

1 BENJAMIN C. MIZER
 2 Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General
 3 Civil Division
 4 JONATHAN F. OLIN
 5 Deputy Assistant Attorney General
 6 MICHAEL S. BLUME
 7 Director
 8 Consumer Protection Branch
 9 JILL FURMAN
 10 Deputy Director
 11 DANIEL ZYTNICK
 12 Trial Attorney
 13 Consumer Protection Branch
 14 U.S. Department of Justice
 15 450 Fifth Street, NW, Suite 6400 South
 16 Washington, DC 20530
 17 Telephone: (202) 598-8337
 18 Facsimile: (202) 514-8742
 19 Email: Daniel.E.Zytnick@usdoj.gov

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 13 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

<p>14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 15 16 Plaintiff, 17 18 v. 19 CLIFFORD WOODS LLC, a limited liability 20 company d/b/a VIBRANT LIFE, 21 and CLIFFORD WOODS, an individual, 22 23 Defendants.</p>	<p>Case No.: 2:15-cv-8889</p> <p>COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF</p>
--	--

24 Plaintiff, the United States of America, by its undersigned attorneys, alleges
 25 as follows:

26 **INTRODUCTION**

27 1. This statutory injunction proceeding is brought under the Federal
 28 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the “Act”), 21 U.S.C. § 332(a), and the civil fraud

1 injunction statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1345, to enjoin and restrain Defendants from
2 violating:

3 a. 21 U.S.C. § 331(d), by introducing or delivering for
4 introduction, and/or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into
5 interstate commerce any new drug within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 321(p) that is
6 neither approved under 21 U.S.C. § 355, nor exempt from approval;

7 b. 21 U.S.C. § 331(a), by introducing or delivering for
8 introduction, and/or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into
9 interstate commerce drugs that are misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C.
10 § 352(f)(1); and

11 c. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 1343, by using the United States mail,
12 private interstate carriers, and interstate wire communication to engage in a scheme
13 to defraud.

14 2. Defendants sell products that they promote as treatments for cancer,
15 type 2 diabetes, Alzheimer’s disease, HIV infection, and AIDS—and those are just
16 some of the numerous therapeutic claims for their products. Because Defendants
17 intend that their products be used to cure, prevent, or treat diseases, the products
18 are drugs under the Act. The drugs are also new drugs because they have not been
19 generally recognized as safe and effective for the claimed therapeutic uses in the
20 products’ labeling. The drugs have not been approved by the Food and Drug
21 Administration (“FDA”) and are not exempt from approval under the Act.
22 Defendants therefore violate the Act by introducing the drugs into interstate
23 commerce.

24 3. Defendants know they are selling unapproved new drugs. FDA
25 warned them that their products were unapproved new drugs and misbranded
26 drugs. Defendants responded to the warning by stating that they were correcting
27 their “violations” and promising that their websites would be “FDA compliant.”
28

1 **DEFENDANTS’ PRODUCTS ARE DRUGS UNDER THE ACT**

2 11. Under the Act, a product is a drug if it is “intended for use in the
3 diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other
4 animals.” 21 U.S.C. § 321(g)(1)(B). Because a product’s intended use determines
5 whether it is a drug, a dietary supplement may also meet the Act’s drug definition
6 if it is intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention
7 of disease. See 21 U.S.C. § 321(ff) (providing that a dietary supplement shall be
8 deemed to be a food within the meaning of Act, “[e]xcept for purposes of . . . [21
9 U.S.C. § 321(g), the Act’s drug definition]”).

10 12. The intended use of a product may be determined from any relevant
11 source, including labeling and other promotional materials. See 21 C.F.R.
12 § 201.128. The Act defines labeling as “all labels and other written, printed, or
13 graphic matter (1) upon any article or any of its containers or wrappers, or
14 (2) accompanying such article.” 21 U.S.C. § 321(m).

