

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

03/24/2023
Clerk of the Court
BY: JEFFREY FLORES
Deputy Clerk

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

10 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CGC-23-605386

11 REGINALD MOORE,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 J.T.D. ENTERPRISES, INC.,
15 WORLDWIDE GOLF SHOPS LLC,
16 ROGER DUNN, LLC,

17 Defendants.

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

18 Plaintiff Reginald Moore (“Plaintiff”), by and through his attorneys, alleges the following
19 cause of action in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California.

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
Search N Rescue® Golf Ball Retrievers, Item # 260066, sold and/or distributed by defendant

1 J.T.D. Enterprises, Inc. (“J.T.D.”), defendant Worldwide Golf Shops LLC (“Worldwide Golf
2 Shops”), and/or defendant Roger Dunn, LLC (collectively, “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, *Search N Rescue*® Golf Ball Retrievers, Item # 260066, (the
23 “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. He brings this
12 action in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

13 12. Defendant J.T.D., 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 J.T.D. 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 Worldwide Golf Shops, through its business, effectively imports,
19 distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies
20 by its conduct that it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the
21 State of California. Plaintiff alleges that defendant Worldwide Golf Shops is a "person" in the
22 course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and
23 25249.11.

24 14. Defendant Roger Dunn, LLC, through its business, effectively imports, distributes,
25 sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California, or it implies by its conduct
26 that it imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the Products for sale or use in the State of California.
27 Plaintiff alleges that defendant Roger Dunn, LLC is a "person" in the course of doing business
28 within the meaning of Health & Safety Code sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.

1 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

2 15. Venue is proper in the County of San Francisco because one or more of the
3 instances of wrongful conduct occurred and continue to occur in this county and/or because
4 Defendants conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with
5 respect to the Products.

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

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

17 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

27 20. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “which results from a
28 person’s acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a

1 consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service.” (27 CCR §
2 25602, para (b).) H&S Code § 25603(c) states that “a person in the course of doing business ...
3 shall provide a warning to any person to whom the product is sold or transferred unless the product
4 is packaged or labeled with a clear and reasonable warning.”

5 21. Pursuant to H&S Code § 25603.1, the warning may be provided by using one or
6 more of the following methods individually or in combination:¹

7 a. A warning that appears on a product’s label or other labeling.

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

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

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

18 22. Proposition 65 provides that any “person who violates or threatens to violate” the
19 statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code § 25249.7.) The phrase
20 “threaten to violate” is defined to mean creating “a condition in which there is a substantial
21 probability that a violation will occur.” (H&S Code § 25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil
22 penalties of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each violation of the Act (H&S Code § 25249.7) for up to
23 365 days (up to a maximum civil penalty amount per violation of \$912,000.00).

24
25
26
27 ¹ 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 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

2 23. On January 1, 1988, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to
3 the State to cause cancer and it has come under the purview of Proposition 65 regulations since
4 that time. Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 & 25249.10(b).
5 On October 24, 2003, the State of California listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause
6 reproductive toxicity.

7 24. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,
8 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Product. The primary route of exposure to the
9 is through dermal absorption directly through the skin when consumers use, touch, or handle the
10 Products. Exposure through ingestion will occur by touching the Product with subsequent touching
11 of the user’s hand to mouth. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with the Products
12 regarding the health hazards of exposure.

13 25. Defendants have manufactured, processed, marketed, distributed, offered to sell
14 and/or sold the Products in California since at least March 30, 2022. The Products continue to be
15 distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.

16 26. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally
17 exposed users of the Products to DEHP without first giving a clear and reasonable exposure
18 warning to such individuals.

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

25 **SATISFACTION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENTS**

26 28. Plaintiff purchased the Product from Worldwide Golf Shops. At the time of
27 purchase, J.T.D., Worldwide Golf Shops, and Roger Dunn, LLC did not provide a Proposition 65
28

1 exposure warning for DEHP or any other Proposition 65 listed chemical in a manner consistent
2 with H&S Code § 25603.1 as described *supra*.

3 29. The Product was sent to a testing laboratory for phthalate testing to determine the
4 phthalate content of the Product.

5 30. The laboratory provided the results of its analysis. Results of this test determined
6 the Product exposes users to DEHP (the “Chemical Test Report”).

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

12 32. On March 30, 2022, Plaintiff received from the analytical chemist an exposure
13 assessment report which concluded that persons in California who use the Products will be exposed
14 to levels of DEHP that require a Proposition 65 exposure warning.

15 33. On March 30, 2022, Plaintiff gave notice of alleged violation of Health and Safety
16 Code § 25249.6 (the “Notice”) to Defendants concerning the exposure of California citizens to
17 DEHP from use of the Products without proper warning, subject to a private action to Defendants
18 and to the California Attorney General’s office and the offices of the County District attorneys and
19 City Attorneys for each city with a population greater than 750,000 persons wherein the herein
20 violations allegedly occurred.

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

26 35. After receiving the Notice, and to Plaintiff’s best information and belief, none of
27 the noticed appropriate public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a
28

1 cause of action against Defendants under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations which
2 are the subject of the Notice.

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

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

7 37. Plaintiff hereby repeats and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 36 of
8 this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

9 38. Defendants have, at all times mentioned herein, acted as distributor, and/or retailer
10 of the Products.

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

13 40. The Products do not comply with the Proposition 65 warning requirements.

14 41. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that at all relevant times
15 herein, and at least since March 30, 2022, continuing until the present, that Defendants have
16 continued to knowingly and intentionally expose California users and consumers of the Products
17 to DEHP without providing required warnings under Proposition 65.

18 42. The exposures that are the subject of the Notice result from the purchase,
19 acquisition, handling and recommended use of the Product. The primary route of exposure to the
20 is through dermal absorption directly through the skin when consumers use, touch, or handle the
21 Products. Exposure through ingestion will occur by touching the Product with subsequent touching
22 of the user's hand to mouth. No clear and reasonable warning is provided with the Products
23 regarding the health hazards of exposure.

24 43. Plaintiff, based on his best information and belief, avers that such exposures will
25 continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to purchasers and users or
26 until this known toxic chemical is removed from the Products.

27 44. Defendants have knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the
28 Products exposes individuals to DEHP, and Defendants intend that exposures to DEHP will occur

1 by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the importation, distribution, sale and offering
2 of the Products to consumers in California

3 45. Plaintiff has engaged in good faith efforts to resolve the herein claims prior to this
4 Complaint.

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

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

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants and requests the following
11 relief:

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

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

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

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

20 Dated: March 24, 2023

BRODSKY & SMITH

21 By:  _____

22 Evan J. Smith (SBN242352)
23 Ryan P. Cardona (SBN302113)
24 9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900
25 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
26 Telephone: (877) 534-2590
27 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*