

Kevin J. Cole, Esq.
e-Mail: kevin@kjclawgroup.com

May 5, 2020

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

California Herbal Remedies, Inc.
c/o Scott Kawasaki
21800 Oxnard Street, Suite 460
Woodland Hills, California 91367

Re: 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 Violation (California Health & Safety Code § 25249 et seq.)

Dear Mr. Kawasaki:

This firm represents Kelli Smith, a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general public. Ms. Smith has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, commencing with Section 25249.5 of the Health and Safety Code ("Proposition 65"), with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because California Herbal Remedies, Inc. ("California Herbal Remedies") failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. Section 25249.6 of the statute provides that "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual . . ."

This letter serves as notice of these violations to California Herbal Remedies and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d), Ms. Smith 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 and Summary of Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65 prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") is attached to this letter.

Consumer Products and Listed Chemical. The products ("Products") which are causing an exposure without a warning in violation of Proposition 65 include all the medical marijuana "flowers" or "buds" sold to California residents for consumption by smoking. California Herbal Remedies failed to clearly and reasonably warn consumers that Marijuana Smoke is a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.¹ On June 19, 2009, OEHHA,

¹ Many of the chemical constituents that have been identified in Marijuana Smoke are carcinogens. "The following 33 marijuana smoke constituents . . . are listed under Proposition 65 as causing cancer: acetaldehyde, acetamide, acrylonitrile, 4-aminobiphenyl, arsenic, benz[a]anthracene, benzene, benzo[a]pyrene, benzo[b]fluoranthene, benzo[j]fluoranthene, benzo[k]fluoranthene, benzofuran, 1,3-butadiene, cadmium, carbazole, catechol, chromium (hexavalent compounds), chrysene, dibenz[a,h]anthracene, dibenz[a,i]pyrene, dibenzo[a,e]pyrene, diethylnitrosamine, dimethylnitrosamine, formaldehyde, indeno[1,2,3,-c,d]pyrene, isoprene, lead, mercury, 5-methylchrysene, naphthalene, nickel, pyridine, and quinoline." Tomar, R.S., J. Beaumont, and J.C.Y. Hsieh, *Evidence on the Carcinogenicity of Marijuana Smoke*. Aug. 2009, California Environmental

part of California's Environmental Protection Agency, added Marijuana Smoke to the Proposition 65 list. OEHHA announced the selection of Marijuana Smoke as a chemical for consideration for listing by the Carcinogen Identification Committee (the "CIC") in the *California Regulatory Notice Register* on December 12, 2007, subsequent to consultation with the CIC at its November 19, 2007 meeting. The CIC determined that Marijuana Smoke was clearly shown, through scientifically valid testing according to generally accepted principles, to cause cancer. As a result, Marijuana Smoke was added to the Proposition 65 list, pursuant to Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25305(a)(1) (formerly Title 22, California Code of Regulations, section 12305(a)(1)).

Listed Chemical and Route of Exposure.

| Chemical | CAS No. | Toxicological Endpoint | Listing Mechanism |
|------------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Marijuana Smoke ² | --- | Cancer | State's Qualified Experts |

The consumer exposures that are the subject of this Notice result from the use of the Products in accordance with their intended use, including the combustion and inhalation of the Products. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to the chemicals contained in marijuana is through direct smoking of marijuana leaves, flowers, and stems.

Period of Exposure and Violation. Exposures to Marijuana Smoke from the use of the Products have occurred each day since the Products were introduced into the California marketplace, but at a minimum since July 10, 2019. Moreover, these exposures will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users. Without proper warnings regarding the toxic effects of exposures to Marijuana Smoke resulting from contact with the Products, California citizens lack the information necessary to make informed decisions on whether and how to eliminate (or reduce) the risk of exposure to the listed chemicals from reasonable foreseeable use of the Products.

Resolution of Noticed Claims. Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65, Ms. Smith is interested in seeking a constructive resolution to this matter to have the ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified. To that end, Ms. Smith intends to file a private enforcement action as provided for in Proposition 65 for the alleged violations by California Herbal Remedies, unless it agrees in an enforceable written instrument to: (i) recall the listed Products or undertake best efforts to ensure that the requisite health hazard warnings are provided to those who have received such Products; (ii) affix clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning labels for Products sold in the future; and (iii) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals and avoid costly and time-consuming litigation.

Protection Agency, Reproductive and Cancer Hazard Assessment Branch, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

² See *Marijuana Smoke Listed Effective June 19, 2009 As Known To The State Of California To Cause Cancer*, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Jun. 19, 2009, available at <https://oehha.ca.gov/proposition-65/cmr/marijuana-smoke-listed-effective-june-19-2009-known-state-california-cause> (last visited May 4, 2020).

If you are interested in discussing a potential early resolution of this matter, you may communicate directly with Ms. Smith's attorneys using the below contact information.

Contact Information. Please direct all questions or issues concerning this Notice to Ms. Smith's counsel at the following address:

Kevin J. Cole, Esq.
KJC Law Group, A Professional Corporation
6700 Fallbrook Avenue, Suite 207
West Hills, CA 91307
Telephone: (818) 392-8995
e-Mail: kevin@kjclawgroup.com

Sincerely,



Kevin J. Cole

Attachments

Certificate of Merit
Certificate of Service
OEHHA Summary (to Violator only)
Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to the California Attorney General only)

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.

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

I, Kevin J. Cole, hereby declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day Notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the Notice has violated California Health and 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 has reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the alleged exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the action.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultations, and on all 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 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. The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this Certificate, including the information identified in Health and Safety Code section 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 5, 2020

Kevin J. Cole, Esq.
KJC Law Group, A Professional Corporation
Attorneys for Kelli Smith

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Chen Wang, declare that I am over the age of 18 years, and am not a party to the within action. I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, California, where the mailing occurs; and my business address is 6700 Fallbrook Avenue, Suite 207, West Hills, CA 91307.

On May 5, 2020, I served the following documents: **(1) 60-DAY NOTICE OF VIOLATION SENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.7(d); (2) CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; (3) PROPOSITION 65: A SUMMARY; and (4) CERTIFICATE OF MERIT ATTACHMENT (served only on the Attorney General)** on the parties listed below by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each party and depositing it at my business address with the U.S. Postal Service for delivery by Certified Mail with the postage thereon fully prepaid:

Via Certified Mail

California Herbal Remedies, Inc.
c/o Scott Kawasaki
21800 Oxnard Street, Suite 460
Woodland Hills, California 91367

On May 5, 2020, I served the California Attorney General (via website Portal) by uploading a true and correct copy thereof as a PDF file via the California Attorney General's website.

On May 5, 2020, I transmitted via electronic mail the above-listed documents to the electronic mail addresses of the City and/or District Attorneys who have specifically authorized email service and the authorization appears on the Attorney General's website.

See Attached Service List

On May 5, 2020, I served the following persons and/or entities at the last known address by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope and depositing it at my business address with the U.S. Postal Service for delivery with the postage thereon fully prepaid, and addressed as follows:

See Attached Service List

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 5, 2020 in Los Angeles, California



Chen Wang

Electronic Service List

| Office | Contact Information |
|--------------|--|
| ALAMEDA | Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney 7776 Oakport Street, Suite 650 Oakland, CA 94621 CEPDProp65@acgov.org |
| CALAVERAS | Barbara Yook, District Attorney 891 Mountain Ranch Rd. San Andreas, CA 95249 Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us |
| CONTRA COSTA | Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org |
| INYO | Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney 168 North Edwards Street Independence, CA 93526 inyoda@inyocounty.us |
| LASSEN | Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us |
| MARIPOSA | Walter W. Wall, District Attorney P.O. Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338 mcda@mariposacounty.org |
| MONTEREY | Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us |
| NAPA | Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org |
| NEVADA | Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959 DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us |
| PLUMAS | David Hollister, District Attorney 520 Main St. Quincy, CA 95971 davidhollister@countyofplumas.com |
| RIVERSIDE | Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| | Prop65@rivcoda.org |
| SACRAMENTO | Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org |
| SAN DIEGO | Summer Stephan, District Attorney 330 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101 SanDiegoDAProp65@sdcdca.org |
| SAN DIEGO | Mark Ankcorn, Deputy City Attorney 1200 Third Avenue San Diego, CA 92101 CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov |
| SAN FRANCISCO | Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org |
| SAN FRANCISCO | Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney 1390 Market Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102 Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org |
| SAN JOAQUIN | Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney County Government Center Annex, 4th Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us |
| SANTA BARBARA | Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara St. Santa Barbara, CA 93101 DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us |
| SANTA CLARA | Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org |
| SANTA CRUZ | Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us |
| SONOMA | Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney 600 Administration Dr. Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org |

| | |
|---------|---|
| | |
| TULARE | Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us |
| VENTURA | Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org |
| YOLO | Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org |

Service List

District Attorney, Alpine
County
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
346 Fifth Street Suite 101
Colusa, CA 95932

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

District Attorney, El Dorado
County
778 Pacific St.
Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno
County
2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000
Fresno, CA 93721

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, Marin
County
3501 Civic Center Drive,
Room 130
San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa
County
Post Office Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338

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

District Attorney, Merced
County
550 W. Main Street
Merced, CA 95340

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, Nevada
County
201 Commercial Street
Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange
County
401 West Civic Center Drive
Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer
County
10810 Justice Center Drive,
Ste 240
Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas
County
520 Main Street, Room 404
Quincy, CA 95971

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
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

District 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

San Jose City Attorney's
Office
200 East Santa Clara Street,
16th Floor
San Jose, CA 95113