1	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 Laurence D. Haveson, State Bar No. 152631		FILED Superior Court Of California	
2	THE CHANLER GROUP 81 Throckmorton Avenue, Suite 203 Mill Valley, CA 94941 Telephone: (415) 388-1128		Sacramento 08/23/2012 Igutierrez2	
3				
4	Facsimile: (415) 388-1135		Ву	, Deputy
5 6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E., RUSSELL BRIMER, and JOHN MOORE		Caea Humber: 34-2012-00130566	
7	<b>,</b>			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO  DEPART			DEPARTMENT
10	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTI		N <sub>C</sub>	ASSIGNMENTS ase Management 36
11	·		Lä	aw and Motion 53 nors Compromise 24
12				
13	ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.; RUSSELL BRIMER; and JOHN MOORE,	Case No		· 
14			D DECLAD	ATODY
15	v.	COMPLAINT FOR DECI INJUNCTIVE, OR OTHE		
16		(Cal. Gov't Code §	11350)	
17	KAMALA D. HARRIS, in her official capacity as the Attorney General of the State of			
18	California; THE DEPARTMENT OF			
19	JUSTICE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA; and DOES 1-20, inclusive,			
20	Defendants.			
21		I		
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF			

Plaintiffs Anthony E. Held, Ph.D., P.E., Russell Brimer, and John Moore allege:

## NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is an action pursuant to California Government Code § 11350 for declaratory and injunctive relief regarding the validity of Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations, section 3003 ("11 CCR § 3003"), adopted by the Attorney General of the State of California ("Attorney General") and the Department of Justice of the State of California ("Department of Justice"), and requiring citizen enforcers of Proposition 65 to file and serve motions to approve settlements under Proposition 65 on the Attorney General no later than 45 days in advance of the hearing on such motions.
- 2. This action is brought by plaintiffs Anthony E. Held, Ph.D., P.E., Russell Brimer, and John Moore to enforce their right as private litigants and citizen enforcers of California's Proposition 65, to file motions to approve proposed Proposition 65 settlements and file and serve notice of such motions, in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure ("CCP") § 1005(b), 16 court days before the hearing, rather than at least 45 days prior to the date of the hearing on such motions, as now required by 11 CCR § 3003. The Attorney General's regulation, 11 CCR § 3003, is in conflict with CCP § 1005(b) and also exceeds the statutory authority relied upon by the Attorney General in support of 11 CCR § 3003.
- 3. Proposition 65 authorizes private citizens to bring actions in the public interest to enforce Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, which provides 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." Proposition 65 imposes civil penalties on violators and provides for injunctive relief. Settlements between private enforcers and alleged violators almost universally require the alleged violator to pay civil penalties into the State's coffers—in private enforcement actions, 75% of civil penalties are paid to the State, and the remaining 25% are paid to the private enforcer who brought the action—and often require the alleged violator to reformulate its products to eliminate the presence of chemicals known to cause birth defects and

other reproductive harm. Under Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(f)(4), the private enforcer must submit Proposition 65 settlements to the court for approval upon noticed motion.

#### **PARTIES**

- 4. Plaintiff Anthony E. Held, Ph.D., P.E. 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 and commercial products.
- 5. Plaintiff Russell Brimer 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 and commercial products.
- 6. Plaintiff John Moore 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 and commercial products.
- 7. Plaintiffs Anthony E Held, Ph.D., P.E., Russell Brimer, and John More are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "plaintiffs."
- 8. Defendant Kamala D. Harris is the Attorney General of the State of California. In her official capacity, the Attorney General is the chief legal officer of the State of California, and the person responsible for adopting 11 CCR § 3003. It is her duty to see that the laws of the State are uniformly and adequately enforced. The Attorney General maintains offices in Sacramento, California. The Attorney General is the head of the Department of Justice. (Cal. Gov't Code § 12510.) Any duties which the Attorney General may perform personally may ordinarily be performed by his or her regularly authorized assistants and deputies.
- 9. Defendant Department of Justice is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a department within the executive branch of the State of California, duly organized under the laws of the State of California, and is under the direction and control of the Attorney General. (Cal. Gov't Code § 15000.) Assistant attorneys general, deputy attorneys general, service agents, experts, and technical and clerical employee appointed by the Attorney General are civil executive officers within the Department of Justice.

- 10. Defendants Attorney General and the Department of Justice are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Attorney General."
- 11. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-20, inclusive, and therefore sue these defendants by these fictitious names.

  Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.

  Plaintiffs are informed and believe that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged.

### **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

- 12. Venue is proper in the Sacramento County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 393 and 395 because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because this is an action against a public officer, one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of Sacramento, and/or because one or more defendants maintain offices in this County.
- 13. 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 California Superior Court also has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Government Code § 11350 as plaintiffs are interested persons seeking a judicial declaration regarding the validity of a regulation adopted by the Attorney General of California. California Government Code § 11350 does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

#### **FACTS**

14. In 2002, operative in January 2003, defendants promulgated and adopted 11 CCR §§ 3000 and 3003, providing in pertinent part as follows:

Section 3000: "This chapter sets forth procedures necessary to comply with Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(e) and (f) as amended by Ch.599, statutes of 1999 and Chapter 578, statutes of 2001. Any private person proceeding 'in the public interest' pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d) or bringing any other action (hereinafter 'Private Enforcer'), who alleges the existence of violations of the Safe

Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Health and Safety Code sections 25249.5 or 25249.6) (hereinafter 'Proposition 65'), shall comply with the applicable requirements of this chapter."

Section 3003: "The Private Enforcer shall serve the Settlement on the Attorney General with a Report of Settlement in the form set forth in Appendix B within five days after the action is Subject to a Settlement, or concurrently with service of the motion for judicial approval of settlement pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), whichever is sooner. The motion and all supporting papers and exhibits shall be served on the Attorney General no later than forty-five days prior to the date of the hearing of the motion." (Emphasis added.)

- 15. The Attorney General's regulation, 11 CCR § 3003, has since its adoption been, and now is, in full force and effect. The Attorney General's note to Section 3003 cites for its authority to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(f), which provides:
  - (1) Any person filing an action in the public interest pursuant to subdivision (d), any private person filing any action in which a violation of this chapter is alleged, or any private person settling any violation of this chapter alleged in a notice given pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (d), shall, after the action or violation is subject either to a settlement or to a judgment, submit to the Attorney General a reporting form that includes the results of that settlement or judgment and the final disposition of the case, even if dismissed. At the time of the filing of any judgment pursuant to an action brought in the public interest pursuant to subdivision (d), or any action brought by a private person in which a violation of this chapter is alleged, the plaintiff shall file an affidavit verifying that the report required by this subdivision has been accurately completed and submitted to the Attorney General.
  - (2) Any person bringing an action in the public interest pursuant to subdivision (d), or any private person bringing an action in which a violation of this chapter is alleged, shall, after the action is either subject to a settlement, with or without court approval, or to a judgment, submit to the Attorney General a report that includes information on any corrective action being taken as a part of the settlement or resolution of the action.
  - (3) The Attorney General shall develop a reporting form that specifies the information that shall be reported, including, but not limited to, for purposes of subdivision (e), the date the action was filed, the nature of the relief sought, and for purposes of this subdivision, the amount of the settlement or civil penalty assessed, other financial terms of the settlement, and any other information the Attorney General deems appropriate.

