

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.**

Ryan J. Clarkson (SBN 257074)  
*rclarkson@clarksonlawfirm.com*  
Shireen M. Clarkson (SBN 237882)  
*sclarkson@clarksonlawfirm.com*  
Matthew T. Theriault (SBN 244037)  
*mtheriault@clarksonlawfirm.com*  
Lauren E. Anderson (SBN 329173)  
*landerson@clarksonlawfirm.com*  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
Tel: (213) 788-4050  
Fax: (213) 788-4070

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**MOON LAW APC**

Christopher D. Moon (SBN 246622)  
*chris@moonlawapc.com*  
Kevin O. Moon (SBN 246792)  
*kevin@moonlawapc.com*  
228 Hamilton Ave., 3<sup>rd</sup> Fl  
Palo Alto, California 94301  
Tel: (619) 915-9432  
Fax: (650) 618-0478

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

ANTHONY BUSH, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

RUST-OLEUM CORPORATION, an Illinois  
corporation,

Defendant.

Case No.: 3:20-cv-03268-LB

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 Plaintiff Anthony Bush (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly  
2 situated, as more fully described herein (the “Class” and “Class Members”), brings this class action  
3 against Defendant Rust-Oleum Corporation (“Defendant”), and alleges as follows:

4 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5 1. In an effort to increase profits and to gain an advantage over its lawfully acting  
6 competitors, Defendant falsely and misleadingly labels certain of its Krud Kutter products as being  
7 “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”



8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1           2.     The products are neither “NON-TOXIC” nor “EARTH FRIENDLY.” That is because  
2 the products can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment.

3           3.     The unlawfully labeled “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY” products at issue  
4 are Krud Kutter Adhesive Remover; Krud Kutter Instant Carpet Stain Remover Plus Deodorizer;  
5 Krud Kutter Original Cleaner & Degreaser; Krud Kutter Tough Task Remover (pictured above);  
6 Krud Kutter Sports Cleaner/Stain Remover; Krud Kutter Gutter & Exterior Metal Cleaner; Krud  
7 Kutter Kitchen Degreaser & All Purpose Cleaner; Krud Kutter Heavy Traffic Carpet Cleaner; Krud  
8 Kutter Deck & Fence Wash; Krud Kutter Multi-Purpose House Wash; Krud Kutter Window Wash;  
9 Krud Kutter Parts Washer Cleaner/Degreaser; Krud Kutter Driveway Cleaner & Degreaser; Krud  
10 Kutter Original Cleaner & Degreaser (Aerosol) (pictured above); Krud Kutter Tough Task Remover  
11 (Aerosol) (collectively, the “Products”).<sup>1</sup>

12           4.     Defendant manufactures, markets, advertises, labels, and sells the Products  
13 throughout California and the United States.

14           5.     Through falsely, misleadingly, and deceptively labeling the Products, Defendant  
15 sought to take advantage of consumers’ desire for non-toxic cleaning products that are safe for  
16 humans, animals, and the environment. Defendant has done so at the expense of unwitting  
17 consumers, as well as Defendant’s lawfully acting competitors, over whom Defendant maintains an  
18 unfair competitive advantage.

19           6.     As a result, Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of those similarly  
20 situated, and seeks to represent a National Class and a California Subclass (defined *infra*). Plaintiff  
21 seeks injunctive relief to stop Defendant’s unlawful labeling and advertising of the Products. In  
22 addition, Plaintiff seeks damages, interest thereon, reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, other  
23 equitable relief, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendant has enjoyed from its conduct. Plaintiff  
24 makes these allegations based on his personal knowledge and, otherwise, on information and belief  
25 based on investigation of his counsel.

26           7.     Plaintiff’s primary litigation objective is to enjoin Defendant’s unlawful labeling  
27 practices and to obtain restitution for the National Class and California Subclass.

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> See Exhibit 1 (images of the Products).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**JURISDICTION**

8. This Court has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d), because the proposed Class consists of 100 or more members; the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of costs and interest; and minimal diversity exists. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

**VENUE**

9. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to Plaintiff’s claims occurred in this District. In addition, Plaintiff purchased the unlawful Products in this District, and Defendant has marketed, advertised, and sold the Products within this District.

**PARTIES**

10. Plaintiff Anthony Bush, who is currently a resident of Berkeley, California, purchased Krud Kutter Original Cleaner & Degreaser (Aerosol) and Krud Kutter Tough Task Remover at Home Depot in Emeryville, California for approximately \$6 and \$7, respectively, in January 2020. The labeling of the Products purchased by Plaintiff is typical of the labeling of the Products purchased by members of the Class. In making his purchase, Plaintiff relied upon the Products’ advertising and labeling claims. The claims were prepared and approved by Defendant and its agents and disseminated statewide and nationwide, as well as designed to encourage consumers to purchase the Products. If Plaintiff had known that the Products were not “non-toxic” and “earth friendly” and can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment, he would not have purchased the Products.

11. However, if the Products were actually non-toxic and earth friendly as labeled and advertised, Plaintiff would purchase the Products in the future. Since Plaintiff would like to purchase the Products again and obtain the advertised benefits, he might purchase them again in the future—despite the fact that they were once marred by false advertising or labeling—as he may reasonably, but incorrectly, assume the Products were improved. In that regard, Plaintiff is an average consumer who is not sophisticated in the chemistry or formulations of household cleaning products, so he is

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 at risk of reasonably, but incorrectly, assuming that Defendant fixed the formulation of the Products  
2 such that he might buy them again believing they were no longer falsely advertised and labeled.

3 12. Defendant Rust-Oleum Corporation is an Illinois corporation with its principal place  
4 of business in Vernon Hills, Illinois, and was doing business in the state of California during all  
5 relevant times. Directly and through its agents, Rust-Oleum Corporation has substantial contacts  
6 with and receives substantial benefits and income from and through the State of California. Rust-  
7 Oleum Corporation is one of the owners, manufacturers, or distributors of the Products, and is one  
8 of the companies that created and/or authorized the false, misleading, and deceptive labeling for the  
9 Products.

10 13. Defendant and its agents promoted, marketed and sold the Products at issue in this  
11 jurisdiction and in this judicial district. The unfair, unlawful, deceptive, and misleading advertising  
12 and labeling of the Products were prepared and/or approved by Defendant and its agents, and was  
13 disseminated by Defendant and its agents through labeling and advertising containing the  
14 misrepresentations alleged herein.

15 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 14. In recent years, consumers have become increasingly concerned about using  
17 household cleaning products that are safe for humans, animals, and the environment. Consumers  
18 have poured billions of dollars into the “eco-friendly” and “natural” cleaning-products market. In  
19 fact, this market segment is expected to reach over \$40 billion by 2025.

20 15. In response to consumers’ desire for safe and non-toxic cleaning products, many  
21 companies “greenwash” their products by deceptively claiming that their cleaning products are safe.  
22 Unfortunately, rather than creating the safe and non-toxic products that consumers desire, many  
23 companies, like Defendant, have chosen instead to “greenwash” their products through deceptive  
24 labeling, suggesting and outright stating that their cleaning products are safe and non-toxic when,  
25 in fact, they can cause harm to humans, animals and/or the environment.

26 16. Recognizing this problem, the United States Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”)  
27 created the “Green Guides” to help companies avoid making misleading and deceptive claims.<sup>2</sup> The

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>2</sup> See generally 16 C.F.R. § 260 – Guides for the Use of Environmental Marketing Claims.

