

From: Environmental Resear Fax: 18662346280

To: 5102675739@rcfax.com

Fax: (510) 267-5739

Page: 3 of 40

12/19/2018 1:45 PM

1 MATTHEW C. MACLEAR (SBN 209228)  
 2 ANTHONY M. BARNES (SBN 199048)  
 3 AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP  
 4 490 43<sup>rd</sup> Street, Suite 108  
 5 Oakland, CA 94609  
 6 Telephone: (415) 568-5200  
 7 Email: mcm@atalawgroup.com

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 9 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.

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

12 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER,  
 13 INC., a non-profit California corporation,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 EVOGEN INC., a California corporation; and  
 17 DOES 1 25,

18 Defendants.

) Case No. RG18928461

) **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
 ) PERMANENT INJUNCTION, CIVIL  
 ) PENALTIES AND OTHER RELIEF**

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

19  
 20 Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“PLAINTIFF” or “ERC”) brings this  
 21 action in the interests of the general public and, on information and belief, hereby alleges:

22 **INTRODUCTION**

23 1. This action seeks to remedy the continuing failure of Defendants EVOGEN INC.  
 24 (“EVOGEN”) and DOES 1-25 (hereinafter individually referred to as “DEFENDANT” or  
 25 collectively as “DEFENDANTS”) to warn consumers in California that they are being exposed  
 26 to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other  
 27 reproductive harm. According to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986,  
 28 Health and Safety Code (“H&S Code”) section 25249.5 (also known as and referred to

1 hereinafter as “Proposition 65”), businesses must provide persons with a “clear and reasonable  
2 warning” before exposing individuals to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or  
3 reproductive harm. DEFENDANTS manufacture, package, distribute, market, and/or sell in  
4 California certain consumer products, as defined in Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, § 25600.1, subd. (d)  
5 and (e), containing lead (the “SUBJECT PRODUCTS”):

- 6 • **Evogen Naturals Evogreens Premium Performance Greens Formula**
- 7 **Chocolate**
- 8 • **Evogen Naturals Evogreens Premium Performance Greens Formula**
- 9 **Berry**
- 10 • **Evogen Naturals Evogreens Premium Performance Greens Formula**
- 11 **Lemon Mint**
- 12 • **Evogen Elite Mass And Recovery Catalyst Cell K.E.M. Cellular**
- 13 **Kinetic Expansion Matrix Raspberry Lemonade**
- 14 • **Evogen Elite Pre-Workout Solution EVP Evopietin One-Alpha**
- 15 **Grape**
- 16 • **Evogen IsoJect Ultra-Pure Whey Isolate Protein Mocha Evoccino**
- 17 • **Evogen Elite Pre-Workout Solution EVP Plus Energy Raspberry**
- 18 **Lemonade**
- 19 • **Evogen Elite Pre-Workout Solution EVP Plus Energy Peach Mango**
- 20 • **Evogen Carnigen Plus Caffeine Peach Tea**

21 2. Lead (hereinafter, the “LISTED CHEMICAL”) is a chemical known to the State of  
22 California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

23 3. Consumption of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS causes exposures to the LISTED  
24 CHEMICAL at levels requiring a “clear and reasonable warning” under Proposition 65.  
25 DEFENDANTS exposed consumers to the LISTED CHEMICAL and have failed to provide the  
26 health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.

27 4. DEFENDANTS’ continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing  
28 and/or sales of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings causes,

1 or threatens to cause, individuals to be involuntarily, unknowingly and unwittingly exposed to  
2 levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL that violate Proposition 65.

3 **PARTIES**

4 5. PLAINTIFF is a non-profit corporation organized under California law. ERC is  
5 dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic substances,  
6 consumer protection, worker safety, and corporate responsibility.

7 6. ERC is a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11 and brings this  
8 enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d). H&S Code §  
9 25249.7(d) specifies that actions to enforce Proposition 65 may be brought by a person in the  
10 public interest, provided certain notice requirements are met and no other public prosecutor is  
11 diligently prosecuting an action for the same violation(s).

12 7. EVOGEN INC., is now, and was at all times relevant herein, a corporation organized  
13 under the laws of California and is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning  
14 of H&S Code §25249.11.

