

Clarkson Law Firm, P.C. | 22525 Pacific Coast Highway | Malibu, CA 90265

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)  
*relarkson@clarksonlawfirm.com*  
Bahar Sodaify (SBN 289730)  
*bsodaify@clarksonlawfirm.com*  
Alan Gudino (SBN 326738)  
*agudino@clarksonlawfirm.com*  
22525 Pacific Coast Highway  
Malibu, CA 90265  
Tel: (213) 788-4050  
Fax: (213) 788-4070

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Classes*

[Additional counsel listed on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

LINDA CHESLOW, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

S.C. JOHNSON & SON, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. VIOLATION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *ET SEQ.*)
2. VIOLATION OF FALSE ADVERTISING LAW (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17500, *ET SEQ.*)
3. VIOLATION OF CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT (CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1750, *ET SEQ.*)
4. UNJUST ENRICHMENT

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. JURISDICTION.....	9
III. VENUE.....	9
IV. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT.....	9
V. PARTIES .....	10
A. Plaintiff.....	10
B. Defendant.....	11
VI. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.....	12
A. The Avoidance of Microplastic Consumption is Material to Consumers.....	12
B. The Products Are Made of Polyethylene and Polypropylene Plastic and Consumers Are Intended, Directed and Instructed to Microwave and Freeze the Products .....	16
C. The Affirmative Misrepresentations and Material Omission Mislead Reasonable Consumers About the Products’ Integrity and Conceal the Material Risk.....	20
D. Plaintiff and Reasonable Consumers Were Misled by the Material Omission and “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” Misrepresentations When Purchasing the Products.....	21
E. The Products are Substantially Similar .....	25
F. No Adequate Remedy at Law .....	26
G. Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b) Allegations ( <i>Affirmative and By Omission</i> ) .....	28
VII. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS .....	29
VIII. CAUSES OF ACTION.....	32
COUNT ONE .....	32
COUNT TWO.....	41
COUNT THREE.....	43
COUNT FOUR.....	46
IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....	47

Clarkson Law Firm, P.C. | 22525 Pacific Coast Highway | Malibu, CA 90265

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

X. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL..... 48

1 **COMPLAINT**

2 1. Plaintiff Linda Cheslow (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly  
3 situated, as more fully described herein (the “Class” and “Class Members”), brings this class action  
4 complaint against Defendant S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc. (“Defendant” or “S.C. Johnson”), and alleges  
5 the following based upon information and belief, unless otherwise expressly stated as based upon  
6 personal knowledge.

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 2. **Overview.** Defendant affirmatively markets its Ziploc bags and containers (the  
9 “Products”) as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use, creating the reasonable impression  
10 that they are fit for use in the microwave and freezer. In reality, these Products are made from  
11 polyethylene and polypropylene—materials that scientific and medical evidence shows release  
12 microplastics when microwaved and frozen—making them fundamentally unfit for microwave and  
13 freezer use. Relying on Defendant’s false misrepresentations, individuals have unwittingly exposed  
14 themselves and their families to undisclosed microplastics during routine kitchen practices.  
15 Defendant has compromised its Products’ integrity for profit and to gain an unfair competitive edge  
16 in the marketplace.

17 3. **Material Risk and Material Omission.** Defendant fails to inform consumers that  
18 when the Products are heated in a microwave or frozen as intended, directed and instructed for  
19 ordinary use, they release microplastics that are then leached into consumers’ food contained therein  
20 (“Material Omission”). The Material Omission is meaningful to consumers as studies show that the  
21 ingestion of microplastics poses serious health risks, including potential harm to the digestive tract,  
22 immune system and reproductive system. The Material Omission leads reasonable consumers to  
23 believe that the Products do not pose a risk of microplastic exposure and contamination of their  
24 food, which in turn creates a false sense of security. Defendant fails to provide any warning to  
25 consumers regarding the release of microplastics when the Products are used as intended, directed  
26 and instructed, despite its knowledge of this fact. Defendant has thus breached its legal obligations  
27 to consumers by failing to disclose clearly and conspicuously on the Products’ front packaging and  
28

1 labeling that the Products leach microplastics into consumers' food through the ordinary use of the  
2 Products—namely microwaving and freezing (the “Material Risk”).

3       4.     **Consumer Expectation of Products in the Marketplace.** Consumers have a  
4 reasonable expectation that products sold in the marketplace are fit for their intended and marketed  
5 use. They trust that if a product is available for purchase, it does not pose risks that are known to  
6 the manufacturer, but undisclosed to the consuming public. Consumers further rely on  
7 manufacturers to provide clear warnings if a product fails to meet this basic expectation. They expect  
8 manufacturers to exercise diligence in ensuring that their products do not present a risk of  
9 microplastics leaching into consumers' food or, at a minimum, to provide clear warnings when  
10 products present such a risk. This expectation is especially heightened when the products are  
11 intended for use in common household practices such as food storage and preparation like  
12 microwave and freezer use. Defendant exploits these consumer expectations by failing to disclose  
13 the Material Risk—that its Products release microplastics that are then leached into consumers' food  
14 when microwaved and frozen—thereby misleading consumers into believing that the Products are  
15 free from such risk.

16       5.     **Food Storage Products are Inherently Represented as, and Expected to be, Fit  
17 for Marketed Use.** Consumers rightfully expect that products designed for food storage and  
18 marketed as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use, are free from the risk of leaching  
19 microplastics into their food through ordinary use as intended, directed and instructed. This  
20 expectation is reasonable, as consumers rely on such products to safely store, microwave and freeze  
21 the food they and their families consume. Ensuring that food storage products protect the integrity  
22 of the food contained inside is a top concern when making purchasing decisions, and consumers  
23 reasonably expect manufacturers to warn them if a product presents the risk of microplastic  
24 exposure through normal use as intended, directed and instructed. Consumers place further trust in  
25 the Products because Defendant's Ziploc brand is widely recognized and reasonably conveys to  
26 consumers that the Products are industry-leading and thus do not pose the Material Risk. The  
27 Products, however, fail to meet this standard by leaching microplastics into food when microwaved  
28 and frozen as intended, directed and instructed for ordinary use. As a result, the Products fail to

1 meet consumers' reasonable expectation that they are fit for their marketed use and free from the  
2 Material Risk.

3         **6. The "Microwave Safe" and "Freezer" Misrepresentations Further Consumer**  
4 **Deception and Lull Consumers into a False Sense of Security.** In addition to the reasonable  
5 expectation that food storage products are fit for their marketed use and do not present the Material  
6 Risk in common kitchen practices, consumers are further deceived and misled by Defendant's  
7 "Microwave Safe" and "Freezer" misrepresentations prominently displayed on the Products' labels.

8         7. The "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation conveys to consumers that the Products can  
9 be heated in a microwave without posing the Material Risk. However, despite this claim, the  
10 Products leach microplastics into food when microwaved as intended, directed and instructed. In  
11 fact, microwave heating causes the highest microplastic release from plastic food containers made  
12 of polyethylene and polypropylene in daily usage scenarios. Some products release as many as 4.22  
13 million microplastic and 2.11 billion nanoplastic particles from *only one square centimeter* of plastic  
14 area within three minutes of microwave heating. These microplastics can negatively impact the  
15 digestive system, immune system and reproductive system, and pose other serious health risks.

16         8. The "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation creates a false sense of security regarding  
17 the Products' quality and misleads consumers to believe the Products are free from the Material  
18 Risk. Reasonable consumers interpret the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation to mean that the  
19 Products are designed for microwave use and will not release microplastics that are then leached  
20 into consumers' food. By making the affirmative misrepresentation that the Products are  
21 "Microwave Safe," while simultaneously failing to disclose the Material Risk, Defendant deceives  
22 consumers into falsely believing that the Products pose no risk of undisclosed microplastic  
23 exposure.

24         9. Similarly, the "Freezer" misrepresentation gives consumers the misleading  
25 impression that the Products can store food at low temperatures without posing the Material Risk.  
26 However, freezing temperatures can alter the physical properties of plastic, making it brittle and  
27 more prone to fragmentation. This weakened structure increases Products' susceptibility to further  
28 degradation, especially when subjected to reheating in a microwave. Studies show that even under

1 refrigeration or room temperature—without any external stress like microwaving—polyethylene  
2 and polypropylene products, like the Products at issue here, release thousands of microplastics and  
3 millions of nanoplastics per square centimeter of surface area. Freezing exacerbates this issue, and  
4 when combined with reheating—particularly microwaving, which has been shown to release the  
5 highest levels of microplastics—these risks are further amplified.

6 10. Given that Defendant markets the Products as reusable, it is foreseeable that the  
7 Products may undergo multiple freeze-thaw and reheat cycles. The “Freezer” misrepresentation thus  
8 falsely conveys that the Products are fit for such use, leading consumers to believe they do not  
9 present the Material Risk. Reasonable consumers interpret this misrepresentation to mean the  
10 Products are fit to store food in a freezer for extended periods without the risk of microplastics  
11 leaching into the food contained inside. It is also foreseeable that consumers may use the same  
12 “Freezer” Products to reheat food in a microwave, especially since the packaging also includes the  
13 “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation. By affirmatively marketing the Products for freezer use—  
14 while failing to disclose the associated Material Risk—Defendant misleads consumers into  
15 believing the Products are free from such hazards, thereby putting consumers and their families at  
16 risk of microplastic exposure and consumption.

17 11. **The Deception of the “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” Misrepresentations and**  
18 **Material Omission in the Unlawful Advertising and Sale of the Products.** Defendant’s deceptive  
19 conduct misleads reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff, through both affirmative  
20 misrepresentations and Material Omission. Defendant affirmatively represents that the Products are  
21 “Microwave Safe,” and/or fit for the “Freezer,” leading consumers to believe they are fit to be  
22 microwaved and frozen without risk of microplastics leaching into their food. At the same time,  
23 Defendant omits material information that the Products release microplastics when microwaved and  
24 frozen as intended, directed and instructed. This dual deception misleads consumers into believing  
25 the Products are free of the Material Risk. Through false, misleading and deceptive labeling,  
26 advertising and marketing practices, Defendant exploits consumers’ reasonable expectations that  
27 the Products, marketed as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use, are fit to be microwaved  
28 and frozen without risk of microplastics leaching into their food. This deception causes consumers

1 to pay a premium for perceived quality and promised benefits that are not delivered. Defendant’s  
2 affirmative misrepresentations and Material Omission are therefore misleading and unlawful.

3 12. **The Products.** The Products at issue are Ziploc bags and containers sold to consumers  
4 in the United States and the state of California, that contain the “Microwave Safe,” “Freezer” and  
5 Material Omission on their labels and/or packaging, in all sizes, variations, packs, sets and bundles.  
6 The Products include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:


- 7 a. Ziploc Freezer Bags Pint/Small,
- 8 b. Freezer Bags Quart/Medium,
- 9 c. Freezer Bags Gallon/Large,
- 10 d. Ziploc Slider Freezer Bags Quart/Medium,
- 11 e. Ziploc Slider Freezer Gallon/Large Bags,
- 12 f. Ziploc Slider Storage Bags Quart/Medium,
- 13 g. Ziploc Slider Storage Bags Gallon/Large, and
- 14 h. Ziploc Container.

15 13. Below are fair and accurate depictions of front labels representative of each Product  
16 category, taken from Defendant’s official website or the website of authorized retailers, evidencing  
17 the Material Omission, “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” misrepresentations:

18 **Ziploc Freezer Bags**



Clarkson Law Firm, P.C. | 22525 Pacific Coast Highway | Malibu, CA 90265



Ziploc Slider Freezer Bags



Clarkson Law Firm, P.C. | 22525 Pacific Coast Highway | Malibu, CA 90265

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



Ziploc Slider Storage Bags



Ziploc Container



14. **Primary Dual Objectives.** Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of similarly situated consumers who purchased the Products during the relevant class period, with two primary objectives. First, Plaintiff seeks, on her individual behalf and on behalf of the Class/Subclass, a monetary recovery for the price premium paid for the Products because of Defendant’s “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation, “Freezer” misrepresentation and Material Omission. This recovery may include damages, restitution, disgorgement and any applicable penalties or punitive damages, as permitted by law. Second, Plaintiff seeks, on her individual behalf and on behalf of the Class/Subclass, injunctive relief to stop Defendant’s unlawful manufacture, advertising and sale of the Products with the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation, “Freezer”

1 misrepresentation and Material Omission. Such relief is necessary to prevent consumers from  
2 continuing to be misled into believing the Products are fit for such use and do not present the  
3 Material Risk. The requested injunctive relief may include one or more of the following: disclosure  
4 of the Material Omission on the Products' labels and/or packaging; disclosure of the Material  
5 Omission in the Products' advertising; modification of the Products so that they no longer pose a  
6 risk of the Material Risk; removal or modification to the "Microwave Safe" and the "Freezer"  
7 misrepresentations; and/or discontinuance of the Products' manufacture, marketing and/or sale.

## 8 **II. JURISDICTION**

9 15. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to the Class Action  
10 Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A), because the proposed Classes consist of 100 or  
11 more members; the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000.00, exclusive of costs and interest;  
12 and minimal diversity exists. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims  
13 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

14 16. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant operates,  
15 conducts and engages in substantial business in this judicial district, including, but not limited to,  
16 the promotion, sale, advertising and distribution of its Products, tortious acts committed in this state  
17 through its misrepresentations and omissions related to the sale, advertising and distribution of the  
18 Products, injury caused to persons within this state and a substantial portion of the actions giving  
19 rise to the claims took place in this state.

## 20 **III. VENUE**

21 17. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial  
22 part of the events and omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District.  
23 Specifically, Plaintiff Linda Cheslow, as detailed below, purchased the unlawful Products in this  
24 District, and Defendant has marketed, advertised and sold the Products within this District.

## 25 **IV. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT**

26 18. Pursuant to Local Rule 3-2(c) and (e), this action may be assigned to the San Francisco  
27 Division, as a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this  
28 Division.

1 **V. PARTIES**

2 **A. Plaintiff**

3 19. **Plaintiff Linda Cheslow.** The following is alleged based upon Plaintiff Linda  
4 Cheslow's personal knowledge:

- 5 a. **Residence.** Plaintiff is a resident of Santa Rosa, Sonoma County, in the state of  
6 California.
- 7 b. **Purchase Details.** In or around 2024, Plaintiff purchased Ziploc Seal Top Freezer  
8 Bag, Gallon, 38-count and Ziploc Seal Top Freezer Bag, Quart, 54-count in  
9 Sonoma County from a Costco store for approximately \$15.00 to \$20.00 for each  
10 (the "Purchased Products").
- 11 c. **Reliance on Material Omission and Misrepresentations.** When making her  
12 purchase, Plaintiff relied upon the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation, the  
13 "Freezer" misrepresentation and the Material Omission on the Products' labels or  
14 packaging. The affirmative misrepresentations and the Material Omission led her  
15 to believe that the Products were safe and suitable for microwave use and food  
16 storage in a freezer without posing the Material Risk.
- 17 d. **No Actual Knowledge of Falsity.** At the time of her purchase, Plaintiff was  
18 unaware that the Products posed the Material Risk—*i.e.*, that the Products could  
19 leach microplastics when used as intended, directed and instructed.
- 20 e. **No Notice of Contradictions.** Plaintiff did not observe any disclaimer, qualifier  
21 or other explanatory statement or information on the Products' labels or packaging  
22 that disclosed or suggested that the Products leach microplastics when  
23 microwaved or frozen as intended, directed and instructed.
- 24 f. **Causation/Damages.** But for the Material Omission and misrepresentations—  
25 *i.e.*, that the Products carry a substantial risk of releasing microplastics when  
26 microwaved or frozen during ordinary use—Plaintiff would not have purchased  
27 the Products or would not have paid as much for them.
- 28 g. **Desire to Repurchase.** Plaintiff regularly visits stores where Defendant's  
Products are sold, continues to see the Products available for purchase and intends  
to purchase the Products again in the future if she can be sure that the Products are  
fit for their central purpose (*i.e.*, if the Products did not pose the Material Risk).  
But absent injunctive relief, Plaintiff cannot now or in the future rely on the  
Products' labels because she cannot know whether they remain deceptive, and she  
may reasonably, but incorrectly, assume the Products were improved or otherwise  
changed to be as marketed and compatible with their central food storage purpose.  
Plaintiff is an average consumer who is not sophisticated in her knowledge of  
plastic composition or in the manufacturing, composition and formulation of food  
storage products, like the Products. An injunction requiring disclosure of the  
Material Risk and removal of the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation and the  
"Freezer" misrepresentation unless the Material Risk was eliminated or otherwise  
prohibiting use of a materially false and misleading labels would enable Plaintiff  
to rely confidently on the labels in making her future purchase decisions. Absent  
injunctive relief, Plaintiff and other reasonable consumers would have no way of  
assessing the fitness of the Products based solely on their packaging, which does  
not disclose the Material Risk.

1           20.   **Plaintiff's Future Harm.** Defendant continues to market and sell the Products with  
2 both the affirmative misrepresentations and Material Omission, creating an ongoing harm to  
3 consumers. As average consumers without specialized knowledge of microplastic composition,  
4 including the properties of polyethylene and polypropylene used in the Products, Plaintiff is  
5 particularly vulnerable to this deceptive practice. Despite Plaintiff's desire to purchase the Products  
6 again, there is a substantial risk of future injury due to Plaintiff's reasonable, but incorrect, belief  
7 that the Products are fit for their intended purpose and do not present a risk of microplastic leaching  
8 into her and her family's food when microwaved and/or frozen. Given Defendant's continued  
9 marketing of the Products as "Microwave Safe" and suitable for the "Freezer," without disclosing  
10 the risk of microplastic contamination, Plaintiff is likely to believe that the Products have been  
11 reformulated to address the Material Risk. This mistaken belief, reinforced by Defendant's ongoing  
12 misrepresentations and Material Omission, would lead Plaintiff to purchase the Products again,  
13 exposing her to the same harm she initially experienced. Plaintiff's lack of expertise in plastic  
14 composition prevents her from independently verifying whether the Products have been modified  
15 to eliminate the risk of microplastic leaching. As a result, Plaintiff and other reasonable consumers  
16 continue to be deprived of the ability to make fully informed purchasing decisions regarding the  
17 Products, despite their desire to purchase them again. Without injunctive relief, consumers have no  
18 way of assessing the Products' Material Risk when microwaved and/or frozen based on the  
19 packaging. The Products do not clearly disclose their material composition, and even if they did,  
20 consumers would still be unable to determine whether those materials release microplastics when  
21 used as intended, directed and instructed.

22           **B.    Defendant**

23           21.   **Defendant SC Johnson & Son, Inc.** is a corporation organized under the laws of  
24 Wisconsin with its principal place of business in Racine, Wisconsin. Defendant was and is doing  
25 business in the state of California at all relevant times. Directly and through its agents, Defendant  
26 has substantial contacts with and receives substantial benefits and income from and through the state  
27 of California. Defendant is the owner, manufacturer and/or distributor of the Ziploc Products at  
28 issue. Defendant and its agents promoted, advertised, marketed and sold the Products throughout

1 the United States, including the state of California. The unfair, unlawful, deceptive and misleading  
 2 “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation, “Freezer” misrepresentation and the Material Omission on  
 3 the Products’ labeling and packaging were prepared, authorized, ratified and/or approved by  
 4 Defendant and its agents to deceive and mislead consumers in the state of California into purchasing  
 5 the Products. Additionally, Defendant knew of the falsity of the “Microwave Safe”  
 6 misrepresentation, the “Freezer” misrepresentation and the Material Omission, but failed to disclose  
 7 them at the time Plaintiff and all Class Members purchased the Products, notwithstanding its duty  
 8 to do so. Further, Defendant had the right and authority, at all relevant times, to disclose the Material  
 9 Omission and clarify the “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” misrepresentations, including the time  
 10 leading up to and through the incident giving rise to the claims asserted herein, including Plaintiff’s  
 11 purchases described above, in addition to all Class Members’ purchases.

## 12 **VI. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

### 13 **A. The Avoidance of Microplastic Consumption is Material to Consumers**

14 22. Microplastics are small plastic particles less than 5 millimeters in diameter that form  
 15 when solid plastics break down through abrasion, degradation or chemical processes such as  
 16 exposure to heat.<sup>1</sup> These tiny particles pose a risk of significant adverse effects on human health.<sup>2</sup>  
 17 Studies show that microplastics alter the composition of gut microbiota, which play a crucial role  
 18 in digestion, nutrient absorption and immune system development.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, microplastics  
 19 “produc[e] a toxic effect on the digestive tract,” that causes irreversible changes in the reproductive  
 20  
 21

22  
 23 <sup>1</sup> See Sumon Sarkar, Hanin Diab & Jonthan Thompson, *Microplastic Pollution: Chemical Characterization and Impact on Wildlife*, 20(3) Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 1745 (2023).

24 <sup>2</sup> See Raffaele Marfella et al., *Microplastics and Nanoplastics in Atheromas and Cardiovascular Events*, 390 NEW ENGLAND J. MED. 900–910 (Mar. 6, 2024), <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2309822> (concluding that “patients with carotid artery plaque in which [microplastics and nanoplastics (MNPs)] were detected had a higher risk of a composite of myocardial infarction, stroke, or death from any cause at 34 months of follow-up than those in whom MNPs were not detected”).

25 <sup>3</sup> See Alba Tamargo et al., *PET Microplastics Affect Human Gut Microbiota Communities During Simulated Gastrointestinal Digestion, First Evidence of Plausible Polymer Biodegradation During Human Digestion*, 12 SCI. REPS. 528 (Jan. 11, 2022), <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-04489-w> (“The work presented here indicates that microplastics are indeed capable of digestive-level health effects.”).

1 axis and central nervous system of offspring after prenatal and neonatal exposure, affect the immune  
2 system due to their physicochemical properties and can cause chronic pulmonary disease.<sup>4</sup>

3 23. Even *in vitro* experiments using human cells and *in vivo* studies conducted on mice  
4 indicate that microplastics can trigger a range of adverse health effects. These include inflammation,  
5 oxidative stress resulting from increased production of reactive oxygen species, disturbances in lipid  
6 metabolism, imbalances in the gut microbiota and neurotoxicity.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, microplastic  
7 exposure in laboratory animals is linked to immunological responses, endocrine disruption and  
8 alterations in energy metabolism.<sup>6</sup>

9 24. Microplastics have been found in blood, saliva, liver, kidneys and even the placenta,  
10 which highlights their ability to translocate within the body.<sup>7</sup> Notably, nanoplastics, the smallest  
11 fraction of these pollutants, are able to enter cells and even penetrate the cell nucleus, which raises  
12 concerns about potential intracellular damage.<sup>8</sup> Research suggests associations between  
13 microplastic exposure and the risk of serious health issues such as cancer, reproductive problems,  
14 lung and liver effects and disruptions in hormone metabolism.<sup>9</sup>

15 25. Given that the Products are intended and advertised to be used by families on a daily  
16 basis, they pose serious safety risks, not only to the adult members, but also children. Therefore,  
17 there is little wonder that scientists studying microplastics emphasize that “enacting solid legislative  
18 laws and policies to manage the excessive use of plastic products is crucial; otherwise, the health of  
19 ecosystems and living organisms will inevitably deteriorate in the coming years. [...] We feel that

20  
21  
22 <sup>4</sup> Nur Hanisah Amran et al., *Exposure to Microplastics During Early Developmental Stage: Review of Current Evidence*, 10 TOXICS 597 (Oct. 10, 2022), <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics10100597>.

23 <sup>5</sup> *In vitro* experiments with human gut microbiota reveal changes in bacterial composition, gut  
24 microbiota dysbiosis, and neurotoxicity, PUBMED CENTRAL (May 3, 2023),  
25 <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10151227/>.

26 <sup>6</sup> Junyi Wu et al., *Effects of Endocrine-Disrupting Chemicals on Gut Microbiota and Their Impact on Gut-Related Diseases*, FRONTIERS IN ENDOCRINOLOGY (Aug. 12, 2021),  
27 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fendo.2021.724989/full>.

28 <sup>7</sup> Andrew Thurston, *Microplastics Everywhere*, Harvard Med. Sch. Mag.,  
<https://magazine.hms.harvard.edu/articles/microplastics-everywhere> (last visited Mar. 21, 2025).

<sup>8</sup> *How Microplastics Get into the Food Chain*, World Econ. F.,  
<https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/02/how-microplastics-get-into-the-food-chain/> (last visited Mar. 21, 2025).

<sup>9</sup> Jiaqi Shi et al., *The Impact of Microplastic Exposure on Gastrointestinal Tract Cancers: A Comprehensive Review*, 16 Cancers 3703 (2024), <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/16/21/3703>.

1 the government and industries must exert the most significant effort to protect children from MPs  
 2 [microplastics] exposure. These procedures include avoiding plastic contact of children’s  
 3 meals[.]”<sup>10</sup>

4 26. Yet another study emphasized the risk of microplastic ingestion on cardiovascular  
 5 systems, finding that subjects with “carotid artery plaque in which microplastics were detected had  
 6 a higher risk of a composite myocardial infarction, stroke, or death from any cause.”<sup>11</sup>

7 27. Despite the clear scientific and medical opinions, Defendant actively conceals the  
 8 known risks associated with microplastic consumption, depriving consumers of the ability to make  
 9 informed choices about their health and well-being. The Products’ Material Omission, combined  
 10 with Defendant’s affirmative “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” representations, create a false sense  
 11 of certainty, leading consumers to believe that the Products are fit for microwaving and freezing  
 12 food and pose no risk of microplastics leaching into their food. In reality, consumers are  
 13 unknowingly consuming and exposing themselves and their families to leached microplastics,  
 14 which are linked to the risk of “irreversible changes in the reproductive axis and central nervous  
 15 system,” among other severe health risks.<sup>12</sup>

16 28. **The Products are Intended for Daily and Constant Use.** The Products at issue—  
 17 Ziploc storage containers and freezer bags—are not occasional-use items. They are essential  
 18 household products consumers rely upon to store, microwave, freeze and prepare food. Many  
 19 consumers use these Products daily, often multiple times, to microwave meals, store leftovers in  
 20 freezers or prepare food for their families. This frequent and repeated use significantly amplifies the  
 21 risk microplastics leach from the Products into consumers’ food when microwaved or frozen,  
 22 compounding consumers’ exposure to the risk of unnecessary and undisclosed microplastics.

23 29. **Microplastics’ Bioaccumulation Contributes to Materiality.** Due to their small  
 24 size, microplastics bioaccumulate.<sup>13</sup> Bioaccumulation results in the compounding risk of negative

25  
 26 <sup>10</sup> Amran *supra* note 6.

27 <sup>11</sup> Marfella, *supra* note 4.

28 <sup>12</sup> Amran *supra* note 6.

<sup>13</sup> Yue Li et al., *Microplastics in the human body: A comprehensive review of exposure, distribution, migration mechanics, and toxicity*, 946 *Science of the Total Environment* (June 22, 2024), at 5, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitoenv.2024.174215>.

1 health effects, such as growth and reproduction issues, DNA damage due to oxidative stress,  
 2 inflammation, physical stress, weakened immunity, histological damage or even death.<sup>14</sup>  
 3 Microplastics transmit into the human body best through digestion or oral intake.<sup>15</sup> From there,  
 4 microplastics can leach toxic additives in the acidic environment of the stomach and cause liver  
 5 inflammation.<sup>16</sup> For people with inflammatory bowel disease (IBS), the microplastics accumulation  
 6 in feces is directly related to disease severity.<sup>17</sup> Those suffering from liver damage also show an 8-  
 7 fold increase in plastic contamination compared to liver samples from healthy individuals.<sup>18</sup> This  
 8 illustrates how microplastics are directly tied to the risk of bodily harm and how the greater the  
 9 amount of microplastics in one's body, the greater the risk of harm. Thus, each instance of exposure  
 10 to microplastics compounds the risk of long-term harm. For example, the quantity of microplastics  
 11 in brain samples collected in 2024 was about 50% higher than in brain samples collected in 2016—  
 12 demonstrating the alarming reality of bioaccumulation.<sup>19</sup>

13 30. A September 2024 study found polypropylene microplastics in every sample of bone  
 14 marrow tested, demonstrating that microplastics, like those shed by Defendant's Products, embed  
 15 themselves deeply into the human body.<sup>20</sup> Another alarming study published in September 2024,  
 16 conclusively demonstrated the presence of microplastics in the human brain, with the authors  
 17 cautioning that their "results should raise concern in the context of increasing prevalence of  
 18 neurodegenerative diseases."<sup>21</sup> Ingestion of microplastics was linked to colon cancer, which is on

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 20 <sup>14</sup> *Id.*

21 <sup>15</sup> *Id.*

22 <sup>16</sup> Dunzhu Li et al., Microplastic Release from the Degradation of Polypropylene Feeding Bottles  
 23 During Infant Formula Preparation, 1 NATURE FOOD 746, 746 (Nov. 2020),  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-020-00171-y>.

24 <sup>17</sup> Zehua Yan et al., Analysis of Microplastics in Human Feces Reveals a Correlation between Fecal  
 25 Microplastics and Inflammatory Bowel Disease Status, 56 Environmental Science & Technology  
 26 414 (Dec. 22, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c03924>

27 <sup>18</sup> Thomas Horvatits et al., *Microplastics detected in cirrhotic liver tissue*, The Lancet (July 11,  
 28 2022), [https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/ebiom/PIIS2352-3964\(22\)00328-0.pdf](https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/ebiom/PIIS2352-3964(22)00328-0.pdf).

<sup>19</sup> Douglas Main, *Microplastics are infiltrating brain tissue, studies show: 'There's nowhere left  
 untouched,'* The Guardian (Aug. 21, 2024),  
[https://www.theguardian.com/environment/article/2024/aug/21/microplastics-brain-pollution-  
 health](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/article/2024/aug/21/microplastics-brain-pollution-health).

<sup>20</sup> Xiaoli Guo, *Discovery and analysis of microplastics in human bone marrow*, 477 J. Hazardous  
 Materials (Sept. 15, 2024), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2024.135266>.

<sup>21</sup> Luís Fernando Amato-Lourenço et al., *Microplastics in the Olfactory Bulb of the Human Brain*,  
 JAMA Network (Sep. 16, 2024),  
<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2823787>.

1 the rise in young people, and other cancers related to the gastrointestinal tract.<sup>22</sup> A recent study  
 2 published in *Nature Medicine* on February 3, 2025 revealed a concerning result that brains  
 3 accumulate *7–30 times greater* than the concentrations seen in livers or kidneys, and brain samples  
 4 from dementia cases exhibited *even greater* microplastic presence.<sup>23</sup> What is even more worrying  
 5 is that liver and brain samples from 2024 had significantly higher concentrations of microplastics  
 6 than 2016 samples.<sup>24</sup>

7 31. Defendant’s Products are intended for regular use, serving as essential tools for  
 8 storing, microwaving, freezing and preparing food that consumers rely on daily. However, with  
 9 each use, consumers unknowingly ingest microplastics that accumulate in their bodies over time  
 10 due to continuous exposure. This buildup increases the risk of serious health issues, including  
 11 problems with digestion, immune function, reproductive health and more.<sup>25</sup> This ongoing risk  
 12 makes Defendant’s misconduct even more egregious and underscores the urgent need for  
 13 accountability.

14 **B. The Products Are Made of Polyethylene and Polypropylene Plastic and**  
 15 **Consumers Are Intended, Directed and Instructed to Microwave and Freeze the**  
 16 **Products**

17 32. **Defendant Intends, Directs and Instructs Consumers to Microwave the Products.**  
 18 Plaintiff and other reasonable consumers understand that the regular and ordinary use of the  
 19 Products involves exposure to heat, particularly when heating food in a microwave. Defendant  
 20 knows this, which is why it instructs consumers to vent Ziploc bags by “1 inch on one side before  
 21 heating” and warns that “the bag itself and its contents may be hot” while cautioning not to “overheat  
 22 the contents as the bag may melt.”<sup>26</sup> Despite these instructions, Defendant omits the material fact  
 23 that the Products—made of polyethylene and polypropylene—release microplastics in significant  
 24

25 <sup>22</sup> Bridget Balch, *Microplastics are inside us all. What does that mean for our health?*, AAMC (June  
 26 27, 2024), <https://www.aamc.org/news/microplastics-are-inside-us-all-what-does-mean-our-health>

27 <sup>23</sup> Alexander J. Nihart et al., *Bioaccumulation of Microplastics in Decedent Human Brains*, *Nature*  
 28 *Medicine* (Feb. 3, 2025), <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-024-03453-1> (emphasis added).

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> Li, *supra* note 17.

<sup>26</sup> Ziploc BrandSlider Freezer Bags Quart/Medium, <https://ziploc.com/en-us/products/bags/slider/medium-freezer> (last visited Mar. 20, 2025).

1 quantities when microwaved. Research shows that polypropylene products can release microplastics  
 2 with values as high as 16.2 million particles per liter, and that exposure to high-temperatures, such  
 3 as those encountered during microwaving, significantly increases microplastic release.<sup>27</sup> By  
 4 advertising and selling the Products as “Microwave Safe,” without disclosing the Material Risk  
 5 associated therewith, Defendant jeopardizes the well-being of countless consumers and misleads  
 6 individuals who trust that these Products are fit for everyday food preparation and storage.

7 **33. Consumers Microwave the Products as Intended, Directed and Instructed.**

8 Consumers frequently use the Products to heat or reheat food in the microwave or to store hot food,  
 9 and they trust that these Products marketed as “Microwave Safe” are fit for such purposes.  
 10 Defendant’s own instructions advise consumers to vent the Ziploc bags before microwaving and  
 11 caution against overheating, instructions that clearly indicate the Products are designed and intended  
 12 to be exposed to heat. However, heating polyethylene and polypropylene containers and bags such  
 13 as Defendant’s Products at higher temperatures is shown to cause a significant increase in the release  
 14 of microplastics. Research demonstrates that microwaving polypropylene products can result in  
 15 more than a two-fold increase in microplastic release, exposing consumers to the leaching of  
 16 undisclosed microplastics from the Products directly into their food. Despite this known risk,  
 17 Defendant fails to warn consumers that microwaving its Products as intended drastically increases  
 18 microplastic exposure, leaving consumers unaware of the leaching of microplastics directly into  
 19 their food through routine and foreseeable use.

