

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda

**01/10/2025 at 04:43:39 PM**

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 X TRAINING INC., a Florida corporation; and  
24 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

25 Defendants.

Case No.: **25CV106492**

**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, a known carcinogen and  
5 reproductive/developmental toxin. Defendants expose consumers to lead by manufacturing, importing,  
6 selling, and/or distributing dumbbells including, but not limited to, Rubber Hex Dumbbells- 5lb Pair  
7 (“Products”). Defendants know and intend 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.       Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about  
17 potential exposure to lead in connection with Defendants’ manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of  
18 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

19           5.       Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers  
20 in California before exposing them to lead in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff  
21 also seeks civil penalties against Defendants 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. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing lead  
9 in 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, Defendants 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 HTM through incidental ingestion via the hand-to-  
16 mouth pathway. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendant placing Products  
17 into the stream of commerce. As such, Defendants intend that consumers will use Products, exposing  
18 them to lead.

19 18. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained lead and exposed  
20 individuals to lead in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants 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 Defendants.

23 19. Defendants' 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 Defendants 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.

///

