

Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319  
Rebecca M. Jackson, State Bar No. 221583  
Seven Hills LLP  
1 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1200  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 926-7247  
laralei@sevenhillslp.com  
rebecca@sevenhillslp.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
BLUE SKY FOREVER

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

**05/27/2025**  
Clerk of the Court  
BY: SHENEQUA GLADNEY  
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

BLUE SKY FOREVER,

Plaintiff,

v.

LIFECORE FITNESS, LLC; and DOES 1-30,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

**CGC-25-625640**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

UNLIMITED CIVIL

1 Plaintiff BLUE SKY FOREVER, acting in the public interest, alleges a cause of action  
2 against Defendants LIFECORE FITNESS, LLC and DOES 1-30.

3 **INTRODUCTION AND NATURE OF THE ACTION**

4 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Blue Sky Forever  
5 (“**BSF**”) in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to  
6 be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (“**DEHP**”) and  
7 diisononyl phthalate (“**DINP**”), toxic chemicals found in and on the vinyl banners manufactured,  
8 imported, distributed, sold or offered for sale by Defendants in the State of California.

9 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants’ continuing failure to warn  
10 individuals not covered by California’s Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code § 6300 *et seq.*  
11 (“**consumers**”) they are being exposed to substances known to the State of California to cause cancer  
12 and birth defects or other reproductive harm through exposures to DEHP and DINP, when they  
13 purchase, use or handle Defendants’ vinyl banners.

14 3. Detectable levels of DEHP and DINP are found in and on the vinyl banners that  
15 Defendants manufacture, import, sell or distribute for sale to individuals throughout California.

16 4. Pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at  
17 Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.* (“**Proposition 65**”), it is unlawful for a person in the course  
18 of doing business to knowingly and intentionally expose consumers in California to chemicals known  
19 to the State to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm, without first providing a “clear  
20 and reasonable” health hazard warning to such individuals prior to purchase or use.

21 5. BSF contends and alleges Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer  
22 for sale, in and into California vinyl banners (“**PRODUCTS**”) containing DEHP and DINP, without  
23 Proposition 65’s requisite health hazard warning regarding the harms associated with exposures to the  
24 chemicals, including, but not limited to, *Assault Fitness Banner, 60”W x 30”H*. Defendants’ conduct  
25 subjects them to civil penalties for each violation, enjoinder as well as preliminary and permanent  
26 injunctive relief. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) and (b).

**PARTIES**

6. Plaintiff BSF is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of California and proceeding in the interest of the general public, dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens and the environment through the elimination or reduction of toxic chemicals utilized in manufacturing consumer products and to increasing public awareness of those chemicals through the promotion of sound environmental practices and corporate responsibility. BSF is a person within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(a), and it brings this action in the public interest, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

7. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges, at all relevant times, Defendant LIFECORE FITNESS, LLC (“**LIFECORE**”) was and is a “person” “in the course of doing business” with ten (10) or more employees, within the meanings of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

8. LIFECORE manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

9. Defendants DOES 1-10 (“**MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS**”) are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, assemble, fabricate, and manufacture, or each implies by its conduct that it does such for one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in California.

10. Defendants DOES 11-20 (“**DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS**”) are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and each of them, distribute, transfer, and transport, or each impliedly does so by its conduct, one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use in the State of California

11. Defendants DOES 21-30 (“**RETAILER DEFENDANTS**”) are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

1 RETAILER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, by and through their conduct, offer the PRODUCTS  
2 for sale to individuals in the State of California.

3 12. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 30, inclusive, are  
4 unknown to plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said DOES Defendants by their fictitious names, pursuant  
5 to Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, each  
6 of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the acts and occurrences  
7 alleged herein and the damages caused thereby. When ascertained, their true names and capacities  
8 shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

9 13. At all times mentioned herein, LIFECORE, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS,  
10 DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, hereinafter, where  
11 appropriate, be referred to collectively as the “DEFENDANTS.”

### 12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 14. This Court has jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code  
14 § 25249.7, allowing enforcement by any court of competent jurisdiction. The California Superior  
15 Court has jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10,  
16 which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to  
17 other trial courts.” The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of  
18 subject matter jurisdiction.

19 15. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS, based on  
20 plaintiff’s information and good faith belief DEFENDANTS are each a person, firm, corporation or  
21 association that is a citizen of the State of California, does sufficient business in California, has  
22 sufficient minimum contacts in California, and/or otherwise purposefully and intentionally avail  
23 themselves of the California market through their manufacture, importation, distribution, promotion,  
24 marketing or sale of PRODUCTS within the State. DEFENDANTS’ purposeful availment renders  
25 the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair  
26 play and substantial justice.

27 16. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco, pursuant to  
28 Code of Civil Procedure §§ 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent

1 jurisdiction, because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more  
2 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because  
3 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with  
4 respect to the PRODUCTS that are the subject of this action.

5 **REGULATORY BACKGROUND AND LAW**

6 17. In 1986, the people of the State of California approved an initiative addressing the  
7 harms caused by hazardous chemicals and declared their right “[t]o be informed about exposures to  
8 chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm.” Ballot Pamp., Proposed  
9 General Law, Gen. Elec. (Nov. 4, 1986) at p.3.

10 18. Formally known as the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 and  
11 codified at Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.*, Proposition 65 states, in relevant part, “[n]o  
12 person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a  
13 chemical known to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving a clear and reasonable  
14 warning to such individual...”