20 **34. Defendant Intends, Directs and Instructs Consumers to Freeze and Microwave**  
 21 **the Products.** Plaintiff and other reasonable consumers understand that the regular and ordinary use  
 22 of the Products involves storing food in a fridge or freezer, as well as reheating food. It is evident  
 23 that Defendant knows this consumer understanding because Defendant advertises on its own official  
 24 webpage that the Products are designed to make “packing up tonight’s dinner *leftovers* super easy,  
 25 to bringing those *leftovers* to the office (or just about anywhere) super convenient.”<sup>28</sup> In addition,

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 <sup>27</sup> Dunzhu Li et al., Microplastic Release from the Degradation of Polypropylene Feeding Bottles  
 During Infant Formula Preparation, 1 NATURE FOOD 746, 746 (Nov. 2020),  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-020-00171-y>.

28 <sup>28</sup> Ziploc® Brand Freezer Bags Quart / Medium, Ziploc, <https://ziploc.com/en-us/products/bags/freezer/medium> (last visited Mar. 27, 2025) (emphasis added).

1 Defendant includes the “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” misrepresentations together on the labeling  
2 and packaging of the Products, making it reasonable and foreseeable that a reasonable consumer  
3 may believe that the “Freezer” bag Products could be also used to reheat food. Despite the above-  
4 mentioned misrepresentations, Defendant omits the material fact that, following refrigeration and/or  
5 freezing, the Products—made of polyethylene and polypropylene—become even more susceptible  
6 to degradation and microplastic release during reheating, especially through microwaving. Studies  
7 show that low temperatures can alter the physical characteristics of plastics, and plastic becomes  
8 fragile when frozen, presenting a comparable possibility of microplastics being released.<sup>29</sup> Research  
9 indicates that, even without external stimulation such as heating, refrigeration and room-temperature  
10 storage for ten days can cause plastic food containers made of polypropylene to release thousands  
11 of microplastics per square centimeter and millions of nanoplastics *from only square centimeter of*  
12 *plastic area*.<sup>30</sup> Given that plastic becomes fragile when frozen, it comes as no surprise that cold  
13 storage and reheat cycles can significantly increase the release of microplastics and nanoplastics  
14 because external stimulations are applied to the frozen plastic containers.<sup>31</sup> In fact, it was confirmed  
15 that polyethylene products release a large amount of microplastics during the cold storage and  
16 reheating process.<sup>32</sup> Food containers equipped with inner membranes composed of polyethylene  
17 exhibited an especially high degree of precipitation for polyethylene in the total microplastic  
18 released.<sup>33</sup> Given that consumers may reasonably reheat frozen stored food in a microwave with  
19 “Freezer” bags labeled as “Microwave Safe,” by advertising and selling the Products as suitable for  
20 “Freezer” use without disclosing the Material Risk associated with freezing or heating them,  
21 Defendant misleads individuals who trust that these Products are fit for everyday food preparation  
22 and storage.

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>29</sup> Chen et al., *Plastic Bottles for Chilled Carbonated Beverages as a Source of Microplastics and*  
25 *Nanoplastics*, ScienceDirect (Aug. 15, 2023),  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0043135423006796?via%3Dihub>  
(citations omitted).

26 <sup>30</sup> Hussain et al., *Assessing the Release of Microplastics and Nanoplastics from Plastic Containers*  
27 *and Reusable Food Pouches: Implications for Human Health*, ACS Publications (June 21, 2023),  
<https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.3c01942?ref=PDF>.

28 <sup>31</sup> *See supra* note 29.

<sup>32</sup> Zhao et al., *Microplastics Release from Infant Feeding Bottles and Milk Storage Bags*,  
ScienceDirect (2025), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0956713524006388>.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

1           **35. Consumers Freeze and Microwave the Products as Intended, Directed and**  
2 **Instructed.** Consumers frequently use the Products to store food in the freezer and reheat that same  
3 food. Defendant’s own advertising tells consumers to use the Products to pack up dinner leftovers  
4 or to bring leftovers to the office, which clearly indicate the Products are designed and intended to  
5 be used for food storage in freezers. Further, Defendant labeled the Products with “Freezer” and  
6 “Microwave Safe” misrepresentations together, deepening the misleading effect on consumer’s  
7 perception that the Products can be used in the microwave following storage in the freezer.  
8 However, freezing polyethylene and polypropylene containers and bags, such as Defendant’s  
9 Products, causes the release of microplastics, let alone the exacerbated vulnerability to microwaving  
10 due to the weakened structure caused by freezing. Heating alone can significantly increase the  
11 amount of microplastic released from polypropylene containers than storage at room temperature.<sup>34</sup>  
12 Despite this known Material Risk, Defendant fails to warn consumers that freezing the Products, as  
13 well as freezing and thereafter microwaving the Products as intended, directed and instructed, poses  
14 the risk of microplastic exposure through the leaching of microplastics from the Products into  
15 consumers’ food, leaving consumers unaware of the Material Risk they face through routine and  
16 foreseeable use.

17           **36. The Products Pose an Undisclosed Material Risk.** The Products are made of  
18 polyethylene and polypropylene plastic, which pose the danger of leaching microplastics when  
19 microwaved and frozen, the ingestion of which presents serious health risks such as compromising  
20 the immune system, damaging the digestive tract and increasing the risk of various cancers. This  
21 risk is exacerbated by the Products’ intended and foreseeable use, as Defendant markets the Products  
22 as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use and instructs consumers to microwave food in  
23 them and store leftovers in freezers without any warning about the Material Risk of microplastic  
24 exposure, leaching and contamination. The Material Risk is further compounded by the frequent,  
25 routine use of the Products in household settings. Many consumers use the Products daily for  
26 storing, microwaving, freezing or preparing food, thus making exposure to, and consumption of,

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>34</sup> Hussain et al., *supra* note 33; Xin Guo et al., *Migration Testing of Microplastics from Selected Water and Food Containers by Raman Microscopy*, Science Direct (Jan. 15, 2024), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0304389423020824>.

1 microplastics a recurring and persistent threat. This is particularly concerning given that  
2 microplastics bioaccumulate in the body, meaning that each exposure and consumption compounds  
3 the risk of long-term health harm. As a result, the Products pose an undisclosed and unnecessary  
4 Material Risk due to their tendency to leach microplastics into consumers' food under normal and  
5 intended uses.

6       **37. The Material Risk Negates the Products' Central Function.** The central function  
7 of Defendant's Products is to provide a means for storing, reheating and preparing food that does  
8 not implicate the Material Risk. However, the Products are defective in fulfilling this function  
9 because they release harmful microplastics into consumers' food contained therein, a defect that  
10 directly compromises the Products' ability to perform their intended purpose. Consumers  
11 reasonably expect that food storage products marketed as "Microwave Safe" and suitable for  
12 "Freezer" use are fit for microwaving and freezing food without the Material Risk of microplastics  
13 leaching into their food. The absence or disclosure of the Material Risk is material and central to  
14 their intended use. Consumers do not purchase food storage products expecting to be exposed to  
15 risks such as microplastic leaching and contamination. By releasing microplastics when  
16 microwaved and frozen as intended, the Products fail to fulfill their essential function of providing  
17 a reliable method for food storage and preparation that does not implicate the Material Risk. As a  
18 result, the Material Risk renders the Products defective and unsuitable for their intended and  
19 advertised purpose.

20       **C. The Affirmative Misrepresentations and Material Omission Mislead Reasonable**  
21       **Consumers About the Products' Integrity and Conceal the Material Risk**

22       38. Defendant materially omits that its Products pose the Material Risk of leaching  
23 microplastics into consumers' food, which presents a risk of detrimental long-term harm to  
24 consumers. Consumers reasonably expect manufacturers to disclose risks associated with their  
25 products, particularly when those products are intended for everyday food storage and preparation.  
26 This expectation is even greater for products marketed as "Microwave Safe" and suitable for  
27 "Freezer" use, where consumers rely on the manufacturer's assurance that the Products can be  
28 microwaved and frozen without posing a risk of microplastic release, leaching, exposure and

1 consumption. By omitting the critical fact that its Products release microplastics when microwaved  
 2 and frozen, Defendant misleads consumers into believing the Products are structurally sound and  
 3 do not pose the Material Risk. This Material Omission is especially harmful given that consumers  
 4 commonly use the Products to reheat food in the microwave and store food in the freezer as part of  
 5 their ordinary use, unwittingly contaminating their food with microplastics. Defendant’s failure to  
 6 disclose this known Material Risk deprives consumers of the ability to make informed decisions  
 7 about their purchasing decisions. A recent study tested consumers’ willingness to pay for products  
 8 that disclosed the risk of microplastic contamination versus those that did not.<sup>35</sup> The results revealed  
 9 that consumers place substantial value on product labels that warn about the potential harm from  
 10 microplastics.<sup>36</sup> This evidence highlights the materiality of Defendant’s Material Omission and the  
 11 importance of disclosing the Material Risk of microplastic contamination to consumers.<sup>37</sup>

12 39. By failing to disclose the Material Risk and by affirmatively misrepresenting that the  
 13 Products are “Microwave Safe,” and suitable for “Freezer” use, Defendant has misled consumers  
 14 about the Material Risk of its Products. This deception has allowed Defendant to boost its profits at  
 15 the expense of consumers’ trust.

16 **D. Plaintiff and Reasonable Consumers Were Misled by the Material Omission and**  
 17 **“Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” Misrepresentations When Purchasing the**  
 18 **Products**

19 40. **Products.** Defendant manufactures, markets, promotes, advertises, labels, packages  
 20 and sells the Products, each of which omits the Material Risk from the Products’ front-facing labels  
 21 and packaging while representing them to be “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use.

22 41. **The Material Omission, the “Microwave Safe” Representation and the “Freezer”**  
 23 **Misrepresentations.** On the Products’ labeling and packaging, Defendant affirmatively  
 24 misrepresents that the Products are “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use to reinforce  
 25 the impression that they can be microwaved and frozen without posing the Material Risk of

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 <sup>35</sup> László Bendegúz Nagy et al., Nudging consumers about the issue of microplastics: an  
 experimental auction study on valuation for sustainable food packaging, 14 *Scientific Reports* (Aug.  
 16, 2024), <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-69962-8>.

28 <sup>36</sup> *Id.*

<sup>37</sup> *Id.*

1 microplastic leaching into consumers' food. Yet, Defendant failed to disclose the Material Risk of  
2 microplastic contamination, creating a false impression that the Products are fit for their intended  
3 use.

4       42. **Reasonable Consumers' Perception.** The combination of Defendant's affirmative  
5 "Microwave Safe" and "Freezer" misrepresentations and its Material Omission lead reasonable  
6 consumers, like Plaintiff, to believe that the Products are absent of the Material Risk. Consumers  
7 are led to believe that the Products are fit for food storage and preparation and that they do not pose  
8 the Material Risk.

9       43. **Materiality.** The Material Omission, along with Defendant's affirmative "Microwave  
10 Safe" and "Freezer" misrepresentations, are material to reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff,  
11 in deciding to purchase the Products because consumers prioritize product integrity when it concerns  
12 food preparation and storage. By labeling the Products as "Microwave Safe" and suitable for  
13 "Freezer" use, Defendant affirmatively misleads consumers into believing that the Products can be  
14 microwaved and frozen without posing the Material Risk of microplastics leaching into consumers'  
15 food. This is especially significant given that microwaving and freezing the Products in accordance  
16 with Defendant's own instructions, result in microplastic contamination. For many consumers,  
17 ensuring the integrity of household products involved in food preparation and storage is a crucial  
18 factor that strongly influences purchasing decisions. Defendant's false "Microwave Safe" and  
19 "Freezer" misrepresentations, combined with its failure to disclose the Material Risk of microplastic  
20 contamination, deprived consumers of critical information they rely on to make informed  
21 purchasing decisions.

