

J. DeHerrera

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

RUSSELL BRIMER,

Plaintiff

v.

EDEN MARKETING CORPORATION; and
DOES 1 through 150,

Defendants.

No. _____

106CV057257

**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 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

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

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

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

13 4. The consumer products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, and for which
14 defendants are responsible, are bowls and other glassware intended for the consumption of food or
15 beverages with colored artwork or designs on the exterior including, but not limited to, *Glass Bowl*
16 *W/PL Lid No2, #DR242033 (#6 92167 03781 6)*. All such consumer products containing the
17 LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS".

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

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

27 _____
28 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 EDEN MARKETING CORPORATION ("EDEN") is a person doing
17 business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

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

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

23 14. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,
24 designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they
25 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing,
26 one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale, consumption or use in the State of California.

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

1 State of California, or otherwise purposefully avails itself of the California market.

2 DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California
3 courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

6 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
7 Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

8 25. The citizens of the State of California have expressly stated in the Safe Drinking
9 Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.* ("Proposition
10 65") that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects and
11 other reproductive harm." (Proposition 65, §1(b).)

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

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

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

27 29. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and
28 diligently prosecute a cause of action, under Health & Safety Code §25249.6, *et seq.*, against

1 DEFENDANTS based on the claims asserted in Plaintiff's 60-Day Notice.

2 30. At all times relevant to this action, the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED
3 CHEMICAL.

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

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

9 33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and
10 continues to cause an exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is defined by
11 22 CCR §12601.

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

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

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

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

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

1 per day for each violation.

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

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

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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


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

16 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit, and

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

18 Dated: January 30, 2006

19 Respectfully Submitted,
HIRST & CHANLER, LLP

20 

21 Daniel Bornstein
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER