-1-

bulk herbs, infusions, extracted powders, tea pills, traditional pills, patent formulas, bulk teas,

liquid extracts, tablets and/or capsules containing lead or lead compounds (referred to collectively hereinafter as the "PRODUCTS").

- 2. Lead and lead compounds (collectively, the "LISTED CHEMICALS") are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity.
- 3. The ingestion of the PRODUCTS causes exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS at levels requiring a "clear and reasonable warning" under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code ("H&S Code") § 25249.5, et seq. (also referred to herein as "Proposition 65"). Defendants have failed to provide these health hazard warnings as required by Proposition 65.
 - 4. By this action, Plaintiff seeks appropriate relief:
 - a. prohibiting the continued import, manufacture, packaging, distribution, marketing, or sale of the PRODUCTS in California by Defendants without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer and/or reproductive toxicity posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the ingestion of the PRODUCTS; and,
 - b. assessing civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day per violation to remedy Defendants' ongoing failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings to thousands of individuals that they are being exposed and continue to be exposed to LISTED CHEMICALS through the ingestion of the PRODUCTS.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

¹ All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law.

6.

belief, Defendants are corporations or associations organized under the laws of the State of
California and/or are doing sufficient business in, and having sufficient minimum contacts
with, California, or otherwise intentionally availing themselves of the California market
through the manufacture, packaging, distribution, marketing and/or sale of the PRODUCTS in
the State of California to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts
consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
7. Venue in this action is proper in the San Francisco Superior Court because
Defendants have violated one or more of the California laws specified herein in the City and
County of San Francisco and/or have their principal place of business in the City and County
of San Francisco.
<u>PARTIES</u>
8. Plaintiff AS YOU SOW ("AYS") is a non-profit foundation organized under the
State of California's Non-Profit Public Benefit Corporation Law. AYS is dedicated to, among
other causes, the protection of the environment, the promotion of human health, the
improvement of worker and consumer safety, and environmental education. AYS is based in
San Francisco, California.
9. AYS brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code
§25249.7(d).
10. Defendant ARIZONA NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTS, INC. ("ARIZONA
NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTS") is a person within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11.

This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, based on information and

11. Defendant J&D LABORATORIES, INC. ("J&D") is a person within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11.

12. Defendant KABCO PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. ("KABCO") is a person within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11.

13. Defendants ARIZONA NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTS, J&D, and KABCO import, manufacture, package, distribute, market and/or sell one or more of the PRODUCTS

for sale or use in California or otherwise causes or contributes to exposures within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.6, *et seq.* to the LISTED CHEMICALS from the PRODUCTS.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

A. Proposition 65

- 14. The People of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).
- 15. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to chemicals listed by the State of California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code § 25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual....

16. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase "threaten to violate" is defined to mean, "to create a condition in which there is a substantial likelihood that a violation will occur." (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2500 per day for each such violation. (H&S Code § 25249.7.)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 17. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed the chemical lead as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code § 25249.5, et seq.)
- 18. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed the chemicals lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became

subject to the warning requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993. (27 CCR § 25000, et seq.; H&S Code § 25249.6, et seq.)

- 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on such information and belief alleges, that one or more of the PRODUCTS have been sold to and/or ingested by individuals in California without clear and reasonable warning since at least August 14, 2006. The PRODUCTS continue to be offered for sale in California without the requisite warning information.
- 20. As a proximate result of acts by Defendants, as persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of California, including in the County of San Francisco, have been exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS without clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the PRODUCTS.
- 21. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed the users of the PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICALS without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 22. Individuals ingesting the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS in excess of the levels determined to cause "no observable effect" or "no significant risk", as applicable, within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.10(c).
- 23. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have, in the course of doing business, failed to provide individuals ingesting the PRODUCTS with a clear and reasonable warning that the PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICALS.
- 24. The PRODUCTS continue to be offered for sale in California without the requisite clear and reasonable warning.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6, et seq.)

- 25. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- Beginning on or about June 17, 2008, AYS sent 60-Day Notices of Proposition 65 violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to Defendants. These notices were issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code § 25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The notices given included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violators; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific products and type of products causing the violations. The named defendant(s) and the California Attorney General were provided copies of the 60-Day Notice by certified mail. Additionally, the named defendant(s) was provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR § 25903.
- 27. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* against Defendants based on the allegations herein.
- 28. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants, at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated H&S Code § 25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who ingest the PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICALS, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 29. By the above-described acts, Defendants are liable, pursuant to H&S Code § 25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of up to \$2500 per day for each unlawful exposure to a LISTED

CHEMICAL from the PRODUCTS.

- 30. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).
- 31. Continuing commission by Defendants, of the acts alleged above will irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

Wherefore, plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, as set forth hereafter.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 32. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through 31, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 33. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, the Defendants have caused irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, Defendants will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by:
 - a. continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the ingestion of the PRODUCTS;
 and,
 - b. preventing consumers from distinguishing products that cause exposures to lead and lead compounds from similar products that do not cause such exposures.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff accordingly prays for the following relief:

A. a preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code § 25249.7(b) enjoining Defendants, their agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or participating with Defendants from importing, manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing or selling the PRODUCTS in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning that the users of the PRODUCTS are exposed, within the meaning of Proposition 65, to the LISTED CHEMICALS.