

1 Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981)

2 reuben@yeroshalmi.com

3 **YERUSHALMI & YERUSHALMI***

4 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W

5 Beverly Hills, California 90212

6 Telephone: (310) 623-1926

7 Facsimile: (310) 623-1930

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff,

9 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
9/03/2025 1:34 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By C. Cervantes, Deputy Clerk

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

12 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.,
13 in the public interest,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 IGOURMET LLC dba IGOURMET.COM, a
17 Pennsylvania Limited Liability Company;
18 and DOES 1-20,

19 Defendants.

CASE NO. **25STCV25770**

COMPLAINT FOR PENALTY AND
INJUNCTION

Violation of Proposition 65, the Safe
Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement
Act of 1986 (*Health & Safety Code*, §
25249.5, *et seq.*)

ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL
CASE (exceeds \$35,000)

20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Plaintiff CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. alleges two causes of action
27 against defendants IGOURMET LLC dba IGOURMET.COM and DOES 1-20 as follows:
28

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. (“Plaintiff” or “CAG”) is an organization qualified to do business in the State of California. CAG is a person within the meaning of Health and Safety Code Section 25249.11, subdivision (a). CAG, acting as a private attorney general, brings this action in the public interest as defined under Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7, subdivision (d).
2. Defendant IGOURMET LLC dba IGOURMET.COM (“IGOURMET”) is a Pennsylvania Limited Liability Company doing business in the State of California at all relevant times herein.
3. Plaintiff is presently unaware of the true names and capacities of defendants DOES 1-20, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each fictitiously named defendant is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged and the damages caused thereby.
4. At all times mentioned herein, the term “Defendants” includes IGOURMET, and DOES 1-20.
5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants at all times mentioned herein have conducted business within the State of California.
6. Upon information and belief, at all times relevant to this action, each of the Defendants, including DOES 1-20, was an agent, servant, or employee of each of the other Defendants. In conducting the activities alleged in this Complaint, each of the Defendants was acting within the course and scope of this agency, service, or employment, and was acting with the consent, permission, and authorization of each of the other Defendants. All actions of each of the Defendants alleged in this Complaint were ratified and approved by every other Defendant or their officers or managing

agents. Alternatively, each of the Defendants aided, conspired with and/or facilitated the alleged wrongful conduct of each of the other Defendants.

7. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that at all relevant times, each of the Defendants was a person doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code Section 25249.11, subdivision (b), and that each of the Defendants had ten (10) or more employees at all relevant times.

JURISDICTION

8. The Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit 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. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7, which allows enforcement of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction.
9. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants named herein because Defendants either reside or are located in this State or are foreign corporations authorized to do business in California, are registered with the California Secretary of State, or who do sufficient business in California, have sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the markets within California through their manufacture, distribution, promotion, marketing, or sale of their products within California to render the exercise of jurisdiction by the California courts permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
10. Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles because one or more of the instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of Los Angeles and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of Los Angeles with respect to the consumer product that is the subject of this action.

BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARY FACTS

11. In 1986, California voters approved an initiative to address growing concerns about exposure to toxic chemicals and declared their right “[t]o be informed about exposures to

chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." Ballot Pamp., Proposed Law, Gen. Elec. (Nov. 4, 1986) at p. 3. The initiative, The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5, *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"), helps to protect California's drinking water sources from contamination, to allow consumers to make informed choices about the products they buy, and to enable persons to protect themselves from toxic chemicals as they see fit.

12. Proposition 65 requires the Governor of California to publish a list of chemicals known to the state to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.8. The list, which the Governor updates at least once a year, contains over 700 chemicals and chemical families. Proposition 65 imposes warning requirements and other controls that apply to Proposition 65-listed chemicals.

13. All businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate or sell products in California must comply with Proposition 65. Under Proposition 65, businesses are: (1) prohibited from knowingly discharging Proposition 65-listed chemicals into sources of drinking water (*Health & Safety Code* § 25249.5), and (2) required to provide "clear and reasonable" warnings before exposing a person, knowingly and intentionally, to a Proposition 65-listed chemical (*Health & Safety Code* § 25249.6).

14. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7. "Threaten to violate" means "to create a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur." *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.11(e). Defendants are also liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation, recoverable in a civil action. *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7(b).

15. Plaintiff identified certain practices of manufacturers and distributors of Vermicelli of exposing, knowingly and intentionally, persons in California to Cadmium and Cadmium Compounds of such products without first providing clear and reasonable warnings of

1 such to the exposed persons prior to the time of exposure. Plaintiff later discerned that
2 Defendants engaged in such practice.

