

KNEUPPER & COVEY, PC
A. Lorraine Weekes, Esq. (CA SBN 332369)
lorraine@kneuppercovey.com
Kevin Kneupper, Esq. (CA SBN 325413)
kevin@kneuppercovey.com
A. Cyclone Covey, Esq. (CA SBN 335957)
cyclone@kneuppercovey.com
17011 Beach Blvd., Suite 900
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
Tel: 657-845-3100
Fax: 855-596-3707

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jeremy Sher, Johanna Dominguez,
And the Putative Class*

**SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

JEREMY SHER, on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated, and
JOHANNA DOMINGUEZ, on behalf of
herself and all others similarly situated

Plaintiffs,

vs.

RAINBOW SANDALS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 23STCV23449

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Breach of Express Warranty;
2. Violation of the Magnuson-Moss
Warranty Act;
3. Violation of the Consumers Legal
Remedies Act; and
4. Violation of the Unfair Competition Law.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs Jeremy Sher and Johanna Dominguez, by and through the undersigned counsel,
2 on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, hereby file this First Amended Class
3 Action Complaint against Defendant Rainbow Sandals, Inc. (Rainbow) and alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. Rainbow is a shoe and apparel company known for its high-end flip-flops.
6 Rainbow brands itself as selling “The World’s Best Made Sandals Since 1974” and uses slogans,
7 such as “For the Long Ride . . .” and “Mileage Plus . . .” that foreground the longevity and
8 durability of its sandals.

9 2. Defendant Rainbow has misrepresented to consumers and continues to
10 misrepresent to consumers that many of its products come with a lifetime guarantee. Specifically,
11 Rainbow represents that many of its sandals come with “The Rainbow® Guarantee” which “is
12 for the lifetime of the sole. The sandals will be eligible for warranty until you have worn through
13 anywhere on the top or bottom layer of the sole.”

14 3. In actuality, Rainbow does not offer purchasers of its sandals a warranty for the
15 lifetime of the sandals’ sole: Defendant routinely denies consumers who seek to have Rainbow
16 repair manufacturing defects *during the lifetime of their sandals’ soles*. As such, Defendant’s
17 representations regarding the Rainbow® Guarantee it offers are false and misleading.

18 4. This is a class action brought on behalf of consumers, like Jeremy Sher and
19 Johanna Dominguez, who believed Rainbow when it touted its lifetime-of-the-sole guarantee and
20 paid a premium for sandals that come with a lifetime-of-the-sole guarantee and then got far less
21 than they bargained for.

22 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23 5. This court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
24 Article VI, section 10.

25 6. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Rainbow because Rainbow
26 purposely directed its advertising and sales to California residents as described herein and because
27 Rainbow has its principal place of business in California and is incorporated in California.

28 7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to California Civil Procedure Code section

395(b) because Plaintiff Sher resided in this county at the time this action was commenced; venue is also proper in this court pursuant to California Civil Procedure Code section 395(b) because Plaintiff Sher signed the contract in this county insofar as he purchased sandals for personal or household use from a retail store in Los Angeles County.

8. Venue is proper under California Civil Code section 1780(d) because Defendant is doing business in Los Angeles County and a substantial portion of the transaction at issue in this case occurred in Los Angeles County.

THE PARTIES

9. Plaintiff Jeremy Sher is a citizen of the State of California and resides in Los Angeles County, California. In 2011, Plaintiff purchased a pair of sandals from one of Defendant's brick-and-mortar storefront locations in Los Angeles County.

10. Plaintiff Johanna Dominguez is a citizen on the State of New York and resides in Buffalo, New York. In 2022, Ms. Dominguez purchased two pairs of sandals from Defendant's online website.

11. Defendant Rainbow Sandals, Inc. is a California corporation. Its principal place of business is at 900 Calle Negocio, San Clemente, CA 92673.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLASS MEMBERS

12. Defendant Rainbow sells a range of footwear, apparel and accessories, but it's best known for its flip-flops.

13. Rainbow emphasizes the durability and longevity of its sandals. For example, in a video featured on Rainbow Sandals' "History" webpage, Rainbow's founder Jay "Sparky" Longley explains "I started Rainbow Sandals because I figured I could make footwear, functional footwear that would last, uh, forever. And that's what I've been doing."¹

14. In adult sizes, the flip-flops Rainbow sells are priced at up to approximately ninety dollars, but most are between sixty and eighty dollars.

¹ See "History," Rainbow Sandals Inc., <https://www.rainbowsandals.com/rainbow-story/history> (embedding video from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KaN_HIVANM) (last accessed February 27, 2025).

15. Rainbow can charge so much for its flip-flops in part because it advertises them as being backed by the lifetime-of-the-sole Rainbow® Guarantee.

The Rainbow Guarantee

16. Rainbow's website describes the Rainbow® Guarantee:

RAINBOW GUARANTEE

The Rainbow® Guarantee is for the lifetime of the sole. The sandals will be eligible for warranty until you have worn through anywhere on the top or bottom layer of the sole.

RAINBOW® SANDALS will repair your sandals if they are damaged or defective due to manufacturing defects only. If your sandals are covered under our warranty and we are unable to repair them, we will issue a new pair.

