

Michael Freund SBN 99687
 Michael Freund & Associates
 1919 Addison Street, Suite 104
 Berkeley, CA 94704
 Telephone: (510) 499-1992
 Email: freund1@aol.com
 Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.

Willis M. Wagner (SBN 310900)
 Greenberg Traurig, LLP
 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2400
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 Ph: (916) 868-0629
 Email: will.wagner@gtlaw.com
 Attorney for Defendant Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba
 Koia

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

**ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
 CENTER, INC., a California non-profit
 corporation**

Plaintiff,

vs.

**RAWNATURE5 CORPORATION,
 individually and dba KOIA; and DOES 1-
 100**

Defendants.

CASE NO. 24CV085267

**~~PROPOSED~~ STIPULATED
 CONSENT JUDGMENT**

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*

Action Filed: July 30, 2024

Trial Date: None set

1. INTRODUCTION

On July 30, 2024, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), a non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by filing a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), against Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia (“Koia”) and Does 1-100. On September

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Alameda
 02/02/2026
 Clerk of the Court / Deputy Clerk of the Court
 By: V. Garcia Deputy
 V. Garcia

23, 2024, a First Amended Complaint was filed. On January 28, 2025, a Second Amended Complaint was filed (the operative Complaint hereinafter referred to as “Complaint”).

In this action, ERC alleges that a number of products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Koia contain mercury and/or perfluorooctanoic acid (“PFOA”), chemicals listed under Proposition 65 as carcinogens and/or reproductive toxins, and expose consumers to these chemicals at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These products (referred to hereinafter individually as a “Covered Product” or collectively as “Covered Products”) are: (1) Koia Protein Vanilla Bean Plant-Based Shake (mercury), (2) Koia Coconut Almond Plant-Based Shake (mercury, PFOA), (3) Koia Cinnamon Horchata Plant-Based Shake (mercury, PFOA), (4) Koia Chocolate Banana Plant-Based Shake (mercury, PFOA), (5) Koia Cacao Bean Plant-Based Shake (mercury, PFOA), (6) Koia Chocolate Peanut Butter Plant-Based Shake (mercury, PFOA), (7) Koia Cookies 'N Creme Organic Plant-Based Shake (PFOA), (8) Koia Birthday Cake Plant-Based Shake (mercury, PFOA), (9) Koia Cold Brew Coffee Plant-Based Shake (mercury, PFOA), (10) Koia Vanilla Bean Plant-Based Shake (PFOA), and (11) Koia Chocolate Brownie Plant-Based Shake (PFOA).

The following Covered Products may also be referred to as “Mercury Covered Products”: Koia Protein Vanilla Bean Plant-Based Shake; Koia Coconut Almond Plant-Based Shake; Koia Cinnamon Horchata Plant-Based Shake; Koia Chocolate Banana Plant-Based Shake; Koia Cacao Bean Plant-Based Shake; Koia Chocolate Peanut Butter Plant-Based Shake; Koia Birthday Cake Plant-Based Shake; and Koia Cold Brew Coffee Plant-Based Shake.

The following Covered Products may also be referred to as “PFOA Covered Products”: Koia Coconut Almond Plant-Based Shake; Koia Cinnamon Horchata Plant-Based Shake; Koia Chocolate Banana Plant-Based Shake; Koia Cacao Bean Plant-Based Shake; Koia Chocolate Peanut Butter Plant-Based Shake; Koia Cookies 'N Creme Organic Plant-Based Shake; Koia Birthday Cake Plant-Based Shake; Koia Cold Brew Coffee Plant-Based Shake; Koia Vanilla Bean Plant-Based Shake; and Koia Chocolate Brownie Plant-Based Shake.

1.1 ERC and Koia are hereinafter referred to individually as a “Party” or

collectively as the “Parties.”

1.2 ERC is a 501 (c)(3) California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

1.3 For purposes of this Stipulated Consent Judgment (“Consent Judgment”), the Parties agree that Koia is a business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action and qualifies as a “person in the course of doing business” within the meaning of Proposition 65. Koia manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Products.

1.4 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC’s Notices of Violation dated April 24, 2024, May 9, 2024, May 17, 2024, July 5, 2024, July 12, 2024, and October 11, 2024, all of which were served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Koia (“Notices”). True and correct copies of the Notices are attached hereto as **Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, and F**, and each is incorporated herein by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notices were served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and Koia and no designated governmental entity has filed a Complaint against Koia with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.

1.5 ERC’s Notices and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products by California consumers exposes them to mercury and/or PFOA without first receiving clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Koia denies all material, factual, and legal allegations contained in the Notices and Complaint.

1.6 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment nor compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law.

1 **1.7** Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall
2 prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in
3 any current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.

4 **1.8** The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered
5 as a Judgment by this Court.

6 **2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become
8 necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter
9 jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction
10 over Koia as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and
11 that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all
12 claims up through and including the Compliance Date (as defined below) that were or could have
13 been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notices and Complaint.

14 **3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS**

15 **3.1** Beginning 45 days after the Effective Date (“Compliance Date”), Koia shall be
16 permanently enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, “Distributing into
17 the State of California,” or directly selling in the State of California, any Mercury Covered
18 Product that exposes a person to a “Daily Mercury Exposure Level” of more than 0.3
19 micrograms of mercury per day and/or any PFOA Covered Product that exposes a person to a
20 quantifiable level of PFOA that can be reliably achieved using industry standard methods for
21 testing in the PFOA Covered Products, unless such Covered Product meets the warning
22 requirements under Section 3.2.

23 **3.1.1** As used in this Consent Judgment, the term “Distributing into the State
24 of California” shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in
25 California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Koia knows or has reason to know
26 will sell the Covered Product in California.

27 **3.1.2** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the “Daily Mercury Exposure
28 Level” shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula:

1 micrograms of mercury per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the
2 product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings
3 of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on
4 the label), which equals micrograms of mercury exposure per day. If the label contains no
5 recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

6 **3.1.3** To the extent that Koia can show that a portion of the PFOA in a Covered
7 Product was contained in water that Koia received from an applicable water source listed in 27
8 CCR § 25401 (2025), that amount of PFOA does not constitute an exposure under Proposition 65,
9 but only as to the amount of PFOA derived from such water source(s) (hereafter “PFOA
10 Allowance”). Koia shall be responsible for any exposure to PFOA in a Covered Product that is
11 derived from sources other than the applicable water sources listed in 27 CCR § 24501 (2025).

