

Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319
Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711
Christopher L. Brooke, State Bar No. 238747
HIRST & CHANLER, LLP
2560 Ninth Street
Parker Plaza, Suite 214
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565
Tel: (510) 848-8880
Fax: (510) 848-8118

Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER

ENDORSED
FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

FEB 14 2006

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk
BY: CRISTINA E. BAUTISTA
Deputy Clerk

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

JUL 14 2006 09:00 AM

DEPARTMENT 212

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

RUSSELL BRIMER,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHOP AT HOME, LLC; SHOP AT HOME
NETWORK, LLC; SHOP AT HOME, INC.; and
DOES 1 through 150, inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 06-06-449424

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:

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 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

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

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

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

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

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

PARTIES

10. 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.

11. Defendant SHOP AT HOME, LLC. ("SHOP AT HOME, LLC") is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

12. SHOP AT HOME, LLC distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

13. Defendant SHOP AT HOME NETWORK, LLC ("NETWORK") is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

14. NETWORK distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

15. Defendant SHOP AT HOME, INC. ("SHOP AT HOME, INC.") is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

16. SHOP AT HOME, INC. distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

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

3 18. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,
4 designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they
5 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing,
6 one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale, consumption or use in the State of California.

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

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

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

14 22. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State
15 of California.

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

21 24. SHOP AT HOME, LLC, NETWORK, SHOP AT HOME, INC.,
22 MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, RETAIL
23 DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 1 through 150 shall, where appropriate, collectively be
24 referred to hereafter as "DEFENDANTS".

25 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

26 25. Venue is proper in the San Francisco County Superior Court, pursuant to Code of
27 Civil Procedure §§394, 395, 395.5 because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because
28 one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continues to occur, in the County of San

1 Francisco and/or because DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in this
2 County with respect to the PRODUCTS.

3 26. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
4 California Constitution Article VI, §10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all
5 causes except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this action is
6 brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

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

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

15 28. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
16 Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive.

17 29. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking
18 Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.* (“Proposition
19 65”) that they must be informed “about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and
20 other reproductive harm.” (Proposition 65, §1(b).)

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

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

1 future.

2 32. On November 23, 2005, a "60-Day Notice" of Proposition 65 violations, containing
3 a Certificate of Merit pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d)(1), was provided to
4 public enforcement agencies and to SHOP AT HOME, LLC, SHOP AT HOME NETWORK, LLC
5 and SHOP AT HOME, INC. stating that exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL were occurring in
6 the State of California from the reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the
7 individual purchasers and users first having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning"
8 regarding such exposure.

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

12 34. At all times relevant to this action, the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED
13 CHEMICAL.

14 35. At all times relevant to this action, the DEFENDANTS knew or should have known
15 that the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL.

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

19 37. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and
20 continues to cause an exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is defined by
21 22 CCR §12601.

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

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

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

5 41. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted
6 directly by California voters, individuals thus exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the
7 PRODUCTS, without “clear and reasonable warning”, have suffered and continue to suffer
8 irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

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

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

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

16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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: February 10, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,
HIRST & CHANLER, LLP


Daniel Bornstein
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER