

ENDORSED  
FILED

2012 SEP 12 PM 3:41

David H. ...  
By: \_\_\_\_\_ M. Rawson  
Clerk of Court

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436  
2 Harris A. Weinstein, State Bar No. 282166  
3 THE CHANLER GROUP  
4 2560 Ninth Street  
5 Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
6 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  
7 Telephone: (510) 848-8880  
8 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
10 PETER ENGLANDER

11  
12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
13 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA  
14 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

15 PETER ENGLANDER,  
16 Plaintiff,  
17 v.  
18 IRON BRIDGE TOOLS, INC.; and DOES 1-  
19 150, inclusive,  
20 Defendants.

Case No. 112CV232186

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

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

BY FAX

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff PETER  
3 ENGLANDER, in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the  
4 People's right to be informed of the presence of di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP"), a toxic  
5 chemical found in hand tool grips sold in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendant's continuing failure to warn  
7 California citizens about their exposure to DEHP, present in or on certain hand tool grips that  
8 defendant manufactures, imports, distributes, and/or offers for sale to consumers throughout the  
9 State of California.

10 3. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986,  
11 California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"), "No person in the course  
12 of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known  
13 to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable  
14 warning to such individual..." (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

15 4. On October 24, 2003, California identified and listed DEHP as a chemical known  
16 to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. DEHP became subject to the warning  
17 requirement one year later and was, therefore, subject to the "clear and reasonable warning"  
18 requirements of Proposition 65, beginning on October 24, 2004. (*27 CCR § 27001 (c); Cal.*  
19 *Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.*)

20 5. Defendant Iron Bridge Tools, Inc. ("IRON BRIDGE" or "Defendant")  
21 manufactures, imports, distributes, and/or sells hand tool grips containing DEHP including, but  
22 not limited to, *Husky Clamp, #690 694 (#8 11187 01209 6)*, hereinafter referred to as the  
23 "Products."

24 6. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of  
25 California not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code § 6300 *et*  
26 *seq.* about their exposure to DEHP in conjunction with Defendant's distribution, importation,  
27 manufacturing, and/or sale of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects  
28

1 Defendant to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.

2 7. For Defendant's violation of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive  
3 and permanent injunctive relief to compel Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the  
4 Products with the required warning regarding the health hazards of DEHP. (*Cal. Health &*  
5 *Safety Code § 25249.7(a).*)

6 8. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of  
7 Proposition 65, as provided for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

8 **PARTIES**

9 9. PETER ENGLANDER is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated to  
10 protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic  
11 exposures from consumer and commercial products, and brings this action in the public interest  
12 pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.

13 10. IRON BRIDGE is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health  
14 & Safety Code § 25249.11.

15 11. IRON BRIDGE manufactures, imports, distributes, and/or offers the Products for  
16 sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,  
17 distributes, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.

18 12. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each persons  
19 doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

20 13. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,  
21 designing, assembling, fabricating, and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they  
22 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating, and/or  
23 manufacturing, one or more of the Products for sale or use in the State of California.

24 14. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each persons  
25 doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.

26  
27  
28



1 association that either are citizens of the State of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in  
2 the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market.  
3 DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California  
4 courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)**

7 23. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
8 Paragraphs 1 through 22, inclusive.

9 24. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in Proposition 65 that  
10 they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and other  
11 reproductive harm." (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

12 25. Proposition 65 states, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly  
13 and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or  
14 reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual..."  
15 (*Id.*)

16 26. On June 15, 2012, a 60-Day Notice of Violation, together with the requisite  
17 Certificate of Merit (the "Notice"), was provided to IRON BRIDGE and various public  
18 enforcement agencies stating that as a result of DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution and/or  
19 sale of the Products, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP  
20 resulting from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the Products, without the individual purchasers  
21 and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic  
22 exposures.

23 27. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, and/or  
24 offering of the Products for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6  
25 and DEFENDANTS' manufacture, importation, distribution, and/or offering of the Products for  
26 sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur  
27  
28

1 beyond IRON BRIDGE's receipt of plaintiff's Notice. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that  
2 such violations will continue to occur into the future.

3 28. After receipt of the claims asserted in the Notice, the appropriate public  
4 enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against  
5 DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

6 29. The Products manufactured, imported, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in  
7 California by DEFENDANTS contained DEHP above the allowable state limits.

8 30. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the Products manufactured,  
9 imported, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California contained  
10 DEHP.

11 31. DEHP was present in or on the Products in such a way as to expose individuals to  
12 DEHP through dermal contact and ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the  
13 PRODUCTS.

14 32. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products has caused and  
15 continues to cause consumer and workplace exposures to DEHP, as such exposure is defined by  
16 27 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 25602(b).

17 33. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of  
18 the Products would expose individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and ingestion.

19 34. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to DEHP from the reasonably  
20 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation  
21 in the manufacture, importation, distribution, and/or offer for sale or use of Products to  
22 individuals in the State of California.

23 35. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those  
24 consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become  
25 exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of  
26 the Products.

27  
28




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 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: September 5, 2012

Respectfully Submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Harris A. Weinstein  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
PETER ENGLANDER