	the state of the s	CIVI-U I
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Barri Stephen Ure (CSB#188244) Law Offices of Stephen Ure, PC. 1518 Sixth Avenue, San Diego, CA 921	CENTRAL DIVISION	
TELEPHONE NO.: (619) 235-5400 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff, Evelyn Wimber		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN STREET ADDRESS: 330 West Broadway	2011 NOV -8 PM 2: 29	
MAILING ADDRESS: Same CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Diego, CA 92101-3 BRANCH NAME: Hall of Justice	SAN DIEGO COUNTY. CA	
CASE NAME: MAUREEN PARKER v. DYN	O, LLC d/b/a DYNO MERCHAND	ISE CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: 37-2011-00100778-CU-NP-CTL
✓ Unlimited Limited (Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defe (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402	
Items 1–6 belo	w must be completed (see instruction	
1. Check one box below for the case type that	best describes this case:	primarile state of the property
Auto Tort Auto (22)	Contract Breach of contract/warranty (06)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)
Asbestos (04)	Insurance coverage (18) Other contract (37)	Mass tort (40) Securities litigation (28)
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)
Medical malpractice (45) Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)	Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)
Intellectual property (19) Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21) Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Wrongful termination (36) Other employment (15)	Writ of mandate (02) Other judicial review (39)	
2. This case is is is not complete factors requiring exceptional judicial manage	ex under rule 3.400 of the California Rement:	Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
a. Large number of separately represe		er of witnesses
b. Extensive motion practice raising di	fficult or novel e. Coordination	with related actions pending in one or more courts
issues that will be time-consuming t		nties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
c. Substantial amount of documentary	evidence f. Substantial p	postjudgment judicial supervision
Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. Number of causes of action (specify): One (declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive
This case is is is not a class		The state of the state of the state of
5. If there are any known related cases, file and		may use form CM-015.)
Date: 11/8/2011	Section 18 and 1	an many a tase, would from a street fair in
	A Landstone, tipos' sur months in the	The result of the relation of the result.
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)
Stephen Ure, Esq. (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) • Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first	NOTICE st paper filed in the action or proceeding	

other parties to the action or proceeding.

• File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.

• If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

DYNO, LLC. d/b/a DYNO MERCHANDISE

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

Maureen Parker

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

CLHIKAL DIVISION

2011 NOV -8 PM 2: 29

SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below

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. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. [AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

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 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.sucorte.ca.gov), 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.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuctas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Hall of Justice 330 West Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101-3827

CASE NUMBER

37-2011-00100778-CU-NP-CTL

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): Stephen Ure, SBC#188244, Law Offices of Stephen Ure, PC., 1518 Sixth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101, Tel (619) 235-5400

PATE: Fecha) NOV 0 8 2011	Clerk, by (Secretario)	A. Fletes	, Deputy (Adjunto)
For proof of service of this summons, use Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión us NOTICE	Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010), se el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served).) (POS-010)).	
2.	as an individual defendant. as the person sued under the fictitious name o	f (specify):	
3.	on behalf of (specify):	8	
under	CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.40 (association or partnersh	CCP 416.60 (min CCP 416.70 (con ip) CCP 416.90 (auth	servatee)
	other (specify):		
4.	by personal delivery on (date):		Page 1 of 1

1 Stephen Ure, Esq., (CSB# 188244) LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN URE, PC 2 1518 Sixth Avenue San Diego, CA 92101 3 Telephone: 619-235-5400 4 Facsimile: 619-235-5404 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Maureen Parker 6 7 8 9 10 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION 11 12 13 MAUREEN PARKER, 14 Plaintiff, 15 and 16 DYNO LLC d/b/a DYNO MERCHANDISE, 17 Defendant. 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

NAME AND DESCRIPTION OF CLATKAL DIVISION

2011 NOV -8 PM 2: 29

JEERN STEERIUM COURT SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CASE NO.: 37-2011-00100770-CO-NF-CTE
COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

ON NO. 27 2011 00100779 CH ND CTI

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

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Maureen Parker, 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 lead, a toxic chemical found in Singer 90 Safety Pins (UPC Numbers 075691002213 and 075691002053, as well as 075691002060, 075691002244, 075691002251, 075691002268, 075691002947, 075691002961, 075691003029, 075691003043, $075691070717,\,075691070748,\,075691074609,\,075691074708,\,075691074807,\,07569003050,$ 07569003081, 075691032036, 075691001629, and 075691001636) sold in California.

- By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failures to warn California citizens about their exposure to lead present in or on certain safety pins that defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 3. High levels of lead are commonly found in Singer 90 Safety Pins (UPC Numbers 075691002213 and 075691002053, as well as 075691002060, 075691002244, 075691002251, 075691002268, 075691002947, 075691002961, 075691003029, 075691003043, 075691070717, 075691070748, 075691074609, 075691074708, 075691074807, 07569003050, 07569003081, 075691032036, 075691001629, and 075691001636that 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), "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. California identified and listed Lead as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead became subject to the warning requirements of Proposition 65 for developmental toxicity beginning on February 27, 1987 and for cancer toxicity on October 1, 1992. (27 CCR § 27002; Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
 - 6. Lead shall hereinafter be referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICAL."
- 7. Defendant manufactures, distributes and/or sells Safety Pins containing excessive levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL including, but not limited to, the Singer 90 Safety Pins (UPC Numbers 075691002213 and 075691002053, as well as 075691002060, 075691002244, 075691002251, 075691002268, 075691002947, 075691002961, 075691003029, 075691003043, 075691070717, 075691070748, 075691074609, 075691074708, 075691074807, 07569003050, 07569003081, 075691032036, 075691001629, and 075691001636). All such Safety Pins containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."

	8.	Defendants'	failures to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of
California	abo	out their expos	sure to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendant's
sale of the	PR	ODUCTS is a	a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinment of
such cond	uct	as well as civ	il penalties for each such violation.

- 9. 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 the LISTED CHEMICAL. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).)
- 10. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65, as provides for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

PARTIES

- 11. Plaintiff Maureen Parker is a citizen of the City of Oceanside, County of San Diego, in the State of California, who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination of reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products, and brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 12. Defendant DYNO LLC d/b/a DYNO MERCHANDEISE ("DYNO") is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 13. Defendant DYNO manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sales 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.
 - 14. DYNO shall, where appropriate, be referred to hereinafter as "DEFENDANT."

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

15. Venue is proper in the San Diego County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § § 394, 495, 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 County of San Diego and/or because DEFENDANT conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this County with respect to the PRODUCTS.

16. 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.

17. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT based on 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 Defendant)

- 18. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if full reference, as if full set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive.
- 19. 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. (Proposotion 65) that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and order reproductive harm." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 20. 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 productive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual... (*Id.*)"
- 21. On July 11, 2011 a sixty-day notice violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, was provided to DYNO, and various public enforcement agencies stating that as a result of the DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from the reasonably foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.

26

27

28

- 22. DEFENDANT has 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.
- 23. 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 DEFENDANT under Proposition 65.
- 24. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by DEFENDANT contained the LISTED CHEMICAL above the allowable state limits.
- 25. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or for sale or use by DEFENDANT in California contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.
- 26. The LISTED CHEMICAL was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such away as to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 27. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of he PRODUCTS has caused and continues to cause consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure s defined by 27 CCR§ 25602(b).
- 28. DEFENDANT 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.
- 29. DEFENDANT intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or use of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

| | ///

- 30. DEFENDANT 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 the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 31. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, sold by DEFENDENT without a "clear and reasonable warning," have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.
- 32. As a consequence of the above-described acts, DEFENDANT is liable for a maximum civil penal of \$2,500 per day for each violation pursuant to California Health& Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 33. 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 DEFENDANT.
- 34. Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANT as set forth hereinafter.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANT as follows:

- That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against DEFENDANT, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation alleged herein; pursuant to
- 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANT from manufacturing, distributing or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing "clear and reasonable warnings" as detailed by 27 CCR § 25601, as to the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and cost of suit; and4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: 1118 2011

Respectfully Submitted,

Law Offices of Stephen Ure, PC.

By:

Stephen Ure, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff MAUREEN PARKER