

ENDORSED Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436 Troy C. Bailey, State Bar No. 277424 THE CHANLER GROUP ALAMEDA COUNTY 2 2560 Ninth Street UG 3 U 2014 3 Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565 4 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Facsimile: (510) 848-8118 By....Ciceli Johnson Deputy 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTHÓNY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E. 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 9 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION 10 11 Case NoR G 1 4 7 4 6 3 1 2 ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E., 12 Plaintiff, 13 COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF 14 ٧. (Health & Safety Code. § 25249.6, et seq.) CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY; and 15 DOES 1-150, inclusive, 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

26 27 28

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

**5** 

## NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E. ("HELD") in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the presence of di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP"), a toxic chemical found in vinyl/PVC golf club covers sold in California.
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff HELD seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failures to warn California citizens about the risks of exposures to DEHP present in and on the vinyl/PVC golf club covers manufactured, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on vinyl/PVC golf club covers that defendants manufacture, distribute, sell, and offer for sale to consumers, throughout the State of California. Individuals in California are exposed to DEHP in the vinyl/PVC golf club covers through various routes of exposure: (i) through dermal exposure when DEHP from the vinyl/PVC golf club covers accumulates in ambient particles that are subsequently touched by such individuals; and (ii) through ingestion when such particles are brought into contact with the mouth.
- 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 one year later on October 24, 2004. (Cal. Code Regs., Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).)
- 6. Defendant CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and/or offers for sale in California vinyl/PVC golf club covers containing DEHP

including, but not limited to, the *Odyssey Mallet Putter Cover, Item #5509006, UPC #6 42331 90380 5*. All such vinyl/PVC golf club covers are hereinafter collectively referred to as "PRODUCTS."

- 7. Although defendants expose individuals to DEHP in the PRODUCTS, defendants provide no warnings about the birth defect and other reproductive hazards associated with these DEHP exposures. Defendants' failures to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of California not covered by California's Occupational Health Act, Labor Code § 6300 et seq. about their exposures to DEHP in conjunction with defendants' sales of the PRODUCTS, is a violation of Proposition 65, and subjects defendants to enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. (Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).)
- 8. As a result of defendants' violations of Proposition 65, HELD seeks preliminary and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of DEHP in the PRODUCTS. (Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).)
- 9. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(b), HELD also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

#### **PARTIES**

- 10. Plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., P.E. is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d).
- 11. Defendant CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY ("CALLAWAY") is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code Section 25249.11.
- 12. CALLAWAY manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

- 13. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate, and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate, and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of California.
- 15. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 16. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use in the State of California.
- 17. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAILER DEFENDANTS") are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State of California.
- 19. At this time, the true names and capacities of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are unknown to HELD, who therefore sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 474. HELD is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names and capacities shall be reflected in an amended complaint.
- 20. CALLAWAY and defendants DOES 1-150 are collectively referred to herein as "Defendants."

#### VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 21. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because HELD seeks civil penalties against Defendants, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in Alameda County, and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this county with respect to the PRODUCTS.
- 22. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.
- 23. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendants based on HELD's information and good faith belief that each Defendant is a person, firm, corporation or association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market. Defendants' purposeful availment of California as a marketplace for the PRODUCTS renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts over Defendants consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)

- 24. HELD realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.
- 25. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm."

- 26. Proposition 65 states, "[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.)
- 27. On April 30, 2014, HELD's sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, was provided to CALLAWAY and certain public enforcement agencies stating that, as a result of Defendants' sales of the PRODUCTS containing DEHP, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting from their reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures, as required by Proposition 65.
- 28. Defendants have engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6, and Defendants' violations have continued to occur beyond their receipt of HELD's sixty-day notice of violation. As such, Defendants' violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and will continue to occur in the future.
- 29. After receiving HELD's sixty-day notice of violation, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65.
- 30. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California by Defendants contain DEHP such that they require a "clear and reasonable" warning under Proposition 65.
- 31. Defendants knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain DEHP.
- 32. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals to DEHP through dermal contact, and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS.

- 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS have caused, and continue to cause, consumer products exposures and occupational exposures to DEHP, as such exposures are defined by Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25602(b).
- 34. Defendants had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS expose individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
- 35. Defendants intended that such exposures to DEHP from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS would occur by Defendants' deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to individuals in the State of California.
- 36. Defendants failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers and other individuals in the State of California who were or who would become exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS.
- 37. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion, resulting from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS sold by Defendants without a "clear and reasonable warning," have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.
- 38. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-described acts, Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation.
- 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against Defendants.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, HELD prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, 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 Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 25601 et seq., as to the harms associated with exposures to DEHP;
- 3. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 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, § 25601 et seq.
  - 4. That the Court grant HELD his 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: October 30, 2014

By: Troy C. Bailey

Attorney for Plaintiff

THE CHANLER GROUP

ANTHÓNY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.