

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
DIVISION OF ST. CROIX
CIVIL DOCKET

ANDREA ABRAHAM		Plaintiff)		
))		CASE NO: SX-2011-CV-0000163
Vs.))		FILING DATE: April 04, 2011
))		JUDGE: Hon. Douglas A. Brady
ST. CROIX ALUMINA LLC))		CASE TYPE: DAMAGES - CIVIL
,ET AL		Defendant)		SECONDARY null
				PETITION

<u>PARTY NAME</u>	<u>LITIGANT</u>	<u>PARTY TYPE</u>
ABRAHAM , ANDREA	P002	PLAINTIFF
PHILLIP , ABRAHAM	P001	PLAINTIFF
ROHN ESQ., LEE J.	P001	ATTORNEY FOR ANY OTHER PARTY
ST. CROIX RENAISSANCE GROUP LLLP ,	D006	DEFENDANT
CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY ,	D005	DEFENDANT
GLENCORE LTD F/K/A CLRENDON, LTD ,	D004	DEFENDANT
ALCOA ,	D003	DEFENDANT
GLENCORE INTERNATIONAL AG ,	D002	DEFENDANT
ST. CROIX ALUMINA LLC ,	D001	DEFENDANT
HYMES III, JAMES L	D001	ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT OR RESPONDENT
SIMPSON ESQ., ANDREW C	D001	ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT OR RESPONDENT
HUNTER ESQ., RICHARD H	D001	ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT OR RESPONDENT

DOCKETS ENTERED ON THIS CASE:

<u>DOCKET DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
07/07/2017	MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER SIGNED BY JUDGE DOUGLAS A. BRADY	
07/07/2017	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 07/07/2017 LEE ROHN, ESQ.; ANDREW SIMPSON, ESQ. WILLIE ELLIS, JR. ESQ.; RENE TATRO, ESQ. RICHARD HUNTER, ESQ.; JOEL HOLT, ESQ. JULIET MARKOWITZ, ESQ.; JAMES HYMES III, ESQ. CARL HARTMANN III, ESQ. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES AND MAGISTRATES LAW CLERK, LAW LIBRARY, IT, RECORD BOOK	
10/24/2016	NOTICE OF FILING CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF VERIFIED COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
09/29/2016	NOTICE OF FILING SUBMITTED BY ATTY. LEE J. ROHN	
09/13/2016	RESPONSE TO COURT ORDER REGARDING PHILLIP ABRAHAM REFILED COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
09/12/2016	AMENDED COMPLAINT FILED BY PHILLIP ABRAHAM AND ANDREA ABRAHAM . SUBMITTED BY: LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
09/09/2016	NOTICE OF FILING CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF CERTAIN VERIFIED COMPLAINTS FILED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
09/07/2016	NOTICE OF APPEARANCE RECEIVED SUBMITTED BY RICHARD HUNTER, ESQ.	
09/02/2016	ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF PHILLIP ABRAHAM, THROUGH COUNSEL LEE J. ROHN AND ASSOCIATES, LLC, TO SHOW CAUSE IN WRITING WITHIN TEN DAYS WHY HIS CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE PRIOR ORDERS DIRECTING HIM TO REFILE, OR BEFORE APRIL 29, 2016, AN AMENDED COMPLAINT. SIGNED BY: JUDGE DOUGLAS A. BRADY	
09/02/2016	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 09/02/2016 LEE J. ROHN, ESQ., WILL ELLIS, ESQ. BERNARD PATTIE, ESQ., RENE P. TATRO, ESQ. JOEL HOLT, ESQ., LORI E. JARVIS, ESQ. RICHARD HUNTER, ESQ. JAMES A. HYMES III, ESQ. JULIET A. MARKOWITZ, ESQ. ANDREW C. SIMPSON, ESQ.	
08/30/2016	NOTICE OF FILING CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF CERTAIN VERIFIED SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
08/29/2016	COPY OF NOTICE OF ENTRY AND TWO (2) ORDERS SIGNED BY: JUDGE DOUGLAS A. BRADY	
08/26/2016	NOTICE OF FILING CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF VERIFIED COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY LEE J. OHN, ESQ.	
08/23/2016	NOTICE OF FILING CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF CERTAIN VERIFIED COMPLAINTS SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
08/17/2016	NOTICE OF FILING CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF CERTAINED VERIFIED COMPLAINTS RECVD FROM LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	

06/07/2016 RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' JUNE 1ST MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME RECEIVED SUBMITTED BY JOEL H HOLT, ESQ.

06/02/2016 MOTION FOR BRIEF EXTENSION OF TIME AND ORDER RECEIVED SUBMITTED BY RHEA LAWRENCE, ESQ. FOR LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

05/12/2016 JOINDER OF OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE INDIVIDIAL VERIFIED COMPLAINT RECEIVED SUBMITTED JAMES L. HYMES,III, ESQ.

05/11/2016 SCRG'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE ADDITIONAL COMPLAINTS SUBMITTED BY JOEL HOLT, ESQ.

05/02/2016 SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE INDIVIDUAL VERIFIED COMPLAINTS AND ORDER SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

02/01/2016 NOTICE OF NO OBJECTION FILED BY ATTY. LEE J. ROHN

01/20/2016 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER
01/20/2016
L.ROHN, ESQ. J.HYMES, ESQ.
J.HOLT, ESQ. A.SIMPSON, ESQ.
R.HUNTER, ESQ. R.TATRO,ESQ.
B.PATTIE, ESQ. J.MARKOWITZ, ESQ.
W.ELLIS, ESQ.
L.JARVIS, ESQ.

01/19/2016 ORDER DENYING AS MOOT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO COURT ORDER FILED BY PLAINTIFF PHILLIP ABRAHAM ON JANUARY 13, 2016. SIGNED BY: JUDGE DOUGLAS A. BRADY.

01/13/2016 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO COURT ORDER AND ORDER SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHBN, ESQ.

01/13/2016 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO MOVE, ABNSWER, OR OTHERWISE RESPOND, MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF OTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO ANSWER AND ORDER SUBMITTED BY JAMES HYMES, ESQ.

12/18/2015 ORDER SIGNED GRANTING IN PART MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME SIGNED BY: JUDGE DOUGLAS A. BRADY

12/18/2015 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER
12/18/2015
L.ROHN, ESQ., J.HYMES, ESQ.
J.HOLT, ESQ., A.SIMPSON, ESQ.
R.HUNTER, ESQ., R.TATRO, ESQ.
B. PATTIE, ESQ., J.MARKOWITZ, ESQ.
W.ELLIS, ESQ.
L.JARVIS, ESQ

12/15/2015 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE INDIVIDUAL VERIFIED COMPLAINT FILED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

08/14/2015 ORDER SIGNED BY JUDGE DOUGLAS A. BRADY; THAT THE CLAIMS BROUGHT BY ALL OF THE PLAINTIFFS EXCEPT FOR PLAINTIFF PHILLIP ABRAHAM ARE DISMISSED FORM THIS ACTION PURSUANT TO THE AUGUST 11, 2015 MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER IN ABEDNEGO REINSTATING THE CLAIM OF THE PLAINTIFFS IN THIS ACTION WITH THE CLAIMS OF THE PLAINTIFFS IN THE ABEDNEGO ACTION; THAT PLAINTIFF ABRAHAM IS GRANTED LEAVE TO RETAIN THIS CASE SX-11-CV-163, AND SHALL, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2015 AND NO SOONER, FILE AN AMENDED, VERIFIED COMPLAINT INDIVIDUALLY IN THE ABOVE -CAPTIONED ACTION AS DIRECTED BY THE AUGUST 11, 2015 ORDER IN THE ABEDNEGO ACTION

08/14/2015 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER
 08/14/2015
 LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.
 ANDREW C. SIMPSON, ESQ.
 RICHARD H. HUNTER, ESQ.
 JAMES L. HYMES III, ESQ.

