LAW OFFICES OF GEORGE RIKOS

555 Beech Street, Suite 500 • San Diego, CA 92101 • TEL: (858) 342-9161 • FAX: (858) 724-1453

March 4, 2022

AMENDED

SIXTY-DAY NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUE FOR VIOLATION OF THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986

(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et see.) ("Proposition 65")

CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Registered Agent for: **Kiva Manufacturing, Inc.** 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N Sacramento, CA 95833

Richard James Jessee Registered Agent for DR GREEN RX 1406 S. Santa Fe Avenue Vista, California 92084

AND THE PUBLIC PROSECUTORS LISTED ON THE DISTRIBUTION LIST ACCOMPANYING THE ATTACHED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Re: Violations of Proposition 65 concerning LOST FARM GUMMIES containing THC

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Charles Jamison, the noticing entity, serves this Notice of Violation ("Notice") upon the violators ("Violator") Kiva Manufacturing, Inc. & DR GREEN RX and pursuant to and in compliance with Proposition 65. Charles Jamison's telephone number is (760) 585-8888. Mr. Jamison's address is 942 Ocean View Avenue, Encinitas, California 92024. Mr. Jamison has retained counsel whose contact information is: Law Offices of George Rikos; 555 West Beech, Suite 2100, San Diego, California 92101, Telephone No. (858) 342-9161, email: George@georgerikoslaw.com. This Notice satisfies a prerequisite for Mr. Jamison to commence an action against Violator in any Superior Court of California

to enforce Proposition 65. The violations addressed by this Notice occurred at numerous locations in each county in California as reflected in the district attorney addresses listed in the attached distribution list. Mr. Jamison is serving this Notice upon each person or entity responsible for the alleged violations, the California Attorney General, the district attorney for each county where alleged violations occurred, and the City Attorney for each city with a population (according to the most recent decennial census) of over 750,000 located within counties where the alleged violations occurred.

- Charles Jamison is a resident of the State of California. By sending this Notice, Mr. Jamison is acting "in the public interest" pursuant to Proposition 65. Mr. Jamison is a concerned citizen and resident of California and is dedicated to protecting the environment, improving human health, and supporting environmentally sound practices.
- This Notice concerns violations of the warning prong of Proposition 65, which states 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 ..." Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.
- The Following products contain Δ9-Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) which are known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. THC was added for reproductive toxicity effective January 3, 2021. This violation has, on information and belief, been ongoing since January 3, 2021 to the present.
 - o An exemplar of the violations caused by the Products includes but is not limited to:

Exemplar Product	Manufacturer/Retailor
Lost Farm Gummies ("Product")	Kiva Manufacturing, Inc.
	/Dr. Green RX

• This Notice addresses consumer products exposures. A "[c]onsumer products exposure' is an exposure which results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service." *Cal. Code Regs.* 27 § 25602(b).

Violator caused consumer product exposures in violation of Proposition 65 by producing or making available for distribution or sale in California to consumers the **Product**. The packaging for the **Product** (meaning any label or other written, printed or graphic matter affixed to or accompanying the product or its container or wrapper) contains no Proposition 65-compliant warning. Nor did Violator, with regard to the **Product**, provide a system of signs, public advertising identifying the system and toll-free information services, or any other system, which provided clear and reasonable warnings. Nor did Violator, with regard to the **Product**, provide identification of the product at

Kiva, et. al. March 4, 2022 Re: Page 3

_

retail outlets in a manner that provided a warning through shelf labeling, signs, or a combination thereof.

The principal route of exposure is through ingestion.

Proposition 65 requires that notice of intent to sue be given to the violator(s) sixty (60) days before the suit is filed. *Cal. Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7(d)(1). With this letter, Mr. Jamison gives notice of the alleged violation to Violators and the appropriate governmental authorities. In absence of any action by the appropriate governmental authorities within sixty (60) calendar days of the sending of this notice (plus five (5) calendar days because the place of address is within the State of California and ten (10) calendar days if the address is outside the State of California but within the United States), Mr. Jamison may file suit. *See Cal. Health & Safety Code* § 25249.7(d)(1); *Cal. Code Regs.* 27 § 25903(d)(1); and *Cal. Code Civ. Proc.* § 1013. Mr. Jamison remains open to discussing the possibility of resolving its grievances short of formal litigation.

With the copy of this notice submitted to the Violators, a copy of the following is attached: The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary.

Dated: March 4, 2022

George Rikos, Esq.

Attorney for Charles Jamison

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.

Products Containing Cannabis, Cannabis Smoke and/or THC

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(d)

I, George Rikos, hereby declares:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice(s) in which it is alleged the party(s) identified in the notice(s) has violated Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
- 2. I am the attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. My client, Charles Jamison, has confirmed the products contain the above identified chemicals and the products did not contain a warning.
- 4. Based on the information obtained, 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 plaintiffs' 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 certified, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: January 6, 2021

By: <u>Jeorge Rikos</u>

George Rikos

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(d)

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this case. I am a resident of employed in the county where the mailing occurred. My business address is 555 West Beech St., Suite 500, San Diego, California 92101.

ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW, I CAUSED TO BE SERVED THE FOLLOWING:

- 1) 60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue Under Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6
- 2) Certificate of Merit: Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d)
- 3) Certificate of Merit (Attorney General Copy): Factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the certificate of merit (*only sent to Attorney General*)
- 4) The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary by enclosing copies of the same in a sealed envelope addressed to each person shown below and depositing the envelope in the U.S. mail with the postage fully prepaid. Place of Mailing: San Diego, California. However, for those public prosecutors who have consented to electronic service, electronic service was made upon their designated email addresses as reflected on the distribution list on the same date as reflected below.

