

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

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.
8

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

10 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

CGC-22-602968

11 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,
INC.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 CLINIQUE LABORATORIES, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company; SEPHORA
USA, INC., a Michigan corporation; and DOES
15 1 through 100, inclusive,

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

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)



**ELECTRONICALLY
FILED**
*Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco*

11/15/2022
Clerk of the Court
BY: JEFFREY FLORES
Deputy Clerk

I.

INTRODUCTION

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Environmental Health Advocates, Inc. (“Plaintiff”) in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California (“the People”). Plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants’ failure to inform the People of exposure to Titanium Dioxide (airborne, unbound particles of respirable size) (“TiO₂”), a known carcinogen. Defendants expose consumers to TiO₂ by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing face powder products including but not limited to the Clinique Superpowder Double Face Makeup (“Products”). Defendants know and intend that customers will use Products containing TiO₂. Below are pictures of TiO₂ particles found in an exemplar of Defendants’ Products:



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

3. California identified and listed Titanium Dioxide (airborne, unbound particles of respirable size) (“TiO₂”) as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as September 2, 2011.

4. Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about

1 potential exposure to TiO₂ in connection with Defendants’ manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of
2 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

3 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers
4 in California before exposing them to TiO₂ in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff
5 also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65 along with attorney’s
6 fees and costs. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(b).)

7 **II.**

8 **PARTIES**

9 6. Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. (“Plaintiff”) is a
10 corporation in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through
11 the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this action in the public
12 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

13 7. Defendant CLINIQUE LABORATORIES, LLC (“CL”) is a limited liability company
14 organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. CL is registered to do business in California, and
15 does business in the County of San Francisco, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section
16 25249.11. CL manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and San Francisco
17 County.

18 8. Defendant SEPHORA USA, INC. (“SUI”) is a corporation organized and existing under
19 the laws of Michigan. SUI is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of
20 San Francisco, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. SUI manufactures,
21 imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and San Francisco County.

22 9. Plaintiff does not know the true names and/or capacities, whether individual, partners,
23 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason sues
24 said defendants under fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the true
25 names and capacities of these defendants have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
26 thereon alleges that these defendants are responsible in whole or in part for the remedies and penalties
27 sought herein.

28 **III.**

1 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

6 11. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil
7 Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this
8 County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

9 12. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise
10 purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would
11 be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

12 **IV.**

13 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)**

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

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

19 15. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing TiO₂
20 in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes such
21 violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to occur into the
22 future.

23 16. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to
24 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed
25 to TiO₂ through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

26 17. Products expose individuals to TiO₂ through direct inhalation. This exposure is a natural
27 and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such,
28 Defendants intend that consumers will use Products, exposing them to TiO₂.

1 18. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained TiO2 and exposed
2 individuals to TiO2 in the way provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of
3 TiO2 in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning TiO2 and related chemicals in consumer
4 products provided constructive notice to Defendants.

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

6 20. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a
7 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff
8 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.
9 The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in
10 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to TiO2 contained in the Products.

11 21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to
12 commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.

13 22. Individuals exposed to TiO2 contained in Products through inhalation resulting from
14 reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer irreparable harm. There
15 is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

16 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation
17 of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also
18 appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).

19 *[Rest of page intentionally left blank]*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants 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;

5 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants 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: November 15, 2022

ENTORNO LAW, LLP

13
14 By: 
15 _____
16 Noam Glick
17 Craig M. Nicholas
18 Jake W. Schulte

19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28