1 2 3 4 5	H. Ty Kharazi, Esq.; SBN 187894 YARRA LAW GROUP 2000 Fresno Street, Suite 300 Fresno, CA 93721 Telephone: (559) 441-1214 Facsimile: (559) 266-4236 Attorney for PLAINTIFF LETITIA SANCHES	E-FILED 2/9/2021 9:43 AM Superior Court of California County of Fresno By: A. Rodriguez, Deputy
6		
7 8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF FRESNO	
10	LETITIA SANCHES	Case No. 21CECG00378
11	Plaintiff.	COMPLAINT FOR EQUITABLE RELIEF
12	Vs.	AND CIVIL PENALTIES (CA B&P 17200 Et Seq. and 17500 Et Seq.)
13	DELI DELICIOUS FRANCHISING, INC. A California Corporation, HESAM HOBAB an Individual and DOES 1-25, inclusive.	
14	murviduai and DOLS 1-23, morasivo.	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, LETITIA SANCHES ("SANCHES"), alleges the following on information and	
18	belief:	
19	NATURE OF THE ACTION 1. Defendant DELI DELICIOUS FRANCHISING INC. ("DDFI") is a franchisor which issues	
20 21	1. Defendant DELI DELICIOUS FRANCHISING INC. ("DDFI") is a franchisor which issues licenses to operate Deli Delicious restaurants primarily in the Central Valley of California. The	
21 22	headquarters of DDFI is located in Fresno, California. The sole stockholder of DDFI is	
23	Mohammad Hobab, the father of Co-Defendant Hesam Hobab.	
24		
(ARRA LAW GROUP	1	
)00 Fresno Street, St. 300 Fresno, CA 93721	COMPLAINT	

- 2. Defendant Hesam Hobab is the president of DDFI and also operates a free standing franchise located at 5628 N. Blackstone Avenue, in Fresno, California.
- 3. Plaintiff Letitia Sanches is a consumer of products within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code §§17200 & 17500 et seq.
- 4. Plaintiff is unaware of the names and capacities of those defendants named as DOES 1-25 herein. Plaintiff believes and thereon alleges that DDFI, HOBAB and DOES 1-25 are principals, agents, successors or affiliates of each other. Plaintiff prays leaved to amend once the true names and capacity of those named as DOES are known to her.
- 5. The events giving rise to this litigation happened in Fresno, California.
- 6. This action arises from Defendants joint and concerted effort to sell deli sandwiches disguised as fresh and organic products whereas the main ingredient of the sandwich, its bread, is baked and then frozen before being shipped to the restaurants.
- 7. As described further below, Defendant DDFI and this franchisee and perhaps score of other restaurants, have violated California's Unfair Competition Law (Business and Professions Code section 17200, et seq.), and False Advertising Law (Business and Professions Code section 17500, et seq.) by selling frozen bread disguised as fresh.
- 8. This action further claims, on information and belief, that DDFI and its applicable franchisees advertise that the bread is made with 100% organic flour but do not make their bread using 100% organic flour the majority of times.
- 9. As a result of Defendant DDFI's unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business acts practices, and deceptive advertising acts, consumers are fooled or mislead by its products and advertisings all in violation of California Consumer Protection Laws.
- 10. A demand for correction was issued to DDFI and HOBAB on November 26, 2020 but neither DDFI nor HOBAB has ceased to correct the deficiency.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. Marion Webster defines a sandwich as two or more slices of bread or a split roll having a filling in between or b: one slice of bread covered with food. Indeed, that is what most people think of a sandwich when they hear the term. Plaintiff Sanchez also believed that she was buying sandwiches made out of bread with a particular filling therein.
- 12. Defendant DDFI advertises its sandwiches as having "fresh ingredients". The main ingredient of a sandwich is its bread as set forth above. One cannot make a sandwich without bread and "wrap" foods do not constitute a sandwich.
- 13. Based on information and belief, DDFI has forced the majority of its franchises to buy frozen bread from its sister entity DD'S Bakery which bakes the sandwich breads and then freezes them before having them sent to restaurants. DD's Bakery's major owner is also Mohammad Hobab.
- 14. DDFI also advertises that it uses 100% organic flour for all its products. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that DDFI's bread which is sold in the sandwiches is not made with 100% organic bread.
- 15. On November 24, 2020, Plaintiff visited the site of Hesam Hobab's restaurant located at 5628 N. Blackstone Avenue, Fresno, California. That store is owned and operated by Hesam Hobab.
- 16. The ordered two sandwiches which were: Classic Ham with Swiss cheese and Turkey Avocado. All signs at the store showed that the DDFI's sandwiches were made of 100% organic flour. There were also signs promoting the sandwiches as having "fresh ingredients" or "always fresh". The photos shown in the store depicted bread that looked nothing like the sandwiches she had just bought.

knew or should have known were untrue or misleading, including but not limited to

or misleading statements in connection with the sale of goods or services, that Defendants

23

24

2

3

5

7

Λ

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment and relief as follows:

- 1. Under Business and Professions Code, sections 17203, 17204 and 17535 and the equitable powers of this Court, Defendant DDFI, together with its successors and assigns, franchisees and all persons who act in concert with them or on their behalf, be permanently enjoined from engaging in any of the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts and practices and deceptive advertising described in this Complaint, and be required to take such actions and adopt such measures as are necessary to prevent Defendant DDFI from engaging in any further such acts, practices and advertising.
- 2. Under Business and Professions Code, sections 17203, 17204 and 17535 and the 26 equitable powers of this Court, Defendants DDFI and HOBAB, together with its successors and assigns and all persons who act in concert with or on their behalf, be ordered to restore to any person any money or property that Defendant DDFI and HOBAB may have acquired by means of the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent business acts and practices and deceptive advertising described in this Complaint.
- 3. Under Business and Professions Code section 17206, Defendants DDFI and HOBAB be assessed a civil penalty in the amount of \$2,500 for each violation of the UCL, according to proof.
- 4. Under Business and Professions Code, section 17536, Defendants DDFI and HOBAB be assessed a civil penalty in the amount of \$2,500 for each violation of Business and Professions Code, section 17500, according to proof.
 - 5. For the costs of suit.
 - 6. For attorney's fees under CCP 1021.50.
 - 7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem to be just and proper.

(ARRA LAW GROUP) 100 Fresno Street, St. 300 Fresno, CA 93721