

1 Tanya E. Moore, SBN 206683
MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.
2 332 North Second Street
San Jose, California 95112
3 Telephone (408) 298-2000
Facsimile (408) 298-6046
4 E-mail: service@moorelawfirm.com

5 Attorney for Plaintiff
Safe Products for Californians, LLC
6

**Electronically Filed
by Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara,
on 5/1/2019 3:35 PM
Reviewed By: L Del Mundo
Case #18CV336498
Envelope: 2832166**

7
8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

10
11 SAFE PRODUCTS FOR CALIFORNIANS,) No. 18CV336498
LLC,)
12 Plaintiff,) **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR**
13 vs.) **CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE**
14 D & R SPORTS CENTER, INC.; BASS PRO) (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*)
15 OUTDOOR WORLD, L.L.C.; DICK'S)
SPORTING GOODS, INC.; CABELA'S LLC;)
16 TACKLE BOX DIRECT LLC; HERB REED)
17 LLC; DOES 2 THROUGH 150,)
18 Defendants.)
19

20 Plaintiff, SAFE PRODUCTS FOR CALIFORNIANS, LLC ("Plaintiff"), alleges as
21 follows:

22 **SUMMARY**

23 1. This is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest of the
24 citizens of the State of California to enforce the public's right to be informed of the health
25 hazards caused by exposures to di-isononyl phthalate ("DINP") and di-isodecyl phthalate
26 ("DIDP), toxic chemicals found in and on the products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold
27 by Defendants, D & R SPORTS CENTER, INC.; BASS PRO OUTDOOR WORLD, L.L.C.;
28 DICK'S SPORTING GOODS, INC.; CABELA'S LLC; TACKLE BOX DIRECT LLC; HERB

1 REED LLC, previously named as DOE 1; and DOES 2 THROUGH 150, inclusive
2 (collectively “Defendants”), as set forth below.

3 2. By this Complaint, Plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants’ continuing failure to
4 warn individuals not covered by California’s Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code
5 § 6300, *et seq.* (“OSHA”), who purchase, use, or handle Defendants’ products, about the risks
6 of exposure to DINP and DIDP present in and on the products manufactured, distributed, and
7 sold throughout the State of California. Individuals not covered by OSHA who purchase, use,
8 or handle Defendants’ products are referred to hereinafter as “Consumers.”

9 3. Detectable levels of DINP and DIDP are found in and on the soft plastic baits
10 that Defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to Consumers throughout the
11 State of California.

12 4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at
13 Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of
14 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to
15 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable
16 warning to such individual ...” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

17 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on December 20, 2013, California identified and
18 listed DINP as a chemical known to cause cancer. DINP became subject to the “clear and
19 reasonable warning” requirements of Proposition 65 one year later on December 20, 2014. Cal.
20 Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.

21 6. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on April 20, 2007, California identified and listed
22 DIDP as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity. DIDP became subject to the “clear
23 and reasonable warning” requirements of Proposition 65 one year later on April 20, 2008. Cal.
24 Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.

25 7. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without
26 health warnings in the State of California, soft plastic baits that contain excessive levels of
27 DINP and/or DIDP including, but not limited to, “Lunker City Slug-Go,” with UPC#
28 725442610104 and 725442645106, containing excessive levels of DINP and DIDP, and

1 725442936082, containing excessive levels of DINP. All such products containing DINP
2 and/or DIDP are referred to collectively hereinafter as “Products.”

3 8. Defendants’ failure to warn Consumers in the State of California of the health
4 hazards associated with exposures to DINP and DIDP in conjunction with Defendants’ sales of
5 the Products are violations of Proposition 65, and subject Defendants, and each of them, to
6 enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code
7 § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

8 9. For Defendants’ violations of Proposition 65, Plaintiff seeks preliminary and
9 permanent injunctive relief to compel Defendants to provide Consumers of the Products with
10 the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures to DINP and
11 DIDP. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

12 10. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), Plaintiff also seeks civil
13 penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 11. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
16 California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original
17 jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under
18 which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

19 12. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over Defendants based on
20 Plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that Defendants are each a person, firm,
21 corporation, or association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum
22 contacts in the State of California, and/or purposefully avails itself of the California market.
23 Defendants’ purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California
24 courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

25 13. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara, pursuant to
26 Code of Civil Procedure §§ 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent
27 jurisdiction, because Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants, because one or more
28 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because

1 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Santa Clara County with respect to
2 the Products.

3 **PARTIES**

4 14. Plaintiff is a limited liability California company with its principal place of
5 business within the State of California, County of Santa Clara. Plaintiff seeks to reduce or
6 eliminate the presence of hazardous substances in consumer products sold in California, and to
7 ensure that California consumers are aware of the presence of such substances in consumer
8 goods so that they can make an educated effort to limit their own exposure where deemed
9 necessary. Plaintiff brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code
10 § 25249.7(d).

11 15. Defendants, D & R SPORTS CENTER, INC.; BASS PRO OUTDOOR
12 WORLD, L.L.C.; DICK'S SPORTING GOODS, INC.; CABELA'S LLC; TACKLE BOX
13 DIRECT LLC; and HERB REED LLC, are each persons in the course of doing business within
14 the meaning of Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

15 16. Defendants manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and/or offer the Products for
16 sale or use in the State of California, or imply by their conduct that they manufacture, import,
17 distribute, sell, and/or offer the Products for sale or use in the State of California.

