

1

2 DANIEL M. KOVALIK  
3 UNITED STEELWORKERS  
4 OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO/CLC  
5 FUND

6 Five Gateway Center  
7 Pittsburgh, PA. 15222  
8 Tel-412-562-2518; Fax-412-562-2574  
9 [Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page]

TERRY COLLINGSWORTH  
NATACHA THYS  
INTERNATIONAL LABOR RIGHTS

733 15<sup>th</sup> Street N.W. Suite 920  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel-202-347-4100; Fax-202-347-4885

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

7

|    |  |   |  |                         |          |
|----|--|---|--|-------------------------|----------|
| 8  | SINALTRAINAL; THE ESTATE OF              | ) |  |                         | Drive,   |
|    | ISIDRO SEGUNDO GIL; LUIS                 | ) |  |                         | Key      |
| 9  | EDUARDO GARCIA; ALVARO                   | ) |  |                         | Biscayne |
|    | GONZALEZ LOPEZ; JOSÉ DOMINGO             | ) |  |                         |          |
| 10 | FLORES; JORGE HUMBERTO LEAL;             | ) |  |                         | ) FL     |
|    | JUAN CARLOS GALVIS                       | ) |  |                         | 33149,   |
|    |  | ) |  |                         |          |
| 11 | all c/o SINALTRAINAL                     | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | Carrera 15 No. 35-18                     | ) |  |                         |          |
| 12 | Santafé de Bogotá                        | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | Colombia, S.A.                           | ) |  |                         |          |
| 13 |  | ) |  |                         | ) )      |
|    | Plaintiffs,                              | ) |  | Defendants.             | )        |
| 14 |  | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | v.                                       | ) |  |                         |          |
| 15 |  | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | THE COCA-COLA COMPANY,                   | ) |  |                         |          |
| 16 | One Coca-Cola Plaza, Atlanta GA, 30313;  | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | COCA-COLA DE COLOMBIA, S.A, c/o          | ) |  |                         |          |
| 17 | One Coca-Cola Plaza, Atlanta GA 30313;   | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | PANAMERICAN BEVERAGES, INC.,             | ) |  | CIVIL ACTION NO.        |          |
| 18 | 701 Waterford Way, Miami, FL 33126;      | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | PANAMCO, LLC, 701 Waterford Way,         | ) |  |                         |          |
| 19 | Miami, FL 33126; PANAMCO                 | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | INDUSTRIAL de GASEOSAS, S.A. a/k/a       | ) |  |                         |          |
| 20 | PANAMCO COLOMBIA, S.A.                   | ) |  | COMPLAINT FOR EQUITABLE |          |
|    | c/o 701 Waterford Way, Miami, FL 33126;  | ) |  | RELIEF AND DAMAGES      |          |
| 21 | RICHARD I. KIRBY,                        | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | 881 Ocean Drive, Key Biscayne, FL 33149; | ) |  |                         |          |
| 22 | RICHARD KIRBY KIELLAND, 881 Ocean        | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | Drive, Key Biscayne, FL 33149; and       | ) |  |                         |          |
| 23 | BEBIDAS y ALIMENTOS de URABA,            | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | S.A., c/o                                | ) |  |                         |          |
| 24 | 881                                      | ) |  |                         |          |
|    | Ocean                                    | ) |  |                         |          |

1 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

2

3

4

5

5

7

3

9

0

1

2

3

4

5

5

7

3

9

0

1

2

3

4

Robert Stropp, Jr.  
1 Edward M. Gleason, Jr.  
MOONEY, GREEN, GLEASON  
2 BAKER, GIBSON & SAINDON, PC  
Suite 400, 1920 L Street N.W.  
3 Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 783-0010  
4 FAX (202) 783-6088

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

# **COMPLAINT**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. This case involves the systematic intimidation, kidnapping, detention and murder of trade unionists in Colombia, South America at the hands of paramilitaries working as agents of corporations doing business in that country. The violent persecution of trade unionists in Colombia has been at epidemic proportions for many years. Since 1986 when the Central Unitaria de Trabajadores de Colombia ("CUT"), the largest trade union confederation in Colombia, was formed, over 3,800 trade unionists have been murdered. Presently, of every five (5) trade unionists murdered in the world, over 3 are Colombian. This case, brought under the Alien Tort Claims Act, RICO and state tort law, is brought to remedy and prevent the violent persecution of trade unionists at various locations of one particular company doing business in Colombia -- Coca Cola. This campaign of terror against trade unionists in Colombia and at Coca Cola in particular is ongoing. For example, on June 21, 2001, at a Coca-Cola bottling plant in Monertia, in the Cordoba Province of Colombia, Oscar Dario Soto Polo an employee at this operation, and a member of the Executive Committee of the CUT, was gunned down in the street as he was accompanying his youngest daughter to her house. Sen. Oscar Soto was engaged in negotiations with Coca Cola at the time over union proposals to provide security to trade unionists under threat.

## **II. NATURE OF THE ACTION**

2. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL is a Colombian trade union and a member of the CUT. SINALTRAINAL represents workers at a number of beverage and food companies in Colombia, including several Coca-Cola bottling plants throughout Colombia. SINALTRAINAL (hereinafter referred to as the "Union") has been decimated by the

1 paramilitary forces working as agents of corporate concerns, including Defendants, in  
2 Colombia. Plaintiff Union brings this Complaint for equitable relief and damages to  
3 remedy the injury to itself caused by the wrongful conduct of the Defendants Coca-Cola  
4 Company (hereinafter referred to as “Coke”); Coca-Cola de Colombia, S.A. (hereinafter  
5 referred to as “Coke Colombia”); Panamerican Beverages, Inc., Panamco, LLC  
6 (collectively referred to herein as "Panamco"); Panamco Industrial de Gaseosas, S.A. a/k/a  
7 Panamco Colombia, S.A. (hereinafter referred to as “Panamco Colombia”); Richard I.  
8 Kirby, Richard Kirby Keilland and Bebidas y Alimentos de Uraba, S.A. (hereinafter  
9 referred to as “Bebidas y Alimentos”).

10

11       3.       Plaintiff Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil ("Plaintiff Estate") represents the  
12 estate of Isidro Segundo Gil who was murdered by paramilitary forces inside the Carepa  
13 plant of Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos. Plaintiff Estate brings this Complaint against  
14 Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Bebidas y Alimentos, Richard I. Kirby and Richard  
15 Kirby Keilland for damages to remedy the wrongful death of Isidro Segundo Gil which  
16 was proximately caused by the wrongful conduct of these Defendants.

17

18       4.       Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez, José Domingo Flores,  
19 Jorge Humberto Leal and Juan Carlos Galvis bring this Complaint against Defendants  
20 Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco and Panamco Colombia for equitable relief and for  
21 damages to remedy the injury to their persons caused by the wrongful conduct of these  
22 Defendants.

23

24

1           5.       The claims in this case arise from Defendants' wrongful actions in  
2 connection with their production, bottling and distribution of Coke products in Colombia.  
3 With respect to their business operations in Colombia, the Defendants hired, contracted  
4 with or otherwise directed paramilitary security forces that utilized extreme violence and  
5 murdered, tortured, unlawfully detained or otherwise silenced trade union leaders of the  
5 Union representing workers at Defendants' facilities. The individual Plaintiffs have been  
7 subjected to serious human rights abuses, including murder, extrajudicial killing,  
3 kidnapping, unlawful detention, and torture in violation of the Alien Tort Claims Act  
9 (ATCA), 28 U.S.C. §1350, the Torture Victims Protection Act (TVPA), international  
9 human rights law, and the common tort law of the state of Florida. Further, Defendants,  
1 their alter egos and/or their agents engaged in a conspiracy to cause physical and mental  
2 harm to Plaintiffs in violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act  
3 (RICO), 18 U.S.C. § 1961 *et seq.*

1  
5           6.       Plaintiffs do not have access to an independent or functioning legal system  
5 within Colombia, a country which is not governed by a rule of law. Further, as has been  
7 well-documented in credible human rights reports by the U.S. Department of State,  
3 Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, Plaintiffs would certainly face violent  
9 retaliation if they were to try to bring these claims in Colombia. Finally, the justice  
9 system in Colombia has utterly failed to bring the perpetrators of anti-union violence to  
1 justice under the laws of Colombia. Indeed, not one perpetrator has been successfully  
2 prosecuted for any of the thousands of cases of trade union assassination which have  
3 taken place since 1986.

### **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1           7.       This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331,  
2 the ATCA and the TVPA, 28 U.S.C. §1350, for the alleged violations of international  
3 human rights law. Federal question jurisdiction is further based on violations of RICO,  
4 18 U.S.C. § 1961 *et seq.* Supplemental jurisdiction exists over the state law causes of  
5 action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

6

7           8.       Venue properly lies in this Judicial District pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
8 §1391(b) and (c).

9

#### **IV. PARTIES**

10

##### **Plaintiffs**

11           9.       Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL is a Colombian trade union that represents  
12 workers in the food and beverage industry in various locations in Colombia, including  
13 several Coke bottling plants operated by Defendants Panamco Colombia and Bebidas y  
14 Alimentos. SINALTRAINAL has had numerous members and leaders assassinated and  
15 tortured by paramilitary forces. Based on the allegations herein, this murder and torture  
16 has been perpetrated by paramilitary units that were acting as agents for one or more of  
17 the Defendants. SINALTRAINAL brings this action for injunctive relief to stop any  
18 further murder or torture of its leaders by the agents of Defendants. In addition,  
19 SINALTRAINAL seeks money damages to recover funds spent to protect its members  
20 and leaders who have received threats of death from the agents of Defendants, and funds  
21 provided for medical care, safe houses, and living expenses for members and leaders who  
22 have received threats of death from the agents of Defendants.

23

24

10. Plaintiff Estate of Isidro Gil seeks damages on behalf of the estate of Isidro Gil, a citizen and resident of Colombia and local Union officer at Bebidas y Alimentos, who was murdered by agents for Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland, acting through their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos.

11. Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez and José Domingo Flores are citizens of Colombia and residents of Bucaramanga, Colombia. They bring this action for equitable relief and for damages to remedy the injuries to their persons caused by the wrongful conduct of Defendants Panamco and Panamco Colombia in having them arbitrarily and wrongfully detained in prison for a prolonged period.

12. Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal is a citizen of Colombia and a resident of Cúcata, Colombia. He brings this action for equitable relief and for damages to remedy the injuries to his person caused by the wrongful conduct of Defendants Panamco and Panamco Colombia who had him kidnapped, tortured, and threatened with death by paramilitaries.

