

1 **BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**  
L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626)  
2 Julia A. Luster (State Bar No. 295031)  
1990 North California Boulevard, Suite 940  
3 Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Telephone: (925) 300-4455  
4 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700  
E-Mail: ltfisher@bursor.com  
5 jluster@bursor.com

6 **BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**  
Scott A. Bursor (State Bar No. 276006)  
7 888 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10019  
8 Telephone: (212) 989-9113  
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163  
9 E-Mail: scott@bursor.com

10 **MILITARY JUSTICE ATTORNEYS, PLLC**  
Gerald Healy (*pro hac vice* motion forthcoming)  
11 219 Scott Street, PMB 315  
Beaufort, SC 29902  
12 Telephone: (844) 334-5459  
Facsimile: (843) 645-6530  
13 E-Mail: gerry@militaryjusticeattorneys.com

14 **MILITARY JUSTICE ATTORNEYS, PLLC**  
John Hafemann (State Bar No. 238758)  
15 21 W. Park Avenue  
Savannah, GA 31401  
16 Telephone: (844) 334-5459  
Facsimile: (843) 645-6530  
17 E-Mail: john@militaryjusticeattorneys.com

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
20 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
21

22 SIERA STRUMLAUF and BENJAMIN  
23 ROBLES, individually and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 STARBUCKS CORPORATION,

27 Defendant.  
28

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

1 Plaintiffs Siera Strumlauf and Benjamin Robles (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) bring this action  
2 on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated against Defendant Starbucks Corporation  
3 (“Starbucks” or “Defendant”). Plaintiffs make the following allegations pursuant to the  
4 investigation of their counsel and based upon information and belief, except as to the allegations  
5 specifically pertaining to themselves, which are based on personal knowledge.

### 6 NATURE OF ACTION

7 1. This is a class action lawsuit on behalf of purchasers of Starbucks Caffè Lattes,  
8 Flavored Lattes, Pumpkin Spice Lattes, Egg Nog Lattes, Skinny Lattes, Skinny Flavored Lattes,  
9 Vanilla Lattes, and Skinny Vanilla Lattes (collectively, “Lattes”). At its retail locations, Starbucks  
10 represents on its menu that its Lattes contain “12 fl. oz.” for a Tall, “16 fl. oz.” for a Grande, and  
11 “20 fl. oz.” for a Venti:<sup>1</sup>



16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Technically, the menu represents that Venti beverages are “20/24 fl. oz.” This means that hot  
27 beverages (like Starbucks Lattes) are purportedly “20 fl. oz.,” while cold beverages are purportedly  
28 “24 fl. oz.” For ease of reference, this complaint will only refer to the relevant representation as  
being “20 fl. oz.” in the context of Lattes.

1 However, Starbucks Lattes are uniformly underfilled pursuant to a standardized recipe. Tall Lattes  
2 are not 12 fluid ounces, Grande Lattes are not 16 fluid ounces, and Venti Lattes are not 20 fluid  
3 ounces. Starbucks cheats purchasers by providing less fluid ounces in their Lattes than  
4 represented. In fact, Starbucks Lattes are approximately 25% underfilled.

5 2. Starbucks Lattes are made from a standardized recipe, which Starbucks instituted in  
6 2009 to save on the cost of milk – one of its most expensive ingredients. To create a Latte, the  
7 standardized recipe requires Starbucks baristas to fill a pitcher with steamed milk up to an etched  
8 “fill to” line that corresponds to the size of the customer’s order, pour shots of espresso into a  
9 separate serving cup, pour the steamed milk from the pitcher into the serving cup, and top with ¼”  
10 of milk foam, leaving ¼” of free space in the cup. However, Starbucks’ standardized recipes for  
11 Lattes result in beverages that are plainly underfilled. Stated otherwise, the etched “fill to” lines in  
12 the pitchers are too low, by several ounces.

13 3. Moreover, the serving cups used by Starbucks for its Lattes are simply too small to  
14 accommodate the fluid ounces listed on Starbucks’ menu. For example, the serving cup used for  
15 Grande beverages holds exactly 16 fluid ounces, when completely full. However, Starbucks’  
16 standardized recipe for its Grande Latte calls to fill the serving cup up to “1/4 inch below cup rim.”  
17 Thus, when used in conjunction with its standardized recipes, Starbucks’ serving cups do not  
18 permit 12 ounce, 16 ounce, and 20 ounce Lattes.