12 Koia presently solely sources its water for Covered Products from the City of Anaheim
13 (CA) Public Utilities (referred to as the “Water Source”¹). The 27 CCR § 25401 (2025) PFOA
14 Allowance shall be based on the following formula: amount of water in the Covered Product, in
15 milliliters, sourced from the Water Source multiplied by the concentration of PFOA in the pertinent
16 Water Source, in ng/milliliter, equals the PFOA Allowance, in nanograms, for that Covered
17 Product. Koia shall be responsible for substantiating the amount of the PFOA Allowance, if any,
18 in accordance with the testing procedures set forth in Section 3.4.3. In order to claim the PFOA
19 Allowance, Koia must obtain laboratory analyses consistent with Section 3.4.3 and shall provide
20 such analyses to ERC upon demand.

21 Nothing in this Section 3.1.3 shall be interpreted to affect the responsibility of Koia for an
22 exposure which arises from any activity other than an applicable activity that is described in 27
23 CCR § 25401 (2025).

24 **3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings**

25 If Koia is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following warning
26

27
28 ¹ In the event Koia changes its water supplier, and the new water supplier qualifies as an
applicable water source listed in 27 CCR § 25401 (2025), then the term Water Source shall
include such new water supplier.

1 must be utilized (“Warning”):

2 **WARNING:** Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including [mercury]
3 [and] [perfluorooctanoic acid] which is [are] known to the State of California to cause
4 [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to
5 www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food.

6 Koia shall use the phrase “cancer and” in the Warning if Koia’s testing pursuant to the
7 quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4 indicates a reportable level of PFOA that is
8 reliably achieved using industry standard methods for testing. As identified in the brackets, the
9 warning shall appropriately reflect whether there is PFOA or mercury in each of the Covered
10 Products, but if PFOA or another chemical is present at a level that requires a cancer warning, the
11 chemical requiring the use of the phrase “cancer and” in the Warning shall always be identified.

12 The Warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the label of each Covered
13 Product, and it must be set off from other surrounding information and enclosed in a box. In
14 addition, for any Covered Product sold on websites where Koia offers the Covered Products for
15 sale over the internet to consumers in California, the Warning shall appear by providing the
16 Warning on the checkout page when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase
17 of any Covered Product, or by otherwise prominently displaying the Warning to the purchaser
18 prior to completing the purchase. If the Warning is provided on the checkout page, an asterisk
19 or other identifying method must be utilized to identify which Covered Product(s) on the
20 checkout page are subject to the Warning. In addition, for any Covered Product sold over the
21 internet, the Warning may be provided through a clearly marked hyperlink using the word
22 “**WARNING**” in all capital and bold letters on the Covered Product’s primary display page so
23 long as the hyperlink links to a page prominently displaying the Warning without content that
24 detracts from the Warning. A Warning is not prominently displayed if the purchaser has to
25 search for it in the general content of the website.

26 The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety
27 warnings also appearing on the website or on the label and the word “**WARNING**” shall be in all
28 capital letters and in bold print. No statements intended to or likely to have the effect of
diminishing the impact of the Warning on the average lay person shall accompany the Warning.

1 Further no statements may accompany the Warning that state or imply that the source of the listed
2 chemical has an impact on or results in a less harmful effect of the listed chemical.

3 Koia must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with other
4 words, statements or designs on the label, or on its website, if applicable, to render the Warning
5 likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase
6 or use of the product. Where a sign or label used to provide the Warning for a Covered Product
7 includes consumer information about the Covered Product in a language other than English, the
8 Warning must also be provided in that language in addition to English.

9 If a Covered Product is being sold by an online third-party seller or downstream reseller
10 (collectively referred to as “Third-Party Seller(s)”), who is subject to Proposition 65 and known to
11 and authorized by Koia to sell such Covered Product to California consumers, and Koia cannot
12 itself add a warning to the authorized Third-Party Seller’s website because Koia lacks control over
13 such authorized Third-Party Seller’s website, then Koia must (a) notify the authorized Third-Party
14 Seller and/or its authorized agent, in writing, of the authorized Third-Party Seller’s duty to provide
15 an internet warning as part of the condition of sale of the Covered Product to California
16 consumers, and (b) comply with 27 C.C.R. § 25600.2 (2025 or as subsequently renumbered)
17 including, but not limited to, by providing the information required by 27 C.C.R. § 25600.2 (2025
18 or as subsequently renumbered), including the warning language required by this Consent
19 Judgment for Covered Products sold on the internet to California consumers, to any such
20 authorized Third-Party Seller (or its authorized agent). The written notice required by this Section
21 shall instruct the Third-Party Seller that it is responsible for providing the Warning on its website
22 for Covered Products sold over the internet to California consumers and that the Warning shall be
23 provided with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements or designs, as to
24 render the Warning likely to be seen, read, and understood by an ordinary individual prior to sale.
25 Confirmation of receipt of the written notice and any renewed written notices must be received
26 electronically or in writing from the authorized Third-Party Seller, or its authorized agent, to
27 which Koia sent the written notice. If Koia is unable to obtain such confirmation of receipt, Koia
28 shall confirm delivery of the notice and retain such confirmation of delivery in written or

1 electronic form for at least one year.

2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term “label” means a display of written,
3 printed or graphic material that is printed on or affixed to a Covered Product or its immediate
4 container or wrapper.

5 There shall be no obligation for Koia to provide a Warning for Covered Products that are
6 (1) manufactured before the Compliance Date and (2) no longer in the possession of or under the
7 control of Koia on the Compliance Date, and the Section 8 release applies to all such Covered
8 Products.

