

# SIXTY-DAY NOTICE OF VIOLATION

---

*SENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(d)*

**DATE:** August 8, 2020

**To:** C. Douglas McMillon, President – Walmart Inc.  
California Attorney General's Office;  
District Attorney's Office for 58 Counties; and  
City Attorneys for San Francisco, San Diego, San Jose, Sacramento and Los Angeles

**FROM:** Laurence Vinocur

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

My name is Laurence Vinocur. I am a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general public. I seek to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and, if possible, to improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. This Notice is provided to the public agencies listed above pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"). As noted above, notice is also being provided to the alleged violator, Walmart Inc. (the "Violator"). The violations covered by this Notice consist of the product exposure, routes of exposure and types of harm potentially resulting from exposure to the toxic chemical ("Listed Chemical") identified below, as follows:

Product Exposure: See Section VII. Exhibit A  
Listed Chemical: Lead  
Routes of Exposure: Ingestion, Dermal  
Types of Harm: Birth Defects and Other Reproductive Harm

## **II. NATURE OF ALLEGED VIOLATION (PRODUCT EXPOSURE)**

The specific product(s) that is causing consumer exposures in violation of Proposition 65, and that is covered by this Notice, is listed under "Product(s)" in Exhibit A in Section VII. All products covered by this Notice shall be referred to hereinafter as the "Products." Exposures to the Listed Chemical from the use of the Products have been occurring without the "clear and reasonable warning" required by Proposition 65, dating as far back as August 8, 2017. Without proper warnings regarding the toxic effects of exposures to the Listed Chemical 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 Chemical from the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

California citizens, through the act of buying, acquiring or utilizing the Products, are exposed to the Listed Chemical. By way of example, consumers and other individuals, including women of childbearing age, ingest the Listed Chemical when they, among other activities, touch the Products and transfer the Listed Chemical from the Products to their mouths through hand-to-mouth activities that may continue to occur for a significant period after one or more contacts with the Product stops. Additionally, consumers and other individuals, including women of childbearing age, are exposed to the Listed Chemical through direct dermal contact when they, among other activities, handle, touch or otherwise use the Products. Further, there are reasonably foreseeably uses of the Products that result in direct ingestion. The California State Plan for Occupational Safety and Health incorporates the provisions of Proposition 65, as approved by Federal OSHA on June 6, 1997. This approval specifically placed certain conditions with regard to occupational exposures on Proposition 65, including that it does not apply to the conduct of manufacturers occurring outside the State of California so long as they are based in the United States. The approval also provides that a United States employer may use the means of compliance in the general hazard communication requirements to comply with Proposition 65. It also requires that supplemental enforcement is subject to the supervision of the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Accordingly, any settlement, civil complaint, or substantive court orders in this matter must be submitted to the Attorney General. Additionally, it is important to note that the sale of the Products through online means of transaction must provide the customer with a clear and reasonable warning for the risk of reproductive toxicity.

### **III. CONTACT INFORMATION**

Please direct all questions concerning this Notice to me through my counsel's office at the following address:

Laurence Vinocur  
c/o Clifford A. Chanler  
Chanler, LLC  
72 Huckleberry Hill Road  
New Canaan, CT 06840-3801  
Telephone: (203) 594-9246

### **IV. PROPOSITION 65 INFORMATION**

For general information concerning the provisions of Proposition 65, please feel free to contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's ("OEHHA") Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900. For the Violator's reference, I have attached a copy of "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary" which has been prepared by OEHHA.

### **V. RESOLUTION OF NOTICED CLAIMS**

Based on the allegations set forth in this Notice, I intend to file a citizen enforcement lawsuit against the alleged Violator unless such Violator enters into a binding written agreement to: (1) recall Products already sold or undertake best efforts to ensure that the requisite health hazard warnings are provided to those who have received such Products; (2) provide "clear and reasonable warnings" for Products sold

in the future or, preferably, reformulate such Products to (or ensure manufacturers or importers do so) eliminate the lead exposures; and (3) pay an appropriate civil penalty based on the factors enumerated in California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b). If the alleged Violator is particularly interested in resolving this dispute without resorting to time-consuming and costly litigation, please feel free to contact my counsel identified in Section III. It should be noted that neither my counsel nor I can: (1) finalize any settlement until after the 60-day notice period has expired; nor (2) speak for the Attorney General or any district or city attorney who received this Notice. Therefore, while reaching an agreement with me will resolve my claims, such agreement may not satisfy the public prosecutors.

## **VI. ADDITIONAL NOTICE INFORMATION**

Identified below is a Product recently purchased and witnessed as being available for purchase or use in California that is covered by this Notice. Based on publicly available information, the retailer, importer and/or manufacturer of the Product are also provided below. I believe and allege that the sale of the offending Product has also occurred without the requisite Proposition 65 “clear and reasonable warning” including, but not limited to, transactions made over-the-counter, business-to-business, through the internet and/or via a catalog by the Violator.

<i>Retailer / Importer<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Manufacturer (If Any Identified)</i>
Walmart Inc. (www.walmart.com)	See <b>Exhibit C</b> and below. <sup>2</sup>

## **VII. EXHIBIT A**

<i>Product</i>	<i>Toxicant</i>
Leo Fishing 50pcs Fishing Lead Fall Olive Shaped Sinkers Hook Connector Opening Mouth Line Weights Round Shot Split; as Illustrated in <b>Exhibit B</b>	Lead

---

<sup>1</sup> If the manufacturer does not have agent for process of service in the United States, then retailer is alleged to be an importer as well.

<sup>2</sup> In accordance with 27 CCR § 25600.29(g), please answer the questions on **Exhibit C**, and return to Mr. Laurence Vinocur at the offices of Chanler, LLC, located at 72 Huckleberry Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840.

## Exhibit B



\* No health hazard warning (for the risk of reproductive toxicity) appears on the website's display page, check-out page or other link reasonably calculated to convey the Proposition 65 message in a clear manner.

## Exhibit C

As it relates to the Product referenced to on **Exhibit A**, and pictured on **Exhibit B**, please provide the full legal entity name and any known contact information for:

- 1) Any and all MANUFACTURER.
- 2) Any and all PRODUCER.
- 3) Any and all PACKAGER.

# PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury:

I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. My business address is 72 Huckleberry Hill Road, New Canaan, CT 06840.

On August 8, 2020, I caused to be served the following documents:

**SIXTY-DAY NOTICE OF VIOLATION SENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(d);**

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; AND**

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

XXXX **By First Class Certified Mail** through the United States Postal Service by placing true and correct copies of the above documents in a sealed envelope, addressed to each alleged violator listed below and providing such envelope to a United States Postal Service Representative.

C. Douglas McMillon, President  
Walmart Inc.  
702 SW 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Bentonville, AR 72716

On August 8, 2020, I caused to be served the following documents:

**SIXTY-DAY NOTICE OF VIOLATION SENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(d); AND**

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

XXXX **By Electronic Mail** by sending true and correct copies of the above documents to the electronic notification (Email) address(es) on the attached "Email Service List".

On August 8, 2020, I caused to be served the following documents:

**SIXTY-DAY NOTICE OF VIOLATION SENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(d);**

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; AND**

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT ATTACHMENTS**

XXXX **By Electronic Upload** by causing true and correct copies of the above documents to be uploaded to the California Attorney General's website at the web address on the attached "Electronic Upload Service List".

Executed on August 8, 2020, in Folsom, California.

Winnie Pang


# CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d)

I, Clifford A. Chanler, hereby declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice has violated Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings;
2. I am the 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 this action and/or the Listed Chemical in substantially similar products and exposes individuals through the same potential routes;
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 under Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(h)(2) including (i) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (ii) certain facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: August 8, 2020



---

Clifford A. Chanler

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](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 contaminant<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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](mailto: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.