

From: ATA Law Group

Fax: (510) 398-0091

To: "5102675739@rcfax.co Fax: (510) 267-5739

Page 1 of 28 04/11/2017 2:41 PM

FILED BY FAX
ALAMEDA COUNTY

April 11, 2017

CLERK OF
THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Burt Moskaira, Deputy

CASE NUMBER:

RG17856308

1 Matthew C. Maclear (State Bar No. 209228)
2 AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP
3 828 San Pablo Avenue, Suite 115B
4 Albany, CA 94706
5 Telephone: (415) 568-5200
6 Email: mcm@atalawgroup.com

7 Attorney for Plaintiffs
8 CENTER FOR ADVANCED PUBLIC
9 AWARENESS

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
11 **COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

12 CENTER FOR ADVANCED PUBLIC
13 AWARENESS, a California non-profit
14 corporation,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 WE ARE HEMP, an entity of unknown type;
18 MICHAEL MORGAN, ADELE MORGAN, and/
19 or ROBERT AKBAR SADEGHI, individually
20 or collectively doing business as We Are Hemp;
21 and DOES 1-25,

22 Defendants.

Case No. _____

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*

1 Plaintiff CENTER FOR ADVANCED PUBLIC AWARENESS (“PLAINTIFF” or “CAPA”)
2 brings this action in the interests of the general public and on information and belief, hereby alleges:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. This action seeks to remedy the continuing failure of Defendants WE ARE HEMP, a
5 California entity of unknown type; MICHAEL MORGAN, ADELE MORGAN, or ROBERT AKBAR
6 SADEGHI, individually and/or collectively doing business as WE ARE HEMP; and DOES 1-25
7 (hereafter individually referred to as “DEFENDANT” or collectively as “DEFENDANTS”) to warn
8 consumers in California they are being exposed to marijuana smoke (“LISTED CHEMICAL”), a
9 substance known in the State of California to cause cancer. According to the Safe Drinking Water and
10 Toxics Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code, section 25249.5 (also known as and referred
11 to hereafter as “Proposition 65”), businesses must provide persons with a “clear and reasonable
12 warning” before exposing individuals to chemicals known to the state to cause cancer. Marijuana smoke
13 is referred to hereinafter as the “LISTED CHEMICAL.”¹

14 2. DEFENDANTS manufacture, package, distribute, market, and/or sell in California
15 products containing marijuana intended for smoking, including, but not limited to, pre-rolled products,
16 unprocessed and processed marijuana intended to be heated, combusted, then inhaled, and specifically,
17 the flowers, leaves, and other organic parts of marijuana plants (“SUBJECT PRODUCTS”), the
18 consumption and use of which result in exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL that require a “clear and
19 reasonable” warning under Proposition 65. DEFENDANTS exposed consumers, users and patients to
20 the LISTED CHEMICAL and have failed to provide the health hazard warnings required under
21 Proposition 65.

22 3. DEFENDANTS continue manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales
23 of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, which causes or threatens to
24 cause, individuals to be involuntarily, unknowingly, and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED

25 _____
26 ¹ Many of the chemical constituents that have been identified in marijuana smoke are carcinogens. The
27 following 33 marijuana smoke constituents . . . are listed under Proposition 65 as causing cancer:
28 acetaldehyde, acetamide, acrylonitrile, 4-aminobiphenyl, arsenic, benz[a]anthracene, benzene,
29 benzo[a]pyrene, benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[j]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, benzofuran, 1,3-
30 butadiene, cadmium, carbazole, catechol, chromium (hexavalent compounds), chrysene,
31 dibenz[a,h]anthracene, dibenz[a,i]pyrene, dibenzo[a,e]pyrene, diethylnitrosamine, dimethylnitrosamine,
32 formaldehyde, indeno[1,2,3,- c,d]pyrene, isoprene, lead, mercury, 5- methylchrysene, naphthalene,
nickel, pyridine, and quinoline. (Evidence on the Carcinogenicity of Marijuana Smoke, Office of
Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Reproductive and Cancer Hazard Assessment Branch,
March, 2009 at 5.)

1 CHEMICAL in violation of Proposition 65, and subjects DEFENDANTS to injunctive relief for such
2 conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. (H&S Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).)

