

1 David R. Bush, State Bar No. 154511  
2 Christopher M. Martin, State Bar No. 186021  
3 HIRST & CHANLER, LLP  
4 2674 Main Street, Suite D, PMB 139  
5 Ventura, CA 93003  
6 Telephone: (800) 935-8116  
7 Facsimile: (800) 935-8116

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9 JAMIE TE'O

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**JAMIE HARRIS**

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA  
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

RG 07360982

12 JAMIE TE'O,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 ECOST.COM, INC.; PFSWEB, INC.; and  
16 DOES 1 through 150, inclusive,

17 Defendants.

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

**VIA FAX**

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff JAMIE TE'O, in  
3 the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the People's right to be  
4 informed of the presence of lead (a toxic chemical) found in certain motherboards sold by  
5 defendants in California.

7 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failure to  
8 warn California citizens about their exposure to lead present in or on certain motherboards that  
9 defendants offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.

10 3. High levels of lead are commonly found in the solder in and on motherboards  
11 that defendants offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.

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

17 5. On February 27, 1987, California identified and listed lead as a chemical known  
18 to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead became subject to the warning  
19 requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable warning"  
20 requirements of Proposition 65, beginning on February 27, 1988. (*22 CCR § 12000(c); Cal.*  
21 *Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.*) Lead shall hereinafter be referred to as the "LISTED  
22 CHEMICAL."

23 6. Defendants sell motherboards with lead solder including, but not limited to,  
24 *Matrix775 P4MBMS Motherboard, Part #3253155, #MB-MACH P4MBMS (#8 78376 00026 5),*  
25 which contain excessive levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL. All such motherboards containing  
26 the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."

27 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers; sole proprietors, employees, and other  
28 persons engaged in the small business field of computer service and repair whom the

1 Occupational Safety Health Act (OSH ACT) does not cover; and/or other individuals in the  
2 State of California about their exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with  
3 defendants' sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects defendants to  
4 enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.

5 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary  
6 injunctive and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users  
7 of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED  
8 CHEMICAL. (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).*)

9 9. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of  
10 Proposition 65, as provided for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

11 PARTIES

12 10. Plaintiff JAMIE TE'O is a citizen of the City and County of San Francisco in the  
13 State of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the  
14 elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products, and brings this action in  
15 the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.

16 11. Defendant ECOST.COM. INC. ("ECOST") is a person doing business within the  
17 meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

18 12. ECOST offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or  
19 implies by its conduct that it offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

20 13. Defendant PFSWEB, INC. ("PFSWEB") is a person doing business within the  
21 meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

22 14. PFSWEB offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or  
23 implies by its conduct that it offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

24 15. Defendants DOES 1 through 50 (MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS) are each  
25 persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

26 16. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,  
27 designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they  
28

1 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or  
2 manufacturing, one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

3 17. Defendants DOES 51 through 100 (DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS) are each  
4 persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

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

9 19. Defendants DOES 101 through 150 (RETAIL DEFENDANTS) are each persons  
10 doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

11 20. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the  
12 State of California.

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

18 22. ECOST, PFSWEB, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR  
19 DEFENDANTS, and RETAIL DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be  
20 referred to hereinafter as "DEFENDANTS."

21 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

22 23. Venue is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of  
23 Civil Procedure §§ 394, 395, 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,  
24 because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the  
25 County of Alameda and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct,  
26 business in this County with respect to the PRODUCTS.

27 24. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to  
28 California Constitution Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction

1 in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this  
2 action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

3 25. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on  
4 plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or  
5 association that either is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in  
7 the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.  
8 DEFENDANTS’ purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by  
9 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 (Violation of Proposition 65)

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

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

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

22 29. On August 30, 2007, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite  
23 certificate of merit, was provided to ECOST, PFSWEB and various public enforcement  
24 agencies stating that as a result of ECOST and PFSWEB’s sale of PRODUCTS, purchasers and  
25 users in the State of California were being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from  
26 the reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users  
27 first having been provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding such toxic  
28 exposures.

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

8           31.    After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notice of violation, the  
9 appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a  
10 cause of action against ECOST and PFSWEB under Proposition 65.

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

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

17           34.    The LISTED CHEMICAL was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way  
18 as to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, ingestion, and/or  
19 inhalation during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

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

23           36.    DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use  
24 of the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal  
25 contact, ingestion, and/or inhalation.

26           37.    DEFENDANTS, and each of them, intended that such exposures to the LISTED  
27 CHEMICAL from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their  
28 deliberate, non accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or

1 use of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

2 38. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those  
3 consumers; sole proprietors, employees, and other persons engaged in the small business field  
4 of computer service and repair whom the Occupational Safety Health Act (OSH ACT) does not  
5 cover; and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become  
7 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, ingestion, and/or inhalation  
8 during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

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

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

18 41. As a consequence of the above described acts, California Health & Safety Code  
19 § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against  
20 DEFENDANTS.

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

23 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

28

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


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

3. That the Court grants plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and

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

Dated: December 12, 2007

Respectfully Submitted,  
HIRST & CHANLER LLP



David R. Bush  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
JAMIE TE'O

**VIA FAX**