

Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352)
esmith@brodskysmith.com
Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113)
rcardona@brodskysmith.com
BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC
9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Telephone: (877) 534-2590
Facsimile: (310) 247-0160

Counsel for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TANNIA DELAPAZ,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL SYSTEMS,
INC.,

Defendant.

) Civil No.
)
)
) **COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY**
) **AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND**
) **CIVIL PENALTIES**
)
) (Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33
) U.S.C. § 1251 et seq.)
)
) **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**
)

Plaintiff Tannia Delapaz (“Plaintiff”), by and through her counsel, alleges as follows:

1. This is a citizen suit, brought pursuant to the section 505(a)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (the “Clean Water Act” or “CWA”), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a)(1), to address violations of the CWA by defendant National Technical Systems, Inc. (“National Technical Systems” or the “Defendant”) arising out of operations at Blair Adhesives’ facility located at 20970 Centre Point Pkwy, Santa Clarita, CA 91350 (the “Facility”).

1 2. Since at least October 21, 2014, Defendant has been discharging and
2 continues to discharge polluted stormwater from the Facility in violation of the
3 express terms and conditions of Sections 301 and 402 of the Clean Water Act, 33
4 U.S.C. §§ 1311, 1342, and in violation of the General Industrial Stormwater Permits
5 issued by the State of California (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001 [State
6 Water Resources Control Board] Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, as amended
7 by Order No. 97-03-DWQ) (“1997 Permit”) and Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ (“2015
8 Permit”) (collectively, the “Industrial Stormwater Permit” or “IGP”).

9 3. Plaintiff seeks a declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, the imposition
10 of civil penalties, and the award of costs, including attorneys’ and expert witness
11 fees, for Defendant’s repeated and ongoing violations of the Clean Water Act.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the parties and subject
14 matter of this action pursuant to section 505(a)(1) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. §
15 1365(a)(1), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (an action arising under the laws of the United States),
16 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 (declaratory relief).

17 5. On October 21, 2019, as required by the CWA, 33 U.S.C. §
18 1365(b)(1)(A), Plaintiff provided notice of intent to file suit against Defendant for
19 CWA violations (“NoV”) to the Administrator of the United States Environmental
20 Protection Agency (“EPA”); the Regional Administrator of EPA Region IX; the
21 Executive Director of the State Water Resources Control Board (“State Board”); the
22 Executive Officer of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles
23 Region (“Regional Board”) collectively, “state and federal agencies”) and
24 Defendant.

25 6. The NoV provided Defendant with sufficient information to determine
26 (i) the CWA requirements Plaintiff alleges Defendant violated, (ii) the activity
27 alleged to constitute the violation(s), (iii) sufficient information to determine the
28

1 date, location, and person responsible for the violation(s), and (iv) the contact
2 information for the Plaintiff and Plaintiff's Counsel. A copy of the NoV is attached
3 as Exhibit 1.

4 7. More than sixty (60) days have passed since the NoV was served upon
5 Defendant and the state and federal agencies. During this time, neither the EPA, nor
6 the State of California, has commenced or is diligently prosecuting a court action to
7 redress the violations alleged herein. No claim in this action is barred by any prior
8 administrative action pursuant to section 309(g) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g).

9 8. Venue is proper in the Central District of California pursuant to section
10 505(c)(1) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(c)(1), because the source of the violations
11 is located within this judicial district.

12 **PARTIES**

13 9. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of California who, through her
14 recreational activities, uses and enjoys the waters of the Santa Clara River, its
15 inflows, outflows, and other waters of the overall Santa Clara River Watershed, of
16 which the Santa Clara River is a part. Plaintiff's use and enjoyment of these waters
17 is negatively affected by the pollution caused by Defendant's operations. Plaintiff
18 is dedicated to protecting the water quality of the Santa Clara River, and the overall
19 Santa Clara River Watershed, for the benefit of its ecosystems and communities. To
20 further these goals, Plaintiff actively seeks federal and state agency implementation
21 of the CWA, and, where necessary, directly initiates enforcement actions on behalf
22 of herself and for her community.

