

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

07/24/2026
Clerk of the Court
BY: JAMES FORONDA
Deputy Clerk

9
10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

11 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CGC-26-638900

12 GABRIEL ESPINOZA,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 LANDS' END, INC., KOHL'S, INC.,

16 Defendants.

Case No.:

**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.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

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

25 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest
26 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health
27 hazards caused by exposure to chromium (hexavalent compounds) ("chromium (VI)"), a toxic
28 chemical found in leather gloves and gloves with leather components, including by not limited to

1 Lands' End suede gloves, UPC # 197231987078 manufactured, sold, and/or distributed by
2 defendant Land's End, Inc. ("Land's End") and/or defendant Kohl's, Inc. ("Kohl's") (collectively,
3 "Defendants" and each a "Defendant") in California.

4 3. Chromium (VI) is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause
5 cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. On February 27, 1987, the State of California
6 listed chromium (VI) as a chemical known to the State to cause cancer and it has come under the
7 purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health
8 & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b). On December 19, 2008, the State of California listed
9 chromium (VI) as a chemical known to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm.

10 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate
11 within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations. Included in
12 such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing a Proposition
13 65-listed chemical that will create an exposure above safe harbor levels with a "clear and
14 reasonable" warning before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing any person to any such listed
15 chemical.

16 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation
17 for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00) to be
18 imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code
19 § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the
20 actions of a defendant which "violate or threaten to violate" the statute. Health & Safety Code §
21 25249.7.

22 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants distribute and/or offer for sale in California,
23 without a requisite exposure warning, leather gloves and gloves with leather components,
24 including by not limited to Lands' End suede gloves, UPC # 197231987078 manufactured, sold,
25 and/or distributed by Defendants in California (the "Products") that expose persons to chromium
26 (VI) when used for their intended purpose.

27 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the
28 health hazards associated with exposure to chromium (VI) in conjunction with the sale and/or

1 distribution of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendants to the
2 enjoinder and civil penalties described herein.

3 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition
4 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

5 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring
6 Defendants to provide purchasers or users of the Products with required warnings related to the
7 dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to chromium (VI) pursuant to Health and
8 Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

9 10. Plaintiff further seeks a reasonable award of attorney's fees and costs.

10 **PARTIES**

11 11. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general
12 public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and to
13 improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. He brings this
14 action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

15 12. Defendant Land's End, Inc., through its business, effectively imports, distributes,
16 sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct
17 that it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.
18 Plaintiff alleges that defendant Land's End, Inc. is a "person" in the course of doing business
19 within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

20 13. Defendant Kohl's, Inc., through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells,
21 and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that
22 it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.
23 Plaintiff alleges that defendant Kohl's, Inc. is a "person" in the course of doing business within
24 the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

25 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

26 14. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco because one or more of the
27 instances of wrongful conduct occurred and continue to occur in this county and/or because
28 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with

1 respect to the Products. The Products are distributed, marketed, and sold to consumers throughout
2 San Francisco County, and the alleged Proposition 65 violations necessarily occurred here. Upon
3 information and belief, the Products are consistently in the stream of commerce and available to
4 consumers for purchase in the City and County of San Francisco.

5 15. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution
6 Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those
7 given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the enforcement
8 of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has
9 jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

10 16. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because each Defendant is either a
11 citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is
12 registered with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business
13 in the State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market.
14 Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent
15 and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Public policy further
16 supports this conclusion.

17 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

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

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

25 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
26 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without
27 first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...
28

1 19. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “which results from a
2 person’s acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a
3 consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” (27 CCR §
4 25602, para (b).) H&S Code § 25603(c) states that “a person in the course of doing business ...
5 shall provide a warning to any person to whom the product is sold or transferred unless the product
6 is packaged or labeled with a clear and reasonable warning.”

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

9 a. A warning that appears on a product’s label or other labeling.

