

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

12/15/2025
Clerk of the Court
BY: JEFFREY FLORES
Deputy Clerk

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

11 Case No.: CGC-25-625547

12 GABRIEL ESPINOZA,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 BRISTOL FARMS,

16 Defendant.

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

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

19 **BACKGROUND OF THE CASE**

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

26 2. This first amended complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the
27 public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to be informed
28 of the health hazards caused by exposure to lead, a toxic chemical found in Natural Catch yellow
fin tuna slices in extra virgin olive oil sold and/or distributed by defendant Natural Catch Seafoods,
LLC (“Natural Catch Seafoods” or “Defendant”) in California.

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

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

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

19 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant distributes and/or offers for sale in California,
20 without a requisite exposure warning, Natural Catch yellow fin tuna slices in extra virgin olive oil
21 (the “Product”) that expose persons to lead when used for their intended purpose.

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

26 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65
27 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
28

1 with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business in the State
2 of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market. Such
3 purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent and
4 permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

5 STATUTORY BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

3 a. A warning that appears on a product's label or other labeling.

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

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

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

14 20. Proposition 65 provides that any "person who violates or threatens to violate" the
15 statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase
16 "threaten to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial
17 probability that a violation will occur." (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil
18 penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the Act (H&S Code § 25249.7) for up to
19 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00).

20 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

21 21. On October 1, 1992, the state of California listed lead as a chemical known to cause
22 cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time. Cal. Code
23 Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b). On February 27,
24 1987, the State of California listed lead as a chemical known to cause birth defects or other
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 reproductive harm. In summary, lead was listed under Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the
2 State to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

3 22. The exposures that are the subject of the Notices result from the purchase,
4 acquisition, and recommended use of the Product. The primary route of exposure to lead is through
5 ingestion. When foods contaminated with lead are consumed, ingestion of lead will occur which
6 will increase blood lead levels. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with the Products
7 regarding the health hazards of exposure.

8 23. Defendant has processed, marketed, distributed, offered to sell and/or sold the
9 Products in California since at least January 30, 2025 with respect to the Natural Catch yellow fin
10 tuna slices in extra virgin olive oil. The Products continue to be distributed and sold in California
11 without the requisite warning information.

12 24. At all times relevant to this action, Defendant has knowingly and intentionally
13 exposed users and/or consumers of the Products to lead without first giving a clear and reasonable
14 exposure warning to such individuals.

15 25. As a proximate result of acts by Defendant, as a person in the course of doing
16 business within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of
17 California, including in San Francisco County, have been exposed to lead without a clear and
18 reasonable warning on the Products. The individuals subject to the violative exposures include
19 normal and foreseeable users and consumers that consume the Products, as well as all others
20 exposed to the Products.

21 SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

22 26. Plaintiff purchased the Products from Bristol Farms. At the time of purchase,
23 Defendant did not provide a Proposition 65 exposure warning for lead or any other Proposition 65
24 listed chemical in a manner consistent with H&S Code § 25603.1 as described *supra*.

25 27. The Products were sent to a testing laboratory to determine if, and what amount of,
26 lead a consumer would be exposed to per serving size.

27 28. The laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Results of these tests determined
28 the Products expose users to lead (the “Chemical Test Report”).

1 29. Plaintiff provided the Chemical Test Report and Product to an analytical chemist
2 to determine if, based on the findings of the Chemical Test Report and the reasonable and
3 foreseeable consumption of the Products, exposure to lead will occur at levels that require
4 Proposition 65 warnings under the Clear and Reasonable Warnings section 25601 of Title 27 of
5 the California Code of Regulations.

6 30. On January 30, 2025, Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure
7 assessment report which concluded that persons in California who consume the Natural Catch
8 yellow fin tuna slices in extra virgin olive oil will be exposed to levels of lead that require a
9 Proposition 65 exposure warning.

10 31. On January 30, 2025, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety
11 Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendant concerning the exposure of California citizens to lead
12 contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendant and to
13 the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District attorneys and City
14 Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein
15 violations allegedly occurred.

16 32. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including
17 the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff's counsel had consulted with at
18 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding lead
19 exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private
20 action.

21 33. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's best information and belief, none of
22 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a
23 cause of action against Defendant under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are
24 the subject of the Notice.

25 34. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the
26 Notice to Defendant, as required by law.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff against Defendant for the Violation of Proposition 65)

35. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 34 of this First Amended Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

36. Defendant has, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer of the Products.

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

38. The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

39. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and since at least January 30, 2025 with respect to the Natural Catch yellow fin tuna slices in extra virgin olive oil, continuing until the present, that Defendant has continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to lead without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

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

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

42. Defendant has knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products exposes individuals to lead, and Defendant intends that exposures to lead will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering of the Product to consumers in California

43. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this First Amended Complaint.

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

3 45. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically
4 authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant.

5 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant and requests the following
7 relief:

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

11 B. That the court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant mandating
12 Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Products;

13 C. That the court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit, in the
14 amount of \$50,000.00.

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

16 Dated: December 15, 2025

BRODSKY SMITH

17 By: 
18 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)
19 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)
20 9465 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 300
21 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
22 Telephone: (877) 534-2590
23 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

Attorneys for Plaintiff