

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

VENANCIO AGUASANTA ARIAS AND ROSA
TANGUILA ANDI, La Comunidad San Francisco 2,
Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador, husband and wife,
as guardians of their four minor children;
ESTER INEZ ANDI, La Comunidad San Francisco 2,
Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador,
as legal Guardian of her minor child
Santiago Domingo Tanguila Andi and
LAURA SARITAMA, La Comunidad San Francisco 2,
Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador, husband and wife of
Quechua nationality,
as legal Guardians of their two minor children,
VIDAL CAMACHO AND DEICY LALANGUI,
La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios,
Ecuador, husband and wife,
as legal guardians of their four minor children,
JOSE CASTILLO AND BETHY SAN MARTIN,
La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios,
Ecuador, husband and wife,
as legal guardians of their three minor children,
JOFRE JIJON ALVARADO AND ENMA PEÑA,
La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios,
Ecuador, husband and wife,
as legal guardians of their minor child,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DYNCORP
11710 Plaza America Drive
Reston, Virginia 20190
DYNCORP AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY
DYNCORP TECHNICAL SERVICES, LLC
DYNCORP INTERNATIONAL, LLC
One Ridgmar Centre
6500 West Freeway, Suite 600
Forth Worth, TX 76116

Defendants.

**C.A. No: 01CV01908
(RWR)
FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL
DEMANDED**

_____ /

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

INTRODUCTION - Nature of Action

1. The claims in this action arise from Defendants' conduct in connection with the implementation of their contracts with agencies of the United States and Colombian governments to exterminate, by the use of fumigants sprayed from airplanes and helicopters, plantations of cocaine and/or heroin poppies in large tracts of the Colombian rainforest. During the course of implementing these contracts, Defendants also sprayed large sections of the Esmeraldas, Carchi, and Sucumbios provinces in Ecuador, across the border from Colombia, and caused severe physical and mental damages to Plaintiffs and their children. Plaintiffs have been subjected to serious and systematic damage to their persons and their property in violation of the Alien Tort Claims Act ("ATCA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1350, international laws, treaties, conventions, resolutions, and the common laws of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Texas, the State of Delaware, and/or the country of Ecuador.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1350 over the violations of laws of nations and international treaties. Supplemental jurisdiction exists over the common law causes of action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Alternatively and concurrently, this Court has diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (a)(2) as Plaintiffs are citizens of Ecuador and Defendants are all United States corporations incorporated in the United States with their principal places of business also within the United States. The amount in dispute between each Plaintiff and

each Defendant exceeds \$75,000.

4. Venue properly lies in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b) and (c).

PARTIES

5. Plaintiffs Venancio Aguasanta Arias (Ecuadorian Identity Card No. 1600251084) and Rosa Tanguila Andi (Ecuadorian Identity Card No. 1500479611), are husband and wife, and reside in La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador. They allege on good faith information and belief, on behalf of themselves, and their four minor children, that between January and February of 2001, heavy spraying of toxic herbicides was carried out by employees or agents of the DynCorp Defendants in Colombian territory located no more than one mile from their home in Ecuador. The herbicides were sprayed repeatedly over the aforementioned period day after day, with occasional rest periods of two and three days. On the days the fumigation took place, the spraying occurred between six in the morning and four in the afternoon. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from the planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the home and land of Plaintiffs.

6. As a result of the heavy fumigation carried out by the DynCorp Defendants over the area, Plaintiffs Venancio Aguasanta Arias and Rosa Tanguila Andi, and their children, developed serious health problems including heavy fevers, diarrhea, and dermatological problems. One of the Plaintiffs' children, Venancio Andres, was affected so severely by the spraying that he suffered from heavy bleeding through his intestinal system and had to be transported to the hospital at Lago Agrio, where he was treated. Plaintiffs and their children were in an excellent state of health prior to the fumigations

by Defendants, and suffered the aforementioned medical problems for a period of weeks after the fumigations stopped. They continue to suffer to this day from serious irritations to their eyes which they have not been able to cure. In addition to the health problems developed as a result of the fumigations of their land, Plaintiffs suffered the losses of their coffee, yucca, plantain and rice plantations, which is their sole source of subsistence. The animals they own were severely affected by the fumigations, including that their chickens developed blisters in their skin and died.