SIGNATURE SERIES GUARANTEE POLICY

Rainbow® Guarantee

Rainbow Sandals will repair your sandals if they are damaged or defective due to manufacturing defects only. If you sandals are covered under our warranty and we are unable to repair them, we will issue a new pair. If a Signature Series Sandal is covered under the lifetime warranty and cannot be repaired we will replace your sandals with another Signature Series pair based on product availability. If no Signature Series sandals are available we will replace your sandals with a new pair of regular sandals of your choice. No additional refund will be issued.²

17. Beneath the guarantee are pictures showing defects covered by the Rainbow Guarantee, which include: (1) **"Strap Pulling Out from Toe Straps[:]"** If toe strap comes unglued and pulls cleanly from between the layers of the sandal;" (2) **"Strap Pulling Out from Side Strap[:]"** If side straps come unglued and pull cleanly from between the layers of the sandals;" and (3) **"Delamination of layers[:]"** The top or bottom sole coming unglued and separating from the middle layer of colored foam."

18. If one scrolls all the way past the "Rainbow Guarantee" and its associated photos, one eventually reaches the "Non Guarantee Policy," which provides: "RAINBOW® SANDALS

² "Rainbow Guarantee," Rainbow Sandals Inc., <https://www.rainbowsandals.com/customer-service/rainbow-guarantee> (last accessed June 26, 2023) (changes made to font, font size, and font formatting for readability).

will NOT Repair or Replace your sandals if they have any of the below issues occurring. The situations described below are wear and tear issues. If any of the below are present on your sandals the warranty is immediately voided, regardless if a manufacturing defect is also present.”

19. Underneath this language one finds photographs of the wear and tear issues contemplated by the Non Guarantee Policy. These include: (1) “**Bottom or Top Sole Wearing Through to Soft Colored Insert**[:] Wearing the sandals from the top or bottom sole into the soft colored insert between the top and bottom soles.” (2) “**Excessive Abuse**[:] Chewed Strap from Dog, Gouged or Ripped materials, Skateboard Abuse, Cuts, Slashes, Burns, etc.”; (3) “**Torn Toe Straps**[:] If the side/toe straps tear out from the surface of the sandal or if the strap itself is cut or torn.” (4) “**Torn/Cut Side Straps**[:] If the side/toe straps tear out from the surface of the sandal or if the strap itself is cut or torn;” and (5) “**Cracked Leather and/or Materials Water Damage**[:] Any damage as a result of the sandal coming in contact with moisture, i.e. bowed, shrunk, faded, wrinkled materials, cracked leather.”

20. Rainbow uses its “lifetime guarantee” as a selling point when hawking its sandals. For example, the ad copy on the product page for Rainbow’s Luxury Leather - Single Layer Arch Support with a 1/2” Narrow Strap women’s flip-flop on Rainbow’s website concludes: “The Luxury Leather Collection is of course backed by the Rainbow® Sandals Lifetime Guarantee.”³ Nothing on that product page discloses that because of Defendant’s routine refusals to honor the Rainbow Guarantee, purchasers will not actually receive protection against manufacturing defects throughout the lifetime of the covered sandals’ soles.

21. Consumers who’ve already forked over the cash for sandals covered by the lifetime-of-the-sole Rainbow® Guarantee (“Guaranteed Sandals”) often find, however, that Rainbow weaponizes its so-called “Non Guarantee Policy” against them in ways that render the lifetime-of-the-sole Rainbow® Guarantee virtually worthless. Specifically, they find that during the lifetime of their Guaranteed Sandals’ soles, Rainbow refuses to repair manufacturing defects

³ See “Luxury Leather - Single Layer Arch Support with a 1/2” Narrow Strap,” Rainbow Sandals Inc., https://www.rainbowsandals.com/product/301ALLN0_LADIES (last accessed March 3, 2025).

based on the pretense that normal wear-and-tear voids the Rainbow® Guarantee pursuant to Rainbow’s “Non Guarantee Policy.”

22. Consumers victimized by Rainbow’s predatory, deceptive, and wildly unreasonable application of the “Non Guarantee Policy” routinely take to the internet to complain about Rainbow’s anti-consumer practices and to highlight the deceptive nature of the company’s representations concerning the Rainbow Guarantee.

23. For example, on July 19, 2022, one consumer complained to the Better Business Bureau: “I purchased a pair of rainbow sandals in April ‘21 -The leather on them has separated from the cushion, indicating a manufacturers defect based on their ‘lifetime guarantee’-Rainbow Sandals says that this is not covered due to the sandals leather being cracked, even though that is not the defect in the product I’m looking to get coverage on.-Rainbow Sandals has a misleading ‘lifetime guarantee.’”⁴

24. On April 17, 2023, one consumer, “kevin m,” submitted the following review of Defendant to the Better Business Bureau:⁵

Always wore rainbow sandals growing up...then I actually grew up. I had a sole completely detach from the sandal but when I contacted them I was told that the condition of the leather wasn’t up to par for a GUARANTEE? I owned them for less than a year. It was clearly an issue with the adhesive that failed because it was the first time in 20 years I’d had this type of issue. Also they sent me photos of a different, more distressed pair of sandals to show how my GUARANTEE didn’t fit their criteria for replacement. Absolutely a scam promise.

25. On November 27, 2018, “King D.” of Trabuco, California posted on the Yelp! Page for Defendant’s San Clemente location:⁶

Quality and service has gone way downhill since my last review. I purchased USA-made sandals in June, and, six months later, the soles are coming apart. I sent them in for warranty replacement.

A week later, I received a letter stating, “Even though a true manufacturing defect

⁴ See <https://www.bbb.org/us/ca/san-clemente/profile/custom-shoes/rainbow-sandals-inc-1126-13166605/complaints> (last accessed March 3, 2025).

⁵ See <https://www.bbb.org/us/ca/san-clemente/profile/custom-shoes/rainbow-sandals-inc-1126-13166605/customer-reviews> (last accessed March 3, 2025).

