

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

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
6 Anthony E. Held, Ph.D., P.E.

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

DEC 6 2013

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By S. IYAMU Deputy

7
8
9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
11 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION
12
13

14 ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 KINDLER, INC.; KINCO
18 INTERNATIONAL; KINCO, LLC; and DOES
1-150, inclusive,

19 Defendant.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. AG 13705863

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*)

VIA FAX

NATURE OF THE ACTION

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

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 health hazards caused by exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP"), a toxic chemical found in vinyl/PVC gloves sold by defendants in California.

2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failure to warn California citizens and other individuals about the risks of exposure to DEHP present in and on vinyl/PVC gloves manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers and other individuals throughout the State of California.

3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on the vinyl/PVC gloves that defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers and other individuals throughout the State of California.

4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"), "[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.

5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, 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 "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of the act one year later on October 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).

6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without health hazard warnings in California, gloves with vinyl/PVC components containing DEHP that require a warning under Proposition 65 including, but not limited to, the *Kinco PVC Coated*

1 *Work Gloves, Style: 7184G, UPC #0 35117 71846 3.* All such gloves with vinyl/PVC
2 components containing DEHP are referred to collectively hereinafter as "PRODUCTS."

3 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of
4 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP in conjunction with
5 defendants' sales of the PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants,
6 and each of them, to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation.
7 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

8 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and
9 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the
10 PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures
11 to DEHP. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

12 9. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil
13 penalties against defendant for their violations of Proposition 65.

14 PARTIES

15 10. Plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E. is a citizen of the State of California
16 who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or
17 reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public
18 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 11. Defendant KINDLER, INC. ("KINDLER") is a person in the course of doing
20 business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

21 12. KINDLER manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS
22 for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,
23 distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

24 13. Defendant KINCO INTERNATIONAL ("KINCO INTL.") is a person in the
25 course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and
26 25249.11.

1 14. **KINCO INTL manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the**
2 **PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it**
3 **manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the**
4 **State of California.**

5 15. **Defendant KINCO, LLC ("KINCO") is a person in the course of doing business**
6 **within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.**

7 16. **KINCO manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS**
8 **for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,**
9 **distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.**

10 17. **Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a**
11 **person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections**
12 **25249.6 and 25249.11.**

13 18. **MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,**
14 **and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,**
15 **and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of**
16 **California.**

17 19. **Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each a person**
18 **in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6**
19 **and 25249.11.**

20 20. **DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and**
21 **transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use**
22 **in the State of California.**

23 21. **Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAILER DEFENDANTS") are each a person in**
24 **the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6**
25 **and 25249.11.**

26 22. **RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the**
27 **State of California.**

28

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)

1
2
3 28. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
4 Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive.

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

9 30. Proposition 65 states, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall
10 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause
11 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
12 individual” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

13 31. On August 16, 2013, plaintiff’s served a sixty-day notice of violation, together
14 with the requisite certificate of merit, on KINDLER, KINCO INTL., KINCO and certain public
15 enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the PRODUCTS
16 containing DEHP, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP
17 resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual
18 purchasers and users first having been provided with a “clear and reasonable warning”
19 regarding the harms associated with such exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

20 32. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS
21 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS’
22 violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation.
23 DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and, as such, will continue in
24 the future.

25 33. After receiving plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, none of the appropriate
26 public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action
27
28

1 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the
2 subject of plaintiff's notice of violation.

3 34. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and
4 offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably
5 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by
6 consumers and other individuals in California are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable"
7 warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no warning.

8 35. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they
9 manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California contained
10 DEHP.

11 36. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals
12 to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

13 37. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and
14 continues to cause, consumer exposures to DEHP, as defined by title 27 of the California Code
15 of Regulations, section 25602(b).

16 38. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of
17 the PRODUCTS exposed individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

18 39. DEFENDANTS intended that exposures to DEHP from the reasonably
19 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation
20 in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or
21 use to consumers and other individuals in California.

22 40. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those
23 consumers and other individuals in California who were or who would become exposed to
24 DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS.

25 41. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted
26 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to DEHP through dermal contact or ingestion
27 as a result of their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS sold without a "clear and
28

1 reasonable" health hazard warning have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for
2 which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

3 42. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the
4 above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day
5 for each violation.

6 43. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code
7 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
8 DEFENDANTS.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

11 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), assess
12 civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for
13 each violation;


14 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),
15 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or
16 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and
17 reasonable warning" in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section
18 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures DEHP;

19 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and

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

21 Dated: December 3, 2013

22 Respectfully Submitted,
23 THE CHANLER GROUP

24 By: 
25 _____
26 Harris A. Weinstein
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff
28 ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.