

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
5

6  
7  
8 **KEVIN ANDERSON, on behalf of himself and**  
9 **all others similarly situated,**

10 **Plaintiff,**

11 **vs.**

12 **JAMBA JUICE COMPANY,**

13 **Defendant.**  
14

**Case No.: 12-CV-01213 YGR**

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION OF  
DEFENDANT JAMBA JUICE COMPANY WITH  
LEAVE TO AMEND**

15 Plaintiff filed this putative class action against Defendant Jamba Juice Company (“Jamba  
16 Juice”), alleging that it falsely represented that its smoothie kits are “All Natural,” when they are  
17 not. Plaintiff brings four claims, alleging violations of: (1) California’s Unfair Competition Law,  
18 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq. (“UCL”); (2) California’s False Advertising Law, Cal.  
19 Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500 et seq. (“FAL”); (3) the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act,  
20 Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750 et seq. (“CLRA”); and (4) the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. §§  
21 2301 et seq. (“MMWA”).

22 Jamba Juice has filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, (Dkt. No.  
23 22 (“FAC”)), on two grounds: First, Plaintiff’s Fourth Cause of Action, under the MMWA, fails  
24 because the “All Natural” statement on the smoothie kits did not establish a written warranty.  
25 Second, Plaintiff only purchased the smoothie kits in two of the five flavors, and therefore, he lacks  
26 standing to bring claims based on products he never purchased.

27 Having carefully considered the papers submitted and the pleadings in this action, and for  
28 the reasons set forth below, the Court hereby **GRANTS IN PART** the Motion to Dismiss, and

1 **DISMISSES** Plaintiff’s Fourth Cause of Action **WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**.<sup>1</sup>

2 **I. BACKGROUND**

3 Jamba Juice is a leading health food and beverage retailer. (FAC ¶ 2). It has retail locations  
4 that offer fruit smoothies, fresh squeezed juices, teas/lattes, and snacks. (Id. ¶¶ 2, 13.) Jamba Juice  
5 also offers consumer at-home products, including frozen novelty bars and at-home smoothie kits  
6 (“smoothie kits”). (Id. ¶¶ 2, 14.) Defendant’s smoothie kits are at issue in this case. (Id. ¶ 2.)

7 Jamba Juice’s smoothie kits are prominently labeled as “All Natural,” and are available in  
8 five flavors: Mango-a-go-go, Strawberries Wild, Caribbean Passion, Orange Dream Machine, and  
9 Razzmatazz. (Id. ¶ 12.) By labeling its smoothie kits as “All Natural,” Jamba Juice has been able  
10 to charge a price premium for its smoothie kits, which cost about \$4.39 each. (Id. ¶ 5.) Plaintiff  
11 alleges that the smoothie kits are not “All Natural,” and contain the following unnaturally  
12 processed, synthetic and/or non-natural ingredients: ascorbic acid, steviol glycosides, xanthan gum,  
13 and citric acid. (Id. ¶¶ 12, 21-24.)

14 In December 2011, Plaintiff Kevin Anderson purchased Jamba Juice’s Mango-a-go-go and  
15 Razzmatazz smoothie kits. (Id. ¶ 12.) Plaintiff relied on the representations that the smoothie kits  
16 were “All Natural” when he made his purchase. The “All Natural” representation was material to  
17 Plaintiff’s decision to buy the smoothie kits, and he paid a price premium for the Jamba Juice  
18 smoothie kits that he would not have paid had the true facts been disclosed to him. (Id.) Plaintiff  
19 filed this action on behalf of himself and a class of consumers who purchased one or more of  
20 Defendant’s smoothie kits, which Plaintiff alleges were falsely labeled as “All Natural” despite the  
21 inclusion of the unnaturally processed, synthetic substances, or substances created via chemical  
22 processing.

23 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

24 A motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) tests the legal sufficiency of the claims alleged in  
25 the complaint. *Ileto v. Glock, Inc.*, 349 F.3d 1191, 1199-1200 (9th Cir. 2003). “Dismissal can be  
26 based on the lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of sufficient facts alleged under a

27 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 78(b) and Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), the Court finds this motion  
28 appropriate for decision without oral argument. Accordingly, the Court **VACATES** the hearing set for August  
28, 2012.

1 cognizable legal theory.” *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).  
2 All allegations of material fact are taken as true and construed in the light most favorable to the  
3 plaintiff. *Johnson v. Lucent Techs., Inc.*, 653 F.3d 1000, 1010 (9th Cir. 2011). To survive a motion  
4 to dismiss, “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to  
5 relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl.*  
6 *Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 557 (2007)).

7 Review is generally limited to the contents of the complaint and documents attached  
8 thereto. *Allarcom Pay Television. Ltd. v. Gen. Instrument Corp.*, 69 F.3d 381, 385 (9th Cir. 1995).  
9 The Court may also consider a matter that is properly the subject of judicial notice without  
10 converting the motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment. *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*,  
11 250 F.3d 668, 688-89 (9th Cir. 2001). Under Federal Rule of Evidence 201, a court may take  
12 judicial notice of a fact not subject to reasonable dispute because it is generally known within the  
13 trial court’s territorial jurisdiction; or can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose  
14 accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. Fed. R. Evid. 201(b).

15 The parties have requested the Court take judicial notice of the First Amended Complaint  
16 filed in this lawsuit, (Dkt. No. 22); the First Amended Complaint filed in *Hairston v. South Beach*  
17 *Beverage Co., Inc.*, CV 12-1429-JFW (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2012), (see Dkt. Nos. 23-2 & 39); an  
18 exemplar of the Jamba Juice smoothie kits’ packaging at issue in this case; and a guidance  
19 document from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration’s (“FDA”) website, titled “FDA Basics-  
20 Did you know that a store can sell food past the expiration date?” (see Dkt. Nos. 36-1 & 36-2). The  
21 Court will take judicial notice of the court filings and the FDA Guidance Document. See *Reyn’s*  
22 *Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc.*, 442 F.3d 741, 746 n.6 (9th Cir. 2006) (courts “may take  
23 judicial notice of court filings and other matters of public record.”). Additionally, because neither  
24 party contests the authenticity of the pictures of the Jamba Juice smoothie kits’ packaging, and  
25 because these food product labels form the basis for Plaintiff’s allegations in the FAC, the Court  
26 takes judicial notice of these materials. See *Wright v. Gen’l Mills, Inc.*, 2009 WL 3247148 (S.D.  
27 Cal. Sept. 30, 2009).

28

1 **III. DISCUSSION**

2 **A. WHETHER “ALL NATURAL” LANGUAGE ON PRODUCT PACKAGING CONSTITUTES**  
3 **A WRITTEN WARRANTY UNDER THE MAGNUSON MOSS WARRANTY ACT?**

4 Plaintiff’s Fourth Cause of Action alleges that Jamba Juice’s representations that its  
5 smoothie kits are “All Natural” violates the Magnuson Moss Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 2301 et  
6 seq., which provides a consumer remedy for breach of a written warranty made in connection with  
7 the sale of a consumer product. According to the FAC, labeling the smoothie kits as “All Natural”  
8 created a written warranty that the ingredients in the smoothie kits were free of a particular type of  
9 defect (i.e., that they were not synthetic, artificial and/or otherwise non-natural). FAC ¶¶ 64. In  
10 Plaintiff’s view, by failing to provide smoothie kits that contained only “All Natural” ingredients,  
11 Jamba Juice breached this written warranty (i.e., the smoothie kits contained unnaturally processed,  
12 synthetic and/or non-natural ingredients, and therefore, were not defect free). Id. ¶ 65.

