ELLISON FOLK (State Bar No. 149232) PETER R. MILJANICH (State Bar No. 281826) SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP 396 Hayes Street San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 552-7272 Telephone: (415) 552-5816 Facsimile: JAN 08 2014 Folk@smwlaw.com CLERK OF THE COURT Miljanich@smwlaw.com MEREDITH GRIER 6 Attorneys for As You Sow Deputy Clerk 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 9 CGC-14-536649 Case No. 10 As You Sow, a California Non-Profit Public 11 Benefit Corporation, **COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE** 12 **RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES** Plaintiff, 13 California Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 v. et seq. 14 House of Cheatham, Inc., and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

CASE NO.

1

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

I. INTRODUCTION

This complaint seeks an injunction and civil penalties to remedy the continuing 1. failure of House of Cheatham, Inc. ("Defendant") to give clear and reasonable warnings to residents of California prior to exposing those residents to products containing formaldehyde, which is a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, also known as "Proposition 65," businesses must provide persons with a "clear and reasonable warning" before exposing them to such chemicals.

II. **PARTIES**

- Plaintiff, As You Sow, is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization based in San 2. Francisco, California, and incorporated under the laws of the State of California. As You Sow is dedicated to, among other causes, the protection of the environment, the promotion of human health, the improvement of worker and consumer safety, and environmental education. As You Sow is a "person" pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.11(a). As You Sow brings this action in the interest of the general public pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7.
- Defendant House of Cheatham Inc. is a business entity that manufactures, 3. distributes, markets, and/or sells hair products, including Africa's Best No-Lye Relaxer System, which contains formaldehyde, to consumers within the State of California.
- The true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 10 are unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues them by fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been determined. Each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible for the manufacture, distribution, marketing, and/or sale of products containing formaldehyde to consumers in California.
- Wherever reference is made to "Defendant" in this complaint, such reference 5. includes the Defendant named in Paragraph 3 and Does 1 through 10, inclusive.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

 $\|_1$

- 6. This court has jurisdiction pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts.
- 7. This court has jurisdiction over Defendant named above because it does sufficient business in California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market, through the manufacture, distribution, sale, marketing, and/or use of its products in California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendant by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 8. Venue is proper in this Court because Defendant's manufacturing, distributing, marketing, and/or sales of products containing formaldehyde has occurred in the County of Alameda and/or to people who live in the County of San Francisco, which causes people to be exposed to formaldehyde while they are physically present in San Francisco County.
- 9. On June 12, 2013, Plaintiff provided a Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 to the California Attorney General, the District Attorney of each county in California, the City Attorney of each California city with a population over 750,000 persons, and Defendant, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d). This Notice of Violation included the following product manufactured, distributed, marketed, and/or sold by Defendant: Africa's Best No-Lye Relaxer System.
- 10. The Notice of Violation included a Certificate of Merit that Plaintiff's attorneys had consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding exposure to formaldehyde from the product manufactured, distributed, marketed, and/or sold by Defendant and that, based on that information, such attorneys believe that there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action. The Notice of Violation also included a Certificate of Service. The Notices of Violation mailed to Defendant included a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986: A Summary." In compliance with Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d) and title 11, section 3102 of the California Code of Regulations, the Attorney General was served with Notices of Violation and Certificates of Merit that included

confidential factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the Certificates of Merit, including the identify of individual(s) with whom Plaintiff consulted and the facts, studies, or other data that was reviewed by such person(s).

- 11. None of the public prosecutors that received the Notices of Violation has commenced and is diligently prosecuting an action against the named Defendant for the violations alleged in this complaint, although the notice period established in Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d) has elapsed since the Notices of Violation were served by mail.
- 12. Because As You Sow has fully complied with the requirements of Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(d), and neither the Attorney General, nor any District Attorney, City Attorney, or prosecutor has commenced and is diligently pursuing an action against the violations alleged herein, Plaintiff has standing to bring this Complaint.

