

Brian Johnson, State Bar No. 235965  
Christopher F. 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

ENTICED  
2016 JAN 20 P 3:20  
Dated this 20th day of January 2016  
By: S. ACKARD

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
DR. WHITNEY R. LEEMAN

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA  
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

**16CV290343**

DR. WHITNEY R. LEEMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRY'S ELECTRONICS, INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
) **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES**  
) **AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
) (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*)

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

**SUMMONS  
(CITACION JUDICIAL)**

**NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:  
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):**

FRY'S ELECTRONICS, INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive

**YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:  
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):**

DR. WHITNEY R. LEEMAN

FOR COURT USE ONLY  
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

ENDORSED

2016 JAN 20 P 3:20

David H. Yamasaki, Clerk  
County of Santa Clara, Calif.

S. ACKARD

**NOTICE!** You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **¡AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California ([www.sucorte.ca.gov](http://www.sucorte.ca.gov)), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, ([www.sucorte.ca.gov](http://www.sucorte.ca.gov)) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. **AVISO:** Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:  
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

Santa Clara Downtown Superior Court  
191 N. First Street, San Jose, CA 95113

DAVID H. YAMASAKI  
Chief Executive Officer, Clerk

CASE NUMBER:  
(Número del Caso) **16CV290343**

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Christopher F. Tuttle (SBN 264545) THE CHANLER GROUP, 2560 Ninth St., Ste 214, Berkeley, CA 94710

DATE:  
(Fecha)

**JAN 20 2016**

Clerk, by  
(Secretario) **S. ACKARD**

, Deputy  
(Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

(SEAL)

**NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED:** You are served

1.  as an individual defendant.
2.  as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):
3.  on behalf of (specify):  
under:  CCP 416.10 (corporation)  CCP 416.60 (minor)  
 CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)  CCP 416.70 (conservatee)  
 CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)  CCP 416.90 (authorized person)  
 other (specify):
4.  by personal delivery on (date):

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff DR. WHITNEY R.  
3 LEEMAN ("Plaintiff") in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce  
4 the 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 earphone cords  
6 sold 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 earphone cords manufactured, distributed,  
11 and 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 earphone cords 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 Plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to  
22 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, 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. FRY’S, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS,  
26 and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall hereinafter, where appropriate, be referred to collectively  
27 as the “DEFENDANTS.”  
28

1 VENUE AND JURISDICTION

2 21. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara, pursuant to  
3 Code of Civil Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of  
4 competent jurisdiction, because Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because  
5 one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county,  
6 and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Santa Clara  
7 with respect to the PRODUCTS.

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

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

18 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

19 (Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)

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

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

26 26. Proposition 65 states, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall  
27 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause  
28

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

3 27. On October 28, 2015, Plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together  
4 with the accompanying certificate of merit, on FRY’S, California Attorney General’s Office,  
5 and the requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales  
6 of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California are being exposed to DEHP resulting  
7 from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the consumers first receiving  
8 a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP, as  
9 required by Proposition 65.

10 28. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS  
11 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS’  
12 violations have continued beyond their receipt of Plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation. As  
13 such, DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined  
14 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 clear & reasonable 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  
2  
3 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

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

8 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),  
9 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or  
10 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and  
11 reasonable warning" in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section  
12 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP;

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

17 4. That the Court grant Plaintiff her reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and

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

19 Dated: January 14, 2016

20 Respectfully submitted,  
21 THE CHANLER GROUP

22 By: 

23 Christopher Tuttle  
24 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
25 DR. WHITNEY R. LEEMAN  
26  
27  
28