

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

MAR 06 2019

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Rosa-Angela Snock
Deputy

1 Laralei Paras, State Bar No. 203319
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
ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., P.E.

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

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

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 SAS SAFETY CORPORATION, and
15 DOES 1-150, inclusive,

16 Defendants.

Case No. **RG15761231**

**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 Anthony E. Held, Ph.D.,
3 P.E., in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to be
4 informed of the presence of di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (“DEHP”), a toxic chemical found in
5 consumer products such as hearing protection with vinyl/PVC ear cushions sold in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failure to warn
7 California citizens about the risks of exposure to DEHP present in and on hearing protection with
8 vinyl/PVC ear cushions 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 hearing protection with
11 vinyl/PVC ear cushions that defendants manufacture, sell, and distribute for sale to consumers
12 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 § 25249.6 *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of doing
15 business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to
16 cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
17 individual” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

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

22 6. DEHP is referred to hereinafter as the “LISTED CHEMICAL.”

23 7. Significant levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL have been discovered in or on the
24 hearing protection with vinyl/PVC ear cushions that are manufactured, imported, distributed, and/or
25 sold by defendants.

26 8. Examples of hearing protection with vinyl/PVC ear cushions containing the LISTED
27 CHEMICAL that are manufactured, imported, distributed and/or sold by defendants are contained in
28 the *Foldable Earmuff, P/N 6110, UPC #7 81311 06110 1*.

1 for the acts and occurrences alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names and capacities shall
2 be reflected in an amended complaint.

3 17. SAS and DOES 1 through 150 shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to as
4 “DEFENDANTS.”

5 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

6 18. Venue is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
7 Procedure §§ 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because
8 plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of wrongful
9 conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in Alameda County, and/or because DEFENDANTS
10 conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this county with respect to the PRODUCTS.

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

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

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

23 21. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs
24 1 through 20, inclusive.

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

28 ///

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

5 24. On or about June 4, 2014, plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, together with the
6 requisite certificate of merit, was provided to SAS Safety Corporation and certain public enforcement
7 agencies stating that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the PRODUCTS containing the
8 LISTED CHEMICAL, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to the
9 LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without
10 the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a “clear and reasonable warning”
11 regarding such toxic exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

12 25. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale,
13 and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6,
14 and DEFENDANTS’ violations have continued to occur beyond their receipt of plaintiff’s sixty-day
15 notice of violation. As such, DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and
16 will continue to occur in the future.

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

20 27. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed for sale or use in
21 California by DEFENDANTS contain the LISTED CHEMICAL such that they require a “clear and
22 reasonable” warning under Proposition 65.

23 28. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they manufacture,
24 import, distribute, sell, and/or offer for sale or use in California contain the LISTED CHEMICAL.

25 29. The LISTED CHEMICAL is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to
26 expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during their
27 reasonably foreseeable use.

28 ///

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

4 31. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the
5 PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or
6 ingestion.

7 32. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the
8 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental
9 participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and/or offering of the PRODUCTS
10 for sale or use to individuals in the State of California.

11 33. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those consumers
12 and other individuals in the State of California who were or who would become exposed to the
13 LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable
14 uses of the PRODUCTS.

15 34. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted
16 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal
17 contact and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS sold by
18 DEFENDANTS without a “clear and reasonable warning,” have suffered, and continue to suffer,
19 irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

20 35. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-
21 described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each
22 violation.

23 36. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a)
24 also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANTS.

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 § 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 § 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 the LISTED CHEMICAL;
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: March 3, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,
THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 
Karalei S. Paras
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D., P.E.