13. Plaintiff Juan Carlos Galvis is a citizen of Colombia and resident of Barrancabermeja, Colombia. He brings this action for equitable relief and for damages to remedy the injuries to his person caused by the wrongful conduct of Defendants Panamco and Panamco Colombia who have placed him at risk of imminent harm, including loss of life, and caused him to be subjected to torture.

## Defendants



1           14.     Defendant Coke, a for-profit corporation incorporated in Delaware, is the  
2 world's largest manufacturer, distributor, and marketer of soft drinks in the world. Its  
3 principal place of business is located at One Coca-Cola Plaza, Atlanta, Georgia 30313.  
4 Coke has offices, production and marketing facilities, and bottling plants throughout the  
5 United States and the world, including the Southern District of Florida.

6

7           15.     Defendant Coke Colombia is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Defendant  
8 Coke and it manufactures soft drink bases, concentrates, syrups, powders and mixes for  
9 sale and distribution within Colombia. Coke Colombia also markets the Coke brand name,  
10 manages quality control, and coordinates relations between Coke and the bottlers and  
11 distributors of Coke within Colombia. Coke Colombia's principal place of business  
12 within Colombia is Calle 71 A #5-30, Piso 7 al 11, Bogota D.C., Colombia. Defendant  
13 Coke Colombia is under the management, control and direction of Defendant Coke to the  
14 extent that its separateness is illusory. Coke Colombia was created by Defendant Coke  
15 and exists for the sole purpose of selling, marketing and distributing Coke products  
16 throughout Colombia for the benefit of Defendant Coke. In essence, Coke Colombia is  
17 merely the sales and marketing office for Defendant Coke in Colombia.

18

19           16.     Defendant Panamerican Beverages, Inc. is a Delaware Corporation. Its  
20 stock is publicly traded on the New York stock exchange. Panamerican Beverages, Inc  
21 has its headquarters and its principle place of business at 701 Waterford Way, Miami,  
22 Florida 33126. It operates its bottling plants and other activities on behalf of and for the  
23 benefit of its parent, Defendant Coke, through its own wholly-owned subsidiary,  
24 Panamco, L.L.C., which also has its headquarters and principle place of business at 701

1 Waterford Way, Miami, Florida 33126. Defendants Panamerican Beverages, Inc and  
2 Panamco L.L.C. will be collectively referred to herein as "Panamco." Panamco is the  
3 largest bottler in Latin America, operating in Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala,  
4 Mexico, Nicaragua, and Venezuela. Panamco maintains offices and bottling facilities in all  
5 of the countries where it has operations. Panamco exists solely and exclusively to serve  
5 as a bottler and distributor for Defendant Coke in Latin America and possesses the  
7 exclusive right to produce and distribute Coke soft drink products in Colombia. According  
3 to Defendant Coke, it designated Panamco as an "anchor bottler" in 1995, making  
9 Panamco one of Coca-Cola's strategic partners in the Coca-Cola bottling system. In the  
9 words of Defendant Coke in its Annual Report, an "anchor bottler" such as Panamco is  
1 "strongly committed to the strategic goals of the Company and to furthering the interests  
2 of our worldwide production, distribution and marketing systems."

3  
1 17. Defendant Panamco Colombia is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Defendant  
5 Panamco. In turn, Panamco Colombia wholly owns and controls 17 bottling plants in  
5 Colombia in which it bottles Coke products and from which it then distributes these  
7 products within Colombia. Defendant Panamco Colombia exists solely and exclusively to  
3 bottle and distribute products for Defendant Coke and Defendants Panamco within  
9 Colombia through its 17 bottling plants, including plants in Barrancabermeja,  
9 Bucaramanga and Cúcata (collectively known as "Embotelladora de Santander, S.A.") and  
1 a plant in Monteria (known as "Embotelladora Roman, S.A."). Panamco Colombia and its  
2 17 bottling plants are under the management control and direction of Defendant Panamco  
3 to such an extent that their separateness is illusory.

1           18.     Defendant Richard I. Kirby resides at 881 Ocean Drive, Unit 27-B, Key  
2 Biscayne, Florida, 33149. From this location he manages and directs the operations of  
3 numerous businesses, including Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos. Defendant Kirby is the  
4 principal owner of Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos, and he personally manages, controls  
5 and directs its operations in Colombia from his residence at 881 Ocean Drive, Key  
6 Biscayne, Florida, 33149. Defendant Kirby also manages, controls and directs these  
7 operations through his family, including his son, Defendant Richard Kirby Keilland, and  
8 Peggy Ann Keilland. Defendant Richard Kirby Keilland resides both at 881 Ocean Drive,  
9 Unit 27-B, Key Biscayne, Florida 33149 and in Colombia. Richard Kirby Keilland  
10 operates as the on-site director of Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos in Colombia.

11

12           19.     Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos is a Coke bottling plant in Carepa,  
13 Colombia in the department of Uraba where some of the events alleged herein occurred.  
14 As demonstrated by the letterhead of Bebidas y Alimentos, a copy of which is attached  
15 hereto as Exhibit A, Bebidas y Alimentos holds itself out as a Coca Cola company and  
16 places the "Coca Cola" trademark above its own name on its letterhead with the express  
17 permission of Defendant Coke. Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos is a closely held  
18 company owned by Defendant Richard I. Kirby. Defendant Kirby personally manages,  
19 controls and directs the operations of Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos from his residence  
20 at 881 Ocean Drive, Key Biscayne, Florida, 33149. Defendant Kirby also manages,  
21 controls and directs these operations through his family, including his son, Defendant  
22 Richard Kirby Keilland, and Peggy Ann Keilland.

23

24

1     **IV. THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE DEFENDANT COMPANIES**  
2     **AND COKE'S ULTIMATE CONTROL OVER AND LIABILITY FOR THE ACTS**  
3                     **OF ITS CO-DEFENDANTS**

1             20. Defendant Coke, which generates the vast majority of its operating income  
5 outside the United States, controls a highly organized network of bottling facilities  
5 throughout the world in order to ensure uniform quality and efficient distribution of Coke  
7 products. Any bottler that is awarded a contract to bottle and distribute Coke is required  
3 to conform absolutely to Coke's requirements as to product quality, presentation, and  
3 production. According to the 10-K Report filed by Defendant Coke on December 31,  
3 2000, and other public sources, the specific details of Coke's control over any particular  
1 bottler are governed by a "Bottler's Agreement." These Bottler's Agreements provide  
2 Defendant Coke with the flexibility to assert the necessary degree of control and  
3 supervision over a particular bottler, depending upon the circumstances. As is indicated in  
1 the paragraphs below, Defendant Coke, through its specific Bottler's Agreements,  
5 exercises a particularly high level of control and supervision over Defendants Panamco  
5 and Bebidas y Alimentos. Further, as illustrated by a similar situation in Guatemala in the  
7 early 1980's, Defendant Coke specifically has control over whether a bottler can continue  
3 to do business in Coke's name if the bottler engages in violence against trade union  
3 leaders. Based on its Bottler Agreement, Coke forced an independently owned franchisee  
3 in Guatemala to sell its bottling business to a third party following the murder of three  
1 trade union leaders and an attempted murder of a fourth at the bottling plant. Coke's  
2 action was the result of a massive public campaign against the company, but its action,  
3 however motivated, shows specifically that Coke has the control to prevent and/or  
1 remedy violence against workers and trade union leaders in its foreign bottling plants,  
including the plants at issue in this case.

1

2           21.     Defendant Coke Colombia is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Defendant  
3 Coke and is under the complete management control of Defendant Coke. All major  
4 decisions concerning the production, distribution, marketing and presentation of Coke  
5 products are made by Defendant Coke and are communicated as directives to wholly-  
6 owned subsidiaries such as Coke Colombia. These wholly-owned subsidiaries are  
7 responsible for implementing and enforcing Defendant Coke's policies and practices  
8 within the specific countries in which they operate, and Defendant Coke Colombia  
9 performs this function within Colombia. Defendant Coke Colombia is an alter ego of  
10 Defendant Coke. Alternatively, Defendant Coke Colombia was acting as the agent of  
11 Defendant Coke, and was acting within the scope of its agency relationship with respect  
12 to its participation in the wrongful acts alleged herein.

13

14           22.     Defendant Panamco Colombia is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Defendant  
15 Panamco and is under the complete management control of Defendant Panamco.  
16 According to its Year 2000 Report, Panamco "conducts its operations through  
17 subsidiaries which are controlled, but in some cases not wholly owned, by Panamco." All  
18 major decisions concerning the production, distribution, marketing and presentation of  
19 Coke products by Panamco Colombia are made by Defendant Panamco. Defendant  
20 Panamco Colombia does not have any independent authority to make or implement  
21 decisions regarding its business practices or direction. Defendant Panamco Colombia  
22 operates in Colombia through its 17 bottling plants, including plants in Barrancabermeja,  
23 Bucaramanga and Cúcata (collectively known as "Embotelladora de Santander, S.A.") and  
24 a plant in Monertia (known as "Embotelladora Roman, S.A."). Defendant Panamco

Colombia, including its wholly-owned and controlled bottling plants at the aforesaid locations, is an alter ego of Defendant Panamco because it is under the complete control of Defendant Panamco. Alternatively, Defendant Panamco Colombia was acting as the agent of Defendant Panamco, and was acting within the scope of its agency relationship with respect to its participation in the wrongful acts alleged herein.

23. Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos is a closely held company owned by Defendant Richard I. Kirby and other members of his family. Defendant Kirby, along with his son Defendant Richard Kirby Keilland, make all of the day-to-day decisions regarding the operation of Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos, and profits from the company are transferred to one or more bank accounts held by Defendant Kirby in Miami and other locations outside of Colombia. Management decisions made by Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland are implemented by members of Defendant Kirby's family who work for Bebidas y Alimentos. The complete control over and ownership of Bebidas y Alimentos by Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Defendant Richard Kirby Keilland makes Bebidas y Alimentos their alter ego. Alternatively, Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos was acting as the agent of Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland, and was acting within the scope of its agency relationship with respect to its participation in the wrongful acts alleged herein.