19 4. By underfilling its lattes, thereby shortchanging its customers, Starbucks has saved  
20 countless millions of dollars in the cost of goods sold and was unjustly enriched by taking payment  
21 for more product than it delivers. Plaintiffs assert claims on behalf of themselves and a nationwide  
22 class of purchasers of Starbucks Lattes for breach of express warranty, breach of the implied  
23 warranty of merchantability, unjust enrichment, violation of California’s Consumers Legal  
24 Remedies Act (“CLRA”), violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”), violation of  
25 California’s False Advertising Law (“FAL”), negligent misrepresentation, and fraud.

26 **PARTIES**

27 5. Plaintiff Siera Strumlauf is a citizen of California who resides in San Francisco,  
28 California. Prior to the filing of this complaint, Plaintiff Strumlauf visited her local Starbucks in

1 San Francisco approximately one to two times per week, where she would purchase Grande-sized  
2 (16 fl. oz.) plain and vanilla-flavored Starbucks Lattes, which cost approximately \$3.95. Plaintiff  
3 Strumlauf saw the representation on Starbucks' menu that her Grande-sized Starbucks Lattes  
4 would be "16 fl. oz." prior to and at the time of purchase, and understood this to be a representation  
5 and warranty that her Lattes would, in fact, contain 16 fluid ounces. Plaintiff Strumlauf relied on  
6 this representation and warranty in deciding to purchase her Starbucks Lattes, and this  
7 representation and warranty was part of the basis of the bargain, in that she would not have  
8 purchased Grande-sized Starbucks Lattes on the same terms if she had known that they were not, in  
9 fact, 16 fluid ounces.

10 6. Plaintiff Benjamin Robles is a citizen of California and has his permanent residence  
11 in Carlsbad, California. In January 2015, Plaintiff Robles visited a Starbucks retail store in  
12 Carlsbad, California, where he purchased a Grande-sized (16 fl. oz.) plain Starbucks Latte, which  
13 cost approximately \$3.95. Plaintiff Robles saw the representation on Starbucks' menu that his  
14 Grande-sized Starbucks Lattes would be "16 fl. oz." prior to and at the time of purchase, and  
15 understood this to be a representation and warranty that his Lattes would, in fact, contain 16 fluid  
16 ounces. Plaintiff Robles relied on this representation and warranty in deciding to purchase his  
17 Starbucks Lattes, and this representation and warranty was part of the basis of the bargain, in that  
18 he would not have purchased Grande-sized Starbucks Lattes on the same terms if he had known  
19 that they were not, in fact, 16 fluid ounces.

20 7. Defendant Starbucks Corporation is a Washington corporation with its principal  
21 place of business in Seattle, Washington. Starbucks is a leading American coffee company and  
22 coffeehouse chain. Since its founding in 1971, Starbucks now operates 23,450 retail locations  
23 worldwide, including 12,937 locations in the United States alone, which serve hot and cold drinks,  
24 whole-bean coffee, espressos, teas, fresh juices, pastries, snacks, merchandise, and Starbucks  
25 Lattes. In 2015, Starbucks realized approximately \$19.2 billion in revenue, and employed 191,000  
26 workers.

27 8. Whenever reference is made in this Complaint to any representation, act, omission,  
28 or transaction of Starbucks, that allegation shall mean that Starbucks did the act, omission, or

1 transaction through its officers, directors, employees, agents, and/or representatives while they  
2 were acting within the actual or ostensible scope of their authority.

### 3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

9 10. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, this Court is the proper venue for this action because  
10 a substantial part of the events, omissions, and acts giving rise to the claims herein occurred in this  
11 District. Plaintiff Strumlauf is a citizen of California, resides in this District, and purchased a  
12 Starbucks Latte from Defendant in this District. Additionally, Starbucks distributed, advertised,  
13 and sold its Lattes, which are the subject of the present complaint, in this District.

### 14 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

#### 15 **A Brief Background On Lattes**

16 11. A latte is a coffee drink made with espresso and steamed milk. The term as used in  
17 English is a shortened form of the Italian *caffè latte*, *caffelatte*, or *caffellatte*, which means “milk  
18 coffee.” The word is also sometimes spelled “latté” or “lattè” in English.

19 12. Traditionally, a latte is created by mixing steamed milk and espresso, which is then  
20 topped with a thin layer of milk foam.

