į		
1 2	CLIFFWOOR LAW FIRM ELHAM SHABATIAN (SBN 221953) 12100 Wilshire Boulevard	Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 3/25/2025 3:29 PM
3	Suite 800 Los Angeles, California 90025	David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
4	Tel: (310) 200-3227 Email: ellie@cliffwoodlaw.com	By Y. Ayala, Deputy Clerk
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
6	Clean Product Advocates, LLC	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	FOR THE COUNTY	OF LOS ANGELES
10	Class Product Advantage IIC	Case No. 25STCV08646
11	Clean Product Advocates, LLC,) PLAINTIFF,	
12	<u> </u>	COMPLAINT FOR PENALTY AND INJUNCTION
13	vs.	Violation of Proposition 65,
14	Cathay LA, Inc.; Does 1 - 100,	Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986
15	DEFENDANTS.	(Health & Safety Code Sections 25249.5, et. seq.)
16		ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL
17) CASE (exceeds \$25,000.00)
18))
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	·	
24		
25		
26		
27		1
28		

COMPLAINT

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

27

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Clean Product Advocates, LLC ("Plaintiff" or "CPA") 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 continue to expose consumers to lead by either manufacturing, and/or importing, and/or selling and/or distributing food products, including, but not limited to, Purple Sweet Potato Vermicelli (UPC No. 6954427507335) ("Source"). Defendants therefore know and intend that customers will ingest products containing lead under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, and California Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 et. seq. ("Proposition 65") which states that "[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 Section 25249.6).
- 2. California has identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as on or about October 1, 1992, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity on or about February 27, 1987.
 - 3. Defendants have failed to sufficiently warn consumers and

individuals in California about potential exposure to lead in connection with Defendants' manufacture and/or import, and/or sale, and/or distribution of Products in violation of Proposition 65.

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

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff CPA is an LLC operating 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 & Safety Code Section 25249.7.
- 6. Defendant Cathay LA, Inc. is a California Corporation that either manufactures and/or imports, and/or sells and/or distributes Products in Los Angeles County and throughout the State of California, within the meaning of Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11.

- 7. Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to Plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged in this complaint and that Plaintiff's damages as alleged in this complaint were proximately caused by such defendants.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that at all times alleged in this complaint, each defendant was the agent, alter ego, servant, joint venturer, joint employer and/or employee, of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of said relationships and with the permission and consent of all other co-defendants. All conduct was also ratified by Defendants and each of them.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. California Constitution Article V1, 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 statutes upon which this action is based do not give

 jurisdiction to any other Court. As such, this Court has jurisdiction over this action.

- 10. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Sections 394, 395 and 395.5 as wrongful conduct as alleged in this complaint has occurred and continues to occur in this County.
- 11. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would therefore be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against all Defendants

- 12. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein, each and every allegation set forth above in this complaint.
- 13. Proposition 65 mandates that California citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.
- 14. More than sixty days prior to the filing of this lawsuit naming each Defendant, Plaintiff issued a 60-Day Notice Of Violation for Purple Sweet Potato Vermicelli as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff provided said Notice to the various required public enforcement

agencies along with a Certificate of Merit. The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to lead in their products.

- 15. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.
- 16. At all times relevant herein, Defendants manufactured and/or imported and/or sold and/or distributed the Product described above in this complaint, containing lead in violation of Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.6 et. seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such violation has continued after receipt of the Notice described above and such conduct will continue to occur into the future.
- 17. In manufacturing, and/or importing, and/or selling and/or distributing the Product, Defendants failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers in the State of California who may be exposed to lead through reasonably foreseeable use of the Product.
- 18. The Product exposed individuals to lead through direct ingestion of the product described above in this complaint. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing the Product into the stream of commerce. As such,

Defendants intend that consumers will ingest said Product, exposing them to lead.

- 19. Defendants knew or should have known that their
 Product contained lead and exposed individuals to lead as
 described above in this complaint. Also, the Notice described
 above in this complaint informed Defendants of the presence of
 lead in their product. Likewise, media coverage concerning lead
 and related chemicals in their product provided "Constructive
 Notice" to Defendants. Defendants' actions, therefore, were
 deliberate and not accidental.
- 20. Individuals exposed to lead contained in

 Defendants' Product through direct ingestion resulting from

 reasonably foreseeable use of the Product have suffered and

 continue to suffer irreparable harm. There is no other plain,

 speedy or adequate remedy at law other than the relief requested

 in this complaint.
- 21. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(a).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

- 1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the law as described above in this complaint. Plaintiff alleges that damages total a minimum of \$1,000,000.00;
- 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against

 Defendants from manufacturing, and/or importing, and/or selling

 and/or distributing Products in California without providing a

 clear and reasonable warning as required by Proposition 65 and

 related regulations;
 - 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit;
 - 4. Pre-Judgement interest as allowed by law; and
 - 5. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.
 Respectfully Submitted:

Dated: March 25, 2025

CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM,

By: <u>15/8/hym 5 han</u>

Elham Shabatian

Attorney for Plaintiff

Clean Product Advocates LLC