3 **PARTIES**

4 4. PLAINTIFF is a non-profit public benefit corporation organized under California law.
5 CAPA is dedicated to, among other causes, providing information to consumers regarding the hazards of
6 toxins in products; protecting public health and drinking water sources by preventing pollution and
7 toxics from being discharged, released or emitted into the environment; and enforcing state and federal
8 environmental laws and regulations through citizen suits.

9 5. CAPA is a person within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11 and
10 brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section
11 25249.7, subdivision (d). Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7, subdivision (d) specifies a person
12 may bring an action to enforce Proposition 65 in the public interest, provided certain notice requirements
13 are satisfied and that no other public prosecutor is diligently prosecuting an action for the same
14 violation(s).

15 6. WE ARE HEMP is now, and was at all times relevant herein, an entity of unknown type
16 doing business in California within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11.

17 7. MICHAEL MORGAN, ADELE MORGAN, and/or ROBERT AKBAR SADEGHI,
18 individually and/or collectively, have been listed as owners of We Are Hemp and/or have been doing
19 business under the fictitious business name We Are Hemp in California within the meaning of Health
20 and Safety Code, section 25249.11.

21 8. DEFENDANTS own, administer, direct, control, and/or operate facilities and/or agents,
22 distributors, sellers, marketers, or other retail operations who place its products into the stream of
23 commerce in California (including but not limited to Alameda County) which contain the LISTED
24 CHEMICAL without first giving clear and reasonable warnings.

25 9. DEFENDANTS, separately and each of them, are or were, at all times relevant to the
26 claims in this Complaint and continuing through the present, legally responsible for compliance with the
27 provisions of Proposition 65. Whenever an allegation regarding any act of a DEFENDANT is made
28 herein, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that DEFENDANT, or its agents, officers, directors,
29 managers, supervisors, or employees did or so authorized such acts while engaged in the affairs of
30 DEFENDANTS' business operations and/or while acting within the course and scope of their
31 employment or while conducting business for DEFENDANTS for a commercial purpose.

32 10. In this Complaint, when reference is made to any act of a DEFENDANTS, such

1 allegation shall mean that the owners, officers, directors, agents, employees, contractors, or
2 representatives of DEFENDANTS acted or authorized such actions, and/or negligently failed and
3 omitted to act or adequately and properly supervise, control, or direct its employees and agents while
4 engaged in the management, direction, operation, or control of the affairs of the business organizations.
5 Whenever reference is made to any act of any DEFENDANTS, such allegation shall be deemed to mean
6 the act of each DEFENDANTS acting individually, jointly and severally as defined by Civil Code,
7 section 1430 *et seq.*

8 11. PLAINTIFF does not know the true names, capacities, and liabilities of Defendants
9 DOES Nos. 1-25, inclusive, and therefore sues them under fictitious names. PLAINTIFF will amend this
10 Complaint to allege the true name and capacities of the DOE Defendants upon being ascertained. Each
11 of these Defendants was in some way legally responsible for the acts, omissions and/or violations
12 alleged herein.

13 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 12. Venue is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
15 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because
16 one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in Alameda County, and
17 because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this County with respect to the
18 SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

19 13. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI,
20 section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by
21 statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other
22 court with jurisdiction.

23 14. This Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS because they are business entities that
24 do sufficient business, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail
25 themselves of the California market, through the sale, marketing, and use of their SUBJECT
26 PRODUCTS in California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts
27 consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

28 15. Venue in this action is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court because the cause,
29 or part thereof, arises in the County of Alameda since DEFENDANTS’ SUBJECT PRODUCTS are
30 marketed, offered for sale, sold, used, and/or consumed in this county.

31 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

32 16. The people of the State of California declared in Proposition 65 their right “[t]o be

1 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm.”
2 (Health & Saf. Code Div. 20, Ch. 6.6 Note [Section 1, subdivision (b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition
3 65].) To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a “clear and
4 reasonable warning” before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California as causing
5 cancer or reproductive toxicity. (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.6.) Health and Safety Code, section
6 25249.6 states, in pertinent part, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and
7 intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive
8 toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual . . .”

9 17. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “which results from a person’s
10 acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or
11 any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” (27 CCR § 25602, subd. (b).)

