AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF – VIOLATION OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5

27

7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers, workers, and other individuals in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to DEHP in conjunction with the sale, and/or distribution of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendants to the enjoinment and civil penalties described herein.

12

13 14

16 17

19

20

21

23

24

25

27

28

- 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring Defendants to provide purchasers or users of the Products with the required warnings related to the dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DEHP pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

### **PARTIES**

- 10. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and to improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. He brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 11. Defendant 20th Century Fox produces and distributes films in theaters. The company also sells movies, television content DVD or Blu-Ray products, and apparel through an online store. The company was founded in 1935 and is based in Los Angeles, California. 20th Century Fox operates as a subsidiary of defendant 21st Century Fox. Through its business, 20th Century Fox effectively imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. 20th Century Fox maintains a registered agent for service of process at c/o The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801.
- 12. Defendant 21st Century Fox is an American multinational mass media corporation. The company's stock is publicly traded on the Nasdaq stock exchange under the symbol, "FOXA". Through its business, 21st Century Fox effectively imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. 21st Century Fox maintains a registered agent for service of process at c/o The Corporation Trust Company, Corporation Trust Center, 1209 Orange Street, Wilmington, DE 19801.

- 13. Defendant FX is an American basic cable and satellite television channel that is owned by defendant 21st Century Fox. Through its business, FX effectively imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. FX maintains a registered agent for service of process at c/o CT Corporation System PO Box 900, Beverly Hills, CA 90213.
- 14. Defendant Piston, a California Corporation, is a manufacturer of clothing apparel for children. Through its business, Piston effectively imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. Piston maintains a registered agent for service of process at c/o John Lucero, 144 E. Garry Avenue, Santa Ana, CA 92707.
- Upon information and belief, Plaintiff avers that at all relevant times herein, each Defendant was a "person" in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

### **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

- 16. Venue is proper in the County of Alameda because one or more of the instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur in this county and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of Alameda with respect to the Products.
- 17. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the enforcement of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit.
- 18. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because each is either is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is registered with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business in the

State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market. Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

# SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMNTS

- 19. On June 1, 2016, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendants and Piston concerning the exposure of California citizens to DEHP contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants and to the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District attorneys and City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein violations allegedly occurred.
- 20. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff's counsel had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding DEHP exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private action.
- 21. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's best information and belief, none of the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are the subject of Plaintiff's notice of violation.
- 22. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of his notice to Defendants, as required by law.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## (By Plaintiff against Defendants for the Violation of Proposition 65)

- 23. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 21 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 24. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as a distributer, and/or retailer of the Products.

28

23

24

25

26

27

26

27

- 25. The Products contain DEHP, s hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of a chemical known to be hazardous to human health.
  - 26. The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.
- 27. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since April 18, 2016 continuing until the present, that Defendants have continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products to DEHP without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.
- 28. With respect to the Products, the exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Products. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals is through dermal exposure. Dermal exposure through the child's hands can occur during fitting and removal of the vest and when hands are placed into pockets. The inside of the vest is likely to be in constant contact with either bare, exposed skin or the child's clothing. If the vest is worn over bare exposed skin, direct skin exposure will occur. Should the wearer's skin perspire inside the vest or the interior of the vest become wet from precipitation, aqueous DEHP skin permeation rates have been reported to be faster than neat DEHP permeation. Although the association between HMWP phthalates such as DEHP and atopic dermatitis has never been elucidated, as a multitude of chemicals are present in plastics that come into contact with human skin, DEHP in headphones and hearing protection aids has been reported to induce contact dermatitis. Clothing worn beneath the vest are likely to absorb DEHP while the vest is worn. The contaminated articles of clothing will continue to be a source of dermal transfer after the vest is removed. If the vest is stored or transported in a carrier, DEHP that leaches from the vest may contaminate other articles contained within the carrier bag that are subsequently handled by people.
- 29. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to the Products' purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Products.
- 30. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products exposes individuals to DEHP, and Defendant intend that exposures to DEHP will occur