1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RACHEL S. DOUGHTY (SBN 255904) Greenfire Law 1202 Oregon St. Berkeley, CA 94702 Telephone: (828) 424.2005 Email: rdoughty@greenfirelaw.com  JAMES M. BIRKELUND (SBN 206328) Law Offices of James Birkelund 548 Market St., # 11200 San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 602.6223 Fax: (415) 789.4556 Email: james@birkelundlaw.com	ALATEDA CULTAR 2015 JOH 22 PH 3: 29 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR CO. M. SALCIDO. DEPUT CO.
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff LARRY LEE	
9		
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
11		
12	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
13		RG15775087
14	LARRY LEE,	Case No
15	Plaintiff,	
16	v.	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
17	ANTHROPOLOGIE, INC.; URBAN	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
18	OUTFITTERS, INC; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,	
19	Defendants.	(Health & Safety Code section 25249.6 et seq.)
20		
21		
22		
23	2	
24		
25		
26		
28		
20	COMPLAINT	

### NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act ("Proposition 65" or "the Act"), Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq., prohibits any person in the course of doing business from knowingly and intentionally exposing any individual to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity, without first giving clear and reasonable warning of such exposure. Health and Safety Code § 25249.6. This prohibition applies with equal force against business entities that manufacture, distribute, or sell consumer products, where the reasonable intended use of such products would result in an exposure to a known carcinogen.
- 2. This is a representative action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to protect users in California, including children, adults, pregnant women, and women of childbearing age from exposure to lead and lead compounds in ceramic dishware designed and specifically marketed for use with food and other household activities.
- 3. Lead and lead compounds are known to the State of California to be reproductive and developmental toxins and carcinogens.
- 4. Humans are exposed to lead and lead compounds though a variety of means, including ingestion, either through direct oral contact with the ceramic dishware or indirectly, as through consuming food stored in ceramic dishware or through hand to mouth exposure following contact with ceramic dishware. These exposures to a reproductive toxin and carcinogens result from the reasonably foreseeable use of commercially marketed ceramic dishware containing lead and lead compounds. The citizens of California have the right to be informed of the presence of lead and lead compounds found in or on ceramic dishware manufactured, distributed, and sold or otherwise offered for use in California by Defendants ("PRODUCTS").
- 5. Each Defendant has failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning that the use of ceramic dishware that they have manufactured, distributed, or sold will result in exposure to

lead and lead compounds, which are known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity and cancer.

6. Accordingly, by this Complaint, plaintiff seeks an order requiring Defendants either discontinue any manufacture, distribution, or sale of the PRODUCTS or provide a clear and reasonable warning that use of the PRODUCTS will result in exposure to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties as provided for under the Act and other appropriate relief.

### **PARTIES**

- 7. Plaintiff LARRY LEE is dedicated to protecting the health of Californians through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products. He brings this action as a private attorney general in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 8. Defendant ANTHROPOLOGIE, INC. ("ANTHROPOLOGIE") is a business entity with ten or more employees doing business within the scope of Proposition 65. Health and Safety Code § 25249.11. ANTHROPOLOGIE manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and/or offers for sale in California ceramic dishware containing lead and lead compounds, including the *Heirloom Bowl 3* (HRLM Gregg F Moore #33097254, 4536 28848).
- 9. Defendant URBAN OUTFITTERS, INC. ("URBAN OUTFITTERS") is a business entity with ten or more employees doing business within the scope of Proposition 65. Health and Safety Code § 25249.11. URBAN OUTFITTERS manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and/or offers for sale in California ceramic dishware containing lead and lead compounds, including the *Heirloom Bowl 3* (HRLM Gregg F Moore #33097254, 4536 28848).
- 10. Each of Defendants DOES 1-150 is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code § 25249.11(b), which manufactures, distributes, sells, and/or offers PRODUCTS for sale in the State of California. At this time, the true names and capacities of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said Defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure

§ 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. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint and include these Doe Defendants' true names and capacities when they are ascertained.

11. ANTHROPOLOGIE, URBAN OUTFITTERS and Defendants DOES 1-150 are collectively referred to herein as "Defendants."

### **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

- 12. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7, which allows enforcement in any court of competent jurisdiction, and pursuant to California Constitution, article VI, section 10, because this case does not present a cause given by statute to other trial courts.
- 13. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendants based on Plaintiff's information and good faith belief that each of the Defendants 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.
- 14. Venue is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 393 and 395 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 Alameda County, and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this county with respect to the PRODUCTS.

### **NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

15. On or before April 22, 2015, Plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation ("NOTICE") was provided to ANTHROPOLOGIE, URBAN OUTFITTERS, and to each of those public enforcement agencies to which Proposition 65 requires notice be given stating that, as a result of

ANTHROPOLOGIE and URBAN OUTFITTERS's sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to lead and lead compounds resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of these 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.

- 16. The NOTICE included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing individual; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific products and type of products causing the violations. The named Defendants and the California Attorney General were provided copies of the 60-Day Notice by mail. Additionally, the named Defendants were each provided with a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to title 27 of California Code of Regulations ("CCR") § 25903.
- 17. Each NOTICE included a certificate of merit executed by Plaintiff's attorney stating that the person executing the certificate had consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed the facts, studies or other data regarding exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice, and that, based on that information, the person executing the certificate believes there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action. Factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the certificate of merit was attached to the certificate of merit served on the California Attorney General.
- 18. No public prosecutor has commenced and is diligently prosecuting an action against the violations at issue herein, although the notice period provided in Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 has elapsed.

///

27 | ///

# STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND

- 19. In 1986, the voters of California overwhelmingly enacted Proposition 65.
- 20. Proposition 65 declares the People's right to be "informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." Health and Safety Code Div. 20, Ch. 6.6 Note, section 1(b). Under Proposition 65:

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.

Health and Safety Code § 25249.6.

- 21. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on February 27, 1987, California identified and listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental, male, and female reproductive toxicity, and on October 1, 1992, California identified and listed the lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to Proposition 65's "clear and reasonable warning" requirement one year after listing, on February 27, 1988 and October 1, 1993, respectively. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b); 27 CCR § 27001(b) and (c).
- 22. 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." 27 CCR § 25602(b).
- 23. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a). "Threaten to violate" is defined to mean "to create a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur." *Id.* at § 25249.11(e).
- 24. Under Proposition 65, an exposure is "knowing" where the party responsible for such exposure has:

"knowledge of the fact that a discharge of, release of, or exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to Section 25249.8(a) of the Act is

occurring. No knowledge that the discharge, release or exposure is unlawful is required."

27 CCR § 25102(n). This knowledge may be actual or constructive. *See*, e.g., Final Statement of Reasons Revised (November 4, 1988) for former 22 CCR § 12201.

- 25. Violators of Proposition 65 are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation, recoverable in a civil action. Healthy and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 26. Private parties are entitled to bring an action in the public interest to enforce the Act under Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 (d).

### **FACTS**

- 27. The PRODUCTS are used by consumers and contain toxic lead and lead compounds.
- 28. Defendants and each of them manufacture, distribute, and/or sell or offer the PRODUCTS for sale or promotional purposes in California.
- 29. Defendants, in the course of doing business, know and intend that individuals will purchase and use their PRODUCTS, thus exposing them to lead and lead compounds.
- 30. Defendants have failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning as required by Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f) to users of their PRODUCTS. As a direct result of Defendants' acts and omissions, the general public in California is being regularly, unlawfully, and involuntarily exposed to lead and lead compounds, which are known to be a reproductive toxin and carcinogens.
- 31. The PRODUCTS continue to be manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or promotional purposes in California without a clear and reasonable warning.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)

32. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

- 33. Lead and lead compounds are present in or on the Defendants' PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals in California to lead and lead compounds, as such exposures are defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25602(b).
- 34. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California require a "clear and reasonable" warning under Proposition 65.
- 35. Defendants knew or should have known that the ceramic dishware they manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain lead and lead compounds.
- 36. Defendants intended that such exposures to lead and lead compounds from the reasonably foreseeable uses of ceramic dishware would occur by Defendants' deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the ceramic dishware for sale or use to individuals in the State of California.
- 37. 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 lead and lead compounds through ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable uses of ceramic dishware.
- 38. Defendants' violations have continued to occur beyond their receipt of Plaintiff's NOTICE. As such, Defendants' violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and will continue to occur in the future.
- 39. 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.
- 40. 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 that the Court:

- 41. Grant civil penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1) against Defendants in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;
- 42. Enter such injunctions or other orders as are necessary pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a) to prevent Defendants from exposing persons within the State of California to the reproductive toxin lead and carcinogenic lead compounds caused by the reasonably foreseeable use of their PRODUCTS without providing clear and reasonable warnings;
- 43. Award Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and as otherwise appropriate; and
  - 44. Grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: June 22, 2015

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:

Rachel Doughty
Attorney for Larry Lee