

1 **GUCOVSKI LAW FIRM, PLLC.**  
 2 Adrian Gucovski (State Bar No. 360988)  
 3 Nathaniel Haim Sari (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 4 165 Broadway, Fl. 23  
 5 New York, NY 10006  
 6 Telephone: (212) 884-4230  
 7 Facsimile: (212) 884-4230  
 8 E-Mail: adrian@gucovschilaw.com  
 9 nsari@gucovschilaw.com

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class*

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 GENESIA TING, individually and on behalf of  
14 all others similarly situated,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 THE ONLY BEAN, LLC,

18 Defendant.

19 Case No. 3:26-cv-6732

20 **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

21 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

1 Plaintiff Genesis Ting (“Plaintiff”) brings this action on behalf of herself and all others  
2 similarly situated against Defendant The Only Bean, LLC (“Defendant”). Plaintiff makes the  
3 following allegations pursuant to the investigation of her counsel and based upon information and  
4 belief, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to herself, which are based on her  
5 personal knowledge.

### 6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. Defendant formulates, manufactures, advertises, and sells the popular “The Only  
8 Bean Crunchy Dry Roasted Edamame” snacks (the “Products”)<sup>1</sup> throughout the United States,  
9 including in California. Defendant markets its Products in a systematically misleading manner by  
10 misrepresenting the quantity and quality of the protein contained therein. Specifically, Defendant  
11 markets the Products as a “High Protein Supersnack” that contains “11 G[rams] Protein,” while  
12 failing to disclose that the corrected, digestible amount of protein the Products provide is materially  
13 less than advertised.

14 2. Defendant’s sales are driven by consumers seeking protein supplementation. To  
15 market to these consumers, Defendant prominently displays the total protein content of its Products  
16 on the front of each label. However, Defendant fails to include the percent of daily value (“%DV”)  
17 for protein in the Nutrition Facts Panel (“NFP”) which would show the adjusted amount after  
18 accounting for protein’s plant-based origin.

19 3. In other words, Defendant shows the total protein amount on the front of its product,  
20 but does not show the daily value for that amount in the back. This is misleading because plant-  
21 based proteins often are less digestible, meaning the human body does not absorb the full amount  
22 of protein. So 10g of plant-based protein oftentimes has a lower daily value percentage than 10g of  
23 meat-based protein. And by not disclosing the daily value to consumers, Defendants misleads  
24 consumers into believing they are getting more protein than they actually are.

25 4. Accordingly, Plaintiff and those similarly situated suffered an injury in fact as a result  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> An illustration of the Products, which are sold in a variety of flavors, can be found on  
28 Defendant’s website: <https://theonlybean.com> (last accessed June 1, 2026).

1 of Defendant’s misleading and deceptive practices set forth herein.

2 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A)  
4 because this case is a class action where the aggregate claims of all members of the proposed class  
5 are in excess of \$5,000,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs, and Plaintiff, as well as most  
6 members of the proposed class, are citizens of states different from Defendant. This Court also has  
7 supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

8 6. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, this Court is the proper venue for this action because  
9 Plaintiff is a citizen of California who resides in this District, and because Plaintiff purchased the  
10 Product in this District. Moreover, Defendant purposefully availed itself of this District through its  
11 distribution, advertisement, and sale of the Products, which are the subject of the present  
12 complaint, in this District.

13 **THE PARTIES**

14 7. Plaintiff Genesisia Ting is a citizen of California who resides in San Francisco,  
15 California. Plaintiff Genesisia Ting purchased the Products for her personal use during the applicable  
16 statute of limitations while residing in San Francisco, California. Plaintiff’s most recent purchase  
17 was Defendant’s Variety Pack Products, which she purchased on Defendant’s Amazon.com listing  
18 for approximately \$24.99 on or about February 2, 2026.<sup>2</sup> Prior to purchasing the Products, Plaintiff  
19 saw and read the Products’ packaging and Amazon storefront, which represented that the Products  
20 were “High Protein Supersnack” containing “11 G[rams] Protein.” Plaintiff also saw and read  
21 Defendant’s Amazon representation that the Products provided a source of “complete plant-based  
22 protein.” Plaintiff relied on these representations by believing that the Products would provide the  
23 specific amount of protein claimed therein in a form that human bodies could utilize. Plaintiff  
24 relied on the Products to meet her protein dietary needs. Had Defendant complied with the law and

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> The listing can also be found through the following link: [Amazon.com: The Only Bean Crunchy](#)  
27 [Roasted Edamame - Healthy Snacks for Adults and Kids \(Variety Pack\), Low Carb Keto Snack](#)  
28 [Food, Vegan Gluten Free High Protein Snacks \(11g\), Office Snack, 0.9oz 24 pack : Grocery &](#)  
[Gourmet Food](#) (last accessed July 1, 2026).

1 not made the protein claims on the front of the Products' packaging, she would not have been  
2 drawn to the Products and would not have purchased them. At a minimum, Plaintiff would have  
3 paid less for each Product.

4 8. In addition, Plaintiff Ting regularly checks the NFP before purchasing any protein  
5 supplement, including the %DV column for protein when manufacturers provide it, and she uses  
6 that information as a basis of comparison between similar products. Manufacturers do not always  
7 disclose a %DV for protein, but when they do, she selects the product that provides more of the  
8 recommended daily amount of protein (*i.e.*, the one with a higher %DV). When purchasing  
9 Defendant's Products on or about February 2, 2026, Plaintiff Ting looked at and read the NFP,  
10 which failed to disclose a statement of the corrected amount of protein per serving expressed as a  
11 percent daily value ("%DV") calculated using the PDCAAS method. In so doing, Plaintiff relied on  
12 the representation that the protein content stated on the Products was accurate and reflected the  
13 amount of protein that could be used by her body, and on the absence of any disclosure in the NFP  
14 that the usable amount of protein the Products provide is materially less than the amount  
15 advertised. Had Defendant adequately disclosed the corrected amount of protein per serving for  
16 each Product expressed as a %DV, as FDA regulations require, Plaintiff Ting would not have  
17 purchased the Products or would have, at minimum, paid less for them.

18 9. Plaintiff continues to purchase protein snacks and remains interested in purchasing  
19 products whose front and back label protein representations are properly calculated. Plaintiff would  
20 purchase the Products again if she could be confident that protein representations were truthful. As  
21 matters stand, however, she cannot determine whether Defendant's labeling has been or will be  
22 corrected, and she is therefore unable to rely on Defendant's protein representations when deciding  
23 whether to purchase the Products in the future.

24 10. Defendant The Only Bean, LLC ("Defendant") is a Michigan limited liability  
25 company with its principal place of business located in Grand Rapids, Michigan. At all times  
26 relevant to this Complaint, Defendant has advertised, marketed, distributed, or sold the Products to  
27 consumers throughout the United States and the State of California. Defendant has sold the  
28

1 Products directly to consumers via the internet and through third-party retail stores throughout the  
2 United States, including this District. Defendant created and/or authorized the false, misleading,  
3 and deceptive advertisements, packaging, and labeling for the Products.

4 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 ***Overview of FDA regulations regarding protein claims***

6 11. It is axiomatic that the amount of reported protein contained within Defendant’s  
7 Products is material to any consumer seeking to purchase a protein supplement. To capitalize on this  
8 trend, Defendant prominently claims on the front label of the Products and on its Amazon  
9 storefront that they contain “11 G[rams] Protein” and are “High Protein.” Consumers, in turn,  
10 reasonably expect that the Products will actually provide the amount of protein claimed on the  
11 front of the Product’s package in a form the body can use.

12 12. The Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) prohibits such front label protein  
13 claims unless manufacturers also provide additional information in the nutrition fact panel about  
14 how much of the recommended daily value for protein the product will actually provide. 21 C.F.R.  
15 §§ 101.9(c)(7)(i), 101.13(b), (n). That is because the FDA recognizes that (1) when manufacturers  
16 tout an amount of protein on the front label, that amount is likely to be material to purchasing  
17 decisions, even though reasonable consumers may not know the total amount of protein they need  
18 to ingest on a daily basis, and (2) not all proteins are the same in their ability to meet human  
19 nutritional requirements, so a simple statement about the number of grams does not actually inform  
20 consumers about how much usable protein they are receiving. Some proteins are deficient in one or  
21 more of the nine amino acids essential to human protein synthesis and/or are not fully digestible  
22 within the human gut. When the human body uses up the least prevalent essential amino acid from  
23 a food product, protein synthesis shuts down and all of the remaining amino acids from that protein  
24 source degrade mostly into waste. Likewise, whatever portion of a protein source is not digestible  
25 is similarly unavailable for protein synthesis. A protein’s ability to support human nutritional  
26 requirements is known as its “quality.”

27 13. The FDA required method for measuring protein quality is called the “Protein  
28

1 Digestibility Corrected Amino Acid Score”—known by its acronym PDCAAS (pronounced  
2 PeeDee-Kass). It combines a protein source’s amino acid profile and its percent digestibility into a  
3 discount factor ranging from 0.0 to 1.0 that, when multiplied by the total protein quantity, shows  
4 how much protein in a product is available to support human nutritional requirements. The  
5 regulations term this the “corrected amount of protein per serving.” 21 C.F.R. § 101.9(c)(7)(ii). For  
6 example, a PDCAAS of .5 means that only half of the protein in that product is available to support  
7 human protein needs. Thus, if a product contains 10 grams total protein per serving with a  
8 PDCAAS of .5, the corrected amount of protein would be only 5 grams per serving. As a result,  
9 protein supplements can vary widely in their ability to support human protein needs—even  
10 between two comparator products with the same total protein quantity.

11 14. Because consumers are generally unaware of the usability of various proteins and  
12 may even be unaware of the total amount of usable protein they should ingest each day, the FDA  
13 prohibits manufacturers from advertising or promoting their products with a protein claim unless  
14 they have satisfied two requirements. First, the manufacturer must calculate the “corrected amount  
15 of protein per serving” based on the quality of the product’s protein using the PDCAAS method.  
16 Second, the manufacturer must use the PDCAAS computation to provide “a statement of the  
17 corrected amount of protein per serving” in the NFP “expressed as” a percent daily value (“%DV”)  
18 and placed immediately adjacent to the statement of protein quantity. 21 C.F.R. § 101.9(c)(7)(i)-  
19 (iii). The %DV is the corrected amount of protein per serving divided by the daily reference value  
20 for protein of 50 grams. *Id.* Using the same example of a product containing 10 grams total protein  
21 per serving with a PDCAAS of .5, the %DV is 10% (5g/50g). On the other hand, if all of the  
22 protein in the product were useful in human nutrition, the %DV would be 50% (25g/50g). The  
23 FDA regulations that govern nutrient content claims are also clear that the manufacturer may not  
24 make any front label claims about the amount of protein in the product unless it complies with  
25 these two requirements. *See* 21 C.F.R. § 101.13(b) (“A nutrient content claim[] may not be made  
26 on the label...unless the claim is made in accordance with this regulation [i.e., § 101.13]...” and  
27 (n) (“[n]utrition labeling in accordance with § 101.8...shall be provided for any food for which a  
28

