1 2	Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352) Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113) BRODSKY & SMITH		
3	9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Telephone: (877) 534-2590 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160	ELECTRONICALLY  FILED	
	, ,	Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff	05/19/2022 Clerk of the Court BY: JEFFREY FLORES	
7		Deputy Clerk	
	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
8	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
9		Case No.:	
10	EMA BELL,	CGC-22-59969 COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND	
11	Plaintiff,	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	
12	VS.	(Violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.)	
13	LIFEGUARD PRESS, INC., SAKS & COMPANY, LLC,		
14 15	Defendants.		
16	Plaintiff Ema Bell ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, alleges the following cause		
17	of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.		
18			
19	1. Plaintiff brings this representa	tive action on behalf of all California citizens to	
20			
21	the Health and Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq ("Proposition 65"), which reads, in relevant part,		
22			
23	"[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any		
- 1		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 against defendants Lifeguard Press, Inc. ("Lifeguard") and		
27	Saks & Company, LLC (Saks) to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health hazards		
28			
- 11			

caused by exposure to Bisphenol A (BPA) from the use of Lilly Pulitzer Glitter Iphone Cases that are manufactured, distributed, offered for sale and/or sold by Lifeguard in California.

- 3. BPA is a harmful chemical known to the State of California to cause female reproductive toxicity. On May 11, 2015, the State of California listed BPA as a chemical known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity and BPA has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).
- 4. Proposition 65 requires all businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate within California or sell products therein to comply with Proposition 65 regulations. Included in such regulations is the requirement that businesses must label any product containing a Proposition 65-listed chemical with a "clear and reasonable" warning before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing any person to any such listed chemical.
- 5. Proposition 65 allows for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day per violation for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00) to be imposed upon defendants in a civil action for violations of Proposition 65. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b). Proposition 65 also allows for any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin the actions of a defendant which "violate or threaten to violate" the statute. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 6. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants distribute and/or offer for sale in California, without a requisite Proposition 65 exposure warning, Lilly Pulitzer Glitter iPhone Cases (the "Products") that expose persons to BPA when used as intended and/or for its intended purpose.
- 7. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in California of the health hazards associated with exposure to BPA from use of the Products in conjunction with the sale and/or distribution of the Products is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects Defendants to the enjoinment and civil penalties described herein.
- 8. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties against Defendants for their violations of Proposition 65 in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

- 9. Plaintiff also seeks injunctive relief, preliminarily and permanently, requiring Defendants to provide purchasers or users of the Products with required warnings related to the dangers and health hazards associated with exposure to BPA from use of the Products pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a).
  - 10. Plaintiff further seeks a reasonable award of attorney's fees and costs.

#### **PARTIES**

- 11. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California acting in the interest of the general public to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals in products sold in California and to improve human health by reducing hazardous substances contained in such items. She brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 12. Defendant Lifeguard, through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it imports, distributes, sells and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Lifeguard is a "person" in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 13. Defendant Saks, through its business, effectively imports, distributes, sells and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct that it imports, distributes, sells and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Saks is a "person" in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

#### **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

- 14. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco because one or more of the instances of wrongful conduct occurred and continues to occur in this county and/or because Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with respect to the Products.
- 15. This 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. Health and Safety Code § 25249.7 allows for the enforcement

of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction; therefore, this Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit.

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

# STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 17. The people of the State of California declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65.)
- 18. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code § 25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

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...

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

- 20. Pursuant to H&S Code § 25603.1, the warning may be provided by using one or more of the following methods individually or in combination:<sup>1</sup>
  - a. A warning that appears on a product's label or other labeling.
  - b. Identification of the product at the retail outlet in a manner which provides a warning. Identification may be through shelf labeling, signs, menus, or a combination thereof.
  - c. The warnings provided pursuant to subparagraphs (a) and (b) shall be prominently placed upon a product's labels or other labeling or displayed at the retail outlet with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices in the label, labeling or display as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use.
  - d. A system of signs, public advertising identifying the system and toll-free information services, or any other system that provides clear and reasonable warnings.
- 21. Proposition 65 provides that any "person who violates or threatens to violate" the statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase "threaten to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur." (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the Act (H&S Code § 25249.7) for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00).

# FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Alternatively, a person in the course of doing business may elect to comply with the warning 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.

