

1 Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)  
2 Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)  
3 BRODSKY & SMITH  
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*

ELECTRONICALLY  
**FILED**  
Superior Court of California,  
County of San Francisco

**03/07/2022**  
Clerk of the Court  
BY: KAREN VALDES  
Deputy Clerk

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
10 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

11 ANTHONY FERREIRO,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 AIRGAS, INC., AIRGAS SAFETY,  
15 INC., HD SUPPLY, INC., HDS IP  
16 HOLDING, LLC, HD SUPPLY  
17 HOLDINGS, INC.,

18 Defendants.

Case No.:

**CGC-22-598547**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

19 Plaintiff Anthony Ferreiro (“Plaintiff”), by and through his attorneys, alleges the following  
20 cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

21 **BACKGROUND OF THE CASE**

22 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action on behalf of all California citizens to  
23 enforce relevant portions of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at  
24 the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq (“Proposition 65”), which reads, in relevant part,  
25 “[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any  
26 individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first  
27 giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual ...”. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

28 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest  
of the citizens of the State of California against defendants Airgas, Inc., Airgas Safety, Inc.  
(collectively, “Airgas”) and HD Supply, Inc., HDS IP Holding, LLC, HD Supply Holdings, Inc.,

1 (collectively, “HD Supply”) (collectively with Airgas, the “Defendants”) to enforce the People’s  
2 right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposure to Bisphenol A (BPA) from the use  
3 of Radnor glasses, UPC# 639890512159, that are manufactured by Airgas and distributed, offered  
4 for sale and/or sold by HD Supply in California.

5 3. BPA is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause female  
6 reproductive toxicity. On May 11, 2015, the State of California listed BPA as a chemical known  
7 to the State to cause reproductive toxicity and BPA has come under the purview of Proposition 65  
8 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8  
9 & 25249.10(b).

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

15 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation  
16 for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00) to be  
17 imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code  
18 § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the  
19 actions of a defendant which “violate or threaten to violate” the statute. Health & Safety Code §  
20 25249.7.

21 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants distribute and/or offer for sale in California,  
22 without a requisite Proposition 65 exposure warning, Radnor glasses, UPC# 639890512159, (the  
23 “Products”) that expose persons to BPA when used as intended and/or for its intended purpose.

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







1           23.     The exposures that are the subject of this complaint result from the purchase,  
2 acquisition, handling and recommend use of the Products. The primary route of exposure to BPA  
3 from use of the Products is dermal exposure. Dermal exposure to BPA is possible when the user  
4 handles the Products, or the Products are placed in contact with exposed areas of the user's skin.  
5 If the Products are placed in contact with the user's mouth during a phone call, ingestion of BPA  
6 can occur resulting in oral exposure to BPA. Additionally, exposure through ingestion will occur  
7 by touching the Products with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

8           24.     Defendants have distributed, offered to sell and/or sold the Products in California  
9 since at least March 8, 2021. The Products continue to be distributed and sold in California without  
10 a requisite Proposition 65 compliant BPA exposure warning.

11           25.     At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally  
12 exposed users, consumers and/or purchasers of the Products to BPA without first providing a clear  
13 and reasonable exposure warning to such individuals.

14           26.     As a proximate result of Defendants' actions, and as persons in the course of doing  
15 business within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of  
16 California, including in San Francisco County, have been exposed to BPA from use of the Products  
17 without having first been provided a clear and reasonable exposure warning. The individuals  
18 subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users and consumers that use the  
19 Products.

20                                   **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

21           27.     On February 12, 2021, Plaintiff purchased the Product from HD Supply. At the  
22 time of purchase, Defendants did not provide a Proposition 65 exposure warning for BPA or any  
23 other Proposition 65 listed chemical in a manner consistent with H&S Code § 25603.1 as described  
24 *supra*.

25           28.     The Product was sent to a testing laboratory to determine the concentration of BPA  
26 present on the surface of the Product.

1           29.     On March 3, 2021, the laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Surface BPA  
2 was collected using a wipe test. Results of this test concluded the presence of BPA at the surface  
3 of the product (the “Chemical Test Report”).

4           30.     Plaintiff provided the Chemical Test Report and Product to an analytical chemist  
5 to determine if, based on the findings of the Chemical Test Report and the reasonable and  
6 foreseeable use of the Product, exposure to BPA will occur at levels that require Proposition 65  
7 warnings under the Clear and Reasonable Warnings section 25601 of Title 27 of the California  
8 Code of Regulations.

9           31.     On March 8, 2021 Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure  
10 assessment report which concluded that persons in California who use the Products will be exposed  
11 to levels of BPA that require a Proposition 65 exposure warning.

12           32.     On March 8, 2021, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety  
13 Code § 25249.6 (the “Notice”) to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to  
14 BPA from use of the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants  
15 and to the California Attorney General’s office and the offices of the County District attorneys and  
16 City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein  
17 violations allegedly occurred.

18           33.     The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including  
19 the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff’s counsel had consulted with at  
20 least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding  
21 BPA exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private  
22 action.

23           34.     After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff’s best information and belief, none of  
24 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a  
25 cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which  
26 are the subject of the Notice.

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

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(By Plaintiff against Defendant for its Violation of Proposition 65)**

3 36. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 35 of  
4 this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

5 37. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributors and/or retailers  
6 of the Products.

7 38. Use of the Products will expose users and consumers thereof to BPA, a hazardous  
8 chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

9 39. The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

10 40. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times  
11 herein, and at least since March 8, 2021, continuing until the present, that Defendants have  
12 continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products  
13 to BPA without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

14 41. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,  
15 acquisition, handling, and recommended use of the Products. The primary route of exposure to  
16 BPA from use of the Products is dermal exposure. Dermal exposure to BPA is possible when the  
17 user handles the Products, or the Products are placed in contact with exposed areas of the user's  
18 skin. If the Products contact hard water and/or soaps at elevated pH, higher extraction rates of BPA  
19 and accumulation of BPA at the surface of the Products will result. Additionally, exposure through  
20 ingestion will occur by touching the Products with subsequent touching of the user's hand to  
21 mouth.

22 42. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will  
23 continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users or  
24 until BPA is removed from the Products.

25 43. Defendants had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
26 Product exposes individuals to BPA, and Defendants intend those exposures to BPA will occur by  
27 their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering of  
28 the Products to consumers in California.



1 44. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to the  
2 filing of the Complaint.

3 45. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), because of the above-described  
4 acts, Defendants are each liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation.

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

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants and requests the following  
9 relief:

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

13 B. That the Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants mandating  
14 Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Products;

15 C. That the Court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit, in the  
16 amount of \$50,000.00.

17 D. That the Court grant any further relief as may be just and proper.

18 Dated: March 7, 2022

BRODSKY & SMITH

19 By: 

20 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)

21 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)

22 9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900

23 Beverly Hills, CA 90212

24 Telephone: (877) 534-2590

25 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*