

FEB 15 2006

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk
BY: JUN P. PANELO
Deputy Clerk

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

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

JUL 21 2006 - 9 00 AM

Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER

DEPARTMENT 212

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

RUSSELL BRIMER,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORIENTAL TRADING COMPANY, INC.;
TERRY'S VILLAGE; and DOES 1 through 150,
inclusive,

Defendants.

No.

CGC 06449465

**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
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

1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER, half of citizens of the State of California, to enforce each citizen's right to be informed of the source 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 and cadmium present in or on consumer products placed into the stream of commerce by defendants.

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

4. The consumer products containing lead, and for which defendants are responsible, safe glasses and other glassware intended for the consumption of food or beverages with artwork or designs on the exterior including, but not limited to, *Pastel Flower Carafe* #M-091/4502 (#8 87600 00233 3). All such consumer products containing the LISTED MATERIAL shall hereafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS".

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

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

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

1 7. Defendants' failures to provide proper mandatory warnings about exposure to the
2 LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with the sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition
3 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such
4 violation.

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

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

11 **PARTIES**

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

16 11. Defendant ORIENTAL TRADING COMPANY, INC. ("ORIENTAL") is a person
17 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

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

21 13. Defendant TERRY'S VILLAGE ("TERRY'S VILLAGE") is a person doing
22 business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

23 14. TERRY'S VILLAGE distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the
24 State of California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for
25 sale or use in the State of California.

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

28 ///

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

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

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

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

12 20. RETAIL DEFENDANTS offer the PRODUCTS for sale to individuals in the State
13 of California.

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

19 22. ORIENTAL, TERRY'S VILLAGE, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS,
20 DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, RETAIL DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 1 through 150
21 shall, where appropriate, collectively be referred to hereafter as "DEFENDANTS".

22 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

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

28 ///

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

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

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

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

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

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

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

28 ///

1 38. 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 39. 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 40. 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 41. 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 ///

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

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

3
4 Dated: February 14, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,
HIRST & CHANLER, LLP

5
6 

Daniel Bornstein
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER