

ENDORSED  
FILED  
San Francisco County Superior Court

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 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

**CGC 06449468**

RUSSELL BRIMER, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
MARTIN & WEYRICH WINERY, LLC; and )  
DOES 1 through 150, inclusive, )  
 )  
Defendants. )

No. \_\_\_\_\_

**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 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 and cadmium present in or on consumer products placed into the stream  
8 of commerce by defendants.

9 3. Lead is a chemical that is identified within 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 "LISTED CHEMICAL".

12 4. The consumer products containing lead, and for which defendants are responsible,  
13 are wine glasses 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, *Glasses w/Logo Crystal,*  
15 *#2851*. All such consumer products containing the LISTED CHEMICAL shall hereafter be  
16 referred to as the "PRODUCTS".

17 5. 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 6. 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 ///

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





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 MARTIN & WEYRICH WINERY, LLC. stating that  
24 exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL were occurring in the State of California from the  
25 reasonably foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first  
26 having been 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 each of the LISTED CHEMICALS 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: February 14, 2006

19 Respectfully Submitted,  
HIRST & CHANLER, LLP

20 

21 Daniel Bornstein  
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
RUSSELL BRIMER