

1 Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981)
2 Daniel D. Cho (SBN 105409)
3 Ben Yeroushalmi (SBN 232540)
4 Yeroushalmi & Associates
5 3700 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 480
6 Los Angeles, CA 90010
7 Telephone: 213-382-3183
8 Facsimile: 213-382-3430
9 Email: lawfirm@yeroushalmi.com
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
11 Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc.

ENDORSED
FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

MAR 06 2008

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk
BY: ERICKA LARNAUTI
Deputy Clerk

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

9 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

11 CONSUMER ADVOCACY)
12 GROUP, INC., in the interest of)
13 the Public,)
14 Plaintiff,)
15 v.)
16 GORDON MOTT ROOFING, CO.)
17 INC., et al.,)
18 Defendants.)

00-4591064
CASE NO. CGC-07-459126

[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING
SETTLEMENT BETWEEN CONSUMER
ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. AND
ALTERNATIVE ROOFING SOLUTIONS, INC.

Judge: Honorable Patrick J. Mahoney
Place: Department 302
Date: January 31, 2008
Time: 9:30 AM

Action Filed: December 26, 2006
Trial date: Not Set

21 On January 31, 2008, at 9:30 AM, the Honorable Patrick J. Mahoney, in Department 302
22 of this Court, heard the motion for judicial approval of settlement of action between plaintiff,
23 Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ("CAG"), on one hand, and, defendant, Alternative Roofing
24 Solutions, Inc. ("Alternative"), on the other. Appearances are in the record. The Court, having
25 considered the documents filed in connection with this matter and the arguments of counsel, has
26 arrived at the following conclusions and SO ORDERS:
27
28

1 A. CAG and Alternative have executed a settlement agreement (“Proposed Settlement”),
2 fully executed as of August 27, 2007, which CAG submitted to this Court for approval pursuant
3 to Proposition 65 (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 25249.5 et seq.).
4

5 B. This Court has considered the Proposed Settlement and determined that it represents a
6 fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement between CAG and Alternative.

7 1. The Proposed Settlement provides that Alternative will:

- 8 • Change its business practices to reduce exposures of Proposition 65-listed chemicals to
9 its employees and the public;
- 10 • Provide warnings to its employees that satisfy the “clear and reasonable” warning
11 requirement under Proposition 65;
- 12 ▪ Pay CAG \$9,000 for its attorney fees and costs; and
- 13 ▪ Pay \$1,000 to an entity, CAG, in lieu of a civil penalty.
14

15
16 2. The court grants the Motion for Judicial Approval of Settlement between CAG
17 and Alternative in its entirety pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision
18 (f)(4) after making the following findings.

- 19 a. CAG followed all procedural rules in seeking approval of the Proposed
20 Settlement;
- 21 b. The Proposed Settlement properly requires Proposition 65 compliant warnings
22 for extant exposures to Proposition 65-listed chemicals;
- 23 c. The award of \$9,000 in attorney fees and costs as set forth in the Proposed
24 Settlement is appropriate and reasonable under California law given the total
25 fees and costs incurred by CAG and its counsel of record in prosecuting this
26 action;
27
28

- 1 d. The Proposed Settlement provides that Alternative will pay \$1,000 to an
2 entity, CAG, in lieu of a civil penalty that is proper in light of the criteria set
3 forth in California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 3203, subdivision (b);
4
5 e. The terms of the Proposed Settlement are in the public interest consistent with
6 Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (d); and
7
8 f. CAG adequately represented the public interest in entering into the Proposed
9 Settlement.

10
11 Dated: 3/6, 2008
12

13 **PATRICK J. MAHONEY**
14 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28