15 13. Defendants market and sell Taheebo Life Tea, Life Glow Plus,
16 Germanium, and Organic Sulfur (identified as “MSM” (methyl sulfonyl methane))
17 (collectively “the Products”). The Products that Defendants introduce into
18 interstate commerce are drugs within the meaning of the Act because they are
19 “intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of
20 disease in man.” 21 U.S.C. § 321(g)(1)(B). Defendants promote the Products for
21 the cure, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of various diseases (e.g., cancer,
22 Alzheimer’s disease, and HIV) in product labeling, on their websites, and in email
23 marketing to consumers. For example, Defendants’ promotional materials include
24 the following disease treatment claims for the Products:

- 25 a. Taheebo Life Tea (capsules):
- 26 i. “The Alternative Cancer Treatment.”
 - 27 ii. “Read about Taheebo as a treatment for cancer.”
- 28

1 iii. “Vibrant Life Taheebo Tea seems to bring improvement in
2 cases of cancer, viral problems and yeast infections because it
3 boosts the immune system naturally.”

4 b. Life Glow Plus (capsules and powder):

5 i. “Although Life Glow Plus was not designed to deal with
6 Erectile Dysfunction - the results that has [sic] occurred with
7 men taking it has [sic] wonderful!”

8 c. Germanium (capsules and powder):

9 i. “Germanium has shown results in tumor reduction . . . and
10 relieving rheumatoid arthritis.”

11 d. Organic Sulfur (MSM) (capsules and powder):

12 i. “MSM can change a cancer cell into a non-malignant cell.
13 Studies have shown that MSM slows the growth rate of
14 cancerous tumors. MSM does not prevent cancer but it will
15 delay the disease. There is still much to learn about msm and
16 cancer but at least you can increase your life span by at least 10
17 years if you take msm to aid in the prevention of cancer.”

18 ii. “MSM has been shown to be effective in the treatment of
19 diabetes, which occur[s] when the body produces or uses
20 insulin inefficiently.”

21 iii. “MSM is also used for relief of . . . ulcers, . . . obesity, . . . high
22 blood pressure, and high cholesterol. It is also used for type 2
23 diabetes, liver problems, Alzheimer’s disease, lung disorders
24 including emphysema and pneumonia, chronic fatigue
25 syndrome, autoimmune disorders (systemic lupus erythematosus
26 [sic]), HIV infection and AIDS, and cancer (breast cancer and
27 colon cancer).”

- 1 iv. “[I]f you had more MSM in your body, you would endure far
2 less pain and suffering from . . . Fibromyalgia”
3 v. “MSM is used for . . . rheumatoid arthritis, osteoporosis”
4 vi. “Other uses of MSM include . . . parasitic infections of the
5 intestinal and urogenital tracts including *Trichomonas vaginalis*
6 and *Giardia*, . . . [and] radiation poisoning”

7 14. Defendants sometimes print disclaimers, but the disclaimers do not
8 negate Defendants’ express claims regarding the Products’ ability to treat, cure,
9 mitigate, and prevent diseases.

10 **WOODS PROMISED TO CORRECT VIOLATIONS**
11 **AFTER PREVIOUSLY BEING WARNED BY FDA**

12 15. Defendants are well aware that their conduct violates the law and that
13 continued violations could lead to an enforcement action.

14 16. FDA sent a Warning Letter, dated August 7, 2013, to Defendant
15 Woods (operating at that time as Vibrant Life or Vibrant Life Vitamins)
16 concerning the Products and claims found on his websites.

17 17. The letter informed Defendant Woods that “[t]he therapeutic claims
18 on your websites establish that the products are drugs because they are intended for
19 use in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease,” and that
20 “introducing or delivering these products for introduction into interstate commerce
21 for such uses violates the Act.”

22 18. The letter quoted “[e]xamples of some of the website claims that
23 provide evidence that your products are intended for use as drugs,” and also quoted
24 “evidence of intended use in the form of personal testimonials recommending or
25 describing the use of products for the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of
26 disease.” The letter also noted that “metatags used to bring consumers to your
27
28

1 websites through Internet searches” provided additional evidence that his products
2 were intended for use as drugs.

3 19. The letter informed Defendant Woods that: “Your above-referenced
4 products are not generally recognized as safe and effective for the above referenced
5 uses and, therefore, are ‘new drugs’ under section 201(p) of the Act [21 U.S.C. §
6 321(p)]. New drugs may not be legally introduced or delivered for introduction
7 into interstate commerce without prior approval from FDA, as described in section
8 505(a) of the Act [21 U.S.C. § 355(a)]. FDA approves a new drug on the basis of
9 scientific data submitted by a drug sponsor to demonstrate that the drug is safe and
10 effective.”

11 20. The letter further warned Defendant Woods that the labeling for his
12 products lacked adequate directions for use, causing the products to be misbranded,
13 and that introducing a misbranded drug into interstate commerce violates the Act.