24. Defendant Coke, acting through its alter ego and/or agent Coke Colombia, supplies Defendant Panamco (acting through its alter ego and/or agent, Panamco Colombia) and Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland (acting through their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos) with the Coke products to be

1 bottled and distributed in Colombia. In addition, Defendant Coke, acting through its alter  
2 ego and/or agent Coke Colombia, monitors and controls all aspects of the compliance of  
3 Defendant Panamco (acting through its alter ego and/or agent, Panamco Colombia) and  
4 Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland (acting through their alter ego  
5 and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos) with their Bottler's Agreements with Coke,  
6 including Defendant Coke's requirements for product quality, presentation, marketing,  
7 and bottling. Defendant Coke's control through the specific Bottler's Agreements  
8 extends to the smallest details of production. For example, according to the 10-K Report  
9 filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on December 31, 2000 by Defendant  
10 Panamco, "[Coke] must also approve the types of container used in bottling and controls  
11 the design and decoration of the bottles, boxes cartons, stamps, and other materials used  
12 in production. The [Bottler's] agreements grant [Coke] the right to inspect the products."  
13 In addition, Coke, through the Bottler's Agreements, imposes standards concerning  
14 employee qualifications and appearance and standards for the appearance and condition  
15 of transport trucks. Further, Defendant Coke also provides direction on issues of  
16 environmental preservation and compliance with a code of conduct governing the  
17 treatment of employees. Coke also monitors the labor relations practices of its  
18 subsidiaries and bottlers, and requires that subsidiaries and bottlers refrain from activities  
19 that will damage Coke's brand-name in the market place. In addition, executives from  
20 Defendant Coke recently met in Colombia with executives of Defendant Panamco  
21 Colombia and told the latter that they must downsize in order to cut costs.

22

23        25.     Among other methods of control over Defendant Panamco (acting through  
24 its alter ego and/or agent, Panamco Colombia) and Defendants Richard I. Kirby and

1 Richard Kirby Keilland (acting through their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y  
2 Alimentos), Defendant Coke, acting through its alter ego and/or agent Coke Colombia,  
3 maintains the right to terminate or suspend the Bottler's Agreements for noncompliance  
4 with their terms and conditions. The Bottler's Agreements also provide Coke with the  
5 right to require that Defendant Panamco (acting through its alter ego and/or agent,  
5 Panamco Colombia) and Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland (acting  
7 through their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos) withdraw any  
3 products from the market that do not conform to Coke's specific requirements in the  
3 Bottler's Agreements. Further, Defendant Coke maintains and exercises the right to  
4 conduct frequent inspections of compliance with the specific terms of the Bottler's  
4 Agreements with Defendant Panamco (acting through its alter ego and/or agent, Panamco  
2 Colombia) and Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland (acting through  
3 their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos). Defendant Coke also  
4 monitors the day-to-day compliance of Defendant Panamco (acting through its alter ego  
5 and/or agent, Panamco Colombia) and Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby  
5 Keilland (acting through their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos) with  
7 their Bottler's Agreements by requiring frequent and comprehensive reports to be  
3 prepared and submitted to Defendant Coke that cover all aspects of the requirements of  
3 the specific Bottler's Agreements.

1 26. In addition to the overall control of its system of bottling and distribution  
2 that Coke maintains, it has direct ownership in 75% of its bottlers, including Defendant  
3 Panamco, of which Defendant Coke possesses a controlling, 24% interest. This additional  
4 leverage ensures Defendant Coke of both control over its bottlers and efficient compliance  
with its standards and requirements. Coke holds two seats on the Board of Directors of



1 Panamco and exercises management control through its presence on the Board. According  
2 to a joint Coke and Panamco press release issued on November 2, 1995, Coke elevated  
3 Panamco to the status of “Anchor Bottler.” This designation was accompanied by Coke’s  
4 increased participation in and ownership of Panamco. In addition to holding two seats on  
5 the Board, Coke’s increased acquisition gives it “certain corporate governance rights.” In  
6 addition, Coke acquired new “Series C preferred stock which carries rights to approve  
7 certain major corporate actions.” This ownership and governance, coupled with the level  
8 of control provided by the specific Bottler’s Agreement between Coke and Panamco,  
9 makes Panamco the alter ego of Coke, with its regular operations and business decisions  
10 subject to the direction and approval of Coke. Alternatively, Defendant Panamco was  
11 acting as the agent of Defendant Coke and was acting within the scope of its agency  
12 relationship with respect to its participation in the wrongful acts alleged herein

13

14       27. Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland, acting through  
15 their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos, in addition to being subject to  
16 the specific and comprehensive requirements of their Bottler’s Agreement with Coke, are  
17 subject to the ultimate control of Coke because the business exists solely at the pleasure  
18 of Coke. As an example of the level of control that Defendant Coke exercises, Defendants  
19 Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland wanted to sell Bebidas y Alimentos.  
20 Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland requested permission of  
21 Defendant Coke to sell the business and its assets. The permission was denied by  
22 Defendant Coke. This ultimate ownership control, coupled with the level of control  
23 provided by the specific Bottler’s Agreement between Coke and Defendants Richard I.  
24 Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland, acting through their alter ego and/or agent Defendant

1 Bebidas y Alimentos, makes Defendants Richard I. Kirby, Richard Kirby Keilland and  
2 Bebidas y Alimentos the alter egos of Coke, with the regular operations and business  
3 decisions subject to the direction and approval of Coke. Alternatively, Defendants  
4 Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland, acting through their alter ego and/or agent  
5 Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos, were acting as the agent of Defendant Coke and were  
6 acting within the scope of their agency relationship with respect to their participation in  
7 the wrongful acts alleged herein.

3  
8 28. Defendant Coke ultimately has complete control over Defendants  
9 Panamco and Bebidas y Alimentos because these companies exist solely to bottle and  
10 distribute Coke products. If there was ever any failure to follow the directives and  
11 submit to the control of defendant Coke, Defendants Panamco and Bebidas y Alimentos  
12 would lose their bottling concession and be out of business.

13  
14 29. Defendant Coke is jointly and severally liable for all of the tortious actions  
15 committed when its alter ego and/or agent, Coke Colombia, acts in concert with any other  
16 person or entity in furtherance of Coke's business interests and activities. All of the  
17 wrongful acts alleged herein were committed by individuals who were acting within the  
18 course and scope of a business relationship with Coke Colombia with the advance  
19 knowledge, acquiescence or subsequent ratification of Coke Colombia.

20  
21 30. Defendant Coke, acting by and through its alter ego and/or agents, Coke  
22 Colombia, Panamco, Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland, hired, contracted with,  
23 or otherwise retained as agents the individuals who committed the violent acts against  
24 Plaintiffs, as described herein. The individuals who committed the violent acts against

1 Plaintiffs were acting as agents of Coke Colombia, Panamco, Richard I. Kirby and/or  
2 Richard Kirby Keilland, and committed the tortious actions described in this Complaint in  
3 connection with and in furtherance of Coke's business interests and activities. In  
4 committing these tortious actions, the individual agents were acting within the course and  
5 scope of the agency relationship, with the advance knowledge, acquiescence or  
6 subsequent ratification of Defendants Coke Colombia, Panamco, Richard I. Kirby and/or  
7 Richard Kirby Keilland. Defendant Coke is therefore vicariously liable for all of the  
8 tortious actions committed by its agents done in connection with and in furtherance of its  
9 business interests and activities in Colombia as described herein.

10

11       31. With respect to all of the causes of action described below, the harm to  
12 Plaintiffs was either caused directly by the acts or omissions of Defendant Coke or was  
13 caused by the acts or omissions of Defendant Coke's alter egos and/or agents -- Coke  
14 Colombia, Panamco or Richard I. Kirby or Richard Kirby Keilland, making Defendant  
15 Coke jointly and severally liable, or making Defendant Coke vicariously liable.

16

17       32. Regardless of whether Defendant Panamco is found to be an alter ego or  
18 agent of Defendant Coke, Defendant Panamco is liable for any and all wrongful acts done  
19 by or on behalf of its alter ego and/or agent Panamco Colombia that resulted in harm to  
20 any of the Plaintiffs. Further, Defendant Panamco is vicariously liable for any wrongful  
21 acts alleged herein that were committed by any of its agents or employees, or any agent or  
22 employee of its alter ego and/or agent, Panamco Colombia, that resulted in harm to any of  
23 the Plaintiffs.

24

1           33.     Regardless of whether Defendants Richard I. Kirby or Richard Kirby  
2     Keilland are found to be an alter ego or agent of Defendant Coke, they are liable for any  
3     and all acts done by or on behalf of their alter ego and/or agent Defendant Bebidas y  
4     Alimentos that resulted in harm to any of the Plaintiffs. Further, Defendants Richard I.  
5     Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland are vicariously liable for any wrongful acts alleged  
5     herein that were committed by any of their agents or employees, or any agent or  
7     employee of their alter ego and/or agent, Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos, that resulted in  
3     harm to any of the Plaintiffs.

1  
2           **V. BACKGROUND FACTS CONCERNING VIOLENCE AGAINST TRADE**  
3           **UNION LEADERS AND MEMBERS IN Colombia.**

1           34.     Colombia is widely known as a country that is torn by a long-standing  
5     civil war involving armed leftist groups on the one side and the Colombian military as well  
5     as right-wing paramilitaries on the other. It is widely acknowledged that the regular  
7     military in Colombia, and the civil government authorities, tolerate the paramilitaries,  
3     allow them to operate, and often cooperate, protect and/ or work in concert with them.

1           35.     Under "Law 48," passed in 1968, the Defense Ministry was authorized to  
1     create and provide weapons to civil patrols. It is by this authorization that most of the  
2     paramilitaries were created and sustained in Colombia. The current government of  
3     Colombia has made some official efforts to curb the powers of paramilitaries, but such  
1     groups continue to thrive, often with the ongoing cooperation of the Colombian military.

1           36.     According to Human Rights Watch, 78% of the murders in Colombia from  
2 October 1999 to March 2000 were attributable to the paramilitaries. These and other  
3 murders go unpunished by the military. This is largely because of the symbiotic  
4 relationship that exists between the regular military and paramilitaries. A large number of  
5 the paramilitary units were created by active, reserve or retired military personnel. In  
6 addition, police officers throughout the country are likewise aligned with the  
7 paramilitaries and refuse to take action against known murderers who were acting on  
8 behalf of a paramilitary unit.

9

10          37.     The Government of Colombia does not officially sanction the murders and  
11 other human rights violations committed by the paramilitaries. However, there have been  
12 few successful prosecutions of paramilitaries. Further, the Government of Colombia has  
13 taken little or no action to reign in the participation of military officers in paramilitary  
14 activities even though such participation is a violation of the Government's official policy  
15 towards paramilitary activity.

