, Ms. Fahey purchased a canister of Defendant's Secret Powder Fresh 24 HR Aerosol from a Walmart in Florida. When purchasing the Product, Ms. Fahey reviewed the accompanying labels and disclosures, and understood them as representations and warranties by the manufacturer that the Secret Product was properly manufactured, free from defects, safe for its intended use, not adulterated or misbranded, and legal to sell. Ms. Fahey relied on these representations and warranties in deciding to purchase the Secret Product manufactured by Defendant, and these representations and warranties were part of the basis of the bargain, in that they would not have purchased the Secret Product from Defendant if they had known that it was not, in fact, properly manufactured, free from defects, safe for its intended, and legal to sell. Ms. Fahey and known that it was not, in fact, properly manufactured, free from defects, safe for its intended, and legal to sell. Ms. Fahey had known that it was not, in fact, properly manufactured, free from defects, safe for its intended, and legal to sell. Ms. Fahey's Secret Product form Defendant if they had known that it was not, in fact, properly manufactured, free from defects, safe for its intended use, adulterated and misbranded, and legal to sell. Ms. Fahey's Secret Product was contaminated with benzene, therefore rendering it

improperly manufactured, defective, not safe for its intended use, adulterated and misbranded, and illegal to sell.

37. Defendant The Procter & Gamble Company is an Ohio corporation with its headquarters at 1 P&G Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. P&G distributes the Products throughout the United States and the State of Florida. The Secret Products, including the adulterated Products purchased by Plaintiffs and members of the putative Classes, are available at retail stores throughout Florida and the United States.

### JURISIDICTION AND VENUE

38. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A), as modified by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, because at least one member of the Class, as defined below, is a citizen of a different state than Defendant, there are more than 100 members of the Class, and the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs.

39. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Plaintiffs purchased the Product in this District.

40. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

41. Plaintiffs seek to represent a class defined as all persons in the United States who purchased the Products (the "Class").

42. Plaintiffs also seek to represent a subclass of all Class members who purchased the Products in Florida (the "Subclass").

43. The Class and Subclass are collectively referred to as the "Classes."

44. Subject to additional information obtained through further investigation and discovery, the foregoing definitions of the Classes may be expanded or narrowed by amendment to the complaint or narrowed at class certification.

45. Specifically excluded from the Classes are Defendant, Defendant's officers, directors, agents, trustees, parents, children, corporations, trusts, representatives, employees, principals, servants, partners, joint ventures, or entities controlled by Defendant, and its heirs, successors, assigns, or other persons or entities related to or affiliated with Defendant and/or Defendant's officers and/or directors, the judge assigned to this action, and any member of the judge's immediate family.

46. **Numerosity.** The members of the proposed Classes are geographically dispersed throughout the United States and are so numerous that individual joinder is impracticable. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs reasonably estimate that there are hundreds of thousands of individuals that are members of the proposed Classes. Although the precise number of proposed members are unknown to Plaintiffs, the true number of members of the Classes are known by Defendant. Members of the Classes may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail and/or publication through the distribution records of Defendant and third-party retailers and vendors.

47. **Typicality.** The claims of the representative Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Classes in that the representative Plaintiffs, like all members of the Classes, purchased the Products, which were worthless due to the presence of benzene, a harmful and carcinogenic

chemical impurity. The representative Plaintiffs, like all members of the Classes, has been damaged by Defendant's misconduct in the very same way as the members of the Classes. Further, the factual bases of Defendant's misconduct are common to all members of the Classes and represent a common thread of misconduct resulting in injury to all members of the Classes.

48. **Existence and predominance of common questions of law and fact.** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Classes and predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Classes. These common legal and factual questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) whether the Products manufactured by Defendant contain dangerously high levels of benzene, thereby breaching the express and implied warranties made by Defendant and making the Products unfit for human use and therefore unfit for their intended purpose;
- (b) whether Defendant knew or should have known the Products contained elevated levels of benzene prior to selling them, thereby constituting fraud and/or fraudulent concealment;
- (c) whether Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Classes for unjust enrichment;
- (d) whether Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Classes for fraud;
- (e) whether Plaintiffs and the Classes have sustained monetary loss and the proper measure of that loss;
- (f) whether Plaintiffs and the Classes are entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief;
- (g) whether Plaintiffs and the Classes are entitled to restitution and

disgorgement from Defendant; and

(h) whether the marketing, advertising, packaging, labeling, and other promotional materials for the Products are deceptive.

49. Adequacy of Representation. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Classes. Plaintiffs have retained counsel who are highly experienced in complex consumer class action litigation, and Plaintiffs intend to vigorously prosecute this action on behalf of the Classes. Plaintiffs have no interests that are antagonistic to those of the Classes.

50. **Superiority.** A class action is superior to all other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The damages or other financial detriment suffered by members of the Classes are relatively small compared to the burden and expense of individual litigation of their claims against Defendant. It would, thus, be virtually impossible for members of the Classes, on an individual basis, to obtain effective redress for the wrongs committed against them. Furthermore, even if members of the Classes could afford such individualized litigation, the court system could not. Individualized litigation would create the danger of inconsistent or contradictory judgments arising from the same set of facts. Individualized litigation would also increase the delay and expense to all parties and the court system from the issues raised by this action. By contrast, the class action device provides the benefits of adjudication of these issues in a single proceeding, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court, and presents no unusual management difficulties under the circumstances.