7. Plaintiff Ester Inez Andi (Ecuadorian Identity Card No. 2100210455) is a single mother, twenty five years of age, and a resident of La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador. She alleges on good faith information and belief, on behalf of herself and her minor child, that between January and February of 2001, heavy spraying of toxic herbicides was carried out by employees or agents of the DynCorp Defendants in Colombian territory located no more than one mile from her home. The herbicides were sprayed repeatedly over the aforementioned period day after day, with occasional rest periods of two and three days. On the days the fumigation took place, the spraying occurred between six in the morning and four in the afternoon. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from the planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the home and land of the Plaintiff.

8. As a result of the heavy fumigation carried out by the DynCorp Defendants over the area, Plaintiff Ester Inez Andi developed serious health problems including serious pains all over her body, fever, diarrhea and sores on her body. Plaintiff's child, who was born in March, 2001, suffered from heavy bleeding through her intestinal system and had to transported to the Hospital in Quito, on the recommendation of the physicians of Lago

Agrio, since the hospital in Lago Agrio did not have adequate facilities or knowledge to treat the child from the poisoning suffered as a result of the fumigations. Other children in the community have suffered equally as a result of the fumigations, including at least two who died. Deaths of infants have not occurred in this community for at least five years prior to the spraying campaign of the DynCorp Defendants.

9. Plaintiffs Santiago Domingo Tanguila Andi (Ecuadorian Identity Card No. 1500455058) and Laura Saritama, husband and wife, are of Quechua nationality, and reside in La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador. They allege on good faith information and belief, on behalf of themselves and their two minor children, that between January and February of 2001, heavy spraying of toxic herbicides was carried out by employees or agents of the DynCorp Defendants in Colombian territory located no more than one mile from their home in Ecuador. The herbicides were sprayed repeatedly over the aforementioned period day after day, with occasional rest periods of two and three days. On the days the fumigation took place, the spraying occurred between six in the morning and four in the afternoon. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from the planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the home and land of Plaintiffs.

10. As a result of the heavy fumigation carried out by the DynCorp Defendants over the area, Plaintiffs Santiago Domingo Tanguila Andi and Laura Saritama, and their children, developed serious health problems including heavy fevers, diarrhea, and dermatological problems. Plaintiffs treated their children at home with medicines appropriate to their culture, but upon not obtaining satisfactory results, transported the children to the Hospital at Lago Agrio, the sub center of Health of San Francisco de Lago

Agrio, and the sub center General Farfay in Lago Agrio. Finally, they took their children to the private clinic of Dr. Gonzabay.

11. Plaintiff Santiago Domingo Andi is a school teacher in the community's school named Escuela Pedro Francisco Tanguila, and attests herein that during the fumigation period, eighteen of the twenty one students in his class fell ill and the school had to be closed for lack of pupils. In addition, the coffee, yucca and plantain plantations cultivated by him and his family were killed by the fumigants at a considerable financial loss to Plaintiffs.

12. Plaintiffs Vidal Camacho and Deicy Lalangui, husband and wife, and residents of La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador, allege on good faith information and belief, on behalf of themselves, and their five minor children, that between January and February of 2001, heavy spraying of toxic herbicides was carried out by employees or agents of the DynCorp Defendants in Colombian territory located no more than one mile from their home. The herbicides were sprayed repeatedly over the aforementioned period day after day, with occasional rest periods of two and three days. On the days the fumigation took place, the spraying occurred between six in the morning and four in the afternoon. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from the planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the home and land of Plaintiffs.

13. Plaintiffs Jose Castillo (Ecuadorian Identity Card No. 1708094451) and Bethy San Martin, husband and wife, and residents of La Comunidad San Francisco 2, Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador, allege on good faith information and belief, on behalf of themselves, and their three minor children, that between January and February of 2001, heavy spraying of toxic herbicides was carried out by employees or agents of the

DynCorp Defendants in Colombian territory located no more than one-half mile from their home. The herbicides were sprayed repeatedly over the aforementioned period day after day, with occasional rest periods of two and three days. On the days the fumigation took place, the spraying occurred between six in the morning and four in the afternoon. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from the planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the home and land of Plaintiffs.

14. As a result of the heavy fumigation carried out by the DynCorp Defendants over the area, Plaintiffs Jose Castillo and Bethy San Martin, and their children, developed serious health problems including vomiting and diarrhea, which were also suffered by all their neighbors following the fumigations. Plaintiff Bethy San Martin was four to five months pregnant during the spraying and she suffered serious medical problems including heavy coughing, vomiting and diarrhea. Her child was born with serious deformities, constant vomiting, fever, coughing, testicular inflammation, and eventually died on June 30, 2001. In Plaintiffs' community there was another death of a child in January, and another two deaths of children occurred after the fumigations were completed. Another child in their community was born after the fumigations with serious neurological problems, unable to nurse from her mother. In the past two years, prior to the fumigations, there have been no deaths of children in Plaintiffs' community or in adjacent communities. Plaintiffs' deceased infant was treated by the physicians of Lago Agrio, who could not find a cure. In addition to the death of their child and the medical problems the family has gone through as a result of the fumigations, the subsistence crops the family grows in their patch of land were destroyed by the DynCorp Defendants at a significant economic loss to the family.

15. Plaintiffs Jofre Jijon Alvarado and Enma Peña, husband and wife, and residents of La Comunidad San Francisco 1, Province of Sucumbios, Ecuador, allege on good faith information and belief, on behalf of themselves, and their minor son, that between January and February of 2001, heavy spraying of toxic herbicides carried out by employees or agents of the DynCorp Defendants in Colombian territory located no more than one-half mile from the home of the Plaintiffs. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from the planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the home and land of Plaintiffs.

16. As a result of the heavy fumigation carried out by the DynCorp Defendants over the area, Plaintiffs Jofre Jijon Alvarado and Enma Peña and their child developed serious health problems including fever, diarrhea, and respiratory problems, which were also suffered by all their neighbors following the fumigations. As a result of the medical condition of their child, they were forced to take him to the hospital in Lago Agrio, where the physicians diagnosed him with pulmonary problems, and told them that he had seen in the last few days a number of similar cases, all of them of residents of the zones sprayed with the fumigants. They also stated that they believed that all these medical conditions were the result of the fumigations. Plaintiffs' child remained hospitalized for five days. During that week Plaintiffs determined that the majority of the people hospitalized originated in the zone where the fumigations were taking place. Plaintiff Enma Peña met her immediate neighbor in the hospital whose child was also hospitalized as a result of the fumigations, and she was a witness to the death of another child who arrived at the hospital from the zone immediately adjacent to the Colombian frontier where heavy fumigations had occurred. Plaintiffs' coffee plantation was decimated by

the fumigation, causing the subsistence farming family a devastating economic blow. In addition, all of their domesticated birds developed growths in their bodies and died immediately after the fumigations.

17. Defendant DynCorp is a Delaware corporation doing business in a number of locations in the United States. Its business consists of information technology and outsourcing professional and technical services primarily to the U.S. government, which accounts for 98% of its revenue. Through its U.S. government related contracts, DynCorp regularly conducts business within the District of Columbia. In addition, DynCorp engages in activities to further its business within the District of Columbia including regular interactions with Members of Congress, the Executive Branch, and various agencies of the U.S. Government including the Department of State. With more than 22,000 employees worldwide and average yearly sales over 1.8 billion, DynCorp is among the largest employee-owned technology companies in the United States.

18. Defendant DynCorp AT is a division of DynCorp operating from Fort Worth, Texas. It provides technical and outsourcing services related to aviation.

19. Defendant DynCorp TS is a Delaware corporation, and is a wholly-owned subsidiary of DynCorp operating from Fort Worth, Texas. DynCorp TS has operations in more than 80 worldwide locations and employs over 12,900 worldwide. Its operations include aviation services, international program management, and personal and physical security services.

20. Defendant DynCorp Int'l is a Delaware Corporation and is a subsidiary of DynCorp operating from Fort Worth, Texas. Upon information and belief, DynCorp Int'l is wholly-owned by DynCorp and was created in December 2000 to focus on the

company's extensive international business in a single unit. Corporate reports indicate that DynCorp Int'l contracts are predominately to the U.S. Government and its agencies and that it has revenues of approximately \$550 million and more than 7,500 employees worldwide.

21. Defendant DynCorp is fully liable for its own acts and the acts of any subsidiaries, units, divisions, or other entities directly or indirectly under its ownership and control, including, but not limited to, DynCorp, DynCorp AT, DynCorp TS and DynCorp Int'l, in relation to the unlawful acts herein. Further, any such subsidiaries, units, divisions, or other entities are alter egos of Defendant DynCorp, or alternatively, are in an agency relationship with it. Defendant DynCorp is also vicariously liable under the doctrine of respondeat superior for the acts or omissions of any subsidiaries, units, divisions, or other entities under its ownership and control, and for the acts of any employees or agents.

BACKGROUND FACTS

22. In the late 1990s the United States government, in conjunction with the government of the Republic of Colombia, developed a joint, wide-spread, multi-billion dollar cooperative agreement to disrupt and eradicate drug production and exportation from Colombia. This plan colloquially became known as "Plan Colombia." As of 2001, the State Department described the Plan as a \$1.3 billion interagency assistance package to Colombia.

