

1 Michael Freund SBN 99687  
2 Michael Freund & Associates  
3 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105  
4 Berkeley, CA 94704  
5 Telephone: (510) 540-1992  
6 Facsimile: (510) 371-0885

7 Attorney for Plaintiff  
8 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

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

14 **Plaintiff,**

15 **vs.**

16 **SCIENCE IN SPORT INC; SIS (SCIENCE**  
17 **IN SPORT) LIMITED; SCIENCE IN**  
18 **SPORT PLC; and DOES 1-100**

19 **Defendants.**

**CASE NO. 22CV009414**

**AMENDED STIPULATED CONSENT**  
**JUDGMENT**

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*

Action Filed: April 1, 2022

Trial Date: None set

20 **1. INTRODUCTION**

21 **1.1** On April 1, 2022, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), a  
22 non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by  
23 filing a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties (the “Complaint”)  
24 pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 *et seq.*  
25 (“Proposition 65”), against Science in Sport Inc, (“Science in Sport”), other entities, and Does  
26 1-100. In this action, ERC alleges that a number of products manufactured, distributed, or sold  
27 by Science in Sport contain lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and  
28 reproductive toxin, and expose consumers to this chemical at a level requiring a Proposition 65  
warning. These products (referred to hereinafter individually as a “Covered Product” or

1 collectively as “Covered Products”) are: (1) SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading  
2 Shot Strawberry, (2) SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading Shot Apple, (3) SIS  
3 Science In Sport Go Energy + Caffeine Sport Energy Supplement Berry Flavor, (4) SIS  
4 Science In Sport Go Energy + Caffeine Sport Energy Supplement Citrus Flavor, (5) SIS  
5 Science In Sport Go Energy + Caffeine Sport Energy Supplement Double Espresso Flavor, (6)  
6 SIS Science In Sport Go Isotonic Energy Sport Energy Supplement Apple Flavor, (7) SIS  
7 Science In Sport Rego Rapid Recovery Sport Recovery Supplement Strawberry Flavor, (8) SIS  
8 Science In Sport Go Energy Bake Strawberry, (9) SIS Science In Sport Energy + Protein  
9 Chewy Banana, (10) SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy Supplement  
10 Blueberry Flavor, (11) SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy Supplement  
11 Banana Fudge Flavor, (12) SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy Supplement  
12 Chocolate Fudge Flavor, (13) SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy  
13 Supplement Red Berry Flavor, (14) SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading Powder  
14 Cherry Cola, (15) SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading Powder Pink Grapefruit,  
15 (16) SIS Science In Sport Protein 20 Double Chocolate Brownie, (17) SIS Science In Sport  
16 Protein 20 Chocolate Peanut Crunch, and (18) SIS Science In Sport Rego Cherry Juice Cherry.

17 **1.2** ERC and Science in Sport are hereinafter referred to individually as a “Party” or  
18 collectively as the “Parties.”

19 **1.3** ERC is a 501 (c)(3) California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other  
20 causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of  
21 hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees,  
22 and encouraging corporate responsibility.

23 **1.4** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that Science in Sport is a  
24 business entity that qualifies as a “person in the course of doing business” within the meaning of  
25 Proposition 65. Science in Sport manufactures, distributes, or sells the Covered Products.

26 **1.5** The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC’s Notices of Violation  
27 dated September 23, 2021, September 30, 2021, October 7, 2021, October 22, 2021, and  
28 January 6, 2022 that were served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers,

1 and Science in Sport (“Notices”). True and correct copies of the 60-Day Notices dated  
2 September 23, 2021, September 30, 2021, October 7, 2021, October 22, 2021 and January 6,  
3 2022 are attached hereto as *Exhibits A, B, C, D* and *E* and each is incorporated herein by  
4 reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notices were served on the Attorney  
5 General, public enforcers, and Science in Sport and no designated governmental entity has  
6 filed a Complaint against Science in Sport with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged  
7 violations.

8 **1.6** ERC’s Notices and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products by  
9 California consumers exposes them to lead without first receiving clear and reasonable  
10 warnings from Science in Sport, which is in violation of California Health and Safety Code  
11 section 25249.6. Science in Sport denies all material allegations contained in the Notices and  
12 Complaint.