- 51. In the alternative, the Classes may be certified because:
  - (a) the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Classes would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudication with respect to individual members of the Classes that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendant;

- (b) the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Classes would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members of the Classes not parties to the adjudications, or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests; and/or
- (c) Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Classes as a whole, thereby making appropriate final declaratory and/or injunctive relief with respect to the members of the Class as a whole.

## CAUSES OF ACTION

## **<u>COUNT I</u>** Breach Of Express Warranty

52. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege each and every allegation set

forth in paragraphs 1-51 above as though fully set forth herein.

53. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and behalf of the members of the proposed

Classes against Defendant.

54. In connection with the sale of the Products, Defendant, as the designer,

manufacturer, marketer, distributor, and/or seller issued written warranties by representing that the Products were antiperspirants that contained only those active and inactive ingredients listed on the Products' labels. Those active and inactive ingredients do not include benzene, a known human carcinogen dangerous to humans.

55. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's breach of express warranty,

Plaintiffs and the Classes have been injured and harmed because they would not have purchased the Products on the same terms if they knew that the Products contained benzene, are not generally recognized as safe, and are not equivalent to their generic forms.

56. On November 12, 2021 and November 15, 2021November 15, 2021 prior to filing

this action, Defendant was served with pre-suit notice letters on behalf of Plaintiffs that complied in all respects with U.C.C. §§ 2-313 and 2-607. Plaintiffs' counsel sent Defendant letters advising Defendant that it breached an express warranty and demanded that it cease and desist from such breaches and make full restitution by refunding the monies received therefrom. True and correct copies of Plaintiffs' counsel's letters are attached hereto as <u>Exhibit 1</u>.

### <u>COUNT II</u> Breach of Implied Warranty

57. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-51 above as though fully set forth herein.

58. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed Classes against Defendant.

59. Defendant, as the designer, manufacturer, marketer, distributor, and/or seller, impliedly warranted that the Products (i) would not contain elevated levels of benzene and (ii) are generally recognized as safe for human use.

60. Defendant breached the warranty implied in the contract for the sale of the defective Products because they could not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description, the Products were not of fair or average quality within the description, and the Products were unfit for their intended and ordinary purpose because the Products manufactured, distributed, and sold by Defendant were defective in that they contained elevated levels of carcinogenic and toxic benzene, and as such are not generally recognized as safe for human use. As a result, Plaintiffs and members of the Classes did not receive the goods as impliedly warranted by Defendant to be merchantable.

61. Plaintiffs and members of the Classes purchased the Products in reliance upon Defendant's skill and judgment and the implied warranties of fitness for the purpose.

62. The Products were not altered by Plaintiffs or members of the Classes.

63. The Products were defective when they left the exclusive control of Defendant.

64. Defendant knew that the Products would be purchased and used without additional testing by Plaintiffs and members of the Classes.

65. The Products were defectively manufactured and unfit for their intended purpose, and Plaintiffs and members of the Classes did not receive the goods as warranted.

66. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's breach of the implied warranty, Plaintiffs and members of the Classes have been injured and harmed because: (a) they would not have purchased the Products on the same terms if they knew that the Products contained harmful levels of benzene and are not generally recognized as safe for human use; and (b) the Products do not have the characteristics, ingredients, uses, or benefits as promised by Defendant.

67. On November 12, 2021 and November 15, 2021November 15, 2021 prior to filing this action, Defendant was served with pre-suit notice letters on behalf of Plaintiffs that complied in all respects with U.C.C. §§ 2-313 and 2-607. Plaintiffs' counsel sent Defendant letters advising Defendant that it breached an implied warranty and demanded that it cease and desist from such breaches and make full restitution by refunding the monies received therefrom. True and correct copies of Plaintiffs' counsel's letters are attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

### <u>COUNT III</u> Violation Of The Florida Deceptive And Unfair Trade Practices Act, Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq*.

68. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-51 above as though fully set forth herein.

69. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed Subclass against Defendant.

70. FDUTPA renders unlawful unfair methods of competition, unconscionable acts or practice, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce. Fla. Stat. § 501.204.

71. Among other purposes, FDUTPA is intended "[t]o protect the consuming public and legitimate business enterprises from those who engage in unfair methods of competition, or unconscionable, deceptive, or unfair acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce." Fla. Stat. § 501.202.

72. FDUPTA can be violated in two ways, both of which are relevant to this case. First, Defendant has committed a "traditional" violation of FDUPTA by engaging in unfair and/or deceptive acts and practices which caused injury to Plaintiffs and members of the Subclass.

73. Second, Defendant has committed a *per se* violation of FDUPTA predicated on a violation of the FDCA. Specifically, by selling adulterated and misbranded Products which is *per se* illegal in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 351 and 21 U.S.C. § 352 of the FDCA, and because the FDCA is designed to protect consumers from harmful and dangerous drugs, Defendant has committed *per se* violations of FDUPTA. Fla. Stat. Ann. § 501.203(3)(c) (explaining that a FDUPTA violation may be based on "[a]ny law, statute, rule, regulation, or ordinance which proscribes unfair methods of competition, or unfair, deceptive, or unconscionable acts or practices.").

