

**ENTORNO LAW, LLP**  
Noam Glick (SBN 251582)  
Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)  
Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777)  
Janani Natarajan (SBN 346770)  
Gianna E. Tirrell (SBN 358788)  
225 Broadway, Suite 1900  
San Diego, California 92101  
Tel: (619) 629-0527  
Email: [noam@entornolaw.com](mailto:noam@entornolaw.com)  
Email: [craig@entornolaw.com](mailto:craig@entornolaw.com)  
Email: [jake@entornolaw.com](mailto:jake@entornolaw.com)  
Email: [janani@entornolaw.com](mailto:janani@entornolaw.com)  
Email: [gianna@entornolaw.com](mailto:gianna@entornolaw.com)

**ELECTRONICALLY  
FILED**  
*Superior Court of California,  
County of San Francisco*

**11/12/2025  
Clerk of the Court  
BY: BENJAMIN YUST  
Deputy Clerk**

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

# IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,  
INC.,

CGC-25-631019

V.

Plaintiff,

Case No.:

## COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

REVLON CONSUMER PRODUCTS LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

## Defendants.

1

**I.**  
**INTRODUCTION**

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 diethanolamine (“DEA”), a  
5 known carcinogen and reproductive/developmental toxin. Defendants expose consumers to DEA by  
6 manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing hair dye including, but not limited to, Revlon  
7 ColorSilk Permanent Hair Color, Ultra Light Sun Blonde (“Products”). Defendants know and intend  
8 that customers will use Products containing DEA.

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 DEA as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as  
15 June 22, 2012.

16       4. Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about  
17 potential exposure to DEA 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 DEA 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).)

23

**II.**  
**PARTIES**

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       ///

7. Defendant REVLON CONSUMER PRODUCTS LLC ("Revlon") is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. Revlon is registered to do business in California, and does business in the County of San Francisco, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Revlon manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and San Francisco County.

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

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

**III.**  
**VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

22       11.     Venue is proper in San Francisco County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil  
23     Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this  
   County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

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

111

1

**IV.**  
**BACKGROUND FACTS**

2 13. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California  
3 Health and Safety Code, section 2529.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), "no person in the course of doing  
4 business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state of  
5 to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
6 individual..." (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6.)

7 14. Proposition 65 requires the State of California to maintain "a list of chemicals known to  
8 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity," which is to be "revised and republished in light of  
9 additional knowledge" on at least an annual basis. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.8(a).)

10 15. On June 22, 2012, the State of California formally identified and listed DEA as a  
11 chemical known to cause cancer. DEA is a common component of cosmetic and grooming products,  
12 and often functions as an emulsifier or foaming agent.

13 16. In 2012, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) also formally  
14 identified DEA as a Group 2B possible human carcinogen. (See IARC Working Group on the Evaluation  
15 of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, Some Chemicals Present in Industrial and Consumer Products, Food  
16 and Drinking-Water. Lyon (FR): International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2013, (IARC  
17 Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, No. 101.)  
18 DIETHANOLAMINE, available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK373177/> [last visited  
19 November 12, 2025].)

20 17. Animal studies have reported effects on various organ systems from long-term topical  
21 administration of DEA. For example, a study conducted by the National Toxicology Program  
22 (hereinafter, the "NTP study") showed that dermal exposure to DEA amplified the development of  
23 tumors in the liver and kidney tubules. (See National Toxicology Program, NTP Toxicology and  
24 Carcinogenesis Studies of Diethanolamine (CAS No. 111-42-2) in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1 Mice  
25 (Dermal Studies). Natl Toxicol Program Tech Rep Ser. 1999 Jul; 478:1-212. PMID: 12571685.,  
26 available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12571685/> [last visited November 12, 2025].)

27 18. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") has established  
28 specific safe harbor levels for many of the chemicals listed under Proposition 65. For cancer-causing

1 chemicals in particular, a safe harbor level is called a “No Significant Risk Level,” or “NSRL.” An  
2 NSRL is the daily intake level calculated to result in one excess case of cancer in an exposed human  
3 population of 100,000, assuming lifetime exposure at the level in question. (See OEHHA’s Proposition  
4 65 Process for Developing Safe Harbor Numbers (February 2001), available at  
5 <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/cmr/2001safeharborprocess.pdf> [last visited November 12,  
6 2025].) The State of California has not yet established an NSRL for DEA. However, research suggests  
7 that an NSRL of 5.6 micrograms/day of DEA is appropriate, where dermal absorption is the route of  
8 exposure. (See Wang B, Amacher DE, Whittaker MH. Derivation of a No-Significant-Risk-Level  
9 (NSRL) for diethanolamine (DEA). *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol.* 2014 Feb;68(1):76-84. doi:  
10 10.1016/j.yrtph.2013.11.009. Epub 2013 Nov 23. PMID: 24275050 [last visited November 12, 2025].)  
11 This NSRL is derived from the NTP study described above, using a benchmark dose modeling method  
12 based on the incidence of hepatocellular carcinomas in female mice, in accordance with the guidelines  
13 of the California Environmental Protection Agency.

14 19. In order to ensure that the injunctive relief sought herein confers a public benefit upon  
15 California consumers, EHA adopts the NSRL of 5.6 micrograms/day for DEA derived from the NTP  
16 study.

17 **V.  
CAUSES OF ACTION**

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)**

20 20. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

1           23. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to  
2 provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed  
3 to DEA through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

4           24. Products expose individuals to DEA through dermal absorption. This exposure is a  
5 natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As  
6 such, Defendants intend that consumers will use Products, exposing them to DEA.

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

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

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

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

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

22           30. 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 intentionally left blank.]*

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted:

Dated: November 12, 2025

## ENTORNO LAW, LLP

By: Noam Glick  
Noam Glick

Noam Glick

Jake W. Schulte  
Janani Natarajan  
Gianna E. Tirrell

Atorneys for Plaintiff  
Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.