

1 Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981)
2 reuben@yeroushalmi.com
3 **YEROUSHALMI & YEROUSHALMI***
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
3/06/2026 4:35 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By S. Ruiz, Deputy Clerk

10
11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
12
13 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

14 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.,
15 in the public interest,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 ENCHANTE ACCESSORIES, INC., a New
19 York Corporation;
20 ROSS STORES, INC., a Delaware
21 Corporation;
22 and DOES 1-10,

23 Defendants.

24 CASE NO. **26STCV07606**

25 COMPLAINT FOR PENALTY AND
26 INJUNCTION

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

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

29 Plaintiff CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. alleges one cause of action against
30 defendants ENCHANTE ACCESSORIES, INC.; ROSS STORES, INC.; and DOES 1-10 as
31 follows:

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 ENCHANTE ACCESSORIES, INC. (“ENCHANTE”) is a New York Corporation, qualified to do business in California, and doing business in the State of California at all relevant times herein.
3. Defendant ROSS STORES, INC. (“ROSS”) is a Delaware Corporation, qualified to do business in California, and doing business in the State of California at all relevant times herein.
4. Plaintiff is presently unaware of the true names and capacities of defendants DOES 1-10, 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.
5. At all times mentioned herein, the term “Defendants” includes ENCHANTE, ROSS, and DOES 1-10.
6. 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.
7. Upon information and belief, at all times relevant to this action, each of the Defendants, including DOES 1-10, 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

1 the other Defendants. All actions of each of the Defendants alleged in this Complaint
2 were ratified and approved by every other Defendant or their officers or managing
3 agents. Alternatively, each of the Defendants aided, conspired with and/or facilitated the
4 alleged wrongful conduct of each of the other Defendants.

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

9 **JURISDICTION**

- 10 9. The Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit pursuant to California Constitution Article
11 VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except
12 those given by statute to other trial courts. This Court has jurisdiction over this action
13 pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7, which allows enforcement of
14 violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction.
- 15 10. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants named herein because Defendants either
16 reside or are located in this State or are foreign corporations authorized to do business in
17 California, are registered with the California Secretary of State, or who do sufficient
18 business in California, have sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise
19 intentionally avail themselves of the markets within California through their
20 manufacture, distribution, promotion, marketing, or sale of their products within
21 California to render the exercise of jurisdiction by the California courts permissible
22 under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 23 11. Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles because one or more of the instances of
24 wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of Los Angeles and/or
25 because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of Los
26 Angeles with respect to the consumer product that is the subject of this action.

27 **BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARY FACTS**

- 1 12. In 1986, California voters approved an initiative to address growing concerns about
2 exposure to toxic chemicals and declared their right “[t]o be informed about exposures to
3 chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm.” Ballot Pamp.,
4 Proposed Law, Gen. Elec. (Nov. 4, 1986) at p. 3. The initiative, The Safe Drinking
5 Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code Sections
6 25249.5, *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), helps to protect California’s drinking water sources
7 from contamination, to allow consumers to make informed choices about the products
8 they buy, and to enable persons to protect themselves from toxic chemicals as they see
9 fit.
- 10 13. Proposition 65 requires the Governor of California to publish a list of chemicals known
11 to the state to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. *Health & Safety*
12 *Code* § 25249.8. The list, which the Governor updates at least once a year, contains over
13 700 chemicals and chemical families. Proposition 65 imposes warning requirements and
14 other controls that apply to Proposition 65-listed chemicals.
- 15 14. All businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate or sell products in California
16 must comply with Proposition 65. Under Proposition 65, businesses are: (1) prohibited
17 from knowingly discharging Proposition 65-listed chemicals into sources of drinking
18 water (*Health & Safety Code* § 25249.5), and (2) required to provide “clear and
19 reasonable” warnings before exposing a person, knowingly and intentionally, to a
20 Proposition 65-listed chemical (*Health & Safety Code* § 25249.6).
- 21 15. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute
22 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. *Health & Safety Code* §
23 25249.7. "Threaten to violate" means "to create a condition in which there is a
24 substantial probability that a violation will occur." *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.11(e).
25 Defendants are also liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation,
26 recoverable in a civil action. *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7(b).
- 27
28

1 16. Plaintiff identified certain practices of manufacturers and distributors of Hydrating Set
2 Hand Cream Pods of exposing, knowingly and intentionally, persons in California to
3 Diethyl Hexyl Phthalate and Di (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate of such products without first
4 providing clear and reasonable warnings of such to the exposed persons prior to the time
5 of exposure. Plaintiff later discerned that Defendants engaged in such practice.

6 17. On January 1, 1988, the Governor of California added Diethyl Hexyl Phthalate and Di
7 (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (“DEHP”) to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause
8 cancer (*Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(b)*), and on October 24, 2003, the Governor
9 added DEHP to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause developmental male
10 reproductive toxicity (*Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c)*). Pursuant to Health and
11 Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10, twenty (20) months after addition of DEHP
12 to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, DEHP became
13 fully subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements and discharge prohibitions.

14 **SATISFACTION OF PRIOR NOTICE**

15 18. Plaintiff served the following notices for alleged violations of Health and Safety Code
16 Section 25249.6, concerning consumer products exposures:

17 a. On or about September 5, 2025, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violations of
18 Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6, concerning consumer products
19 exposures subject to a private action to ENCHANTE, ROSS, and to the
20 California Attorney General, County District Attorneys, and City Attorneys for
21 each city containing a population of at least 750,000 people in whose
22 jurisdictions the violations allegedly occurred, concerning the Hydrating Set
23 Hand Cream Pods.

