

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

01/14/2025 at 10:32:47 AM

By: Damaree Franklin,
Deputy Clerk

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 Gianna E. Tirrell (SBN 358788)

7 225 Broadway, Suite 1900
8 San Diego, California 92101
9 Tel: (619) 629-0527
10 Email: noam@entornolaw.com
11 Email: craig@entornolaw.com
12 Email: jake@entornolaw.com
13 Email: janani@entornolaw.com
14 Email: gianna@entornolaw.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff
16 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.

17 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

18 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

19 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,
20 INC.,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 GOYA FOODS OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a
24 California corporation; NORTH PARK
25 PRODUCE, INC., a California corporation; and
26 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

27 Defendants.

Case No.: **25CV106776**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

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 Defendants’ failure to inform the People of exposure to lead and cadmium, known
5 carcinogens and reproductive/developmental toxins. Defendants expose consumers to lead and
6 cadmium by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing frozen spinach including, but not
7 limited to, Goya - Frozen Chopped Spinach (“Products”). Defendants know and intend that customers
8 will ingest Products containing lead and cadmium.

9 2. Under California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California
10 Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of doing
11 business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to
12 cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
13 individual. . . .” (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6.)

14 3. California identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as
15 October 1, 1992, and as a chemical known to cause developmental/reproductive toxicity on February
16 27, 1987.

17 4. California identified and listed cadmium as a chemical known to cause developmental/
18 reproductive toxicity as early as May 1, 1997.

19 5. Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about
20 potential exposure to lead and cadmium in connection with Defendants’ manufacture, import, sale, or
21 distribution of Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

22 6. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers
23 in California before exposing them to lead and cadmium in Products. (Health & Safety Code, §
24 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for violations of Proposition 65 along
25 with attorney’s fees and costs. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(b).)

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

II.
PARTIES

1
2 7. Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. (“Plaintiff”) is a
3 corporation in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through
4 the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this action in the public
5 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

6 8. Defendant GOYA FOODS OF CALIFORNIA, INC. ("Goya") is a corporation
7 organized and existing under the laws of California. Goya is registered to do business in California, and
8 does business in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section
9 25249.11. Goya manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda
10 County.

11 9. Defendant NORTH PARK PRODUCE, INC. ("NPP") is a corporation organized and
12 existing under the laws of California. NPP is registered to do business in California, and does business
13 in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. NPP
14 manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

15 10. Plaintiff does not know the true names and/or capacities, whether individual, partners,
16 or corporate, of the Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason sues
17 said Defendants under fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. § 474. Plaintiff will seek leave to
18 amend this Complaint when the true names and capacities of these Defendants have been ascertained.
19 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that these Defendants are responsible in whole or
20 in part for the remedies and penalties sought herein.

21 11. At all times mentioned, Defendants were the agents, alter egos, servants, joint venturers,
22 joint employers, or employees for each other. Defendants acted with the consent of the other Co-
23 Defendants and acted within the course, purpose, and scope of their agency, service, or employment.
24 All conduct was ratified by Defendants, and each of them.

25 *[Rest of page left intentionally blank.]*
26
27
28

1 **III.**
2 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

3 12. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court original
4 jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health and Safety Code
5 statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. As such, this Court
6 has jurisdiction.

7 13. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil
8 Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this
9 County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

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

13 **IV.**
14 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
16 **(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)**

17 15. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

18 16. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that
19 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

20 17. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing lead
21 and cadmium in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and
22 believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to
23 occur into the future.

24 18. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to
25 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed
26 to lead and cadmium through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

27 ///

28 ///

///

1 19. Products expose individuals to lead and cadmium through direct ingestion. This
2 exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of
3 commerce. As such, Defendants intend that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to lead and
4 cadmium.

5 20. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained lead and cadmium
6 and exposed individuals to lead and cadmium in the ways provided above. The Notice informed
7 Defendants of the presence of lead and cadmium in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning
8 lead and cadmium and related chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to
9 Defendants.

10 21. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

11 22. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a
12 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff
13 provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit.
14 The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in
15 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to lead and cadmium contained in the
16 Products.

17 23. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to
18 commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.

19 24. Individuals exposed to lead and cadmium contained in Products through direct ingestion
20 resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer
21 irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

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

25 *[Rest of page left intentionally blank.]*
26
27
28

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

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

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

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

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

10
11 Respectfully submitted:

12 Dated: January 14, 2025

ENTORNO LAW, LLP

13
14 By: 
Noam Glick

15
16 Craig M. Nicholas
17 Jake W. Schulte
18 Janani Natarajan
19 Gianna Tirrell

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
21 Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28