1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 9/09/2024 2:46 PM David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, By Y. Ayala, Deputy Clerk  HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  LOS ANGELES
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	MONARCH, LLC,  Plaintiff,  vs.  PAPARAZZI, LLC dba PAPARAZZI ACCESSORIES and DOES 1 through 100, Inclusive,  Defendants.	Unlimited Jurisdiction  CASE NO. 24STCV23164  COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.)
28		1
ļ	I	

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

## 3

4 6

# 7 8

## 10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

**26** 

27

28

#### I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 1. This complaint seeks to remedy the failure of Defendants to warn persons of exposure to cadmium, a chemical known to the State of California to cause developmental and reproductive toxicity.
- 2. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 ("Proposition 65") businesses must provide persons with a "clear and reasonable warning" before exposing individuals to chemicals known to the state to cause cancer, birth defects of other reproductive harm.

#### II. **PARTIES**

- 3. Plaintiff, Mothers Oversight Network for Actionable Contaminant Harm, LLC (FKA MONARCH Action) ("MONARCH"), is a limited liability company formed pursuant to the laws of the State of California, made up of a California citizen, represented by and through its counsel of record, the Greenbaum Law Firm. PLAINTIFF sues herein as MONARCH, LLC, whose name is incorporated in its name under the articles of incorporation, as stated above.
- 4. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d) provides that actions to enforce Proposition 65 may be brought by "any person in the public interest."
- 5. Defendant Paparazzi, LLC d/b/a Paparazzi Accessories is a business entity with ten of more employees that sells, or has, at times relevant to this complaint, authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of ring products manufactured by or for Defendant, imported by or for Defendant, or distributed or sold by or for Defendant, including but not limited to, Treasury Fund White Ring (P4RE-WTXX-280XX) that contains Cadmium, for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.
- 6. The identities of DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, Plaintiff suspects they are business entities with at least ten or more employees that at all times relevant to this complaint, authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of ring products manufactured by of for Defendant, imported by or for Defendant, or distributed or sold by or for Defendant, including but

not limited to, Treasury Fund White Ring (P4RE – WTXX - 280XX), that contains Cadmium, for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.

7. Defendants named in paragraphs 5 through 6 have at all times relevant to this complaint, authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of ring products manufactured by or for Defendant, imported by or for Defendant, or distributed or sold by or for Defendant, including, but not limited to, Treasury Fund White Ring (P4RE – WTXX - 280XX), that contains Cadmium, for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.

### III. ALTER EGO ALLEGATIONS

- 8. At all relevant times, as alleged more fully herein, each Defendant acted as an agent, servant, employee, co-conspirator, alter-ego, and/or joint venturer of the other Defendants, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency, employment, alter-ego and/or in furtherance of the joint venture.
- 9. Each of the Defendant's acts alleged herein was done with the permission and consent of each of the other Defendants.

## IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts.
- 11. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants, because they are business entities that do sufficient business, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market, through the sale, marketing, and use of its products in California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 12. Venue is proper in this Court because the cause, or part thereof, arises in Los Angeles County because Defendant's products are sold and consumed in this county.

### V. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

13. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 is an initiative statute passed as "Proposition 65" by a vote of the people in November of 1986.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 24. Cadmium was placed on the Governor's list of chemicals known to the State to cause developmental and reproductive toxicity on May 1, 1997. (27 CCR 27001(b))
- 25. Defendant Paparazzi, LLC d/b/a Paparazzi Accessories ("Paparazzi") owns, controls, facilitates, manages, and operates Paparazzi Accessories which sells the Treasury Fund white ring (P4RE WTXX 280XX) through its "Consultants."
- 26. The Treasury Fund white ring (P4RE WTXX 280XX), which contains Cadmium, is hereinafter referred to as "PRODUCT."
- 27. Paparazzi is a multi-level marketing operation; it sells its products to "Consultants" who then independently market and sell the PRODUCT.
- 28. On or about September 12, 2023, Plaintiff purchased the PRODUCT from Defendant's online Paparazzi "Consultant."
- 29. Neither the PRODUCT'S online listing, the PRODUCT'S packaging, nor the PRODUCT itself contained or presented a Proposition 65 warning label.
- 30. On or about January 22, 2024, Plaintiff's expert prepared a report summarizing the results of analysis of the PRODUCT, including the amount of Cadmium to which a typical user of the PRODUCT would be exposed.
- 31. Based on these levels, Plaintiff's expert opined the PRODUCT would lead to consumer exposure to Cadmium above the Safe Harbor levels set by the Office of Environment Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).
- 32. Based on that report and opinion, and lack of statutorily required warning language on the PRODUCT, Plaintiff prepared a Sixty Notice of Violation.
- 33. Pursuant to the statute and regulations referenced above, on February 7, 2024, Plaintiff served a copy of the Notice of Violation on the California Office of the Attorney General, Defendant, and all requisite public agencies.
  - 34. Plaintiff is unaware of any governmental prosecution against Defendant.
  - 35. At least sixty (60) days have elapsed since MONARCH served the Notice of Violation.

- 36. Based upon consultation with experts, Plaintiff alleges that individuals who purchase, handle, or use the PRODUCT are exposed to Cadmium chiefly through:
  - a. contact between the item and the skin;
  - b. transfer of Cadmium from the skin to the mouth, both by transfer of Cadmium directly from the hand to mouth, and indirectly by transfer of cadmium from the skin to objects that are placed in the mouth, such as food; and/or
    - c. absorption of Cadmium through the skin.
- 37. Such individuals are thereby exposed to Cadmium present on or in the PRODUCT during the intended and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCT.
- 38. At all times material to this complaint, Defendant had knowledge the PRODUCT contains Cadmium and that an individual's skin may contact Cadmium through the intended and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCT.
- 39. At all times material to this complaint, Defendant had knowledge that individuals within the State of California handle the PRODUCT, which contains Cadmium.
- 40. At all times material to this complaint, Defendant knew the PRODUCT was sold throughout the State of California.
  - 41. At all times material to this complaint, Defendant profited from such sales.
- 42. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendant intentionally authorized and reauthorized the sale of the PRODUCT, thereby exposing consumers to Cadmium.
- 43. At all times material to this complaint, Defendant knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals within the State of California to Cadmium.
- 44. The exposure is knowing and intentional because it results from the Defendant's deliberate act of authorizing the sale of products known to contain Cadmium, in a manner whereby these products were, and would inevitably be, sold to consumers within the State of California, and with the knowledge the intended use of this PRODUCT would result in exposures to Cadmium by individuals within the State of California.
- 45. Defendants have failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings that the use of the PRODUCT in question in California results in exposure to a chemical known to the State of California

1	4. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, award Plaintiff their reasonable attorney's fe	
2	and costs of at least \$37,709.27 as of the filing of this Complaint, and an anticipated addition	
3	\$15,000.00 of attorney's fees at minimum to obtain a default judgment, if a default is entered; and	
4	5. Grant such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.	
5		
6	Respectfully submitted,	
7	DATED: September 9, 2024	
8	GREENBAUM LAW FIRM	
9	Sail Br	
10	By: DANIEL N. GREENBAUM	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff MONARCH, LLC	
12	Morvincen, EEC	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	8	