

ENDORSED
FILED

2014 JUL -3 P 12:49

Division of the Superior Court
County of Santa Clara, California

By _____
Deputy Clerk

A. Ramirez

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

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff
WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, PH.D.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, PH.D.,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE WISE CO., INC.; and DOES 1-150,
inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No **114 CV 267501**
)
) **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES**
) **AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**
)
) (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*)
)
)
)
)

BY 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 WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, PH.D. 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 seats with vinyl/PVC upholstery 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 seats with vinyl/PVC upholstery 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 seats with vinyl/PVC upholstery 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 seats with vinyl/PVC upholstery containing DEHP.

7. Defendants also manufacture, distribute, import, sell and/or offer for sale without health hazard warnings in California the *Wise Professional Seating Fishing Chair*,

1 *WD1062PLS-933, CH-12-12, UPC #0 85211 75476* 8. All seats with vinyl/PVC upholstery
2 containing DEHP are referred to collectively hereinafter as "PRODUCTS."

3 8. 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 9. 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 10. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil
13 penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

14 PARTIES

15 11. Plaintiff WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, PH.D. 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 she brings this action in the public
18 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 12. Defendant THE WISE CO., INC. ("WISE") 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 13. WISE manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for
22 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 14. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a
25 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections
26 25249.6 and 25249.11.

1 15. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
2 and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
3 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of
4 California.

5 16. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each a person
6 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6
7 and 25249.11.

8 17. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and
9 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use
10 in the State of California.

11 18. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAILER DEFENDANTS") are each a person in
12 the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6
13 and 25249.11.

14 19. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the
15 State of California.

16 20. At this time, the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are
17 unknown to plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to
18 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis
19 alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences
20 alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

21 21. WISE, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS,
22 and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to as
23 "DEFENDANTS."

24 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

25 22. Venue is proper in Santa Clara County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
26 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,
27 because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of
28

1 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
2 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Santa Clara County with
3 respect to the PRODUCTS.

4 23. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
5 California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original
6 jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under
7 which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

8 24. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on
9 plaintiff's information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or
10 association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the
11 State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.
12 DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by
13 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

16 25. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
17 Paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive.

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

22 27. Proposition 65 states, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall
23 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause
24 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
25 individual . . ." Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

26 28. On February 26, 2014, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together
27 with the requisite certificate of merit, on WISE and certain public enforcement agencies
28

1 alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS containing DEHP,
2 purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting from their
3 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first
4 having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding the harms associated
5 with such exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

6 29. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS
7 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS'
8 violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation.
9 DEFENDANTS' violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and, as such, will continue in
10 the future.

11 30. After receiving plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, none of the appropriate
12 public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action
13 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the
14 subject of plaintiff's notice of violation.

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

20 32. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they
21 manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California contained
22 DEHP.

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

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

28

5

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

offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP;


3. That the Court, Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain of commerce in California without a “clear and reasonable warning” as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 *et seq.*;

4. That the Court grant plaintiff her reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and

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

Dated: July 2, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,
THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 

Harris A. Weinstein
Attorneys for Plaintiff
WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, PH.D.