

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

**01/14/2022**  
Clerk of the Court  
BY: KAREN VALDES  
Deputy Clerk

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

11 PRECILA BALABBO,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 vs.  
14 TARGET CORP.,  
15 Defendant.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

**CGC-22-597649**

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

18 **BACKGROUND OF THE CASE**

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

25 2. This complaint is a representative action brought by Plaintiff in the public interest  
26 of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People’s right to be informed of the health  
27 hazards caused by exposure to di-isodecyl phthalate (DIDP), a toxic chemical found in Threshold  
28 mail pouches (UPC # 191908005263) sold and/or distributed by defendant Target Corp. (“Target”  
or “Defendant”) in California.

1           3.       DIDP is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause reproductive  
2 toxicity. On April 20, 2007, the State of California listed DIDP as a chemical known to the State  
3 to cause reproductive toxicity and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations  
4 since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &  
5 25249.10(b).

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

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

18           6.       Plaintiff alleges that Defendant distributes and/or offers for sale in California,  
19 without a requisite exposure warning, Threshold mail pouches (UPC # 191908005263) (the  
20 “Products”) that expose persons to DIDP when used for their intended purpose.

21           7.       Defendant’s failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the  
22 health hazards associated with exposure to DIDP in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution  
23 of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendant to the enjoinder and civil  
24 penalties described herein.

25           8.       Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendant for its violations of Proposition 65  
26 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

27           9.       Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring  
28 Defendant to provide purchasers or users of the Products with required warnings related to the

1 dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to DIDP pursuant to Health and Safety Code  
2 § 25249.7(a).

3 10. Plaintiff further seeks a reasonable award of attorney’s fees and costs.

4 **PARTIES**

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

9 12. Defendant Target, through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells, and/or  
10 offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it  
11 imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.

12 13. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Target is a “person” in the course of doing business  
13 within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

14 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

15 14. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco because one or more of the  
16 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur in this county and/or because  
17 Defendant conducted, and continues to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with  
18 respect to the Products.

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

24 16. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant is either a citizen of  
25 the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts with the State of California, is registered  
26 with the California Secretary of State as foreign corporations authorized to do business in the State  
27 of California, and/or has otherwise purposefully availed itself of the California market. Such  
28

1 purposeful availment has rendered the exercise of jurisdiction by California courts consistent and  
2 permissible with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

3 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

13 19. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “which results from a  
14 person’s acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a  
15 consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” (27 CCR §  
16 25602, para (b).) H&S Code § 25603(c) states that “a person in the course of doing business ...  
17 shall provide a warning to any person to whom the product is sold or transferred unless the product  
18 is packaged or labeled with a clear and reasonable warning.”

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

- 21 a. A warning that appears on a product’s label or other labeling.
- 22 b. Identification of the product at the retail outlet in a manner which provides  
23 a warning. Identification may be through shelf labeling, signs, menus, or a combination  
24 thereof.

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

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

8 21. Proposition 65 provides that any "person who violates or threatens to violate" the  
9 statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase  
10 "threaten to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial  
11 probability that a violation will occur." (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil  
12 penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the Act (H&S Code § 25249.7) for up to  
13 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00).

14 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

15 22. On April 20, 2007, the State of California listed DIDP as a chemical known to the  
16 State to cause reproductive toxicity and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65  
17 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8  
18 & 25249.10(b).

19 23. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this Complaint result from through  
20 dermal absorption. The primary route of exposure to the DIDP is through dermal absorption  
21 directly through the skin when consumers use, touch, or handle the Products. Some amount of  
22 exposure through ingestion can occur by touching the Products with subsequent touching of the  
23 user's hand to mouth. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with the Products regarding  
24 the health hazards of exposure to the DIDP.

25 24. Defendant has manufactured, processed, marketed, distributed, offered to sell  
26 and/or sold the Products in California since at least June 29, 2021. The Products continue to be  
27 distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.



1 and to the California Attorney General’s office and the offices of the County District attorneys and  
2 City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein  
3 violations allegedly occurred.

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

9 34. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff’s best information and belief, none of  
10 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a  
11 cause of action against Defendant under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are  
12 the subject of the Notice.

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

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(By Plaintiff against Defendant for the Violation of Proposition 65)**

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

19 37. Defendant has, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer of  
20 the Product.

21 38. Use of the Products will expose consumers to DIDP, a hazardous chemical found  
22 on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.

23 39. The Product does not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

24 40. Plaintiff, based on her best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times  
25 herein, and at least since June 29, 2021, continuing until the present, that Defendant has continued  
26 to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Product to DIDP  
27 without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

1           41.     The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,  
2 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Products. The primary route of exposure to the  
3 DIDP is through dermal absorption directly through the skin when consumers use, touch, or handle  
4 the Products. Some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by touching the Products with  
5 subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth. No clear and reasonable warning is provided  
6 with the Products regarding the health hazards of exposure to the DIDP.

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

10          43.     Defendant has knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the  
11 Products exposes individuals to DIDP, and Defendant intends that exposures to DIDP will occur  
12 by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering of  
13 the Products to consumers in California

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

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

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



1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant 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 Defendant 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: January 14, 2022

BRODSKY & SMITH

13 By: 

14 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)  
15 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)  
16 9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900  
17 Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
18 Telephone: (877) 534-2590  
19 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*