

1 Caspar Jivalagian, Esq., State Bar No.: 282818
 2 Vache Thomassian, Esq., State Bar No.: 289053
 3 **KJT LAW GROUP, LLP**
 4 230 N. Maryland Avenue, Suite 306
 5 Glendale, California 91206
 6 Telephone: 818-507-8525
 7 Facsimile: 818-507-8588

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
 9 TAMAR KALOUSTIAN

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

12 TAMAR KALOUSTIAN, in the public interest,

Civil Action No.: **21STCV03245**

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND
 CIVIL PENALTIES**

15 Lotus Foods, Inc.; Whole Foods Market
 16 California, Inc., a California Corporation; and
 17 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

[Cal. Health and Safety Code Sec. 25249.6, *et
 seq.*]

18 Defendants.

KJTLAWGROUP, LLP
 Jivalagian | Thomassian

1 Tamar Kaloustian, in the public interest, based on information and belief and investigation
2 of counsel, except for information based on knowledge, hereby makes the following allegations.
3

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This Complaint seeks to remedy Defendants’ continuing failure to adequately warn
6 individuals in California that they are being exposed to lead, a chemical known to the State of
7 California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Such exposures have occurred, and
8 continue to occur, through the manufacture, distribution, sale and consumption of Defendants’ Rice
9 Ramen Soup (the “Product”). The Product is available to consumers in California through a
10 multitude of retail channels including, without limitation (a) third-party traditional brick-and-mortar
11 retail locations; (b) via the internet through Defendants’ website; and (c) via the internet through
12 third-party retail websites. Consumers are exposed to lead when they consume the Product.

13 2. Under California’s Proposition 65, Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq., it is
14 unlawful for businesses to knowingly and intentionally expose individuals in California to chemicals
15 known to the State to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm without providing clear
16 and reasonable warnings to individuals prior to their exposure. Defendants introduce a product
17 contaminated with significant quantities of lead into the California marketplace, exposing consumers
18 of the Product to lead.

19 3. Despite the fact that the Defendants expose consumers to lead, Defendants provide
20 no warning, or inadequate warnings about the reproductive hazards associated with lead exposure.
21 Defendants’ conduct thus violates the warning provision of Proposition 65, Health & Safety Code §
22 25249.6.
23

24 **PARTIES**

25 4. Plaintiff brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health &
26 Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

27 5. Defendant LOTUS FOODS, INC. (“LOTUS FOODS”) is a person in the course
28

1 of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. LOTUS FOODS
2 manufactures, distributes and/or sells the Product for sale and use in California.

3 6. Defendant WHOLE FOODS MARKET CALIFORNIA, INC. (“WHOLE
4 FOODS”) is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §
5 25249.11. WHOLE FOODS manufactures, distributes and/or sells the Product for sale and use in

6 7. The true names of DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to Plaintiff at this time. When
7 their identities are ascertained, the Complaint shall be amended to reflect their true names.

8
9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 8. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Health & Safety Code §
11 25249.7, which allows enforcement in any court of competent jurisdiction, and pursuant to
12 California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to
13 other trial courts.

14 9. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants as business entities that do sufficient
15 business, have sufficient minimum contacts in California or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the
16 California market through the sale, marketing or use of the Product in California and/or by having
17 such other contacts with California so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the
18 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

19 10. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County Superior Court because one or more of the
20 violations arise in the County of Los Angeles.

21
22 **BACKGROUND FACTS**

23 11. The People of the State of California have declared by initiative under Proposition
24 65 their right “[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or
25 other reproductive harm.” Proposition 65 § 1(b).

26 12. To effectuate this goal, Proposition 65 prohibits exposing people to chemicals listed
27 by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm above
28

1 certain levels without a “clear and reasonable warning” unless the business responsible for the
2 exposure can prove that it fits within a statutory exemption. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 states
3 in pertinent part:

4
5 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
6 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without
7 first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...

8 13. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical
9 known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead is specifically identified as a reproductive toxicant under
10 two subcategories: “developmental reproductive toxicity,” which means harm to the developing
11 fetus, and “male reproductive toxicity,” which means harm to the male reproductive system. 27
12 California Code of Regulations (“C.C.R.”) § 27001(c). On May 1, 1998, one year after it was listed
13 as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity, lead became subject to the clear and reasonable
14 warning requirement regarding reproductive toxicants under Proposition 65.

15 14. The level of exposure to a chemical causing reproductive toxicity under Proposition
16 65 is determined by multiplying the level in question times the reasonably anticipated rate of
17 exposure for an individual to a given medium. 27 C.C.R. § 25821(b). for exposures to consumer
18 products, the level of exposure is calculated using the reasonably anticipated rate of intake or
19 exposure for average users of the consumer product. 27 C.C.R. § 25821(C)(2).

20 15. Defendants’ Product contains sufficient quantities of lead such that consumers,
21 including pregnant women, who consume the Product are exposed to lead. The primary route of
22 exposure for the violations is direct ingestion when consumers orally ingest the Product. These
23 exposures occur in homes, workplaces and everywhere in California where the Product is
24 consumed.