⁶ See [https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=aRlugMtwEHJdS3HPtEtJlQ&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=coppy_link&utm_source=\(direct\)](https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=aRlugMtwEHJdS3HPtEtJlQ&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=coppy_link&utm_source=(direct)) (last accessed September 25, 2023).

is present...the manufacturer's warranty is voided since your sandals have a non-covered issue."

The non-covered issue they are referring to is a slightly frayed strap. The threads on the strap came loose (another manufacturing defect), which caused the fraying.

I'm really disappointed. These are no longer the world's greatest sandals :(

26. On July 3, 2018, Paige R. from Paradise Valley, Arizona, posted on the Yelp! Page for the San Clemente Rainbow sandals locations:⁷

I grew up in SC and my family, kids, everyone, have been buying Rainbow forever. We've now had two instances where the toe straps have cleanly broken loose. Rainbow would not honor their stated warranty. Guess this family is going to another brand. Perhaps Reef? Done with Rainbow

27. On April 14, 2015, Mike S. from Honolulu, Hawaii, posted on the Yelp! Page for the San Clemente Rainbow location:⁸

Good luck getting them to honor the lifetime warranty. They're all in your face about it the time of purchase. But, when it's come times to utilize it, they quickly backpedal by denying all responsibility and pushing the small print. Never again. Get them from somewhere else. You will be disappointed. Overpriced rubbish. What a joke!

28. On August 22, 2015, Alex W. from Irvine California, posted on the Yelp! Page for a San Clement Rainbow location:⁹

Would not replace defective sandals I bought here said they were not covered by warranty even though they were clearly made defective. So much for a lifetime warranty against manufacturing defects, I also did not wear through any layer of the sandals so they were suppose to be covered. After 10 years of wearing rainbows never again as they are made poorly and will not back up their product with their lifetime warrenty. [sic]

29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that these reviews and comments accurately reflect the experiences the posting consumers had with Defendant Rainbow.

⁷ See [https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=T8Izg2jZKDVIPSs-0UkVTQ&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_source=\(direct\)](https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=T8Izg2jZKDVIPSs-0UkVTQ&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_source=(direct)) (last accessed March 12, 2025).

⁸ See [https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=mCnTaBfbPvYe8meCGgd7xg&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_source=\(direct\)](https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=mCnTaBfbPvYe8meCGgd7xg&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_source=(direct)) (last accessed March 12, 2025).

⁹ See [https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=hbh2P3ikMUSPDKeG76AZWw&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_source=\(direct\)](https://www.yelp.com/biz/rainbow-sandals-san-clemente-3?hrid=hbh2P3ikMUSPDKeG76AZWw&utm_campaign=www_review_share_popup&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_source=(direct)) (last accessed March 12, 2025).

1 30. Based on the number of online complaints
2 concerning Rainbow's failure to honor its lifetime
3 warranty, which date back more than five years, Plaintiffs
4 are informed and believe that Defendant Rainbow is aware
5 that numerous reasonable consumers have been misled by
6 Defendant's representations concerning its "lifetime
7 guarantee." Plaintiffs are informed and believe that
8 notwithstanding its knowledge of the misleading and
9 deceptive nature of its representations concerning the
10 Rainbow Guarantee, Defendant persisted in advertising its
11 Guaranteed Sandals in a misleading manner.



Figure 1 Photo included with Mr. Sher's first February 27, 2023 email to Rainbow.

12 ***Mr. Sher's Individual Allegations***

13 31. In 2011, Jeremy Sher purchased a pair of leather sandals from a brick-and-mortar
14 store operated by Defendant and located in the County of Los Angeles.

15 32. At the time Mr. Sher purchased these shoes, the operative lifetime guarantee
16 Rainbow offered was substantively the same as the currently-offered Rainbow Guarantee.

17 33. On the Rainbow Guarantee webpage, Rainbow instructs its customers: "If you are
18 not sure if your sandals are covered under the lifetime warranty please email pictures of the top
19 and bottom of both sandals to customer service at Info@RainbowSandals.com for review before
20 mailing them in."¹⁰

21 34. On February 27, 2023, Mr. Sher sent an email to info@RainbowSandals.com. The
22 leather lining of his Rainbow sandals was pulling away from the sole of his shoe. Mr. Sher wrote:
23 "I'm fairly confident that my sandals will qualify for replacement due to the delamination, if
24 nothing else, but wanted to confirm before I went to the trouble to send them in. Here are photos.
25 I tried to be thorough, and the soles are holding up great as far as I can tell."

26
27 ¹⁰ "Rainbow Guarantee," Rainbow Sandals Inc.,
28 <https://www.rainbowsandals.com/customer-service/rainbow-guarantee> (last accessed February 27, 2025).

1 35. Mr. Sher's February 27, 2023 email included a photo showing that his sandals'
2 soles were intact.

3 36. Mr. Sher's email also included
4 photos showing that, due to a manufacturing
5 defect, the top layer of the sandal was
6 delaminating from the sole.



Figure 2 Delamination of Mr. Sher's sandal.

7 37. Wear was visible on the
8 sandals' straps in some of the photos Mr. Sher
9 sent to Rainbow on February 27, 2023.

10 38. On February 27, 2023,
11 Rainbow wrote back to Mr. Sher refusing to
12 repair his delaminated sandals. Rainbow wrote:
13 "Thank you for sending us the photos,
14 unfortunately torn straps are not covered under
15 our warranty. Our warranty covers
16 manufacturing defects such as straps pulling out,
17 stitching coming undone, layers of the sandals
18 separating, leather bubbling, anything that
19 would indicate the sandals were not constructed



Figure 3 Wear visible on the strap of Mr. Sher's sandal.

20 properly. Wear and tear issues such as worn down soles, torn straps, cracked leather, dog chew,
21 etc. are not covered because they are caused by use which as a manufacture we have no control
22 over. Please let us know if you have additional questions."

23 39. Mr. Sher promptly wrote back on February 27, 2023, reiterating that "the layers of
24 the sandal are separating." Mr. Sher acknowledged that the straps were not in perfect condition
25 but, he wrote: "the layer of the sandals are separating from the sole." He concluded: "I look
26 forward to hearing back that these sandals qualify for replacement!"

27 40. Rainbow's only response to Mr. Sher's second email was to refer Mr. Sher to its
28 "Non-Guarantee Policy."

1 41. Frustrated, Mr. Sher sent an email (on February 27, 2023) to Rainbow’s executive
2 team explaining his experience and his disappointment with Rainbow’s refusal to fulfil its
3 commitment to repair his sandals’ delamination pursuant to its Rainbow Guarantee.

4 42. Sabrina Sexton, Rainbow’s Executive Vice President for Sales & Operations wrote
5 back, admitting that “Yes, the delamination, and the stitching coming out are defects that are
6 generally covered for repair” Ms. Sexton then stated that even though these manufacturing
7 defects were generally covered by the Rainbow Guarantee, Rainbow would not repair Mr. Sher’s
8 sandals. Ms. Sexton did not contend that the soles on Mr. Sher’s sandals had worn through.
9 Rather, she claimed that *during the lifetime of the sandals*, the sandals were outside the lifetime
10 of-the-sole guarantee because their leather had cracked and the straps exhibited some tearing:
11 “Had this been sent in prior to the leather cracking, and the straps tearing away like they did,”
12 Ms. Sexton wrote, “they would have been repaired for you.”

13 43. On February 28, 2023, Mr. Sher wrote back to Rainbow’s executives highlighting
14 the absurdity and duplicity of Rainbow’s refusal to repair the manufacturing defects in his sandals.
15 “I have owned the sandals for 10 years,” he wrote. “I have abided by the rules of not applying
16 lotions/oils or whatever, I haven’t submerged them in water, etc. The condition of the strap is
17 normal wear and tear - the fact that using that as an excuse to not repair the sole IS the problem
18 The fact that you advertise as ‘the world’s best made sandals’ IS the problem. If the policy of the
19 warranty is that normal wear and tear to the strap can void the warranty of the sole THAT’S a
20 problem.” Despite his frustration, Mr. Sher remained open to the possibility that Rainbow might
21 cure its breach and honor its commitment under the lifetime guarantee. He wrote, in bold: “**If**
22 **you’d like to fix or repair the sandals I’ll look forward to hearing back about that.**”

23 44. Despite Mr. Sher’s pleas that Rainbow honor its lifetime guarantee, Rainbow
24 would not budge. It persisted in refusing to repair the manufacturing defects present in Mr. Sher’s
25 sandals *even though* these defects manifested during the lifetime of the sandals’ soles.

26 45. Mr. Sher filed a demand for arbitration against Defendant Rainbow with the
27 American Arbitration Association (the AAA).

28 46. On June 9, 2023, the AAA informed the Parties to the arbitration that Rainbow

1 had not submitted its arbitration provision to the AAA for review and had not paid certain fees
2 that were required to be paid before the AAA would administer an arbitration involving Defendant
3 Rainbow. Defendant Rainbow did not pay the required fees and did not submit its arbitration
4 provision to the AAA for review within the timeframe provided for by the AAA. Accordingly,
5 on July 20, 2023, the AAA administratively closed its file and declined to administer the
6 arbitration between Plaintiff Sher and Defendant.

7 47. On July 13, 2023, Mr. Sher notified Defendant, via a notice sent via certified mail,
8 return receipt requested, that it had one final opportunity to cure its breach of express warranty
9 and repair his defective sandals. The notice Mr. Sher sent Rainbow indicated that Mr. Sher was
10 writing on behalf of not only himself, but also on behalf of a class of similarly situated consumers.

11 48. On or around August 2, 2023, Defendant Rainbow emailed Plaintiff stating that it
12 was willing to repair or replace his defective sandals.

13 49. On August 17, 2023, Plaintiff responded via email indicating that he would like a
14 pair of replacement sandals. Plaintiff provided Defendant his mailing address.

15 50. As of the filing of this First Amended Class Action Complaint, more than thirty
16 days after Plaintiff provided Defendant his mailing address, Plaintiff has not received any
17 replacement sandals from Defendant. Nor has Plaintiff received and response to his August 17,
18 2023 email advising him of when to expect the replacement sandals.

19 ***Ms. Dominguez's Individual Allegations***

20 51. In July 2022, Ms. Dominguez ordered two pairs of Rainbow sandals from
21 Rainbow sandals from Defendant's online website. One pair of single layer "Classic" tan leather
22 sandals with a wide strap and one pair of single layer green premier leather sandals.

23 52. The price of each pair of sandals was \$55.99 and, with tax, Ms. Dominguez's order
24 total came to \$117.30.

25 53. Ms. Dominguez paid \$55.99 for a pair of flip flops in part because she believed,
26 based on Defendant's advertising, that the sandals she was buying came with a guarantee for the
27 lifetime of their soles.

28 54. The sandals' advertised lifetime-of-the-soles guarantee was important to Ms.

Dominguez and was part of the basis of her bargain with Defendant.

55. Because of Rainbow’s unfair and deceptive anti-consumer practices, the sandals Ms. Dominguez purchased did not actually, as a practical matter, come with a guarantee for the lifetime of their soles.

56. When Ms. Dominguez learned that the sandals she had paid a premium for did not actually come with a guarantee for the lifetime of their soles, she felt cheated and disappointed.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

57. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Civil Code Section 1781, Jeremy Sher and Johanna Dominguez, the named individual plaintiffs, seek class certification. Plaintiffs propose the following class and subclass definitions:

Class: All natural persons in the United States who, within the applicable statute of limitations period until the date notice is disseminated, have either: (1) purchased a sandal subject to the Rainbow Guarantee for personal, consumer, and/or household use; or (2) had a warranty claim made in connection with a sandal subject to the Rainbow Guarantee and purchased for personal, consumer, and/or household denied by Defendant pursuant to its “Non-Guarantee” policy.

Purchase Subclass: All natural persons in the United States who, within the applicable statute of limitations period until the date notice is disseminated, purchased sandals subject to the Rainbow Guarantee for personal, consumer, and/or household use.

Warranty Denial Subclass: All natural persons in the United States who, within the applicable statute of limitations period until the date notice is disseminated have had a warranty claim made in connection with a sandal subject to the Rainbow Guarantee for personal, consumer, and/or household denied by Defendant pursuant to its “Non-Guarantee” policy.

58. Excluded from the Class are governmental entities, Defendants, any entity in which Defendants have a controlling interest, and Defendants’ officers, directors, affiliates, legal representatives, employees, co-conspirators, successors, subsidiaries, and assigns. Also excluded from the Class is any judge, justice, or judicial officer presiding over this matter and the members

of their immediate families and judicial staff.

59. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or modify the class or subclass descriptions by altering them or by making them more specific or by dividing the class members further into subclasses or limiting the issues as appropriate.

60. The class, like both of the proposed subclasses, is ascertainable and constitutes a well-defined community of interest.

61. **Numerosity:** Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that the proposed class is so numerous that individual joinder of all members would be impracticable. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis alleged, that the proposed class is greater than 100 consumers geographically dispersed throughout the United States.

62. **Commonality:** Defendant's practices and omissions were applied uniformly to all members of each subclass such that the questions of law and fact are common to all members of a given subclass. All members of the putative Purchase Subclass were and are similarly affected by having purchased Guaranteed Sandals from Defendant at a price premium; likewise, all members of the putative Warranty Denial Subclass were and are similarly affected by having their warranty claims denied during the lifetime of their sandals' soles notwithstanding the supposed lifetime-of-the-sole guarantee offered by Defendant.

63. Questions of law and fact common to the Class exist that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The common questions of law and fact include:

- a. Whether Defendant markets Guaranteed Sandals in a manner that is false or misleading;
- b. Whether the wrongful conduct detailed in this First Amended Class Action Complaint constitutes unfair or unlawful business practices;
- c. Whether it is "reasonable" to read the Non Guarantee Policy together with the Rainbow Guarantee such that Defendant has no warranty obligations under the latter, *even during the lifetime of a given sandal's sole*, if any of the wear-and-tear issues identified in the Non Guarantee Policy are present;
- d. The extent to which Purchase Subclass members overpaid for flip-flops that came

with highly limited guarantee that was far less comprehensive than the lifetime-of-the-sole Guarantee used to market the sandals;

- e. Whether the Rainbow labels its written warranty as “full” or “limited;”
- f. Whether Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to recover statutory attorney’s fees; and
- g. Whether Plaintiffs and the class are entitled to appropriate remedies, including injunctive relief.

64. **Typicality:** The claims asserted by Plaintiff Dominguez in this action are typical of the claims of the members of the Purchase Subclass as the claims arise from the same course of conduct by Defendants, all members of the Purchase Subclass have been similarly affected by Defendant’s course of conduct, and the relief sought is common. The claims asserted by Plaintiff Sher in this action are typical of the claims of the members of the Warranty Denial Subclass as the claims arise from the same course of conduct by Defendants, all members of the Purchase Subclass have been similarly affected by Defendant’s course of conduct, and the relief sought is common.

65. **Adequacy:** Plaintiffs Sher and Dominguez will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff Dominguez will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Purchase Subclass; and Plaintiff Sher will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Warranty Denial Subclass. Plaintiffs have no interest adverse to the interests of the other class members. Plaintiffs have retained competent counsel with substantial experience in complex litigation and litigation involving consumer issues and Plaintiffs’ counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the class.

66. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the present controversy, in that it will permit a large number of claims to be resolved in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary hardship that would result from the prosecution of numerous individual actions and the duplication of discovery, effort, expense and burden on the courts that individual actions would engender. The

benefits of proceeding as a class action, including providing a method for obtaining redress for claims that would not be practical to pursue individually, far outweigh any difficulties that it might be argued could arise in connection with the management of this class action. These benefits make class litigation superior to any other method available for the fair and efficient adjudication of these claims. Absent a class action, it would be highly unlikely that many members of the class would be able to protect their own interests because the cost of litigation through individual lawsuits might exceed expected recovery.

67. Certification of this class action is appropriate because the questions of law or fact common to the respective members of the class predominate over questions of law or fact affecting only individual members. Certification also is appropriate because Defendant acted, or refused to act, on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate the relief sought on behalf of the class as a whole. Further, given the large number of potentially injured consumers, allowing individual actions to proceed in lieu of a class action would run the risk of yielding inconsistent and conflicting adjudications. Certification of Plaintiffs' claims for class-wide treatment is also appropriate because Plaintiffs and the class can prove the elements of the claims on a class-wide basis using the same evidence as would be used to prove those elements in individual actions alleging the same claims.

