

1 Melvin B. Pearlston (SBN 54291)
2 Robert B. Hancock (SBN 179438)
3 PACIFIC JUSTICE CENTER
4 50 California Street, Suite 1500
5 San Francisco, California 94111
6 Tel: (415) 310-1940
7 e-mail: rbh@lawyer.com

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

ENDORSED
FILED
Superior Court of California
County of San Francisco

MAY 10 2017

CLERK OF THE COURT
BY: ROSSALY DELAVEGA
Deputy Clerk

9
10 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
11 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

GGC 17-558822

12 ERIKA MCCARTNEY, in the public interest,)
13 Plaintiff,)
14 v.)
15 NUTRACEUTICAL CORPORATION, a)
16 Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 500,)
17 inclusive,)
18 Defendants.)

CIVIL ACTION NO.

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

[Cal. Health and Safety Code
Sec. 25249.6, *et seq.*]

BY FAX
ONE LEGAL LLC

1 Erika McCartney, in the public interest, based on information and belief and investigation of
2 counsel, except for information based on knowledge, hereby makes the following allegations.

3
4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This Complaint seeks to remedy Defendant's failure to adequately warn individuals
6 in California that they are being exposed to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to
7 cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm (hereinafter "Lead"). Such exposures have
8 occurred, and continue to occur, through the manufacture, distribution, sale and consumption of
9 Defendant's "Allvia Clinical Strength Maca Dietary Supplement" (the "Product"). The Product is
10 available to consumers in California through a multitude of retail channels which may include,
11 without limitation: (a) third-party traditional brick-and-mortar retail locations; (b) via the internet
12 through Defendant's website; and (c) via the internet through third-party retail websites.
13 Consumers are exposed to Lead when they consume the Product.
14

15 2. Under California's Proposition 65, Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*, it is
16 unlawful for businesses to knowingly and intentionally expose individuals in California to
17 chemicals known to the State to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm without
18 providing clear and reasonable warnings to individuals prior to their exposure. Defendant
19 introduces a product contaminated with significant quantities of Lead into the California
20 marketplace, exposing consumers of the Product to Lead.
21

22 3. Despite the fact that the Defendant exposes consumers to Lead, during the relevant
23 period, units of the Product distributed into California provided no warning about the reproductive
24 hazards associated with Lead exposure. Defendant's conduct thus violates the warning provision of
25 Proposition 65, Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

5. Defendant NUTRACEUTICAL CORPORATION (“Defendant”) is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. Defendant manufactures, distributes and/or sells the Product for sale and use in California.

6. The true names of DOES 1 through 500 are unknown to Plaintiff at this time. When their identities are ascertained, the Complaint shall be amended to reflect their true names.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, which allows enforcement in any court of competent jurisdiction, and pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts.

8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant as a business entity that does sufficient business, has sufficient minimum contacts in California or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market through the sale, marketing or use of the Product in California and/or by having such other contacts with California so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9. Venue is proper in San Francisco County Superior Court because one or more of the violations arise in the County of San Francisco, and because Defendant has designated no principal office in the State of California.

BACKGROUND FACTS

1
2 10. The People of the State of California have declared by initiative under Proposition
3 65 their right “[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or
4 other reproductive harm.” Proposition 65 § 1(b).

5 11. To effectuate this goal, Proposition 65 prohibits exposing people to chemicals listed
6 by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm above
7 certain levels without a “clear and reasonable warning” unless the business responsible for the
8 exposure can prove that it fits within a statutory exemption. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6
9 states, in pertinent part:
10

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

15 12. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed Lead as a chemical
16 known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead is specifically identified as a reproductive toxicant
17 under three subcategories: “developmental reproductive toxicity,” which means harms to the
18 developing fetus, “female reproductive toxicity,” which means harm to the female reproductive
19 system, and “male reproductive toxicity,” which means harm to the male reproductive system. 27
20 California Code of Regulations (“C.C.R.”) § 27001(c). On February 27, 1988, one year after it was
21 listed as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity, Lead became subject to the clear and
22 reasonable warning requirement regarding reproductive toxicants under Proposition 65. *Ibid.*;
23 Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(b).

