ENDORSED Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352) Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113) FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900 FEB 0 7 2019 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Telephone: (877) 534-2590 4 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 9 Case No.: RG19005991 10 ANTHONY FERREIRO, COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND 11 Plaintiff, INJUNCTIVE RELEIF (Violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et 12 VS. seq.) 13 **BRIGGS MEDICAL SERVICE** COMPANY, OFFICEMAX 14 INCORPORATED, 15 Defendants. 16 Plaintiff Anthony Ferreiro ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, alleges the 17 following cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California. 18 BACKGROUND OF THE CASE 19 Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to 1. 20 enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified 21 at the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq ("Proposition 65"), which reads, in relevant part, 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 24 giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...". Health & Safety Code § 25249.6. 25 This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest 2. 26 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health 27 hazards caused by exposure diisononyl phthalate (DINP), a toxic chemical found in DMS 28 inflatable seat cushions sold and/or distributed by defendants Briggs Medical Service Company

("Briggs Medical") and OfficeMax Incorporated ("OfficeMax") (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, DMS inflatable seat cushions (the "Products") that expose users 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. He brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 11. Defendants Briggs Medical, 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 Briggs Medical is a "person" in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 12. Defendants OfficeMax, 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 imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. Plaintiff alleges that defendant OfficeMax 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 conduct, 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 August 23, 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 Plaintiff's notice of violation.
- 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 Defendants 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.

- 12
- 13
- 14

- 21
- 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.
 - The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements. 23.
- 24. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since July 11, 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 exposure. Dermal exposure through the user's hands is possible during positioning and manipulation of the Product. During normal expected use, the Product will be in contact with the user's buttocks and the back of the user's legs and will be in contact with either bare, exposed skin or the user's clothing. In the case of bare, exposed skin, dermal exposure is possible. DINP from the Product can absorb to the user's clothing or the furniture it is placed upon and the DINP contaminated articles of clothing and/or furniture will continue to be a source of dermal DINP transfer after the Product is removed. If the Product is stored or transported in a carrier, DINP that leaches from the Product may contaminate other articles contained within these closed spaces are subsequently handled, worn, mouthed, or consumed. Finally, while mouthing of the Product does not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by handling the Product 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. 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