

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY
11 JUL 14 PM 12:59
CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
BY BARBARA C. YOUNG, DEPUTY

1 Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534
Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
2 Jennifer Henry, State Bar No. 208221
THE CHANLER GROUP
3 2560 Ninth Street
Parker Plaza, Suite 214
4 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565
Telephone: (510) 848-8880
5 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
JOHN MOORE
7

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
10 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION
11

12 JOHN MOORE,
13 Plaintiff,
14 v.
15

16 DAS DISTRIBUTORS, INC.; and DOES 1-
17 150, inclusive,
18 Defendants.

Case No. **RG 1158540**
**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, JOHN MOORE, in
3 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 di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (“DEHP”), a toxic chemical found in
5 coverings for notebooks sold in California.

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

10 3. High levels of DEHP are commonly found in and on the coverings for notebooks
11 that defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State
12 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”), “[n]o person in the
15 course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical
16 known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and
17 reasonable warning to such individual ...” (Cal. Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6.)

18 5. On October 24, 2003, California identified and listed DEHP as a chemical known
19 to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. DEHP became subject to the “clear and
20 reasonable warning” requirements of Proposition 65 one year later on October 24, 2004. (Tit.
21 27 Cal. Code Regs. (“CCR”) § 27001(c); Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &
22 25249.10(b).) DEHP shall be referred to hereinafter as the “LISTED CHEMICAL.”

23 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale coverings for notebooks
24 containing excessive levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL including, but not limited to, the
25 *RoadPro Pad Holder with Calculator, RPPT6672-5 (#0 45464 25766 9)*. All such coverings
26 for notebooks containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to as the
27 “PRODUCTS.”

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

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

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

17 26. Proposition 65 states, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall
18 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause
19 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
20 individual....” (*Ibid.*)

21 27. On or about April 8, 2011, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the
22 requisite certificate of merit, was provided to DAS and various public enforcement agencies
23 stating that, as a result of the DEFENDANTS’ sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in
24 the State of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting from the reasonably foreseeable
25 use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided
26 with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding such toxic exposures.

27 28. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of
28 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, and

1 DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use
2 in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond
3 DEFENDANTS' receipt of Plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. Plaintiff further alleges and
4 believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those
27 consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were, or who could become
28

1 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the
2 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

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

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

11 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, California Health & Safety Code
12 § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
13 DEFENDANTS.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

19 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a),
20 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or
21 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing “clear and reasonable
22 warnings” as defined by 27 CCR § 25601, as to the harms associated with exposure the LISTED
23 CHEMICAL;

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

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///


28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

Dated: July 17, 2011

Respectfully Submitted,
THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 
Jennifer Henry
Attorneys for Plaintiff
JOHN MOORE