

ORIGINAL FILED

2017 AUG 29 P 3:39
RICHARD W. WIPKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 GEORGE A. KIMBRELL (*Pro Hac Vice application pending*)
2 PAIGE M. TOMASELLI State Bar No. 237737
3 RACHEL A. ZUBATY State Bar No. 240785
4 Center for Food Safety
5 303 Sacramento Street, 2nd Floor
6 San Francisco, CA 94111
7 T: (415) 826-2770 / F: (415) 826-0507
8 Emails: gkimbrell@icfa.org
9 ptomaselli@icfa.org
10 rzubaty@icfa.org

Counsel for Plaintiffs

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DMR

11 CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY, and CENTER
12 FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,

Plaintiffs,

v.

14 MARGARET A. HAMBURG, M.D.,
15 COMMISSIONER OF U.S. FOOD AND DRUG
16 ADMINISTRATION, and JEFFREY ZIENTS,
17 ACTING DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF
18 MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Defendants.

CV 12 4529 Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Administrative Procedure Act Case

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. This is an action for declaratory and injunctive relief regarding the failure by the
3 Food and Drug Administration (“FDA” or “the agency”) to promulgate final regulations by
4 mandatory deadlines contained in the FDA Food Safety and Modernization Act (“FSMA”).¹

5 2. FSMA is the first major piece of federal legislation to overhaul food safety laws
6 since 1938.² Continuous high profile outbreaks related to various foods, ranging from spinach to
7 peanut products to eggs, underscored the need for serious legislative and regulatory reform.³ The
8 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that every year, as a result of foodborne
9 diseases, 48 million people (1 in 6 Americans) get sick, 128,000 are hospitalized, and 3,000 die.⁴

10 3. Importantly, FSMA enables FDA to better protect public health by strengthening
11 its ability to regulate and granting the agency enhanced preventative and mandate authority.⁵
12 The law also provides FDA with new enforcement capacity, such as mandatory recall authority,
13 and the ability to require that imported foods comply with U.S. inspection and preventive safety
14 standards. The implementation of these measures by the agency will result in millions of lives
15 being saved and illnesses prevented, and spare even more people from being infected in the first
16 place. Unfortunately, the positive public health outcomes that were the original intent behind
17 enacting FSMA can only be realized if the FDA actually complies with the law by promulgating
18 regulations and enforcing provisions mandated by Congress.

19 4. Instead, FDA has missed not one, not two, but *seven* critical deadlines, and
20 counting, in failing to implement FSMA’s major food safety regulations. FDA has submitted
21

22 ¹ Pub. L. No. 111-353, 124 Stat. 3885 (2011) (to be codified as amended in scattered
23 sections of 21 U.S.C. § 301 *et seq.*)

24 ² Congress passed the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act on June 25, 1938. 21 U.S.C.
25 § 301 *et seq.* (1938).

26 ³ U.S. Food & Drug Admin., *Food Bill Aims to Improve Safety* (Dec. 23, 2010),
27 <http://www.fda.gov/ForConsumers/ConsumerUpdates/ucm237758.htm>.

28 ⁴ Ctrs. for Disease Control & Prevention, *2011 Estimates of Foodborne Illness in the
United States*, <http://www.cdc.gov/Features/dsFoodborneEstimates/> (last updated Apr. 15, 2011).

⁵ U.S. Food & Drug Admin., *Background on the FDA Food Safety and Modernization
Act (FSMA)*, <http://www.fda.gov/Food/FoodSafety/FSMA/ucm239907.htm> (last updated Nov.
14, 2011).

1 several of these unlawfully delayed regulations to the Office of Management and Budget
2 (“OMB”), where they are still awaiting approval. However, FDA has authority to promulgate
3 the regulations without OMB approval.

4 5. FDA’s failure to implement FSMA’s critical food safety regulations by their
5 statutory deadlines is an abdication of the agency’s fundamental responsibilities. Moreover, the
6 agency’s unlawful delay is putting millions of lives at risk from contracting foodborne illnesses.
7 This lawsuit seeks to require FDA to immediately promulgate the FSMA regulations required by
8 law and enforce self-executing sections of FSMA even without finalized regulations.