16

17          38.     The paramilitaries in Colombia are particularly well-known for murdering,  
18 abducting and torturing trade union leaders who they view as being subversives. The  
19 paramilitaries' characterization of trade unionists as subversives is in accord with the view  
20 of the Colombian government which, in Decree 180, has designated trade union leaders as  
21 "terrorists." This is also in accord with the U.S. government which is funding the  
22 Colombian military in the amount of over \$1 billion, making Colombia the 3rd largest  
23 recipient of U.S. military aid in the world. The U.S. government has trained over 10,000  
24 of Colombia's military troops at the School of the Americas ("SOA") in Fort Benning,

1 Georgia. And, SOA training manuals which the Pentagon was forced to turn over in 1996  
2 show that the U.S. encouraged these troops to engage in torture and murder of those  
3 who, inter alia, do "union organizing and recruiting"; pass out "propaganda in favor of the  
4 interests of the workers"; and "sympathize with demonstrators or strikes." As a  
5 consequence of the official vilification of trade unionists by the Colombian and U.S.  
5 governments as well as corporations operating in Colombia, Colombia has lead the world  
7 in the number of murders of trade unionists for the past 10 years. More than 50 trade  
3 union leaders have been killed so far this year, 128 were killed in the year 2000, and in the  
3 last 10 years, over 1,500 have been murdered. A much larger number have been subjected  
3 to torture, including regular threats of death, unlawful detention, and kidnapping.

1  
2 39. There is comprehensive public reporting on the systematic human rights  
3 violations occurring in Colombia by the paramilitaries, as well as on the specific targeting  
4 for murder and other human rights violations of trade union leaders and members. At the  
5 time of the events alleged herein, Defendants knew, or were substantially certain, that  
5 they were doing business in an environment in Colombia where their workers who were  
7 members of trade unions were at great risk of being murdered, tortured, kidnapped or  
3 unlawfully detained by paramilitaries working for or on behalf of Defendants' alter egos  
3 and/or agents in Colombia.

## 1 **VI. SPECIFIC INJURIES AND HARM SUFFERED BY THE PLAINTIFFS**

### 2 **A. The Events at Bebidas y Alimentos in Carepa**

3 40. In April of 1994, paramilitary forces murdered Jose Eleazar Manco David  
4 and Luis Enrique Gomez Granado, both of whom were workers at Bebidas y Alimentos  
and members of SINALTRAINAL.

1

2       41.     The paramilitary forces in Carepa then began to intimate other  
3 SINALTRAINAL members as well as the local leadership of SINALTRAINAL, telling  
4 them, upon threat of physical harm, to resign from the union or to flee Carepa altogether.  
5 The management of Bebidas y Alimentos permitted these paramilitary forces to appear  
6 within the plant to deliver this message to Union members and leaders. A number of  
7 Union members began leaving town as a result. And, in April of 1995, following more  
8 death threats, every member of the executive board of the SINALTRAINAL local  
9 representing the Bebidas y Alimentos workers fled Carepa in fear for their lives.

10

11       42.     In June of 1995, the SINALTRAINAL local union elected a new executive  
12 board to replace the one that had fled. Isidro Gil was elected as a member of this new  
13 board as was an individual named Dorlahome Tuborquia. Shortly thereafter, in July of  
14 1995, Bebidas y Alimentos began to hire members of the paramilitaries who had  
15 threatened the first Union executive board into fleeing. These members of the  
16 paramilitaries were hired both into the sales and production departments.

17

18       43.     In September of 1995, Ariosto Milan Mosquera took over as the manager  
19 of the Bebidas y Alimentos plant in Carepa. Mosquera proceeded to discharge  
20 Dorlahome Tuborquia. SINALTRAINAL challenged this discharge through the legal  
21 process, and a judge, finding the discharge to be unlawful, ordered Bebidas y Alimentos to  
22 rehire Tuborquia. He returned to work at Bebidas y Alimentos in December of 1995.

23

24

1           44.     Shortly after the return of Tuborquia, Bebidas Y Alimentos Manager  
2 Mosquera began threatening to destroy the union. Specifically, Mosquera announced in  
3 public that he had given an order to the paramilitaries to carry out the task of destroying  
4 the union. In addition, Mosquera, in the presence of paramilitary forces, told a member  
5 of the local SINALTRAINAL executive board that he would "sweep away the union."  
6 In keeping with these threats of Mosquera, the paramilitaries began to renew threats  
7 against SINALTRAINAL members, including Dorlahome Tuborquia. Specifically, the  
8 paramilitaries threatened to kill Tuborquia. In response to these threats, Tuborquia fled  
9 Carepa and went into hiding. The paramilitaries then seized Tuboquia's home to use for  
0 their operations.

1  
2           45.     Throughout 1996, SINALTRAINAL members witnessed Bebidas y  
3 Alimentos Manager Mosquera socializing with members of the paramilitary forces and  
4 providing the paramilitaries with Coke products for their parties.

5  
6           46.     Meanwhile, Bebidas y Alimentos and SINALTRAINAL began negotiating  
7 a new labor agreement at the outset of 1996. These negotiations included  
8 SINALTRAINAL's proposals for increased security for threatened trade unionists and a  
9 cessation of Manager Mosquera's threats against the union as well as his collusion with  
0 the paramilitaries. Defendant Richard Kirby Keilland personally participated in these  
1 negotiations on behalf of Bebidas y Alimentos and he flatly refused the union's requests  
2 in this regard.

3  
4           47.     In response to the aforesaid events, SINALTRAINAL began a national  
5 campaign in August of 1996 to call upon Bebidas y Alimentos, as well as Panamco



1 Colombia and Coca Cola Colombia, to protect the SINALTRAINAL leadership and  
2 members in Carepa from what it feared was the imminent threat of attack by the  
3 paramilitaries.

4

5       48. By letter to Bebidas y Alimentos Manager Aristo Milan Mosquera dated  
6 September 27, 1996, national leaders of SINALTRAINAL accused Mosquera of working  
7 with the paramilitaries to destroy the union, and they urged that Bebidas y Alimentos  
8 ensure the security of the workers in the Carepa plant in the face of the paramilitary  
9 threats. Copies of this letter were contemporaneously sent to Coca Cola Colombia as  
10 well as Panamco Colombia. A copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B. In  
11 response to this letter, Mosquera told the union to retract its accusations.

12

13       49. On or around November 18, 1996, SINALTRAINAL presented a written  
14 labor contract proposal to Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos. This proposal included a  
15 provision entitled, "Seguro de Vida" ("Assurance of Life"), which would have required  
16 Bebidas y Alimentos to provide heightened security in the plant to protect workers from  
17 assault by paramilitary forces. Manager Mosquera brought this labor contract proposal  
18 to Bogota to discuss it with Defendant Richard Kirby Keilland.

19

20       50. On December 5, 1996, at 9:00 in the morning, two paramilitaries  
21 approached Isidro Gil, who was then involved in negotiations on behalf of the union with  
22 Bebidas y Alimentos, as he stood in the entrance of the Bebidas y Alimentos plant. They  
23 asked him if he was in fact Isidro Gil. Isidro Gil responded, "what for?" The  
24 paramilitaries stated that they needed to go into the plant to talk to someone inside.

1 Isidro Gil proceeded to open the door and the two paramilitaries then shot him to death  
2 inside the plant. That same night, these same paramilitaries went to the local union hall  
3 of SINALTRAINAL and started a fire therein.

4  
5 51. On December 6, 1996, paramilitaries approached several more members of  
6 the local SINALTRAINAL executive board. These paramilitaries told the union board  
7 members that they killed Isidro Gil and burned the union office and that they would kill  
8 the remaining board members if they did not leave town. The paramilitaries also  
9 explained that they would have a meeting with the workers at the Bebidas y Alimentos  
0 plant the next day to tell them that they would have to resign from the union or face being  
1 killed.

2  
3 52. On December 7, 1996 at 8:00 a.m., the paramilitaries appeared at the  
4 Bebidas y Alimentos plant as threatened. They assembled the workers and told them  
5 that Bebidas y Alimentos did not want the union at the plant. The paramilitaries  
6 explained that the workers had the option of either resigning from the union or leaving  
7 Carepa altogether lest they be killed. The paramilitaries then proceeded to direct the  
8 workers into the manager's office to sign resignation forms which were prepared by  
9 Defendant Bebidas y Alimentos itself. As a result of the threats of the paramilitaries,  
0 workers resigned en masse from SINALTRAINAL. A copy of one of the resignation  
1 forms signed by a Bebidas y Alimentos worker is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

2  
3 53. In fear for their life, fourteen SINALTRAINAL members, including the  
4 remainder of the local SINALTRAINAL executive board, fled Carepa after this meeting  
5 on December 7, 1996. As a result of the flight of these individuals and the resignation of

1 the other workers from the union, the local SINALTRAINAL union in Carepa was  
2 destroyed. This union has never returned to Carepa.

3

4       54.     The SINALTRAINAL members who fled Carepa on December 7, 1996  
5 continue to fear for their life and continue to remain in hiding, moving frequently from  
6 house to house. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL, as it does for all such displaced members,  
7 helps provide support to these individuals.

8

9       55.     After the murder of Isidro Gil, the paramilitaries presented themselves at  
10 the Bebidas y Alimentos plant with the medical cards of workers which they had taken  
11 from the local union office before they burned it. Bebidas y Alimentos paid the  
12 paramilitaries remuneration in the amount owed under these cards. The paramilitaries  
13 repaired the union office which they had burned and took it over for the purpose of  
14 storing their weapons.

15

16       56.     On December 26, 1996, the paramilitaries killed another Bebidas y  
17 Alimentos worker, José Herrera. The same paramilitaries later killed the wife of Isidro  
18 Gil in 2000, leaving their two children without parents.

19

20       57.     In 1997, Peggy Ann Keilland, a close relative of Defendants Richard I.  
21 Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland, took over as the Manager of the Bebidas y Alimentos  
22 plant in Carepa. Very shortly after taking over, Ms. Keilland worked with the Chief of  
23 the Colombian military in the zone to ensure that the paramilitaries were kept out of the  
24 plant.

1  
2           58.     Also in 1997, Defendants Richard I. Kirby and Richard Kirby Keilland  
3 asked Defendant Coke if they could sell the Bebidas y Alimentos business along with the  
4 Carepa plant. Defendant Coke denied them this request and these Defendants still  
5 maintain ownership of the Carepa operations, under the direction and control of  
5 Defendants Coke and Coke Colombia.  
7

3                   **B. The Events At Panamco Colombia (Bucaramanga)**

3           59.     The Panamco Colombia plant in Bucaramanga is known as "Embotelladora  
4 de Santander, S.A." Prospective employees at all Panamco Colombia sites, such as that  
5 in Bucaramanga, are required to fill out an employment application. The only trade mark  
6 name on this application is "Coca Cola." Along with the Coke logo is a plant designation  
7 which, in type written words reads "Anexo #5 Embotelladores de \_\_\_\_\_. " Then,  
8 in the blank space is written in hand the specific plant location. In the case of the  
9 Bucaramanga site, the word "Santander" is hand-written in this blank. Similarly, the  
10 employee badges of those working at the various Panamco Colombia sites, including the  
11 Bucaramanga site, include the trade mark "Coca Cola" symbol as well as a plant  
12 designation.  
13

13           60.     For many years, SINALTRAINAL has had a bargaining relationship with  
14 Panamco at the Bucamaranga site. In 1992, the Panamco Colombia management at this  
15 location began to exhibit antipathy toward SINALTRAINAL. For example, the manager  
16 at this plant, Jose Castro, with the intent to undermine support for the union, told  
17 workers during 1992 contract negotiations that SINALTRAINAL's labor contract

1 proposal was supported by the "guerillas." Castro also accused the unionists of being  
2 "guerillas."

3

4       61.     In 1995, Panamco began to renege on its obligations under the labor  
5 agreement with SINALTRAINAL. For example, Panamco ceased the contractually-  
6 required medical insurance for employees. In response, the local members of  
7 SINALTRAINAL went out on a 120-hour strike against Panamco at the Bucaramanga  
8 location. This strike was led by the members of the local SINALTRAINAL executive  
9 board, including Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez, and José Domingo  
10 Flores.

11

12       62.     Shortly after this strike, the chief of security for the Bucaramanga plant,  
13 Jose Alejo Aponte, told authorities that he found a bomb in the plant, and he accused five  
14 members of the local union executive board, including the aforesaid Plaintiffs, of planting  
15 the bomb. In response to this allegation, local police entered the plant on March 6, 1996,  
16 and arrested Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez and José Domingo  
17 Flores while they were working.

18

19       63.     In the process of being arrested, and while in transit to the jail, Plaintiff  
20 José Domingo Flores was repeatedly and brutally beaten by police. In addition, police  
21 pointed a gun at him, threatening to shoot him.

22

23

24

1           64.     As the official criminal documents demonstrate, charges against these three  
2 individuals, as well as the other two members of the union executive board, were then  
3 pressed by "COCA COLA EMBOTELLADORA SANTANDER."

1  
5           65.     As a result of these charges, the three aforesaid Plaintiffs, who were all  
5 married at the time and had at least one child each, were incarcerated in the local  
7 Bucaramanga prison for six (6) months. These Plaintiffs were permitted to see their  
3 families only once a month during this period and earned no income during this time. In  
5 addition, the Plaintiffs and their families were stigmatized as "terrorists" in the  
7 community. As a result of this, the wife of Plaintiff Alvaro Gonzalez Perez lost her job.  
1 The separation, stigma and income loss placed a great psychological and economic  
2 hardship on the Plaintiffs and their families. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL did provide  
3 some financial assistance to the Plaintiffs' families during this time.

1  
5           66.     While in prison, all of the aforesaid Plaintiffs were confined to filthy and  
5 overcrowded cells. This prison provided one (1) shower and two (2) toilets for every 300  
7 prisoners. In addition, the prisoners, including Plaintiffs, were forced to pay guards  
3 money for, inter alia, using the phone or being permitted to take shelter in the yard from  
5 inclement weather.

1           67.     Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia and José Domingo Flores were confined to  
2 the highest security and toughest section of the prison where the majority of prisoners  
3 were paramilitaries. These Plaintiffs had to conform to the rules set by the paramilitaries  
1 upon threat of being beaten or killed. These Plaintiffs went out of their way to avoid the

1 shower and toilets as much as possible because every foray there put them at risk of  
2 assault.

3

4       68.     After being imprisoned for six (6) months upon these charges by "COCA  
5 COLA EMBOTELLADORA SANTANDER," Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro  
6 Gonzalez Perez and José Domingo Flores were finally released upon the order of the  
7 Regional Prosecutor who found the charges to be completely without basis. To wit, the  
8 Prosecutor concluded not only that the Plaintiffs had nothing to do with placing a bomb  
9 in the plant as charged, but that there in fact was never a bomb in the plant as the  
10 company had claimed.

11

12       69.     As it turned out, Defendant Panamco Colombia (d/b/a Embottellador de  
13 Santander, S.A.) brought charges against the aforesaid Plaintiffs in retaliation for their  
14 trade union activities. Their resulting prolonged unlawful detention and accompanying  
15 torture was therefore the result of Panamco Colombia's malicious prosecution.

16

17       70.     To this day, the Plaintiffs and their family suffer from the psychological  
18 trauma and economic impact, as well as the social stigma, of the aforementioned events.

19

20                   **C. The Events At Panamco Colombia (Cúcata)**

21       71.     Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL has represented employees at Panamco  
22 Colombia's plant in Cúcata (known as Embotelladoras de Santander, S.A.) for a number of  
23 years. At all time relevant hereto, Cúcata has been dominated by paramilitary forces  
24 which have engaged in summary executions of a number of individuals (many of whom

1 were targeted as a result of their (peaceful) participation in the social change movement).  
2 These paramilitary forces have created an explosive and dangerous environment in the  
3 city.

1 72. Panamco Colombia management in Cúcata began to exhibit antagonism  
2 toward SINALTRAINAL in 1997. Specifically, Panamco Colombia management,  
3 without any basis, began to publicly accuse local SINALTRAINAL leadership of being  
4 dangerous subversives. Given the threat in Cúcata posed by the paramilitaries, such  
5 accusations reasonably could be expected to place this leadership in imminent danger.

1 73. On the night of January 17, 1998, local SINALTRAINAL Secretary of  
2 Cultural Affairs, Rafael Caravajal Peñaranda, an employee of Panamco Colombia, stood  
3 outside the Cúcata plant waiting for a ride home. As no ride was forthcoming, he decided  
4 to go back into the plant to call for a taxi. For this purpose, Sen. Caravajal entered the  
5 plant and was approached by a security guard, Martín Ortega. Caravajal, who exhibited  
6 his employee badge, tried to explain to Ortega that he wished to use the phone to call for  
7 a taxi and to wait inside the plant until the taxi came. Whereupon, Ortega pulled out a  
8 revolver and shot at Caravajal, barely missing him. Carajaval was able to flee the plant  
9 without being harmed. This is one of many concrete examples of retaliation suffered by  
0 members of SINALTRAINAL at the Coke facility in Cúcata.

1 74. The next day, January 18, the plant security guard, Martín Ortega, visited  
2 Carajaval at his house. Ortega begged Carajaval's forgiveness for the aforesaid incident.  
3 Ortega explained that he had reacted in fear of Carajaval as a result of the fact that  
4 Panamco Colombia management had told him that Carajaval was a "dangerous" and  
5 "explosive" person. The same day, Ortega visited the local SINALTRAINAL union hall



1 while the leadership was having a meeting. Ortega repeated his plea for forgiveness and  
2 again related that his reaction was the result of his being told by Panamco Colombia  
3 management that they feared the union and that the members of the union executive  
4 board, Carajaval in particular, were dangerous persons.

5

6       75.     Threats against Rafael Carajaval continued. Thus, on July 15, 1999, his  
7 wife received a call from an anonymous security guard from the Panamco Colombia plant  
8 telling her that Rafael, along with some other union brothers working at Coca Cola, were  
9 on the black list of the paramilitaries and that it was necessary for Rafael and his family  
10 to leave their neighborhood, a neighborhood where the paramilitaries maintained a  
11 particularly strong presence. In response to this call, the Caravajal family did in fact flee  
12 their neighborhood, and they have never gone back. Carajaval continues to live in fear for  
13 his life.

14

15       76.     Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal is also an employee at the Panamco  
16 Colombia plant in Cúcata and a SINALTRAINAL official. Among his responsibilities  
17 for the union was his work on the “claims commission,” which hears employee  
18 complaints and seeks redress from the employer. On December 13, 1999, at 7:15 a.m., he  
19 was in a taxi going to his house. Two armed men in a truck intercepted the taxi and forced  
20 Plaintiff Jorge Jorge Humberto Leal into their truck at gunpoint. They took him,  
21 blindfolded, and, after a long drive, placed him in a dark room. One of the men asked him  
22 questions about his role in the union. The aggressor showed him a copy of a press  
23 account of his work on the claims commission, and an accompanying dispute with  
24 defendant Panamco Colombia, and threatened both him and Rafael Carajaval.

1  
2           77. Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal was eventually released after being  
3 kidnapped, tortured, and unlawfully detained. He was specifically told to refrain from  
4 his activities with the union or he would face his tormentors again. He reasonably fears  
5 that his life is at great risk. Paramilitary forces have subsequently visited and threatened  
6 Jorge Humberto Leal at his home on a number of occasions, including on September 6,  
7 2000.

8  
9           78. Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal lives in constant fear that he will be killed or  
0 that he will again be kidnapped, tortured, and unlawfully detained. Defendants Coke,  
1 Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia have failed to take any action to  
2 protect Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal from the specific death threats that Defendants  
3 knew about and that originated from Defendants' actions to use the paramilitaries as  
4 agents to oust the local SINALTRAINAL union.

5  
6                   **D. Events At Panamco Colombia (Barrancabermeja)**

7           79. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL also represents workers at Panamco  
8 Colombia's plant in Barrancabermeja (also known as "Embotelladoras de Santander,  
9 S.A."). Plaintiff Juan Carlos Galvis is the President of the local SINALTRAINAL union  
0 representing these workers. He is also the treasurer for the local CUT chapter and  
1 performs volunteer social work.

2  
3           80. The local management of Panamco Colombia have openly sided with the  
4 paramilitaries in the civil war which is intensely manifested in Barrancabermeja. This  
management has had meetings with paramilitary leaders and has provided refreshments to

1 paramilitary forces when they have demonstrated against the ongoing peace process  
2 between the Colombian government and the ELN, one of the two major guerilla groups in  
3 Colombia. Without basis, Panamco Colombia has publicly released communications  
4 accusing SINALTRAINAL of being an arm of the guerillas. Such an accusation is  
5 incredibly provocative and dangerous in Barrancabermeja which is now wholly controlled  
6 by paramilitary forces which are presently assassinating people at a rate of about fifty  
7 (50) individuals per month. These paramilitary forces are specifically targeting, among  
8 others, human rights workers, and union and peasant leaders.

9

10       81. Plaintiff Galvis has personally been receiving death threats from paramilitary  
11 forces for the past ten years. In particular, the paramilitaries have threatened him and his  
12 wife, both in person, over the phone and in writing, that they will kill him if he does not  
13 stop his union activities and leave Coca Cola. Some of these threats have appeared in  
14 writing on the walls inside the Panamco Colombia plant. For example, in June of 2000,  
15 the words, "Get Out Galvis From Coca Cola, Signed AUC" appeared on the walls of the  
16 plant. The AUC is the largest paramilitary force in Colombia. Galvis complained to the  
17 regional Panamco Colombia manager about this threat. Other such threats by  
18 paramilitary forces have appeared on the plant walls.