- (4) If there is a settlement of an action brought by a person in the public interest under subdivision (d), the plaintiff shall submit the settlement, other than a voluntary dismissal in which no consideration is received from the defendant, to the court for approval upon noticed motion, and the court may approve the settlement only if the court makes all of the following findings:
  - (A) Any warning that is required by the settlement complies with this chapter.
  - (B) Any award of attorney's fees is reasonable under California law.
  - (C) Any penalty amount is reasonable based on the criteria set forth in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).
- (5) The plaintiff subject to paragraph (4) has the burden of producing evidence sufficient to sustain each required finding. The plaintiff shall serve the motion and all supporting papers on the Attorney General, who may appear and participate in any proceeding without intervening in the case.
- (6) Neither this subdivision nor the procedures provided in subdivision (e) and subdivisions (g) to (j), inclusive, shall affect the requirements imposed by statute or a court decision in existence on January 1, 2002, concerning whether claims raised by any person or public prosecutor not a party to the action are precluded by a settlement approved by the court.
- Attorney General to adopt regulations altering the time for notice of a motion to approve a Proposition 65 settlement. The provisions of section 25249.7(f) that govern the Attorney General's authority and the procedures for a private enforcer to obtain court approval of a Proposition 65 settlement are subparts (3), (4), and (5), which confer no authority on the Attorney General other than to develop a reporting form for settlement.
- 17. 11 CCR § 3003 is in conflict with CCP § 1005(b), which provides in pertinent part: "Unless otherwise ordered or specifically provided by law, all moving and supporting papers shall be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. . . . The court, or a judge thereof, may prescribe a shorter time."
- 18. Whereas CCP § 1005(b) allows a plaintiff to file and serve a motion to approve a Proposition 65 settlement 16 court days before the date set for hearing on the motion, 11 CCR § 3003 requires that the plaintiff serve the Attorney General with the moving and supporting papers no less than 45 days before the date set for hearing on the motion. Section 25249.7(f)

contains no authority for the Attorney General to require a private enforcer of Proposition 65 to provide a longer period of notice for a motion than required by CCP § 1005(b). Because 11 CCR § 3003 alters or amends CCP § 1005(b) for private enforcers of Proposition 65, it is clearly void.

19. 11 CCR § 3003 denies plaintiffs' statutory right under CCP § 1005(b) to file and serve a motion to approve a Proposition 65 settlement less than 45 days before the date set for the hearing on the motion. 11 CCR § 3003 is detrimental not only to plaintiffs but also to the citizens of California because it illegally delays plaintiffs' ability to obtain court approval of settlements that result in payments of civil penalties to the State, reformulation of products to eliminate the presence of chemicals known to cause cancer or reproductive harm, or otherwise require alleged violators of Proposition 65 to bring their products into compliance with the health hazard warning law.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Declaratory Relief - Against All Defendants)

- 20. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference, as if fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1 through 19, inclusive.
- 21. An actual and judicially cognizable controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiffs and defendants regarding whether 11 CCR § 3003 is invalid and unenforceable, both on its face and as construed by defendants, in that 11 CCR § 3003, a regulation adopted by the Attorney General, conflicts with CCP § 1005(b), a statute duly adopted by the California Legislature. The Attorney General is presently enforcing 11 CCR § 3003 to the detriment of plaintiffs, other private enforcers of Proposition 65, and the public interest.
- 22. Plaintiffs desire a declaration of their rights with respect to the application or nonapplication of 11 CCR § 3003 to plaintiffs, with particular reference as to the legality of plaintiffs' ability to file and serve a motion to approve a Proposition 65 settlement less than 45 days before the date of the hearing on the motion.

23. Such a declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiffs may ascertain their rights and duties.

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendant as follows:

- 1. That the Court declare the respective rights and duties of plaintiffs and defendants under the regulation in question and that by its declaration and judgment the court declare that the regulation is unconstitutional, invalid, and void;
- 2. Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter a preliminary and a permanent injunction enjoining enforcement or application of 11 CCR § 3003;
- 3. That the Court grant plaintiffs their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
  - 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

By:

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 22, 2012

THE CHANLER GROUP

Clifford A. Chanler Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.;

RUSSELL BRIMER; and JOHN MOORE

RECEIVED IN DROP BOX

12 AUG 23 PM 12: 51

GDSSC COURTHOUSE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

any an