

1 Andre A. Khansari, Esq. (SBN 223528)
andre@khansarilaw.com

2 Peter T. Sato, Esq., Of Counsel (SBN 238486)
peter@khansarilaw.com

3 KHANSARI LAW CORPORATION

4 16133 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1200

Encino, California 91436

5 Telephone: (818) 650-6444

6 Facsimile: (818) 650-6445

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
8 CA Citizen Protection Group, LLC

9
10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
11 **COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

12 CA CITIZEN PROTECTION GROUP,
13 LLC,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16
17 NEW VIEW GIFTS & ACCESSORIES,
18 LTD.; KOHL'S, INC.; KOHL'S
CORPORATION; and DOES 1 to 50,

19 Defendants.

CASE NO.

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES**

[Violations of Proposition 65, the Safe
Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement
Act of 1986 (*Health & Safety Code* §§
25249.5, *et seq.*)]

UNLIMITED CIVIL
(exceeds \$35,000)

22 Plaintiff CA CITIZEN PROTECTION GROUP, LLC ("CCPG" or "Plaintiff")
23 brings this action in the interests of the general public pursuant to California's Safe
24 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified as Cal. Health & Safety
25 Code ("HSC") § 25249.5 *et seq.* and related statutes (also known and referred to herein as
26 "Proposition 65") and, based on information and belief, hereby alleges:

27 ////

28 ////

I
THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff CCPG is dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the amount of chemical toxins in consumer products, the promotion of human health, environmental safety, and improvement of worker and consumer safety.

2. Plaintiff is a person within the meaning of HSC § 25249.11(a) and brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to HSC § 25249.7(d).

3. Upon information and belief, Defendant NEW VIEW GIFTS & ACCESSORIES, LTD. (“New View”) is a Pennsylvania corporation, and a person doing business in the State of California within the meaning of HSC §25249.11(b) and had ten (10) or more employees at all relevant times.

4. Upon information and belief, Defendant KOHL’S, INC. (“KI”) is a Delaware corporation, and a person doing business in the State of California within the meaning of HSC §25249.11(b) and had ten (10) or more employees at all relevant times.

5. Upon information and belief, Defendant KOHL’S CORPORATION (“KC”), and together with KI and New View, collectively referred to as “Defendants”, and each is a “Defendant”), is a Wisconsin corporation, and a person doing business in the State of California within the meaning of HSC §25249.11(b) and had ten (10) or more employees at all relevant times.

6. Defendants own, administer, direct, control, and/or operate facilities and/or agents, distributors, sellers, marketers, or other retail operations who placed the “Subject Product” (as defined in Paragraph 17, p.5 below) into the stream of commerce in California which contains Di-n-butyl Phthalate (“DBP”) without first giving “clear and reasonable” warnings.

7. Defendants DOES 1-50 are named herein under fictitious names, as their true names and capacities are unknown to Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said DOES has manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed, sold and/or has otherwise been involved in the chain of commerce of, and

continues to manufacture, package, distribute, market, sell, and/or otherwise continues to be involved in the chain of commerce of the Subject Product for sale or use in California, and/or is responsible, in some actionable manner, for the events and happenings referred to herein, either through its conduct or through the conduct of its agents, servants or employees, or in some other manner, causing the harms alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of DOES when ascertained.

8. Upon information and belief, at all times relevant to this action, each of DOES 1-50, was an agent, servant, or employee of either of the Defendants. In conducting the activities alleged in this Complaint, each of DOES 1-50 was acting within the course and scope of this agency, service, or employment, and was acting with the consent, permission, and authorization of the relevant Defendant. All actions of each of DOES 1-50 alleged in this Complaint were ratified and approved by the relevant Defendant or its officers or managing agent. Alternatively, each of the DOES 1-50 aided, conspired with and/or facilitated the alleged wrongful conduct of the relevant Defendant.

II

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to HSC § 25249.7, which allows enforcement of violations of Proposition 65 in any Court of competent jurisdiction.

10. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, based on information and belief, Defendants are business entities having sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally availing themselves of the California market through the sale, marketing, distribution and/or use of the Subject Product in the State of California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendants by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

11. Venue is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure (“CCP”) §§ 395 and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in Alameda County, and the cause of action, or part thereof, arises in Alameda County because Defendants’ violations occurred (the Subject Product is marketed, offered for sale, sold, used, and/or consumed without clear and reasonable warnings) in this County. Furthermore, this Court is the proper venue under CCP § 395.5 and HSC §§ 25249.7(a) and (b), which provide that any person who violates or threatens to violate HSC §§ 25249.5 or 25249.6 may be enjoined in, and civil penalty assessed and recovered in a civil action brought in, any court of competent jurisdiction.