25 16. During the relevant one-year period herein, no clear and reasonable warning was
26 provided with the Product regarding the reproductive hazards of lead.

27 17. Any person acting in the public interest has standing to enforce violations of
28 Proposition 65 provided that such person has supplied the requisite public enforcers with a valid

1 60-Day Notice of Violation and such public enforcers are not diligently prosecuting the action
2 within such time. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

3 18. More than sixty days prior to naming each Defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff
4 provided a 60-Day “Notice of Violation of Proposition 65” to the California Attorney General, the
5 District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a
6 population greater than 750,000 and to the named Defendants. In compliance with Health & Safety
7 Code § 25249.7(d) and 27 C.C.R. § 25903(b), each Notice included the following information: (1)
8 the name and address of each violator; (2) the statute violated; (3) the time period during which
9 violations occurred; (4) specific descriptions of the violations, including (a) the routes of exposure
10 to lead from the Product, and (b) the specific type of Product sold and used in violation of
11 Proposition 65; and (5) the name of the specific Proposition 65-listed chemical that is the subject of
12 the violations described in each Notice.

13 19. Plaintiff also sent a Certificate of Merit for each Notice to the California Attorney
14 General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California
15 city with a population greater than 750,000 and to the named Defendants. In compliance with
16 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. § 3101, each Certificate certified that Plaintiff’s
17 counsel: (1) has consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or
18 expertise who reviewed facts, studies or other data regarding the exposures to lead alleged in each
19 Notice; and (2) based on the information obtained through such consultations, believes that there is
20 a reasonable and meritorious case for a citizen enforcement action based on the facts alleged in
21 each Notice. In compliance with Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. § 3102, each
22 Certificate served on the Attorney General included factual information-provided on a confidential
23 basis-sufficient to establish the basis for the Certificate, including the identity of the person(s)
24 consulted by the Plaintiff’s counsel and the facts, studies or other data reviewed by such persons.

25 20. None of the public prosecutors with the authority to prosecute violations of
26 Proposition 65 has commenced and/or is diligently prosecuting a cause of action against
27 Defendants under Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*, based on the claims asserted in each of
28

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

Plaintiff's Notices.

21. Defendants both know and intend that individuals will consume the Product, thus exposing them to lead.

22. Under Proposition 65, an exposure is "knowing" where the party responsible for such exposure has:

Knowledge of the fact that a[n]...exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to [Health & Safety Code § 25249.8(a)] is occurring. No knowledge that the... exposure is unlawful is required. 27 C.C.R.§ 25102(n). This knowledge may be either actual or constructive. *See, e.g.*, Final Statement of Reasons Revised (November 4, 1988) (pursuant to former 22 C.C.R. Division 2, § 12201).

23. Defendants have been informed of the lead in their Products by the 60-Day Notice of Violation and accompanying Certificate of Merit served on them.

24. Defendants also have constructive knowledge that the Products contain lead due to the widespread media coverage concerning the problem of lead in consumer products.

25. As entities that manufacture, import, distribute and/or sell the Product for use in the California marketplace, Defendants know or should know that the Product contains lead and that individuals who consume the Product will be exposed to lead. The lead exposures to consumers who consume the Product are a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant's placing the Product into the stream of commerce.

26. Nevertheless, Defendants continue to expose consumers to lead without prior clear and reasonable warnings regarding the reproductive hazards of lead.

27. Plaintiff has engaged in good-faith efforts to resolve the claims alleged herein prior to filing this Complaint.

28. Any person "violating or threatening to violate" Proposition 65 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7. "Threaten to violate" is defined to mean "to create a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur." Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(c). Proposition 65 provides for civil penalties not to

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

exceed \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65.

CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violations of the Health & Safety Code 25249.6)

29. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference as if specifically set forth herein Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive.

30. By placing the Product into the stream of commerce, each Defendant is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

31. Lead is a chemical listed by the State of California as known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

32. Defendants know that average use of the Product will expose users of the Product to lead. Defendants intend that the Product be used in a manner that results in exposures to lead from the Products.

33. Defendants have failed, and continue to fail, to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding the reproductive toxicity of lead to users of the Products.

34. By committing the acts alleged above, Defendants have at all times relevant to this Complaint violated Proposition 65 by knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals to lead without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such individuals regarding the reproductive toxicity of lead.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against the Defendants in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65;
2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from offering the Product for sale in California without either reformulating the Products such that no Proposition 65 warnings are required or providing prior

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

clear and reasonable warnings, as Plaintiff shall specify in further application to the Court;


3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), order Defendants to take action to stop ongoing unwarranted exposures to lead resulting from use of Product sold, as Plaintiff shall specify in further application to the Court;

4. That the Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 or any other applicable theory or doctrine, grant Plaintiff her reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and

5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: January 27, 2021

KJT LAW GROUP, LLP

By: 
Vache Thomassian
Attorneys for Plaintiff
TAMAR KALOUSTIAN

KJT LAW GROUP LLP
Jivalegian | Thomassian