21 13. In America, lattes rose to popularity in the 1980s and 1990s, beginning in affluent  
22 urban markets such as Seattle and New York City. Specialty coffee products are now a booming  
23 industry, which is driven by lattes. For example, a 2013 article from Forbes reports that “about  
24 83% of U.S. adults drink coffee in one form or another.” Of these consumers, “about a third of  
25 them drink a ‘gourmet’ coffee each day,” of which “lattes and cappuccinos seem to be the kind  
26  
27  
28

1 ordered most frequently.” That said, “[i]t’s neck-and-neck [whether lattes or cappuccinos] gets the  
2 top spot, but lattes currently seem to have the slight edge.”<sup>2</sup>

3 14. While Starbucks does not release precise sales data on each of its products, there are  
4 indications that its lattes constitute a substantial portion of its sales. For example, Starbucks  
5 reported that it sold over 200 million pumpkin spice lattes (a limited seasonal offering) from 2003  
6 to 2013, generating revenues of at least \$100 million per year in recent seasons, according to  
7 Forbes.

8 **How Starbucks Lattes Are Created, Per The Company’s Standardized Recipe**

9 15. Starbucks Lattes are created according to a standardized recipe. As discussed in the  
10 company’s Beverage Resource Manual, Starbucks Lattes are created with 4 simple steps, as shown  
11 in the following diagram:

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>2</sup> See [http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertpassikoff/2013/09/16/u-s-consumers-drinking-a-latte-  
28 more-coffee/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertpassikoff/2013/09/16/u-s-consumers-drinking-a-latte-more-coffee/)

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

	SHORT	TALL	GRANDE	VENTI	QUALITY NOTES	
<b>1 steam milk</b>	2% milk is the default.				Measure to appropriate line on pitcher. Aerate milk 3–5 seconds.	
<b>2 queue shots</b>	Espresso	1 shot	1 shot	2 shots	2 shots	Pull shots directly into cup.
<b>3 add syrup</b>	Starbucks® syrup (from espresso bar if requested)	2 pumps	3 pumps	4 pumps	5 pumps	Full pumps
<b>4 finish and connect</b>	Fill with steamed milk. Top with ¼ inch of foam.				¼ inch below cup rim	

16. First, pursuant to the standardized recipe, the barista fills a standardized pitcher with steamed milk up to an etched “fill to” line. Each pitcher has at least 3 lines: one each for Tall, Grande, and Venti beverages. By having these “fill to” lines, the barista has no discretion to individually determine how much milk to use in each Latte, nor is there any room for deviation.

17. Second, pursuant to the standardized recipe, the barista adds shots of espresso to a separate serving cup. One shot is used for Tall Lattes, while two shots are used for Grande and Venti Lattes. Again, the barista has no discretion to individually determine how much espresso to use. A calibrated machine dispenses each shot.

1           18.    Third, pursuant to the standardized recipe, the barista adds flavoring syrup, if  
2 requested, according to the diagram above. Yet again, the barista has no discretion to individually  
3 determine how much flavoring syrup to use. Calibrated pumps dispense the syrup in measured  
4 amounts.

5           19.    Fourth, pursuant to the standardized recipe, the barista pours the steamed milk from  
6 the pitcher into the serving cup with the espresso. The barista then tops the beverage with ¼” of  
7 milk foam, leaving at least ¼” of space below the rim of the serving cup.

8    **Starbucks Lattes Are Underfilled**

9           20.    When Starbucks Lattes are created pursuant to the company’s standardized recipe,  
10 the resulting beverages are underfilled. Several categories of evidence support these allegations.

11           21.    First, Plaintiffs’ counsel purchased and measured Starbucks Lattes at different  
12 stores, in different states, in different sizes, and in different flavors. However, each Latte was  
13 underfilled by approximately 25%. Additionally, no Starbucks Latte was actually filled to the fluid  
14 ounces promised on Starbucks’ menu (*e.g.*, Tall should be “12 fl. oz.,” Grande should be “16 fl.  
15 oz.,” and Venti should be “20 fl. oz.”).

16           22.    Second, Plaintiffs’ counsel acquired several copies of the standardized pitcher  
17 currently in use by Starbucks baristas to make Lattes. However, the etched “fill to” lines used to  
18 measure the steamed milk are plainly set too low. For a Grande beverage, the “fill to” line  
19 comprises less than 12 fluid ounces of milk. After adding 2 shots of espresso (2 fluid ounces), the  
20 resulting beverage measures less than 14 fluid ounces at most. This falls far short of Starbucks’  
21 “16 fl. oz.” representation.

22           23.    Third, the serving cups used by Starbucks simply do not accommodate the promised  
23 beverage sizes in fluid ounces, per the standardized recipe for Lattes. For example, when filled to  
24 the brink, the serving cup used for Grande beverages holds *exactly* 16 fluid ounces (the same is true  
25 for the Tall cup, which holds *exactly* 12 fluid ounces, and the Venti cup, which holds *exactly* 20  
26 fluid ounces). However, Starbucks’ recipe for its Grande Latte calls to fill the serving cup up to  
27 “1/4 inch below cup rim.” Thus, ¼” of empty cup space exists above ¼” of milk foam, which sits  
28



1 atop the fluid Latte. Accordingly, per the recipe, the Grande serving cup is just too small to hold a  
2 16 fluid ounce latte.

