1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 CHANLER, LLC 72 Huckleberry Hill Road New Canaan, CT 06840 Telephone: (203) 594-9246 Facsimile: (203) 594-9247 Email: Clifford@ChanlerLLC.com Steven Y. Chen, State Bar No. 243200 STEVEN Y. CHEN, A PROFESSIONAL LAW 2650 River Avenue, Unit A Rosemead, CA 91702 Telephone: (626) 782-5017 Facsimile: (626) 307-1657 Email: Schen@Schenlaw.com	/ CORPORATION	ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco 04/05/2022 Clerk of the Court BY: LAURA SIMMONS Deputy Clerk		
9 10	Attorneys for Plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK				
11					
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
13	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CGC-22-599021				
14	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION				
15					
16	PAUL WOZNIAK,	Case No.			
17	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF			
18	V.				
19	COMPASS HEALTH BRANDS CORP.,	(Health & Safety Coo	de §25249.5 et seq.)		
20	Defendant.				
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF				

#### NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK 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 exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP), a toxic chemical found in and on wheelchairs with armrests and/or other accessible vinyl components (as well as wheelchair components offered for sale separately) (Products) sold by defendant COMPASS HEALTH BRANDS CORP. in California.

8 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendant's continuing failure to warn
9 individuals not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code §6300 *et*10 *seq.*, about the risks of exposure to DEHP present in and on the Products that are manufactured,
11 distributed, and offered for sale or use throughout the State of California. Individuals not covered
12 by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code §6300 *et seq.*, who purchase, use or
13 handle defendant's Products, are referred to hereinafter as "consumers."

3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on Products that defendant
manufactures, distributes, and/or offers for sale to consumers and other individuals throughout the
State of California.

4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at
Health & safety Code §25249.6 *et seq.* (Proposition 65), "[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.

5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on October 24, 2003, California identified and listed
DEHP as a chemical known to cause birth defects (and reproductive harm). DEHP became
subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of the act one year later on October 24,
2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, §27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§25249.8 and 25249.10(b).

26 6. Defendant manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and offers for sale without
27 health hazard warnings in California, the Products including, but not limited to, the *Armrest Pad*,

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Full-Length For Reclining, Item #90152, UPC #0 92237 60762 6. All such Products containing
 DEHP that were (and in many instances continue to be) manufactured, distributed, sold, or offered
 for sale in the State of California are referred to collectively hereinafter as "PRODUCTS."

7. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of
California of the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP in conjunction with
defendant's sales of the PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject the defendant to
enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code
§25249.7(a) and (b)(1). Violative sales of the PRODUCTS include transactions by downstream
sellers such as online retailers.

8. For defendant's violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and
 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendant to provide consumers of the PRODUCTS with
 the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP. Health &
 Safety Code §25249.7(a).

9. Pursuant to Health & safety Code §25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil penalties
against defendant for its violations of Proposition 65.

16

#### PARTIES

17 10. Plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated
18 to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic
19 exposures from consumer products, and he brings this action in the public interest pursuant to
20 Health & safety Code §25249.7(d).

21 11. Defendant COMPASS HEALTH BRANDS CORP. is a person in the course of
22 doing business within the meaning of Health & safety Code §§25249.6 and 25249.11.

12. COMPASS HEALTH BRANDS CORP. manufactures, imports, distributes, sells,
and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct
that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the
State of California.

- 27
- 28

COMPASS HEALTH BRANDS CORP. shall hereinafter, where appropriate, be
 referred to as the "DEFENDANT."

3

## VENUE AND JURISDICTION

4 14. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco pursuant to
5 Code of Civil Procedure §§393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent
6 jurisdiction, because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANT, because one or more
7 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
8 DEFENDANT conducted, and continues to conduct, business in San Francisco with respect to the
9 PRODUCTS.

10 15. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
11 California Constitution Article VI, §10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in
12 all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action
13 is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

14 16. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT based on
15 plaintiff's information and good faith belief that DEFENDANT is a person, firm, corporation or
16 association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the State
17 of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.
18 DEFENDANT'S purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California

19 courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

20 21

22

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Violation of Proposition 65)

17. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,

23 Paragraphs 1 through 16, inclusive.

18. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic
Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right "[t]o be informed
about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm."

