

NOV 07 2005

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By _____ *llf* Deputy

Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534
Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711
Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319
HIRST & CHANLER
2560 Ninth Street
Parker Plaza, Suite 214
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565

Tel: (510) 848-8880
Fax: (510) 848-8118

Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA – HAYWARD BRANCH
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

RUSSELL BRIMER,

Plaintiff,

v.

BUFFALO BILL'S BREWERY; STEINBECK)
BREWING COMPANY; and DOES 1 through)
150, inclusive.)

Defendants.)

No. *HL* 05240924

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

6. Defendants' failures to provide proper mandatory warnings about exposure to the

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
2

1 LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with the sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition
2 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such
3 violation.

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

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

10 **PARTIES**

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

15 10. Defendant BUFFALO BILL'S BREWERY ("BUFFALO BILL'S") is a person
16 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

17 11. BUFFALO BILL'S distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the
18 State of California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for
19 sale or use in the State of California.

20 12. Defendant STEINBECK BREWING COMPANY ("STEINBECK") is a person
21 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

22 13. STEINBECK distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State
23 of California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or
24 use in the State of California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

19. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State of California.

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

21. BUFFALO BILL'S, STEINBECK, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, RETAIL DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 1 through 150 shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereafter as "DEFENDANTS".

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

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

23. 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

1 brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

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

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

10 25. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
11 Paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive.

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

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

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

25 29. On September 2, 2005, a "60-Day Notice" of Proposition 65 violations was
26 provided to public enforcement agencies and to BUFFALO BILL'S and STEINBECK stating that
27 exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL were occurring in the State of California from the
28 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first

1 having been provided with a “clear and reasonable warning” regarding such exposure.

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

5 31. At all times relevant to this action, the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED
6 CHEMICAL.

7 32. At all times relevant to this action, the DEFENDANTS knew or should have known
8 that the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.

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

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

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

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

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

26 38. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted
27 directly by California voters, individuals thus exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the
28 PRODUCTS, without “clear and reasonable warning”, have suffered and continue to suffer

1 irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

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

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

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

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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


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

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

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

21 Dated: November 7, 2005

22 Respectfully Submitted,
HIRST & CHANLER

23 
24 Laralei S. Paras
25 Attorneys for Plaintiff
26 RUSSELL BRIMER
27
28