3 24. Moreover, Starbucks refuses to fill any hot beverage up to the brim of the cup.  
4 Thus, under no circumstances will Starbucks ever serve a Grande Latte that actually meets the fluid  
5 ounces represented on the menu.

6 25. The milk foam added to the top of Starbucks Lattes does not count toward the  
7 volume of its beverages. In the food science community, as well as in the weights and measures  
8 community, foam is not measured on a volumetric basis. Rather, it is measured by mass. When  
9 food scientists – and weights and measures inspectors – measure a liquid with foam, the  
10 industry-standard procedure is to let the foam dissipate or eliminate the foam, then measure the  
11 resulting liquid. Under this analysis, milk foam cannot compensate for an otherwise underfilled  
12 Latte.

13 **Starbucks Made A Conscious Decision To Underfill Its Lattes To Save Money On Milk**

14 26. Starbucks faced financial difficulty at the end of 2007. Its stock was down 42%,  
15 and many of its stores were failing. In January 2008, Howard Schultz, Chairman of the board,  
16 resumed his position as CEO (which he had left in 2000), and lead an effort to return the company  
17 to profitability. As part of these efforts, Mr. Schultz made over \$500 million of permanent cuts in  
18 costs by laying off 4,000 employees, closing 800 retail locations in the United States, and reducing  
19 the cost of goods sold.

20 27. A key component to this cost-cutting effort was to reduce the amount of milk used  
21 by baristas and in Starbucks beverages. As reported by Bloomberg in 2009, Starbucks  
22 accomplished this objective by putting standardized, etched lines in its steaming pitchers. These  
23 etched lines on the pitchers were made specifically for Starbucks, and are used by all Starbucks  
24 retail locations. In doing so, barista discretion was eliminated, and the amount of milk in each latte  
25 was standardized:

26 [T]he baristas were [previously] pouring millions of dollars of  
27 leftover milk down the drain. As store managers for the first time  
28 began thinking about how to operate more efficiently, an idea  
emerged. It was simple, obvious, and made everyone wonder why

1 no one had thought of it before: They could put etched lines in the  
2 steaming pitchers so that the baristas would know exactly how much  
3 milk to use for each size drink. Before, they just guessed. “The  
4 celebration of that line in the halls of Starbucks has become a  
5 metaphor,” says Schultz. “How many other lines can we find?  
6 We’ve found a lot because no one was ever looking. The people  
7 who have found those lines have become part of the folklore.”

8 *See [http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2009-08-06/starbucks-howard-schultz-vs-dot-](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2009-08-06/starbucks-howard-schultz-vs-dot-howard-schultz)*  
9 *howard-schultz (emphasis added).*

10 28. Simply put, milk is an expensive ingredient. As reported by ABC News in a piece  
11 entitled “Record Milk Price Squeezing Starbucks,” “CEO Howard Schultz told reporters earlier  
12 this week, following the company’s annual meeting in Seattle: ‘I am concerned about dairy  
13 [prices], both domestically and around the world, and we are working feverishly with our  
14 suppliers.’”

15 29. Accordingly, by etching “fill to” lines on its steaming pitchers and removing  
16 employee discretion, Starbucks was able to reduce its daily costs, and the company eventually  
17 made a soaring comeback. Its stock went from a low of 3.92 on November 21, 2008 to 62.61 on  
18 October 23, 2015.

19 30. In the process, however, Starbucks cut too much milk. Stated otherwise, when a  
20 standard recipe is used to create a drink that is purportedly 16 fluid ounces, the resulting beverage  
21 should in fact be 16 fluid ounces. In connection with these cost-saving measures, Starbucks knew  
22 that the etched “fill to” lines in its steaming pitchers resulted in underfilled beverages. Yet  
23 Starbucks continued to advertise its Tall beverages as “12 fl. oz.,” its Grande beverages as “16 fl.  
24 oz.,” and its Venti beverages as “20 fl. oz.”

### 25 **CLASS REPRESENTATION ALLEGATIONS**

26 31. Plaintiffs seek to represent a class defined as all persons in the United States who  
27 purchased a Starbucks Latte (the “Class”). Excluded from the Class are persons who made such  
28 purchase for purpose of resale.

31. Plaintiffs also seek to represent a subclass of all Class members who purchased a  
Starbucks Latte in California (the “Subclass”).