14 21. Identifying himself as Executive Director of Vibrant Life, Defendant
15 Woods responded to FDA’s letter on August 19, 2013, by stating that he would
16 “review, investigate and correct where needed” and “probably simply remove any
17 violations I encounter.”

18 22. Defendant Woods sent a subsequent response to FDA, dated
19 September 7, 2013, stating that he had deleted specified material from his websites.

20 23. FDA replied to Defendant Woods on October 18, 2013, noting that his
21 response was “inadequate” and identified numerous claims remaining on Vibrant
22 Life’s websites that cause his products to be drugs.

23 24. In a letter dated December 16, 2013, Defendant Woods stated that he
24 believed his www.oralchelation.com website was “now FDA compliant” and that
25 “[a]ny additions to this website in the future will be reviewed thoroughly to ensure
26 they are fully FDA compliant.”

1 25. Despite Defendant Woods’ promise to ensure that his website is
2 “FDA compliant,” Defendants market Taheebo Life Tea to treat cancer, Life Glow
3 Plus to treat erectile dysfunction, Germanium to treat rheumatoid arthritis, and
4 Organic Sulfur (MSM) to treat numerous diseases including diabetes, breast
5 cancer, colon cancer, Alzheimer’s disease, lupus, rheumatoid arthritis, HIV
6 infection, and AIDS. None of these products have been approved by FDA for any
7 of these claimed uses.

8 **INTERSTATE COMMERCE UNDER THE ACT AND SECTION 1345**

9 26. Defendants, operating in California, cause their products to be
10 distributed to customers through a fulfillment center located in Idaho. Defendants’
11 products can be ordered online directly from their websites, using a credit card for
12 delivery by an interstate carrier such as FedEx. Defendants’ products can also be
13 ordered from the company by telephone.

14 27. Defendants ship their finished products in interstate commerce using
15 the United States mail or a private interstate carrier. For example, on or about May
16 4, 2015, Defendants caused Taheebo Life Tea to be shipped from Idaho to
17 Washington, D.C. via FedEx.

18 28. Defendants market their products on the internet and in emails to
19 persons outside of California, making claims about the drugs’ therapeutic benefits
20 via wire in interstate commerce.

21 **COUNT 1**

22 **(FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT –**
23 **DISTRIBUTING UNAPPROVED NEW DRUGS (21 U.S.C. §§ 331(d) & 355(a)))**

24 29. The United States realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs
25 1 through 28 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

26 30. A “new drug” is defined as any drug “the composition of which is
27 such that the drug is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by
28

1 scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs,
2 as safe and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or
3 suggested in the labeling thereof.” 21 U.S.C. § 321(p)(1). For a product to be
4 deemed generally recognized as safe and effective (“GRAS/GRAE”), it must have
5 substantial evidence of safety and effectiveness. 21 U.S.C. § 355(d).

6 31. Under the Act, a “new drug” may not be introduced or delivered for
7 introduction into interstate commerce unless FDA has approved a new drug
8 application (“NDA”) or abbreviated new drug application (“ANDA”) with respect
9 to such drug, or such drug is exempt from approval. 21 U.S.C. §§ 355(a) &
10 331(d). A drug may be exempt from the Act’s new drug approval requirements,
11 21 U.S.C. § 355(a), if it is the subject of an investigational new drug application
12 (“IND”). 21 U.S.C. § 355(i).

13 32. The Products are “new drugs” as defined by 21 U.S.C. § 321(p)(1),
14 because they are not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific
15 training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs, as safe
16 and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested
17 in their labeling. The Products lack substantial evidence of safety and
18 effectiveness. There are no published adequate and well-controlled investigations
19 demonstrating that the drugs are generally recognized as safe and effective for any
20 use and, therefore, qualified experts cannot come to a consensus of opinion
21 concerning the effectiveness of the Products.

22 33. None of the Products are the subject of an approved NDA or ANDA,
23 or an effective IND. Defendants have no such approvals on file from FDA.

24 34. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(d) by introducing or delivering
25 for introduction into interstate commerce unapproved new drugs. Defendants’
26 history of promoting products to cure, mitigate, treat, and/or prevent diseases,
27
28

1 including, but not limited to, such serious health problems as cancer, HIV, and
2 diabetes, demonstrates their unwillingness to comply with the Act.