9 The Parties agree that Koia shall be deemed to be in compliance with this Consent
10 Judgment by either adhering to this Section of the Consent Judgment or by complying with
11 warning regulations adopted by the State of California’s Office of Environmental Health Hazard
12 Assessment (“OEHHA”) and made applicable to the Covered Products pursuant to entry of a
13 Modified Consent Judgment in accordance with Section 5. In the event that the OEHHA
14 promulgates one or more regulations requiring or permitting Proposition 65 warning text and/or
15 methods of transmission applicable to the Covered Products and the chemicals at issue, which are
16 different from those set forth above, Koia shall be entitled seek a modification of this Consent
17 Judgment pursuant to Section 5, and such modification shall not be unreasonably withheld by
18 ERC.

19 If regulations or legislation are enacted providing that Proposition 65 warnings are no
20 longer required with respect to mercury and/or PFOA in the Covered Products, or should safe
21 harbor warning exposure thresholds be promulgated, such that a lack of warning by Koia will
22 arguably not thereafter be a breach of this Consent Judgment, Koia shall be entitled to seek to
23 modify this Consent Judgment pursuant to Section 5 of this Consent Judgment. ERC agreement
24 to permit modification of the Consent Judgment shall not be unreasonably withheld.

25 **3.3 Conforming Covered Products**

26 A Conforming Covered Product is a Covered Product that complies with Section 3.1
27 without requiring a warning.

28 ///

3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology

3.4.1 Beginning within one year of the Compliance Date, Koia shall arrange for mercury and PFOA testing of the Covered Products at least once a year for a minimum of three consecutive years by arranging for testing of one (1) randomly selected sample of each of the Covered Products, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which Koia intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a consumer in California or “Distributing into the State of California.” If tests conducted pursuant to this Section demonstrate that no Warning is required for a Covered Product during each of three consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Covered Product. However, if during or after the three-year testing period, Koia changes ingredient suppliers for any of the Covered Products and/or reformulates any of the Covered Products, Koia shall test that Covered Product for one additional year after such change is made, but in no event shall the total testing period be less than three years.

3.4.2 For purposes of measuring the “Daily Mercury Exposure Level” and the quantifiable level of PFOA, the mercury or PFOA detection result, as applicable, of the randomly selected sample of each of the Covered Products will be controlling.

3.4.3 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate for the method used, including limit of detection and limit of quantification, sensitivity, accuracy and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (“ICP-MS”) achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.005 mg/kg for mercury. For the PFOA Covered Products, testing shall be conducted by Symbio Laboratories, or another lab that can achieve at least as sensitive of testing as Symbio Laboratories, using Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) and using the lowest reporting level that can be reliably quantified using available technologies for PFOA.

3.4.4 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory

1 Accreditation Program, an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the United
2 States Food & Drug Administration, or an independent third-party laboratory otherwise
3 accredited to perform such testing. Koia may rely on testing it conducts at such laboratories as
4 its evidence of compliance with this Section.

5 **3.4.5** Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Koia's ability to conduct,
6 or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including the raw
7 materials used in their manufacture.

8 **3.4.6** Within thirty (30) days of ERC's written request, Koia shall deliver lab
9 reports obtained pursuant to Section 3.4 to ERC. Koia shall retain all test results and
10 documentation for a period of five years from the date of each test.

11 **3.5** Nothing in Section 3 of this Consent Judgment shall prevent or preclude ERC
12 from obtaining and relying upon its own testing for purposes of enforcement, so long as such
13 testing meets the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4. Koia likewise asserts the right to rely
14 on its own testing to respond to an enforcement notice, so long as such testing meets the
15 requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4. Nothing in Section 3.4 of this Consent Judgment is
16 intended by either party to set a precedent for the level of mercury or PFOA permissible in
17 consumer products under Proposition 65.

18 **4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT**

19 **4.1** In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement
20 payments, attorney's fees, and costs, Koia shall make a total payment of \$150,000.00 ("Total
21 Settlement Amount") to ERC within 10 business days of the Effective Date ("Due Date").
22 Koia shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's account, for which ERC will give
23 Koia the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as
24 follows:

25 **4.2** \$22,500.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and
26 Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$16,875.00) of the civil penalty to
27 the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe
28 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety

Code section 25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$5,625.00) of the civil penalty.

4.3 \$9,592.89 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action.

4.4 \$41,160.00 shall be distributed to Michael Freund & Associates as reimbursement of ERC's attorney fees, while \$76,747.11 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

4.5 In the event that Koia fails to remit the Total Settlement Amount owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Koia shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the delinquency to Koia via electronic mail. If Koia fails to deliver the Total Settlement Amount within five (5) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Amount shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the California Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, Koia agrees to pay ERC's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs for any efforts to collect the payment due under this Consent Judgment.

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified or terminated only as to injunctive terms (i) by written stipulation of the Parties and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment or (ii) by motion of either Party pursuant to Section 5.3, following the meet and confer process outlined herein.

5.2 If Koia seeks to terminate or otherwise modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then Koia must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC must provide written notice to Koia within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies Koia in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person, via remote meeting, or by telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the proposed modification, ERC shall provide to Koia a written basis for its position. The Parties shall

1 continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any
2 remaining disputes, unless an impasse is reached. Should it become necessary, the Parties may
3 agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

4 **5.3** In the event that Koia initiates a modification or termination under Section 5.1,
5 and the meet and confer process leads to a stipulation or motion for an agreed upon
6 modification or termination of the Consent Judgment, Koia shall reimburse ERC for its costs
7 and attorneys' fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process.

8 **6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT**
9 **JUDGMENT**

10 **6.1** This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or
11 terminate this Consent Judgment.

12 **6.2** If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Conforming
13 Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall
14 inform Koia in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient
15 to permit Koia to identify the Covered Products at issue. Koia shall, within thirty (30) days
16 following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party
17 laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, demonstrating Koia's
18 compliance with the Consent Judgment. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter
19 prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

20 **7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT**

21 This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their
22 respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries,
23 divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers,
24 retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application
25 to any Covered Product that is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and
26 that is not used by California consumers.

27 **8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED**

28 **8.1** This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on

1 behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Koia and its respective officers, directors,
2 shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers,
3 franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Koia), distributors,
4 wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain
5 of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them
6 (collectively, "Released Parties").

