

Assigned for All Purposes

Judge William Claster

CX-101

Hoang H. Ngo, Esq. (SBN 246578)

THE NGO LAW FIRM

15460 Magnolia Street

Westminster, California 92683

Tel. (949) 886-5433

E-mail: *hoang@thengolawfirm.com*

Attorney for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Classes: ANNIE EUNG, DAVID COLE, KEVIN ANH KIET NGUYEN, JEFFERSON NGUYEN, CHRISTOPHER NGUYEN, TIFFANY THUY NGUYEN, HUNG NGUYEN, MICHAEL NGUYEN, KATIE CHOR AND RAYENDRA RAMIL and The Classes

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE, CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER COURTHOUSE

ANNIE EUNG, DAVID COLE, KEVIN ANH KIET NGUYEN, JEFFERSON NGUYEN, CHRISTOPHER NGUYEN, TIFFANY THUY NGUYEN, HUNG NGUYEN, MICHAEL NGUYEN, KATIE CHOR, AND RAYENDRA RAMIL individually and on behalf of all residents and lawful occupants of the evacuation zone similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GKN AEROSPACE TRANSPARENCY SYSTEMS, INC.; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2026-01572418-CU-TT-CXC

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. Negligence**
- 2. Public Nuisance**
- 3. Private Nuisance**
- 4. Strict Liability / Ultrahazardous Activity**
- 5. Trespass**
- 6. Violation of California Unfair Competition Law, Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200**
- 7. Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**
- 8. Negligence Per Se**

CLASS ACTION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs Annie Eung, David Cole, Kevin Anh Kiet Nguyen, Jefferson Nguyen, Christopher Nguyen, Tiffany Thuy Nguyen, Hung Nguyen, Michael Nguyen, Katie Chor, and Rayendra Ramil ("Plaintiffs"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and the proposed Classes, bring this Class Action Complaint against **GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems,**

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1 **Inc. and DOES 1 through 100**, inclusive. Plaintiffs allege facts concerning their own residences
2 within the evacuation zone and the harm they personally experienced based on personal
3 knowledge, and allege all other facts based upon investigation, public records, emergency-
4 response reports, regulatory records, government notices, media reports, and information and
5 belief.

6 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

- 7 1. This is a class action arising from the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or
8 involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s facility in Garden
9 Grove, California.
- 10 2. Plaintiffs are residents who lived within the evacuation zone created in response to the
11 chemical emergency. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves, and all similarly
12 situated residents, occupants, renters, property owners, and other persons who were
13 displaced, evacuated, or otherwise directly affected by the emergency response.
- 14 3. The incident involved a chemical tank containing methyl methacrylate, a flammable
15 chemical, which authorities reported was overheating and created a risk of rupture,
16 release, fire, and/or explosion.
- 17 4. As a result, government authorities issued evacuation orders affecting residents in and
18 around Garden Grove and surrounding Orange County communities.
- 19 5. Plaintiffs and class members were forced to leave their homes, lose access to their
20 residences and personal property, incur displacement-related expenses, suffer disruption
21 to daily life, and experience fear and uncertainty regarding the safety of their homes,
22 families, and neighborhood.
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

7. Plaintiffs seek damages, restitution where available, abatement, injunctive relief, and all other relief the Court deems proper for the harm caused to evacuation-zone residents and similarly situated persons.

8. Plaintiff Annie Eung is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Annie Eung lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

9. Plaintiff David Cole is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff David Cole lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

10. Plaintiff Kevin Anh Kiet Nguyen is an individual residing in Orange County, California.

At all relevant times, Plaintiff Kevin Anh Kiet Nguyen lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

11. Plaintiff Jefferson Nguyen is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Jefferson Nguyen lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

12. Plaintiff Christopher Nguyen is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Christopher Nguyen lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

13. Plaintiff Tiffany Thuy Nguyen is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Tiffany Thuy Nguyen lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

14. Plaintiff Hung Nguyen is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Hung Nguyen lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

15. Plaintiff Michael Nguyen is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Michael Nguyen lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

16. Plaintiff Katie Chor is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Katie Chor lived within the evacuation zone established in connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

17. Plaintiff Rayendra Ramil is an individual residing in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Rayendra Ramil lived within the evacuation zone established in

connection with the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

18. Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of all similarly situated residents, lawful occupants, renters, property owners, and other persons who lived within or were directly affected by the evacuation zone arising from the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency at or involving Defendant's Garden Grove facility.

19. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc. is a California corporation or business entity authorized to conduct business in California, and at all relevant times owned, leased, operated, permitted, maintained, or controlled the Garden Grove facility located at or near 12122 Western Avenue, Garden Grove, California.

20. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc. owned, leased, operated, controlled, maintained, supervised, or managed the facility, chemical tank, equipment, hazardous materials, employees, contractors, safety systems, warning systems, emergency procedures, and operations involved in the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency.

21. Plaintiffs are ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sue those Defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when ascertained.

22. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that each DOE Defendant was responsible in some manner for the events, conditions, acts, omissions, ownership, operation, maintenance, inspection, repair, storage, handling, monitoring, emergency response, regulatory compliance, warning procedures, or safety practices alleged in this Complaint.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

23. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that DOES 1 through 25 include owners, lessees, operators, permit holders, parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliated entities, and managing agents responsible for the facility.