68. Notice to the members of the Class may be accomplished inexpensively, efficiently, and in a manner best designed to protect the rights of all Class members. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant has objective evidence concerning class members' identities, including without limitation, sales receipts, credit card data, e-mails concerning warranty-related inquiries, and other objective evidence. Class notice can thus likely be directly sent to individual members of the class.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST RAINBOW

BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY

On behalf of Plaintiff Sher and the Warranty Denial Subclass

69. Rainbow Sandals gave Plaintiff Sher and the Warranty Denial Subclass a written warranty against manufacturing defects "for the lifetime of the sole." Specifically, Defendant

1 warranted in writing that: “The sandals will be eligible for warranty until you have worn through
2 anywhere on the top or bottom layer of the sole.”

3 70. Under California Commercial Code section 2316, as under Uniform Commercial
4 Code section 2-316, “[w]ords or conduct relevant to the creation of an express warranty and words
5 or conduct tending to negate or limit warranty shall be construed wherever reasonable as
6 consistent with each other; but subject to the provisions of this division on parol or extrinsic
7 evidence . . . negation or limitation is inoperative to the extent that such construction is
8 unreasonable.”

9 71. Defendant Rainbow’s “Non Guarantee Policy” purports to excuse Rainbow from
10 its obligation under the Rainbow Guarantee to repair manufacturing defects that occur during the
11 lifetime of a shoe’s sole if a given Guaranteed Sandal exhibits certain routine signs of wear-and-
12 tear.

13 72. It is not reasonable to construe the Rainbow Guarantee and the Non-Guarantee
14 Policy as consistent with one another: under the former Rainbow warrants that it will repair
15 manufacturing defects during the lifetime of a Guaranteed Sandal’s sole, under the latter,
16 Rainbow disavows its obligation to repair manufacturing defects during the lifetime of a
17 Guaranteed Sandal’s sole.

18 73. Because it is unreasonable to construe the Rainbow Guarantee as consistent with
19 the Non-Guarantee, the “negation or limitation” (the Non Guarantee Policy) is inoperative.

20 74. Rainbow breached its express warranty (the Rainbow Guarantee) when it refused
21 to repair manufacturing defects that manifested during the lifetime of the Guaranteed Sandals’
22 soles.

23 75. When the Guaranteed Sandals of Mr. Sher and the Warranty Denial Subclass
24 members exhibited manufacturing defects during the lifetimes of their soles, Plaintiff Sher and
25 other the members of the Warranty Denial Subclass took reasonable steps to notify Defendant
26 within a reasonable time of the defects.

27 76. Defendant refused to repair the Guaranteed Sandals as required by its written
28 warranty.

1 77. Defendant’s refusal to repair the manufacturing defects in the Guaranteed Sandals
2 is a breach of its express warranty, the Rainbow Guarantee.

3 78. Mr. Sher and the members of the Warranty Denial Subclass were harmed by
4 Defendant’s breach of its express warranty insofar as they had paid a premium for sandals that
5 came with a lifetime guarantee and were deprived the benefit of that bargain by Defendant refusal
6 to honor the lifetime guarantee.

7 79. The sandals Plaintiff Sher and the Warranty Denial Subclass purchased have a
8 lower value than they would have if Defendant did not breach its express warranty.

9 80. Defendant’s breach of express warranty has directly and proximately caused
10 Plaintiff Sher and the Warranty Denial Subclass members to suffer damages in an amount to be
11 determined at trial. These damages are actual damages insofar as Plaintiff Sher and the Warranty
12 Denial Subclass Members decided to purchase the Guaranteed Sandals acting in reliance on the
13 “Rainbow Guarantee,” but, because of Rainbow’s persistent refusal to fulfil its obligations under
14 the Rainbow Guarantee, received products that were not covered by the guarantee and therefore
15 had a lesser value than reasonably understood at the time of purchase.

16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST RAINBOW**

17 **VIOLATIONS OF THE MAGNUSON-MOSS WARRANTY ACT**

18 ***On behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class***

19 81. The sandals Rainbow sold Plaintiffs and class members are a “consumer product”
20 within the meaning of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act (“Magnuson-Moss”) because they are
21 “tangible personal property which is distributed in commerce and which is normally used for
22 personal, family, or household purposes” *See* 15 U.S.C. § 2301(1).

23 82. The Rainbow Guarantee is a written warranty within the meaning of the
24 Magnuson-Moss because it is a “written affirmation of fact or written promise made in connection
25 with the sale of a consumer product by a supplier to a buyer which relates to the nature of the
26 material or workmanship and affirms or promises that such material or workmanship is defect
27 free or will meet a specified level of performance over a specified period of time” that is “part of
28 the basis of the bargain between a supplier and a buyer for purposes other than resale of such

product.” *See* 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(A).

83. The Rainbow Guarantee is a written warranty within the meaning of the Magnuson-Moss because it is an “undertaking in writing in connection with the sale by a supplier of a consumer product to refund, repair, replace, or take other remedial action with respect to such product in the event that such product fails to meet the specifications set forth in the undertaking,” that is “part of the basis of the bargain between a supplier and a buyer for purposes other than resale of such product.” *See* 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(B).

84. Mr. Sher and Ms. Dominguez and each member of the proposed Class is a “consumer” within the meaning of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act because they are “buyer[s] (other than for purposes of resale) of any consumer product.” *See* 15 U.S.C. section 2301(3).

85. Rainbow is a supplier within the meaning of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act because it is a “person engaged in the business of making a consumer product directly or indirectly available to consumers.” 15 U.S.C. § 2301(4).

86. Rainbow is a warrantor within the meaning of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act because it is “a supplier or other person who gives or offers to give a written warranty or who is or may be obligated under an implied warranty.” 15 U.S.C. § 2301(5).