74. While FDUPTA does not define "deceptive" or "unfair," Florida courts have looked to the Federal Trade Commission's interpretations for guidance. "[D]eception occurs if there is a representation, omission, or practice that is likely to mislead the consumer acting reasonably in the circumstances, to the consumer's detriment." *Lombardo v. Johnson & Johnson* 

*Consumer Companies, Inc.*, 124 F. Supp. 3d 1283, 1287 (S.D. Fla. 2015) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Courts define a "deceptive trade practice" as any act or practice that has the tendency or capacity to deceive consumers. *Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Partners In Health Care Ass'n, Inc.*, 189 F. Supp. 3d 1356, 1367 (S.D. Fla. 2016). Courts define an "unfair trade practice" as any act or practice that "offends established public policy and one that is immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous or substantially injurious to consumers." *Kenneth F. Hackett & Assocs., Inc. v. GE Capital Info. Tech. Sols., Inc.*, 744 F. Supp. 2d 1305, 1312 (S.D. Fla. 2010).

75. Defendant engaged in conduct that is likely to deceive members of the public. This conduct includes representing that the Products contained only the ingredients listed in the label, which is untrue, and failing to make any mention that the Products contained harmful levels of benzene and were adulterated and misbranded.

76. As alleged herein, Plaintiffs have suffered injury in fact and lost money as a result of Defendant's conduct because they purchased the Products from Defendant in reliance on Defendant's representation that the Products were safe and effective and not contaminated with benzene, as well as Defendant's material omissions regarding the true nature of the Products.

77. As alleged herein, Defendant's actions are deceptive and in clear violation of
FDUTPA, entitling Plaintiffs and the Subclass to damages and relief under Fla. Stat. §§ 501.201213.

78. By committing the acts alleged above, Defendant engaged in unconscionable, deceptive, or unfair acts or practices, which constitute unfair competition within the meaning of FDUTPA.

79. Defendant's conduct is substantially injurious to consumers. Consumers are

purchasing and using Defendant's Products without knowledge that the Products are adulterated with a human carcinogen. This conduct has caused, and continues to cause, substantial injury to consumers because consumers would not have paid for the Products, which are contaminated with benzene, but for Defendant's false labeling, advertising, promotion, and material omissions. Thus, Plaintiffs and the Subclass have been "aggrieved" (*i.e.*, lost money) as required for FDUTPA standing, and such an injury is not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to consumers or competition.

80. Indeed, no benefit to consumers or competition results from Defendant's conduct. Because consumers reasonably rely on Defendant's representation of the ingredients contained on Products' label and injury resulted from ordinary use of the Products, consumers could not have reasonably avoided such injury.

81. Further, Defendant's conduct is ongoing and continuing, such that prospective injunctive relief is necessary. Plaintiffs desire to purchase Defendant's Products in the future if they can be assured that the Products are not adulterated or misbranded and meet the advertising claims on the Products' label.

### <u>COUNT IV</u> Fraud

82. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-51 above as though fully set forth herein.

83. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the Classes against Defendant.

84. Defendant made fraudulent misrepresentations to Plaintiffs and Class members regarding the Products, specifically that the Products contained only the active and inactive ingredients stated on the label, and not harmful impurities such as benzene. Defendant also

materially omitted facts from Plaintiffs and Class members, including that the Products in fact contained harmful levels of benzene.

85. Defendant had a duty to disclose material facts to Plaintiffs and the Classes given its relationship as contracting parties and intended users of the Products. Defendant also had a duty to disclose material facts to Plaintiffs and the Classes, namely that it was in fact manufacturing, distributing, and selling harmful products unfit for human use, because Defendant had superior knowledge such that the transactions without the disclosure were rendered inherently unfair.

86. Defendant knew or should have known that the Products were contaminated with benzene, but continued to manufacture them nonetheless. Defendant was required to engage in impurity testing to ensure that harmful impurities such as benzene were not present in the Products. Had Defendant undertaken proper testing measures, it would have been aware that the Products contained dangerously high levels of benzene. During this time, Plaintiffs and members of the Classes were using the Products without knowing it contained dangerous levels of benzene.

87. Defendant failed to discharge its duty to disclose these material facts.

88. In so failing to disclose these material facts to Plaintiffs and the Classes, Defendant intended to hide from Plaintiffs and the Classes that they were purchasing and using the Products with harmful defects that were unfit for human use, and thus acted with scienter and/or an intent to defraud.

89. Plaintiffs and the Classes reasonably relied on Defendant's failure to disclose insofar as they would not have purchased the defective Products manufactured and sold by Defendant had they known they contained unsafe levels of benzene.

90. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant's fraudulent concealment, Plaintiffs and the Classes suffered damages in the amount of monies paid for the defective Products.

91. As a result of Defendant's willful and malicious conduct, punitive damages are warranted.

## <u>COUNT V</u> Unjust Enrichment

92. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-51 above as though fully set forth herein.

93. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the members of the Classes against Defendant.

94. Plaintiffs and the Classes conferred a benefit on Defendant in the form of monies paid to purchase Defendant's defective and worthless Products.

