

1 Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711  
2 Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319  
3 PARAS LAW GROUP  
4 2560 Ninth Street, Suite 214  
5 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  
6 Tel: (510) 848-8880  
7 Fax: (510) 848-8118

ENDORSED  
FILED  
San Francisco County Superior Court

OCT 11 2005

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk

BY: JUN P. PANELO  
Deputy Clerk

6 Christopher M Martin, State Bar No. 186021  
7 MARTIN LAW GROUP  
8 23 N. Lincoln, suite 204  
9 Hinsdale, IL 60521  
10 Tel: (630) 789-6998  
11 Fax: (630) 214-0979

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

MAR 10 2006 - 9 @ AM

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11 RUSSELL BRIMER

DEPARTMENT 212

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

13 FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

14 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

16 RUSSELL BRIMER, )

No. CGC 05 445628

17 Plaintiff, )

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL  
PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF

18 v. )

19 THINGS FROM ANOTHER WORLD, INC.; )  
20 DARK HORSE COMICS, INC.; and DOES 1 )  
21 through 150, inclusive. )

(Health & Safety Code §25249, et seq.)

22 Defendants. )

23 RUSSELL BRIMER, by and through his counsel, on behalf of himself, on behalf all others  
24 similarly situated and on behalf of the general public, hereby alleges as follows:

25 NATURE OF THE ACTION

26 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER,  
27 on behalf of citizens of the State of California, to enforce each citizen's right to be informed of the  
28 presence of and nature of toxic chemicals in consumer goods.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1           2.       This Complaint seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failures to warn the citizens  
2 of the State of California about the presence of, the nature of, and such citizens' actual and  
3 potential exposure to lead present in or on consumer products placed into the stream of commerce  
4 by defendants.

5           3.       Lead is a chemical that is identified in title 22, California Code of Regulations  
6 ("CCR") §12000 that is known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other  
7 reproductive harm. Lead shall hereafter be referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICAL".

8           4.       The consumer products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, and for which  
9 defendants are responsible, are mugs and other ceramic containers intended for the consumption of  
10 food or beverages with colored artwork or designs on the exterior including, but not limited to,  
11 *Rocket Comics Mug (#4 000500 90720 3)* and shot glasses and other glassware intended for the  
12 consumption of food or beverages with colored artwork or designs on the exterior including, but  
13 not limited to, *Goon Shot Glass #1: The Goon (#E94 10206)*, *Ghost Jade Shot Glass (#E94 19481)*  
14 and *Austin Powers Psychedelic Shot Glass Set (#7 61568 18557 7)*. All such consumer products  
15 containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS".

16           5.       Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986,  
17 Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*<sup>1</sup> (hereafter "Proposition 65"), "No person in the course of  
18 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the  
19 state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to  
20 such individual..."

21           6.       On February 27, 1987, the State listed lead as a chemical known to cause birth  
22 defects and other reproductive harm. This chemical became subject to the warning requirement  
23 one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of  
24 Proposition 65, beginning on February 27, 1988. (22 CCR §12000(b)(c); Proposition 65.)

25           7.       Defendants' failures to provide proper mandatory warnings about exposure to the  
26 LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with the sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> Unless specifically noted, all statutory citations refer to California law.

1 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such  
2 violation.

3 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive  
4 and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers of the PRODUCTS  
5 with the appropriate Proposition 65 warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED  
6 CHEMICAL.

7 9. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against defendants for their violations of  
8 Proposition 65, as provided for by Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b).

9  
10 **PARTIES**

11 10. Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER is a citizen of the State of California who resides in  
12 the County of Alameda and who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens,  
13 including the elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products, and who brings  
14 this action on behalf of the general public pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7.

15 11. Defendant THINGS FROM ANOTHER WORLD, INC. ("TFAW") is a person  
16 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

17 12. TFAW distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of  
18 California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use  
19 in the State of California.

20 13. Defendant DARK HORSE COMICS, INC. ("DARK HORSE") is a person doing  
21 business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

22 14. DARK HORSE manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or  
23 use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or offers  
24 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

25 15. Defendants DOES 1-50 (hereafter "MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each  
26 persons doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

27 16. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,  
28 designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they

1 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing,  
2 one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale, consumption or use in the State of California.

3 17. Defendants DOES 51-100 (hereafter "DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each  
4 persons doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

5 18. DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process and/or  
6 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses or retailers in the State of  
7 California.

8 19. Defendants DOES 101-150 (hereafter "RETAIL DEFENDANTS") are each persons  
9 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

10 20. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State  
11 of California.