87. Rainbow violated the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act by failing to comply with 15 U.S. Code section 2303(a)’s requirement that written warranties be designated either “full” or “limited.” Rainbow violated this provision because its written warranty (the Rainbow Guarantee) applies to products costing more than \$10.00 and is neither designated “full” nor “limited.”

88. 16 CFR § 701.3(a) provides that “[a]ny warrantor warranting to a consumer by means of a written warranty a consumer product actually costing the consumer more than \$15.00 shall clearly and conspicuously disclose in a single document in simple and readily understood language, the following items of information A statement in the following language: This warranty gives you specific legal rights, and you may also have other rights which vary from State to State.”

89. Defendant violated the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act by failing to include the statement “This warranty gives you specific legal rights, and you may also have other rights which

1 vary from State to State” in its written warranty, the Rainbow Guarantee.

2 90. Plaintiffs and the class are entitled to damages and other legal and equitable relief
3 and are also entitled to recover their attorneys’ fees based on actual time expended and costs. *See*
4 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(1)-(2).

5 ***On Behalf of Plaintiff Sher and the Warranty Denial Subclass***

6 91. Rainbow breached its written warranty by refusing to fulfil its obligations under
7 the Rainbow Guarantee.

8 92. Though Mr. Sher gave Rainbow reasonable notice on behalf of both himself and
9 the Class that Defendant had failed to fulfil its obligations under the written warranty, Rainbow
10 did not cure its breach.

11 93. As alleged above, Mr. Sher and the Class suffered damages as a result of
12 Rainbow’s breach of its written warranty.

13 94. Rainbow’s breach of its written warranty is a violation of the Magnuson-Moss
14 Warranty Act and Mr. Sher and the Warranty Denial Subclass are entitled to bring an action for
15 damages and other legal and equitable relief in this court. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(1)(A).

16 95. Plaintiff Sher and the and the Warranty Denial Subclass are also entitled to recover
17 their attorneys’ fees based on actual time expended and costs. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(2).

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST RAINBOW**

19 **VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT**

20 ***On behalf of Plaintiff Dominguez and the Purchase Subclass***

21 96. The Consumers Legal Remedies Act (CLRA) prohibits unfair and deceptive acts
22 and practices in connection with the conduct of a business that provides goods, property, or
23 services primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

24 97. Rainbow’s conduct and representations, as alleged herein, extend to transactions
25 that are intended to result, or which have resulted, in the sale of goods to consumers.

26 98. Plaintiff Dominguez and the other Purchase Subclass members are “consumers”
27 as that term is defined in California Civil Code section 1761(d).

28 99. The sandals Plaintiff Dominguez and the other Purchase Subclass members

1 purchased from Rainbow were “goods” within the meaning of California Civil Code section
2 1761(a).

3 100. Rainbow violated California Civil Code section 1770(a)(5) by representing that its
4 Guaranteed Sandals had “sponsorship, approval, characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or
5 quantities” that they did not actually have insofar as it represented that those sandals came with a
6 lifetime guarantee against manufacturing defects when, in practice, Rainbow would not actually
7 provide such a guarantee.

8 101. Rainbow violated California Civil Code section 1770(a)(9) by advertising that
9 Rainbow’s Guaranteed Sandals come with a lifetime guarantee against manufacturing defects
10 even though it did not actually intend to sell the sandals with a guarantee against manufacturing
11 defects that lasted as long as those products’ soles.

12 102. Rainbow violated California Civil Code section 1770(a)(14) by representing that
13 a transaction confers or involves rights, remedies, or obligations that it does not have or involve,
14 insofar as it represented the purchase of Guaranteed Sandals as coming with a lifetime-of-the-
15 sole guarantee conferring certain rights and remedies when such purchase did not actually, as a
16 practical matter, confer such rights and remedies.

17 103. These violations of the CLRA were malicious because Rainbow carried them out
18 intentionally to maximize its profits and the expense of the victimized consumers it had deceived
19 into overpaying for sandals that came with a written warranty that provided for far more robust
20 and extensive that the coverage Rainbow actually, in practice, provided. These violations were
21 carried out with a willful and conscious disregard of the rights of Plaintiff Dominguez and the
22 other Purchase Subclass members insofar as the violations duped these consumers into paying for
23 sandals which came with a written warranty that offered far fewer benefits and far less value than
24 Ms. Dominguez and the Purchase Subclass were led to believe they offered. Plaintiff Dominguez
25 and the other Purchase Subclass members’ injuries — paying a premium for sandals that come
26 with a “lifetime guarantee” and then missing out on the benefits of that guarantee due to
27 Rainbow’s wrongful conduct — are the intended outcome of Rainbow’s CLRA violations.

28 104. Plaintiff Dominguez and the other Purchase Subclass members are informed and

1 believe that the CLRA violations alleged herein were committed, authorized or ratified by
2 Rainbow's officers, directors, or managing agents in California. This belief is informed by the
3 fact that on February 27, 2023, Plaintiff Sher sent a lengthy email to Rainbow executives and
4 officers explaining how its refusal to repair manufacturing defects in his sandals during their
5 soles' lifetime was a breach of the Rainbow Guarantee. The recipients of this email included Jay
6 Longley (President), Jack Robbins (Executive Vice President and General Counsel), Don Daley
7 (Director of Retail Operations), and Sabrina Sexton (Vice President Sales and Operations).
8 Rainbow did not change course after Plaintiff Sher alerted it to its unlawful conduct.

9 105. The misrepresentations that form the basis of this CLRA claim were made by a
10 California corporation and emanated out from California. Additionally, Plaintiff Dominguez is
11 informed and believes that the policies which led to Rainbow's violation of the CLRA were
12 formulated and codified by individuals within California. Plaintiff's belief that the unlawful
13 conduct which forms the basis of this CLRA claim occurred in California is also informed by the
14 fact that Rainbow has its principal place of business in California.

