1	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 CHANLER, LLC	
2	72 Huckleberry Hill Road New Canaan, CT 06840	ELECTRONICALLY
3 4	Telephone: (475) 277-2932 Facsimile: (203) 702-5011 Email: Clifford@ChanlerLLC.com	FILED Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
5	Steven Y. Chen, State Bar No. 243200	01/31/2025 Clerk of the Court BY: SAHAR ENAYATI
6	STEVEN Y. CHEN, APLC 2650 River Avenue, Unit A Rosemead, CA 91770	Deputy Clerk
7	Telephone: (626) 782-5017 Facsimile: (626) 307-1657	
8	Email: Schen@Schenlaw.com	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff JAY EPPS	
11		
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
13	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
14	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
15		
16	JAY EPPS,	Case No. CGC-24-620274
17	Plaintiff,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
18	V.	
19	MICHAELS STORES, INC.; THE MICHAELS COMPANIES, INC.,	REDIEF
20	Defendant.	(Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq.)
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	I .	

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Jay Epps in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to lead, a toxic chemical found in oil-based grounds and artist paste paints sold by defendant that are purchased by and/or shipped to citizens in California (the "Products").
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendant Michaels Stores, Inc. and The Michaels Companies, Inc. (collectively "MICHAELS" or Defendant) continuing failure to warn consumers and businesses not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code §§6300 *et seq.* about the risks of exposure to lead present in the Products that are manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale for used by citizens in the State of California. Individuals, consumers and businesses not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code §§6300 *et seq.* who purchase, and/or use or handle the Products are referred to hereinafter as "consumers."
- 3. Lead is found at elevated levels in oil-based grounds and artist paste paints that defendant imports, distributes, retails or otherwise markets or offers for sale to consumers or shipped throughout California. Defendant has knowledge of the Products' lead content. Most, if not all, of the violative sales of the Products were and continue to be offered for purchase and/or transacted through MICHAELS.com.
- 4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health & Safety Code §§25249.6 *et seq.* (Proposition 65), "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual..." Health & Safety Code §25249.6.
- 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on February 27, 1987, California identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead became

subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of the act one year later on February 27, 1988. 27 Cal. Code Regs. §27001(b); Health & Safety Code §25249.8 and §25249.10(b).

6. Defendant imports, distributes, facilitates and/or otherwise offers for sale the Products without the mandated health hazard warning in California. Examples of the Products are shown on the table below:

Product Exemplars	UPC Number
Williamsburg Artist Oil Colors Lead Oil Ground, #6009128-6, 473 ml	7 38797 96440 2
MH Michael Harding Handmade Artists Oil Colors Genuine Naples Yellow Dark, No.606 Series 6, PY41, 40ml	5 060154 042238
MH Michael Harding Handmade Artists Oil Colors Cremnitz White, No.308 Series 3, PW1, 40ml	5 060154 043204
Old Holland Classic Oil Colours Flake White No.1, 125ml	

- 7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the reproductive hazards associated with exposures to lead in conjunction with its sale of the Products are violations of Proposition 65 which subject defendant to be enjoined of such conduct as well as civil penalties assessed for each violation. Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a) and (b)(1).
- 8. For defendant's violations and threatened (i.e., continuing) violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendant to provide purchasers of the Products with the required warning regarding specific health hazards associated with exposures to lead prior to the sale. Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).
- 9. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendant for its violations of Proposition 65, some of which are ongoing for the relevant period specified the two 60-Day Notice of Violation reference below in paragraph 20 and 21.

PARTIES

10. Plaintiff Jay Epps is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposures

from consumer products, and he brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d).

- MICHAELS is person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health
 Safety Code §§25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 12. MICHAELS imports, distributes, sells, facilitates, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it imports, distributes, facilitates for sale, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. MICHAELS has offered for sale Products supplied to it by entities that are not subject to enforcement under Proposition 65 because: (i) they have fewer than ten employees during all relevant periods; and/or (ii) do not have an agent for process of service in California. Further, in some instances, the Products may be shipped to California consumers, either directly (or indirectly through a MICHAELS fulfilment center in the United States) by exporters located in foreign countries without offices in the United States, after purchase at MICHAELS.com.
 - 13. MICHAELS is often referred to hereinafter as the "defendant."

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 14. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against defendant, one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or defendant conducted, and continue to conduct business in San Francisco.
- 15. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.
- 16. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over defendant based on plaintiff's information and good faith belief that defendant is a person, firm, corporation has a principal office or association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in

the State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market. defendant's purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction (specific, limited or both) by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65)

- 17. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 16, inclusive.
- 18. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm."
- 19. Proposition 65 states, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual..."

 Health & Safety Code §25249.6.
- 20. On September 23, 2024, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notice of Violation (the September Notice), together with the requisite certificates of merit, on MICHAELS, the California Attorney General's Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of defendant's sales of oil-based grounds, consumers in California were and likely continue to be exposed to lead from the reasonably foreseeable use of oil-based grounds, without them first receiving a "clear and reasonable warning" at the time of purchase of the oil-based grounds on MICHAELS.com regarding the reproductive and developmental harms associated with such exposures, as required by Proposition 65.
- 21. On November 22, 2024, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notice of Violation (the November Notice), together with the requisite certificates of merit, on MICHAELS, the California Attorney General's Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of defendant's sales of artist paste paints, consumers in California were and likely continue to be exposed to lead from the reasonably foreseeable use of the artist paste paints, without them first

receiving a "clear and reasonable warning" at the time of purchase of the artist paste paints on MICHAELS.com regarding the reproductive and developmental harms associated with such exposures, as required by Proposition 65. The September Notice and the November Notice shall be referred to collectively as the "Notices."

- 22. As allege in the Notices, during the relevant period, defendant imported, distributed, facilitated for sale, sold, and/or offered the Products for sale or use on its website in violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.6, and defendant's violations before (and likely beyond) have done so continued beyond its receipt of plaintiff's Notices. As such, defendant's violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined will continue.
- 23. After receiving each of plaintiff's Notices, no public enforcement agency has commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against defendant under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the subject of plaintiff's sixty-day letters.
- 24. The Products that defendant imports, distributes, or offers for sale throughout the State of California cause exposures to lead as a result of the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products. Such exposures caused by defendant and endured by consumers in California who purchase, use or handle the Products are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet defendant does not provide compliant warnings for the reproductive toxicity of lead on its website in a clear and conspicuous manner, if at all.
 - 25. Defendant has knowledge that the Products contain lead.
- 26. Lead is present in or on the Products in such a way as to expose consumers through dermal contact, ingestion and/or inhalation during reasonably foreseeable use.
- 27. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products has caused, and continues to cause, consumer product exposures to lead as defined by 27 California Code of Regulations §25600.1(e) and other types of exposures set forth in the Notices.
- 28. Defendant knows that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products exposes individuals to lead through dermal contact, ingestion and/or inhalation.

- 29. Defendant intends that exposures to lead from the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the Products for sale or use to consumers and others in California.
- 30. Defendant failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" on its website to those consumers and other citizens in California who have been, or who will be, exposed to lead through dermal contact, ingestion and/or inhalation resulting from their use of the Products.
- 31. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted directly by California voters, consumers exposed to lead as a result of their use of the Products that defendant sold without a "clear and reasonable" health hazard warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.
- 32. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-described acts, defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation (e.g., each unit sale).
- 33. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against defendant.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant as follows:

- 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against defendant, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation that occurred during the period relevant to the claims set forth in the September Notice and the November Notice;
- 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin defendant from manufacturing, importing, distributing, or offering the Products for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding the harms associated with exposures to lead unless they are reformulated to eliminate the toxicant;