15 8. DEFENDANTS own, administer, direct, control and/or operate facilities and/or  
16 agents, distributors, sellers, marketers or other retail operations who place their SUBJECT  
17 PRODUCTS into the stream of commerce in California (including but not limited to Alameda  
18 County) under the brand name EVOGEN NATURALS and other brand names, which contain the  
19 LISTED CHEMICAL, without first giving clear and reasonable warnings.

20 9. DEFENDANTS, separately and each of them, are or were, at all times relevant to the  
21 claims in this First Amended Complaint and continuing through the present, legally responsible  
22 for compliance with the provisions of Proposition 65. Whenever an allegation regarding any act  
23 or omission of a DEFENDANT is made herein, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that  
24 DEFENDANT, or its agent, officer, director, manager, supervisor, or employee did, or so  
25 authorized, or failed to do, such acts while engaged in the affairs of DEFENDANT's business  
26 operations and/or while acting within the course and scope of their employment or while  
27 conducting business for DEFENDANT(S) for a commercial purpose.

28 10. In this First Amended Complaint, when reference is made to any act or omission of

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

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

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 12. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article  
16 VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all causes except those  
17 given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this action is brought does not  
18 specify any other court with jurisdiction.

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

24 14. Venue in this action is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court because the  
25 cause, or part thereof, arises in the County of Alameda since DEFENDANTS’ products are  
26 marketed, offered for sale, sold, used, and/or consumed in this county.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

2 15. The People of the State of California declared in Proposition 65 their right “[t]o be  
3 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive  
4 harm.” (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).

5 16. To effectuate this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a  
6 “clear and reasonable warning” before being exposed to chemicals listed by the State of  
7 California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code §25249.6 states, in pertinent  
8 part:

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

13 17. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “that results from a person’s  
14 acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or any reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer  
15 product, including consumption of a food.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, § 25600.1, subd. (e).) A  
16 “consumer product” includes “any article, or component part thereof, including food, that is  
17 produced, distributed, or sold for the personal use, consumption or enjoyment of a consumer,”  
18 and the term “food” is further defined to include dietary supplements. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, §  
19 25600.1, subd. (d) and (g).)

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

25 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

26 19. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical  
27 known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning requirement one year  
28 later and was therefore subject to the “clear and reasonable” warning requirements of Proposition

1 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 California Code of Regulations (“CCR”) §25600, *et*  
2 *seq.*; H&S Code §25249.5, *et seq.*).

3 20. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds  
4 as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to the warning  
5 requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the “clear and reasonable” warning  
6 requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993. (27 CCR § 25600, *et seq.*; H&S  
7 Code §25249.6, *et seq.*). Due to the high toxicity of lead, the maximum allowable dose level for  
8 lead is 0.5 µg/day (micrograms a day) for reproductive toxicity and the no significant risk level  
9 for carcinogens is 15µg/day (oral).

10 21. To test DEFENDANTS’ SUBJECT PRODUCTS for lead, PLAINTIFF hired a well-  
11 respected and accredited testing laboratory. The results of testing undertaken by PLAINTIFF of  
12 DEFENDANTS’ SUBJECT PRODUCTS show that the SUBJECT PRODUCTS tested were in  
13 violation of the 0.5 µg/day “safe harbor” daily dose limits set forth for lead in Proposition 65’s  
14 regulations. Very significant is the fact that people are being exposed to lead through ingestion  
15 as opposed to other not as harmful methods of exposure.

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

19 23. The SUBJECT PRODUCTS have allegedly been sold by DEFENDANTS for use  
20 in California since at least August 31, 2015. The SUBJECT PRODUCTS continue to be  
21 distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.

22 24. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANTS, as persons in the course of doing  
23 business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, individuals throughout the  
24 State of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to the LISTED  
25 CHEMICAL without a clear and reasonable warning on the SUBJECT PRODUCTS. The  
26 individuals subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users of the  
27 SUBJECT PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

28 25. On August 31, 2018 and October 9, 2018, ERC served EVOGEN and each of the

1 appropriate public enforcement agencies with a document entitled “Notice of Violations of  
2 California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5” that provided EVOGEN and the public  
3 enforcement agencies with notice that EVOGEN was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing  
4 to warn purchasers and individuals using the SUBJECT PRODUCTS that the consumption of  
5 the SUBJECT PRODUCTS exposes them to lead, a chemical known to the State of California  
6 to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity (“NOTICES”). True and correct copies of the 60-  
7 Day NOTICES are attached hereto as **Exhibits A and B** and are hereby incorporated by  
8 reference and the NOTICES are available on the Attorney General’s website located at  
9 <http://oag.ca.gov/prop65>.

10 26. The NOTICES were issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of  
11 H&S Code §25249.7(d) and the statute’s implementing regulations regarding the notice of the  
12 violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The NOTICES  
13 included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the  
14 noticing individual; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time  
15 period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations including the  
16 chemical involved, the route of toxic exposure, and the specific products or type of products  
17 causing the violations.

18 27. EVOGEN was also provided copies of the document with each Notice entitled “The  
19 Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary,” which  
20 is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903, via Certified Mail.

21 28. The California Attorney General was provided copies of the NOTICES and a  
22 Certificate of Merit by the attorney for the noticing party stating that there is a reasonable and  
23 meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis  
24 for the certificate, including the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the  
25 certifier, and the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code  
26 §25249.7(h) (2) via online submission.

27 29. After expiration of the sixty (60) day notice period, the appropriate public enforcement  
28 agencies failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code

1 §25249.5, *et seq.* against DEFENDANTS based on the allegations herein.

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* concerning the**  
4 **SUBJECT PRODUCTS described in the August 31, 2018 and October 9, 2018**  
5 **Proposition 65 Notices of Violation) Against DEFENDANTS**

6 30. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 29,  
7 inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.

8 31. By committing the acts alleged in this First Amended Complaint, DEFENDANTS at  
9 all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated H&S Code  
10 §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals  
11 in California to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive  
12 toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such persons who consume the  
13 SUBJECT PRODUCTS containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6  
14 and 25249.11(f).

15 32. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable, pursuant to H&S Code  
16 §25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure  
17 to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the SUBJECT PRODUCTS, in an amount in excess of \$1  
18 million.

19 **THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

20 **(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* concerning**  
21 **the SUBJECT PRODUCTS described in the August 31, 2018 and October 9, 2018**  
22 **Proposition 65 Notices of Violation) Against DEFENDANTS**

23 33. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through 32,  
24 as if set forth below.

25 34. By committing the acts alleged in this First Amended Complaint, DEFENDANTS at  
26 all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated, or threaten to  
27 violate, H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally  
28 exposing individuals in California to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer  
or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such persons who



1 consume the SUBJECT PRODUCTS containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, pursuant to H&S  
2 Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).

3 35. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS have violated, or threaten to violate,  
4 H&S Code § 25249.6 and are therefore subject to preliminary and permanent injunctions ordering  
5 DEFENDANTS to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future  
6 customers, and to provide warnings to DEFENDANTS' past customers who purchased or used  
7 the SUBJECT PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.

8 36. A remedy of injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by H&S  
9 Code §25249.7(a).

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

13 38. In the absence of preliminary and then permanent injunctive relief, DEFENDANTS  
14 will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause consumers  
15 to be involuntarily, unknowingly and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through  
16 the consumption of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for the following relief:

19 A. A preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b),  
20 enjoining DEFENDANTS, their agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or  
21 participating with DEFENDANTS, from manufacturing, distributing, marketing or selling the  
22 SUBJECT PRODUCTS in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning,  
23 within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the consumers of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS are  
24 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

25 B. An injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), compelling  
26 DEFENDANTS to identify and locate each individual who has purchased the SUBJECT  
27 PRODUCTS since August 31, 2015, and to provide a warning to such person that the  
28 consumption of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS will expose the consumer to a chemical known to

1 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm;

2 C. An assessment of civil penalties pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), against  
3 DEFENDANTS in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65, in an  
4 amount in excess of \$1 million, according to proof;

5 D. An award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit  
6 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 1032 *et. seq* and 1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall  
7 specify in further applications to the Court; and,

8 E. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

9  
10 DATED: December 19, 2018

AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP

11  
12  
13 

14 Matthew C. Maclear  
15 Anthony M. Barnes  
16 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17 Environmental Research Center, Inc.

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

# **EXHIBIT A**



Matthew Maclear  
[mcm@atalawgroup.com](mailto:mcm@atalawgroup.com)  
415-568-5200

Anthony Barnes  
[amb@atalawgroup.com](mailto:amb@atalawgroup.com)  
415-326-3173

August 31, 2018

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

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC 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, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC 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 products 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. 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), ERC 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.