15 106. As a result of Rainbow's violations of the CLRA, Plaintiff Dominguez and the
16 other Purchase Subclass members have, as alleged above, suffered harm and seek injunctive relief
17 prohibiting further violations of the CLRA by Rainbow. Plaintiff Dominguez and the other
18 Purchase Subclass members also seek to recover money damages in an amount to be proven at
19 trial and their attorneys' fees and costs.

20 107. Plaintiff Dominguez sent Rainbow a CLRA notification letter via certified mail,
21 return receipt requested more than thirty days before the filing of this First Amended Class Action
22 Complaint and the CLRA violations that are identified above have not been remedied.

23 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST RAINBOW**

24 **VIOLATIONS OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**

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

26 ***On behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class***

27 108. The UCL prohibits "unfair competition," which includes any "unlawful, unfair, or
28 fraudulent business act or practice and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising." *See*

1 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.

2 109. Plaintiff brings this action under the “unlawful” and “unfair” prongs of the UCL.

3 ***Rainbow’s Unlawful Acts***

4 110. As alleged in this complaint, Rainbow’s conduct has violated the Consumers
5 Legal Remedies Act and the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act. These unlawful acts are a violation
6 of the UCL.

7 ***Rainbow’s Unfair Acts***

8 111. Defendant Rainbow’s conduct is “unfair” and in violation of both the letter and
9 the spirit of the UCL; Rainbow acted in an unscrupulous, deceptive, oppressive, and substantially
10 injurious manner by advertising, to the public at large, that its Guaranteed Sandals come with a
11 “lifetime guarantee” when, in fact, the guarantee Rainbow *in practice* honors is so undercut by
12 exceptions such that it is not actually a lifetime-of-the-sole guarantee.

13 112. The unfair practices herein alleged are substantially injurious to consumers,
14 including Plaintiffs and the Class, who suffered injury in fact because of Rainbow’s unfair acts
15 and practices.

16 113. The harm suffered by Plaintiff and the Class as a result of Rainbow’s unfair acts
17 outweighs any potential benefit or utility of Rainbow derives from duping consumers into
18 overpaying for sandals that do not come with the comprehensive lifetime-of-the-sole guarantee
19 they are advertised as coming with.

20 114. The injuries Rainbow’s unfair practices cause consumers could not be reasonably
21 avoided by consumers.

22 115. There were reasonably available alternatives that would have further Rainbow’s
23 business interests in selling sandals, for example, declining to publicize any guarantee so that
24 consumers understood that the sandals they were purchasing did not come with a warranty against
25 manufacturing defects.

26 116. The unlawful and unfair conduct that forms the basis of this claim for violations
27 of the UCL occurred in California, where Rainbow is incorporated and has its principal place of
28 business. Additionally, Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the policies which led to

Rainbow's unlawful and unfair acts were formulated and codified by individuals within California.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs seek the following relief from the court:

A. A certification of the Class as defined herein and the appointment of Plaintiffs Jeremy Sher and Johanna Dominguez as Class representatives;

B. The appointment of Plaintiff Jeremy Sher as Representative of the Warranty Denial Subclass.

C. The appointment of Plaintiff Johanna Dominguez as Representative of the Purchase Subclass.

D. The appointment of A. Lorraine Weekes, Kevin Kneupper, and Cyclone Covey of Kneupper & Covey PC as class counsel;

E. An award of damages against Defendant and in favor of Plaintiffs and the putative class in an amount to be determined at trial;

F. An award of statutory damages, as appropriate;

G. Restitution;

H. An award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees as provided for by law, contract, or statute;

I. An award of pre and post-judgment interest;

J. Public injunctive relief in the form of an order prohibiting Rainbow from advertising any of its sandals as coming with a guarantee for the lifetime of the soles when Rainbow does not actually, in practice, provide such a guarantee;

K. A finding that such injunctive relief constitutes public injunctive relief, has resulted in the enforcement of an important right affecting the public interest, and otherwise meets the requirements of California Civil Procedure Code section 1021.5;

L. An award of attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Civil Procedure Code section 1021.5 and other applicable provisions;

M. Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

- 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

DATED: May 30, 2025.

Louise Weber

KNEUPPER & COVEY, PC
17011 Beach Blvd., Suite 900
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
Tel: 657-845-3100
Fax: 855-596-3707

24
FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA

I am employed by a law firm with a business address in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business mailing address is 17011 Beach Blvd., Suite 900, Huntington Beach, CA 92647.

On May 30, 2025, I served the forgoing documents described as: FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT on the following person(s) in the manner indicated:

SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & *Attorney of Record for Defendant Rainbow*
HAMPTON LLP *Sandals, Inc.*

A Limited Liability Partnership

Including Professional Corporations

SASCHA HENRY, Cal Bar No. 191914

ANDREA FEATHERS, Cal. Bar No.

287188

MICHELLE GARABETIAN, Cal Bar No.

357367

350 S. Grand Ave., 40th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90071-3460

Telephone: 213.620.1780

Facsimile: 213.620.1398


shenry@sheppardmullin.com

afeathers@sheppardmullin.com

mgarabetian@sheppardmullin.com

☒ (BY CASEANYWHERE) On this date, a true and correct copy of said document(s) was/were electronically served by transmission to CASEANYWHERE, pursuant to Court's Order Authorizing Electronic Service (CaseAnywhere) dated February 16, 2024.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on May 30, 2025, at Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania.



Lorraine Weekes