1           33.     Members of the Class and Subclass are so numerous that their individual joinder  
2 herein is impracticable. On information and belief, members of the Class and Subclass number in  
3 the millions. The precise number of Class members and their identities are unknown to Plaintiffs  
4 at this time but may be determined through discovery. Class members may be notified of the  
5 pendency of this action by mail and/or publication through the distribution records of Defendant  
6 and third party retailers and vendors.

7           34.     Common questions of law and fact exist as to all Class members and predominate  
8 over questions affecting only individual Class members. Common legal and factual questions  
9 include, but are not limited to: whether Starbucks Lattes are underfilled; whether Defendant  
10 warranted that Starbucks Lattes contained a specific “fl. oz.” measurement for each size; whether  
11 Defendant breached these warranties; and whether Defendant committed statutory and common  
12 law fraud by doing so.

13           35.     The claims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class in that the  
14 named Plaintiffs purchased Starbucks Lattes in reliance on the representations and warranties  
15 described above and suffered a loss as a result of that purchase.

16           36.     Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class and Subclass because their  
17 interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class members they seek to represent, they have  
18 retained competent counsel experienced in prosecuting class actions, and they intend to prosecute  
19 this action vigorously. The interests of Class members will be fairly and adequately protected by  
20 Plaintiffs and their counsel.

21           37.     The class mechanism is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient  
22 adjudication of the claims of Class and Subclass members. Each individual Class member may  
23 lack the resources to undergo the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex and  
24 extensive litigation necessary to establish Defendant’s liability. Individualized litigation increases  
25 the delay and expense to all parties and multiplies the burden on the judicial system presented by  
26 the complex legal and factual issues of this case. Individualized litigation also presents a potential  
27 for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. In contrast, the class action device presents far fewer  
28 management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and

1 comprehensive supervision by a single court on the issue of Defendant’s liability. Class treatment  
2 of the liability issues will ensure that all claims and claimants are before this Court for consistent  
3 adjudication of the liability issues.

4 **COUNT I**

5 **Breach Of Express Warranty**

6 38. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding  
7 paragraphs of this complaint.

8 39. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed Class against  
9 Defendant.

10 40. Defendant, as the designer, manufacturer, marketer, distributor, and/or seller,  
11 expressly warranted that Starbucks Lattes contained “12 fl. oz.” for a Tall, “16 fl. oz.” for a  
12 Grande, and “20 fl. oz.” for a Venti.

13 41. In fact, Starbucks Lattes are not fit for such purposes because each of these express  
14 warranties are false. Starbucks Lattes are underfilled. A Tall does not contain 12 fluid ounces, a  
15 Grande does not contain 16 fluid ounces, and a Venti does not contain 20 fluid ounces.

16 42. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant’s breach of express warranty,  
17 Plaintiffs and Class members have been injured and harmed because: (a) they would not have  
18 purchased Starbucks Lattes on the same terms if the true facts were known concerning the Lattes’  
19 quantity; (b) they paid a price premium for Starbucks Lattes due to Defendant’s promises that its  
20 Lattes contained “12 fl. oz.,” “16 fl. oz.,” and “20 fl. oz.,” respectively; and (c) Starbucks Lattes  
21 did not have the characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities as promised.

22 **COUNT II**

23 **Breach Of The Implied Warranty Of Merchantability**

24 43. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding  
25 paragraphs of this complaint.

26 44. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed Class against  
27 Defendant.

1 45. Defendant, as the designer, manufacturer, marketer, distributor, and/or seller,  
2 impliedly warranted that Starbucks Lattes contained “12 fl. oz.” for a Tall, “16 fl. oz.” for a  
3 Grande, and “20 fl. oz.” for a Venti.

4 46. Defendant breached the warranty implied in the contract for the sale of Starbucks  
5 Lattes because they could not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description, the  
6 goods were not of fair average quality within the description, and the goods were unfit for their  
7 intended and ordinary purpose because Starbucks Lattes are underfilled, in that a Tall does not  
8 contain 12 fluid ounces, a Grande does not contain 16 fluid ounces, and a Venti does not contain 20  
9 fluid ounces. As a result, Plaintiffs and Class members did not receive the goods as impliedly  
10 warranted by Defendant to be merchantable.

11 47. Plaintiffs and Class members purchased Starbucks Lattes in reliance upon  
12 Defendant’s skill and judgment and the implied warranties of fitness for the purpose.

13 48. Starbucks Lattes were not altered by Plaintiffs or Class members.

14 49. Starbucks Lattes were defective when they left the exclusive control of Defendant.

