SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

CALLAHAN WHOLESALE HARDWARE CO., a California Corporation; JENNINGS & AGNEW HARDWARE, an Unknown

Business Entity; and DOES 1-50

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

CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC., in the public interest

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

CONFORMED COPY OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court

JUN 25 2009

.lat	ın A.	.ejad	ka. E	cacuti:	in Othic	cer/Clo	erk
Βv	d		-	A STATE	استمصنت	Dopt	ity
- J	A	BOR	UTHY	AWG	IN		

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.courtimo.ca.gov/se	melprespension, o permenueus en	, •••••		
The name and address of			CASE NUMBER:	
(El nombre y dirección de	la corte es):	O.T	(Número del Caso):	416535
Superior Court of Ca	lifornia for the County of	Los Angeles	- 86	41000
Stanley Mosk Courth	iouse			
111 North Hill Street	t, Los Angeles, CA 90012	2		
The name address and t	elephone number of plaintiff's a	attorney, or plaintiff without an	attorney, is:	
(El nombre, la dirección y	el número de teléfono del abog	gado del demandante, o del di Mil e: A CCOCIA TEC	emandante que no tiene ab	ogado, es).
Daniel D. Cho (SBN	105409), YEROUSHALI	VII & ASSOCIATES	\ 200 2102 (
	vard, Suite 480, Los Ange	les, CA 90010; 1el (213) 382-3183	
DATE: JUN 25 2009	(38 ⁽⁴⁾	Clerk, by		, Deputy
(Fecha)	s summoris use Proof of Servi	(Secretario)	W ₀	(Adjunto)
	s summons, use Proof of Servi	ce of Summons (form POS-0	10).)	
(Para prueba de entrega d	le esta citatión use el formulari	o Proof of Service of Summor	is, (POS-010)).	
	NOTICE TO THE PERS	SON SERVED: You are served	Ł	
[SEAL]	1. as an individua		5 (
	2. as the person s	sued under the fictitious name	or (specity):	
	3. on behalf of (s)	necify):		
	3. Land on behalf of (s)	300		
	under: CCP 4	116.10 (corporation)	CCP 416.60 (r	•
		116.20 (defunct corporation)	CCP 416.70 (d	•
	CCP 4	116.40 (association or partners	ship) CCP 416.90 (a	authorized person)
	other ((specify):		
	4. by personal de	livery on (date):		Page 1 of

SCOPY SCOPY

///

///

///

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 Callahan Wholesale Hardware Company is a California Corporation.
- 3. Defendant Jennings & Agnew Hardware is an unknown business entity.
- 4. 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.
- 5. At all times mentioned herein, the term "Defendants" includes Callahan Wholesale Hardware Company, Jennings & Agnew Hardware, and Does 1-50.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants at all times mentioned herein have conducted business within the State of California.
- 7. 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 (10) or more employees at all relevant times.

JURISDICTION

8. 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

- 9. 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.
- 10. 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 800 chemicals and chemical families. Proposition 65 imposes warning requirements and other controls that apply to Proposition 65-listed chemicals.
- 11. All businesses with ten (10) 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).
- 12. Plaintiff conducted research, from which it identified a widespread practice of manufacturers and distributors of lead-bearing products, including automotive accessories, 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 the time of exposure. Plaintiff later discerned that Defendants engaged in such practice.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. and against Callahan Wholesale Hardware Company, Jennings & Agnew Hardware, and Does 1-50 for Violations of Proposition 65,

The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Health & Safety Code, §§ 25249.5, et seq.))

Lead Battery Terminals, Part No. BT - 10

- 13. Plaintiff Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 11 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 14. Each of the Defendants is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a manufacturer or distributor of Lead Battery Terminals, including Part No. BT 10 (hereinafter "Lead Terminal"), a consumer product designed for use on automotive batteries.
- 15. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Lead Terminal contains Lead.
- 16. On October 1, 1992, the Governor of California added Lead and lead compounds to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer (*Cal. Code Regs.* 27 § 27001(b)).
 Pursuant to Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10, twenty (20) months after addition of Lead and lead compounds to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer, Lead and lead compounds became fully subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements and discharge prohibitions.
- 17. On February 27, 1987, the Governor of California added Lead to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity (*Cal. Code Regs.* 27 § 27001(c)). Lead is known to the State to cause developmental, female, and male reproductive toxicity. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10, twenty (20) months after addition of Lead to the list of chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, Lead became fully subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements and discharge prohibitions.
- 18. Plaintiff's allegations regarding Lead Terminal concern a "[c]onsumer products exposure," which "is an exposure that results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service." *Cal. Code Regs.* 27 § 25602(b). Lead Terminal is a consumer product, and exposures to Lead took place as a result of such consumption and foreseeable use as is described herein.

- 19. Plaintiff's allegations regarding Lead Terminal also concern an "[o]ccupational exposure," which are exposures "to any employees in his or her employer's workplace." Cal. Code Reg. 27 § 25602(f). As mentioned in herein, employees were exposed to Lead in their employer's workplace as a result of handling Lead Terminal, among other activities, without having first been given clear and reasonable warnings that such handling would cause exposures to Lead.
- 20. Plaintiff's allegations also concern an "[e]nvironmental exposure," which are exposures "that may foreseeably occur as a result of contact with an environmental medium, including, but not limited to, ambient air, indoor air, drinking water, standing water, running water, soil, vegetation, or manmade or natural substances, either through inhalation, ingestion, skin contact, or otherwise. Environmental exposures include all exposures that are not consumer products exposures, or occupational exposures." *Cal. Code Reg.* 27 § 25602(c). As mentioned in herein, Defendants caused environmental exposures by not providing clear and reasonable warnings at its facilities, and other locations where such exposures would foreseeably occur to persons who could foreseeably come into contact with Lead Terminal.
- 21. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that between March 6, 2006 and the present, each of the Defendants knowingly and intentionally exposed California consumers and users of Lead Terminal, which Defendants manufactured or distributed as mentioned above, to Lead, without first providing any type of clear and reasonable warning of such to the exposed persons before the time of exposure. Defendants have distributed Lead Terminal in California. Defendants thereby violated Proposition 65.
- 22. The principal routes of exposure are through dermal contact, ingestion and inhalation. Persons sustain exposure by handling Lead Terminal without wearing gloves or by touching bare skin with gloves after handling Lead Terminal. Persons handling Lead Terminal also suffer exposures by breathing in particulate matter emanating from Lead Terminal as part of the process of installing Lead Terminal on or removing Lead Terminal from an automobile battery.

- 23. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of Defendants' violations of Proposition 65 as to Lead Terminal 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 person was exposed to Lead by Lead Terminal as mentioned herein.
- 24. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each violation of Proposition 65 mentioned herein is ever continuing.

SATISFACTION OF PRIOR NOTICE

- 25. On or about March 6, 2009, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violations of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, concerning consumer products exposures, subject to a private action to Callahan Wholesale Hardware Company and Jennings & Agnew Hardware, identified in the notice as "Callahan Wholesale Hardware Company" and "Jennings & Agnew Hardware," 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 Lead Battery Terminals, including Part No. BT 10.
- 26. 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 Lead, the corporate structure of each of the Defendants, and other relevant matters.
- 27. Plaintiff's notice of alleged violation included a certificate of merit executed by the attorney for the noticing party, Plaintiff. The certificate 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 Lead, 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