1 nutrient content claim is made”); *accord* 58 Fed. Reg. 2302, 23310 (manufacturer can only make a  
2 ”nutrient content claim...on the label or in labeling of a food, provided that the food bears nutrition  
3 labeling that complies with the requirements in proposed § 101.9.”).

4 15. Identical federal and California laws regulate the content of labels on packaged  
5 food. The requirements of the FDCA, and its labeling regulations, including those set forth in 21  
6 C.F.R. §§ 101, 102, were adopted by the California legislature in the Sherman Food Drug &  
7 Cosmetic Law (the “Sherman Law”). California Health & Safety Code § 110100 (“All food  
8 labeling regulations and any amendments to those regulations adopted pursuant to the federal act,  
9 in effect on January 1, 1993, or adopted on or after that date shall be the food labeling regulations  
10 of this state.”) The federal laws and regulations discussed herein are applicable nationwide to all  
11 sales of packaged food products. Additionally, none of the California laws sought to be enforced  
12 here impose different requirements on the labeling of packaged food for sale in the United States.

13 16. Indeed, when promulgating 21 C.F.R. § 101.9(c)(7), the FDA explained in  
14 published guidance that “Information on protein quantity alone can be misleading on foods that are  
15 of low protein quality.” It also explained that it was prohibiting manufacturers from making any  
16 protein claims at all unless the manufacturer provides a statement of the corrected amount of  
17 protein per serving in the NFP based on PDCAAS because “nutrition labeling must allow  
18 consumers to readily identify foods with particularly low quality protein to prevent them from  
19 being misled by information on only the amount of protein present.” 58 Fed. Reg. 2079 at 2101-2.

20 17. In addition to regulating the NFP, the FDA has promulgated a separate set of  
21 regulations that govern nutrient content claims on the front of a package. 21 C.F.R. § 101.13. A  
22 nutrient content claim is a claim that “expressly or implicitly characterizes the level of a nutrient.”  
23 21 C.F.R. § 101.13(b). “Express” nutrient content claims include any statement outside the  
24 Nutrition Facts Panel, about the level of a nutrient. 21 C.F.R. 101.13(b)(1); 21 C.F.R. § 101.13(c).  
25 Stating information from the nutrition facts panel (such as grams of protein per serving) elsewhere  
26 on the package necessarily constitutes a nutrient content claim. 21 C.F.R. § 101.13(c).

27 18. A manufacturer cannot make a nutrient content claim in the form of a “statement  
28

1 about the amount or percentage of a nutrient” if the statement is “false or misleading in any  
2 respect.” 21 C.F.R. 101.13(i)(3). If it is, then “it may not be made on the label.” 21 C.F.R. §  
3 101.13(b). This is true even if the same amount appears in the nutrition facts panel. 21 C.F.R. §  
4 101.13(c). The FDA explained in promulgating section 101.13(i) that the regulation was necessary  
5 “since many consumers have a limited knowledge and understanding of the amounts of nutrients  
6 that are recommended for daily consumption,” which means that “a statement declaring that the  
7 product contained a specified amount of a nutrient could be misleading. By its very presence, such  
8 a statement could give consumers who were unfamiliar with the dietary recommendations the false  
9 impression that the product would assist them in maintaining healthy dietary practices relative to  
10 the amount of the nutrient consumed when it, in fact, would not.” 56 Fed. Reg. 60421. The rules  
11 are different for amounts in the NFP and nutrient content claims because a voluntary nutrient  
12 declaration on the front panel “is viewed by the agency as an effort to market the food as a  
13 significant source of nutrients.” 56 Fed. Reg. 60366.

14 19. While a required statement inside of the NFP escapes regulations reserved for  
15 nutrient content claims (21 C.F.R. § 101.13(c)), the identical statement outside of the NFP is still  
16 considered a nutrient content claim and is therefore subject to 21 C.F.R. § 101.13(i)(3). 21 C.F.R. §  
17 101.13(c). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has specifically held that “a requirement to state certain facts  
18 in the nutrition label is not a license to make that statement elsewhere on the product.” *Reid v.*  
19 *Johnson & Johnson*, 780 F.3d 952, 960 (9th Cir. 2015).

20 20. Under the FDCA, the term false has its usual meaning of “untruthful,” while the  
21 term misleading is a term of art that covers labels that are technically true but are likely to deceive  
22 consumers. Similarly, both the FDCA and California’s Sherman Law provide that a food is  
23 misbranded if “its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.” 21 U.S.C. § 343(a); *see also*  
24 California Health & Safety Code § 110660.

