9		
1 2 3 4 5	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 PETER ENGLANDER	MAR 2 6 2013 KIM TURNER, Court Executive Officer MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT By: J. Chen, Deputy
6		
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
8	FOR THE COUNTY OF MARIN	
9	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
10		Case No. 4 130 130 5
11	PETER ENGLANDER,	Case No. 4 1301305
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND
13	VS.	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
14	Q.E.P CO., INC. and DOES 1-150,	(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL P	ENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff PETER ENGLANDER, 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 chemicals found in and on certain tile cutter hand grips 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 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.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4. Where appropriate, DEHP shall hereinafter be referred to as "LISTED CHEMICAL." 5. The presence of DEHP has been detected in and/or on the consumer accessible grip components of the tile cutters that defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California. An illustrative example of this type of DEHPcontaining tile cutter product includes, but is not limited to, the QEP 14 in. Tile Cutter, Item #10214.

6. All such tile cutter products made with grips containing DEHP, shall hereinafter be referred to collectively as the "PRODUCTS."

7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California about their exposures to DEHP in conjunction with defendants' sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65.

8.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1	9. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and		
2	permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of any and all of		
3	the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED		
4	CHEMICAL content. (<i>Cal. Health & Safety Code</i> § 25249.7(<i>a</i>).)		
5	10. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of		
6	Proposition 65, as provided for by California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(b).		
7	PARTIES		
8	11. Plaintiff PETER ENGLANDER is a citizen of the State of California who is		
9	experienced in protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of		
10	toxic exposures from consumer products, and brings this action in the public interest pursuant to		
11	California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7.		
12	12. Defendant Q.E.P. CO., INC. (hereafter "QEP") is a person doing business within the		
13	meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11.		
14	13. Defendant QEP manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or		
15	use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes, and/or		
16	offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.		
17	14. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each persons		
18	doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11.		
19	MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing, designing,		
20	assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they engage in the		
21	process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating, and/or manufacturing, one or		
22	more of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.		
23	15. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each persons doing		
24	business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11. DISTRIBUTOR		
25	DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process and/or transport one or more of the		
26	PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses or retailers for sale or use in the State of California.		
27			
28			
	2 COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		

16. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAIL DEFENDANTS") are each persons doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State of California.

17. 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.

18. QEP, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAIL DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereinafter as "DEFENDANTS".

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

19. Venue is proper in the Marin County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
Procedure Sections 393, 395, and 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 this
County and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this
County with respect to the PRODUCTS.

20. 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.

2 21. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on
3 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 and that each defendant has 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)

22. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 21, inclusive.

23. In passing Proposition 65, the citizens of the State of California expressed their intent through the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 that they must be "informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm."

24. 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"
Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

25. On November 21, 2012, a sixty-day notice of violation ("60-Day Notice"), supported by the requisite Certificate of Merit, was served upon QEP 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 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 plaintiff is informed and believes that 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 QEP's receipt of plaintiff's 60-Day Notice. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations are reasonably likely to occur into the future absent express injunctive relief.

26 27. After receipt of the claims asserted in the 60-Day Notice, the appropriate public
27 enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against
28 DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

4

28. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by DEFENDANTS contain DEHP.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

29. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS contain DEHP.

30. DEHP is present in or on each of the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose (as such exposure is defined by 27 CCR Section 25602(b)) individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion during 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).

36. As a consequence of the above-described acts, California Health & Safety Code
Section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
DEFENDANTS.

26

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

27 Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, as28 follows:

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

 That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against DEFENDANTS in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation alleged herein;
 That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(a),

preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing "clear and reasonable warnings" as defined by 27 CCR Section 25601, as to the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

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

Dated: March 26, 2013

Respectfully submitted, THE CHANLER GROUP

Bv: Gregory M Sheffer Attorneys for Plaintiff PETER ENGLANDER

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF