

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)
Jake Schulte (SBN 293777)
225 Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 325-0492
Email: cnicholas@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) 393-0154
Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

SMART & FINAL, LLC., a Delaware
corporation, STAR SNACKS CO., LLC., a
New Jersey corporation, and DOES 1 through
100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: RG20067555

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

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.*)

FILED BY FAX

ALAMEDA COUNTY

August 20, 2020

CLERK OF
THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Cheryl Clark, Deputy

CASE NUMBER:

RG20067555

1 **NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP**
Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)
2 Jake Schulte (SBN 293777)
225 Broadway, Suite 1900
3 San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 325-0492
4 Email: cnicholas@nicholaslaw.org
Email: jschulte@nicholaslaw.org
5

6 **GLICK LAW GROUP, PC**
Noam Glick (SBN 251582)
225 Broadway, Suite 2100
7 San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 382-3400
8 Fax: (619) 393-0154
Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com
9

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.

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

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

13 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
14 ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 SMART & FINAL, LLC., a Delaware
corporation, STAR SNACKS CO., LLC., a
New Jersey corporation, and DOES 1 through
18 100, inclusive,

19 Defendants.
20
21
22

Case No.: RG20067555

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

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.*)

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 First Street Almonds Roasted &
6 Salted (“Products”). Defendants know and intend that customers will ingest Products containing
7 acrylamide.

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

13 3. California identified and listed acrylamide as a chemical known to cause cancer as
14 early as January 1, 1990, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity in
15 February 20, 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 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 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. (“Plaintiff”) is a
26 corporation organized in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California
27 citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this
28 action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

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

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 each Defendant 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 consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to acrylamide contained in the Products.

///

