

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

OCT 26 2017

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By *Janie Thomas*
JANIE THOMAS, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

11 ANTHONY FERREIRO,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 POLARIS INDUSTRIES, INC.,
15 Defendant.

Case No.: **RG17880148**
**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**
**(Violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.5
et seq.)**

17 Plaintiff Anthony Ferreiro ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, alleges the
18 following cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

19 **BACKGROUND OF THE CASE**

20 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to
21 enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified
22 at the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq* ("Proposition 65"), which reads, in relevant part,
23 "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
24 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first
25 giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...". Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

26 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest
27 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health
28

BY FAX

1 hazards caused by exposure to Diisononyl phthalate (DINP), a toxic chemical found in Cycle
2 Country Hot Thermal Grips manufactured, sold and/or distributed in California by defendant
3 Polaris Industries, Inc. (“Polaris” 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[s] or threaten[s] to violate” the statute. Health &
17 Safety Code § 25249.7.

18 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant produces, manufactures, distributes, imports, sells,
19 and/or offers for sale in California, without the required warning, handlebar grips, including but
20 not limited to, Cycle Country Hot Thermal Grips, UPC No. 6 6010300694 3 (“Product” or
21 “Products”), that contain DINP.

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

26 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition
27 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

28

1 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring
2 Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the Product with the required warnings related to the
3 dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DINP pursuant to Health and Safety
4 Code § 25249.7(a).

5 **PARTIES**

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

10 11. Defendant, through its subsidiary Kolpin Outdoors, Inc. (“Kolpin”), effectively
11 manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of
12 California, or it implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or
13 offers the Product for sale or use in the State of California.

14 12. Defendant Polaris is a “person” in the course of doing business within the
15 meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

16 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

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

26 15. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because it is either a citizen of the
27 State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is registered
28 with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business in the

1 State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market.
2 Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts
3 consistent and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4 **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

5 16. On May 11, 2017, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety
6 Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Polaris via Kolpin concerning the exposure of California
7 citizens to DINP contained in the Product without proper warning, subject to a private action to
8 Polaris and to the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District
9 attorneys and City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons
10 wherein the herein violations allegedly occurred.

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

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

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

22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

1 22. The Product contains DINP, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65
2 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

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

4 24. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times
5 herein, and at least since July 15, 2016, continuing until the present, that Polaris has continued to
6 knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to DINP
7 without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

8 25. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,
9 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the product. Consequently, the primary route of
10 exposure to these chemicals is through dermal exposure. Dermal exposure through the user's
11 bare hands is expected when the wire is handled during installation or manipulation of the grip
12 wiring. Finally, while mouthing of the product does not seem likely, some amount of exposure
13 through ingestion can occur by handling the product with subsequent touching of the user's hand
14 to mouth.

15 26. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will
16 continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to Product purchasers and
17 users or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Product.

18 27. Defendant has knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
19 Product exposes individuals to DINP, and Defendant intends that exposures to DINP will occur
20 by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution,
21 sale and offering of the Product to consumers in California

22 28. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this
23 Complaint.

24 29. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above
25 described acts, Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation.

26 30. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically
27 authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant.

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant and requests the following relief:

- A. That the court assess civil penalties against Defendant in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b);
- B. That the court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant mandating Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Product;
- C. That the court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit.
- D. That the court grant any further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: October 25, 2017

BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC

By: 

Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)
Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)
9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Telephone: (877) 534-2590
Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

Attorneys for Plaintiff