

1 Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534  
2 CHANLER, LLC  
3 72 Huckleberry Hill Road  
4 New Canaan, CT 06840  
5 Telephone: (203) 722-4514  
6 Facsimile: (203) 702-5011  
7 Email: Clifford@ChanlerLLC.com

8 Steven Y. Chen, State Bar No. 243200  
9 STEVEN Y. CHEN, APLC  
10 2650 River Avenue, Unit A  
11 Rosemead, CA 91770  
12 Telephone: (626) 782-5017  
13 Facsimile: (626) 307-1657  
14 Email: Schen@Schenlaw.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
16 JAY EPPS

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

**04/08/2025**  
**Clerk of the Court**  
BY: SAHAR ENAYATI  
Deputy Clerk

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**CGC-25-624138**

UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

JAY EPPS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WALMART INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

1 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Jay Epps in the public  
3 interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the  
4 health hazards caused by exposures to carcinogens, specifically *p*-dichlorobenzene (*p*-DCB) found  
5 in moth balls, limited to those manufactured by Willert Home Products and/or branded under its  
6 Enoz name (the Products). The Products are repackaged, produced, stored, distributed, shipped  
7 and/or sold online (sold) to California citizens (or to a non-California citizen and shipped to an  
8 address in California) by defendant.

9 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendant Walmart Inc., (WALMART  
10 or defendant) continuing failure to warn consumers and businesses not covered by California's  
11 Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code §§6300 *et seq.* about the risks of exposure to *p*-DCB  
12 present in the Products that are distributed, and/or offered for sale for used by citizens in the State  
13 of California. Individuals, consumers and businesses not covered by California's Occupational  
14 Safety Health Act, Labor Code §§6300 *et seq.* who purchase, and/or use or handle the Products are  
15 referred to hereinafter as "consumers."

16 3. Defendant has actual knowledge of the *p*-DCB contents of the Products which were  
17 and do continue to be offered for purchase and/or transacted through walmart.com.

18 4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at  
19 Health & Safety Code §§25249.6 *et seq.* (Proposition 65), "[n]o person in the course of doing  
20 business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state  
21 to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
22 individual..." Health & Safety Code §25249.6.

23 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on January 1, 1989, California identified and listed *p*-  
24 DCB as a chemical known to cause cancer. *P*-DCB became subject to the "clear and reasonable  
25 warning" requirements of the act twelve months later. 27 Cal. Code Regs. §27001(b); Health &  
26 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. An example of a Product is shown on the table below:

<i>Product Exemplar</i>	<i>ID</i>
Enoz Para Moth Balls, 4 oz. (Pack of 4)	5167223463

7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the risk of cancer associated with exposures to *p*-DCB in conjunction with its sale of the Products are violations of Proposition 65 which subjects defendant to be enjoined of such further conduct as well as assessed civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a) and (b)(1).

8. For defendant's violations and threatened 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 *p*-DCB prior to the sale. Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).

9. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil fines against defendant for its violations of Proposition 65 dating back as far as April 8, 2021.

#### **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).

11. WALMART is person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §§25249.6 and 25249.11.

12. WALMART 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. One or more of the Products offered for sale by WALMART were supplied to it by entities that are not

1 subject to enforcement under Proposition 65 because: (i) they have fewer than ten employees  
2 during all relevant periods; and/or (ii) do not have an agent for process of service in California.

### 3 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

4 13. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco pursuant to  
5 Code of Civil Procedure §§393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent  
6 jurisdiction, because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against defendant, one or more instances of  
7 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or defendant conducted, and  
8 continue to conduct business in San Francisco.

9 14. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to  
10 California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original  
11 jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under  
12 which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

13 15. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over defendant based on plaintiff’s  
14 information and good faith belief that defendant is a person, firm, corporation has a principal  
15 office or association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in  
16 the State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.  
17 defendant’s purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction (specific, limited or  
18 both) by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

### 19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### 20 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

21 16. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
22 Paragraphs 1 through 15, inclusive.

23 17. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic  
24 Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right “[t]o be informed  
25 about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm.”

26 18. Proposition 65 states, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly  
27 and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or  
28

1 reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...”  
2 Health & Safety Code §25249.6.

3 19. On January 27, 2025, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notice of Violation dated January  
4 24, 2025 (Notice), together with the requisite certificates of merit, on WALMART, the California  
5 Attorney General’s Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result  
6 of defendant’s sales of Enoz-branded moth balls, consumers in California were and likely continue  
7 to be exposed to *p*-DCB from the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products, without them first  
8 receiving a “clear and reasonable warning” at the time of purchase of the moth balls on  
9 walmart.com regarding the risk of cancer associated with such exposures, as required by  
10 Proposition 65.

11 20. Defendant imported, distributed, facilitated for sale, sold, and/or offered the  
12 Products for sale or use on its website in violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.6, as far back  
13 as May 1, 2021. Defendant’s violations likely have continued beyond its receipt of the Notice. As  
14 such, defendant’s violations are allegedly ongoing and, unless enjoined, will continue to occur.

15 21. After receiving the Notice, no public enforcement agency has commenced and  
16 diligently prosecuted a cause of action against defendant under Proposition 65 to enforce the  
17 alleged violations that are the subject of plaintiff’s sixty-day letter.

18 22. The Products that defendant imports, distributes, or offers for sale throughout the  
19 State of California cause exposures to *p*-DCB as a result of the reasonably foreseeable use of the  
20 Products. Such exposures caused by defendant and endured by consumers in California who  
21 purchase, use or handle the Products are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable” warning  
22 requirements of Proposition 65, yet defendant does not provide compliant warnings for the risk of  
23 cancer from *p*-DCB on its website in a clear and conspicuous manner, if at all.

24 23. Defendant has actual knowledge that the Products contain *p*-DCB

25 24. *P*-DCB is present in or on the Products in such a way as to expose consumers  
26 through dermal contact, ingestion and/or inhalation during reasonably foreseeable use.

25. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products has caused, and continues to cause, consumer product exposures to *p*-DCB as defined by 27 California Code of Regulations §25600.1(e) and other types of exposures set forth in the Notice.

26. Defendant knows that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products exposes individuals to *p*-DCB through dermal contact, ingestion and/or inhalation.

27. Defendant intends that exposures to *p*-DCB 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.

28. 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 *p*-DCB through dermal contact, ingestion and/or inhalation resulting from their use of the Products.

29. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted directly by California voters, consumers exposed to *p*-DCB 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.

30. 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).

31. 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 since February 25, 2021;

1           2.       That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a), preliminarily and  
2 permanently enjoin defendant from importing, distributing, or offering the Products for sale or use  
3 in California without first providing a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms  
4 associated with exposures to *p*-DCB unless they are reformulated to eliminate the toxicant;

5           3.       That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a), mandate defendant  
6 to contact each California online purchaser of the Products that were sold in violation of Health &  
7 Safety Code §25249.6 and refund them of the monies paid to WALMART for each such  
8 transaction;

9           4.       That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and

10          5.       That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

11  
12 Dated: April 8, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

CHANLER, LLC

13  
14   
15 By: \_\_\_\_\_

16 Clifford A. Chanler

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
18 JAY EPPS  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28