Simpson Thacher

The Ad Standard: Monthly Update

September 2026

This month's headline FTC action was the announcement that the FTC and 22 states sued Amazon over deceptive advertising practices. But the FTC has also kept its sights trained on protecting cash-strapped consumers. The FTC announced settlements involving empty credit-repair promises, bill payment platforms masquerading as official payment channels, and tacked-on fees at used car dealerships.

On the class action front, plaintiffs are taking aim at manufacturers over claims that their older devices were prematurely rendered obsolete and questioning whether products can still be called "original" if the recipe and ingredients are quietly changed. Meanwhile, the 9th Circuit rejected class certification finding that without a single or dominant industry standard defining an advertising claim like "pasture raised," plaintiffs lacked proof of common deception.

And for those who thought the claim, "World's Highest Quality," was pure puffery, NAD disagreed concluding that when the claim appears alongside descriptions of specific product features, the claim becomes an objective representation requiring substantiation.

TOPICS

FTC Focus

FTC Enforcement Activity

1. The FTC and 22 states recently filed suit against Amazon, alleging it engaged in deceptive and unfair practices to inflate the prices that brands and sellers paid to advertise on its platform. The complaint alleges that beginning in 2019 Amazon imposed undisclosed surcharges on its advertising customers that participated in auctions for advertising placements on Amazon.com and its mobile app. The complaint specifically alleges Amazon increased advertising prices beyond what it could achieve through a genuine auction.

   FTC, States Sue Amazon Over Secret Ad Surcharge Scheme | Federal Trade Commission

2. The FTC has obtained a temporary restraining order against a network of 16 related entities and their five principals that were allegedly running a false and misleading credit repair scheme in violation of federal statutes including the FTC Act and ROSCA. The FTC's complaint alleged that defendants took nearly $200 million from consumers by making false and misleading promises about their credit repair services, impersonating debt collection companies and creditors, charging illegal upfront fees, and using unlawful subscription enrollment practices. Christopher Mufarrige, Director of the FTC's Bureau of Consumer Protection, commented that "Using paid Google search ads to target and deceive vulnerable consumers, including military servicemembers, through falsely promising to improve their credit is egregious behavior that will not be tolerated by the FTC."

   FTC Stops Sprawling Credit Repair Scheme that Scammed Consumers Out of Nearly $200 Million | Federal Trade Commission

3. Online bill payment firm Doxo will pay $2.1 million to settle FTC allegations that it and two of its co-founders used misleading search ads to impersonate consumers' billers to trick them into using Doxo's third-party bill payment platform to pay utility, car loan and other bills. According to the FTC, Doxo's landing page featured the names and logos of companies that it falsely claimed were part of its payment network. The FTC further alleged that the scheme violated ROSCA by deceptively signing consumers up for a recurring subscription program and also added millions in extra "delivery fees" to the bills it paid that were not clearly disclosed.

   Bill Payment Firm Doxo to Pay $2.1 Million to Settle FTC Allegations It Deceived Consumers and Charged Them Add-On Fees | Federal Trade Commission

4. The FTC finalized orders requiring Cox Media Group (CMG) and two other firms to pay nearly $1 million to settle allegations that they deceived customers by falsely claiming to offer an AI-powered service that could target localized ads based on conversations captured from consumers' smart devices and that consumers had opted into such targeting. The FTC alleged that the companies deceived customers by claiming to use a special algorithm to listen in on and detect pertinent conversations from smart devices to target ads to consumers within a specific geographic region. However, the service was not based on voice data and consumers had not opted into it. If the service had functioned as claimed, the collection and use of voice data without consent would have violated the FTC Act.

   FTC Finalizes Orders with Cox Media Group, Two Other Firms Settling Charges They Deceived Customers About "Active Listening" AI-Powered Marketing Service | Federal Trade Commission

5. Under a proposed order filed in federal court, the FTC and state of Connecticut secured a $4 million settlement with Chase Nissan LLC, a Connecticut-based auto dealer, and its owners and managers resolving allegations that the business was, among other things, double-charging for "certified pre-owned" vehicles and collecting other fees, such as total loss protection charges, without consumers' authorization. The FTC and Connecticut alleged that the dealership's own data showed that customers were frequently charged thousands in unlawful fees, such as paying to "certify" used cars that the dealership had advertised as already being "certified pre-owned." Under the proposed order, defendants must refrain from misrepresentations, including whether vehicles are certified or include a limited manufacturer warranty, and must disclose as the most prominently displayed item the maximum total price for each vehicle, excluding only required government charges.

