SUM-100

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE) DIVISIO

2015 JUN -9 PM 1: 10

CLEAK-SUPERIOR L SAN NEGO COUNTY, CA

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC., LOWE'S COMPANIES, INC., LOWE'S HIW INC. AND DOES 1 - 50 INCLUSIVE

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

KINGPUN CHENG

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. [AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

CASE NUMBER

37-2015-00019190-CU-NP-CTL

CCP 416.70 (conservatee)

CCP 416.90 (authorized person)

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es). Superior Court of California,

County of San Diego, Hall of Justice

330 West Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es): Parker A. Smith, Attorney at Law, 2173 Salk Avenue, Suite #250, Carlsbad, CA 92008

DATE: (Fecha)		0 2015	Clerk, by (Secretaria) GC	nodlina
(For proof of s	ervice of this	summons,	use Proof of Service of Summons (form BOS of	1011
(Para prueba	de entrega d	e esta citatio	on use el formulario Proof of Service of Summo	ns (POS-010))
[SEAL]		NOTI	CE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are serve	ed
		2 -	as an individual defendant.	
		2	as the person sued under the fictitious name	e of (specify):
		3, 🗀	on behalf of (specify):	
		un	der: CCP 416.10 (corporation)	CCP 416.60 (minor)

other (specify): by personal delivery on (date):

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California SUM-100 [Rev. July 1, 2009]

SUMMONS

CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)

CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)

Page 1 of 1

, Deputy (Adjunto)

ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State B Parker A. Smith (CSB# 290311), Attorne 2173 Salk Avenue, Suite #250	lar number, and address)	CM-01				
	FOR COURT USE ONLY					
Carlsbad, CA 92008	CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 3 CENTRAL DIVISION					
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff, King Pun (CENTRAL DIFICION					
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STREET ADDRESS: 330 West Broadway	2015 JUN -9 PM 1: 10					
MAILING ADDRESS:	CLERK-SUPERIOR LOUD					
CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Diego, CA 9210 BRANCH NAME: Hall of Justice	SAN NEGO COUNTY, CA					
CASE NAME:						
KINGPUN CHENG v. EZ-FLO IN	TERNATIONAL, INC., et al.					
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER:				
(Amount (Amount		37-2015-00019190-CU-NP-CTL				
demanded demanded is	voilaci					
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defenda (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEST				
1 Check one how half of the literal 1-6 beautiful in the literal 1-6 beaut	OW must be completed to	page 2)				
Check one box below for the case type that Auto Tort	it best describes this case:	1-3-4)				
Auto (22)	Contract Pr	rovisionally Complex Civil Litigation				
Uninsured motorist (46)	Breach of contract/warranty (06) (C) Rule 3.740 collections (09)	cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)				
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Other collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)				
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Insurance coverage (18)	Construction defect (10) Mass tort (40)				
Asbestos (04) Product liability (24)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)				
Medical malpractice (45)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)				
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the				
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	above listed provisionally complex case types (41)				
Business tort/unfair business practice (07)		forcement of Judgment				
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)				
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	scellaneous Civil Complaint				
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)				
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)				
Professional negligence (25) Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Judicial Review Mis	scellaneous Civil Petition				
Employment	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)				
Wrongful termination (36)	Petition re: arbitration award (11) Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)				
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)					
2. This case is ✓ is not comp	ex under rule 3 400 of the O-life : D :	of Court If the case is completed at the				
		of oddre if the case is complex, mark the				
a. Large number of separately represented parties d. Large number of witnesses						
b. Extensive motion practice raising dissues that will be time-consuming	,	related actions pending in one or more courts				
c. Substantial amount of documentary	in other counties,	states, or countries, or in a federal court udgment judicial supervision				
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.	✓ monetary b. ✓ nonmonetany doct	and a second second				
4. Number of causes of action (specify): One	(1)	aratory or injunctive relief c. 🗸 punitive				
5. This case is is is not a class	action suit.					
6. If there are any known related cases, file and	d serve a notice of related case. (You may	use form CM-015.)				
Date: 6/9/2015						
Parker A. Smith, Esq.						
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		TURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)				
 Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Wein sanctions. File this cover sheet in addition to any cover. 	st paper filed in the action or proceeding (exelfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of	r Court, rule 3,220.) Failure to file may result				
 File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule. If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding. Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only. 						
amosa triis is a collections case under rule 3.	740 or a complex case, this cover sheet w	ill be used for statistical purposes only				

Parker Smith, Esq., (CSB# 290311) **Law Office of Parker A. Smith, PC** 2173 Salk Ave. #250 Carlsbad, CA 92009 Telephone: 760 579 7600

FILED CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE C CENTRAL DIVISION

2015 JUN -9 PM 1: 10

CLERK-SUPERIUR L. SAN MEGO COURTY, CA

Attorney for Plaintiff, Kingpun Cheng

JUN 9'15 mm11:08

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

KINGPUN CHENG,) CASE NO.: 37-2015-00019190-CU-NP-CTL
Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
and	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC., LOWE'S COMPANIES, INC., LOWE HIW, INC. AND DOES 1 -50	(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.) (S)
INCLUSIVE ,))
Defendant.	