04/29/2014 NOTICE OF RECUSAL SIGNED BY JUDGE ROBERT A. MOLLOY

04/29/2014 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

04/29/2014 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF REASSIGNMENT TO JUDGE DOUGLAS A. BRADY

04/29/2014 DIRECT JUDGE REASSIGNMENT FROM: RAM TO: DAB

10/21/2013 DIRECT JUDGE REASSIGNMENT FROM: DDD TO: RAM

07/16/2012 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER
 07/13/2012
 BERNARD PATTIE, ESQ.
 JAMES HYMES, ESQ.
 RICHARD HUNTER, ESQ.
 LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

07/13/2012 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO ALLOW THE FILING OF ITS
 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS ST. CROIX ALUMINA, LLC. ALCOA INC. AND
 GLENCORE LTD.'S MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT IN EXCESS OF
 TWENTY (20) PAGES
 SIGNED BY JUDGE DARRYL DEAN DONOHUE

07/10/2012 DEFENDANT CENTURY ALUMINUM'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS
 PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT RECEIVED FROM ATTY. JAMES HYMES III

07/05/2012 DEFENDANTS ST. CROIX ALUMINA, LLC, ALCOA INC., AND GLENCORE LTD.'S
 REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT
 SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

06/29/2012 NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO SERVICE OF IMCOMPLETE OPPOSITION
 SUBMITTED BY JAMES HYMES, ESQ.

06/28/2012 NOTICE OF FILING PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBITS TO PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
 SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

06/28/2012 NOTICE OF FILING PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBITS TO PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION
 DEFENDANT CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY'S MOTION TO DISMISS IN RESPONSE
 TO DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO SERVICE OF INCOMPLETE
 OPPOSITION
 SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

06/21/2012 PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY'S
 MOTION TO DISMISS RECEIVED FROM ATTY. LEE ROHN WITH PROPOSED ORDER

06/21/2012 PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS ST. CROIX ALUMINA, LLC, ALCOA
 INC., AND GLENCORE LTD.'S MOTION TO DISMISS RECEIVED FROM ATTY. LEE
 ROHN WITH PROPOSED ORDER

06/21/2012 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO FILE BRIEF IN EXCESS OF 20 PAGES RECEIVED
 FROM ATTY. LEE ROHN WITH PROPOSED ORDER

06/21/2012 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME NUNC PRO TUNC TO FILE PLAINTIFFS'
 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS CENTURY ALUMINA COMPANY'S MOTION TO
 DISMISS RECEIVED FROM ATTY. LEE ROHN WITH PROPOSED ORDER

06/21/2012 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME NUNC PRO TUNC TO FILE PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS ST. CROIX ALUMINA, LLC. ALCOA INC. AND GENCORE LTD.'S MOTION TO DISMISS RECEIVED FROM ATTY . LEE ROHN WITH PROPOSED ORDER

06/20/2012 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME NUNC PRO TUNC TO FILE PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS ST. CROIX ALUMINA,LLC. ALCOA INC. AND GLENCORE LTD'S MOTION TO DISMISS FILED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

06/20/2012 PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDNATS ST .CROIX ALUMINA,LLC. ALCOA INC., AND GLENCORE LTD'S MOTION TO DISMISS FILED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

06/20/2012 PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY'S MOTION TO DISMISS FILED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

06/20/2012 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME NUNC PRO TUNC TO FILE PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS CENTURY ALUMINA COMPANY'S MOTION TO DISMISS FILED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

05/31/2012 NOTICE OF APPEARANCE RECEIVED SUBMITTED BY ANDREW SIMPSON, ESQ.

04/17/2012 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME NUNC PRO TUNC AND ORDER RECEIVED SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

04/16/2012 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME AND ORDER RECEIVED FROM LEE ROHN

04/16/2012 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME NUNC PRO TUNC AND ORDER RECEIVED RECEIVED FROM LEE ROHN.

03/26/2012 CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY'S MOTION TO FILE BRIEF IN EXCESS OF TWENTY (20) PAGES AND ORDER SUBMITTED BY JAMES HYMES, ESQ.

03/26/2012 CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND ORDER SUBMITTED BY JAMES HYMES, ESQ.

03/26/2012 NOTICE OF APPEARANCE RECEIVED SUBMITTED BY JAMES HYMES, ESQ.

03/26/2012 MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY'S MOTION TO DISMISS SUBMITTED BY JAMES HYMES, ESQ.

03/26/2012 NOTICE OF SERVICE OF RETURN OF SUMMONS ISSUED TO CT CORPORATION SYSTEM AS REGISTERED AGENT FOR ALCOA SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

03/21/2012 DEFENDANT'S ST. CROIX ALUMINA, LLC, ALCOA INC., AND GLENCORE LTD.'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT WITH BRIEF IN SUPPORT SUBMITTED BY BERNARD PATTIE, ESQ .

03/21/2012 DEFENDANT'S ST. CROIX ALUMINA, LLC'S ALCOA INC .'S AND GLENCORE LTD.'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT ON THEIR MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT SUBMITTED BY BERNARD PATTIE, ESQ .

03/21/2012 NOTICE OF SERVICE AS TO DEFENDANT CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

03/12/2012 MOTION TO APPOINT SPECIAL PROCESS SERVER AND ORDER RECEIVED SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

03/08/2012 NOTICE OF SERVICE RECEIVED FOR GLENCORE LTD. SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.

03/08/2012	NOTICE OF SERVICE RECEIVED FOR ST. CROIX ALUMINA LLC. SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
02/29/2012	SUMMONS ISSUED TO CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY AS REGISTERED AGENT FOR CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY, DEFENDANT	
02/29/2012	SUMMONS ISSUED TO THE CORPORATION TRUST COMPANY AS REGISTERED AGENTS FOR ST. CROIX ALUMINA LLC, DEFENDANT	
02/29/2012	SUMMONS ISSUED TO THE PRENTICE-HALL CORPORATION SYSTEM, INC. AS REGISTERED AGENT FOR GLENCORE, LTD f/k/a CLARENDON, LTD., DEFENDANT	
02/29/2012	SUMMONS ISSUED TO CT CORPORATION SYSTEM AS REGISTERED AGENT FOR ALCOA, DEFENDANT	
02/08/2012	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 02/07/2012 LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
02/07/2012	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME SIGNED BY JUDGE DARRYL DEAN DONOHUE, SR.; PLAINTIFFS' SHALL HAVE THIRTY DAYS TO RESPOND TO THE COURT'S DECEMBER 27, 2011 ORDER	
02/07/2012	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SERVE DEFENDANTS SIGNED BY JUDGE DARRYL DEAN DONOHUE, SR.; PLAINTIFFS' SHALL HAVE THIRTY DAYS TO SERVE DEFENDANTS	
01/25/2012	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SERVE DEFENDANTS PURSUANT TO RULE 4(M) OUT OF TIME AND ORDER SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
01/20/2012	FILE FORWARDED TO JUDGE DONOHUE'S CHAMBER WITH MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME	
01/12/2012	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO COURT ORDER AND ORDER SUBMITTED BY LEE J. ROHN, ESQ.	
12/27/2011	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 12/20/2011 LEE ROHN, ESQ.	
12/20/2011	14-DAY ORDER SIGNED BY JUDGE DONOHUE	
04/04/2011	DIRECT JUDGE ASSIGNMENT Hon. Darryl Dean Donohue Sr. DDD	
04/04/2011	VERIFIED COMPLAINT RECEIVED	
04/04/2011	FILING FEE ASSESSED	
04/04/2011	FEE RECEIVED RECEIPT # - 00063565	50.00
04/04/2011	SUMMONS RECEIVED	
04/04/2011	SUMMONS ISSUED	
04/04/2011	TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED	

TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES: 85

PREPARED BY:

*****END OF REPORT*****

DAB

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

PHILLIP ABRAHAM and ANDREA ABRAHAM

Plaintiffs,

v.

