

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
Troy C. Bailey, State Bar No. 277424
THE CHANLER GROUP
2560 Ninth Street
Parker Plaza, Suite 214
Berkeley, CA 94710
Telephone: (510) 848-8880
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

FILED

AUG 04 2014

KIM TURNER, Court Executive Officer
MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
By: J. Chen, Deputy.

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., P.E.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., P.E.,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

LEVLAD, LLC; SPROUTS FARMERS
MARKET, INC. ; and DOES 1 through 150,
inclusive,

 Defendants.

) Case No. CIV1402798
)
) **NOTICE OF ERRATA RE COMPLAINT**
) **FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND**
) **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

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


TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Troy C. Bailey hereby files this Notice of Errata with respect to the Complaint for Civil Penalties and Injunctive Relief filed with this Court on July 21, 2014 ("Complaint"). On Page 1, Line 18, of the Complaint, there is an inadvertent error pertaining to listing of the chemical benzophenone as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm, when it should have read "...benzophenone as a chemical known to cause cancer." A true and correct copy is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 4, 2014

THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 

Troy C. Bailey
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Anthony E. Held, Ph.D., P.E.

EXHIBIT 1

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
Troy C. Bailey, State Bar No. 277424
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.

7
8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF MARIN
10 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

11
12 ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.) Case No. CIV1402798
13 Plaintiff,)
14 v.) **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES**
15 LEVLAD, LLC; SPROUTS FARMERS) **AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**
16 MARKET, INC.; and DOES 1-150,) (Health & Safety Code. § 25249.6 *et seq.*)
inclusive,)
17 Defendants.)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1
2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Anthony E. Held,
3 Ph.D., P.E. 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 benzophenone, a toxic chemical found in sunscreens sold
5 in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failure to
7 warn California citizens about the risk of exposure to benzophenone present in and on
8 sunscreens manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers throughout the
9 State of California.

10 3. High levels of benzophenone are commonly found in sunscreens that defendants
11 manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.

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

17 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on June 22, 2012, California identified and listed
18 benzophenone as a chemical known to cause cancer. Benzophenone became subject to the
19 “clear and reasonable warning” requirements of the act one year later on June 22, 2013. Cal.
20 Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).

21 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, and sell sunscreens that contain
22 benzophenone in levels that require a warning under Proposition 65 including, but not limited
23 to, *Nature’s Gate Kids Broad Spectrum SPF 50 Sunscreen Lotion, UPC #0 78347 30044 2*. All
24 such sunscreens containing benzophenone are referred to collectively hereinafter as
25 “PRODUCTS.”

26 7. Defendants’ failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of
27 California about their exposure to benzophenone in conjunction with defendants’ sales of the
28

1 PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65, and subjects defendants to enjoinder of such
2 conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) &
3 (b)(1).

4 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and
5 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the
6 PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of benzophenone. Health
7 & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

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

10 **PARTIES**

11 10. Plaintiff Anthony E. Held, Ph.D., P.E. is a citizen of the State of California who is
12 dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of
13 toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public interest
14 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

15 11. Defendant LEVLAD, LLC. ("LEVLAD") is a person in the course of doing
16 business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11.

17 12. LEVLAD manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use
18 in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes, and/or offers
19 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

20 13. Defendant SPROUTS FARMERS MARKET, INC. ("SPROUTS") is a person in
21 the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11.

22 14. SPROUTS manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use
23 in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes, and/or offers
24 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

25 15. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each
26 persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section
27 25249.11.

28

1 16. 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 17. 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 section 25249.11.

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

10 19. Defendants DOES 101-150 (“RETAILER DEFENDANTS”) are each a person in
11 the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11.

12 20. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the
13 State of California.

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

19 22. LEVLAD, SPROUTS, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR
20 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be
21 referred to as “DEFENDANTS.”

22 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

23 23. Venue is proper in the Marin County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
24 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,
25 because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in Marin
26 County, and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this
27 county with respect to the PRODUCTS.

28

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

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

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

13 26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
14 Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive.

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

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

23 29. On March 26, 2014, plaintiff's 60-Day Notice of Violation (the “Notice”),
24 together with the requisite Certificate of Merit, was provided to LEVLAD, SPROUTS, and
25 certain public enforcement agencies stating that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the
26 PRODUCTS containing benzophenone, purchasers and users in the State of California were
27 being exposed to benzophenone resulting from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the
28

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

3 30. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and offering of
4 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and
5 such violations have continued to occur beyond DEFENDANTS’ receipt of plaintiff’s Notice.
6 As such, DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and will continue to
7 occur in the future.

8 31. After receiving the claims asserted in the Notice, the appropriate public
9 enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action
10 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

11 32. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use in
12 California by DEFENDANTS contain benzophenone in amounts above the allowable state
13 limits, such that they require a “clear and reasonable” warning under Proposition 65.

14 33. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they
15 manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use in California contained benzophenone.

16 34. Benzophenone is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose
17 individuals through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

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

21 36. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable uses
22 of the PRODUCTS exposed individuals to benzophenone through dermal contact and/or
23 ingestion.

24 37. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to benzophenone from the
25 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental
26 participation in the manufacture, distribution, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to
27 individuals in the State of California.

28

1 38. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those
2 consumers and other individuals in the State of California who were or who would become
3 exposed to benzophenone through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably
4 foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS.

5 39. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted
6 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to benzophenone through dermal contact
7 and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS sold by
8 DEFENDANTS without a “clear and reasonable warning,” have suffered, and continue to
9 suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

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

13 41. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code
14 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
15 DEFENDANTS.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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


PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against DEFENDANTS in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;
2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and 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 first providing a "clear and reasonable warning" as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 *et seq.*, as to the harms associated with exposures to Benzophenone;
3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: August 4, 2014

Respectfully Submitted,
THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 

Troy C. Bailey
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.