

1 LEXINGTON LAW GROUP  
Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389  
2 Joseph Mann, State Bar No. 207968  
503 Divisadero Street  
3 San Francisco, CA 94117  
Telephone: (415) 913-7800  
4 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112  
mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com  
5 jmann@lexlawgroup.com

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

ENDORSED  
FILED  
ALAMEDA COUNTY  
JAN - 8 2015  
CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  
BY MARGARET I. DOWD Deputy

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

11 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, )  
12 a non-profit corporation, )

13 Plaintiff, )

14 v. )

15 PACIFIC PLAY TENTS, INC.; BATTAT )  
INCORPORATED; MAISON JOSEPH )  
16 BATTAT LTD.; TARGET CORPORATION; )  
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, )

17 Defendants. )  
18

Case No. **RG15753975**

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES**

Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, *et seq.*

(Other)

1 Plaintiff Center for Environmental Health, in the public interest, based on  
2 information and belief and investigation of counsel, except for information based on knowledge,  
3 hereby makes the following allegations:

#### 4 INTRODUCTION

5 1. This Complaint seeks to remedy Defendants' continuing failure to warn  
6 individuals in California that they are being exposed to tris(1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate  
7 ("TDCPP"), a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. TDCPP is a toxic  
8 chemical that is used as a flame retardant to treat fabrics used in a variety of products, including  
9 tents. This Complaint addresses exposures that have occurred, and continue to occur, through  
10 the manufacture, distribution, sale, and/or use of Defendants' children's play tents (the  
11 "Products"). Individuals in California, including children, are exposed to TDCPP when they  
12 inhale TDCPP released from Products, when TDCPP from Products accumulates in ambient  
13 particles that are subsequently touched by such individuals and brought into contact with the  
14 mouth, and when fabric is touched directly and brought into contact with the mouth.

15 2. Under California's Proposition 65, Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et*  
16 *seq.*, it is unlawful for businesses to knowingly and intentionally expose individuals in California  
17 to chemicals known to the State to cause cancer without providing clear and reasonable warnings  
18 to individuals prior to their exposure. Defendants introduce Products contaminated with  
19 significant quantities of TDCPP into the California marketplace, exposing consumers of their  
20 Products, primarily children, to TDCPP.

21 3. Despite the fact that Defendants expose individuals to TDCPP, Defendants  
22 provide no warnings whatsoever about the carcinogenic hazards associated with these TDCPP  
23 exposures. Defendants' conduct thus violates the warning provision of Proposition 65. Health &  
24 Safety Code § 25249.6.

#### 25 PARTIES

26 4. Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ("CEH") is a  
27 non-profit corporation dedicated to protecting the public from environmental health hazards and  
28 toxic exposures. CEH is based in Oakland, California and is incorporated under the laws of the

1 State of California. CEH is a “person” within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §  
2 25249.11(a) and brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety  
3 Code § 25249.7(d). CEH is a nationally recognized non-profit environmental advocacy group  
4 that has prosecuted a large number of Proposition 65 cases in the public interest. These cases  
5 have resulted in significant public benefit, including the reformulation of thousands of products  
6 to remove toxic chemicals to make them safer. CEH also provides information to Californians  
7 about the health risks associated with exposure to hazardous substances, where manufacturers  
8 and other responsible parties fail to do so.

9           5. Defendant PACIFIC PLAY TENTS, INC. is a person in the course of  
10 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. PACIFIC PLAY  
11 TENTS, INC. manufactures, distributes, and/or sells Products for sale or use in California.

12           6. Defendant BATTAT INCORPORATED is a person in the course of doing  
13 business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. BATTAT INCORPORATED  
14 manufactures, distributes, and/or sells Products for sale or use in California.

15           7. Defendant MAISON JOSEPH BATTAT LTD. is a person in the course of  
16 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. MAISON JOSEPH  
17 BATTAT LTD. manufactures, distributes, and/or sells Products for sale or use in California.

18           8. Defendant TARGET CORPORATION is a person in the course of doing  
19 business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. TARGET CORPORATION  
20 manufactures, distributes, and/or sells Products for sale or use in California.

21           9. DOES 1 through 100 are each a person in the course of doing business  
22 within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. DOES 1 through 100 manufacture,  
23 distribute, and/or sell Products for sale or use in California. Defendants PACIFIC PLAY  
24 TENTS, INC.; BATTAT INCORPORATED; MAISON JOSEPH BATTAT LTD.; TARGET  
25 CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 100 are collectively referred to herein as “Defendants.”

26           10. The true names of DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to CEH at this time.  
27 When their identities are ascertained, the Complaint shall be amended to reflect their true names.

28           11. The defendants identified in paragraphs 5 through 8 and DOES 1 through

1 100 are collectively referred to herein as “Defendants.”

2 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3 12. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Health & Safety  
4 Code § 25249.7, which allows enforcement in any court of competent jurisdiction, and pursuant  
5 to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute  
6 to other trial courts.

7 13. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because each is a business  
8 entity that does sufficient business, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise  
9 intentionally avails itself of the California market through the sale, marketing, or use of Products  
10 in California and/or by having such other contacts with California so as to render the exercise of  
11 jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and  
12 substantial justice.

13 14. Venue is proper in the Alameda Superior Court because one or more of the  
14 violations arise in the County of Alameda.

15 **BACKGROUND FACTS**

16 15. The People of the State of California have declared by initiative under  
17 Proposition 65 their right “[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth  
18 defects, or other reproductive harm.” Proposition 65, § 1(b).

19 16. To effectuate this goal, Proposition 65 prohibits exposing people to  
20 chemicals listed by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, or other  
21 reproductive harm without a “clear and reasonable warning” unless the business responsible for  
22 the exposure can prove that it fits within a statutory exemption. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6  
23 states, in pertinent part:

24 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and  
25 intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the  
26 state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving  
clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...

27 17. TDCPP has been used in consumer products as an additive flame retardant  
28 since the 1960s. In the late 1970s, based on findings that exposure to TDCPP could have

1 potentially mutagenic effects, the use of TDCPP as a flame retardant in children's pajamas was  
2 discontinued. Around the same time, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission banned the  
3 use of a related chemical flame retardant – tris (2,3,-dibromopropyl) phosphate – in children's  
4 clothing based on studies confirming its carcinogenic properties.

5           18.     On May 29, 2009, the Proposition 65 Carcinogen Identification  
6 Committee, a group of qualified experts who advise the State of California on Proposition 65  
7 chemical listing determinations, announced that it was assigning priority to the preparation of  
8 hazard identification materials for TDCPP based on the chemical's suspected carcinogenic  
9 properties. 27 Cal. Code Regs. ("C.C.R.") § 25102(c)(1). On February 11, 2011, the California  
10 Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment  
11 ("OEHHA") announced that it was preparing hazard identification materials for TDCPP as a  
12 precursor to formally identifying the chemical as carcinogenic. On July 8, 2011, OEHHA made  
13 its hazard identification materials for TDCPP publicly available, and announced that the State of  
14 California would be making a TDCPP listing determination by October 2011.

15           19.     On October 28, 2011, the State of California officially listed TDCPP as a  
16 chemical known to cause cancer. 27 C.C.R. § 27001(b). In making this listing determination,  
17 OEHHA credited studies showing that exposure to TDCPP induces tumor formation in test  
18 animals, and that TDCPP metabolizes into other chemicals found to have similar carcinogenic  
19 properties in test subjects.

20           20.     On October 28, 2012, one year after it was listed as a chemical known to  
21 cause cancer, TDCPP became subject to the clear and reasonable warning requirement regarding  
22 carcinogens under Proposition 65. 27 C.C.R. § 27001(b); Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(b).  
23 The chief purpose of the one-year grace period between the listing date of a chemical under  
24 Proposition 65 and the effective date of the warning requirement is to give potentially liable  
25 parties sufficient time to come into complete compliance with this requirement, such that all  
26 illegal exposures can be averted.