   FTC, Connecticut Secure $4 Million Settlement with Manchester City Nissan Over Deceptive Fees Allegations | Federal Trade Commission

Class Actions

Ingredient-Based Claims

McCormick & Co., Inc. has been sued in a putative class action alleging that it misleads consumers by not disclosing that following its acquisition of the well-known Cholula hot sauce brand in 2020 that it has changed the ingredients of Cholula Original Hot Sauce by adding acetic acid and "natural flavor" as well as increasing the ratio of xanthan gum. The complaint alleges that "[b]y preserving the Product's iconic branding, front label elements, and 'Original' designations, Defendant induces consumers to purchase what they believed was the 'Original' Product when, in fact, it has materially changed." Plaintiff asserts violations of New York General Business Law Sections 349 and 350.

Wright v. McCormick & Co., No. 1:26-cv-04870 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2026)

Unilever United States, Inc. has been sued in a putative class action alleging that it falsely labels, markets, and sells over two-dozen of its Knorr-branded products as containing "No Artificial Flavors or Preservatives" because each product, in fact, contains citric acid, a known artificial preservative. Plaintiff asserts violations of New York General Business Law Sections 349 and 350.

Edwards v. Unilever U.S., Inc., No. 1:26-cv-06792 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2026)

Rice and grain manufacturer Mars Food US, LLC d/b/a Seeds of Change was sued in a putative class action alleging that it falsely and misleadingly represents that quinoa is a substantial or main ingredient in its Organic Quinoa, Brown & Red Rice with Flaxseed product because, contrary to the impression created by the front of the package, the product's ingredient list identifies quinoa among the ingredients comprising less than 2% of the product. Plaintiff asserts violations of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, False Advertising Law, and Unfair Competition Law.

Merrick v. Mars Food US, LLC, No. 3:26-cv-04610 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2026)

Avocado Oil Claims

Snack food company Utz Brands Inc. and condiment company Chosen Foods LLC were sued in separate putative class actions in New York and California federal court alleging that their products, which purport to be made exclusively with avocado oil, are made exclusively or partially with other oils. Both complaints cite the same 2026 study by researchers at University of California, Davis who tested the authenticity of avocado oil in commercially processed foods.

Schultz v. Utz Brands Inc., No. 1:26-cv-04969 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2026) (asserting violations of New York General Business Law Sections 349 and 350)

Treasure v. Chosen Foods LLC, No. 3:26-cv-04606 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2026) (asserting violations of California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act and Unfair Competition Law, and Maryland's Consumer Protection Act)

Unscented Claims

The Procter & Gamble Co. ("P&G") and Church & Dwight Co., Inc. ("Church") have been sued in separate putative class actions in New York federal court, alleging that each company falsely advertises its deodorants as "unscented," when they in fact, contain fragrance ingredients. It is alleged that P&G's Native Unscented Deodorant contains the fragrance ingredient *Zingiber officinale* (ginger) root extract and that Church's Arm & Hammer Essentials Unscented Deodorant and Arm & Hammer UltraMax Unscented Antiperspirant and Deodorant allegedly contain *Ethylene brassylate*. Each complaint asserts violations of New York General Business Law Sections 349 and 350 and both plaintiffs are represented by the same counsel from Fitzgerald Monroe Flynn, PC and Smith Krivoshey, PC.

Chiaravalloti v. The Procter & Gamble Co., No. 1:26-cv-06902 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 12, 2026)

Glickman v. Church & Dwight Co., No. 2:26-cv-04936 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 12, 2026)

Generic Drug Claims

Glenmark Pharmaceuticals Inc., USA was sued in a putative class action alleging that it represents to consumers that its generic drug "Carvedilol" is therapeutically equivalent to, and otherwise the same as, the actual FDA-approved brand name drug Coreg®, but that it, in fact, does not have the same safety profile, identity, strength, quality, or purity because Carvedilol is contaminated with nitrosamine (a probable human carcinogen) and is manufactured in a manner that is not compliant with current Good Manufacturing Practices. Plaintiff asserts violations of various state consumer protection laws including California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, False Advertising Law, and Unfair Competition Law and New York General Business Law Sections 349 and 350.

