



FILED  
ALAMEDA COUNTY

16 JUN -7 AM 10: 57

MC

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436  
2 Warren M. Klein, State Bar No. 303958  
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 E-mail josh@chanler.com  
10 E-mail warren@chanler.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
12 PETER ENGLANDER

13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
14 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA  
15 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

16 PETER ENGLANDER,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 BB17, LLC; SAFEWAY INC.; and DOES 1-  
20 150, inclusive,

21 Defendants.

RG 16 820290

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

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 PETER  
3 ENGLANDER 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 ethylheyl)phthalate (DEHP), a toxic chemical found in vinyl/PVC travel bags and notebooks  
6 with Vinyl/PVC components 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 vinyl/PVC travel bags and notebooks with Vinyl/PVC  
11 components manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use throughout the State of  
12 California. Individuals not covered by California’s Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor  
13 Code section 6300 et seq. who purchase, use or handle defendants’ products are referred to  
14 hereinafter as “consumers”.

15 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on the vinyl/PVC travel bags and  
16 notebooks with Vinyl/PVC components that defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for  
17 sale without a warning to consumers throughout the State of California.

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

23 5. On October 24, 2003, California listed DEHP pursuant to Proposition 65 as a  
24 chemical that is known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. DEHP became  
25 subject to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements of the act one year later on October  
26 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(b); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &  
27 25249.10(b).

1 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without health  
2 hazard warnings in California, vinyl/PVC travel bags and notebooks with Vinyl/PVC  
3 components containing DEHP including, but not limited to *Travel Need Set, UPC #4 897027*  
4 *107333* and *Personal Notebook, UPC #897027 107531*. All vinyl/PVC travel bags and  
5 notebooks with Vinyl/PVC components containing DEHP are referred to collectively  
6 hereinafter as “PRODUCTS.”

7 7. Defendants’ failure to warn consumers in the State of California of the health  
8 hazards associated with exposures to DEHP in conjunction with defendants’ sales of the  
9 PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants, and each of them, to  
10 enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code  
11 § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

12 8. For defendants’ violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and  
13 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide consumers of the PRODUCTS with  
14 the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP. Health  
15 & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

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

18 **PARTIES**

19 10. Plaintiff PETER ENGLANDER is a citizen of the State of California who is  
20 dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of  
21 toxic exposures from consumer products; and she brings this action in the public interest  
22 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

23 11. Defendant BB17, LLC (“BB17”) is a person in the course of doing business  
24 within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

25 12. BB17 manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for  
26 sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,  
27 distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.  
28

1           13. Defendant SAFEWAY INC. (“SAFEWAY”) is a person in the course of doing  
2 business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

3           14. SAFEWAY manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the  
4 PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it  
5 manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the  
6 State of California.

7           15. Defendants DOES 1-50 (“MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS”) are each a  
8 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections  
9 25249.6 and 25249.11.

10          16. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,  
11 and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,  
12 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of  
13 California.

14          17. Defendants DOES 51-100 (“DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS”) are each persons  
15 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6  
16 and 25249.11.

17          18. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and  
18 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use  
19 in the State of California.

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

23          20. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the  
24 State of California.

25          21. At this time, the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are  
26 unknown to plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to  
27 Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis  
28

1 alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences  
2 alleged herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

3 22. BB17, SAFEWAY, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR  
4 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be  
5 referred to as “DEFENDANTS.”

6 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

13 24. 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 25. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on  
18 plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or  
19 association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the  
20 State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.  
21 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 26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
26 Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive.  
27  
28

1           27. 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           28. 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           29. On March 23, 2016, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with  
10 the requisite certificate of merit, on BB17, SAFEWAY and certain public enforcement agencies  
11 alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the PRODUCTS containing DEHP,  
12 consumers in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting from their  
13 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the consumers first having been  
14 provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with such  
15 exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

16           30. 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.  
19 DEFENDANTS’ violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, as such, will continue in  
20 the future.

21           31. 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           32. 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 warning.

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

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

7 35. 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 36. DEFENDANTS know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
11 PRODUCTS exposes consumers to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

12 37. 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 38. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those  
17 consumers in California who were or who would become exposed to DEHP through dermal  
18 contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS.

19 39. 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 sell 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 40. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the  
25 above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day  
26 for each violation.

27  
28

1           41. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code  
2 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against  
3 DEFENDANTS.

4                                   **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

9           2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),  
10 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or  
11 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and  
12 reasonable warning" in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section  
13 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP;

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

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

19           5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.  
20

21 Dated: June 7, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP

24  
25 By:   
26 Warren M. Klein  
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
28 PETER ENGLANDER