

ENDORSED  
FILED  
ALAMEDA COUNTY

MAR 26 2013

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  
BY Esther Coleman DEPUTY

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436  
2 Rachel Doughty, State Bar No. 255904  
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 LAURENCE VINOCUR

11  
12  
13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
14 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA  
15 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION  
16  
17  
18

19 LAURENCE VINOCUR,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 EVENFLO COMPANY, INC.; and DOES 1-  
23 150, inclusive,

24 Defendants.

25 Case No. RG13673019

26 **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
27 AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

28 (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6 *et seq.*)

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff LAURENCE  
3 VINOCUR in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s  
4 right to be informed of the presence of Tris(1,3-dichloroisopropyl) phosphate (“TDCPP”), a  
5 toxic chemical found car seats with padding sold in California. TDCPP is a toxic chemical that  
6 is used to treat polyurethane foam, which is used as padding or cushioning in a variety of  
7 products.

8 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants’ continuing failures to  
9 warn California citizens about the risk of exposure to TDCPP present in and on car seats with  
10 padding manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers throughout the State  
11 of California.

12 3. Detectable levels of TDCPP are commonly found in and on car seats with  
13 padding that Defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers, many of  
14 whom are infants and children, throughout the State of California. Individuals in California,  
15 including infants and children, are exposed to TDCPP when they inhale TDCPP released from  
16 car seats with padding, and also when TDCPP from car seats with padding accumulates in  
17 ambient particles that are subsequently touched by such individuals and brought into contact  
18 with the mouth.

19 4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at  
20 Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of  
21 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to  
22 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable  
23 warning to such individual . . . .” (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6.)

24 5. TDCPP has been used in consumer products as an additive flame retardant since  
25 the 1960s. In the late 1970s, based on findings that exposure to TDCPP could have mutagenic  
26 effects, the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission banned the use of TDCPP in  
27 children’s pajamas.



1 toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public interest  
2 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (d).

3 12. Defendant EVENFLO COMPANY, INC. (“EVENFLO”) is a person in the course  
4 of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11.

5 13. EVENFLO manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS  
6 for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,  
7 distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

8 14. Defendants DOES 1-150 are each persons in the course of doing business within  
9 the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11, subdivision (b), which manufacture,  
10 distribute, sell, and/or offer the PRODUCTS for sale in the State of California. At this time, the  
11 true names and capacities of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are unknown to  
12 Plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil  
13 Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of  
14 the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences alleged herein.  
15 When ascertained, their true names and capacities shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

16 15. EVENFLOW and Defendants DOES 1-150 are collectively referred to herein as  
17 “Defendants.”

### 18 VENUE AND JURISDICTION

19 16. Venue is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil  
20 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,  
21 because Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of  
22 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in Alameda County, and/or because  
23 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this county with respect to the  
24 PRODUCTS.

25 17. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to  
26 California Constitution, article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original  
27  
28

1 jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under  
2 which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

3 18. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendants based on  
4 Plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that each Defendant is a person, firm, corporation  
5 or association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the  
6 State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.  
7 Defendants’ purposeful availment of California as a marketplace for the PRODUCTS renders  
8 the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts over Defendants consistent with  
9 traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

12 19. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
13 Paragraphs 1 through 18, inclusive.

14 20. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic  
15 Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right “[t]o be  
16 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive  
17 harm.”

18 21. Proposition 65 states, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall  
19 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause  
20 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
21 individual . . . .” (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.6.)

22 22. On December 28, 2012, Plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, together with the  
23 requisite certificate of merit, was provided to EVENFLO and certain public enforcement  
24 agencies stating that, as a result of Defendants’ sales of the PRODUCTS containing the  
25 LISTED CHEMICAL, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to the  
26 LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS,  
27  
28

1 without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a “clear and  
2 reasonable warning” regarding such toxic exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

3 23. Defendants have engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and  
4 offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section  
5 25249.6, and Defendants’ violations have continued to occur beyond their receipt of Plaintiff’s  
6 sixty-day notice of violation. As such, Defendants’ violations are ongoing and continuous in  
7 nature, and will continue to occur in the future.

8 24. After receiving Plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, the appropriate public  
9 enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action  
10 against Defendants under Proposition 65.

11 25. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale  
12 or use in California by Defendants contain the LISTED CHEMICAL such that they require a  
13 “clear and reasonable” warning under Proposition 65.

14 26. Defendants knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they manufacture,  
15 import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain the LISTED CHEMICAL.

16 27. The LISTED CHEMICAL is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to  
17 expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, ingestion, and/or  
18 inhalation during reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

19 28. The normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS have caused, and  
20 continue to cause, consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposures are  
21 defined by California Code of Regulations, title 27, section 25602, subdivision (b).

22 29. Defendants had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the  
23 PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, ingestion,  
24 and/or inhalation.

25 30. Defendants intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the  
26 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS would occur by Defendants’ deliberate, non-  
27  
28

1 accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the  
2 PRODUCTS for sale or use to individuals in the State of California.

3 31. Defendants failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those consumers  
4 and other individuals in the State of California who were or who would become exposed to the  
5 LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, ingestion, and/or inhalation during the  
6 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS.

7 32. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted  
8 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal  
9 contact, ingestion, and/or inhalation resulting from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the  
10 PRODUCTS sold by Defendants without a “clear and reasonable warning,” have suffered, and  
11 continue to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at  
12 law.

13 33. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (b), as a  
14 consequence of the above-described acts, Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of  
15 \$2,500 per day for each violation.

16 34. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code  
17 section 25249.7, subdivision (a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief  
18 against Defendants.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as  
21 follows:

22 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision  
23 (b), assess civil penalties against Defendants in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;

24 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision  
25 (a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from manufacturing, distributing, or  
26 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and  
27  
28

1 reasonable warning” as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 27, section 25601 *et*  
2 *seq.*, as to the harms associated with exposures the LISTED CHEMICAL;

3 3. That the Court grant Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and

4 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

5  
6 Dated: March 26, 2013

THE CHANLER GROUP

7  
8 By: 

9 Rachel S. Doughty  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11 LAURENCE VINOCUR  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28