23. A key aspect of Plan Colombia was aerial eradication of coca and heroin production in Colombia via herbicides. On or about February 1, 1998, the United States Government, by and through its executive agencies, issued Contract No. S-OPRAQ-0051

to Defendants for the eradication of coca and heroin poppy crops in Colombia by aerial spraying. On or about May 6, 2005, the United States Government, by and through its executive agencies, issued Contract No. S-AQMPD-05-C1103 to Defendants for the eradication of coca and heroin poppy crops in Colombia by aerial spraying.

24. On information and belief, the government contracts described above do not provide for the spraying of fumigants, herbicides, or the contamination with toxic chemicals of any part of Ecuador, especially the region where Plaintiffs reside. Rather, it would violate the terms of any contract with the United States government for Defendants to spray poisonous chemicals on the persons, land, livestock and water supply of Plaintiffs. On information and belief, the express terms of the contracts under which Defendants conducted operations in Colombia, those operations were intended and limited to operations within the territorial boundaries of the Republic of Colombia. No portions of those contracts permitted operations without Colombia or within the Republic of Ecuador.

25. At all relevant times herein, there have been no territorial disputes between the Republic of Colombia and the Republic of Ecuador and their shared border has been recognized by each sovereign and the international community.

26. The eastern third (approximately) of the border between the Province of Sucumbios and Colombia is delineated by the Río Putumayo, a major watercourse. The remainder of the border between Ecuador and Colombia is well marked on maps and aerial charts.

27. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were aware of, or should have been aware of, the precise and exact location of the border between Colombia and Ecuador.

28. On or about December 1, 2000, and continuing to the present, Defendants, pursuant to "Plan Colombia," conducted aerial spraying over areas of Colombia where suspected cocaine and heroin fields are located. Defendants utilized harmful chemicals which are injurious to humans, livestock, vegetation, and water which conducting its operations.

29. Defendants sprayed and continue to spray the toxic chemicals at, near and across the border between Colombia and Ecuador without regard to the health, safety, and well-being of the Plaintiffs and knowing that the water and winds would carry the toxic chemicals to the areas inhabited by the Plaintiffs.

30. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have witnessed Defendants' planes flying over their villages in Ecuador, clearly beyond their intended Colombian targets, spraying them with the harmful chemicals. The toxic chemicals landed on Plaintiffs, their children, livestock, surrounding land, and drinking water.

31. The extent of Defendant's spraying operations in Colombia was massive. As of August 2001, the State Department had estimated that 50,000 hectares of coca plantations had been sprayed from the air nationwide.

32. On information and belief, Defendants repeatedly: (1) crossed the Colombia-Ecuador border and sprayed within Ecuador; and/or (2) sprayed in such close proximity to the border between Ecuador and Colombia such that it was known or knowable that substantial quantities of the sprayed herbicide would drift and flow into Ecuadorian territory. As alleged more fully herein, these actions by Defendants violated: (1) the express terms of the contracts between Defendants and the United States; (2) international law; and (3) the common law.

33. In approximately January of 2006, in response to the illegal actions of Defendants and the ecological and health crisis generated by the spraying, the Colombian government established a six mile wide no-spray zone along the Ecuadorian-Colombian border. At the end of 2006, the Colombian government rescinded its six mile buffer and permitted spraying within 330 feet of the border. Despite this change, Defendants remained obligated by international and common law, as well as the express terms of its contracts with the United States government, to exercise all due care to ensure that its spraying activities did not impact the environment or residents of Ecuador.

34. Defendants had knowledge and were aware of the adverse and harmful effects of their wrongful conduct. Defendants' aerial spraying has been the subject of critical medial attention. Despite knowledge of the dangerous and harmful effects of their conduct, Defendants continue to spray toxic chemicals on Plaintiffs.

35. On good faith, information and belief the herbicide/fumigant used by Defendants in their spraying operations was a glyphosate-based herbicide. Commercial versions of the herbicide have been sold under the trade name Roundup®. It is alleged that the herbicide was obtained by Defendants in bulk and in a concentrated form. It is further alleged that Defendants were responsible for diluting the concentrated herbicide for application.

36. On good faith, information and belief the herbicide/fumigant contained, in addition to its active ingredient glyphosate: polyoxyethylenamine (POEA); COSMO FLUX-411f; and COSMO-iN-D.

37. On good faith, information and belief, the use label for Roundup® warns against contact with the eyes and skin, warns against applications to bodies of water, and warns

against contact with food sources. Despite these use warnings, Defendants sprayed the herbicide on Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' drinking water sources, and Plaintiffs' food sources.