19

20       82. Plaintiff Galvis is presently in imminent danger of being killed by the  
21 paramilitaries. And indeed, the Human Rights Division of the Colombian Ministry of the  
22 Interior reached this very conclusion in March of this year and has enrolled Galvis in the  
23 state protection program specifically created to assist trade unionists under imminent  
24 threat. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia have failed to

1 take any action to protect Plaintiff Galvis from the specific death threats that defendants  
2 knew about and that originated from Defendants' actions to use the paramilitaries as  
3 agents to oust the local SINALTRAINAL union.

## 4 5 **VII. DEFENDANTS' VIOLATIONS OF LAW**

5 83. Defendants' actions violate, and Plaintiffs' causes of action arise from, the  
7 following laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties, which constitute  
3 specific examples of the applicable law of nations or customary international law:

- 3 (1) Alien Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350;
- 3 (b) Torture Victim Protection Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350;
- 1 (c) Common law of the United States of America;
- 2 (d) United Nations Charter, 59 Stat. 1031, 3 Bevans  
3 1153 (1945);
- 1 (e) Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res.  
5 217A(iii), U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948);
- 5 (f) International Covenant on Civil and Political  
7 Rights, G.A. Res. 2220A(xxi), 21 U.N. Doc., GAOR  
3 Supp. (No. 16) at 52, U.N. Doc. A/6316 (1966);
- 3 (g) Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman  
3 or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, G.A. res.  
1 39/46, 39 U.N. Doc., GAOR Supp. (No. 51) at 197,  
2 U.N. Doc. A/39/51 (1984) (ratified 10/28/98);
- 3 (h) Declaration on the Protection of All Persons From  
1 Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman  
or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, G.A. Res.

1           3452, 30 U.N. Doc., GAOR Supp. (No. 34) at 91, U.N.  
2           Doc. A/10034 (1976);

3       (i) Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (World  
4           Conference on Human Rights, 1993);

5       (j) International Labor Organization Conventions 87 and  
6           98, which protect the fundamental rights to  
7           associate and organize; and

8       (k) Statutes and common law of the State of Florida,  
9           including but not limited to, assault and battery,  
10          false imprisonment, kidnapping, negligence,  
11          recklessness, intentional infliction of emotional  
12          distress, and negligent infliction of emotional  
13          distress.

14                               **VIII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

15                               **First Cause of Action**

16               **The Alien Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350**  
17               **For Murder on Behalf of the Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil**  
                              **Against**  
18               **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and**  
                              **Bebidas y Alimentos**

19           84. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1  
20 through 83 of this Complaint as if set forth herein.

21  
22           85. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby  
23 Keilland and Bebidas y Alimentos engaged in acts and  
24

1 omissions of intentionally and tortiously causing their  
2 employees and/or agents to murder Isidro Segundo Gil. These  
3 acts violate the law of nations, customary international law,  
4 and worldwide industry standards and practices, including,  
5 but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements,  
6 conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83,  
7 *supra*. The acts described herein are actionable under the  
8 ATCA, and, if such a showing is required, were done with the  
9 complicity of state actors. In acting together with their  
10 agent, the paramilitary security force permitted to exist and  
11 openly operate under the laws of Colombia, and assisted by  
12 government military officials, Defendants acted under color  
13 of law in violating each of the applicable laws, agreements,  
14 conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83,  
15 *supra*. Further, the Government of Colombia fails to enforce  
16 its laws that would prevent or remedy the violations alleged  
17 herein.

3

4 86. Defendants' conduct in violation of the law of  
5 nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry  
6 standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the  
7 specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
8 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*, resulted in the death  
9 of Isidro Segundo Gil. Defendants are jointly and severally  
10 liable for the acts of any and all subsidiaries that are in

1violation of the law of nations, customary international law,  
2and worldwide industry standards and practices, including,  
3but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements,  
4conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83,  
5*supra*. Defendants are also vicariously liable for any  
6violations of their employees or agents of the law of  
7nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry  
8standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the  
9specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
10treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. The Estate of Isidro  
11Segundo Gil seeks compensatory and punitive damages in  
12amounts to be ascertained at trial.

**Second Cause of Action**

13       **The Torture Victim Protection Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350**  
14       **For Extrajudicial Killing on Behalf of the Estate of Isidro**  
15       **Segundo Gil Against**  
16       **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and**  
17       **Bebidas y Alimentos**

18       87. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1  
19 through 86 of this Complaint as if set forth herein.

20       88. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby  
21 Keilland and Bebidas y Alimentos engaged in acts and  
22 omissions of intentionally and tortiously causing their  
23 employees and/or agents to murder Isidro Segundo Gil. These  
24 acts amounted to an extrajudicial killing for purposes of the

1 TVPA, violate the law of nations, customary international  
2 law, and worldwide industry standards and practices,  
3 including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements,  
4 conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83,  
5 *supra*. In acting together with their agent, the paramilitary  
6 force permitted to exist and openly operate under the laws of  
7 Colombia, and assisted by government military officials,  
8 Defendants acted under color of law in violating each of the  
9 applicable laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
10 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Further, the  
11 Government of Colombia fails to enforce its laws that would  
12 prevent or remedy the violations alleged herein.

3  
4 89. Defendants' conduct in violation of the law of  
5 nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry  
6 standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the  
7 specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
8 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*, resulted in the death  
9 of Isidro Segundo Gil. Defendants are jointly and severally  
10 liable for the acts of any and all subsidiaries that are in  
11 violation of the law of nations, customary international law,  
12 and worldwide industry standards and practices, including,  
13 but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements,  
14 conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83,  
15 *supra*. Defendants are also vicariously liable for any



1violations of their employees or agents of the law of  
2nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry  
3standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the  
4specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
5treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. The Estate of Isidro  
6Segundo Gil seeks compensatory and punitive damages in  
7amounts to be ascertained at trial.

8

9

10                                   **Third Cause of Action**  
                                  **RICO Violations**  
11                                   **18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq**  
                                  **on Behalf of the Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil and**  
                                  **SINALTRAINAL Against**  
12       **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and**  
                                  **Bebidas y Alimentos**

13

14

15

90. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1  
through 89 of this Complaint as if set forth herein.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

91. Defendant Coke is a person within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1961(3).  
Defendants Coke Columbia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and Bebidas y Alimentos collectively  
as an association in fact constitute an enterprise (hereafter referred to as the “Bebidas  
Enterprise”) within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1961(4). In violation of 18 U.S.C. §  
1962(c), Defendant Coke through its employees and agents has conducted, and continues  
to conduct, the affairs of the Bebidas Enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity

1 consisting of multiple acts and threats of murder, kidnapping and extortion, as set forth  
2 specifically in Paragraphs 40 through 58.

3  
4 92. In violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d), Defendant Coke has conspired, and  
5 continues to conspire, to violate 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c). As a result of this unlawful  
6 conspiracy, Isidro Segundo Gil was brutally murdered. The Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil  
7 is entitled to compensatory and punitive damages, as well as statutory damages under  
8 RICO, including treble damages, as well as injunctive relief, in an amount to be determined  
9 at trial. Further, Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL was harmed by the intended loss of members  
10 and leaders caused by the targeted violence against Isidro Segundo Gil, and is entitled to  
11 compensatory and punitive damages, as well as statutory damages under RICO, including  
12 treble damages, as well as injunctive relief, in an amount to be determined at trial. Plaintiff  
13 SINALTRAINAL and current members and leaders of SINALTRAINAL continue to  
14 suffer harm from the ongoing conspiracy.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

**Fourth Cause of Action**  
**The Alien Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350**  
**For Denial of Fundamental Rights to Associate and Organize**  
**on Behalf of the Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil and SINALTRAINAL Against**  
**Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and Bebidas y Alimentos**

2 93. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 92 of this  
3 Complaint as if set forth herein.

1           94.     Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and Bebidas y  
2 Alimentos committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' co-venturers or  
3 agents committed, violent acts against Isidro Segundo Gil, described fully in the preceding  
4 paragraphs, resulting in his murder. This violence was intentionally designed and carried  
5 out to deny Isidro Segundo Gil and his colleagues in SINALTRAINAL their fundamental  
6 rights to associate and organize, and did in fact result in the denial of these rights.

7

8           95.     The acts described herein constitute violations of the law of nations,  
9 customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including,  
10 but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties  
11 listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. The acts described herein are actionable under the ATCA,  
12 and, if such a showing is required, were done with the complicity of state actors. In acting  
13 together with their agent, the paramilitary force permitted to exist and openly operate  
14 under the laws of Colombia, and assisted by government military officials, Defendants  
15 acted under color of law in violating each of the applicable laws, agreements, conventions,  
16 resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Further, the Government of  
17 Colombia fails to enforce its laws that would prevent or remedy the violations alleged  
18 herein.

19

20           96.     Defendants' conduct in violation of the law of nations, customary  
21 international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not  
22 limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in  
23 paragraph 83, *supra*, resulted in the murder of Isidro Segundo Gil, and has caused  
24 significant injury to Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL, which has lost significant membership

1 because of death threats directed against, and the murders of, leaders of local unions.  
2 Further, SINALTRAINAL must expend substantial resources to protect and support  
3 union members who are targets of death threats. SINALTRAINAL must also provide  
4 material support and protection to family members of murdered trade union leaders.  
5 Defendants are jointly and severally liable for the acts of any subsidiaries that are in  
5 violation of the law of nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry  
7 standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements,  
3 conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Defendants are also  
9 vicariously liable for any violations of their employees and/or agents of the law of  
9 nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices,  
1 including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
2 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. The Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil and Plaintiff  
3 SINALTRAINAL are entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and  
4 punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

5  
5  
7  
3  
9  
9  
**Fifth Cause of Action**  
**Wrongful Death**  
**on Behalf of the Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil Against**  
**Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and Bebidas y Alimentos**

3  
1 97. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 95 of this  
Complaint as if set forth herein.

1

2           98.     Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Kirby, Kirby Keilland and Bebidas y  
3 Alimentos committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' co-venturers or  
4 agents committed acts that constitute wrongful death under the laws of the State of  
5 Florida, the laws of the United States and the laws of Colombia, and that caused the death  
6 of Isidro Segundo Gil. The Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil represents his heirs at law herein.  
7 The Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil, on behalf of his heirs at law, seeks damages herein for  
8 pecuniary loss resulting from loss of society, comfort, attention, services and support.

