1	ENTORNO LAW, LLP	ELECTRONICALLY FILED	
2	Noam Glick (SBN 251582) Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)		
3	Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777)	Superior Court of California, Countγ of Alameda	
	Janani Natarajan (SBN 346770)	12/04/2024 at 10:20:24 AM	
4	225 Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, California 92101	By: Abdul Kargbo,	
5	Tel: (619) 629-0527	Deputy Clerk	
6	Email: noam@entornolaw.com Email: craig@entornolaw.com		
7	Email: jake@entornolaw.com		
8	Email: janani@entornolaw.com		
	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
9	Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.		
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		
12	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,	Case No.: 240V102196	
13	INC., Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	
14	v.		
15	PESCIENCE LLC, a Florida limited liability	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)	
16	company; PERFORMANCE ENHANCING SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, a Delaware limited		
17	liability company; AMAZON.COM, INC., a		
	Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,		
18	Defendants.		
19	Derendunts.		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
20			

I.
INTRODUCTION

1

24

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 protein pancake and waffle mix products including, but not limited to,
 PESience Buttermilk Protein Pancake & Waffle Mix ("Products"). Defendants know and intend that
 customers will ingest Products containing lead.

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.)

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.

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

5. 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).)

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.

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

5

6

7

8

9

25

26

27

28

8. Defendant PERFORMANCE ENHANCING SUPPLEMENTS, LLC ("PES") is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. PES 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. PES manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

9. Defendant AMAZON.COM, INC. ("Amazon") is a corporation organized and existing
 under the laws of Delaware . Amazon 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. Amazon
 manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

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

20 11. At all times mentioned, Defendants were the agents, alter egos, servants, joint venturers,
21 joint employers, or employees for each other. Defendants acted with the consent of the other Co22 Defendants and acted within the course, purpose, and scope of their agency, service, or employment.
23 All conduct was ratified by Defendants, and each of them.

24 [Rest of page is left intentionally blank.]

1	III. <u>VENUE AND JURISDICTION</u>		
2	12. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court original		
3	jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health and Safety Code		
4	statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. As such, this Court		
5	has jurisdiction.		
6	13. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil		
7	Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this		
8	County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.		
9	14. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise		
10	purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would		
11	be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.		
12	IV.		
13	CAUSES OF ACTION		
14	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION		
15	(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)		
16	 Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above. 		
17	16. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that		
18	cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.		
19	17. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing lead		
20	in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes such		
21	violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined <i>infra</i>) and will continue to occur into the		
22	future.		
22	18. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to		
23 24	provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed		
	to lead through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.		
25 26	19. Products expose individuals to lead through direct ingestion. This exposure is a natural		
26 27	and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such,		
27 28	Defendants intend that consumers will ingest Products, exposing them to lead.		
28	2		

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

5

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

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

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

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

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

[Rest of page intentionally left blank.]

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: December 4, 2024	ENTORNO LAW, LLP	
13		No. State	
14	By	: Noam Slick	
15			
16		Craig M. Nicholas	
17		Jake W. Schulte Janani Natarajan	
18		Attorneys for Plaintiff	
19		Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			