ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

ALAMEDA COUNTY JUN Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq. (SBN 268104) LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL N. GREENBAUM 1 SUPERIOR COURT CLERK OF THE The Hathaway Building Deputy 7120 Hayvenhurst Ave., Suite 320 Van Nuys CA 91406 Telephone: (818) 809-2199 3 Facsimile: (424) 243-7689 Email: dgreenbaum@greenbaumlawfirm.com 5 Attorney for Shefa LMV, INC. 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 9 10 SHEFA LMV, INC., **Unlimited Jurisdiction** 11 Plaintiff, 12 CASE NO. RG18907968 vs. 13 SUMMIT CE GROUP; SUMMIT COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTY AND ELECTRONICS LLC; and DOES 1 through 14 INJUNCTIVE RELIEF 100, Inclusive, Defendants. 15 (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.) 16 TOXIC TORT/ENVIRONMENTAL 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff, Shefa LMV, INC., hereby alleges:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 1. This complaint seeks to remedy the failure of Defendants to warn persons of exposure to Diisononyl Phthalate ("DINP"), a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
- 2. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 (commonly known as "Proposition 65") businesses must provide persons with a "clear and reasonable warning" before exposing individuals to chemicals known to the state to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm.
- 3. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant(s) failed to provide such warning before exposing individuals to DINP.

II. PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff is a non-profit public benefit corporation formed pursuant to the laws of the State of California, made up of California citizens, represented by and through its counsel of record, the Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum.
- 5. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d) provides that actions to enforce Proposition 65 may be brought by "any person in the public interest."
- 6. Defendant SUMMIT CE GROUP is a business entity with ten or more employees that sells, or has, at times relevant to this complaint, authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of headphones, including, but not limited to, CVH-814-BLU Coby® Alto Stereo Headphones; ID: 1259 032089110; UPC: 812180023546, that contain DINP, for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.
- 7. Defendant SUMMIT ELECTRONICS LLC is a business entity with ten or more employees that sells, or has, at times relevant to this complaint, authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of headphones, including, but not limited to, CVH-814-BLU Coby® Alto Stereo Headphones; ID: 1259 032089110; UPC: 812180023546, that contain DINP, for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.

- 8. The identities of DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, Plaintiff suspects they are business entities with at least ten or more employees that at all times relevant to this complaint, authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of headphones, including, but not limited to, CVH-814-BLU Coby® Alto Stereo Headphones; ID:1259–032089110;UPC: 812180023546, that contain DINP, for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.
- 9. Defendants named in paragraphs 6 through 8 have at all times relevant to this complaint, authorized the manufacture, distribution, or sale of headphones, including, but not limited to, CVH-814-BLU Coby® Alto Stereo Headphones; ID:1259–032089110;UPC: 812180023546, that contain DINP (hereinafter "PRODUCTS"), for sale within the State of California, without first giving clear and reasonable warning.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts.
- 11. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants, because they are business entities that do sufficient business, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market, through the sale, marketing, and use of its products in California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 12. Venue is proper in this Court because the cause, or part thereof, arises in Alameda County because Defendant's products are sold and consumed in this county.

IV. STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 13. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 is an initiative statute passed as "Proposition 65" by a vote of the people in November of 1986.
- 14. The warning requirement of Proposition 65 is contained in Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, which provides:

No 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, except as provided in Section 25249.10.

- 15. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one "which results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service." (27 CCR 25602(b))
- 16. Proposition 65 establishes a procedure by which the State develops a list of chemicals "known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity." (Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.)
- 17. No warning must be provided concerning a listed chemical until twelve (12) months after the chemical first appears on the list. (Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(b).)
- 18. Any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7.)
- 19. Proposition 65 defines to "threaten to violate" as "to create a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur." (Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(e).)
- 20. In addition, violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation, recoverable in a civil action. (Health & Safety Code § 25249.7 (b).)
- 21. Actions to enforce the law "may be brought by the Attorney General in the name of the People of the State of California [or] by any district attorney [or] by any City Attorney of a City having a population in excess of 750,000 . . ." (Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(c).)
- 22. Private parties are given authority to enforce Proposition 65 "in the public interest," but only if the private party first provides written notice of a violation to the alleged violator, the Attorney General, and every District Attorney in whose jurisdiction the alleged violation occurs.
- 23. If no public prosecutors commence enforcement within sixty (60) days, then the private party may sue. (Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).)

V. FACTS

- 24. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") is the California agency tasked (in part) with providing the regulatory and scientific framework for Proposition 65.
- 25. OEHHA placed DINP on the list of chemicals known to California to cause cancer on December 20, 2013. (27 CCR 27001(b))

- 26. Defendants SUMMIT CE GROUP and SUMMIT ELECTRONICS LLC Are the manufacturer(s) and distributor(s) of the PRODUCTS for use by individuals in the home and other endeavors.
- 27. The PRODUCTS are sold through various retailers located in California for use by citizens of the State of California.
- 28. On April 02, 2017, Plaintiff purchased the PRODUCT from a retail location in California.
- 29. On May 5, 2017, Plaintiff's expert prepared a report summarizing the results of analysis on the PRODUCTS, including the amount of the DINP in the product.
- 30. Based on the levels found in analysis, Plaintiff's expert opined the use of the PRODUCTS would lead to exposure to DINP above the safe harbor levels set by the Office of Environment Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA).
- 31. Based on that report and opinion, Plaintiff and its counsel prepared a Notice of Violation.
- 32. Pursuant to the statute and regulations referenced above, on May 26, 2017 Plaintiff served the Notice of Violation on the Office of the Attorney General, Defendant, as well as all required public agencies.
 - 33. Plaintiff is unaware of any governmental prosecution against Defendant.
 - 34. At least sixty (60) days have elapsed since service of the Notice of Violation.
- 35. Based upon consultation with experts, Plaintiff alleges that individuals who purchase, handle, or use the PRODUCTS are exposed to DINP chiefly through:
 - a. contact between the item and the skin;
 - b. transfer of DINP from the skin to the mouth, both by transfer of DINP directly from the hand to mouth, and indirectly by transfer of DINP from the skin to objects that are placed in the mouth, such as food or cigarettes; and
 - c. through direct absorption of DINP through the skin.

- 36. Such individuals are thereby exposed to the DINP that is present on or in the PRODUCTS during the intended and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 37. At all times material to this complaint, Defendants have had knowledge that the PRODUCTS contain DINP and that an individual's skin may contact DINP through the intended and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 38. At all times material to this complaint, Defendants have had knowledge that individuals within the State of California handle the PRODUCTS, which contain DINP.
- 39. At all times material to this complaint, Defendants knew that the PRODUCTS were sold throughout the State of California in large numbers, and Defendants profited from such sales.
- 40. Notwithstanding this knowledge, Defendants intentionally authorized and reauthorized the sale of the PRODUCTS, thereby exposing consumers to DINP.
- 41. At all times material to this complaint, therefore, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals within the State of California to DINP.
- 42. The exposure is knowing and intentional because it is the result of the Defendants' deliberate act of authorizing the sale of products known to contain DINP, in a manner whereby these products were, and would inevitably be, sold to consumers within the state of California, and with the knowledge that the intended use of this PRODUCTS would result in exposures to DINP by individuals within the State of California.
- 43. Defendants have failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings that the use of the PRODUCTS in question in California results in exposure to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm, and no such warning was provided to those individuals by any other person.

VI. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Violation of Proposition 65)

- 44. Paragraphs 1 through 43 are re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 45. By committing the acts alleged above, Defendants have, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals in California to chemicals known to the