12 18. Proposition 65 provides that any “person who violates or threatens to violate” the statute
13 may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.7). Health and
14 Safety Code section 25603(c) states that “a person in the course of doing business . . . shall provide a
15 warning to any person to whom the product is sold or transferred unless the product is packaged or
16 labeled with a clear and reasonable warning.”

17 19. Pursuant to H&S Code section 25603.1:

18 The warning may be provided by using one or more of the following methods singly or
19 in combination:

20 (a) A warning that appears on a product's label or other labeling.

21 (b) Identification of the product at the retail outlet in a manner which provides a
22 warning. Identification may be through shelf labeling, signs, menus, or a combination
23 thereof.

24 (c) The warnings provided pursuant to subparagraphs (a) and (b) shall be prominently
25 placed upon a product's label or other labeling or displayed at the retail outlet with such
26 conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices in the
27 label, labeling or display as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary
28 individual under customary conditions of purchase or use.

29 (d) A system of signs, public advertising identifying the system and toll-free information
30 services, or any other system that provides clear and reasonable warnings.

31 20. Proposition 65 provides that any “person who violates or threatens to violate” the statute
32 may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7.) The phrase “threaten to
violate” is defined to mean creating “a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a
violation will occur” (*Id.*, § 25249.11, subd. (e).) Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500

1 per day for each violation of the Act. (*Id.*, § 25249.7.)

2 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

3 21. On December 12, 2007, the State of California, Office of Environmental Health Hazard
4 Assessment (“OEHHA”) announced the selection of marijuana smoke as a chemical for consideration
5 for listing by the Carcinogen Identification Committee (“CIC”) in the *California Regulatory Register*.
6 The CIC subsequently determined that marijuana smoke has been clearly shown, through scientifically
7 valid testing according to general accepted principles, to cause cancer. Consequently, on June 19, 2009,
8 marijuana smoke was added to the Proposition 65 list, pursuant to California Code of Regulations,
9 section 25305, subdivision (a)(1) (formerly Title 22, California Code of Regulations, § 12305(a)(1)).
10 The clear and reasonable warning requirement for marijuana smoke went into effect one year later on
11 June 19, 2010.

12 22. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this Complaint result from the
13 combustion and inhalation of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS resulting in exposure to the LISTED
14 CHEMICAL, to wit – marijuana smoke. Consequently, a primary route of exposure to the LISTED
15 CHEMICAL contained in marijuana is through direct smoking of the marijuana leaves, flowers, and
16 stems or pre-rolled products.

17 23. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANTS, therefore, have knowingly and
18 intentionally exposed the users, consumers, and/or handlers of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS to the
19 LISTED CHEMICAL without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.

20 24. DEFENDANTS have manufactured, grown, processed, marketed, distributed, offered to
21 sell and/or sold the SUBJECT PRODUCTS for use and consumption by inhalation/smoking in
22 California since at least February 1, 2016. The SUBJECT PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and
23 sold in California without the requisite warning information.

24 25. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANTS, therefore, have knowingly and
25 intentionally exposed the users, consumers and/or patients to the SUBJECT PRODUCTS and the
26 LISTED CHEMICAL without first giving a clear and reasonable warning(s) to such individuals.

27 26. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANTS, as persons in the course of doing
28 business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11, individuals throughout the
29 State of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to the LISTED
30 CHEMICAL without a clear and reasonable warnings on the SUBJECT PRODUCTS. The individuals
31 subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users, consumers and patients of the
32 SUBJECT PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

1 27. On February 1, 2017, CAPA served DEFENDANTS and each other the appropriate
2 public enforcement agencies with a document entitled “Notice of Violation of California Health &
3 Safety Code Section 25249.5 *et seq.* (Proposition 65)” that provided DEFENDANTS and the public
4 enforcement agencies with notice that DEFENDANTS were in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to
5 warn purchasers and individuals using the SUBJECT PRODUCTS that the use of the SUBJECT
6 PRODUCTS exposes them to marijuana smoke, a chemical known in the State of the California to cause
7 cancer. A true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A, is hereby
8 incorporated by reference, and is available on the Attorney General’s website located at
9 <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65>.

10 28. On February 1, 2017, PLAINTIFF sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 Violations
11 (“NOTICE”) to the requisite public enforcement agencies, and to DEFENDANTS. The NOTICE was
12 issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of Health and Safety Code, section
13 25249.7, subdivision (d) and the statute’s implementing regulations regarding the notice of the
14 violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The NOTICE alleged
15 DEFENDANTS were in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn consumers, users or patients
16 using the SUBJECT PRODUCTS would cause exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL – to wit,
17 marijuana smoke, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. A true and correct copy
18 of the 60-Day Notice (“NOTICE”) is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and is hereby incorporated by
19 reference, and is available on the Attorney General’s website located at <http://oag.ca.gov/prop65>.

20 29. The NOTICE included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and
21 telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violators; the statute violated; the
22 approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations including
23 the chemicals involved, the routes of toxic exposure; and the specific product or type of product causing
24 the violations.

25 30. DEFENDANTS were provided copies of the NOTICE and the document entitled “The
26 Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary,” which is also
27 known as Appendix A to Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25903, via certified
28 mail.

29 31. The California Attorney General was provided a copy of the NOTICE and a Certificate of
30 Merit by the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for
31 this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including
32 the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other

1 data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7, subdivision (h)(2)
2 via online submission.

3 32. After expiration of the sixty (60) day notice period, the appropriate public enforcement
4 agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under Health and Safety
5 Code, section 25249.5, *et seq.* against DEFENDANTS based on the allegations herein.

6 33. Based on information and belief, MEDITHRIVE has sold multiple strains of buds,
7 flowers and pre-rolled marijuana/cannabis products intended for combustion and inhalation by doctor-
8 recommended “patients” without giving clear and reasonable warnings that medical cannabis can cause
9 cancer. WE ARE HEMP has sold dozens, if not hundreds/thousands, of units of SUBJECT PRODUCT
10 to a PERSON² in the State of California during each and every month from February 1, 2016 through
11 the present, amounting to numerous violative products sold in that period.

12 **Basis for Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* concerning**
13 **the SUBJECT PRODUCTS described in the February 1, 2017 Prop. 65 Notice of Violation**
14 **to DEFENDANTS**

15 34. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 33, inclusive,
16 as specifically set forth herein.

17 35. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANTS at all times relevant to
18 this action, and continuing through the present, have violated Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6
19 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals in California to
20 chemicals knowing in the State of California to cause cancer without first giving clear and reasonable
21 warnings to such persons who use, consume, or handle the SUBJECT PRODUCTS containing the
22 LISTED CHEMICAL, pursuant to Health and Safety Code, sections 25249.6 and 25249.11,
23 subdivision (f).

24 36. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANTS have caused or
25 threaten to cause irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. In the
26 absence of equitable relief, DEFENDANTS will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable
27 injury by continuing to cause patients and consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to
28 cancer-causing marijuana smoke through the foreseeable and/or intended use and/or consumption of the
29 SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

30 ² “PERSON” includes a natural person, firm, association, organization, partnership, business, trust,
31 corporation, public entity, joint venture, and any other incorporated or unincorporated association,
32 business or enterprise.

1 37. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS have violated Health and Safety Code,
2 section 25249.6 and are therefore subject to preliminary and permanent injunctions ordering
3 DEFENDANTS to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future
4 customers, and possibly to provide warnings to DEFENDANTS' past customers or patients who
5 purchased or used the SUBJECT PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.

6 38. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by Health
7 and Safety Code, section 25249.7, subdivision (a).

8 39. Continuing commission by DEFENDANTS of the acts alleged above will irreparably
9 harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate
10 remedy at law.

11 40. In the absence of preliminary and then permanent injunctive relief, DEFENDANTS will
12 continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause patients, users and/or
13 consumers to be involuntarily, unknowingly and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL
14 through the use, consumption and/or handling of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.5, et seq. Concerning the**
17 **PRODUCT Described in the February 1, 2017 Prop. 65 Notice of Violation)**

18 41. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 40, inclusive,
19 as if specifically set forth herein.

20 42. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANTS at all times relevant to
21 this action, and continuing through the present, have violated H&S Code section 25249.6 by, in the
22 course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals in California to a chemical
23 known to the State of California to cause cancer, to wit – marijuana smoke, without first giving clear and
24 reasonable warnings to such persons who use, consume or inhale the SUBJECT PRODUCTS containing
25 the LISTED CHEMICAL, pursuant to H&S Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11, subdivision (f).

26 43. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable, pursuant to Health and Safety
27 Code, section 25249.7, subdivision (b), for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day per violation for each
28 unlawful exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the SUBJECT PRODUCTS, according to proof.

29 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

30 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for the following relief:

31 A. A preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section
32 25249.7, subdivision (b), enjoining DEFENDANTS, their agents, employees, assigns, and all persons

1 acting in concert or participating with DEFENDANTS, from manufacturing, distributing, marketing, or
2 selling the SUBJECT PRODUCTS to consumers or patients in California without first providing a
3 “clear and reasonable warning” regarding exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL within the meaning of
4 Proposition 65 from the SUBJECT PRODUCTS;

5 B. An injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code section 25249.7(b) and California Code of
6 Regulations, title 27, sections 25603 and 25603.1, compelling DEFENDANTS to provide “clear and
7 reasonable” warnings at the entrance to DEFENDANTS’ medical marijuana facility; on
8 DEFENDANTS’ website; inside DEFENDANTS’ membership agreement; on the labels of the
9 SUBJECT PRODUCTS; at the point of sale; inside display cases; at concerts and conventions that
10 DEFENDANTS participate in; and/or on receipts for SUBJECT PRODUCTS that are delivered to
11 consumers. The warnings should indicate that the SUBJECT PRODUCTS will expose the user,
12 consumer or patient to chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer;

13 C. An assessment of civil penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7,
14 subdivision (b), against DEFENDANTS in the amount on \$2,500 per day for each violation of
15 Proposition 65, according to proof;

16 D. An award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney’s fees and cost of suit pursuant to
17 California Code of Civil Procedure, sections 1032 *et seq.* and 1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall specify in
18 further applications to the Court; and

19 E. Such other and further relief the Court deems just and proper.

20
21 Dated: April 10, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

22 AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP

23
24 

25 Matthew C. Maclear
26 Attorney for Plaintiff Center for Advanced
27 Public Awareness

**Exhibit A -
Notice of Violation**



Matthew M. Maclear
mcm@atalawgroup.com
415.568.5200

February 1, 2017

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

ATA Law Group represents the Center for Advanced Public Awareness, Inc. ("CAPA"), 180 Promenade Circle, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95834; CAPA is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, fostering and increasing the public awareness of chemicals used to manufacture consumer products, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

CAPA has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the product(s) identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. Section 25249.6 of the statute provides that "[n]o 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 providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individual . . ." Without proper warnings regarding the toxic effects of exposures to this listed chemical(s) that results from contact with this product, California citizens lack the information necessary to make an informed decision on whether and/or how to eliminate (or reduce) their risk of exposure to the listed chemical(s) from the reasonably foreseeable use of the product.

This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), CAPA intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

Certificate of Merit and General Information about Proposition 65. Pursuant to Title 11 C.C.R. § 3100, a certificate of merit is attached hereto. Pursuant to Title 27, C.C.R. §25903(b), a copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violator") is:

We Are Hemp and Michal Morgan, Adele Morgan, or Robert Akbar Sadeghi, individually and/or collectively doing business as We Are Hemp
3033 Telegraph Avenue
Oakland, CA 94609



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
February 1, 2017

Consumer Products and Listed Chemical. All the medical marijuana “flowers” or “buds” sold to California residents by Violators are the subject of this Notice and Violators failed to clearly and reasonably warn consumers that Marijuana Smoke¹ is a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

On June 19, 2009, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) of the California Environmental Protection Agency added marijuana smoke to the Proposition 65 list.

OEHHA announced the selection of marijuana smoke as a chemical for consideration for listing by the Carcinogen Identification Committee (CIC) in the *California Regulatory Notice Register* on December 12, 2007, subsequent to consultation with the CIC at their November 19, 2007 meeting. The CIC determined that marijuana smoke was clearly shown, through scientifically valid testing according to generally accepted principles, to cause cancer. Consequently, marijuana smoke was added to the Proposition 65 list, pursuant to Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25305(a)(1) (formerly Title 22, California Code of Regulations, section 12305(a)(1)).