Carroll v. Glenmark Pharms. Inc., USA, No. 2:26-cv-00327 (E.D. Wash. Aug. 4, 2026)

Technology Platform Class Actions

GoFundMe, Inc. was sued in a putative class action alleging that it automatically and furtively adds supposedly optional, but difficult to remove "tips" on each donation via a deceptive negative option. The complaint describes negative options as "a feature in an online transaction wherein a consumer's failure to act is interpreted as acceptance of an additional product or service, leading to automatic charges the consumer is forced to accept unless they discover how to decline the product or service before completing the transaction." The complaint further alleges that GoFundMe misdescribes the purpose of the tips by deceptively informing consumers that it "relies primarily" on tips "to operate its service" when, in fact, it charges charitable organizations transaction fees on each donation. Plaintiffs assert violations of the Georgia Fair Business Practices Act and the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act.

Donovan v. GoFundMe, Inc., No. 1:26-cv-09423 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 6, 2026)

Apple Inc. was sued in a putative class action alleging that it markets its Apple Watches as sophisticated wearable computers, but without warning discontinues software support for them before the end of the hardware's useful life, which can cause the watches to lose functionality, become insecure, or cease to function entirely. The complaint alleges that manufacturers like Apple are incentivized to "brick" or render older models obsolete so they can manufacture and sell new devices. Plaintiff asserts violations of California's Unfair Competition Law.

Goetz v. Apple Inc., No. 3:26-cv-08384 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2026)

Amazon.com, Inc. was sued in a putative class action alleging that it deceives consumers by "makes unqualified, unsupported, and at times untrue environmental and ecological representations" about "numerous seafood products sold on its platform" such as that they are "sustainable," "sustainably sourced," "responsibly sourced," "wild caught," "traceable," "MSC Certified Sustainable Seafood," and "dolphin safe." Plaintiffs assert violations of Washington's Consumer Protection Act.

Rogow v. Amazon.com, Inc., No. 2:26-cv-02702 (W.D. Wash. July 31, 2026)

Dismissal Denied

A federal district court largely denied dismissal of claims in a putative class action alleging that Safeway, Inc. violated California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act, False Advertising Law, and Unfair Competition Law by advertising discounted member prices on wine lasting "Thru" a particular date, as this misrepresents that the discounted price is only available for a brief window, when, in fact, the wine is never sold to members at the non-discounted price. The court rejected Safeway's argument that no reasonable consumer would interpret the "Thru" date as plaintiffs assert because the ads "say *nothing* about what happens after the 'Thru' date." The court concluded that a reasonable consumer could interpret the statement that a sale exists through a particular date means that the sale will not continue past that date. The court further concluded that in light of plaintiffs' theory of deception, the reference price cases Safeway cited are not persuasive because in this case plaintiffs allege that "the 'Thru' date paired with the reference price . . . is misleading," rather than the non-members' "reference" price itself.

Tempest v. Safeway, Inc., No. 24-cv-06553, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 174915 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2026)

Dismissal Granted

A federal district court dismissed a putative class action filed by a group of financial professionals alleging that non-party scammers allegedly posted fraudulent ads on Meta Platforms, Inc.'s social media platforms (Facebook and Instagram) that directed victims to investment-focused chat groups on Meta's messaging platforms (WhatsApp and Messenger) where the scammers, impersonating plaintiffs, peddled worthless securities. Seeking to hold Meta liable for the damage created by the misappropriation of their identities and professional reputations, plaintiffs alleged violations of California Unfair

Competition Law ("UCL") and Florida's Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA"), among others. Noting that plaintiffs conceded that the core illegal content–their impersonations on WhatsApp and Messenger–was created entirely by the scammers, the court concluded that the liability shield of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act applies to most of plaintiffs' claims (including unfair competition under the UCL's unlawful and unfair prongs and FDUTPA). The court stated that plaintiffs' claim under the UCL's fraudulent prong depended on the alleged falsity of Meta's public representations that it would remove offending content from its sites and concluded that Meta did not make any statements "likely to deceive the public" because "these representations were not promises to its community of users; they were warnings to potential offenders." The court granted plaintiffs leave to amend, finding that "there remains a sliver of ambiguity" about whether plaintiffs allege that they were impersonated in the ads they contend Meta participated in creating.

Suddeth v. Meta Platforms, Inc., No. 25-cv-08581, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 181678 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2026)

Class Certification Granted

A federal district court granted a motion to certify in a class action alleging that Reynolds Consumer Products LLC violated New York General Business Law Sections 349 and 350 by deceptively labeling its "Reynolds Wrap" aluminum foil products as "FOIL MADE IN U.S.A." finding that plaintiffs satisfied all of the necessary Rule 23 requirements. Plaintiffs alleged that the MADE IN U.S.A. label would cause consumers to expect that the raw materials used in the products are sourced from within the U.S. and that a substantial amount of the transformation of raw materials into defendant's products takes place within the U.S. However, plaintiffs alleged it would be impossible to produce aluminum foil products without a key raw material mined outside of the U.S., as none of the bauxite mined in the U.S. has been used for aluminum since 1981, and "a substantial amount of the making, manufacturing, and/or production" of the products takes place outside of the U.S.

Washington v. Reynolds Consumer Prods. LLC, No. 1:24-cv-02327 (S.D.N.Y. July 30, 2026)

Class Certification Reversed

The Ninth Circuit reversed a grant of class certification in a suit alleging that The Happy Group Inc.'s egg cartons stating that hens were "pasture raised on over 8 acres" deceptively represented that the eggs met dominant industry standards concerning living standards. The Ninth Circuit concluded that the district court erred in certifying the classes based on its materiality and damages findings alone. Citing *Ruiz Torres v. Mercer Canyons Inc.,* 835 F.3d 1125 (9th Cir. 2016), the Ninth Circuit stated that "the district court must weigh the common issues against the individualized issues and determine whether the common issues are, on balance, important enough to justify class-wide treatment despite the existence of individualized issues." Pointing out that the district court did not undertake this analysis but if it had, the Ninth Circuit stated that "it should have declined to certify the class—even assuming that its materiality and damages analyses were correct." The Ninth Circuit concluded that "[o]n this record, the lack of a classwide showing on deception cannot be overcome by supposedly common issues of materiality and damages that are unmoored from any classwide showing of actionable wrongdoing." The Ninth Circuit further concluded that "because the plaintiffs did not demonstrate that there was a single or dominant industry standard for 'pasture raised,' and that a reasonable consumer would perceive that representation in those terms, plaintiffs lacked common proof of deception."

Rusoff v. The Happy Group, Inc., No. 24-7706, 2026 U.S. App. LEXIS 24726 (9th Cir. Aug. 17, 2026)

"World's Highest Quality" Claims

In a challenge brought by competitor Mueller Sports Medicine, Inc., NAD found certain claims made by Howies Hockey, Inc. about its Athletic Tape and Hockey Tape products to be puffery, but recommended superiority claims be modified or discontinued. Specifically, NAD reviewed product packaging and point-of-sale displays where the claim "World's Highest Quality" appears alone, without reference to specific product attributes or competitors and, in this context, NAD concluded that the claim is puffery because it is an expression of corporate pride. However, for webpages, social media, print advertising, and third-party retail sites where the claim "World's Highest Quality" appears alongside descriptions of specific product attributes, NAD found that the claim becomes an objective representation regarding the product's performance for which substantiation is required. NAD also recommended that Howies discontinue the claim when it appears in close proximity to measurable product attributes or modify the advertising to avoid conveying the unsupported message that its products are superior. NAD further recommended that Howies make bona fide, good-faith efforts to have third-party retail websites modify or discontinue the superiority claim.

Howies Hockey, Inc. (Howies Athletic Tape and Hockey Tape), Report #7577, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (Aug. 2026)

Eczema Relief Claims

In a challenge brought by competitor Galderma Laboratories, L.P., NAD concluded that there was support for certain challenged claims made by Sanofi S.A. about Dupixent, its prescription drug for moderate-to-severe eczema. These claims included that Dupixent helps patients "stay ahead of eczema," blocks "a key source of inflammation," can "help heal your skin from within," and that many adults saw 90% clearer skin supported. Although NAD found that the 90% clearer skin claim does not need a disclosure, NAD recommended that if Sanofi continues to present the results from one particular study as the basis for the claim in a disclosure, that it uses a disclosure that does not overstate the supporting evidence or obscure the treatment context. NAD determined that Sanofi's evidence supports a properly qualified claim that some adults achieved long-lasting clearer skin at four months and at one year and that some saw fast itch relief after the first dose at two weeks. However, NAD recommended modifying or discontinuing the challenged television claims to clearly and conspicuously disclose how many patients achieved the advertised results or that the results reflected treatment with Dupixent used in combination with topical corticosteroids. As to a prescriber-facing claim that Dupixent reduced itch "starting as early as day 2," NAD recommended that Sanofi discontinue or modify the claim because Sanofi's post hoc analysis did not support the message that Dupixent demonstrated a meaningful treatment benefit beginning as early as day 2.

Sanofi S.A. (Dupixent), Report #7557, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (July 2026)

Hair-Loss Product Claims

In a challenge brought by competitor Kenvue Inc. challenging express and implied claims made by Hims & Hers Health, Inc. for compounded topical hair-loss products, NAD determined that Hims provided a reasonable basis for its comparative efficacy claim, "Finasteride is doctor trusted to give even better results when paired with minoxidil, which helps to kickstart regrowth," to the extent it conveys that finasteride provides better results when paired with minoxidil than when used alone. However, as there was no evidence that doctors trust finasteride for that reason, NAD recommended that the claim be modified to remove the "doctor trusted" language. NAD further determined that a confidential Hims survey of 250 independent dermatologists was sufficient to support certain carefully qualified claims about the level of dermatologist trust reported for particular ingredients, ingredient combinations, and patient populations but recommended that Hims modify its "doctor-trusted ingredients" claims to clearly and conspicuously disclose the relevant survey results, including the reported level of trust for particular ingredients, ingredient combinations, and patient populations, or otherwise make the level of support clear. Hims also represented it modified the claim that one Hims product "is a treatment alternative to oral finasteride that has been shown in research studies to be safe and effective," so that the "safe and effective" language refers to topical finasteride rather than the challenged product. NAD recommended that Hims further modify the claim to clearly identify the subject of the research, the relevant limitations of the evidence, and the distinction between topical finasteride generally and the challenged compounded products to avoid conveying the message that the Hims Spray and Serum have been shown to be safe in clinical studies.

Hims & Hers Health, Inc. (Compounded Finasteride and Minoxidil Hair Loss Sprays and Serums), Report #7543, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (July 2026)

Two-Minute Hair Drying Claims

In a Fast-Track SWIFT challenge brought by competitor Dyson Inc., NAD recommended that Dreame Technology modify or discontinue advertising claims that its Dazzle Hair Styler and its Miracle Pro Hair Dryer can dry hair "in just 2 minutes," which appeared alongside images of models with long hair, to avoid conveying the unsupported message that the products can dry long hair in that time. Noting that visual depictions can convey objective messages that require substantiation, NAD found that one reasonable takeaway of the challenged ads is that the two-minute drying claim applies to the long hair depicted in the images even where the text refers to shoulder-length hair. NAD stated that to "avoid conveying an unsupported message, the images and the text should match, or the advertising should clearly indicate that the claim does not apply to the length of hair depicted in the image." Stating that disclosures cannot contradict or cure an unsupported message, NAD determined that no disclosure can cure the message that the products can dry longer hair in two minutes and pointed out that none of Dreame's disclosures directly address the expected results for users with longer hair.

Dreame Technology (Dazzle Hair Styler and Miracle Pro Hair Dryer), Report #7600, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (Aug. 2026)

AI Product Claims

In an NAD inquiry, NAD found SafelyYou Inc. to have supported certain claims for its SafelyYou Safety AI fall detection and monitoring system but recommended that other claims be modified or discontinued. The claims at issue included statements regarding fall detection accuracy, response times, false alarms, reductions in falls and fall-related emergency room visits, costs, care quality, and industry leadership. NAD determined the evidence established a reasonable basis for the claims "On-site staff is alerted within seconds," "Only one false alarm per sensor every two years," and "SafelyYou Safety AI™ is proven to reduce falls by 40% and fall-related ER visits by a staggering 80% in the senior living communities we serve, saving costs for residents and families, and helping communities create safer environments and provide higher-quality care." However, while NAD found that SafelyYou supported the claim "Falls are detected with over 99% accuracy," it recommended that the company modify the claim to disclose its basis, including that it is based on a single study. NAD also recommended that SafelyYou discontinue or modify the claim "Proven to reduce falls, risk, and costs while elevating care" to avoid conveying the message that its AI is "proven" to do so and to disclose the claim's basis. NAD recommended that SafelyYou discontinue the claim, "Get industry-leading capabilities and reliability" because SafelyYou did not provide reliable comparative evidence to support the superiority message.