38. The herbicide sprayed by Defendants over Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' lands and livestock has a very high inhalation toxicity rating.

39. Exposure to Roundup® by humans has been associated with: death; erosion of the gastrointestinal tract (seen as sore throat, dysphasia, and gastrointestinal hemorrhage); duodenal injury; pulmonary injury; respiratory injury; ocular injury; central nervous system injury; toxicity to human placental JEG3 cells and inhibition of steroidogenesis demonstrating endocrine toxicity; and other human diseases. Animal studies have demonstrated similar toxic effects of both glyphosate, the surfactants used in Roundup®, and the Roundup® formulation. POEA has been described as having serious pulmonary toxicity although not as much as the Roundup® combination. Furthermore, studies of the exposed population have displayed chromosomal and genetic damage associated with exposure to the herbicide mixture.

40. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs' exposure to Defendants' spraying, they have been injured to their person. Each Plaintiff herein alleges that he or she has been exposed to Defendants' spraying, that his or her exposure was a substantial factor in causing or contributing to the suffered injury, that he or she did suffer injury, and that he or she has suffered damages as a result.

41. Roundup® is a broad spectrum herbicide. Roundup® is not intended to, and is incapable of, differentiating between illicit coca and poppy plants and legal crops or natural flora. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's spraying, Plaintiffs' crops have been destroyed. Furthermore, deaths of animals including cows, pigs, horses,

chickens, cats, dogs, as well as mountain animals, have been reported as a result of Defendants' spraying.

DEFENDANTS' VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A. International Common Law

42. The present-day law of nations recognizes the territorial integrity of sovereigns. It is generally accepted as international law that trespass of international borders resulting in harm is unlawful. Such a right was generally accepted by the civilized world in the 18th Century. Furthermore, such a norm is analogous to, or a direct converse of, well-recognized and specific features of the 18th Century paradigms of international law. For example, transgression of a sovereign's borders and causing harm to citizens within the foreign nation is a direct corollary to violations of safe conduct, which was understood to be actionable.

43. It has become a specific, universal, and obligatory norm of international law that activities within a state's jurisdictional control be conducted so as to not cause significant injury to the environment or another state or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

44. Such a norm has been set forth in section 601 of the Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law of the United States. Such a norm has been observed in cases of cross-border environmental impact such as the *Trail Smelter* case and the *Gut Dam* case.

45. As alleged herein, Defendants violated international law by crossing the Ecuadorian-Colombian border and spraying herbicides in Ecuador.

46. As alleged herein, Defendants violated international law by aerial spraying within Colombia when and where it knew or should have known that such spraying would result

in herbicides being deposited within the Republic of Ecuador.

47. Herbicides were sprayed repeatedly by Defendants within one mile of the Ecuadorian border and the homes or farms of Plaintiffs. The herbicides were sprayed repeatedly day after day, with occasional rest periods of two and three days. On the days the fumigations took place, the spraying occurred between six in the morning and four in the afternoon. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from the planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the homes and lands of Plaintiffs.

48. Defendants are responsible for all significant injury to the environment of another state (Ecuador) or to its property, or to persons or property within that state's territory or under its jurisdiction or control. Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law § 601(3) (1987).

49. As a direct and proximate result of these violations of international law, Plaintiffs were injured to their persons and property.

**B. United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in
Narcotic Drugs as Psychotropic Substances, 1988**

50. The United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (hereinafter "The 1988 Convention") was signed in Vienna on December 20, 1988 and entered into force November 11, 1990. The Republic of Ecuador, the Republic of Colombia, and the United States (with declaration(s)) are all parties to The 1988 Convention.

51. Article 2, section 2, of The 1988 Convention states, "[t]he Parties shall carry out their obligations under this Convention in a manner consistent with the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of States and that of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States."

52. Article 2, section 3, of The 1988 Convention states, “[a] Party shall not undertake in the territory of another Party the exercise of jurisdiction and performance of functions which are exclusively reserved for the authorities of that other Party by its domestic law.”

53. Article 14 (“Measures to Eradicate Illicit Cultivation of Narcotic Plants and to Eliminate Illicit Demand for Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances”), section 2, of The 1988 Convention states, “[e]ach Party shall take appropriate measures to prevent illicit cultivation of and to eradicate plants containing narcotic or psychotropic substances, such as opium poppy, coca bush and cannabis plants, cultivated illicitly in its territory. The measures adopted shall respect fundamental human rights and shall take due account of traditional illicit uses, where there is historic evidence of such use, as well as the protection of the environment.”

