# CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM, PC

12100 WILSHIRE BLVD, SUITE 800 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025 (310)200-3227

## **60-DAY NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUE**

for violations of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986

June 8, 2024

Current President/CEO Amorepacific US Inc. Attn: Legal Dept. 1407 Broadway Ste 210 New York, NY 10018 Current President/CEO
Sephora USA, Inc.
c/o CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
251 Little Falls Dr.
Wilmington, DE 19808

Current President/CEO
Amorepacific US Investment, Inc.
c/o The Corporation Trust Company
1209 Orange St.
Wilmington DE 19801

Re: NOTICE OF VIOLATION AGAINST AMOREPACIFIC US INC., AMOREPACIFIC US INVESTMENT, INC., AND SEPHORA USA, INC., of CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.6

To Whom It May Concern and to Public Prosecutors:

We represent Initiative for Safer Cosmetics ("IFSC"), an organization in the State of California acting in the interest of the general public. This letter serves as notice that the parties listed above are in violation of Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act, commencing with section 25249.5 of the Health and Safety Code ("Proposition 65"). In particular, the violations alleged by this notice consist of types of harm that may potentially result from exposures to the toxic chemical Diethanolamine ("DEA"). This chemical was listed as a carcinogen on June 22, 2012.

The specific type of product that is causing exposures in violation of Proposition 65 is lip masks, including but not limited to:

Product Name	Violative Chemical	Violators	
LANEIGE Lip Sleeping Mask - Vanilla	Diethanolamine	Amorepacific US Inc.;	
UPC: 8809803532563	(DEA)	Amorepacific US Investment, Inc.;	
		Sephora USA, Inc.	

The routes of exposure for the violations include inhalation by consumers. These exposures occur through the reasonably foreseeable use of the product. The sales of this product have been occurring since at least May 17, 2024, are continuing to this day and will continue to occur as long as the product subject to this notice is sold to and used by consumers.

Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning is provided with these products regarding the exposures to DEA caused by ordinary use of the product. The Parties are in violation of Proposition

65 by failing to provide such warning to consumers and as a result of the sales of this product, exposures to DEA have been occurring without proper warnings.

Pursuant to Proposition 65, notice and intent to sue shall be provided to violators 60 days before filing a complaint. This letter provides notice of the alleged violation to the parties listed above and the appropriate governmental authorities. A summary of Proposition 65 is attached.

IFSC identifies Dekee Yangzom as a responsible individual within the entity; 2934 1/2 Beverly Glen Blvd., Suite 46, Los Angeles, CA 90077; 310-892-5658. Ms. Yangzom requests all communications be directed to IFSC's attorneys.

Please direct all communication regarding this notice to IFSC's attorney, Elham Shabatian (ellie@cliffwoodlaw.com), Cliffwood Law Firm PC, 12100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 800, Los Angeles, CA 90025, 310-200-3227.

Sincerely,

Elham Shabatian

CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM, PC

Cc: see attached distribution list

## Attachments:

- 1. Certificate of Merit;
- 2. Certificate of Service;
- 3. Appendix "A" "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary" (to the Noticed Parties only);
- 4. Certificate of Merit (Attorney General Copy); Factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the certificate of merit (only sent to Attorney General)

#### **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d)

Re: Initiative for Safer Cosmetics's (IFSC) Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Amorepacific US Inc., Amorepacific US Investment, Inc., and Sephora USA, Inc.Company 1-4.

- I, Elham Shabatian, attorney at law, hereby declare:
- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the parties identified in the notice have 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. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, and/or other data regarding the alleged exposures to the listed chemical that is the cause of 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 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 certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: June 8, 2024

By \_\_\_\_\_\_

Elham Shabatian

#### **PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Elham Shabatian, am over the age of 18 and am not a party to this case. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. My business address is 12100 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 800, Los Angeles, CA 90025

On June 8, 2024, I served the following documents:

- 1. 60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue Under Health and 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 on the alleged violator (s) listed below via First Class Mail through the United States Postal Service by placing a true and correct copy in a sealed envelope, addressed to the entity listed below and providing such envelope to a United States Postal Service Representative:

Current President/CEO	Current President/CEO
Amorepacific US Inc.	Sephora USA, Inc.
Attn: Legal Dept.	c/o CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
1407 Broadway Ste. 210	251 Little Falls Dr.
New York, NY 10018	Wilmington, DE 19808
Current President/CEO	
Amorepacific US Investment, Inc.	
c/o The Corporation Trust Company	
1209 Orange St.	
Wilmington DE 19801	

as well as by filing electronically a true and correct copy thereof as permitted through the website of the California Office of the Attorney General via link at oag.ca.gov/prop65:

State of California Department of Justice Office of the Attorney General of California Filing link: oag.ca.gov/prop65

Copies of the notice were provided to the public enforcers by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the District Attorney and City Attorney offices the parties listed on the attached Distribution List. The District Attorney and City Attorney offices that have requested electronic service only were served electronically via the email addresses listed on the Distribution List.

