1 2 3	NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444) Shaun Markley (SBN 291785) Jake Schulte (SBN 293777) 225 Broadway, 19 th Floor San Diego, California 92101	FILED BY FAX ALAMEDA COUNTY August 09, 2019 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By Shabra Iyamu, Deputy
4	Tel: (619) 325-0492 Fax: (619) 325-0496	CASE NUMBER: HG19030680
5 6	Email: cnicholas@nicholaslaw.org Email: smarkley@nicholaslaw.org Email: jschulte@nicholaslaw.org	
7	GLICK LAW GROUP, PC	
8	Noam Glick (SBN 251582) 225 Broadway, Suite 2100	
9	San Diego, California 92101 Tel: (619) 382-3400 Fax: (619) 615-2193	
10	Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Embry	
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13	IN AND FOR THE	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
14	KIM EMBRY, an individual	Case No.:
15 16	Plaintiff, v.	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
17	LUCERNE FOODS, INC., a Delaware	(Thould be Colored Code Carana)
18	corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, INC., a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)
18 19	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through	(Health & Salety Code § 23249.6 et seq.)
	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code § 23249.6 et seq.)
19	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code § 23249.6 et seq.)
19 20	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code § 23249.6 et seq.)
19 20 21	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)
19 20 21 22	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Safety Code § 23249.6 et seq.)
19 20 21 22 23	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)
19 20 21 22 23 24	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code § 23249.6 et seq.)
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	a Michigan corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

1

To: Superior Court of CA

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

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California ("the People"). Plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants' failure to inform the People of exposure to Acrylamide, a known carcinogen. Defendants exposed consumers to Acrylamide by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing O Organics Dry Roasted Almonds with Sea Salt ("Products"). Defendants knew and intended that customers will ingest the Products containing Acrylamide.
- 2. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual. . . ." (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6.)
- 3. California identified and listed Acrylamide as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as January 1, 1990, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity as of February 20, 2011.
- 4. Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about potential exposure to Acrylamide in connection with Defendants' manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of the Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.
- 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers in California before exposing them to Acrylamide in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65 along with attorney's fees and costs. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(b).)

II. **PARTIES**

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

1
$\hat{}$
Ł

- 7. Defendant LUCERNE FOODS, INC., a Delaware corporation ("Lucerne Foods"), is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. Defendant is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Lucerne Foods, Inc. manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County, including, for example O Organics Dry Roasted Almonds with Sea Salt.
- 8. Defendant THE VONS COMPANIES, INC., a Michigan corporation ("Vons"), is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Michigan. Defendant is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 252249.11. The Vons Companies, Inc. manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County, including, for example O Organics Dry Roasted Almonds with Sea Salt.
- 9. The true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff sues these Defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each fictitiously named Defendant is responsible for the acts and occurrences herein alleged. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

III. VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 10. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health and Safety Code statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. As such, this Court has jurisdiction.
- 11. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to the Products.

2

3

5

6 7

8

10 11

12

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

12. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

IV. CAUSES OF ACTION

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

- 13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.
- 14. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.
- 15. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing Acrylamide in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notices (defined *infra*) and will continue to occur into the future.
- 16. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed to Acrylamide through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.
- 17. Products expose individuals to Acrylamide through direct ingestion. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such, Defendants intend that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to Acrylamide.
- 18. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained Acrylamide and exposed individuals to Acrylamide in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of Acrylamide in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning Acrylamide and related chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendants.
 - 19. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.
- 20. More than sixty days prior to naming the Defendants in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice(s)") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit. The Notices alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn

Products. 21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants. 22. Individuals exposed to Acrylamides contained in the Products through directly resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continuirreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for expression of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as the content of the products through directly appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). 11. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation; 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum civil penalty and penalt				
21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants. 22. Individuals exposed to Acrylamides contained in the Products through did resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continuirreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a continuity of the proposition; 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from most importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear are warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: August August 8, 2019 GLICK LAW GROUP, PC	l.	consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to Acrylamide contained in th		
commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants. 22. Individuals exposed to Acrylamides contained in the Products through did resulting from reasonably foresceable use of the Products have suffered and continuity irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a continuity of the proposition of \$2,500 per day for each violation; 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from maximum gas required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 GLICK LAW GROUP, PC By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	2	Products.		
22. Individuals exposed to Acrylamides contained in the Products through did resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continitreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for e of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a continuous selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear art warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 GLICK LAW GROUP, PC By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	3	21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notices failed to		
resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continirreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for e of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a linear content of \$2,500 per day for each violation; 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from m importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear ar warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 GLICK LAW GROUP, PC By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	4	commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.		
irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for e of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation; A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from m importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear are warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 GLICK LAW GROUP, PC By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	5	22. Individuals exposed to Acrylamides contained in the Products through direct ingestion		
23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for e of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a constant of the second of them, as a second of the second of	6	resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer		
of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as 1 Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation; A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from m importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear ar warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	7	irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.		
appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a). PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a control of section 25249.7(a). Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation; A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from m importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear are warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	8	23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation		
PRAYER FOR RELIEF Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as function against Defendants and each of them, as function against Defendants from more importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear arwarning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	9	of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also		
Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as a second sec	0	appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).		
1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation; 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from m importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear ar warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	1	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from m importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear ar warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Moam Maluk Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	2	Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:		
importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear ar warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Community Comm	3	1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;		
warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations; 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	4	2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from manufacturing		
3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	5	importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear and reasonable		
4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Acar Male Manager of Plaintiff By: Acar Male Manager of Plaintiff	6	warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;		
Respectfully submitted: Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff	7	3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and		
Dated: August 8, 2019 By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff By: Down John John John John John John John Joh	8	4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.		
By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff 25 26 27	9	Respectfully submitted:		
By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff Attorney for Plaintiff	20	Dated: August 8, 2019 GLICK LAW GROUP, PC		
By: Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff 25 26 27	21			
Noam Glick Attorney for Plaintiff 25 26 27	22			
25 26 27	23	Noam Glick		
27	24	Attorney for Plaintiff		
27	25			
	26			
28	27			
	28			