

(ENDORSED)  
FILED

AUG 13 2014

David W. ... Clerk of the Superior Court  
County of Santa Clara, California

By: REINA GARZA

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436  
Harris A. Weinstein, State Bar No. 282166  
THE CHANLER GROUP  
2560 Ninth Street  
Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  
Telephone: (510) 848-8880  
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA  
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

114CV269378

ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.,

Plaintiff,

v.

EDEN FOODS, INC.; and DOES 1-150,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6 *et seq.*)

BY FAX

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1  
2           1.     This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff ANTHONY E.  
3 HELD, PH.D., P.E. in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the  
4 People’s right to be informed of the presence of arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds), a toxic  
5 chemical found in dried seaweed sold in California.

6           2.     By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failure to  
7 warn California citizens about the risk of exposure to arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds)  
8 present in and on dried seaweed manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to  
9 consumers throughout the state of California.

10          3.     High levels of arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds) are commonly found in and  
11 on dried seaweed that defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers  
12 throughout the state of California.

13          4.     Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at  
14 Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of  
15 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to  
16 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable  
17 warning to such individual . . . .” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

18          5.     Pursuant to Proposition 65, on February 27, 1987, California identified and listed  
19 arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds) as a chemical known to cause cancer. Arsenic  
20 (inorganic arsenic compounds) became subject to the “clear and reasonable warning”  
21 requirements of the act one year later on February 27, 1988. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, §  
22 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b). Arsenic (inorganic arsenic  
23 compounds) is referred to hereinafter as the “LISTED CHEMICAL.”

24          6.     Defendants manufacture, distribute, and sell dried seaweed that contain arsenic  
25 (inorganic arsenic compounds) in levels that require a warning under Proposition 65 including,  
26 but not limited to, *Eden Hiziki Sea Vegetable, #7838, UPC #0 24182 15079 7*. All such dried  
27  
28

1 seaweed containing arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds) are referred to collectively  
2 hereinafter as "PRODUCTS."

3 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the state of  
4 California about their exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendants'  
5 sales of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65, and subjects defendants to enjoinder  
6 of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a)  
7 & (b)(1).

8 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and  
9 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the  
10 PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED  
11 CHEMICAL. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

12 9. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil  
13 penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

#### 14 PARTIES

15 10. Plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E. is a citizen of the state of California  
16 who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or  
17 reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public  
18 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 11. Defendant EDEN FOODS, INC. ("EDEN") is a person in the course of doing  
20 business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11.

21 12. EDEN manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in  
22 the state of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes, and/or offers  
23 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the state of California.

24 13. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each  
25 persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section  
26 25249.11.

27  
28

1 14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,  
2 and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,  
3 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the state of  
4 California.

5 15. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each a person  
6 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11.

7 16. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and/or  
8 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use  
9 in the state of California.

10 17. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAILER DEFENDANTS") are each a person in  
11 the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11.

12 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the  
13 state of California.

14 19. At this time, the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are  
15 unknown to plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to  
16 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis  
17 alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences  
18 alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

19 20. EDEN, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS,  
20 and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to as  
21 "DEFENDANTS."

22 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

23 21. Venue is proper in the Santa Clara County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of  
24 Civil Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent  
25 jurisdiction, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to  
26 occur, in Santa Clara County, and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to  
27 conduct, business in this county with respect to the PRODUCTS.  
28



1 PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a  
2 “clear and reasonable warning” regarding such toxic exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

3 28. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and offering of  
4 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and  
5 such violations have continued to occur beyond DEFENDANTS’ receipt of plaintiff’s sixty-day  
6 notice of violation. As such, DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature,  
7 and will continue to occur in the future.

8 29. After receiving the claims asserted in the sixty-day notice of violation, the  
9 appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a  
10 cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

11 30. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use in  
12 California by DEFENDANTS contain the LISTED CHEMICAL in amounts above the  
13 allowable state limits, such that they require a “clear and reasonable” warning under Proposition  
14 65.

15 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they  
16 manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale or use in California contain the LISTED  
17 CHEMICAL.

18 32. The LISTED CHEMICAL is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to  
19 expose individuals through ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use and consumption.

20 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use and consumption of the PRODUCTS  
21 have caused, and continue to cause, consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such  
22 exposures are defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25602(b).

23 34. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use  
24 and consumption of the PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through  
25 ingestion.

26 35. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from  
27 the reasonably foreseeable use and consumption of the PRODUCTS would occur by their  
28

1 deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution, and offering of the  
2 PRODUCTS for sale or use to individuals in the state of California.

3 36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those  
4 consumers and other individuals in the state of California who were or who would become  
5 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use  
6 and consumption of the PRODUCTS.

7 37. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted  
8 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through  
9 ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use and consumption of the PRODUCTS  
10 sold by DEFENDANTS without a “clear and reasonable warning”, have suffered, and continue  
11 to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

12 38. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the  
13 above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day  
14 for each violation.

15 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code  
16 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against  
17 DEFENDANTS.

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

19 Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

20 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), assess  
21 civil penalties against DEFENDANTS in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;

22 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),  
23 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or  
24 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and  
25 reasonable warning” as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 *et*  
26 *seq.*, as to the harms associated with exposures the LISTED CHEMICAL;

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


3. That the Court, Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain of commerce in California without a "clear and reasonable warning" as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 et seq.;

4. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and

5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: August 12, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP

By:   
Harris A. Weinstein  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.