3 **COUNT 2**

4 **(FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT –**

5 **MISBRANDED DRUGS (21 U.S.C. § 331(a))**

6 35. The United States realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs
7 1 through 34 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

8 36. The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce
9 of any drug that is misbranded violates the Act. 21 U.S.C. § 331(a).

10 37. A drug is misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 352(f)(1) if
11 its labeling fails to bear “adequate directions for use” and it does not fall within a
12 regulatory exemption from that requirement. “Adequate directions for use” means
13 “directions under which the layman can use a drug safely and for the purposes for
14 which it is intended.” 21 C.F.R. § 201.5.

15 38. By definition, a drug that is also a prescription drug cannot have
16 adequate instructions for lay use. 21 U.S.C. § 353 (b)(1)(A) (requiring a drug to be
17 dispensed by prescription that, “because of its toxicity or other potentiality for
18 harmful effect, or the method of its use, or the collateral measures necessary to its
19 use, is not safe for use except under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by
20 law to administer such drug”). Drugs that are unapproved are not exempt from the
21 requirement for adequate directions for use. See 21 C.F.R. §§ 201.100(c)(2),
22 201.115.

23 39. It is not possible to write adequate directions for use for Defendants’
24 Products because such directions -- including dosages, indications,
25 contraindications, warnings, side effects, and necessary collateral measures -- are
26 premised on animal and clinical data derived from extensive, scientifically
27
28

1 controlled testing and reviewed by FDA during the approval process. As noted in
2 paragraph 32 above, there are no well-controlled clinical test data for the Products.

3 40. In addition, because of the purposes for which they are intended
4 and/or the potential for serious adverse effects, the Products are prescription drugs,
5 which, as a matter of law, cannot meet the requirement for “adequate directions for
6 use.” See 21 U.S.C. § 352(f)(1); 21 C.F.R. § 201.5(a).

7 41. The Products are misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C.
8 § 352(f)(1) because their labeling fails to bear “adequate directions for use,” and
9 the Products do not fall within a regulatory exemption from that requirement. See,
10 e.g., 21 C.F.R. Part 201, Subpart D.

11 42. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(a) by introducing or delivering for
12 introduction into interstate commerce misbranded drugs.

13 **COUNT 3**

14 **(CIVIL FRAUD INJUNCTION (18 U.S.C. § 1345))**

15 43. The United States realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs
16 1 through 42 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

17 44. Defendants are engaged in an ongoing scheme to defraud consumers
18 by promoting the Products to cure, mitigate, treat, or prevent diseases despite the
19 absence of well-controlled clinical studies or any other credible scientific
20 substantiation to support those representations and despite having received
21 warnings from FDA that their therapeutic claims violate the law.

22 45. Defendants ship the Products via the United States mail and/or a
23 private or commercial interstate carrier.

24 46. Defendants make their representations about the therapeutic value of
25 the Products on the internet and in emails sent via wire in interstate commerce.

26 47. By reason of the conduct described herein, Defendants violated, are
27 violating, and are about to violate 18 U.S.C. § 1341 by executing a scheme or
28

1 artifice to defraud or for obtaining money or property by means of false or
2 fraudulent representations with the intent to defraud, and, in so doing, using the
3 United States mail and/or a private or commercial interstate carrier.

4 48. By reason of the conduct described herein, Defendants violated, are
5 violating, and are about to violate 18 U.S.C. § 1343 by executing a scheme or
6 artifice to defraud or for obtaining money or property by means of false or
7 fraudulent representations with the intent to defraud, and, in so doing, transmitting
8 writings by wire in interstate commerce for the purpose of executing such scheme
9 or artifice.

10 49. For instance, Defendants promote Taheebo Life Tea as a treatment for
11 “cancer, viral problems and yeast infections,” but the claims are misleading
12 because they conceal the material fact that there are no well-controlled clinical
13 studies or any other credible scientific substantiation to support the use of Taheebo
14 Life Tea in treating those diseases.

15 50. FDA’s August 7, 2013 Warning Letter expressly cited the claim that
16 Taheebo Life Tea could treat “cancer, viral problems and yeast infections” as one
17 of the “[e]xamples of some of the website claims that provide evidence that your
18 products are intended for use as drugs,” and Woods agreed that he would “remove
19 any violations” and ensure his website is “fully FDA compliant.” But Defendants
20 continue to promote Taheebo Life Tea with the same representations despite
21 knowing that Taheebo Life Tea is an unapproved new drug and despite the absence
22 of credible and meaningful scientific support for their disease claims.

23 51. As shown above, Defendants promote their Germanium products as a
24 treatment for tumors and rheumatoid arthritis, Life Glow Plus as a treatment for
25 erectile dysfunction, and their Organic Sulfur (MSM) products as a treatment for
26 numerous diseases, including cancer, HIV, and Alzheimer’s.

1 II. Permanently restrain and enjoin, under 21 U.S.C. § 332(a),
2 Defendants, and each and all of their directors, officers, agents, representatives,
3 employees, attorneys, successors, assigns, and any and all persons in active concert
4 or participation with any of them, from introducing or delivering for introduction
5 into interstate commerce Taheebo Life Tea, Life Glow Plus, Germanium, Organic
6 Sulfur (MSM), or any other product, unless or until:

7 A. A new drug application or abbreviated new drug application is
8 approved and in effect for the product pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355; or

9 B. An investigational new drug exemption filed pursuant to 21
10 U.S.C. § 355(i) is in effect for the product; or

11 C. Defendants have removed all claims that cause their products to
12 be drugs, as defined by the Act, from labeling and other materials, including, but
13 not limited to: (1) websites owned, controlled by, or related to Defendants
14 (including arthritisinformation.net, bulkmsm.com, chelationtherapyonline.com,
15 heart-disease-bypass-surgery.com, oralchelation.com, vibrantlifemsm.com, and
16 vibrantlifeneeds.com), Defendants' Facebook page(s), any future website created
17 by Defendants, and Defendants' postings on other websites (collectively,
18 "Defendants' websites"); and (2) other product labeling and promotional materials,
19 including videos.

20 III. Permanently restrain and enjoin, under 18 U.S.C. § 1345, Defendants,
21 and each and all of their directors, officers, agents, representatives, employees,
22 attorneys, successors, assigns, and any and all persons in active concert or
23 participation with any of them, from making, directly or indirectly, in connection
24 with the advertising, promoting, or offering for sale, selling, or distributing of

25 A. Taheebo Life Tea;

26 B. Life Glow Plus;

27 C. Germanium;

28

1 D. Organic Sulfur (MSM); or

2 E. any other product,

3 any representation, expressly or by implication, about the therapeutic benefits of
4 the product, unless the representation is true, non-misleading, and, at the time of
5 making such representation, Defendants possess and rely upon competent and
6 reliable scientific evidence, that is sufficient in quality and quantity based on
7 standards generally accepted in the relevant scientific fields, when considered in
8 light of the entire body of relevant and reliable evidence, to substantiate that the
9 representation is true.

10 IV. Permanently restrain and enjoin, under 18 U.S.C. § 1345, Defendants,
11 and each and all of their directors, officers, agents, representatives, employees,
12 attorneys, successors, assigns, and any and all persons in active concert or
13 participation with any of them, from engaging in any mail fraud or wire fraud in
14 connection with the sale of any product promoted as a cure, prevention, mitigation,
15 or treatment of any disease.

16 V. Order restitution and disgorgement, as appropriate.

17 VI. Grant judgment to Plaintiff for its costs herein, and that this Court
18 grant such other and further relief as it deems just and proper.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: November 16, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

2
3 OF COUNSEL:

BENJAMIN C. MIZER
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney
General
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division

4 WILLIAM B. SCHULTZ
5 General Counsel

6 ELIZABETH H. DICKINSON
7 Chief Counsel
8 Food and Drug Division

JONATHAN F. OLIN
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

9 PERHAM GORJI
Deputy Chief Counsel for Litigation

MICHAEL S. BLUME
Director
Consumer Protection Branch

10 CLAUDIA J. ZUCKERMAN
11 Senior Counsel
12 Office of the Chief Counsel
13 Food and Drug Administration
14 10903 New Hampshire Avenue
15 Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002
16 301-796-8609

JILL FURMAN
Deputy Director
Consumer Protection Branch

/s/ Daniel Zytneck
DANIEL ZYTNICK
Trial Attorney
Consumer Protection Branch
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 386
Washington, D.C. 20044
Tel. (202) 598-8337
Fax. (202) 514-8742
Daniel.E.Zytneck@usdoj.gov

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28