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff King Pun Cheng, 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 lead and lead compounds, a toxic chemical found in Universal Fit 5ft Dishwasher Connector (091712985235) sold in California.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy DEFENDANTS continuing failures to warn California citizens about their exposure to the toxic chemical in or on certain products that DEFENDANTS manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 3. High levels of lead and/or lead compounds are commonly found in Universal Fit 5ft Dishwasher Connector (091712985235) that DEFENDANTS manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 4. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. (Proposition 65), "No 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..." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 5. California identified and listed Lead and Lead Compounds as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead became subject to the warning requirements of Proposition 65 for developmental toxicity beginning on February 27, 1987 and for cancer toxicity on October 1, 1992. (27 CCR § 27002; Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 6. Lead and lead compounds shall hereinafter be referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICAL."
- 7. Defendants manufacture, distribute and/or sell products containing excessive levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL including, but not limited to Universal Fit 5ft Dishwasher Connector (091712985235). All such products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."
- 8. DEFENDANTS' failures to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California about their exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendants' sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects DEFENDANTS to enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.
- 9. For DEFENDANTS' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive and permanent injunctive relief to compel DEFENDANTS to provide purchasers or

users of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED CHEMICAL. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).)

10. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS for their violations of Proposition 65, as provides for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

PARTIES

- 11. Plaintiff Kingpun Cheng is a citizen of the City of Carlsbad, County of San Diego, in 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 brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 12. Defendant EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC. ("DEFENDANT") is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 13. Defendant EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC. import, manufacture, distribute, and/or offer the PRODUCTS for sales or use in the State of California or implies by their conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.
- 14. Defendant LOWE'S COMPANIES, INC. ("DEFENDANT") is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 15. Defendant LOWE'S HIW, INC. ("DEFENDANT") is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 16. Defendant LOWE'S COMPANIES, INC. AND LOWE'S HIW, INC. import, manufacture, distribute, and/or offer the PRODUCTS for sales or use in the State of California or implies by their conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.
- 17. EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC., LOWE'S COMPANIES, INC., and LOWE'S HIW, INC. where appropriate, be referred to hereinafter as "DEFENDANTS."

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

18. Venue is proper in the San Diego County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § § 394, 495, 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,

because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of San Diego and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this County with respect to the PRODUCTS.

- 19. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, § 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.
- 20. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on plaintiff's information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or association that either are citizens of the State of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market. DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against Defendant)

- 21. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates by reference, as if full reference, as if full set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 20, inclusive.
- 22. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. (Proposition 65) that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and order reproductive harm." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 23. Proposition 65 states, "No 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 productive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual (*Id.*)"
- 24. On August 21, 2014, a sixty-day notice violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, was provided to EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC., LOWE'S HIW, INC., LOWE'S COMMPANIES, INC. and various public enforcement agencies stating that as a result of the DEFENDANTS' sale of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California

were being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from the reasonably foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.

- 25. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and
- 26. DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond DEFENDANTS' receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.
- 27. After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notices of violation, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.
- 28. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by DEFENDANTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL above the allowable state limits.
- 29. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.
- 30. The LISTED CHEMICAL was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 31. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS have caused and continue to cause consumer exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is defined by 27 CCR§ 25602(b).
- 32. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

33. DEFENDANT intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or use of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

- 34. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 35. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, sold by DEFENDENT without a "clear and reasonable warning," have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.
- 36. As a consequence of the above-described acts, each DEFENDANT is liable for a maximum civil penal of \$2,500 per day for each violation pursuant to California Health& Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 37. As a consequence of the above-described acts, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANTS.
- 38. Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as set forth hereinafter.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

- 1. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation alleged herein;
- 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing or

offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing "clear and reasonable warnings" as detailed by 27 CCR § 25601, as to the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

- 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorney's fees and cost of suit; and
- 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6/9/15

Parker Smith

Attorney for Plaintiff