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

Signature	
Elda	June 8, 2024
Elham Shabatian	

## **DISTRIBUTION LIST**

	DISTRIBUTION LIST	
District Attorney Alpine County	District Attorney Lake County	District Attorney Sierra County
PO Box 248	255 North Forbes Street	PO Box 457
Markleeville, CA 96120	Lakeport, CA 95453	Downieville, CA 95936
District Attorney Amador County	District Attorney Los Angeles County	District Attorney's Office Siskiyou
708 Court Street, Suite 202	Hall of Justice 211 W. Temple St. Ste 1200	County Courthouse
Jackson, CA 95642	Los Angeles, CA 90012	311 Fourth Street, Room 204
		Yreka, CA 96097
District Attorney Butte County	District Attorney Madera County	District Attorney Solano County
25 County Center Drive, Suite 245	209 West Yosemite Avenue	675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Oroville, CA 95965	Madera, CA 93637	Fairfield, CA 94533
District Attorney Colusa County	District Attorney Marin County	District Attorney Stanislaus County
310 6th Street	3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130	832 12th Street, Ste 300
Colusa, CA 95932	San Rafael, CA 94903	Modesto, CA 95354
District Attorney Del Norte County	District Attorney Mendocino County	District Attorney Sutter County
450 H Street, Suite 171	PO Box 1000	446 Second Street
Crescent City, CA 95531	Ukiah, CA 95482	Yuba City, CA 95991
District Attorney EL Dorado County	District Attorney Modoc County	District Attorney Tehama County
778 Pacific Street	204 S Court Street, Room 202	PO Box 519
Placerville, CA 95667	Alturas, CA 96101-4020	Red Bluff, CA 96080
District Attorney Mono County	District Attorney Orange County	District Attorney Trinity County
Post Office Box 617	300 N Flower St.	Post Office Box 310
Bridgeport, CA 93517	Santa Ana, CA 92703	Weaverville, CA 96093
District Attorney Glenn County	District Attorney San Benito County	District Attorney Tuolumne County
Post Office Box 430	419 4th Street	423 North Washington St.
Willows, CA 95988	Hollister, CA 95023	Sonora, CA 95370
District Attorney Humboldt County	District Attorney San Bernardino County	District Attorney Yuba County
825 5th Street 4th Floor	316 No. Mountain View Avenue	215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
Eureka, CA 95501	San Bernardino, CA 92415	Marysville, CA 95901
District Attorney Imperial County	District Attorney San Mateo County	Los Angeles City Attorney's Office
940 West Main Street, Suite 102	400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor	City Hall East 200 N. Main St., Suite 800
El Centro, CA 92243	Redwood City, CA 94063	Los Angeles, CA 90012
District Attorney Kern County	District Attorney Shasta County	District Attorney Kings County
1215 Truxtun Avenue	1355 West Street	1400 West Lacey Blvd.
Bakersfield, CA 93301	Redding, CA 96001	Hanford, CA 93230
Alameda County District Attorney	Calaveras County District Attorney	Contra Costa County District Attorney
CEPDProp65@acgov.org	Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us	sgrassini@contracostada.org
Inyo County District Attorney	Lassen County District Attorney	Mariposa County District Attorney
inyoda@inyocounty.us	mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us	mcda@mariposacounty.org
Merced County District Attorney	Monterey County District Attorney	Napa County District Attorney
Prop65@countyofmerced.com	Pro65DA@co.monterey.ca.us	CEPD@countyofnapa.org
Nevada County District Attorney	Placer County District Attorney	Plumas County District Attorney
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us	Prop65@placer.ca.gov	davidhollister@countyofplumas.com
Riverside County District Attorney	Sacramento County District Attorney	San Diego City Attorney
Prop65@rivcoda.org	Prop65@sacda.org	CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov
San Diego County District Attorney	San Francisco County District Attorney	San Francisco City Attorney
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdcda.org	alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org	Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org
San Joaquin County District Attorney DA	San Luis Obispo County District Attorney	Santa Barbara County District Attorney
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org	edobroth@co.slo.ca.us	DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us
Santa Clara County District Attorney	Santa Cruz County District Attorney	Sonoma County District Attorney
EPU@da.sccgov.org	Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us	jbarnes@sonoma-county.org
Tulare County District Attorney	Ventura County District Attorney	Yolo County District Attorney
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us	daspecialops@veutura.org	cfepd@yolocounty.org
San Jose City Attorney's Office	District Attorney Fresno	District Attorney of Roseville
proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov	consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
propositionosnotices@sanjoseca.gov	consumerprotection@rresnocountyca.gov	pwp65@place.ca.gov

#### **APPENDIX A**

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA PROTECTION AGENCY THE SAFE
DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACTION

1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the Lead and Toxic Enforcement Act 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 law. The reader is directed to the statue and its implementing regulations (See citations below) for further information.

Proposition 65 appears in California law as Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13. 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 Regulations, Sections 250000 through 27000.

## WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The "Governor's List" Proposition 65 requires the Governor to publish a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm. This list must be updated at least once a year. Over 725 chemicals have been listed as of November 16, 2001. Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under this law. Businesses that produce, use, release, or otherwise engage in activities involving those 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. 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.

Exposures are exempt from the warning requirement if they occur less than twelve months after the date of the listing of the chemical.

*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. Discharges are exempt from this requirement if they occur less than twenty months after the date of the listing of chemicals.

## DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. The law exempts:

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.

CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM, PC

12100 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 800 ♦ Los Angeles, CA 90025 ♦ ellie@cliffwoodlaw.com

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed as known to the State to cause cancer ("carcinogens"), a warning is not required if the business 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 for more than 250 listed carcinogens.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm ("reproductive toxicants"), a warning is not required if the business 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 (NOEL)," divided by a 1,000-fold safety or uncertainty factor. The "no observable effect level" is the highest dose level which has not been associated with an observable adverse reproductive or developmental effect.

Discharge that does not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering into 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 list chemical has not, does not, or will not enter any drinking water source, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount; expect an amount that would meet the " no significant risk" or "no observable effect" test if an individual were exposed to such an amount in drinking water.

#### **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 (those in cities with a population exceeding 750,000). 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. A notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in regulations (Title 27. California Code of Regulations, Section 25903). A private party may not pursue an enforcement action directly under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an action within sixty days of 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 of law to stop committing the violation.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION....

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment=s Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916)445-6900