

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

10/20/2021 at 10:03:01 AM

By: Shabra Iyamu, Deputy Clerk

ENTORNO LAW, LLP

Noam Glick (SBN 251582)

Jake W. Schulte (SBN 293777)

Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444)

225 Broadway, Suite 1900

San Diego, California 92101

Tel: (619) 629-0527

Email: noam@entornolaw.com

Email: jake@entornolaw.com

Email: craig@entornolaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES,
INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE-MATE, INC., a Georgia corporation,
TARGET CORPORATION, a Minnesota
corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

I.
INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by Environmental Health Advocates,
3 Inc. (“Plaintiff”) in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California (“the People”). Plaintiff
4 seeks to remedy Defendants’ failure to inform the People of exposure to Di-n-butyl phthalate (DBP)
5 “DBP”, a known carcinogen. Defendants expose consumers to DBP by manufacturing, importing,
6 selling, and/or distributing Case-Mate Minis - Twinkle (“Products”). Defendants know and intend that
7 customers will use Products containing DBP.

8 2. Under California’s Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California
9 Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. (“Proposition 65”), “[n]o person in the course of doing
10 business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to
11 cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
12 individual. . . .” (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.6.)

13 3. California identified and listed DBP as a chemical known to cause developmental and
14 reproductive toxicity on December 2, 2005.

15 4. Defendants failed to sufficiently warn consumers and individuals in California about
16 potential exposure to DBP in connection with Defendants’ manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of
17 Products. This is a violation of Proposition 65.

18 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers
19 in California before exposing them to DBP in Products. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(a).) Plaintiff
20 also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65 along with attorney’s
21 fees and costs. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7(b).)

II.
PARTIES

22
23
24 6. Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC. (“Plaintiff”) is a
25 corporation in the State of California dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through
26 the elimination or reduction of toxic exposure from consumer products. It brings this action in the public
27 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7.

28 ///

1 7. Defendant CASE-MATE, INC. (“Case-Mate”) is a corporation organized and existing
2 under the laws of Georgia. Case-Mate is registered to do business in California, and does business in
3 the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Case-Mate
4 manufactures, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

5 8. Defendant TARGET CORPORATION (“Target”) is a corporation organized and
6 existing under the laws of Minnesota. Target is registered to do business in California, and does business
7 in the County of Alameda, within the meaning of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.11. Target
8 manufacturers, imports, sells, or distributes the Products in California and Alameda County.

9 9. Plaintiff does not know the true names and/or capacities, whether individual, partners,
10 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason sues
11 said defendants under fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the true
12 names and capacities of these defendants have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
13 thereon alleges that these defendants are responsible in whole or in part for Plaintiff’s alleged damages.

14 **III.**
15 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

16 10. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court original
17 jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health and Safety Code
18 statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. As such, this Court
19 has jurisdiction.

20 11. Venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court pursuant to Code of Civil
21 Procedure, sections 394, 395, and 395.5. Wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this
22 County. Defendants conducted and continue to conduct business in this County as it relates to Products.

23 12. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise
24 purposefully avails themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would
25 be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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
27
28

IV.
CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Violation of Proposition 65 – Against all Defendants)

13. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

14. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

15. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed Products containing DBP in violation of Health and Safety Code, section 25249.6 et seq. Plaintiff is informed and believes such violations have continued after receipt of the Notice (defined *infra*) and will continue to occur into the future.

16. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing Products, Defendants failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who may be exposed to DBP through reasonably foreseeable use of the Products.

17. Products expose individuals to DBP through dermal absorption, ingestion, and inhalation by consumers. This exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing Products into the stream of commerce. As such, Defendants intend that consumers will dermally absorb, ingest, or inhale Products, exposing them to DBP.

18. Defendants knew or should have known that the Products contained DBP and exposed individuals to DBP in the ways provided above. The Notice informed Defendants of the presence of DBP in the Products. Likewise, media coverage concerning DBP and related chemicals in consumer products provided constructive notice to Defendants.

19. Defendants' action in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

20. More than sixty days prior to naming each defendant in this lawsuit, Plaintiff issued a 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice") as required by and in compliance with Proposition 65. Plaintiff provided the Notice to the various required public enforcement agencies along with a certificate of merit. The Notice alleged that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to DBP contained in the Products.

21. The appropriate public enforcement agencies provided with the Notice failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action against Defendants.

1 22. Individuals exposed to DBP contained in Products through dermal absorption,
2 ingestion, and inhalation resulting from reasonably foreseeable use of the Products have suffered and
3 continue to suffer irreparable harm. There is no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

4 23. Defendants are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation
5 of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 252497(b). Injunctive relief is also
6 appropriate pursuant to Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7(a).

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

9 1. Civil penalties in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation. Plaintiff alleges that
10 damages total a minimum of \$1,000,000.00;

11 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Defendants from manufacturing,
12 importing, selling, and/or distributing Products in California without providing a clear and reasonable
13 warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations;

14 3. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and

15 4. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

16
17 Respectfully submitted:

18 Dated: October 19, 2021

ENTORNO LAW, LLP

19
20 By:



Noam Glick

Jake W. Schulte

Craig M. Nicholas

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.