

ENTORNO LAW, LLP
Noam Glick (SBN 251582)
Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)
Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777)
Janani Natarajan (SBN 346770)
225 Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, California 92101
Tel: (619) 629-0527
Email: noam@entornolaw.com
Email: craig@entornolaw.com
Email: jake@entornolaw.com
Email: janani@entornolaw.com

SUMMONS ISSUED

Per local Rule, This case is assigned to Judge Treat, Charles S, for all purposes.

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

C23-01579

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,
INC.,

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Plaintiff,

v.



(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

SHEGLAM, INC., a California corporation; and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

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 Defendant's failure to inform the People of exposure to Titanium Dioxide (airborne,
5 unbound particles of respirable size) (“TiO₂”), a known carcinogen. Defendant exposes consumers to
6 TiO₂ by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing powdered face makeup including, but
7 not limited to, Sheglam Glitz Wiz Palette - Ecstasy (“Products”). Defendant knows and intends that
8 customers will use Products containing TiO₂. Below are pictures of TiO₂ particles found in an exemplar
9 of Defendant’s Products:



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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

III.
VENUE AND JURISDICTION

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

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

12. Defendant has sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendant would be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

IV.
CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)

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

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

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

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

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

1 18. Defendant knew or should have known that the Products contained TiO2 and exposed
2 individuals to TiO2 in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendant 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 Defendant.

5 19. Defendant's 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 Defendant 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 Defendant.

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

16 23. Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation of
17 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 Defendant 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 Defendant 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 27, 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.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28