

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 GOYA FOODS, INC., a Delaware corporation;  
22 WALMART INC., a Delaware corporation; and  
23 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

24 Defendants.

Case No.: **24CV070864**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda

**04/08/2024 at 01:56:37 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 Defendants' failure to inform the People of exposure to lead, a known carcinogen and  
5 reproductive toxin. Defendants expose consumers to lead by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or  
6 distributing cactuses including, but not limited to, Goya Tender Cactus Nopalitos (“Products”).  
7 Defendants know and intend that customers will ingest Products containing lead.

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

13           3.       California identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as  
14 October 1, 1992, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity on February  
15 27, 1987.

16           4.       Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about  
17 potential exposure to lead in connection with Defendants' manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of  
18 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

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

**II.**  
**PARTIES**

23  
24           6.       Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. (“Plaintiff”) is a  
25 corporation in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through  
26 the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this action in the public  
27 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

28 ///

7. Defendant Goya Foods, Inc. ("Goya") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. Goya is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Goya manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

8. Defendant Walmart Inc. ("Walmart") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. Walmart is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Walmart manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

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

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

**III.**  
**VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

11. 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.

12. Venue is proper in Alameda 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. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

///



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

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

8           23.     Individuals exposed to lead contained in Products through direct ingestion resulting  
9 from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer irreparable harm.  
10 There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

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

14 *[Rest of page intentionally left blank.]*

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
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: April 8, 2024

**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.