23 10. Plaintiff, like other citizens, taxpayers, property owners, and residents
24 of her community, lives, works, travels near, and recreates in, the Santa Clara River,
25 its inflows, outflows, and other waters of the overall Santa Clara River Watershed,
26 of which the Santa Clara River is a part, into which Defendant discharges pollutants.
27 Plaintiff, like other citizens, taxpayers, property owners, and residents, uses and
28

1 enjoys the Santa Clara River, its inflows, outflows, and other waters of the overall
2 Santa Clara River Watershed, of which the Santa Clara River is a part, for
3 recreational, educational, scientific, conservation, aesthetic, spiritual, and other
4 purposes. Defendant's discharges of stormwater containing pollutants impairs each
5 of these uses. Thus, Plaintiff's interests have been, are being, and will continue to
6 be adversely affected by Defendant's failure to comply with the CWA and the
7 Industrial Stormwater Permit.

8 11. Plaintiff enjoys going to the Duane R. Harte Park (the "Park"). Plaintiff
9 enjoys relaxing in the park and walking along the paths located in the Park.

10 12. The Santa Clara River runs immediately adjacent to the Park, and the
11 Santa Clara River is accessible from the Park by Park goers to recreate and fish in.
12 While at the Park, Plaintiff has witnessed the polluted nature of the Santa Clara
13 River. She has observed that the Santa Clara River appears both brown and dirty.
14 In addition to her visual observation of the water, Plaintiff has also noticed an
15 unpleasant smell coming from the water.

16 13. Plaintiff is aware that Defendant's Facility is upstream from the Park
17 and that the pollution from the Facility flows downstream through the Santa Clara
18 River and the Park before ultimately reaching the Pacific Ocean. Plaintiff believes
19 that this has degraded the beauty of the Park and curtailed her enjoyment of the Park.

20 14. Plaintiff intends to return to the Park in the future and believes that
21 reducing Defendant's pollution of the Santa Clara River will improve the water
22 quality in the Santa Clara River and allow her the opportunity to better enjoy the
23 recreational and aesthetic interests in the Santa Clara River and the Park.

24 15. Defendant is a California Corporation with headquarters at 24007
25 Ventura Blvd., Ste. 200, Calabasas, CA 91302.

26 16. Defendant owns and operates the Facility, located at 20970 Centre
27 Point Pkwy, Santa Clarita, CA 91350.

1 17. The Facility operates as a testing facility and provider of engineering
2 services to various industries. Industrial activities carried out at the Facility include
3 (i) industrial testing; (ii) loading and unloading of materials; and (iii) outdoor storage
4 of materials. Repair and maintenance activities carried out at the Facility include,
5 but are not limited to, electrical, plumbing, roofing, asphalt, concrete, and utilities
6 repairs as well as janitorial duties.

7 18. The Facility's industrial activities fall under Standard Industrial
8 Classification ("SIC") Code 3826, relating to Laboratory Analytical Instruments and
9 SIC Code 3825, relating to Instruments for Measuring and testing of Electricity and
10 Electrical Signals. Defendant applied for and received coverage under the California
11 Industrial General Permit since at least June 30, 2005, and was issued WDID No. 4
12 19I019623. Defendant reapplied for coverage under the 2015 Industrial Stormwater
13 Permit on July 9, 2015, and was granted the continued use of its previously issued
14 WDID No. These "Notice of Intents" for the Facility to comply with the terms of
15 the Industrial Stormwater Permit list "National Technical Systems" as the name of
16 the Operator and Facility name. Plaintiff is therefore informed and believes and
17 thereon alleges that Defendant owns and/or operates the Facility.

18 REGULATORY BACKGROUND

19 *The Problem of Stormwater Pollution*

20 19. Stormwater runoff is one of the most significant sources of water
21 pollution in the nation and has been recognized as a leading cause of significant and
22 cumulative harmful impacts to the water quality of the Santa Clara River, its inflows,
23 outflows, and other waters of the overall Santa Clara River Watershed, of which the
24 Santa Clara River is a part. With every rainfall event, significant amounts of polluted
25 rainwater flow from local industrial facilities, such as the Facility, and pour into
26 storm drains, local tributaries, and directly into the Santa Clara River, its inflows,
27
28

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.