

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

Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
Troy C. Bailey, State Bar No. 277424
Warren M. Klein, State Bar No. 303958
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
ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D, P.E.

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

JUL 10 2015

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Marla Carrera
Marla Carrera, Deputy

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

ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
INTEPLAST GROUP, LTD.; and DOES 1-150,
Defendants.

Case No. RG15777038

**FIRST AMENDED 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 ANTHONY E.
3 HELD, PH.D., P.E. 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 diisononyl phthalate
5 ("DINP"), a toxic chemical found in vinyl/PVC gloves sold by defendants in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failure to
7 warn California citizens and other individuals about the risks of exposure to DINP present in
8 and on vinyl/PVC gloves manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use by defendants to
9 consumers and other individuals throughout the State of California.

10 3. Detectable levels of DINP are found in and on the vinyl/PVC gloves that
11 defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers and other individuals
12 throughout the State of California.

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

18 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on December 20, 2013, California identified and listed
19 DINP as a chemical known to cause cancer. DINP became subject to the "clear and reasonable
20 warning" requirements of the act one year later on December 20, 2014. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27,
21 § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).

22 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without a
23 health hazard warning in California, vinyl/PVC gloves containing DINP including, but not
24 limited to, the *Vinyl Gloves, VF002, #1 07 62935 00026 1, UPC #7 62935 00026 4*. All such
25 vinyl/PVC gloves containing DINP, shall be referred to hereinafter as "PRODUCTS."

26 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of
27 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to DINP in conjunction with
28

1 defendants' sales of the PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants,
2 and each of them, to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation.
3 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

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

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

10 PARTIES

11 10. Plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E. is a citizen of the State of California
12 who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or
13 reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public
14 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d).

15 11. Defendant INTEPLAST GROUP, LTD. is a person in the course of doing
16 business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

17 12. INTEPLAST GROUP, LTD. manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or
18 offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it
19 manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the
20 State of California.

21 13. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a
22 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections
23 25249.6 and 25249.11.

24 14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
25 and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
26 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of
27 California.

1 15. Defendants DOES 51-100 (“DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS”) are each a person
2 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6
3 and 25249.11.

4 16. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and
5 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use
6 in the State of California.

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

10 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the
11 State of California.

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

17 20. INTEPLAST GROUP, LTD., MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS,
18 DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate,
19 collectively be referred to as “DEFENDANTS.”

20 VENUE AND JURISDICTION

21 21. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
22 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,
23 because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of
24 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
25 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Santa Clara County with
26 respect to the PRODUCTS.

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

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

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

23 27. On April 24, 2015, ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E. provided a sixty-day
24 notice of violation, together with the requisite certificates of merit, to INTEPLAST GROUP,
25 LTD., and certain public enforcement agencies, alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS'
26 sales of their respective PRODUCTS containing DINP, purchasers and users in the State of
27 California were being exposed to DINP resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the
28

1 PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a
2 “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with such exposures, as required
3 by Proposition 65.

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 34. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of
27 the PRODUCTS exposed individuals to DINP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
28

1 35. DEFENDANTS intended that exposures to DINP from the reasonably foreseeable
2 use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the
3 manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to
4 consumers and other individuals in California.

5 36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those
6 consumers and other individuals in California who were or who would become exposed to
7 DINP through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS.

8 37. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted
9 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to DINP through dermal contact and/or
10 ingestion as a result of their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS sold without a "clear
11 and reasonable" health hazard warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm
12 for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

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

16 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code
17 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
18 DEFENDANTS.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

24 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),
25 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or
26 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and
27
28

1 reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section
2 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures DINP;

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

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


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

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: July 9, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,

THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 
Warren M. Klein
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.