27           21.     TDCPP is used in Products primarily as an additive flame retardant in the  
28 fabric used to make the Products. TDCPP in the fabric of the Products is known to migrate from

1 such Products into nearby environments.

2           22. Defendants' Products contain sufficient quantities of TDCPP such that  
3 individuals, including children, are exposed to TDCPP through the average use of Products. The  
4 routes of exposure include inhalation, ingestion, and/or dermal absorption by individuals.  
5 Inhalation occurs when TDCPP is released from the products into the ambient environment.  
6 Ingestion and dermal absorption occur when TDCPP from the products accumulates in ambient  
7 particles (*e.g.*, dust) that are subsequently touched by individuals and brought into contact with  
8 the mouth, or when exposed fabric is touched directly and brought into contact with the mouth.

9           23. The Products are specifically designed for children, and are marketed to  
10 persons who care for children, such as parents, teachers, and child care professionals. The  
11 Products are enclosed structures, which increases the likelihood of inhalation exposures for  
12 anyone playing inside the Products. Children spend a large proportion of their time inside and in  
13 intimate contact with such Products, which may increase their risk of TDCPP exposure from  
14 inhalation and dermal absorption. Children may also be especially prone to ingesting ambient  
15 particles containing TDCPP from Products, given the greater amount of time they spend crawling  
16 on floors and their greater tendency to put their hands in their mouths. Once exposed to TDCPP,  
17 infants and children may be more susceptible to its carcinogenic properties because they are  
18 smaller than adults and because their bodies are still developing.

19           24. Any person acting in the public interest has standing to enforce violations  
20 of Proposition 65 provided that such person has supplied the requisite public enforcers with a  
21 valid 60-Day Notice of Violation and such public enforcers are not diligently prosecuting the  
22 action within such time. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

23           25. More than sixty days prior to naming each Defendant in this lawsuit, CEH  
24 provided a 60-Day "Notice of Violation of Proposition 65" to the California Attorney General,  
25 the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city  
26 with a population greater than 750,000, and to each of the named Defendants. In compliance  
27 with Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 27 C.C.R. § 25903(b), each Notice included the  
28 following information: (1) the name and address of each violator; (2) the statute violated; (3) the

1 time period during which violations occurred; (4) specific descriptions of the violations,  
2 including (a) the routes of exposure to TDCPP from Products, and (b) the specific type of  
3 Products sold and used in violation of Proposition 65; and (5) the name of the specific  
4 Proposition 65-listed chemical that is the subject of the violations described in each Notice.

5           26. More than sixty days prior to naming each Defendant in this lawsuit,  
6 concurrent with sending the Notices described in the preceding paragraph, CEH also sent a  
7 Certificate of Merit for each Notice to the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of  
8 every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater  
9 than 750,000, and to the named Defendants. In compliance with Health & Safety Code §  
10 25249.7(d) and 11 C.C.R. § 3101, each of the Certificates certified that CEH's counsel: (1) has  
11 consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who  
12 reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposures to TDCPP alleged in each of the  
13 Notices; and (2) based on the information obtained through such consultations, believes that  
14 there is a reasonable and meritorious case for a citizen enforcement action based on the facts  
15 alleged in each of the Notices. In compliance with Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) and 11  
16 C.C.R. § 3102, each of the Certificates served on the Attorney General included factual  
17 information – provided on a confidential basis – sufficient to establish the basis for the  
18 Certificate, including the identity of the person(s) consulted by CEH's counsel and the facts,  
19 studies, or other data reviewed by such persons.

20           27. None of the public prosecutors with the authority to prosecute violations  
21 of Proposition 65 has commenced and/or is diligently prosecuting a cause of action against  
22 Defendants under Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*, based on the claims asserted in the  
23 Notices.

24           28. Defendants both know and intend that consumers in California, including  
25 children, will use, touch, and/or handle Products, or will come into close proximity to Products,  
26 thus exposing them to TDCPP.

27           29. Under Proposition 65, an exposure is “knowing” where the party  
28 responsible for such exposure has:

1 knowledge of the fact that a[n] ... exposure to a chemical listed  
2 pursuant to [Health and Safety Code § 25249.8(a)] is occurring.  
3 No knowledge that the ... exposure is unlawful is required.

4 27 C.C.R. § 25102(n). This knowledge may be either actual or constructive. *See, e.g.*, Final  
5 Statement of Reasons Revised (November 4, 1988) (pursuant to former 22 C.C.R. Division 2, §  
6 12201).

7 30. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with Products regarding the  
8 carcinogenic hazards of TDCPP.

9 31. Defendants have been informed of the TDCPP in their Products by the 60-  
10 Day Notice of Violation and accompanying Certificate of Merit served on them by CEH.

11 32. Defendants also have constructive knowledge that their Products contain  
12 TDCPP due to the widespread media coverage concerning the problem of TDCPP in consumer  
13 products in general and in fabric in particular. The problem of TDCPP in consumer products has  
14 been the subject of articles in national newspapers, industry trade papers, and scholarly journals,  
15 as well as numerous Internet weblog postings.

16 33. As companies that manufacture, import, distribute, and/or sell Products for  
17 use in the California marketplace, Defendants know or should know that Products contain  
18 TDCPP and that individuals who use Products, or who otherwise come into close proximity to  
19 Products, will be exposed to TDCPP. These TDCPP exposures are a natural and foreseeable  
20 consequence of Defendants' placing Products into the stream of commerce.

21 34. Nevertheless, Defendants continue to expose consumers in California,  
22 including children, to TDCPP without prior clear and reasonable warnings regarding the  
23 carcinogenic hazards of TDCPP.

24 35. CEH has engaged in good-faith efforts to resolve the claims alleged herein  
25 prior to filing this Complaint.

26 36. Any person "violating or threatening to violate" Proposition 65 may be  
27 enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7. "Threaten to  
28 violate" is defined to mean "to create a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a

1 violation will occur.” Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(e). Proposition 65 provides for civil  
2 penalties not to exceed \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65. Health & Safety  
3 Code § 25249.7(b).

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
5 **(Violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6)**

6 37. CEH realleges and incorporates by reference as if specifically set forth  
7 herein Paragraphs 1 through 36, inclusive.

8 38. TDCPP is a chemical listed by the State of California as known to cause  
9 cancer.

10 39. By placing their Products into the stream of commerce, Defendants are  
11 each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §  
12 25249.11.

13 40. Defendants know that average installation and use of their Products will  
14 expose users of Products to TDCPP. Defendants intend that their Products be used in a manner  
15 that results in users of their Products, and others who come into close proximity to these  
16 Products, being exposed to TDCPP contained therein.

17 41. Defendants have failed, and continue to fail, to provide prior clear and  
18 reasonable warnings regarding the carcinogenicity of TDCPP to users of their Products and  
19 others who come into close proximity to these Products.

20 42. By committing the acts alleged above, Defendants have at all times  
21 relevant to this Complaint violated Proposition 65 by knowingly and intentionally exposing  
22 individuals to TDCPP without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such individuals  
23 regarding the carcinogenicity of TDCPP.

24 Wherefore, CEH prays for judgment against Defendants, as set forth hereafter.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, CEH prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 3 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess  
4 civil penalties against each Defendant in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of  
5 Proposition 65 alleged herein according to proof;
- 6 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a),  
7 preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from offering Products for sale in California  
8 without providing prior clear and reasonable warnings, as CEH shall specify in further  
9 application to the Court;
- 10 3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), order  
11 Defendants to take action to stop ongoing unwarned exposures to TDCPP resulting from use of  
12 Products sold by Defendants, as CEH shall specify in further application to the Court;
- 13 4. That the Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 or any other  
14 applicable theory, grant CEH its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
- 15 5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and  
16 proper.

17  
18 Dated: January 7, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

19 LEXINGTON LAW GROUP

20 

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Mark N. Todzo  
23 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
24 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH  
25  
26  
27  
28