27 28 Proposition 65 states, "[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.

5 20. On February 11, 2020, and on June 5, 2020, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notice of 6 Violation and a Supplemental 60-Day Notice of Violation, respectively (the Notices), together with a certificate of merit, on COMPASS HEALTH BRANDS CORP., the California Attorney 7 8 General's Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of 9 DEFENDANT'S sales of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California are being exposed 10 to DEHP resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the 11 consumers first receiving a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding the harms associated with 12 exposures to DEHP, as required by Proposition 65.

13 21. DEFENDANT manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and offers the PRODUCTS
14 for sale or use in violation of Health & safety Code §25249.6, and DEFENDANT'S violations
15 have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff's Notices. As such, DEFENDANT'S violations
16 are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined will continue in the future.

After receiving plaintiff's Notices, no public enforcement agency has commenced
and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against DEFENDANT under Proposition 65 to enforce
the alleged violations that are the subject of plaintiff's Notices.

20 23. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANT manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and
21 offers for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably
22 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANT and endured by
23 consumers and other individuals in California are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable"
24 warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANT provides no warning.

25 24. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS it manufactures,
26 imports, distributes, sells, and offers for sale in California contain DEHP.

- 27
- 28

DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose consumers
 through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

3 26. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and
4 continues to cause, consumer product exposures to DEHP, as defined by title 27 of the California
5 Code of Regulations, §25600.1(e).

6 27. DEFENDANT knows that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
7 PRODUCTS exposes individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.

8 28. DEFENDANT intended that exposures to DEHP from the reasonably foreseeable
9 use of the PRODUCTS will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the
10 manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to
11 consumers in California.

12 29. DEFENDANT failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those
13 consumers in California who have been, or who will be, exposed to DEHP through dermal contact
14 and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS.

30. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted
directly by California voters, consumers exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or
ingestion as a result of their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANT sold without a "clear and
reasonable" health hazard warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for
which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

20 31. Pursuant to Health & safety Code §25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above21 described acts, DEFENDANT is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each
22 violation.

32. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health & safety Code §25249.7(a)
also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANT.

33. On June 1, 2020, PAUL WOZNIAK filed an enforcement action in the Court based
on the sixty-notice of violation dated February 11, 2020. PAUL WOZNIAK did perfect service of
this complaint, but defendant did not file a responsive pleading. Therefore, on February 10, 2022,

28

1	plaintiff filed and served a Request for Entry of Default on DEFENDANT. Upon stipulation			
2	between the parties that the statute of limitation would be tolled for all claims alleged in the			
3	February 11, 2020, notice as well as the June 5, 2020, supplemental notice from the date that each			
4	notice was issued through April 15, 2022, plaintiff dismissed the prior action without prejudice.			
5	PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
6	Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANT as follows:			
7	1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & safety Code §25249.7(b), assess civil penalties	s		
8	against DEFENDANT in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;			
9	2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & safety Code §25249.7(a), preliminarily and			
10	permanently enjoin DEFENDANT from manufacturing, distributing, or offering the PRODUCTS			
11	for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and reasonable warning" in accordance			
12	with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, §25600 et seq., regarding the harms associated			
13	with exposures to DEHP;			
14	3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & safety Code §25249.7(a), issue preliminary			
15	and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANT recall all PRODUCTS currently in the			
16	chain of commerce in California without a "clear and reasonable warning" as defined by			
17	California Code of Regulations title 27, §25600 et seq.;			
18	4. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and			
19	5. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.			
20				
21	Dated: April 5, 2022 Respectfully submitted,			
22	CHANLER, LLC			
23				
24	By: Children and the second se			
25	Clifford A. Chanler Attorneys for Plaintiff			
26	PAUL WOZNIAK			
27				
28				
	6 COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	_		
	CONTLAINT FOR CIVIL FENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE KELIEF			