SUMMONS ON FIRST AMENDED (CITACION JUDICIAL) COMPLAINT COMPLAINT

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

The name and address of the court is:

UNITED EXCHANGE CORP., a California Corporation, and DOES 1-50

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC., in the public interest

CONFORMED OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court

ULU 3 1 2008

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales,

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):			CASE NUMBER: (Numero del Caso):	BC403123
Superior Court of California for the	ne County of Los Ang	geles	(712/1/6/10 00/ 0000).	
Stanley Mosk Courthouse				
111 North Hill Street, Los Angele	s, CA 90012			
The name, address, and telephone number	er of plaintiff's attorney, or	plaintiff without an at	ttorney, is:	
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de te	léfono del abogado del de	mandente, o del den	nandante que no tiene	e abogado, es):
Daniel D. Cho (SBN 105409), YE	ROUSHALMI & AS	SOCIATES	·	
3700 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 48	0, Los Angeles, CA	90010; Tel	382-3183	a Jacobs
•		CLASE	CAMIM	M GNO
DATE: DEC - 4 0000	MERC	Clerk, by	. —	, Deputy
3700 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 48 DATE: (Fecha) DEC 3 1 2008	10 000	(Secretario)		(Adjunto)
(For proof of service of this summons, use	Proof of Service of Sumn	nons <i>(form POS-010,</i>).)	
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión u	se el formulario Proof of S	Service of Summons,	(POS-010)).	

[SEAL]	NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served 1 as an individual defendant. 2 as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):	
	a. on behalf of (specify): under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.60 (min CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.70 (con CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) CCP 416.90 (auti	servatee)
	other (specify): 4. by personal delivery on (date):	Page 1 of 1

SUMMONS

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California SUM-100 [Rev. January 1, 2004] Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465

DC402122

CASE NUMBER

, ,	CONFORMED COPY OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Count Lucy 3 1 2008
	John A. Clarke, Executive Office ICH By CYNTHIA IN. JACOES THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA - CENTRAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT CASE NO. BC403123 FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PENALTY, INJUNCTION, AND RESTITUTION PESTITUTION
UNITED EXCHANGE CORP., a California corporation, and DOES 1-50; Defendants.	 Violation of Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Health & Safety Code., §§ 25249.5, et seq.) ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (exceeds \$25,000)))
cause of action against defendants as follows:	Inc. alleges, based on information and belief, a 1 NOF PROPOSITION 65, THE SAFE DRINKING WATER

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ("Plaintiff"), is a non-profit corporation qualified to do business in the State of California. It brings this action in the public interest as defined under Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (d).
- 2. Defendant United Exchange Corp. is a California corporation.
- 3. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants Does 1-50, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each fictitiously named defendant is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged and the damages caused thereby.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that United Exchange Corp. at all times mentioned herein has conducted business within the State of California.
- At all times mentioned herein, "Defendants" include United Exchange Corp. and Does 1 50.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that at all relevant times, each of the Defendants was a person doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11, subdivision (b), and that each of the Defendants had ten or more employees.

JURISDICTION

7. The Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.

BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARY FACTS

8. In 1986, California voters approved an initiative to address growing concerns about exposure to toxic chemicals. The initiative, The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code sections 25249.5, et seq.

("Proposition 65"), helps to protect California's drinking water sources from contamination, to allow consumers to make informed choices about the products they buy, and to enable persons to protect themselves from toxic chemicals as they see fit.

- 9. Proposition 65 requires the Governor of California to publish a list of chemicals known to the state to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. *Health & Safety Code*, § 25249.8. The list, which the Governor updates at least once a year, contains over 550 chemicals. Proposition 65 imposes warning requirements and other controls that apply to Proposition 65-listed chemicals.
- 10. All businesses with ten or more employees that operate or sell products in California must comply with Proposition 65. Under Proposition 65, businesses are: (1) prohibited from knowingly discharging Proposition 65-listed chemicals into sources of drinking water (*Health & Safety Code*, § 25249.5), and (2) required to provide "clear and reasonable" warnings before exposing a person, knowingly and intentionally, to a Proposition 65-listed chemical (*Health & Safety Code*, § 25249.6).
- 11. Plaintiff conducted research, from which it identified a widespread practice of manufacturers and distributors of hair coloring products of exposing, knowingly and intentionally, persons in California to the Proposition 65-listed chemicals of such products without first providing clear and reasonable warnings of such to the exposed persons prior to exposure. Plaintiff later discerned that Defendants engaged in such practice.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. and against United Exchange Corp. and Does 1-50 For Violation Of Proposition 65, The Safe Drinking Water And Toxic Enforcement Act Of 1986 (Health & Safety Code, §§ 25249.5, et seq.))

