1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ENTORNO LAW, LLP Noam Glick (SBN 251582) Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444) Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777) Janani Natarajan (SBN 346770) 225 Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, California 92101 Tel: (619) 629-0527 Email: noam@entornolaw.com Email: craig@entornolaw.com Email: jake@entornolaw.com Email: jake@entornolaw.com	<b>ELECTRONICALLY FILED</b> Superior Court of California, County of Alameda <b>11/07/2024 at 09:15:12 AM</b> By: Abdul Kargbo, Deputy Clerk			
9 10	Environmental Health Advocates, Inc. SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
11	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA				
12 13	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC.,	Case No.: 24CV098647			
13	Plaintiff, v.	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF			
15	GREENS PLUS, LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 100,	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)			
16	inclusive,				
17	Defendants.				
18 19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

I.
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Environmental Health Advocates,
 Inc. ("Plaintiff") 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 lead, a known carcinogen and
 reproductive/developmental toxin. Defendants expose consumers to lead by manufacturing, importing,
 selling, and/or distributing dietary supplements including, but not limited to, Greens Organics Superfood
 ("Products"). 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.)

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

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

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

23

1

## II. PARTIES

6. Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. ("Plaintiff") is a
corporation 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 and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

28 ///

7. Defendant GREENS PLUS, LLC ("GP") is a limited liability company organized and
 existing under the laws of California. GP 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. GP
 manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

8. 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 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. § 474. 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.

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. <u>VENUE AND JURISDICTION</u>

10. 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.

11. 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. Defendant conducted and continues to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

12. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

1	IV. <u>CAUSES OF ACTION</u>			
2	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION			
3		(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)		
4	13.	Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.		
5	14.	Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that		
6	cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.			
7	15.	Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing lead		
8	in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes such			
9	violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined <i>infra</i> ) and will continue to occur into the			
10	future.			
11	16.	In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to		
12	provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed			
13	to lead through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.			
14	17.	Products expose individuals to lead through direct ingestion. This exposure is a natural		
15	and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such,			
16	Defendants intend that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to lead.			
17	18.	Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained lead and exposed		
18	individuals to le	ead in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of		
19	lead in the Prod	ducts. Likewise, media coverage concerning lead and related chemicals in consumer		
20	products provide	ed constructive notice to Defendants.		
21	19.	Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.		
22	20.	More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a		
23	60-Day Notice of	of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff		
24	provided the Not	tice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.		
25	The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in			
26	California of the health hazards associated with exposures to lead contained in the Products.			
27	21.	The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to		
28	commence and o	diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.		

1	22. Individuals exposed to lead contained in Products through direct ingestion resulting			
2	from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer irreparable harm.			
3	There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.			
4	23.	Defendants are liable for a maximu	m civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation	
5	of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also			
6	appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).			
7	PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
8	Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:			
9	1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation. Plaintiff alleges that			
10	damages total a minimum of \$1,000,000;			
11	2.	A preliminary and permanent inj	junction against Defendants from manufacturing,	
12	importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear and reasonable			
13	warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;			
14	3.	Reasonable attorney's fees and cost	ts of suit; and	
15	4.	4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.		
16				
17	Respectfully	submitted:		
18	Dated: Nover	nber 7, 2024	ENTORNO LAW, LLP	
19			Noon Slich	
20		By:	Noam Glick	
21			Craig M. Nicholas	
22			Jake W. Schulte	
23			Janani Natarajan	
24			Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.	
25				
26				
27				
28				