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

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

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

20 21. Proposition 65 provides that any “person who violates or threatens to violate” the
21 statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase
22 “threaten to violate” is defined to mean creating “a condition in which there is a substantial
23 probability that a violation will occur.” (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil
24
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.

penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the Act (H&S Code § 25249.7) for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

22. On February 27, 1987, the State of California listed chromium (VI) as a chemical known to the State to cause cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b). On December 19, 2008, the State of California listed chromium (VI) as a chemical known to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm. In summary, chromium (VI) was listed under Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

23. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Products. Increased duration of contact with the Products, natural aging of the Products, temperature, light exposure, and contact of the Products with oxidizing agents and alkaline solutions will result in increased conversion of chromium (III) to chromium (VI) in the Products and thus increased dermal exposure to chromium (VI). Direct mouthing of the Products and indirect hand to mouth exposure to chromium (VI) will occur by touching the Products with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

24. Defendants have manufactured, processed, marketed, distributed, offered to sell and/or sold the Products in California since at least January 30, 2026. Upon information and belief, the Products are consistently in the stream of commerce and available to consumers for purchase in the City and County of San Francisco and the alleged Proposition 65 violations necessarily occurred here. The Products continue to be distributed, offered for sale and/or sold in California without the requisite warning information.

25. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally exposed users, consumers and/or patients to the Products and the chromium (VI) without first giving a clear and reasonable exposure warning to such individuals.

26. As a proximate result of acts by each Defendant, as a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of

California, including in San Francisco County, have been exposed to chromium (VI) without a clear and reasonable warning on the Products. The individuals subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users, consumers and patients that use the Products, as well as all others exposed to the Products.

SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

27. On January 30, 2026, Plaintiff purchased the Product from Kohl's in California. At the time of purchase, Defendants did not provide a Proposition 65 exposure warning for chromium (VI) or any other Proposition 65 listed chemical in a manner consistent with H&S Code § 25603.1 as described *supra*.

28. On April 1, 2026, the Product was sent to a testing laboratory to determine the chromium (VI) content of the Products.

29. On April 27, 2026, the laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Results of this test determined the Product exposes users to chromium (VI) (the "Chemical Test Report").

30. Plaintiff provided the Chemical Test Report and Product to an analytical chemist to determine if, based on the findings of the Chemical Test Report and the reasonable and foreseeable use of the Product, exposure to chromium (VI) will occur at levels that require Proposition 65 warnings under the Clear and Reasonable Warnings section 25601 of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations.

31. On April 29, 2026, Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure assessment report which concluded that persons in California who use the Products will be exposed to levels of chromium (VI) that require a Proposition 65 exposure warning.

32. On April 29, 2026, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to chromium (VI) contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants and to the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District attorneys and City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein violations allegedly occurred.

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

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

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

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

37. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer of the Products.

38. Use of the Products will expose users and consumers thereof to chromium (VI), a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

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

40. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since April 29, 2026, continuing until the present, that Defendants have continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products to chromium (VI) without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

41. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Products. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals is through dermal exposure. Increased duration of contact with the

1 Products, natural aging of the Products, temperature, light exposure, and contact of the Products
2 with oxidizing agents and alkaline solutions will result in increased conversion of chromium (III)
3 to chromium (VI) in the Products and thus increased dermal exposure to chromium (VI). Direct
4 mouthing of the Products and indirect hand to mouth exposure to chromium (VI) will occur by
5 touching the Products with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

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

9 43. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
10 Product exposes individuals to chromium (VI), and Defendants intend those exposures to
11 chromium (VI) will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation,
12 distribution, sale and offering of the Products to consumers in California

13 44. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this
14 Complaint.

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

18 46. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically
19 authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants and requests the following

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

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

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

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

Dated: July 24, 2026

BRODSKY SMITH

By: _____

Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)

Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)

9465 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 300

Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Telephone: (877) 534-2590

Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

Attorneys for Plaintiff