

**FAXED**

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

Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436  
Christopher F. Tuttle, State Bar No. 264545  
**THE CHANLER GROUP**  
2560 Ninth Street  
Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
Telephone: (510) 848-8880  
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118  
ctuttle@chanler.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
PETER ENGLANDER

**FILED**  
San Francisco County Superior Court

NOV 20 2017

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: [Signature]  
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

PETER ENGLANDER,

Plaintiff,

v.

TOO GOOD GOURMET, INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **CGC - 17 - 562573**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.*)

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1  
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 about exposures to lead, a toxic chemical that is found in mugs  
5 with exterior designs sold in California.

6           2.     By this Complaint, Plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants’ continuing failure to  
7 warn California citizens about the risks of exposures to lead present in and on the mugs with  
8 exterior designs manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers throughout  
9 the State of California.

10          3.     Detectable levels of lead are commonly found in and on the mugs with exterior  
11 designs that defendants import, manufacture, distribute, ship, sell and offer for sale to  
12 consumers throughout the State of California.

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

18          5.     On February 27, 1987, pursuant to Proposition 65, California identified and listed  
19 lead as a chemical known to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm. Lead became  
20 subject to the “clear and reasonable warning” requirements of the act one year later on February  
21 27, 1988. (Cal. Code Regs., Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &  
22 25249.10(b).)

23          6.     Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without  
24 warning in California, mugs with exterior designs containing lead, including, but not limited to,  
25 the *Too Good Dark Chocolate Cocoa Mix and Mug Set*, UPC #6 59422 22255 4. All such  
26 mugs with exterior designs containing lead are referred to collectively hereinafter as the  
27 “PRODUCTS”.  
28



1 and manufacture one or more of the PRODUCTS offered for sale or use in the State of  
2 California.

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

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

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

12 18. RETAILER DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the  
13 State of California.

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

19 20. ~~TWO GOOD, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR~~  
20 DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS are hereinafter collectively referred to as  
21 "DEFENDANTS."

22 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

23 21. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, pursuant to Code of Civil  
24 Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction,  
25 because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more instances of  
26 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because  
27  
28

1 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in San Francisco county with  
2 respect to the PRODUCTS.

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

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

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

21 26. Proposition 65 states, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall  
22 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause  
23 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
24 individual . . . ." Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

25 27. On August 1, 2017, Plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, together with the  
26 requisite certificate of merit, was provided to TOO GOOD, and the requisite public enforcement  
27 agencies stating that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS containing lead,  
28

1 workers, consumers and other individuals in the State of California are being exposed to lead  
2 resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual  
3 purchasers and users first having received a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such  
4 toxic exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

5 28. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale,  
6 and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section  
7 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS' violations have continued to occur beyond their receipt of  
8 plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. As such, DEFENDANTS' violations are ongoing and  
9 continuous in nature, and, unless enjoined, will continue to occur in the future.

10 29. After receiving plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, the appropriate public  
11 enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action  
12 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

13 30. The PRODUCTS manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale  
14 or use in California by DEFENDANTS contain lead in such a way that the reasonably  
15 foreseeable uses of these products result in exposures that require a "clear and reasonable"  
16 warning under Proposition 65.

17 31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they  
18 manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain lead.

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

21 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and  
22 continues to cause, consumer exposures to lead, as such exposures are defined by title 27 of the  
23 California Code of Regulations, section 25602(b).

24 34. DEFENDANTS have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use  
25 of the PRODUCTS exposes individuals to lead through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

26 35. DEFENDANTS intend for such exposures to lead from the reasonably  
27 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS to occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in  
28

1 the manufacture, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to  
2 individuals in the State of California.

3 36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those  
4 workers, consumers and other individuals in California who have been, or will be, exposed to  
5 lead.

6 37. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted  
7 directly by California voters, consumers, and other individuals exposed to lead through dermal  
8 contact and/or ingestion, resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS sold  
9 by DEFENDANTS without a "clear and reasonable warning," have suffered, and continue to  
10 suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

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

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

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

19 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code ~~section 25249.7(b)~~, assess  
20 civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for  
21 each violation;

22 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a),  
23 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, or  
24 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and  
25 reasonable warning" as defined by title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25601  
26 *et seq.*, as to the harms associated with exposures to lead;


27 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and  
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

4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: November 17, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP



By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher Tuttle  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
PETER ENGLANDER