24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that DOES 26 through 50 include maintenance contractors, tank service providers, valve repair contractors, chemical suppliers, safety consultants, environmental consultants, emergency planning consultants, and other persons or entities responsible for inspection, maintenance, repair, monitoring, chemical storage, chemical handling, warning, emergency planning, or regulatory compliance.

25. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that DOES 51 through 100 include additional persons or entities whose acts or omissions contributed to the overheating tank, failed valve functionality, inability to drain or stabilize the tank, delayed warning, emergency response, evacuation, displacement, or resulting harms.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

26. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article VI, section 10 of the California Constitution because this is a civil action for damages, restitution, nuisance abatement, declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and other relief arising from events occurring in Orange County, California.

27. This Court has jurisdiction under Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated as a proposed class action.

28. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc. because Defendant conducts business in California, operates or controls an aerospace manufacturing facility in Garden Grove, California, and the acts, omissions,

events, emergency response, evacuation orders, and injuries alleged in this Complaint occurred in California.

29. Venue is proper in the Superior Court of California, County of Orange, because Defendant's facility is located in Orange County, the hazardous chemical emergency occurred in Orange County, the evacuation zone was located in Orange County, Plaintiffs and Class members resided in Orange County, and the injuries and damages alleged herein occurred in Orange County.

30. Venue is also proper because Defendant does business in Orange County and because the obligations, liabilities, and wrongful conduct alleged in this Complaint arose from Defendant's operations in Garden Grove, California.

31. The Central Justice Center is the proper courthouse because the events giving rise to this action occurred in Orange County and involve residents, property, emergency response, and public safety impacts within Orange County.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

32. Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc. operates an aerospace manufacturing facility located at or near 12122 Western Avenue, Garden Grove, California, where it stores, uses, handles, and processes hazardous industrial chemicals, including methyl methacrylate ("MMA"), a volatile, toxic, and highly flammable chemical used in plastics and aerospace manufacturing.

33. Beginning on or about May 21, 2026, a chemical storage tank at GKN's Garden Grove facility containing approximately 5,000 to 7,000 gallons of methyl methacrylate began heating, destabilizing, and emitting toxic fumes. The Governor's emergency proclamation states that the tank contained a volatile and highly flammable liquid and that the incident created a significant risk of a catastrophic hazardous chemical release.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
34. The incident was serious enough that the Orange County Fire Authority responded, and Orange County activated its emergency operations center. The State of California found that the magnitude and impact of the incident were beyond the control of any single local government and required coordinated mutual-aid response.
35. Emergency officials ordered evacuations around the GKN facility. Approximately 50,000 residents were subject to evacuation orders, and additional shelter space was required for displaced residents.
36. The evacuation zone included areas south of Ball Road, east of Valley View Street, west of Dale Street, and north of Trask Avenue, according to the City of Garden Grove emergency evacuation map. The City warned residents to avoid the area, follow evacuation orders and road closures, and monitor official public safety updates.
37. The City of Garden Grove established evacuation centers and emergency resources for displaced residents, including shelter locations, hotel resources, emergency rates, transportation assistance, and public hotlines.
38. The chemical incident disrupted schools, families, businesses, and daily life across Garden Grove and surrounding communities. Multiple school districts implemented evacuation procedures, school closures, student relocations, and contingency planning because of the hazardous materials incident.
39. Emergency officials publicly described the situation as involving a compromised tank that could either rupture and spill thousands of gallons of chemicals or trigger a fire/explosion event. Officials stated that methyl methacrylate is highly volatile and highly flammable.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
40. Public reports stated that the tank’s drainage valves were not functioning, preventing responders from safely accessing, draining, neutralizing, or stabilizing the chemical contents.
41. The danger was not speculative. The Governor expressly found that, despite mitigation efforts, “significant risk remains of a catastrophic event that could lead to a hazardous release of dangerous chemicals.”
42. Methyl methacrylate exposure can cause irritation to the eyes, skin, nose, throat, and lungs, and higher exposure can lead to respiratory distress and hospitalization. Public health officials warned that a blast or chemical release could create hazardous vapors.
43. Before this incident, GKN had already been cited or penalized by South Coast AQMD for environmental compliance violations. In January 2025, South Coast AQMD’s civil penalty report identified GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems Inc., Facility ID 140961, with a settlement dated January 9, 2025, involving Notice No. P68777, rules 109, 203, 222, 1146, and 1147, and a total settlement of \$909,935.95.
44. The South Coast AQMD rules identified in the January 2025 penalty report include recordkeeping for volatile organic compound emissions, permit-to-operate requirements, filing requirements for specific emission sources, and emissions rules for boilers, process heaters, and miscellaneous sources.
45. These prior regulatory violations are relevant because they show GKN had notice of environmental compliance obligations, hazardous operations, emissions controls, permitting duties, and recordkeeping requirements before the May 2026 chemical emergency.
46. The Orange County District Attorney’s Office reportedly launched an investigation into the Garden Grove chemical crisis and established an anonymous tipline and online

reporting form to gather information about the failed chemical storage tank and GKN's operations.