22       44. **Reliance.** The Class, including Plaintiff, reasonably relied on the Material Omission,  
23 the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation and the "Freezer" misrepresentation in deciding to  
24 purchase the Products.

25       45. **Falsity.** The Material Omission, the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation and the  
26 "Freezer" misrepresentation are deceptive because the Products leach microplastics through  
27 ordinary use—primarily through microwave and freezer use.

28       46. **Consumers Lack Knowledge of Falsity.** When purchasing the Products, members

1 of the Class, including Plaintiff, are unaware and have no reason to believe that the Material  
2 Omission, the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation are  
3 misleading, deceptive and unlawful. The Products’ labeling and packaging leads consumers to  
4 believe that the Products are fit for microwave and freezer use and free from the Material Risk of  
5 microplastics leaching from the Products into their food. The Products do not contain a clear,  
6 unambiguous and conspicuously displayed statement informing reasonable consumers that the  
7 Products pose the Material Risk.

8 47. **Defendant’s Knowledge.** Defendant knew, or should have known, that the Material  
9 Omission, the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation were  
10 misleading, deceptive and unlawful at the time Defendant manufactured, marketed, advertised,  
11 labeled and sold the Products.

12 a. **Knowledge of Reasonable Consumers’ Perception.** Defendant knew, or should  
13 have known, that the Material Omission, the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation  
14 and the “Freezer” misrepresentation would lead reasonable consumers to believe  
15 that the Products would not expose them, or their families, to microplastics. Not  
16 only has Defendant utilized a long-standing brand strategy to promote its Products  
17 as reliable for common household use absent the Material Risk, but Defendant  
18 also has an obligation under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act,  
19 codified at 15 U.S.C. §§ 45, *et seq.*, to evaluate its marketing claims from the  
20 perspective of the reasonable consumer. This statutory obligation required  
21 Defendant to consider whether the Material Omission, whether in isolation or in  
22 conjunction with its marketing strategy, would mislead reasonable consumers to  
23 believe that the Products are free from the Material Risk of microplastic exposure.  
24 Thus, Defendant either knew that the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation, the  
25 “Freezer” misrepresentation and the Material Omission were misleading before it  
26 marketed the Products to the Class, including Plaintiff, or Defendant would have  
27 known that the misrepresentations and Material Omission were deceptive had it  
28 complied with its statutory obligation to evaluate marketing claims from the  
reasonable consumer’s perspective.

b. **Knowledge of Falsity.** Defendant manufactured and marketed the Products with  
the Material Omission, the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and the “Freezer”  
misrepresentation despite knowing that the Products did not conform to these  
misrepresentations and omission. Specifically, Defendant advertised, labeled and  
packaged the Products as “Microwave Safe” and fit for “Freezer” use, while  
intentionally failing to inform consumers that the Products release microplastics  
when microwaved or frozen. This conduct indicates that Defendant either knew  
the Products could not perform as advertised, or would have known had it fulfilled  
its statutory duty to evaluate marketing claims from the reasonable consumer’s  
perspective. Defendant’s conscious decision to withhold this critical information  
reflects an intentional effort to mislead consumers into believing the Products  
were of different quality and nature than they actually are.

c. **Exclusive Knowledge.** Defendant is in a superior position to Plaintiff and the

1 Class to know about the Products' Material Risk. As the manufacturer of the  
 2 Products, Defendant has exclusive knowledge of the risks associated with  
 3 microplastic contamination. Defendant's control over the manufacturing, design,  
 4 distribution and testing of the Products gives it unique insight into the presence of  
 5 the Material Risk. Rather than disclosing this information, Defendant purposely  
 6 retained its exclusive knowledge by failing to inform consumers that the Products  
 are made from polyethylene and polypropylene, materials known to release  
 microplastics when microwaved and/or frozen. Defendant further concealed this  
 Material Risk by prominently labeling the Products as "Microwave Safe" and  
 suitable for "Freezer" use to reinforce the false impression that they could be  
 microwaved and frozen without presenting the Material Risk of microplastic  
 contamination.

- 7
- 8 d. **Knowledge of Materiality.** Defendant knew, or should have known, that the  
 9 Material Omission, the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation and the "Freezer"  
 10 misrepresentation were material to consumers. Manufacturers and marketers, like  
 11 Defendant, are well aware that product integrity is a paramount concern for  
 12 consumers, particularly for products designed to hold, heat or freeze food. Here,  
 13 the Material Omission directly relates to the Products' fitness for marketed use.  
 14 Defendant's awareness of this materiality is evident by its decision to prominently  
 label the Products as "Microwave Safe" and suitable for "Freezer" use, which  
 Defendant knew would signal to consumers that the Products were fit for  
 microwaving and freezing food. Furthermore, it is common sense that information  
 about the Material Risk of microplastic contamination would directly influence  
 consumer purchasing decisions. Defendant knew that disclosing the Material Risk  
 of microplastic leaching would likely deter consumers from purchasing the  
 Products.
- 15 e. **Defendant's Continued Deception, Despite Its Knowledge.** As the  
 16 manufacturer and marketer of the Products, Defendant had exclusive control over  
 the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation, the "Freezer" misrepresentation and the  
 Material Omission on the Products' labels, packaging and advertisements.  
 17 Defendant could have easily disclosed the Material Risk of microplastic  
 contamination or corrected consumers' mistaken belief that the Products were fit  
 for microwaving or freezing food. Despite its knowledge and its awareness that  
 18 consumers reasonably rely on the misrepresentations and Material Omission when  
 making purchasing decisions, Defendant deliberately chose to market the Products  
 with the misleading "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation and the "Freezer"  
 19 misrepresentation while omitting the associated Material Risk. This intentional  
 20 deception misleads consumers into purchasing or overpaying for the Products  
 under the false belief that they were fit for their intended use. Accordingly,  
 21 Defendant knew, or should have known, at all relevant times, that its conduct  
 would mislead reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff, into purchasing the  
 22 Products based on false and deceptive representations.

23 48. **Duty to Disclose Material Omission.** Defendant had an obligation, at all relevant  
 24 times, to disclose the Material Omission—that the Products leach microplastics into food when  
 25 microwaved or frozen during ordinary use. This critical information, which Defendant deliberately  
 26 withheld from consumers, is not only material to their purchasing decisions, but also poses  
 27 significant risks to consumer well-being. Defendant knew, or should have known, that reasonable  
 28 consumers would interpret the "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation and the "Freezer"

1 misrepresentation, combined with the absence of any disclosure about the Material Risk of  
2 microplastic contamination, to mean that the Products were fit for microwaving and freezing and  
3 did not present the Material Risk of microplastics leaching into their food. Defendant was also fully  
4 aware that consumers place a high value on product integrity, particularly when it comes to food  
5 preparation and storage, and that this perceived integrity was a key factor influencing consumers'  
6 purchasing decisions. By failing to disclose this crucial information, Defendant misled consumers  
7 into relying on the absence of the Material Omission when deciding to purchase the Products.

8 49. **Detriment.** Plaintiff and similarly situated consumers would not have purchased the  
9 Products, or would not have paid a price premium for them, had they known that the Products posed  
10 the Material Risk and, therefore, did not possess the attributes claimed, promised, warranted,  
11 advertised and/or represented. Defendant's affirmative "Microwave Safe" misrepresentation and  
12 "Freezer" misrepresentation, combined with its Material Omission, misled reasonable consumers  
13 into believing the Products were fit for microwaving and freezing food and did not present the  
14 Material Risk. As a result, reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff, purchased the Products to their  
15 detriment, unknowingly exposing themselves and their families to the Material Risk of microplastic  
16 contamination.

17 **E. The Products are Substantially Similar**

18 50. As described herein, Plaintiff purchased the Products. The additional Products  
19 identified *supra*, are substantially similar to the Purchased Product.

- 20 a. **Defendant.** All Products are manufactured, sold, marketed, advertised, labeled  
21 and packaged by Defendant.
- 22 b. **Brand.** All Products are sold under the same brand name: Ziploc.
- 23 c. **Marketing Demographics.** All Products are marketed directly to consumers for  
24 personal use.
- 25 d. **Purpose.** All Products are Ziploc storage containers and freezer bags designed  
26 and marketed as suitable for heating food in microwaves and storing food in  
27 freezers. Defendant's marketing, instructions and labeling reinforce that the  
28 Products are intended to be regularly and repeatedly microwaved or frozen, yet  
Defendant fails to disclose that such ordinary use poses the Material Risk the  
Products release microplastics into consumers' food.
- e. **Use.** All Products are used in the same manner—for heating food in microwaves  
and storing food in freezers. Defendant's marketing and instructions encourage

1 consumers to use the Products in ways that expose them to heat and freeze, yet  
 2 Defendant fails to disclose the resulting Material Risk of microplastic  
 3 contamination.

- 4 f. **Material Omission and Misrepresentations.** All Products contain the Material  
 5 Omission and are marketed as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use  
 6 on their packaging and labeling, reinforcing the false impression that they are fit  
 7 for microwave and freezer use without the Material Risk of microplastic  
 8 contamination.
- 9 g. **Packaging.** All Products are similarly packaged in a way that emphasizes their  
 10 suitability for microwave use and/or freezer use, while omitting any warning about  
 11 the Material Risk of microplastic contamination.
- 12 h. **Key Attributes.** Defendant’s Products release microplastics into food when  
 13 microwaved and/or frozen. Defendant encourages consumers to microwave and  
 14 freeze the Products through its instructions and advertising, reinforcing the  
 15 expectation that the Products are fit for such use.
- 16 i. **Misleading Effect.** The misleading effect of Defendant’s Material Omission,  
 17 “Freezer” misrepresentation and “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation is  
 18 consistent across all Products—consumers overpay for the Products under the  
 19 mistaken belief that they are fit for microwaving and freezing food and pose no  
 20 Material Risk of microplastic contamination.

21 **F. No Adequate Remedy at Law**

22 51. **No Adequate Remedy at Law.** Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to  
 23 equitable relief as no adequate remedy at law exists.

- 24 a. **Broader Statutes of Limitations.** The statutes of limitation for the causes of  
 25 action pled herein vary. The limitations period is four years for claims brought  
 26 under the California Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), which is one year longer  
 27 than the statutes of limitation under the California False Advertising Law (“FAL”)  
 28 and the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”). In addition, the  
 statutes of limitation vary for certain states’ laws for unjust enrichment/restitution,  
 between approximately 2 and 6 years. Thus, California Subclass Members who  
 purchased the Products more than 3 years prior to the filing of the complaint will  
 be barred from recovery if equitable relief were not permitted under the UCL.  
 Similarly, Nationwide Class Members who purchased the Products prior to the  
 furthest reach-back under the statute of limitation, will be barred from recovery if  
 equitable relief were not permitted for restitution/unjust enrichment.
- b. **Broader Scope of Conduct.** In addition, the scope of actionable misconduct  
 under the unfair prong of the UCL is broader than the other causes of action  
 asserted herein. It includes, for example, Defendant’s overall unfair marketing  
 scheme to promote and brand the Products with the Material Omission, the  
 “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation, across  
 a multitude of media platforms, including the Products’ labels and packaging, over  
 a long period of time, in order to gain an unfair advantage over competitor  
 products and to take advantage of consumers’ desire for products that comport  
 with the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and “Freezer” misrepresentation.  
 The UCL also creates a cause of action for violations of law (such as statutory or  
 regulatory requirements and court orders related to similar misrepresentations and

omissions made on the type of Products at issue). Thus, Plaintiff and Class Members may be entitled to restitution under the UCL, while not entitled to damages under other causes of action asserted herein (e.g., the FAL requires actual or constructive knowledge of the falsity; the CLRA is limited to certain types of plaintiffs (an individual who seeks or acquires, by purchase or lease, any goods or services for personal, family, or household purposes) and other statutorily enumerated conduct). Similarly, unjust enrichment/restitution is broader than other claims. For example, in some states, some common law claims may require privity of contract or pre-lawsuit notice, which are not typically required to establish unjust enrichment/restitution. Thus, Plaintiff and Class Members may be entitled to recover under unjust enrichment/restitution, while not entitled to damages under other common law claims, because they purchased the Products from third-party retailers or did not provide adequate notice of a breach prior to the commencement of this action.

- c. **Injunctive Relief to Cease Misconduct and Dispel Misperception.** Injunctive relief is appropriate on behalf of Plaintiff and members of the Class because Defendant continues to misrepresent the Products with the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation, the “Freezer” misrepresentation and Material Omission. Injunctive relief is necessary to prevent Defendant from continuing to engage in the unfair, fraudulent and/or unlawful conduct described herein and to prevent future harm—none of which can be achieved through available legal remedies (such as monetary damages to compensate past harm). Further, injunctive relief, in the form of affirmative disclosure is necessary to dispel the public misperception about the Products that has resulted from years of Defendant’s unfair, fraudulent and unlawful marketing efforts. Such disclosures would include, but are not limited to, publicly disseminated statements providing accurate information about the Products’ true nature; and/or requiring prominent qualifications and/or disclaimers on the Products’ front labels concerning the Products’ true nature. An injunction requiring affirmative disclosures to dispel the public’s misperception and prevent the ongoing deception and repeat purchases based thereon, is also not available through a legal remedy (such as monetary damages). In addition, Plaintiff is currently unable to accurately quantify the damages caused by Defendant’s future harm, because discovery and Plaintiff’s investigation have not yet completed, rendering injunctive relief all the more necessary. For example, because the Court has not yet certified any class, the following remains unknown: the scope of the class, the identities of its members, their respective purchasing practices, prices of past/future Product sales and quantities of past/future Product sales.
- d. **Public Injunction.** Further, because a “public injunction” is available under the UCL, damages will not adequately “benefit the general public” in a manner equivalent to an injunction.
- e. **California vs. Nationwide Class Claims.** Violations of the UCL, FAL and CLRA are claims asserted on behalf of Plaintiff and the California Subclass against Defendant, while unjust enrichment/restitution are asserted on behalf of Plaintiff and the Nationwide Class. Dismissal of farther-reaching claims, such as restitution, would bar recovery for non-California members of the Class. In other words, legal remedies available or adequate under the California-specific causes of action (such as the UCL, FAL and CLRA) have no impact on this Court’s jurisdiction to award equitable relief under the remaining causes of action asserted on behalf of non-California putative Class Members.
- f. **Procedural Posture—Incomplete Discovery & Pre-Certification.** In addition, discovery—which has not yet been provided and/or completed—may reveal that

1 the claims providing legal remedies are inadequate. At this time, forcing an  
2 election of remedies at the initial pleadings stage, in the absence of completed  
3 discovery regarding class certification and merits, is premature and likely to lead  
4 to subsequent, potentially belated, and hotly contested motions to amend the  
pleadings to add equitable remedies based on a lengthy historical recount of  
discovery and analysis of voluminous exhibits, transcripts, discovery responses,  
document productions, etc., as well as related motions to seal confidential  
information contained therein.

5 **G. Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b) Allegations (*Affirmative and By Omission*)**

6 52. Although Defendant is in the best position to know what content it placed on its  
7 marketing materials during the relevant timeframe, and the knowledge that it had regarding the  
8 Material Risk and its failure to disclose, to the extent necessary, Plaintiff satisfies the requirements  
9 of Rule 9(b) by alleging the following facts with particularity:

10 53. Who: Defendant made the “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” affirmative  
11 misrepresentations regarding the Products despite the Material Risk presented when microwaving  
12 and freezing the Products as intended, directed and instructed. It also made the Material Omission  
13 regarding the Material Risk. It made these misrepresentations and omission on the Products’  
14 packaging, its website and marketing materials, in written and electronic form.

15 54. What: Defendant’s conduct here was, and continues to be, fraudulent because it  
16 misrepresented its Products while omitting and concealing that the Products pose the Material Risk  
17 when microwaved and/or frozen as intended, directed and instructed. Defendant’s conduct deceived  
18 Plaintiff and the Class into believing that the Products pose no Material Risk. Defendant knew, or  
19 should have known, that this information is material to reasonable consumers, including Plaintiff  
20 and the Class, in making their purchasing decisions; yet it omitted and continues to omit any warning  
21 that the Products pose the Material Risk when microwaved and/or frozen as intended, directed and  
22 instructed. No reasonable consumer would expect that the Products pose the Material Risk.

23 55. When: Defendant’s marketing of the Products and the Material Omission detailed  
24 herein were made during the class period, prior to and at the point of sale, leaving Plaintiff and the  
25 Class unaware of the Material Risk prior to purchasing the Products.

26 56. Where: Defendant’s marketing of the Products and the Material Omission were made  
27 on its packaging and marketing materials, on its website and through its social media, in written and  
28 electronic form.

1           57. How: Defendant made misrepresentations and failed to disclose material facts about  
2 the Material Risk through normal use of the Products as intended, directed and instructed, in written  
3 and electronic form on the Products' packaging and company website.

4           58. Why: Defendant marketed its Products and the Material Omission for the express  
5 purpose of inducing Plaintiff and the Class to purchase the Products, the effect of which was that  
6 Defendant profited by selling the Products to many thousands of consumers.

7           59. Injury: Plaintiff and the Class purchased, or paid more for, the Products when they  
8 otherwise would not have absent Defendant's marketing and Material Omission. Consumers  
9 continue to suffer economic harm by purchasing the Products that pose the Material Risk.

## 10 **VII. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11           60. **Class Definition.** Plaintiff brings this action as a class action on behalf of herself and  
12 all others similarly situated as Members of the Class defined as follows:

13                   **Nationwide Class**: All residents of the United States who, within the  
14 applicable statute of limitations periods, purchased the Products, for  
purposes other than resale ("Nationwide Class"); and

15                   **California Subclass**: All residents of California who, within four years  
16 prior to the filing of this action, purchased the Products, for purposes other  
than resale ("California Subclass").

17 (the "Nationwide Class" and "California Subclass" are collectively referred to as the "Class").

18           61. **Class Definition Exclusions.** Excluded from the Class are: (i) Defendant, its assigns,  
19 successors and legal representatives; (ii) any entities in which Defendant has controlling interests;  
20 (iii) federal, state and/or local governments, including, but not limited to, their departments,  
21 agencies, divisions, bureaus, boards, sections, groups, counsels and/or subdivisions; and (iv) any  
22 judicial officer presiding over this matter and person within the third degree of consanguinity to  
23 such judicial officer.

24           62. **Reservation of Rights to Amend the Class Definition.** Plaintiff reserves the right to  
25 amend or otherwise alter the Class definitions presented to the Court at the appropriate time in  
26 response to facts learned through discovery, legal arguments advanced by Defendant or otherwise.

27           63. **Numerosity.** Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is  
28 impracticable. Upon information and belief, the Nationwide Class consists of tens of thousands of

1 purchasers (if not more) dispersed throughout the United States, and the California Subclass  
2 likewise consists of thousands of purchasers (if not more) dispersed throughout the state of  
3 California. Accordingly, it would be impracticable to join all members of the Class before the Court.

4 64. **Common Questions Predominate.** There are numerous and substantial questions of  
5 law or fact common to all members of the Class that predominate over any individual issues.  
6 Included within the common questions of law or fact are:

- 7 a. Whether Defendant engaged in unlawful, unfair or deceptive business practices  
8 by advertising and selling the Products;
- 9 b. Whether Defendant's conduct of advertising and selling the Products while  
10 labeling them as "Microwave Safe," suitable for "Freezer" use, and omitting that  
11 they leach microplastics during ordinary use constitutes an unfair method of  
12 competition, or unfair or deceptive act or practice, in violation of Civil Code  
13 section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 14 c. Whether Defendant used deceptive representations or omission in connection with  
15 the sale of the Products in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 16 d. Whether Defendant represented that the Products have characteristics or quantities  
17 that they do not have in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 18 e. Whether Defendant advertised the Products with intent not to sell them as  
19 advertised in violation of Civil Code section 1750, *et seq.*;
- 20 f. Whether Defendant's labeling and advertising of the Products are misleading in  
21 violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500, *et seq.*;
- 22 g. Whether Defendant knew or by the exercise of reasonable care should have known  
23 its labeling and advertising was and is misleading in violation of Business and  
24 Professions Code section 17500, *et seq.*;
- 25 h. Whether Defendant's conduct is an unfair business practice within the meaning of  
26 Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 27 i. Whether Defendant's conduct is a fraudulent business practice within the meaning  
28 of Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 29 j. Whether Defendant's conduct is an unlawful business practice within the meaning  
30 of Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- 31 k. Whether Plaintiff and the Class paid more money for the Products than they  
32 actually received;
- 33 l. How much more money Plaintiff and the Class paid for the Products than they  
34 actually received;
- 35 m. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to injunctive relief; and
- 36 n. Whether Defendant was unjustly enriched by its unlawful conduct.

1           65. **Predominance.** The common questions of law and fact predominate over questions  
2 that affect only individual Class Members.

3           66. **Typicality.** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class Members she seeks  
4 to represent because Plaintiff, like the Class Members, purchased Defendant's misleading and  
5 deceptive Products. Defendant's unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent actions concern the same  
6 business practices described herein irrespective of where they occurred or were experienced.  
7 Plaintiff and the Class sustained similar injuries arising out of Defendant's conduct. Plaintiff's and  
8 Class Members' claims arise from the same practices and course of conduct and are based on the  
9 same legal theories.

10           67. **Adequacy.** Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class she seeks to represent  
11 because her interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class Members. Plaintiff will fairly and  
12 adequately protect Class Members' interests and she has retained counsel experienced and  
13 competent in the prosecution of complex class actions, including complex questions that arise in  
14 consumer protection litigation.

15           68. **Ascertainability.** Class Members can easily be identified by an examination and  
16 analysis of the business records regularly maintained by Defendant, among other records within  
17 Defendant's possession, custody or control. Additionally, further Class Member data can be  
18 obtained through additional third-party retailers who retain customer records and order histories.

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

- 23           a. The claims presented in this case predominate over any questions of law or fact,  
24 if any exist at all, affecting any individual member of the Class;
- 25           b. Absent a Class, the members of the Class will continue to suffer damage and  
26 Defendant's unlawful conduct will continue without remedy while Defendant  
27 profits from and enjoys its ill-gotten gains;
- 28           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.

70. **Inconsistent Rulings.** Because Plaintiff seeks relief for all members of the Class, the prosecution of separate actions by individuals 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.

71. **Injunctive/Declaratory Relief.** The prerequisites to maintaining a class action for injunctive or equitable relief are met as Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive or declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

72. **Manageability.** Plaintiff and her 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.

**VIII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

**COUNT ONE**

**Violation of California Unfair Competition Law**

**(Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

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

73. **Incorporation by Reference.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 72, as though fully set forth herein.

