

FILED

FEB 10 2016

JAMES M. KIM, Court Executive Officer
MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
By: C. Lucchesi, Deputy

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
Warren M. Klein, State Bar No. 303958
2 THE CHANLER GROUP
2560 Ninth Street
3 Parker Plaza, Suite 214
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565
4 Telephone: (510) 848-8880
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118
5 E-mail josh@chanler.com
E-mail warren@chanler.com

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
7 LAURENCE VINO CUR

8
9
10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11 COUNTY OF MARIN
12 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

13 LAURENCE VINO CUR,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 ULTIMATE SURVIVAL
17 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; SPORT CHALET,
18 LLC; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,

19 Defendants.

Case No. C171600531 ^{d'}

**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 People’s
4 right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate
5 (DEHP), a toxic chemical found in vinyl/PVC lantern handles sold by defendants in California.

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

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

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

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

26 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without health
27 hazard warnings in California, vinyl/PVC lantern handles containing DEHP including, but not
28

1 limited to *UST 3- Day LED Lantern, #20-PL20C3D, UPC #8 12713 01446 1*. All vinyl/PVC
2 lantern handles containing DEHP are referred to collectively hereinafter 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 she brings this action in the public interest
18 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 11. Defendant ULTIMATE SURVIVAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC. (“ULTIMATE”) is
20 a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections
21 25249.6 and 25249.11.

22 12. ULTIMATE manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the
23 PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it
24 manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the
25 State of California.

1 13. Defendant SPORT CHALET, LLC (“SPORT CHALET”) is a person in the
2 course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and
3 25249.11.

4 14. SPORT CHALET manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the
5 PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it
6 manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the
7 State of California.

8 15. Defendants DOES 1-50 (“MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS”) are each a
9 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections
10 25249.6 and 25249.11.

11 16. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
12 and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
13 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of
14 California.

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

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

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

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

26 21. At this time, the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are
27 unknown to plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to
28

1 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis
2 alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences
3 alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

4 22. ULTIMATE, SPORT CHALET, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS,
5 DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate,
6 collectively be referred to as “DEFENDANTS.”

7 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

8 23. Venue is proper in Marin County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
9 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,
10 because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of
11 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
12 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Marin County with respect to
13 the PRODUCTS.

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

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

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

26 26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
27 Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive.
28

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

5 28. Proposition 65 states, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall
6 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause
7 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
8 individual” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

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

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

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

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

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

3 33. 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 34. 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 35. 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 36. DEFENDANTS know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
11 PRODUCTS exposes consumers to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

12 37. 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 38. 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 39. 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 40. 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.