47. Plaintiffs and proposed class members were forced to evacuate, shelter elsewhere, incur expenses, lose use and enjoyment of their homes, experience fear and uncertainty, suffer disruption to work, school, childcare, transportation, and daily routines, and face potential exposure to toxic fumes and explosion risk.

48. Plaintiffs allege that GKN failed to safely store, monitor, maintain, inspect, cool, drain, stabilize, and/or control hazardous chemicals at its facility; failed to maintain functional valves and emergency systems; failed to prevent overheating and toxic vapor emissions; failed to timely warn surrounding residents; and failed to operate its facility in a manner that protected the surrounding community.

49. As a direct and proximate result of GKN's conduct, thousands of residents were subjected to mandatory evacuation, displacement, fear of toxic exposure, loss of property use, out-of-pocket costs, and substantial interference with the safe occupancy and enjoyment of their homes.

50. Plaintiffs were not members of the general public merely observing the incident. Each named Plaintiff lived within the evacuation zone and was directly subject to the emergency conditions, evacuation orders, public safety warnings, road closures, and displacement caused by the GKN chemical incident.

51. Plaintiffs' homes were located within the geographic area identified by public authorities as unsafe or potentially unsafe because of the overheating methyl methacrylate tank, toxic fumes, fire risk, explosion risk, and potential hazardous chemical release.

1 52. Plaintiffs were forced to make immediate decisions regarding whether to leave their
2 homes, where to shelter, how to protect family members, how to preserve access to
3 medications, personal property, vehicles, pets, work obligations, and daily necessities.

4 53. Plaintiffs lost the normal use, comfort, safety, and enjoyment of their homes during the
5 evacuation period. Their homes could not be used in the ordinary manner because public
6 authorities warned residents to evacuate or avoid the area.

7 54. Plaintiffs incurred or are expected to incur evacuation-related expenses, including
8 transportation, food, temporary lodging, replacement necessities, lost time, missed work,
9 childcare disruption, and other costs according to proof.

10 55. Plaintiffs also suffered non-economic disruption, including fear, uncertainty,
11 inconvenience, loss of residential security, and distress caused by the possibility of toxic
12 chemical exposure, fire, explosion, or contamination.

13 56. Plaintiffs' injuries arise from the same common event: the hazardous chemical
14 emergency originating from GKN's facility and the resulting government evacuation
15 response.

16 57. The harms suffered by Plaintiffs are typical of the harms suffered by other residents and
17 lawful occupants within the evacuation zone, including displacement, loss of access to
18 homes, interruption of family life, out-of-pocket costs, and fear for personal safety.

19
20
21 **PROCEDURAL AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSE HISTORY**

22 58. On or about May 21, 2026, emergency responders were dispatched to Defendant GKN
23 Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility after a chemical storage
24 tank containing methyl methacrylate began overheating, destabilizing, and emitting toxic
25 fumes.
26
27
28

- 1 59. The incident quickly escalated from a facility-level industrial event into a community-
2 wide hazardous materials emergency requiring response by the Orange County Fire
3 Authority, local law enforcement, public health officials, the City of Garden Grove,
4 Orange County emergency officials, and state agencies.
- 5 60. Emergency officials issued evacuation orders for surrounding residential areas because of
6 the risk that the compromised tank could rupture, release toxic chemical vapors, ignite,
7 explode, or trigger a broader hazardous materials event.
- 8 61. The evacuation orders displaced thousands of residents and lawful occupants, including
9 Plaintiffs and class members, from their homes. Plaintiffs and class members were not
10 evacuated because of any act of their own, but because Defendant's hazardous chemical
11 operations created an unsafe condition affecting the surrounding community.
- 12 62. The City of Garden Grove published emergency notices, evacuation-zone maps, shelter
13 information, hotel resources, transportation assistance, emergency hotlines, and public
14 safety updates for affected residents.
- 15 63. Schools, businesses, families, and public agencies were forced to alter operations, close
16 campuses, relocate students, cancel activities, and respond to the emergency conditions
17 caused by the chemical incident.
- 18 64. On or about May 23, 2026, the Governor of California proclaimed a State of Emergency
19 in Orange County due to the Orange County Chemical Incident, finding that the incident
20 involved a volatile and highly flammable liquid, toxic fumes, evacuation orders affecting
21 approximately 50,000 residents, and a continuing risk of catastrophic hazardous chemical
22 release.
- 23 65. The State of Emergency confirms that the incident was not a minor inconvenience or
24 isolated workplace event. It was a public safety emergency affecting residential
25 26
27
28

communities, public infrastructure, schools, local government resources, and the safe use and occupancy of private homes.

66. Public reports further stated that the Orange County District Attorney's Office opened an investigation and sought information concerning the failed chemical storage tank, GKN's operations, maintenance practices, and circumstances leading to the incident.

67. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that emergency responders and public officials were required to take extraordinary action because Defendant failed to prevent, contain, control, or safely manage the hazardous condition at its facility.

68. These facts support Plaintiffs' negligence claim because Defendant owed surrounding residents a duty to safely store, monitor, inspect, maintain, and control hazardous chemicals and related equipment, and breached that duty by allowing a dangerous condition to develop and threaten the surrounding community.