SafelyYou, Inc. (SafelyYou Safety AI), Report #7529, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (Aug. 2026)

Baby Formula Claims

In a challenge brought by competitor Abbott Laboratories against Kendal Nutricare Limited concerning claims for its Kendamil infant formula, NAD determined that Kendal substantiated its ingredient claims regarding whole milk use, finding that whole milk serves as a primary ingredient and contributes naturally occurring milk fat to the formula. NAD further found that claims that competing formulas lose "natural milk fats and important nutrients" reasonably convey that competing formulas are nutritionally inferior. As the record did not establish this or that infants receive superior nutritional benefits from Kendamil, NAD recommended that Kendal discontinue the claim, "Creamy whole milk from European grass-fed cows, sourced from family farms. No skimming, no shortcuts, and no unnecessary ingredients." NAD also determined that while the record supports qualified statements concerning compositional similarities between whole milk fat and breast milk, that the evidence did not establish that those similarities result in comparative nutritional benefits. Therefore, NAD recommended that Kendal discontinue claims that Kendamil's use of whole milk keeps natural fats closer to breast milk, it provides "natural milk fat instead of relying on vegetable oils," and "We source creamy European whole milk from grass-fed cows, raised on family farms. No skimming, no shortcuts, just pure, natural whole milk fats…the way nature intended." NAD also determined that consumers are reasonably likely to understand unqualified heritage claims including "Est. 1962" and "60 years of experience" as communicating that the Kendamil brand or formula itself has existed continuously since 1962. Therefore, NAD recommended that Kendal discontinue or modify these heritage claims to clearly communicate that references such as "Est. 1962" and "60 years of experience" refer to the manufacturing facility or production heritage, rather than the age of the Kendamil brand or formula itself.

Kendal Nutricare Limited (Kendamil Infant Formula), Report #7562, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (Aug. 2026)

Voluntarily Discontinued Claims

In a challenge brought by competitor Reese Consumer Health, challenging claims made by YYBA Corp. d/b/a Wellspring Meds for its chewable pinworm treatment for humans, PIN RID®, Wellspring Meds voluntarily permanently discontinued all of the challenged claims, which appeared on the PIN RID® website homepage and FAQ page. NAD will treat the discontinued claims as though it recommended they be discontinued.

YYBA Corp. d/b/a Wellspring Meds (PIN RID®), Report #7597, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (Aug. 2026)

In a challenge brought by competitor The Procter & Gamble Company, Quanovate Tech, Inc. voluntarily permanently discontinued all of the challenged claims for its Mira Fertility Monitor and Test Wands, including comparative, performance, and superiority claims. NAD will treat the discontinued claims as though it recommended they be discontinued.

Quanovate Tech, Inc. (Mira Fertility Monitor and Test Wands), Report #7556, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (Aug. 2026)

IQ, LLC (PetArmor® Extend Flea & Tick Collar), Report #7567, *NAD/CARU Case Reports* (July 2026)

Simpson Thacher

KEY CONTACTS

Laura Brett
Partner
+1-212-455-2180
laura.brett@stblaw.com

Lynn K. Neuner
Partner
+1-212-455-2696
lneuner@stblaw.com

SIMPSON THACHER WORLDWIDE

UNITED STATES

New York
425 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
+1-212-455-2000

Boston
855 Boylston Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02116
+1-617-778-9200

Dallas
100 Crescent Court, Suite 1250
Dallas, TX 75201
+1-214-751-3150

Houston
1000 Main Street, Suite 2900
Houston, TX 77002
+1-713-821-5650

Los Angeles
1999 Avenue of the Stars
Los Angeles, CA 90067
+1-310-407-7500

Palo Alto
2475 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304
+1-650-251-5000

San Francisco
One Market Plaza
Spear Tower, Suite 3800
San Francisco, CA 94105
+1-415-426-7300

Washington, D.C.
900 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
+1-202-636-5500

EUROPE

Brussels
Square de Meeus 1, Floor 7
B-1000 Brussels
Belgium
+32-2-504-73-00

London
CityPoint
One Ropemaker Street
London EC2Y 9HU
England
+44-(0)20-7275-6500

Luxembourg
Espace Monterey
40 Avenue Monterey
L-2163 Luxembourg
Grand Duchy of Luxembourg
+352-27-94-23-00

SOUTH AMERICA

São Paulo
Av. Presidente Juscelino
Kubitschek, 1455
São Paulo, SP 04543-011
Brazil
+55-11-3546-1000

ASIA

Beijing
6208 China World Tower B
1 Jian Guo Men Wai Avenue
Beijing 100004
China
+86-10-5965-2999

Hong Kong
ICBC Tower
3 Garden Road, Central
Hong Kong
+852-2514-7600

Tokyo
Ark Hills Sengokuyama Mori Tower
9-10, Roppongi 1-Chome
Minato-Ku, Tokyo 106-0032
Japan
+81-3-5562-6200

* *In April 2026, Simpson Thacher announced plans to expand its presence in Asia with an office in Singapore.*

** *In August 2026, Simpson Thacher announced plans to expand its presence in the U.S. with an office in Chicago.*