### 25 ***Defendant’s Products Violate the FDA and Sherman Law Regulations***

26 21. The sole protein source in Defendant’s Products is edamame (soybeans). Scientific  
27 research establishes that the PDCAAS of edamame and soy products is, at best, approximately  
28

1 0.856.<sup>3</sup> As a result, the corrected amount of protein the Products provide is materially less than the  
2 crude protein quantity prominently advertised on the front label and Amazon storefront. A  
3 PDCAAS of 0.856 means that the corrected amount of protein in a Product advertised as  
4 containing 11 grams is approximately 9.4 grams per serving. Nevertheless, Defendant failed to  
5 provide in the NFP a statement of the corrected amount of protein per serving calculated according  
6 to the PDCAAS methodology.

7 22. Accordingly, the “11 G[rams] Protein” and “High Protein Supersnack” claims on  
8 the front of the Products’ packages and Amazon storefront are unlawful in violation of parallel  
9 state and federal laws because Defendant did not comply with the regulatory requirements for  
10 making a protein claim. 21 C.F.R. § 101.9(c)(7)(i) & (iii), 101.13(b), (n). Furthermore, the failure  
11 to include a statement of the corrected amount of protein inside the NFP also rendered the NFP  
12 itself unlawful. *Id.* § 101.9(c)(7)(i). Defendant’s failure to comply with this requirement renders its  
13 front label protein claim unlawful *per se* and the Products misbranded pursuant to 21 § 101.13(n)  
14 and (b), as well as California Health & Safety Code § 110660, *et seq.*

15 23. Defendant’s standalone, front label protein quantity claims are also misleading, and  
16 therefore prohibited under 21 § 101.13(i)(3), (b), and (n) due to Defendant’s failure to include a  
17 statement of the corrected amount of protein per serving in the NFP calculated using the PDCAAS  
18 method and expressed as a %DV. Consumers have a “limited knowledge and understanding of the  
19 amount of [protein] that [is] recommended for daily consumption,” let alone an understanding of  
20 the science behind protein quality and how different types of proteins are used and absorbed in the  
21 body. 56 Fed. Reg. 60421. The FDA requires a statement of the corrected amount of protein per  
22 serving in the NFP precisely to ensure that “consumers are not misled by information on only the  
23 amount of protein present” in a product with low quality protein. 58 Fed. Reg. 2079 at 2101-2.  
24 Defendant’s failure to provide it rendered the label misleading.

25 24. Defendant’s marketing, advertising, and sale of the Products violates the

26 <sup>3</sup> See Van Den Berg et al., *Protein quality of soy and the effect of processing: A quantitative*  
27 *review*, PMC9552267 (2022) (“For all soy products combined, mean DIAAS was  $84.5 \pm 11.4$  and  
28 mean PDCAAS was  $85.6 \pm 18.2$ .”).

1 misbranding provisions of the Sherman Law (California Health & Safety Code § 110660, *et. seq.*),  
2 including but not limited to:

- 3 a. Section 110660 (a food is misbranded if its label is false or misleading in any particular)
- 4 b. Section 110665 (a food is misbranded if its labeling does not conform with the  
5 requirements for nutrition labeling as set forth in 21 U.S.C. Sec. 343(q));
- 6 c. Section 110705 (a food is misbranded if words, statements and other information  
7 required by the Sherman Law to appear on food labeling are either missing or not  
8 sufficiently conspicuous);
- 9 d. Section 110760 (making it unlawful for any person to manufacture, sell, deliver, hold, or  
10 offer for sale any food that is misbranded);
- 11 e. Section 110765 (making it unlawful for any person to misbrand any food); and
- 12 f. Section 110770 (making it unlawful for any person to receive in commerce any food  
13 that is misbranded or to deliver or proffer for delivery any such food).

14 25. Defendant's marketing, advertising, and sale of the Products also violates the false  
15 advertising provisions of the Sherman Law (California Health & Safety Code § 110390, *et. seq.*),  
16 including, but not limited to:

- 17 a. Section 110390 (making it unlawful to disseminate false or misleading food  
18 advertisements that include statements on products and product packaging or labeling or  
19 any other medium used to directly or indirectly induce the purchase of a food product);
- 20 b. Section 110395 (making it unlawful to manufacture, sell, deliver, hold or offer to sell  
21 any falsely or misleadingly advertised food); and
- 22 c. Sections 110398 and 110400 (making it unlawful to advertise misbranded food or to  
23 deliver or proffer for delivery any food that has been falsely or misleadingly  
24 advertised).

25 26. Defendant has also violated the FDCA, and the standards set by FDA regulations,  
26 including but not limited to 21 U.S.C. § 343(a), 21 C.F.R. § 101.9 (c)(7), 21 C.F.R. § 101.13(i)(3),  
27 (b), (n), and 21 C.F.R. § 101.9(h), which have been incorporated by reference in the Sherman Law,  
28

1 by failing to include on the Products packaging the nutritional information required by law.

2 ***Defendant's Protein Representations are False and Misleading***

3 27. In addition to being unlawful, Defendant's prominent protein claims on the front of  
4 the Products' packaging and Amazon storefront while failing to include a statement of the  
5 corrected amount of protein per serving expressed as a %DV in the NFP are also likely to mislead  
6 consumers. Consumers reasonably expect that Defendant's Products will provide the full amount  
7 of protein per serving claimed on the front of the package. But Defendant's Products do not do so,  
8 because the corrected, digestible amount of protein the Products provide is materially less than the  
9 amount advertised. Had Defendant included a statement of the corrected amount of protein per  
10 serving in the NFP, as they were required to do under the law, it would have revealed that the  
11 Products provide materially less usable protein than the amount represented on the Products'  
12 packaging. That information was material to reasonable consumers.

13 28. A reasonable consumer would expect that the Products provide what Defendant  
14 identifies them to provide on the product labels and that the labels would not be contrary to the  
15 policies or regulations of the State of California and/or the FDA. For example, a reasonable  
16 consumer would expect that when Defendant labels the Products as containing "11 G[rams]  
17 Protein," and that that amount counts as a "complete plant-based protein," the Products would  
18 provide 11 grams of protein per serving in a form their bodies could use. Because Defendant did  
19 not conduct PDCAAS and provide a statement of the corrected amount of protein per serving,  
20 expressed as a corrected %DV in the NFP, consumers could not have discovered that the Products  
21 provide significantly less protein.

22 29. Consumers lack the meaningful ability to test or independently ascertain the  
23 truthfulness of Defendant's food labeling claims, especially at the point of sale. Reasonable  
24 consumers, when looking at the front label of the Products, believe that the Products provide the  
25 amount of protein represented therein. Because Defendant do not include legally required  
26 information as to the quality of the protein in the NFP via the statement of corrected amount of  
27 protein expressed as a %DV, consumers do not have any reason to think otherwise. Reasonable  
28

1 consumers do not walk around with the PDCAAS values for various protein sources in their heads.  
2 They would not know the true amount of protein the Products provide nutritionally merely by  
3 looking elsewhere on the Products' packaging. That discovery requires investigation well beyond  
4 what is advertised and knowledge of food chemistry beyond that of the average consumer. An  
5 average consumer does not have the specialized knowledge necessary to ascertain that the Products  
6 do not provide the number of grams of protein that is represented on their packaging. An average  
7 consumer also lacks the specialized knowledge necessary to determine the PDCAAS for the  
8 Products. The average reasonable consumer had no reason to suspect that Defendant's  
9 representations on the packages were misleading. Therefore, consumers had no reason to  
10 investigate whether the Products actually do provide the amount of protein per serving that the  
11 labels claim they do and reasonably relied on Defendant's representations regarding the nature of  
12 the Products.

13 30. Defendant intends and knows that consumers will and do rely upon food labeling  
14 statements in making their purchasing decisions. Label claims and other forms of advertising and  
15 marketing drive product sales, particularly if placed prominently on the front of product packaging,  
16 as Defendant has done with the claims on the Products that they contain and provide specific  
17 amounts of protein per serving.

18 31. In making unlawful, false, misleading, and deceptive representations, Defendant  
19 distinguishes the Products from its competitors' products. Defendant knew and intended that  
20 consumers would purchase and pay a premium for products labeled with protein claims. By using  
21 this branding and marketing strategy, Defendant is stating that the Products are superior to, better  
22 than, and more nutritious and healthful than other products that do not make protein claims, or that  
23 properly provide the required statement of the corrected amount of protein as determined by the  
24 PDCAAS method and expressed as a %DV.

25 32. Because consumers pay a price premium for products that make protein claims, and  
26 also pay a premium for products that provide more protein, by labeling its Products with protein  
27 claims and misrepresenting the required statement of the corrected amount of protein per serving,  
28

1 Defendant is able to both increase its sales and retain more profits.

2 33. Defendant engaged in the practices complained of herein to further its private  
3 interests of: (i) increasing sales of the Products while decreasing the sales of competitors that do  
4 not mislead consumers about the quality of the protein in its products, and/or (ii) commanding a  
5 higher price for its Products because consumers will pay more for the Products due to consumers'  
6 demand for products with protein claims.

7 34. The market for protein products is continuing to grow and expand, and because  
8 Defendant knew consumers rely on representations about the number of grams of protein in food  
9 products, Defendant has an incentive to continue to make such unlawful and misleading  
10 representations. In addition, other trends suggest that Defendant has no incentive to change their  
11 labeling practices.

12 35. For example, one market analysis revealed that between 2013-2017, product  
13 launches with a protein claim grew 31%.<sup>4</sup>

14 36. To capitalize on the growing market, the Defendant continues to launch new  
15 product lines and flavors to diversify its portfolio and maintain a competitive edge. It is therefore  
16 likely that Defendant will continue to unlawfully and/or misleadingly advertise the Products and  
17 perpetuate the misrepresentations regarding the protein in the Products.

18 ***Plaintiff Lacks an Adequate Remedy at Law***

19 37. Plaintiff lacks an adequate remedy at law for the future harm described above.  
20 Damages cannot remedy Plaintiff's inability to rely on Defendant's protein representations when  
21 deciding whether to purchase the Products in the future, and only injunctive relief requiring  
22 Defendant to cease the misleading protein representations or reformulate the Products can address  
23 that prospective harm.

24 38. Equitable relief is also necessary because legal remedies may prove inadequate to  
25 provide complete relief, including restitution measured by the difference between the price Plaintiff

26 <sup>4</sup> [https://www.bakeryandsnacks.com/Article/2018/11/26/10-key-snack-trends-to-](https://www.bakeryandsnacks.com/Article/2018/11/26/10-key-snack-trends-to-watch/?utm_source=copyright&utm_medium=OnSite&utm_campaign=copyright)  
27 [watch/?utm\\_source=copyright&utm\\_medium=OnSite&utm\\_campaign=copyright](https://www.bakeryandsnacks.com/Article/2018/11/26/10-key-snack-trends-to-watch/?utm_source=copyright&utm_medium=OnSite&utm_campaign=copyright) (last accessed  
28 May 23, 2025).

1 and the Class paid and the value of the Products as received, and disgorgement of the revenues  
2 Defendant unfairly obtained, which are equitable remedies not necessarily coextensive with  
3 damages.

4 39. Equitable relief is also appropriate because the statutes of limitations for the causes  
5 of action pled herein vary. The UCL and FAL's statute of limitations are four years — one year  
6 longer than the CLRA's statute of limitations. Thus, class members who purchased the Products  
7 more than three years before the filing of the complaint would be barred from recovery if equitable  
8 relief were not permitted under the UCL and FAL.

9 40. The scope of actionable misconduct under the FAL and UCL is also broader than  
10 under the other causes of action asserted herein. The FAL and UCL prohibit Defendant's  
11 fraudulent marketing scheme. Plaintiff's warranty and common-law claims, on the other hand, are  
12 more limited, focusing on the specific duties and obligations arising from Defendant's  
13 misrepresentations and omissions at the point of purchase. The UCL also creates a cause of action  
14 for violations of laws that do not themselves provide for a private cause of action — including the  
15 FDA's and Sherman Law's prohibition on misrepresenting the protein in the Products.

#### 16 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

17 41. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated  
18 persons pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a), (b)(1), (b)(2) and (b)(3).

19 42. Plaintiff seeks to represent all persons in the United States who purchased  
20 Defendant's Products (the "Class").

21 43. The Class does not include (1) Defendant, its officers, and/or its directors; or (2) the  
22 Judge to whom this case is assigned and the Judge's staff.

23 44. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the above class definition and add additional  
24 classes or subclasses as appropriate based on investigation, discovery, and the specific theories of  
25 liability.

1           45.     **Community of Interest:** There is a well-defined community of interest among  
2 members of the Class, and the disposition of the claims of these members of the Class in a single  
3 action will provide substantial benefits to all parties and to the Court.

4           46.     **Numerosity:** While the exact number of members of the Class is unknown to  
5 Plaintiff at this time and can only be determined by appropriate discovery, upon information and  
6 belief, members of the Class number in the millions. The precise number of the members of the  
7 Class and their identities are unknown to Plaintiff at this time but may be determined through  
8 discovery. Members of the Class may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail and/or  
9 publication through the distribution records of Defendant and third-party retailers and vendors.

10           47.     **Existence and predominance of common questions of law and fact:** Common  
11 questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Class and predominate over any questions  
12 affecting only individuals of the Class. These common legal and factual questions include, but are  
13 not limited to:

- 14           (a)     Whether Defendant’s protein representation and omissions about the Products are  
15 false and misleading in violation of California’s False Advertising Law (“FAL”),  
16 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*, California’s Consumers Legal Remedies  
17 Act (“CLRA”), Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*, and/or California’s Unfair  
18 Competition Law (“UCL”), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;
- 19           (b)     Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Class have suffered damages as a result of  
20 Defendant’s actions and the amount thereof; and
- 21           (c)     Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to attorney’s fees and  
22 costs.

23           48.     **Typicality:** The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of other  
24 members of the Class in that the named Plaintiff was exposed to Defendant’s false and misleading  
25 marketing, purchased Defendant’s Product, and suffered a loss as a result of those purchases.

26           49.     **Adequacy:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of  
27 the Class as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23(a)(4). Plaintiff is an adequate  
28

1 representative of the Class because she has no interests that are adverse to the interests of the  
2 members of the Class. Plaintiff is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action and, to that  
3 end, Plaintiff has retained skilled and experienced counsel.

4 50. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to all other available methods of the fair and  
5 efficient adjudication of the claims asserted in this action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
6 23(b)(3) because:

- 7 (a) The expense and burden of individual litigation makes it economically unfeasible  
8 for members of the Class to seek to redress their claims other than through the  
9 procedure of a class action;
- 10 (b) If separate actions were brought by individual members of the Class, the resulting  
11 duplicity of lawsuits would cause members of the Class to seek to redress their  
12 claims other than through the procedure of a class action; and
- 13 (c) Absent a class action, Defendant likely will retain the benefits of its wrongdoing,  
14 and there would be a failure of justice.

15 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

16 **COUNT I**

17 **Violation of California’s False Advertising Law,  
18 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500, et seq.  
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

19 51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations contained in the foregoing  
20 paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

21 52. The FAL makes it “unlawful for any person...to make or disseminate or cause to be  
22 made or disseminated before the public in this state, ... [in] any advertising device ... or in any  
23 other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement, concerning ...  
24 personal property or those services, professional or otherwise, or ... performance or disposition  
25 thereof, which is untrue or misleading and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable  
26 care should be known, to be untrue or misleading.” Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500.





1           69. Defendant has violated the UCL’s proscription against engaging in Unlawful  
2 Business Practices as a result of its violations of the FAL, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500,  
3 *et seq.*; CLRA, Cal. Civ. Code § 1770, *et seq.*; and the Sherman Law, including without  
4 limitation, California Health & Safety Code §§ 110390, 110395, 110398 and 110400; the  
5 misbranded food provisions of the Sherman Law (Article 6), including without limitation,  
6 California Health & Safety Code §§ 110660, 110665, 110705, 110760, 110765, and  
7 110770; and federal laws regulating the advertising and branding of food in 21 U.S.C. §  
8 343(a), *et seq.* and FDA regulations, including but not limited to 21 C.F.R. § 101.9 (c)(7),  
9 21 C.F.R. § 101.13(i)(3), (b), (n), and 21 C.F.R. § 101.9(h), which are incorporated into the  
10 Sherman Law (California Health & Safety Code §§ 110100(a), 110380, and 110505).

11           70. In particular, Defendant has engaged, and continues to engage, in unfair and  
12 fraudulent practices by, without limitation, the following: (i) unlawfully making a protein  
13 claim on the front labels of the Products packages without complying with the regulatory  
14 requirements for making protein claims set forth in 21 C.F.R. § 101.9(c)(7)(i)-(iii) and  
15 incorporated by reference by California’s Sherman law; (ii) failing to provide a statement of  
16 the corrected amount of protein per serving in the NFP, calculated according to the  
17 PDCAAS method and expressed as a %DV, as required by FDA regulations; and (iii)  
18 misleading reasonable consumers regarding the amount of protein the Products provide  
19 nutritionally in a form that humans can use.

20           71. Defendant has also violated the UCL’s proscription against engaging in  
21 Unfair Business Practices. Defendant’s acts, omissions, misrepresentations, practices and  
22 non-disclosures as alleged herein also constitute “unfair” business acts and practices  
23 within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* in that its conduct is  
24 substantially injurious to consumers, offends public policy, and is immoral, unethical,  
25 oppressive, and unscrupulous as the gravity of the conduct outweighs any alleged benefits  
26 attributable to such conduct. Defendant’s deceptive business model has led consumers to  
27 purchase the Products over other comparable dietary supplements that properly represent  
28

1 their nutritional value. Such injury is not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to consumers  
2 or competition. Indeed, no benefit to consumers or competition results from Defendant's conduct.  
3 Since consumers reasonably rely on the Products' labels, and thus also their omissions, consumers  
4 could not have reasonably avoided such injury. *Davis v. Ford Motor Credit Co.*, 179 Cal. App.  
5 4th 581, 597-98 (2009); *see also Drum v. San Fernando Valley Bar Ass'n*, 182 Cal. App. 4th 247,  
6 257 (2010) (outlining the third test based on the definition of "unfair" in Section 5 of the FTC  
7 Act). Furthermore, Defendant's packaging and sale of the Products is also unfair because it  
8 violates public policy as declared by specific constitutional, statutory, or regulatory provisions,  
9 including, but not limited to, the FDA and the Sherman Law.

10 72. Finally, Defendant has further violated the UCL's proscription against engaging in  
11 Fraudulent Business Practices. Defendant's claims, omissions, and misleading statements, as more  
12 fully set forth above, were false, misleading and/or likely to deceive the consuming public.

13 73. Pursuant to California Business and Professional Code § 17203, Plaintiff and the  
14 Class Members seek restitution, injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, and all other relief that the Court  
15 deems proper.

16 **COUNT IV**  
17 **Unjust Enrichment**  
18 **(On behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

19 74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations contained in the foregoing  
20 paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

21 75. Plaintiff and the Class Members conferred benefits on Defendant by purchasing the  
22 Products.

23 76. Defendant was unjustly enriched in retaining the revenues derived from Plaintiff  
24 and the Class Members' purchases of the Products. Retention of those monies under these  
25 circumstances is unjust and inequitable because Defendant misrepresented the benefits of the  
26 Products. These omissions and misrepresentations caused injuries to Plaintiff and the Class  
27 Members because they would not have purchased the Products if the true facts were known.

28 77. Because Defendant's retention of the non-gratuitous benefits conferred on them by

1 Plaintiff and the Class Members is unjust and inequitable, Defendant has been unjustly enriched in  
2 an amount to be determined at trial.

3 78. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(e)(2), Plaintiff makes the following  
4 allegations in this paragraph as an alternative to any contrary allegations in her other causes of  
5 action, in the event that such causes of action will not succeed. Plaintiff and the Class Members  
6 may be unable to obtain monetary, declaratory and/or injunctive relief directly under other causes  
7 of action and will lack an adequate remedy at law, if the Court requires them to show classwide  
8 reliance and materiality beyond the element required under unjust enrichment. In addition,  
9 Plaintiffs and the Class Members may be unable to obtain such relief under other causes of action  
10 and will lack an adequate remedy at law, if Plaintiff is unable to demonstrate the requisite *mens rea*  
11 (intent, reckless, and/or negligence), because an action under unjust enrichment imposes no such  
12 *mens rea* requirement and liability exists even if Defendant acted in good faith. Restitution may  
13 also be more certain, prompt, and efficient than other legal remedies requested herein. The return  
14 of the full premium price will ensure that Plaintiff and the Class are in the same place they would  
15 have been in had Defendant's wrongful conduct not occurred, *i.e.*, the position to make an  
16 informed decision about the purchase of the Products absent omissions and misrepresentations with  
17 the full purchase price at their disposal. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's unjust  
18 enrichment, Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered injury and seek the disgorgement and  
19 restitution of Defendant's wrongful profits, revenue, and benefits, plus interest, to the extent and in  
20 the amount deemed appropriate by the Court, and such other relief as the Court deems just and  
21 proper to remedy Defendant's unjust enrichment.