United Exchange 5 Minute Hair Color (Including Dark Brown)

12. Plaintiff, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 11 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

- 13. Each of the Defendants is, and at all times mentioned herein, was a manufacturer or distributor United Exchange 5 Minute Hair Color (Including Dark Brown) (hereinafter "United Exchange"), a consumer product designed for the coloring of hair.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that United Exchange contains Diaminotoluene (mixed).
- 15. On January 1, 1990, the Governor of California added Diaminotoluene (mixed) to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer (*Cal. Code Regs.* 22 § 12000(b)).

 Pursuant to Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10, twenty (20) months after addition of Diaminotoluene (mixed) to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer, Diaminotoluene (mixed) became fully subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements and discharge prohibitions.
- 16. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that between June 11, 2005 and the present, each of the Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed California consumers and users of United Exchange, which it manufactured or distributed as mentioned above, to Diaminotoluene (mixed), without first giving clear and reasonable warning of such to the exposed persons before the time of exposure. Defendants have distributed United Exchange in California. Defendants thereby violated Proposition 65.
- 17. The principal routes of exposure are through dermal contact and inhalation when users of United Exchange pour color base into applicator bottle, replace cap, shake applicator bottle thoroughly to mix color until uniform, snip applicator tip, squeeze product onto scalp area, massaging color from hair roots to tips, leaving product on hair for approximately 5 minutes before rinsing from hair. In doing so, users permit bare skin, including scalp and hands, to touch the product containing Diaminotoluene (mixed). In doing so, users also breathed in fumes emanating from the product. The foregoing routes of exposure assume use of the product in accordance with its instructions.
- 18. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of Proposition 65 as to United Exchange have been ongoing and continuous to the date of the signing of this complaint, so that a separate and distinct violation of Proposition 65

- occurred each and every time a consumer was exposed to Diaminotoluene (mixed) by using United Exchange as mentioned herein.
- 19. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each violation of Proposition 65 mentioned herein is ever continuing.

Men's Select® 5 Minute Hair Color

- 20. Plaintiff, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 11 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 21. Each of the Defendants is, and at all times mentioned herein, was a manufacturer or distributor Men's Select® 5 Minute Hair Color (hereinafter "Men's Select"), a consumer product designed for the coloring of hair.
- 22. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Men's Select contains Diaminotoluene (mixed).
- 23. On January 1, 1990, the Governor of California added Diaminotoluene (mixed) to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer (*Cal. Code Regs.* 22 § 12000(b)).

 Pursuant to Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10, twenty (20) months after addition of Diaminotoluene (mixed) to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer, Diaminotoluene (mixed) became fully subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements and discharge prohibitions.
- 24. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that between March 31, 2005 and the present, each of the Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed California consumers and users of Men's Select, which it manufactured or distributed as mentioned above, to Diaminotoluene (mixed), without first giving clear and reasonable warning of such to the exposed persons before the time of exposure. Defendants have distributed Men's Select in California. Defendants thereby violated Proposition 65.
- 25. The principal routes of exposure are through dermal contact and inhalation when users of Men's Select pour color base into applicator bottle, replace cap, shake applicator bottle thoroughly to mix color until uniform, snip applicator tip, squeeze product onto scalp

minutes before rinsing from hair. In doing so, users permit bare skin, including scalp and hands, to touch the product containing Diaminotoluene (mixed). In doing so, users also breathed in fumes emanating from the product. The foregoing routes of exposure assume use of the product in accordance with its instructions.

Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of

26. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of Proposition 65 as to Men's Select have been ongoing and continuous to the date of the signing of this complaint, so that a separate and distinct violation of Proposition 65 occurred each and every time a consumer was exposed to Diaminotoluene (mixed) by using Men's Select as mentioned herein.

area, massaging color from hair roots to tips, leaving product on hair for approximately 5

27. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each violation of Proposition 65 mentioned herein is ever continuing.

Nu-Pore® Permanent Cream Hairdye (in assorted colors including dark blonde, medium brown, light blonde, black, and dark brown)

- 28. Plaintiff, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 11 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein. Each of the Defendants is, and at all times mentioned herein, was a manufacturer or distributor Nu-Pore® Permanent Cream Hairdye (in assorted colors including dark blonde, medium brown, light blonde, black, and dark brown) (hereinafter "Nu-Pore"), a consumer product designed for the coloring of hair.
- 29. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Nu-Pore contains Diaminotoluene (mixed).
- 30. On January 1, 1990, the Governor of California added Diaminotoluene (mixed) to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer (*Cal. Code Regs.* 22 § 12000(b)).

