

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

GLICK LAW GROUP, PC
Noam Glick (SBN 251582)
225 Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 382-3400
Fax: (619) 393-0154
Email: noam@gllicklawgroup.com

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

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.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SREAM INC., a California corporation, and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

FILED BY FAX

ALAMEDA COUNTY

November 12, 2020

CLERK OF
THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Milagros Cortez, Deputy

CASE NUMBER:

HG20079925

I.
INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Environmental Health Advocates,
3 Inc. (“Plaintiff”) in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California (“the People”). Plaintiff
4 seeks to remedy Defendant’s failure to inform the People of exposure to marijuana (cannabis) smoke, a
5 known carcinogen. Defendant exposes consumers to marijuana smoke by manufacturing, importing,
6 selling, and/or distributing Roor Classic Straight 5mm Orange & Blue and other similar bong/water pipe
7 products (“Products”). Defendant knows and intends that customers will use Products exposing
8 consumers to marijuana smoke.

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

14 3. California identified and listed marijuana smoke as a chemical known to cause cancer
15 as early as June 19, 2009, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity on
16 January 3, 2020.

17 4. Defendant failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about
18 potential exposure to marijuana smoke in connection with Defendant’s manufacture, import, sale, or
19 distribution of Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

20 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendant to sufficiently warn consumers in
21 California before exposing them to marijuana smoke from Products. (Health & Safety Code, §
22 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65
23 along with attorney’s fees and costs. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(b).)

II.
PARTIES

24
25
26 6. Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. (“Plaintiff”) is a
27 corporation in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through
28

1 the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this action in the public
2 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

3 7. Defendant SREAM INC. (“Sream”) is a corporation organized and existing under the
4 laws of California. Sream is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of
5 Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Sream manufactures,
6 imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

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

12 **III.**
13 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

18 10. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil
19 Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this
20 County. Defendant conducted and continues to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

21 11. Defendant has sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise
22 purposefully avails itself of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendant would be
23 consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

24 **IV.**
25 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

26 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)

27 13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

28 ///

///

1 14. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that
2 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

3 15. Defendant manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products exposing
4 consumers to marijuana smoke in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff
5 is informed and believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and
6 will continue to occur into the future.

7
8 16. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendant failed to
9 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed
10 to marijuana smoke through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

11 17. Products expose individuals to marijuana smoke through dermal absorption, ingestion,
12 and inhalation by consumers. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant
13 placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such, Defendant intends that consumers will use
14 Products, exposing them to marijuana.

15 18. Defendant knew or should have known that the Products exposed individuals to
16 marijuana smoke in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendant of the exposure of
17 marijuana smoke in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning marijuana smoke and related
18 chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendant.

19 19. Defendant's action in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

20 20. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a
21 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff
22 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.
23 The Notice alleged that Defendant violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in
24 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to marijuana smoke contained in the Products.

25 21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to
26 commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendant.

27 ///

28 ///

1 22. Individuals exposed to marijuana smoke related to Products through dermal absorption,
2 ingestion, and inhalation resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and
3 continue to suffer irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

4 23. Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation of
5 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 Defendant 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 Defendant 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
16 Respectfully submitted:

17 Dated: November 12, 2020

GLICK LAW GROUP, PC

18
19 By:



20 Noam Glick

NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP

Craig M. Nicholas

Jake W. Schulte

21
22
23 Attorneys for Plaintiff

24 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.
25
26
27
28