13 **1.7** The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle,  
14 compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation.  
15 Nothing in this Consent Judgment nor compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute  
16 or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties or by any of their respective officers,  
17 directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions,  
18 franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of any fact,  
19 issue of law, or violation of law. Science in Sport agrees that it will not attempt to shift the  
20 performance of any responsibility or obligation it may have under this Consent Judgment to  
21 SiS (Science in Sport) Limited or Science in Sport PLC.

22 **1.8** Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall  
23 prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in  
24 any current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.

25 **1.9** The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered  
26 as a Judgment by this Court.

27 **2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

28 For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become

1 necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter  
2 jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction  
3 over Science in Sport as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda  
4 County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final  
5 resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date that were or could have been  
6 asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notices and Complaint.

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

8 **3.1** Beginning on the Effective Date, Science in Sport shall be permanently  
9 enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, “Distributing into the State of  
10 California,” or directly selling in the State of California, any Covered Product that exposes a  
11 person to a “Daily Lead Exposure Level” of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day unless it  
12 meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.

13 **3.1.1** As used in this Consent Judgment, the term “Distributing into the State  
14 of California” shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in  
15 California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Science in Sport knows or has  
16 reason to know will sell the Covered Product in California.

17 **3.1.2** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the “Daily Lead Exposure  
18 Level” shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula:  
19 micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the  
20 product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings  
21 of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on  
22 the label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day. If the label contains no  
23 recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

24 **3.1.3** In calculating the Daily Lead Exposure Level for a Covered Product,  
25 Science in Sport shall be allowed to deduct the amount of lead which is deemed “naturally  
26 occurring” in the ingredients listed in **Table 1** that are contained in that Covered Product under  
27 the following conditions: If Science in Sport claims entitlement to a “naturally occurring”  
28 allowance, then, for each year that Science in Sport claims such an entitlement, Science in Sport

1 shall provide ERC with the following information: (a) Science in Sport must produce to ERC a  
 2 written list of each ingredient in the Covered Product, and the amount, measured in grams, of each  
 3 such ingredient contained therein, for which a “naturally occurring” allowance is claimed; (b)  
 4 Science in Sport must provide ERC with documentation of laboratory testing, conducted during  
 5 the year for which the “naturally occurring” allowance is claimed, that complies with Sections  
 6 3.4.3 through 3.4.4 and that shows the amount of lead, if any, contained in each ingredient listed  
 7 in **Table 1** that is contained in the Covered Product and for which Science in Sport intends to  
 8 deduct “naturally occurring” lead; (c) if the laboratory testing reveals the presence of lead in any  
 9 of the ingredients listed in **Table 1** that are contained in the Covered Product, Science in Sport  
 10 shall be entitled to deduct the amount of lead contained in each ingredient, up to the full amount  
 11 of the allowance for each ingredient as shown in **Table 1**, for those ingredients that are in the  
 12 Covered Product; and (d) if the Covered Product does not contain any of the ingredients listed in  
 13 **Table 1**, Science in Sport shall not be entitled to a deduction for “naturally occurring” lead in the  
 14 Covered Product for those ingredients. The information required by Sections 3.1.3(a) and (b) shall  
 15 be provided to ERC within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date, or anniversary thereof, for any  
 16 year that Science in Sport shall claim entitlement to the “naturally occurring” allowance.

17 **TABLE 1**

INGREDIENT	ALLOWANCES OF AMOUNT OF LEAD
Cocoa Powder	Up to 0.225 microgram/gram
Chocolate Liquor	Up to 0.225 microgram/gram
Cocoa Butter	Up to 0.1 micrograms/gram
Calcium (elemental)	Up to 0.8 micrograms/gram
Ferrous Fumarate	Up to 0.4 micrograms/gram
Zinc Oxide	Up to 8.0 micrograms/gram
Magnesium Oxide	Up to 0.4 micrograms/gram
Magnesium Carbonate	Up to 0.332 microgram/gram
Magnesium Hydroxide	Up to 0.4 micrograms/gram

Zinc Gluconate	Up to 0.8 micrograms/gram
Potassium Chloride	Up to 1.1 micrograms/gram

### 3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings


If Science in Sport is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, one of the two following warnings must be utilized (“Warning”):

#### **OPTION 1:**

**WARNING:** Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including [lead] which is [are] known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to [www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food](http://www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food).

or

#### **OPTION 2:**

 **WARNING:** [Cancer and] Reproductive Harm - [www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food](http://www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food)

