1 2	Brian Gaffney, Esq. (CBN 168778) LAW OFFICES OF BRIAN GAFFNEY 605 Market Street, Suite 505		
3	San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 442-0711 Facsimile: (415) 442-0713		
4 5	Attorney for Plaintiff ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION		
6			
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF SA (Unlimited J		
10		G1 GE NO. 05 140404	
11	ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION,	CASE NO. 05-443431	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v.	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL	
14 15	ROYAL CABINETS, INC.; ROYAL INDUSTRIES, INC.; and DOES 1 through 100 INCLUSIVE	PENALTIES	
16	Defendants.	TOXIC TORT/ENVIRONMENTAL	
17		JURY TRIAL REQUESTED	
18			
19	ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION alleges	s as follows:	
20 21			
	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>		
22	1. This Complaint seeks civil penalties and an injunction to remedy the continuing		
23	failure of Defendants to give clear and reasonable warnings to residents of California, who		
24	handle and/or use furniture which contains leaded glass inserts, leaded mullions, leaded caming		
25	or lead solder (collectively "Leaded glass furnitur	re" or "products"), manufactured, distributed,	
26 27	marketed and/or sold by Defendants. The handling and/or use of such products causes those		
27	residents to be exposed to lead and lead compounds, chemicals known to the State of California		
28	to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproduct	ive harm.	

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

1

- 2. Defendants intend that residents of California handle and/or use Leaded glass furniture that Defendants manufacture, market, sell and/or distribute. When these products are handled and/or used in their normally intended manner, they expose people to lead and lead compounds. In spite of knowing that residents of California were and are being exposed to these chemicals when they handle and/or use Leaded glass furniture, Defendants did not and do not provide clear and reasonable warning that these products cause exposure to chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.
- 3. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7 to compel Defendants to bring their business practices into compliance with Health & Safety Code sections 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65") by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who has been or in the future may be exposed to the above mentioned toxic chemicals from the use of Defendants' products.
- 4. In addition to injunctive relief, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties to remedy the Defendants' continuing failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings to individuals that have been and continue to be exposed to chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION ("ERF") is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to the protection and enhancement of the environment, educating consumers of toxic exposures from products, and enforcing California and federal environmental laws. ERF is based in California, and is incorporated under the laws of the State of California. ERF is a "person" pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25118. ERF brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(d). Residents of California are regularly exposed to lead and lead compounds from Leaded glass furniture manufactured, distributed, sold and/or marketed by Defendants without a clear and reasonable Proposition 65.
- 6. Defendant ROYAL CABINET, INC. is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11.

- 7. Defendant ROYAL INDUSTRIES, INC. is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11.
- 8. Unless otherwise noted, Defendants are collectively hereafter referred to as Defendants.
- 9. Each and every Defendant is a business that manufactures, distributes, sells and/or markets Leaded glass furniture in California, including the City and County of San Francisco. Manufacture, distribution, sale and/or marketing of these products in the City and County of San Francisco causes people to be exposed to lead and lead compounds while they are physically present in the City and County of San Francisco.
  - 10. Each and every Defendant is a business that employs ten or more people.
- 11. ERF is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 100, inclusive. Defendants DOES 1 through 100 inclusive are therefore sued herein pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. section 474. When ERF learns their identities, it will amend the complaint.

### **JURISDICTION**

- 12. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Health & Safety Code section 25249.7 which allows enforcement in any court of competent jurisdiction. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." Chapter 6.6 of the Health & Safety Code which contains the statute under which this action is brought, does not grant jurisdiction to any other trial court.
- 13. This Court also has jurisdiction over Defendants because they are businesses that have sufficient minimum contacts in California and within the City and County of San Francisco. Defendants intentionally availed themselves of the California and San Francisco County markets for Leaded glass furniture. It is thus consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice for the San Francisco Superior Court to exercise jurisdiction over them.
- 14. Plaintiff brings this enforcement action against Defendants pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(d). On or about May 13, 2005, ERF sent 60-Day Notices of

Proposition 65 violations to Defendants, to California's Attorney General, to every District 1 2 Attorney in the State, and to the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater 3 than 750,000. These notices were issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements 4 of Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding 5 the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. Attached to the 60-Day Notice Letters sent to each Defendant was a summary of Proposition 65 6 7 that was prepared by California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. Each 60-8 Day Notice Letter Plaintiff sent was accompanied by a Certificate of Service and a Certificate of Merit. In addition, the 60-Day Notice Letter which Plaintiff sent to California's Attorney 10 General was accompanied by the information required by California Code of Regulations, title 11 11, section 3102. 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**VENUE** 

