1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 CHANLER, LLC 72 Huckleberry Hill Road New Canaan, CT 06840 Telephone: (203) 594-9246 Facsimile: (203) 702-5011 Email: Clifford@ChanlerLLC.com  Steven Y. Chen, State Bar No. 243200 STEVEN Y. CHEN, A PROFESSIONAL LAW 2650 River Avenue, Unit A Rosemead, CA 91702 Telephone: (626) 782-5017 Facsimile: (626) 307-1657 Email: Schen@Schenlaw.com	CORPORATION	FILED Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco  11/09/2022 Clerk of the Court BY: JEFFREY FLORES Deputy Clerk
	Attorneys for Plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK		
10			
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
13	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CGC-22-602834		
14	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION		
15	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDIC HON		
16	PAUL WOZNIAK,	Case No.	
17	Plaintiff,	Case No.	
18	V.	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	
19	AMAZON.COM, INC.,	(Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq.)	
20	Defendant.		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		

# 

### NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP), a toxic chemical found in and on padded armrest pads used for wheelchairs sold by defendant AMAZON.COM, INC. in California. Besides padded armrest, AMAZON.COM, INC., sells other wheelchair components as well as wheelchairs sold as complete products that use the same or substantially similar vinyl upholstery (products) containing phthalates regulated by the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health & Safety Code §25249.6 et seq. (Proposition 65).
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendant's continuing failure to warn individuals not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code §6300 *et seq.*, about the risks of exposure to DEHP present in and on the products that are manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use throughout the State of California. Individuals not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code §6300 *et seq.*, who purchase, use or handle defendant's products, are referred to hereinafter as "consumers."
- 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on products that defendant manufacture, distribute, and/or offer for sale to consumers and other individuals throughout the State of California.
- 4. Under Proposition 65, "[n]o 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 . . ." Health & Safety Code §25249.6.
- 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on October 24, 2003, California identified and listed DEHP as a chemical known to cause birth defects (and reproductive harm). DEHP became subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of the act one year later on October 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, §27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§25249.8 and 25249.10(b).

- 6. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on December 20, 2013, California identified and listed diisononyl phthalate (DINP) as a chemical known to cause cancer. DINP, which is not yet at issue in this case, became subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of the act one year later on December 20, 2014. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, §27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§25249.8 and 25249.10(b).
- 7. Defendant manufacture, distribute, import, sells, and/or offer for sale without health hazard warnings in California, products including, but not limited to, the *Universal Desk Length Wheelchair Arm Pad, UPC #847102015286, ASIN #B00NY2YYOY*; AlveyTech 10" Desk Length Padded Vinyl Armrests for Wheelchairs (Pair), #E41-9802, ASIN #B07V2JX8JZ; and Healthline Padded Armrest for Wheelchairs Vinyl Pair, Universal Arm Pads Replacement 10" Desk Arm, Black ASIN #B008ARRD8. All vinyl upholstered padded armrests containing DEHP that were (and in many instances continue to be) manufactured, distributed, sold, and/or offered for sale in the State of California are referred to collectively hereinafter as "PRODUCTS."
- 8. Defendant's failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of California of the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP in conjunction with defendant's sales of the PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject the defendant to enjoinment of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation. Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a) and (b)(1). Violative sales of the PRODUCTS include, but are not limited to, transactions made by AMAZON.COM, INC., through its Fulfillment by Amazon program or when it acts as both the "shipper" and "seller."
- 9. For defendant's violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendant to provide consumers of the PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures to DEHP and other equitable relief. Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Claims released in one or more settlement agreements reached between plaintiff and upstream suppliers of wheelchairs and wheelchairs components containing DEPH, which were sold directly by the settling entity on amazon.com, are excluded from the cause of action alleged herein. This exclusion, however, does not apply to the sale of PRODUCTS by third-parties (i.e., non-settling entities) on amazon.com. Further, this action also excludes claims relating to products sold and/or branded by Alco Sales & Service Co., which are covered by San Francisco Superior Court Case Number CGC-22-602014 filed on September 28, 2022.

10. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendant for their violations of Proposition 65.

### **PARTIES**

- 11. Plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK is a citizen of the State of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products, and he brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d).
- 12. Defendant AMAZON.COM, INC. is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §§25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 13. AMAZON.COM, INC. manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.
- 14. AMAZON.COM, INC. shall hereinafter, where appropriate, be referred to as the "DEFENDANT."

### **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

- 15. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANT, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because DEFENDANT conducted, and continue to conduct, business in San Francisco with respect to the PRODUCTS.
- 16. 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.

17. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT based on plaintiff's information and good faith belief that DEFENDANT are each a person, firm, corporation or association that is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California, and/or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market. DEFENDANT'S 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)

- 18. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 17, inclusive.
- 19. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm."
- 20. Proposition 65 states, "[n]o 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 . . ." Health & Safety Code §25249.6.
- 21. On June 1, 2022, plaintiff served several 60-Day Notices of Violation (Attorney General Notice Numbers 2022-01125, 2022-01123 and 2022-01126) (the Notices), together with a certificate of merit, on AMAZON.COM, INC., the California Attorney General's Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANT'S sales of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California are being exposed to DEHP and to its reproductive harm effects resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the consumers first receiving a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP, as required by Proposition 65.
- 22. On October 19, 2022, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notices of Violation (Attorney General Notice Numbers 2022-02531 and 2022-02532) (the October 19 Notices), together with a

certificate of merit, on AMAZON.COM, INC., the California Attorney General's Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANT'S sales of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California are being exposed to DINP and its risk to cause cancer resulting from their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the consumers first receiving a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding the harms associated with exposures to DINP, as required by Proposition 65. As of December 30, 2022, plaintiff expects to seek leave to file a first amended complaint to include allegations relating to DINP in the Products as set forth in the October 19 Notices, provided no public enforcer is diligently prosecuting such claims by then.

- 23. DEFENDANT manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and/or offer the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health & Safety Code §25249.6, and DEFENDANT'S violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff's Notices. As such, DEFENDANT'S violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined will continue in the future.
- 24. After receiving plaintiff's Notices, no public enforcement agency has commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action against DEFENDANT under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the subject of plaintiff's Notices.
- 25. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANT manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and/or offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to DEHP as a result of the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANT and endured by consumers and other individuals in California are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANT provide no warning.
- 26. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers for sale in California contain DEHP.
- 27. DEHP is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose consumers through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

26

23

24

25

- 28. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and continues to cause, consumer product exposures to DEHP, as defined by title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, §25600.1(e).
- 29. DEFENDANT know that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS exposes individuals to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion.
- 30. DEFENDANT intended that exposures to DEHP from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture, importation, distribution, sale, and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use to consumers in California.
- 31. DEFENDANT failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers in California who have been, or who will be, exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from their use of the PRODUCTS. The DEFENDANT's knowing and intentional acts are particularly heightened when the PRODUCTS are directly ship and sold to California consumers by DEFENDANT.
- 32. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65 enacted directly by California voters, consumers exposed to DEHP through dermal contact and/or ingestion as a result of their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANT sold without a "clear and reasonable" health hazard warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.
- 33. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-described acts, DEFENDANT are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation.
- 34. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANT.

1,

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANT as follows:

- 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), assess civil penalties against DEFENDANT in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation;
- 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANT from manufacturing, distributing, or offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and reasonable warning" in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, §25600 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures to DEHP;
- 3. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANT recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain of commerce in California without a "clear and reasonable warning" as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, §25600 *et seq.*;
- 4. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions including that the defendant recall all Products currently in the chain of commerce in California without a "clear and reasonable warning" as defined by 27 California Code of Regulations §§25600 et seq. and disgorge defendant's revenues from sales of the Products allowing purchasers to return products and receive full refunds.
  - 5. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
- 6. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper including product recall and full refunds, including shipping costs.

Dated: November 8, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

CHANLER, LLC

By:

Clifford A. Chanler Attorneys for Plaintiff PAUL WOZNIAK