**General Information about Proposition 65.** 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:

**Evogen Inc.**



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
August 31, 2018  
Page 2

**Consumer Products and Listed Chemical.** The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

1. **Evogen Naturals Evogreens Premium Performance Greens Formula Chocolate - Lead**
2. **Evogen Naturals Evogreens Premium Performance Greens Formula Berry - Lead**
3. **Evogen Naturals Evogreens Premium Performance Greens Formula Lemon Mint - Lead**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

**Route of Exposure.** The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least August 31, 2015, 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 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 ingesting 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, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
August 31, 2018  
Page 3

ERC has retained ATA Law Group as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention, or the attention of ATA partner Anthony Barnes, using the address or contact information indicated on the letterhead.**

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matthew Maclear". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "M".

---

Matthew Maclear  
**AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP**

Attachments

- Certificate of Merit
- Certificate of Service
- OEHHA Summary (to Evogen Inc. and its Registered Agent for Service of Process only)
- Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
August 31, 2018  
Page 4

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Evogen Inc.**

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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Matthew Maclear".

Dated: August 31, 2018

\_\_\_\_\_  
Matthew Maclear



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
August 31, 2018  
Page 5

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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 and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On August 31, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Evogen Inc.  
271 E Hacienda Avenue  
Campbell, CA 95008

Yun Zong  
(Registered Agent for Evogen Inc.)  
20111 Stevens Creek Blvd., #280  
Cupertino, CA 95014

Current President or CEO  
Evogen Inc.  
11311 White Rock Road  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Current President or CEO  
Evogen Inc.  
3837 Bay Lake Trail, Suite 115  
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

On August 31, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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.*  
August 31, 2018  
Page 6

On August 31, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney  
Sacramento County  
901 G Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Prop65@sacda.org

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney  
Contra Costa County  
900 Ward Street  
Martinez, CA 94553  
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Mark Ankcorn, Deputy City Attorney  
San Diego City Attorney  
1200 Third Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101  
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney  
San Francisco County  
732 Brannan Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney  
Monterey County  
1200 Aguajito Road  
Monterey, CA 93940  
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney  
San Joaquin County  
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202  
Stockton, CA 95202  
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Allison Haley, District Attorney  
Napa County  
1127 First Street, Suite C  
Napa, CA 94559  
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney  
San Luis Obispo County  
County Government Center Annex, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408  
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney  
Riverside County  
3072 Orange Street  
Riverside, CA 92501  
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney  
Santa Barbara County  
1112 Santa Barbara Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
August 31, 2018  
Page 7

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney  
Santa Clara County  
70 W Hedding St  
San Jose, CA 95110  
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney  
Tulare County  
221 S Mooney Blvd  
Visalia, CA 95370  
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney  
Santa Cruz County  
701 Ocean Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney  
Ventura County  
800 S Victoria Ave  
Ventura, CA 93009  
daspecialops@ventura.org

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney  
Yolo County  
301 Second Street  
Woodland, CA 95695  
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On August 31, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 attached hereto 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 First Class Mail.

Executed on August 31, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq.  
August 31, 2018  
Page 8

**Service List**

- |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| District Attorney, Alpine County<br>P.O. Box 248<br>Markleeville, CA 96120                     | District Attorney, Kings County<br>1400 West Lacey Boulevard<br>Hanford, CA 93230                                  | District Attorney, Plumas County<br>520 Main Street, Room 404<br>Quincy, CA 95971                         | District Attorney, Tuolumne County<br>423 N. Washington Street<br>Sonora, CA 95370                             |
| District Attorney, Amador County<br>708 Court Street, Suite 202<br>Jackson, CA 95642           | District Attorney, Lake County<br>255 N. Forbes Street<br>Lakeport, CA 95453                                       | District Attorney, San Benito County<br>419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor<br>Hollister, CA 95023               | District Attorney, Yuba County<br>215 Fifth Street, Suite 152<br>Marysville, CA 95901                          |
| District Attorney, Butte County<br>25 County Center Drive, Suite 245<br>Oroville, CA 95965     | District Attorney, Los Angeles County<br>Hall of Justice<br>211 West Temple St., Ste 1200<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012 | District Attorney, San Bernardino County<br>303 West Third Street<br>San Bernadino, CA 92415              | Los Angeles City Attorney's Office<br>City Hall East<br>200 N. Main Street, Suite 800<br>Los Angeles, CA 90012 |
| District Attorney, Calaveras County<br>891 Mountain Ranch Road<br>San Andreas, CA 95249        | District Attorney, Madera County<br>209 West Yosemite Avenue<br>Madera, CA 93637                                   | District Attorney, San Diego County<br>330 West Broadway, Suite 1300<br>San Diego, CA 92101               | San Francisco, City Attorney<br>City Hall, Room 234<br>1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL<br>San Francisco, CA 94102   |
| District Attorney, Colusa County<br>346 Fifth Street Suite 101<br>Colusa, CA 95932             | District Attorney, Marin County<br>3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130<br>San Rafael, CA 94903                       | District Attorney, San Mateo County<br>400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor<br>Redwood City, CA 94063               | San Jose City Attorney's Office<br>200 East Santa Clara Street,<br>16th Floor<br>San Jose, CA 95113            |
| District Attorney, Del Norte County<br>450 H Street, Room 171<br>Crescent City, CA 95531       | District Attorney, Mariposa County<br>Post Office Box 730<br>Mariposa, CA 95338                                    | District Attorney, Shasta County<br>1355 West Street<br>Redding, CA 96001                                 |  |
| District Attorney, El Dorado County<br>515 Main Street<br>Placerville, CA 95667                | District Attorney, Mendocino County<br>Post Office Box 1000<br>Ukiah, CA 95482                                     | District Attorney, Sierra County<br>100 Courthouse Square, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor<br>Downieville, CA 95936 |  |
| District Attorney, Fresno County<br>2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000<br>Fresno, CA 93721         | District Attorney, Merced County<br>550 W. Main Street<br>Merced, CA 95340   | District Attorney, Siskiyou County<br>Post Office Box 986<br>Yreka, CA 96097                              |  |
| District Attorney, Glenn County<br>Post Office Box 430<br>Willows, CA 95988                    | District Attorney, Modoc County<br>204 S Court Street, Room 202<br>Alturas, CA 96101-4020                          | District Attorney, Solano County<br>675 Texas Street, Ste 4500<br>Fairfield, CA 94533                     |  |
| District Attorney, Humboldt County<br>825 5th Street 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor<br>Eureka, CA 95501 | District Attorney, Mono County<br>Post Office Box 617<br>Bridgeport, CA 93517                                      | District Attorney, Stanislaus County<br>832 12th Street, Ste 300<br>Modesto, CA 95354                     |  |
| District Attorney, Imperial County<br>940 West Main Street, Ste 102<br>El Centro, CA 92243     | District Attorney, Nevada County<br>201 Commercial Street<br>Nevada City, CA 95959                                 | District Attorney, Sutter County<br>463 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street<br>Yuba City, CA 95991                     |  |
| District Attorney, Inyo County<br>P.O. Drawer D<br>Independence, CA 93526                      | District Attorney, Orange County<br>401 West Civic Center Drive<br>Santa Ana, CA 92701                             | District Attorney, Tehama County<br>Post Office Box 519<br>Red Bluff, CA 96080                            |  |
| District Attorney, Kern County<br>1215 Truxtun Avenue<br>Bakersfield, CA 93301                 | District Attorney, Placer County<br>10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240<br>Roseville, CA 95678                     | District Attorney, Trinity County<br>Post Office Box 310<br>Weaverville, CA 96093                         |  |

## 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. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>.

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](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 make known 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 Period.*** 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 contaminant<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4).

## *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 copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:  
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

*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](mailto:P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov).

Revised: May 2017

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.



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

# **EXHIBIT B**



Matthew Maclear  
[mcm@atalawgroup.com](mailto:mcm@atalawgroup.com)  
415-568-5200

Anthony Barnes  
[amb@atalawgroup.com](mailto:amb@atalawgroup.com)  
415-326-3173

October 9, 2018

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

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC’s Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC 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, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC 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 products 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. 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), ERC 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.

**General Information about Proposition 65.** 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:

**Evogen Inc.**



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
October 9, 2018  
Page 2

**Consumer Products and Listed Chemical.** The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

1. **Evogen Elite Mass And Recovery Catalyst Cell K.E.M. Cellular Kinetic Expansion Matrix Raspberry Lemonade - Lead**
2. **Evogen Elite Pre-Workout Solution EVP Evopoietin One-Alpha Grape - Lead**
3. **Evogen IsoJect Ultra-Pure Whey Isolate Protein Mocha Evoccino - Lead**
4. **Evogen Elite Pre-Workout Solution EVP Plus Energy Raspberry Lemonade - Lead**
5. **Evogen Elite Pre-Workout Solution EVP Plus Energy Peach Mango – Lead**
6. **Evogen Carnigen Plus Caffeine Peach Tea - Lead**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

**Route of Exposure.** The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least October 9, 2015, 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 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 ingesting 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, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
October 9, 2018  
Page 3

warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained ATA Law Group as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention, or the attention of ATA partner Anthony Barnes, using the address or contact information indicated on the letterhead.**

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matthew Maclear". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "M".

---

Matthew Maclear  
**AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP**

Attachments

- Certificate of Merit
- Certificate of Service
- OEHHA Summary (to Evogen Inc. and its Registered Agent for Service of Process only)
- Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
October 9, 2018  
Page 4

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Evogen Inc.**

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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Matthew Maclear".

Dated: October 9, 2018

Matthew Maclear



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
October 9, 2018  
Page 5

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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 and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On October 9, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Evogen Inc.  
271 E Hacienda Avenue  
Campbell, CA 95008

Yun Zong  
(Registered Agent for Evogen Inc.)  
20111 Stevens Creek Blvd., #280  
Cupertino, CA 95014

Current President or CEO  
Evogen Inc.  
11311 White Rock Road  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Current President or CEO  
Evogen Inc.  
3837 Bay Lake Trail, Suite 115  
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

On October 9, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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.*  
October 9, 2018  
Page 6

On October 9, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney  
Sacramento County  
901 G Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Prop65@sacda.org

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney  
Contra Costa County  
900 Ward Street  
Martinez, CA 94553  
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Mark Ankcorn, Deputy City Attorney  
San Diego City Attorney  
1200 Third Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101  
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney  
San Francisco County  
732 Brannan Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney  
Monterey County  
1200 Aguajito Road  
Monterey, CA 93940  
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney  
San Joaquin County  
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202  
Stockton, CA 95202  
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Allison Haley, District Attorney  
Napa County  
1127 First Street, Suite C  
Napa, CA 94559  
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney  
San Luis Obispo County  
County Government Center Annex, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408  
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney  
Riverside County  
3072 Orange Street  
Riverside, CA 92501  
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney  
Santa Barbara County  
1112 Santa Barbara Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

October 9, 2018

Page 7

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney  
Santa Clara County  
70 W Hedding St  
San Jose, CA 95110  
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney  
Tulare County  
221 S Mooney Blvd  
Visalia, CA 95370  
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney  
Santa Cruz County  
701 Ocean Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney  
Ventura County  
800 S Victoria Ave  
Ventura, CA 93009  
daspecialops@ventura.org

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney  
Yolo County  
301 Second Street  
Woodland, CA 95695  
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On October 9, 2018, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 attached hereto 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 First Class Mail.

Executed on October 9, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody





Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

October 9, 2018

Page 8

### Service List

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120	District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230	District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971	District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370
District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, Suite 202 Jackson, CA 95642	District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453	District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023	District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901
District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965	District Attorney, Los Angeles County Hall of Justice 211 West Temple St., Ste 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012	District Attorney, San Bernardino County 303 West Third Street San Bernadino, CA 92415	Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012
District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249	District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637	District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101	San Francisco, City Attorney City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Francisco, CA 94102
District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932	District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903	District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063	San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor San Jose, CA 95113
District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531	District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338	District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001	
District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667	District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482	District Attorney, Sierra County 100 Courthouse Square, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Downieville, CA 95936	
District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721	District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340	District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097	
District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988	District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020	District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533	
District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor Eureka, CA 95501	District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517	District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354	
District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243	District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959	District Attorney, Sutter County 463 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street Yuba City, CA 95991	
District Attorney, Inyo County P.O. Drawer D Independence, CA 93526	District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701	District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080	
District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301	District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678	District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093	

## 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. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>.

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](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 make known 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 Period.*** 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 contaminant<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4).

## *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 copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:  
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

*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](mailto:P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov).

Revised: May 2017

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.