95. Defendant voluntarily accepted and retained this benefit.

96. Because this benefit was obtained unlawfully, namely by selling and accepting

compensation for products unfit for human use, it would be unjust and inequitable for Defendant to retain the benefit without paying the value thereof.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully requests, individually and on behalf of the alleged

Classes, that the Court enter judgment in their favor and against Defendant as follows:

- (a) For an order certifying the Classes under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and naming Plaintiffs as the representatives for the Classes and Plaintiffs' attorneys as Class Counsel;
- (b) For an order declaring that Defendant's conduct violates the causes of action referenced herein;

- (c) For an order finding in favor of Plaintiffs and the Classes on all counts asserted herein;
- (d) For compensatory, statutory, and punitive damages in amounts to be determined by the Court and/or jury;
- (e) For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded;
- (f) For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- (g) For injunctive relief as pleaded or as the Court may deem proper; and
- (h) For an order awarding Plaintiffs and the Classes their reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses and costs of suit.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury of any

and all issues in this action so triable as of right.

Dated: November 15, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

### **BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

By: <u>/s/ Sarah N. Westcot</u> Sarah N. Westcot

Sarah N. Westcot 701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1420 Miami, FL 33131 Tel: (305) 330-5512 Fax: (305) 676-9006 E-Mail: swestcot@bursor.com

### **BURSOR & FISHER, P.A**

Andrew J. Obergfell\* Max S. Roberts\* 888 Seventh Avenue New York, NY 10019 Telephone: (646) 837-7150 Facsimile: (212) 989-9163 E-Mail: aobergfell@bursor.com Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 26 of 26

mroberts@bursor.com

\*Pro Hac Vice Application Forthcoming

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 1 of 7

# **EXHIBIT 1**

Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 2 of 7

BURSOR FISHER

701 BRICKELL AVENUE SUITE 1420 MIAMI, FL 33131 www.bursor.com **SARAH N. WESTCOT** Tel: **305.330.5512** Fax: **305.676.9006** <u>swestcot@bursor.com</u>

November 12, 2021

### Via Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested

The Proctor & Gamble Company c/o CT Corporation System 4400 Easton Commons Way, Suite 125 Columbus, OH 43219

*Re:* Notice and Demand Letter Pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607; Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, et seq.; and all other relevant state and local laws

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as a preliminary notice and demand for corrective action by The Proctor & Gamble Company ("P&G" or "You") pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607(3)(a) concerning breaches of express and implied warranties – and violations of state consumer protection laws, including but not limited to the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA"), Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.* – related to our client, Aleida Mendoza, and a class of all similarly situated purchasers (the "Class") of defective and falsely labeled Secret antiperspirant products manufactured and sold by You.

In or about October 2021, our client purchased a canister of antiperspirant labeled as "Secret Powder Fresh 24 HR Aerosol" (the "Secret Product") in Florida. The Secret Product was manufactured by You in Ohio and sold by You in Florida and across the United States. Our client's Product was defective in that it contained elevated levels of Benzene, a carcinogenic and toxic chemical impurity that has been linked to leukemia and other cancers. On November 3, 2021, Valisure, an online pharmacy registered with the FDA, "detected high levels of benzene and other contaminants in specific batches of body spray products, some of which contain active pharmaceutical ingredients aluminum chlorohydrate or aluminum sesquichlorohydrate."<sup>1</sup> This included the Secret Product manufactured by You, which contained as much as 16.2 parts per million of Benzene.<sup>2</sup> Notably, the presence of Benzene in the Secret Product is avoidable,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> VALISURE, VALISURE CITIZEN PETITION ON BENZENE IN BODY SPRAY PRODUCTS, Nov. 3, 2021, https://www.valisure.com/wp-content/uploads/Valisure-FDA-Citizen-Petition-on-Body-Spray-v4.0-3.pdf (the "Valisure Petition"), at 1.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  *Id.* at 12-14.

meaning the Product could have been manufactured without Benzene. There is no reason Benzene should be present in the Secret Product and there is no acceptable level of Benzene in the Secret Product.

In short, the Secret Product that our client and the Class purchased are worthless, as it contains Benzene, rendering it unusable and unfit for humans. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 331(a), 352; *see also Debernardis v. IQ Formulations, LLC*, 942 F.3d 1076, 1085 (11th Cir. 2019); *In re Valsartan, Losartan, & Irbesartan Prod. Liab. Litig.,* 2021 WL 222776, at \*16 (D.N.J. Jan. 22, 2021). You violated express and implied warranties made to our client and the Class regarding the quality and safety of the Secret Product they purchased. *See* U.C.C. §§ 2-313, 2-314.

This letter also serves as notice of violation of the FDUTPA, Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*, and all other relevant state and local laws. You violated FDUTPA by failing to disclose that the Secret Product contained elevated levels of Benzene, rendering the Secret Product unsafe for human use. You also violated the FDUTPA by selling an adulterated and misbranded product in violation of the Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act.

On behalf of our client and the Class, we hereby demand that You immediately (1) cease and desist from continuing to sell the defective Secret Product, and (2) make full restitution to all purchasers of the defective and falsely labeled Secret Product of all purchase money obtained from sales thereof.