69. These facts support Plaintiffs' public nuisance claim because Defendant's conduct affected an entire community, interfered with public safety, required evacuation orders, disrupted schools and public services, and obstructed the public's right to safely occupy and move through the affected area.

70. These facts support Plaintiffs' private nuisance claim because Defendant's conduct substantially and unreasonably interfered with Plaintiffs' and class members' use and enjoyment of their homes, including by forcing evacuation, displacement, fear of exposure, loss of access, and disruption of ordinary residential life.

71. These facts support Plaintiffs' strict liability claim because storing and handling thousands of gallons of volatile, toxic, and highly flammable methyl methacrylate in a residential-adjacent area presents an abnormally dangerous risk of serious harm even when precautions are attempted.

1 72. These facts support Plaintiffs' trespass claim because toxic fumes, vapors, chemical
2 emissions, odors, particulates, and/or hazardous airborne substances from Defendant's
3 facility invaded or threatened to invade surrounding residential properties, interfering
4 with Plaintiffs' possessory rights.

5 73. These facts support Plaintiffs' UCL claim because Defendant's unsafe chemical storage,
6 deficient maintenance, inadequate emergency prevention, prior environmental
7 compliance history, and resulting evacuation constitute unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive
8 or misleading business practices.

9 74. These facts support declaratory and injunctive relief because Plaintiffs and class members
10 remain entitled to judicial declarations regarding Defendant's duties and future safety
11 obligations, including inspection, maintenance, monitoring, warning, emergency
12 planning, abatement, and prevention of future hazardous chemical incidents.

13 75. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the chemical emergency did not occur in
14 isolation, but resulted from a chain of failures involving hazardous chemical storage, tank
15 monitoring, valve functionality, temperature control, emergency planning, inspection,
16 maintenance, and warning procedures.

17 76. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants had the ability and responsibility to
18 maintain the chemical tank, valves, sensors, containment systems, emergency response
19 systems, and related equipment in a condition that would prevent overheating, vapor
20 emissions, uncontrolled pressure, rupture risk, and community evacuation.

21 77. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants failed to identify, correct, or prevent
22 unsafe conditions before the tank overheated and before emergency responders were
23 required to intervene.
24
25
26
27
28

1 78. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants failed to maintain adequate backup
2 systems, drainage systems, emergency shutoff systems, cooling procedures, and/or
3 contingency plans sufficient to prevent a facility-level chemical problem from becoming
4 a community-wide evacuation emergency.

5 79. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants failed to provide timely, complete,
6 and adequate warnings to surrounding residents before public authorities were required to
7 issue evacuation orders and emergency instructions.

8 80. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants' prior regulatory history, including
9 the January 2025 South Coast AQMD settlement, placed Defendants on notice of the
10 need for strict compliance with environmental, emissions, permitting, recordkeeping, and
11 safety obligations.

12 81. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants' violation of applicable environmental, hazardous
13 materials, fire safety, permitting, reporting, and emissions regulations constitutes
14 evidence of negligence and/or negligence per se to the extent discovery confirms that
15 such statutes, rules, regulations, permits, or orders were violated and were designed to
16 protect persons such as Plaintiffs from the type of harm alleged herein.

17 82. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that chemical vapors, fumes, odors, airborne
18 substances, or particulate matter migrated beyond the facility boundary and into the
19 evacuation zone. Plaintiffs will seek discovery regarding air monitoring data, plume
20 modeling, wind direction, deposition, odor complaints, and contamination testing to
21 determine the extent of physical invasion onto residential properties.

22 83. South Coast AQMD is the regional air pollution control agency responsible for regulating
23 stationary sources of air pollution in Orange County, including industrial facilities that
24 emit volatile organic compounds and other regulated pollutants. Its rules and permit
25
26
27
28

requirements are designed to protect nearby residents, workers, schools, businesses, and the public from harmful emissions, unsafe operations, and uncontrolled releases.

84. Before the May 2026 chemical emergency, GKN had already been the subject of South Coast AQMD enforcement history. In January 2025, South Coast AQMD identified GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems Inc., Facility ID 140961, in connection with Notice No. P68777, Rules 109, 203, 222, 1146, and 1147, and a settlement totaling \$909,935.95.

85. This prior enforcement history placed GKN on notice that its facility was subject to emissions, permitting, equipment, operational, recordkeeping, and regulatory compliance obligations before the May 2026 chemical emergency.

DAMAGES ALLEGATIONS

86. Plaintiffs and Class members suffered harm during the class period, **from May 21, 2026 through the date evacuation orders were lifted, or such other period established by discovery**, as a result of the May 2026 hazardous chemical emergency, evacuation orders, road closures, public safety warnings, and loss of access to residences within the evacuation zone.

87. Plaintiffs and Class members were deprived of the normal use, occupancy, comfort, safety, and enjoyment of their homes during the evacuation period.

88. Plaintiffs and Class members incurred or may incur evacuation-related expenses, including temporary lodging, transportation, food, replacement necessities, childcare, pet-related costs, lost wages, lost work time, and other out-of-pocket expenses according to proof.

89. Plaintiffs and Class members suffered property-related losses, including loss of use, interference with possession, disruption of residential property rights, and costs for

inspection, cleaning, air filtration, HVAC filter replacement, odor removal, contamination testing, or remediation, if supported by evidence.

90. Plaintiffs and Class members suffered disruption to work, school, family obligations, transportation, caregiving, medical needs, and daily routines.

91. Plaintiffs and Class members experienced fear, anxiety, inconvenience, uncertainty, and loss of residential security caused by the risk of toxic vapor exposure, fire, explosion, rupture, spill, or hazardous chemical release.

92. Plaintiffs do not allege confirmed chemical exposure for every Class member at this stage. Plaintiffs allege that evacuation, displacement, loss of property use, emergency response, toxic-fume risk, fire risk, explosion risk, and threatened hazardous release are direct harms caused by the incident.

93. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that chemical vapors, fumes, odors, airborne substances, or particulate matter migrated beyond the facility boundary and into the evacuation zone. Plaintiffs will seek discovery regarding air monitoring data, plume modeling, wind direction, deposition, odor complaints, and contamination testing to determine the extent of physical invasion onto residential properties.

94. Plaintiffs and Class members may also require medical evaluation or monitoring to the extent evidence shows potential exposure, symptoms, or medically recognized risk from methyl methacrylate or related hazardous substances.

95. Plaintiffs' damages arise from the same common course of conduct: the hazardous condition originating from Defendant's facility, the overheating methyl methacrylate tank, the risk of toxic vapor release, fire, explosion, rupture, or spill, and the government evacuation response that displaced residents from their homes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

96. Plaintiffs seek damages according to proof, including economic damages, property-related damages, nuisance damages, trespass damages, restitution where available, abatement, injunctive relief, punitive damages where permitted by law, attorneys' fees where authorized, costs, interest, and all other relief the Court deems proper.

97. Plaintiff David Cole suffered unique displacement-related harm because he is currently in a skilled nursing facility after suffering a stroke, while his wife resides within the evacuation zone near him. Because of the evacuation and related access restrictions, his wife has been unable to visit him. Mr. Cole has called her crying and distressed, believing she abandoned or left him, causing emotional distress and disruption to his care, comfort, and family support.

98. Plaintiff Katie Chor suffered harm because she has three minor children who were displaced from their home within the evacuation zone. The evacuation disrupted the children's schooling, daily routines, stability, transportation, and access to their normal home environment.

99. Plaintiff Tiffany Thuy Nguyen suffered harm because she is a surviving cancer patient and was unable to access medication that was left inside her home when she was evacuated. The evacuation and loss of access to her residence interfered with her ability to obtain necessary medication and caused fear, stress, and health-related disruption.

100. These individualized harms are examples of the foreseeable injuries caused by the evacuation and loss of access to homes within the evacuation zone, including disruption to medical needs, family caregiving, school attendance, emotional stability, and daily life.

101. Plaintiff Hung Nguyen suffered harm because he both lives and works within the evacuation zone. As a result of the evacuation orders, road closures, and access restrictions, Mr. Nguyen was displaced from his home and unable to report to work,

causing loss of access to his residence, disruption of daily life, lost work time, and economic harm according to proof.

102. Plaintiff Jefferson Nguyen suffered harm because he is a senior in high school and the evacuation disrupted his ability to attend school, complete end-of-year requirements, participate in graduation-related activities, and proceed with graduation. The displacement and loss of access to his home caused educational disruption, emotional distress, and uncertainty during a critical period of his senior year.

103. Plaintiff Christopher Nguyen suffered harm because he is a college student and was unable to access his desktop computer and school materials left inside his home within the evacuation zone. As a result, the evacuation interfered with his ability to complete homework, attend class, meet academic deadlines, and continue his coursework, causing educational disruption, stress, and damages according to proof.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

104. Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382 on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated.

105. Plaintiffs seek certification of the following proposed class:

Evacuation Zone Class:

All persons who resided in, rented, owned, occupied, or had lawful possession of residential property located within the evacuation zone ordered, recommended, or maintained from May 21, 2026 through the date evacuation orders were lifted, or such other period established by discovery involving GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.'s Garden Grove facility.

106. Plaintiffs also seek certification of the following subclass, if appropriate:

Displacement Expense Subclass:

All members of the Evacuation Zone Class who incurred out-of-pocket expenses, including hotel, transportation, food, pet boarding, lost work time, childcare, or other evacuation-related costs because of the May 2026 GKN chemical emergency.

107. Excluded from the Class are Defendant GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems, Inc.; its officers, directors, employees, agents, insurers, parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates; any judicial officer assigned to this case; and any person who timely and validly opts out of the Class.

108. Numerosity: The Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Public emergency records indicate that approximately 50,000 residents were subject to evacuation orders in connection with the chemical incident.

109. Ascertainability: The Class is ascertainable because membership can be determined through objective records, including evacuation-zone maps, residential addresses, lease records, property ownership records, utility records, shelter records, hotel records, government alerts, and other documents identifying persons who lived in or occupied residences within the evacuation zone.

110. Commonality: Common questions of law and fact exist, including whether Defendant owned, operated, maintained, or controlled the facility and chemical tank; whether the tank overheated and emitted toxic fumes; whether Defendant's conduct caused evacuation orders; whether Plaintiffs and Class members lost use and enjoyment of their homes; whether Defendant's conduct created a nuisance; whether Defendant's handling of methyl methacrylate created an abnormally dangerous risk; and whether injunctive relief is necessary to prevent future harm.