III STATUTORY BACKGROUND

12. The People of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right “[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm.” (HSC, Div. 20, Ch. 6.6 Note [Section 1, subdivision (b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65]). Proposition 65 is classically styled as a “right-to-know” law intended to inform consumers’ choices prior to exposure.

13. To affect 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. HSC § 25249.6, which 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...”

14. Proposition 65 requires the Governor of California to publish a list of chemicals known to the state to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. See HSC § 25249.8. The list, which the Governor updates at least once a year, contains

1 over 700 chemicals and chemical families. Proposition 65 imposes warning requirements
2 and other controls that apply to Proposition 65-listed chemicals.

3 15. All businesses with ten (10) or more employees that operate or sell products in
4 California must comply with Proposition 65. Under Proposition 65, businesses are: (1)
5 prohibited from knowingly discharging Proposition 65-listed chemicals into sources of
6 drinking water (HSC § 25249.5), and (2) required to provide “clear and reasonable”
7 warnings before exposing a person, knowingly and intentionally, to a Proposition 65-listed
8 chemical (HSC § 25249.6).

9 16. Proposition 65 provides that any person who “violates or threatens to
10 violate” the statute “may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction.” HSC
11 §25249.7(a). “Threaten to violate” is defined to mean creating “a condition in which there
12 is a substantial probability that a violation will occur.” HSC §25249.11(e). Violators are
13 liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 *per day for each* violation of Proposition 65. See
14 HSC §25249.7(b)(emphasis added).

15 **IV**
16 **BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARY FACTS**

17 17. This action seeks to remedy the continuing failure of Defendants to clearly
18 and reasonably warn consumers in California that they are being exposed to DBP, a
19 chemical known to the State of California to cause developmental toxicity, and
20 reproductive toxicity.

21 18. Defendants manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed, sold and/or have
22 otherwise been involved in the chain of commerce of, and continue to manufacture,
23 distribute, package, promote, market, sell and/or otherwise continue to be involved in the
24 chain of the following consumer product which contains the chemical DBP: *Poppy*
25 *Flowers Gardening Gloves, UPC: 606683519213* (referred to herein as the “Subject
26 Product”).

27 19. The Subject Product continues to be offered for sale, sold and/or otherwise
28 provided for use and/or handling to individuals in California.

1 20. The use and/or handling of the Subject Product causes exposures to DBP at
2 levels requiring a “clear and reasonable warning” under Proposition 65. Defendants
3 expose consumers of the Subject Product to DBP and have failed to provide the health
4 hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.

5 21. The past, and continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing
6 and/or sale of the Subject Product, without the required health hazard warnings, causes
7 individuals to be involuntarily exposed to high levels of DBP in violation of Proposition
8 65.

9 22. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief enjoining Defendants from the continued
10 manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or selling of Subject Product in
11 California without first providing clear and reasonable warnings, within the meaning of
12 Proposition 65, regarding the risks of developmental harm and other reproductive harm,
13 posed by exposures to DBP through the use and/or handling of the Subject Product.
14 Plaintiff seeks an injunctive order compelling Defendants to bring its business practices
15 into compliance with Proposition 65 by providing clear and reasonable warnings to each
16 individual who may be exposed to DBP from the use and/or handling of the Subject
17 Product. Plaintiff also seeks an order compelling Defendants to identify and locate each
18 individual person who in the past has purchased Subject Product, and to provide to each
19 such purchaser a clear and reasonable warning that the use of the Subject Product, as
20 applicable, will cause exposure to DBP.

21 23. In addition to injunctive relief, Plaintiff seeks an assessment of civil penalties
22 to remedy Defendants’ failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding
23 exposures to DBP.

24 24. On December 02, 2005, the State of California officially listed DBP as a
25 chemical known cause developmental toxicity, male reproductive toxicity, and female
26 reproductive toxicity.

27 25. The Maximum Allowable Dose Level (“MADL”) for developmental and
28 reproductive toxicity as relating DBP is 8.7 µg/days.

