

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

**05/06/2022**  
Clerk of the Court  
BY: JEFFREY FLORES  
Deputy Clerk

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA **CGC-22-599527**

10 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

11 PRECILA BALABBO,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 TZUMI INNOVATIONS, LLC, &  
15 BURLINGTON STORES, INC.,

16 Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

17 Plaintiff Precila Balabbo (“Plaintiff”), by and through her attorneys, alleges the following  
18 cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

19 **BACKGROUND OF THE CASE**

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

26 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest  
27 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to be informed of the health  
28 hazards caused by exposure to di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), a toxic chemical found in  
GOODYEAR 2 in 1 PET BOOSTER SEAT and CARRIERS sold and/or distributed by defendants

1 Tzumi Innovations, LLC (“Tzumi”) and/or Burlington Stores, Inc. (“Burlington”) (collectively,  
2 “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 that will create an exposure above safe harbor levels with a “clear and  
13 reasonable” warning before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing any person to any such listed  
14 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 exposure warning, GOODYEAR 2 in 1 PET BOOSTER SEAT and CARRIERS  
23 (the “Products”) that expose persons to DEHP when used for their intended purpose.

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

1 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition  
2 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

3 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring  
4 Defendants to provide purchasers or users of the Products with required warnings related to the  
5 dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DEHP pursuant to Health and Safety Code  
6 § 25249.7(a).

7 10. Plaintiff further seeks a reasonable award of attorney's fees and costs.

8 **PARTIES**

9 11. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general  
10 public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and to  
11 improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. She brings this  
12 action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

13 12. Defendant Tzumi, through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells, and/or  
14 offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it  
15 imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.  
16 Plaintiff alleges that defendant Tzumi is a "person" in the course of doing business within the  
17 meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

18 13. Defendant Burlington, through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells,  
19 and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that  
20 it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.  
21 Plaintiff alleges that defendant Burlington is a "person" in the course of doing business within the  
22 meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

23 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

24 14. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco because one or more of the  
25 instances of wrongful conduct occurred and continue to occur in this county and/or because  
26 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with  
27 respect to the Products.

1 15. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution  
2 Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those  
3 given by statute to other trial courts. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the enforcement  
4 of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has  
5 jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

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

12 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 21. Proposition 65 provides that any "person who violates or threatens to violate" the  
15 statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase  
16 "threaten to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial  
17 probability that a violation will occur." (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil  
18 penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the Act (H&S Code § 25249.7) for up to  
19 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00).

### 20 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

21 22. On January 1, 1988, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to  
22 the State to cause cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since  
23 that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).

24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Alternatively, a person in the course of doing business may elect to comply with the warning  
28 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 On October 24, 2003, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause  
2 reproductive toxicity.

3 23. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,  
4 acquisition, handling, and recommended use of the Products. Consequently, the primary route of  
5 exposure to these chemicals is through dermal absorption. Dermal absorption of DEHP can occur  
6 through direct skin contact when the Products are contacted with bare hands or other exposed skin.  
7 Additionally, some amount of exposure through ingestion will occur by touching the Products with  
8 subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

9 24. Defendants have manufactured, processed, marketed, distributed, offered to sell  
10 and/or sold the Products in California since at least May 6, 2021. The Products continue to be  
11 distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.

12 25. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally  
13 exposed users of the Products to DEHP without first giving a clear and reasonable exposure  
14 warning to such individuals.

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

21 **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

22 27. On April 18, 2021, Plaintiff purchased the Product from Burlington. At the time of  
23 purchase, Burlington and Tzumi did not provide a Proposition 65 exposure warning for DEHP or  
24 any other Proposition 65 listed chemical in a manner consistent with H&S Code § 25603.1 as  
25 described *supra*.

26 28. The Product was sent to a testing laboratory for phthalate testing to determine the  
27 phthalate content of the Product.

1 29. On May 5, 2021, the laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Results of this  
2 test determined the Product exposes users to DEHP (the “Chemical Test Report”).

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

8 31. On May 6, 2021, Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure  
9 assessment report which concluded that persons in California who use the Products will be exposed  
10 to levels of DEHP that require a Proposition 65 exposure warning.

11 32. On May 6, 2021, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety  
12 Code § 25249.6 (the “Notice”) to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to  
13 DEHP from use of the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants  
14 and to the California Attorney General’s office and the offices of the County District attorneys and  
15 City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein  
16 violations allegedly occurred.

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

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

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

28 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

4           37.     Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer  
5 of the Products.

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

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

9           40.     Plaintiff, based on her best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times  
10 herein, and at least since May 6, 2021, continuing until the present, that Defendants have continued  
11 to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products to DEHP  
12 without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

13           41.     The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,  
14 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Products. Consequently, the primary route of  
15 exposure to these chemicals is through dermal absorption. Dermal absorption of DEHP can occur  
16 through direct skin contact when the Products are contacted with bare hands or other exposed skin.  
17 Additionally, some amount of exposure through ingestion will occur by touching the Products with  
18 subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.

19           42.     Plaintiff, based on her best information and belief, avers that such exposures will  
20 continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users or  
21 until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Products.

22           43.     Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
23 Products exposes individuals to DEHP, and Defendants intend that exposures to DEHP will occur  
24 by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering  
25 of the Products to consumers in California

26           44.     Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this  
27 Complaint.



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

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

5 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants and requests the following  
7 relief:

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

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

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

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

16 Dated: May 6, 2022

BRODSKY & SMITH

17 By:   
18 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)  
19 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)  
9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900  
20 Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Telephone: (877) 534-2590  
21 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*