

Lucas Novak (SBN 257484)
LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK
8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217
Los Angeles, CA 90069
Telephone: (323) 337-9015
Email: lucas.nvk@gmail.com

Attorney for Plaintiff, THE LIVING GALLERY, LLC

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

THE LIVING GALLERY, LLC, a limited
liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

RCBA NUTRACEUTICALS, LLC, a limited
liability company, iHERB, LLC, a limited
liability company, and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 26STCV24435

**PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR
CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

Judge:

Dept.:

Compl. Filed:

Unlimited Jurisdiction

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

INTRODUCTION

1. This Complaint is brought by Plaintiff, The Living Gallery, LLC (“Plaintiff”) in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, a representative action to enforce the People’s right to be informed of the presence of lead (“Lead”), a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm, in Ronnie Coleman Signature Series King Whey sold by Defendants.

2. The purpose of this Complaint is to remedy Defendants’ continuing failure to warn California residents about the risk of exposure to the Lead in the products manufactured, distributed, sold, and/or offered for sale to consumers in California.

3. Defendants have and continue to manufacture, distribute, sell, and/or offer to sell Ronnie Coleman Signature Series King Whey, including but not limited to 8-56263-0060-2 (the “Products”).

4. Children and adults are exposed to the Lead when they consume, ingest, touch, mouth, handle, inhale, or otherwise use the Products.

5. Hazardous levels of the Lead are found in the Products manufactured, distributed, sold, and/or offered for sale by Defendants to consumers in California.

6. California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 et seq. (“Proposition 65”) provides in pertinent part: “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...”

7. Studies repeatedly conclude that exposure to the Lead is hazardous to the health of children and adults. Children are especially vulnerable to the toxic effects of Lead. Accordingly, California has listed the Lead as a chemical known to the state to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm, and therefore subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements.

8. Defendants have and continue to manufacture, distribute, sell, and/or offer to sell the Products without the required warnings. Defendants’ conduct violates the warning requirements of Proposition 65.

1 **PARTIES**

2 9. Plaintiff is an organization based in California acting in the public interest.
3 Plaintiff brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health and Safety Code
4 section 25249.7(d).

5 10. Defendant, RCBA NUTRACEUTICALS, LLC is a person in the course of doing
6 business within the meaning of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.11. RCBA
7 NUTRACEUTICALS, LLC manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Products for sale and use
8 in California. To the extent RCBA contends it qualifies for the employee exemption set forth in
9 section 25249.11(b), Plaintiff alleges that such exemption does not apply.

10 11. Defendant, iHERB, LLC is a person in the course of doing business within the
11 meaning of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.11. iHERB, LLC manufactures,
12 distributes, and/or sells the Products for sale and use in California.

13 12. DOES 1 through 100 are each a person in the course of doing business within the
14 meaning of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.11. DOES 1 through 100
15 manufacture, distribute, and/or sell the Products for sale and use in California. The true names of
16 DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to Plaintiff at this time. When their identities are discovered,
17 Plaintiff's Complaint shall be amended to reflect their true names.

18 13. The defendants identified in paragraphs 10-12 shall collectively be referred to
19 herein as "Defendants".

20 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

21 14. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Health and
22 Safety Code section 25249.7, which allows enforcement in any court of competent jurisdiction,
23 and pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, because this lawsuit is based on a
24 cause not given by statute to other trial courts. Moreover, this action belongs in unlimited
25 jurisdiction since the amount in controversy exceeds \$35,000 and Plaintiff seeks permanent
26 injunctive relief.

27 15. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because each is a person, firm,
28 corporation, or association with sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California, or

1 otherwise purposefully avails itself to the California market as to render jurisdiction by the
2 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

3 16. Venue is proper in Los Angeles County Superior Court because one or more
4 occurrences of the wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in Los Angeles County,
5 and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this County with
6 respect to the Products.

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Violations of Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 et seq.)**

9 17. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
10 Paragraphs 1 through 16, inclusive.

11 18. On April 15, 2026, Plaintiff served a Sixty-Day Notice of Violation with a
12 Certificate of Merit (the “Notice”), to RCBA NUTRACEUTICALS, LLC, iHERB, LLC, and the
13 various public enforcement agencies with respect to the Proposition 65 violations related to Lead
14 in the Products. In addition, on said date, in compliance with Health & Safety Code section
15 25249.7(d), Plaintiff provided confidential factual information sufficient to establish the basis for
16 the Certificate of Merit to the California Attorney General.

17 19. None of the public prosecutors with the authority to prosecute Proposition 65
18 violations has commenced and/or is diligently prosecuting the causes of action against
19 Defendants based on the claims asserted in Plaintiff’s Notice.

20 20. By placing the Products into the stream of commerce, each Defendant is a person
21 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11.

22 21. Defendants knew and intended that consumers will consume, ingest, touch,
23 mouth, handle, inhale, or otherwise use the Products.

24 22. The Maximum Allowable Dose Level (“MADL”) for lead as set by the State of
25 California is 0.5 micrograms per day. 27 Cal Code. Regs. Section 25805. Consuming one serving
26 of the Products will result in ingestion of lead that exceeds the MADL.

27 23. Defendants knew that the Products contain Lead. Defendants, who are in the
28 business of marketing foods, drink mixes, and/or dietary supplements, also should have known

1 or have constructive knowledge that the Products contain Lead from testing they completed or
2 should have completed and from widespread media coverage and/or other channels of
3 information concerning the presence of Lead in similar products.

4 24. Lead is a chemical listed by the State of California as known to cause cancer and
5 birth defects or other reproductive harm.

6 25. Defendants' Products contain sufficient quantities of the Lead such that
7 consumers, including children, who consume, ingest, touch, mouth, handle, inhale, or otherwise
8 use the Products are exposed to unsafe levels of Lead. Lead is present in the Products in such a
9 way as to expose individuals to Lead, as exposure is defined by 27 CCR section 25600.1(e):
10 "...that results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or any reasonably
11 foreseeable use..." Direct and indirect exposure occurs through inhalation, ingestion and/or
12 dermal contact during the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

13 26. Defendants knew or should have known that the reasonably foreseeable use of the
14 Products exposes individuals to Lead through inhalation, ingestion and/or dermal contact.

15 27. Defendants failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to individuals in
16 the State of California who were or could become exposed to Lead during the reasonably
17 foreseeable use of the Products.

18 28. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants have violated
19 California Health & Safety Code section 25249.6 et seq. by knowingly and intentionally
20 exposing individuals to Lead without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such
21 individuals regarding the toxicity of Lead.

22 29. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, individuals in the State of California
23 have been exposed to Lead through the inhalation, ingestion and/or dermal contact during the
24 reasonably foreseeable use of the Products without a "clear and reasonable warning", and have
25 suffered and continue to suffer harm, each and every day since at least April 15, 2025 to the
26 present.

27 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

28 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

1 1. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(b),
2 assess civil penalties against Defendants in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation
3 alleged herein;

4 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(a),
5 preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from manufacturing, distributing, or offering
6 the Products for sale in California without providing “clear and reasonable warnings” as defined
7 by 27 CCR section 25601;

8 3. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(a),
9 order Defendants to take action to stop ongoing unwarned exposures to Lead resulting from use
10 of Products sold by Defendants;

11 4. That the Court, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, or
12 any other applicable theory, grant Plaintiff’s reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and
13 Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

14
15 Dated: July 29, 2026

LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK

16
17 By: 

18 LUCAS T. NOVAK
19 Attorney for Plaintiff, The Living Gallery, LLC
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28