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

Mary France

27

28

found in underbed storage boxes/bags/containers manufactured by Ningbo General Union Co., Ltd. sold and/or distributed by defendant Ross Stores, Inc. ("Ross Stores" or "Defendant") in California.

- 3. DEHP is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. On January 1, 1988, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to the State to cause cancer 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). On October 24, 2003, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity.
- 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 or threaten to violate" the statute. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 6. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant distributes and/or offers for sale in California, without a requisite exposure warning, underbed boot bags, Under-the-Bed shoe organizers, and Under-the-Bed storage bags (collectively, the "Products") that expose persons to DEHP.
- 7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to DEHP in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendant to the enjoinment and civil penalties described herein.
- 8. Plaintiffs seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is

This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant is either a citizen

27

28

15.

registered with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business in the State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market. Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMNTS

- On March 19, 2018, March 20, 2018, and July 26, 2018, plaintiffs Velarde, Bell and Ferreiro, respectively, gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (collectively, the "Notices") to Defendant concerning the exposure of California citizens to DEHP contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendant and to the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District attorneys and City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the
- The Notices complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiffs' counsel had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding DEHP exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private action.
- 18. After receiving the Notices, and to Plaintiffs' best information and belief, none of the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against Defendant under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are the subject of Plaintiff's notice of violation.
- 19. Plaintiffs are commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the Notice to Defendant, as required by law.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

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

28

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

21. Defendant has, at all times mentioned herein, acted as a distributer and/or retailer of the Product.

- 22. The Products contain DEHP, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.
 - 23. The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.
- 24. Plaintiffs, based on their best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since August 5, 2017, continuing until the present, that Defendant has continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to DEHP 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 Products. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals is through dermal absorption. Users may potentially be exposed to DEHP by dermal absorption through direct skin contact with the Products during routine use when the Products are manipulated with bare hands. The Products can be expected to emit gas phase DEHP into the air and accumulate DEHP at the surface over the lifetime of the Products. Concentrations of gas phase DEHP can potentially be absorbed to the surface of the interior contents that are subsequently handled, worn in direct contact with skin, mouthed, or ingested by the user. If the Products are stored in a drawer, DEHP that leaches from the Products may contaminate other articles contained within the storage space that are subsequently handled, worn, or ingested by the user. Finally, while mouthing of the Products does not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by touching the Products with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.
- 26. Plaintiffs, based on their best information and belief, avers that such exposures will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users of the Products, or until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Products.
- 27. Defendant has knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products exposes individuals to DEHP, and Defendant intends that exposures to DEHP will

28