9 JURISDICTION

10 6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal
11 question) and 28 U.S.C. § 1346 (United States as Defendant).

12 7. Plaintiffs have a right to bring this action pursuant to the Administrative
13 Procedure Act (“APA”). 5 U.S.C. § 702.

14 8. The relief requested is specifically authorized pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 706(1), 28
15 U.S.C. § 1651 (writs), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202 (declaratory relief).

16 9. An actual controversy exists between the parties within the meaning of 28 U.S.C.
17 § 2201 (declaratory judgments).

18 VENUE

19 10. Venue properly lies in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because one or
20 more of the Plaintiffs reside in this District.

21 PARTIES

22 11. Plaintiff CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY (“CFS”) brings this action on behalf of
23 itself and its members. CFS is a public interest non-profit membership organization that has
24 offices in San Francisco, CA, Portland, OR, and Washington, D.C. CFS has over 200,000
25 members, including members in almost every state across the country, who have all been
26 affected and impacted by the ongoing risk of contracting foodborne illnesses. CFS and its
27 members are being, and will be, adversely affected by FDA’s continued failure to promulgate
28 FSMA regulations.

1 12. Since the organization’s founding in 1997, CFS’s overarching mission has been to
2 address and ameliorate the adverse impacts of industrial agriculture and food production systems
3 on human health, animal welfare, and the environment. Industrial agriculture and food
4 production systems have led to an increase in the prevalence of foodborne illness. For example,
5 one major cause of food contamination is overcrowded, unsanitary conditions on factory farms
6 where animals get sick and pass diseases on to other animals. Another factor is our industrial
7 food distribution system, through which contaminated food is transported across the nation. In
8 addition, our increased reliance on imported foods (e.g., sixty percent of our seafood is imported)
9 with unknown safety standards puts the U.S. food supply at risk. Adding to this perfect storm of
10 risk is government deregulation and inadequate funding for inspections and oversight. CFS
11 seeks to redress and prevent these harms through promoting sustainable forms of agriculture and
12 food production, as well as proper government oversight and regulation of existing paradigms.

13 13. CFS combines multiple tools and strategies in pursuing its goals, including public
14 and policymaker education, outreach, campaigning and, when necessary, litigation. With regard
15 to education, CFS disseminates to government agencies, members of Congress, and the general
16 public a wide array of informational materials addressing foodborne illnesses and food supply.
17 These materials include news articles, policy reports, legal briefs, press releases, action alerts,
18 and fact sheets.

19 14. CFS also sends action alerts to its membership. These action alerts generate
20 public involvement, education, and engagement with governmental officials on issues related to
21 fighting the health and environmental impacts of industrial agriculture and promoting a more
22 sustainable, healthier food system. Collectively, the dissemination of this material has made
23 CFS an information clearinghouse for public involvement and governmental oversight of food
24 safety issues.

25 15. Plaintiff Center for Environmental Health (“CEH”) is located in Oakland, CA.
26 Founded in 1996, CEH is a non-profit organization dedicated to protecting the public from
27 environmental and public health hazards. CEH is committed to environmental justice, promoting
28 a safe and sustainable food supply, supporting communities in their quest for a safer

1 environment, and fostering corporate accountability. CEH and its members are being, and will
2 be, adversely affected by FDA's failure to promulgate FSMA regulations.

3 16. Defendant Dr. Margaret A. Hamburg is sued in her official capacity as FDA
4 Commissioner. As Commissioner, Dr. Hamburg has the ultimate responsibility for FDA's
5 activities and policies.

6 17. Defendant Jeffrey Zients is sued in his official capacity as Acting Director,
7 Deputy Director for Management, and Chief Performance Officer of OMB. As Acting Director,
8 Deputy Director for Management, and Chief Performance Officer, Mr. Zients has the ultimate
9 responsibility for OMB's activities and policies.

10 **LEGAL BACKGROUND**

11 *Administrative Procedure Act*

12 18. The APA requires an agency to conclude a matter presented to it "within a
13 reasonable time." 5 U.S.C. § 555(b).

14 19. The APA provides that "[a] person suffering legal wrong because of agency
15 action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action . . . is entitled to judicial review
16 thereof." *Id.* § 702.

17 20. The definition of "agency action" includes a "failure to act." *Id.* § 551(13).

18 21. Under the APA, a reviewing court "shall compel agency action unlawfully
19 withheld or unreasonably delayed." *Id.* § 706(1).

20 *Executive Order 12866*

21 22. Executive Order ("EO") 12866⁶ provides for centralized review of regulations by
22 OMB to ensure that regulations are consistent with applicable law and the President's priorities,
23 and that decisions made by one agency do not conflict with policies or actions taken or planned
24 by another agency. Exec. Order No. 12,866, § 2(b), 58 Fed. Reg. 51,735 (Sept. 30, 1993).

25
26
27
28 ⁶ EO 12866 was reaffirmed and supplemented by EO 13563. 76 Fed. Reg. 3,821 (Jan.
18, 2011).

1 year cause 9.4 million illnesses, 55,961 hospitalizations, and 1,351 deaths.⁹ Other unspecified
2 agents in food consumed in the U.S. cause an additional 38.4 million gastroenteritis illnesses,
3 71,878 hospitalizations, and 1,686 deaths each year.¹⁰ After combining the estimates for the
4 major known pathogens and the unspecified agents, the overall annual estimate of the total
5 burden of disease due to contaminated food consumed in the U.S. is 47.8 million illnesses,
6 127,839 hospitalizations, and 3,037 deaths.¹¹ The annual economic loss due to foodborne illness
7 has been estimated to top \$77 billion, and that figure does not include all costs.¹²

8 27. On January 4, 2011, President Obama signed FSMA into law. FSMA enables
9 FDA to better protect public health by strengthening the food safety system. The major elements
10 of FSMA can be divided into five key areas: preventive controls, inspection and compliance,
11 imported food safety, response, and enhanced partnerships.¹³ Preventive controls are only
12 effective to the extent they are followed; therefore, FSMA grants FDA inspection and
13 enforcement powers to ensure compliance as well as the power to suspend facilities from
14 distributing food and mandate recalls.

15 28. Congress established specific implementation dates within the FSMA legislation.
16 These deadlines require FDA to complete various tasks by a date certain including *inter alia*: the
17 promulgation of regulations; completion of industry guidance documents and reports; enhanced
18 tracking mechanisms for food products to help identify possible contamination incidents; and a
19 consumer-friendly web site for recall information and foodborne illness outbreaks. FDA has
20 failed to meet hundreds of these deadlines, seven of which are the required promulgation of
21 major food safety regulations.

23 ⁹ Ctrs. for Disease Control & Prevention, *2011 Estimates of Foodborne Illness in the*
24 *United States*, <http://www.cdc.gov/Features/dsFoodborneEstimates/> (last updated Apr. 15, 2011).

25 ¹⁰ *Id.*

26 ¹¹ *Id.*

27 ¹² Helena Bottemiller, *Annual Foodborne Illnesses Cost \$77 Billion, Study Finds*, Food
28 Safety News (Jan. 3, 2012), <http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2012/01/foodborne-illness-costs-77-billion-annually-study-finds/#.UDU4Isx5XIN>.

¹³ U.S. Food & Drug Admin., *Frequently Asked Questions*,
<http://www.fda.gov/Food/FoodSafety/FSMA/ucm247559.htm> (last updated Aug. 14, 2012).

1 29. FSMA mandates FDA to require science-based preventive controls across the
2 food supply. For food facilities, this includes requiring a written preventive controls plan
3 addressing hazard analysis. Final regulations with regard to establishing science-based minimum
4 standards for conducting hazard analysis, documenting hazards, implementing preventive
5 controls and documenting the implementation of preventive controls were due within 18 months
6 after enactment of FSMA, by **July 4, 2012**. See FSMA, Pub. L. No. 111-353, § 103(a), 124 Stat.
7 3885, 3895 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 350g(n)(1)(A)). This is the **first** of seven major food safety
8 regulations required by FSMA that FDA has failed to promulgate.

