ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, Stat		CM-010
Parker A. Smith, Attorney at Law (#29 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 100 Del Mar, CA 92130	number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
TELEPHONE NO.: (858) 746-9554 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff, King Pun C SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF S.	FAX NO.: (858) 746-5199 Cheng an Diego	S CIVIL DUSC ESSIONEDES
STREET ADDRESS: 330 West Broadway MAILING ADDRESS:	<u> </u>	
city and zip code: San Diego, CA 9210 Branch name: Hall of Justice	1	2015 DEC 15 A 9:38
CASE NAME: King Pun Cheng v. CERRO WIRE,	LLC., et al.	0.1949.11
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET  Unlimited Limited	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER: 37-2016-00044231-CU-NP-CTL
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder	
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	Filed with first appearance by defend (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:
1 Check and have below for the area to a the	low must be completed (see instructions o	n page 2).
1. Check one box below for the case type the Auto Tort  Auto Tort  Auto (22)  Uninsured motorist (46)  Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort  Asbestos (04)  Product liability (24)  Medical malpractice (45)  Other PI/PD/WD (23)  Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort  Business tort/unfair business practice (07 Civil rights (08)  Defamation (13)  Fraud (16)  Intellectual property (19)  Professional negligence (25)  Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)  Employment  Wrongful termination (36)	Contract  Breach of contract/warranty (06)  Rule 3.740 collections (09)  Other collections (09)  Insurance coverage (18)  Other contract (37)  Real Property  Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)  Wrongful eviction (33)  Other real property (26)  Unlawful Detainer  Commercial (31)  Residential (32)  Drugs (38)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400–3.403)  Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)  Construction defect (10)  Mass tort (40)  Securities litigation (28)  Environmental/Toxic tort (30)  Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)  inforcement of Judgment  Enforcement of judgment (20)  discellaneous Civil Complaint  RICO (27)  Other complaint (not specified above) (42)  discellaneous Civil Petition  Partnership and corporate governance (21)  Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Other employment (15)  2. This case is ✓ is not comfactors requiring exceptional judicial mana	Other judicial review (39)  Plex under rule 3,400 of the California Rule	es of Court. If the case is complex, mark the
a. Large number of separately repre b. Extensive motion practice raising issues that will be time-consuming c. Substantial amount of documenta  3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. 4. Number of causes of action (specify): On  5. This case is vis not a class  6. If there are any known related cases, file a  Date: 12/15/2016  Parker A. Smith, Esq.  (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)   • Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the funder the Probate Code, Family Code, or vin sanctions.  • File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet in sanctions.  • File this case is complex under rule 3.400 et another parties to the action or proceeding.	sented parties  difficult or novel g to resolve ry evidence  f. Substantial position of the counties seaction suit.  Substantial position of related case. (You make the counties of related case)  NOTICE  irst paper filed in the action or proceeding Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of seq. of the California Rules of Court, you research the counties of court, you research to the counties of the counties of court, you research to the counties of the c	ith related actions pending in one or more courts es, states, or countries, or in a federal court stjudgment judicial supervision eclaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive eay use form CM-015.)  NATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)  (except small claims cases or cases filed a of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result enust serve a copy of this cover sheet on all
Unless this is a collections case under rule     mandatory Use		Page 1 of 2
Judicial Council of California	CIVIL CASE COVED SHEET	Cal Rules of Court gules 2.20, 2.000, p. 400, p. 400, p.

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Council of California CM-010 [Rev. July 1, 2007]

# INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that

#### **Auto Tort** Auto (22)-Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

#### Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort

Asbestos (04) Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24) Medical Malpractice (45) Medical Malpractice-Physicians & Surgeons Other Professional Health Care Malpractice Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD

(e.g., assault, vandalism) Intentional Infliction of **Emotional Distress** Negligent Infliction of

**Emotional Distress** Other PI/PD/WD

## Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

**Business Tort/Unfair Business** Practice (07) Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination, false arrest) (not civil harassment) (08) Defamation (e.g., slander, libel) (13)

Fraud (16) Intellectual Property (19) Professional Negligence (25) Legal Malpractice

Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal) Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

**Employment** 

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

#### CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES Contract

#### Breach of Contract/Warranty (06) Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) Contract/Warranty Breach-Seller Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence) Negligent Breach of Contract/ Warranty Other Breach of Contract/Warranty Collections (e.g., money owed, open book accounts) (09) Collection Case-Seller Plaintiff Other Promissory Note/Collections Case Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

Other Contract (37) Contractual Fraud Other Contract Dispute

**Real Property** 

**Eminent Domain/Inverse** Condemnation (14)

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation

Other Coverage

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26) Writ of Possession of Real Property Mortgage Foreclosure Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, or foreclosure)

### **Unlawful Detainer**

Commercial (31) Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal drugs, check this item; otherwise. report as Commercial or Residential)

#### **Judicial Review**

Asset Forfeiture (05) Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39) Review of Health Officer Order Notice of Appeal-Labor Commissioner Appeals

### Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03) Construction Defect (10) Claims Involving Mass Tort (40) Securities Litigation (28) Environmental/Toxic Tort (30) Insurance Coverage Claims (arising from provisionally complex case type listed above) (41)

## **Enforcement of Judgment**

Enforcement of Judgment (20) Abstract of Judgment (Out of County) Confession of Judgment (nondomestic relations)

Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) Petition/Certification of Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment Case

#### Miscellaneous Civil Complaint RICO (27)

Other Complaint (not specified above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only Injunctive Relief Only (nonharassment)

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)

### Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate Governance (21) Other Petition (not specified

above) (43) Civil Harassment Workplace Violence Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse **Election Contest** Petition for Name Change Petition for Relief From Late Claim

Other Civil Petition

Parker Smith, Esq., (CSB# 290311) **Sy and Smith, PC** 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 100 Del Mar, CA 92130 Telephone: 858-746-9554

ONTERUSTESS CARCES

2016 DEC 15 A 9:30

QEASALL ST

Attorney for Plaintiff, King Pun Cheng

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

### **COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

## UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

KING PUN CHENG,	) CASE NO.: ) 37-2016-00044231-CU-NP-CTL
Plaintiff,	OMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUCTIVE RELIEF
CERRO WIRE, LLC	) (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.) )
Defendant.	) ) )

## **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff King Pun Cheng, in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the people's right to be informed of the presence of Diisononyl phthalate (hereinafter referred to as "DINP") found in Cerro Wire Low Voltage Cable.
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendant's failure to warn California citizens about the risks of exposure to DINP present in Cerro Wire Low Voltage Cable

////

////

manufactured, distributed and/or offered for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.

- 3. Detectable levels of DINP are found in Cerro Wire Low Voltage Cable and components that Defendant manufactures, distributes and/or offers for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.
- 4. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq. (Proposition 65), "No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual..." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 5. Under Proposition 65, California identified and listed DINP as chemicals known to cause cancer.
  - 6. DINP shall hereinafter be referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICALS."
- 7. Defendant manufactures, distributes and/or sells without a health hazard warning in California, Cerro Wire Low Voltage Cable including, UPC 048243319480, containing the LISTED CHEMICALS shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."
- 8. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California about their exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS in conjunction with Defendant's distribution or sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendant to enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.
- 9. For Defendant's violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive and permanent injunctive relief to compel Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED CHEMICAL. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).)
- 10. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65, as provided for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

- 11. Plaintiff King Pun Cheng is a citizen of the City of Carlsbad, County of San Diego, in the State of California, who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products, represented by and through its counsel of record, Parker A. Smith. Plaintiff brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 12. Cerro Wire, LLC is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 13. The parties in paragraphs 12 of this Complaint shall be collectively referred to as "Defendant".
- 14. Cerro Wire, LLC manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.
- 15. The identities of DOES 1-25 are unknown to Plaintiff at this time. Plaintiff suspects that they are business entities with at least ten or more employees that have sold, authorized the distribution, or sale of the said PRODUCTS under the name "Cerro Wire Low Voltage Cable" and other brand names, that contain and/or produce DINP, for sale within the State of California, without giving clear and reasonable warning.

# VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 16. Venue is proper in the San Diego County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § § 394, 495, 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of San Diego and/or because Defendant conducted, and continues to conduct, business in this County with respect to the PRODUCTS.
- 17. The California Superior 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." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

18. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendant based on plaintiff's information and good faith belief that Defendant is a person, firm, corporation or association that either are citizens of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avail itself of the California market. Defendant's 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 Defendant)

- 19. Plaintiff alleges and incorporates by reference, as if full reference, as if full set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 19, inclusive.
- 20. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. (Proposition 65) that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and order reproductive harm." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 21. Proposition 65 states, "No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or productive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual (*Id.*)"
- 22. On, September 26, 2016, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite certificates of merit, was provided to Defendant, other potential violators and various public enforcement agencies, including the California Attorney General's Office, stating that as a result of the Defendant's sale of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS resulting from the reasonably foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.

- 23. Defendant manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and Defendant's manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond Defendant's receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notices of violation. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.
- 24. After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notices of violation, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendant under Proposition 65.
- 25. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in California by Defendant contained the LISTED CHEMICALS above the allowable state limits.
- 26. Defendant knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or for sale or use by Defendant in California contained the LISTED CHEMICALS.
- 27. The LISTED CHEMICALS were present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICALS through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 28. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS have caused and continue to cause consumer exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS, as such exposure is defined by 27 CCR§ 25602(b).
- 29. Defendant had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICALS through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
- 30. Defendant intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or use of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

- 31. Defendant failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 32. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, sold by Defendant without a "clear and reasonable warning," have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.
- 33. As a consequence of the above-described acts, each Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penal of \$2,500 per day for each violation pursuant to California Health& Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 34. As a consequence of the above-described acts, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against Defendant.
  - 35. Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as set forth hereinafter.

# PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 1. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against Defendant, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation alleged herein;
- 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant from manufacturing, distributing or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing "clear and reasonable warnings" as detailed by 27 CCR § 25601, as to the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS:
  - 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and cost of suit; and
  - 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: 12/15/16

Respectfully Submitted,

By:

Parker A. Smith

Attorney for Plaintiff