

1 Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)
2 Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)
3 BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC
4 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900
5 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
6 Telephone: (877) 534-2590
7 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

OCT 09 2020

SUE PESKO

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ANTHONY FERREIRO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MYLEC, INC., DICK'S SPORTING
GOODS, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No.:

R G20077121

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

Plaintiff Anthony Ferreiro ("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

1. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to
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.

2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest
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 di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), a toxic chemical found in

1 Mylec sharp shooter goals/targets sold and/or distributed by defendant Mylec, Inc. (“Mylec”) and
2 defendant Dick’s Sporting Goods, Inc. (“Dick’s”) (collectively, the “Defendants”) in California.

3 3. DEHP is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and
4 reproductive toxicity. On January 1, 1988, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known
5 to the State to cause cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since
6 that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).
7 On October 24, 2003, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause
8 reproductive toxicity.

9 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate
10 within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations. Included in
11 such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing a Proposition
12 65-listed chemical with a “clear and reasonable” warning before “knowingly and intentionally”
13 exposing any person to any such listed chemical.

14 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation
15 for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00) to be
16 imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code
17 § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the
18 actions of a defendant which “violate or threaten to violate” the statute. Health & Safety Code §
19 25249.7.

20 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants distribute and/or offers for sale in California,
21 without a requisite exposure warning, Mylec sharp shooter goals/targets (the “Products”) that
22 expose persons to DEHP.

23 7. Defendants’ failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the
24 health hazards associated with exposure to DEHP in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution
25 of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendants to the injunction and civil
26 penalties described herein.

27 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition
28 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

1 of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has
2 jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

3 16. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because each defendant is either a
4 citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is
5 registered with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business
6 in the State of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market.
7 Such purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent
8 and permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

10 17. The people of the State of California declared in Proposition 65 their right “[t]o be
11 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive
12 harm.” (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65.)

13 18. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a
14 “clear and reasonable warning” before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California
15 as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code § 25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

16 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any
17 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without
18 first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...

19 19. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “which results from a
20 person’s acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a
21 consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” (27 CCR §
22 25602, para (b).) H&S Code § 25603(c) states that “a person in the course of doing business ...
23 shall provide a warning to any person to whom the product is sold or transferred unless the product
24 is packaged or labeled with a clear and reasonable warning.”
25
26
27
28

20. Pursuant to H&S Code § 25603.1, the warning may be provided by using one or more of the following methods individually or in combination:¹

a. A warning that appears on a product's label or other labeling.

b. Identification of the product at the retail outlet in a manner which provides a warning. Identification may be through shelf labeling, signs, menus, or a combination thereof.

c. The warnings provided pursuant to subparagraphs (a) and (b) shall be prominently placed upon a product's labels or other labeling or displayed at the retail outlet with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices in the label, labeling or display as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use.

d. A system of signs, public advertising identifying the system and toll-free information services, or any other system that provides clear and reasonable warnings.

21. Proposition 65 provides that any “person who violates or threatens to violate” the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase “threaten to violate” is defined to mean creating “a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur.” (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the Act (H&S Code § 25249.7) for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

22. 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

¹ Alternatively, a person in the course of doing business may elect to comply with the warning requirements set out in the amended version of 27 CCR 25601, *et.seq.*, as amended on August 30, 2016, and operative on August 30, 2018.

1 reproductive toxicity. In summary, the Listed Chemical was listed under Proposition 65 as a
2 chemical known to the State to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity.

3 23. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this Complaint result from through
4 dermal absorption. Users can be exposed to DEHP by dermal absorption through direct skin
5 contact with the Products when handled with bare hands. If the Products are stored or transported
6 in a carrier, DEHP that leaches from the Products may contaminate other articles contained within
7 these closed spaces that are subsequently handled, worn, mouthed, or ingested by the user. Finally,
8 while mouthing of the Products does not seem likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion
9 can occur by touching the Products with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

10 24. Defendants have manufactured, processed, marketed, distributed, offered to sell
11 and/or sold the Products in California since at least January 17, 2020. The Products continue to be
12 distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.

13 25. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally
14 exposed users, consumers and/or patients to the Products and the Listed Chemical without first
15 giving a clear and reasonable exposure warning to such individuals.

16 26. As a proximate result of acts by each defendant, as a person in the course of doing
17 business within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of
18 California, including in Alameda County, have been exposed to the Listed Chemical without a
19 clear and reasonable warning on the Products. The individuals subject to the violative exposures
20 include normal and foreseeable users, consumers and patients that use the Products, as well as all
21 others exposed to the Products.

22 **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

23 27. On January 17, 2020, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety
24 Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to
25 DEHP contained in the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants
26 and to the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District attorneys and
27 City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein
28 violations allegedly occurred.

1 28. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including
2 the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff's counsel had consulted with at
3 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding
4 DEHP exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private
5 action.

6 29. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's best information and belief, none of
7 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a
8 cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which
9 are the subject of the Notice.

10 30. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the
11 Notice to Defendants, as required by law.

12 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(By Plaintiff against Defendants for the Violation of Proposition 65)**

14 31. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 30 of
15 this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

16 32. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer
17 of the Products.

18 33. The Products contain DEHP, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list
19 of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

20 34. The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

21 35. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times
22 herein, and at least since January 17, 2020, continuing until the present, that Defendants have
23 continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products
24 to DEHP without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

25 36. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,
26 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Products. Consequently, the primary route of
27 exposure to these chemicals is through dermal absorption. Users can be exposed to DEHP by
28 dermal absorption through direct skin contact with the Products when handled with bare hands. If

1 the Products are stored or transported in a carrier, DEHP that leaches form the Products may
2 contaminate other articles contained within these closed spaces that are subsequently handled,
3 worn, mouthed, or ingested by the user. Finally, while mouthing of the Products does not seem
4 likely, some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by touching the Products with
5 subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

6 37. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will
7 continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users or
8 until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Products.

9 38. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
10 Product exposes individuals to DEHP, and Defendants intend that exposures to DEHP will occur
11 by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering of
12 the Products to consumers in California

13 39. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this
14 Complaint.

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

17 41. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically
18 authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants.

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants and requests the following
3 relief:

4 A. That the court assess civil penalties against each defendant in the amount of \$2,500
5 per day for each violation for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per
6 violation of \$912,000.00) in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b);

7 B. That the court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants mandating
8 Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Products;

9 C. That the court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit, in the
10 amount of \$50,000.00.

11 D. That the court grant any further relief as may be just and proper.

12 Dated: October 8, 2020

BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC

13 By: 

14 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)

15 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)

9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900

16 Beverly Hills, CA 90212

17 Telephone: (877) 534-2590

18 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*