9 30. For purposes of registration of food facilities, FDA was to promulgate regulations
10 with regard to (i) activities that constitute on-farm packing or holding of food that is not grown,
11 raised, or consumed on such farm or another farm under the same ownership for purposes of
12 section 415 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 350d), as amended by this
13 Act; and (ii) activities that constitute on-farm manufacturing or processing of food that is not
14 consumed on that farm or on another farm under common ownership for purposes of such
15 section 415. FSMA, Pub. L. No. 111-353, § 103(c), 124 Stat. 3885, 3896 (amending 21 U.S.C. §
16 350d). A notice of proposed rulemaking was to be published within 9 months after enactment of
17 FSMA, by **October 4, 2011** (final rules to be adopted 9 months after close of comment period).¹⁴
18 This regulation is critical because FSMA grants FDA the power to suspend registration of a
19 facility if it determines that the food poses a reasonable probability of serious adverse health
20 consequences or death. *Id.* § 102(b)(1)(C), 124 Stat. at 3887 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 350d(b)). A
21 food facility that is under suspension is prohibited from distributing food. *Id.* However,
22 suspension can only be implemented if the appropriate rules are promulgated. This is the **second**
23 of seven major food safety regulations required by FSMA that FDA has failed to promulgate.

24 31. FSMA also requires FDA to establish science-based minimum standards for the
25 safe production and harvesting of fruits and vegetables. FDA was to publish a notice of
26 proposed rulemaking within one year after enactment of FSMA, by **January 4, 2012**, with
27

28 ¹⁴ *Id.* § 103(c), 124 Stat. at 3896 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 350d).

1 regard to establishing science-based minimum standards for the safe production and harvesting
2 of those types of fruits and vegetables, including specific mixes or categories of fruits and
3 vegetables that are raw agricultural commodities for which FDA has determined that such
4 standards minimize the risk of serious adverse health consequences or death. *Id.* § 105(a), 124
5 Stat. at 3899 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 350h(a)(1)(A)). Under 21 U.S.C. § 350h(b)(1), the final
6 regulation was to be adopted within one year after the close of the comment period to provide for
7 minimum science-based standards for those types of fruits and vegetables, including specific
8 mixes or categories of fruits or vegetables that are raw agricultural commodities, based on
9 known safety risks, which may include a history of foodborne illness outbreaks. This is the
10 **third** of seven major food safety regulations required by FSMA that FDA has failed to
11 promulgate.

12 32. FSMA grants FDA the authority to prevent intentional contamination. Final
13 regulations to protect against the intentional adulteration of food subject to FSMA were due
14 within 18 months after enactment of FSMA, **by July 4, 2012**. FSMA, Pub. L. No. 111-353, §
15 106(b), 124 Stat. 3885, 3906 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 350i). The regulations shall (i) specify how
16 a person shall assess whether the person is required to implement mitigation strategies or
17 measures intended to protect against the intentional adulteration of food; and (ii) specify
18 appropriate science-based mitigation strategies or measures to prepare and protect the food
19 supply chain at specific vulnerable points. *Id.* This is the **fourth** of seven major food safety
20 regulations required by FSMA that FDA has failed to promulgate.

21 33. With regard to the transportation of food, FSMA requires FDA to require
22 shippers, carriers by motor vehicle or rail vehicle, receivers, and other persons engaged in the
23 transportation of food to use sanitary transportation practices to ensure that food is not
24 transported under conditions that may render food adulterated. *Id.* § 111, 124 Stat. at 3916
25 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 350e). Regulations were due within 18 months after enactment of
26 FSMA, **by July 4, 2012**. *Id.* This is the **fifth** of seven major food safety regulations required by
27 FSMA that FDA has failed to promulgate.

28 34. Final regulations regarding the foreign supplier verification program were due

1 within one year after enactment of FSMA, by **January 4, 2012**. *Id.* § 301(a), 124 Stat. at 3953
2 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 384a(c)(1)). Specifically, each importer shall perform risk-based foreign
3 supplier verification activities for the purpose of verifying that the food imported by the importer
4 or agent of an importer is in compliance with § 350g [Hazard analysis and risk-based preventive
5 controls] and § 350h [Standards for produce safety] and is not adulterated under § 342 or
6 misbranded under § 343(w). *Id.* § 301(a), 124 Stat. at 3953 (amending 21 U.S.C. § 384a(c)(1)).
7 This is the **sixth** of seven major food safety regulations required by FSMA that FDA has failed
8 to promulgate.

