

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
2 Christopher Tuttle, State Bar No. 264545
3 THE CHANLER GROUP
4 2560 Ninth Street
5 Parker Plaza, Suite 214
6 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565
7 Telephone: (510) 848-8880
8 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 LAURENCE VINOCUR

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

SEP 12 2017

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: 
Deputy Clerk

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

LAURENCE VINOCUR,

Plaintiff,

v.

BANKY, INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **CGC - 17 - 561254**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.*)

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
FILED

- 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

6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without warning in California, glassware with exterior designs containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, including, but not limited to, the *Set of Four Drinking Glasses, Item #435, Ctn #288*. All such glass containers with exterior designs containing the LISTED CHEMICAL are referred to collectively hereinafter as the (“PRODUCTS”).

7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendants' sales of the PRODUCTS containing the LISTED CHEMICAL are violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants to enjoinder of such conduct, as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

9. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants, and each of them, for each violation of Proposition 65.

PARTIES

10. Plaintiff LAURENCE VINOCUR is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of harmful exposures to toxic chemicals from consumer products. He brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

11. Defendant Banky, Inc. ("BANKY") is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

12. **BANKY** 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 **PRODUCTS** for sale or use in the State of California.

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

14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate, and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,

1 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of
2 California.

3 15. Defendants DOES 51-100 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each a person
4 in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6
5 and 25249.11.

6 16. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process, and
7 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or retailers for sale or use
8 in the State of California.

9 17. Defendants DOES 101-150 ("RETAILER DEFENDANTS") are each a person in
10 the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6
11 and 25249.11.

12 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the
13 State of California.

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

19 20. BANKY, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR
20 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS are hereinafter collectively referred to as
21 "DEFENDANTS."

22 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

23 21. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, pursuant to Code of Civil
24 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,
25 because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of
26 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
27
28

1 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in San Francisco with respect to
2 the PRODUCTS.

3 22. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
4 California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original
5 jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under
6 which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

7 23. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on
8 plaintiff's information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or
9 association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the
10 State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.
11 DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by
12 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)**

15 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
16 Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

17 25. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic
18 Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right "[t]o be
19 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive
20 harm."

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

25 27. On April 27, 2017 plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, together with the
26 requisite certificate of merit, was provided to BANKY, and the requisite public enforcement
27 agencies stating that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS containing the
28

1 LISTED CHEMICAL, workers, consumers and other individuals in the State of California are
2 being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of
3 the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having received a "clear and
4 reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

5 28. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale,
6 and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section
7 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS' violations have continued to occur beyond their receipt of
8 plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. As such, DEFENDANTS' violations are ongoing and
9 continuous in nature, and, unless enjoined, will continue to occur in the future.

10 29. After receiving plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, the appropriate public
11 enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action
12 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

13 30. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale
14 or use in California by DEFENDANTS contain the LISTED CHEMICAL in such a way that the
15 reasonably foreseeable uses of these products result in exposures that require a "clear and
16 reasonable" warning under Proposition 65.

17 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they
18 manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain the LISTED
19 CHEMICAL.

20 32. The LISTED CHEMICAL is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to
21 expose individuals through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

22 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and
23 continues to cause, consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposures are
24 defined by title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25602(b).

25 34. DEFENDANTS have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use
26 of the PRODUCTS exposes individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact
27 and/or ingestion.

28

1 reasonable warning” as defined by title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25601
2 *et seq.*, as to the harms associated with exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL;


3 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and

4 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

5
6 Dated: September 12, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,

7 THE CHANLER GROUP

8
9 By: 

10 Christopher Tuttle
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
12 LAURENCE VINOCUR
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28