

CONFORMED COPY  
ORIGINAL FILED  
Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles

MAY 14 2015

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk  
By Shaunya Bolden, Deputy

1 LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL N. GREENBAUM  
The Hathaway Building  
2 Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq. (SBN 268104)  
7120 Hayvenhurst Ave.  
3 Suite 320  
Van Nuys CA 91406  
4 Telephone: (818) 809-2199  
Facsimile: (424) 243-7689  
5 Email: dgreenbaum@greenbaumlawfirm.com  
6 Attorney for Shefa LMV, LLC

7  
8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - CENTRAL DISTRICT  
10

11 SHEFA LMV, LLC, ) Unlimited Jurisdiction BC 5 81 908  
12 )  
Plaintiff, )  
13 vs. ) CASE NO.  
14 )  
EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC.; ) COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTY AND  
15 FAUCETS AND ACCESSORIES; and ) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
DOES 1 through 100, Inclusive, )  
16 Defendants. ) (Health and Safety Code § 25249.5  
et seq.  
17 ) TOXIC TORT/ENVIRONMENTAL  
18 )  
19 )

20 Plaintiff, Shefa LMV, LLC, hereby alleges:  
21

22 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

23 1. This complaint seeks to remedy the failure of Defendants to warn persons of exposure  
24 to Lead (hereinafter "Pb"), which is a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth  
25 defects, or other reproductive harm.

26 2. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and  
27 Safety Code section 25249.6, also known as "Proposition 65," businesses must provide persons with  
28

1 a “clear and reasonable warning” before exposing individuals to chemicals known to the state to  
2 cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm.

3  
4 **II. PARTIES**

5 3. Plaintiff is a limited liability company formed pursuant to the laws of the State of  
6 California, made up of California citizens, represented by and through its counsel of record, the Law  
7 Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum.

8 4. Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d) provides that actions to enforce  
9 Proposition 65 may be brought by “any person in the public interest.”

10 5. Defendant EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC. (hereinafter “EZ-FLO”) is a business  
11 entity with ten or more employees that sells, or has, at times relevant to this complaint, authorized the  
12 manufacture, distribution, or sale of plumbing hardware Diverter Stem product(s) that contain Pb, for  
13 sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.

14 6. Defendant FAUCETS AND ACCESSORIES (hereinafter “FAUCETS”) is a business  
15 entity with ten or more employees that sells, or has, at times relevant to this complaint, authorized the  
16 manufacture, distribution, or sale of plumbing hardware Diverter Stem product(s) that contain Pb, for  
17 sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.

18 7. The identities of DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however,  
19 Plaintiff suspects that they are business entities with at least ten or more employees that have sold,  
20 authorized the distribution, or sale of plumbing hardware Diverter Stem product(s) that contain Pb,  
21 for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.

22 8. Defendants (hereinafter and collectively known as the “Defendants”) named in  
23 paragraphs 5 – 7 have at all time relevant hereto authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of  
24 Diverter Stem Plumbing Products, including but not limited to, those with an identifying designation  
25 of SKU 32421 (hereinafter “PRODUCTS”), which contain Pb, for sale within the State of California.

26 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

9. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts.

10. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants, because they are business entities that do sufficient business, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market, through the sale, marketing, and use of its products in California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

11. Venue is proper in this Court because the cause, or part thereof, arises in Los Angeles County because Defendant’s products are sold and consumed in this county.

#### IV. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

##### A. Proposition 65

12. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 is an initiative statute passed as “Proposition 65” by a vote of the people in November of 1986.

13. The warning requirement of Proposition 65 is contained in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, which provides:

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, except as provided in Section 25249.10.

14. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “which results from a person’s acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 22, § 12601, subd. (b).)

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

15. Proposition 65 establishes a procedure by which the state is to develop a list of chemicals “known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity.” (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.8.)

16. No warning need be given concerning a listed chemical until one year after the chemical first appears on the list. (*Id.*, § 25249.10, subd. (b).)

17. Any person “violating or threatening to violate” the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.7.)

18. To “threaten to violate” is defined to mean “to create a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur.” (*Id.*, § 25249.11, subd. (e).)

19. In addition, violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation, recoverable in a civil action. (*Id.*, § 25249.7, subd. (b).)

