

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda

**10/17/2022 at 03:54:53 PM**

By: Chan Huang,  
Deputy Clerk

**ENTORNO LAW, LLP**

Noam Glick (SBN 251582)

Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777)

Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)

225 Broadway, Suite 1900

San Diego, California 92101

Tel: (619) 629-0527

Email: noam@entornolaw.com

Email: jake@entornolaw.com

Email: craig@entornolaw.com

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., a California organization

Plaintiff,

v.

CVB, INC. dba "LINENSPA", a Utah  
corporation; WALMART, INC., a Delaware  
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **22CV019857**

**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 Defendants’ failure to inform the People of exposure to Formaldehyde (gas)  
5 (“Formaldehyde”), a known carcinogen. Defendants expose consumers to Formaldehyde by  
6 manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing pillowcases including, but not limited to,  
7 Linenspa 600 Thread Count Cotton Blend Pillowcases Queen (“Products”). Defendants know and intend  
8 that customers will use Products containing Formaldehyde.

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 Formaldehyde as a chemical known to cause cancer as  
15 early as January 1, 1988.

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

19           5.       Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers  
20 in California before exposing them to Formaldehyde in Products. (Health & Safety Code, §  
21 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition  
22 65 along with 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  
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

**IV.**  
**CAUSES OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

16. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed to Formaldehyde through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

17. Products expose individuals to Formaldehyde through dermal absorption, ingestion, and inhalation by consumers. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such, Defendants intend that consumers will dermally absorb, ingest, or inhale Products, exposing them to Formaldehyde.

18. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained Formaldehyde and exposed individuals to Formaldehyde in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of Formaldehyde in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning Formaldehyde and related chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendants.

19. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

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

