

George W. Dowell, State Bar No. 234759
D. Joshua Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
HIRST & CHANLER LLP
2560 Ninth Street
Parker Plaza, Suite 214
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565
Telephone: (510) 848-8880
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

OCT 27 2005 - 9 00 AM

DEPARTMENT 212

ENDORSED
FILED
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT
2006 MAY 26 PM 3:57
GORDON PAGE, CLERK
D. STEPPE

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

RUSSELL BRIMER,
Plaintiff,

v.

BLUE SKY BRANDS, INC.; BITS &
PIECES, INC.; and DOES 1 through 150,
inclusive,
Defendants.

No. _____

CGC - 06-452652

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:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

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

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

1 3. Lead is a chemical identified in Title 22, California Code of Regulations ("CCR")
2 §12000 that is known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.
3 Lead shall hereafter be referred to as "LISTED CHEMICAL." The consumer products containing
4 the LISTED CHEMICAL, and for which defendants are responsible, are glass and metal sun
5 catchers and other glass and metal products including, but not limited to, Cardinal Stained Glass
6 Suncatcher, #80-6080. All such consumer products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL on the
7 exterior shall hereafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."

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

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

17 6. Defendants' failures to provide proper mandatory warnings about exposure to the
18 LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with the sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition
19 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such
20 violation.

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

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

27 _____
28 ¹ Unless specifically noted, all statutory citations refer to California law.

PARTIES

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

10. Defendant BLUE SKY BRANDS, INC. ("BLUE SKY") is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

11. BLUE SKY manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

12. Defendant BITS & PIECES, INC. ("BITS & PIECES") is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

13. BITS & PIECES manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

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

15. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing, 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.

\\

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

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

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

10 21. BLUE SKY, BITS & PIECES, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS,
11 DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, RETAIL DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 1 through 150
12 shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereafter as "DEFENDANTS".

13 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

19 23. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
20 California Constitution Article VI, §10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in
21 all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action
22 is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

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

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

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

5 26. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking
6 Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et seq. ("Proposition
7 65") that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and
8 other reproductive harm." (Proposition 65, §1(b).)

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

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

19 29. On November 23, 2005, a "60-Day Notice" of Proposition 65 violations containing
20 a Certificate of Merit pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d)(1) was provided
21 to public enforcement agencies and to BLUE SKY BRANDS, INC. and BITS & PIECES, INC.
22 stating that exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL were occurring in the State of California from
23 the reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users
24 first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such exposure.

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

28 \\\

1 31. At all times relevant to this action, the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED
2 CHEMICAL.

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 38. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted
23 directly by California voters, individuals thus exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the
24 PRODUCTS, without "clear and reasonable warning", have suffered and continue to suffer
25 irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

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

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

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as follows:

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

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

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

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

Dated: May 26, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,
HIRST & CHANLER, LLP


D. Joshua Voorhees
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER