

1 Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)  
2 Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)  
3 BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC  
4 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900  
5 Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
6 Telephone: (877) 534-2590  
7 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**ENDORSED  
FILED  
ALAMEDA COUNTY**

**MAR 19 2018**

**CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**  
By CURTIAH GANTER  
Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

10 GABRIEL ESPINOSA,  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 vs.  
13 REGENT BABY PRODUCTS CORP.,  
14 Defendant.

Case No.: **RG1089727-14**  
**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
**(Violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.5  
et seq.)**

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.

**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

**BY FAX**

1 hazards caused by exposure to Diisononyl phthalate (DINP), a toxic chemical found in Baby  
2 King stroller covers/shields sold and/or distributed by defendant Regent Baby Products Corp.  
3 (“Regent Baby Products” or “Defendant”) in California.

4 3. DINP is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. On  
5 December 20, 2013, the State of California listed DINP as a chemical known to the State to  
6 cause cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time.  
7 Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).

8 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that  
9 operate within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations.  
10 Included in such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing  
11 a Proposition 65-listed chemical with a “clear and reasonable” warning before “knowingly and  
12 intentionally” exposing any person to it.

13 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation  
14 to be imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety  
15 Code § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin  
16 the actions of a defendant which “violate or threaten to violate” the statute. Health & Safety  
17 Code § 25249.7.

18 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant manufactures, distributes and/or offers for sale in  
19 California, without the requisite exposure warning, Baby King stroller covers/shields (the  
20 “Products”) that expose persons to DINP.

21 7. Defendant’s failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the  
22 health hazards associated with exposure to DINP in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution  
23 of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendant to the enjoinder and  
24 civil penalties described herein.

25 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition  
26 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

27 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring  
28 Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the Products with required warnings related to the

1 dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DINP pursuant to Health and Safety  
2 Code § 25249.7(a).

3 **PARTIES**

4 10. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general  
5 public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and  
6 to improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. He brings  
7 this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

8 11. Defendant Regent Baby Products, through its business, effectively manufactures,  
9 imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or  
10 it implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the  
11 Products for sale or use in the State of California.

12 12. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Regent Baby Products is a “person” in the course  
13 of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

14 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

15 13. Venue is proper in the County of Alameda because one or more of the instances  
16 of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur in this county and/or because Defendant  
17 conducted, and continues to conduct, business in the County of Alameda with respect to the  
18 Products.

19 14. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution  
20 Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those  
21 given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the  
22 enforcement of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore,  
23 this Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

24 15. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant is either a citizen  
25 of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is  
26 registered with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business  
27 in the State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California  
28

1 market. Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts  
2 consistent and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

3 **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

4 16. On April 21, 2017, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety  
5 Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendant concerning the exposure of California citizens to  
6 DINP contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendant  
7 and to the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District attorneys  
8 and City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the  
9 herein violations allegedly occurred.

10 17. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including  
11 the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff's counsel had consulted with at  
12 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding  
13 DINP exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a  
14 private action.

15 18. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's best information and belief, none of  
16 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted  
17 a cause of action against Defendant under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which  
18 are the subject of Plaintiff's notice of violation.

19 19. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of his  
20 notice to Defendant, as required by law.

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

25 21. Defendant has, at all times mentioned herein, acted as manufacturer, distributor,  
26 and/or retailer of the Product.

27 22. The Products contain DINP, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65  
28 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

1           23.     The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

2           24.     Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times  
3 herein, and at least since March 21, 2017, continuing until the present, that Defendant has  
4 continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product  
5 to DINP without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

6           25.     The exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase,  
7 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the product. Consequently, the primary route of  
8 exposure to these chemicals is through dermal absorption. Users may potentially be exposed to  
9 DINP by dermal absorption through direct skin contact with the clear plastic stroller shield  
10 during routine use when the plastic is grasped, opened, or manipulated with bare hands. If the  
11 plastic shield becomes wet with precipitation or is handled with wet hands, aqueous HMWP skin  
12 permeation rates have been reported to be faster than neat HMWP permeation. The product can  
13 be expected to emit gas phase DINP into the air over the lifetime of the product. Concentrations  
14 of gas phase DINP can be expected to build within the enclosed stroller interior. This gas phase  
15 DINP can potentially be absorbed to the all interior surfaces including children's bodies,  
16 clothing, and the stroller surfaces. The rate of DINP emission from the plastic shield will  
17 increase with increasing environmental temperatures and can be expected to increase during  
18 warmer, summer seasons. If the clear plastic shield is stored or transported in a carrier DINP  
19 that leaches from the plastic may contaminate other articles contained within these closed spaces  
20 that are subsequently handled, worn, or ingested by the user. Finally, while mouthing of the  
21 product does not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by touching  
22 the product with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth. Indirect ingestion is also  
23 possible if enclosed interior items become contaminated with DINP. These contaminated items  
24 will provide routes of transfer of DINP to users and result in ingestion exposure should children  
25 touch contaminated surfaces and mouth their hands, consume DINP contaminated food, or  
26 mouth DINP contaminated items.

27  
28



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

Telephone: (877) 534-2590  
Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*