

1 David Lavine, State Bar No. 166744
2 Christopher M. Martin, State Bar No. 186021
3 HIRST & CHANLER LLP
4 2560 Ninth Street
5 Parker Plaza, Suite 214
6 Berkeley, CA 94710
7 Telephone: (510) 848-8880
8 Facsimile: (510) 848-8188

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12 FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO
13 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

14 ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 ADVANCE WATCH COMPANY, LTD.;
18 GENEVA WATCH COMPANY, INC.; and
19 DOES 1 through 150, inclusive,

20 Defendants.

Case No. 07AS04690

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.*)

BY FAX

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff ANTHONY E.
3 HELD, PH.D., P.E., in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the
4 People's right to be informed of the presence of di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, a toxic chemical,
5 found in certain children's watches sold in California.

7 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failures to
8 warn California citizens about their exposure to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate present in or on
9 certain children's watches that defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to
10 consumers throughout the State of California.

11 3. High levels of di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate are commonly found in or on the
12 children's watches that defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers
13 throughout the State of California.

14 4. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986,
15 California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), "No person in the course
16 of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known
17 to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable
18 warning to such individual" (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

19 5. On January 1, 1988, California identified and listed di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate as
20 a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Di(2-
21 ethylhexyl)phthalate became subject to the warning requirement one year later and was
22 therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of Proposition 65,
23 beginning on January 1, 1989. (*22 CCR § 12000(c); Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.*)
24 Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate shall hereinafter be referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICAL."

25 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute and/or sell children's watches containing
26 Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate including, but not limited to, *Sesame Street LCD Watch, #878647 (#6*
27 *53899 60019 8)*. All such children's watches containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall
28 hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."

1 15. Defendants DOES 1-50 (“MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS”) are each
2 persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

3 16. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,
4 designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they
5 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or
7 manufacturing, one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

8 17. Defendants DOES 51-100 (“DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS”) are each persons
9 doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

10 18. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process and/or
11 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses or retailers for sale or use in
12 the State of California.

13 19. Defendants DOES 101-150 (“RETAIL DEFENDANTS”) are each persons doing
14 business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

15 20. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the
16 State of California.

17 21. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are
18 unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by their fictitious name pursuant to
19 Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that
20 each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences herein
21 alleged. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

22 22. ADVANCE WATCH COMPANY, LTD., GENEVA WATCH COMPANY,
23 Inc., MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAIL
24 DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereinafter as
25 “DEFENDANTS.”

26 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

27 23. Venue is proper in the Sacramento County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of
28 Civil Procedure §§ 394, 395, 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,

1 because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the
2 County of Sacramento, and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct,
3 business in this County with respect to the PRODUCTS.

4 24. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
5 California Constitution Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction
6 in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this
7 action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.
8

9 25. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on
10 plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or
11 association that either are citizens of the State of California, have sufficient minimum contacts
12 in the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market.
13 DEFENDANTS’ purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by
14 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 (Violation of Proposition 65)

17 26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
18 Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive.

19 27. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking
20 Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*
21 (Proposition 65) that they must be informed “about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer,
22 birth defects and other reproductive harm.” (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

23 28. Proposition 65 states, “No person in the course of doing business shall
24 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause
25 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
26 individual” (*Id.*)

27 29. On August 2, 2007, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite
28 certificate of merit, was provided to ADVANCE WATCH COMPANY, LTD., GENEVA

1 WATCH COMPANY, INC., and various public enforcement agencies, stating that as a result of
2 DEFENDANTS' sale of PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California were
3 being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from the reasonably foreseeable uses of
4 the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a
5 "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.

7 30. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution and/or offering of
8 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, and
9 DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in
10 violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond
11 DEFENDANTS' receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. Plaintiff further alleges and
12 believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.

13 31. After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notice of violation, the
14 appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a
15 cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

16 32. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in
17 California by DEFENDANTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL above the allowable state
18 limits.

19 33. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS
20 manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California
21 contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.

22 34. The LISTED CHEMICAL was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way
23 as to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and ingestion
24 during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

25 35. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and
26 continues to cause consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is
27 defined by 22 CCR § 12601(b).

28

1 36. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use
2 of the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal
3 contact and ingestion.

4 37. DEFENDANTS, and each of them, intended that such exposures to the LISTED
5 CHEMICAL from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their
7 deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or
8 use of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

9 38. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those
10 consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become
11 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and ingestion during the
12 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

13 39. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65,
14 enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through
15 dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the
16 PRODUCTS, sold by DEFENDANTS without “clear and reasonable warning,” have suffered,
17 and continue to suffer, irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate
18 remedy at law.

19 40. As a consequence of the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS, and each of
20 them, are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation pursuant to
21 California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

22 41. As a consequence of the above-described acts, California Health & Safety Code
23 §25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
24 DEFENDANTS.

25 42. Wherefore, plaintiff prays judgment against DEFENDANTS, and each of them,
26 as set forth hereinafter.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

3 1. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess
4 civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for
5 each violation alleged herein;

7 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a),
8 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS, and each of them, from manufacturing,
9 distributing or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing “clear
10 and reasonable warnings” as defined by 22 CCR § 12601, as to the harms associated with
11 exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

12 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and

13 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

14 Dated: October 12, 2007

Respectfully Submitted,

15 HIRST & CHANLER LLP

16 

17 _____
David Lavine
18 Attorney for Plaintiff
ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.