15 50. Defendant knew that Starbucks Lattes would be purchased and used without  
16 additional testing by Plaintiffs and Class members.

17 51. Starbucks Lattes were defectively designed and unfit for their intended purpose, and  
18 Plaintiffs and Class members did not receive the goods as warranted.

19 52. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendant’s breach of the implied warranty,  
20 Plaintiffs and Class members have been injured and harmed because: (a) they would not have  
21 purchased Starbucks Lattes on the same terms if the true facts were known concerning the Lattes’  
22 quantity; (b) they paid a price premium for Starbucks Lattes due to Defendant’s promises that its  
23 Lattes contained “12 fl. oz.,” “16 fl. oz.,” and “20 fl. oz.,” respectively; and (c) Starbucks Lattes  
24 did not have the characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities as promised.

25 **COUNT III**

26 **Unjust Enrichment**

27 53. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding  
28 paragraphs of this complaint.



1 63. Plaintiffs and the Subclass suffered injuries caused by Defendant because: (a) they  
2 would not have purchased Starbucks Lattes on the same terms if the true facts were known  
3 concerning the Lattes' quantity; (b) they paid a price premium for Starbucks Lattes due to  
4 Defendant's promises that its Lattes contained "12 fl. oz.," "16 fl. oz.," and "20 fl. oz.,"  
5 respectively; and (c) Starbucks Lattes did not have the characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or  
6 quantities as promised.

7 64. On or about January 29, 2016, prior to filing this action, a CLRA notice letter was  
8 served on Defendant which complies in all respects with California Civil Code § 1782(a). Plaintiff  
9 Robles sent Starbucks a letter via certified mail, return receipt requested, advising Starbucks that it  
10 is in violation of the CLRA and demanding that it cease and desist from such violations and make  
11 full restitution by refunding the monies received therefrom. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's  
12 letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

13 65. Wherefore, Plaintiffs seek damages, restitution, and injunctive relief for this  
14 violation of the CLRA.

### 15 **COUNT V**

#### 16 **Violation Of California's Unfair Competition Law,** 17 **California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.***

18 66. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding  
19 paragraphs of this complaint.

20 67. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed Subclass  
21 against Defendant.

22 68. Defendant is subject to California's Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof.  
23 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* The UCL provides, in pertinent part: "Unfair competition shall mean and  
24 include unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue or  
25 misleading advertising ...."

26 69. Defendant's misrepresentations and other conduct, described herein, violated the  
27 "unlawful" prong of the UCL by violating the CLRA as described herein; the FAL as described  
28 herein; and Cal. Com. Code § 2607.

1           70. Defendant's misrepresentations and other conduct, described herein, violated the  
2 "unfair" prong of the UCL in that its conduct is substantially injurious to consumers, offends public  
3 policy, and is immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous, as the gravity of the conduct  
4 outweighs any alleged benefits.

5           71. Defendant violated the "fraudulent" prong of the UCL by making  
6 misrepresentations about Starbucks Lattes, as described herein.

7           72. Plaintiffs and the Subclass lost money or property as a result of Defendant's UCL  
8 violations because: (a) they would not have purchased Starbucks Lattes on the same terms if the  
9 true facts were known concerning the Lattes' quantity; (b) they paid a price premium for Starbucks  
10 Lattes due to Defendant's promises that its Lattes contained "12 fl. oz.," "16 fl. oz.," and "20 fl.  
11 oz.," respectively; and (c) Starbucks Lattes did not have the characteristics, ingredients, uses,  
12 benefits, or quantities as promised.

### 13 **COUNT VI**

#### 14 **Violation Of California's False Advertising Law,**

#### 15 **California Business & Professions Code §§ 17500, et seq.**

16           73. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding  
17 paragraphs of this complaint.

18           74. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed Subclass  
19 against Defendant.

20           75. California's False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.,  
21 makes it "unlawful for any person to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated  
22 before the public in this state, ... in any advertising device ... or in any other manner or means  
23 whatever, including over the Internet, any statement, concerning ... personal property or services,  
24 professional or otherwise, or performance or disposition thereof, which is untrue or misleading and  
25 which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or  
26 misleading."



1           76. Defendant committed acts of false advertising, as defined by §17500, by  
2 misrepresenting that Starbucks Lattes contained “12 fl. oz.” for a Tall, “16 fl. oz.” for a Grande,  
3 and “20 fl. oz.” for a Venti.

4           77. Defendant knew or should have known, through the exercise of reasonable care that  
5 its representations about Starbucks Lattes were untrue and misleading.

