

1 Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)
2 Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)
3 BRODSKY SMITH
4 9465 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 300
5 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
6 Telephone: (877) 534-2590
7 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

ELECTRONICALLY
FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

01/20/2026
Clerk of the Court
BY: MARIVIC VIRAY
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

9 GABRIEL ESPINOZA,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 WILD OATS MARKETS, INC.,
13 SPROUTS FARMERS MARKET, INC.,

14 Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

**(Violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et
seq.)**

CGC-26-632956

15 Plaintiff Gabriel Espinoza (“Plaintiff”), by and through his attorneys, alleges the following
16 cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

17 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to
18 enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at
19 the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq (“Proposition 65”), which reads, in relevant part,
20 “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
21 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first
22 giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...”. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

23 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest
24 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to be informed of the health
25 hazards caused by exposure to lead, a toxic chemical found in *Sprouts Farmers Market*® mini
26 blueberry cookies manufactured, sold, and/or distributed by defendant Wild Oats Markets, Inc.
27
28

1 and/or defendant Sprouts Farmers Market, Inc. (collectively, “Defendants” and each a
2 “Defendant”) in California.

3 3. Lead is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and
4 birth defects or other reproductive harm. On October 1, 1992, the state of California listed lead as
5 a chemical known to cause cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations
6 since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &
7 25249.10(b). On February 27, 1987, the State of California listed lead as a chemical known to
8 cause birth defects or other reproductive harm.

9 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate
10 within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations. Included in
11 such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing a Proposition
12 65-listed chemical that will create an exposure above safe harbor levels with a “clear and
13 reasonable” warning before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing any person to any such listed
14 chemical.

15 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation
16 for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00) to be
17 imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code
18 § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the
19 actions of a defendant which “violate or threaten to violate” the statute. Health & Safety Code §
20 25249.7.

21 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants distribute and/or offer for sale in California,
22 without a requisite exposure warning, *Sprouts Farmers Market*® mini blueberry cookies (the
23 “Products”) that expose persons to lead when used for their intended purpose.

24 7. Defendants’ failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the
25 health hazards associated with exposure to lead in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution of
26 the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendants to the enjoinder and civil
27 penalties described herein.

1 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

2 14. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco because one or more of the
3 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur in this county and/or because
4 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with
5 respect to the Products.

6 15. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution
7 Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those
8 given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the enforcement
9 of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has
10 jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

11 16. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because each Defendant is either a
12 citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is
13 registered with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business
14 in the State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market.
15 Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent
16 and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

17 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

18 17. The people of the State of California declared in Proposition 65 their right “[t]o be
19 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive
20 harm.” (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65.)

21 18. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a
22 “clear and reasonable warning” before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California
23 as causing cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. H&S Code § 25249.6 states, in
24 pertinent part:

25 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
26 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without
27 first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...
28

1 19. In this case, exposures are caused by consumer products. A “Consumer Product” is
2 defined as “any article, or component part thereof, including food, that is produced, distributed, or
3 sold for the personal use, consumption or enjoyment of a consumer.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, §
4 25600.1, subd. (d).) Food includes “dietary supplements” as defined in California Code of
5 Regulations, title 17, section 10200. (*Id.* at subd. (g).) An exposure to a chemical in a Consumer
6 Product is one “which results from a person’s acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other
7 reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a
8 consumer service.” (27 CCR § 25602, para (b).) H&S Code § 25603(c) states that “a person in the
9 course of doing business ... shall provide a warning to any person to whom the product is sold or
10 transferred unless the product is packaged or labeled with a clear and reasonable warning.”

11 20. Pursuant to H&S Code § 25603.1, the warning may be provided by using one or
12 more of the following methods individually or in combination:¹

13 a. A warning that appears on a product’s label or other labeling.

14 b. Identification of the product at the retail outlet in a manner which provides
15 a warning. Identification may be through shelf labeling, signs, menus, or a combination
16 thereof.

17 c. The warnings provided pursuant to subparagraphs (a) and (b) shall be
18 prominently placed upon a product’s labels or other labeling or displayed at the retail outlet
19 with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices
20 in the label, labeling or display as to render it likely to be read and understood by an
21 ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use.

22 d. A system of signs, public advertising identifying the system and toll-free
23 information services, or any other system that provides clear and reasonable warnings.

24
25
26
27 ¹ Alternatively, a person in the course of doing business may elect to comply with the warning
28 requirements set out in the amended version of 27 CCR 25601, *et.seq.* as amended on August 30,
2016, and operative on August 30, 2018.

1 normal and foreseeable users and consumers that use the Products, as well as all others exposed to
2 the Products.

3 **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

4 27. On December 11, 2024, Plaintiff purchased the Products from Sprouts Farmers
5 Market, Inc. At the time of purchase, Defendants did not provide a Proposition 65 exposure
6 warning for lead or any other Proposition 65 listed chemical in a manner consistent with H&S
7 Code § 25603.1 as described *supra*.

8 28. On December 27, 2024, the Products were sent to a testing laboratory to determine
9 if, and what amount of, lead a consumer would be exposed to per serving size.

10 29. On January 9, 2025, the laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Results of
11 this test determined the Product exposes consumers to lead (the “Chemical Test Report”).

12 30. Plaintiff provided the Chemical Test Report and Products to an analytical chemist
13 to determine if, based on the findings of the Chemical Test Report and the reasonable and
14 foreseeable use of the Products, exposure to lead will occur at levels that require Proposition 65
15 warnings under the Clear and Reasonable Warnings section 25601 of Title 27 of the California
16 Code of Regulations.

17 31. On January 20, 2025, Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure
18 assessment report which concluded that persons in California who consume the Products will be
19 exposed to levels of lead that require a Proposition 65 exposure warning.

20 32. On January 20, 2025, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety
21 Code § 25249.6 (the “Notice”) to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to
22 lead contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants
23 and to the California Attorney General’s office and the offices of the County District attorneys and
24 City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein
25 violations allegedly occurred.

26 33. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including
27 the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff’s counsel had consulted with at
28 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding lead

1 exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private
2 action.

3 34. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's best information and belief, none of
4 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a
5 cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which
6 are the subject of the Notice.

7 35. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the
8 Notice to Defendants, as required by law.

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(By Plaintiff against Defendants for the Violation of Proposition 65)**

11 36. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 35 of
12 this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

13 37. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer
14 of the Product.

15 38. Consumption of the Products will expose users to lead, a hazardous chemical found
16 on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

17 39. The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

18 40. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times
19 herein, and at least since January 20, 2025, continuing until the present, that Defendants have
20 continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to
21 lead without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

22 41. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,
23 acquisition, and recommended use of the Products. The primary route of exposure to lead is
24 through ingestion. When foods contaminated with lead are consumed, ingestion of lead will occur
25 which will increase blood lead levels. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with the
26 Products regarding the health hazards of exposure.

1 42. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will
2 continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users or
3 until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Products.

4 43. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
5 Products exposes individuals to lead, and Defendants intend that exposures to lead will occur by
6 its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering of the
7 Products to consumers in California

8 44. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this
9 Complaint.

10 45. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above
11 described acts, each Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per
12 violation.

13 46. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically
14 authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants.

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against each Defendant and requests the
3 following relief:

4 A. That the court assess civil penalties against each Defendant in the amount of \$2,500
5 per day for each violation for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per
6 violation of \$912,000.00) in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b);

7 B. That the court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants mandating
8 Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Products;

9 C. That the court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit, in the
10 amount of \$50,000.00.

11 D. That the court grant any further relief as may be just and proper.

12 Dated: January 19, 2026

BRODSKY SMITH

13 By:  _____

14 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)
15 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)
16 9465 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 300
17 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
18 Telephone: (877) 534-2590
19 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

Attorneys for Plaintiff