

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

Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534  
Jennifer Henry, State Bar No. 208221  
THE CHANLER GROUP  
2560 Ninth Street  
Parker Plaza, Suite 214  
Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  
Telephone: (510) 848-8880  
Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
RUSSELL BRIMER

**ENDORSED**

2010 MAY 20 A 9:03

David H. Yarnash, Clerk of the Superior Court  
County of Santa Clara  
Clerk Santa Clara  
Henry Clark

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

RUSSELL BRIMER,

Plaintiff,

v.

BROOKSTONE, INC.; BROOKSTONE  
COMPANY, INC.; and DOES 1-150,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **110CV172362**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

*(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)*

**BY FAX**

1 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

2 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff RUSSELL  
3 BRIMER, in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California, to enforce the People's  
4 right to be informed of the presence of lead, a toxic chemical found in luggage tags sold in  
5 California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failures to  
7 warn California citizens about their exposure to lead, present in or on certain luggage tags that  
8 defendants manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of  
9 California.

10 3. High levels of lead are commonly found in and on luggage tags that defendants  
11 manufacture, distribute and/or offer for sale to consumers throughout the State of California.

12 4. Under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986,  
13 California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. (Proposition 65), "No person in the course of  
14 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to  
15 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable  
16 warning to such individual. . . ." (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

17 5. On February 27, 1987, California identified and listed lead as a chemical known  
18 to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead became subject to the warning  
19 requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable warning"  
20 requirements of Proposition 65, beginning on February 27, 1988. (*27 CCR § 27001 (c); Cal.*  
21 *Health & Safety Code § 25249.8.*) Lead shall be referred to hereinafter as the "LISTED  
22 CHEMICAL."

23 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or sell luggage tags containing excessive  
24 levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL including, but not limited to, the *Brookstone Luggage Tags,*  
25 *Orange, #598219 (#8 83594 01382 9).* All such luggage tags containing the LISTED  
26 CHEMICAL shall hereinafter be referred to as the "PRODUCTS."

27 7. Defendants' failures to warn consumers and/or other individuals in the State of  
28 California about their exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL in conjunction with defendants'

1 sale of the PRODUCTS is a violation of Proposition 65 and subjects defendants to enjoinder  
2 of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each such violation.

3 8. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive  
4 and permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the  
5 PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards of the LISTED  
6 CHEMICAL. (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).*)

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

9 **PARTIES**

10 10. Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER, is a citizen of the County of Alameda in the State  
11 of California who is dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the  
12 elimination or reduction of toxic exposures from consumer products, and brings this action in  
13 the public interest pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.

14 11. Defendant BROOKSTONE, INC. and BROOKSTONE COMPANY, INC.  
15 ("BROOKSTONE") are persons doing business within the meaning of California Health &  
16 Safety Code § 25249.11.

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

21 13. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each  
22 persons doing business within the meaning of California 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  
26 manufacturing, one or more of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

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



1 in the State of California, or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market.  
2 DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by  
3 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All Defendants)**

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, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.*  
10 (Proposition 65) that they must be informed "about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer,  
11 birth defects and other reproductive harm." (*Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.*)

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

16 27. On February 12, 2010, a sixty-day notice of violation, together with the requisite  
17 certificate of merit, was provided to BROOKSTONE and various public enforcement agencies  
18 stating that as a result of the DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS, purchasers and users in  
19 the State of California were being exposed to lead resulting from the reasonably foreseeable  
20 uses of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first having been provided  
21 with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding such toxic exposures.

22 28. DEFENDANTS have engaged in the manufacture, distribution and/or offering of  
23 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and  
24 DEFENDANTS' manufacture, distribution and/or offering of the PRODUCTS for sale or use in  
25 violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 has continued to occur beyond  
26 DEFENDANTS' receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notices of violation. Plaintiff further alleges  
27 and believes that such violations will continue to occur into the future.

28

1           29. After receipt of the claims asserted in the sixty-day notices of violation, the  
2 appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a  
3 cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65.

4           30. The PRODUCTS manufactured, distributed, and/or offered for sale or use in  
5 California by DEFENDANTS contained the LISTED CHEMICAL above the allowable state  
6 limits.

7           31. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS manufactured,  
8 distributed, and/or offered for sale or use by DEFENDANTS in California contained the  
9 LISTED CHEMICAL.

10          32. The LISTED CHEMICAL was present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as  
11 to expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion  
12 during the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

13          33. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused and  
14 continues to cause consumer exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL, as such exposure is  
15 defined by 27 CCR § 25602(b).

16          34. DEFENDANTS had knowledge that the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of  
17 the PRODUCTS would expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact  
18 and/or ingestion.

19          35. DEFENDANTS intended that such exposures to the LISTED CHEMICAL from  
20 the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS would occur by their deliberate, non-  
21 accidental participation in the manufacture, distribution and/or offer for sale or use of  
22 PRODUCTS to individuals in the State of California.

23          36. DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those  
24 consumers and/or other individuals in the State of California who were or who could become  
25 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal contact and/or ingestion during the  
26 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

27          37. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, enacted  
28 directly by California voters, individuals exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through dermal

1 contact and/or ingestion resulting from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, sold  
2 by DEFENDANTS without a "clear and reasonable warning," have suffered, and continue to  
3 suffer, irreparable harm, for which harm they have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

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

7 39. As a consequence of the above-described acts, California Health & Safety Code  
8 § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against  
9 DEFENDANTS.

10 40. Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS as set forth  
11 hereinafter.

12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

17 2. That the Court, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a),  
18 preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing or  
19 offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, without providing "clear and reasonable  
20 warnings" as defined by 27 CCR § 25601, as to the harms associated with exposures the  
21 LISTED CHEMICAL;

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25

26

27


28

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

- 3. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
- 4. That the Court grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: May 18, 2010

Respectfully Submitted,  
THE CHANLER GROUP

By:   
Jennifer Henry  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
RUSSELL BRIMER