1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ENTORNO LAW, LLP Noam Glick (SBN 251582) Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777) Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444) Janani Natarajan (SBN 346770) 225 Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, California 92101 Tel: (619) 629-0527 Email: noam@entornolaw.com Email: jake@entornolaw.com Email: craig@entornolaw.com Email: craig@entornolaw.com	ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of Alameda 02/23/2023 at 10:26:25 AM By: Angela Linhares, Deputy Clerk	
8 9 10	Attorneys for Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	IN AND FOR THE	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
12	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC.,	Case No.: 230V028335	
13	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	
14	V.	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)	
15 16	SANTOS AGENCY INC., a California corporation; ASIA MART INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,		
17	Defendants.		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

I. INTRODUCTION

1

23

24

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 lead, a known carcinogen.
 Defendants expose consumers to lead by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing chili
 powder including, but not limited to, Santos Fine Red Chili Powder ("Products"). Defendants know and
 intend that customers will ingest Products containing lead.

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.)

California identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as
 October 1, 1992, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity on February
 27, 1987.

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

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

II. <u>PARTIES</u>

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

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

8. Defendant ASIA MART INC. ("AM") is a corporation organized and existing under the
laws of California. AM is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of
Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. AM 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 is informed and believes and thereon alleges that these
12 Defendants are responsible in whole or in part for violation of the Labor Code sections described in this
13 Complaint.

14 10. At all times mentioned, Defendants were the agents, alter egos, servants, joint venturers,
15 joint employers, or employees for each other. Defendants acted with the consent of the other Co16 Defendants and acted within the course, purpose, and scope of their agency, service, or employment.
17 All conduct was ratified by Defendants, and each of them.

- 18
- 19

III. VENUE AND JURISDICTION

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

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

27 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. IV. 4 **CAUSES OF ACTION** 5 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants) 6 14. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above. 7 15. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that 8 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm. 9 16. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing lead 10 in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes such 11 violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to occur into the 12 future. 13 17. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to 14 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed 15 to lead through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products. 16 18. Products expose individuals to lead through direct ingestion. This exposure is a natural 17 and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such, 18 Defendants intend that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to lead. 19 19. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained lead and exposed 20 individuals to lead in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of lead 21 in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning lead 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 lead contained in the Products. 4 COMPLAINT

1	22.	The appropriate public enforcem	ent agencies provided with the Notice failed to
2	commence and o	diligently prosecute a cause of action	on against Defendants.
3	23.	Individuals exposed to lead conta	ined in Products through direct ingestion 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 maximu	im 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	Wherefo	re, Plaintiff prays for judgment aga	inst 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 in	junction 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.	3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and	
17	4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.		y be just and proper.
18	Respectfully su	bmitted:	
19	Dated: Februar	y 23, 2023	ENTORNO LAW, LLP
20			
21		Dev	Noam Slick
22		By:	Noam Glick
23			Jake W. Schulte
24			Craig M. Nicholas Janani Natarajan
25			-
26			Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.
27			
28			