

SCL LAW FIRM
17890 Castleton St. Ste 289,
City of Industry, CA 91748
840.777.8877
www.sophialiulaw.com

April 24, 2026

Via USPS Mail

Amazon.com Services LLC Attn: Andy Jassy, CEO c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N Sacramento, CA 95833	UNOINTER LLC Attn: President/CEO 17748 Upland Ave Fontana, CA 92335-3755
--	---

Re: Withdrawal of 60-Day Notice of Violation – AG No. 2025-04325

To Whom It May Concern:

Please take notice that the 60-Day Notice of Violation dated October 6, 2025, served on behalf of Anthony Jiang concerning alleged exposures to Lead arising from certain products identified therein, is hereby withdrawn in its entirety without prejudice.

This withdrawal shall not constitute a waiver, relinquishment, or limitation of any rights, claims, causes of action, or remedies under California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65), or under any other applicable law.

Sincerely,



Chang Liu, esq.
SCL LAW FIRM
Attorney for Anthony Jiang

October 6, 2025

Andy Jassy, CEO Amazon.com Services, LLC c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service, Agent 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive Sacramento, CA 95833	President/CEO UNOINTER LLC 17748 Upland Ave Fontana, CA 92335-3755
---	--

**60-DAY NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH&SAFETY CODE
§25249.7(d) (PROPOSITION 65)**

To Whom it May Concern:

This Notice of Violation (the "Notice") is provided to you pursuant to and in compliance with California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d).

Chang Liu, esq. represents Anthony Jiang, a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of general public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals from use of consumer products sold in California and to improve human health and the environment by reducing hazardous substances.

This 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") is being provided to the alleged violator, as well as the California Attorney General's Office, the District Attorney's Offices for 58 Counties, and City Attorneys for San Francisco, San Diego, San Jose, Sacramento and Los Angeles.

I. INTRODUCTION

Anthony Jiang identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), based on the failure to provide a clear and reasonable health hazard warning in connection with the sale or use of the products, listed below, in the State of California. The Notice Recipient is hereby given notice it violated and continues to violate Proposition 65 with respect to the warning requirement, codified at California's Health & Safety Code §25249.6: "No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individual." Without proper warnings about the toxic effects of exposures to listed chemicals, citizens in California lack the information necessary to make an informed decision as to whether or how to eliminate or reduce their risk of exposure from the reasonably foreseeable use of products containing listed chemicals.

II. NATURE OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

Product Types/Categories: The specific types or categories of products that are causing consumer exposures in violation of Proposition 65, and that are covered by this Notice, are 4 Way Brass Hose Splitter Identified below is a specific example of Covered Products recently purchased and witnessed as being available for purchase or use in California (the “Exemplar Product”). Based on publicly available information, the retailers, distributors, and/or manufacturers of the Exemplar Product is also provided. The Exemplar Product is identified for the Notice Recipients’ benefit to assist in their investigation of the allegations set forth in this Notice. The Exemplar Product is not meant to be an exhaustive or comprehensive identification of each specific offending product falling within the specific types or categories of Covered Products at issue in this Notice. It is the private enforcer’ s position that the Notice Recipients are obligated to conduct a good-faith investigation into other specific products falling within the type or category of Covered Products that have been manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, shipped, stored, or are otherwise within the Notice Recipients’ custody or control, so as to ensure the requisite toxic warnings were and are provided to California citizens prior to purchase.

Exemplar Product (ASIN)	Violators
B08HC93F5M	1. Manufacturer/Distributor: UNOINTER LLC 2. Retailer: Amazon.com Services, LLC (www.amazon.com)

If an applicable manufacturer, supplier, seller, exporter and/or importer of one or more of the Products does not have a known agent for process of service in California or employs less than ten people as defined by the operative regulation, then the Violator 2 has heightened regulatory responsibilities beyond 27 CCR §25600.2(d) especially if the Violator 2 is also an importer or fulfills additional upstream roles in the commercial marketplace.

Listed Chemical. The chemical that is the subject of this Notice is the heavy metal, Lead. The State of California listed Lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, male reproductive toxicity, and female reproductive toxicity on February 27, 1987, and as a chemical known to cause cancer on October 1, 1992.

Routes of Exposure. The exposures subject to this Notice result from the purchase, acquisition and handling of Products containing lead .Exposures occur when consumers ,including Children and women of childbearing age, handle, touch or

otherwise utilize gold hoop earrings containing lead in accordance with the Products' reasonably foreseeable and intended uses, resulting in exposures through ingestion and dermal absorption. Individuals ingest lead when they touch or handle the Products or intermediary objects, transferring the chemical from their fingers or hands to their mouths. Dermal absorption of lead occurs when consumers handle, touch, or utilize the Products.

Violations and Time Period of Exposure.

The violations have been occurring as far back as 10/26/2022, and are continuing to this day

III. RESOLUTION OF NOTICED CLAIMS

Based on the allegations set forth in this Notice, Chang Liu intends to file a citizen enforcement lawsuit against the alleged Violator unless such Violator enters into a binding written agreement to: (a) recall Products already sold or undertake best efforts to ensure that the requisite health hazard warnings are provided to those who have received such Products; (b) provide "clear and reasonable warnings" for Products sold in the future or, preferably, reformulate such Products to eliminate the Cadmium exposures (or undertake best efforts to ensure upstream selling entities in the chain of commerce such as manufacturers, exporters, importers or distributors do so); and (c) pay an appropriate civil penalty based on the factors enumerated in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b). If the alleged Violator is particularly interested in resolving this dispute without resorting to time-consuming and costly litigation, please feel free to contact Chang Liu identified in Section V.

It should be noted Anthony Jiang cannot: (1) finalize any settlement until after the expiration of the 60-day Notice period; or (2) speak for the California Attorney General or any District or City in receipt of this Notice. Therefore, while reaching an agreement with Anthony Jiang will satisfy its claims, the agreement may not satisfy any public prosecutors.

IV. GENERAL INFORMATION AND SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 65

A copy of a summary of Proposition 65's provisions, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") is enclosed with the copy of the Notice served on the Notice Recipient for its reference. For further general information concerning Proposition 65, contact OEHHA's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916)445-6900.

V. CONTACT INFORMATION

Anthony Jiang has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this Notice. Please direct all questions, issues or communications regarding this 60-Day Notice of Violation and its potential resolution to Chang Liu at the following Address:

Represented private enforcer's contact information:

Chang Liu

Address: 17890 Castleton St, Ste 289

Email: sophia@sophialiulaw.com

Telephone: (840) 777-8877

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chang Liu", written over a horizontal line.

Chang Liu

Attachments:

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

PROOF OF SERVICE

THE SAFE WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY OEHHA/CAL EPA

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT Health and Safety Code §25249.7(d)

Chang Liu, hereby declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the notice violated Health & Safety Code §25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
2. I am the attorney for the noticing party, Anthony Jiang.
3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed facts, studies or other data regarding the alleged exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the action.
4. Based on the information obtained through those consultations, and on all other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established, and the information did not prove that the alleged violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
5. The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in Health & 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 6, 2025



Chang Liu

Attorney for Anthony Jiang

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury:

I am over the age of 18 years of age and not a party to this case. My address is 141 Draw Irvine Ca 92618. On October 14, 2025, I caused to be served the following:

60-DAY NOTICE OF VIOLATION SENT IN COMPLIANCE
WITH HEALTH&SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d);
APPENDIX A:THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC
ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A
SUMMARY; and
CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

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

Representative:


CEO UNOINTER LLC,17748 UPLAND AVE, FONTANA ,CA, 92335-3755;

Andy Jassy, CEO Amazon.com Services, LLC c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service,
Agent 2710 Gateway Oaks Drive Sacramento, CA 95833.

As well as by providing electronic copies to the addressees listed on the following page, as well as by sending hard copies to the District Attorney for each of the remaining counties and The City Attorney for Los Angeles, San Jose, and Sacramento.

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

Executed on October 14, 2025, at Irvine, California.