7 **8.2** ERC, acting in the public interest, releases the Released Parties from any and all
8 claims for violations of Proposition 65 up to and including the Compliance Date, based on
9 exposure to mercury (for the Mercury Covered Products) and/or PFOA (for the PFOA Covered
10 Products) as set forth in the Notices of Violation. ERC, on behalf of itself only, hereby fully
11 releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all claims, actions, causes of action,
12 suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could
13 have been asserted from the manufacture, handling, use, or consumption of the Covered
14 Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising
15 from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Mercury Covered Products
16 regarding mercury and/or on the PFOA Covered Products regarding PFOA up to and including
17 the Compliance Date. However, Third-Party Sellers that do not provide a Warning within a
18 reasonable time after being instructed or notified by Koia to do so as outlined in Section 3.2,
19 are not released from liability for violations of Proposition 65.

20 **8.3** ERC on its own behalf only, and Koia on its own behalf only, further waive and
21 release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made
22 or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition 65 in
23 connection with the Notices and Complaint up through and including the Compliance Date,
24 provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to
25 enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

26 **8.4** It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts
27 alleged in the Notices and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be
28 discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Koia on behalf of itself only, acknowledge that

1 this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through
2 and including the Compliance Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and Koia
3 acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.2 and 8.3 above may include unknown
4 claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such unknown
5 claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

6 A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE
7 CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO
8 EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE
9 AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY
AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED
PARTY.

10 ERC on behalf of itself only, and Koia on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and understand
11 the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section
12 1542.

13 **8.5** Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to
14 constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any of the Released Parties regarding alleged
15 exposures to mercury (for the Mercury Covered Products) and/or PFOA (for the PFOA
16 Covered Products) as set forth in the Notices and Complaint. However, Third-Party Sellers that
17 do not provide a Warning within a reasonable time after being instructed or notified by Koia to
18 do so as outlined in Section 3.2, are not deemed to be compliant with Proposition 65 and are
19 not released from liability for violations of Proposition 65.

20 **8.6** Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or
21 environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Koia's
22 products other than the Covered Products.

23 **9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS**

24 In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be
25 unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be adversely
26 affected.

27 **10. GOVERNING LAW**

28 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in

accordance with the laws of the State of California.

11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below via first-class mail or via electronic mail where required. Courtesy copies via email may also be sent.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.:

Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Center
3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92108
Ph: (619) 500-3090
Email: chris.heptinstall@erc501c3.org

With a copy to:

Michael Freund
Michael Freund & Associates
1919 Addison Street, Suite 104
Berkeley, CA 94704
Telephone: (510) 499-1992
Email: freund1@aol.com

FOR RAWNATURE5 CORPORATION, individually and dba KOIA:

Chris Hunter, CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation dba Koia
1920 Hillhurst Ave #V911
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Email: chris@drinkkoia.com

With a copy to:

Willis M. Wagner
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2400
Sacramento, CA 95814
Ph: (916) 868-0629
Email: will.wagner@gtlaw.com

12. COURT APPROVAL

12.1 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this Consent Judgment.

1 **12.2** If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,
2 the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible
3 prior to the hearing on the motion.

4 **12.3** If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have
5 no force or effect.

6 **13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS**

7 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be
8 deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid
9 as the original signature.

10 **14. DRAFTING**

11 The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for
12 each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms
13 and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and
14 construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn,
15 and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact
16 that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any
17 portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated
18 equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

19 **15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES**

20 If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent
21 Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet and confer in person, via remote meeting,
22 by telephone, and/or in writing and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No
23 action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute
24 beforehand.

25 **16. ENFORCEMENT**

26 ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda
27 County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action
28 brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs,

penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

17.1 This Consent Judgment contains the current sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, including any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related thereto. No prior agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

17.2 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment.

18. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:

(1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and

(2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.

(3) Retain jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 664.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, after the Consent Judgment is entered in order to enforce, modify, or terminate this Consent Judgment.

///


///

///

1 **IT IS SO STIPULATED:**

2
3 Dated: December 15, 2025

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
CENTER, INC.

4
5 By: 
6 Chris Heptinstall
7 Executive Director

8 Dated: 12/13/2025, 2025


RAWNATURE5 CORPORATION,
individually and dba KOIA

9
10 Signed by: 
11 
12 Its: CEO

13 **APPROVED AS TO FORM:**


14
15 Dated: December 15, 2025

MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES

16
17 By: 
18 Michael Freund
19 Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental
20 Research Center, Inc.

21 Dated: December 15, 2025

GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP

22
23 By: 
24 Willis M. Wagner
25 Attorney for Defendant Rawnature5
26 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
27
28

~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.

Dated: 02/02/2026, 2026



Judge of the Superior Court

Rebekah Evenson / Judge

EXHIBIT A

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.371.0885

Michael Freund, Esq.

April 24, 2024

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC’s Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (“Proposition 65”), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violator”) is:

Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

Consumer Products and Listed Chemicals. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Koia Protein Vanilla Bean Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**
- 2. Koia Coconut Almond Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**
- 3. Koia Cinnamon Horchata Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

On July 1, 1990, the State of California officially listed mercury and mercury compounds as chemicals known to cause developmental toxicity and male and female reproductive toxicity.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to these chemicals has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least April 24, 2021, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at freund1@aol.com.**

Sincerely,



Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

I, Michael Freund, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the notice.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: April 24, 2024



Michael Freund

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On April 24, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
1920 Hillhurst Ave, #V911
Los Angeles, CA 90027

The Corporation Trust Company
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
1209 N. Orange St
Wilmington, DE 19801

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
5840 Moss Ranch Road
Pinecrest, FL 33156

CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr, Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

On April 24, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On April 24, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Pamela Y. Price, District Attorney
Alameda County
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650
Oakland, CA 94621
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney
Contra Costa County
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney
Calveras County
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

James Clinchard, Assistant District Attorney
El Dorado County
778 Pacific Street
Placerville, CA 95667
EDCDAPROP65@edcda.us

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

April 24, 2024

Page 5

Lisa A. Smittcamp, District Attorney
Fresno County
2100 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov

Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney
Inyo County
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526
inyoda@inyocounty.us

Devin Chandler, Program Coordinator
Lassen County
2950 Riverside Dr
Susanville, CA 96130
dchandler@co.lassen.ca.us

Lori E. Frugoli, District Attorney
Marin County
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 145
San Rafael, CA 94903
consumer@marincounty.org

Walter W. Wall, District Attorney
Mariposa County
P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338
mcda@mariposacounty.org

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney
Merced County
550 West Main St
Merced, CA 95340
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Ste C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney
Nevada County
201 Commercial St
Nevada City, CA 95959
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney
Orange County
300 N Flower St
Santa Ana, CA 92703
Prop65notice@ocdapa.org

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney
Placer County
10810 Justice Center Drive
Roseville, CA 95678
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

David Hollister, District Attorney
Plumas County
520 Main St
Quincy, CA 95971
davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney
Riverside County
3072 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney
Sacramento County
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Prop65@sacda.org

Summer Stephan, District Attorney
San Diego County
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

Mark Ankorn, Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney
San Francisco District Attorney's Office
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Henry Lifton, Deputy City Attorney
San Francisco City Attorney
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Prop65@sfcityattys.org

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

April 24, 2024

Page 6

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney
Santa Clara County
70 W Hedding St
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney
Santa Clara City Attorney
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San Jose, CA 96113
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney
Santa Cruz County
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney
Sonoma County
600 Administration Dr
Sonoma, CA 95403
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney
Tulare County
221 S Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 95370
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney
Ventura County
800 S Victoria Ave
Ventura, CA 93009
daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney
Yolo County
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On April 24, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on April 24, 2024, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.


Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

April 24, 2024

Page 7

Service List

District Attorney, Alpine
County
17300 Hwy 89
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador
County
708 Court Street, Suite 202
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte
County
25 County Center Drive, Suite
245
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Colusa
County
310 6th St
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte
County
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, Glenn
County
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt
County
825 5th Street 4th Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial
County
940 West Main Street, Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Kern County
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings
County
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles
County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera
County
209 West Yosemite Avenue
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Mendocino
County
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Modoc
County
204 S Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono
County
Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, San Benito
County
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San
Bernardino County
303 West Third Street
San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Mateo
County
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta
County
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra
County
Post Office Box 457
100 Courthouse Square, 2nd
Floor
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou
County
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano
County
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus
County
832 12th Street, Ste 300
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter
County
463 2nd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Attorney, Tehama County
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity
County
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne
County
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba
County
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at
P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

EXHIBIT B

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.371.0885

Michael Freund, Esq.

May 9, 2024

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC’s Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (“Proposition 65”), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violator”) is:

Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

Consumer Products and Listed Chemicals. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Koia Chocolate Banana Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**
- 2. Koia Cacao Bean Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**
- 3. Koia Chocolate Peanut Butter Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**
- 4. Koia Cookies 'N Creme Organic Plant-Based Shake - Lead**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

On July 1, 1990, the State of California officially listed mercury and mercury compounds as chemicals known to cause developmental toxicity and male and female reproductive toxicity.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to these chemicals has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least May 9, 2021, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at freund1@aol.com.**

Sincerely,



Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

I, Michael Freund, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the notice.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.



Dated: May 9, 2024

Michael Freund

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On May 9, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
1920 Hillhurst Ave, #V911
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
5840 Moss Ranch Road
Pinecrest, FL 33156

The Corporation Trust Company
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
1209 N. Orange St
Wilmington, DE 19801

CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr, Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

On May 9, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On May 9, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Pamela Y. Price, District Attorney
Alameda County
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650
Oakland, CA 94621
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney
Calveras County
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney
Contra Costa County
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
sgrassini@contracostada.org

James Clinchard, Assistant District Attorney
El Dorado County
778 Pacific Street
Placerville, CA 95667
EDCDAPROP65@edcda.us

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

May 9, 2024

Page 5

Lisa A. Smittcamp, District Attorney
Fresno County
2100 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov

Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney
Inyo County
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526
inyoda@inyocounty.us

Devin Chandler, Program Coordinator
Lassen County
2950 Riverside Dr
Susanville, CA 96130
dchandler@co.lassen.ca.us

Lori E. Frugoli, District Attorney
Marin County
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 145
San Rafael, CA 94903
consumer@marincounty.org

Walter W. Wall, District Attorney
Mariposa County
P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338
mcda@mariposacounty.org

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney
Merced County
550 West Main St
Merced, CA 95340
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Ste C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney
Nevada County
201 Commercial St
Nevada City, CA 95959
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney
Orange County
300 N Flower St
Santa Ana, CA 92703
Prop65notice@ocdapa.org

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney
Placer County
10810 Justice Center Drive
Roseville, CA 95678
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

David Hollister, District Attorney
Plumas County
520 Main St
Quincy, CA 95971
davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney
Riverside County
3072 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney
Sacramento County
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Prop65@sacda.org

Summer Stephan, District Attorney
San Diego County
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

Mark Ankorn, Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney
San Francisco District Attorney's Office
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Henry Lifton, Deputy City Attorney
San Francisco City Attorney
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Prop65@sfcityattys.org

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

May 9, 2024

Page 6

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjeda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney
Santa Clara County
70 W Hedding St
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney
Santa Clara City Attorney
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San Jose, CA 96113
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney
Santa Cruz County
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney
Sonoma County
600 Administration Dr
Sonoma, CA 95403
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org


Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney
Tulare County
221 S Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 95370
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney
Ventura County
800 S Victoria Ave
Ventura, CA 93009
daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney
Yolo County
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On May 9, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on May 9, 2024, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.



Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

May 9, 2024

Page 7

Service List

District Attorney, Alpine
County
17300 Hwy 89
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador
County
708 Court Street, Suite 202
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte
County
25 County Center Drive, Suite
245
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Colusa
County
310 6th St
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte
County
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, Glenn
County
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt
County
825 5th Street 4th Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial
County
940 West Main Street, Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Kern County
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings
County
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles
County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera
County
209 West Yosemite Avenue
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Mendocino
County
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Modoc
County
204 S Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono
County
Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, San Benito
County
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San
Bernardino County
303 West Third Street
San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Mateo
County
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta
County
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra
County
Post Office Box 457
100 Courthouse Square, 2nd
Floor
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou
County
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano
County
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus
County
832 12th Street, Ste 300
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter
County
463 2nd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Attorney, Tehama County
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity
County
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne
County
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba
County
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at
P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

EXHIBIT C

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.371.0885

Michael Freund, Esq.

May 17, 2024

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC’s Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (“Proposition 65”), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violator”) is:

Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

Consumer Products and Listed Chemicals. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Koia Birthday Cake Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**
- 2. Koia Cold Brew Coffee Plant-Based Shake – Lead, Mercury**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

On July 1, 1990, the State of California officially listed mercury and mercury compounds as chemicals known to cause developmental toxicity and male and female reproductive toxicity.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to these chemicals has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least May 17, 2021, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at freund1@aol.com.**

Sincerely,



Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

I, Michael Freund, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the notice.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.



Dated: May 17, 2024

Michael Freund

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On May 17, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
1920 Hillhurst Ave, #V911
Los Angeles, CA 90027

The Corporation Trust Company
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
1209 N. Orange St
Wilmington, DE 19801

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
5840 Moss Ranch Road
Pinecrest, FL 33156

CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr, Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

On May 17, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On May 17, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Pamela Y. Price, District Attorney
Alameda County
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650
Oakland, CA 94621
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney
Contra Costa County
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney
Calaveras County
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

James Clinchard, Assistant District Attorney
El Dorado County
778 Pacific Street
Placerville, CA 95667
EDCDAPROP65@edcda.us

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

May 17, 2024

Page 5

Lisa A. Smittcamp, District Attorney
Fresno County
2100 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov

Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney
Inyo County
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526
inyoda@inyocounty.us

Devin Chandler, Program Coordinator
Lassen County
2950 Riverside Dr
Susanville, CA 96130
dchandler@co.lassen.ca.us

Lori E. Frugoli, District Attorney
Marin County
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 145
San Rafael, CA 94903
consumer@marincounty.org

Walter W. Wall, District Attorney
Mariposa County
P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338
mcda@mariposacounty.org

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney
Merced County
550 West Main St
Merced, CA 95340
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Ste C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney
Nevada County
201 Commercial St
Nevada City, CA 95959
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney
Orange County
300 N Flower St
Santa Ana, CA 92703
Prop65notice@ocdapa.org

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney
Placer County
10810 Justice Center Drive
Roseville, CA 95678
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

David Hollister, District Attorney
Plumas County
520 Main St
Quincy, CA 95971
davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney
Riverside County
3072 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney
Sacramento County
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Prop65@sacda.org

Summer Stephan, District Attorney
San Diego County
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

Mark Ankorn, Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney
San Francisco District Attorney's Office
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Henry Lifton, Deputy City Attorney
San Francisco City Attorney
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Prop65@sfcityattys.org

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

May 17, 2024

Page 6

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney
Santa Clara County
70 W Hedding St
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney
Santa Clara City Attorney
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San Jose, CA 96113
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney
Santa Cruz County
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney
Sonoma County
600 Administration Dr
Sonoma, CA 95403
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org


Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney
Tulare County
221 S Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 95370
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney
Ventura County
800 S Victoria Ave
Ventura, CA 93009
daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney
Yolo County
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On May 17, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on May 17, 2024, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.



Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

May 17, 2024

Page 7

Service List

District Attorney, Alpine
County
17300 Hwy 89
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador
County
708 Court Street, Suite 202
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte
County
25 County Center Drive, Suite
245
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Colusa
County
310 6th St
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte
County
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, Glenn
County
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt
County
825 5th Street 4th Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial
County
940 West Main Street, Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Kern County
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings
County
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles
County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera
County
209 West Yosemite Avenue
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Mendocino
County
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Modoc
County
204 S Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono
County
Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, San Benito
County
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San
Bernardino County
303 West Third Street
San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Mateo
County
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta
County
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra
County
Post Office Box 457
100 Courthouse Square, 2nd
Floor
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou
County
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano
County
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus
County
832 12th Street, Ste 300
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter
County
463 2nd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Attorney, Tehama County
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity
County
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne
County
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba
County
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at
P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

EXHIBIT D

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.371.0885

Michael Freund, Esq.

July 5, 2024

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC’s Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (“Proposition 65”), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violator”) is:

Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

Consumer Products and Listed Chemical. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Koia Cinnamon Horchata Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 2. Koia Cold Brew Coffee Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 3. Koia Birthday Cake Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 4. Koia Chocolate Banana Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 5. Koia Vanilla Bean Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**

On November 10, 2017, the State of California officially listed Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity. On February 25, 2022, the State of California officially listed Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) as a chemical known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least July 5, 2021, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) recall the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, and/or (2) affix clear and reasonable Prop 65 warning labels for products sold in the future while reformulating such products to eliminate the exposures, and (3) conduct bio-monitoring of all California consumers that have ingested the identified chemical in the listed products, and (4) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at freund1@aol.com.**

Sincerely,



Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

I, Michael Freund, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.



Dated: July 5, 2024

Michael Freund

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On July 5, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
1920 Hillhurst Ave, #V911
Los Angeles, CA 90027

The Corporation Trust Company
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
1209 N. Orange St
Wilmington, DE 19801

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
5840 Moss Ranch Road
Pinecrest, FL 33156

CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr, Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

On July 5, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On July 5, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Pamela Y. Price, District Attorney
Alameda County
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650
Oakland, CA 94621
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney
Contra Costa County
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney
Calaveras County
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
Pro65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

James Clinchard, Assistant District Attorney
El Dorado County
778 Pacific Street
Placerville, CA 95667
EDCDAPROP65@edcda.us

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 5, 2024

Page 5

Lisa A. Smittcamp, District Attorney
Fresno County
2100 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov

Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney
Inyo County
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526
inyoda@inyocounty.us

Devin Chandler, Program Coordinator
Lassen County
2950 Riverside Dr
Susanville, CA 96130
dchandler@co.lassen.ca.us

Lori E. Frugoli, District Attorney
Marin County
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 145
San Rafael, CA 94903
consumer@marincounty.org

Walter W. Wall, District Attorney
Mariposa County
P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338
mcda@mariposacounty.org

