1 2 3 4 5	CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM ELHAM SHABATIAN (SBN 221953) 12100 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 800 Los Angeles, California 90025 Tel: (310) 200-3227 Email: ellie@cliffwoodlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff Clean Product Advocates, LLC		Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 11/22/2024 4:09 PM David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, By M. Elder, Deputy Clerk
7		SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
8			
9		FOR THE COUNT	Y OF LOS ANGELES
10	Class Bu	duck Administration III	\ Casa Na
11	Californi Company,	ia Limited Liability) Case No. 248MCV05756)) COMPLAINT FOR PENALTY AND
12	PLAINTIFF,	PLAINTIFF.) INJUNCTION
13	vs.	,	Violation of Proposition 65,
14 15	Tai Foong USA, Inc.; Tawa) the Safe Drinking Water and) Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986) (Health & Safety Code Sections) 25249.5, et. seq.)) ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL) CASE (exceeds \$25,000.00)	
16	Supermarket, Inc. DBA Ranch Market; DOES 1 Through 100,		
17	DEFENDANTS.		
18))
19))
20	**************************************	!	1
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

- 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 "Cadmium", a known carcinogen. Defendants continue to expose consumers to Cadmium by either manufacturing, and/or importing, and/or selling and/or distributing food products including, but not limited to, "Sea Salt & Pepper Calamari" ("Source"). Defendants therefore know and intend that customers will ingest products containing Cadmium 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 Cadmium 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.

26

27

2

- 3. Defendants have failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about potential exposure to Cadmium 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 Cadmium 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 Tai Foong USA, Inc. is a 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. Defendant Tawa Supermarket, Inc. DBA 99 Ranch Market is

a 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.

- 8. 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.
- 9. 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.

- 10. 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 does not give jurisdiction to any other Court. As such, this Court has jurisdiction over this action.
- 11. 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.
- 12. 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

- 13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein, each and every allegation set forth above in this complaint.
 - 14. Proposition 65 mandates that California citizens be

informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

- 15. More than sixty days prior to the filing of this lawsuit naming each Defendant, Plaintiff issued a 60-Day Notice Of Violation dated January 19, 2024 ("Notice") 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 Cadmium contained in their Products.
- 16. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.
- 17. At all times relevant herein, Defendants manufactured and/or imported and/or sold and/or distributed Products, including "Sea Salt & Pepper Calamari", containing

 Cadmium in violation of Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.6 et. seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such violations have continued after receipt of the Notice described above and such conduct will continue to occur into the future.
- 18. In manufacturing, and/or importing, and/or selling and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers in the State of

California who may be exposed to Cadmium through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

- 19. The Products exposed individuals to Cadmium through direct ingestion of the product described in paragraph 17 of this complaint. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing the Products into the stream of commerce. As such Defendants intend that consumers will ingest said Products, exposing them to Cadmium.
- 20. Defendants knew or should have known that their
 Products contained Cadmium and exposed individuals to Cadmium
 as described above in this complaint. Also, the Notice described
 above in this complaint informed Defendants of the presence of
 Cadmium in their products. Likewise, media coverage concerning
 Cadmium and related chemicals in consumer products provided
 "Constructive Notice" to Defendants. Defendants' actions,
 therefore, were deliberate and not accidental.
- 21. Individuals exposed to Cadmium contained in Defendants' Products through direct ingestion resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products 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.
- 22. 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 pursuant to all causes of action:

- 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: November 20, 2024 CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM

By: 151 Ellan Shabaslan

Elham Shabatian

Attorney for Plaintiff

Clean Product Advocates LLC