M

ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California. 1 Stephanie Sy Esq., (247071) County of San Diego Law Offices of Stephanie Sy 04/26/2022 at 09:41:33 AM 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 100 San Diego, CA 92130 Clerk of the Superior Court 3 By Keira McCray Deputy Clerk Telephone: 858-746-9554 4 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Keep America Safe and Beautiful 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 **COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO** 10 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION 11 12 13 CASE NO.: 37-2022-00015487-CU-NP-CTL KEEP AMERICA SAFE AND **BEAUTIFUL** 14 **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES** Plaintiff, 15 AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF VS. 16 (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.) AMG MEDICAL, INC 17 **AND** 18 **DOES 1-25 INCLUSIVE** 19 20 **DEFENDANTS.** 21 22 NATURE OF THE ACTION 23 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff Keep America Safe 24

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff Keep America Safe and Beautiful, in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the people's right to be informed of the dangers from exposures to DINP (Diisononyl Phthalate) (hereafter "Listed Chemical") toxic chemical when using the "Medpro Durable Home Sitz Bath with Tubing and Water Bag" sold by DEFENDANTS in California.

25

26

27

28

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy DEFENDANTS' continuing failures to warn California citizens about their exposure to the Listed Chemicals during the normal and intended use of the "Medpro Durable Home Sitz Bath with Tubing and Water Bag (hereafter "PRODUCT"), that the DEFENDANT manufactured, distributed and sold, in the State of California and continue to manufacture, distribute and offer for sale in the State of California.
- 3. California citizens, through the act of buying, acquiring or utilizing the product, are exposed to the listed chemical in homes and places throughout California where these products are used.
- 4. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. (Proposition 65), "No 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..." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 5. California identified and listed DINP (Diisononyl Phthalate) as a chemical known to cause cancer. DINP (Diisononyl Phthalate) became subject to the warning requirements of Proposition 65 for cancer beginning on December 20, 2013 (27 CCR § 27002; Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 6. DEFENDANTS' past and continuing failures to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California about their exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendant's sale of the PRODUCT is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects DEFENDANTS to enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.
- 7. For DEFENDANTS' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive and permanent injunctive relief to compel DEFENDANTS to provide purchasers or users of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED CHEMICAL. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).)
- 8. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS for their violations of Proposition 65, as provides for by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff, Keep America Safe and Beautiful is a citizen and resident of the State of California, who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination and reduction of toxic exposures from consumer PRODUCTS, and brings this action in the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 10. Defendant AMG Medical, Inc ("DEFENDANTS") is a person doing business within the meaning of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.11.
- 11. DEFENDANT manufactures, distributes, and/or offers the PRODUCT for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCT for sale or use in the State of California.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

- 12. Venue is proper in the San Diego County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 394, 495, 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of San Diego and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this County with respect to the PRODUCT.
- 13. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.
- 14. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on plaintiff's information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or association that either are citizens of the State of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market.

 DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against Defendant)

- 15. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if full reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 14, inclusive.
- 16. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. (Proposition 65) that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and order reproductive harm." (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.)
- 17. Proposition 65 states, "No 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 productive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual... (*Id.*)"
- 18. On May 21, 2021 a sixty-day notice violation, together with the requisite certificate of merit, was provided to DEFENDANTS, and various public enforcement agencies stating that as a result of the DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.
- 19. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond DEFENDANTS' receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation. Plaintiff further alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.
- 20. After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notices of violation, the appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

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	١

21. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in
California by DEFENDANTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL above the allowable state
limits.

- 22. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.
- 23. The PRODUCTS, through normal use exposes users to the LISTED CHEMICAL in such a way as to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through inhalation, dermal contact and/or ingestion during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 24. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and continues to cause consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is defined by 27 CCR§ 25602(b).
- 25. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL..
- 26. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, nonaccidental participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or use of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.
- 27. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.
- 28. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, sold by DEFENDENTS without a "clear and reasonable warning," have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

27

28