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney
Merced County
550 West Main St
Merced, CA 95340
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Ste C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney
Nevada County
201 Commercial St
Nevada City, CA 95959
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney
Orange County
300 N Flower St
Santa Ana, CA 92703
Prop65notice@ocdapa.org

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney
Placer County
10810 Justice Center Drive
Roseville, CA 95678
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

David Hollister, District Attorney
Plumas County
520 Main St
Quincy, CA 95971
davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney
Riverside County
3072 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney
Sacramento County
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Prop65@sacda.org

Summer Stephan, District Attorney
San Diego County
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

Mark Ankorn, Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney
San Francisco District Attorney's Office
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Henry Lifton, Deputy City Attorney
San Francisco City Attorney
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Prop65@sfcityattorney.org

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 5, 2024

Page 6

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney
Santa Clara County
70 W Hedding St
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney
Santa Clara City Attorney
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San Jose, CA 96113
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney
Santa Cruz County
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney
Sonoma County
600 Administration Dr
Sonoma, CA 95403
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org


Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney
Tulare County
221 S Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 95370
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney
Ventura County
800 S Victoria Ave
Ventura, CA 93009
daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney
Yolo County
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On July 5, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on July 5, 2024, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.



Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 5, 2024

Page 7

Service List

District Attorney, Alpine
County
17300 Hwy 89
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador
County
708 Court Street, Suite 202
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte
County
25 County Center Drive, Suite
245
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Colusa
County
310 6th St
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte
County
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, Glenn
County
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt
County
825 5th Street 4th Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial
County
940 West Main Street, Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Kern County
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings
County
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles
County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera
County
300 South G Street, Suite 300
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Mendocino
County
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Modoc
County
204 S Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono
County
Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, San Benito
County
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San
Bernardino County
303 West Third Street
San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Mateo
County
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta
County
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra
County
Post Office Box 457
100 Courthouse Square, 2nd
Floor
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou
County
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano
County
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus
County
832 12th Street, Ste 300
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter
County
463 2nd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Attorney, Tehama County
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity
County
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne
County
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba
County
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at
P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

EXHIBIT E

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.371.0885

Michael Freund, Esq.

July 12, 2024

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 *ET SEQ.*
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC’s Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (“Proposition 65”), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violator”) is:

Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

Consumer Products and Listed Chemical. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Koia Chocolate Brownie Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 2. Koia Chocolate Peanut Butter Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 3. Koia Cookies 'N Creme Organic Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 4. Koia Cacao Bean Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**
- 5. Koia Coconut Almond Plant-Based Shake - Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA)**

On November 10, 2017, the State of California officially listed Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity. On February 25, 2022, the State of California officially listed Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) as a chemical known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least July 12, 2021, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) recall the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, and/or (2) affix clear and reasonable Prop 65 warning labels for products sold in the future while reformulating such products to eliminate the exposures, and (3) conduct bio-monitoring of all California consumers that have ingested the identified chemical in the listed products, and (4) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at freund1@aol.com.**

Sincerely,



Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

I, Michael Freund, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.



Dated: July 12, 2024

Michael Freund

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On July 12, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
1920 Hillhurst Ave, #V911
Los Angeles, CA 90027

The Corporation Trust Company
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
1209 N. Orange St
Wilmington, DE 19801

Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia
5840 Moss Ranch Road
Pinecrest, FL 33156

CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr, Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

On July 12, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On July 12, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Pamela Y. Price, District Attorney
Alameda County
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650
Oakland, CA 94621
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney
Contra Costa County
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney
Calaveras County
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
Pro65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

James Clinchard, Assistant District Attorney
El Dorado County
778 Pacific Street
Placerville, CA 95667
EDCDAPROP65@edcda.us

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 12, 2024

Page 5

Lisa A. Smittcamp, District Attorney
Fresno County
2100 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov

Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney
Inyo County
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526
inyoda@inyocounty.us

Devin Chandler, Program Coordinator
Lassen County
2950 Riverside Dr
Susanville, CA 96130
dchandler@co.lassen.ca.us

Lori E. Frugoli, District Attorney
Marin County
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 145
San Rafael, CA 94903
consumer@marincounty.org

Walter W. Wall, District Attorney
Mariposa County
P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338
mcda@mariposacounty.org

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney
Merced County
550 West Main St
Merced, CA 95340
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Ste C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney
Nevada County
201 Commercial St
Nevada City, CA 95959
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney
Orange County
300 N Flower St
Santa Ana, CA 92703
Prop65notice@ocdapa.org

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney
Placer County
10810 Justice Center Drive
Roseville, CA 95678
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

David Hollister, District Attorney
Plumas County
520 Main St
Quincy, CA 95971
davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney
Riverside County
3072 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney
Sacramento County
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Prop65@sacda.org

Summer Stephan, District Attorney
San Diego County
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

Mark Ankorn, Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney
San Francisco District Attorney's Office
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Henry Lifton, Deputy City Attorney
San Francisco City Attorney
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Prop65@sfcityatty.org

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 12, 2024

Page 6

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney
Santa Clara County
70 W Hedding St
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney
Santa Clara City Attorney
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San Jose, CA 96113
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney
Santa Cruz County
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney
Sonoma County
600 Administration Dr
Sonoma, CA 95403
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org


Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney
Tulare County
221 S Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 95370
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney
Ventura County
800 S Victoria Ave
Ventura, CA 93009
daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney
Yolo County
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On July 12, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on July 12, 2024, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.


Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

July 12, 2024

Page 7

Service List

District Attorney, Alpine
County
17300 Hwy 89
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador
County
708 Court Street, Suite 202
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte
County
25 County Center Drive, Suite
245
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Colusa
County
310 6th St
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte
County
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, Glenn
County
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt
County
825 5th Street 4th Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial
County
940 West Main Street, Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Kern County
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings
County
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles
County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera
County
300 South G Street, Suite 300
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Mendocino
County
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Modoc
County
204 S Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono
County
Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, San Benito
County
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San
Bernardino County
303 West Third Street
San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Mateo
County
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta
County
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra
County
Post Office Box 457
100 Courthouse Square, 2nd
Floor
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou
County
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano
County
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus
County
832 12th Street, Ste 300
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter
County
463 2nd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Attorney, Tehama County
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity
County
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne
County
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba
County
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at
P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

EXHIBIT F

Michael Freund & Associates

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
Berkeley, CA 94704
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.371.0885

Michael Freund, Esq.