We also demand that You preserve all documents and other evidence which refers or relates to any of the above-described practices including, but not limited to, the following:

- 1. All documents concerning the packaging, labeling, and manufacturing process for Your Secret Product;
- 2. All documents concerning the design, development, supply, production, extraction, and/or testing of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 3. All tests of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 4. All documents concerning the pricing, advertising, marketing, and/or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 5. All communications with customers involving complaints or comments concerning the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 6. All documents concerning communications with any retailer involved in the marketing or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 7. All documents concerning communications with federal or state regulators; and

# Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 4 of 7 BURSOR&FISHER PAGE 3

8. All documents concerning the total revenue derived from sales of the Secret Product.

If you contend that any statement in this letter is inaccurate in any respect, please provide us with your contentions and supporting documents immediately upon receipt of this letter.

Please contact me right away if you wish to discuss an appropriate way to remedy this matter. If I do not hear from you promptly, I will take that as an indication that you are not interested in doing so.

Very truly yours,

Sarah n. Westoot

Sarah N. Westcot

Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 5 of 7

BURSOR FISHER

701 BRICKELL AVENUE SUITE 1420 MIAMI, FL 33131 www.bursor.com **SARAH N. WESTCOT** Tel: **305.330.5512** Fax: **305.676.9006** <u>swestcot@bursor.com</u>

November 15, 2021

### Via Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested

The Proctor & Gamble Company c/o CT Corporation System 4400 Easton Commons Way, Suite 125 Columbus, OH 43219

*Re:* Notice and Demand Letter Pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607; Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, et seq.; and all other relevant state and local laws

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as a preliminary notice and demand for corrective action by The Proctor & Gamble Company ("P&G" or "You") pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607(3)(a) concerning breaches of express and implied warranties – and violations of state consumer protection laws, including but not limited to the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA"), Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.* – related to our client, Andrea Fahey, and a class of all similarly situated purchasers (the "Class") of defective and falsely labeled Secret antiperspirant products manufactured and sold by You.

In or about September 2021, our client purchased a canister of antiperspirant labeled as "Secret Powder Fresh 24 HR Aerosol" (the "Secret Product") in Florida. The Secret Product was manufactured by You in Ohio and sold by You in Florida and across the United States. Our client's Product was defective in that it contained elevated levels of Benzene, a carcinogenic and toxic chemical impurity that has been linked to leukemia and other cancers. On November 3, 2021, Valisure, an online pharmacy registered with the FDA, "detected high levels of benzene and other contaminants in specific batches of body spray products, some of which contain active pharmaceutical ingredients aluminum chlorohydrate or aluminum sesquichlorohydrate."<sup>1</sup> This included the Secret Product manufactured by You, which contained as much as 16.2 parts per million of Benzene.<sup>2</sup> Notably, the presence of Benzene in the Secret Product is avoidable,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> VALISURE, VALISURE CITIZEN PETITION ON BENZENE IN BODY SPRAY PRODUCTS, Nov. 3, 2021, https://www.valisure.com/wp-content/uploads/Valisure-FDA-Citizen-Petition-on-Body-Spray-v4.0-3.pdf (the "Valisure Petition"), at 1.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  *Id.* at 12-14.

# Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 6 of 7 BURSOR FISHER PAGE 2

meaning the Product could have been manufactured without Benzene. There is no reason Benzene should be present in the Secret Product and there is no acceptable level of Benzene in the Secret Product.

In short, the Secret Product that our client and the Class purchased are worthless, as it contains Benzene, rendering it unusable and unfit for humans. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 331(a), 352; *see also Debernardis v. IQ Formulations, LLC*, 942 F.3d 1076, 1085 (11th Cir. 2019); *In re Valsartan, Losartan, & Irbesartan Prod. Liab. Litig.,* 2021 WL 222776, at \*16 (D.N.J. Jan. 22, 2021). You violated express and implied warranties made to our client and the Class regarding the quality and safety of the Secret Product they purchased. *See* U.C.C. §§ 2-313, 2-314.

This letter also serves as notice of violation of the FDUTPA, Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*, and all other relevant state and local laws. You violated FDUTPA by failing to disclose that the Secret Product contained elevated levels of Benzene, rendering the Secret Product unsafe for human use. You also violated the FDUTPA by selling an adulterated and misbranded product in violation of the Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act.

On behalf of our client and the Class, we hereby demand that You immediately (1) cease and desist from continuing to sell the defective Secret Product, and (2) make full restitution to all purchasers of the defective and falsely labeled Secret Product of all purchase money obtained from sales thereof.

We also demand that You preserve all documents and other evidence which refers or relates to any of the above-described practices including, but not limited to, the following:

- 1. All documents concerning the packaging, labeling, and manufacturing process for Your Secret Product;
- 2. All documents concerning the design, development, supply, production, extraction, and/or testing of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 3. All tests of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 4. All documents concerning the pricing, advertising, marketing, and/or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 5. All communications with customers involving complaints or comments concerning the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 6. All documents concerning communications with any retailer involved in the marketing or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 7. All documents concerning communications with federal or state regulators; and

# Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 7 of 7 BURSOR&FISHER PAGE 3

8. All documents concerning the total revenue derived from sales of the Secret Product.

If you contend that any statement in this letter is inaccurate in any respect, please provide us with your contentions and supporting documents immediately upon receipt of this letter.

Please contact me right away if you wish to discuss an appropriate way to remedy this matter. If I do not hear from you promptly, I will take that as an indication that you are not interested in doing so.

Very truly yours,

Sarah n. Westoot

Sarah N. Westcot

## JS 44 (Rev. Case 4:21-cv2/10108-XXXX Document 12 Covered supplies D Docket 11/15/2021 Page 1 of 2

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)* NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS ANGELA LEYVA and ANDREA FAHEY, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

### DEFENDANTS

### THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY,

(b)	County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Monroe County, FL	County of Resid	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			
	(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)				
		NOTE:	IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c)	Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)	Attorneys (If K	nown)			

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
 Bursor & Fisher, P.A., 701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1420, Miami, FL 33131 (305) 330-5512

(d) Check County Where Action Arose: 🗆 MIAMI- DADE 🖬 MONROE 🗆 BROWARD 🗆 PALM BEACH 🗋 MARTIN 🗋 ST. LUCIE 📄 INDIAN RIVER 🗖 OKEECHOBEE 🗖 HIGHLANDS

II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in	n One Box Only) II	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P		<b>PARTIES</b> (P		
1 U.S. Government	□3 Fede	eral Question	(For Diversity Cases Only)	PTF DEF		and One Box fo	or Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government				Incorporated or Pri of Business In This	•	$\square 4 \square 4$
2 U.S. Government Defendant		ersity ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 2	Incorporated <i>and</i> Prof Business In A	•	5 5 5
			Citizen or Subject of a [ Foreign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation		6 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			Click here for: Nature of Suit Code	•		OTHER	
CONTRACT		RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY		KRUPTCY	-	STATUTES
<ul> <li>110 Insurance</li> <li>120 Marine</li> <li>130 Miller Act</li> <li>140 Negotiable Instrument</li> <li>150 Recovery of Overpayment &amp; Enforcement of Judgment</li> <li>151 Medicare Act</li> <li>152 Recovery of Defaulted</li> </ul>	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liabi	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other		SC 157 <b>RTY RIGHTS</b> rights t – Abbreviated rug Application mark	☐ 410 Antitrus     ☐ 430 Banks a     ☐ 450 Comme     ☐ 460 Deporta     ☐ 470 Packet	m (31 USC eapportionment st and Banking erce
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine			Act of 2	nd Trade Secrets 016	Corrupt Org	ganizations
(Excl. Veterans)	□ 345 Marine Product		LABOR	SOCIA	L SECURITY	480 Consun (15 USC	1681 or 1692)
<ul> <li>☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits</li> <li>☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits</li> <li>☐ 190 Other Contract</li> <li>☐ 195 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>☐ 196 Franchise</li> </ul> <b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <ul> <li>☐ 210 Land Condemnation</li> <li>☐ 220 Foreclosure</li> <li>☐ 230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>☐ 240 Torts to Land</li> <li>☐ 245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>☐ 290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL PROPERTY	<ul> <li>710 Fair Labor Standards Act</li> <li>720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations</li> <li>740 Railway Labor Act</li> <li>751 Family and Medical Leave Act</li> <li>790 Other Labor Litigation</li> <li>791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act</li> </ul> e IMMIGRATION <ul> <li>462 Naturalization Application</li> <li>465 Other Immigration Actions</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>■ 864 SSID</li> <li>■ 865 RSI (</li> <li>■ 870 Taxes or De</li> <li>■ 871 IRS- 7609</li> </ul>	Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	<ul> <li>↓ 490 Cable/S</li> <li>↓ 850 Securiti Exchange</li> <li>↓ 890 Other S</li> <li>↓ 891 Agricul</li> <li>↓ 893 Environ</li> <li>↓ 895 Freedon</li> <li>∧ Act</li> <li>↓ 896 Arbitrat</li> <li>↓ 899 Admini Act/Review</li> <li>∧ Agrecy Dec</li> </ul>	ies/Commodities/ itatutory Actions Itural Acts montal Matters m of Information tion istrative Procedure w or Appeal of
■ 1 Original Proceeding □ 2 Remo from S Court	state (See VI below)	or another Reopened (specify		Distr from Judg	ict Judge Magistrate ment	Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File	Remanded from Appellate Court
VI. RELATED/ RE-FILED CASE(S)	(See instructions): a) JUDO		✓NO b) Related C	Cases □YES DOC	S ☑NO EKET NUMBER:		
VII. CAUSE OF ACTIO	<b></b>	) - Unfair and decepti	iling and Write a Brief Stateme ve practices (for both sides to try entire case		Do not cite jurisdicti	onal statutes unle	ess diversity):
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	<b>DEMAND \$</b> 5,000,00		HECK YES only i	f demanded in o	complaint:
	et DER Finden			JUR	Y DEMAND:	Yes	🗆 No
ABOVE INFORMATION IS TRUE & CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE DATE November 15, 2021 Signature of attorney of record Sarah N. Westcot							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY : RECI	EIPT # AMO	UNT IFP	JUDGE		MAG JUDGE		

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

#### Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

**I.** (a) **Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

**II.** Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked. Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

**III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

**IV.** Nature of Suit. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Refiled (3) Attach copy of Order for Dismissal of Previous case. Also complete VI.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (8) Check this box if remanded from Appellate Court.

VI. Related/Refiled Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases or re-filed cases. Insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judges name for such cases.

VII. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553

Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VIII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

Case 4:21-cv-10108-XXXX Document 1-3 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 1 of 2

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of Florida

)

)

ANGELA LEYVA and ANDREA FAHEY, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

Civil Action No.

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY,

Defendant(s)

### SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) The Proctor & Gamble Company 1 P&G Plaza Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Sarah N. Westcot

Bursor & Fisher, P.A. 701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1420 Miami, FL 33131

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

## **PROOF OF SERVICE**

## (This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (no	ame of individual and title, if any)						
was re	ceived by me on (date)							
	□ I personally serve	d the summons on the individual	at (place)					
			on (date)	; or				
	□ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)							
		, a pers	on of suitable age and discretion who re	sides there,				
	on <i>(date)</i> , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or							
	□ I served the summ	nons on (name of individual)		, who is				
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)							
			on (date)	; or				
	$\Box$ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted because		; or				
	□ Other (specify):							
	My fees are	for travel and	for services, for a total of	0.00				
	I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.							
Date:			Server's signature					
			Printed name and title					

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 4:21-cv-10108-JEM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 1 of 7

# **EXHIBIT 1**

Case 4:21-cv-10108-JEM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 2 of 7

BURSOR FISHER

701 BRICKELL AVENUE SUITE 1420 MIAMI, FL 33131 www.bursor.com **SARAH N. WESTCOT** Tel: **305.330.5512** Fax: **305.676.9006** <u>swestcot@bursor.com</u>

November 12, 2021

### Via Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested

The Proctor & Gamble Company c/o CT Corporation System 4400 Easton Commons Way, Suite 125 Columbus, OH 43219

*Re:* Notice and Demand Letter Pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607; Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, et seq.; and all other relevant state and local laws

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as a preliminary notice and demand for corrective action by The Proctor & Gamble Company ("P&G" or "You") pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607(3)(a) concerning breaches of express and implied warranties – and violations of state consumer protection laws, including but not limited to the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA"), Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.* – related to our client, Aleida Mendoza, and a class of all similarly situated purchasers (the "Class") of defective and falsely labeled Secret antiperspirant products manufactured and sold by You.

In or about October 2021, our client purchased a canister of antiperspirant labeled as "Secret Powder Fresh 24 HR Aerosol" (the "Secret Product") in Florida. The Secret Product was manufactured by You in Ohio and sold by You in Florida and across the United States. Our client's Product was defective in that it contained elevated levels of Benzene, a carcinogenic and toxic chemical impurity that has been linked to leukemia and other cancers. On November 3, 2021, Valisure, an online pharmacy registered with the FDA, "detected high levels of benzene and other contaminants in specific batches of body spray products, some of which contain active pharmaceutical ingredients aluminum chlorohydrate or aluminum sesquichlorohydrate."<sup>1</sup> This included the Secret Product manufactured by You, which contained as much as 16.2 parts per million of Benzene.<sup>2</sup> Notably, the presence of Benzene in the Secret Product is avoidable,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> VALISURE, VALISURE CITIZEN PETITION ON BENZENE IN BODY SPRAY PRODUCTS, Nov. 3, 2021, https://www.valisure.com/wp-content/uploads/Valisure-FDA-Citizen-Petition-on-Body-Spray-v4.0-3.pdf (the "Valisure Petition"), at 1.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  *Id.* at 12-14.

# Case 4:21-cv-10108-JEM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 3 of 7 BURSOR FISHER PAGE 2

meaning the Product could have been manufactured without Benzene. There is no reason Benzene should be present in the Secret Product and there is no acceptable level of Benzene in the Secret Product.

In short, the Secret Product that our client and the Class purchased are worthless, as it contains Benzene, rendering it unusable and unfit for humans. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 331(a), 352; *see also Debernardis v. IQ Formulations, LLC*, 942 F.3d 1076, 1085 (11th Cir. 2019); *In re Valsartan, Losartan, & Irbesartan Prod. Liab. Litig.,* 2021 WL 222776, at \*16 (D.N.J. Jan. 22, 2021). You violated express and implied warranties made to our client and the Class regarding the quality and safety of the Secret Product they purchased. *See* U.C.C. §§ 2-313, 2-314.

This letter also serves as notice of violation of the FDUTPA, Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*, and all other relevant state and local laws. You violated FDUTPA by failing to disclose that the Secret Product contained elevated levels of Benzene, rendering the Secret Product unsafe for human use. You also violated the FDUTPA by selling an adulterated and misbranded product in violation of the Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act.

On behalf of our client and the Class, we hereby demand that You immediately (1) cease and desist from continuing to sell the defective Secret Product, and (2) make full restitution to all purchasers of the defective and falsely labeled Secret Product of all purchase money obtained from sales thereof.

We also demand that You preserve all documents and other evidence which refers or relates to any of the above-described practices including, but not limited to, the following:

- 1. All documents concerning the packaging, labeling, and manufacturing process for Your Secret Product;
- 2. All documents concerning the design, development, supply, production, extraction, and/or testing of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 3. All tests of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 4. All documents concerning the pricing, advertising, marketing, and/or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 5. All communications with customers involving complaints or comments concerning the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 6. All documents concerning communications with any retailer involved in the marketing or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 7. All documents concerning communications with federal or state regulators; and

# Case 4:21-cv-10108-JEM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 4 of 7 BURSOR FISHER PAGE 3

8. All documents concerning the total revenue derived from sales of the Secret Product.

If you contend that any statement in this letter is inaccurate in any respect, please provide us with your contentions and supporting documents immediately upon receipt of this letter.