ST. CROIX ALUMINA LLC, GLENCORE
INTERNATIONAL AG, ALCOA, GLENCORE, LTD.
f/k/a CLARENDON, LTD., CENTURY ALUMINUM
COMPANY, and ST. CROIX RENAISSANCE
GROUP, LLLP

Defendants.

163
CIVIL NO: 2011/63

Red Dust Docket

ACTION FOR DAMAGES

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

RECEIVED
SEP 12 2016
SUPERIOR COURT
OF THE V.I.

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs PHILLIP ABRAHAM and ANDREA ABRAHAM, by and through their undersigned counsel, file their Verified Complaint and respectfully represent to the Court as follows:

1. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 4 V.I.C § 76, *et seq.*
2. Plaintiff PHILLIP ABRAHAM is a resident of St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands.
3. Plaintiff ANDREA ABRAHAM is a resident of St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands.
4. Plaintiffs PHILLIP ABRAHAM and ANDREA ABRAHAM were married on January 2, 1969.
5. Plaintiff PHILLIP ABRAHAM was born February 27, 1935.
6. Plaintiff ANDREA ABRAHAM was born March 11, 1943.

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Page 2

7. At the time of Hurricane Georges on or about September 21, 1998, all Plaintiffs physically resided in the same house at No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project, St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands.
8. Plaintiff CHARLES GILBERT resided at No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project at the time of Hurricane Georges and continuously thereafter up to today.
9. Plaintiff ANNABELLE GILBERT resided at No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project at the time of Hurricane Georges and continuously thereafter up to today.
10. Each individual Plaintiff was a member of the *Henry*¹ class until it was decertified. As of September 21, 1998, each individual Plaintiff resided in property, specifically No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project, which is located in one of the following six communities adjacent to and downwind from the St. Croix Alumina Refinery Plant: the Projects of Harvey, Clifton Hill and the estates of Barren Spot, Profit, Clifton Hill and La Reine, and suffered damages or injuries as a result of exposure *during and after* Hurricane Georges to red dust and red mud blown during Hurricane George. None of the individual Plaintiffs opted out of the class.
11. On information and belief, Defendant St. Croix Alumina, LLC, is a limited liability company, and is deemed to be a citizen of each state in which one of its members is a citizen.
12. On information and belief, Defendant Alcoa is a Pennsylvania corporation with its principal place of business in New York.

¹ *Henry v. St. Croix Alumina, LLC*, Civ. No. 1999-0036, in the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Page 3

13. On information and belief, Defendant Glencore, LTD, is a limited liability company, and is deemed to be a citizen of each state in which one of its members is a citizen.
14. On information and belief, Defendant Glencore International, AG, is an Anglo-Swiss multinational commodity trading and mining company headquartered in Baar, Switzerland, with its registered office in Saint Helier, Jersey. Plaintiffs do not know its exact form of organization.
15. On information and belief, Defendant St. Croix Renaissance Group, LLLP is a limited liability limited partnership, with its principle place of business in St. Croix. On information and belief, Defendant St. Croix Renaissance Group, LLLP is deemed to be a citizen of Florida, Massachusetts, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, because of the citizenship of its partners.
16. For about thirty years, an alumina refinery located near thousands of homes on the south shore of the island of St. Croix was owned and/or operated by a number of entities. The facility refined a red ore called bauxite into alumina, creating enormous mounds of the by-product, bauxite residue, red mud, or red dust.
17. Defendant Glencore, Ltd., f/k/a as Clarendon, Ltd., is a Swiss company that wholly owned and controlled Virgin Islands Alumina Company ("VIALCO"), and VIALCO acquired the alumina refinery on St. Croix in 1989. VIALCO is not a party to this lawsuit
18. Glencore, Ltd. is wholly owned by Defendant Glencore International AG

("Glencore International"), a Swiss company.

19. Glencore, Ltd. f/k/a Clarendon Ltd., actively participated in planning meetings and data collection for the startup of the alumina refinery and in VIALCO's operation of the alumina refinery. Glencore had to approve VIALCO's most basic decisions, including but not limited to, salaries and benefits of its employees, and improvements at the facility. Glencore funded all refinery activities and regularly inspected the facility.
20. The height of the red mud piles increased while Glencore and VIALCO operated the refinery.
21. In April 1995, VIALCO's stock was transferred to Defendant Century Aluminum Company ("Century Aluminum") Century Chartering Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of Glencore International. Century Chartering Company changed its name to Century Aluminum Company ("Century Aluminum") in July 1995 and remained a wholly owned subsidiary of Glencore International through April 1996. Defendant Century Aluminum is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in California.
22. Substantially all of VIALCO's assets, including the alumina refinery, were sold by Defendant Century Aluminum to Defendant St. Croix Alumina, L.L.C. ("SCA"), a subsidiary of Defendant Alcoa, Inc. (Alcoa"), on July 24, 1995. In the Acquisition Agreement for the sale of the refinery, Defendant Glencore International was identified as VIALCO's ultimate parent and Alcoa was identified as the ultimate parent of SCA.

23. As a condition of the sale, Glencore International, retained liability for up to \$18 million for claims made by July 24, 2001 arising from specified environmental conditions, including without limitation, claims related to substances migrating from the refinery, and the parties agreed to cooperate with regard to the investigation and remediation of environmental conditions covered by the Acquisition Agreement.
24. Subsequently, both Glencore Ltd and Century Aluminum acted to satisfy the indemnification obligations of Glencore International pursuant to the Acquisition Agreement for the sale of the VIALCO facility to SCA. Glencore International, Glencore Ltd. and Century Aluminum are hereinafter collectively "the Glencore Defendants."
25. Century Aluminum "accrued the expense of settlement in 1996" of a 1995 case against VIALCO for, *inter alia*, nuisance from "pollutants, toxins, dusts . . . and particulates" discharged from the refinery property.
26. As another condition of the 1995 sale, Alcoa agreed to purchase bauxite from Glencore, Ltd. for the St. Croix facility at least through 1998. Concurrent with the sale, various Alcoa entities entered into three separate alumina supply contracts with Glencore, Ltd.
27. As a term of the 2002 sale of the refinery to SCRG, and as further established by a subsequent amendment of the PSA, Defendants ALCOA and SCA retained liability arising out of any alleged failure to secure materials at the refinery, including but not limited to bauxite, "red dust" and "red mud" and a right of access

to remediate the red mud piles.

28. Defendant St. Croix Alumina, LLC ("SCA") is a limited liability corporation which is registered in Delaware and is deemed to be a citizen of Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Australia. SCA operated the alumina refinery from 1998 to 2001. At all relevant times, SCA was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Defendant ALCOA, Inc. and was an "Alcoa-controlled entity."
29. Defendant ALCOA, Inc., ("Alcoa") formerly Alumina Company of America, is a Pennsylvania corporation with its principal place of business in New York, and at all relevant times ALCOA was the parent company of St. Croix Alumina and made environmental decisions concerning the refinery as well as economic and budgetary decisions. Alcoa and SCA are hereinafter collectively "the Alcoa Defendants."
30. In or about 2002, the Alcoa Defendants entered into a Purchase and Sale Agreement ("PSA") for the refinery with Brownfields Recovery Corporation ("BRC") and Energy Answers of Puerto Rico ("EAPR") and BRC and EAPR immediately transferred their interests in the refinery to St. Croix Renaissance Group ("SCRG").
31. SCRG has owned and/or operated the refinery from 2002 to the present.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. The St. Croix Alumina Refinery

32. Alumina is extracted from a naturally-occurring ore called bauxite. Bauxite is red in color. Defendants' own Material Safety Data Sheet ("MSDS") for bauxite

warns that it can cause irritation of the eyes, skin and upper respiratory tract.

33. The byproduct of the alumina refining process used at the St. Croix refinery is a red substance called bauxite residue, or "red mud" or "red dust," which is indistinguishable in color and texture from bauxite. The MSDS for red mud states that it can cause "severe irritation and burns [of eyes], especially when wet," "can cause severe irritation [of skin], especially when wet," and "can cause irritation of the upper respiratory tract." It also advises against skin and eye exposure to red mud. Both red mud and bauxite damage real and personal property and can stain it.
34. From the beginning of the alumina refinery's operations, the red mud was stored with coal dust and other particulates outdoors in open piles that at times were as high as approximately 120 feet and covered up to 190 acres of land. For years, the uncovered piles often emitted fugitive dust when winds blew across the refinery and on the frequent occasions when bulldozers ran over them.
35. In addition, the refinery contained asbestos and other particulates in various conditions that were never removed from the premises, in violation of law.
36. The bauxite was stored in a steel A-frame structure with plastic sheets hung down the sides, called the bauxite storage shed. In 1995, Hurricane Marilyn hit St. Croix and damaged the roof of the bauxite storage shed, which allowed the dusty bauxite to be blown out of the shed.
37. The Glencore Defendants failed to correctly control the storage and containment of the bauxite while they owned and operated the alumina refinery. The

Glencore Defendants also failed to properly store, contain and/or remove the asbestos, red dust and/or red mud, coal dust, and other particulates prior to the sale of the refinery to the Alcoa Defendants. Instead Glencore left the red dust, coal dust, and other particulates in open uncovered piles on the property and failed to remove or properly contain the friable, unencapsulated and/or uncovered asbestos that was there.

38. Defendants ALCOA and St. Croix Alumina continued to fail to correctly control the storage and containment of the bauxite, red mud, coal dust, and other particulates.
39. In 1995, Defendants ALCOA and St. Croix Alumina estimated the cost of asbestos removal to be "in the range of \$20 million" and continued to fail to correctly control the storage and containment of friable, unencapsulated and/or uncovered asbestos.
40. Defendants ALCOA and St. Croix Alumina added red dust, coal dust and other particulates to the materials left behind by the Glencore Defendants and continued to stack and store them in huge uncovered piles.
41. The Alcoa Defendants failed to properly store, contain and/or remove the asbestos, red dust and/or red mud, coal dust, and other particulates, prior to the sale of the refinery to SCRG. Instead, the Alcoa Defendants left the red dust, coal dust, and other particulates, in uncovered piles on the property. In 1995, Alcoa estimated the future costs to close the red dust disposal areas at \$3.7 to \$15 million and the total projected cost to clean up major environmental issues

on shut down at \$30 to \$45 million.

42. At all relevant times, Defendants knew about the risk of dust emissions from the alumina refinery. In 1977, the owners and operators of the alumina refinery learned about the need to control drainage, erosion, and dust problems from the red mud piles and ways in which to prevent such emissions.
43. In 1987, an Alcoa research scientist wrote about the potential for emissions from the red mud piles and recommended methods for controlling releases.
44. A 1989 report from Ormet Corporation to Glencore identified a potential air pollution problem posed by bauxite residue and the concern about the ability of the bauxite shed to withstand storm conditions.
45. In 1991, SCA knew that residents living downwind from the alumina refinery had complained about fugitive dusts from the refinery.
46. For years before Georges, the uncovered red mud piles often emitted fugitive dust when winds blew across the alumina refinery or on the frequent occasions when SCA ran bulldozers over them.
47. In 1994, a DPNR field inspection found evidence of dust emissions from the red mud piles. There had also been numerous reports of water causing the erosion of red mud during storms.
48. In June of 2000, SCA itself acknowledged that a major community concern is fugitive emissions from red mud dusting in weather conditions less severe than hurricanes.

B. Hurricane Georges

49. Despite their admitted knowledge that St. Croix was a hurricane-prone area, that the red-mud piles and the bauxite shed could emit fugitive dusts, and that emissions from the refinery affected the neighboring residences, the Glencore Defendants and the Alcoa Defendants recklessly failed to properly prepare for Hurricane Georges including, but not limited to, failing to secure the bauxite, red dust, coal dust and other particulates or remove and/or secure asbestos.
50. Hurricane Georges struck St. Croix on September 21, 1998.
51. Because Defendants did not properly store and/or safeguard the bauxite, red mud, coal dust, and other particulates, the winds of Hurricane Georges blew huge quantities of red dust consisting of both red mud and bauxite and/other particulates into the neighboring residences. Refinery workers employed by the Alcoa Defendants reported seeing the winds shift and blow huge amounts of bauxite out of holes in the roof of the storage shed towards the nearby neighborhoods, and area residents saw red dust swirling about their properties during the storm. Later, Defendants also admitted that the hurricane carried bauxite and red mud from the piles to the adjacent neighborhoods. Witnesses could see the red-mud piles were visibly smaller after the hurricane. On information and belief, Defendants hired a third party to measure the red mud piles after Hurricane Georges but Defendants have concealed this evidence.
52. Plaintiffs' home, yard, and personal property was coated in the red dust consisting of both red mud and bauxite and other particulates from the alumina

refinery and was damaged and/or destroyed.

53. Specifically, Plaintiffs incurred costs of cleaning the Red Dust from No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project including cleaning out the cistern and refilling the cistern with usable water. Plaintiffs had to clean and replace furniture, clothes, curtains, and bedding. Plaintiffs had to clean roof and walls. Plaintiffs suffered from emotional distress because they were covered in Defendants' industrial waste.
54. The Red Dust consisting of red mud and bauxite and other particulates blew into Plaintiffs' cistern, the primary source of potable water for many residents of St. Croix, and turned the water red.
55. Plaintiffs also inhaled, ingested and/or was physically exposed to numerous toxic substances that blew over from the alumina refinery.
56. Plaintiffs incurred the costs of having to clean the inside and outside of the house which was covered in Red Dust.
57. Plaintiffs had to purchase water as a result of their cistern being contaminated.
58. Plaintiffs cleaned the inside and outside of the house themselves, as a family, which took several weeks and are entitled to the reasonable value of this cleanup.
59. Plaintiffs suffered from fatigue from having to constantly clean the house because of Defendants' industrial waste.
60. During this time of cleanup, all Plaintiffs did not have the reasonable use and enjoyment of their family home and suffered stress and anxiety as a result.
61. All of Plaintiffs personal items, such as their clothes, furniture, curtains, etc.

became stained or damaged by Red Dust.

C. After Hurricane Georges

62. After Hurricane Georges, Defendants continued to improperly store the bauxite, red dust, and other particulates and allowed those substances to continue to blow about the island and damage Plaintiffs wherever there was a strong wind or work done on the Red Dust piles.
63. Defendants also delayed cleaning up the bauxite, red dust, and other particulates and allowed those substances to continue to blow about the island and damage Plaintiffs.
64. When Defendants ALCOA and St. Croix Alumina finally began to attempt to clean up the substances from the neighborhoods, they did so in a negligent matter which resulted in incomplete clean up, damage to Plaintiffs' homes, appliances, furnishings and clothes among other items.
65. Defendants have failed to clean and thoro-seal the Plaintiffs cisterns required as a result of the release.
66. Plaintiffs were forced to obtain potable water and incur the expense, thereof.
67. Alcoa and SCA retained responsibility for red mud or bauxite releases during Hurricane Georges and were required to continue post-closing remediation of certain areas of the alumina refinery premises to the satisfaction of the DPNR.
68. The refinery ceased operations in approximately 2002.
69. Upon information, in 2001 the Alcoa Defendants sought indemnification from the Glencore Defendants, pursuant to the Acquisition Agreement between Alcoa and

Glencore, for the investigation and cleanup of the refinery prior to closure.

70. In January 2003, SCA entered into a consent order with DPNR to remediate releases from the red mud piles that occurred in 2002 and to construct a control system to prevent or minimize future releases from the red mud piles into the environment.
71. Defendant SCRG has also granted "DPNR, SCA and VIALCO and the contractors, subcontractors, and other agents of DPNR, SCA and/or VIALCO access to the Alumina Facility reasonably necessary to effectuate any and all remediation of the red mud piles and red mud releases, which may be (a) ordered by a court, (b) ordered and/or approved by DPNR, or (c) agreed to by DPNR and SCA and/or VIALCO."
72. Upon information Defendant ALCOA failed to properly disclose to SCRG all hazardous substances and particulates at the refinery and concealed the same and, further, went in after the sale and destabilized the red mud piles.
73. In addition, ALCOA represented that it was abating all asbestos at the refinery at the time of the sale to SCRG.
74. In reality, they failed to do so and failed to disclose this to SCRG.
75. At the time it failed to do so, it knew there was friable asbestos throughout the plant blowing into the Plaintiffs' home and being inhaled by Plaintiffs.
76. The Alcoa Defendants further concealed from Plaintiffs the true extent of the toxic substances, the toxicity of the substances, and misrepresented to Plaintiffs that there were no dangerous conditions or substances at the refinery to which

they were being exposed.

77. SCRG discovered that ALCOA had not abated the asbestos on or about 2006 when it was informed by DPNR.
78. SCRG attempted to conceal the fact it had friable asbestos in the plant and left it there for years.
79. SCRG knew that friable asbestos was being blown into Plaintiffs' home and being inhaled by Plaintiffs but failed to disclose or warn.
80. During its operation and/or ownership of the alumina refinery, SCRG has failed to remove the asbestos from the refinery.
81. Upon information the asbestos has been friable and in an extremely dangerous condition for at least 10 years but Plaintiffs had no way of knowing or discovering that. In particular, Defendants concealed the existence of the friable asbestos from Plaintiffs until 2010, when DPNR produced documents, indicating the presence of asbestos in discovery in the *Bennington v. SCRG* matter indicating that unencapsulated asbestos fibers were permitted to hang and blow about freely.
82. Upon information SCRG hid the fact that it had friable asbestos not only from the Plaintiffs but also from Department of Natural Resources (DPNR) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and in fact, made false reports concerning the same.
83. SCRG did nothing to remove that asbestos for some three (3) years.
84. As a result deadly asbestos blew about the neighborhoods near the refinery for

at least ten (10) years causing Plaintiffs to inhale asbestos and otherwise be exposed to asbestos.

85. The Red Dust has continued to be allowed to lay accumulated in enormous piles on the SCRG property and to blow into No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project to this date any time there is a strong wind or the Red Dust piles are worked on.
86. In or about 2014, SCRG began efforts to finally contain the red dust piles but did so in a negligent and improper manner to include, but not limited to, failing to properly maintain the moisture of the dust such that it virtually on a daily basis blew into Plaintiffs' home at No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project and contaminated their cistern and vegetation.
87. As a result, Red Dust continued to blow into No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project and cause damage to the personal and real property of Plaintiffs who continue to reside at No. 33 New Works/Harvey Project and continue to inhale Defendants' industrial waste. Plaintiffs also suffered from emotional distress and anxiety as a result of damage to their real property and dwelling and as a result of exposure to the released industrial waste, including bauxite.
88. As a result of Defendants' conduct before, during and after Hurricane Georges, and continuing to date, Plaintiffs suffered and continue to suffer mental distress, expenses, damage to their real property and personal possessions, mental anguish, pain and suffering and loss of enjoyment of life, a propensity for additional medical illness, a reasonable fear of contracting illness in the future, all of which are expected to continue into the foreseeable future.

89. To this date, Defendants are continuing to expose Plaintiffs to red dust, bauxite, asbestos and other particulates and toxic substances. Defendants' conduct is also continuing to prevent Plaintiffs from freely enjoying their property.

D. Related Litigation

90. In 1999, local residents and workers filed a class action ("*Henry*") against all the Defendants in this case except SCRG in a case styled *Henry v. St. Croix Alumina, LLC*, Civ. No. 1999-0036, in the District Court of the Virgin Islands. The *Henry* plaintiffs sought compensatory and punitive damages for personal injuries and property damage sustained from exposure to toxic materials from the refinery, including bauxite, red mud, and other particulates, during and after Hurricane Georges.

91. In addition to damages for personal injuries and property damages, the *Henry* plaintiffs also sought an injunction requiring the defendants to (a) stop all activities that allow the release of pollutants, (b) remove the piles of red dust, coal dust, and other particulates from the island, and (c) refrain from allowing said substances from reaccumulating on the island.

92. The initial class in *Henry* was defined as

[a]ll individuals who, as of September 21, 1998 [the date of Hurricane Georges], resided, worked, and/or owned property located in the following six communities adjacent to and downwind from the St. Croix Alumina Refinery Plant—the projects of Harvey and Clifton Hill and the estates of Barren Spot, Profit, Clifton Hill and La Reine—who, due to Defendants' conduct with regard to the containment and storage of red dust containing bauxite and red mud, suffered damages and/or injuries as a result

of exposure during and after Hurricane Georges to red dust and red mud blown during Hurricane Georges.

93. Plaintiffs herein are former members of the original class in *Henry* in that, as of September 21, 1998, they either resided and/or worked and/or owned property located in one of the six communities described above, and they have suffered and continue to suffer damages and/or injuries as a result of exposure to red dust, red mud, and other particulates during and after Hurricane Georges.
94. Plaintiffs did not opt out of the *Henry* class.
95. In 2004, SCRG filed a separate suit against Alcoa for fraud, breach of contract, and negligence arising out of the sale of the St. Croix Alumina Refinery.
96. In 2006, the *Henry* court ruled that the class would only remain certified for the liability stage of trial, and then the class would be decertified for the damages stage.
97. About two years later, on June 3, 2008, the *Henry* court decertified the original class and certified a new class of “[a]ll persons who **currently** reside, work, and/or own property in the projects of Harvey and Clifton Hill and the estates of Barren Spot, Profit, Clifton Hill, and La Reine. . . .” Also, the *Henry* court ruled that the new class was certified “only insofar as they seek cleanup, abatement or removal of the substances **currently present** on the refinery property.” The *Henry* court also appointed the representatives of the former class to represent the new class. The Court ruled that it would not hear individual damage claims on a class basis. Plaintiffs then timely filed their individual claims.

COUNT I: Abnormally Dangerous Condition

98. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each allegation of Paragraph 1-97 as if set forth herein verbatim.
99. The action of each Defendant constitutes maintaining an abnormally dangerous condition.
100. The St. Croix Alumina refinery is located in a known hurricane zone at the head of the Kraus Lagoon Channel at Port Alucroix, which leads to the Caribbean Sea. The natural resources of the Virgin Islands are particularly sensitive and precious.
101. Residential communities are also located just north of the refinery.
102. Defendants' use, storage, disposal and failure to remediate the bauxite, red dust and/or red mud, asbestos, coal dust, and other particulates at the refinery was solely for Defendants' own business purposes.
103. Defendants knew and understood that there was a high risk that strong winds could blow bauxite, red mud, asbestos and other particulates into Plaintiffs' neighborhood.
104. Defendants' storage, disposal, and failure to remediate the bauxite, red mud, asbestos, and other particulates presented a high risk of great harm to Plaintiffs' health, chattel, and properties. Bauxite and red mud can irritate the skin, respiratory tract, and eyes and can permanently stain, clog, and otherwise damage property and objects. Friable asbestos is also a known carcinogen that can cause a variety of respiratory illnesses.