15 19. Under the Act, a “person in the course of doing business” is defined as a business with  
16 ten (10) or more employees. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(b). Businesses are prohibited from  
17 exposing individuals to hazardous chemicals without first giving a “clear and reasonable” warning.  
18 Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

19 20. Exposing individuals to hazardous chemicals means to cause individuals to ingest,  
20 inhale, contact via body surfaces or otherwise come into contact with a listed chemical. 27 CCR  
21 § 25102(i). An exposure to a hazardous chemical is defined as one that “results from a person’s  
22 acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a product...”  
23 27 C.C.R. § 25600(h).

24 21. Under Proposition 65, persons violating the statute may be enjoined in any court of  
25 competent jurisdiction and may be subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day, per violation.  
26 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.

27 22. On January 1, 1988, pursuant to Proposition 65’s implementing regulations, California  
28 identified and listed DEHP as a chemical known to the State cause cancer. DEHP became subject to

1 the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements for cancer one year later, on January 1, 1989. Cal.  
2 Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8, 25249.10(b). On October 24, 2003  
3 pursuant to Proposition 65’s implementing regulations, California identified and listed DEHP as a  
4 chemical known to the State cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. DEHP became subject  
5 to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements for birth defects and reproductive harm one year  
6 later, on October 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8,  
7 25249.10(b).

8 23. On December 20, 2013, pursuant to Proposition 65’s implementing regulations,  
9 California identified and listed DINP as a chemical known to the State cause cancer. DINP became  
10 subject to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements one year later, on December 20, 2014.  
11 Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8, 25249.10(b).

#### 12 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

13 24. Plaintiff purchased DEFENDANTS’ PRODUCTS, without a warning, in California.

14 25. Plaintiff investigated and tested DEFENDANTS’ PRODUCTS at an accredited lab,  
15 and consulted with a person with relevant and appropriate knowledge and expertise, who, after  
16 reviewing the collected data and analyzing the risk of exposure to DEHP and DINP, determined the  
17 PRODUCTS subject consumers in California to exposure to the listed chemicals at levels requiring a  
18 warning under the statute, based on touching, handling or otherwise utilizing PRODUCTS in  
19 accordance with their reasonably foreseeable and intended usages.

20 26. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff’s attorney executed a certificate of merit, attesting  
21 there was a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action and included the factual  
22 information supporting the certificate when it served the notice on the California Attorney General’s  
23 Office, as required. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d); Title 11 C.C.R. § 3102.

24 27. Thereafter, on March 10, 2025, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notice of Violation  
25 (“**Notice**”), together with the certificate of merit, on LIFECORE, the California Attorney General’s  
26 Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies, alleging, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales  
27 of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California were, and are, being exposed to DEHP and  
28

1 DINP through their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS as intended without first receiving  
2 a “clear and reasonable warning,” as required by Proposition 65.

3 28. After receiving plaintiff’s Notice, no public enforcement agency has commenced and  
4 is diligently prosecuting a cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65 to enforce  
5 the alleged violations that are the subject of the Notice.

6 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All DEFENDANTS)**

8 29. BSF realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully stated herein, the allegations  
9 set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 28, inclusive.

10 30. DEFENDANTS’ PRODUCTS contain DEHP and DINP in levels requiring a clear and  
11 reasonable warning under Proposition 65.

12 31. DEFENDANTS know or should have known the PRODUCTS they manufacture,  
13 import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale in California contain DEHP and DINP. As a result of  
14 plaintiff’s Notice, DEFENDANTS also have actual knowledge of the presence of DEHP and DINP in  
15 the PRODUCTS.

16 32. The PRODUCTS DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for  
17 sale in or into the State of California cause exposures to DEHP and DINP, both direct and/or indirect  
18 dermal contact and ingestion, through the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

19 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and  
20 continues to cause, exposures to DEHP and DINP.

21 34. DEFENDANTS know the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS  
22 exposes individuals to DEHP and DINP through direct and indirect dermal contact and/or ingestion.

23 35. DEFENDANTS intend that exposures to DEHP and DINP from the reasonably  
24 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the  
25 California marketplace.

26 36. The exposures to DEHP and DINP, caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by  
27 consumers and other individuals in California, are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable”  
28 warning requirements of Proposition 65.

1           37.     DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those consumers  
2 and other individuals in California who have been, or who will be, exposed to DEHP and DINP  
3 through direct and indirect dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the use of the PRODUCTS  
4 as intended.

5           38.     Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, consumers  
6 and other individuals, exposed to DEHP and DINP through dermal contact and ingestion as a result of  
7 their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS sold without a “clear and reasonable” health hazard  
8 warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy,  
9 or adequate remedy at law.

10          39.     DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS for  
11 sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS’ violations have  
12 continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff’s Notice. As such, DEFENDANTS’ violations are  
13 ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined, will continue in the future.

14          40.     Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-  
15 described acts, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500  
16 per day for each violation.

17          41.     As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a)  
18 also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANTS.

19                                   **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20          Wherefore, BSF prays for relief and judgment against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, as  
21 follows:

22          1.       That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and  
23 permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, importing, marketing or  
24 otherwise offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and  
25 reasonable warning” to consumers addressing the harms associated with exposures to DEHP and  
26 DINP;



1           2.       That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), issue preliminary  
2 and permanent injunctions mandating DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain  
3 of commerce in California that do not bear a clear and reasonable health hazard warning;

4           3.       That the Court assess civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the  
5 amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65, in an amount to be determined at trial;

6           4.       That the Court award plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, incurred  
7 herein; and

8           5.       That the Court grant any further relief as it deems just and equitable.

9 Dated: May 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

SEVEN HILLS LLP

11  
12 By: 

Rebecca M. Jackson  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
*Blue Sky Forever*