

1 Christopher M. Martin, State Bar No. 186021
HIRST & CHANLER LLP
2 566 W. Adams, Suite 450
Chicago, IL 60521
3 Telephone: (312) 376-1801
Facsimile: (312) 376-1804
4

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
MICHAEL DIPIRRO
6

**ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY**

AUG 19 2008
CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Esther Coleman, Deputy

7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
8 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
9 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION
10

11
12 MICHAEL DIPIRRO,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 COMPUVEST CORPORATION; and DOES 1
16 through 150, inclusive,

17 Defendants.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

RG08404882

Case No. _____

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

1 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff MICHAEL DIPIRRO,
3 in 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 and sound cards
5 manufactured and sold by defendants in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failures to warn
7 California citizens about their exposure to lead present in or on certain motherboards and sound
8 cards that defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the
9 State of California.

10 3. High levels of lead are commonly found in the solder in and on motherboards and
11 sound cards that defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout
12 the State of California.

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

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

23 6. Defendants manufacture and sell motherboards with solder containing lead,
24 including, but not limited to, *Azza Socket A ATX MB Kit w/Athon Xp 2200+ HS/Fan KT3AV, P/N*
25 *351004706-01 (#7 78656 03683 3)*, and sound cards with solder containing lead including, but not
26 limited to, *Creative Labs Sound Blaster Live! Sound Card, Model No. CT4780*. These
27 motherboards and sound cards contain excessive levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL. All such
28

1 motherboards and sound cards containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to
2 as the "PRODUCTS."

3 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers; sole proprietors, employees, and other
4 persons engaged in the small business field of computer service and repair whom the Occupational
5 Safety Health Act (OSH ACT) does not cover; and/or other individuals in the State of California
6 about their exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendants' sale of the
7 PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinder of such
8 conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.

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

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

15 **PARTIES**

16 10. Plaintiff MICHAEL DIPIRRO is a citizen of the County of San Francisco in the
17 State of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the
18 elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products, and brings this action in the
19 public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §25249.7.

20 11. Defendant COMPUVEST CORPORATION (COMPUVEST) is a person doing
21 business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

22 12. COMPUVEST manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or
23 use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or
24 offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

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

27 14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,
28

1 designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they
2 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing,
3 one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

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

6 16. 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 17. Defendants DOES 101-150 (RETAIL DEFENDANTS) are each persons doing
10 business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

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

13 19. 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 Code
15 of Civil Procedure §474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of
16 the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences herein alleged. When
17 ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

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

21 VENUE AND JURISDICTION

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

27 22. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
28

1 California Constitution Article VI, §10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all
2 causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this action is
3 brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

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

10
11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

13 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
14 Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

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

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

22 27. On March 24, 2008, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite
23 certificate of merit, was provided to COMPUVEST and various public enforcement agencies
24 stating that as a result of COMPUVEST’s sale of PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of
25 California were being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from the reasonably
26 foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been
27 provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding such toxic exposures.
28

1 28. 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
5 COMPUVEST's receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. Plaintiff further alleges and
6 believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

2 36. 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 of
4 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 exposed
6 to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, ingestion, and/or inhalation during the
7 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

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

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

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

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

22 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

27 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a),
28

1 distributing or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing “clear and
2 reasonable warnings” as defined by 22 CCR §12601, as to the harms associated with exposures to
3 the LISTED CHEMICAL;


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

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

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

Dated: August 15, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,
HIRST & CHANLER LLP



Christopher M. Martin
Attorneys for Plaintiff
MICHAEL DIPIRRO