

1 **NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP**
 2 Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)
 3 Shaun Markley (SBN 391785)
 4 225 Broadway, 19th 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 **GLICK LAW GROUP, PC**
 7 Noam Glick (SBN 251582)
 8 225 Broadway, Suite 2100
 9 San Diego, California 92101
 10 Tel: (619) 382-3400
 11 Fax: (619) 615-2193
 12 Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Embry

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

13 KIM EMBRY, an individual

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 WALMART STORES, INC., a Delaware
 17 corporation, and DOES I through 100,
 18 inclusive,

19 Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
 AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

FILED BY FAX

ALAMEDA COUNTY

September 18, 2019

CLERK OF
 THE SUPERIOR COURT
 By Xian-xii Bowie, Deputy

CASE NUMBER:

RG19035610

28

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 Great Value Dry Roasted and
6 Unsalted Peanuts (“Product(s)"). Defendants know and intend that customers will ingest Products
7 containing Acrylamide.

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

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

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

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

II.
PARTIES

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

1 14. Defendant 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, Defendant 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. The Product exposes individuals to Acrylamide through direct ingestion. This exposure
9 is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant placing Products into the stream of commerce.
10 As such, Defendant intends that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to Acrylamide.

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

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

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

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

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

26 22. Defendant is held liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each
27 violation of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is
28 also appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

3 1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;

4 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from manufacturing,
5 importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear and reasonable
6 warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;


7 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and

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

9
10 Respectfully submitted:

11
12 Dated: September 18, 2019

GLICK LAW GROUP, PC

13
14
15 By: 
16 Noam Glick
17 Attorney for Plaintiff
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28