t:		2010 inc	
		2010 JAN 11 PT 3:36	
	S. OTT I D. Char Dankle 16		
1	ANDREW L. PACKARD (State Bar No. 16 ERIK M. ROPER (State Bar No. 259756)	58690) D. STEPPE	
2	Law Offices of Andrew L. Packard 319 Pleasant Street	Į.	
3	Petaluma, CA 94952 Tel. (707) 763-7227	CASE MANAGEMENT CONTERENCE SET	
4	Fax. (707) 763-9227 E-mail: Andrew@PackardLawOffices.com	jun 1 1 2010 ge an	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff	Chris w w w 10/10/16	
6	STEPHEN D. GILLETT	DEFARIMENT 213	
7	,		
8			
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF T	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	COUNTY OF §	SAN FRANCISCO	
11		CGC-10-495959	
12	STEPHEN D. GILLETT, an individual,) Case No.	
13	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES	
14	V.	Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et seq.;	
15	MILK SPECIALTIES, INC., NATURE'S PRODUCTS, INC.,		
16	Defendants.		
17			
18			
19	Plaintitt Stephen D. Officer brings and action in the interests of the general passes		
20	on information and belief, hereby alleges:		
21	<u> </u>	RODUCTION	
22		Defendants' continuing failure to warn thousands	
23		ing exposed to lead, a substance known to the State	
24	of Camornia to cause cancer, of the defects and other reproductive fairth. Defendants		
25	manufacture, package, distribute, market, and/or sell in California certain herbal products		
26	containing lead (collectively referred to hereinafter as the "PRODUCTS").		
	COMPLAINT FOR INTER	-1- ICTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES	
	COM DAINT FOR MUCH		
	••		

4.

- 2. Lead and lead compounds (hereinafter, the "LISTED CHEMICALS") are substances known to the State¹ of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.
- The use and/or handling 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 known as "Proposition 65"). Defendants have failed to provide the health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.
- 4. Defendants' continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, causes individuals to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to levels of the LISTED CHEMICALS that violate Proposition 65.
- 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief enjoining Defendants from the continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS in California without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS. Plaintiff seeks an injunctive order compelling each Defendant to bring its business practices into compliance with Proposition 65 by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who has been and who in the future may be exposed to LISTED CHEMICALS from the use of the PRODUCTS. Plaintiff also seeks an order compelling each Defendant to identify and locate each individual person who in the past has purchased the PRODUCTS, and to provide to each such purchaser a clear and reasonable warning that the use of the PRODUCTS will cause exposures to LISTED CHEMICALS.
 - 6. In addition to injunctive relief, Plaintiff seeks an assessment of civil penalties to

All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.

 remedy each Defendant's failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposures to LISTED CHEMICALS.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. 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 statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over each Defendant because, based on information and belief, each Defendant is a business having sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally availing itself of the California market through the distribution and sale of the PRODUCTS in the State of California to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- Venue in this action is proper in the San Francisco Superior Court because each
 Defendant has violated California law in the City and County of San Francisco.

PARTIES

- 10. Plaintiff STEPHEN D. GILLETT ("SDG") is a citizen enforcer dedicated to the protection of the environment, the promotion of human health and the improvement of worker and consumer safety. SDG resides in San Francisco, California.
- 11. SDG is a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25118 and brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d).
- 12. Defendant MILK SPECIALTIES, INC. ("MILK SPECIALTIES") is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota and a person doing business within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11.
- 13. MILK SPECIALTIES manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California.
 - 14. Defendant NATURE'S PRODUCTS, INC. ("NATURE'S PRODUCTS") is a

corporation organized under the laws of the State of California and a person doing business within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11.

15. NATURE'S PRODUCTS manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 16. 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).
- 17. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to substances 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....

18. 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 "threatening to violate" is defined to mean creating "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 penaltics of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. (H&S Code §25249.7.)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 19. 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.)
 - 20. 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.)

- 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on such information and belief alleges the PRODUCTS have been distributed and/or sold to individuals in California without clear and reasonable warning since at least January 11, 2007. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.
- 22. As a proximate result of acts by Defendants, as a person 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.
- 23. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally exposed the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICALS without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 24. Individuals using or handling the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS in excess of the "maximum allowable daily" and "no significant risk" levels determined by the State of California, as applicable, within the meaning of H&S Code \$25249.10(c).
- 25. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have, in the course of doing business, failed to provide individuals using and/or handling the PRODUCTS with a clear and reasonable warning that the PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICALS.
- 26. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite clear and reasonable warning.

 (Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning those PRODUCTS described in Plaintiff's November 2, 2009 60-Day Notice of Violation)

- 27. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 26, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to Defendants ("Notice"). The Notice was 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 Notice given included, inter alia, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violator; 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 or type of products causing the violations, and was issued as follows:
 - a. Defendants and the California Attorney General were provided copies of the Notice by Certified Mail.
 - b. Defendants were 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.
 - c. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identify of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code

}

- 29. 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.
- 30. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, each Defendant at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use or handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice 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).
- 31. By the above-described acts, Defendants have violated H&S Code § 25249.6 and are therefore subject to an injunction ordering Defendants to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers and to provide warnings to Defendants' past customers who purchased or used the PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.
- 32. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).
- 33. 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.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. concerning those PRODUCTS described in Plaintiff's November 2, 2009 60-Day Notice of Violation)

- 34. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 33, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
 - On November 2, 2009, Plaintiff sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65

violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to Defendants ("Notice"). The Notice was 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 Notice given included, inter alia, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which the violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific products or type of products eausing the violations, and was issued as follows:

- Defendants and the California Attorney General were provided copies of the Notice by Certified Mail.
- b. Defendants were 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.
- c. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identify of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h) (2).
- 36. 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.
- 37. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, each Defendant at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code §25249.6 by,

 in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use or handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice 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).

38. By the above-described acts, Defendants are liable, pursuant to H&S Code \$25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each unlawful exposure to a LISTED CHEMICAL from the PRODUCTS.

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

THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 39. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through 38, as if set forth below.
- 40. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, each Defendant has 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 continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS.

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 each Defendant, its agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or participating with each Defendant, from distributing or selling the PRODUCTS in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS.
- B. an injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), compelling Defendants to identify and locate each individual who has purchased the PRODUCTS since November 4, 2006 and to provide a warning to such person that the use of the Products will expose the user

to chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.		
an assessment of civil penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b),		
against each Defendant in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65;		
D. an award to Plaintiff of its reasonable attorneys fees and costs of suit pursuant to		
California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, as Plaintiff shall specify in further application to		
the Court; and,		
E. such other and further relief as may be just and proper.		
DATED: January 11, 2010 LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW L. PACKARD		
DATED: January 11, 2010		
Chille to the first the second		
Andrew L. Packard		
Erik M. Roper Attorneys for Plaintiff		
STEPHEN D. GILLETT		
,		
4		
5		
6		
-10- COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES		

euf Rh: Ebeemueettu Brrounek genatee