Court Rejects Georgia Man's $850M PFAS Remediation Demand

By Brian D. Gross

December 17, 2024

A Georgia federal court has denied a request for an injunction that would have required the defendants to pay $850 million for remediation of water sources in Georgia that are contaminated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), finding that the plaintiff lacked standing to pursue such a remedy. This decision has major implications for PFAS litigation, as it emphasizes the importance of demonstrating concrete harm before seeking remedial measures. The ruling serves as a reminder of the legal hurdles plaintiffs must overcome to pursue large-scale environmental remediation, particularly when the damage is not specific to an individual or clearly defined.

The Case: Jarrod Johnson's Legal Challenge

The case revolves around Jarrod Johnson, a Georgia resident who filed a lawsuit in 2019 against 59 companies, including chemical manufacturers and waste handlers. Johnson claims that industrial wastewater from Dalton, which contained PFAS, flowed downstream into drinking water sources used by approximately 100,000 residents in Rome, Georgia and surrounding areas. The contamination led to rising water bills for local residents—the result of rising costs associated with the installation of PFAS filtration systems.

Johnson's suit focused on the financial impact to ratepayers in Rome, arguing that increased water rates were necessary to fund PFAS filtering efforts. He sought an injunction requiring the defendants to fund an $850 million remediation plan to address the contamination.

US District Judge Amy Totenberg ruled, however, that Johnson did not have the necessary legal standing to pursue the injunction. She noted that while Johnson could pursue monetary damages for the increased water bills, he failed to prove that the remediation sought would address a specific injury that he suffered.

Judge's Ruling: Lack of Concrete Injury

Judge Totenberg explained that Johnson's case lacked the necessary foundation to justify the broad remediation he proposed. While PFAS contamination may present a concern for public health, the plaintiff did not demonstrate that he personally suffered harm that could be directly redressed by the requested cleanup. Johnson did not claim any health effects from consuming PFAS-contaminated water, nor did he establish that his property was damaged by the contamination.

Moreover, the judge noted that Johnson's claim that he was deprived of the ability to use local waters for recreational activities was too speculative. He had not, for instance, alleged that he was an active fisherman or boater, which would have made his claim of recreational injury more concrete.

In essence, Judge Totenberg ruled that Johnson's injuries were generalized dangers associated with PFAS contamination, not specific to him or his property. As a result, the legal basis for his request for an injunction fell short.

The Economic Impact: Ratepayer Injury and the Mootness Issue

One of Johnson's key allegations was that the cost of PFAS filtration was unfairly passed on to consumers in the form of increased water rates. While Judge Totenberg acknowledged that this claim might have some merit, she concluded that the requested remedy would not resolve the issue.

The settlement that the City of Rome reached with the defendants in a parallel case had previously reset water rates, making the claim of ongoing harm from rate hikes moot. Moreover, the possibility of future rate hikes due to further PFAS remediation was too speculative and could be revisited through further legal action if it ever materialized.

The court also ruled that Johnson's ratepayer injury was primarily an economic harm, which could be addressed through monetary damages rather than a sweeping environmental cleanup. Due to the fact that Johnson has standing to pursue damages for increased water rates, there was no need for an injunction.

Legal Standing and the Road Ahead

The ruling highlights a key challenge in environmental litigation: demonstrating standing to bring a claim. In cases like this, where the harm is widespread and affects large groups of people, plaintiffs must provide specific evidence of injury that can be directly addressed by the requested remedy. The court's decision reinforces the need for plaintiffs to show that they are uniquely impacted by environmental issues like PFAS contamination, rather than relying on generalized harm that could apply to any member of the affected community.

This ruling underscores the complexity of PFAS litigation, which is expected to continue as more communities grapple with contamination from these persistent chemicals. As the legal landscape evolves, companies must remain vigilant about their potential exposure to liability, while plaintiffs must navigate the intricate legal requirements of proving both harm and a viable path to remedy.

Looking Ahead: What's Next for PFAS Litigation?

While Jarrod Johnson's specific request for an injunction to force defendants to fund a multi-million-dollar cleanup effort was denied, the ruling does not preclude Johnson from pursuing other legal avenues, such as seeking damages for his ratepayer injury. It also provides guidance for future PFAS cases, demonstrating the necessity to allege concrete injury and standing.

While this ruling provides some relief to the defendants, it is not likely the final word on the ongoing litigation surrounding PFAS contamination. As governments, corporations, and private citizens continue to address PFAS contamination, businesses should be prepared for additional legal challenges and regulatory changes.

Attorney Advertising. This material is for general informational purposes only and does not represent our advice as to any particular set of facts; nor does it represent any undertaking to keep recipients advised of all legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. © 2026 MG+M The Law Firm