1 2 3 4 5 6	GLICK LAW GROUP, PC Noam Glick (SBN 251582) Kelsey McCarthy (SBN 305372) 225 Broadway, Suite 2100 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (619) 382-3400 Facsimile: (619) 615-2193 Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com Email: kelsey@glicklawgroup.com	ENDORSED FILED San Francisco County Superior Court SEP 25 2017 CLERK OF THE COURT BY: Deputy Clerk
7 8 9	Alex M. Tomasevic (SBN 245598) 225 Broadway, 19 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Diego, California 92101 Tel: (619) 325-0492 Fax: (619) 325-0496	
10 11	Attorneys for Plaintiff Kim Embry	
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
13	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
14	WIM DMDDV on individual	Case No.: CGC-17-561521
15	KIM EMBRY, an individual	
16	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
17	V.	(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)
18	BONIDE PRODUCTS, INC., a New York corporation, AMAZON.COM, INC., a	
19	Delaware corporation, CONTROL SOLUTIONS INC., a California corporation,	
20	SOLUTIONS PEST & LAWN a Texas corporation, PBI-GORDON CORPORATION, a Missouri corporation,	
21 22	TRACTOR SUPPLY COMPANY., a Delaware corporation, DOES 1 through 100,	
	inclusive,	
23	Defendants.	
24		
25		
26		BY FAX
27 28		ONE LEGAL LLC
20		

COMPLAINT

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California. Plaintiff seeks to enforce the People's right to be informed of the presence of Malathion, ("Listed Chemical") found in Martin's Malathion 57%, Bonide Malathion Insect Control Concentrate and Gordon's Malathion 50% Spray. All manufactured, imported, sold, or distributed for sale in California by Defendants.

2. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code Section 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...." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)

3. California identified and listed Malathion as a chemical known to cause cancer as early as May 20, 2016.

4. Bonide Malathion Insect Control Concentrate, Martin's Malathion 57%, and Gordon's Malathion 50% Spray are manufactured, imported, sold, or distributed in California contains prohibited levels of Malathion ("Products").

5. Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about potential exposure to Malathion in connection with Defendants' manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

6. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers in California before exposing them to Malathion in Products or other products containing Malathion pursuant to Proposition 65 and related Regulations. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).)

### II. <u>PARTIES</u>

Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of
 California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. She
 brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.

8. Defendant BONIDE PRODUCTS, INC., ("Bonide Products" or "Defendant") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York. Defendant is registered to do and does business in California, County of San Francisco, within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. Defendant manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes Products in California and San Francisco County.

9. Defendant PBI-GORDON CORPORATION, ("PBI- Gordon" or "Defendant") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Missouri. Defendant is registered to do and does business in California, County of San Francisco, within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. Defendant manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes Products in California and San Francisco County.

10. Defendant CONTROL SOLUTIONS INC. ("PBI- Gordon" or "Defendant") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Missouri. Defendant is registered to do and does business in California, County of San Francisco, within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. Defendant manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes Products in California and San Francisco County.

11. Defendant AMAZON.COM, INC. ("Amazon") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. Amazon does business in California, County of San Francisco, within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. Amazon manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes Products in California and San Francisco County.

12. Defendant TRACTOR SUPPLY COMPANY. ("Tractor Supply") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. Tractor Supply does business in California, County of San Francisco, within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. Tractor Supply manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes Products in California and San Francisco County.

Defendant SOLUTIONS PEST & LAWN. ("Solution Pest") is a corporation organized
and existing under the laws of the State of Texas. Solution Pest does business in California, County of
San Francisco, within the meaning of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11. Solution Pest
manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes Products in California and San Francisco County.

14. The true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff sues these Defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each fictitiously named defendant is responsible for the acts and occurrences herein alleged. When ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

15. At all times mentioned, Defendants were the agents, alter egos, servants, joint venturers, joint employers, or employees for each other. Defendants acted with the consent of the other Co-Defendants and acted within the course, purpose, and scope of their agency, service, or employment. All conduct was ratified by Defendants, and each of them.

### III. **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

16. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health & Safety Code statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. As such, this Court has jurisdiction.

17. Venue is proper in San Francisco County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

18. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise purposefully avails themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

#### IV. **CAUSES OF ACTION**

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)

19. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

20. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

26 21. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing Listed Chemical in violation of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed

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

and believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to occur into the future.

22. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed to the Listed Chemical through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

23. The presence of Listed Chemical in Products exposes individuals to the Listed Chemicals through dermal absorption, ingestion, and inhalation by consumers.

24. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained Listed Chemical and exposed individuals to Listed Chemical in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of Listed Chemical in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning Listed Chemical and related chemicals in consumer products, provided constructive notice to Defendants. By manufacturing, importing, distributing, and/or selling Products in California, Defendants should know that the Products contain Listed Chemical and that individuals who come into contact with Products will be exposed to Listed Chemicals.

25. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

26. On September 19<sup>,</sup> 2017, Plaintiff provided Defendants a 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. The Notice was provided to the various required public enforcement agencies and contained a certificate of merit. The Notice alleged that Defendant violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to Listed Chemical contained in the Products.

27. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.

28. Individuals exposed to Listed Chemicals contained in the Products through dermal absorption, ingestion, and inhalation resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and continue to suffer irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

1	29. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation	
2	of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also	
3	appropriate pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(a).	
4	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	
5	Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:	
6	1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;	
7	2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from manufacturing	
8	importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear	
9	and reasonable warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;	
10	3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and	
11	4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.	
12		
13	Dated: September 25, 2017GLICK LAW GROUP, PC	
14		
15	By: Noan Slich	
16	Noam Glick	
17	Kelsey McCarthy	
18	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
25 26		
20 27		
27		
20		