9 35. The **seventh** major food safety regulation required by FSMA that FDA has
10 failed to promulgate deals with ensuring the neutrality and independence of third-party audits.
11 Final regulations were due within 18 months after enactment of FSMA, by **July 4, 2012**,
12 requiring that (i) audits be performed unannounced; (ii) a structure to decrease the potential for
13 conflicts of interest, including timing and public disclosure, for fees paid by eligible entities to
14 accredited third-party auditors; and (iii) appropriate limits on financial affiliations between an
15 accredited third-party auditor or audit agents of such auditor and any person that owns or
16 operates an eligible entity to be certified by such auditor. *Id.* § 307 (amending 21 U.S.C.
17 § 384d(c)(5)(C)).

18 36. According to OMB's website, FDA has submitted some of the draft FSMA
19 regulations (or portions thereof) and is awaiting OMB approval prior to publishing for public
20 comment. These include: (1) Hazard Analysis and Risk-Based Preventive Controls under FSMA
21 § 103, received by OMB on November 22, 2011¹⁵ and the same regarding food for animals,
22 received by OMB on December 5, 2011;¹⁶ (2) standards for produce safety under FSMA § 105,
23
24

25 ¹⁵ Office of Info. & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Mgmt. & Budget, *Pending EO 12866*
26 *Regulatory Review, RIN 0910-AG36*, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eoDetails?rrid=121258>
(last visited Aug. 23, 2012).

27 ¹⁶ Office of Info. & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Mgmt. & Budget, *Pending EO 12866*
28 *Regulatory Review, RIN 0910-AG10*, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eoDetails?rrid=121305>
(last visited Aug. 23, 2012).

1 received by OMB on December 9, 2011;¹⁷ (3) protection against intentional adulteration under
2 FSMA § 106;¹⁸ and (4) Foreign Supplier Verification Program under FSMA § 301(a), received
3 by OMB on November 28, 2011.¹⁹

4 37. For all draft regulations listed in paragraph 36, OMB review is still pending, 8 and
5 9 months after receipt, despite the fact that OMB has a 90-day deadline for reviews. Exec. Order
6 12,866 § 6(b)(2)(B), 58 Fed. Reg. 51,735. (The one-time 30-day review extension under
7 § 6(b)(2)(C) has passed as well.)

8 38. In addition to the lapsed deadlines for the seven major food safety regulations
9 required by FSMA discussed in paragraphs 29 through 35, at least nine additional FSMA
10 deadlines will come due in early 2013. Based on FDA's lack of progress to date, Plaintiffs have
11 serious concerns regarding the likelihood that these future deadlines will be met.

12 39. Also alarming is the policy adopted by FDA to not enforce provisions that are
13 self-executing. There are certain provisions within FSMA that are self-executing under the
14 statute and become effective even if FDA has not promulgated final regulations. With regard to
15 preventive controls, the statute states that the amendments "shall take effect 18 months after the
16 date of enactment," by **July 4, 2012**. *Id.* § 103(i), 124 Stat. at 3898 (amending 21 U.S.C. §
17 350g). There is no mention that finalized regulations are required for this section to take effect
18 and industry has interpreted these provisions not to so require regulations in order to take
19 effect.²⁰

20 40. For this reason, industry is eagerly awaiting FDA guidance on final regulations

21
22 ¹⁷ Office of Info. & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Mgmt. & Budget, *Pending EO 12866*
23 *Regulatory Review*, RIN 0910-AG35, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eoDetails?rrid=121344>
(last visited Aug. 23, 2012).

24 ¹⁸ Office of Info. & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Mgmt. & Budget, *View Rule*, RIN 0910-
25 *AG36*, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eAgendaViewRule?pubId=201104&RIN=0910-AG63>
(last visited Aug. 23, 2012).

26 ¹⁹ Office of Info. & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Mgmt. & Budget, *Pending EO 12866*
27 *Regulatory Review*, RIN 0910-AG64, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eoDetails?rrid=121268>
(last visited Aug. 23, 2012).

28 ²⁰ Hogan Lovells, *Summary of Key FSMA Effective Dates* (Feb. 2011), available at
[http://www.gmaonline.org/file-
manager/Food_Safety/Summary_of_Key_FSMA_Effective_Dates.pdf](http://www.gmaonline.org/file-manager/Food_Safety/Summary_of_Key_FSMA_Effective_Dates.pdf).