3 16. On May 1, 1997, the Governor of California added Cadmium and Cadmium Compounds
4 (“Cadmium”) to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause developmental and
5 reproductive toxicity (*Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c)*). Cadmium is known to the
6 State to cause developmental, and male reproductive toxicity. Pursuant to Health and
7 Safety Code Sections 25249.9 and 25249.10, twenty (20) months after addition of
8 Cadmium to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause developmental and
9 reproductive toxicity, Cadmium became fully subject to Proposition 65 warning
10 requirements and discharge prohibitions.

11 **SATISFACTION OF PRIOR NOTICE**

12 17. Plaintiff served the following notices for alleged violations of Health and Safety Code
13 Section 25249.6, concerning consumer products exposures:

- 14 a. On or about February 27, 2025, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violations of
15 Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6, concerning consumer products
16 exposures subject to a private action to IGOURMET, and to the California
17 Attorney General, County District Attorneys, and City Attorneys for each city
18 containing a population of at least 750,000 people in whose jurisdictions the
19 violations allegedly occurred, concerning the Vermicelli.
- 20 b. On or about March 6, 2025, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violations of Health
21 and Safety Code Section 25249.6, concerning consumer products exposures
22 subject to a private action to IGOURMET, and to the California Attorney
23 General, County District Attorneys, and City Attorneys for each city containing
24 a population of at least 750,000 people in whose jurisdictions the violations
25 allegedly occurred, concerning the Vermicelli.
- 26
27
28

- 1 18. Before sending the notice of alleged violations, Plaintiff investigated the consumer
2 products involved, the likelihood that such products would cause users to suffer
3 significant exposures to Cadmium, and the corporate structure of each of the Defendants.
- 4 19. Plaintiff's notice of alleged violation included a Certificate of Merit executed by the
5 attorney for the noticing party, CAG. The Certificate of Merit stated that the attorney for
6 Plaintiff who executed the certificate had consulted with at least one person with relevant
7 and appropriate expertise who reviewed data regarding the exposures to Cadmium, the
8 subject Proposition 65-listed chemical of this action. Based on that information, the
9 attorney for Plaintiff who executed the Certificate of Merit believed there was a
10 reasonable and meritorious case for this private action. The attorney for Plaintiff
11 attached to the Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General the confidential
12 factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the Certificate of Merit.
- 13 20. Plaintiff's notice of alleged violations also included a Certificate of Service and a
14 document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water & Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986
15 (Proposition 65) A Summary." *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7(d).
- 16 21. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the dates that Plaintiff
17 gave notice of the alleged violations to IGOURMET, and the public prosecutors
18 referenced in Paragraph 17.
- 19 22. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that neither the Attorney General, nor
20 any applicable district attorney or city attorney has commenced and is diligently
21 prosecuting an action against the Defendants.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

23 **(By CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. and against IGOURMET, and**
24 **DOES 1-10 for Violations of Proposition 65, The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic**
25 **Enforcement Act of 1986 (*Health & Safety Code*, §§ 25249.5, *et seq.*))**

Pasta Products I

- 26 23. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 22 of this complaint
27 as though fully set forth herein.
28

1 24. Each of the Defendants is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a manufacturer,
2 distributor, promoter, or retailer of Vermicelli (“Vermicelli I”).

3 25. Vermicelli I contains Cadmium.

4 26. Defendants knew or should have known that Cadmium has been identified by the State
5 of California as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity and reproductive
6 toxicity and therefore was subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements. Defendants
7 were also informed of the presence of Cadmium in Vermicelli I within Plaintiff’s notice
8 of alleged violations further discussed above at Paragraph 17b.

9 27. Plaintiff’s allegations regarding Vermicelli I concerns “[c]onsumer products
10 exposure[s],” which “is an exposure that results from a person’s acquisition, purchase,
11 storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any
12 exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” *Cal. Code Regs.* tit. 27, §
13 25602(b). Vermicelli I are consumer products, and, as mentioned herein, exposures to
14 Cadmium took place as a result of such normal and foreseeable consumption and use.

15 28. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that between March 6, 2022 and the
16 present, each of the Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed California
17 consumers and users of Vermicelli I, which Defendants manufactured, distributed, or
18 sold as mentioned above, to Cadmium, without first providing any type of clear and
19 reasonable warning of such to the exposed persons before the time of exposure.
20 Defendants have distributed and sold Vermicelli I in California. Defendants know and
21 intend that California consumers will use and consume Vermicelli I, thereby exposing
22 them to Cadmium. Further, Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that
23 Defendants are selling Vermicelli I under a brand or trademark that is owned or licensed
24 by the Defendants or an entity affiliated thereto; have knowingly introduced Cadmium
25 into Vermicelli I or knowingly caused Cadmium to be created in Vermicelli I; have
26 covered, obscured or altered a warning label that has been affixed to Vermicelli I by the
27 manufacturer, producer, packager, importer, supplier or distributor of Vermicelli I; have
28

received a notice and warning materials for exposure from Vermicelli I without conspicuously posting or displaying the warning materials; and/or have actual knowledge of potential exposure to Cadmium from Vermicelli I. Defendants thereby violated Proposition 65.