Science in Sport shall use the phrase “cancer and” in the Warning if Science in Sport has reason to believe that the “Daily Lead Exposure Level” is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4 or if Science in Sport has reason to believe that another Proposition 65 chemical is present which may require a cancer warning. For the Option 2 Warning, a symbol consisting of a black exclamation point in a yellow equilateral triangle with a bold black outline shall be placed to the left of the text of the Warning, in a size no smaller than the height of the word “**WARNING.**”

The Warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the label of each Covered Product and it must be set off from other surrounding information and enclosed in a box. In addition, for any Covered Product sold over the internet, the Warning shall appear on the checkout page when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered Product. An asterisk or other identifying method must be utilized to identify which products on the checkout page are subject to the Warning. In no event shall any internet or website Warning be contained in or made through a link.

The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on the website or on the label and the word “**WARNING**” shall be in all

1 capital letters and in bold print. No statements intended to or likely to have the effect of  
2 diminishing the impact of the Warning on the average lay person shall accompany the Warning.  
3 Further, no statements may accompany the Warning that state or imply that the source of the listed  
4 chemical has an impact on or results in a less harmful effect of the listed chemical.

5 Science in Sport must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared  
6 with other words, statements or designs on the label, or on its website, if applicable, to render the  
7 Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions  
8 of purchase or use of the product.

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

### 12 **3.3 Conforming Covered Products**

13 A Conforming Covered Product is a Covered Product for which the “Daily Lead Exposure  
14 Level” is no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day as determined by the exposure  
15 methodology set forth in Section 3.1 and the quality control methodology described in Section  
16 3.4, and that is not known by Science in Sport to contain other chemicals that violate Proposition  
17 65’s safe harbor thresholds.

### 18 **3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology**

19 **3.4.1** Beginning within one year of the Effective Date, Science in Sport shall  
20 arrange for lead testing of Covered Products at least once a year for a minimum of five  
21 consecutive years by arranging for testing of three (3) randomly selected samples of each of  
22 the Covered Products, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which Science in Sport  
23 intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a consumer in  
24 California or “Distributing into the State of California.” If tests conducted pursuant to this  
25 Section demonstrate that no Warning is required for a Covered Product during each of five  
26 consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to  
27 that Covered Product. However, if during or after the five-year testing period, Science in Sport  
28 changes ingredient suppliers for any of the Covered Products and/or reformulates any of the

1 Covered Products, Science in Sport shall test that Covered Product annually for at least four (4)  
2 consecutive years after such change is made.

3 **3.4.2** For purposes of measuring the “Daily Lead Exposure Level,” the highest  
4 lead detection result of the three (3) randomly selected samples of the Covered Products will  
5 be controlling.

6 **3.4.3** All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a  
7 laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate  
8 for the method used, including limit of detection and limit of quantification, sensitivity,  
9 accuracy and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass  
10 Spectrometry (“ICP-MS”) achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.005  
11 mg/kg.

12 **3.4.4** All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an  
13 independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory  
14 Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the  
15 United States Food & Drug Administration.

16 **3.4.5** Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Science in Sport’s ability  
17 to conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including  
18 the raw materials used in their manufacture.

19 **3.4.6** Within thirty (30) days of ERC’s written request, Science in Sport shall  
20 deliver lab reports obtained pursuant to Section 3.4 to ERC. Science in Sport shall retain all  
21 test results and documentation for a period of five years from the date of each test.

22 **3.4.7** The testing and reporting requirements of Section 3.4 do not apply to  
23 any Covered Product for which Science in Sport is providing a Warning pursuant to Section  
24 3.2 of this Consent Judgment continuously and uninterrupted after the Effective Date. In the  
25 event a Warning is provided after the Effective Date but Science in Sport thereafter ceases to  
26 provide the Warning, the testing and reporting requirements of Section 3.4 of this Consent  
27 Judgment shall apply beginning within one year after the date the Warning ceases to be  
28 provided, unless Science in Sport can show to the satisfaction of ERC that the cessation in



1 providing the Warning was a temporary error that was resolved when discovered.

2 **4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT**

3 **4.1** In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement  
4 payments, attorney's fees, and costs, Science in Sport shall make a total payment of  
5 \$130,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC within 10 (ten) days of the Effective Date  
6 ("Due Date"). Science in Sport shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's account, for  
7 which ERC will give Science in Sport the necessary account information. The Total Settlement  
8 Amount shall be apportioned as follows:

9 **4.2** \$33,000.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and  
10 Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$24,750.00) of the civil penalty to  
11 the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe  
12 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety  
13 Code section 25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$8,250.00) of the civil penalty.

14 **4.3** \$9,316.70 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable  
15 costs incurred in bringing this action.

16 **4.4** \$21,400.00 shall be distributed to Michael Freund as reimbursement of ERC's  
17 attorney's fees, while \$66,283.30 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except  
18 as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

19 **4.5** In the event that Science in Sport fails to remit the Total Settlement Amount  
20 owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Science in Sport  
21 shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC  
22 shall provide written notice of the delinquency to Science in Sport via electronic mail. If  
23 Science in Sport fails to deliver the Total Settlement Amount within five (5) days from the  
24 written notice, the Total Settlement Amount shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment  
25 interest rate provided in the California Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally,  
26 Science in Sport agrees to pay ERC's reasonable attorney's fees and costs for any efforts to  
27 collect the payment due under this Consent Judgment.

28 ///

1     **5.    MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT**

2           **5.1**     This Consent Judgment may be modified only as to injunctive terms (i) by  
3 written stipulation of the Parties and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment,  
4 (ii) by motion of either Party in the event of a modification warranted by a Final Decision of  
5 the United States Supreme Court, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the California Supreme  
6 Court, or a California Court of Appeal rendered after entry of this Consent Judgment, that  
7 establishes that a conflict exists between this Consent Judgment and the United States or  
8 California Constitution, (iii) by motion of either Party in the event of a revision to the  
9 Proposition 65 statute that occurs after entry of this Consent Judgment and that directly bears  
10 on this Consent Judgment, or (iv) by motion of either Party pursuant to an agreement by the  
11 Parties for entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment. For purposes of Section 5.1, a  
12 Final Decision means that the time to file an appeal has expired and/or the appellate process is  
13 concluded.

14           **5.2**     If Science in Sport seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1,  
15 then Science in Sport must provide written notice to ERC of its intent (“Notice of Intent”). If  
16 ERC seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then  
17 ERC must provide written notice to Science in Sport within thirty (30) days of receiving the  
18 Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies Science in Sport in a timely manner of ERC’s intent to meet  
19 and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The  
20 Parties shall meet in person or via telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC’s notification of its  
21 intent to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the  
22 proposed modification, ERC shall provide to Science in Sport a written basis for its position.  
23 The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to  
24 resolve any remaining disputes. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing  
25 to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

26           **5.3**     In the event that Science in Sport initiates or otherwise requests a modification  
27 by motion or other method under Section 5.1, Science in Sport shall reimburse ERC its costs  
28 and reasonable attorney’s fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and that are

1 incurred as a result of the motion or other method pursued by Science in Sport to seek  
2 modification of the Consent Judgment. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, ERC shall not  
3 be entitled to reimbursement of its costs and reasonable attorney's fees to the extent it is not the  
4 prevailing party with regard to a motion pursued by Science in Sport pursuant to Section 5.1(ii)  
5 or (iii).

6 **6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT**  
7 **JUDGMENT**

8 **6.1** This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or  
9 terminate this Consent Judgment.

10 **6.2** If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Conforming  
11 Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall  
12 inform Science in Sport in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information  
13 sufficient to permit Science in Sport to identify the Covered Products at issue. Science in Sport  
14 shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information,  
15 from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and  
16 3.4.4, demonstrating Science in Sport's compliance with the Consent Judgment. The Parties  
17 shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

18 **7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT**

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

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

26 **8.1** This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on  
27 behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Science in Sport and its respective officers,  
28 directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers,

1 franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Science in Sport),  
2 distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the  
3 distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any  
4 of them (collectively, “Released Parties”).

5 **8.2** ERC, acting in the public interest, releases the Released Parties from any and all  
6 claims for violations of Proposition 65 up through the Effective Date based on exposure to lead  
7 from the Covered Products as set forth in the Notices of Violation. ERC, on behalf of itself  
8 only, hereby fully releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all claims,  
9 actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs, and  
10 expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the handling, use, or consumption of  
11 the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing  
12 regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered  
13 Products regarding lead to and including the Effective Date.

