1 2 3	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	ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY JUN 1 9 2019	
4	Facsimile: (310) 247-0160	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By Jamin Man	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff	JANUE THOMAS, Deputy	
6			
7 8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		
10	DDECH A DALADDO	Case No.: RG19023573	
11	PRECILA BALABBO, Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF	
12	Vs.	(Violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et	
13	LIKE DREAMS, INC., ROSS STORES,	seq.)	
14	INC.,		
15	Defendant,		
16	Plaintiff Precila Balabbo ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, alleges the following cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.		
17			
18		UND OF THE CASE	
19	11		
20:	1		
21	ii a can		
22	"[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any		
23	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.		
24			
25		ative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest	
26	of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposure to dissononyl phthalate (DINP), a toxic chemical found in Like		
27	nazards caused by exposure to disononyl ph	ithalate (DINP), a toxic chemical found in Like	
28		_1	
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELEIF – VIOLATION OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5		

Dreams totes/bags/cases/pouches sold and/or distributed by defendants Like Dreams, Inc. ("Like Dreams") and Ross Stores, Inc. ("Ross Stores") (collectively, "Defendants") in California.

- 3. DINP is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. On December 20, 2013, the State of California listed DINP 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
- 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 Defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale in California, without a requisite exposure warning, Like Dreams totes/bags/cases/pouches (the "Products") that expose persons to DINP.
- 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to DINP in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendants to the enjoinment and civil penalties described herein.
- 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).
- 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring

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

dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DINP 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. She brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- Defendant Like Dreams, 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. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Like Dreams is a "person" in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 12. Defendant Ross Stores, through its business, effectively 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. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Ross Stores 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 Defendants conducted, and continue 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 Defendants because each 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 20, 2018, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to DINP contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants 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 DINP 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 Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are the subject of the Notice.
- 19. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the Notice to Defendants, 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.

7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

- 21. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as either a manufacturer, distributer, and/or retailer of the Product.
- 22. The Products contain DINP, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.
 - 23. The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.
- 24. Plaintiff, based on her best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since June 20, 2018, continuing until the present, that Defendants have continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to DINP 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 dermal absorption. Users may be exposed to DINP by dermal absorption through direct skin contact with the Product during routine use when the Product is manipulated with bare hands. If the Product is handled with wet hands or the plastic is wet, aqueous HMWP skin permeation rates have been reported to be faster than neat HMWP permeation. Concentrations of gas phase DINP can be expected to build within the enclosed interior of the Product. This gas phase DINP can potentially be absorbed to the surface of the interior contents that are subsequently handled, worn, mouthed or ingested by the user. If the Product is stored or transported in a carrier, DINP that leaches from the item may contaminate other articles contained within these closed spaces that are subsequently handled, worn, mouthed, or ingested by the user. Finally, while mouthing of the Product does not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by touching the Product with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.
- 26. Plaintiff, based on her 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. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Product exposes individuals to DINP, and Defendants intend that exposures to DINP will occur

1	by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution,		
2	sale and offering of the Products to consumers in California		
3	3 28. Plaintiff has engaged	in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this	
4	4 Complaint.		
5	5 29. Pursuant to Health at	nd Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above	
6	described acts, Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation.		
7	30. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically		
8			
9			
10			
11			
12		t assess civil penalties against each Defendant in the amount	
13		day for each violation in accordance with Health and Safety	
14	Code § 25249	9.7(b);	
15	B. That the cour	t preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants	
16	mandating Pr	roposition 65 compliant warnings on the Product;	
17	C. That the cour	t grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit.	
18	D. That the cour	t grant any further relief as may be just and proper.	
19	III.		
20	20 Dated: June 19, 2019	BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC	
21	21	By:	
22	22	Evan J. Smith (SBN242352) Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)	
23		9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900	
		Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Telephone: (877) 534-2590	
24	24	Facsimile: (310) 247-0160	
25	25	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
26	26	Anomeys for 1 turniff	
27	27		
	11		