74. **California Subclass.** This cause of action is brought pursuant to Business and Professions Code, sections 17200, *et seq.*, on behalf of Plaintiff and a California Subclass who purchased the Products within the applicable statute of limitations.

75. **The UCL.** California Business & Professions Code, sections 17200, *et seq.* (the

1 “UCL”) prohibits unfair competition and provides, in pertinent part, that “unfair competition shall  
2 mean and include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or  
3 misleading advertising.”

4 76. **False Advertising Claims.** Defendant, in its advertising and packaging of the  
5 Products, made misleading statements and fraudulent omissions regarding the quality and  
6 characteristics of the Products—specifically, the Material Omission, the “Microwave Safe”  
7 misrepresentation, and the “Freezer” misrepresentation—even though the Products are not fit for  
8 their represented use because they leach microplastics when used as intended, directed and  
9 instructed. Such misrepresentations and omission appear on the label and packaging of the Products,  
10 which are sold at retail stores, as well as Defendant’s official website, and other retailers’  
11 advertisements that have adopted Defendant’s advertisements.

12 77. **Defendant’s Deliberately Fraudulent Marketing Scheme.** Defendant lacks any  
13 reasonable basis for the misrepresentations and omission made about the Products in its advertising,  
14 packaging and labeling because the Products are not fit for their intended use. Defendant knew, and  
15 continues to know, that the Products pose the Material Risk of microplastic leaching into consumers’  
16 food when microwaved and/or frozen during ordinary use. Despite this knowledge, Defendant  
17 intentionally marketed, advertised and labeled the Products as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for  
18 “Freezer” use to deceive reasonable consumers into believing that the Products are fit for everyday  
19 food preparation (microwaving) and storage (freezing). In knowingly omitting the Material Risk of  
20 microplastic contamination, while affirmatively representing the Products as fit for microwave and  
21 freezer use, Defendant misleads consumers into purchasing Products that pose the Material Risk.

22 78. **Exclusive Knowledge.** Defendant has exclusive knowledge of the Products’ Material  
23 Risk of leaching microplastics. As the manufacturer of the Products, Defendant is in a superior  
24 position to consumers, including Plaintiff, to know about the risks associated with microplastic  
25 contamination resulting from the microwaving and freezing of the Products. Defendant’s control  
26 over the manufacturing, design, distribution and integrity testing of the Products gives it unique and  
27 exclusive knowledge of the presence of the Material Risk. This superior knowledge places  
28 Defendant in a position of responsibility to disclose the Material Risk of microplastic exposure, yet

1 Defendant deliberately withheld this critical information from consumers while marketing the  
2 Products as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use.

3       79. **Misleading Advertising Claims Cause Purchases of the Products.** Defendant’s  
4 labeling and advertising of the Products led, and continues to lead, reasonable consumers, including  
5 Plaintiff, to believe that the Products are a fit and reliable solution for food storage and preparation.  
6 Because it markets the Products with the “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” misrepresentations  
7 without disclosing the Material Risk of microplastic contamination, Defendant misleads consumers  
8 into believing the Products are fit to be used to microwave or freeze food, reinforcing the false  
9 impression that they do not present the Material Risk.

10       80. **Injury-in-Fact.** Plaintiff and the California Subclass have suffered injury in-fact and  
11 have lost money or property as a result of, and in reliance upon, Defendant’s affirmative  
12 misrepresentations and Material Omission. Specifically, Plaintiff and the California Subclass paid  
13 the purchase price for the Products under the false belief that they were fit for their intended use.  
14 Had Defendant disclosed the Material Risk of microplastic contamination, Plaintiff and the  
15 California Subclass would not have purchased the Products or would have paid less for them.

16       81. **Conduct Violates the UCL.** Defendant’s conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes  
17 unfair, unlawful and fraudulent business practices in violation of the UCL. Defendant’s use of  
18 various forms of advertising media to promote, advertise and draw attention to the sale of its  
19 Products constitutes unfair competition, deceptive advertising and unlawful business practices  
20 under Business and Professions Code Sections 17200 and 17531. Defendant’s marketing of the  
21 Products with the “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” misrepresentations while omitting material  
22 information about the Material Risk of microplastic contamination, misleads consumers into  
23 believing the Products are fit for ordinary use—namely fit for microwave and freezer use. These  
24 deceptive practices have deceived, and are likely to continue deceiving, the consuming public in  
25 violation of California law.

26       82. **No Reasonably Available Alternatives/Legitimate Business Interests.** Defendant  
27 failed to avail itself of reasonably available, lawful alternatives to further its legitimate business  
28 interests.



1 suitable for “Freezer” use, while omitting the Material Risk of microplastic contamination provides  
2 no benefit to consumers; rather, it harms them. By concealing this material information, Defendant  
3 causes consumers to purchase Products that fail to meet their reasonable expectations, overpay for  
4 Products they believed were fit for their marketed use and receive Products that pose a greater risk  
5 than what they were led to believe. Consumers are deprived of the ability to make informed  
6 decisions and cannot avoid the injuries caused by Defendant’s deceptive labeling and advertising.  
7 Accordingly, the injuries resulting from Defendant’s deceptive conduct far outweigh any purported  
8 benefits.

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

13       89. **No Utility.** Here, Defendant’s conduct of labeling the Products as “Microwave Safe”  
14 and “Freezer,” while omitting the Material Risk has no legitimate utility and financially harms  
15 consumers. Any potential utility from Defendant’s conduct is vastly outweighed by the gravity of  
16 the harm caused to consumers, who are unknowingly exposed to the Material Risk of microplastic  
17 contamination and unjustly pay a premium for Products that fail to meet their reasonable  
18 expectations.

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

22       91. **Unfair Conduct.** Defendant’s labeling and advertising of the Products, as alleged  
23 herein, is deceptive, misleading and unreasonable, and constitutes unfair conduct. Defendant knew,  
24 or should have known, of its unfair conduct. Defendant’s Material Omission, the “Microwave Safe”  
25 misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation constitute unfair business practices within  
26 the meaning of California Business and Professions Code Section 17200.

27       92. **Reasonably Available Alternatives.** Reasonably available alternatives existed that  
28 would have allowed Defendant to further its legitimate business interests without engaging in the



1 1267 (1992).

2 97. **Fraudulent “Microwave Safe” Misrepresentation, “Freezer” Misrepresentation**  
3 **and Material Omission.** Defendant employed the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation, the  
4 “Freezer” misrepresentation and the Material Omission with the intent to sell the Products to  
5 consumers, including Plaintiff and the California Subclass. The “Microwave Safe”  
6 misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation are deceptive, and Defendant knew, or  
7 should have known, of their deceptive nature. By affirmatively representing the Products as  
8 “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use, while omitting the Material Risk that the Products  
9 release microplastics when microwaved and frozen, Defendant misled and continues to mislead  
10 consumers into believing the Products are fit for their intended use. Both the affirmative  
11 misrepresentations and the Material Omission are likely to mislead reasonable consumers, as they  
12 pertain to fitness for the marketed use, which is material to the purchasing decisions of the average,  
13 ordinary and reasonable consumer.

14 98. **Fraudulent Business Practice.** As alleged herein, the misrepresentations by  
15 Defendant constitute a fraudulent business practice in violation of California Business &  
16 Professions Code Section 17200.

17 99. **Reasonable and Detrimental Reliance.** Plaintiff and the California Subclass  
18 reasonably and detrimentally relied on the Material Omission, the “Microwave Safe”  
19 misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation to their detriment in that they purchased the  
20 Products.

21 100. **Reasonably Available Alternatives.** Defendant had reasonably available alternatives  
22 to further its legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein. Defendant could  
23 have refrained from labeling the Products as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use,  
24 without disclosing the Material Risk of microplastic contamination. Alternatively, Defendant could  
25 have provided clear warnings on the Products’ labels to inform consumers of the Material Risk of  
26 microplastic exposure associated with microwaving and freezing the Products as intended, directed  
27 and instructed.

28 101. **Business Practice.** All of the conduct alleged herein occurs, and continues to occur,



1 and 1711 (deceit upon the public), as set forth herein.

2           107. **Additional Violations.** Defendant’s conduct in making the misrepresentations and  
3 deceptive Material Omission described herein constitutes a knowing failure to adopt policies in  
4 accordance with and/or adherence to applicable laws, as set forth herein, all of which are binding  
5 upon and burdensome to its competitors. This conduct engenders an unfair competitive advantage  
6 for Defendant, thereby constituting an unfair, fraudulent and/or unlawful business practice under  
7 California Business & Professions Code sections 17200-208. Additionally, Defendant’s omission  
8 of material facts, as set forth herein, violates California Civil Code sections 1572, 1573, 1709, 1710,  
9 1711 and 1770, as well as the common law.

10           108. **Unlawful Conduct.** Defendant’s packaging, labeling and advertising of the Products,  
11 as alleged herein, are deceptive, misleading and unreasonable, and constitute unlawful conduct.  
12 Defendant knew, or should have known, of its unlawful conduct.

13           109. **Reasonably Available Alternatives.** Defendant had reasonably available alternatives  
14 to further its legitimate business interests, other than the conduct described herein. Defendant could  
15 have refrained from labeling the Products as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use,  
16 without disclosing the Material Risk of microplastic contamination. Alternatively, Defendant could  
17 have provided clear warnings on the Products’ labels to inform consumers of the Material Risk  
18 associated with microwaving and freezing the Products as intended, directed and instructed.

19           110. **Business Practice.** All of the conduct alleged herein occurs, and continues to occur,  
20 in Defendant’s business. Defendant’s wrongful conduct is part of a pattern or generalized course of  
21 conduct.

22           111. **Injunction.** Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Section 17203, Plaintiff and  
23 the California Subclass seek an order from this Court enjoining Defendant from continuing its  
24 practice of labeling the Products as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use, without  
25 disclosing the Material Risk of microplastic contamination. Plaintiff and the California Subclass  
26 further seek an order requiring Defendant to cease its deceptive conduct and to provide clear and  
27 conspicuous warnings about the Material Risk of microplastic exposure when the Products are  
28 microwaved and frozen as intended, directed and instructed.



1 microplastic contamination.

2           117. **Knowledge.** In making and disseminating the Material Omission, the “Microwave  
3 Safe” misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation alleged herein, Defendant knew, or  
4 should have known, that the Material Omission, “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and the  
5 “Freezer” misrepresentation were untrue or misleading and thereby acted in violation of California  
6 Business and Professions Code section 17500. Defendant’s affirmative misrepresentations that the  
7 Products are “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use, combined with its failure to disclose  
8 the Material Risk of microplastic contamination, constitute deceptive practices that Defendant  
9 knew, or should have known, were false and likely to mislead reasonable consumers.

10           118. **Exclusive Knowledge.** Defendant has exclusive knowledge of the Products’ danger  
11 of leaching microplastics when microwaved and/or frozen as intended, directed and instructed. As  
12 the manufacturer of the Products, Defendant is in a superior position to consumers, including  
13 Plaintiff, to know about the risks associated with microplastic contamination. Defendant’s control  
14 over the manufacturing, design, distribution and testing of the Products provides it with exclusive  
15 knowledge of the presence of the Material Risk. This superior knowledge placed Defendant in a  
16 position of responsibility to disclose the Material Risk of microplastic exposure, yet Defendant  
17 deliberately withheld this critical information while affirmatively marketing the Products as  
18 “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use.

19           119. **Intent to sell.** Defendant’s Material Omission, “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation  
20 and “Freezer” misrepresentation were specifically designed to induce reasonable consumers, like  
21 Plaintiff and the California Subclass, to purchase the Products.

22           120. **Causation/Damages.** As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s misconduct, in  
23 violation of the FAL, Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass were harmed in the amount  
24 of the purchase price they paid for the Products. Additionally, Plaintiff and members of the  
25 California Subclass have suffered, and continue to suffer, economic losses and other damages,  
26 including but not limited to, the amounts paid for the Products and any interest that would have  
27 accrued on those monies, in an amount to be proven at trial. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks a monetary  
28 award for violation of the FAL in the form of damages, restitution and/or disgorgement of ill-gotten

1 gains to compensate Plaintiff and the California Subclass. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief to  
2 enjoin Defendant’s misconduct and prevent ongoing and future harm to consumers.

3 **COUNT THREE**

4 **Violation of California Consumers Legal Remedies Act**

5 **(Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, *et seq.*)**

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

7 121. **Incorporation by Reference.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference  
8 paragraphs 1 through 72, as though fully set forth herein.

9 122. **California Subclass.** Plaintiff brings this claim individually and on behalf of the  
10 California Subclass who purchased the Products within the applicable statute of limitations.

11 123. **CLRA Standard.** The California Consumers Legal Remedies Act provides that  
12 “unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices undertaken by any person  
13 in a transaction intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services to any  
14 consumer are unlawful.” (hereinafter the “CLRA”).

15 124. **Goods/Services.** The Products are “goods,” as defined by the CLRA in California  
16 Civil Code § 1761(a).

17 125. **Defendant.** Defendant is a “person,” as defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code  
18 § 1761(c).

19 126. **Consumers.** Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass are “consumers,” as  
20 defined by the CLRA in California Civil Code § 1761(d).

21 127. **Transactions.** The purchase of the Products by Plaintiff and members of the  
22 California Subclass are “transactions” as defined by the CLRA under California Civil Code §  
23 1761(e).

24 128. **Violations of the CLRA.** Defendant violated the following sections of the CLRA by  
25 selling the Products to Plaintiff and the California Subclass through the misleading, deceptive and  
26 fraudulent Material Omission, “Freezer” misrepresentation and “Microwave Safe”  
27 misrepresentation:

- 28 a. Section 1770(a)(5) by representing that the Products have “characteristics, . . .

uses [or] benefits . . . which [they] do not have.”

- b. Section 1770(a)(7) by representing that the Products “are of a particular standard, quality, or grade...when] they are of another.”
- c. Section 1770(a)(9) by advertising the Products “with [the] intent not to sell them as advertised.”

129. **Knowledge.** Defendant’s uniform misrepresentations and Material Omission of the Material Risk regarding the Products were likely to deceive reasonable consumers. Defendant knew, or should have known, that its Material Omission of the Material Risk that the Products release microplastics when microwaved or frozen, along with its affirmative “Microwave Safe” and “Freezer” misrepresentations, were misleading and deceptive. By failing to disclose this Material Risk, Defendant misled consumers into believing the Products were fit for their use as intended, directed and instructed.

130. **Exclusive Knowledge.** Defendant has exclusive knowledge of the Products’ Material Risk of leaching microplastics. As the manufacturer of the Products, Defendant is in a superior position to consumers, including Plaintiff, to know about the risks associated with microplastic contamination. Defendant’s control over the manufacturing, design, distribution and testing of the Products gives Defendant exclusive knowledge of the presence of the Material Risk. This superior knowledge placed Defendant in a position of responsibility to disclose the Material Risk of microplastic exposure when microwaving and freezing the Products as intended, directed and instructed, yet Defendant concealed this critical information while affirmatively marketing the Products as “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use.

131. **Malicious.** Defendant’s conduct is malicious, fraudulent and wanton in that Defendant intentionally misled and withheld material information from consumers, including Plaintiff, to increase the sale of the Products.

132. **Plaintiff Could Not Have Avoided Injury.** Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass could not have reasonably avoided such injury. Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass were misled and unaware of the existence of facts that Defendant suppressed and failed to disclose, and Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass would not have purchased the Products and/or would have purchased them on different terms had they known the truth.

1           133. **Causation/Reliance/Materiality.** Plaintiff and the California Subclass suffered harm  
2 as a result of Defendant’s violations of the CLRA because they relied on the Material Omission, the  
3 “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation in deciding to purchase  
4 the Products. The Material Omission, the “Microwave Safe” misrepresentation and the “Freezer”  
5 misrepresentation were together a substantial factor. The Material Omission and “Microwave Safe”  
6 misrepresentation and the “Freezer” misrepresentation were and are material because a reasonable  
7 consumer would consider them important in deciding whether to purchase the Products.

8           134. **Section 1782(d).** Pursuant to California Civil Code, Section 1782, Plaintiff’s counsel,  
9 acting on behalf of all members of the Class, concurrent with the filing of this complaint mailed a  
10 statutory notice letter, via U.S. Certified Mail, return receipt requested, addressed to Defendant at  
11 its headquarters, principal place of business and registered agent for service of process registered  
12 with the Wisconsin Department of State (1525 Howe Street Racine, WI 53403). The letter notified  
13 Defendant of its violations of section 1770 described herein and demanded that it correct the  
14 problems associated with the actions detailed herein and give notice to all affected consumer of  
15 Defendant’s intent to do so. If Defendant does not agree to rectify the problems identified and give  
16 notice to all affected consumers within 30 days of the date of written notice, Plaintiff will amend  
17 this complaint to seek actual, punitive and statutory damages, as appropriate.

18           135. **Venue Declaration.** A declaration establishing that venue in this District is proper  
19 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1780(d) was filed with the complaint on April 25, 2025. *See* ECF No.  
20 1-001.

21           136. **Injunction.** Given that Defendant’s conduct violated California Civil Code section  
22 1780, Plaintiff and members of the California Subclass are entitled to seek, and do hereby seek,  
23 injunctive relief to put an end to Defendant’s violations of the CLRA and to dispel the public  
24 misperception created, facilitated and fostered by Defendant’s false and misleading advertising  
25 campaign. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Without equitable relief, Defendant’s unfair and  
26 deceptive practices will continue to harm Plaintiff and the California Subclass. Accordingly,  
27 Plaintiff seeks an injunction pursuant to section 1780(a)(2) to enjoin Defendant from continuing its  
28 unlawful methods, acts and practices, including its deceptive labeling of the Products as

1 “Microwave Safe” and suitable for “Freezer” use, while omitting the Material Risk of microplastic  
2 contamination. Plaintiff also seeks an order requiring Defendant to take corrective action necessary  
3 to dispel the public misperception created by Defendant’s deceptive conduct and to provide clear  
4 and conspicuous disclosures about the Material Risk posed through microwaving and freezing the  
5 Products as intended, directed and instructed.

#### 6 COUNT FOUR

#### 7 **Unjust Enrichment/Restitution**

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

9 137. **Incorporation by Reference.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all  
10 paragraphs 1 through 72, as though fully set forth herein.

11 138. **Nationwide Class & California Subclass.** Plaintiff brings this claim individually and  
12 on behalf of the Nationwide Class and, in the alternative, the California Subclass who purchased  
13 the Products within the applicable statute of limitations.

14 139. **Plaintiff/Class Conferred a Benefit.** By purchasing the Products, Plaintiff and  
15 members of the Class conferred a benefit on Defendant in the form of the purchase price of the  
16 Products.

17 140. **Defendant’s Knowledge of Conferred Benefit.** Defendant had knowledge of such  
18 benefit and Defendant appreciated the benefit because, were consumers not to purchase the  
19 Products, Defendant would not generate revenue from the sales of the Products.

20 141. **Exclusive Knowledge.** Defendant has exclusive knowledge of the Products’ Material  
21 Risk to leach microplastics. Defendant, as the manufacturer of the Products, is in a superior  
22 knowledge position to consumers, including Plaintiff, to know about the Material Risk. Defendant’s  
23 control of the manufacturing, design, distribution and testing of the Products gives Defendant  
24 exclusive knowledge of the presence of the Material Risk.

25 142. **Defendant’s Unjust Receipt Through Deception.** Defendant’s knowing acceptance  
26 and retention of the benefit is inequitable and unjust because the benefit was obtained by  
27 Defendant’s fraudulent, misleading and deceptive omission.

28 143. **Causation/Damages.** As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s unjust

1 enrichment, Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed in the amount of the purchase price  
2 they paid for the Products. Additionally, Plaintiff and members of the Class suffered, and continue  
3 to suffer, economic losses and other damages, including but not limited to, the amounts paid for the  
4 Products and any interest that would have accrued on those monies, in an amount to be proven at  
5 trial. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks a monetary award in the form of damages, restitution and/or  
6 disgorgement of ill-gotten gains to compensate Plaintiff and the Class for these losses. Plaintiff also  
7 seeks injunctive relief to enjoin Defendant's misconduct and prevent ongoing and future harm to  
8 consumers.

9 **IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 144. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,  
11 prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 12 a. **Certification:** For an order certifying this action as a class action, appointing  
13 Plaintiff as the Class Representative and appointing Plaintiff's Counsel as Class  
14 Counsel;
- 15 b. **Declaratory Relief:** For an order declaring that Defendant's conduct violates the  
16 statutes and laws referenced herein, consistent with applicable law and pursuant  
17 to only those causes of action so permitted;
- 18 c. **Injunction:** For an order requiring Defendant to change its business practices to  
19 prevent or mitigate the risk of the consumer deception and violations of law  
20 outlined herein. This includes, for example, orders that Defendant immediately  
21 cease and desist from selling the unlawful Products in violation of law; enjoin  
22 Defendant from continuing to market, advertise, distribute and sell the Products  
23 in the unlawful manner described herein; require Defendant to add appropriate  
24 warning labels or engage in an affirmative advertising campaign to dispel the  
25 public misperception of the Products resulting from Defendant's unlawful  
26 conduct; and take all further corrective action, consistent with applicable law and  
27 pursuant to only those causes of action so permitted;
- 28 d. **Damages/Restitution/Disgorgement:** For an order awarding monetary  
compensation in the form of damages, restitution and/or disgorgement to Plaintiff  
and the Class, consistent with applicable law and pursuant to only those causes of  
action so permitted;
- e. **Punitive Damages/Penalties:** For an order awarding punitive damages, statutory  
penalties and/or monetary fines, consistent with applicable law and pursuant to  
only those causes of action so permitted;
- f. **Attorneys' Fees & Costs:** For an order awarding attorneys' fees and costs,  
consistent with applicable law and pursuant to only those causes of action so  
permitted;
- g. **Pre/Post-Judgment Interest:** For an order awarding pre-judgment and post-

1 judgment interest, consistent with applicable law and pursuant to only those  
2 causes of action so permitted; and

3 h. **All Just & Proper Relief:** For such other and further relief as the Court deems  
4 just and proper.

5 **X. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

6 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues and causes of action so triable.

7 Dated: April 25, 2025

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

8 /s/ Bahar Sodaify

9 Ryan J. Clarkson  
Bahar Sodaify  
Alan Gudino

10 **PEARSON WARSHAW, LLP**

11 Melissa S. Weiner (*PHV forthcoming*)  
12 Ryan T. Gott (*PHV forthcoming*)  
13 328 Barry Avenue S., Suite 200  
Wayzata, Minnesota 55391  
14 Tel: (612) 389-0600  
15 Fax: (612) 389-0610  
mweiner@pwfirm.com  
rgott@pwfirm.com

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Ziploc Lawsuit Claims 'Microwave Safe' Storage Freezer Bags, Containers Leach Microplastics into Food](#)

---