14 **8.3** ERC on its own behalf only, and Science in Sport on its own behalf only,  
15 further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or  
16 statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of  
17 Proposition 65 in connection with the Notices and Complaint up through and including the  
18 Effective Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party’s  
19 right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

20 **8.4** It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts  
21 alleged in the Notices and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be  
22 discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Science in Sport on behalf of itself only,  
23 acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such  
24 claims up through and including the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore.  
25 ERC and Science in Sport acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.2 and 8.3 above  
26 may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to  
27 any such unknown claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

28 A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE  
CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO

1 EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE  
2 AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY  
3 AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED  
PARTY.

4 ERC on behalf of itself only, and Science in Sport on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and  
5 understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code  
6 section 1542.

7 **8.5** Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to  
8 constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any of the Released Parties regarding alleged  
9 exposures to lead in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notices and Complaint.

10 **8.6** Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or  
11 environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Science in  
12 Sport's products other than the Covered Products.

13 **9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS**

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

17 **10. GOVERNING LAW**

18 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in  
19 accordance with the laws of the State of California.

20 **11. PROVISION OF NOTICE**

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

24 **FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.:**

25 Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Center  
26 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400  
27 San Diego, CA 92108  
28 Ph: (619) 500-3090  
Email: [chris.heptinstall@erc501c3.org](mailto:chris.heptinstall@erc501c3.org)

1 With a copy to:  
2 Michael Freund  
3 Michael Freund & Associates  
4 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105  
5 Berkeley, CA 94704  
6 (510) 499-1992  
7 Email: [freund1@aol.com](mailto:freund1@aol.com)

8 **FOR SCIENCE IN SPORT INC:**

9 Stephen Moon, Director  
10 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
11 16-18 Hatton Garden  
12 London EC1N 8AT  
13 United Kingdom

14 With a copy to:  
15 Gary M. Roberts  
16 Dentons US LLP  
17 601 S Figueroa St, Ste 2500  
18 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5709  
19 Telephone: 213-623-9300  
20 Email: [gary.roberts@dentons.com](mailto:gary.roberts@dentons.com)

21 **12. COURT APPROVAL**

22 **12.1** Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a  
23 Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this  
24 Consent Judgment.

25 **12.2** If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,  
26 the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible  
27 prior to the hearing on the motion.

28 **12.3** If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be  
void and have no force or effect.

**13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS**

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

1     **14. DRAFTING**

2             The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for  
3 each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms  
4 and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and  
5 construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn,  
6 and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact  
7 that one of the Parties or one of the Parties’ legal counsel prepared or drafted all or any portion of  
8 the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated equally in  
9 the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

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

11             If a dispute arises with respect to either Party’s compliance with the terms of this Consent  
12 Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet and confer in person, by telephone, or in  
13 writing and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be  
14 filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

15     **16. ENFORCEMENT**

16             ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda  
17 County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action  
18 brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs,  
19 penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment.  
20 To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of  
21 Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent  
22 Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are  
23 provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

24     **17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION**

25             **17.1** This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding  
26 of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, including any and all prior  
27 discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related thereto. No representations,  
28 oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any

1 Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be  
2 deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

3 **17.2** Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully  
4 authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment.

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

7 This Consent Judgment is presented to the Court upon the request of the Parties. The  
8 Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed  
9 regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:


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

13 (2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section  
14 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.

15 **IT IS SO STIPULATED:**

16 Dated: 8/24, 2022

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH  
CENTER, INC.

17  
18  
19 By:   
Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director

20 Dated: 24th August, 2022

SCIENCE IN SPORT INC

21  
22 *James Simpson*

23 By: James Simpson  
24 Its: CFO




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

Dated: August 30, 2022

MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES

By:   
Michael Freund  
Attorney for Environmental Research  
Center, Inc.

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

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

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2022 \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge of the Superior Court

# **EXHIBIT A**

**Michael Freund & Associates**

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

Michael Freund, Esq.

September 23, 2021

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

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

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

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

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

**Alleged Violators.** The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violators”) are:

**Science in Sport Inc  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
Science in Sport PLC**

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

- 1. SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading Shot Strawberry - Lead**
- 2. SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading Shot Apple - Lead**
- 3. SIS Science In Sport Go Energy + Caffeine Sport Energy Supplement Berry Flavor - Lead**

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

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

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

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least September 23, 2018, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

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

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

Sincerely,



---

Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC**

I, Michael Freund, declare:

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

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

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

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

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

Dated: September 23, 2021



---

Michael Freund

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

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

On September 23, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Tom Santangelo  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
300 Garden City Plaza, Ste 326  
Garden City, NY 11530

USA Corporate Services Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
3500 S Dupont Hwy  
Dover, DE 19901

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
19 W 34<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 1018  
New York, NY 10001

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

On September 23, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

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

On September 23, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

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

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

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

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

September 23, 2021

Page 6

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

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

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

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

Alethea Sargent, Assistant District Attorney  
White Collar Division  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
North Building, Suite 400N  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
alethea.sargent@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org

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

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

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

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

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

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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




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

September 23, 2021

Page 7

On September 23, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on September 23, 2021, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Phyllis Dunwoody". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "P".

---

Phyllis Dunwoody

**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 4<sup>th</sup> 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, Mendocino  
County  
Post Office Box 1000  
Ukiah, CA 95482

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

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

District Attorney, Orange  
County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Sierra  
County  
Post Office Box 457  
100 Courthouse Square, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

## 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.

# **EXHIBIT B**



**Michael Freund & Associates**

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

Michael Freund, Esq.

September 30, 2021

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

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

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

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

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

**Alleged Violators.** The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violators”) are:

**Science in Sport Inc  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
Science in Sport PLC**

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

- 1. SIS Science In Sport Go Energy + Caffeine Sport Energy Supplement Citrus Flavor - Lead**
- 2. SIS Science In Sport Go Energy + Caffeine Sport Energy Supplement Double Espresso Flavor - Lead**
- 3. SIS Science In Sport Go Isotonic Energy Sport Energy Supplement Apple Flavor - Lead**

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

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

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

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least September 30, 2018, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

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

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

Sincerely,



---

Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC**

I, Michael Freund, declare:

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

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

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

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

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

Dated: September 30, 2021



---

Michael Freund

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

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

On September 30, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Tom Santangelo  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
300 Garden City Plaza, Ste 326  
Garden City, NY 11530

USA Corporate Services Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
3500 S Dupont Hwy  
Dover, DE 19901

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
19 W 34<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 1018  
New York, NY 10001

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

On September 30, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

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

On September 30, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

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

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

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

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

September 30, 2021

Page 6

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

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

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

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

Alethea Sargent, Assistant District Attorney  
White Collar Division  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
North Building, Suite 400N  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
alethea.sargent@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org

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

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

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

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

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

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
September 30, 2021  
Page 7

On September 30, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on September 30, 2021, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Phyllis Dunwoody

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

September 30, 2021

Page 8

**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 4<sup>th</sup> 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, Mendocino  
County  
Post Office Box 1000  
Ukiah, CA 95482

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

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

District Attorney, Orange  
County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Sierra  
County  
Post Office Box 457  
100 Courthouse Square, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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



## 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.

# **EXHIBIT C**

**Michael Freund & Associates**

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

Michael Freund, Esq.

October 7, 2021

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

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

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

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

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

**Alleged Violators.** The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violators”) are:

**Science in Sport Inc  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
Science in Sport PLC**

**Consumer Product and Listed Chemical.** The product that is the subject of this notice and the chemical in that product identified as exceeding allowable levels is:

**SIS Science In Sport Rego Rapid Recovery Sport Recovery Supplement Strawberry Flavor - Lead**

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

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

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

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least October 7, 2018, as well as every day since the product was introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the product. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting this product with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

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

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

Sincerely,



---

Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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



**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC**

I, Michael Freund, declare:

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

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

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

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

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



Dated: October 7, 2021

---

Michael Freund

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

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

On October 7, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Tom Santangelo  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
300 Garden City Plaza, Ste 326  
Garden City, NY 11530

USA Corporate Services Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
3500 S Dupont Hwy  
Dover, DE 19901

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
19 W 34<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 1018  
New York, NY 10001

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

On October 7, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

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

On October 7, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alethea Sargent, Assistant District Attorney  
White Collar Division  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
North Building, Suite 400N  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
alethea.sargent@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org

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

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

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

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

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

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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


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

October 7, 2021

Page 7

On October 7, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on October 7, 2021, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

  
Phyllis Dunwoody

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

October 7, 2021

Page 8

**Service List**

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

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Sutter  
County  
463 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Yuba City, CA 95991

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Orange  
County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Humboldt  
County  
825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Eureka, CA 95501

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## APPENDIX A

### OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

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

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

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.<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.

