

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.,
Attorney General of the State of California
2 FRANCES T. GRUNDER,
Senior Assistant Attorney General
3 MICHELE VAN GELDEREN, State Bar No. 171931
Deputy Attorney General
4 300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
5 Telephone: (213) 897-6027
Fax Number: (213) 897-4951
6

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
People of the State of California

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
10

11 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
12 Plaintiff,
13
14 v.
15 HY CITE CORPORATION, a Wisconsin
16 corporation, ERIK JOHNSON, an individual,
17 PETER O. JOHNSON, JR., an individual,
18 JAMES D. MARTIN, an individual, and
19 LAWRENCE SCHAUFF, an individual,
20 Defendants.
21

NO.

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION,
CIVIL PENALTIES, AND OTHER
RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF
BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS
CODE SECTIONS 17200 AND 17500
(UNFAIR COMPETITION AND
FALSE ADVERTISING LAWS)**

VERIFIED ANSWER REQUIRED
PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE
OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 446

EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES
PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT
CODE SECTION 6103

1 The People of the State of California (“the People” or “Plaintiff”), by and through Edmund
2 G. Brown Jr., Attorney General of the State of California, allege on information and belief as
3 follows:

4 **PARTIES**

5 1. Defendant Hy Cite Corporation (“Hy Cite”) is a Wisconsin corporation with its
6 principal place of business in Madison, Wisconsin. Hy Cite does business as “Royal Prestige.” Hy
7 Cite is, and at all relevant times was, engaged in the business of selling housewares, including
8 cookware, tableware and water filters, to the public, and providing financing to its customers for the
9 purchase of Defendants’ products. Hy Cite and/or its direct and indirect subsidiaries, affiliates,
10 officers, directors, employees, agents, related entities, successors, and assigns, at all times
11 mentioned herein, have transacted, and continue to transact, business within the State of California,
12 including in the County of Los Angeles.

13 2. Defendant Erik Johnson is, and at all relevant times was, the chairman and chief
14 executive officer of Hy Cite. In such capacity and as an individual, Johnson controls, manages,
15 supervises and directs the operations and activities of Hy Cite.

16 3. Defendant Peter O. Johnson, Jr. is, and at all relevant times was, the president and
17 chief operating officer of Hy Cite. In such capacity and as an individual, Johnson controls,
18 manages, supervises and directs the operations and activities of Hy Cite.

19 4. Defendant James D. Martin is, and at all relevant times was, the vice president of
20 sales and marketing. In such capacity and as an individual, Martin controls, manages, supervises
21 and directs the operations and activities of Hy Cite.

22 5. Defendant Lawrence Schauff is, and at all relevant times was, the senior vice
23 president of consumer credit. In such capacity and as an individual, Schauff controls, manages,
24 supervises and directs the operations and activities of Hy Cite.

25 6. Whenever reference is made in this Complaint to “Defendants,” such reference shall
26 include Hy Cite, Erik Johnson, Peter O. Johnson, Jr., James D. Martin and Lawrence Schauff.

27 7. Whenever reference in this complaint is made to any act of Defendant(s), that
28 allegation shall be deemed to mean the act of each Defendant acting individually and jointly.

- 1 a. To induce consumers to attend a sales presentation for Defendants' products
2 or to induce consumers to provide referrals to others whom Defendants can
3 solicit to attend such a sales presentation,
- 4 i. Defendants make untrue or misleading statements that consumers
5 have been "selected" to win a prize or gift or to enter a raffle for a
6 valuable prize. In fact, Defendants make the offer of a prize, gift or
7 raffle entry either indiscriminately or to any adult with a job.
8 Defendants make these statements so that the consumer will make an
9 appointment to receive the gift, prize or raffle entry form. At that
10 appointment, Defendants make their sales presentation.
- 11 ii. Defendants offer consumers free prizes or gifts or the opportunity to
12 enter a raffle for a valuable prize, and make untrue or misleading
13 statements that they are doing "publicity" for the company or that
14 Defendants are offering the gift, prize or raffle entry in exchange for
15 the consumer's opinion about Defendants' company or their products.
16 Defendants make these statements to disguise their true purpose of
17 scheduling appointments to make sales presentations for Defendants'
18 products.
- 19 iii. Defendants make untrue or misleading statements that a consumer
20 enters a raffle to win a valuable prize by providing his or her personal
21 information to Defendants. In fact Defendants use the consumer's
22 personal information to contact the consumer to schedule a sales
23 presentation for Defendants' products. The consumer must make an
24 appointment to meet a salesperson to get the raffle entry form, at
25 which time Defendants make a sales presentation for Defendants'
26 products.
- 27 iv. Defendants ask consumers for the names of family members or
28 friends who would like either to receive a prize or to enter a raffle for