9

10           99.     Defendants' actions and omissions were a direct and substantial cause of  
11 the deaths of Isidro Segundo Gil. Defendants failed to use due care to protect him from  
12 injury and harm, thereby proximately causing his wrongful death. The Estate of Isidro  
13 Segundo Gil is entitled to recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be  
14 ascertained at trial.

15                                   **Sixth Cause of Action**  
16                                   **The Alien Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350**  
17                                   **For Kidnapping, Unlawful Detention, Torture, and Crimes Against Humanity**  
18                                   **on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**  
19                                   **José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, Juan Carlos Galvis,**  
20                                   **and SINALTRAINAL Against**  
21                                   **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

22           100.     Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 99 of this  
23 Complaint as if set forth herein.

24

25           101.     Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, and José Domingo  
26 Flores were all forcibly captured and detained as a result of knowingly false charges

27

1 brought against them by employees and/or agents of Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia,  
2 Panamco, and Panamco Colombia, and were held against their will for a lengthy period of  
3 time. These removals and detentions were done intentionally and with malice to cause  
4 Plaintiffs severe mental and physical pain and suffering. Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal  
5 was kidnapped and unlawfully detained by paramilitary agents of Defendants. These  
5 acts amounted to kidnapping and unlawful detention and violate the law of nations,  
7 customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including,  
3 but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties  
9 listed in paragraph 83, *supra*.

1           102. Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez and José Domingo  
2 Flores were all sent, based on the false charges knowingly brought by Defendants, to  
3 dangerous, filthy prison facilities. There, they were threatened constantly with death and  
4 serious bodily injury and were subjected to regular and systematic forms of brutality and  
5 cruelty. Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal was subjected to violence and the threat of death  
5 by paramilitary agents of Defendants. Plaintiff Juan Carlos Galvis was, and continues to  
7 be, subjected to ongoing threats against his life by notorious paramilitary groups acting on  
3 behalf of Defendants. These acts were inflicted intentionally and with malice to cause  
9 Plaintiffs severe mental and physical pain and suffering, and to have the lasting effect of  
1 forever causing Plaintiffs to live in fear of being subjected to similar acts. These acts  
1 amounted to torture and violate the law of nations, customary international law, and  
2 worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific  
3 laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*.

1           103. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia,  
2 committed, through their employees and/or agents, acts that had the intent and the effect  
3 of grossly humiliating and debasing Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez  
4 Perez José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis, forcing them  
5 to act against their will and conscience, inciting fear and anguish, and breaking their  
6 physical and/or moral resistance. Plaintiffs were placed in great fear for their lives and  
7 forced to suffer severe physical and psychological abuse and agony. The acts described  
8 herein constitute cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment in violation of the law of nations,  
9 customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including,  
10 but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties  
11 listed in paragraph 83, *supra*.

12

13           104. As a result of Defendants' wrongful acts directed against Plaintiffs Luis  
14 Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal,  
15 Juan Carlos Galvis, and others, Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL has lost significant  
16 membership because other potential members and leaders have been intimidated and fear  
17 that similar acts of reprisal would be directed against them. Further, SINALTRAINAL  
18 expended substantial resources to protect and support the families of Plaintiffs Luis  
19 Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, and José Domingo Flores while they were  
20 wrongfully detained.

21

22           105. Defendants' conduct in violation of the law of nations, customary  
23 international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not  
24 limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in

1 paragraph 83, *supra*, has caused Plaintiffs significant injury. Defendants are jointly and  
2 severally liable for the acts of any and all subsidiaries that are in violation of the law of  
3 nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices,  
4 including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
5 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Defendants are also vicariously liable for any  
5 violations of their employees or agents of the law of nations, customary international law,  
7 and worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific  
3 laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*.  
9 Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and punitive  
9 damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

1  
2 106. The acts described herein are actionable under the ATCA, and, if such a  
3 showing is required, were done with the complicity of state actors. In acting together with  
4 their agent, the paramilitary force permitted to exist and openly operate under the laws of  
5 Colombia, and assisted by government military officials, Defendants acted under color of  
5 law in violating each of the applicable laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
7 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Further, the Government of Colombia fails to  
3 enforce its laws that would prevent or remedy the violations alleged herein.

9  
9 **Seventh Cause of Action**  
9 **The Torture Victim Protection Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350**  
9 **For Torture**  
1 **on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**  
2 **José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, Juan Carlos Galvis,**  
2 **and SINALTRAINAL Against**  
3 **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

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



1

2           108.   Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez and José Domingo  
3 Flores were all sent, based on the false charges knowingly brought by Defendants, to  
4 dangerous, filthy prison facilities. There, they were threatened constantly with death and  
5 serious bodily injury and were subjected to regular and systematic forms of brutality and  
6 cruelty. Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal was subjected to violence and the threat of death  
7 by paramilitary agents of Defendants. Plaintiff Juan Carlos Galvis was, and continues to  
8 be, subjected to ongoing threats against his life by notorious paramilitary groups acting on  
9 behalf of Defendants. These acts were inflicted intentionally and with malice to cause  
10 Plaintiffs severe mental and physical pain and suffering, and to have the lasting effect of  
11 forever causing Plaintiffs to leave in fear of being subjected to similar acts. These acts  
12 amounted to torture and violate the law of nations, customary international law, and  
13 worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific  
14 laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 82, *supra*.

15

16           109.   As a result of Defendants' wrongful acts directed against Plaintiffs Luis  
17 Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and  
18 Juan Carlos Galvis, Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL has lost significant membership because  
19 other potential members and leaders have been intimidated and fear that similar acts of  
20 reprisal would be directed against them.

21

22           110.   Defendants' conduct in violation of the law of nations, customary  
23 international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not  
24 limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in

1 paragraph 83, *supra*, has caused Plaintiffs significant injury. Defendants are jointly and  
2 severally liable for the acts of any and all subsidiaries that are in violation of the law of  
3 nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices,  
4 including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
5 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Defendants are also vicariously liable for any  
5 violations of their employees or agents of the law of nations, customary international law,  
7 and worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific  
3 laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*.  
9 Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and punitive  
9 damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

1  
2 111. The acts described herein are actionable under the ATCA, and, if such a  
3 showing is required, were done with the complicity of state actors. In acting together with  
4 their agent, the paramilitary force permitted to exist and openly operate under the laws of  
5 Colombia, and assisted by government military officials, Defendants acted under color of  
5 law in violating each of the applicable laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
7 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Further, the Government of Colombia fails to  
3 enforce its laws that would prevent or remedy the violations alleged herein.

9  
9  
**Eighth Cause of Action**

1 **RICO Violations**

2 **18 U.S.C. § 1961 *et seq***

3 **on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**

4 **José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, Juan Carlos Galvis,**

5 **and SINALTRAINAL Against**

6 **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

1           112. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 111 of this  
2 Complaint as if set forth herein.

3

4           113. Defendant Coke is a person within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1961(3).  
5 Defendants Coke Columbia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia collectively as an  
6 association in fact constitute an enterprise (hereafter referred to as the “Panamco  
7 Enterprise”) within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1961(4). In violation of 18 U.S.C. §  
8 1962(c), Defendant Coke through its employees and agents has conducted, and continues  
9 to conduct, the affairs of the Panamco Enterprise through a pattern of racketeering  
10 activity consisting of multiple acts and threats of murder, kidnapping and extortion, as set  
11 forth specifically in Paragraphs 59 through 82.

12

13           114. In violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d), Defendant Coke has conspired, and  
14 continues to conspire, to violate 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c). As a result of this unlawful  
15 conspiracy, Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores,  
16 Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis were subjected to violent acts and were  
17 severely harmed. Further, Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL was harmed by the intended loss  
18 of members and leaders caused by the targeted violence and threats of death against  
19 Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge  
20 Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis. Plaintiffs are entitled to compensatory and  
21 punitive damages, as well as statutory damages under RICO, including treble damages, as  
22 well as injunctive relief, in an amount to be determined at trial. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL  
23 and current members and leaders of SINALTRAINAL continue to suffer harm from the  
24 ongoing conspiracy.

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  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

**Ninth Cause of Action**  
**The Alien Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350**  
**For Denial of Fundamental Rights to Associate and Organize**  
**on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**  
**José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, Juan Carlos Galvis,**  
**and SINALTRAINAL Against**  
**Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

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

116. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants’ co-venturers or agents committed, violent acts and/or made death threats against Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, Juan Carlos Galvis, and others, as is described fully in the preceding paragraphs. This violence was intentionally designed and carried out to deny Plaintiffs and their colleagues in SINALTRAINAL their fundamental rights to associate and organize, and did in fact result in the denial of these rights.

117. The acts described herein constitute violations of the law of nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. The acts described herein are actionable under the ATCA, and, if such a showing is required, were done with the complicity of state actors. In acting together with their agent, the paramilitary force permitted to exist and openly operate under the laws of Colombia, and assisted by government military officials, Defendants acted under color of law in violating each of the applicable laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Further, the Government of

1 Colombia fails to enforce its laws that would prevent or remedy the violations alleged  
2 herein.

3

4       118. Defendants' conduct in violation of the law of nations, customary  
5 international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices, including, but not  
6 limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in  
7 paragraph 83, *supra*, resulted in acts of severe violence against Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo  
8 Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan  
9 Carlos Galvis, and has caused significant injury to Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL, which has  
10 lost significant membership because of violence, death threats directed against, and the  
11 murders of, leaders of local unions. Further, SINALTRAINAL must expend substantial  
12 resources to protect and support union members who are targets of violence and death  
13 threats. SINALTRAINAL must also provide material support and protection to family  
14 members of trade union leaders who are kidnapped and/or unlawfully detained.  
15 Defendants are jointly and severally liable for the acts of any subsidiaries that are in  
16 violation of the law of nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry  
17 standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements,  
18 conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Defendants are also  
19 vicariously liable for any violations of their employees and/or agents of the law of  
20 nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry standards and practices,  
21 including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements, conventions, resolutions and  
22 treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief and to  
23 recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

24

**Tenth Cause of Action**  
**Arbitrary Arrest and Detention**  
**on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**  
**José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal and SINALTRAINAL Against**  
**Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

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

120. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' employees or agents committed acts which caused Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, and José Domingo Flores to be arrested and detained. Such arrest and detention of Plaintiffs was illegal and unjust, carried out without a warrant, probable cause or reasonable suspicion. Further, Defendants committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' employees or agents committed acts which caused Plaintiff Jorge Humberto Leal to be arrested and detained without judicial process by paramilitary agents of Defendants.

121. Plaintiffs were placed in fear for their lives, were deprived of their freedom, separated from their families and forced to suffer severe physical and mental abuse. Plaintiffs did not consent to such conduct, which caused injury, damage, loss and harm to each of them.

