ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

SFP 0 7 2018

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

Plaintiff,

Defendant.

SUE PESKO The state of the second of the

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

VS.

SASHA HANDBAGS, INC.,

6

4

5

7

8

9

GABRIEL ESPINOSA, 10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

22 23

21

24 25

26 27

28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Case No.:

的最佳的专业分别至5

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF

(Violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq.)

Plaintiff Gabriel Espinosa ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, alleges the following cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

- Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to 1. enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq ("Proposition 65"), which reads, in relevant part, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...". Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.
- This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest 2. of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposure di-n-butyl phthalate (DBP) and lead, toxic chemicals found in shoes and sandals sold and/or distributed by defendant Sasha Handbags, Inc. ("Sasha Handbags" or "Defendant") in California.

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

- 3. DBP and lead are harmful chemicals known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity and/or cancer. On December 5, 2005, and on February 27, 1987, the State of California listed DBP and lead, respectively, as chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity and each chemical 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). Additionally, on October 1, 1992, the State of California listed lead as a chemical known to cause cancer.
- 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. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant manufactures, distributes and/or offers for sale in California, without a requisite exposure warning, shoes and sandals (the "Products") that expose persons to DBP and lead.
- 7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to DBP and lead 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. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring

 Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the Products with required warnings related to the

dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DBP and lead pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

PARTIES

- 10. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and to improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. He brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 11. Defendant Sasha Handbags, through its business, effectively manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.
- 12. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Sasha Handbags is a "person" in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 13. Venue is proper in the County of Alameda because one or more of the instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur in this county and/or because Defendant conducted, and continues to conduct, business in the County of Alameda with respect to the Products.
- 14. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the enforcement of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit.
- 15. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant is either a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is 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

- 16. On June 5, 2018, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendant concerning the exposure of California citizens to DBP and lead 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 herein violations allegedly occurred.
- 17. 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 DBP and lead exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private action.
- 18. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's 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. Plaintiff is 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. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 21. Defendant has, at all times mentioned herein, acted as manufacturer, distributer, and/or retailer of the Product.
- 22. The Products contain DBP and lead, hazardous chemicals found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

10

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25 26

2728

The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

- 24. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since January 16, 2018, continuing until the present, that Defendant has continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to DBP and lead without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.
- The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase, 25. acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Product. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals is through dermal exposure. Dermal exposure through the hands is possible when the user manipulates and grasps the sandals with bare hands. If the Products are worn with bare feet, the strap will be in constant contact with the top of the user's foot and dermal exposure will occur. Should the Products be worn in water or handled with wet hands, aqueous phthalate skin permeation rates have been reported to be faster than neat phthalate permeation. If the Products are worn over closing, these articles of clothing are likely to absorb DBP/lead during use. The contaminated articles of clothing will continue to be a source of dermal transfer after the sandals are removed. If the Products are stored or transported in a carrier, DBP/lead that leaches from the sandals may contaminate other articles contained within these closed spaces that are subsequently handled, worn, or ingested by the user. DBP/lead can also be transferred to soil or dirt on the exterior of the Products, this DBP/lead containing sole can potentially be resuspended in the air and ingested. Finally, while mouthing of the Products does not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by handling the Products 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 DBP and lead, and Defendant intends that exposures to DBP and lead will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale and offering of the Products to consumers in California