18 17. Defendants DOES 2 THROUGH 50, inclusive ("Manufacturer Defendants"),
19 are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code
20 §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

21 18. Manufacturer Defendants, and each of them, research, test, design, assemble,
22 fabricate, and manufacture, or each implies by its conduct that it researches, tests, designs,
23 assembles, fabricates, and manufactures, one or more of the Products offered for sale or use in
24 California.

25 19. Defendants DOES 51 THROUGH 100, inclusive ("Distributor Defendants"),
26 are each a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code
27 §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

28 ///

1 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
2 individual ...” Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

3 28. On June 1, 2018, Plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, including the
4 attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff’s counsel had consulted with at
5 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding
6 the alleged exposures to DINP and DIDP and that counsel believed there was meritorious and
7 reasonable cause for a public action, on Defendants D & R SPORTS CENTER, INC.; BASS
8 PRO OUTDOOR WORLD, L.L.C.; DICK’S SPORTING GOODS, INC.; CABELA’S LLC;
9 TACKLE BOX DIRECT LLC, the California Attorney General’s Office, and the requisite
10 public enforcement agencies, alleging that, as a result of Defendants’ sales of the Products,
11 Consumers in the State of California are being exposed to DINP and DIDP resulting from their
12 reasonably foreseeable use of the Products, without the Consumers first receiving a “clear and
13 reasonable warning” regarding the harms associated with exposures to DINP and DIDP, as
14 required by Proposition 65.

15 29. On January 10, 2019, Plaintiff served a supplemental sixty-day notice of
16 violation, including the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff’s counsel
17 had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed
18 relevant data regarding the alleged exposures to DINP and DIDP and that counsel believed
19 there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a public action, on Defendants D & R SPORTS
20 CENTER, INC.; BASS PRO OUTDOOR WORLD, L.L.C.; DICK’S SPORTING GOODS,
21 INC.; CABELA’S LLC; TACKLE BOX DIRECT LLC; HERB REED LLC, the California
22 Attorney General’s Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies, alleging that, as a
23 result of Defendants’ sales of the Products, Consumers in the State of California are being
24 exposed to DINP and DIDP resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the Products,
25 without the Consumers first receiving a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding the harms
26 associated with exposures to DINP and DIDP, as required by Proposition 65.

27 30. Defendants manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the Products for sale
28 or use in violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, and Defendants’ violations have

1 continued beyond their receipt of Plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. As such, Defendants'
2 violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined, will continue in the
3 future.

4 31. After receiving Plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, and to Plaintiff's best
5 information and belief, no public enforcement agency has commenced and diligently
6 prosecuted a cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged
7 violations that are the subject of Plaintiff's notice of violation.

8 32. The Products that Defendants manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for
9 sale or use in California cause exposures to DINP and DIDP as a result of the reasonably
10 foreseeable use of the Products. Such exposures caused by Defendants and endured by
11 Consumers in California are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements
12 of Proposition 65, yet Defendants provide no clear and reasonable warning.

13 33. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products they manufacture,
14 import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale or use in California contain DINP and/or DIDP.

15 34. DINP and/or DIDP are present in or on the Products in such a way as to expose
16 Consumers through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

17 35. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Products has caused, and
18 continues to cause, consumer exposures to DINP and DIDP, as defined by title 27 of the
19 California Code of Regulations, section 25602(b).

20 36. Defendants know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
21 Products exposes individuals to DINP and/or DIDP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

22 37. Defendants intend that exposures to DINP and/or DIDP through the reasonably
23 foreseeable use of the Products will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in
24 the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the Products for sale or use to
25 Consumers in California.

26 38. Defendants failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those
27 Consumers in California who have been, or will be, exposed to DINP and DIDP through
28 dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the Products.

1 39. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65
2 enacted directly by California voters, consumers exposed to DINP and DIDP through dermal
3 contact and/or ingestion as a result of their use of the Products that Defendants sold without a
4 “clear and reasonable” health hazard warning have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable
5 harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

6 40. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-
7 described acts, Defendants, and each of them, are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500
8 per day for each violation.

9 41. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health & Safety Code
10 § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against
11 Defendants.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them, for:

- 13 1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation, pursuant to
- 14 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b);
- 15 2. Preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that Defendants recall all
- 16 Products currently in the chain of commerce in California without a “clear and
- 17 reasonable warning” as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27,
- 18 section 25601, *et seq.*;
- 19 3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily
- 20 and permanently enjoin Defendants from manufacturing, distributing, or
- 21 offering the Products for sale or use in California without first providing a
- 22 “clear and reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California
- 23 Code of Regulations, section 25601, *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with
- 24 DINP and DIDP;
- 25 4. Plaintiff’s reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit; and
- 26

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

Dated: May 1, 2019

MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.

Tanya Moore
Tanya E. Moore
Attorney for Plaintiff
Safe Products for Californians, LLC