1 2 3 4 5	Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352) Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113) BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Telephone: (877) 534-2590 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160	MAY 0 1 2018 CLEEK OF 16 14 CANTAGOR COURT By
6	Thorneys for Framing	to the second of the second o
7 8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
9		
10		
11	ANTHONY FERREIRO,	Case No.: (618903154
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF
13	v. RDI-USA, INC.,	(Violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.5
14	Defendant.	et seq.)
15 16	Boiondail.	
17		
18	Plaintiff Anthony Ferreiro ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, alleges the following cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.	
19		
20	BACKGROUND OF THE CASE	
21	1. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to	
22	enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified	
23	at the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq ("Proposition 65"), which reads, in relevant part,	
24	"[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any	
25	individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first	
26	giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual". Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.	
27	2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interes	
28	of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health	
		1

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF – VIOLATION OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5

hazards caused by exposure to Bisphenol A (BPA), a toxic chemical found in polycarbonate tableware and serving dishes manufactured, sold and/or distributed in California by defendant RDI-USA, Inc. ("Thunder" or "Defendant") in California.

- 3. BPA is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to reproductive toxicity. On May 11, 2015, the State of California listed BPA as a chemical known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).
- 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations. Included in such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing a Proposition 65-listed chemical with a "clear and reasonable" warning before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing any person to it.
- 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation to be imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the actions of a defendant which "violate[s] or threaten[s] to violate" the statute. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and/or offers for sale in California, without the required Proposition 65 exposure warning, polycarbonate tableware and serving dishes, including coffee decanters ("Product" or "Products") that contain BPA.
- 7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to BPA in conjunction with the sale, manufacture, and/or distribution of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendant to the enjoinment and civil penalties described herein.
- 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business in the

28

Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

- The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff's counsel had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding
- After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's best information and belief, none of 18. the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against Thunder under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are the subject of Plaintiff's notice of violation.
- Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the 19. Notice to Thunder, as required by law.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

- 20. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- Defendant has, at all times mentioned herein, acted as manufacturer, distributer, 21. and/or retailer of the Product.

28

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.7

private action.

6

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25 26

27

- The Products contain BPA, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list 22. of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.
 - The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements. 23.
- Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times 24. herein, and at least since May 18, 2017, continuing until the present, that Thunder has continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products to BPA without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.
- 25. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of the product. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals is through oral ingestion. The polycarbonate tested is expected to be in contact with hot liquids, such as coffee, during normal expected use and thus BPA can leach from the polycarbonate plastic into liquids that come into contact with the polycarbonate. Extraction of BPA may be enhanced into liquids when the coffee decanter contains liquids at elevated temperatures or when the decanter contains alcohol or milk. When BPA contaminated liquids contained in the decanter are consumed, oral ingestion of BPA will result. Over time, it is expected that the polycarbonate will be exposed to hot water and abrasion during hand and/or machine washing and future BPA leaching rates can be expected to increase with continued exposure to hot water and washing cycles. Washing the product with hard water and/or dishwashing soaps at elevated pH will result in higher extraction rates of BPA with subsequent uses of the decanter. Dermal exposure to BPA will occur when the polycarbonate is handled with bare hands during normal expected use and cleaning. Finally, some amount of exposure to BPA through ingestion can occur by handling the product, with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.
- 26. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to Product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Product.
- 27. Defendant has knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Product exposes individuals to BPA, and Defendant intends that exposures to BPA will occur by

28