

“Comprehensive Nutrition” Deemed Puffery – Consumers Understand You Can’t Eat Gummies for Dinner, Court Confirms

Proskauer on Advertising Law on June 3, 2026

The Southern District of New York recently dismissed a putative class action challenging the marketing of Grüns Nutrition’s “Superfood Greens Gummies.” In a detailed opinion, Judge Liman found that the company’s core messaging around “comprehensive nutrition” was either obvious puffery or too ambiguous—once read in context—to mislead a reasonable consumer. *Cavallaro-Kearins v. Grüns Nutrition Inc.*, No. 25-cv-4998 (LJL) (S.D.N.Y. May 19, 2026).

The plaintiffs alleged that Grüns built its brand around the idea that its gummies were an “all-in-one” solution: a substitute for other supplements, and in some instances even for fruits and vegetables. According to the complaint, that message was false because the products lack key nutrients such as protein, fat, and certain minerals, and therefore cannot deliver what consumers would expect from “complete” or “comprehensive” nutrition.

The Court was unconvinced. Judge Liman began with the most literal reading of “comprehensive nutrition”—that the gummies provide all nutrients necessary to sustain life. A reasonable consumer, the Court observed, of course would not believe that a small packet of gummy supplements could replace all food intake or eliminate the need for a balanced diet. Read that way, the phrase is plainly exaggerated and therefore non-actionable puffery. The opinion underscores a familiar principle: when a claim is so sweeping that it becomes implausible on its face, courts are unlikely to treat it as a concrete, factual representation.

The Court further reasoned that consumers are expected to look beyond a sweeping front-of-the-label statement to look at the claim and label as a whole. And here, that broader context proved decisive. The packaging and accompanying disclosures explained what the gummies actually contain—vitamins, minerals, fiber, and various plant-based ingredients—and, just as importantly, what they do not contain. The Court held that these additional details were sufficient to dispel any potential confusion.

One narrow category of claims, however, gave the court some pause. Plaintiffs alleged that Grüns had marketed its gummies to consumers using GLP-1 medications with claims suggesting that the product could help address nutritional gaps associated with those drugs. The Court found that a reasonable consumer could interpret these claims, which were arguably more targeted and concrete, as representing that GLP-1 users face identifiable deficiencies and that the gummies are designed to fill those specific gaps. Even so, that theory ultimately fell short. The Court held that plaintiffs did not adequately allege what those supposed deficiencies are or how the product fails to address them. The Court therefore dismissed that claim as well, although without prejudice.

The decision reinforces that courts remain skeptical of attempts to recast puffery as actionable misrepresentations, even where plaintiffs allege that the case implicates health and wellness claims.

[Related Professionals](#)

- **Baldassare Vinti**
Partner
- **Craig Whitney**
Partner
- **Jana R. Ruthberg**
Associate
- **Jeff H. Warshafsky**
Partner
- **Jennifer Yang**
Partner