Name: Steven Xiao

ELECTRONIC MAIL SERVICE LIST

The Attorney General of the State of California: Electronic upload via the Attorney General website

Alameda County-Nancy O'Malley , District Attorney: CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Calaveras County-Barbara Yook, District Attorney: Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

Contra Costa County- Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney:
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Fresno County-Lisa A. Smittcamp-District Attorney:
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov

Inyo County-Thomas Hardy, District Attorney: inyoda@inyocounty.us

Lassen County-Michelle Latimer, program Coordinator: mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Mariposa County-Walter Wall, District Attorney: mcda@mariposacounty.org

Merced County-Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney: Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Monterey County-Janine M. Pacioni, District Attorney: Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Napa County-Allison Haley, District Attorney: CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Nevada County-Clifford H. Newell, District Attorney: DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Placer County-Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney: prop65@placer.ca.gov

Plumas County-David Hollister, District Attorney: davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

Riverside County-Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney: Prop65@rivcoda.org

Sacramento County-Anne Schubert, District Attorney: Prop65@sacda.org

San Diego County-Summer Stephan, District Attorney: SanDiegoDAProp65@sdcdca.org

San Diego City-Mark Ankcorn, Deputy City Attorney: CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

San Francisco County-Alexandra Grayner, Asst. District Attorney:
alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

San Francisco City-Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney: Starla.Sousa@sfcityatty.org

San Joaquin County-Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney:

DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

San Luis Obispo County-Eric Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney: edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Santa Barbara County-Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney:
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Santa Clara County-Bud Porter, Deputy District Attorney: EPU@da.sccgov.org

Santa Clara City-Nora Frimann, City Attorney: Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

Santa Cruz County-Jeffrey Rosell, District Attorney: Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Sonoma County-Jill Ravitch, District Attorney: Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org

Tulare County-Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney: Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Ventura County-Gregory Trotten, District Attorney: daspecialops@ventura.org

Yolo County-Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney: cfepd@yolocounty.org

Public Agency USPS Mail Service List

District Attorney, Alpine County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
P.O. Box 248
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
708 Court Street, #202 Jackson, CA
95642

District Attorney, Butte County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
25 County Center Drive Oroville, CA
95965

District Attorney, Colusa County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
547 Market Street Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
450 H Street, Ste. 171
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County Attn:
Prop. 65
Enforcement
515 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Glenn County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
Post Office Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
825 5th Street
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County Attn:

Prop. 65 Enforcement
939 West Main Street El Centro, CA
92243

Post Office Box 617
Bridgeport, CA 93517
District Attorney, Orange County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
401 Civic Center Drive West Santa Ana,
CA 92701

District Attorney, San Benito County
Attn: Prop. 65 Enforcement
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister,
CA 95023

District Attorney, San Bernardino Co.
Attn: Prop. 65 Enforcement
316 N. Mountain View Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004

District Attorney, San Mateo County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City,
CA 94063

District Attorney, Sutter County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
446 Second Street
Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Santa Cruz County
Attn: Prop. 65 Enforcement
701 Ocean Street, Room 200
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

District Attorney, Shasta County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
1525 Court Street, Third Floor Redding,
CA 96001-1632

District Attorney, Sierra County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement

Courthouse, Post Office Box 457
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Kern County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA
93301

District Attorney, Mono County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement

District Attorney, Lake County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County
Attn: Prop. 65 Enforcement
210 West Temple Street, Rm 345 Los
Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA
93637

District Attorney, Marin County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
3501 Civic Center, Room 183
San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mendocino County
Attn: Prop. 65 Enforcement
Post Office Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Modoc County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
204 S Court Street
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Solano County Attn:

Prop. 65 Enforcement
District Attorney, Siskiyou County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
Post Office Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Kings County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA
93230

600 Union Avenue Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
800 11th Street, Room 200
Modesto, CA 95353

District Attorney, Tehama County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
Post Office Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
Post Office Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
2 South Green
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
215 Fifth Street
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office Attn:
Prop. 65 Enforcement
200 N. Main Street, Suite 1800 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 27001.1. These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The “Proposition 65 List.” Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or

reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html. Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65.

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>.

Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

Grace Period. Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.