Using Civil Litigation to Fight Seafood Substitution: Consumers, Competitors & Whistleblowers

Jonathan K. Tycko (202) 973-0900 www.tzlegal.com



Who is potentially impacted by seafood substitution?

Consumers

- don't get what they bargain for
- overpay
- potentially exposed to health risks

Competitors

 honest players lose sales and market share to dishonest players

Taxpayers

 government buys directly, or funds the purchase of, food including seafood products

Introduction

Consumers

→ can bring claims for fraud and/or violations of consumer protection laws

Competitors

→ can bring claims for anticompetitive conduct, including false advertising

Taxpayers

→ whistleblowers with inside information about fraud on government programs can bring "qui tam" actions

Introduction

Consumer who buys product labeled Fish A, that is really cheaper Fish B, could bring class action claims for:

- Common law fraud
- Negligent misrepresentation
- Violation of consumer protection statutes

Consumers

- All participants in supply chain (retailers, manufacturers, importers) selling mislabeled seafood have potential liability.
- Lack of reasonable safeguards and monitoring could give rise to liability.
- In some jurisdictions (including District of Columbia) "testors" may have standing to bring a lawsuit.

Consumers

- Substitution and mislabeling, as a way to gain market share or increase profits, is illegal and unethical. "Honest players" have legal remedies against "dishonest players."
- Primary tool is the federal Lanham Act, designed to combat false advertising.

Competitors

§ 43(a) of the Lanham Act authorizes civil lawsuits against a competitor that makes "any false or misleading description of fact or false or misleading representation of fact, which . . . in commercial advertising or promotion, misrepresents the nature, characteristics, qualities, or geographic origin of his or her or another person's good, services, or commercial activities."

Competitors

Under Lanham Act, two primary remedies:

Injunction

A court order prohibiting the dishonest competitor from continuing to engage in false advertising or promotion; often the primary goal of Lanham Act lawsuit.

Damages

Can be recovered if honest competitor can show lost sales, or other types of business injuries

Competitors

The federal government pays for a lot of food.

- Purchases directly for its own use (cafeterias in federal buildings, food for armed services, prisons, etc.)
- Purchases or pays for food through various assistance programs, including:
 - School Lunch Program (\$10.2 billion)
 - Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants & Children (WIC) (\$6.6 billion)
 - Child and Adult Care Program (\$2.8 billion)
 - The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) (\$308 million)
 - Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (\$102 million)

If taxpayer dollars used to buy fish that isn't what it claims to be, seller may be liable for defrauding the government.

- Under the federal False Claims Act, unlawful to present, or cause to be presented, a "false claim" to the government or to a government program.
- "Cause to be presented" even downstream sellers (ones that sell to contractors or other middlemen) can be liable.

Under the federal False Claims Act, the government can recover significant sums of money, even beyond what it paid for the product.

- Treble damages, plus
- Penalties of up to \$11,000 per false claim

- A whistleblower with non-public information about fraud on a government program can bring a "qui tam" lawsuit, which means a lawsuit brought in the name of the government.
- If case is successful, the whistleblower receives an award of between 15-30% of the amount recovered for the government.

Through qui tam cases, whistleblowers not only "do the right thing," but also received large awards.

For example, whistleblower has information about 10 fraudulent shipments, \$100,000 each:

Government

(\$1 million x 3) + \$110,000 = \$3,110,000

Whistleblower

Between \$466,500 and \$930,000

Government / Whistleblowers

To be a successful under False Claims Act, a seafood substitution whistleblower would need to at least have non-public information that:

- A company was engaged in substitution;
- The company was acting knowingly; and
- The government was purchasing the substituted product

Government / Whistleblowers

Using Civil Litigation to Fight Seafood Substitution: Consumers, Competitors & Whistleblowers

Jonathan K. Tycko (202) 973-0900 www.tzlegal.com

