

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

Jonathan A. Bornstein, State Bar No. 196345  
THE CHANLER GROUP  
2560 Ninth Street  
Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  
Telephone: (510) 848-8880  
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
LAURENCE VINO CUR

ENDORSED  
FILED  
ALAMEDA COUNTY  
OCT 21 2015

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  
By MARGARET J. DOWNIE  
Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA  
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

LAURENCE VINO CUR

Plaintiff,

v.

SPORT SQUAD, LLC, SEARS HOLDINGS  
CORPORATION, WAL-MART STORES,  
INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. RG15790459

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*)

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff LAURENCE  
3 VINOCUR, in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the  
4 People's right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to Di(2-  
5 ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP"), a toxic chemical found in vinyl/PVC Racquet Cases sold by  
6 defendants in California.

7 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failure to  
8 warn individuals not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code  
9 section 6300 et seq., who purchase, use or handle defendants' products, about the risks of  
10 exposure to DEHP present in and on vinyl/PVC Racquet Cases manufactured, distributed, and  
11 offered for sale or use throughout the State of California. Individuals not covered by  
12 California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code section 6300 et seq. who purchase,  
13 use or handle defendants' products are referred to hereinafter as "consumers".

14 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on the vinyl/PVC Racquet Cases that  
15 defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale without a warning to consumers  
16 throughout the State of California.

17 4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at  
18 Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), "[n]o person in the course of  
19 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to  
20 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable  
21 warning to such individual . . . ." Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

22 5. On October 24, 2003, California identified and listed DEHP pursuant to  
23 Proposition 65 as a chemical known to cause cancer. DEHP became subject to the "clear and  
24 reasonable warning" requirements of the act one year later on October 24, 2004. Cal. Code  
25 Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(b); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).

26 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and/or offer for sale without  
27 health hazard warnings in California, vinyl/PVC Racquet Cases containing DEHP including, but  
28 not limited to, *Joola Spirit Set, UPC #4 002560 548332* and *Joola Spirit Set, UPC #4 002560*

1 591567. All vinyl/PVC Racquet Cases containing DEHP are referred to collectively hereinafter  
2 as "PRODUCTS."

3 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers in the State of California of the health  
4 hazards associated with exposures to DEHP in conjunction with defendants' sales of the  
5 PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants, and each of them, to  
6 enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code  
7 § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

8 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and  
9 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide consumers of the PRODUCTS with  
10 the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP. Health  
11 & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

12 9. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil  
13 penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

#### 14 **PARTIES**

15 10. Plaintiff LAURENCE VINOCUR. is a citizen of the State of California who is  
16 dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of  
17 toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public interest  
18 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 11. Defendant SPORT SQUAD, LLC. ("SPORT"), is a person in the course of doing  
20 business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

21 12. Defendant SEARS HOLDINGS CORPORATION ("SEARS") is a person in the  
22 course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and  
23 25249.11.

24 13. Defendant WAL-MART STORES, INC. ("WAL-MART") is a person in the  
25 course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and  
26 25249.11.

27 14. Defendants SPORT, SEARS, and WAL-MART manufacture, import, distribute,  
28 sells, and/or offer the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by their

1 conduct that they manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and/or offer the PRODUCTS for sale or  
2 use in the State of California.

3 15. Defendants DOES 1-50 (“MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS”) are each a  
4 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections  
5 25249.6 and 25249.11.

6 16. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,  
7 and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,  
8 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of  
9 California.

10 17. Defendants DOES 51-100 (“DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS”) are each persons  
11 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6  
12 and 25249.11.

13 18. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and  
14 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use  
15 in the State of California.

16 19. Defendants DOES 101-150 (“RETAILER DEFENDANTS”) are each a person in  
17 the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6  
18 and 25249.11.

19 20. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the  
20 State of California.

21 21. At this time, the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are  
22 unknown to plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to  
23 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis  
24 alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences  
25 alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

26 22. SPORT, SEARS, WAL-MART, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS,  
27 DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate,  
28 collectively be referred to as “DEFENDANTS.”

1 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

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

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

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

20 26. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
21 Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive.

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

26 28. Proposition 65 states, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall  
27 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause  
28

1 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
2 individual . . . .” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

3 29. On March 13, 2015, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with  
4 the requisite certificate of merit, on SPORT, SEARS, and certain public enforcement agencies  
5 alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the *Joola Spirit Set, UPC #4 002560*  
6 *548332* containing DEHP, consumers in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP  
7 resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of this item, without the consumers first having  
8 been provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with such  
9 exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

10 30. On July 13, 2015, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the  
11 requisite certificate of merit, on SPORT, SEARS, WAL-MART and certain public enforcement  
12 agencies alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the PRODUCTS containing  
13 DEHP, consumers in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting from their  
14 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the consumers first having been  
15 provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with such  
16 exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

17 31. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS  
18 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS’  
19 violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation.  
20 DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, as such, will continue in  
21 the future.

22 32. After receiving plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, no public enforcement  
23 agency has commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against DEFENDANTS  
24 under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the subject of plaintiff’s notice of  
25 violation.

26 33. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and  
27 offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably  
28 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by

1 consumers in California are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable” warning requirements  
2 of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no warning.

3 34. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they  
4 manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain DEHP.

5 35. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose consumers  
6 to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

7 36. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and  
8 continues to cause, consumer exposures to DEHP, as defined by title 27 of the California Code  
9 of Regulations, section 25602(b).

10 37. DEFENDANTS know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
11 PRODUCTS exposes consumers to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

12 38. DEFENDANTS intend that exposures to DEHP from the reasonably foreseeable  
13 use of the PRODUCTS will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the  
14 manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to  
15 consumers in California.

16 39. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those  
17 consumers in California who were or who would become exposed to DEHP through dermal  
18 contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS.

19 40. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted  
20 directly by California voters, consumers exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or  
21 ingestion as a result of their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS sell without a “clear  
22 and reasonable” health hazard warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm  
23 for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

24 41. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the  
25 above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day  
26 for each violation.

27  
28

1           42. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code  
2 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against  
3 DEFENDANTS.

4   **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5           Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

6           1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), assess  
7 civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for  
8 each violation;

9           2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),  
10 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or  
11 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and  
12 reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section  
13 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP;


14           3. That the Court, Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a), issue  
15 preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS  
16 currently in the chain of commerce in California without a “clear and reasonable warning” as  
17 defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 *et seq.*;

18           4. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and

19           5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.  
20  
21

22 Dated: October 20, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP

25 By:   
26 Jonathan Bornstein  
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
28 LAURENCE VINO CUR