

REC'D JUL 30 7 2009

GRAHAM & MARTIN, LLP
Anthony G. Graham (SBN 148682)
Michael J. Martin (SBN 171757)
950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (714) 850-9390
Facsimile: (714) 850-9392
AnthonyGGraham@msn.com

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

JUL 21 2009

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk
BY: *Maguel S. Muzilla*
Deputy Clerk

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

7 LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA
8 Roy Penuela (SBN 107267)
9 3303 Castleman Lane
10 Burbank Hills, CA 91504-1630
11 Telephone: (818) 843-8435
12 lalawyer@lawyer.com

LEE LAW GROUP
Robert Y. Lee (SBN 213848)
3699 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite-1100
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Telephone: (213) 383-5400
admin@lgcounsel.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

13 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

14 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.,
15 Plaintiff,
16 v.
17 AEROFLOT, et al.,
18 Defendants.

Case No.: 06-455658 (Consolidated with
Case Nos. 05-439749, 05-447903, 06-
452413, 07-462756)

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER PURSUANT TO
TERMS OF STIPULATION AND
ORDER RE: CONSENT JUDGMENT
(PASSENGER)

19 AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS.
20

Date: January 27, 2009
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Department: 220
Judge: Hon. A. James Robertson

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

AJ73057082.2

[PROPOSED] ORDER PURSUANT TO TERMS OF STIPULATION
AND ORDER RE: CONSENT JUDGMENT (PASSENGER)

1 In the above-entitled action, Plaintiff Environmental World Watch, Inc., Plaintiff
2 Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. and Defendants Air Canada, Air Wisconsin Airlines Corp.,
3 Alaska Airlines, Inc., America West Airlines, Inc., American Airlines, Inc., American Eagle
4 Airlines, Inc., Continental Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., Eva Airways Corp., Frontier
5 Airlines, Inc., Hawaiian Airlines Inc., Horizon Air Industries, Inc., JetBlue Airways Corp., Mesa
6 Air Group Inc., Midwest Air Group Inc. (a.k.a. Midwest Airlines), MN Airlines, LLC dba Sun
7 Country, Sky West, Inc., Southwest Airlines Co., United Air Lines, Inc., Aer Lingus, Limited,
8 Air France, Air India, Ltd., Air New Zealand, Ltd., Air Tahiti Nui, All Nippon Airways, Asiana
9 Airlines, British Airways, Plc, Air China; Aeromexico, Aerolitoral, Air Jamaica, Air Pacific,
10 AirTran Airways, Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd., COPA, El Al Israel Airlines, Korean Air Lines,
11 LAN Airlines, Lufthansa German Airlines, LTU International, Malaysia Airlines, Philippine Air
12 Lines, Spirit Airlines, TACA International Airlines, S.A., Thai Airways, WestJet, China Airlines,
13 Ltd., HMY Airways, Inc., Japan Airlines International Company, Ltd., KLM Royal Dutch
14 Airlines, Mexicana Airlines, Qantas Airways Limited, Singapore Airlines, Limited, Swiss
15 International Air Lines, Ltd., Virgin Atlantic Airways Limited, China Southern Airlines, Inc.,
16 China Eastern Airlines Co., Ltd., Aeroflot-Russian Airlines, and Allegiant Airlines (collectively,
17 "Parties"), having agreed through their respective counsel that judgment be entered pursuant to
18 the terms of the Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Re: Consent Judgment entered into by the
19 Parties, and after consideration of the papers submitted and the arguments presented, the Court
20 finds that the settlement agreement as modified by the STIPULATED JUDGMENT
21 PURSUANT TO AMENDED TERMS OF STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: CONSENT
22 JUDGMENT (PASSENGER) meets the criteria established by Senate Bill 471, in that:

-
- 23 1. The health hazard warning that is required by the Stipulation and
24 [Proposed] Order Re: Consent Judgment complies with Health & Safety Code section 25249.7;
25 2. The reimbursement of fees and costs to be paid pursuant to the Parties'
26 Consent Judgment is reasonable under California law; and
27 3. The payment pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(b) is
28 reasonable.