15. Venue is proper in this Court because each of the Defendants markets, sells and/or distributes their products in and around San Francisco, has violated one or more of the California laws specified herein in the City and County of San Francisco, and has caused people to be exposed to lead and lead compounds while those people are physically present in San Francisco. Liability for Plaintiff's causes of action, or some parts thereof, has accordingly arisen in San Francisco during the times relevant to this Complaint.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Claim for Injunctive Relief)

- 16. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 17. The People of the State of California have declared by referendum under Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer."
- 18. To effectuate this goal, Section 25249.6 of the Health and Safety Code mandates that persons who, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer or birth defects must first provide a clear and reasonable warning to such individual(s) prior to the exposure.
  - 19. Since at least May 13, 2001, each and every Defendant has engaged in conduct

which violates Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 et seq. This conduct includes knowingly and intentionally exposing to lead and lead compounds, California residents who handle and/or use Leaded glass furniture. The normally intended use of Leaded glass furniture causes exposure to lead and lead compounds, which are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm. Defendants have not provided clear and reasonable warnings, within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

- 20. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants knew that the Leaded glass furniture they manufactured, distributed, sold and/or marketed were causing exposures to lead and lead compounds. Defendants intended that residents of California handle and/or use Leaded glass furniture in such ways as would result in significant exposures to these chemicals.
- 21. By the above described acts, each Defendant has violated Health & Safety Code section 25249.6 and are therefore subject to an injunction ordering them to stop violating Proposition 65 and requiring them to provide warnings to their past customers who purchased Defendants' products without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Claim for Civil Penalties)

- 22. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs..
- 23. By the above described acts, each Defendant is liable and should be liable, pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of \$2,500.00 per day for each individual exposed without proper warning to lead and lead compounds from the handling or use of Defendants' Leaded glass furniture.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Declaratory Relief Regarding Actual and Present Controversy over Defendants' Compliance with Proposition 65
(Code of Civil Procedure section 1060)

- 24. Plaintiff hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs.
  - 25. An actual and present controversy exists between Plaintiff and Defendants as to

whether Defendants are fully complying with Proposition 65.

- 26. Plaintiff contends that Defendants, and each of them, have failed to fully comply with Proposition 65 as alleged in this Complaint.
  - 27. Defendants deny each of Plaintiff' contentions.
- 28. Plaintiff seeks a judicial determination and declaration that Defendants have an obligation to fully comply with Proposition 65.
- 29. Such a declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in order that Plaintiff may ascertain the right to have Defendants act in accordance with the obligations under Proposition 65.
- 30. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to violate Proposition 65.
- 31. Said course of conduct by Defendants irreparably harms and will continue to irreparably harm Plaintiff in that Defendants' actions knowingly and intentionally expose individuals to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer or birth defects without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals prior to the exposure.
- 32. Plaintiff have no adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law to obtain relief from the consequences of said actions by Defendants for the harms alleged herein.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for the following relief against Defendants:

- 1. Pursuant to the First Cause of Action, a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining, restraining, and ordering all Defendants to comply with the provisions of Section 25249.6 of the California Health & Safety Code;
- 2. Pursuant to the First Cause of Action, a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining, restraining, and ordering all Defendants to identify and locate each individual who purchased Leaded glass furniture from May 13, 2001 to the present and notify all such individuals that 1) the Leaded glass furniture causes an exposure to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects, 2) certain actions can be taken to minimize that exposure, and 3) they may return any such purchase for a full refund;

1	3. Pursuant to the Second Cause o	
2	penalty in an amount equal to \$2,500.00 per da	
3	compounds from May 13, 2004 to the present	
4	Health & Safety Code, as the result of Defenda	
5	marketing of Leaded glass furniture in Californ	
6	warning;	
7	4. Pursuant to the Third Cause of A	
8	declaration that Defendants are obliged to com	
9	5. For costs of the suit incurred he	
10	6. For attorneys' fees pursuant to s	
11	7. For such other relief as this Cou	
12		
13		
14	Dated: July 25, 2005 B	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

3. P	ursuant to the Second Cause of Action, that each Defendant be assessed a civil		
enalty in an am	ount equal to \$2,500.00 per day per individual exposed to lead and lead		
compounds from	May 13, 2004 to the present for violation of Section 25249.6 of the California		
Health & Safety	Code, as the result of Defendants' manufacturing, distributing, selling and/or		
marketing of Leaded glass furniture in California without the proper clear and reasonable			
warning;			
4. P	ursuant to the Third Cause of Action, for a judicial determination and		
leclaration that Defendants are obliged to comply with Proposition 65.;			

- erein;
- section 1021.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure; and
- urt deems just and proper.

Brian Gaffney Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Rights Foundation

7