In summary, marijuana smoke was listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer:

Chemical	CAS No.	Toxicological Endpoint	Listing Mechanism
Marijuana smoke ²	--	Cancer	State’s qualified experts

Violations. The alleged Violator knowingly and intentionally has exposed and continues to knowingly and intentionally expose consumers within the State of California to marijuana smoke without providing clear and reasonable warning of this exposure. In particular, the products do not warn that they contain chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the combustion and inhalation of the products. Consequently, a primary route of exposure to the chemicals contained in marijuana is through direct smoking of the marijuana leaves, flowers, and stems.

Approximate Time of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least February 1, 2016, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified

¹ Many of the chemical constituents that have been identified in marijuana smoke are carcinogens. The following 33 marijuana smoke constituents are listed under Proposition 65 as causing cancer: acetaldehyde, acetamide, acrylonitrile, 4-aminobiphenyl, arsenic, benz[a]anthracene, benzene, benzo[a]pyrene, benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[j]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, benzofuran, 1,3-butadiene, cadmium, carbazole, catechol, chromium (hexavalent compounds), chrysene, dibenz[a,h]anthracene, dibenz[a,i]pyrene, dibenzo[a,e]pyrene, diethylnitrosamine, dimethylnitrosamine, formaldehyde, indeno[1,2,3,- c,d]pyrene, isoprene, lead, mercury, 5-methylchrysene, naphthalene, nickel, pyridine, and quinoline.

² *Marijuana Smoke Listed Effective June 19, 2009 as Known to the State of California to Cause Cancer*, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, June 19, 2009, available at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/proposition-65/crn/marijuana-smoke-listed-effective-june-19-2009-known-state-california-cause> (last visited: Dec. 27, 2016).



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
February 1, 2017

chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons handling and/or using these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, CAPA is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) recall products already sold or undertake best efforts to ensure that the requisite health hazard warnings are provided to those who have received such products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 for products sold in the future. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time consuming litigation.

CAPA has retained Aqua Terra Aeris (ATA) Law Group as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated herein.**

Dated: February 1, 2017

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Matthew C. Maclear".

Matthew C. Maclear
AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP
Attorney for Center for Advanced Public
Awareness

Attachments

- Certificate of Merit
- Certificate of Service
- OEHHA Summary (to We Are Hemp and Michal Morgan, Adele Morgan, or Robert Akbar Sadeghi, individually and/or collectively doing business as We Are Hemp)
- Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
February 1, 2017

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Center for Advanced Public Awareness, Inc.’s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by We Are Hemp and Michal Morgan, Adele Morgan, or Robert Akbar Sadeghi, individually and/or collectively doing business as We Are Hemp

I, Matthew Maclear, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.
4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that “reasonable and meritorious case for the private action” means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff’s case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: February 1, 2017

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Matthew C. Maclear".

Matthew C. Maclear
AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP
Attorney for Center for Advanced Public
Awareness



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
February 1, 2017

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 828 San Pablo Avenue, Albany, CA 94706. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at in Albany, California.

On February 1, 2017, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

We Are Hemp
913 E. Lewelling Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94541

Current President or CEO
Michal Morgan, Adele Morgan, or Robert Akbar Sadeghi, individually and/or collectively doing business as We Are Hemp
913 E. Lewelling Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94541

On February 1, 2017, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
February 1, 2017

On February 1, 2017, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List below by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by US First Class Mail.

Executed on February 1, 2017, in Albany,
California.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Matthew Maclear". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Matthew Maclear

SERVICE LIST

Alameda County District Attorney's Office
1225 Fallon Street
Oakland, CA 94612
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Appendix A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986
(PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. Please refer to the statute and OEHHA's implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and

reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly say that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Periods. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off- premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;

- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A private party may not file an action against the alleged violator for these exposures, or recover in a settlement any payment in lieu of penalties any reimbursement for costs and attorney's fees, if the notice was served on or after October 5, 2013, and the alleged violator has done *all* of the following within 14 days of being served notice:

- Corrected the alleged violation;
- Agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$500 (subject to change as noted below) to the private party within 30 days; and
- Notified the private party serving the notice in writing that the violation has been corrected.

The written notification to the private-party must include a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form completed by the alleged violator as directed in the notice. On April 1, 2019, and every five years thereafter, the dollar amount of the civil penalty will be adjusted by the Judicial Council based on the change in the annual California Consumer Price Index. The Judicial Council will publish the dollar amount of the adjusted civil penalty at each five-year interval, together with the date of the next scheduled adjustment. An alleged violator may satisfy these conditions only one time for a violation arising from the same exposure in the same facility or on the same premises. The satisfaction of these conditions does not prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney of a city of greater than 750,000 population, or any full-time city prosecutor with the consent of the district attorney, from filing an enforcement action against an alleged violator. The amount of any civil penalty for a violation shall be reduced to reflect any payment made by the alleged violator for the same alleged violation to a private-party.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included with this notice and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>. The notice is reproduced here, below:

Date: February 1, 2017

Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party: Center for Advanced Public Awareness, Inc. ("CAPA"),
Address: 180 Promenade Circle, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95834
Phone number: 415.568.5200

**SPECIAL COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE
PROOF OF COMPLIANCE**

You are receiving this form because the Noticing Party listed above has alleged that you are violating California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 (Prop. 65).

The Noticing Party may not bring any legal proceedings against you for the alleged violation checked below if:

1. **You have actually taken the corrective steps that you have certified in this form**
2. **The Noticing Party has received this form at the address shown above, accurately completed by you, postmarked within 14 days of your receiving this notice**
3. **The Noticing Party receives the required \$500 penalty payment from you at the address shown above postmarked within 30 days of your receiving this notice.**
4. **This is the first time you have submitted a Proof of Compliance for a violation arising from the same exposure in the same facility on the same premises.**

PART 1: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE NOTICING PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR THE NOTICING PARTY

The alleged violation is for an exposure to: (check one)

Alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent on-site consumption is permitted by law.

A chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises for immediate consumption on or off premises to the extent: (1) the chemical was not intentionally added; and (2) the chemical was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination.

Environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises.

Chemicals known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking noncommercial vehicles.

IMPORTANT NOTES:

1. You have no potential liability under California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 if your business has nine (9) or fewer employees.
2. Using this form will NOT prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney, or a prosecutor in whose jurisdiction the violation is alleged to have occurred from filing an action over the same alleged violations, and that in any such action, the amount of civil penalty shall be reduced to reflect any payment made at this time.

Date: February 1, 2017

Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party: Center for Advanced Public Awareness, Inc. ("CAPA"),
Address: 180 Promenade Circle, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95834
Phone number: 415.568.5200

PART 2: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ALLEGED VIOLATOR OR AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Certification of Compliance

Accurate completion of this form will demonstrate that you are now in compliance with California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 for the alleged violation listed above. You must complete and submit the form below to the Noticing Party at the address shown above, postmarked within 14 days of you receiving this notice.

I hereby agree to pay, within 30 days of completion of this notice, a civil penalty of \$500 to the Noticing Party only and certify that I have complied with Health and Safety Code §25249.6 by (check only one of the following):

- Posting a warning or warnings about the alleged exposure that complies with the law, and attaching a copy of that warning and a photograph accurately showing its placement on my premises;
- Posting the warning or warnings demanded in writing by the Noticing Party, and attaching a copy of that warning and a photograph accurately its placement on my premises; OR
- Eliminating the alleged exposure, and attaching a statement accurately describing how the alleged exposure has been eliminated.

Certification

My statements on this form, and on any attachments to it, are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and are made in good faith. I have carefully read the instructions to complete this form. I understand that if I make a false statement on this form, I may be subject to additional penalties under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65).

Signature of alleged violator or authorized representative Date

Name and title of signatory

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS. . .

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2014

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at:

<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

Note: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

HISTORY

1. New Appendix A filed 4-22-97; operative 4-22-97 pursuant to Government Code section 11343.4(d) (Register 97, No. 17).
2. Amendment filed 1-7-2003; operative 2-6-2003 (Register 2003, No. 2).
3. Change without regulatory effect renumbering title 22, section 12903 and Appendix A to title 27, section 25903 and Appendix A, including amendment of appendix, filed 6-18-2008 pursuant to section 100, title 1, California Code of Regulations (Register 2008, No. 25).
4. Amendment filed 11-19-2012; operative 12-19-2012 (Register 2012, No. 47).
5. Amendment of appendix and Note filed 11-19-2014; operative 1-1-2015 (Register 2014, No. 47).
This database is current through 9/18/15 Register 2015, No. 38
27 CCR Appendix A, 27 CA ADC Appendix A