24 b. On or about September 12, 2025, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violations of
25 Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6, concerning consumer products
26 exposures subject to a private action to ENCHANTE, ROSS, and to the
27 California Attorney General, County District Attorneys, and City Attorneys for
28

1 each city containing a population of at least 750,000 people in whose
2 jurisdictions the violations allegedly occurred, concerning the Hydrating Set
3 Hand Cream Pods.

4 19. Before sending the notice of alleged violations, Plaintiff investigated the consumer
5 products involved, the likelihood that such products would cause users to suffer
6 significant exposures to DEHP and the corporate structure of each of the Defendants.

7 20. Plaintiff's notice of alleged violation included a Certificate of Merit executed by the
8 attorney for the noticing party, CAG. The Certificate of Merit stated that the attorney for
9 Plaintiff who executed the certificate had consulted with at least one person with relevant
10 and appropriate expertise who reviewed data regarding the exposures to DEHP, the
11 subject Proposition 65-listed chemical of this action. Based on that information, the
12 attorney for Plaintiff who executed the Certificate of Merit believed there was a
13 reasonable and meritorious case for this private action. The attorney for Plaintiff
14 attached to the Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General the confidential
15 factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the Certificate of Merit.

16 21. Plaintiff's notice of alleged violations also included a Certificate of Service and a
17 document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water & Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986
18 (Proposition 65) A Summary." *Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7(d).

19 22. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the dates that Plaintiff
20 gave notice of the alleged violations to ENCHANTE, ROSS, and the public prosecutors
21 referenced in Paragraph 18.

22 23. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that neither the Attorney General, nor
23 any applicable district attorney or city attorney has commenced and is diligently
24 prosecuting an action against the Defendants.

25 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

Cosmetic Accessories

24. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 23 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

25. Each of the Defendants is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a manufacturer, distributor, promoter, or retailer of Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods, including but not limited to: “BEAUTY INTUITION”; “Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods”; “DISTRIBUTED BY ENCHANTE ACCESSORIES INC.”; “EXPIRATION DATE: 02-13-2027”; “MANUFACTURE DATE: 02-14-2025”; “BATCH CODE: EC251540214-07”; “4002844604558”; “UPC 729016943605”.

26. Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods contain DEHP.

27. Defendants knew or should have known that DEHP has been identified by the State of California as a chemical known to cause cancer, and reproductive toxicity, and therefore was subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements. Defendants were also informed of the presence of DEHP in Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods within Plaintiff's notice of alleged violations further discussed above at Paragraphs 18a, and 18b.

28. Plaintiff's allegations regarding Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods concerns “[c]onsumer products exposure[s],” which “is an exposure that results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” *Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 25602(b)*. Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods are consumer products, and, as mentioned herein, exposures to DEHP took place as a result of such normal and foreseeable consumption and use.

29. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that between September 5, 2022 and the present, each of the Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed California consumers and users of Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods, which Defendants manufactured, distributed, or sold as mentioned above, to DEHP, without first providing any type of clear and reasonable warning of such to the exposed persons before the time

1 of exposure. Defendants have distributed and sold Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods in
2 California. Defendants know and intend that California consumers will use and consume
3 Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods, thereby exposing them to DEHP. Further, Plaintiff is
4 informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants are selling Hydrating Set Hand
5 Cream Pods under a brand or trademark that is owned or licensed by the Defendants or
6 an entity affiliated thereto; have knowingly introduced DEHP into Hydrating Set Hand
7 Cream Pods or knowingly caused DEHP to be created in Hydrating Set Hand Cream
8 Pods; have covered, obscured or altered a warning label that has been affixed to
9 Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods by the manufacturer, producer, packager, importer,
10 supplier or distributor of Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods; have received a notice and
11 warning materials for exposure from Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods without
12 conspicuously posting or displaying the warning materials; and/or have actual
13 knowledge of potential exposure to DEHP from Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods.
14 Defendants thereby violated Proposition 65.

15 30. The principal routes of exposure are through dermal contact, ingestion and inhalation.
16 Persons sustain exposures by handling Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods without wearing
17 gloves or any other personal protective equipment, or by touching bare skin or mucous
18 membranes with gloves after handling Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods, as well as
19 through direct and indirect hand to mouth contact, hand to mucous membrane, or
20 breathing in particulate matter dispersed from Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods.

21 31. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of
22 Proposition 65 as to Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods have been ongoing and continuous,
23 as Defendants engaged and continue to engage in conduct which violates Health and
24 Safety Code Section 25249.6, including the manufacture, distribution, promotion, and
25 sale of Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods, so that a separate and distinct violation of
26 Proposition 65 occurred each and every time a person was exposed to DEHP by
27 Hydrating Set Hand Cream Pods as mentioned herein.

28

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

4 33. Based on the allegations herein, Defendants are liable for civil penalties of up to
5 \$2,500.00 per day per individual exposure to DEHP from Hydrating Set Hand Cream
6 Pods, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(b).

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

9
10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 Plaintiff demands against each of the Defendants as follows:

- 12 1. A permanent injunction mandating Proposition 65-compliant warnings;
- 13 2. Penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7, subdivision (b);
- 14 3. Costs of suit;
- 15 4. Reasonable attorney fees and costs; and
- 16 5. Any further relief that the court may deem just and equitable.

17
18 Dated: March 6, 2026

YEROUSHALMI & YEROUSHALMI*

19
20
21 /s/ Reuben Yeroushalmi

Reuben Yeroushalmi

Attorneys for Plaintiff,

CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.