

1 Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)
2 Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)
3 BRODSKY SMITH
4 9465 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 300
5 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
6 Telephone: (877) 534-2590
7 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

ELECTRONICALLY
FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

01/07/2025
Clerk of the Court
BY: SAHAR ENAYATI
Deputy Clerk

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

11 GABRIEL ESPINOZA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 MELIN, LLC, O'NEILL,

15 Defendants.

Case No.:

CGC-25-621237

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

**(Violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et
seq.)**

16 Plaintiff Gabriel Espinoza ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, alleges the following
17 cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

18 **BACKGROUND OF THE CASE**

19 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to
20 enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at
21 the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq ("Proposition 65"), which reads, in relevant part,
22 "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
23 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first
24 giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...". Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

25 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest
26 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health
27 hazards caused by exposure to perfluorooctanoic acid ("PFOA"), a toxic chemical found in Melin
28 hydro Coronado caps, UPC # 840357200704 sold and/or distributed by defendants Melin, LLC
and/or O'Neill (collectively, "Defendants" and each a "Defendant") in California.

1 3. PFOA is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and
2 birth defects or other reproductive harm. On November 10, 2017, the state of California listed
3 PFOA as a chemical known to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm and it has come
4 under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, §
5 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b). On February 25, 2022, the State of
6 California listed PFOA as a chemical known to cause cancer.

7 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate
8 within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations. Included in
9 such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing a Proposition
10 65-listed chemical that will create an exposure above safe harbor levels with a “clear and
11 reasonable” warning before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing any person to any such listed
12 chemical.

13 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation
14 for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00) to be
15 imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code
16 § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the
17 actions of a defendant which “violate or threaten to violate” the statute. Health & Safety Code §
18 25249.7.

19 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants distribute and/or offer for sale in California,
20 without a requisite exposure warning, Melin hydro Coronado caps, UPC # 840357200704 (the
21 “Products”) that expose persons to PFOA when used for their intended purpose.

22 7. Defendants’ failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the
23 health hazards associated with exposure to PFOA in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution
24 of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendants to the enjoinder and civil
25 penalties described herein.

26 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition
27 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

1 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring
2 Defendants to provide purchasers or users of the Products with required warnings related to the
3 dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to PFOA pursuant to Health and Safety Code
4 § 25249.7(a).

5 10. Plaintiff further seeks a reasonable award of attorney's fees and costs.

6 **PARTIES**

7 11. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general
8 public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and to
9 improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. He brings this
10 action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

11 12. Defendant Melin, LLC, through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells,
12 and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that
13 it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.
14 Plaintiff alleges that defendant Melin, LLC is a "person" in the course of doing business within
15 the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

16 13. Defendant O'Neill, through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells,
17 and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that
18 it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.
19 Plaintiff alleges that defendant O'Neill is a "person" in the course of doing business within the
20 meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

21 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

22 14. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco because one or more of the
23 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur in this county and/or because
24 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with
25 respect to the Products.

26 15. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution
27 Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those
28 given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the enforcement

1 of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has
2 jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

3 16. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because each Defendant is either a
4 citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is
5 registered with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business
6 in the State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market.
7 Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent
8 and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

10 17. The people of the State of California declared in Proposition 65 their right “[t]o be
11 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive
12 harm.” (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65.)

13 18. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a
14 “clear and reasonable warning” before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California
15 as causing cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm. H&S Code § 25249.6 states, in
16 pertinent part:

17 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
18 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without
19 first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...

20 19. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “which results from a
21 person’s acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a
22 consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” (27 CCR §
23 25602, para (b).) H&S Code § 25603(c) states that “a person in the course of doing business ...
24 shall provide a warning to any person to whom the product is sold or transferred unless the product
25 is packaged or labeled with a clear and reasonable warning.”
26
27
28

1 known to cause cancer. In summary, PFOA was listed under Proposition 65 as a chemical known
2 to the State to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

3 23. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,
4 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Product. The primary route of exposure to the
5 is through dermal absorption directly through the skin when consumers use, touch, or handle the
6 Products. Exposure through ingestion will occur by touching the Product with subsequent touching
7 of the user's hand to mouth. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with the Products
8 regarding the health hazards of exposure.

9 24. Defendants have processed, marketed, distributed, offered to sell and/or sold the
10 Products in California since at least January 23, 2024. The Products continue to be distributed and
11 sold in California without the requisite warning information.

12 25. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally
13 exposed users of the Products to PFOA without first giving a clear and reasonable exposure
14 warning to such individuals.

15 26. As a proximate result of acts by each Defendant, as a person in the course of doing
16 business within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of
17 California, including in San Francisco County, have been exposed to PFOA without a clear and
18 reasonable warning on the Products. The individuals subject to the violative exposures include
19 normal and foreseeable users and consumers that use the Products, as well as all others exposed to
20 the Products.

21 SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

22 27. Plaintiff purchased the Product from O'Neill. At the time of purchase, Defendants
23 did not provide a Proposition 65 exposure warning for PFOA or any other Proposition 65 listed
24 chemical in a manner consistent with H&S Code § 25603.1 as described *supra*.

25 28. The Product was sent to a testing laboratory for PFOA testing to determine the
26 PFOA content of the Product.

27 29. The laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Results of this test determined
28 the Product exposes users to PFOA (the "Chemical Test Report").

1 30. Plaintiff provided the Chemical Test Report and Product to an analytical chemist
2 to determine if, based on the findings of the Chemical Test Report and the reasonable and
3 foreseeable use of the Product, exposure to PFOA will occur at levels that require Proposition 65
4 warnings under the Clear and Reasonable Warnings section 25601 of Title 27 of the California
5 Code of Regulations.

6 31. On January 23, 2024, Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure
7 assessment report which concluded that persons in California who use the Products will be exposed
8 to levels of PFOA that require a Proposition 65 exposure warning.

9 32. On January 23, 2024, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety
10 Code § 25249.6 (the “Notice”) to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to
11 PFOA contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants
12 and to the California Attorney General’s office and the offices of the County District attorneys and
13 City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein
14 violations allegedly occurred.

15 33. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including
16 the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff’s counsel had consulted with at
17 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding
18 PFOA exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private
19 action.

20 34. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff’s best information and belief, none of
21 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a
22 cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which
23 are the subject of the Notice.

24 35. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the
25 Notice to Defendants, as required by law.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff against Defendants for the Violation of Proposition 65)

36. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 35 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

37. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer of the Product.

38. Use of the Products will expose users to PFOA, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

39. The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

40. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since January 23, 2024, continuing until the present, that Defendants have continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to PFOA without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

41. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Product. The primary route of exposure to the is through dermal absorption directly through the skin when consumers use, touch, or handle the Products. Exposure through ingestion will occur by touching the Product with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with the Products regarding the health hazards of exposure.

42. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Products.

43. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products exposes individuals to PFOA, and Defendants intend that exposures to PFOA will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering of the Products to consumers in California

44. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this Complaint.

1 45. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above
2 described acts, each Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per
3 violation.

4 46. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically
5 authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against each Defendant.

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against each Defendant and requests the
8 following relief:

- 9 A. That the court assess civil penalties against each Defendant in the amount of \$2,500
10 per day for each violation for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per
11 violation of \$912,000.00) in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b);
- 12 B. That the court preliminarily and permanently enjoin each Defendant mandating
13 Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Products;
- 14 C. That the court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit, in the
15 amount of \$50,000.00.
- 16 D. That the court grant any further relief as may be just and proper.

17 Dated: January 7, 2025

18 BRODSKY SMITH
19 By: 
Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)
20 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)
9465 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 300
21 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Telephone: (877) 534-2590
22 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*