1 a valuable prize. Defendants do not disclose prior to making this
2 request that the consumers' family members and friends will be asked
3 to view a sales presentation for Defendants' products.

4 b. During the sales presentation for their products,

5 i. Defendants make untrue or misleading statements that other
6 cookware, including cookware made with non-stick surfaces or
7 aluminum, is or may be hazardous to consumers' health.

8 ii. Defendants perform a demonstration in which a mixture of baking
9 soda and water is heated in various types of cookware, including other
10 cookware and their own cookware. Due to a chemical reaction, when
11 the baking soda and water mixture is heated in Defendants' stainless
12 steel cookware, it does not have the objectionable taste that it has
13 when heated in cookware with other surfaces such as aluminum or
14 non-stick surfaces. Defendants make untrue or misleading statements
15 that the objectionable taste demonstrates that cooking in other
16 cookware is or may be hazardous to consumers' health, but that
17 cooking in Defendants' cookware is safe.

18 iii. Defendants perform a demonstration in which various types of
19 cookware, including other cookware and Defendants' cookware, are
20 scrubbed with a coarse sponge and rinsed, with the resulting mixture
21 poured into a cup. The mixture from Defendants' cookware is clearer
22 than the mixture from cast iron, non-stick or aluminum-coated
23 cookware. Defendants then make untrue or misleading statements
24 that the results show that cooking in other cookware is or may be
25 harmful to consumers' health, but that cooking in Defendants'
26 cookware is safe.

27 iv. Defendants make untrue or misleading statements that the use of
28 Defendants' cookware, rather than other cookware, will result in

1 savings due to reduced energy usage or food shrinkage.

2 v. Defendants make untrue or misleading statements that Defendants are
3 offering Defendants' products at a discounted price for a limited time
4 or that Defendants are having a special "promotion" in which
5 consumers can receive additional products as gifts or prizes with
6 purchase.

7 vi. Defendants make untrue or misleading statements that Defendants
8 offer financing at an interest rate of about 2% per year, when in fact
9 Defendants offer financing at about 2% per month; the annual
10 percentage rate over 20%.

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FOR VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 *ET SEQ.***

13 **(UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES)**

14 13. The People reallege and incorporate by reference each of the paragraphs above as
15 though fully set forth herein.

16 14. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions Code
17 section 17200, by engaging in acts or practices including, but not necessarily limited to, the
18 following:

- 19 a. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions
20 Code section 17500 *et seq.*, as alleged above in the First Cause of Action.
- 21 b. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions
22 Code section 17500.3(a) by soliciting consumers in their homes, either in
23 person or by telephone, without disclosing in the manner required by this
24 section that the purpose of the contact is to effect a sale.
- 25 c. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions
26 Code section 17500.3(b) by using plans, schemes and ruses that misrepresent
27 Defendants' true status or mission for the purpose of making a sale.
- 28 d. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions

1 Code section 17508 by, among other things, making untrue or misleading
2 advertising claims, including claims that:

- 3 i. purport to be based on factual, objective, or clinical evidence,
 - 4 ii. compare their products' effectiveness or safety to that of other
5 products, or
 - 6 iii. purport to be based on any fact.
- 7 e. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions
8 Code section 17537.1(a) by, as part of an advertising plan or program,
9 offering incentives as an inducement to consumers to visit a location, attend a
10 sales presentation, or contact a salesperson, without clearly and
11 conspicuously disclosing in writing the information required by that section.
- 12 f. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions
13 Code section 17537.1(g), in making an offer subject to section 17537.1(a), by
14 falsely representing directly or by implication that the number of participants
15 has been significantly limited or that the consumer has been selected to
16 receive a particular incentive.
- 17 g. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Business and Professions
18 Code section 17533.8 by offering a prize or gift with the intent to offer a
19 sales presentation, without disclosing at the time of the offer of the prize or
20 gift, in a clear and unequivocal manner, the intent to offer that sales
21 presentation.
- 22 h. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, the Consumer Legal
23 Remedies Act, Civil Code section 1770, by, among other things:
- 24 i. Disparaging the goods, services or business of another by untrue or
25 misleading representation of fact, in violation of Civil Code section
26 1770(a)(8).
 - 27 ii. Making untrue or misleading statements of fact concerning reasons
28 for, existence of, or amount of price reductions, in violation of Civil

1 Code section 1770(a)(13).

- 2 i. Defendants have violated, and continue to violate, Civil Code section 1689.5
3 *et seq.* Defendants enter into contracts with consumers for the purchase of
4 Defendants' products at locations other than Defendants' appropriate trade
5 premises, such as in consumers' homes, at shopping centers or at fairs.
6 Defendants, however, do not comply with the law governing home
7 solicitation contracts as set forth in Civil Code section 1689.7.
- 8 j. Defendants have offered contract terms, credit terms, rights, privileges and/or
9 advantages to certain consumers, and denied them to other consumers, based
10 on prohibited criteria.

11 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
12 **FOR VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE**
13 **SECTIONS 17207 AND 17535.5**
14 **(VIOLATION OF INJUNCTION)**

15 15. The People reallege and incorporate by reference each of the paragraphs above as
16 though fully set forth herein.

17 16. On March 9, 2000, the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of
18 San Francisco entered a stipulated final judgment and permanent injunction in the case of *The*
19 *People of the State of California v. Hy Cite Corporation, et al.*, Case Number 301274 (the "Final
20 Judgment").

21 17. Prior to the court's entry of the Final Judgment as set forth in the preceding
22 paragraph, the parties signed a stipulation agreeing to entry of that Final Judgment. The stipulation
23 was signed by Defendant Dennis R. Young, Hy Cite's Executive Vice-President and Chief
24 Operating Officer, individually and on behalf of Hy Cite; Peter O. Johnson, Sr.; James D. Martin;
25 and counsel for each of the foregoing Defendants.

26 18. Pursuant to Paragraph B of the Final Judgment, the injunction bound "defendant Hy
27 Cite Corporation, its successors, officers, directors, employees, agents and representatives;
28 defendants Peter O. Johnson Sr., Dennis R. Young and James D. Martin, their employees, agents

1 and representatives; and all persons who are acting in concert or in participation with any of them
2 who have actual or constructive knowledge of this Final Judgment . . .” Pursuant to that paragraph,
3 such defendants were permanently enjoined and restrained from directly or indirectly engaging in a
4 variety of enumerated acts or practices in or from California. Defendants have violated the Final
5 Judgment’s injunctive provisions including, but not limited to, the following provisions:

- 6 a. Paragraph B(2): “Making any claim concerning health risks users of any
7 cookware sold by any of Defendants’ competitors may incur unless such
8 claim is true and not misleading and Defendants can substantiate each
9 specific claim in regards to the cookware with information obtained in
10 accordance with generally accepted scientific testing procedures or with
11 information that is otherwise of the type that the scientific community would
12 reasonably rely upon to substantiate such claim. This includes, but is not
13 limited to, making any of the following claims which cannot be substantiated
14 as required above:

15 “(a) Cooking with pots or pans containing Teflon or similar
16 coatings could be hazardous to one’s health; or

17 “(b) Cooking with pots or pans containing aluminum could be
18 hazardous to one’s health.”

