

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: janani@entornolaw.com

Per local Rule, This case is assigned to
Judge Maier, Clare, for all purposes.

SUMMONS ISSUED

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,
INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GUERLAIN, INC, a New York corporation;
SEPHORA USA, INC., a Michigan
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: C23-00402



**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

I.

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Environmental Health Advocates,
4 Inc. (“Plaintiff”) in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California (“the People”). Plaintiff
5 seeks to remedy Defendants’ failure to inform the People of exposure to Titanium Dioxide (airborne,
6 unbound particles of respirable size) (“TiO₂”), a known carcinogen. Defendants expose consumers to
7 TiO₂ by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing powdered face makeup products
8 including but not limited to the Guerlain Terracotta Sunkissed Natural Bronzer Powder (“Products”).
9 Defendants know and intend that customers will use Products containing TiO₂. Below are pictures of
10 TiO₂ particles found in an exemplar of Defendants’ Products:



20
21
22
23
24
25

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.)

26
27

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.

28

4. Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about potential exposure to TiO₂ in connection with Defendants’ manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of

1 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

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

6 **II.**

7 **PARTIES**

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

12 7. Defendant GUERLAIN, INC (“Guerlain”) is a corporation organized and existing under
13 the laws of New York. Guerlain is registered to do business in California, and does business in the
14 County of Contra Costa, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Guerlain
15 manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Contra Costa County.

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

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

26 10. At all times mentioned, Defendants were the agents, alter egos, servants, joint venturers,
27 joint employers, or employees for each other. Defendants acted with the consent of the other Co-
28 Defendants and acted within the course, purpose, and scope of their agency, service, or employment.

1 All conduct was ratified by Defendants, and each of them.

2 **III.**

3 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

8 12. Venue is proper in Contra Costa County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil
9 Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this
10 County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

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

14 **IV.**

15 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

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

28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

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

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

3. Reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit; and

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

Respectfully submitted:

Dated: February 23, 2023

ENTORNO LAW, LLP

By: 
Noam Glick

Craig M. Nicholas
Jake W. Schulte
Janani Natarajan

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.