October 11, 2024

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC’s Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (“Proposition 65”), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violator”) is:

Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

Consumer Products and Listed Chemicals. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. Koia Fruity Cereal Plant-Based Shake - Lead**
- 2. Koia Cinnamon Cereal Plant-Based Shake - Lead**
- 3. Koia Cocoa Cereal Plant-Based Shake - Lead, Mercury**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

On July 1, 1990, the State of California officially listed mercury and mercury compounds as chemicals known to cause developmental toxicity and male and female reproductive toxicity.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to these chemicals has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least October 11, 2021, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) recall the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, and/or (2) affix clear and reasonable Prop 65 warning labels for products sold in the future while reformulating such products to eliminate the exposures, and (3) conduct bio-monitoring of all California consumers that have ingested the identified chemicals in the listed products, and (4) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead or at freund1@aol.com.**

Sincerely,



Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.’s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Rawnature5 Corporation, individually and dba Koia

I, Michael Freund, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the notice.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that “reasonable and meritorious case for the private action” means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff’s case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.



Dated: October 11, 2024

Michael Freund

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On October 11, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Christopher Hunter, Chief Executive Officer
or Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually
and dba Koia
1920 Hillhurst Ave, #V911
Los Angeles, CA 90027

The Corporation Trust Company
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
1209 N. Orange St
Wilmington, DE 19801

Christopher Hunter, Chief Executive Officer
or Current President or CEO
Rawnature5 Corporation, individually
and dba Koia
5840 Moss Ranch Road
Pinecrest, FL 33156

CT Corporation System
(Registered Agent for Rawnature5 Corporation,
individually and dba Koia)
330 N Brand Blvd, Ste 700
Glendale, CA 91203

On October 11, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On October 11, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Pamela Y. Price, District Attorney
Alameda County
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650
Oakland, CA 94621
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney
Calveras County
891 Mountain Ranch Road
San Andreas, CA 95249
Pro65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

October 11, 2024

Page 5

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney
Contra Costa County
900 Ward Street
Martinez, CA 94553
sgrassini@contracostada.org

James Clinchard, Assistant District Attorney
El Dorado County
778 Pacific Street
Placerville, CA 95667
EDCDAPROP65@edcda.us

Lisa A. Smittcamp, District Attorney
Fresno County
2100 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov

Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney
Inyo County
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526
inyoda@inyocounty.us

Devin Chandler, Program Coordinator
Lassen County
2950 Riverside Dr
Susanville, CA 96130
dchandler@co.lassen.ca.us

Lori E. Frugoli, District Attorney
Marin County
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 145
San Rafael, CA 94903
consumer@marincounty.org

Walter W. Wall, District Attorney
Mariposa County
P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338
mcda@mariposacounty.org

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney
Merced County
550 West Main St
Merced, CA 95340
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Ste C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney
Nevada County
201 Commercial St
Nevada City, CA 95959
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney
Orange County
300 N Flower St
Santa Ana, CA 92703
Prop65notice@ocdapa.org

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney
Placer County
10810 Justice Center Drive
Roseville, CA 95678
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

David Hollister, District Attorney
Plumas County
520 Main St
Quincy, CA 95971
davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney
Riverside County
3072 Orange Street
Riverside, CA 92501
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney
Sacramento County
901 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Prop65@sacda.org

Summer Stephan, District Attorney
San Diego County
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

Mark Ankorn, Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

October 11, 2024

Page 6

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney
San Francisco District Attorney's Office
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Henry Lifton, Deputy City Attorney
San Francisco City Attorney
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Prop65@sfcityatty.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney
San Joaquin County
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney
Santa Clara County
70 W Hedding St
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney
Santa Clara City Attorney
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San Jose, CA 96113
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney
Santa Cruz County
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney
Sonoma County
600 Administration Dr
Sonoma, CA 95403
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org


Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney
Tulare County
221 S Mooney Blvd
Visalia, CA 95370
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney
Ventura County
800 S Victoria Ave
Ventura, CA 93009
daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney
Yolo County
301 Second Street
Woodland, CA 95695
cfepd@yolocounty.org

On October 11, 2024, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on October 11, 2024, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.


Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

October 11, 2024

Page 7

Service List

District Attorney, Alpine
County
17300 Hwy 89
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador
County
708 Court Street, Suite 202
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte
County
25 County Center Drive, Suite
245
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Colusa
County
310 6th St
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte
County
450 H Street, Room 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, Glenn
County
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt
County
825 5th Street 4th Floor
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial
County
940 West Main Street, Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Kern County
1215 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings
County
1400 West Lacey Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles
County
Hall of Justice
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera
County
300 South G Street, Suite 300
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Mendocino
County
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Modoc
County
204 S Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono
County
Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, San Benito
County
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San
Bernardino County
303 West Third Street
San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Mateo
County
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta
County
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra
County
Post Office Box 457
100 Courthouse Square, 2nd
Floor
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou
County
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano
County
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus
County
832 12th Street, Ste 300
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter
County
463 2nd Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

Attorney, Tehama County
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity
County
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne
County
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba
County
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

¹ All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at
P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: Rene C. Davidson Courthouse 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612		FILED Superior Court of California County of Alameda 02/02/2026 Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court By: <u>Valentin Garcia</u> Deputy V. Garcia
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Environmental Research Center, Inc., a California non-profit corporation		
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: RawNature5 Corporation		
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1010.6		CASE NUMBER: 24CV085267

I, the below named Executive Officer/Clerk of Court of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that on this date I served one copy of the Order [PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT entered herein upon each party or counsel of record in the above entitled action, by electronically serving the document(s) from my place of business, in accordance with standard court practices.


Michael Bruce Freund
Michael Freund & Associates
freund1@aol.com

Willis M Wagner
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
Will.Wagner@gtlaw.com

Dated: 02/02/2026

Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court

By:


V. Garcia, Deputy Clerk