| 1 2 3 4 | Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352) Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113) BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Telephone: (877) 534-2590 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160 | ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY MAY 16 2017 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COUR, By Lanette Buffin, Deputy |
|------------------|--|---|
| 5 | Attorneys for Plaintiff | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 8 | COUNTY OF ALAMEDA | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | CADDIEL ECODIOCA | 217860441 |
| 11 | GABRIEL ESPINOSA, Plaintiff, | Case No.: |
| 12 | ŕ | COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF |
| 13 14 | v. HUFFY CORP., | (Violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.5 |
| 14 | Defendant. | et seq.) |
| 16 | Dolondan | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | Plaintiff Gabriel Espinosa ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, alleges the | |
| 19 | following cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California. | |
| 20 | BACKGROUND OF THE CASE | |
| 21 | 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to | |
| 22 | enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified | |
| 23 | at the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq ("Proposition 65"), which reads, in relevant part, | |
| 24 | "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any | |
| 25 | individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first | |
| 26 | giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual". Health & Safety Code § 25249.6. | |
| 27 | 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest | |
| 28 | of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health | |
| | | a i a |

hazards caused by exposure to Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), a toxic chemical found in Huffy Handlebar Bags manufactured, sold and/or distributed in California by defendant Huffy Corp. ("Huffy" or "Defendant") in California.

- 3. DEHP is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. On January 1, 1988, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to the State to cause cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b). On October 24, 2003, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. *Id*.
- 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations.

 Included in such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing a Proposition 65-listed chemical with a "clear and reasonable" warning before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing any person to it.
- 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation to be imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the actions of a defendant which "violate[s] or threaten[s] to violate" the statute. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant produces, manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and/or offers for sale in California, without the required warning, Huffy Handlebar Bags, including but not limited to SKU No. 0 32447 00411 2 ("Product" or "Products"), that contain DEHP.
- 7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to DEHP in conjunction with the sale, manufacture, and/or distribution of the Product is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendant to the enjoinment and civil penalties described herein.

- 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the Product 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).
- Defendant Huffy sells and distributes bicycles and cycling gear. Through its business, Huffy effectively manufactures, 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 manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Product for sale or use in the State of California.
- 12. Defendant Huffy is a "person" in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 13. 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 Defendant conducted, and continues to conduct, business in the County of Alameda with respect to the Product.
- 14. 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.

15. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because it is either 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

- 16. On March 15, 2017, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Huffy concerning the exposure of California citizens to DEHP contained in the Product without proper warning, subject to a private action to Huffy 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.
- 17. 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.
- 18. 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 Huffy under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are the subject of Plaintiff's notice of violation.
- 19. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the Notice to Huffy, as required by law.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff against Defendant for the Violation of Proposition 65)

20. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

8

7

11 12

10

1415

13

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

- 21. Defendant has, at all times mentioned herein, acted as manufacturer, distributer, and/or retailer of the Product.
- 22. The Product contains DEHP, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.
 - 23. The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.
- 24. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since February 11, 2017, continuing until the present, that Huffy has continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to DEHP without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.
- The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase, 25. acquisition, handling and recommended use of the product. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals is through dermal exposure. The potential exists for dermal exposure of DEHP and DINP through direct contact with the user's bare hands and the clear touchscreen when a smartphone is inserted or removed from the pocket. The product can be expected to emit gas phase DEHP into the air over the lifetime of the product. If the handlebar cooler bag is stored in a closed drawer or carrier, DEHP that leaches from the touchscreen window may contaminate other articles contained within the drawer or carrier that are subsequently handled, used, or consumed by people. If the handlebar cooler bag is exposed to moisture or humidity, DEHP skin permeation rates have been reported to be faster than neat DEHP permeation. Finally, while mouthing of the product docs not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by touching the product with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth, through touching the DEHP contaminated smartphone screen after it is removed from the pocket with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth, or if the phone surface is contaminated with DEHP and comes into contact with the user's mouth during use.
- 26. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to Product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Product.

Attorneys for Plaintiff