1 Christopher C. Moscone, State Bar No. 170250 Rachel J. Sater, State Bar No. 147976 ENDORSED 2 San Francisco County Superior Court Jordan M. Otis, State Bar No. 276274 MOSCONE EMBLIDGE SATER & OTIS LLP 3 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 2100 MAY 22 2014 San Francisco, CA 94104 4 Telephone: (415) 362-3599 CLERK OF THE COURT Facsimile: (415) 362-2006 BY: CAROLYN BALISTRERI 5 Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 Deputy Clerk 6 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street 7 Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710 8 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff 10 ANTHONY E. HELD, PhD., P.E. 11 12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 13 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION 14 ANTHONY E. HELD, PhD., P.E., Case No. CGC-14-538674 15 Plaintiff, FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE 16 v. RELIEF 17 PACIFIC TRADE INTERNATIONAL, (Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, et seq.) INC.; TARGET CORPORATION; and 18 DOES 1 -20, inclusive. 19 Defendants. **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 20 NATURE OF THE ACTION 21 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff ANTHONY E. 22 HELD, PhD., P.E. ("PLAINTIFF") in the public interest of the citizens of the State of 23 California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the presence of lead, a toxic chemical 24 found in reed diffusers sold in California. 25 By this Complaint, PLAINTIFF seeks to remedy Defendants' continuing failures 2. 26

27

28

to warn California citizens about the risk of exposure to lead present in and on reed diffusers

manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers throughout the State of California.

- 3. Detectable levels of lead are commonly found on the reed diffusers that Defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 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 February 27, 1987, California identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead became subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of the Act one year later on February 27, 1988. California Code of Regulations Title 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.
- 6. Defendant PACIFIC TRADE INTERNATIONAL, INC. ("PACIFIC TRADE") manufactures, distributes, imports, sells and/or offers for sale in California, reed diffusers containing lead without a warning including, but not limited to, Pure and Natural Lemongrass Eucalyptus Reed Diffuser, #054 09 1965, UPC #7 54870 52452 3, and Pure and Natural Fig & Redwood Reed Diffuser, #054 09 0770, UPC #7 54870 79179 6.
- 7. Defendant TARGET CORPORATION ("TARGET") manufactures, distributes, imports, sells and/or offers for sale in California, reed diffusers containing lead without a warning including, but not limited to, Pure and Natural Lemongrass Eucalyptus Reed Diffuser, #054 09 1965, UPC #7 54870 52452 3, and Pure and Natural Fig & Redwood Reed Diffuser, #054 09 0770, UPC #7 54870 79179 6.
 - 8. Lead is hereinafter referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICAL."
 - 9. All products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, as listed in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL

PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 10. Although Defendants expose infants, children, and other people to the LISTED CHEMICAL in the PRODUCTS, Defendants provide no warnings about the hazards associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL. Defendants' failures to warn consumers and other individuals and workers (specifically those not subject to California's Occupational Health Act, Labor Code section 6300 et seq. or exempted under the out-of-state manufacturer rule) in the State of California about their exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with Defendants' sales of the PRODUCTS, is a violation of Proposition 65, and subject Defendants to enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).
- 11. As a result of Defendants' violations of Proposition 65, PLAINTIFF 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 the LISTED CHEMICAL in the PRODUCTS. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).
- 12. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), PLAINTIFF also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

PARTIES

- 13. Plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, PhD., 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).
- 14. Defendant PACIFIC TRADE INTERNATIONAL, INC. is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 15. PACIFIC TRADE 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.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 16. Defendant TARGET CORPORATION is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 17. TARGET 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.
- 18. Defendants DOES 1 -20 are each persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11(b), which manufacture, distribute, sell, and/or offer the PRODUCTS for sale in the State of California. At this time, the true names and capacities of defendants DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, are unknown to PLAINTIFF, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 474. PLAINTIFF 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.
- 19. PACIFIC TRADE, TARGET and Defendants DOES 1 -20 are collectively referred to herein as "DEFENDANTS."

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 20. Venue is proper in San Francisco 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 PLAINTIFF seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in the County of San Francisco, and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this county with respect to the PRODUCTS.
- 21. 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.
 - 22. 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 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)

- 23. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 22, inclusive.
- 24. 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."
- 25. 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.
- 26. On October 25, 2013, PLAINTIFF's sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, was provided to PACIFIC TRADE and TARGET and certain public enforcement agencies stating that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS containing lead, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to lead resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use 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.
- 27. 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

PLAINTIFF'S sixty-day notice of violation. As such, DEFENDANTS' violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and will continue to occur in the future.

- 28. After receiving PLAINTIFF'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.
- 29. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California by DEFENDANTS contain the LISTED CHEMICAL such that they require a "clear and reasonable" warning under Proposition 65.
- 30. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain the LISTED CHEMICAL.
- 31. The LISTED CHEMICAL is 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 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS including through workplace exposure to the PRODUCTS.
- 32. The normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS have caused, and continue to cause, consumer products exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposures are defined by the California Code of Regulations Title 27, section 25602(b).
- 33. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, and/or ingestion.
- 34. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL 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.
- 35. 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 the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact, and/or ingestion during the

reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS including through workplace exposure to the PRODUCTS.

- 36. 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 uses of the PRODUCTS including through workplace exposure to 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.
- 37. 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.
- 38. 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, PLAINTIFF 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 the California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 *et seq.*, as to the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL;
- 3. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS

PROOF OF SERVICE

San Francisco County Superior Court Case No. CGC-14-538674

I, Anna L. Hill, declare as follows:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action. On May 22, 2014, I served the attached:

 First Amended Complaint for Civil Penalties and Injunctive Relief; Demand for Jury Trial

on the interested party(ies) named below:

Chris M. Amantea, Esq. Squire Sanders (US) LLP 555 S. Flower Street, 31st Fl. Los Angeles, CA 90071

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

Jeffey Margulies, Esq. Fulbright & Jaworski LLP 555 South Flower Street, 41st Fl. Los Angeles, CA 90071

Attorneys for defendant Pacific Trade International, Inc.

Attorneys for defendant Target Corporation

I served the attached document(s) in the manner indicated below:

BY MAIL: I caused true and correct copy(ies) of the above documents to be placed and sealed in envelope(s) addressed to the addressee(s) named above and, following ordinary business practices, placed said envelope(s) at the Law Offices of Moscone Emblidge Sater & Otis LLP, 220 Montgomery, Ste. 2100, San Francisco, California, 94104, for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service and there is delivery by the United States Post Office at said address(es). In the ordinary course of business, correspondence placed for collection on a particular day is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day.

BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused true and correct copies of the above documents to be placed and sealed in envelope(s) addressed to the addressee(s) and I caused such envelope(s) to be delivered by hand on the office(s) of the addressee(s).

BY FACSIMILE: I caused a copy(ies) of such document(s) to be transmitted via facsimile machine. The fax number of the machine from which the document was transmitted was (415) 362-2006. The fax number(s) of the machine(s) to which the document(s) were transmitted are listed above. The fax transmission was reported as complete and without error.

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS OVERNIGHT: I caused true and correct copies of the above documents to be placed and sealed in envelope(s) addressed to the addressee(s) named above and, following ordinary business practices, placed said envelope(s) at the Law Offices of Moscone Emblidge Sater & Otis LLP, 220 Montgomery Street, Ste. 2100, San Francisco, California, 94104, for collection and mailing with Federal Express. I am informed that there is delivery service by Federal Express at the address(es) of the addressee(s) named above. In the ordinary course of business, correspondence placed for collection on a particular day is deposited with Federal Express that same day.

1

1	BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: I caused true and correct copies of the above documents to
2	be sent via e-mail to the e-mail addressee(s) named above. I did not receive, within a reasonable amount of time after the transmission, any electronic message other
3	indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.
4	BY CERTIFIED MAIL: I caused true and correct copy(ies) of the above documents to be placed and sealed in envelope(s), certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed to the
5	addressee(s) named above and, following ordinary business practices, placed said envelope(s) at
6	the Law Offices of Moscone Emblidge Sater & Otis LLP, 220 Montgomery, Ste. 2100, San Francisco, California, 94104, for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service and
7	there is delivery by the United States Post Office at said address(es). In the ordinary course of business, correspondence placed for collection on a particular day is deposited with the United
8	States Postal Service that same day.
9	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
10	foregoing is true and correct. Executed May 22, 2014, at San Francisco, California.
11	Anna L. Hell
12	Anna L. Hill
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	