1 Green Guides specifically address the use of the term “non-toxic” in the marketing of a product,  
 2 stating, “A non-toxic claim likely conveys that a product, package, or service is non-toxic both for  
 3 humans and for the environment generally.”<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, “[i]t is deceptive to misrepresent,  
 4 directly or by implication, that a product, package or service is non-toxic. Non-toxic claims should  
 5 be clearly and prominently qualified to the extent necessary to avoid deception.”<sup>4</sup>

6 17. Indeed, in commenting on the Green Guides, the Environmental Protection Agency  
 7 (“EPA”) **“believes that marketers will ‘rarely, if ever, be able to adequately qualify and  
 8 substantiate such a claim of ‘non-toxic’ in a manner that will be clearly understood by  
 9 consumers.’”** (Emphasis added).<sup>5</sup> The EPA further explained:

10 [A] “non-toxic” claim conveys that a product is non-toxic for both humans and for the  
 11 environment generally. Demonstrating a lack of toxicity in a generic sense involves  
 12 testing for a broad array of endpoints (e.g. acute toxicity, carcinogenicity and other  
 13 chronic effects, developmental and reproductive toxicity, neurotoxicity, sensitization,  
 14 etc.) across a variety of species. It is highly unlikely that the typical consumer product  
 15 will have been subjected to this degree of testing with a resulting finding of “no  
 16 adverse effect” for each of the endpoints evaluated.<sup>6</sup>

17 18. “According to the EPA, this inference might prevent consumers from taking necessary  
 18 precautions in handling a product.”<sup>7</sup>

19 19. The Green Guides also provide examples of marketing claims in order to “provide the  
 20 Commission’s views on how reasonable consumers likely interpret certain claims.”<sup>8</sup> The FTC  
 21 provided the following relevant example:<sup>9</sup>

22 <sup>3</sup> 16 C.F.R. § 260.10(b).

23 <sup>4</sup> 16 C.F.R. § 260.10(a).

24 <sup>5</sup> EPA Comments on Proposed Revisions to Green Guides (2010) (*available at*  
 25 [https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public\\_comments/guides-use-environmental-marketing-claims-project-no.p954501-00288%20A0/00288-57070.pdf](https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_comments/guides-use-environmental-marketing-claims-project-no.p954501-00288%20A0/00288-57070.pdf)

26 <sup>6</sup> *Id.* See also Fed. Trade Comm’n, The Green Guide Statement and Business Purpose (2012)  
 27 (*available at* <https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/attachments/press-releases/ftc-issues-revised-green-guides/greenguidesstatement.pdf>) (“Similarly, CU suggested that because ‘non-toxic’ claims are so difficult to substantiate and for consumers to verify, the marketplace would be better served with ‘specific claims of how a product contains less toxic or no toxic materials rather than using a ‘non-toxic’ claim.’”).

28 <sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> 16 C.F.R. § 260.1(d)

<sup>9</sup> 16 C.F.R. § 260.10.



1 A marketer advertises a cleaning product as “essentially non-toxic” and “practically  
2 non-toxic.” **The advertisement likely conveys that the product does not pose**  
3 **any risk to humans or the environment, including household pets.** If the  
4 cleaning product poses no risks to humans but is toxic to the environment, the  
5 claims would be deceptive. (Emphasis added).

6 20. This example demonstrates that even when “non-toxic” claims are qualified by such  
7 terms as “essentially” or “practically,” they are nonetheless construed by reasonable consumers as  
8 “not pos[ing] any risk to humans or the environment, including household pets.” Thus, broad and  
9 unqualified non-toxic claims, such as the ones present on the Products, would even more strongly  
10 convey such a meaning.

11 21. In addressing “General Environmental Benefit Claims,” the Green Guides state:

12 (a) It is deceptive to misrepresent, directly or by implication, that a product, package, or  
13 service offers a general environmental benefit.

14 (b) Unqualified general environmental benefit claims are difficult to interpret and likely  
15 convey a wide range of meanings. In many cases, such claims likely convey that the product,  
16 package, or service has specific and far-reaching environmental benefits **and may convey**  
17 **that the item or service has no negative environmental impact. Because it is highly**  
18 **unlikely that marketers can substantiate all reasonable interpretations of these claims,**  
19 **marketers should not make unqualified general environmental benefit claims.**

20 (c) Marketers can qualify general environmental benefit claims to prevent deception about  
21 the nature of the environmental benefit being asserted. To avoid deception, marketers should  
22 use clear and prominent qualifying language that limits the claim to a specific benefit or  
23 benefits. Marketers should not imply that any specific benefit is significant if it is, in fact,  
24 negligible. If a qualified general claim conveys that a product is more environmentally  
25 beneficial overall because of the particular touted benefit(s), marketers should analyze trade-  
26 offs resulting from the benefit(s) to determine if they can substantiate this claim.

27 (d) Even if a marketer explains, and has substantiation for, the product’s specific  
28 environmental attributes, this explanation will not adequately qualify a general environmental  
benefit claim if the advertisement otherwise implies deceptive claims. Therefore, marketers  
should ensure that the advertisement’s context does not imply deceptive environmental  
claims.

16 C.F.R. § 260.4 (emphasis added).

22. As relevant here, while the Green Guides do not specifically address the term “Earth  
Friendly,” they do consider its close analog, “Eco-Friendly.” According to the Green Guides, “[t]he  
brand name **‘Eco-friendly’ likely conveys that the product has far-reaching environmental**  
**benefits and may convey that the product has no negative environmental impact.** Because it is

1 highly unlikely that the marketer can substantiate these claims, the use of such a brand name is  
2 deceptive.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

3 23. Like “Eco-Friendly,” “EARTH FRIENDLY” conveys to reasonable consumers that  
4 the product has far-reaching environmental benefits and has no negative environmental impact.

5 24. Because of concerns about safety, consumers have increasingly sought out safe and  
6 non-toxic household cleaning products, the sales of which have surged in recent years.

7 25. As described *supra*, Defendant manufactures, markets, advertises, labels, and sells  
8 Krud Kutter Adhesive Remover; Krud Kutter Instant Carpet Stain Remover Plus Deodorizer; Krud  
9 Kutter Original Cleaner & Degreaser; Krud Kutter Tough Task Remover (pictured above); Krud  
10 Kutter Sports Cleaner/Stain Remover; Krud Kutter Gutter & Exterior Metal Cleaner; Krud Kutter  
11 Kitchen Degreaser & All Purpose Cleaner; Krud Kutter Heavy Traffic Carpet Cleaner; Krud Kutter  
12 Deck & Fence Wash; Krud Kutter Multi-Purpose House Wash; Krud Kutter Window Wash; Krud  
13 Kutter Parts Washer Cleaner/Degreaser; Krud Kutter Driveway Cleaner & Degreaser; Krud Kutter  
14 Original Cleaner & Degreaser (Aerosol) (pictured above); Krud Kutter Tough Task Remover  
15 (Aerosol).

16  
17 ///

18  
19 ///

20  
21 ///

22  
23 ///

24  
25 ///

26  
27 ///

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069



1 26. True and correct images of the Cleaner/Degreaser Aerosol and Tough Task Remove  
2 Products appear below<sup>10</sup>:



23 27. Defendant prominently and uniformly labels the front display panel of the Products  
24 with the labels “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.” The labels are set against—and  
25 highlighted by—an eye-catching background and/or font color.

26 28. In addition, Defendant’s official website touts its Products as follows: “We believe  
27 cleaners should clean without being toxic. Krud Kutter safely removes the toughest stains and  
28

<sup>10</sup> See Exhibit 1 for images of all Products.

1 everyday messes that most ‘all-purpose’ cleaners can’t touch . . . Our eco-friendly formula is safe  
2 for the environment and your family.’”<sup>11</sup>

3 29. Based on the “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY” representations, reasonable  
4 consumers, including Plaintiff, believe that the Products do not pose any risk of harm to humans,  
5 animals, and/or the environment.

6 30. However, in spite of the labeling, the Products do pose a risk of harm to humans,  
7 animals, and/or the environment. That is because they contain (in varying combinations) a number  
8 of harmful ingredients, including the following: Alcohol Ethoxylates;<sup>12</sup> Sodium Metasilicate;  
9 Poly(oxy-1, 2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-(2-propylheptyl)-.omega.-hydroxy-; Dipropylene Glycol  
10 Monomethyl Ether; Monoethanolamine; Sodium Xylene Sulfonate; Potassium Hydroxide;  
11 Diethanolamine; Trisodium Phosphate, Dodecahydrate; and n-Butane.<sup>13</sup> Accordingly, the Products  
12 are not “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”

13 31. **Alcohol Ethoxylates (“AEs”)** are surfactants, which are compounds that lower the  
14 surface tension (or interfacial tension) between two liquids, between a gas and a liquid, or between  
15 a liquid and a solid. Surfactants may act as detergents, wetting agents, emulsifiers, foaming agents,  
16 and dispersants. For those Products that contain AEs, the percentage by weight of AEs in the  
17 Products ranges from 1% to 10%. At these percentages or concentrations, the AEs (and therefore  
18 the Products) can cause harm to the skin and eyes when these surfaces are exposed to the Products.  
19 In addition, the AEs, at their given concentrations in the Products, are also phytotoxic. Therefore,  
20 the environment, when exposed to the Products, can be negatively impacted.

21 32. **Sodium Metasilicate (“SM”)** is used to soften water and enhance cleaning  
22 performance and efficiency. For those Products that contain SM, the percentage by weight of SM  
23 in the Products ranges from 1% to 2.5%. Because SM is very corrosive, on information and belief,  
24 it is responsible for the highly alkaline pH of the Products. Alkalinity extremes—a pH above 11.5—

25  
26 <sup>11</sup> See <https://www.rustoleum.ca/product-catalog/consumer-brands/krud-kutter>.

27 <sup>12</sup> “Alcohol Ethoxylates” include “Ethoxylated Alcohols,” “Fatty Alcohol Ethoxylate,” and “C9-  
28 C11 Alcohols Ethoxylated.”

<sup>13</sup> The harmful ingredients contained in each Product is described in detail *infra* and in Exhibit 2.

1 can cause skin and eye burns and irritation, as well as esophageal burns. In addition, highly alkaline  
 2 substances can harm or kill vegetation and soil microorganisms. By way of example, the following  
 3 Products have extremely high—and therefore potentially harmful—pH levels<sup>14</sup>:

- 4 • Instant Carpet Stain Remover Plus Deodorizer has a pH of **12.69**
- 5 • Tough Task Remover has a pH of **12.7**
- 6 • Tough Task Remover (Aerosol) has a pH of **12.4**
- 7 • Multi-Purpose House Wash has a pH of **12.7**
- 8 • Original Cleaner & Degreaser (Aerosol) has a pH of **12.4**

9  
 10 33. **Poly(oxy-1, 2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-(2-propylheptyl)-.omega.-hydroxy-** is used as  
 11 an emulsifier or wetting agent. This ingredient can cause serious eye damage and is harmful if  
 12 swallowed.

13 34. In addition, according to the Products' Safety Data Sheets (described in detail *infra*  
 14 and in Exhibit 2), the following ingredients are classified as "Hazardous Substances" at their  
 15 respective percentages or concentrations in the Products: Dipropylene Glycol Monomethyl Ether;  
 16 Monoethanolamine; Sodium Xylene Sulfonate; Potassium Hydroxide; Diethanolamine; Trisodium  
 17 Phosphate, Dodecahydrate; and n-Butane.

### 18 **THE PRODUCTS' SAFETY DATA SHEETS**

19 35. The Hazard Communication Standard (29 C.F.R. § 1910.1200, *et seq.*) requires that a  
 20 chemical manufacturer, distributor, or importer provide a Safety Data Sheet ("SDS") for each  
 21 hazardous chemical to downstream users to communicate information on these hazards. "Hazardous  
 22 chemical means any chemical which is classified as a physical hazard or a health hazard, a simple  
 23 asphyxiant, combustible dust, pyrophoric gas, or hazard not otherwise classified." 29 C.F.R. §  
 24 1910.1200(c).  
 25

26 36. An SDS includes information concerning the properties of each chemical; the  
 27 physical, health, and environmental health hazards; protective measures; and safety precautions for  
 28

---

<sup>14</sup> The pH level is not known for every Product.

1 handling, storing, and transporting the chemical. In addition, an SDS must provide specific  
2 minimum information as detailed in Appendix D of 29 C.F.R. § 1910.1200.

3 37. Defendant created an SDS for each of the Products.<sup>15</sup> In each SDS, Defendant details  
4 information about the particular Product, including information concerning the properties of certain  
5 hazardous chemicals contained in the Product, and the Product’s physical, health, and  
6 environmental health hazards. The Products’ SDSs make clear that the Products are certainly not  
7 “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”

8 38. The following information is provided in the referenced Product’s SDS:

9  
10 **ADHESIVE REMOVER**

11 **Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- 12 • Signal Word: Danger<sup>16</sup>

13 **GHS Hazard Statements**<sup>17</sup>

- 14 • Causes serious eye damage  
15 • Causes skin irritation

16 **Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

17 **Hazardous Substances:**  
18 \_\_\_\_\_

19 <sup>15</sup> See Exhibit 2. A Safety Data Sheet could not be located for the Sports Cleaner/Stain Remover  
20 Product. However, on information and belief, that Product contains Ethoxylated Alcohols and  
Sodium Metasilicate.

21 <sup>16</sup> A “Signal Word” is used to emphasize hazards and indicate the relative level of severity of the  
22 hazard. See 29 C.F.R. § 1910.1200(c). The signal words are either “Danger,” which indicates more  
23 severe hazards, or “Warning,” which indicates less severe hazards. See *id.*

24 <sup>17</sup> “GHS” is an acronym for the United Nations Globally Harmonized System of Classification and  
25 Labeling of Chemicals. The GHS is a system for standardizing and harmonizing the classification  
26 and labeling of chemicals, including defining health, physical and environmental hazards of  
27 chemicals. The GHS covers all hazardous chemicals. In addition, the stated goal of the GHS is to  
28 identify the intrinsic hazards of chemical substances and mixtures and to convey hazard information  
about these hazards.

A “GHS Hazard Statement” is a standard phrase assigned to a hazard class and category that  
describes the nature of the hazard. According to the GHS, an appropriate statement for each GHS  
hazard should be included on the label for products possessing more than one hazard.

- Dipropylene Glycol Monomethyl Ether
- Ethoxylated Alcohols
- Monoethanolamine
- Sodium Xylene Sulfonate
- Potassium Hydroxide
- Coconut Oil Diethanolamine
- Diethanolamine

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2\*<sup>18</sup>

**INSTANT CARPET STAIN REMOVER PLUS DEODORIZER**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Danger

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes serious eye damage
- Causes skin irritation

**Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

---

<sup>18</sup> The Hazardous Materials Identification System (“HMIS”) is a numerical hazard rating system. The “Health Hazard Rating” of a material is determined by evaluating the potential for harm and relative toxicity. The Health Hazard Rating considers the toxicological properties of ingredients such as carcinogen status and permissible exposure limits. A Health Rating of “2” means Moderate Health Hazard such that temporary or minor injury may occur. A Health Rating of “1” means Slight Health Hazard such that irritation or minor reversible injury is possible. If present, the asterisk signifies a Chronic Health Hazard, meaning that long-term exposure to the material could cause a health problem such as emphysema or kidney damage.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

- Poly(oxy-1, 2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-(2-propylheptyl)-.omega.-hydroxy-
- Sodium Metasilicate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Skin Corrosion or Irritation, Serious eye damage or eye irritation

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2\*

**ORIGINAL CLEANER & DEGREASER**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Danger

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes serious eye damage
- Causes skin irritation

**Section 3. Composition/Information On Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

- Fatty Alcohol Ethoxylate
- Sodium Metasilicate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069



- 1 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.
- 2 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- 3 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- 4 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- 5 • PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

6 **Section 15. Regulatory Information**

7 This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under  
8 Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title  
9 III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

10 Skin Corrosion or Irritation, Serious eye damage or eye irritation

11 **Section 16. Other Information**

12 HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2\*

13  
14 **TOUGH TASK REMOVER**

15 **Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- 16 • Signal Word: Danger

17 **GHS Hazard Statements**

- 18 • Causes severe skin burns and eye damage

19 **Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

20 **Hazardous Substances:**

- 21 • Fatty Alcohol Ethoxylate
- 22 • Sodium Metasilicate

23 **Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- 24 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Substance causes severe eye irritation. Injury may be permanent.
- 25 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Severely irritating; may cause permanent skin damage.
- 26 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: Harmful if inhaled. High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- 27 • High vapor concentrations are irritating to the eyes, nose, throat and lungs.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Corrosive and may cause severe and permanent damage to mouth, throat and stomach. Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - CHRONIC HAZARDS: Repeated exposure to low concentrations of HCl vapor or mist may cause bleeding of nose and gums.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Skin Corrosion or Irritation

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2\*

**GUTTER & EXTERIOR METAL CLEANER**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Danger

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes skin irritation
- Causes serious eye damage

**Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

- Fatty Alcohol Ethoxylate
- Sodium Metasilicate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 **Section 15. Regulatory Information**

2 This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under  
3 Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title  
4 III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

5 Skin Corrosion or Irritation, Serious eye damage or eye irritation

6 **Section 16. Other Information**

7 HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2\*

8 **KITCHEN DEGREASER & ALL PURPOSE CLEANER**

9 **Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- 10
- 11 • Signal Word: Warning

12 **GHS Hazard Statements**

- 13 • Causes serious eye irritation

14 **Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

15 **Hazardous Substances:**

- 16 • Poly(oxy-1, 2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-(2-propylheptyl)-.omega.-hydroxy-

17 **Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- 18 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not  
19 removed promptly.
- 20 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling  
21 or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- 22 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations  
23 may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- 24 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- 25 • PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin  
26 Contact

27 **Section 15. Regulatory Information**

28 This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under  
Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title  
III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Serious eye damage or eye irritation

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 **Section 16. Other Information**

2 HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 1

3  
4 **HEAVY TRAFFIC CARPET CLEANER**

5 **Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- 6 • Signal Word: Danger

7 **GHS Hazard Statements**

- 8 • Causes serious eye damage  
9 • Causes skin irritation

10 **Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

11 **Hazardous Substances:**

- 12 • Poly(oxy-1, 2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-(2-propylheptyl)-.omega.-hydroxy-  
13 • Sodium Metasilicate

14 **Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- 15 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not  
16 removed promptly.  
17 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling  
or commercial handling by trained personnel.  
18 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations  
may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.  
19 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.  
20 • PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin  
Contact.

21 **Section 15. Regulatory Information**

22 This product has been reviewed according to the EPA 'Hazard Categories' promulgated under  
23 Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title  
24 III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

25 Skin Corrosion or Irritation, Serious eye damage or eye irritation

26 **Section 16. Other Information**

27 HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2  
28

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

**DECK & FENCE WASH**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Danger

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes serious eye damage
- Causes skin irritation

**Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

- Ethoxylated Alcohols
- Sodium Metasilicate
- Sodium Xylene Sulfonate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Reactive Hazard, Acute Health Hazard, Chronic Health Hazard

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 1

**MULTI-PURPOSE HOUSE WASH**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Danger

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 **GHS Hazard Statements**

- 2 • Causes severe skin burns and eye damage

3 **Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

4 **Hazardous Substances:**

- 5 • Ethoxylated Alcohols  
6 • Sodium Metasilicate  
7 • Sodium Xylene Sulfonate

8 **Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- 9 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Substance causes severe eye irritation.  
10 Injury may be permanent.  
11 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Severely irritating; may cause permanent  
12 skin damage.  
13 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: Harmful if inhaled. High gas, vapor, mist  
14 or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.  
15 High vapor concentrations are irritating to the eyes, nose, throat and lungs.  
16 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Corrosive and may cause severe and  
17 permanent damage to mouth, throat and stomach. Substance may be harmful if swallowed.  
18 • EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - CHRONIC HAZARDS: Repeated exposure to low  
19 concentrations of HCl vapor or mist may cause bleeding of nose and gums.  
20 • PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin  
21 Contact

22 **Section 16. Other Information**

23 HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 1

24 **WINDOW WASH**

25 **Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- 26 • Signal Word: Warning

27 **GHS Hazard Statements**

- 28 • Causes serious eye irritation  
• Causes skin irritation

**Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069



- Ethoxylated Alcohols
- Sodium Metasilicate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Skin Corrosion or Irritation, Serious eye damage or eye irritation

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2\*

**PARTS WASHER CLEANER/DEGREASER**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Warning

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes serious eye irritation
- Causes skin irritation

**Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

- Trisodium Phosphate, Dodecahydrate
- Sodium Metasilicate
- Dipropylene Glycol Monomethyl Ether

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Fire Hazard, Reactive Hazard, Acute Health Hazard, Chronic Health Hazard

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2\*

**DRIVEWAY CLEANER & DEGREASER**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Danger

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes skin irritation
- Causes serious eye damage

**Section 3. Composition/Information On Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

- Ethoxylated Alcohols
- Sodium Metasilicate
- Sodium Xylene Sulfonate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Irritating, and may injure eye tissue if not removed promptly.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: Low hazard for usual industrial handling or commercial handling by trained personnel.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Substance may be harmful if swallowed.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Reactive Hazard, Acute Health Hazard, Chronic Health Hazard

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 1

**ORIGINAL CLEANER & DEGREASER (AEROSOL)**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Warning

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes serious eye irritation
- Causes skin irritation

**Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

- n-Butane
- C9-C11 Alcohols Ethoxylated
- Sodium Metasilicate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Causes Serious Eye Irritation
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: May cause skin irritation. Allergic reactions are possible.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: Harmful if inhaled. High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist. High vapor concentrations are irritating to the eyes, nose, throat and lungs. Prolonged or excessive inhalation may cause respiratory tract irritation.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Harmful if swallowed.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - CHRONIC HAZARDS: May cause central nervous system disorder (e.g., narcosis involving a loss of coordination, weakness, fatigue, mental confusion, and blurred vision) and/or damage. High concentrations may lead to central nervous system effects (drowsiness, dizziness, nausea, headaches, paralysis, and blurred vision) and/or damage. Reports have associated repeated and prolonged occupational overexposure to solvents with permanent brain and nervous system damage.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Gas under pressure, Skin Corrosion or Irritation, Serious eye damage or eye irritation

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2

**TOUGH TASK REMOVER (AEROSOL)**

**Section 2. Hazard Identification:**

- Signal Word: Warning

**GHS Hazard Statements**

- Causes serious eye irritation
- Causes skin irritation

**Section 3. Composition/Information on Ingredients**

**Hazardous Substances:**

- n-Butane
- C9-C11 Alcohols Ethoxylated
- Sodium Metasilicate

**Section 11. Toxicological Information**

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - EYE CONTACT: Causes Serious Eye Irritation
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - SKIN CONTACT: May cause skin irritation. Allergic reactions are possible.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INHALATION: Harmful if inhaled. High gas, vapor, mist or dust concentrations may be harmful if inhaled. Avoid breathing fumes, spray, vapors, or mist.

High vapor concentrations are irritating to the eyes, nose, throat and lungs. Prolonged or excessive inhalation may cause respiratory tract irritation.

- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - INGESTION: Harmful if swallowed.
- EFFECTS OF OVEREXPOSURE - CHRONIC HAZARDS: May cause central nervous system disorder (e.g., narcosis involving a loss of coordination, weakness, fatigue, mental confusion, and blurred vision) and/or damage. High concentrations may lead to central nervous system effects (drowsiness, dizziness, nausea, headaches, paralysis, and blurred vision) and/or damage. Reports have associated repeated and prolonged occupational overexposure to solvents with permanent brain and nervous system damage.
- PRIMARY ROUTE(S) OF ENTRY: Eye Contact, Ingestion, Inhalation, Skin Absorption, Skin Contact

**Section 15. Regulatory Information**

This product has been reviewed according to the EPA ‘Hazard Categories’ promulgated under Sections 311 and 312 of the Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) and is considered, under applicable definitions, to meet the following categories:

Gas under pressure, Skin Corrosion or Irritation, Serious eye damage or eye irritation

**Section 16. Other Information**

HMIS Health Hazard Rating: 2

**THE PRODUCTS VIOLATE THE FEDERAL HAZARDOUS SAFETY ACT**

39. The Federal Hazardous Substances Act (“FHSA”) (15 U.S.C. 1261, *et seq.*) provides “nationally uniform requirements for adequate cautionary labeling of packages of hazardous substances which are sold in interstate commerce and are intended or suitable for household use.” House Comm. On Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act, H.R. Rep. No. 1861, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. 2 (1960), reprinted in 1960 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2833, 2833.

