

1 **ENTORNO LAW, LLP**

2 Noam Glick (SBN 251582)  
3 Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)  
4 Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777)  
5 Janani Natarajan (SBN 346770)  
6 225 Broadway, Suite 1900  
7 San Diego, California 92101  
8 Tel: (619) 629-0527  
9 Email: noam@entornolaw.com  
10 Email: craig@entornolaw.com  
11 Email: jake@entornolaw.com  
12 Email: janani@entornolaw.com

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda

**01/11/2023 at 12:30:51 PM**

By: Angela Linhares,  
Deputy Clerk

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC.

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

12 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,  
13 INC.,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 LCL BEAUTY, INC., a Washington  
17 corporation; AMAZON.COM, INC., a  
18 Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through  
19 100, inclusive,

20 Defendants.

Case No.: **23CV025544**

**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 Diisononyl phthalate (“DINP”),  
5 a known carcinogen. Defendants expose consumers to DINP by manufacturing, importing, selling,  
6 and/or distributing manicure tables including, but not limited to, LCL Beauty Portable Folding 1 Drawer  
7 Manicure Table (“Products”). Defendants know and intend that customers will use Products containing  
8 DINP.

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 DINP as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as  
15 December 20, 2013.

16           4.       Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about  
17 potential exposure to DINP in connection with Defendants’ manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of  
18 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 DINP in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).)  
21 Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their 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 7. Defendant LCL BEAUTY, INC. ("LCL") is a corporation organized and existing under  
2 the laws of Washington. LCL is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County  
3 of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. LCL manufactures,  
4 imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

5 8. Defendant AMAZON.COM, INC. ("Amazon") is a corporation organized and existing  
6 under the laws of Delaware. Amazon is registered to do business in California, and does business in the  
7 County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Amazon  
8 manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

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

15 10. At all times mentioned, Defendants were the agents, alter egos, servants, joint venturers,  
16 joint employers, or employees for each other. Defendants acted with the consent of the other Co-  
17 Defendants and acted within the course, purpose, and scope of their agency, service, or employment.  
18 All conduct was ratified by Defendants, and each of them.

19 **III.**  
**VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

20  
21 11. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court original  
22 jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health and Safety Code  
23 statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. As such, this Court  
24 has jurisdiction.

25 12. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil  
26 Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this  
27 County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.  
28

1 13. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise  
2 purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would  
3 be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

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

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

7 14. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

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

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

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

17 18. Products expose individuals to DINP through dermal absorption. This exposure is a  
18 natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As  
19 such, Defendants intend that consumers will use Products, exposing them to DINP.

20 19. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained DINP in the  
21 Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning DINP and related chemicals in consumer products  
22 provided constructive notice to Defendants.

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

24 21. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a  
25 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff  
26 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.  
27 The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in  
28 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to DINP contained in the Products.

1 22. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to  
2 commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.

3 23. Individuals exposed to DINP contained in Products through dermal absorption resulting  
4 from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer irreparable harm.  
5 There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

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

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

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

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

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

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

18 Respectfully submitted:

19 Dated: January 11, 2023

**ENTORNO LAW, LLP**

20  
21  
22 By:



Noam Glick

Craig M. Nicholas

Janani Natarajan

Jake W. Schulte

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.