IV. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

Proposition 65

- 13. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 is an initiative statute passed as "Proposition 65" by a vote of the people in November of 1986.
- 14. The warning requirement of Proposition 65 is contained in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, which provides:

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, except as provided in Health and Safety Code section 25249.10.

- 15. Regulations promulgated to implement Proposition 65 provide that the warning method "must be reasonably calculated, considering the alternative methods available under the circumstances, to make the warning message available to the individual prior to exposure." 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25601(a).
- 17. Proposition 65 also establishes a procedure by which the state is to develop a list of chemicals "known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity." Health & Saf. Code § 25249.8. No warning need be given concerning a listed chemical until one year after the chemical first appears on the list.

7

11

10

12 13

> 14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

25

26 27

28

- 18. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. Health & Saf. Code § 25249.7. To "threaten to violate" is defined to mean "to create a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur." Health & Saf. Code § 25249.11(e). In addition, violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation, recoverable in a civil action. Health & Saf. Code § 25249.7(b).
- Private actions to enforce Proposition 65 "may be brought by any person in the 19. public interest" if the action is commenced more than sixty days from the date that the person has given notice of an alleged violation of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.5 or 25249.6 to the Attorney General, and the District Attorney, City Attorney, or prosecutor in whose jurisdiction the violation occurred and to the alleged violator. A certificate of merit shall be included with the notification to the Attorney General, District Attorney, City Attorney, or prosecutor in each jurisdiction where the violation occurred. If no public prosecutors commence enforcement within sixty days, then the person giving notice may sue.

V. **FACTS**

- Formaldehyde is listed under Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State of 20. California to cause cancer.
- Defendant manufactures, distributes, markets, and/or sells products that contain 21. formaldehyde for sale or use in the State of California. Specifically, Defendant sold to consumers in the State of California the following products containing formaldehyde: Africa's Best No-Lye Relaxer System (or "product").
- Use of the product identified in Paragraph 21, above, results in human exposure to formaldehyde through inhalation when consumers breathe near the products, as well as during mixing, application, and rinsing of the products.
- Defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the product that it 23. manufactured, distributed, marketed, and/or sold contained formaldehyde. Defendant has intended that individuals use and handle this product. Defendant has had knowledge that individuals use the product that Defendant has manufactured, distributed, marketed, and/or sold.

Defendant has knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals to formaldehyde through its deliberate act(s) of manufacturing, distributing, marketing, and/or selling the product.

- The product described in this complaint was tested in a certified laboratory, and 24. found to contain sufficiently high levels of formaldehyde to necessitate clear and reasonable warnings, under Proposition 65, that use of the product results in exposure to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
- Defendant has failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings that the use of the product described above results in exposure to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, and no such warning was provided to consumers using those products.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VI.

- Paragraphs 1 through 25 are realleged as if fully set forth herein. 26.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on such information and belief, 27. alleges that Defendant employs ten or more persons.
- By committing the acts alleged above, Defendant has, within the previous twelve 28. months and in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals in the State of California to formaldehyde, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individuals within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.
- Said violations render Defendant liable to Plaintiff for civil penalties of up to 29. \$2,500 per day for each violation, as well as other remedies.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays that the Court:

- Pursuant to the First Cause of Action, assess civil penalties against Defendant in 1. the amount of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65, according to proof;
- 2. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, enter such temporary restraining orders, preliminary injunctions, permanent injunctions, or other orders prohibiting Defendant from exposing persons within the State of California to formaldehyde by use of their

22

23

24

25

26

27

1	product without providing clear and reasonable warnings, as Plaintiff shall specify in further	
2	application to the court;	
3	3. Award plaintiff its costs of suit;	
4	4. Pursuant to section 1021.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure and any other applicab	le
5	provision of law, order Defendant to pay Plaintiff such attorney's fees and costs as Plaintiff	
6	incurs in bringing this enforcement action; and	
7	5. Grant such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.	
8		
9	DATED: January 6, 2014 SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP	
10		
11.	By:	
12	ELLISON FOLK	
13	PETER R. MILJANICH	
14	Attorneys for As You Sow	
15	547776.1	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES	_
	CASE NO.	