

1 Cliff Chanler, State Bar No. 135534  
2 Christopher Tuttle, State Bar No. 264545  
3 THE CHANLER GROUP  
4 2560 Ninth Street  
5 Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
6 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  
7 Telephone: (510) 848-8880  
8 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
10 WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, PH.D.

ENDORSED

2016 NOV -9 P 1:00

David H. Yamasaki, Clerk of the Superior Court  
County of Santa Clara, California

By:

Deputy Clerk

LEEMAN/ROSELLA

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

13 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

14 WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, PH.D.,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 FREMONT DIE CONSUMER PRODUCTS,  
18 INC.; AMAZON.COM, INC.; and DOES 1-  
19 150, inclusive,

20 Defendants.

Case No. 16CV302457

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

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

BY FAX

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This First Amended Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff  
3 Whitney R. Leeman 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 vinyl/PVC bar stool covers  
6 sold by defendants in California.

7 2. By this First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants'  
8 continuing failure to warn individuals not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health  
9 Act, Labor Code section 6300 et seq., who purchase, use or handle defendants' products, about  
10 the risks of exposure to DEHP present in and on the vinyl/PVC bar stool covers manufactured,  
11 distributed, and offered for sale or use throughout the State of California. Individuals not  
12 covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code section 6300 et seq., who  
13 purchase, 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 bar stool covers  
15 that 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 other 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           13.    AMAZON manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS  
2 for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,  
3 distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

4           14.    Defendants DOES 1-50 (“MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS”) are each a  
5 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections  
6 25249.6 and 25249.11.

7           15.    MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, research, test, design,  
8 assemble, fabricate, and manufacture, or each implies by its conduct that it researches, tests,  
9 designs, assembles, fabricates, and manufactures one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for  
10 sale or use in California.

11          16.    Defendants DOES 51-100 (“DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS”) are each a person  
12 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6  
13 and 25249.11.

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

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

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

24          20.    At this time, the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are  
25 unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to  
26 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis  
27 alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences  
28

1 alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

2 21. FREMONT, AMAZON, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR  
3 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall hereinafter, where appropriate, be  
4 referred to collectively as the "DEFENDANTS."

5  
6 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

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

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

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

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

16           29. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS  
17 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS’  
18 violations have continued beyond their receipt of Plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation. As  
19 such, DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined  
20 will continue in the future.

21           30. After receiving Plaintiff’s sixty-day notice of violation, no public enforcement  
22 agency has commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against DEFENDANTS  
23 under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the subject of Plaintiff’s notice of  
24 violation.

25           31. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and  
26 offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably  
27 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by  
28

1 consumers in California are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable” warning requirements  
2 of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no clear & reasonable warning.

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

5 33. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose consumers  
6 through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

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

10 35. DEFENDANTS know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
11 PRODUCTS exposes individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

12 36. DEFENDANTS intend that exposures to DEHP from the reasonably foreseeable  
13 use of the PRODUCTS will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the  
14 manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to  
15 consumers in California.

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

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

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

27  
28