111. Typicality: Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the Class because Plaintiffs lived within the evacuation zone and suffered the same type of harm as other Class members, including evacuation, displacement, loss of access to their homes, disruption of daily life, fear for safety, and evacuation-related expenses.

112. Adequacy: Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs have no interests antagonistic to the Class and seek relief for the same common course of conduct affecting all evacuation-zone residents.

113. Predominance: Common questions predominate over individual issues because liability arises from the same facility, the same chemical incident, the same emergency response, the same evacuation orders, and the same alleged failure to prevent or control the hazardous condition.

114. Superiority: A class action is superior to individual actions because the number of affected residents is large, individual damages may vary, and separate lawsuits would create duplicative litigation, inconsistent rulings, and unnecessary burden on the courts and parties.

115. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or refine the class definition, subclasses, and class period after discovery, including after obtaining evacuation records, incident reports, air monitoring data, shelter records, and Defendant's internal records.

116. Plaintiff Annie Eung suffered harm because she lives within the evacuation zone and was displaced from her home. As a result of the evacuation orders, road closures, and access restrictions, Ms. Eung has been unable to visit her husband, Plaintiff David Cole, at his skilled nursing facility and has also been unable to work, causing emotional distress, disruption of family support, lost work time, and economic harm according to proof.

1
2
3
4
5
117. Plaintiff Kevin Anh Kiet Nguyen suffered harm because he lives within the evacuation zone and was displaced from his home. As a result of the evacuation orders, road closures, and access restrictions, Mr. Nguyen lost access to his residence, personal property, daily necessities, and normal home environment, causing disruption, inconvenience, fear for safety, and damages according to proof.

6
7
8
9
10
11
118. Plaintiff Michael Nguyen suffered harm because he both lives and works within the evacuation zone. As a result of the evacuation orders, road closures, and access restrictions, Mr. Nguyen was displaced from his home and unable to report to work, causing loss of access to his residence, disruption of daily life, lost work time, and economic harm according to proof.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
119. Plaintiff Rayendra Ramil suffered harm because he lives within the evacuation zone and has children whose daily lives were disrupted by the evacuation. As a result of the evacuation orders, road closures, and access restrictions, Mr. Ramil and his children lost access to their home, normal routines, school-related activities, family stability, and daily necessities, causing disruption, inconvenience, fear for safety, and damages according to proof.

19
20
21
22
120. These individualized harms further demonstrate that Plaintiffs' injuries are not speculative or generalized. Each named Plaintiff lived within the evacuation zone and suffered displacement, loss of access to their residence, disruption of work, school, caregiving, family obligations, or daily routines, and damages according to proof.

23
24
25
26
27
28
121. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement these individualized harm allegations after obtaining additional records, receipts, employment records, school records, medical records, evacuation records, shelter records, and other evidence through investigation and discovery.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligence

Against All Defendants

122. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

123. Defendants owned, operated, managed, maintained, controlled, inspected, supervised, or were otherwise responsible for the GKN facility, chemical storage tank, hazardous materials, equipment, valves, safety systems, employees, contractors, and emergency procedures involved in the May 2026 chemical incident.

124. Defendants owed Plaintiffs and Class members a duty to use reasonable care in storing, handling, monitoring, inspecting, maintaining, cooling, draining, and controlling hazardous chemicals, including methyl methacrylate.

125. Defendants also owed a duty to maintain functional equipment, valves, containment systems, monitoring systems, emergency systems, and warning procedures so that hazardous chemicals would not create an unreasonable risk to surrounding residents.

126. Defendants breached these duties by failing to safely store, monitor, maintain, inspect, stabilize, drain, cool, contain, and/or control the methyl methacrylate tank and related equipment.

127. Defendants further breached their duties by allowing a hazardous condition to develop that required emergency response, evacuation orders, road closures, shelter resources, and displacement of surrounding residents.

128. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs and Class members suffered harm, including evacuation, displacement, loss of access to their homes, loss of use and

1 enjoyment of property, out-of-pocket expenses, disruption of daily life, fear for safety,
2 and other damages according to proof.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **Public Nuisance**

5 **Against All Defendants**

6 129. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

7 130. Defendants created, maintained, permitted, or failed to abate a condition that was
8 harmful to health, safety, comfort, convenience, and public welfare.

9 131. The chemical emergency interfered with public rights by requiring evacuation
10 orders, road closures, emergency shelters, school disruptions, public agency response,
11 and restrictions on residents' ability to safely remain in or access the affected area.

12 132. The nuisance affected a substantial number of people, including Plaintiffs, Class
13 members, residents, families, schools, businesses, and public agencies in and around the
14 evacuation zone.

15 133. Plaintiffs suffered harm different in kind from the general public because they
16 lived within the evacuation zone and were directly displaced from their homes.

17 134. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing the public nuisance and
18 the resulting harm to Plaintiffs and Class members.

19 135. Plaintiffs seek damages, abatement, injunctive relief, and all other appropriate
20 relief.