29. The principal routes of exposure are through ingestion, especially direct (oral) ingestion. Persons sustain exposures by eating and consuming Vermicelli I.

30. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of Proposition 65 as to Vermicelli I have been ongoing and continuous, as Defendants engaged and continue to engage in conduct which violates Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6, including the manufacture, distribution, promotion, and sale of Vermicelli I, so that a separate and distinct violation of Proposition 65 occurred each and every time a person was exposed to Cadmium by Vermicelli I as mentioned herein.

31. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each violation of Proposition 65 mentioned herein is ever continuing. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that the violations alleged herein will continue to occur into the future.

32. Based on the allegations herein, Defendants are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per individual exposure to Cadmium from Vermicelli I, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(b).

33. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the claims alleged herein prior to filing this Complaint.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(By CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. and against IGOURMET, and DOES 11-20 for Violations of Proposition 65, The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (*Health & Safety Code*, §§ 25249.5, *et seq.*))

Pasta Products II

34. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 22 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

1 35. Each of the Defendants is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a manufacturer,
2 distributor, promoter, or retailer of Vermicelli (“Vermicelli II”), identified as: “Tasty
3 Joy”; “LONGKOU”; “Vermicelli”; “Packed for: Golden Country Oriental Food
4 Company”; “UPC 738055100436”.

5 36. Vermicelli II contains Cadmium.

6 37. Defendants knew or should have known that Cadmium has been identified by the State
7 of California as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and reproductive
8 toxicity and therefore was subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements. Defendants
9 were also informed of the presence of Cadmium in Vermicelli II within Plaintiff’s notice
10 of alleged violations further discussed above at Paragraph 17a.

11 38. Plaintiff’s allegations regarding Vermicelli II concerns “[c]onsumer products
12 exposure[s],” which “is an exposure that results from a person’s acquisition, purchase,
13 storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any
14 exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” *Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, §*
15 *25602(b)*. Vermicelli II are consumer products, and, as mentioned herein, exposures to
16 Cadmium took place as a result of such normal and foreseeable consumption and use.

17 39. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that between February 27, 2022 and
18 the present, each of the Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed California
19 consumers and users of Vermicelli II, which Defendants manufactured, distributed, or
20 sold as mentioned above, to Cadmium, without first providing any type of clear and
21 reasonable warning of such to the exposed persons before the time of exposure.
22 Defendants have distributed and sold Vermicelli II in California. Defendants know and
23 intend that California consumers will use and consume Vermicelli II, thereby exposing
24 them to Cadmium. Further, Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that
25 Defendants are selling Vermicelli II under a brand or trademark that is owned or licensed
26 by the Defendants or an entity affiliated thereto; have knowingly introduced Cadmium
27 into Vermicelli II or knowingly caused Cadmium to be created in Vermicelli II; have
28

covered, obscured or altered a warning label that has been affixed to Vermicelli II by the manufacturer, producer, packager, importer, supplier or distributor of Vermicelli II; have received a notice and warning materials for exposure from Vermicelli II without conspicuously posting or displaying the warning materials; and/or have actual knowledge of potential exposure to Cadmium from Vermicelli II. Defendants thereby violated Proposition 65.

40. The principal routes of exposure are through ingestion, especially direct (oral) ingestion. Persons sustain exposures by eating and consuming Vermicelli II.

41. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of Proposition 65 as to Vermicelli II have been ongoing and continuous, as Defendants engaged and continue to engage in conduct which violates Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6, including the manufacture, distribution, promotion, and sale of Vermicelli II, so that a separate and distinct violation of Proposition 65 occurred each and every time a person was exposed to Cadmium by Vermicelli II as mentioned herein.

42. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each violation of Proposition 65 mentioned herein is ever continuing. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that the violations alleged herein will continue to occur into the future.

43. Based on the allegations herein, Defendants are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per individual exposure to Cadmium from Vermicelli II, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(b).

Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the claims alleged herein prior to filing this Complaint.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff demands against each of the Defendants as follows:

1. A permanent injunction mandating Proposition 65-compliant warnings;
2. Penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7, subdivision (b);
3. Costs of suit;
4. Reasonable attorney fees and costs; and

5. Any further relief that the court may deem just and equitable.

Dated: September 3, 2025

YERUSHALMI & YERUSHALMI*

/s/ Reuben Yeroushalmi

Reuben Yeroushalmi

Attorneys for Plaintiff,

CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.