1 26. The MADL is calculated based on a body weight of 58 kg for an adult or
2 pregnant woman, 70 kg for an adult male, 40 kg for an adolescent, 20 kg for a child, 10 kg
3 for an infant, and 3.5 kg for a neonate (27 CCR § 25803, subd. (b)).

4 27. The exposure estimates from the Subject Product exceed the DBP MADL set
5 by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (“OEHHA”). As a
6 result, the Subject Product is required to have a clear and reasonable warning under
7 Proposition 65.

8 28. Plaintiff purchased the Subject Product without a Proposition 65 warning on
9 the Subject Product, or as required by Proposition 65.

10 29. To test the Subject Product for DBP, Plaintiff engaged a well-respected and
11 accredited testing laboratory that used the testing protocol used and approved by the
12 California Attorney General.

13 30. The results of testing undertaken by Plaintiff of the Subject Product, shows that
14 the Subject Product tested was in violation of the 8.7 µg/day MADL “safe harbor” daily
15 limit for DBP set forth in Proposition 65’s regulations. As a result, the Subject Product is
16 required to have clear and reasonable warning under Proposition 65.

17 31. As a proximate result of acts by the Defendants, as persons in the course of
18 doing business within the meaning of HSC §25249.11(b), individuals throughout the State
19 of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to DBP without
20 clear and reasonable warnings. The individuals subject to exposures to DBP include
21 normal and foreseeable users of the Subject Product, as well as all other persons exposed
22 to the Subject Product.

23 32. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and
24 intentionally exposed the users of the Subject Product to DBP without first giving clear
25 and reasonable warnings to such individuals.

26 33. Individuals using the Subject Product are exposed to DBP in excess of the
27 “maximum allowable daily” levels determined by the State of California, as applicable for
28 DBP.

34. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have, in the course of doing business, failed to provide individuals using and/or handling the Subject Product with clear and reasonable warnings that the Subject Product exposes individuals to DBP.

V
SATISFACTION OF PRIOR NOTICE OF PROPOSITION 65 VIOLATIONS AND
SIXTY (60) DAY INTENT TO SUE

35. On or about May 16, 2024, Plaintiff gave 60-day notice of alleged violations of HSC §25249.6 (the “Notice”), filed as AG Number 2024-01953, concerning consumer product exposures subject to a private action, to each Defendant, the California Attorney General, County District Attorneys, and City Attorneys for each city containing a population of at least 750,000 people in whose jurisdictions the violations allegedly occurred, concerning the Subject Product, containing DBP.

36. Before sending the Notice of alleged violations, Plaintiff investigated the consumer product involved, the likelihood that such product would cause users to suffer significant exposures to DBP, and the corporate structure of Defendants.

37. The Notice of alleged violations included a Certificate of Merit executed by the attorney for the noticing party, Plaintiff CCPG. The Certificate of Merit states that the attorney for Plaintiff who executed the certificate had consulted with at least one person with relevant and appropriate expertise who reviewed data regarding the exposures to DBP, the subject Proposition 65-listed chemical related to this action. Based on that information, the attorney for Plaintiff who executed the Certificate of Merit believed there was a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action. The attorney for Plaintiff attached to the Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General, the confidential factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the Certificate of Merit.

38. Plaintiff's Notice of alleged violations also includes a Certificate of Service and documents entitled "Appendix "A" - The Safe Drinking Water & Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary", and "Appendix "B" - The Safe Drinking

////

1 Water & Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): Special Compliance
2 Procedure”. HSC §25249.7(d).

3 39. The Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements
4 of HSC § 25249.7, subdivision (d) and the statute’s implementing regulations regarding the
5 notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the
6 violator.

7 40. Plaintiff is commencing this action more than sixty (60) days from the date
8 that Plaintiff served the Notice to Defendants, and the public prosecutors referenced in the
9 paragraphs above.

10 41. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that neither the Attorney
11 General, nor any applicable district attorney or city attorney has commenced an action or is
12 diligently prosecuting an action against either Defendant with respect to the Subject
13 Product.

14
15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Proposition 65, The Safe Drinking Water and**
17 **Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (*Health & Safety Code*, §§ 25249.5, *et seq.*))**
18 **(Against Defendants and Does 1 - 50)**

19 42. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 41,
20 inclusive, as if specifically set forth in this cause of action.

21 43. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants at all times
22 relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated and continue to
23 violate HSC § 25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally
24 exposing individuals, who use or handle the Subject Product, to the chemical DBP at levels
25 exceeding allowable exposure levels under Proposition 65 guidelines without Defendants
26 first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such individuals pursuant to HSC §§ 25249.6
27 and 25249.11(f).

28 ////

44. Defendants have manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed, sold and/or have otherwise been involved in the chain of commerce of, and continue to manufacture, package, distribute, market, sell and/or otherwise continue to be involved in the chain of commerce of the Subject Product, which has been, is, and will be used and/or handled by individuals in California, without Defendants providing clear and reasonable warnings, within the meaning of Proposition 65, regarding the risks of developmental harm and reproductive harm, posed by exposure to DBP through the use and/or handling of the Subject Product. Furthermore, Defendants have threatened to violate HSC §25249.6 by the Subject Product being marketed, offered for sale, sold and/or otherwise provided for use and/or handling to individuals in California.

45. By the above-described acts, Defendants have violated HSC § 25249.6 and are therefore subject to an injunction ordering Defendants to stop violating Proposition 65, and to provide warnings to consumers and other individuals who will purchase, use and/or handle the Subject Product.

46. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by HSC § 25249.7(a) in any court of competent jurisdiction.

47. Continuing commission by Defendants of the acts alleged above will irreparably harm consumers within the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, Defendants will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to DBP through the use and/or handling of the Subject Product.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties for Violations of Proposition 65, The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (*Health & Safety Code*, §§ 25249.5, *et seq.*))

(Against Defendants and Does 1 - 50)

////

1 48. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 47,
2 inclusive, as if specifically set forth in this cause of action.

3 49. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants at all times
4 relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated and continue to
5 violate HSC § 25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally
6 exposing individuals who use or handle the Subject Product to the chemical DBP at levels
7 exceeding allowable exposure levels without Defendants first giving clear and reasonable
8 warnings to such individuals pursuant to HSC §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).

9 50. Defendants have manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed, sold and/or
10 has otherwise been involved in the chain of commerce of, and continue to manufacture,
11 package, distribute, market, sell and/or otherwise continue to be involved in the chain of
12 commerce of the Subject Product, which has been, is, and will be used and/or handled by
13 individuals in California, without Defendants providing clear and reasonable warnings,
14 within the meaning of Proposition 65, regarding the risks of developmental harm and
15 reproductive harm, posed by exposure to DBP through the use and/or handling of the
16 Subject Product. Furthermore, Defendants have threatened to violate HSC § 25249.6 by
17 the Subject Product being marketed, offered for sale, sold and/or otherwise provided for
18 use and/or handling to individuals in California.

19 51. By the above-described acts, Defendants are liable, pursuant to HSC § 25249.7(b),
20 for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day, for each violation of HSC § 25249.6 relating to
21 the Subject Product (applying a 365 per day year, equals a maximum civil penalty amount
22 of \$912,500 for each violation).

23 52. Wherefore, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, as set forth
24 hereafter.

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against Defendants as follows:

- 3 1. A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, their
4 agents employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or
5 participating with Defendants, from manufacturing, packaging,
6 distributing, marketing and/or selling the Subject Product, and any
7 related products, for sale or use in California without first providing
8 clear and reasonable warnings, within the meaning of Proposition 65,
9 that the users and/or handlers of the Subject Product are exposed to
10 the chemical DBP;
- 11 2. An injunctive order, pursuant to HSC § 25249.7(b) and 27 CCR §§
12 25603 and 25603.1, compelling Defendants to provide a “clear and
13 reasonable” warning on the label of the Subject Product, and warnings
14 online as required and applicable. The warning should indicate that
15 the Subject Product will expose the user or consumer to chemicals
16 known to the State of California to cause developmental harm and
17 reproductive harm.
- 18 3. An assessment of civil penalties against Defendants, pursuant to HSC
19 § 25249.7(b), in the amount of \$2,500, per day, for each violation of
20 Proposition 65;
- 21 4. An award to Plaintiff of its attorneys’ fees pursuant to CCP § 1021.5
22 or the substantial benefit theory;
- 23 5. An award of costs of suit herein pursuant to CCP § 1032 *et seq.* or as
24 otherwise warranted; and

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

1 6. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

2
3 Respectfully submitted,

4 DATED: November 14, 2024

KHANSARI LAW CORPORATION

5
6
7 

8 Andre A. Khansari, Esq.
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
10 CA Citizen Protection Group, LLC