40. The FHSA is administered by the Consumer Product Safety Commission (“CPSC”), in which Congress vested the authority to promulgate regulations. If a hazardous substance’s label fails to comply with the CPSC’s regulations, then that hazardous substance is “misbranded” in violation of the FHSA.

41. The FHSA requires that certain signal words, such as “CAUTION,” must be provided on a hazardous substance’s packaging or label, as well as an “affirmative statement of the principal hazard or hazards” such as “EYE AND SKIN IRRITANT.” *See* 16 C.F.R. § 1500.3(b)(14).

42. As relevant here, under the FHSA, the Products are deemed “hazardous substances.”

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 For this reason, the Products bear the statement “CAUTION: EYE AND SKIN IRRITANT” on the  
2 Products’ packaging and label.

3 43. Recognizing that other product labeling statements could detract from or dilute the  
4 warnings required by the FHSA, the CPSC promulgated 16 C.F.R. § 1500.122, titled “Deceptive  
5 use of disclaimers.” This regulation states that a label may not feature “words, statements, designs,  
6 or other graphic materials that in any manner negates or disclaims any of the label statements  
7 required by the act.” *Id.* “[F]or example, the statement ‘Harmless’ or ‘Safe around pets’ on a toxic  
8 or irritant substance.” *Id.*

9 44. Here, the Products’ “NON-TOXIC” label violates 16 C.F.R. § 1500.122, because it  
10 “negates or disclaims” the “CAUTION: EYE AND SKIN IRRITANT” label, which is “required by  
11 the act.” *Id.* According, the Products are misbranded in violation of the FHSA.

12  
13 **PLAINTIFF AND REASONABLE CONSUMERS WERE MISLED BY THE PRODUCTS**

14 45. Labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY” when they can  
15 cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment is wholly misleading and deceptive.

16 46. By misleadingly and deceptively labeling the Products, as described herein,  
17 Defendant sought to take advantage of consumers’ desire for true non-toxic, safe cleaning products.  
18 Defendant has done so at the expense of unwitting consumers—many of whom seek to protect their  
19 household members and pets—and Defendant’s lawfully acting competitors, over whom Defendant  
20 has an unfair competitive advantage.

21 47. The “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY” representations were and are  
22 material to reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff, in making purchasing decisions.

23 48. Plaintiff relied on Defendant’s misrepresentations, described herein, in making the  
24 decision to purchase the Products.

25 49. At the time Plaintiff purchased the Products, Plaintiff did not know, and had no reason  
26 to know, that the Products’ labeling and advertising were false, misleading, deceptive, and unlawful  
27 as set forth herein.

28 50. Defendant materially misled and failed to adequately inform reasonable consumers,



1 including Plaintiff, that the Products can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment.

2 51. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Products if he had known the truth.  
3 Accordingly, based on Defendant’s material misrepresentations and omissions, reasonable  
4 consumers, including Plaintiff, purchased the Products to their detriment.

5 52. It is possible, however, that Plaintiff would purchase the Products in the future if they  
6 were properly labeled, and/or the Products complied with the labeling and advertising statements.  
7 Specifically, Plaintiff would like to purchase the Products again if the Products no longer posed a  
8 risk of harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment.

9  
10 **THE PRODUCTS ARE SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR**

11 53. Plaintiff Anthony Bush purchased Krud Kutter Original Cleaner & Degreaser  
12 (Aerosol) and Krud Kutter Tough Task Remover. The additional Products, Krud Kutter Adhesive  
13 Remover; Krud Kutter Instant Carpet Stain Remover Plus Deodorizer; Krud Kutter Original Cleaner  
14 & Degreaser; Krud Kutter Sports Cleaner/Stain Remover; Krud Kutter Gutter & Exterior Metal  
15 Cleaner; Krud Kutter Kitchen Degreaser & All Purpose Cleaner; Krud Kutter Heavy Traffic Carpet  
16 Cleaner; Krud Kutter Deck & Fence Wash; Krud Kutter Multi-Purpose House Wash; Krud Kutter  
17 Window Wash; Krud Kutter Parts Washer Cleaner/Degreaser; Krud Kutter Driveway Cleaner &  
18 Degreaser; and Krud Kutter Tough Task Remover (Aerosol) are substantially similar to the Products  
19 purchased by Plaintiff. All Products are cleaning products sold by Defendant. All Products are sold  
20 under the Krud Kutter brand. All Products are sold to consumers as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH  
21 FRIENDLY” products. All Products are labeled with the same “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH  
22 FRIENDLY” claims. All Products contain overlapping ingredients and/or various combinations of  
23 the same ingredients. All Products can harm humans, animals, and/or the environment. And the  
24 misleading effect of the Products’ labels is the same for all Products.

25 ///

26  
27 ///

**CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

1  
2 54. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil  
3 Procedure 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and as  
4 members of the Classes defined as follows:

5 All residents of the United States who, within the applicable statute of limitations  
6 periods, purchased the Products (“Nationwide Class”); and

7 All residents of California who, within four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,  
8 purchased the Products (“California Subclass”).

9 (“Nationwide Class” and “California Subclass,” collectively, “Class”).

10 55. Excluded from the Class are: (i) Defendant, its assigns, successors, and legal  
11 representatives; (ii) any entities in which Defendant has controlling interests; (iii) federal, state,  
12 and/or local governments, including, but not limited to, their departments, agencies, divisions,  
13 bureaus, boards, sections, groups, counsels, and/or subdivisions; (iv) all persons presently in  
14 bankruptcy proceedings or who obtained a bankruptcy discharge in the last three years; and (v) any  
15 judicial officer presiding over this matter and person within the third degree of consanguinity to  
16 such judicial officer.

17 56. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or otherwise alter the class definitions presented  
18 to the Court at the appropriate time in response to facts learned through discovery, legal arguments  
19 advanced by Defendant, or otherwise.

20 57. This action is properly maintainable as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
21 Procedure 23 for the reasons set forth below.

22 58. **Numerosity:** Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is  
23 impracticable. Upon information and belief, the Nationwide Class consists of tens of thousands of  
24 purchasers (if not more) dispersed throughout the United States, and the California Subclass  
25 likewise consists of thousands of purchasers (if not more) dispersed throughout the State of  
26 California. Accordingly, it would be impracticable to join all members of the Class before the Court.

1           59.   **Common Questions Predominate:** There are numerous and substantial questions of  
2 law or fact common to all members of the Class that predominate over any individual issues.

