

**COPY**

1 Joshua Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436  
2 THE CHANLER GROUP  
3 2560 Ninth Street  
4 Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
5 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  
6 Telephone: (510) 848-8880  
7 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9 MARK MOORBERG

**ENDORSED**

2015 NOV 25 P 1:40

Deputy Clerk, County of Santa Clara  
By **S. ACKARD**  
Deputy Clerk

10  
11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
12 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA  
13 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

14 MARK MOORBERG,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 COLART/AMERICAS, INC. and DOES 1 –  
18 150, inclusive,

19 Defendants.

Case No. **115CV288486**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

**By Fax**

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1  
2           1.     This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff MARK  
3 MOORBERG 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 and on the vinyl/PVC art cases sold  
6 by 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 the vinyl/PVC art 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 art cases that  
15 defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of  
16 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.     Pursuant to Proposition 65, on October 24, 2003, California identified and listed  
23 DEHP as a chemical known to cause birth defects (and reproductive harm). DEHP became  
24 subject to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements of the act one year later on October  
25 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &  
26 25249.10(b).



1 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections  
2 25249.6 and 25249.11.

3 14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, research, test, design,  
4 assemble, fabricate, and manufacture, or each implies by its conduct that it researches, tests,  
5 designs, assembles, fabricates, and manufactures one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for  
6 sale or use in California.

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

10 16. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and each of them, distribute, exchange,  
11 transfer, process, and transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or  
12 retailers for sale or use in the State of California, or each implies by its conduct that it  
13 distributes, exchanges, transfers, processes, and transports one or more of the PRODUCTS to  
14 individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use in the State of California.

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

18 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, offer the PRODUCTS for sale to  
19 individuals in the State of California.

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

25 20. COLART, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR  
26 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall hereinafter, where appropriate, be  
27 referred to collectively as the “DEFENDANTS”.

28

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

**VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

21. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, 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 this county, and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Santa Clara with respect to the PRODUCTS.

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

23. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that DEFENDANTS are each 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 renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

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

3 27. On July 31, 2015, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the  
4 accompanying certificate of merit, on COLART, California Attorney General’s Office, and the  
5 requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the  
6 PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California are being exposed to DEHP resulting from  
7 their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the consumers first receiving a  
8 “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP, as  
9 required by Proposition 65.

10 28. DEFENDANTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered the  
11 PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and  
12 DEFENDANTS’ violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff’s sixty-day notice  
13 of violation. As such, DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and,  
14 unless enjoined will continue in the future.

15 29. After receiving plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, no public enforcement  
16 agency has commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against DEFENDANTS  
17 under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the subject of plaintiff’s notice of  
18 violation.

19 30. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and  
20 offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably  
21 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by  
22 consumers in California are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable” warning requirements  
23 of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no warning.

24 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they  
25 manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale in California contain DEHP.

26 32. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose consumers  
27 through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.  
28

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

4           34. DEFENDANTS know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
5 PRODUCTS exposes individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

6           35. DEFENDANTS intend that exposures to DEHP from the reasonably foreseeable  
7 use of the PRODUCTS will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the  
8 manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to  
9 consumers in California.

10           36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those  
11 consumers in California who have been, or who will be, exposed to DEHP through dermal  
12 contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS.

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

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

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

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

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

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

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

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

17  
18 Dated: November 24, 2015

Respectfully submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP

19  
20 By:   
21 Joshua Voorhees  
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
23 MARK MOORBERG  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28