

FORWARDED

SUMMONS ISSUED  
**FILED**  
San Francisco County Superior Court

DEC 13 2005

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk

BY: \_\_\_\_\_ Deputy Clerk  
HELENA VEGA-AVAREZ, Mossaly

1 Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534  
2 Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711  
3 Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319  
4 HIRST & CHANLER  
5 2560 Ninth Street  
6 Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
7 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565

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

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11 RUSSELL BRIMER

MAY 12 2006 09 AM

DEPARTMENT 212

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

13 FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

14 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

15  
16  
17 RUSSELL BRIMER, )  
18 )  
19 Plaintiff, )  
20 v. )  
21 GREEN FROG MARKET; GREEN FROG )  
22 MARKET BERNARD, LLC; and DOES 1 )  
23 through 150, inclusive. )  
24 Defendants. )

No. CGC-05-447601

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL  
PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF

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

25  
26  
27 RUSSELL BRIMER, by and through his counsel, on behalf of himself, on behalf all others  
28 similarly situated and on behalf of the general public, hereby alleges as follows:

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1 NATURE OF THE ACTION

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

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

9 3. Lead is a chemical that is identified in Title 22, California Code of Regulations  
10 ("CCR") §12000 and that is known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other  
11 reproductive harm. Lead shall hereafter be referred to as the "LISTED CHEMICAL". The  
12 consumer products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, and for which defendants are responsible,  
13 are beer bottles and other glassware intended for the consumption of food or beverages with  
14 colored artwork or designs on the exterior including, but not limited to, *Cerveza Sol Beer 6 Pk (#0*  
15 *72311 63021 4)*. All such consumer products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereafter  
16 be referred to as the "PRODUCTS".

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

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

26 6. Defendants' failures to provide proper mandatory warnings about exposure to the  
27

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

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 GREEN FROG MARKET ("GREEN FROG") is a person doing business  
16 within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

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

20 12. Defendant GREEN FROG MARKET BERNARD, LLC ("BERNARD, LLC") is a  
21 person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

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

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

5 17. 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 18. Defendants DOES 101-150 (hereafter "RETAIL DEFENDANTS") are each persons  
9 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

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

12 20. 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 21. GREEN FROG, BERNARD, LLC, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS,  
18 DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, RETAIL DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 1 through 150  
19 shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereafter as "DEFENDANTS".

#### 20 VENUE AND JURISDICTION

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

26 23. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to  
27 California Constitution Article VI, §10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all  
28 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 27, 2005, a "60-Day Notice" of Proposition 65 violations was  
26 provided to public enforcement agencies and to GREEN FROG MARKET and GREEN FROG  
27 MARKET BERNARD, LLC stating that exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL were occurring in  
28 the State of California from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the

1 individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a “clear and reasonable warning”  
2 regarding such exposure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 38. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted  
28 directly by California voters, individuals thus exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the

1 PRODUCTS, without "clear and reasonable warning", have suffered and continue to suffer  
2 irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

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

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

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

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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


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

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

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

22 Dated: December 12, 2005

23 Respectfully Submitted,  
HIRST & CHANLER

24   
25 Daniel Bornstein  
26 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
27 RUSSELL BRIMER  
28