1 2 3 4 5 6	Gregory M. Sheffer, State Bar No. 173124 THE CHANLER GROUP 835 Fifth Avenue San Rafael, CA 94901 Telephone: (415) 459-1411 Facsimile: (415) 459-1911 Attorneys for Plaintiff JOHN MOORE	ERENCE SET ENDORSED FILE Superior Court of California County of San Francisco AUG 2 7 2010 CLERK OF THE COUPT				
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
9	FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO					
10	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION					
11						
12	JOHN MOORE,	Case No.				
13	Plaintiff,	Case No. C G C - 10 - 503036				
14	v.	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF				
15	BORDERS GROUP, INC. BORDERS, INC. and	NC. and (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)				
16	DOES 1-600, inclusive,					
17	Defendants.					
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff John Moore, in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the People's right to be informed of the presence of Di(2-ethylhexl)phthalate ("DEHP"), a toxic chemical surprisingly found in certain components of select notebooks, spacers and notebooks with vinyl keychains/charms sold in California.
- 2. By this Complaint, Plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants' continuing failures to warn California citizens about their exposure to DEHP present in or on certain notebook products that Defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 3. Elevated levels of DEHP have been identified in and on notebooks with vinyl key-chains/charms, including, but not limited to Paperchase Notebooks with character spacers, that Defendants continue to manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to consumers and businesses throughout the State of California.
- 4. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. (Proposition 65), "No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual. . . ." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 5. On October 24, 2003, the State listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. DEHP became subject to the warning requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of Proposition 65, beginning on October 24, 2004. (27 CCR § 27001(c); Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.)
 - DEHP shall hereinafter be referred to as the "Listed Chemical."
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants Borders Group, Inc. and Borders, Inc. manufacture or cause to manufacture, distribute, and/or sell notebooks containing excessive levels of the Listed Chemical in or on attached vinyl key-chains/charms

business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

28

- 17. Manufacturer Defendants engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, one or more of the Products for sale or use in the State of California.
- 18. Defendant DOES 201-400 ("Distributor Defendants") are each persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 19. Distributor Defendants distribute, exchange, transfer, process and/or transport one or more of the Products to individuals, businesses or retailers for sale or use in the State of California.
- 20. Defendant DOES 401-600 ("Retailer Defendants") are each persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- Retailer Defendants offer the Products for sale primarily to individuals in the State of California.
- 22. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 600, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences herein alleged. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.
- 23. Defendant Borders, Retailer Defendants, Distributor Defendants and Manufacturer Defendants shall hereafter be collectively referred to as "Defendants"

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

24. Venue is proper in the San Francisco County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 394, 395, 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the City and County of San Francisco and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this County with respect to the Products.

25.

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

26. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendants based on Plaintiff's information and good faith belief that each Defendant is a person, firm, corporation

California Constitution Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction

The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to

Plaintiff's information and good faith belief that each Defendant is a person, firm, corporation or association that either are citizens of the State of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Defendants' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)

- 27. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 26, inclusive.
- 28. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. (Proposition 65) that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 29. Proposition 65 states, "No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...." (*Id.*)
- 30. On December 15, 2009, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, was provided to Borders Group, Inc., Borders, Inc. and various public enforcement agencies stating that as a result of Defendants' sales of the products listed above in paragraph 7, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to the Listed Chemical resulting from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the Products, without

the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures; and

- 31. Defendants have engaged in the manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the Products for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and Defendants' manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the Products for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond Defendants' receipt of Plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.
- 32. After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notices of violation, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65.
- 33. The Products manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by Defendants contained the Listed Chemical above the allowable state limits.
- 34. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use by Defendants in California contained the Listed Chemical.
- 35. The Listed Chemical was present in or on the Products in such a way as to expose individuals to the Listed Chemical through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.
- 36. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products has caused and continues to cause consumer exposures to the Listed Chemical, as such exposure is defined by 27 CCR § 25602(b).
- 37. Defendants had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products would expose individuals to the Listed Chemical through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
- 38. Defendants, and each of them, intended that such exposures to the Listed Chemical from the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products would occur by their deliberate,

- 1	1						
1		3. That the Court grant Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit;					
2	and						
3		4. That the Court grants such other and further relief as may be just and prop					
4			20				
5		Dat	ted: August <u>23</u> , 2010	Respectfully Sub			
6				THE CHANLER	GROUP		
7				25	5		
8				By: Gregory M. S	Sheffer		
9				Gregory M. S Attorneys for JOHN MOO	RE		
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19 20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							