

FAXED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Brian Johnson, State Bar No. 235965
Kimberly Gates, State Bar No. 282369
THE CHANLER GROUP
2560 Ninth Street
Parker Plaza, Suite 214
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565
Telephone: (510) 848-8880
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118
Brian@chanler.com
Kimberly@chanler.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
PAUL WOZNIAK

**ENDORSED
FILED**
San Francisco County Superior Court

OCT 26 2017
CLERK OF THE COURT
BY: NEYL WEBB
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

PAUL WOZNIAK,

Plaintiff,

v.

W.C. BRADLEY/ZEBCO HOLDINGS, INC.;
and DOES 1-150, inclusive,

Defendants.

CGC - 17 - 562147

Case No. _____

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Paul Wozniak in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (“DEHP”), a toxic chemical found in and on vinyl/PVC zipper pulls sold by defendants in California.

2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failure to warn individuals not covered by California’s Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code § 6300 *et seq.*, who purchase, use or handle defendants’ products, about the risks of exposure to DEHP present in and on vinyl/PVC zipper pulls that are manufactured, purchased, imported, distributed, sold and/or offered for sale or use throughout the State of California by defendants. Individuals not covered by California’s Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code § 6300 *et seq.*, who purchase, use or handle defendants’ products, are referred to hereinafter as “consumers.”

3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on the vinyl/PVC zipper pulls that defendants manufacture, purchase, import, distribute, sell and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.

4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o 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” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

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

1 manufactures, purchases, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use
2 in the State of California.

3 13. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a
4 person in the course of doing business, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§
5 25249.6 and 25249.11.

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

10 15. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each a person
11 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and
12 25249.11.

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

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

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

23 19. At this time, the true names of defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are
24 unknown to Plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said defendants by their fictitious names pursuant to
25 Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that
26 each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences alleged
27 herein. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.
28

1 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive
2 harm.”

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

7 27. On March 30, 2017, Plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with
8 the accompanying certificate of merit, on ZEBSCO, the California Attorney General’s Office,
9 and the requisite public enforcement agencies, alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’
10 sales of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California are being exposed to DEHP,
11 resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the consumers first
12 receiving a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with exposures to
13 DEHP, as required by Proposition 65.

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

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

23 30. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, purchase, import, distribute,
24 sell, and/or offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP, as a result of the
25 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures, caused by DEFENDANTS
26 and endured by consumers in California, are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable”
27
28

1 warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no clear & reasonable
2 warning.

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

5 32. 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 33. 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, § 25602(b).

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

12 35. 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, purchase, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale
15 or use to consumers in California.

16 36. 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 37. 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 38. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-
25 described acts, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable for a maximum civil penalty of
26 \$2,500 per day for each violation.

27
28

1 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code
2 § 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 § 25249.7(b), assess civil
7 penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each
8 violation;

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

14 3. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 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, § 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: October 25, 2017

Respectfully submitted,
THE CHANLER GROUP

22
23 By: K. Gates
24 Kimberly Gates
25 Attorneys for Plaintiff
26 PAUL WOZNIAK
27
28