 Pursuant to Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10, twenty (20) months after addition of Diaminotoluene (mixed) to the list of chemicals known to the State to

cause cancer, Diaminotoluene (mixed) became fully subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements and discharge prohibitions.

- 31. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that between March 31, 2005 and the present, each of the Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed California consumers and users of Nu-Pore, which it manufactured or distributed as mentioned above, to Diaminotoluene (mixed), without first giving clear and reasonable warning of such to the exposed persons before the time of exposure. Defendants have distributed Nu-Pore in California. Defendants thereby violated Proposition 65.
- 32. The principal routes of exposure are through dermal contact and inhalation when users of Nu-Pore pour color base into applicator bottle, replace cap, shake applicator bottle thoroughly to mix color until uniform, snip applicator tip, squeeze product onto scalp area, massaging color from hair roots to tips, leaving product on hair for approximately 25 minutes before rinsing from hair. In doing so, users permit bare skin, including scalp and hands, to touch the product containing Diaminotoluene (mixed). In doing so, users also breathed in fumes emanating from the product. The foregoing routes of exposure assume use of the product in accordance with its instructions.
- 33. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of Proposition 65 as to Nu-pore have been ongoing and continuous to the date of the signing of this complaint, so that a separate and distinct violation of Proposition 65 occurred each and every time a consumer was exposed to Diaminotoluene (mixed) by using Nu-Pore as mentioned herein.
- 34. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each violation of Proposition 65 mentioned herein is ever continuing.

SATISFACTION OF PRIOR NOTICE

35. On or about March 31, 2008, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violations of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 subject to a private action to United Exchange Corp., identified in the notice as United Exchange Corp., and to the California Attorney General,

County District Attorneys, and City Attorneys for each city containing a population of at least 750,000 people in whose jurisdictions the violations allegedly occurred, concerning consumer products Men's Select and Nu-Pore.

- 36. On or about June 11, 2008, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violations of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 subject to a private action to United Exchange Corp., identified in the notice as United Exchange Corp., and to the California Attorney General, County District Attorneys, and City Attorneys for each city containing a population of at least 750,000 people in whose jurisdictions the violations allegedly occurred, concerning consumer products United Exchange and Nu-Pore.
- 37. Before sending the notice of alleged violation, Plaintiff investigated the consumer products involved, the likelihood that such products would cause users to suffer significant exposures to Diaminotoluene (mixed), the corporate structure of each of the Defendants, and other relevant matters.
- 38. Plaintiff's notice of alleged violation included a certificate of merit executed by the attorney for the noticing party, Plaintiff. The certificates of merit stated that the attorney for Plaintiff who executed the certificate had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who had reviewed data regarding the exposure to Diaminotoluene (mixed), respectively, which are the subject Proposition 65-listed chemicals of this action. Based on that information, the attorney for Plaintiff who executed the certificates believed there was a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action. The attorney for Plaintiff attached to the certificates of merit served on the Attorney General information sufficient to establish the basis of the certificates of merit.
- 39. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the dates that Plaintiff gave notice of the alleged violations to United Exchange Corp. and to the public prosecutors referenced in Paragraphs 35 and 36.
- 40. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that neither the Attorney General, nor any applicable district attorney or city attorney has commenced and is diligently prosecuting an action against the Defendants.

28

- 41. Plaintiff's allegations regarding United Exchange concern a "consumer product exposure," which is an exposure that results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good. United Exchange is a consumer product, and as mentioned in paragraphs 12-19, exposure to Diaminotoluene (mixed) took place as a result of such consumption and foreseeable use.
- 42. Plaintiff's allegations regarding Men's Select concern a "consumer product exposure," which is an exposure that results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good. Men's Select is a consumer product, and as mentioned in paragraphs 20-27, exposure to Diaminotoluene (mixed) took place as a result of such consumption and foreseeable use.
- 43. Plaintiff's allegations regarding Nu-Pore concern a "consumer product exposure," which is an exposure that results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good. Nu-Pore is a consumer product, and as mentioned in paragraphs 28-34, exposure to Diaminotoluene (mixed) took place as a result of such consumption and foreseeable use.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff demands against each of the Defendants as follows:

- 1. A permanent injunction mandating Proposition 65 compliant warnings;
- 2. Penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (b);
- 3. Costs of suit;
- 4. Reasonable attorney fees and costs; and
- 5. Any further relief that the court may deem just and equitable.

Dated: December 30, 2008

YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

3Y:<u>//</u>

Daniel D. Cho

Attorneys for Plaintiff,

Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc.