

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

NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP
Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)
Shaun Markley (SBN 291785)
Jake Schulte (SBN 293888)
225 Broadway, 19th Floor
San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 325-0492
Fax: (619) 325-0496
Email: cnicholas@nicholaslaw.org
Email: smarkley@nicholaslaw.org
Email: jschulte@nicholaslaw.org

GLICK LAW GROUP, PC
Noam Glick (SBN 251582)
225 Broadway, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 382-3400
Fax: (619) 615-2193
Email: noam@gllicklawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Embry

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

KIM EMBRY, an individual

Plaintiff,

v.

MONDELEZ GLOBAL, LLC., a Delaware
corporation; RALPHS., a Ohio corporation;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: HG 19023388

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

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

FILED BY FAX

ALAMEDA COUNTY

October 09, 2019

CLERK OF
THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Cheryl Clark, Deputy

CASE NUMBER:

HG19023388

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

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 Biscos Sugar Wafers and Chips
6 Ahoy Double Chocolate Thins (collectively, “Products”). Defendants know and intend that customers
7 will ingest Products 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. Defendants 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 the 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).)

23 **II. PARTIES**

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 **IV. CAUSES OF ACTION**

2 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
3 **(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)**

4 13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

5 14. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that
6 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

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

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

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

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

21 19. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

22 20. More than sixty days prior to naming each Defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued
23 60-Day Notices of Violation ("Notices") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff
24 provided the Notices to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of
25 merit. The Notices alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn
26 consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to Acrylamide contained in the
27 Products.

