

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 ALAMEDA**

17 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,
18 INC.,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 F&A BUSINESS GROUP, LLC, a New York
22 limited liability company; and DOES 1 through
23 100, inclusive,

24 Defendants.

Case No.: **23CV054288**



**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda
11/28/2023 at 04:28:30 PM
By: Milagros Cortez,
Deputy Clerk

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, NOMAD x Encinitas Surf Shack Intense Eyeshadow Palette (“Products”). Defendant
8 knows and intends that customers will use Products containing TiO2. Below are pictures of TiO2
9 particles found in an exemplar of Defendant's 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) (“TiO2”) as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as September 2, 2011.

27 ///

28 ///

1 4. Defendant failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about
2 potential exposure to TiO2 in connection with Defendant's manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of
3 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

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

8 **II.**
9 **PARTIES**

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

14 7. Defendant F&A BUSINESS GROUP, LLC ("F&A") is a limited liability company
15 organized and existing under the laws of New York. F&A is registered to do business in California, and
16 does business in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section
17 25249.11. F&A manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda
18 County.

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

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

///
///

1 **III.**
2 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

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

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

13 **IV.**
14 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

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

27 17. Products expose individuals to TiO₂ through direct inhalation. This exposure is a natural
28 and foreseeable consequence of Defendant placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such,
29 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 is 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: November 28, 2023

ENTORNO LAW, LLP

13
14 By: 
Noam Glick

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

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
19 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28