

COPY

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

Christopher Tuttle, State Bar No. 264545  
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  
RUSSELL BRIMER

ENDORSED  
FILED  
San Francisco County Superior Court

JUN 17 2015

CLERK OF THE COURT  
DENNIS TOYAMA  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_ Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

RUSSELL BRIMER,  
Plaintiff,

v.

AUTOMOTIVE INNOVATIONS, INC.; and  
DOES 1-150, inclusive,  
Defendants.

Case No. CGC-15-546423

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

By Fax

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff RUSSELL  
3 BRIMER 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 automobile seat covers sold by defendants in  
6 California.

7 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failure to  
8 warn California citizens and other individuals about the risks of exposure to DEHP present in  
9 and on vinyl/PVC automobile seat covers manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use  
10 to consumers and other individuals throughout the State of California.

11 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on the vinyl/PVC automobile seat  
12 covers that defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers and other  
13 individuals throughout the State of California.

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

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

24 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without a  
25 health hazard warning in California, vinyl/PVC automobile seat covers containing DEHP that  
26 require a warning under Proposition 65 including, but not limited to, the *Saddleman Seat Cover*,  
27 *Part# 19452-14, UPC #0 42374 66132 6*, hereinafter the “PRODUCTS.”  
28

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

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

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

12                                   **PARTIES**

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

17          11. Defendant AUTOMOTIVE INNOVATIONS, INC. ("AUTOMOTIVE") is a  
18 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections  
19 25249.6 and 25249.11.

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

24          13. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a  
25 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections  
26 25249.6 and 25249.11.

27  
28



1 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because  
2 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in San Francisco County with  
3 respect to the PRODUCTS.

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

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

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

16 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
17 Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

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

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

26 27. On March 31, 2015, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with  
27 the requisite certificate of merit, on AUTOMOTIVE and certain public enforcement agencies  
28

1 alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS containing DEHP,  
2 purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting from their  
3 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first  
4 having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding the harms associated  
5 with such exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

6 28. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS  
7 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS'  
8 violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation.  
9 DEFENDANTS' violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and, as such, will continue in  
10 the future.

11 29. After receiving plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, none of the appropriate  
12 public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action  
13 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the  
14 subject of plaintiff's notice of violation.

15 30. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and  
16 offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably  
17 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by  
18 consumers and other individuals in California are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable"  
19 warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no warning.

20 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they  
21 manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California contained  
22 DEHP.

23 32. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals  
24 to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

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

28



1 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and  
2 reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section  
3 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures DEHP;

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

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

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

10  
11 Dated: June 17, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,

THE CHANLER GROUP

12  
13  
14  
15 By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Christopher Tuttle  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
RUSSELL BRIMER