

1 Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)  
Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)  
2 BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC  
9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900  
3 Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Telephone: (877) 534-2590  
4 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

ENDORSED  
FILED  
ALAMEDA COUNTY

MAY 01 2013

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  
By CURTIAN GANTER  
Deputy

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
8 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

10 ANTHONY FERREIRO,  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 vs.  
13 DELFONICS CO., LTD.,  
14 Defendant.

Case No.: PG18903146  
**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF**  
**(Violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.5  
et seq.)**

18 Plaintiff Anthony Ferreiro ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, alleges the  
19 following cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

20 **BACKGROUND OF THE CASE**

**BY FAX**

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 interest  
28 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health

1 hazards caused by exposure to Diisononyl phthalate (DINP), a toxic chemical found in Delfonics  
2 purses, bags, pouches and totes sold and/or distributed by defendant Delfonics Co., Ltd.  
3 (“Defendant”) in California.

4 3. DINP is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. On  
5 December 20, 2013, the State of California listed DINP as a chemical known to the State to  
6 cause cancer and DINP has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that  
7 time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).

8 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that  
9 operate within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations.  
10 Included in such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing  
11 a Proposition 65-listed chemical with a “clear and reasonable” warning before “knowingly and  
12 intentionally” exposing any person to it.

13 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation  
14 to be imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety  
15 Code § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin  
16 the actions of a defendant which “violate or threaten to violate” the statute. Health & Safety  
17 Code § 25249.7.

18 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant manufactures, distributes, imports, sells and/or  
19 offers for sale in California, without the requisite exposure warning, Delfonics purses, bags, totes  
20 and pouches including, but not limited to, Delfonics Quitterie C’est Mon Tresor Faux Leather  
21 Pouches (the “Products”) that expose persons to DINP.

22 7. Defendant’s failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the  
23 health hazards associated with exposure to DINP in conjunction with the sale, manufacture,  
24 and/or distribution of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendant to the  
25 enjoinder and civil penalties described herein.

26 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition  
27 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

28

1 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring  
2 Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the Product with the required warnings related to the  
3 dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DINP pursuant to Health and Safety  
4 Code § 25249.7(a).

5 **PARTIES**

6 10. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general  
7 public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and  
8 to improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. He brings  
9 this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

10 11. Defendant, through its business, effectively manufactures, imports, distributes,  
11 sells, and/or offers the Product for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its  
12 conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Product for sale or use  
13 in the State of California.

14 12. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant is a “person” in the course of doing business  
15 within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

16 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

17 13. Venue is proper in the County of Alameda because one or more of the instances  
18 of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur in this county and/or because Defendant  
19 conducted, and continues to conduct, business in the County of Alameda with respect to the  
20 Product.

21 14. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution  
22 Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those  
23 given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the  
24 enforcement of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore,  
25 this Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

26 15. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because it is either a citizen of the  
27 State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is registered  
28 with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business in the

1 State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market.  
2 Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts  
3 consistent and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4 **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

5 16. On August 22, 2017, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and  
6 Safety Code § 25249.6 (the “Notice”) to Defendant concerning the exposure of California  
7 citizens to DINP contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to  
8 Defendant and to the California Attorney General’s office and the offices of the County District  
9 attorneys and City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons  
10 wherein the herein violations allegedly occurred.

11 17. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including  
12 the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff’s counsel had consulted with at  
13 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding  
14 DINP exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a  
15 private action.

16 18. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff’s best information and belief, none of  
17 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted  
18 a cause of action against Defendant under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which  
19 are the subject of Plaintiff’s notice of violation.

20 19. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the  
21 Notice to Defendant, as required by law.

22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

24 20. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19 of  
25 this complaint as though fully set forth herein.

26 21. Defendant have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as manufacturer, distributor,  
27 and/or retailer of the Product.

28

1           22.     The Products contain DINP, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65  
2 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

3           23.     The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

4           24.     Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times  
5 herein, and at least since July 12, 2017, continuing until the present, that Defendant has  
6 continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product  
7 to DINP without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

8           25.     The exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase,  
9 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the product. Consequently, the primary route of  
10 exposure to these chemicals is through dermal absorption. Users may potentially be exposed to  
11 DINP by dermal absorption through direct handling of the black faux leather during insertion and  
12 removal of an item from the pouch. The product can be expected to emit gas phase DINP into  
13 the air and accumulate DINP at the surface of the item over the lifetime of the product. DINP  
14 levels can be expected to build within the zippered, closed interior of the pouch. DINP that  
15 leaches from the black faux leather may contaminate items in the pouch that are subsequently  
16 handled, worn in direct contact with skin, mouthed, or ingested by the user. If the pouch is  
17 stored or transported in a carrier, DINP that leaches from the black faux leather may contaminate  
18 other articles contained within the storage area or carrier that are subsequently handled, worn,  
19 mouthed, or ingested by the user. Finally, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur  
20 by handling the product with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

21           26.     Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will  
22 continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to Product purchasers and  
23 users or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Product.

24           27.     Defendant have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
25 Product exposes individuals to DINP, and Defendant intend that exposures to DINP will occur  
26 by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution,  
27 sale and offering of the Product to consumers in California  
28

1 28. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this  
2 Complaint.

3 29. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above  
4 described acts, Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation.

5 30. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically  
6 authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant.

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant and requests the  
9 following relief:

- 10 A. That the court assess civil penalties against Defendant in the amount of  
11 \$2,500 per day for each violation in accordance with Health and Safety  
12 Code § 25249.7(b);
- 13 B. That the court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant mandating  
14 Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Product;
- 15 C. That the court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit.
- 16 D. That the court grant any further relief as may be just and proper.

17 Dated: May 1, 2018

BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC

18 By:   
19 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)  
20 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)  
21 9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900  
22 Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
23 Telephone: (877) 534-2590  
24 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*