

1 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436
2 Harris A. Weinstein, State Bar No. 282166
3 THE CHANLER GROUP
4 2560 Ninth Street
5 Parker Plaza, Suite 214
6 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565
7 Telephone: (510) 848-8880
8 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 RUSSELL BRIMER

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY
JUL - 9 2014
CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By MARGARET J. DOWNIE
Deputy

11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

13 UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

14 RUSSELL BRIMER,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 ANEST IWATA-MEDEA, INC.; and DOES
18 1-150, inclusive,

19 Defendants.

20) Case No. RG14732193

21) **COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES**
22) **AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

23) (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*)

VIA 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 health hazards caused by exposures to lead, a toxic chemical found
5 in metal hose nozzle fittings sold by defendants in California.

6 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy defendants' continuing failure to
7 warn California citizens and other individuals about the risks of exposure to lead present in and
8 on metal hose nozzle fittings manufactured, distributed, and offered for sale or use to consumers
9 and other individuals throughout the State of California.

10 3. Detectable levels of lead are found in and on the metal hose nozzle fittings that
11 defendants manufacture, distribute, and offer for sale to consumers and other individuals
12 throughout the State of California.

13 4. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at
14 Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"), "[n]o person in the course of
15 doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to
16 the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable
17 warning to such individual . . ." Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

18 5. Pursuant to Proposition 65, on February 27, 1987, California identified and listed
19 lead as a chemical known to cause birth defects (and other reproductive harm). Lead became
20 subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements of the act one year later on February
21 27, 1988. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8 &
22 25249.10(b).

23 6. Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer for sale without health
24 hazard warnings in California metal hose nozzle fittings containing lead.

25 7. Defendants also manufacture, distribute, import, sell and/or offer for sale without
26 health hazard warnings in California the *Iwata Professional Airbrush Straight Shot Airhose, DT*

1 1 10, UPC #7 34748 20020 9. All metal hose nozzle fittings containing lead are referred to
2 collectively hereinafter as "PRODUCTS."

3 8. Defendants' failure to warn consumers and other individuals in the State of
4 California of the health hazards associated with exposures to lead in conjunction with
5 defendants' sales of the PRODUCTS are violations of Proposition 65, and subject defendants,
6 and each of them, to enjoinder of such conduct as well as civil penalties for each violation.
7 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) & (b)(1).

8 9. For defendants' violations of Proposition 65, plaintiff seeks preliminary and
9 permanent injunctive relief to compel defendants to provide purchasers or users of the
10 PRODUCTS with the required warning regarding the health hazards associated with exposures
11 to lead. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a).

12 10. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), plaintiff also seeks civil
13 penalties against defendants for their violations of Proposition 65.

14 **PARTIES**

15 11. Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER is a citizen of the State of California who is
16 dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens through the elimination or reduction of
17 toxic exposures from consumer products; and he brings this action in the public interest
18 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).

19 12. Defendant ANEST IWATA-MEDEA, INC. ("ANEST") is a person in the course
20 of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections 25249.6 and
21 25249.11.

22 13. ANEST manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for
23 sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports,
24 distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

25 14. Defendants DOES 1-50 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a
26 person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code sections
27 25249.6 and 25249.11.

28

1 wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
2 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in Alameda County with respect
3 to the PRODUCTS.

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

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

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

16 25. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth herein,
17 Paragraphs 1 through 24, inclusive.

18 26. In enacting Proposition 65, in the preamble to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic
19 Enforcement Act of 1986, the People of California expressly declared their right "[t]o be
20 informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive
21 harm."

22 27. Proposition 65 states, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall
23 knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause
24 cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such
25 individual . . ." Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

26 28. On April 16, 2014, plaintiff served a sixty-day notice of violation, together with
27 the requisite certificate of merit, on ANEST, others and certain public enforcement agencies
28

1 alleging that, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales of the PRODUCTS containing lead,
2 purchasers and users in the State of California were being exposed to lead resulting from their
3 reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS, without the individual purchasers and users first
4 having been provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" regarding the harms associated
5 with such exposures, as required by Proposition 65.

6 29. DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS
7 for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS'
8 violations have continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation.
9 DEFENDANTS' violations are ongoing and continuous in nature, and, as such, will continue in
10 the future.

11 30. After receiving plaintiff's sixty-day notice of violation, none of the appropriate
12 public enforcement agencies have commenced and diligently prosecuted a cause of action
13 against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the
14 subject of plaintiff's notice of violation.

15 31. The PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and
16 offer for sale or use in California cause exposures to lead as a result of the reasonably
17 foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS. Such exposures caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by
18 consumers and other individuals in California are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable"
19 warning requirements of Proposition 65, yet DEFENDANTS provide no warning.

20 32. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that the PRODUCTS they
21 manufactured, imported, distributed, sold, and offered for sale or use in California contained
22 lead.

23 33. Lead is present in or on the PRODUCTS in such a way as to expose individuals to
24 lead through dermal contact and/or ingestion during reasonably foreseeable use.

25 34. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and
26 continues to cause, consumer exposures to lead, as defined by title 27 of the California Code of
27 Regulations, section 25602(b).

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

offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a “clear and reasonable warning” in accordance with title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, section 25601 *et seq.*, regarding the harms associated with exposures to lead;

3. That the Court, Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating that DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain of commerce in California without a “clear and reasonable warning” as defined by California Code of Regulations title 27, section 25601 *et seq.*;


4. That the Court grant plaintiff his reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs of suit; and

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: July 8, 2014

THE CHANLER GROUP

By: 
Harris A. Weinstein
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUSSELL BRIMER