12 21. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, are  
13 unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues said defendants by their fictitious name pursuant to Code  
14 of Civil Procedure §474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of  
15 the fictitiously named defendants is responsible for the acts and occurrences herein alleged. When  
16 ascertained, their true names shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

17 22. TFAW, DARK HORSE, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR  
18 DEFENDANTS, RETAIL DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 1 through 150 shall, where  
19 appropriate, collectively be referred to hereafter as "DEFENDANTS".

20  
21 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

22 23. Venue is proper in the San Francisco Superior Court, pursuant to Code of Civil  
23 Procedure §§394, 395, 395.5 because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because one or  
24 more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of San  
25 Francisco and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this  
26 County with respect to the PRODUCTS.

27 24. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to  
28 California Constitution Article VI, §10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all

1 causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this action is  
2 brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

3 25. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS based on  
4 plaintiff’s information and good faith belief that each defendant is a person, firm, corporation or  
5 association that either is a citizen of the State of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in the  
6 State of California, or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.  
7 DEFENDANTS’ purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California  
8 courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9  
10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

12 26. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,  
13 Paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive.

14 27. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking  
15 Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.* that they must  
16 be informed “about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive  
17 harm.” (Proposition 65, §1(b).)

18 28. Proposition 65 further states that, “No person in the course of doing business shall  
19 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer  
20 or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual....”

21 29. Based on information and good faith belief, plaintiff alleges that, at all times  
22 relevant to this Complaint, DEFENDANTS have engaged in the sales of the PRODUCTS in  
23 violation Health & Safety Code §25249.6, *et seq.*, and that DEFENDANTS’ offensive sale of the  
24 PRODUCTS has continued to occur beyond DEFENDANTS’ receipt of plaintiff’s 60-Day Notice  
25 of Violation. Plaintiff also alleges and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the  
26 future.

27 30. Beginning on August 5, 2005, “60-Day Notices” of Proposition 65 violations were  
28 provided to public enforcement agencies and to TFAW and DARK HORSE stating that exposures

1 to the LISTED CHEMICAL were occurring in the State of California from the reasonably  
2 foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been  
3 provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding such exposure.

4 31. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and  
5 diligently prosecute a cause of action, under Health & Safety Code §25249.6, *et seq.*, against  
6 DEFENDANTS based on the claims asserted in Plaintiff’s 60-Day Notices.

7 32. At all times relevant to this action, the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED  
8 CHEMICAL.

9 33. At all times relevant to this action, the DEFENDANTS knew or should have known  
10 that the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.

11 34. At all times relevant to this action, the LISTED CHEMICAL was present in or on  
12 the PRODUCTS in such a way as to be available for transfer or release from PRODUCTS to  
13 individuals during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

14 35. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and  
15 continues to cause an exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is defined by  
16 22 CCR §12601.

17 36. Based on information and good faith belief, plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant  
18 to this action, DEFENDANTS had knowledge that individuals’ normal and reasonably foreseeable  
19 use of the PRODUCTS would cause an exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL.

20 37. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, intended that  
21 such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the reasonably foreseeable use of the  
22 PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the manufacture,  
23 distribution and/or sale of PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

24 38. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANTS failed to provide a “clear and  
25 reasonable warning” of reproductive toxicity (as defined by 22 CCR §12601) to those consumers or  
26 other individuals in the State of California who were or could become exposed to the PRODUCTS  
27 and the LISTED CHEMICAL contained therein.

28 39. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted

1 directly by California voters, individuals thus exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the  
2 PRODUCTS, without "clear and reasonable warning", have suffered and continue to suffer  
3 irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

4 40. As a consequence of the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS, and each of them,  
5 are liable, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500  
6 per day for each violation.

7 41. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health & Safety Code §25249.7 also  
8 specifically authorizes the grant of injunctive relief under Proposition 65 against DEFENDANTS.

9 Wherefore, plaintiff prays judgment against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, as  
10 set forth hereafter.

11  
12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

14 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), assess civil penalties  
15 against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation  
16 alleged herein;

17 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a), preliminarily and  
18 permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS, and each of them, from offering the PRODUCTS for sale or  
19 use in California, without providing an identification of the LISTED CHEMICAL in the  
20 PRODUCTS as well as "clear and reasonable warning[s]" as defined by 22 CCR §12601, as  
21 plaintiff shall specify in further application to the Court;

22 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and

23 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

24 Dated: October 1, 2005

25 Respectfully Submitted,  
26 PARAS LAW GROUP

27 

28 Daniel Bornstein  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
RUSSELL BRIMER