13 Jamba Juice argues that Plaintiff’s MMWA claim must be dismissed because the phrase  
14 “All Natural” does not fit within the statute’s definition of a “written warranty.” The MMWA  
15 defines a written warranty as follows:

16 any written affirmation of fact or written promise made in connection with the sale  
17 of a consumer product by a supplier to a buyer which relates to the nature of the  
18 material or workmanship and affirms or promises that such material or workmanship  
19 is defect free or will meet a specified level of performance over a specified period of  
20 time.

21 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(A).

22 Plaintiff maintains that the language “All Natural” on the smoothie kits’ labels “relates to  
23 the nature of the material” and is a written affirmation of fact or promise as to the quality and  
24 contents of the product—that the smoothie kits are “defect free.”<sup>2</sup> Relying upon court decisions  
25 interpreting the California Commercial Code, Plaintiff argues that courts have found that the  
26 language “All Natural” can create a warranty. See Pl’s Opp’n 6-7 (citing *Vicuna v. Alexia Foods,*  
27 *Inc.*, Case No. C-11-6119 PJH, 2012 WL 1497507, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 27, 2012); *In re Ferrero*  
28 *Litig.*, 794 F. Supp. 2d 1107 (S.D. Cal. 2011)). As Jamba Juice points out, these cases are

---

<sup>2</sup> The Court agrees with Plaintiff that “defect free” and “specified level of performance over a specified period of time” are separate bases to establish a written warranty under the MMWA. Because Plaintiff’s claim is under the “defect free” theory, the representation does not need a temporal element to establish a written warranty.

1 inapposite because Plaintiff’s warranty claim is under the MMWA, which defines written warranty  
2 differently than does California state law.<sup>3</sup> Jamba Juice argues that the language “All Natural” on  
3 the smoothie kits’ labels does not constitute a written warranty within the meaning of the MMWA.  
4 The Court agrees.

5 District Courts have held consistently that labeling a product “All Natural” is not a “written  
6 warranty” under the MMWA. See *Astiana v. Dreyer’s Grand Ice Cream, Inc.*, C-11-2910 EMC,  
7 2012 WL 2990766 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 20, 2012) (claim that food product is “natural” describes product  
8 but does not give assurance that product is defect free and therefore does not create warranty);  
9 *Littlehale v. Trader Joe’s Co.*, C-11-6342 PJH, Dkt. No. 48, (N.D. Cal. Jul. 2, 2012) (statements  
10 “Pure Natural” and “All Natural” are “mere product descriptions,” not “affirmations or promises  
11 that the products are defect free”); *Larsen v. Nonni’s Foods, LLC*, C-11-05188 SI, Dkt. No. 41  
12 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 14, 2012) (“All Natural” and “100% Natural” are not written warranties promising  
13 that food products are defect free because “this Court is not persuaded that being ‘synthetic’ or  
14 ‘artificial’ is a ‘defect.’”); *Hairston v. South Beach Beverage Co., Inc.*, 2012 WL 1893818 (C.D.  
15 Cal. May 18, 2012) (representations that beverage was “all natural with vitamins” “are product  
16 descriptions rather than promises that Lifewater is defect-free or guarantees of specific performance  
17 levels.”). The Court finds the reasoning in these cases persuasive.

18 The statement “All Natural” is a general product description rather than a promise that the  
19 product is defect free. See *Larsen*, supra, C-11-05188 SI, Dkt. No. 41 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 14, 2012)  
20 (rejecting claim that the use of synthetic ingredients in food labeled “all natural” rendered that food  
21 defective, reasoning the “deliberate use of [synthetic] ingredients does not comport with the plain  
22 meaning of the word ‘defect.’”). A product description does not constitute a written warranty under  
23 the MMWA. See *Littlehale*, supra, C-11-6342 PJH, Dkt. No. 48, (N.D. Cal. Jul. 2, 2012) (“To  
24 accept plaintiffs’ argument [that the statement “All Natural” promises the product is defect free]  
25 would be to transform most, if not all, product descriptions into warranties against a defect, and

---

26 <sup>3</sup> Plaintiff also cites *In re McDonald’s French Fries Litig.*, 503 F. Supp. 2d 953, 958 (N.D. Ill. 2007), which  
27 did involve a breach of written warranty claim under the MMWA. That case, however, addressed only  
28 whether privity of contract is required for a warranty claim under the MMWA. The district court did not  
address whether advertising french fries as safe for consumption by individuals with food allergies created a  
warranty.

1 plaintiffs have not articulated any limiting principle to convince the court otherwise.”). Therefore,  
2 the language “All Natural” on the smoothie kits’ labels did not create a written warranty within the  
3 meaning of the MMWA.

4 Based on the foregoing analysis, the Court **GRANTS** the motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s claim  
5 for breach of written warranty under the Magnuson Moss Warranty Act **WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**  
6 to the extent some other basis may exist for this claim.

7 **B. WHETHER PLAINTIFF HAS STANDING TO BRING CLAIMS ON BEHALF OF**  
8 **PURCHASERS OF FLAVORS PLAINTIFF DID NOT BUY?**

9 Standing under Article III and the UCL, FAL, and CLRA requires that a plaintiff has  
10 suffered an injury-in-fact. *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992); *Bower v.*  
11 *AT&T Mobility, LLC*, 196 Cal. App. 4th 1545, 1554-56 (Cal. Ct. App. 2011).<sup>4</sup> In addition to the  
12 injury-in-fact requirement, standing under the UCL, FAL and CLRA, requires that a plaintiff “has  
13 lost money or property” as a result of the defendant’s alleged conduct. See Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code  
14 §§ 17204, 17535; Cal. Civ. Code § 1780(a).

15 Jamba Juice argues that Plaintiff does not have standing to bring claims on behalf of  
16 purchasers of smoothie kit flavors he did not buy: Strawberries Wild, Caribbean Passion, and  
17 Orange Dream Machine. (FAC ¶ 28.) Plaintiff only alleges that he purchased Mango-a-go-go and  
18 Razzmatazz smoothie kits. (Id. ¶ 12.) Thus, Jamba Juice argues that Plaintiff’s claims as to the  
19 Strawberries Wild, Caribbean Passion, and Orange Dream Machine smoothie kits should be  
20 dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim because Plaintiff has failed to  
21 allege that he purchased those three smoothie kit products, let alone that he suffered any injury  
22 from them.

23 The parties recognize that district courts in this circuit have diverged on the issue of whether  
24 a plaintiff has standing to bring claims on behalf of consumers who purchased similar, but not  
25 identical products. See *Donohue v. Apple, Inc.*, — F. Supp. 2d —, 11-CV-05337 RMW, 2012 WL  
26 1657119, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2012) (noting divergence and collecting cases). Plaintiff argues

27 <sup>4</sup> To establish Article III standing, a plaintiff must satisfy three elements: (1) injury-in-fact; (2) causation;  
28 and (3) redressability. *Lujan*, supra, 504 U.S. at 560-61.

1 that he has standing to represent a class of consumers with regard to a product he did not purchase  
2 so long as his claims are based on the ““same core factual allegations and causes of action.”” Pl’s  
3 Opp’n 10.<sup>5</sup> Defendant argues that this case is more similar to the *Johns v. Bayer Corp.*, No. 09-  
4 1935 DMS, 2010 WL 476688 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2010) (purchaser of One A Day Men’s Health  
5 Formula vitamin product lacks standing to sue on behalf of purchasers of One A Day Men’s 50+  
6 Advantage vitamin product), which held that a plaintiff “cannot expand the scope of his claims to  
7 include a product he did not purchase.”

8 The “critical inquiry [in these cases] seems to be whether there is sufficient similarity  
9 between the products purchased and not purchased.” *Astiana*, supra, C-11-2910 EMC, 2012 WL  
10 2990766, at \*11 (different flavors of ice cream carried under different brand names, Edy’s/Dreyer’s  
11 and Haagen-Daz, sufficiently similar where same wrongful conduct applied).<sup>6</sup> If there is a  
12 sufficient similarity between the products, any concerns regarding material differences in the  
13 products can be addressed at the class certification stage. *Id.*; *Donohue*, supra, 2012 WL 1657119,  
14 at \*6 (allowing plaintiff to represent a class of persons who purchased different but similar products  
15 reasoning that “questions of whether common issues predominate and whether plaintiff can  
16 adequately represent absent class members, [are] issues that are better resolved at the class  
17 certification stage.”).

18 Here, Plaintiff is challenging the “All Natural” labeling of Jamba Juice at-home smoothie  
19 kits, which comes in a variety of flavors—Mango-a-go-go, Strawberries Wild, Caribbean Passion,  
20 Orange Dream Machine, and Razzmatazz. There is sufficient similarity between the products

---

21 <sup>5</sup> Plaintiff cites *Wang v. OCZ Techn. Group, Inc.*, 276 F.R.D. 618, 632-33 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (denying motion  
22 to strike claims with respect to computer models plaintiffs did not purchase; more appropriate to resolve  
23 issue on Rule 12(b) motion or on class certification motion); *Carideo v. Dell Inc.*, 706 F. Supp. 2d 1122,  
24 1134 (W.D. Wash. 2010) (standing under Washington state law for products not purchased where causes of  
25 action and factual allegations were the same); and *Hewlett-Packard v. Super. Ct.*, 167 Cal. App. 4th 87, 89-  
26 91 (Cal. Ct. App. 2008) (denying writ to vacate order certifying class of computer purchasers for lack of  
27 community of interest where class included models of computers plaintiff had not purchased).

28 <sup>6</sup> Compare with *Carrea v. Dreyer’s Grand Ice Cream, Inc.*, C-10-01044 JSW, 2011 WL 159380 (N.D. Cal.  
Jan. 10, 2011), *aff’d*, 2012 WL 1131526 (9th Cir. Apr. 5, 2012) (plaintiff had standing to bring claim as to  
Defendant’s Original Vanilla Drumstick ice cream product he purchased but not as to the Dibs products  
because he did not allege that he purchased Dibs or otherwise suffered any injury or lost money or property  
with respect to those products); *Larsen*, supra, C-11-05188 SI, Dkt. No. 41 (purchasers of cookies, juices,  
cinnamon rolls, and biscuits did not have standing to bring claims as to crescent rolls they did not purchase).

1 purchased (Mango-a-go-go and Razzmatazz smoothie kits) and the products not purchased  
2 (Strawberries Wild, Caribbean Passion, and Orange Dream Machine smoothie kits) because the  
3 same alleged misrepresentation was on all of the smoothie kit regardless of flavor; all smoothie kits  
4 are labeled “All Natural,” and all smoothie kits contain allegedly non-natural ingredients (xanthan  
5 gum, ascorbic acid and steviol glycosides). Therefore, the Court finds that Plaintiff has standing to  
6 bring claims on behalf of purchasers of smoothie kit flavors he did not buy, and the Court has  
7 subject matter jurisdiction over such claims.

8 Based on the foregoing analysis, the Court **DENIES** the Motion to Dismiss for lack of  
9 standing.

10 **IV. CONCLUSION**

11 For the reasons set forth above, the Court **GRANTS IN PART** the Motion to Dismiss.

12 Plaintiff’s Fourth Cause of Action for breach of warranty under the Magnuson Moss  
13 Warranty Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 2301 et seq., is **DISMISSED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**.

14 No later than **September 14, 2012**, Plaintiff shall file either (i) a second amended complaint  
15 or (ii) a notice that he intends to proceed on the First Amended Complaint.

16 Within 21 days of the filing of the above, Defendant shall file a response.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 **[Date]**



---

**YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE**

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28