- 23. The exposures that are the subject of this complaint result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommend use of the Products. The primary route of exposure to BPA from use of the Products is dermal exposure. Dermal exposure to BPA is possible when the user handles the Products, or the Products are placed in contact with exposed areas of the user's skin. Finally, exposure through ingestion will occur by touching the Products with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.
- 24. Lifeguard has distributed, offered to sell and/or sold the Products in California since at least August 13, 2021. The Products continue to be distributed and sold in California without a requisite Proposition 65 compliant BPA exposure warning.
- 25. At all times relevant to this action, Lifeguard has knowingly and intentionally exposed users, consumers and/or purchasers of the Products to BPA without first providing a clear and reasonable exposure warning to such individuals.
- 26. As a proximate result of Defendants' actions, and as a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of H&S Code § 25249.11, individuals throughout the State of California, including in San Francisco County, have been exposed to BPA from use of the Products without having first been provided a clear and reasonable exposure warning. The individuals subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users and consumers that use the Products.

# SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMNTS

- 27. On April 19, 2021, Plaintiff purchased the Product from Saks. At the time of purchase, Best Buy and Lifeguard did not provide a Proposition 65 exposure warning for BPA or any other Proposition 65 listed chemical in a manner consistent with H&S Code § 25603.1 as described *supra*.
- 28. On or about August 9, 2021, the Product was sent to a testing laboratory to determine the concentration of BPA present on the surface of the Product.
- 29. On August 10, 2021, the laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Surface BPA was collected using a wipe test. Results of this test concluded the presence of BPA at the surface of the product (the "Chemical Test Report").

- 30. Plaintiff provided the Chemical Test Report and Product to an analytical chemist to determine if, based on the findings of the Chemical Test Report and the reasonable and foreseeable use of the Product, exposure to BPA will occur at levels that require Proposition 65 warnings under the Clear and Reasonable Warnings section 25601 of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations.
- 31. On August 13, 2021, Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure assessment report which concluded that persons in California who use the Products will be exposed to levels of BPA that require a Proposition 65 exposure warning.
- 32. On August 13, 2021, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 (the "Notice") to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to BPA from use of the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants and to the California Attorney General's office and the offices of the County District attorneys and City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein violations allegedly occurred.
- 33. The Notice complied with all procedural requirements of Proposition 65 including the attachment of a Certificate of Merit affirming that Plaintiff's counsel had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed relevant data regarding BPA exposure, and that counsel believed there was meritorious and reasonable cause for a private action.
- 34. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff's best information and belief, none of the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which are the subject of the Notice.
- 35. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date of the Notice to Defendants, as required by law.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(By Plaintiff against Defendants for their Violation of Proposition 65)

- 36. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 35 of this first amended complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 37. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as a distributers and/or retailers of the Products.
- 38. Use of the Products will expose users and consumers thereof to BPA, a hazardous chemical found on the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to be hazardous to human health.
  - 39. The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.
- 40. Plaintiff, based on her best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times herein, and at least since August 13, 2021, continuing until the present, that Defendants have continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products to BPA without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.
- 41. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Product. The primary route of exposure to the BPA is through dermal absorption directly through the skin when consumers use, touch, or handle the Products. Some amount of exposure through ingestion can occur by touching the Product with subsequent touching of the user's hand to mouth.
- 42. Plaintiff, based on her best information and belief, avers that such exposures will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users or until BPA is removed from the Products.
- 43. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the Product exposes individuals to BPA, and Defendants intend those exposures to BPA will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering of the Products to consumers in California.
- 44. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to the filing of the first amended complaint.
- 45. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), because of the above-described acts, each Defendant is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation.

1	46. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), this Court is specifically
2	authorized to grant injunctive relief in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants.
3	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
4	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants and requests the following
5	relief:
6	A. That the court assess civil penalties against each Defendant in the amount of \$2,500
7	per day for each violation for up to 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per
8	violation of \$912,000.00) in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b);
9	B. That the Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants mandating
10	Proposition 65 compliant warnings on the Products;
11	C. That the Court grant Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit, in the
12	amount of \$50,000.00.
13	D. That the Court grant any further relief as may be just and proper.
14	Dated: May 19, 2022 BRODSKY & SMITH
15	By:
16	Evan J. Smith (SBN242352) Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)
17	9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
18	Telephone: (877) 534-2590 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160
19	
20	Attorneys for Plaintiff
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	