19 Defendants have made claims that cooking with pots made with non-stick
20 coating or containing aluminum could be hazardous to consumers’ health.
21 Defendants did not substantiate those claims as required by the Final
22 Judgment.

- 23 b. Paragraph B(10): “If Defendants provide literature or training to distributors
24 concerning the use of gifts or prizes to set appointments or as a sales tool,
25 failing to train distributors that it is unlawful for any person to offer, by mail,
26 by telephone, in person, or by any other means or in any other form, a prize
27 or gift, with the intent to offer a sales presentation, without disclosing at the
28 time of the offer of the prize or gift, in a clear and unequivocal manner, the

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

intent to offer such sales presentation.”

Defendants have provided materials to train distributors to use prizes or gifts to set appointments for the sale of Defendants’ products, but have not trained distributors as required by this provision of the Final Judgment.

c. Paragraph B(12): “Representing that any prospective consumer will save money on his or her energy bill by cooking with products sold by Defendants or by following Defendants’ cooking method unless such representation is true and not misleading and Defendants can substantiate the claim by the results of a study that was performed with Defendant’s products by following generally accepted testing or measuring techniques.”

Defendants have claimed that consumers will save money on their energy bills by using Defendants’ products or by following Defendants’ cooking method. This is untrue, misleading and was not substantiated as required by this provision of the Final Judgment.

d. Paragraph B(14): “Requesting or requiring a consumer to enter into a “retail installment account” (as defined by Civil Code § 1802.7) instead of a “retail installment contract” (as defined by Civil Code § 1802.6) for the purchase of goods or services if any of the following is true:

“(b) A credit application is required, a credit check is performed, or a certain number of payments must have been timely received before a consumer can make a subsequent purchase on the same account (however, nothing herein precludes Defendants from determining whether the line of credit has been or will be exceeded, previously has been revoked or is currently delinquent); or

“(c) Defendants have the right to decline subsequent purchases from a consumer whose credit line has not been revoked or whose account is not delinquent.”

Defendants require consumers to enter into retail installment accounts in

1 violation of these terms, including, but not limited to, the following: (1) a
2 consumer whose credit score is below a designated threshold is required to
3 make four or more consecutive payments and meet other criteria before the
4 consumer can make subsequent purchases; (2) a consumer's request to make
5 a subsequent purchase over \$1,000 may be denied even if the consumer's
6 credit line has not been revoked and the account is not delinquent.

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

9 1. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17535, that Defendants, their
10 successors, agents, representatives, employees, and all persons who act in concert with Defendants,
11 be permanently enjoined from making untrue or misleading statements in violation of Business and
12 Professions Codes section 17500 as alleged in this complaint.

13 2. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17203, that Defendants, their
14 successors, agents, representatives, employees, and all persons who act in concert with Defendants,
15 be permanently enjoined from committing acts of unfair competition as alleged in this complaint.

16 3. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17536, that the Court assess a
17 civil penalty of two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500) for each violation of Business and
18 Professions Code section 17500, as proved at trial.

19 4. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17206, that the Court assess a
20 civil penalty of two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500) for each violation of Business and
21 Professions Code section 17200, as proved at trial.

22 5. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17207 and 17535.5, that the
23 Court assess a civil penalty of six thousand dollars (\$6,000) for each violation of the Final
24 Judgment entered March 9, 2000 as proved at trial.

25 6. That Defendants be ordered to make restitution of any money or other property that
26 may have been acquired by their violations of Business and Professions Code sections 17500 *et seq.*
27 and 17200 *et seq.* as alleged in this complaint.

28 ///

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

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

7. Such other and further relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: August 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
EDMUND G. BROWN JR.,
Attorney General of the State of California
FRANCES T. GRUNDER,
Senior Assistant Attorney General
MICHELE VAN GELDEREN,
Deputy Attorney General

By: _____
MICHELE VAN GELDEREN
Deputy Attorney General