

1 **ENTORNO LAW, LLP**  
Noam Glick (SBN 251582)  
2 Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777)  
Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)  
3 225 Broadway, Suite 1900  
San Diego, California 92101  
4 Tel: (619) 629-0527  
Email: noam@entornolaw.com  
5 Email: jake@entornolaw.com  
Email: craig@entornolaw.com  
6

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda  
**03/21/2022 at 09:17:25 AM**  
By: Xian-xii Bowie, Deputy Clerk

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC.  
8

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

11 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,  
INC.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 BETTERBODY FOODS & NUTRITION  
LLC, a Utah limited liability company; and  
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,  
15

16 Defendants.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No.: **22CV008655**

**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 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 cadmium, a known carcinogen.  
5 Defendant exposes consumers to cadmium by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing  
6 Organic Super Seeds (“Products”). Defendant knows and intends that customers will ingest Products  
7 containing cadmium.

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.)

13           3.       California identified and listed cadmium as a chemical known to cause cancer as early  
14 as October 1, 1987, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity on May 1,  
15 1997.

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

19           5.       Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendant to sufficiently warn consumers in  
20 California before exposing them to cadmium in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).)  
21 Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its 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 in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through  
27 the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this action in the public  
28 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.



1           14. Defendant manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing  
2 cadmium in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and  
3 believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to  
4 occur into the future.

5           15. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendant failed to  
6 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed  
7 to cadmium through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

8           16. Products expose individuals to cadmium through direct ingestion. This exposure is a  
9 natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant placing Products into the stream of commerce. As  
10 such, Defendant intends that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to cadmium.

11           17. Defendant knew or should have known that the Products contained cadmium and  
12 exposed individuals to cadmium in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendant of the  
13 presence of cadmium in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning cadmium and related  
14 chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendant.

15           18. Defendant's actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

16           19. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a  
17 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff  
18 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.  
19 The Notice alleged that Defendant violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in  
20 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to cadmium contained in the Products.

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

23           21. Individuals exposed to cadmium contained in Products through direct ingestion  
24 resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer  
25 irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

26           22. Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation of  
27 Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also  
28 appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

3 1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation. Plaintiff alleges that  
4 damages total a minimum of \$1,000,000.00;

5 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendant from manufacturing,  
6 importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear and reasonable  
7 warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;

8 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and

9 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

10  
11 Respectfully submitted:

12 Dated: March 21, 2022

**ENTORNO LAW, LLP**

13  
14  
15 By:   
16 Noam Glick

17 Jake W. Schulte  
18 Craig M. Nicholas

19 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
20 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.