22 **COUNT V**  
23 **Breach of Express Warranty**  
24 **(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

25 79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations contained in the foregoing  
26 paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

27 80. Plaintiff brings this claim under the laws of California and those of the other states  
28

1 which are materially identical to California warranty law against Defendant.<sup>5</sup>

2 81. As the manufacturer, marketer, advertiser, and promoter of the Products, Defendant  
3 issued an express warranty by representing that the Products have a certain amount of protein that  
4 they do not have.

5 82. Defendant's representations were part of the basis of the bargains upon which the  
6 goods were offered for sale and purchased by Plaintiff and the Class Members.

7 83. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's breach, Plaintiff and the Class  
8 Members were injured because they: (1) paid money for the Products that were not what Defendant  
9 represented; (2) were deprived of the benefit of the bargain because the Products they purchased  
10 were different than Defendant had advertised; and (3) were deprived of the benefit of the bargain  
11 because the Products they purchased had less value than Defendant represented. Had Defendant not  
12 breached its express warranty by making the false representations alleged herein, Plaintiff and the  
13 Class Members would not have purchased the Products or would not have paid as much as they did  
14 for them.

15 84. As a result, Plaintiff and the Class Members suffered and continue to suffer damage  
16 and injury, and are entitled to all damages, in addition to costs, interest and fees, including  
17 attorneys' fees, as allowed by law.

---

18  
19 <sup>5</sup> While discovery may alter the following, Plaintiff asserts that the states with similar express  
20 warranty laws under the facts of this case include, but are not limited to: Alaska Stat. § 45.02.313;  
21 Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 47-2313; Ark. Code § 4-2-313; Cal. Com. Code § 2313; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 4-2-  
22 313; Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42a-2-313; Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 2-313; D.C. Code § 28:2-313; Fla. Stat.  
23 § 672.313; Ga. Code § 11-2-313; Haw. Rev. Stat. § 490:2-313; Idaho Code § 28-2-313; 810 ILCS  
24 5/2-313; Ind. Code § 26-1-2-313; Kan. Stat. Ann. § 84-2-313; Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 355.2-313;  
25 Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 11, § 2-313; Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 106, § 2-313; Minn. Stat. § 336.2-313; Miss.  
26 Code Ann. § 75-2-313; Mo. Rev. Stat. § 400.2-313; Mont. Code Ann. § 30-2-313; Neb. U.C.C. §  
27 2-313; Nev. Rev. Stat. § 104.2313; N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 382-A:2-313; N.J. Stat. Ann. § 12A:2-  
28 313; N.M. Stat. Ann. § 55-2-313; N.Y. U.C.C. Law § 2-313; N.C. Gen. Stat. § 25-2-313; N.D.  
Cent. Code § 41-02-30; Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 1302.26; Okla. Stat. tit. 12A, § 2-313; Or. Rev.  
Stat. § 72.3130; 13 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 2313; R.I. Gen. Laws § 6A-2-313; S.C. Code Ann. § 36-2-  
313; S.D. Codified Laws § 57A-2-313; Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-2-313; Tex. Bus. & Com. Code §  
2.313; Utah Code Ann. § 70A-2-313; Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 9A, § 2-313; Va. Code Ann. § 8.2-313;  
Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 62A.2-313; W. Va. Code § 46-2-313; Wis. Stat. § 402.313; and Wyo.  
Stat. Ann. § 34.1-2-313.

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, seeks  
3 judgment against Defendant, as follows:

- 4 (a) For an order certifying the Class under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;  
5 naming Plaintiff as a representative of the Class; and naming Plaintiff’s attorneys as  
6 Class Counsel to represent the Class;
- 7 (b) For an order finding in favor of Plaintiff and the Class on all counts asserted herein;
- 8 (c) For actual, compensatory, statutory, and/or punitive damages in amounts to be  
9 determined by the Court and/or jury;
- 10 (d) For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- 11 (e) For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded; and
- 12 (f) For an order awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable attorneys’ fees, expenses,  
13 and costs of suit.

14 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

15 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of any  
16 and all issues in this action so triable as of right.

17  
18 Dated: July 1, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

19 **GUCOVSKI LAW FIRM, PLLC.**

20  
21 By: /s/ Adrian Gucovski  
22 Adrian Gucovski (State Bar No. 360988)  
23 Nathaniel Haim Sari (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
24 165 Broadway, Fl. 23  
25 New York, NY 10006  
26 Telephone: (212) 884-4230  
27 Facsimile: (212) 884-4230  
28 E-Mail: adrian@gucovschilaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CLRA Venue Declaration Pursuant to California Civil Code Section 1780(d)**

I, Adrian Gucovschi, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of California and a member of the bar of this Court. I am a partner at Gucovschi Law Firm, PLLC, counsel of record for Plaintiff Genesia Ting in this action. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto under oath.

2. The Complaint filed in this action is filed in the proper place for trial under Civil Code Section 1780(d) in that a substantial portion of the transaction alleged in the Complaint occurred in this County.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed this 1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2026.

/s/ Adrian Gucovschi  
Adrian Gucovschi