

1 Tanya E. Moore, SBN 206683  
MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.  
2 300 South First Street, Suite 342  
San Jose, California 95113  
3 Telephone (408) 298-2000  
Facsimile (408) 298-6046  
4 E-mail: service@moorelawfirm.com

E-FILED  
9/16/2020 4:05 PM  
Clerk of Court  
Superior Court of CA,  
County of Santa Clara  
20CV370809  
Reviewed By: S. Alvarez

5 Attorney for Plaintiff  
Safe Products for Californians, LLC  
6  
7

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**  
9 **COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

10  
11 SAFE PRODUCTS FOR CALIFORNIANS, ) No. 20CV370809  
LLC, )  
12 ) **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES**  
Plaintiff, ) **AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
13 )  
vs. )  
14 ) (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*)  
15 SENSATUS GROUP, LLC; SUPPZ INC.; )  
XTREME SPORTS NUTRITION, INC.; ) **UNLIMITED CIVIL**  
16 DOES 1 THROUGH 150, )  
17 Defendants. )  
18 )  
19 )

20 Plaintiff, SAFE PRODUCTS FOR CALIFORNIANS, LLC (“Plaintiff”), alleges as  
21 follows:

22 **SUMMARY**

23 1. This is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest of the  
24 citizens of the State of California to enforce the public’s right to be informed of the health  
25 hazards caused by exposures to lead and lead compounds, a toxic chemical found in and on the  
26 products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Defendants, SENSATUS GROUP, LLC;  
27 SUPPZ INC.; XTREME SPORTS NUTRITION, INC.; and DOES 1 THROUGH 150,  
28 inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), as set forth below.

1           2.       By this Complaint, Plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants’ continuing failure to  
2 warn individuals not covered by California’s Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code  
3 § 6300, *et seq.* (“OSHA”), who purchase, use, or handle Defendants’ products, about the risks  
4 of exposure to lead and lead compounds present in and on the products manufactured,  
5 distributed, and sold throughout the State of California. Individuals not covered by OSHA who  
6 purchase, use, or handle Defendants’ products are referred to hereinafter as “Consumers.”

7           3.       Detectable levels of lead and lead compounds are found in and/or on the  
8 American Metabolix Keto Powdered Supplements that Defendants manufacture, distribute,  
9 and/or offer for sale to Consumers throughout the State of California.

10          4.       Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at  
11 Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of  
12 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to  
13 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable  
14 warning to such individual ...” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

15          5.       Pursuant to Proposition 65, on February 27, 1987, California identified and  
16 listed lead and lead compounds as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead and  
17 lead compounds became subject to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements of  
18 Proposition 65 one year later on February 27, 1988. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health  
19 & Safety Code § 25249.8.

20          6.       Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without  
21 health warnings in the State of California, American Metabolix Keto Powdered Supplements  
22 that contain excessive levels of lead and lead compounds including, but not limited to,  
23 “American Metabolix – Keto Meal Replacement Meal Peanut Butter Cookie,” UPC #8-60000-  
24 49796-1; “American Metabolix – Keto Meal Replacement Meal Blueberry Cheesecake,” UPC  
25 #8-60000-49791-6; “American Metabolix – Keto Meal Replacement Meal Apple Pie,” UPC  
26 #8-60001-18672-7; “American Metabolix – Best Keto Superfood Greens Sweet Berry,” UPC  
27 #8-60215-00091-8; “American Metabolix – Keto Meal Replacement Meal Chocolate  
28 Peppermint Bark,” UPC #8-60000-49795-4; and “American Metabolix – Keto Meal

1 Replacement Meal Vanilla Cake,” UPC #6-40816-19116-7. All such products containing lead  
2 and lead compounds are referred to collectively hereinafter as “Products.”

3 7. Defendants’ failure to warn Consumers in the State of California of the health  
4 hazards associated with exposures to lead and lead compounds in conjunction with  
5 Defendants’ sales of the Products are violations of Proposition 65, and subject Defendants, and  
6 each of them, to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health  
7 & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

8 8. For Defendants’ violations of Proposition 65, Plaintiff seeks preliminary and  
9 permanent injunctive relief to compel Defendants to provide Consumers of the Products with  
10 the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures to lead and lead  
11 compounds. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

12 9. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), Plaintiff also seeks civil  
13 penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 10. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to  
16 California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original  
17 jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under  
18 which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

19 11. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendants based on  
20 Plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that Defendants are each a person, firm,  
21 corporation, or association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum  
22 contacts in the State of California, and/or purposefully avails itself of the California market.  
23 Defendants’ purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California  
24 courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

25 12. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara, pursuant to  
26 Code of Civil Procedure §§ 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent  
27 jurisdiction, because Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants, because one or more  
28 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because

1 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Santa Clara County with respect to  
2 the Products.

3 **PARTIES**

4 13. Plaintiff is a limited liability California company with its principal place of  
5 business within the State of California, County of Santa Clara. Plaintiff seeks to reduce or  
6 eliminate the presence of hazardous substances in consumer products sold in California, and to  
7 ensure that California consumers are aware of the presence of such substances in consumer  
8 goods so that they can make an educated effort to limit their own exposure where deemed  
9 necessary. Plaintiff brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code  
10 § 25249.7(d).

11 14. Defendants SENSATUS GROUP, LLC; SUPPZ INC.; and XTREME SPORTS  
12 NUTRITION, INC. are persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health  
13 & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

14 15. Defendants manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and/or offer the Products for  
15 sale or use in the State of California, or imply by their conduct that they manufacture, import,  
16 distribute, sell, and/or offer the Products for sale or use in the State of California.

17 16. Defendants DOES 1 THROUGH 50, inclusive (“Manufacturer Defendants”),  
18 are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code  
19 §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

20 17. Manufacturer Defendants, and each of them, research, test, design, assemble,  
21 fabricate, and manufacture, or each implies by its conduct that it researches, tests, designs,  
22 assembles, fabricates, and manufactures, one or more of the Products offered for sale or use in  
23 California.

24 18. Defendants DOES 51 THROUGH 100, inclusive (“Distributor Defendants”),  
25 are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code  
26 §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

27 19. Distributor Defendants, and each of them, distribute, exchange, transfer,  
28 process, and transport one or more of the Products to individuals, businesses, or retailers for

1 sale or use in the State of California, or each implies by its conduct that it distributes,  
2 exchanges, transfers, processes, and transports one or more of the Products to individuals,  
3 businesses, or retailers for sale or use in the State of California.

4 20. Defendants DOES 101 THROUGH 150, inclusive (“Retailer Defendants”), are  
5 each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code  
6 §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

7 21. Retailer Defendants, and each of them, offer the Products for sale to individuals  
8 in the State of California.

9 22. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 THROUGH 150, inclusive,  
10 are unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names  
11 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis  
12 alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and  
13 occurrences alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an  
14 amended complaint.

### 15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 16 **Violation of Proposition 65**

17 23. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in  
18 each of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

19 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the  
20 Defendants employs ten or more persons.

21 25. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and  
22 Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right “[t]o be  
23 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive  
24 harm.”

25 26. Proposition 65 states, “[no] person in the course of doing business shall  
26 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause  
27 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
28 individual ...” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

1           27.     On or about May 7, 2020 and July 30, 2020, Plaintiff served sixty-day notices of  
2 violation, including the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff’s counsel  
3 had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed  
4 relevant data regarding the alleged exposures to lead and lead compounds and that counsel  
5 believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a public action, on Defendants  
6 SENSATUS GROUP, LLC; SUPPZ INC.; XTREME SPORTS NUTRITION, INC., the  
7 California Attorney General’s Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies, alleging  
8 that, as a result of Defendants’ sales of the Products, Consumers in the State of California are  
9 being exposed to lead and lead compounds resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of  
10 the Products, without the Consumers first receiving a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding  
11 the harms associated with exposures to lead and lead compounds, as required by Proposition  
12 65.

13           28.     Defendants manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the Products for sale  
14 or use in violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, and Defendants’ violations have  
15 continued beyond their receipt of Plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation. As such, Defendants’  
16 violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined, will continue in the  
17 future.

18           29.     After receiving Plaintiff’s sixty-day notices of violation, and to Plaintiff’s best  
19 information and belief, no public enforcement agency has commenced and diligently  
20 prosecuted a cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged  
21 violations that are the subject of Plaintiff’s notice of violation.

22           30.     The Products that Defendants manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for  
23 sale or use in California cause exposures to lead and lead compounds as a result of the  
24 reasonably foreseeable use of the Products. Such exposures caused by Defendants and endured  
25 by Consumers in California are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable” warning  
26 requirements of Proposition 65, yet Defendants provide no clear and reasonable warning.

27           31.     Defendants knew or should have known that the Products they manufacture,  
28 import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain lead and lead compounds.

1           32.     Lead and lead compounds are present in or on the Products in such a way as to  
2 expose Consumers through ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

3           33.     The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products has caused, and  
4 continues to cause, consumer exposures to lead and lead compounds, as defined by title 27 of  
5 the California Code of Regulations, section 25602(b).

6           34.     Defendants know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
7 Products exposes individuals to lead and lead compounds through ingestion.

8           35.     Defendants intend that exposures to lead and lead compounds through the  
9 reasonably foreseeable use of the Products will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental  
10 participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the Products  
11 for sale or use to Consumers in California.

12           36.     Defendants failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those  
13 Consumers in California who have been, or will be, exposed to lead and lead compounds  
14 through ingestion resulting from their use of the Products.

15           37.     Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65  
16 enacted directly by California voters, consumers exposed to lead and lead compounds through  
17 ingestion as a result of their use of the Products that Defendants sold without a “clear and  
18 reasonable” health hazard warning have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for  
19 which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

20           38.     Pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-  
21 described acts, Defendants, and each of them, are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500  
22 per day for each violation.

23           39.     As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health & Safety Code  
24 § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against  
25 Defendants.

26 //

27 //

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

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them, for:

1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b);
2. Preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that Defendants recall all Products currently in the chain of commerce in California without a “clear and reasonable warning” as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601, *et seq.*;
3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from manufacturing, distributing, or offering the Products for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25601, *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with lead and lead compounds;
4. Plaintiff’s reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit; and
5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

Dated: September 15, 2020

MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.

*Tanya Moore*

Tanya Moore (Sep 15, 2020 16:17 PDT)

Tanya E. Moore  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
Safe Products for Californians, LLC