

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436  
2 Christopher Tuttle, State Bar No. 264545  
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 PAUL WOZNIAK

ENDORSED

2014 AUG 15 P 3: 25

Given: General Order of the State Court  
County of Santa Clara  
By: J. CAO-NGUYEN  
15041029

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
12 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA  
13 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

14 PAUL WOZNIAK,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 TOYS "R" US, INC.; and DOES 1-150,  
18 inclusive,

19 Defendants.

Case No. **114CV269539**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK  
3 in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to be  
4 informed about exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (“DEHP”), a toxic chemical that is found  
5 in and on the vinyl/PVC cushions of headphones that are sold in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failure to  
7 warn California citizens about the risks of exposures to DEHP present in and on the vinyl/PVC  
8 cushions of headphones manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers  
9 throughout the State of California.

10 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are commonly found in and on the vinyl/PVC  
11 cushions of headphones that defendants import, manufacture, distribute, ship, sell and/or offer  
12 for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.

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

18 5. On October 24, 2003, California listed DEHP pursuant to Proposition 65 as a  
19 chemical that is known to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm. DEHP became  
20 subject to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements of the act one year later on October  
21 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &  
22 25249.10(b).

23 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without  
24 warning in California, headphones with vinyl/PVC cushions containing DEHP, including, but  
25 not limited to, the *Tabeo Headset with Volume Control*, #09182012, #5F604CE, UPC #8 03516  
26 02892 2. All such headphones with vinyl/PVC cushions containing DEHP are referred to  
27  
28

1 collectively hereinafter as the “PRODUCTS.” DEHP is referred to hereinafter as the “LISTED  
2 CHEMICAL.”

3 7. Defendants’ failure to warn workers, consumers, and other individuals in  
4 California of the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction  
5 with defendants’ sales of the PRODUCTS containing the LISTED CHEMICAL constitute  
6 violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants to enjoinder of such conduct, as well as  
7 civil penalties for each violation. 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 the LISTED CHEMICAL. 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 defendants, and each of them, for each violation of Proposition 65.

14 **PARTIES**

15 10. Plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated  
16 to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of harmful  
17 exposures to toxic chemicals from consumer products. He brings this action in the public  
18 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 11. Defendant TOYS “R” US, INC. (“TRU”) 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. TRU manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for  
22 sale or use in the State of California, or it 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. 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 14. 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 15. 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 16. 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 17. 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 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the  
15 State of California.

16 19. 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 20. TRU, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS,  
22 and RETAILER DEFENDANTS are hereinafter collectively referred to as “DEFENDANTS.”

### 23 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

24 21. Venue is proper in the County of Santa Clara, pursuant to Code of Civil  
25 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,  
26 because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of  
27 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because  
28

1 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Santa Clara County with  
2 respect to the PRODUCTS.

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

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

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

15 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
16 Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

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

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

25 27. On March 26, 2014, plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, together with the  
26 requisite certificate of merit, was provided to TRU and certain public enforcement agencies  
27 stating that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the PRODUCTS containing the LISTED  
28

1 CHEMICAL, workers, consumers, and other individuals in the State of California were being  
2 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the  
3 PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having received a “clear and  
4 reasonable warning” regarding such toxic exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

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

10 29. After receiving plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, the appropriate public  
11 enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action  
12 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

13 30. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale  
14 or use in California by DEFENDANTS contain the LISTED CHEMICAL in such a way that the  
15 reasonably foreseeable uses of these products result in exposures that require a “clear and  
16 reasonable” warning under Proposition 65.

17 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they  
18 manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain the LISTED  
19 CHEMICAL.

20 32. The LISTED CHEMICAL is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to  
21 expose individuals through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

22 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS have caused, and  
23 continue to cause, consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposures are  
24 defined by title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25602(b).

25 34. DEFENDANTS have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable uses  
26 of the PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact  
27 and/or ingestion.

28

1 35. DEFENDANTS intend for such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the  
2 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS to occur by their deliberate, non-accidental  
3 participation in the manufacture, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or  
4 use to individuals in the State of California.

5 36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those  
6 workers, consumers and other individuals in California not covered by California's  
7 Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code section 6300 *et seq.* who have been, or will be,  
8 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL.

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

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

18 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code  
19 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against  
20 DEFENDANTS.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

26 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),  
27 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or  
28

1 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and  
2 reasonable warning” as defined by title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25601  
3 *et seq.*, as to the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

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

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

6 Dated: August 14, 2014

7 Respectfully Submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP

8  
9  
10 By:  \_\_\_\_\_

11 Christopher Tuttle, Esq.  
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
13 PAUL WOZNIAK  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28