

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

A-Gas US Holdings, Inc. v. Flat Out Recovery and Recharge;
American Refrigerant Services Inc.; and Ian Meindersee

No. 2:24-cv-03319-TLN-CSK (E.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-03319-TLN-CSK · Decided September 9,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California dismissed A-Gas US Holdings, Inc.’s claims against Flat Out Recovery and Recharge, American Refrigerant Services Inc., and Ian Meindersee for lack of Article III standing. The court held that the complaint failed to allege an injury-in-fact to the plaintiff, including in connection with alleged Clean Air Act violations, and rejected the argument that a Clean Air Act citizen suit dispenses with the constitutional standing requirement. The dismissal was granted with leave to amend, and the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment was denied as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 9, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-03319-TLN-CSK
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for summary judgment, and defendants moved to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction based on lack of Article III standing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 12(b)(1) motion challenges subject matter jurisdiction. The plaintiff bears the burden of clearly alleging facts establishing each element of Article III standing, including injury in fact, causation, and redressability.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

- standing
- subject matter jurisdiction
- motions to dismiss
- clean air act
- summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

constitutional law

environmental law

administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff adequately alleged an injury in fact sufficient to establish Article III standing.
2. Whether the Clean Air Act's citizen-suit provision, 42 U.S.C. § 7604, dispenses with the constitutional injury-in-fact requirement.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed with leave to amend.
4. Whether Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment should be denied as moot after dismissal of the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to allege a concrete and particularized injury to itself. Allegations of harm to the environment, the general public, and the United States did not establish Plaintiff's injury in fact.
2. Section 7604 does not dispense with Article III standing. A plaintiff bringing a Clean Air Act citizen suit must still allege an injury in fact.
3. Dismissal was warranted, but the action could not be dismissed with prejudice because the pleading might be cured by alleging additional facts.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To satisfy Article III standing, a plaintiff must allege: (1) an injury-in-fact that is concrete and particularized, as well as actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical; (2) that is fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant; and (3) that is redressable by a favorable judicial decision.” (at 2)

“The Court therefore declines to follow Metropolitan Washington. 511 F.2d at 814.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a seller, servicer, and reclaimer in the refrigeration-services industry. Defendant Ian Meindersee, a former Plaintiff employee, began operating Flat Out Recovery and Recharge, a refrigerant-recovery and reclaiming business. Plaintiff alleged that defendants stole, manufactured, assembled, and altered proprietary equipment and used equipment that was not properly certified under Environmental Protection Agency regulations, but the complaint did not allege injury to Plaintiff itself.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this action on November 27, 2024, alleging Clean Air Act violations and civil conspiracy arising from defendants' alleged use of uncertified refrigerant-recovery equipment. Plaintiff later moved for summary judgment, and defendants moved to dismiss. The court granted the motion to dismiss with leave to amend and denied the summary-judgment motion as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

None. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint limited to curing the identified deficiencies within thirty days after electronic filing of the order. Defendants' responsive pleading is due twenty-one days after Plaintiff files an amended complaint.

CASES CITED

- Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1547-48 (2016)
- Monsanto Co. v. Geertson Seed Farms, 561 U.S. 139, 149 (2010)
- Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490, 518 (1975)
- Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc., 528 U.S. 167, 181 (2000)
- Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters, 459 U.S. 519, 526 (1983)
- Metropolitan Washington Coalition for Clean Air v. District of Columbia, 511 F.2d 809, 814 (D.C. Cir. 1975)
- Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000)