

1 Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534
2 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
3 THE CHANLER GROUP
4 2560 Ninth Street
5 Parker Plaza, Suite 214
6 Berkeley, CA 94710
7 Telephone: (510) 848-8880
8 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., P.E.

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

14 ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., P.E.,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 SHIN'S TRADING CO., INC.; CALA
18 PRODUCTS; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,

19 Defendants.

20 Case No. 101254200

21 **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
22 AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

24 ENDORSED
25 FILED
26 ALAMEDA COUNTY

27 MAR - 8 2011

28 CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
By _____
Deputy

1 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff ANTHONY E.
3 HELD, Ph.D., P.E., in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the
4 People’s right to be informed of the presence of di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, a toxic chemical
5 found in cosmetic cases/bags sold in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failures to
7 warn California citizens about their exposure to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, present in or on
8 certain cosmetic cases/bags that defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to
9 consumers throughout the State of California.

10 3. High levels of di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate are commonly found in and on cosmetic
11 cases/bags 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
15 of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known
16 to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable
17 warning to such individual. . . .” (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

18 5. On October 24, 2003, California identified and listed di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate as
19 a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate
20 became subject to the warning requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the “clear
21 and reasonable warning” requirements of Proposition 65, beginning on October 24, 2004. (27
22 *CCR § 27001(c); Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.*)

23 6. Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate shall hereinafter be referred to as the “LISTED
24 CHEMICAL.”

25 7. Defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or sell cosmetic cases/bags containing
26 excessive levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL including, but not limited to, the *Cala Travel*
27 *Manicure Kit, Item #70-669B (#6 16513 70669 0)*. All such cosmetic cases/bags containing the
28 LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to as the “PRODUCTS.”

1 16. Defendants DOES 51-100 (“DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS”) are each persons
2 doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

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

6 18. Defendants DOES 101-150 (RETAILER DEFENDANTS) are each persons doing
7 business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

8 19. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the
9 State of California.

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

15 21. SHIN’S, CALA, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR
16 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be
17 referred to hereinafter as “DEFENDANTS.”

18 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

24 23. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
25 California Constitution Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in
26 all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this action
27 is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

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

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)**

9 25. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
10 Paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive.

11 26. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in Proposition 65 that
12 they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and other
13 reproductive harm." (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

14 27. Proposition 65 states, "No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly
15 and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or
16 reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual..."
17 (*Id.*)

18 28. On December 30, 2010, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite
19 certificate of merit, was provided to SHIN'S, CALA, and various public enforcement agencies
20 stating that as a result of the DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in
21 the State of California were being exposed to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate resulting from the
22 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first
23 having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.

24 29. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of
25 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and
26 DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in
27 violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond
28

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

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

6 31. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in
7 California by DEFENDANTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL above the allowable state
8 limits.

9 32. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured,
10 distributed, and/or offered for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California contained the
11 LISTED CHEMICAL.

12 33. The LISTED CHEMICAL was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as
13 to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion
14 during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

15 34. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and
16 continues to cause consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is defined
17 by 27 CCR § 25602(b).

18 35. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of
19 the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact
20 and/or ingestion.

21 36. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from
22 the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-
23 accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution, and/or offer for sale or use of
24 PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

25 37. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those
26 consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become
27 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the
28 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