1 and enforcement plans for clarity and planning purposes. On May 7, 2012 the Grocery
2 Manufacturers Association (“GMA”) wrote to the FDA inquiring about enforcement of
3 preventive controls and the foreign supplier verification program (FSMA §§ 103 and 301,
4 respectively), noting the “great uncertainty within the food industry, consumer advocates, the
5 media and the public regarding this issue.”²¹ The Snack Food Association, joined by tens of
6 industry groups, sent a similar letter dated May 25, 2012 urging FDA to issue a guidance with a
7 timeline on enforcement “as soon as possible.”²²

8 41. FDA replied to both letters on June 18, indicating that the agency would not
9 enforce provisions until the regulations implementing those sections of the law were finalized.²³
10 The self-executing feature of one of FSMA’s most crucial provisions, preventive controls,
11 confirms the certainty with which Congress intended the statute to be implemented and is an
12 indication of the magnitude of the harm the provisions are capable of preventing. FDA’s policy
13 to not enforce these provisions because of its own failure to promulgate final regulations is a
14 complete failure to follow a Congressional mandate.

15 *Harm to Plaintiffs*

16 42. The interests of Plaintiffs are being and will be adversely affected by Defendants’
17 continued failure to promulgate food safety regulations required by FSMA.

19 ²¹ Letter from Leon Bruner, Senior Vice President for Scientific & Regulatory Affairs &
20 Chief Sci. Officer, GMA, to Michael R. Taylor, Deputy Comm’r for Foods, U.S. Food & Drug
21 Admin. (May 7, 2012), *available at*
<http://www.foodsafetynews.com/GMA%20Mike%20Taylor%20May%207%202012.pdf>.

22 ²² Letter from Snack Food Ass’n to Michael R. Taylor, Deputy Comm’r for Foods, U.S.
23 Food & Drug Admin. 1 (May 25, 2012), *available at*
<http://www.foodsafetynews.com/Snack%20Food%20Association%20FDA%20Letter.pdf>.

24 ²³ Letter from Michael R. Taylor, Deputy Comm’r for Foods, U.S. Food & Drug Admin.,
25 to James A. McCarthy, President & CEO, Snack Food Ass’n (June 18, 2012), *available at*
<http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/CentersOffices/OfficeofFoods/CFSAN/CFSANFOIAElectronicReadingRoom/ucm310083.htm>;
26 Letter from Michael R. Taylor, Deputy Comm’r for Foods, U.S. Food & Drug Admin., to Leon Bruner, Senior Vice President for Scientific & Regulatory Affairs
& Chief Sci. Officer, GMA (June 18, 2012), *available at*
27 <http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/CentersOffices/OfficeofFoods/CFSAN/CFSANFOIAElectronicReadingRoom/ucm310084.htm> (“FDA will expect to enforce compliance with these new FSMA
28 requirements in timeframes that will be described in the final rules.”).

1 43. The interests of Plaintiffs are also being and will be adversely affected by the
2 policy FDA has adopted to not enforce self-executing provisions of FSMA prior to promulgating
3 final regulations.

4 44. In particular, Defendants' unreasonable delay injures Plaintiff organizations by
5 putting their members' health and safety in jeopardy, because they risk contracting foodborne
6 illnesses.

7 45. As of 2011, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that each year
8 roughly 1 in 6 Americans (or 48 million people) gets sick, 128,000 are hospitalized, and 3,000
9 die of foodborne diseases.²⁴ While some will recover, many will die or have serious long-term
10 effects that can be devastating to both the victims and their families. Serious long-term effects
11 associated with several common types of food poisoning include kidney failure, chronic arthritis,
12 and brain and nerve damage.²⁵ The numerous preventative measures contained in FSMA
13 required to be carried out by FDA is critical, as they would dramatically reduce the number of
14 illnesses caused by foodborne pathogens in the U.S., as well as reduce the economic healthcare
15 burden of treating these problems. In an era of seeking ways to lower healthcare costs,
16 prevention of foodborne illness and outbreaks should be paramount.

17 46. Since Congress passed FSMA, numerous outbreaks have occurred. Just this
18 summer, there have been devastating outbreaks, putting peoples' health and lives at risk. For
19 example, in July, *Listeria* contaminated cantaloupes were recalled by North Carolina's Burch
20 Farms.²⁶ What started as the shocking recall of 189,000 cantaloupes was subsequently expanded
21 to include "all of this growing season's cantaloupes and honeydew melons distributed in 18
22 states."²⁷ This recall comes just a year after recalled cantaloupe from Colorado caused one of the
23

24 ²⁴ Ctrs. for Disease Control & Prevention, *2011 Estimates of Foodborne Illness in the*
25 *United States*, <http://www.cdc.gov/Features/dsFoodborneEstimates/> (last updated Apr. 15, 2011).

26 ²⁵ FoodSafety.gov, *Food Poisoning*, <http://www.foodsafety.gov/poisoning/index.html>
(last accessed Aug. 23, 2012).

27 ²⁶ Helena Bottemiller, *Cantaloupe Recall Expanded to Include Whole Growing Season,*
Honeydew, Food Safety News (Aug. 10, 2012), <http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2012/08/burch-farms-expands-cantaloupe-recall-to-include-more-melons/#.UDVAG8x5XIN>.

28 ²⁷ *Id.*

1 deadliest outbreaks in recent history, sickening at least 147 and killing 33.²⁸ Listeria-
2 contaminated apples and Salmonella-contaminated cilantro and tomatoes have also been recalled
3 this summer.²⁹ The apple recall consisted of 293,488 cases and 296,224 individual units of fruit,
4 vegetable, and sandwich products containing apples distributed to the District of Columbia and
5 36 states.³⁰

6 47. According to Sandra Eskin, project director the Pew Health Group's Food Safety
7 Campaign, "Until we get these rules finalized, we're going to keep seeing these outbreaks."³¹

8 48. Congress's substantial overhaul and modernization of federal food safety
9 oversight, as well as the express inclusion of strict deadlines required for regulatory
10 implementation and the existence of self-executing provisions, evinces Congress's express and
11 clear intent that FDA act without delay in implementing regulations and enforcing this crucial
12 new law and its preventive food safety measures.

13 49. The requested relief will redress this harm by forcing FDA to promulgate
14 regulations and enforce self-executing provisions as required by law for the safety of all
15 Americans, and Plaintiff organizations' members in particular.

16 **CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 [Violation of the FDA Food Safety and Modernization Act and
18 the Administrative Procedure Act – Against FDA and OMB]
19 [By All Plaintiffs]

20 50. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all allegations contained in paragraphs 1
21 through 49 *supra*.

22 ²⁸ *Burch Farms Cantaloupe Recalled for Possible Listeria Contamination*, Food Safety
23 News (July 29, 2012), <http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2012/07/burch-farms-cantaloupe-recalled-for-possible-listeria-contamination/#.UDVBr8x5XIN>.

24 ²⁹ Gretchen Goetz, *Cilantro Latest in Series of MDP-Prompted Recalls*, Food Safety
25 News (Aug. 13, 2012), <http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2012/08/cilantro-the-latest-in-series-of-mdp-prompted-recalls/#.UDVFrMx5XIN>.

26 ³⁰ *Apples Recalled for Potential Listeria Contamination*, Food Safety News (Aug. 13,
27 2012), <http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2012/08/apples-recalled-for-potential-listeria-contamination/#.UDU9q8x5XIN>.

28 ³¹ James Andrews, *Pew: Cantaloupe Outbreak Underscores Need for FSMA*, Food Safety
News (Aug. 22, 2012), <http://www.foodsafetynews.com/2012/08/pew-cantaloupe-outbreak-underscores-need-for-fsma/#.UDadpEIVfw0>.

1 51. FSMA requires FDA to promulgate major food safety regulations by mandatory
2 statutory deadlines described in detail in paragraphs 29 through 35. FDA’s failure to promulgate
3 said regulations constitutes unlawfully withheld and unreasonably delayed agency action within
4 the meaning of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 555(b), and FSMA.