# **EXHIBIT D**

**Michael Freund & Associates**

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

Michael Freund, Esq.

October 22, 2021

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

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

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

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

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

**Alleged Violators.** The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violators”) are:

**Science in Sport Inc  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
Science in Sport PLC**

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

- 1. SIS Science In Sport Go Energy Bake Strawberry - Lead**
- 2. SIS Science In Sport Energy + Protein Chewy Banana - Lead**
- 3. SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy Supplement Blueberry Flavor - Lead**
- 4. SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy Supplement Banana Fudge Flavor - Lead**
- 5. SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy Supplement Chocolate Fudge Flavor - Lead**
- 6. SIS Science In Sport SiS Go Energy Bar Sport Energy Supplement Red Berry Flavor - Lead**
- 7. SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading Powder Cherry Cola - Lead**

### **8. SIS Science In Sport Performance Nitrate Loading Powder Pink Grapefruit - Lead**

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

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

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

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least October 22, 2018, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

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

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

Sincerely,



---

Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC**

I, Michael Freund, declare:

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

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

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

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

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



Dated: October 22, 2021

---

Michael Freund

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

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

On October 22, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Tom Santangelo  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
1160 Battery St E, Ste 100  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
300 Garden City Plaza, Ste 326  
Garden City, NY 11530

USA Corporate Services Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
3500 S Dupont Hwy  
Dover, DE 19901

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
19 W 34<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 1018  
New York, NY 10001

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom



On October 22, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

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

On October 22, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alethea Sargent, Assistant District Attorney  
White Collar Division  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
North Building, Suite 400N  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
alethea.sargent@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org

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

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

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

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

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

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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


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

October 22, 2021

Page 7

On October 22, 2021, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on October 22, 2021, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Phyllis Dunwoody". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P".

---

Phyllis Dunwoody

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

October 22, 2021

Page 8

**Service List**

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

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Sutter  
County  
463 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Yuba City, CA 95991

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Orange  
County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Humboldt  
County  
825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Eureka, CA 95501

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## APPENDIX A

### OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

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

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

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.<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.

# **EXHIBIT E**

**Michael Freund & Associates**

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

Michael Freund, Esq.

January 6, 2022

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

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

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

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

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

**Alleged Violators.** The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the “Violators”) are:

**Science in Sport Inc  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
Science in Sport PLC**

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

- 1. SIS Science In Sport Protein 20 Double Chocolate Brownie - Lead**
- 2. SIS Science In Sport Protein 20 Chocolate Peanut Crunch - Lead**
- 3. SIS Science In Sport Rego Cherry Juice Cherry - Lead**

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

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

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

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least January 6, 2019, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

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

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

Sincerely,



---

Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Science in Sport Inc; SiS (Science in Sport) Limited; Science in Sport PLC**

I, Michael Freund, declare:

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

2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.

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

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

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



Dated: January 6, 2022

---

Michael Freund

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

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

On January 6, 2022, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; “THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY”** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
300 Garden City Plaza, Ste 326  
Garden City, NY 11530

USA Corporate Services Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Science in Sport Inc)  
3500 S Dupont Hwy  
Dover, DE 19901

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport Inc  
19 W 34<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 1018  
New York, NY 10001

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
SiS (Science in Sport) Limited  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
The Innovation Centre  
35 Churchill Way  
Nelson, Lancashire BB9 6RT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO  
Science in Sport PLC  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
16-18 Hatton Garden  
Farringdon, London EC1N 8AT  
United Kingdom

On January 6, 2022, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

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

On January 6, 2022, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

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

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

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

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

January 6, 2022

Page 6

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

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

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

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

Alethea Sargent, Assistant District Attorney  
White Collar Division  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
North Building, Suite 400N  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
alethea.sargent@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org

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

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

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

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

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

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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




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

January 6, 2022

Page 7

On January 6, 2022, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on January 6, 2022, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Phyllis Dunwoody". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "P".

---

Phyllis Dunwoody

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

January 6, 2022

Page 8

**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 4<sup>th</sup> 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, Mendocino  
County  
Post Office Box 1000  
Ukiah, CA 95482

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

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

District Attorney, Orange  
County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Sierra  
County  
Post Office Box 457  
100 Courthouse Square, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

## 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.