122. The acts described herein constitute arbitrary arrest and detention, actionable under the laws of Florida, the laws of the United States, and the laws of Colombia. Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, and Jorge Humberto Leal are entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

1  
2       123.    The arbitrary arrest and detention of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia,  
3 Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores and Jorge Humberto Leal has also caused  
4 significant injury to Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL, which has lost significant membership  
5 because of violence directed against leaders of local unions. Further, SINALTRAINAL  
6 must expend substantial resources to protect and support union members who are targets  
7 of violence and death threats. SINALTRAINAL must also provide material support and  
8 protection to family members of trade union leaders who are victims of arbitrary arrest  
9 and detention. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL is entitled to injunctive relief and to recover  
10 compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

11

12                               **Eleventh Cause of Action**  
13                               **False Imprisonment**  
14                               **on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**  
15                               **José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal and SINALTRAINAL Against**  
16                               **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

17

18       124.    Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 123 of this  
19 Complaint as if set forth herein.  
20

21

22       125.    Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia  
23 committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' employees or agents committed  
24 acts to unlawfully exercise force or the express or implied threat of force to restrain,  
25 detain or confine Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo  
26 Flores, and Jorge Humberto Leal. The restraint, detention or confinement compelled  
27 Plaintiffs to stay or go somewhere against their will for some appreciable time.

28

126. Plaintiffs were placed in fear for their lives, were deprived of their freedom, separated from their families and forced to suffer severe physical and mental abuse. Plaintiffs did not consent to such conduct, which caused injury, damage, loss and harm to each of them.

127. The acts described herein constitute false imprisonment, actionable under the laws of Florida, the laws of the United States, and the laws of Colombia. Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, and Jorge Humberto Leal are entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

128. The false imprisonment of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, and Jorge Humberto Leal has also caused significant injury to Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL , which has lost significant membership because of violence directed against leaders of local unions. Further, SINALTRAINAL must expend substantial resources to protect and support union members who are targets of violence and death threats. SINALTRAINAL must also provide material support and protection to family members of trade union leaders who are victims of false imprisonment. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL is entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

### Twelfth Cause of Action Battery

**on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,  
José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal and SINALTRAINAL Against  
Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**



1           129.   Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 128 of this  
2 Complaint as if set forth herein.

3

4           130.   Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia  
5 committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' employees or agents committed  
6 acts which resulted in harmful or offensive contact with the bodies of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs  
7 did not consent to the contact, which caused injury, damage, loss and harm to Plaintiffs  
8 Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, and Jorge Humberto  
9 Leal.

10

11           131.   The acts described herein constitute battery, actionable under the laws of  
12 Florida, the laws of the United States and the laws of Colombia. Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo  
13 Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, and Jorge Humberto Leal are  
14 entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts  
15 to be ascertained at trial.

16

17           132.   The battery of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,  
18 José Domingo Flores, and Jorge Humberto Leal has also caused significant injury to  
19 Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL , which has lost significant membership because of violence  
20 directed against leaders of local unions. Further, SINALTRAINAL must expend  
21 substantial resources to protect and support union members who are targets of violence  
22 and death threats. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL is entitled to injunctive relief and to recover  
23 compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

24

**Thirteenth Cause of Action**

**Assault**

**on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,  
José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, Juan Carlos Galvis,  
and SINALTRAINAL Against  
Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

133. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 132 of this Complaint as if set forth herein.

134. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' employees or agents committed acts which caused Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis to be apprehensive that Defendants would subject them to imminent batteries and/or intentional invasions of their rights to be free from offensive and harmful contact, and said conduct demonstrated that Defendants had a present ability to subject Plaintiffs to an immediate, intentional, offensive and harmful touching. Plaintiffs did not consent to such conduct, which caused injury, damage, loss and harm to each of the Plaintiffs.

135. The acts described herein constitute assault, actionable under the laws of the Florida, the laws of the United States and the laws of Colombia. Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis are entitled to injunctive relief and to recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

136. The assault of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis has also caused

1 significant injury to Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL, which has lost significant membership  
2 because of violence directed against leaders of local unions. Further, SINALTRAINAL  
3 must expend substantial resources to protect and support union members who are targets  
4 of violence and death threats. Plaintiff SINALTRAINAL is entitled to injunctive relief  
5 and to recover compensatory and punitive damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

6

**Fourteenth Cause of Action**  
**Negligence Per Se**

7

**on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,  
8 José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal and SINALTRAINAL Against  
9 Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

10

11 137. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 136 of this  
12 Complaint as if set forth herein.

12

13

14 138. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia failed  
15 to use ordinary or reasonable care in order to avoid injury to Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo  
16 Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and  
17 SINALTRAINAL. Defendants' negligence was a cause of injury, damage, loss and harm  
18 to Plaintiffs.

18

19

20 139. As a result of these acts, Plaintiffs suffered harm including, but not limited  
21 to, physical harm, pain and suffering, and severe emotional distress. Defendants' conduct  
22 constitutes negligence and is actionable under the laws of Florida, the United States,  
23 Colombia, the law of nations, customary international law, and worldwide industry  
24 standards and practices, including, but not limited to, the specific laws, agreements,

24

1 conventions, resolutions and treaties listed in paragraph 83, *supra*. Plaintiffs are entitled  
2 to recover compensatory damages in amounts to be ascertained at trial.

3  
4 **Fifteenth Cause of Action**  
5 **Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress**  
6 **on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**  
7 **José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal,**  
8 **and Juan Carlos Galvis Against**  
9 **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

10  
11 140. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 139 of this  
12 Complaint as if set forth herein.

13  
14 141. The acts described herein constitute outrageous conduct against Plaintiffs  
15 Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal,  
16 and Juan Carlos Galvis, and were without privilege.

17  
18 142. Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia  
19 committed, or acted in concert to commit, or Defendants' co-venturers or agents  
20 committed acts, which were intended to cause Plaintiffs to suffer emotional distress. In  
21 the alternative, Defendants engaged in the conduct with reckless disregard of the  
22 probability of causing Plaintiffs to suffer emotional distress. Plaintiffs were present at  
23 the time the outrageous conduct occurred, and Defendants, or Defendants' alter egos or  
24 agents, knew that the Plaintiffs were present.

25  
26 143. Plaintiffs suffered severe emotional distress and the outrageous conduct of  
27 Defendants was a cause of the emotional distress suffered by Plaintiffs.

1           144. Defendants' outrageous conduct constitutes the intentional infliction of  
2 emotional distress and is actionable under the laws of the State of Florida, and the laws of  
3 the United States.

4                           **Sixteenth Cause of Action**  
5                           **Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress**  
6                           **on Behalf of Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez,**  
7                           **José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal,**  
8                           **and Juan Carlos Galvis Against**  
9                           **Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and Panamco Colombia**

10           145. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 144 of this  
11 Complaint as if set forth herein.

12           146. At all relevant times, Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and  
13 Panamco Colombia, and each of them, owed Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro  
14 Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis a  
15 duty to act with reasonable care, and at all relevant times, harm and/or injury to these  
16 Plaintiffs was reasonably foreseeable if such duty of care was breached.

17           147. At all relevant times, Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and  
18 Panamco Colombia, and each of them, had the power, ability, authority and duty to stop  
19 engaging in the conduct described herein and to intervene to prevent or prohibit such  
20 conduct.

21  
22           148. At all relevant times, Defendants, Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, and  
23 Panamco Colombia, and each of them, knew, or reasonably should have known, that the  
24

1 conduct described herein would and did proximately result in physical and emotional  
2 distress to Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores,  
3 Jorge Humberto Leal, and Juan Carlos Galvis.

1  
5 149. Despite said knowledge, power, and duty, Defendants, and each of them,  
5 breached their duty to Plaintiffs, and thereby negligently failed to act so as to stop  
7 engaging in the conduct described herein and to prevent or to prohibit such conduct or to  
3 otherwise protect Plaintiffs. To the extent that said negligent conduct was perpetrated by  
5 certain Defendants, and each of them, the remaining Defendants confirmed and ratified  
7 said conduct with the knowledge that Plaintiffs' emotional and physical distress would  
1 thereby increase and with a wanton and reckless disregard for the deleterious  
2 consequences to Plaintiffs.

3  
1 150. As a direct and legal result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiffs Luis  
5 Eduardo Garcia, Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal, and  
5 Juan Carlos Galvis have suffered and will continue to suffer significant physical injury,  
7 pain and suffering and extreme and severe mental anguish and emotional distress.

3  
5 151. Defendants' conduct constitutes the negligent infliction of emotional  
7 distress and is actionable under the laws of the State of Florida, and the laws of the  
1 United States.

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

**Seventeenth Cause of Action**  
**Aiding and Abetting**  
**on Behalf of the Estate of Isidro Segundo Gil, Plaintiffs Luis Eduardo Garcia,**  
**Alvaro Gonzalez Perez, José Domingo Flores, Jorge Humberto Leal,**  
**Juan Carlos Galvis and SINALTRAINAL Against**  
**Defendants Coke, Coke Colombia, Panamco, Panamco Colombia,**  
**Kirby, Kirby Keilland and Bebidas y Alimentos**

152. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 151 of this Complaint as if set forth herein.

153. All of the Defendants knowingly provided substantial assistance to their agents and/or employees, including the paramilitary security forces that committed the wrongful acts delineated in the preceding causes of action at the time such wrongful acts were perpetrated.

154. Defendants’ aiding and abetting the wrongful acts delineated in the preceding causes of action is actionable under the laws of Florida.

**IX. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

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

**X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court to:

(a) enter judgment in favor of Plaintiffs on all counts of the Complaint;

(b) declare that Defendants have violated Plaintiffs’ human rights and the laws of the State of Florida and the United States, as set forth herein;

- 1 (c) award Plaintiffs compensatory and punitive damages, as well as statutory  
2 damages and treble damages under RICO;
- 3 (d) grant Plaintiffs equitable relief, permanently enjoining Defendants from  
4 further engaging in human rights abuses against Plaintiffs and their fellow  
5 members of SINALTRAINAL ;
- 5 (e) award Plaintiffs the costs of suit including reasonable attorneys' fees, and  
7 (f) award Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just under  
the circumstances.

3  
3  
3  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
5  
7  
3  
3  
1  
2  
3  
4

Respectfully submitted this 20<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2001,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel M Kovalik  
UNITED STEELWORKERS  
OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO/CLC  
Five Gateway Center  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222  
(412) 562-2518  
Fax (412) 562-2574

\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Collingsworth  
Natacha Thys  
INTERNATIONAL LABOR  
RIGHTS FUND  
Suite 920  
733 15<sup>th</sup> Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 347-4100  
Fax-202-347-4885

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS