		FILED BY FAX		
i	NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)	ALAMEDA COUNTY December 05, 2019		
2	Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777) 225 Broadway, Suite 1900	CLERK OF		
3	San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 325-0492	THE SUPERIOR COURT By Xian-xii Bowie, Deputy		
4	Email: craig@nicholaslaw.org	CASE NUMBER: HG19045678		
5	Email: jschulte@nicholaslaw.org	11010010070		
6	GLICK LAW GROUP, PC Noam Glick (SBN 251582)			
7	225 Broadway, Suite 2100 San Diego, CA 92101			
8	Tel: (619) 382-3400 Fax: (619) 393-0154			
9	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,	Case No.:		
14	Plaintiff, v.	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		
15	AMERICAN DAIRY QUEEN	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)		
16	CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,			
17	Defendants.			
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 Defendant's failure to inform the People of exposure to acrylamide, a known carcinogen. Defendant exposed consumers to acrylamide by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Ice Cream Cup ("Product" or "Products"). Defendant knew and intended that customers would ingest 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 in February of 2011.
- 4. Defendant failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about potential exposure to acrylamide in connection with Defendants' manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.
- 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendant 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 Defendant for their violations of Proposition 65 along with attorney's fees and costs. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(b).)

II. <u>PARTIES</u>

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	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	y	
1	0	
1	I	
ì	2	
į	3	
****	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
į	8	
1	9	

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	7.	Defendant AMERICAN DAIRY QUEEN CORPORATION ("Defendant"), a Delaware
corp	oration, is	a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. Defendant is registered
to do	business i	n California, and does business in the County of San Diego, within the meaning of Health
and S	Safety Coo	le, section 25249.11. Defendant manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes Products in
Calif	ornia and	Alameda County, including, for example Ice Cream Cup.

8. The true names of Defendant DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff sues this Defendant 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. <u>VENUE AND JURISDICTION</u>

- 9. 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.
- 10. 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. Defendant conducts and continues to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.
- 11. Defendant has sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendant 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 Defendant)

- 12. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.
- 13. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

- 14. Defendant 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 Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to occur into the future.
- 15. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendant 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.
- 16. Products expose individuals to acrylamide through direct ingestion. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such, Defendant intend that consumers would ingest Products, exposing them to acrylamide.
- 17. Defendant knew or should have known that the Products contained acrylamide and exposed individuals to acrylamide in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendant of the presence of acrylamide in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning acrylamide and related chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendants.
 - 18. Defendant's actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.
- 19. More than sixty days prior to naming the Defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") 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 Notice alleged that Defendant violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to Acrylamide contained in the Products.
- 20. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.
- 21. Individuals exposed to acrylamide contained in the Products through direct ingestion resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.
- 22. Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).

1	PRAYER FOR RELIEF					
2	Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:					
3	1.	1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;				
4	2.	2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendant from manufacturing,				
5	importing, se	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.	4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.				
9						
10	Respectfully	y submitted:				
11	Dated: Dece	ember 4, 2019		GLICK LAW GROUP, PC		
12						
13			By:	Room Bleken		
14			By.	Noam Glick		
15				Attorney for Plaintiff		
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
2223						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
-						