

FEB - 1 2006

GORDON PAHK-LI, Clerk  
BY: PARAM NATY  
Deputy Clerk

1 Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711  
2 Christopher M. Martin, State Bar No. 186021  
3 Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319  
4 HIRST & CHANLER, L.L.P.  
5 Hinsdale Square  
6 23 N. Lincoln, Suite 204  
7 Chicago, IL 60521  
8 Tel: (630) 789-6998  
9 Fax: (630) 214-0979

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

JUL 07 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.

STRAUS FAMILY CREAMERY, INC.; and  
DOES 1 through 150,

Defendants.

No. CGC - 06 449080

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL  
PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

Health & Safety Code §25249

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

///

1 exposure to lead present in or on consumer products placed into the stream of commerce by  
2 defendants.

3 3. Lead is a chemical that is identified within 22 C.C.R. §12000 and that is known to  
4 the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects (and other reproductive harm). Lead shall  
5 hereafter be referred to as "LISTED CHEMICALS".

6 4. The consumer products containing the LISTED CHEMICALS, and for which  
7 defendants are responsible, are milk bottles and other glassware intended for the consumption of  
8 food or beverages with colored artwork or designs (containing lead) on the exterior including, but  
9 not limited to, *Organic Chocolate Nonfat Milk* (#7 84830 00032 3). All such consumer products  
10 containing the LISTED CHEMICALS shall hereafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS".

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

16 6. Beginning on February 27, 1987, the State had listed lead as a chemical known to  
17 cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. This chemical became subject to the warning  
18 requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable warning"  
19 requirements of Proposition 65, beginning on February 27, 1988. (22 Code of Regulations  
20 §12000(b)(c); Health and Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*)

21 7. Defendants' failure to provide proper mandatory warnings about exposure to the  
22 LISTED CHEMICALS in conjunction with the sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of  
23 Proposition 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for  
24 each such violation.

25 ///

26 ///

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

1           8.     For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and  
2 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide users of the PRODUCTS with the  
3 appropriate Proposition 65 warning regarding the hazards of such LISTED CHEMICALS.

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

6                                   PARTIES

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

11          11.    Defendant STRAUS FAMILY CREAMERY, INC. ("STRAUS FAMILY") is a  
12 person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11.

13          12.    STRAUS FAMILY distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the  
14 State of California or implies by its conduct that it distributes and/or offers the PRODUCTS for  
15 sale or use in State of California.

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

18          14.    MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS engage in the process of research, testing,  
19 designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing, or imply by their conduct that they  
20 engage in the process of research, testing, designing, assembling, fabricating and/or manufacturing,  
21 one or more of the PRODUCTS in the State of California or for consumption or use in the State of  
22 California.

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

25          16.    DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS distribute, exchange, transfer, process and/or  
26 transport one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses or retailers in the State of  
27 California.

28    ///



1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of Proposition 65)**

3 24. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if specifically set forth herein,  
4 Paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

5 25. 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 26. 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 cancer  
11 or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual...."

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

18 28. Beginning on November 23, 2005, "60-Day Notices" of Proposition 65 violations  
19 containing a Certificate of Merit pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d)(1)  
20 were provided to public enforcement agencies and to STRAUS FAMILY stating that exposures to  
21 the LISTED CHEMICALS were occurring in the State of California from the reasonably  
22 foreseeable uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been  
23 provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such exposure.

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

27 30. At all times relevant to this action, the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED  
28 CHEMICALS.

1           31.     At all times relevant to this action, the DEFENDANTS knew or should have known  
2 that the PRODUCTS contained the LISTED CHEMICALS.

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

6           33.     The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and  
7 continues to cause an exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS, as such exposure is defined by  
8 22 C.C.R. §12601.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 Wherefore, plaintiff prays judgment against DEFENDANTS as set forth hereafter.

2 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

3 Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants as follows:

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

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


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

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

14 Dated: January 27, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,

HIRST & CHANLER, L.L.P.

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Christopher M. Martin  
20 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
21 RUSSELL BRIMER  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28