

1 **NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP**  
 2 Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)  
 3 Shaun Markley (SBN 391785)  
 4 225 Broadway, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 5 San Diego, California 92101  
 6 Tel: (619) 325-0492  
 7 Fax: (619) 325-0496  
 8 Email: craig@nicholaslaw.org  
 9 Email: smarkley@nicholaslaw.org

6 **NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP**  
 7 Stephen M. Frayne (SBN: 188938)  
 8 3090 Glascock Street, Suite 101  
 9 Oakland, CA 94601  
 10 Tel: 510-479-1081  
 11 Fax: 619-325-0496  
 12 Email: sfrayne@nicholaslaw.org

10 **GLICK LAW GROUP, PC**  
 11 Noam Glick (SBN 251582)  
 12 225 Broadway, Suite 2100  
 13 San Diego, California 92101  
 14 Tel: (619) 382-3400  
 15 Fax: (619) 615-2193  
 16 Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Embry

15 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

16 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

17 KIM EMBRY, an individual  
 18 Plaintiff,  
 19 v.  
 20 THE WONDERFUL COMPANY LLC, a  
 21 Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through  
 22 100, inclusive,  
 23 Defendants.

Case No.: RG19012133

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
 CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE  
 RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

**FILED BY FAX**

ALAMEDA COUNTY

May 01, 2019

CLERK OF  
 THE SUPERIOR COURT  
 By Cheryl Clark, Deputy

CASE NUMBER:

**RG19012133**

**I.**  
**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2           1.       This Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest of  
3 the citizens of the State of California (“the People”). Plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants’ failure to  
4 inform the People of exposure to Acrylamide, a known carcinogen. Defendants expose consumers to  
5 Acrylamide by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing almonds (“Products”).  
6 Defendants know and intend that customers will ingest Products containing Acrylamide.

7           2.       Under California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California  
8 Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of doing  
9 business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to  
10 cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
11 individual. . . .” (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6.)

12           3.       California identified and listed Acrylamide as a chemical known to cause cancer as early  
13 as January 1, 1990, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity in February  
14 of 2011.

15           4.       Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about  
16 potential exposure to Acrylamide in connection with Defendants’ manufacture, import, sale, or  
17 distribution of Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

18           5.       Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers  
19 in California before exposing them to Acrylamide in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).)  
20 Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65 along with  
21 attorney’s fees and costs. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(b).)

**II.**  
**PARTIES**

22  
23  
24           6.       Plaintiff KIM EMBRY is a citizen of the State of California dedicated to protecting the  
25 health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer  
26 products. She brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section  
27 25249.7.  
28



1           14. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing  
2 Acrylamide in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and  
3 believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notices (defined *infra*) and will continue to  
4 occur into the future.

5           15. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to  
6 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed  
7 to Acrylamide through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

8           16. Products expose individuals to Acrylamide through direct ingestion. This exposure is a  
9 natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As  
10 such, Defendants intend that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to Acrylamide.

11           17. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained Acrylamide and  
12 exposed individuals to Acrylamide in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of  
13 the presence of Acrylamide in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning Acrylamide and  
14 related chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendants.

15           18. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

16           19. More than sixty days prior to naming each Defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a  
17 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice(s)") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65.  
18 Plaintiff provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate  
19 of merit. The Notices alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn  
20 consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to Acrylamide contained in the  
21 Products.

22           20. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notices failed to  
23 commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.

24           21. Individuals exposed to Acrylamides contained in the Products through direct ingestion  
25 resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer  
26 irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.  
27  
28

