1 Brian C. Johnson, State Bar No. 235965 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436 THE CHANLER GROUP 2 2560 Ninth Street 3 NOV -7 2011 Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 KIM TURNER. Court Executive Officer MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT 4 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118 By: K. Main. Deputy 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTHÓNY E. HELD, PhD., P.E. 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 MARIN COUNTY 10 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION 11 12 ANTHONY E. HELD, PhD., P.E., Case No.: CIV1103668 13 Plaintiff, FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR 14 CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE v. RELIEF 15 CASHCO DISTRIBUTORS, INC.; SEACLIFF BEAUTY PACKAGING & 16 LABORATORIES; and DOES 1-150, (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.) inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

**NATURE OF THE ACTION** 

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff, ANTHONY E. HELD PhD., P.E., 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-ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP"), a toxic chemical found in or on toiletry cases/bags sold in California.
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failure to warn California citizens about their exposure to DEHP present in or on certain toiletry cases/bags that defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the state of California.
- 3. High levels of DEHP are commonly found in and on toiletry cases/bags that defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to consumers 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"), "[n]o 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, California identified and listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. DEHP became subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of Proposition 65 one year later on October 24, 2004. (Tit. 27 Cal. Code Regs. ("CCR") § 27001(c); Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).)
- 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or sell toiletry cases/bags containing excessive levels of DEHP including, but not limited to, those sold in connection with the *Good To Go Women's Travel Kit (#8 93698 00202 5)*. All such toiletry cases/bags containing DEHP shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."
- 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the state of California about their exposure to DEHP in conjunction with defendants' sale of the

PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.

- 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of DEHP. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).)
- 9. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65, as provided for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

#### **PARTIES**

- 10. Plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, PhD., P.E. is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products; he brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 11. Defendant CASHCO DISTRIBUTORS, INC. ("CASHCO") is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 & 25249.11.
- 12. Defendant CASHCO manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the state of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the state of California.
- 13. Defendant SEACLIFF BEAUTY PACKAGING & LABORATORIES ("SEACLIFF") is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 & 25249.11.
- 14. Defendant SEACLIFF manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the state of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the state of California.
- 15. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 & 25249.11.

- 16. 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.
- 17. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 & 25249.11.
- 18. 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.
- 19. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAILER DEFENDANTS") are persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 & 25249.11.
- 20. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the state of California.
- 21. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff who, therefore, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 474, sues said defendants by their fictitious names. 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.
- 22. CASHCO, SEACLIFF, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to herein as "DEFENDANTS."

#### VENUE AND JURISDICTION

23. Venue is proper in the Marin County Superior Court, pursuant to California 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 continue to occur in Marin

County, and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this county with respect to the PRODUCTS.

- 24. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution, Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction 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.
- 25. 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 or association that either is a citizen of the state of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the state of California, or otherwise purposefully avails itself 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)

- 26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive.
- 27. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in 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.)
- 28. Proposition 65 states "[n]o 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...."

  (*Ibid.*)
- 29. On or about May 4, 2011, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, on CASHCO and various public enforcement agencies stating that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the state of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of

30.

such toxic exposures.

31.

5

11 12

10

13

14 15

16

17

the future.

18 19

2021

2223

2425

2627

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 and supplemental sixty-day notice of

"clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.

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

violation. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into

the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a

of violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, on CASHCO, SEACLIFF, and

PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the state of California were being exposed to DEHP

resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual

various public enforcement agencies stating that, as a result of the DEFENDANTS' sales of the

purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding

the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and

On or about September 1, 2011, plaintiff served a supplemental sixty-day notice

DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of

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 DEHP in an amount above the level at which a warning is required by Proposition 65.

- 34. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California contained DEHP.
- 35. DEHP was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals to DEHP 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 DEHP, as such exposure is defined by Tit. 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25602(b).
- 37. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
- 38. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to DEHP from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the state of California.
- 39. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers and/or other individuals in the state of California who were or who could become exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 40. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition contained in Proposition 65, as enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS sold by DEFENDANTS without a "clear and reasonable warning" have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm, for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.
- 41. As a consequence of the above-described acts, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation.
- 42. As a consequence of the above-described acts, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANTS.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

- 1. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against DEFENDANTS in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation alleged herein;
- 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, and/or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and reasonable warning" as defined by Tit. 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25601, as to the harms associated with exposure DEHP;
  - 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
  - 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: November  $\frac{1}{2}$ , 2011

Respectfully Submitted, THE CHANLER GROUP

By:(\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ANTHONY E. HELD, PhD., P.E.