54. Article 14, section 3, subdivision (c), of The 1988 Convention states as follows, “[w]herever they have common frontiers, the Parties shall seek to co-operate in eradication programs in their respective areas along those frontiers.”

55. Defendants’ spraying activities violate the provisions of The 1988 Convention

C. Narcotic Drug Bi-Laterals and Multi-Laterals

56. The United States has consistently advanced the principles set forth in The 1988 Convention with respect to its narcotic drug foreign relations in the Andean region.

57. The Declaration of Cartagena, T.I.A.S. 124111, signed in Cartagena on February 1, 1990 by the President of the United States and the President of the Republic of Colombia, states, in pertinent part, as follows, “[g]iven that the Parties act within a framework of respect for human rights, they reaffirm that nothing would do more to undermine the war on drugs than disregard for human rights by participants in the effort.”

Section B (preamble).

* * *

“Eradication programs must safeguard human health and preserve the ecosystem.”

Section B, subdivision 5 (emphasis added).

* * *

“[The United Nations] has called for a Global Action Plan and it has convened a Special Session, February 20-23, 1990, to discuss the magnitude of this problem. This will be a proper occasion to reiterate the need to bring into force as quickly as possible the UN Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, which provides for energetic measures against illegal drug trafficking, while recognizing the ancestral and traditional uses of coca leaf.” Section C, subdivision 4.

58. A Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Ecuador on Measures to Prevent the Diversion of Chemical Substances was signed in Quito on June 17, 1991 by the United States Ambassador, the Attorney General, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Ecuador. T.I.A.S. 12129.

59. In this Memorandum of Understanding, these nations re-iterated their commitment to The 1998 Convention, stating, “[t]he contracting states declare that their cooperation in this area will also take into consideration the applicable provisions of the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, to which the two states are parties.” Article VII, Section 3.

60. Defendants’ spraying activities violate these international agreements and norms of international law.

**D. Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use
of Environmental Modification Techniques**

61. The Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques is a multilateral treaty done at Geneva on May 18, 1977, ratified by the Senate and signed by the President of the United States. 31 U.S.T. 333.

62. Article I, Section 1, of this Treaty provides, “[e]ach State Party to this Convention undertakes not to engage in military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or injury to any other State Party.”

63. Defendants’ spraying activities violate this Treaty.

E. Rio Declaration on Environment and Development

64. Principle 2 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development states, “[s]tates have, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of International law, the sovereign right to exploit their own resources pursuant to their own environmental and development policies, and the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.”

65. Defendants’ spraying violates this principle of international law.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**Torts Committed in Violation of the Laws of Nations and Treaties of the United
States 28 U.S.C. § 1350**

66. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 65 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

67. As set forth above and herein, Defendants have tortuously caused harm to Plaintiffs as a direct and proximate result of their violations on the laws of nations and treaties of the United States.

68. Defendants were on actual or constructive notice of the laws of nations and United States Treaties applicable to their spraying operations pursuant to their contracts with the United States Governments.

69. Despite that knowledge, Defendants negligently or intentionally violated various provisions of the laws of nations and treaties of the United States.

70. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violations of the laws of nation and treaties of the United States, Plaintiffs have been injured to their person and their property in an amount to be proven at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligence Per Se

71. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 70 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

72. There exist several international treaties, declarations, and conventions which impose obligations or duties on Defendants which are intended to protect a class of persons which includes Plaintiffs from harms including personal injury and property damage.

73. Defendants have violated or breached these treaties, declarations, and conventions.

74. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violations or breaches of these treaties, declarations, and conventions, Plaintiffs have suffered injuries to their persons

and property.

75. The 1988 Convention provides, “The Parties shall carry out their obligations under this Convention in a manner consistent with the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of States and that of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States,” and “[t]he measures adopted shall respect fundamental human rights and shall take due account of traditional illicit uses, where there is historic evidence of such use, as well as the protection of the environment.”

76. Defendants’ sprayed in a manner which did not respect, and in fact breached, the sovereign equality and territorial integrity of the Republic of Ecuador. Defendants’ spraying operations were performed in a manner where Defendants knew or should have known that substantial amounts of herbicide would be deposited in Ecuador, on crops, on drinking water supplies, and on the Plaintiffs in a manner inconsistent with fundamental human rights and likely to cause harm to the environment.

77. The Cartagena Declaration provides, “[e]radication programs must safeguard human health and preserve the ecosystem.”

78. Defendants’ implementation of the spraying program was known to, or should have been known to, and in fact did, present a substantial risk of harm to human health and the ecosystem.