24 13. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed Lead and Lead
25 compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. On October 1, 1993, one year after they were
26

1 listed as chemicals known to cause cancer, Lead and Lead compounds became subject to the clear
2 and reasonable warning requirement regarding carcinogens under Proposition 65. 27 C.C.R.
3 27001(c); Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(b).

4 14. There is no safe level of exposure to Lead and even minute amounts of Lead have
5 been proven harmful to children and adults. See Report of the Advisory Committee on Childhood
6 Lead Poisoning Prevention of the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, "Low Level Lead
7 Exposure Harms Children: A Renewed Call For Primary Prevention," January 2, 2012. A study
8 performed by the California Office of Environment Health Hazard Assessment determined that
9 exposures to Lead even at levels previously considered safe have now been shown to cause adverse
10 health effects including reduced cognitive ability and significant diminution of intellectual
11 potential. Carlisle, *et al.*, "A Blood Lead Benchmark for Assessing Risks from Childhood Lead
12 Exposure," *Journal of Environmental Science and Health*, 44, 2009. This conclusion is based on a
13 meta study of 1,333 children who participated in seven international studies. Lanphear, *et al.*,
14 "Low-Level Environmental Lead Exposure and Children's Intellectual Function: An International
15 Pooled Analysis," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 113:7, 2005.

16 15. Lead exposures for pregnant women are also of particular concern in light of
17 evidence that even short-term Lead exposures *in utero* may have long-term harmful effects. Hu,
18 H., *et al.*, "Fetal Lead Exposure at Each State of Pregnancy as a Predictor of Infant Mental
19 Development," *Environmental Health Perspectives* 114:11,2 006; Schnaas, Lourdes, *et al.*,
20 "Reduced Intellectual Development in Children with Prenatal Lead Exposure," *Environmental*
21 *Health Perspectives* 114:5, 2006. Increased Lead exposure during pregnancy has also been shown
22 to cause increased risk of premature birth and increased blood pressure in both the mother during
23 pregnancy and the child after birth. Vigeh, *et al.*, "Blood Lead at Currently Acceptable Levels May
24
25
26

1 Cause Preterm Labour,” *Occupational Environmental Medicine*, 68:231-234, 2010; Zhang, *et al.*,
2 “Association Between Prenatal Lead Exposure and Blood Pressure in Children,” *Environmental*
3 *Health Perspectives*, 120:3, 2012; Wells, *et al.*, “Low-Level Lead Exposure and Elevations in
4 Blood Pressure During Pregnancy,” 119:5, 2011.

5 16. The level of exposure to a chemical causing reproductive toxicity under Proposition
6 65 is determined by multiplying the level in question times the reasonably anticipated rate of
7 exposure for an individual to a given medium. 27 C.C.R. § 25821(b). For exposures to consumer
8 products, the level of exposure is calculated using the reasonably anticipated rate of intake or
9 exposure for average users of the consumer product. 27 C.C.R. § 25821(c)(2).

10 17. Defendant’s Product contains sufficient quantities of Lead such that consumers,
11 including pregnant women, who consume the Product are exposed to Lead. The primary route of
12 exposure for the violations is direct ingestion when consumers orally ingest the Product. These
13 exposures occur everywhere in California where the Product is consumed.

14 18. During the relevant period herein, no clear and reasonable warning was provided
15 with units of the Product distributed into California regarding the reproductive hazards of Lead.

16 19. Any person acting in the public interest has standing to enforce violations of
17 Proposition 65 provided that such person has supplied the requisite public enforcers with a valid
18 60-Day Notice of Violation and such public enforcers are not diligently prosecuting the action
19 within such time. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

20 20. More than sixty days prior to naming each Defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff
21 provided a 60-Day “Notice of Violation of Proposition 65” to the California Attorney General, the
22 District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a
23 population greater than 750,000 and to the named Defendant. In compliance with Health & Safety
24
25
26

1 Code § 25249.7(d) and 27 C.C.R. § 25903(b), each Notice included the following information: (1)
2 the name and address of each violator; (2) the statute violated; (3) the time period during which
3 violations occurred; (4) specific descriptions of the violations, including (a) the routes of exposure
4 to Lead from the Product, and (b) the specific type of Product sold and used in violation of
5 Proposition 65; and (5) the name of the specific Proposition 65-listed chemical that is the subject of
6 the violations described in each Notice.

7
8 21. Plaintiff also sent a Certificate of Merit for each Notice to the California Attorney
9 General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California
10 city with a population greater than 750,000 and to the named Defendant. In compliance with
11 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. § 3101, each Certificate certified that Plaintiff's
12 counsel: (1) has consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or
13 expertise who reviewed facts, studies or other data regarding the exposures to Lead alleged in the
14 Notice; and (2) based on the information obtained through such consultations, believes that there is
15 a reasonable and meritorious case for a citizen enforcement action based on the facts alleged in
16 each Notice. In compliance with Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. § 3102, each
17 Certificate served on the Attorney General included factual information - provided on a confidential
18 basis – sufficient to establish the basis for the Certificate, including the identity of the person(s)
19 consulted by the Plaintiff's counsel and the facts, studies or other data reviewed by such persons.

20
21 22. None of the public prosecutors with the authority to prosecute violations of
22 Proposition 65 has commenced and/or is diligently prosecuting a cause of action against
23 Defendants under Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*, based on the claims asserted in each of
24 Plaintiff's Notices.
25
26

1 23. Defendant both knows and intends that individuals will consume the Product, thus
2 exposing them to Lead.

3 24. Under Proposition 65, an exposure is “knowing” where the party responsible for
4 such exposure has:

5 knowledge of the fact that a[n] ... exposure to a chemical listed pursuant
6 to [Health & Safety Code § 25249.8(a)] is occurring. No knowledge that
7 the ... exposure is unlawful is required.

8 27 C.C.R. § 25102(n). This knowledge may be either actual or constructive. *See, e.g.*, Final
9 Statement of Reasons Revised (November 4, 1988) (pursuant to former 22 C.C.R. Division 2, §
10 12201).

11 25. Defendant has further been informed of the Lead in the Product by the 60-Day
12 Notice of Violation and accompanying Certificate of Merit served on them.

13 26. Defendant also has constructive knowledge that its Product contains Lead due to the
14 widespread media coverage concerning the problem of Lead in consumer products in general.

15 27. As an entity that manufactures, imports, distributes and/or sells the Product for use
16 in the California marketplace, Defendant knows or should know that the Product contains Lead and
17 that individuals who consume the Product will be exposed to Lead. The Lead exposures to
18 consumers who consume the Product are a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant’s
19 placing the Product into the stream of commerce.
20

21 28. Nevertheless, on information and belief, Defendant continues to expose consumers
22 to Lead without prior clear and reasonable warnings regarding the reproductive hazards of Lead.
23

24 29. Plaintiff has engaged in good-faith efforts to resolve the claims alleged herein prior
25 to filing this Complaint.
26

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against the Defendant of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65 occurring during or after the statutory period;

2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant from offering the Product for sale in California without either reformulating the Products such that no Proposition 65 warnings are required or providing prior clear and reasonable warnings, as Plaintiff shall specify in further application to the Court;


3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), order Defendant to take action to stop ongoing unwarranted exposures to Lead resulting from use of Product sold, as Plaintiff shall specify in further application to the Court;

4. That the Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 or any other applicable theory or doctrine, grant Plaintiff her 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: May 9, 2017

PACIFIC JUSTICE CENTER

By: 
Robert B. Hancock
Attorneys for Plaintiff