To: Alameda County Superior Court Page 5 of 9 2020-10-16 21:10:00 (GMT)

16193930154 From: Samantha Dice

	D BY FAX EDA COUNTY
Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444) Octo	ber 16, 2020
225 Broadway, Suite 1900 THE SU	CLERK OF PERIOR COURT ne Downie, Deputy
Tel: (619) 325-0492 CASE N CASE N	IUMBER:
5 Email: cnicholas@nicholaslaw.org 5 Email: jschulte@nicholaslaw.org	G20077077
6 GLICK LAW GROUP, PC Noam Glick (SBN 251582)	
7 225 Broadway, Suite 2100 San Diego, California 92101	
 8 Tel: (619) 382-3400 Fax: (619) 393-0154 9 Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com 	
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff	
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.	
12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIF	ORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
13 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMED	A
14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, Case No.:	A
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, Case No.: INC., a California corporation, 15 COMPLAINT FOR CI 	VIL PENALTIES
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, 15 Plaintiff, 16 v. 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, Plaintiff, v. GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, 15 Plaintiff, 16 v. 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 18 Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, 15 Plaintiff, 16 v. 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a 18 Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 19 Defendants. 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, 15 Plaintiff, 16 v. 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 19 Defendants. 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, 15 Plaintiff, 16 v. 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 19 Defendants. 20 21 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, Case No.:: 15 Plaintiff, Complaint FOR CIAND INJUNCTIVE RIS 16 v. (Health & Safety Code § 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, (Health & Safety Code § 19 Defendants. (Health & Safety Code § 20 Defendants. (Health & Safety Code § 21 Defendants. (Health & Safety Code § 22 (Health & Safety Code §) (Health & Safety Code §)	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, 15 Plaintiff, 16 v. 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 19 Defendants. 20 1 21 2 23 1 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, Case No.: 15 Plaintiff, Complaint FOR CIAND INJUNCTIVE RI 16 v. GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, (Health & Safety Code § 19 Defendants. 100, 20 21 21 22 23 24	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
 14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, 15 Plaintiff, 16 v. 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 19 Defendants. 20 1 21 2 23 1 	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF
14 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC., a California corporation, Case No.: 15 Plaintiff, Complaint FOR Cland, 16 v. Complaint FOR Cland, 17 GENERAL MILLS, INC., a Delaware corporation, THE VONS COMPANIES, Inc., a Michigan corporation, DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, (Health & Safety Code § 19 Defendants. 100, 20 Defendants. 100, 21	VIL PENALTIES ELIEF

COMPLAINT

I.
INTRODUCTION

1

23

24

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Environmental Health Advocates,
 Inc. ("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 expose consumers to acrylamide by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or
 distributing Gardetto's Special Request Garlic Rye Chips ("Products"). Defendants know and intend
 that customers 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.)

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. 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 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

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. <u>PARTIES</u>

6. Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. ("Plaintiff") is an
organization in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through
the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this action in the public
interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

7. Defendant GENERAL MILLS, INC. ("General Mills") is a corporation organized and
 existing under the laws of Delaware. General Mills 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.
 General Mills manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda
 County.

8. Defendant THE VONS COMPANIES, INC. ("Vons") is a corporation organized and
existing under the laws of Michigan. Vons 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. Vons
manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

9. Plaintiff does not know the true names and/or capacities, whether individual, partners,
 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason sues
 said defendants under fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the true
 names and capacities of these defendants have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
 thereon alleges that these defendants are responsible in whole or in part for Plaintiff's damages.

III. VENUE AND JURISDICTION

15

16

27

28

17 10. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court original
18 jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health and Safety Code
19 statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. As such, this Court
20 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 Products.

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

3 COMPLAINT

IV. 1 **CAUSES OF ACTION** 2 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants) 3 13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above. 4 14. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that 5 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm. 6 15. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing 7 acrylamide in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and 8 believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to 9 occur into the future. 10 16. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to 11 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed 12 to acrylamide through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products. 13 17. Products expose individuals to acrylamide through direct ingestion. This exposure is a 14 natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As 15 such, Defendants intend that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to acrylamide. 16 18. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained acrylamide and 17 exposed individuals to acrylamide in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the 18 presence of acrylamide in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning acrylamide and related 19 chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendants. 20 19. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental. 21 20. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a 22 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff 23 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit. 24 The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in 25 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to acrylamide contained in the Products. 26 21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to 27 commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants. 28

1	22.	Individuals exposed to acrylamide contained in Products through direct ingestion	
2	resulting from	n reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer	
3	irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.		
4	23.	Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation	
5	of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also		
6	appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).		
7	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
8	Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:		
9	1.	Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;	
10	2.	A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from manufacturing,	
11	importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear and reasonable		
12	warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;		
13	3.	Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and	
14	4.	Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.	
15	Respectfully submitted:		
16	Dated: Octob	ner 16, 2020 NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP	
17			
18		Jak Jutte	
19		By: Jake Schulte	
20		Attorney for Plaintiff	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			