79. The Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques provides, “[e]ach State Party to this Convention undertakes not to engage in military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects as the means of destruction, damage or injury to any other State Party.”

80. The Defendants' spraying program was another hostile use of environmental modification which had widespread and several effects to Plaintiffs in Ecuador which resulted in destructions, damage, and injury. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' actions, Plaintiffs have been injured and have suffered damages.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Ordinary Negligence

81. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 80 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth herein.

82. At all times relevant herein, there existed a duty on the part of the Defendants to act with all due care towards the safety, health, and property of Plaintiffs.

Defendants breached that duty of care by engaging in the following conduct:

- a) Spraying directly on Plaintiffs' drinking water supplies;
- b) Failing to warn Plaintiffs that they would spray toxic chemicals on and near their villages on a continued and repeated basis;
- c) Failing to properly follow the warnings on the herbicide/fumigant labels;
- d) Failing to properly spray the intended Colombian targets, by spraying in such a manner that the winds carried the harmful chemicals into Ecuador; and
- e) Crossing the border and spraying the harmful chemicals on the Plaintiffs.

As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have been injured and have suffered damages.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Hiring

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 82 of this Consolidated

Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

83. On good faith, information and belief, Defendants selected, hired, retained and contracted with pilots to fly the aircraft that sprayed toxic chemicals on Plaintiffs.

84. Defendants failed to exercise reasonable care in selecting, hiring, retaining, and contracting with these pilots. At the time that Defendants selected, hired, retained and contracted with the pilots, Defendants knew or reasonably should have known that these pilots would violate Plaintiffs' rights and that, as a direct and proximate result of those violations, Plaintiffs would suffer injuries.

85. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent selection, hiring, retention and contracting with the pilots who sprayed toxic chemicals on Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer injuries entitling them to damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Supervision

86. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 85 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

87. When engaging in the wrongful conduct alleged herein, the pilots who sprayed toxic chemicals on Plaintiffs were employees or agents of Defendants. Defendants exercised control over their employees or agents, and provided direction as to the flight paths, and the frequency and duration of the spraying.

88. Defendants knew or reasonable should have known that the pilots would not be able to control with precision the spraying line due to winds and movement of the aircraft, and that as a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs would suffer injuries as alleged herein.

Furthermore, Defendants knew or reasonably should have known that their pilots were directly spraying Plaintiffs and that as a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs would suffer injuries as alleged herein.

89. Defendants had the authority to supervise, prohibit, control, and/or regulate the pilots that were acting as their employees and/or agents so as to prevent the acts and omissions described herein from occurring. Defendants also had the ability to cease operations until such time as the violations alleged herein were stopped and/or prevented.

90. Defendants knew or reasonably should have known unless they intervened to protect Plaintiffs and properly supervise, prohibit, control and/or regulate the conduct described herein, Plaintiffs would suffer the injuries alleged herein.

91. Defendants failed to exercise due care by failing to supervise, prohibit, control or regulate their employees and/or agents, and also failed to make appropriate investigations into the possible negative impact on Plaintiffs once the initial spraying was completed. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent supervision, Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer injuries entitling them to damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress

92. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 91 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

93. Defendants' negligent conduct created a zone of physical danger for all Plaintiffs. Heavy clouds of liquid spray dropped from Defendants' planes, shifted with the wind, and repeatedly fell on the homes and lands of Plaintiffs.

94. Defendants' negligent spraying caused Plaintiffs to fear for their own safety, and caused Plaintiffs to suffer emotional distress.

95. Plaintiffs claimed distress is serious and verifiable.

96. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs' distress they have suffered damages, in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Nuisance

97. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 96 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

98. Defendants, at all times relevant herein, were the owners and/or operators of the planes that sprayed toxic herbicides on Plaintiffs' lands.

99. Defendants created and permitted a condition or activity at, near, and beyond the frontier between Ecuador and Colombia which caused contamination of Plaintiffs' lands with a toxic herbicide.

100. Defendants' continued and repeated activities at or near the frontier between Ecuador and Colombia caused and continues to cause a substantial and unreasonable interference with Plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of their properties.

101. Defendants' continued and repeated discharge, release, and spraying of a toxic herbicide constitutes a public and private nuisance and a substantial, unreasonable interference with Plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of their properties and the environment.

102. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions and/or omissions, Plaintiffs have suffered damages and will continue to suffer damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Battery

103. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 106 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

104. Defendants repeatedly and intentionally sprayed toxic chemicals over Plaintiffs, their land, livestock, and water supply which resulted in harmful and offensive contacts. Plaintiffs did not consent to the intentional, repeated, harmful and offensive contacts.

105. As a direct and proximate result of these acts of battery, Plaintiffs have suffered damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

106. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 57 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Trespass

107. Defendants, without authorization, intentionally and repeatedly sprayed toxic chemicals over Plaintiffs' property from on or about December of 2000 to the present.

108. Defendants' intentional, reckless, foreseeable and unprivileged actions at, near, and beyond the frontier between Ecuador and Colombia directly and proximately resulted, and continues to result, in the intrusion and contamination of Plaintiffs' lands.

109. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions and omissions, Plaintiffs have suffered damages and will continue to suffer damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

110. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 109 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

111. By intentionally and repeatedly spraying and continuing to spray toxic chemicals over Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' families, livestock, and property, Defendants engaged in outrageous conduct which went beyond all bounds of decency.

112. By conducting an aerial attack on Plaintiffs and spraying them with toxic chemicals, Defendants committed acts described herein which were intended to cause Plaintiffs to suffer severe emotional distress. In the alternative, Defendants engaged in the conduct with reckless disregard of the probability of causing Plaintiffs to suffer severe emotional distress. Plaintiffs were present at the time the outrageous conduct occurred, and Defendants knew that Plaintiffs were present.

113. The outrageous conduct of Defendants was the cause of severe emotional distress and physical damage suffered by the Plaintiffs.

114. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered damages in an amount to be ascertained at trial.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Strict Liability

115. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 114 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

116. The handling, use, storage, disposal and/or spraying of massive amounts of toxic herbicide near populated areas constitutes an ultra hazardous and/or abnormally dangerous

activity.

117. A toxic herbicide has been released by Defendants and has contaminated the air, land, water, subsurface water, groundwater, drinking water, and soil of Plaintiffs' properties all of which render the same hazardous.

118. As a direct and proximate result of such activity and such contamination, Plaintiffs have suffered damages and will continue to suffer damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Medical Monitoring

119. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 118 of this Consolidated Complaint as if set forth fully herein.

120. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have been exposed to known hazardous and toxic chemicals.

121. As a result of the exposure, Plaintiffs are at a heightened risk of contracting latent diseases, including cancer.

122. Early medical detection and treatment of these diseases is medically necessary and advisable.

123. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover the costs of a medical monitoring program in an amount to be ascertained at trial.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable as a matter of right.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For general damages in an amount as shall be proved at the time of trial in a sum according to proof;
2. For special damages in an amount as shall be proven at the time of trial in a sum according to proof;
3. For punitive and exemplary damages;
4. For costs of suit incurred herein;
5. For the reasonable cost of medical monitoring;
6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper under the circumstances.

Dated this 4th day of March, 2008.

/s/ Terry Collingsworth
Terry Collingsworth (DC Bar No. 71830)
Natacha Thys (DC Bar No. 458143)
INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS ADVOCATES
218 D Street SE (Third Floor)
Washington, DC 20003
Ph: (202) 543-5811
Fax: (202) 347-4885
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on March 4, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF. I also certify that the foregoing document is being served this day on all counsel of record identified on the attached Service List in the manner specified, either via transmission of Notices of Electronic Filing generated by CM/ECF or in some other authorized manner for those counsel or parties who are not authorized to receive electronically Notices of Electronic Filing.

s/Rebecca Pendleton

SERVICE LIST

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 01CV01908 (RWR)

William R. Scherer
Conrad & Scherer, LLP
P.O. Box 14723
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33302
Telephone: (954) 462-5500
Facsimile: (954) 463-9244
Email: wrs@conradscherer.com
Counsel for Plaintiffs

Walter J. Lack
Stephen R. Terrell
Engstrom, Lipscomb & Lack
10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
16th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 552-3800
Facsimile: (310) 552-9434
Emails: wlack@elllaw.com
sterrell@elllaw.com
Counsel for Plaintiffs

Thomas V. Girardi
J. Paul Sizemore
Girardi & Keese
1126 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 977-0211
Facsimile: (213) 481-1554
Emails: tgiradi@girardikeese.com
psizemore@girardikeese.com
Counsel for Plaintiffs

Joe G. Hollingsworth
Eric G. Lasker
Rosemary Stewart
Spriggs & Hollingsworth
1350 I Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3305
Telephone: (202) 898-5800
Facsimile: (202) 682-1639
Emails: elasker@spriggs.com
jhollingsworth@spriggs.com
rstewart@spriggs.com
Counsel for Defendants