Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436 Harris A. Weinstein, State Bar No. 282166 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 3 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 4 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTHÓNY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E. 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA 9 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION 10 11 Case No. 112CV231474 12 ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E., Plaintiff. 13 **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES** 14 V. AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF SPEEN & COMPANY, INC.; and DOES 1-15 150, inclusive, (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.) 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff ANTHONY E.

 HELD, Ph.D., 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 footwear sold in California.
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendant's continuing failure to warn California citizens about their exposure to DEHP, present in or on certain footwear that defendant manufactures, imports, distributes, and/or offers for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 3. 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.)
- 4. 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 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.)
- 5. Defendant SPEEN & COMPANY, INC. ("Speen & Company" or "Defendant") manufactures, imports, distributes, and/or sells footwear containing DEHP including, but not limited to, Tanya by Coloriffics (#8 45117 01092 0).
- 6. All such footwear containing DEHP shall hereinafter be collectively referred to as the "PRODUCTS."
- 7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California about their exposure to DEHP in conjunction with defendant's sale of the

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

- 8. For defendant's violation of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendant 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 defendant for its violations of Proposition 65, as provided for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

PARTIES

- 10. ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., 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 and commercial products, and brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 11. Speen & Company is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 12. Speen & Company manufactures, imports, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, 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 doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 14. 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.
- 15. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 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 doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State of California and, in some circumstances, may also be manufacturers and/or distributors.
- 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 § 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.
- 20. Speen & Company, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereinafter as "DEFENDANTS."

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 21. Venue is proper in the Santa Clara County Superior Court, pursuant to 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 continues to occur, in the County of Santa Clara, 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, § 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 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)

- 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 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 & Safely 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 March 29, 2012, a 60-Day Notice of Violation, together with the requisite Certificate of Merit (the "Notice"), was provided to Speen & Company and various public enforcement agencies stating that as a result of DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution and/or sale of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California were 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.
- 28. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and DEFENDANTS' manufacture, importation, 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 Speen & Company's receipt of plaintiff's Notice. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.

- 29. After receipt of the claims asserted in the Notice, 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, imported, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by DEFENDANTS contained DEHP above the allowable state limits.
- 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California contained DEHP.
- 32. DEHP was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and 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 and workplace exposures to DEHP, as such exposure is defined by 27 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 25602(b).
- 34. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and ingestion.
- 35. 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, importation, distribution, and/or offer for sale or use of PRODUCTS 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 DEHP through dermal contact and ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

6

28

1	3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and						
2	4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.						
3							
4	Dated: Augu	st 31, 2012		Respectf	ully Submitted	L	
5				THE CH	ANLER GRO	UP	
6		Ti		1.6	11	_	
7				By: Harris A.	Weinstein		•8
8	Ī			Attorney ANTHO	s for Plaintiff NY E. HELD,	PH.D., P.E.	
9							
10							
11							
12							
13 14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20				Ä			
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26	-						
27							
28							-