6           78. Defendant’s actions in violation of § 17500 were false and misleading such that the  
7 general public is and was likely to be deceived.

8           79. Plaintiffs and the Subclass lost money or property as a result of Defendant’s FAL  
9 violations because: (a) they would not have purchased Starbucks Lattes on the same terms if the  
10 true facts were known concerning the Lattes’ quantity; (b) they paid a price premium for Starbucks  
11 Lattes due to Defendant’s promises that its Lattes contained “12 fl. oz.,” “16 fl. oz.,” and “20 fl.  
12 oz.,” respectively; and (c) Starbucks Lattes did not have the characteristics, ingredients, uses,  
13 benefits, or quantities as promised.

14    **COUNT VII**

15    **Negligent Misrepresentation**

16           80. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding  
17 paragraphs of this complaint.

18           81. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed Class against  
19 Defendant.

20           82. As discussed above, Defendant misrepresented that Starbucks Lattes contained “12  
21 fl. oz.” for a Tall, “16 fl. oz.” for a Grande, and “20 fl. oz.” for a Venti.

22           83. At the time Defendant made these representations, Defendant knew or should have  
23 known that these representations were false or made them without knowledge of their truth or  
24 veracity.

25           84. At an absolute minimum, Defendant negligently misrepresented and/or negligently  
26 omitted material facts about Starbucks Lattes.

27  
28

1 85. The negligent misrepresentations and omissions made by Defendant, upon which  
2 Plaintiffs and Class members reasonably and justifiably relied, were intended to induce and  
3 actually induced Plaintiffs and Class members to purchase Starbucks Lattes.

4 86. Plaintiffs and Class members would not have purchased Starbucks Lattes on the  
5 same terms if the true facts had been known.

6 87. The negligent actions of Defendant caused damage to Plaintiffs and Class members,  
7 who are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable relief as a result.

8 **COUNT VIII**

9 **Fraud**

10 88. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in all preceding  
11 paragraphs of this complaint.

12 89. Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the proposed Class against  
13 Defendant.

14 90. As discussed above, Defendant provided Plaintiffs and Class members with false or  
15 misleading material information and failed to disclose material facts about Starbucks Lattes,  
16 including but not limited to the fact that they contained “12 fl. oz.” for a Tall, “16 fl. oz.” for a  
17 Grande, and “20 fl. oz.” for a Venti.

18 91. The misrepresentations and omissions made by Defendant, upon which Plaintiffs  
19 and Class members reasonably and justifiably relied, were intended to induce and actually induced  
20 Plaintiffs and Class members to purchase Starbucks Lattes.

21 92. The fraudulent actions of Defendant caused damage to Plaintiffs and Class  
22 members, who are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable relief as a result.

23 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, seek  
25 judgment against Defendant, as follows:

- 26 a. For an order certifying the nationwide Class and the Subclass under Rule 23 of the  
27 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and naming Plaintiffs as the representatives of the  
28

1 Class and Subclass and Plaintiffs' attorneys as Class Counsel to represent members  
2 of the Class and Subclass;

- 3 b. For an order declaring the Defendant's conduct violates the statutes referenced  
4 herein;
- 5 c. For an order finding in favor of Plaintiffs, the nationwide Class, and the Subclass on  
6 all counts asserted herein;
- 7 d. For compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be determined by the Court  
8 and/or jury;
- 9 e. For prejudgment interest on all amounts awarded;
- 10 f. For an order of restitution and all other forms of equitable monetary relief;
- 11 g. For injunctive relief as pleaded or as the Court may deem proper; and
- 12 h. For an order awarding Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Subclass their reasonable  
13 attorneys' fees and expenses and costs of suit.

14 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

15 Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury of all issues so triable.

16 Dated: March 16, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

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

18 By: /s/ L. Timothy Fisher  
19 L. Timothy Fisher

20 L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626)  
21 Julia A. Luster (State Bar No. 295031)  
22 1990 North California Boulevard, Suite 940  
23 Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
24 Telephone: (925) 300-4455  
25 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700  
26 E-Mail: ltfisher@bursor.com  
27 jluster@bursor.com

28 **BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**  
Scott A. Bursor (State Bar No. 276006)  
888 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 989-9113  
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163  
E-Mail: scott@bursor.com

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

**MILITARY JUSTICE ATTORNEYS, PLLC**  
Gerald Healy (*pro hac vice* motion forthcoming)  
219 Scott Street, PMB 315  
Beaufort, SC 29902  
Telephone: (844) 334-5459  
Facsimile: (843) 645-6530  
E-Mail: gerry@militaryjusticeattorneys.com

**MILITARY JUSTICE ATTORNEYS, PLLC**  
John Hafemann (State Bar No. 238758)  
21 W. Park Avenue  
Savannah, GA 31401  
Telephone: (844) 334-5459  
Facsimile: (843) 645-6530  
E-Mail: john@militaryjusticeattorneys.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*


1  
2 I, Siera Strumlauf, declare as follows:

3 1. I am a plaintiff in this action and a citizen of the State of California. I have personal  
4 knowledge of the facts stated herein and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify  
5 competently thereto.

