

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

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
14 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.

15 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

17 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,  
18 INC.,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 IT COSMETICS, LLC, a New York limited  
22 liability company; ULTA SALON,  
23 COSMETICS & FRAGRANCE, INC., a  
24 Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through  
25 100, inclusive,

26 Defendants.

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


**06/28/2023**  
Clerk of the Court

BY: MARK UDAN  
Deputy Clerk

**CGC-23-607338**

**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 Titanium Dioxide (airborne,  
5 unbound particles of respirable size) (“TiO<sub>2</sub>”), a known carcinogen. Defendants expose consumers to  
6 TiO<sub>2</sub> by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing powdered face makeup including, but  
7 not limited to, IT Cosmetics Your Skin But Better CC+ Airbrush Perfecting Color Setting Powder  
8 (“Products”). Defendants know and intend that customers will use Products containing TiO<sub>2</sub>. Below are  
9 pictures of TiO<sub>2</sub> particles found in an exemplar of Defendants’ Products:



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

25           3.       California identified and listed Titanium Dioxide (airborne, unbound particles of  
26 respirable size) (“TiO<sub>2</sub>”) as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as September 2, 2011.

27       ///

28       ///





1           17.     In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to  
2 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed  
3 to TiO<sub>2</sub> through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

4           18.     Products expose individuals to TiO<sub>2</sub> through direct inhalation. This exposure is a natural  
5 and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such,  
6 Defendants intend that consumers will use Products, exposing them to TiO<sub>2</sub>.

7           19.     Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained TiO<sub>2</sub> and exposed  
8 individuals to TiO<sub>2</sub> in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of  
9 TiO<sub>2</sub> in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning TiO<sub>2</sub> and related chemicals in consumer  
10 products provided constructive notice to Defendants.

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

12           21.     More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a  
13 60-Day Notice of Violation (“Notice”) as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff  
14 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.  
15 The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in  
16 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to TiO<sub>2</sub> contained in the Products.

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

19           23.     Individuals exposed to TiO<sub>2</sub> contained in Products through direct inhalation resulting  
20 from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer irreparable harm.  
21 There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

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

25     *[Rest of page intentionally left blank.]*  
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: June 28, 2023

**ENTORNO LAW, LLP**

13  
14 By:   
Noam Glick

15 Jake W. Schulte  
16 Craig M. Nicholas  
17 Janani Natarajan

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
19 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.