

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff PETER
3 ENGLANDER in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the
4 People’s right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to di(2-
5 ethylhexyl)phthalate (“DEHP”), a toxic chemical found in gloves sold by defendants in
6 California.

7 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants’ continuing failure to
8 warn California citizens and other individuals about the risks of exposure to DEHP present in
9 and on gloves manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers and other
10 individuals throughout the State of California.

11 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on the gloves that defendants
12 manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers and other individuals throughout the
13 State of California.

14 4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at
15 Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of
16 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to
17 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable
18 warning to such individual . . .” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

19 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on October 24, 2003, California identified and listed
20 DEHP as a chemical known to cause birth defects (and reproductive harm). DEHP became
21 subject to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements of the act one year later on October
22 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &
23 25249.10(b).

24 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and/or offer for sale without
25 health hazard warnings in California, gloves containing DEHP including, but not limited to, the
26 *Truck Stuff Hi-Visibility Work Gloves/Wild Wear Hi-Vis Deluxe Mechanics Glove, RN #119514,*
27 *UPC #0 98974 72518 0.* All gloves containing DEHP that are manufactured, distributed, sold
28

1 and/or offered for sale by defendants in the State of California are referred to collectively
2 hereinafter as “PRODUCTS.”

3 7. Defendants’ failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of
4 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP in conjunction with
5 defendants’ sales of the PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants,
6 and each of them, to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation.
7 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

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

12 9. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil
13 penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

14 **PARTIES**

15 10. Plaintiff PETER ENGLANDER is a citizen of the State of California who is
16 dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of
17 toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public interest
18 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 11. Defendant HI-WAY DISTRIBUTING CORP. OF AMERICA (“HI-WAY”) is a
20 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections
21 25249.6 and 25249.11.

22 12. HI-WAY manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS
23 for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,
24 distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

25 13. Defendants DOES 1-50 (“MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS”) are each a
26 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections
27 25249.6 and 25249.11.

28

1 14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
2 and manufacture, or imply by their conduct that they research, test, design, assemble, fabricate,
3 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of
4 California.

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

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

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

14 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the
15 State of California.

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

21 20. HI-WAY, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR
22 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, where appropriate, collectively be
23 referred to as “DEFENDANTS.”

24
25
26
27
28

1 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

2 21. Venue is proper in Marin County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil
3 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,
4 because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of
5 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
6 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Marin County with respect to
7 the PRODUCTS.

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

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

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

26 26. Proposition 65 states, “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall
27 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause
28

1 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
2 individual . . .” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

3 27. On May 31, 2017, plaintiff served a 60-day Notice of Violation (the “Notice”),
4 together with the requisite certificate of merit, on HI-WAY and certain public enforcement
5 agencies alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS’ sales of the PRODUCTS containing
6 DEHP, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to DEHP resulting
7 from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and
8 users first having been provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms
9 associated with such exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

10 28. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS
11 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS’
12 violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff’s Notice. DEFENDANTS’ violations
13 are ongoing and continuous in nature, and, as such, will continue in the future.

14 29. After receiving plaintiff’s Notice, none of the appropriate public enforcement
15 agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against DEFENDANTS
16 under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the subject of plaintiff’s Notice.

17 30. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and
18 offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably
19 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by
20 consumers and other individuals in California are not exempt from the “clear and reasonable”
21 warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no warning.

22 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they
23 manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California contained
24 DEHP.

25 32. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals
26 to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

27
28

1 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and
2 continues to cause, consumer exposures to DEHP, as defined by title 27 of the California Code
3 of Regulations, section 25602(b).

4 34. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of
5 the PRODUCTS exposed individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

6 35. DEFENDANTS intended that exposures to DEHP from the reasonably
7 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation
8 in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or
9 use to consumers and other individuals in California.

10 36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and reasonable warning” to those
11 consumers and other individuals in California who were or who would become exposed to
12 DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS.

13 37. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted
14 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or
15 ingestion as a result of their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS sold without a “clear
16 and reasonable” health hazard warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm
17 for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

18 38. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the
19 above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day
20 for each violation.

21 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code
22 section 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
23 DEFENDANTS.

24
25
26
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


PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;
2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP;
3. That the Court, Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain of commerce in California without a “clear and reasonable warning” as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 *et seq.*;
4. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and
5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: November 16, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,
THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 
Troy C. Bailey
Attorneys for Plaintiff
PETER ENGLANDER