5 52. EO 12866 requires OMB to review regulations within 90 days after submission
6 (with one 30-day extension allowed). Exec. Order 12,866, §§ 6(b)(2)(B), 6(b)(2)(C), 58 Fed.
7 Reg. 51,735. OMB’s failure to review those FSMA regulations described in paragraph 36, more
8 than 8 and 9 months after receipt, constitutes unlawfully withheld and unreasonably delayed
9 agency action within the meaning of the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 555(b), and EO 12866.

10 53. FSMA also requires FDA to enforce self-executing provisions, as described in
11 paragraph 39. FDA’s policy to not enforce said provisions until it promulgates final regulations
12 constitutes unlawfully withheld and unreasonably delayed agency action within the meaning of
13 the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 555(b), and FSMA.

14 54. The APA grants a right of judicial review to “a person suffering legal wrong
15 because of agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action.” *Id.* § 702.

16 55. The definition of “agency action” includes a “failure to act.” *Id.* § 551(13).

17 56. Plaintiffs and their members are adversely affected by FDA’s past and continued
18 failure to promulgate regulations required by Congress in FSMA. *See id.*

19 57. Plaintiffs and their members are adversely affected by OMB’s past and continued
20 failure to approve draft FSMA regulations, interfering with Congress’s mandate that FDA
21 promulgate FSMA regulations by strict deadlines. *See id.*

22 58. Plaintiffs and their members are adversely affected by FDA’s policy to not
23 enforce self-executing provisions of FSMA until after final regulations are promulgated. *See id.*

24 59. The APA states that a reviewing court “shall” interpret statutes and “compel
25 agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed.” *Id.* § 706(1),

26 60. FDA’s failure to promulgate said regulations constitutes unlawfully withheld and
27 unreasonably delayed agency action that this Court shall compel. *See id.*

28 61. OMB’s failure to approve draft FSMA regulations constitutes unlawfully

1 withheld and unreasonably delayed agency action that this Court shall compel. *See id.*

2 62. FDA's policy to not enforce self-executing provisions of FSMA constitutes
3 unlawfully withheld and unreasonably delayed agency action that this Court shall compel. *See*
4 *id.*

5 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter an Order:

7 1. Declaring that FDA has violated FSMA and the APA by failing to promulgate
8 FSMA regulations by statutory deadlines;

9 2. Declaring that FDA continues to be in violation of FSMA and the APA by failing
10 to promulgate FSMA regulations by statutory deadlines;

11 3. Declaring that OMB has violated EO 12866 and the APA by interfering with
12 FDA's promulgation of FSMA regulations by statutory deadlines;

13 4. Declaring that OMB continues to be in violation of EO 12866 and the APA by
14 interfering with FDA's promulgation of FSMA regulations by statutory deadlines;

15 5. Declaring that FDA has violated FSMA and the APA by its policy to not enforce
16 self-executing provisions of FSMA;

17 6. Declaring that FDA continues to be in violation of FSMA and the APA by its
18 policy to not enforce self-executing provisions of FSMA;

19 7. Ordering FDA to promulgate all FSMA regulations as soon as reasonably
20 practicable, according to a Court-ordered timeline;

21 8. Ordering OMB to approve and/or release FSMA regulations as to cease
22 interfering with FDA's promulgation of FSMA regulations or their ability to comply with the
23 Court-ordered timeline;

24 9. Ordering FDA to enforce all self-executing FSMA regulations immediately.

25 10. Retaining jurisdiction of this action to ensure compliance with its decree;

26 11. Awarding Plaintiffs attorney's fees and all other reasonable expenses occurred in
27 pursuit of this action; and

28 12. Granting other such relief as the Court deems just and proper.

1 Respectfully submitted this 29th day of August, 2012.

2 

3
4 PAIGE M. TOMASELLI State Bar No. 237737
5 GEORGE A. KIMBRELL (*Pro Hac Vice application pending*)
6 RACHEL A. ZUBATY State Bar No. 240785
7 Center for Food Safety, 2nd Floor
8 303 Sacramento Street
9 San Francisco, CA 94111
10 T: (415) 826-2770 / F: (415) 826-0507
11 Emails: gkimbrell@icta.org
12 ptomaselli@icta.org
13 rzubaty@icta.org

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Counsel for Plaintiffs