ENDORSED

JUN 1 4 2012

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Anita Dhir

Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436 Rachel S. Doughty, State Bar No. 255904 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

Attorneys for Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER

RUSSELL BRIMER,

v.

inclusive,

Plaintiff,

DMI SPORTS, INC.; and DOES 1-150,

Defendants.

7

6

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

Case No. RG1263467 ¥

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

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

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff, RUSSELL BRIMER, 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 table tennis sets sold in California.
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failure to warn California citizens about reproductive harms associated with their exposure to the lead present in or on certain table tennis sets that defendants manufacture, import, distribute, and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the state of California.
- 3. High levels of lead are commonly found in and on the table tennis sets 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, Health & Safety Code section 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 ..." (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.6.)
- 5. On February 27, 1987, California identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead became subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of Proposition 65, beginning on February 27, 1988. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, § 27001, subd. (c); Health & Saf. Code, §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10, subd. (b).)
- 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale table tennis sets containing lead including, but not limited to, the *Prince 2 Player Racket Set, Item #: 2PLAYSET (#7 19981 70590 2).* All such table tennis sets containing lead shall hereinafter be referred to as the "Products."
- 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the state of California not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code section 6300 et seq., about their exposure to lead and its potential to cause birth defects and other

reproductive harm in conjunction with Defendants' distribution, importation, manufacturing, and/or 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 lead. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7, subd. (a).)
- 9. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65, as provided by Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (b).

PARTIES

- 10. Plaintiff, Russell Brimer, 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 Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (d).
- 11. Defendant DMI Sports, Inc. ("DMI") is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11.
- 12. Defendant DMI 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. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("Manufacturer Defendants") are each persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11.
- 14. Manufacturer Defendants engage in the process of researching, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating, and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they engage in the process of researching, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating, and/or manufacturing, one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the state of California.
- 15. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("Distributor Defendants") are each persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11.

- 16. 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.
- 17. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("Retailer Defendants") are each persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.11.
- 18. Retailer Defendants offer the Products for sale to individuals in the state of California.
- 19. 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 alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.
- 20. DMI, Manufacturer Defendants, Distributor Defendants, and Retailer Defendants shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to as "Defendants."

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 21. Venue is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 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 Alameda County, and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this County with respect to the Products.
- 22. 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.
- 23. 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 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)

- 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.
- 25. The citizens of the state of California have stated expressly in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm." (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.6.)
- 26. 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...." (*Id.*)
- 27. On or about January 19, 2012, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, was provided to DMI 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 exposed to lead resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products, without the individual purchasers and users first having received a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.
- 28. Defendants have engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of the Products for sale or use in violation of Health & Safety Code section 25249.6, and Defendants' manufacture, distribution, and/or offering of the Products for sale or use in violation of Health & Safety Code section 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.

-

- 29. After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notice of violation, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65.
- 30. The Products manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by Defendants contained lead in an amount above the allowable state limits.
- 31. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California contained lead.
- 32. Lead was present in or on the Products in such a way as to expose individuals to lead through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.
- 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products has caused, and continues to cause, consumer exposures to lead, as such exposure is defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25602, subdivision (b).
- 34. Defendants had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products would expose individuals to lead through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
- 35. Defendants intended that such exposures to lead 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 or use to individuals in the state of California.
- 36. 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 lead through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.
- 37. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to lead 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.

- 38. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (b).
- 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (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 Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (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 Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (a) preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from manufacturing, distributing, and/or offering the Products for sale or use in California, without providing "clear and reasonable warnings" as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 as to the harms associated with exposure to lead;
 - 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: June <u>14</u>, 2012

Respectfully Submitted, THE CHANLER GROUP

Rachel S. Doughty

Attorneys for Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER