1 2 3 4 5 6	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 Gregory M. Sheffer, State Bar No. 173124 THE CHANLER GROUP 81 Throckmorton Ave., Suite 202 Mill Valley, CA 94941 Telephone: 415.388.0911 Facsimile: 415.388.9911 Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTHONY HELD, PH.D.	SEP 05 2012 CLERK OF THE COURT ROSSALY DELAVEGA-NAVARRO Deputy Clerk
7	CLIDED OF COLUMN OF	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
10	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
11	ANTHONY HELD BUD	Case No. CGC-12-523956
12	ANTHONY HELD, PH.D., Plaintiff,	Case No.
13		COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
14	v. UNIVERSITY ART CENTER, INC. and DOES	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
15	1-150,	(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)
16	Defendants.	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

COMDI AINT EOD CIVII DENAITIEC AND INITINICTIVE DELIEF

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff ANTHONY HELD, PH.D., 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 found in the components of certain of defendant's plastic pen and pencil cases manufactured, distributed and/or otherwise sold by defendants in California.
- 2. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code Section 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.)
- 3. On October 24, 2003, the State listed Di(2-ethylhexl)phthalate 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.)
 - 4. DEHP shall hereinafter be referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICAL."
- Significant levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL have been discovered in or on plastic pen and pencil cases composed of, or with components composed of material containing DEHP, including, but not limited to, Manhattan KMM-31 Pen Case (#7 17188 00031 8). All such pen and pencil cases containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."
- 6. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California about their exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendant's sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65.
- 7. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the

PRODUCTS wit	h the required warning regardi	ng the health hazards of the LISTED
CHEMICAL. (C	al. Health & Safety Code § 25249.	7(a).)

8. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65, as provided for by California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(b).

PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff ANTHONY HELD, PH.D. 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, and brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7.
- 10. Defendant UNIVERSITY ART CENTER, INC. ("UNIVERSITY ART") is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11.
- 11. Defendant UNIVERSITY ART 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.
- 12. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11.
- 13. 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.
- Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11.
- 15. 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.

 16. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAIL DEFENDANTS") are each persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11.

- 17. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State of California.
- 18. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by their fictitious name pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 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.
- 19. UNIVERSITY ART, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR
 DEFENDANTS, and RETAIL DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereinafter as "DEFENDANTS".

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 20. Venue is proper in the San Francisco Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Sections 394, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction and because DEFENDANTS are believed to have conducted, and continue to conduct, business with residents of this County with respect to the PRODUCTS.
- 21. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 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.
- 22. 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 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)

- 23. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 22, inclusive.
- 24. 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 Section 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.)
- 25. On September 21, 2011, a sixty-day notice of violation ("60-Day Notice"), together with the requisite Certificate of Merit, was provided to UNIVERSITY ART and various public enforcement agencies stating that as a result of the UNIVERSITY ART's manufacture, distribution and sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California are being exposed to DEHP 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.
- 26. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 and DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond UNIVERSITY ART's receipt of plaintiff's 60-Day Notice. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.
- 27. After receipt of the claims asserted in the 60-Day Notice, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

- 28. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by DEFENDANTS, contain the LISTED CHEMICAL.
- 29. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.
- 30. The LISTED CHEMICAL is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is defined by 27 CCR Section 25602(b), through dermal contact and/or ingestion during or as a consequence of the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS exposes individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
- 32. DEFENDANTS' participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or use of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California was deliberate and non-accidental.
- 33. 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 the LISTED CHEMICAL during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 34. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL 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 harm they have no other plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.
- 35. As a consequence of the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65 pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(b).