Please contact me right away if you wish to discuss an appropriate way to remedy this matter. If I do not hear from you promptly, I will take that as an indication that you are not interested in doing so.

Very truly yours,

Sarah n. Westoot

Sarah N. Westcot

Case 4:21-cv-10108-JEM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 5 of 7

BURSOR FISHER

701 BRICKELL AVENUE SUITE 1420 MIAMI, FL 33131 www.bursor.com **SARAH N. WESTCOT** Tel: **305.330.5512** Fax: **305.676.9006** <u>swestcot@bursor.com</u>

November 15, 2021

### Via Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested

The Proctor & Gamble Company c/o CT Corporation System 4400 Easton Commons Way, Suite 125 Columbus, OH 43219

*Re:* Notice and Demand Letter Pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607; Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, et seq.; and all other relevant state and local laws

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as a preliminary notice and demand for corrective action by The Proctor & Gamble Company ("P&G" or "You") pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607(3)(a) concerning breaches of express and implied warranties – and violations of state consumer protection laws, including but not limited to the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA"), Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.* – related to our client, Andrea Fahey, and a class of all similarly situated purchasers (the "Class") of defective and falsely labeled Secret antiperspirant products manufactured and sold by You.

In or about September 2021, our client purchased a canister of antiperspirant labeled as "Secret Powder Fresh 24 HR Aerosol" (the "Secret Product") in Florida. The Secret Product was manufactured by You in Ohio and sold by You in Florida and across the United States. Our client's Product was defective in that it contained elevated levels of Benzene, a carcinogenic and toxic chemical impurity that has been linked to leukemia and other cancers. On November 3, 2021, Valisure, an online pharmacy registered with the FDA, "detected high levels of benzene and other contaminants in specific batches of body spray products, some of which contain active pharmaceutical ingredients aluminum chlorohydrate or aluminum sesquichlorohydrate."<sup>1</sup> This included the Secret Product manufactured by You, which contained as much as 16.2 parts per million of Benzene.<sup>2</sup> Notably, the presence of Benzene in the Secret Product is avoidable,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> VALISURE, VALISURE CITIZEN PETITION ON BENZENE IN BODY SPRAY PRODUCTS, Nov. 3, 2021, https://www.valisure.com/wp-content/uploads/Valisure-FDA-Citizen-Petition-on-Body-Spray-v4.0-3.pdf (the "Valisure Petition"), at 1.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  *Id.* at 12-14.

# Case 4:21-cv-10108-JEM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 6 of 7 BURSOR FISHER PAGE 2

meaning the Product could have been manufactured without Benzene. There is no reason Benzene should be present in the Secret Product and there is no acceptable level of Benzene in the Secret Product.

In short, the Secret Product that our client and the Class purchased are worthless, as it contains Benzene, rendering it unusable and unfit for humans. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 331(a), 352; *see also Debernardis v. IQ Formulations, LLC*, 942 F.3d 1076, 1085 (11th Cir. 2019); *In re Valsartan, Losartan, & Irbesartan Prod. Liab. Litig.,* 2021 WL 222776, at \*16 (D.N.J. Jan. 22, 2021). You violated express and implied warranties made to our client and the Class regarding the quality and safety of the Secret Product they purchased. *See* U.C.C. §§ 2-313, 2-314.

This letter also serves as notice of violation of the FDUTPA, Fla. Sta. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*, and all other relevant state and local laws. You violated FDUTPA by failing to disclose that the Secret Product contained elevated levels of Benzene, rendering the Secret Product unsafe for human use. You also violated the FDUTPA by selling an adulterated and misbranded product in violation of the Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act.

On behalf of our client and the Class, we hereby demand that You immediately (1) cease and desist from continuing to sell the defective Secret Product, and (2) make full restitution to all purchasers of the defective and falsely labeled Secret Product of all purchase money obtained from sales thereof.

We also demand that You preserve all documents and other evidence which refers or relates to any of the above-described practices including, but not limited to, the following:

- 1. All documents concerning the packaging, labeling, and manufacturing process for Your Secret Product;
- 2. All documents concerning the design, development, supply, production, extraction, and/or testing of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 3. All tests of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 4. All documents concerning the pricing, advertising, marketing, and/or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 5. All communications with customers involving complaints or comments concerning the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 6. All documents concerning communications with any retailer involved in the marketing or sale of the Secret Product manufactured by You;
- 7. All documents concerning communications with federal or state regulators; and

# Case 4:21-cv-10108-JEM Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 11/15/2021 Page 7 of 7 BURSOR FISHER PAGE 3

8. All documents concerning the total revenue derived from sales of the Secret Product.

If you contend that any statement in this letter is inaccurate in any respect, please provide us with your contentions and supporting documents immediately upon receipt of this letter.

Please contact me right away if you wish to discuss an appropriate way to remedy this matter. If I do not hear from you promptly, I will take that as an indication that you are not interested in doing so.

Very truly yours,

Sarah n. Westoot

Sarah N. Westcot