

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 TOOL SHACK WEB, a California corporation;
22 and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

23 Defendants.

Case No.: **24CV081144**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

06/25/2024 at 10:40:25 AM

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 Defendant's failure to inform the People of exposure to lead, a known carcinogen and
5 reproductive/developmental toxin. Defendant exposes consumers to lead by manufacturing, importing,
6 selling, and/or distributing air chucks including, but not limited to, Haltec H5265 Clip-On Air Chuck
7 (“Products”). Defendant knows and intends that customers will use 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. Defendant failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about
17 potential exposure to lead in connection with Defendant's manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of
18 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

19 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendant to sufficiently warn consumers in
20 California before exposing them to lead in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff
21 also seeks civil penalties against Defendant 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

1 **IV.**
2 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

3 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)**

5 13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

6 14. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that
7 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

8 15. Defendant manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing lead in
9 violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes such
10 violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to occur into the
11 future.

12 16. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendant failed to
13 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed
14 to lead through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

15 17. Products expose individuals to lead through incidental ingestion via the hand-to-mouth
16 pathway. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant placing Products into
17 the stream of commerce. As such, Defendant intends that consumers will use Products, exposing them
18 to lead.

19 18. Defendant knew or should have known that the Products contained lead and exposed
20 individuals to lead in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendant of the presence of lead
21 in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning lead and related chemicals in consumer products
22 provided constructive notice to Defendant.

23 19. Defendant's actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

24 20. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a
25 60-Day Notice of Violation (“Notice”) as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff
26 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.
27 The Notice alleged that Defendant violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in
28 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to lead contained in the Products.

1 21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to
2 commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendant.

3 22. Individuals exposed to lead contained in Products through incidental ingestion via the
4 hand-to-mouth pathway resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and
5 continue to suffer irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

6 23. Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation of
7 Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also
8 appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

11 1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation. Plaintiff alleges that
12 damages total a minimum of \$1,000,000;

13 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendant from manufacturing,
14 importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear and reasonable
15 warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;

16 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and

17 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

18
19 Respectfully submitted:

20 Dated: June 21, 2024

ENTORNO LAW, LLP

21 By: 
22 Noam Glick

23
24 Craig M. Nicholas
25 Jake W. Schulte
26 Janani Natarajan

27 Attorneys for Plaintiff
28 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.