Name and address of each party to whom documents were mailed:

CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Registered Agent for: **Kiva Manufacturing, Inc.** 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N Sacramento, CA 95833

Richard James Jessee Registered Agent for DR GREEN RX 1406 S. Santa Fe Avenue Vista, California 92084

Name and address of each public prosecutor to whom documents were mailed or emailed¹:

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.

Date of Mailing: MARCH 4, 2022 By:

George Rikos

George Rikos

¹ Electronic service was issued to those parties who have agreed to electronic service at the email addresses reflected on the attached distribution list.

Distribution List

Alameda County District Attorney CEPDProp65@acgov.org	Los Angeles County District Attorney 210 W. Temple St., 18 th Floor	Mono County District Attorney PO Box 617
	Los Angeles, CA 90012	Bridgeport CA, 93517
Alpine County District Attorney	Madera County District Attorney	San Joaquin County District Attorney
PO Box 248	209 W Yosemite Ave	DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org
Markleeville, CA 96120	Madera, CA 93637	Con Francisco County District Attanson
Amador County District Attorney 708 Court, Suite 202	Mariposa County District Attorney mcda@mariposacounty.org	San Francisco County District Attorney alethea.sargent@sfgov.org
Jackson, CA 95642	mcda@mariposacounty.org	aletnea.sargent@sigov.org
Butte County District Attorney	Marin County District Attorney	San Diego City Attorney
25 County Center Dr.	3501 Civic Center Drive, #130	CityAttyCrimProp65@sandiego.gov
Oroville, CA 95965-3385	San Rafael, CA 94903	Cityrtity Crimir ropos assunding o.gov
Calaveras County District Attorney	Mendocino County District Attorney	San Bernardino County District Attorney
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us	P.O. Box 1000	316 N Mountain View Ave
. 🔾	Ukiah, CA 95482	San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004
Office of the Attorney General	Los Angeles City Attorney	San Francisco City Attorney
P.O. Box 70550	200 N Main St Ste 1800	Valerie.lopez@sfcityatt.org
Oakland, CA 94612-0550	Los Angeles CA 90012	
Colusa County District Attorney	Inyo County District Attorney	Placer County District Attorney
Courthouse, 547 Market St.	inyoda@inyocounty.us	Prop65@placer.ca.gov
Colusa, CA 95932		
Contra Costa County District Attorney	Orange County District Attorney	Merced County District Attorney
sgrassini@contracostada.org	PO Box 808	Prop65@countyofmerced.com
	Santa Ana, CA 92702	
Del Norte County District Attorney	Nevada County District Attorney	Napa County District Attorney
450 "H" St.	DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us	CEPD@countyofnapa.org
Crescent City, CA 95531	M C + P'++++	P: :1 C + P: : : A#
El Dorado County District Attorney 515 Main St.	Plumas County District Attorney Davidhollister@countyofplumas.com	Riverside County District Attorney Prop65@rivcoda.org
Placerville, CA 95667-5697	Davidnonister@countyorpiumas.com	Propos@rivcoda.org
Fresno County District Attorney	Sacramento County District Attorney	San Benito County District Attorney
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov	Prop65@sacda.org	419 4th St
	Tropos (e) succession	Hollister, CA 95023
Glenn County District Attorney	San Luis Obispo County District Attorney	Siskiyou County District Attorney
PO Box 430	edobroth@co.slo.ca.us	PO Box 986
Willows, CA 95988		Yreka, CA 96097
Humboldt County District Attorney	San Mateo County District Attorney	Solano County District Attorney
825 5 th St., 4 th Floor	400 County Center	600 Union Ave
Eureka, CA 95501	Redwood City, CA 94063	Fairfield, CA 94533
Imperial County District Attorney	Santa Barbara County District Attorney	Sonoma County District Attorney
939 W. Main St., 2 nd Floor	DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us	jbarnes@sonoma-county.org
El Centro, CA 92243-2860		
Kern County District Attorney	Santa Clara County District Attorney	Shasta County District Attorney
1215 Truxtun Ave.	EPU@da.sccgov.org	1525 Court St., 3 rd Floor
Bakersfield, CA 93301	Santa Cruz County District Attorney	Redding, CA 96001-1632 Sierra County District Attorney
Kings County District Attorney Gov't Ctr., 1400 W. Lacey Blvd.	Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us	PO Box 457
Hanford, CA 93230	F10p03DA@santacruzcounty.us	Downieville, CA 95936-0457
Lake County District Attorney	Stanislaus County District Attorney	Trinity County District Attorney
255 N. Forbes St.	PO Box 442	PO Box 310
Lakeport, CA 95453-4790	Modesto, CA 95353	Weaverville, CA 96093
Modoc County District Attorney	Sutter County District Attorney	Yuba County District Attorney
204 S. Court Street	446 Second Street	215 5 th St
Alturas, CA 96101-4020	Yuba City, CA 95991	Marysville, CA 95901
San Diego District Attorney	Lassen County District Attorney	Monterey County District Attorney
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdcda.org	mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us	Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us
Tuolumne County District Attorney	Tulare County District Attorney	Yolo County District Attorney
2 S. Green St	Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us	cfepd@yolocounty.org
Sonora, CA 95370		
Ventura County District Attorney	Tehama County District Attorney	San Jose City Attorney
daspecialops@ventura.org	P.O. Box 519	151 W. Mission St.
77.	Red Bluff, CA 96080	San Jose, CA 95110
Electronically Uploaded to:		
Office of the Attorney General		
Proposition 65 Enforcement Reporting		
Attn: Prop 65 Coordinator https://oag.ca.gov/Prop65/add-60-day-notice		
nups.//oag.ca.gov/r10p03/add-00-day-notice		