3 Included within the common questions of law or fact are:

- 4           a.    Whether Defendant engaged in unlawful, unfair or deceptive business practices by  
5                advertising and selling the Products;
- 6           b.    Whether Defendant’s conduct of advertising and selling the Products as non-toxic and  
7                earth friendly when they are not constitutes an unfair method of competition, or unfair  
8                or deceptive act or practice, in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 9           c.    Whether Defendant used deceptive representations in connection with the sale of the  
10             Products in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 11          d.    Whether Defendant represented the Products have characteristics or quantities that  
12             they do not have in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 13          e.    Whether Defendant advertised the Products with intent not to sell them as advertised  
14             in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 15          f.    Whether Defendant’s labeling and advertising of the Products are untrue or  
16             misleading in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500, *et seq.*;
- 17          g.    Whether Defendant knew or by the exercise of reasonable care should have known its  
18             labeling and advertising was and is untrue or misleading in violation of Business and  
19             Professions Code section 17500, *et seq.*;
- 20          h.    Whether Defendant’s conduct is an unfair business practice within the meaning of  
21             Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 22          i.    Whether Defendant’s conduct is a fraudulent business practice within the meaning of  
23             Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 24          j.    Whether Defendant’s conduct is an unlawful business practice within the meaning of  
25             Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 26          k.    Whether Defendant’s advertising and labeling of the Products constitute misleading  
27             environmental marketing claims in violation of California Business and Professions  
28             Code Section 17580.5;

- 1 l. Whether Defendant’s advertising and labeling of the Products violates the Federal
- 2 Hazardous Substances Act, 15 U.S.C. 1261, *et seq.*;
- 3 m. Whether Plaintiff and the Class paid more money for the Products than they actually
- 4 received;
- 5 n. How much money Plaintiff and the Class paid for the Products than they actually
- 6 received;
- 7 o. Whether Defendant’s conduct constitutes breach of express warranty;
- 8 p. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to equitable and/or injunctive relief;
- 9 q. Whether Defendant was unjustly enriched by its unlawful conduct;
- 10 r. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages as a result of Defendant’s
- 11 unlawful conduct; and
- 12 s. The proper measure of damages sustained by Plaintiff and Class Members.

13 60. **Typicality:** Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the Class Members he seeks  
14 to represent because Plaintiff, like the Class Members, purchased Defendant’s misleading and  
15 deceptive Products. Defendant’s unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent actions concern the same  
16 business practices described herein irrespective of where they occurred or were experienced.  
17 Plaintiff and the Class sustained similar injuries arising out of Defendant’s conduct. Plaintiff’s and  
18 Class Members’ claims arise from the same practices and course of conduct and are based on the  
19 same legal theories.

20 61. **Adequacy:** Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class he seeks to represent  
21 because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class Members Plaintiff seeks to  
22 represent. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect Class Members’ interests and has retained  
23 counsel experienced and competent in the prosecution of complex class actions, including complex  
24 questions that arise in consumer protection litigation.

25 62. **Superiority and Substantial Benefit:** A class action is superior to other methods for  
26 the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual joinder of all members of the  
27 Class is impracticable and no other group method of adjudication of all claims asserted herein is  
28 more efficient and manageable for at least the following reasons:

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- a. The claims presented in this case predominate over any questions of law or fact, if any exist at all, affecting any individual member of the Class;
- b. Absent a Class, the members of the Class will continue to suffer damage and Defendant’s unlawful conduct will continue without remedy while Defendant profits from and enjoys its ill-gotten gains;
- c. Given the size of individual Class Members’ claims, few, if any, Class Members could afford to or would seek legal redress individually for the wrongs Defendant committed against them, and absent Class Members have no substantial interest in individually controlling the prosecution of individual actions;
- d. When the liability of Defendant has been adjudicated, claims of all members of the Class can be administered efficiently and/or determined uniformly by the Court; and
- e. This action presents no difficulty that would impede its management by the Court as a class action, which is the best available means by which Plaintiff and Class Members can seek redress for the harm caused to them by Defendant.

63. Because Plaintiff seeks relief for all members of the Class, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.

64. The prerequisites to maintaining a class action for injunctive or equitable relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) are met as Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive or equitable relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

65. Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s counsel are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

**COUNT ONE**

**Unfair and Unlawful Business Acts and Practices**

**(Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.)**

***(On Behalf of the California Subclass)***

66. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

67. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17200, et seq., on behalf of Plaintiff and a California Subclass consisting of all persons residing in

1 the State of California who purchased the Products for personal use and not for resale during the  
2 time period of four years prior to the filing of the complaint through the present.

3 68. Defendant, in its advertising and packaging of the Products, made false and  
4 misleading statements and fraudulent omissions regarding the quality and characteristics of the  
5 Products, specifically, labeling the Products “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY” when they  
6 can harm humans, animals, and/or the environment. Such claims and omissions appear on the label  
7 and packaging of the Products, which are sold at retail stores, point-of-purchase displays, as well as  
8 Defendant’s official website, and other retailers’ advertisements that have adopted Defendant’s  
9 advertisements.

10 69. Defendant’s labeling and advertising of the Products led to, and continues to lead to,  
11 reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff, believing that the Products are non-toxic and earth  
12 friendly.

13 70. Defendant does not have any reasonable basis for the claims about the Products made  
14 in Defendant’s advertising and on Defendant’s packaging or labeling because the Products can  
15 cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment. Defendant knew and knows that the  
16 Products are not “NON-TOXIC” or “EARTH FRIENDLY,” though Defendant intentionally  
17 advertised and marketed the Products to deceive reasonable consumers into believing that Products  
18 were “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”

19 71. The misrepresentations by Defendant alleged herein constitute unfair, unlawful, and  
20 fraudulent business practices within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code  
21 Section 17200.

22 72. In addition, Defendant’s use of various forms of advertising media to advertise, call  
23 attention to, or give publicity to the sale of goods or merchandise that are not as represented in any  
24 manner constitutes unfair competition, unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising, and an  
25 unlawful business practice within the meaning of Business and Professions Code Sections 17200  
26 and 17531, which advertisements have deceived and are likely to deceive the consuming public, in  
27 violation of Business and Professions Code Section 17200.

28 73. Defendant failed to avail itself of reasonably available, lawful alternatives to further

1 its legitimate business interests.

2 74. All of the conduct alleged herein occurs and continues to occur in Defendant's  
3 business. Defendant's wrongful conduct is part of a pattern, practice and/or generalized course of  
4 conduct, which will continue on a daily basis until Defendant voluntarily alters its conduct or it is  
5 otherwise ordered to do so.

6 75. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17203 and 17535, Plaintiff and  
7 the members of the California Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from  
8 continuing to engage, use, or employ its practice of labeling and advertising the sale and use of the  
9 Products. Likewise, Plaintiff and the members of the California Subclass seek an order requiring  
10 Defendant to disclose such misrepresentations, and to preclude Defendant's failure to disclose the  
11 existence and significance of said misrepresentations. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.  
12 Without equitable relief, Defendant's unlawful, fraudulent, and unfair practices will continue to  
13 harm Plaintiff and the California Subclass. Plaintiff also seeks restitution of the amounts Defendant  
14 acquired through the unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices described herein.

15 76. Plaintiff and the California Subclass have suffered injury in fact and have lost money  
16 or property as a result of and in reliance upon Defendant's false representations.

17 77. Plaintiff and the California Subclass would not have purchased the Products but for  
18 the representations by Defendant about the Products as being "NON-TOXIC" and "EARTH  
19 FRIENDLY."

20 78. The UCL prohibits unfair competition and provides, in pertinent part, that "unfair  
21 competition shall mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair,  
22 deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising." Cal. Bus & Prof. Code § 17200.

23 **A. "Unfair" Prong**

24 79. Under California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code Section 17200,  
25 *et seq.*, a challenged activity is "unfair" when "any injury it causes outweighs any benefits provided  
26 to consumers and the injury is one that the consumers themselves could not reasonably avoid."  
27 *Camacho v. Auto Club of Southern California*, 142 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1403 (2006).

28 80. Defendant's action of labeling the Products as "NON-TOXIC" and "EARTH



1 FRIENDLY” when they can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment does not  
2 confer any benefit to consumers.

3 81. Defendant’s action of labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH  
4 FRIENDLY” when they can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment causes injuries  
5 to consumers, who do not receive products commensurate with their reasonable expectations.

6 82. Defendant’s action of labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH  
7 FRIENDLY” when they can cause harm to humans, animals, and the environment causes injuries  
8 to consumers, who end up overpaying for the Products and receiving Products of lesser standards  
9 than what they reasonably expected to receive.

10 83. Consumers cannot avoid any of the injuries caused by Defendant’s deceptive labeling  
11 and advertising of the Products.

12 84. Accordingly, the injuries caused by Defendant’s deceptive labeling and advertising  
13 outweigh any benefits.

