

1 Daniel Cooper (SBN 153576)  
2 daniel@sycamore.law  
3 Jesse C. Swanhuysen (SBN 282186)  
4 jesse@sycamore.law  
5 SYCAMORE LAW, INC.  
6 1004 O'Reilly Avenue, Ste. 100  
7 San Francisco, CA 94129  
8 Tel: (415) 360-2962

9 Benjamin Harris (SBN 313193)  
10 Ben@lawwaterkeeper.org  
11 Barak Kamelgard (SBN 298822)  
12 Barak@lawwaterkeeper.org  
13 LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER  
14 120 Broadway, Suite 105  
15 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
16 Tel: (310) 394-6162  
17 Fax: (310) 394-6178

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
19 LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
21 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

22 LOS ANGELES WATERKEEPER, a  
23 public benefit non-profit corporation,

24 Plaintiff,

25 vs.

26 HUGHES BROTHERS  
27 AIRCRAFTERS, INC., a California  
28 corporation,

Defendant.

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

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND  
CIVIL PENALTIES

Federal Water Pollution Control Act,  
33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 to 1387

1 **I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2 1. This is a civil action brought under the citizen suit provisions of the  
3 Federal Water Pollution Control Act (“Clean Water Act” or “Act”), 33 U.S.C. § 1251,  
4 *et seq.*

5 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Los Angeles Waterkeeper  
6 (“LA Waterkeeper” or “Plaintiff”) and Hughes Brothers Aircrafters, Inc. (“Hughes” or  
7 “Defendant”) (collectively the “Parties”) and over the subject matter of this action  
8 pursuant to section 505(a)(1)(A) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a)(1)(A), and 28 U.S.C.  
9 § 1331 (an action arising under the laws of the United States).

10 3. This complaint (“Complaint”) seeks relief for ongoing violations by  
11 Hughes of the Clean Water Act, and the terms and conditions of the *National*  
12 *Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CA S000001, State Water*  
13 *Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 91-13-DWQ*, as amended by  
14 *Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, Water Quality Order No. 97-03-DWQ, Order*  
15 *No. 2014-0057-DWQ*, and as amended on November 6, 2018 (“General Permit”),  
16 related to polluted storm water and non-storm water discharges from the  
17 aerospace/aviation manufacturing facility owned and operated by Hughes at and near  
18 11010 Garfield Place in South Gate, California (“Facility”).

19 4. The relief requested is authorized pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–02  
20 (power to issue declaratory relief in case of actual controversy and further necessary  
21 relief based on such a declaration) and 33 U.S.C. §§ 1319(b), 1365(a) (injunctive  
22 relief and civil penalties).

23 5. Prospective citizen plaintiffs must, as a jurisdictional pre-requisite to

1 enforcing the Clean Water Act in Federal District Court, prepare a Notice of Violation  
2 and Intent to File Suit letter (“Notice Letter”) containing, *inter alia*, sufficient  
3 information to allow the recipient to identify the standard, limitation or order alleged  
4 to be violated, and the activity alleged to constitute a violation. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a);  
5 40 C.F.R. § 135.3(a).

6       6. The Notice Letter must be sent via certified mail at least sixty (60) days  
7 prior to filing a complaint (“Notice Period”) to the owner of the facility alleged to be  
8 in violation of the Act and, where the alleged violator is a corporation, to the  
9 corporation’s registered agent for service of process. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b); 40 C.F.R.  
10 § 135.2(a)(1).

11       7. A copy of the Notice Letter must be mailed to the Attorney General, U.S.  
12 Department of Justice (“U.S. DOJ”), the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental  
13 Protection Agency (“U.S. EPA”), the Regional Administrator of the U.S. EPA for the  
14 region in which a violation is alleged to have occurred, and the chief administrative  
15 officer for the water pollution control agency for the State in which the violation is  
16 alleged to have occurred. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b); 40 C.F.R. § 135.2(b)(1)(A).

17       8. On April 12, 2022, Plaintiff sent a Notice Letter via certified mail to  
18 Hughes and its registered agent for service of process. The Notice Letter described  
19 ongoing violations of the Act and General Permit at the Facility, and provided notice  
20 of Plaintiff’s intention to file suit against Defendant at the expiration of the Notice  
21 Period. A true and accurate copy of the Notice Letter as provided to Hughes is  
22 attached to, and incorporated by reference into, this Complaint at EXHIBIT 1.

23       9. The Notice Letter was received by Tim Whitaker, Hughes’ General

1 Manager on April 14, 2022, and by James P. Hughes, Hughes' registered agent for  
2 service of process on April 14, 2022.

3 10. The Notice Letter was received by Merrick Garland, the U.S. Attorney  
4 General on April 18, 2022, by Michael Regan, Administrator of the U.S. EPA on  
5 April 18, 2022, and by Eileen Sobeck, Director of the State Water Resources Control  
6 Board on April 19, 2022.

7 11. More than sixty (60) days have passed since the Notice Letter was served  
8 on Hughes, and the State and Federal agencies.

9 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that neither the  
10 U.S. EPA nor the State of California has commenced or is diligently prosecuting a  
11 court action to redress violations alleged in the Notice Letter and this complaint.

12 13. Plaintiff's claim for civil penalties is not barred by any prior  
13 administrative penalty under section 309(g) of the Act. 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g).

14 14. Venue is proper in the Central District of California pursuant to section  
15 505(c)(1) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(c)(1), because the source of the violations is  
16 located within this judicial district.

17 LA Waterkeeper, a California public benefit non-profit corporation, by and  
18 through its counsel, hereby alleges:

19 **II. INTRODUCTION**

20 15. This Complaint seeks relief for unpermitted and unlawful discharges of  
21 pollutants, polluted storm water, and polluted non-storm water from the Facility in  
22 violation of the Act and General Permit.

23 16. Defendant is liable for its past and ongoing failures to comply with the

1 Act, including failures to comply with the General Permit's discharge prohibitions,  
2 technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations, planning and  
3 monitoring requirements, and other procedural and substantive requirements. 33  
4 U.S.C. §§ 1342, 1365.

5 17. With every significant rainfall event, millions of gallons of polluted  
6 storm water originating from industrial operations, like those conducted by Defendant,  
7 flow into Los Angeles' storm drains and contaminate local streams, creeks, rivers,  
8 estuaries, harbors, bays, beaches, and coastal waters.

9 18. The consensus among agencies and water quality specialists is that storm  
10 water pollution accounts for more than half of the total pollution entering local creeks  
11 and rivers each year. *See e.g. Bay, S., Study of the Impact of Stormwater Discharge on*  
12 *Santa Monica Bay*, (Nov. 1999).

13 19. Numerous scientific studies in recent decades have documented serious  
14 health risks to recreational users of Southern California's waters from pollutant-  
15 loaded storm water and non-storm water discharges. *See, e.g., Stenstrom, M.K.,*  
16 *Southern California Environmental Report Card: Stormwater Impact* at 15; Los  
17 Angeles County Grand Jury, *Reducing the Risks of Swimming at Los Angeles County*  
18 *Beaches* (1999-2000) at 205; Haile, R. et al., *An Epidemiological Study of Possible*  
19 *Adverse Health Effects of Swimming in Santa Monica Bay* (Santa Monica Bay  
20 Restoration Project, 1996) at 5.

21 20. A landmark epidemiological study showed that people who swam  
22 directly in front of storm drain outlets into Santa Monica Bay were far more likely to  
23 experience fevers, chills, vomiting, gastroenteritis, and similar health effects than

# 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.