20. Actions to enforce the law “may be brought by the Attorney General in the name of the People of the State of California [or] by any district attorney [or] by any City Attorney of a City having a population in excess of 750,000 . . .” (*Id.*, § 25249.7, subd. (c).)

21. Private parties are given authority to enforce Proposition 65 “in the public interest,” but only if the private party first provides written notice of a violation to the alleged violator, the Attorney General, and every District Attorney in whose jurisdiction the alleged violation occurs.

22. If no public prosecutors commence enforcement within sixty days, then the private party may sue. (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.7(d).)

23. No such governmental action has been pursued against Defendants.

**V. FACTS**

24. “Lead” was placed in the Governor’s list of chemicals known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity on February 27, 1987.

25. It is specifically identified under three subcategories: “developmental reproductive toxicity,” which means harm to the developing fetus, “female reproductive toxicity,” which means

1 harm to the female reproductive system, and “male reproductive toxicity,” which means harm to the  
2 male reproductive system. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 22, § 12000, subd. (c).)

3 26. “Lead and Lead compounds” were placed in the Governor's list of chemicals known to  
4 the State of California to cause cancer on October 1, 1992. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 22, § 12000, subd.  
5 (b).)

6 27. Defendants are the manufacturer and marketer of the PRODUCTS for use by  
7 individuals in the home and in other occupational endeavors.

8 28. The PRODUCTS are sold through various retailers located in California for use by  
9 citizens of the State of California.

10 29. Individuals who purchase, handle, or install the PRODUCTS are exposed to Pb chiefly  
11 through:

12 a. contact between the item and the skin;

13 b. transfer of Pb from the skin to the mouth, both by transfer of Pb directly from  
14 the hand to mouth and by transfer of Pb from the skin to objects that are put in the mouth,  
15 such as food, and

16 c. through absorption of Pb through the skin.

17 30. Such individuals are thereby exposed to the Pb that is present on or in the  
18 PRODUCTS in the course of the intended and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

19 31. At all times material to this complaint, Defendants have had knowledge that the  
20 PRODUCTS contain Pb and that an individual’s skin may come into contact with Pb through the  
21 intended and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

22 32. At all times material to this complaint, Defendants have had knowledge that  
23 individuals within the State of California handle the PRODUCTS, which contain Pb.

24 33. At all times material to this complaint, Defendants knew that the PRODUCTS were  
25 sold throughout the State of California in large numbers, and Defendants profited from such sales.

26 34. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants intentionally authorized and reauthorized  
27 the sale of the PRODUCTS, thereby exposing consumers to Pb.

1           35. At all times material to this complaint, therefore, Defendants have knowingly and  
2 intentionally exposed individuals within the State of California to Pb.

3           36. The exposure is knowing and intentional because it is the result of the Defendants'  
4 deliberate act of authorizing the sale of products known to contain Pb, in a manner whereby these  
5 products were, and would inevitably be, sold to consumers within the state of California, and with the  
6 knowledge that the intended use of this PRODUCTS would result in exposures to Pb by individuals  
7 within the State of California.

8           37. Defendants have failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings that the use of the  
9 PRODUCTS in question in California results in exposure to a chemical known to the State of  
10 California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm, and no such warning was  
11 provided to those individuals by any other person.

12  
13                                   **VI. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

15           38. Paragraphs 1 through 37 are re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.

16           39. By committing the acts alleged above, Defendants have, in the course of doing  
17 business, knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals in California to chemicals known to the  
18 State of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable  
19 warning to such individuals, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.

20           40. Said violations render Defendants liable to Plaintiffs for civil penalties not to exceed  
21 \$2,500 per day for each violation, as well as other remedies.

22  
23                                   **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24       WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that the Court:

- 25                           1. Pursuant to the First Causes of Action, grant civil penalties according to proof;  
26                           2. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, enter such temporary  
27 restraining orders, preliminary injunctions, permanent injunctions, or other orders  
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

prohibiting Defendant from exposing persons within the State of California to Listed Chemicals caused by the use of their products without providing clear and reasonable warnings, as Plaintiffs shall specify in further application to the court;

3. Enter such orders as “may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, which may have been acquired by means of” these unlawful acts, as provided in Business and Professions Code section 17203 and other applicable laws;

4. Award Plaintiffs their costs of suit;

5. Grant such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: May 14, 2015

LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL N. GREENBAUM



By: DANIEL N. GREENBAUM  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Shefa LMV, LLC