21 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Private Nuisance**

23 **Against All Defendants**

24 136. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

137. Plaintiffs and Class members had possessory interests in homes, residences, rental units, or residential property located within the evacuation zone.

138. Defendants' chemical incident substantially and unreasonably interfered with Plaintiffs' and Class members' use and enjoyment of their homes.

139. The interference included evacuation, displacement, loss of access, fear of chemical exposure, fear of explosion or fire, disruption of daily routines, inability to safely occupy their homes, and loss of quiet enjoyment.

140. The interference was substantial because it affected basic residential safety, occupancy, shelter, family life, and access to personal property.

141. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing the interference and resulting damages.

142. Plaintiffs seek damages, abatement, injunctive relief, and all other appropriate relief.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Strict Liability / Ultrahazardous Activity

Against All Defendants

143. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

144. Defendants stored, handled, used, maintained, or controlled thousands of gallons of methyl methacrylate, a volatile and highly flammable chemical, at or near a residential community.

145. The storage and handling of large quantities of methyl methacrylate created a foreseeable risk of serious harm, including toxic vapor release, fire, explosion, evacuation, and displacement.

146. The risk of harm could not be eliminated entirely even with the exercise of care because of the nature, quantity, volatility, flammability, and location of the chemical.

147. Plaintiffs and Class members were within the zone of danger created by Defendants' hazardous chemical operations.

148. The May 2026 chemical emergency arose from the type of risk that made the activity dangerous.

149. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs and Class members suffered evacuation, displacement, loss of use and enjoyment of property, out-of-pocket expenses, fear for safety, and other damages according to proof.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Trespass

Against All Defendants

150. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

151. Plaintiffs and Class members owned, rented, occupied, possessed, or had lawful rights to residential property within the evacuation zone.

152. Defendants caused or permitted hazardous chemical vapors, fumes, odors, emissions, particulates, or airborne contaminants from the GKN facility to enter, invade, affect, or threaten Plaintiffs' and Class members' residential properties.

153. Defendants' conduct also caused government authorities to restrict Plaintiffs' and Class members' access to their properties because of the hazardous condition originating from Defendants' facility.

154. The intrusion interfered with Plaintiffs' and Class members' possessory rights, including the right to safely occupy, access, use, and enjoy their homes.

155. Plaintiffs and Class members did not consent to any chemical intrusion, hazardous condition, evacuation-causing release, or interference with their possessory rights.

156. As a direct and proximate result, Plaintiffs and Class members suffered damages according to proof.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Unfair Competition Law Business & Professions Code § 17200

Against All Defendants

157. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

158. Defendants engaged in business acts and practices involving the operation of an aerospace manufacturing facility, storage and handling of hazardous chemicals, maintenance of chemical tanks and equipment, regulatory compliance, safety procedures, and emergency prevention.

159. Defendants' acts and practices were unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive or misleading within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 17200.

160. Defendants' practices were unlawful because they included violations or suspected violations of environmental, safety, permitting, hazardous materials, emissions, warning, and public safety requirements, including prior South Coast AQMD enforcement history involving GKN.

161. Defendants' practices were unfair because they shifted the risks and costs of hazardous chemical operations onto surrounding residents, including evacuation, displacement, emergency response, shelter needs, and loss of residential safety.

162. Defendants' practices were deceptive or misleading or misleading to the extent Defendants failed to adequately disclose, warn, prevent, or correct known risks involving

hazardous chemical storage, equipment failure, emissions compliance, emergency planning, or facility safety.

163. Plaintiffs and Class members lost money or property as a result, including evacuation expenses, hotel costs, transportation costs, food costs, lost work time, property-use losses, and other economic losses.

164. Plaintiffs seek restitution, injunctive relief, abatement-related relief, and all other relief available under Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Declaratory and Injunctive Relief

Against All Defendants

165. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

166. An actual controversy exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants concerning Defendants' duties, obligations, and responsibilities regarding the safe storage, handling, monitoring, inspection, maintenance, warning, containment, and emergency planning for hazardous chemicals at the Garden Grove facility.

167. Plaintiffs contend Defendants are required to operate the facility in a manner that does not endanger surrounding residents, cause evacuation, create nuisance conditions, interfere with residential property rights, or expose the community to unreasonable risks of chemical release, fire, explosion, or toxic vapor exposure.

168. Plaintiffs are informed and believe Defendants dispute or will dispute the nature and scope of those duties and their responsibility for the May 2026 chemical emergency.

169. Declaratory relief is necessary to determine the parties' rights and obligations.

170. Injunctive relief is necessary to require Defendants to abate unsafe conditions, inspect and repair hazardous chemical systems, maintain functional valves and

emergency systems, implement adequate monitoring and warning procedures, comply with regulatory requirements, and prevent future hazardous chemical incidents affecting surrounding residents.

171. Plaintiffs and Class members have no adequate remedy at law for the continuing risk of future hazardous chemical incidents, evacuation, displacement, and interference with the safe use and enjoyment of their homes.

172. Plaintiffs seek temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief, declaratory relief, abatement, and all other relief the Court deems just and proper.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligence Per Se

Against All Defendants

173. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

174. At all relevant times, Defendants were subject to applicable federal, state, regional, and local laws, regulations, rules, permits, and safety requirements governing hazardous materials, chemical storage, emissions, air quality, fire prevention, emergency planning, equipment maintenance, recordkeeping, permitting, reporting, and public safety.

175. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that these laws, regulations, rules, permits, and safety requirements include, but are not limited to, requirements enforced by South Coast AQMD, OSHA, EPA, local fire authorities, hazardous materials regulators, and other governmental agencies responsible for protecting workers, nearby residents, property occupants, schools, businesses, and the public from hazardous chemical releases, toxic vapors, fire, explosion, and evacuation-related harm.

176. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants violated one or more applicable statutes, regulations, rules, permits, orders, or safety requirements by failing to safely store, monitor, inspect, maintain, cool, drain, stabilize, contain, and control methyl methacrylate and related equipment at the Garden Grove facility.

177. Plaintiffs are further informed and believe that Defendants violated applicable safety and regulatory requirements by failing to maintain functional valves, drainage systems, containment systems, emergency systems, monitoring systems, warning procedures, and emergency response protocols sufficient to prevent the chemical emergency and resulting evacuation.

178. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that the applicable statutes, regulations, rules, permits, and safety requirements were designed to prevent the type of harm suffered by Plaintiffs and Class members, including hazardous chemical release risk, toxic vapor exposure risk, fire risk, explosion risk, evacuation, displacement, loss of access to homes, property interference, and economic loss.

179. Plaintiffs and Class members are within the class of persons these laws, regulations, rules, permits, and safety requirements were intended to protect because they lived, occupied, rented, owned, or had lawful possession of residential property within the evacuation zone surrounding Defendants' facility.

180. Defendants' violations constitute negligence per se and/or evidence of negligence under California law.

181. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violations, Plaintiffs and Class members suffered harm, including evacuation, displacement, loss of access to their homes, loss of use and enjoyment of property, out-of-pocket expenses, lost time, fear for safety, and other damages according to proof.

182. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages, restitution where available, abatement, injunctive relief, costs, attorneys' fees where permitted by law, and all other relief the Court deems just and proper.

183. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants acted with conscious disregard for the safety of surrounding residents by continuing hazardous chemical operations despite known risks associated with methyl methacrylate, prior regulatory enforcement history, foreseeable equipment or valve failure risks, and the foreseeable danger that a chemical tank failure could cause evacuation, displacement, toxic vapor risk, fire, explosion, and community-wide harm.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all Class members, pray for judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

A. For an order certifying this action as a class action, appointing Plaintiffs as Class Representatives, and appointing Plaintiffs' counsel as Class Counsel;

B. For compensatory damages according to proof, including evacuation-related expenses, temporary lodging, transportation, food, replacement necessities, lost wages, lost work time, business interruption, childcare disruption, pet-related expenses, and other out-of-pocket losses;

C. For damages for loss of use, loss of enjoyment, interference with possession, disruption of residential property rights, and substantial interference with the safe occupancy and enjoyment of Plaintiffs' and Class members' homes;

D. For property-related damages according to proof, including inspection, cleaning, remediation, air filtration, HVAC filter replacement, odor removal, contamination testing, and other mitigation costs reasonably caused by the chemical emergency;

1 E. For medical evaluation, medical monitoring, and personal-injury damages according to
2 proof, to the extent supported by evidence;

3 F. For restitution, disgorgement, and injunctive relief under Business and Professions
4 Code section 17200 et seq.;

5 G. For nuisance abatement and all appropriate nuisance-related relief;

6 H. For declaratory relief determining Defendants' duties and obligations regarding
7 hazardous chemical storage, monitoring, inspection, maintenance, warning, containment,
8 emergency planning, regulatory compliance, and community safety;

9 I. For temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief requiring Defendants to
10 comply with all applicable South Coast AQMD rules, permit requirements, hazardous-
11 materials requirements, fire-safety requirements, emergency-planning requirements, and
12 state and local regulations;

13 J. For temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief requiring Defendants to
14 implement enhanced chemical storage safeguards, tank monitoring, valve inspection and
15 maintenance, emissions monitoring, containment measures, emergency shutoff
16 procedures, community notification protocols, and other measures necessary to prevent
17 future harm to the surrounding community;

18 K. For an order requiring Defendants to establish and fund a community air-quality
19 monitoring and notification program, if supported by evidence;

20 L. For punitive and exemplary damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an
21 amount sufficient to punish and deter wrongful conduct, based on Defendants' alleged
22 conscious, willful, malicious, oppressive, deceptive or misleading, and/or reckless
23 disregard for the health, safety, property rights, and welfare of Plaintiffs, Class members,
24 and the surrounding community;

1 M. For pre-judgment interest at the legal rate;

2 N. For post-judgment interest at the legal rate;

3 O. For costs of suit, including expert witness fees and expenses where recoverable by
4 law;

5 P. For reasonable attorneys' fees where authorized by statute, contract, common fund,
6 substantial benefit doctrine, private attorney general doctrine, or other applicable law;
7 and

8 Q. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
9

10 **JURY DEMAND**

11 Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.
12

13
14 Date: May 26, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

15 THE NGO LAW FIRM,
16

17 

18 _____
Hoang H. Ngo, Esq.

19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Classes
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28