105. Defendants' use, storage, disposal and failure to remediate bauxite, red mud, asbestos and other particulates at the alumina refinery caused serious harm to Plaintiffs' persons, chattel, and properties. As a result, the Plaintiffs suffered damages as alleged herein.

COUNT II: Public Nuisance

106. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each allegation of Paragraphs 1-105 as if set forth herein verbatim.
107. The actions of all Defendants constitute a public nuisance.
108. Specifically, the ongoing release of harmful dusts, including bauxite, red mud, coal dust, asbestos, and other particulates, from the alumina refinery unreasonably threatens and interferes with the public rights to safety, health, peace, comfort, and the enjoyment of private land and public natural resources.
109. The actions of all Defendants violated the statutes of the Virgin Islands (including, but not limited to, 12 V.I.R. & R. § 204-20(d) & (e), § 204-25(a)(2) & (3), § 204-25(c), and § 204-27(a)) and constitutes nuisance *per se*.
110. Plaintiffs are entitled to damages as a result, thereof.

COUNT III: Private Nuisance/Trespass

111. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each allegation of Paragraphs 1-110 as if set forth herein verbatim.
112. All Defendants' actions constitute a private nuisance and/or a trespass.
113. All Defendants' release of massive quantities of bauxite, red mud, asbestos, and other particulates has stained, clogged, and otherwise damaged Plaintiffs' home

and yard.

114. All Defendants' release of massive quantities of bauxite, red mud, asbestos, and other particulates has exposed Plaintiffs' bodies to toxic and/or irritating dusts.
115. By so doing, all Defendants have wrongfully and unreasonably interfered with Plaintiffs' private use and enjoyment of their home and property. As a result, Plaintiffs have been damaged as alleged, herein.

COUNT IV: Negligence as to Defendants Alcoa, SCA and SCRG only

116. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each allegation of Paragraphs 1-115 as if set forth herein verbatim.
117. Defendants' negligently attempted to abate the nuisance of the bauxite and/or red mud deposited in Plaintiffs' neighborhood, such that Defendants caused additional damage to Plaintiffs' bodies, real property, and personal property.
118. For some time after Hurricane Georges hit St. Croix, SCA and Alcoa failed to clean up the bauxite, red mud, and other particulates from both the alumina refinery and the nearby neighborhoods. This failure allowed toxic and irritating dusts to blow about Plaintiffs' neighborhood and damage Plaintiffs and their property.
119. Eventually, SCA and Alcoa admitted they were responsible for the bauxite, red mud and other particulates that had inundated the Plaintiffs and their property and voluntarily undertook the effort to clean up the bauxite, red mud, and other particulates from Plaintiffs' neighborhood.
120. Defendants SCA and Alcoa negligently and improperly used high-pressure water

sprayers on Plaintiffs' property, which damaged Plaintiffs' home, yard, cistern, and other property.

121. Defendants SCA and Alcoa improperly and/or inadequately used cleaning agents on Plaintiffs' property, which damaged Plaintiffs' home, yard, cistern, and other property.

122. Defendants SCA and Alcoa failed to thoroughly remove all the deposits of bauxite and/or red mud or other particulates from Plaintiffs' home, yard, cistern, and other property, which caused further damage to such property and further exposed Plaintiffs to the toxic and irritating dusts.

123. As a result, Plaintiffs have suffered damages as alleged, herein.

COUNT V: Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

124. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each allegation of Paragraphs 1-123 as if set forth herein verbatim.

125. The actions of all Defendants constitute the intentional infliction of emotional distress on Plaintiffs.

126. For many years before Hurricane Georges hit St. Croix, Defendants knew and understood that exposure to bauxite and red mud asbestos and other particulates presented serious risks to the health and property of thousands of St. Croix residents. Defendants also understood that the emissions posed serious threats to the local environment and natural resources.

127. Long before Hurricane Georges, Defendants knew that wind, rain and/or flooding, and other physical disturbances could release bauxite, red mud

asbestos and other particulates from the alumina refinery into Plaintiffs' neighborhood.

128. For decades, Defendants have understood that St. Croix is a hurricane-prone area and that local residents rely on cisterns as their primary source of drinking water.
129. Since at least 2006, Defendant SCRG also knew that dangerous friable asbestos was present at the refinery and could be blown by winds into Plaintiffs' neighborhood as well as the red mud and related particulates.
130. Despite this knowledge, Defendants' knowingly and intentionally failed to take precautions to prevent bauxite, red mud, asbestos and other particulates from blowing into Plaintiffs' neighborhood.
131. Furthermore, after Hurricane Georges, Defendants SCA and Alcoa delayed the clean-up and failed to properly remove the bauxite and red mud from Plaintiffs' cistern and property, even though they knew that hurricane victims had limited access to clean drinking water.
132. After Defendants permitted Plaintiffs to be exposed to bauxite, red mud, asbestos and other particulates emissions from the alumina refinery, Defendants' purposefully concealed and/or misrepresented the health risks associated with exposure to the emissions from Plaintiffs.
133. Years after learning that emissions from the alumina refinery presented high risk of serious injury to Plaintiffs and the natural resources of the Virgin Islands, Defendants continue to allow bauxite, red mud, asbestos and other particulates

to blow into Plaintiffs' neighborhood and cause significant harm to Plaintiffs' minds, bodies, and property.

134. Defendants (1) acted intentionally or recklessly; (2) engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct that exceeds all bounds of decency such that it is regarded as atrocious and utterly intolerable in a civilized society; and (3) caused the Plaintiffs to suffer from severe emotional distress.

135. As a result of Defendants' outrageous and callous disregard for the health, safety, well-being and property of Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs have suffered damages as alleged herein, including severe emotional distress and physical ailments resulting from such distress.

COUNT VI: Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress

136. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each allegation of Paragraphs 1-135 as if set forth herein verbatim.

137. In the alternative to intentional infliction of emotional distress, the actions of all Defendants constitute the negligent infliction of emotional distress. Defendants owed the Plaintiffs a duty of care to ensure that the plaintiff did not suffer from serious emotional distress, which duty arose by operating an abnormally hazardous condition, through the common law, and through statutory and regulatory obligations to prevent hazardous material from escaping from its facility; (2) Defendants breached its duty; and (3) as a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' breach, Plaintiffs suffered a serious emotional injury.

138. As a result, Plaintiffs have been damaged as alleged, herein.

COUNT VII: Negligence as to All Defendants

139. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each allegation of Paragraphs 1-138 as if set forth herein verbatim.
140. The actions of Defendants constitute negligence that damaged Plaintiffs.
141. Before Hurricane Georges, Defendant Glencore owned and operated the alumina refinery.
142. Glencore failed to secure and/or properly store or maintain bauxite and/or red mud and/or asbestos and other particulates. Glencore also continued to supply bauxite to the successive owners and/or operators of the refinery without adequately warning and/or ensuring that those successors properly stored and/or maintained the bauxite and/or red mud and or removed the asbestos and other particulates.
143. Glencore's conduct fell below the standard of care of a reasonable property owner and/or operator in similar circumstances.
144. Glencore knew and/or should have known that its failure to secure the bauxite and red mud and related particulates at the alumina refinery and remove the asbestos would allow these dangerous and irritating materials to blow freely into Plaintiffs' neighborhoods and harm Plaintiffs' and their properties.
145. Glencore's failure to secure the bauxite and red mud, asbestos and related particulates at the alumina refinery caused the toxic and irritating dusts to blow into nearby neighborhoods and damage Plaintiffs and their properties.
146. Before and after Hurricane Georges, Alcoa and SCA owned and/or operated the

alumina refinery and failed to adequately secure the bauxite and red mud and related particulates on the premises or to remove the asbestos.

147. Alcoa and SCA's conduct fell below the standard of care of a reasonable property owner and/or operator in similar circumstances.
148. Alcoa and SCA knew and/or should have known that its failure to secure the bauxite and red mud and related particulates at the alumina refinery and remove the asbestos would allow these toxic and irritating materials to blow freely into Plaintiffs' neighborhoods and harm Plaintiffs' and their property.
149. Alcoa and SCA's failure to secure the bauxite and red mud and related particulates at the alumina refinery and failure to remove the asbestos caused the toxic and irritating dusts to blow into nearby neighborhoods and damage Plaintiffs and their property.
150. Before and after Hurricane Georges, Alcoa and SCA failed to adequately secure the bauxite and red mud and related particulates at the alumina refinery and failed to remove asbestos.
151. Alcoa and SCA's conduct fell below the standard of care of a reasonable property owner and/or operator in similar circumstances.
152. Alcoa and SCA knew and/or should have known that its failure to secure the bauxite and red mud and related particulates at the alumina refinery and to remove the asbestos would allow these toxic and irritating materials to blow freely into Plaintiffs' neighborhood and harm Plaintiffs' and their property.
153. Alcoa and SCA's failure to secure the bauxite and red mud and related

particulates at the alumina refinery and remove the asbestos caused the toxic and irritating dusts to blow into nearby neighborhoods and damage Plaintiffs and their properties.

154. SCRG owned and/or operated the alumina refinery.
155. SCRG failed to properly store and/or secure bauxite, red mud, related particulates and asbestos on the premises.
156. SCRG knew and/or should have known that its failure to secure these dangerous materials would allow them to blow freely into Plaintiffs' neighborhood and harm Plaintiffs and their property.
157. SCRG's failure to properly secure, store and/or maintain the bauxite, red mud, related particulates and asbestos at the alumina refinery allowed these materials to blow into the nearby areas and harm Plaintiffs and their property.
158. Defendants' negligence caused both physical personal injury and real and personal property damage that also resulted in emotional distress and anxiety.
159. Plaintiffs also specifically allege that they are entitled to recover under *Banks* and the Restatement (Second) of Torts: (a) for bodily harm; and (b) for emotional distress, without any proof of pecuniary loss. See RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 905 (1979); see also *Moolenaar v. Atlas Motor Inns, Inc.*, 616 F.2d 87, 90 (3d Cir. 1980). "Bodily harm is *any impairment of the physical condition of the body*, including illness or physical pain. It frequently causes the harms described in Comments c to e. It is not essential to a cause of action that pecuniary loss result. Furthermore, damages can be awarded although there is no impairment

of a bodily function and, in some situations, even though the defendant's act is beneficial." See *id.* at cmt. a.

160. The general rule is that if an actor's negligent conduct causes bodily harm, he is also liable for the emotional disturbance resulting from the bodily harm, as further bodily harm resulting from the emotional disturbance. See RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 456 (1965). The rule is "not limited to emotional disturbance resulting from the bodily harm itself, but also includes such disturbance resulting from the conduct of the actor." See *id.* cmt. e.
161. Under Restatement § 905, comment b, as an element of damages for a tort, a plaintiff can also recover for anxiety—independent of physical injury—if this is the expectable result of the defendant's tortious act or if the defendant intended that result. See Illustrations 6 and 7. In accordance with the rule stated in § 501, the extent of liability for this sort of emotional distress is increased if the actor's conduct is reckless rather than merely negligent. See Illustration 8. In some cases fear and anxiety alone are a sufficient basis for the action, as when the defendant has assaulted the plaintiff or trespassed on her property. See Illustrations 7 and 9. See, e.g., *Moolenaar*, 616 F.2d at 90.
162. Moreover, Restatement § 939 expressly authorizes recovery for "discomfort and annoyance" for actions in which that person's property has been injured but not totally destroyed without physical injury. See RESTATEMENT (SECOND) TORTS § 939 (1979). "Discomfort and annoyance to an occupant of the land and to the members of the household are distinct grounds of compensation for which in

ordinary cases the person in possession is allowed to recover in addition to the harm to his proprietary interests.” See *id.* cmt. on subsection 1.

163. Additionally, courts interpreting Restatement §§ 905 and 939 have concluded that claims for nuisance and property damage are also sufficient to support a claim for mental-anguish-personal-injury damages, even in the absence of physical injury when they result in pecuniary loss or when the tortfeasor engages in reckless conduct. For example, in *Nnadili v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 93 (D.D.C. 2008), the plaintiffs alleged that gas spilled from a Chevron station and “Plaintiffs further allege that the gasoline subsequently migrated into the Riggs Park neighborhood, contaminating the air, soil, and groundwater of the properties currently or formerly owned or occupied by plaintiffs.” See *id.* at 96. Chevron moved for summary judgment on claims for recovery of “emotional distress” because there was no proof of physical injury or physical endangerment. See *id.* The court, relying on §§ 905 and 939, determined these sections allowed, under the facts of the case, for the recovery of mental anguish in the absence of bodily injury, under plaintiff’s theories of trespass, nuisance, and negligence. See *id.*; see also *French v. Ralph E. Moore, Inc.*, 203 Mont. 327, 661 P.2d 844, 847-48 (Mont. 1983) (holding damages for mental anguish recoverable for trespass, nuisance, and negligence claims arising out of gasoline discharge from USTs).

164. In *Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co.* (1955), 45 Cal.2d 265, 288 P.2d 507, the plaintiffs brought an action for nuisance and trespass for damages sustained as

the result of dust pollution emanating from the defendant's ginning mill. See *id.* The court upheld the right to seek damages for injury to real property as well as for personal discomfort, annoyance, nervous distress and mental anguish. See *id.* The court expressly recognized that such damages would, or at least could, be proximately caused by a defendant's invasion of the property, even where there is no physical injury suffered. See *id.* (collecting cases).

165. Furthermore, in *Antilles Ins. v. James*, 30 V.I. 230 (D.V.I. 1994), the appellate division of the district court affirmed a Superior Court jury verdict awarding emotions-distress damages without physical injuries in a negligence case, where the jury awarded the James's \$146,486, consisting of property damage in the amount of \$96,486; \$10,000 for extended loss of use of their home; and \$40,000 in emotional distress, relying on Restatement §§ 904 and 436A. The court reasoned:

"The Restatement considers several hours worrying about securing shelter to be a potential element of damage recovery. RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 905, cmt. e, illus. 8. Antilles' suggestion that in the absence of physical injury, emotional distress is only compensable if Antilles' conduct was intentional or extremely outrageous is rejected. If appellees only recovered damages for emotional distress, appellants would be correct in asserting that the award would not be permitted pursuant to the Restatement. RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 436A. Since emotional distress was only a part of the damages awarded, this section is inapplicable.

Antilles Ins., 30 V.I. at 257.

166. Here, Plaintiffs were covered in industrial waste and suffered from some form of physical bodily harm sufficient to support a claim for mental anguish. Plaintiffs

are also entitled to recover for personal discomfort, annoyance, nervous distress and mental anguish because: (1) the Refinery acted with reckless disregard for the health and safety of its neighbors such that the recovery of these types of damages is authorized by the Restatement; (2) Plaintiffs suffered other pecuniary losses, including property damage to their homes and the contamination of their cisterns; (3) the type of torts at issue here are sufficiently like a trespass and the illustrations to § 905 to warrant these remedies even if Plaintiffs weren't physically injured; and (4) Plaintiffs are entitled to recover for their "discomfort and annoyance" under Restatement § 939 because the Defendants' damaged or ruined their property, regardless of whether the Plaintiffs recover in nuisance, negligence, trespass, or any other theory of liability.

167. Plaintiffs are also entitled to punitive damages. The Defendants knew that escaping red mud and bauxite presented health risks to the surrounding neighborhoods, but consciously and with reckless indifference took no reasonable steps to protect the surrounding neighborhoods.
168. There were seven cells of red mud when Hurricane Georges hit; all were above 50 feet; the tallest was about 120 feet. Alcoa's Management Standards and Guidelines for handling red mud states that: "Dust from the residue can effect neighbors and vegetation. . .bauxite residue deposits have been assessed as a major potential environmental liability for the company." The cells were visibly smaller after the hurricane.
169. Before Hurricane Georges, VICZM conducted a field inspection of the Refinery

and found that the branches of vegetation were stained red and so were the white shirt, faces, and arms of the staff, "indicating the presence of [red dust] in the air." The Title V permitting-application documents admitted that red-mud piles could be covered or treated with chemicals to prevent wind erosion and to reduce fugitive emissions—and despite complaints from neighbors about red dust—the Refinery took no steps to contain emissions.

170. Plant personnel who handled bauxite and bauxite residue were issued safety equipment that included respirators, dust masks, face shields, and cover gear. Black admitted that full respirators—not just dust masks—were required in potential high-dust areas. Despite this, Mr. Black, in his capacity as an environmental manager for the Refinery, admitted he never took into account the safety and protections of the surrounding residents in considering how to store bauxite or the bauxite residue.
171. In another litigation, SCA and Alcoa filed a "Statement of Undisputed Facts" in Case No. 2004/67. They admitted that, "much of the current bauxite residue disposal area is uncovered" and should be "stabilized" and presents an environmental hazard for a number of reasons, included that the containment area "no longer reflected any containment." They admitted that that the poor condition and lack of containment was "open and obvious." They also admitted there were elevated levels of poisons in the ground water including arsenic, selenium and lead, along with elevated pH levels.
172. The Refinery had prior knowledge about its dangerous industrial waste escaping.

Mr. Black admitted they knew about complaints from neighbors about red-mud dusting and drinking-water contamination. Mr. Pedersen admitted he knew generally about complaints that fugitive emissions were making people in the surrounding neighborhoods sick. Mr. Black admitted the Refinery used a type of bauxite that was particularly susceptible to dusting. Internal documents show that the bauxite-storage facility was inadequately constructed to withstand storms—portions of the roof had previously blown off in Hurricanes Hugo, Marilyn, and did so again in Georges. (This caused problems even before Georges storing both dry and wet bauxite because 25% of the bauxite-storage-building roof was missing and there's no structural siding.) Internal documents admitted that the entire structure should have been enclosed to handle "particularly the dusty bauxites," but Mr. Black isn't aware of any efforts to fully enclose the building, except for using "plastic curtains."

173. The Refinery's officials knew hurricanes were a problem and Mr. Black was one of the officials responsible for preparing for them. Despite this, Mr. Black took no steps to prevent bauxite from being blown around the islands. The Refinery never took any steps to prevent the red mud from escaping during a hurricane. Documents show Black falsely justified the Refinery's failure to prepare the shed to DPNR by claiming the bauxite-storage building was "built to withstand hurricanes." In fact the bauxite was stored in an open A-frame and with only plastic curtains on it. Mr. Pedersen, the official in charge of the whole Refinery, wasn't aware of any extra precautions taken to protect neighbors in the area in


the event of a hurricane. Mr. Black admitted the Refinery failed to take any steps to secure the red mud and bauxite.

174. Refinery employees witnessed the bauxite leaving the storage shed during the storm through a hole in the roof. The facility was cited by DEP because "a substance described as red mud contaminated numerous properties including cisterns during the hurricane." The Refinery's investigation revealed homes with "what looked like bauxite on the walls." The Refinery recklessly failed to test or measure to determine the amount of bauxite and red mud that escaped the Refinery during the hurricane.
175. DEP found that the Refinery failed to take any precautionary measures to prevent bauxite from escaping. This prompted the Refinery to buy approximately \$50,000 worth of tarps to cover the bauxite in the event of another storm, but it didn't take any steps to secure the red mud. The Refinery covered the bauxite with tarp the next time a hurricane threatened.
176. In prior lawsuits, SCRG learned in or about 2006 that its property contained friable asbestos as well as red mud, bauxite and other toxic waste.
177. Despite this knowledge, SCRG took no measures to remove or contained those hazardous chemicals.
178. SCRG knew that those substances repeatedly blew into Plaintiffs' home but failed to warn Plaintiffs or attempt to contain the substances.
179. The actions of Defendants were and are so callous and done with such extreme indifference to the rights and interests of the Plaintiffs and the citizens of St. Croix

so as to entitle Plaintiffs to an award of punitive damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for damages as they may appear, compensatory and punitive, and interest and litigation costs and such other relief this Court finds fair and just.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED
LEE J. ROHN & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Attorneys for Plaintiffs



DATED: September 12, 2016

BY: _____

Lee J. Rohn, Esq.
VI Bar No. 52
1101 King Street
Christiansted, St. Croix
U.S. Virgin Islands 00820
Telephone: (340) 778-8855
Fax: (340) 773-2954

VERIFICATION

I, **PHILLIP ABRAHAM**, being fully sworn, state that I have read the allegations contained in the foregoing **VERIFIED COMPLAINT** and know that the facts relating to my personal situation, including my personal and property damages are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I have given Lee J. Rohn and Associates, LLC authority to file this lawsuit on my behalf.

PHILLIP ABRAHAM

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

Before me this _____ day of _____, 2016.

NOTARY PUBLIC

VERIFICATION

I, **ANDREA ABRAHAM**, being fully sworn, state that I have read the allegations contained in the foregoing **VERIFIED COMPLAINT** and know that the facts relating to my personal situation, including my personal and property damages are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I have given Lee J. Rohn and Associates, LLC authority to file this lawsuit on my behalf.

ANDREA ABRAHAM

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

Before me this ____ day of _____, 2016.

NOTARY PUBLIC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on this 12th day of September 2016, I caused a true and correct copy of **NOTICE OF FILING VERIFIED COMPLAINT** to the following:

Andrew C. Simpson, Esquire
Law Offices of Andrew Simpson, P.C.
2191 Church Street, Suite 5
Christiansted, St. Croix, VI 00820
Email Address: asimpson@coralbrief.com
Attorney For: ALCOA

Richard Hunter, Esquire
Hunter, Cole & Bennett
Pentheny Bldg., 3rd Floor
1138 King Street
Christiansted, VI 00820
Attorney For: Glencore LTD

Carl J. Hartmann III, Esquire
Law Office of Carl J. Hartmann III
5000 Estate Coakley Bay, L-6
Christiansted, VI 00820
Email Address: carl@carlhartmann.com
Attorney For: St. Croix Renaissance Group LLLP

Bernard Pattie, Esquire
Law Office of Bernard Pattie
1244 Queen Cross Street, Suite 5
St. Croix, VI 00820-4932
Attorney For: St. Croix Alumina LLC and ALCOA, Inc.

James L. Hymes, Esquire
Law Offices of James L. Hymes, III, P.C.
#33-1 Estate Elizabeth, #7736
P.O. Box 990
St. Thomas, USVI 00804-990
Email Address: jim@hymeslawvi.com; rauna@hymeslawvi.com
Attorney For: Century Aluminum Company

Joel Holt, Esquire
Law Offices of Joel Holt
Quinn House
2132 Company Street, Suite 2
Christiansted, VI 00820
Email Address: holtvi@aol.com
Attorney For: St. Croix Renaissance Group LLLP

Juliet A. Markowitz, Esquire
Tatro Tekosky Sadwick LLP
333 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 4270
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Email Address: jmarkowitz@ttsmlaw.com
Attorney For: Glencore LTD

Rene' P. Tatro, Esquire
Tatro Tekosky Sadwick LLP
333 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 4270
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Email Address: renetatro@ttsmlaw.com
Attorney For: Glencore LTD

BY:  (ksj)