14 85. Some courts conduct a balancing test to decide if a challenged activity amounts to  
15 unfair conduct under California Business and Professions Code Section 17200. They “weigh the  
16 utility of the defendant’s conduct against the gravity of the harm to the alleged victim.” *Davis v.*  
17 *HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A.*, 691 F.3d 1152, 1169 (9th Cir. 2012).

18 86. Here, Defendant’s conduct of labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH  
19 FRIENDLY” when they can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment has no utility  
20 and financially harms purchasers. Thus, the utility of Defendant’s conduct is vastly outweighed by  
21 the gravity of harm.

22 87. Some courts require that “unfairness must be tethered to some legislative declared  
23 policy or proof of some actual or threatened impact on competition.” *Lozano v. AT&T Wireless*  
24 *Servs. Inc.*, 504 F. 3d 718, 735 (9th Cir. 2007).

25 88. Defendant’s labeling and advertising of the Products, as alleged herein, is false,  
26 deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable, and constitutes unfair conduct.

27 89. Defendant knew or should have known of its unfair conduct.

28 90. As alleged herein, the misrepresentations by Defendant constitute an unfair business

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 practice within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code Section 17200.

2 91. There existed reasonably available alternatives to further Defendant’s legitimate  
3 business interests, other than the conduct described herein. Defendant could have refrained from  
4 labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”

5 92. All of the conduct alleged herein occurs and continues to occur in Defendant’s  
6 business. Defendant’s wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of conduct  
7 repeated on thousands of occasions daily.

8 93. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17203, Plaintiff and the  
9 California Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage, use,  
10 or employ its practice of labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”  
11 Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Without equitable relief, Defendant’s unlawful, fraudulent,  
12 and unfair practices will continue to harm Plaintiff and the California Subclass. Plaintiff also seeks  
13 restitution of the amount Defendant acquired through the unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business  
14 practices described herein.

15 94. Plaintiff and the California Subclass have suffered injury in fact and have lost money  
16 as a result of Defendant’s unfair conduct. Plaintiff and the California Subclass paid an unwarranted  
17 premium for these Products. Specifically, Plaintiff and the California Subclass paid for Products  
18 that can harm humans, animals, and/or the environment. Plaintiff and the California Subclass would  
19 not have purchased the Products, or would have paid substantially less for the Products, if they had  
20 known that the Products’ advertising and labeling were deceptive.

21 **B. “Fraudulent” Prong**

22 95. California Business and Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq.*, considers conduct  
23 fraudulent (and prohibits said conduct) if it is likely to deceive members of the public. *Bank of the*  
24 *West v. Superior Court*, 2 Cal. 4th 1254, 1267 (1992).

25 96. Defendant’s conduct of labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH  
26 FRIENDLY” when they can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment is likely to  
27 deceive members of the public.

28 97. Defendant’s labeling and advertising of the Products, as alleged in the preceding

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1 paragraphs, is false, deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable, and constitutes fraudulent conduct.

2 98. Defendant knew or should have known of its fraudulent conduct.

3 99. As alleged in the preceding paragraphs, the misrepresentations by Defendant detailed  
4 above constitute a fraudulent business practice in violation of California Business & Professions  
5 Code Section 17200.

6 100. Defendant had reasonably available alternatives to further its legitimate business  
7 interests, other than the conduct described herein. Defendant could have refrained from labeling the  
8 Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”

9 101. All of the conduct alleged herein occurs and continues to occur in Defendant’s  
10 business. Defendant’s wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of conduct  
11 repeated on thousands of occasions daily.

12 102. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 17203, Plaintiff and the  
13 California Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage, use,  
14 or employ their practice of labeling the Products as “NON-TOXIC” and “EARTH FRIENDLY.”  
15 Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Without equitable relief, Defendant’s unlawful, fraudulent,  
16 and unfair practices will continue to harm Plaintiff and the California Subclass. Plaintiff also seeks  
17 restitution of the amounts Defendant acquired through the unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business  
18 practices described herein.

19 103. Plaintiff and the California Subclass have suffered injury in fact and have lost money  
20 as a result of Defendant’s fraudulent conduct. Plaintiff paid an unwarranted premium for the  
21 Products. Specifically, Plaintiff and the California Subclass paid for products that they believed  
22 were non-toxic when, in fact, they can cause harm to humans, animals, and/or the environment.  
23 Plaintiff and the California Subclass would not have purchased the Products if they had known that  
24 they were neither non-toxic nor earth friendly.

25 **C. “Unlawful” Prong**

26 104. California Business and Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq.*, identifies violations  
27 of other laws as “unlawful practices that the unfair competition law makes independently  
28 actionable.” *Velazquez v. GMAC Mortg. Corp.*, 605 F. Supp. 2d 1049, 1068 (C.D. Cal. 2008).

1           105. Here, Defendant’s labeling of the Products, as alleged herein, violates the Federal  
2 Hazardous Substances Act, 15 U.S.C. 1261, *et seq.*

3           106. The FHSA provides “nationally uniform requirements for adequate cautionary  
4 labeling of packages of hazardous substances which are sold in interstate commerce and are  
5 intended or suitable for household use.” House Comm. On Interstate and Foreign Commerce,  
6 Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act, H.R. Rep. No. 1861, 86th Cong., 2d Sess. 2 (1960),  
7 reprinted in 1960 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2833, 2833.

8           107. The FHSA is administered by the Consumer Product Safety Commission (“CPSC”),  
9 in which Congress vested the authority to promulgate regulations. If a hazardous substance’s label  
10 fails to comply with the CPSC’s regulations, then that hazardous substance is “misbranded” in  
11 violation of the FHSA.

12           108. The FHSA requires that certain signal words, such as “CAUTION,” must be provided  
13 on a hazardous substance’s packaging or label, as well as an “affirmative statement of the principal  
14 hazard or hazards” such as “EYE AND SKIN IRRITANT.” *See* 16 C.F.R. § 1500.3(b)(14).

15           109. As relevant here, under the FHSA, the Products are deemed “hazardous substances.”  
16 For this reason, the Products bear the statement “CAUTION: EYE AND SKIN IRRITANT” on the  
17 Products’ packaging and label.

18           110. Recognizing that other product labeling statements could detract from or dilute the  
19 warnings required by the FHSA, the CPSC promulgated 16 C.F.R. § 1500.122, titled “Deceptive  
20 use of disclaimers.” This regulation states that a label may not feature “words, statements, designs,  
21 or other graphic materials that in any manner negates or disclaims any of the label statements  
22 required by the act.” *Id.* “[F]or example, the statement ‘Harmless’ or ‘Safe around pets’ on a toxic  
23 or irritant substance.” *Id.*

24           111. Here, the Products’ “NON-TOXIC” label violates 16 C.F.R. § 1500.122, because it  
25 “negates or disclaims” the “CAUTION: EYE AND SKIN IRRITANT” label, which is “required by  
26 the act.” *Id.* Accordingly, the Products are misbranded in violation of the FHSA.

27           112. Additionally, Defendant’s advertising of the Products, as alleged herein, violates  
28 California Civil Code Section 1750, *et seq.* and California Business and Professions Code Section

1 17500, *et seq.*

2 113. Defendant’s packaging, labeling, and advertising of the Products, as alleged herein,  
3 are false, deceptive, misleading, and unreasonable, and constitute unlawful conduct.

4 114. Defendant knew or should have known of its unlawful conduct.

5 115. As alleged herein, the misrepresentations by Defendant constitute an unlawful  
6 business practice within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code Section 17200.

7 116. Additionally, Defendant’s misrepresentations constitute violations of California  
8 Business and Professions Code Section 17580.5, which provides that it is “unlawful for any person  
9 to make any untruthful, deceptive, or misleading environmental marketing claim, whether explicit  
10 or implied.”

11 117. There were reasonably available alternatives to further Defendant’s legitimate  
12 business interests other than the conduct described herein.

13 118. All of the conduct alleged herein occurred and continues to occur in Defendant’s  
14 business. Defendant’s wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of conduct  
15 repeated on thousands of occasions daily.

16 119. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17203, Plaintiff and the California  
17 Subclass seek an order of this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing to engage, use, or employ  
18 its practice of false and deceptive advertising of the Products. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at  
19 law. Without equitable relief, Defendant’s unlawful, fraudulent, and unfair practices will continue  
20 to harm Plaintiff and the California Subclass. Plaintiff also seeks restitution of the amounts  
21 Defendant acquired through the unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices described  
22 herein.

23 120. Plaintiff and the California Subclass have suffered injury in fact and have lost money  
24 as a result of Defendant’s unlawful conduct. Plaintiff and the California Subclass paid an  
25 unwarranted premium for the Products. Plaintiff and the California Subclass would not have  
26 purchased the Products if they had known that Defendant purposely deceived consumers into  
27 believing that the Products are non-toxic, earth friendly cleaning products.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**COUNT TWO**

**Deceptive Advertising Practices**

**(California Business & Professions Code § 17500, *et seq.*)**

***(On Behalf of the California Subclass)***

121. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

122. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the California Subclass.

123. California Business & Professions Code § 17500 prohibits “unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising[.]”

124. Defendant violated § 17500 when it represented, through its false and misleading advertising and other express representations, that Defendant’s Products possessed characteristics and value that they did not actually have.

125. Defendant’s deceptive practices were specifically designed to induce reasonable consumers like Plaintiff to purchase the Products. Defendant’s uniform, material representations and omissions regarding the Products were likely to deceive, and Defendant knew or should have known that its uniform representations and omissions were untrue and misleading. Plaintiff purchased the Products in reliance on the representations made by Defendant, as alleged herein.

126. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass have been directly and proximately injured by Defendant’s conduct in ways including, but not limited to, the monies paid to Defendant for the Products that lacked the characteristics advertised, interest lost on those monies, and consumers’ unwitting support of a business enterprise that promotes deception and undue greed to the detriment of consumers, such as Plaintiff and Subclass members.

127. The above acts of Defendant, in disseminating materially misleading and deceptive representations and statements throughout California to consumers, including Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass, were and are likely to deceive reasonable consumers in violation of § 17500.

128. In making and disseminating the statements alleged herein, Defendant knew or should have known that the statements were untrue or misleading, and acted in violation of § 17500.

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069





1           139. Defendant violated Section 1770(a)(5) by representing that the Products have  
2 “characteristics, . . . uses [or] benefits . . . which [they] do not have” in that the Products are falsely  
3 labeled and advertised as being, among other things, non-toxic and earth friendly. Defendant knew  
4 that consumers will often pay more for products with this attribute and have unfairly profited from  
5 their false and misleading claims.

6           140. Similarly, Defendant violated section 1770(a)(7) by representing that the Products  
7 “are of a particular standard, quality, or grade . . . if they are of another” by falsely and deceptively  
8 labeling and advertising the Products as, among other things, non-toxic and earth friendly.

9           141. In addition, Defendant violated section 1770(a)(9) by advertising the Products “with  
10 intent not to sell them as advertised” in that the Products are falsely labeled and advertised as, among  
11 other things, being non-toxic and earth friendly.

12           142. Defendant’s uniform and material representations and omissions regarding the  
13 Products were likely to deceive, and Defendant knew or should have known that its representations  
14 and omissions were untrue and misleading.

15           143. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass could not have reasonably avoided  
16 such injury. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass were unaware of the existence of the  
17 facts that Defendant suppressed and failed to disclose; and Plaintiff and members of the California  
18 Subclass would not have purchased the Products and/or would have purchased them on different  
19 terms had they known the truth.

20           144. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass have been directly and proximately  
21 injured by Defendant’s conduct. Such injury includes, but is not limited to, the purchase price of  
22 the Products and/or the price of the Products at the prices at which they were offered.

23           145. Given that Defendant’s conduct violated § 1770(a), Plaintiff and members of the  
24 California Subclass are entitled to seek and seek injunctive relief to put an end to Defendant’s  
25 violations of the CLRA. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Without equitable relief,  
26 Defendant’s unfair and deceptive practices will continue to harm Plaintiff and the Class. Plaintiff  
27 also seeks restitution of the amounts Defendant acquired through the unfair and deceptive business  
28 practices described herein.

1 146. Moreover, Defendant’s conduct is malicious, fraudulent, and wanton in that  
2 Defendant intentionally misled and withheld material information from consumers to increase the  
3 sale of the Products.

4 147. On May 13, 2020, pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782(a), Plaintiff on his own  
5 behalf, and on behalf of members of the California Subclass, notified Defendant of the alleged  
6 violations of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act.

7 148. Plaintiff further requests that the Court enjoin Defendant from continuing to employ  
8 the unlawful methods, acts, and practices alleged herein pursuant to § 1780(a)(2). Plaintiff also  
9 seeks compensatory, monetary, restitutionary, and punitive damages in an amount to be determined  
10 at trial.

11 **COUNT FOUR**

12 **Breach of Express Warranty**

13 *(On Behalf of the Nationwide Class and California Subclass)*

14 149. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the  
15 preceding paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

16 150. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the Nationwide Class and  
17 California Subclass.

18 151. By advertising and selling the Products at issue, Defendant made promises and  
19 affirmations of fact on the Products’ packaging and labeling, and through its marketing and  
20 advertising, as described herein. This labeling and advertising constitutes express warranties and  
21 became part of the basis of the bargain between Plaintiff and members of the Class and Defendant.

22 152. Defendant purports, through the Products’ labeling and advertising, to create express  
23 warranties that the Products are, among other things, non-toxic and earth friendly.

24 153. Despite Defendant’s express warranties about the nature of the Products, the Products  
25 are not non-toxic and earth friendly, and the Products are, therefore, not what Defendant represented  
26 them to be.

27 154. Accordingly, Defendant breached express warranties about the Products and their  
28 qualities because the Products do not conform to Defendant’s affirmations and promises.

1 155. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s breach of express warranty, Plaintiff  
2 and members of the Class were harmed in the amount of the purchase price they paid for the  
3 Products. Further, Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered and continue to suffer economic  
4 losses and other damages including, but not limited to, the amounts paid for the Products, and any  
5 interest that would have accrued on those monies, in an amount to be proven at trial.

6 **COUNT FIVE**

7 **Unjust Enrichment**

8 *(On Behalf of the Nationwide Class and California Subclass)*

9 156. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of the preceding paragraphs as if fully  
10 set forth herein.

11 157. Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the Nationwide Class and  
12 California Subclass.

13 158. By purchasing the Products, Plaintiff and members of the Class conferred a benefit on  
14 Defendant in the form of the purchase price of the Products.

15 159. Defendant had knowledge of such benefit.

16 160. Defendant appreciated the benefit because, were consumers not to purchase the  
17 Products, Defendant would not generate revenue from the sales of the Products.

18 161. Defendant’s acceptance and retention of the benefit is inequitable and unjust because  
19 the benefit was obtained by Defendant’s fraudulent and misleading representations and omissions.  
20 Therefore, restitution and/or disgorgement of such economic enrichment is required.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, prays  
23 for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 24 a. For an order declaring that Defendant’s conduct violates the statutes and laws  
25 referenced herein;
- 26 b. For an order requiring Defendant to immediately cease and desist from selling the  
27 unlawful Products in violation of law; enjoining Defendant from continuing to market,  
28 advertise, distribute, and sell the Products in the unlawful manner described herein;  
and ordering Defendant to engage in corrective action;

- c. For an order awarding, as appropriate, compensatory and monetary damages, restitution or disgorgement to Plaintiff and the Class for all causes of action;
- d. For an order awarding punitive damages;
- e. For an order awarding attorneys' fees and costs;
- f. For an order awarding pre-and post-judgment interest; and
- g. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all causes of action.

Dated: August 24, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

**CLARKSON LAW FIRM**

By:




---

RYAN J. CLARKSON  
 SHIREEN M. CLARKSON  
 MATTHEW T. THERIAULT  
 LAUREN E. ANDERSON

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**MOON LAW APC**

By:




---

CHRISTOPHER D. MOON  
 KEVIN O. MOON

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 804  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28