6 2. The complaint filed in this action is filed in the proper place for trial under  
7 California Civil Code Section 1780(d) in that Defendant conducts a substantial amount of business  
8 in this District.

9 3. While living in San Francisco, California, I purchased one or more Grande  
10 Starbucks Lattes for my household and my personal use. I purchased a Grande Starbucks Latte  
11 after I read the representation that a Grande is "16 fl. oz." This representation was a substantial  
12 factor influencing my decision to purchase a Grande Starbucks Latte. I would not have purchased  
13 a Grande Starbucks Latte if I had known that it was underfilled.  
14

15 I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
16 foregoing is true and correct, executed on February 29, 2016 at San Francisco, California.  
17

18  
19 

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  

---

SIERA STRUMLAUF

**EXHIBIT A**



1990 NORTH CALIFORNIA BLVD.  
SUITE 940  
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596-7351  
[www.bursor.com](http://www.bursor.com)

L. TIMOTHY FISHER  
Tel: 925.300.4455  
Fax: 925.407.2700  
[ltfisher@bursor.com](mailto:ltfisher@bursor.com)

January 29, 2016

**Via Certified Mail – Return Receipt Requested**

Starbucks Corporation  
Attn: Legal Department  
2401 Utah Avenue South  
Seattle, WA 98134

*Re: Demand Letter Pursuant to California Civil Code § 1782 and  
Violation of U.C.C. §§ 2-313, 2-314*

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as a preliminary notice and demand for corrective action by Starbucks Corporation (“Starbucks”) pursuant to California’s Consumers Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code § 1782, on behalf of our client, Benjamin Robles, and a class of all similarly situated purchasers (the “Class”) of Starbucks Caffè Latte, Flavored Latte, Skinny Latte, Skinny Flavored Latte, Vanilla Latte, and Skinny Vanilla Latte beverages (collectively, “Starbucks Lattes”). This letter also serves as notice pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607(3)(A) concerning the breaches of express and implied warranties described herein.

Starbucks Lattes are sold to consumers in the following sizes: Short (8 fl. oz.), Tall (12 fl. oz.), Grande (16 fl. oz.), and Venti (20 fl. oz.). However, instead of receiving a latte with these represented fluid ounces, Starbucks systematically underfills its lattes. In short, Starbucks is cheating purchasers by providing less fluid ounces in their lattes than they are paying for. *See* U.C.C. §§ 2-313, 2-314.

By systematically underfilling Starbucks Lattes, Starbucks has violated and continues to violate numerous provisions of California law, including but not limited to subsections (a)(5) and (a)(9) of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code § 1770, which prohibits representing that goods or services have sponsorship, approval, characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities which they do not have, and advertising goods or services with intent not to sell them as advertised.

In 2015, Mr. Robles purchased Starbucks Grande Caffè Lattes in San Diego and Carlsbad, California. On behalf of our client and the putative class, we hereby demand that Starbucks immediately (a) cease and desist from continuing to underfill Starbucks Lattes, and (b) make full restitution to all purchasers of its mislabeled lattes of all purchase money obtained from the sales thereof.

It is further demanded that Starbucks preserve all documents and other evidence which refer or relate to any of the above-described practices including, but not limited to, the following:

1. All documents concerning recipes for Starbucks Lattes;
2. All documents concerning the advertisement, marketing, or sale of Starbucks Lattes; and
3. All communications with customers concerning complaints or comments concerning the practices described herein related to Starbucks Lattes.

This letter also serves as a thirty (30) day notice and demand requirement under California Civil Code § 1782 for damages. Accordingly, should Starbucks fail to rectify the situation on a class-wide basis within 30 days of receipt of this letter, we will seek actual damages, plus punitive damages, interest, attorneys' fees and costs.

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

Very truly yours,



L. Timothy Fisher

Gerald R. Healy  
Gerald R. Healy (Jan 29, 2016)

Mr. Gerald R. Healy  
Owner/Managing Partner  
Military Justice Attorneys, PLLC  
[gerry@militaryjusticeattorneys.com](mailto:gerry@militaryjusticeattorneys.com)