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

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that judgment be entered in this case, in accordance with the terms of the attached Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Re: Consent Judgment as modified by the attached STIPULATED JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO AMENDED TERMS OF STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: CONSENT JUDGMENT (PASSENGER).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

July 21, 2009
JUL 21 2009



JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
A. JAMES ROBERTSON, II

EXHIBIT 1

1 GRAHAM & MARTIN, LLP
2 Anthony G. Graham (SBN 148682)
3 Michael J. Martin (SBN 171757)
4 950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220
5 Costa Mesa, CA 92626
6 Telephone: (714) 850-9390
7 Facsimile: (714) 850-9392
8 AnthonyGGraham@msn.com

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

11 LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA
12 Roy Penuela (SBN 107267)
13 3303 Castleman Lane
14 Burbank Hills, CA 91504-1630
15 Telephone: (818) 843-8435
16 lalawyer@lawyer.com

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff
18 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

19 LEE & GAFNI, LLP
20 Robert Y. Lee (SBN 213848)
21 Adam I. Gafni (SBN 230045)
22 3699 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1100
23 Los Angeles, CA 90010
24 Telephone: (213) 383-5400
25 admin@lgcounsel.com

26 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

27 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

28 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AEROFLOT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 06-455658 (Consolidated with
Case Nos. 05-439749, 05-447903, 06-
452413, 07-462756)

**STIPULATION AND PROPOSED
ORDER RE: CONSENT JUDGMENT
(PASSENGER)**

Date: January 27, 2009

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Department: 220

Judge: Hon. A. James Robertson

AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS.

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2 **1.1 Plaintiffs and Defendants.** This Stipulation and Proposed Order Re: Consent
3 Judgment (“Consent Judgment”) is entered into by and among Plaintiff Environmental World
4 Watch, Inc. (“EWW”), Plaintiff Consumer Advocacy Group (“CAG”), Yeroushalmi &
5 Associates (former counsel of record for EWW), and Defendants Air Canada, Air Wisconsin
6 Airlines Corp., Alaska Airlines, Inc., America West Airlines, Inc., American Airlines, Inc.,
7 American Eagle Airlines, Inc., Continental Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., Eva Airways
8 Corp., Frontier Airlines, Inc., Hawaiian Airlines Inc., Horizon Air Industries, Inc., JetBlue
9 Airways Corp., Mesa Air Group Inc., Midwest Air Group Inc. (a.k.a. Midwest Airlines), MN
10 Airlines, LLC dba Sun Country, Sky West, Inc., Southwest Airlines Co., United Air Lines, Inc.,
11 Aer Lingus, Limited, Air France, Air India, Ltd., Air New Zealand, Ltd., Air Tahiti Nui, All
12 Nippon Airways, Asiana Airlines, British Airways, Plc, Air China; Aeromexico, Aerolitoral, Air
13 Jamaica, Air Pacific, AirTran Airways, Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd., COPA, El Al Israel
14 Airlines, Korean Air Lines, LAN Airlines, Lufthansa German Airlines, LTU International,
15 Malaysia Airlines, Philippine Air Lines, Spirit Airlines, TACA International Airlines, S.A., Thai
16 Airways, WestJet, China Airlines, Ltd., HMY Airways, Inc., Japan Airlines International
17 Company, Ltd., KLM Royal Dutch Airlines, Mexicana Airlines, Qantas Airways Limited,
18 Singapore Airlines, Limited, Swiss International Air Lines, Ltd., Virgin Atlantic Airways
19 Limited, China Southern Airlines, Inc., China Eastern Airlines Co., Ltd., Aeroflot-Russian
20 Airlines, and Allegiant Airlines (“Defendants”) (collectively referred to as the “Parties”). The
21 Parties, by and through their counsel of record, stipulate to entry of this Consent Judgment.

22 **1.2 Plaintiffs.** EWW and CAG are corporations that seek to promote awareness of
23 exposures to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous
24 substances contained in consumer and industrial products.

25 **1.3 Defendants.** Defendants are passenger airline companies alleged to have
26 operated aircraft at one or more airports in California.

27 **1.4 General Allegations.** Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have exposed employees,
28 passengers, and individuals to chemicals listed under Cal. Health & Safety Code section 25249.6

1 (“Proposition 65”) such as Benz[a]anthracene, Chrysene, Benzo[a]pyrene, Indeno[1,2,3-
2 cd]pyrene, Formaldehyde (gas), Acetaldehyde, Napthalene, Benzene; Ethylbenzene,
3 Benzo[b]fluroanthene, Benzo[k]fluoranthene, Dibenz[a,h]anthracene, Toluene, and Carbon
4 Monoxide, without first providing Proposition 65 warnings of these alleged exposures.

5 **2. CONSENT TO JURISDICTION.**

6 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court
7 has jurisdiction over the Parties and concerning the alleged violations at issue and personal
8 jurisdiction over Defendants as to the acts alleged, that venue is proper in the County of San
9 Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment and to enforce the
10 provisions thereof.

11 **3. INCORPORATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.**

12 The Parties agree that judgment in the above-entitled action, including all
13 consolidated actions, shall be entered, subject to Court approval, in accordance with the terms of
14 the Settlement Agreement by and among the Parties (“Settlement Agreement”), which is
15 attached hereto as Exhibit 1, and the terms of which are incorporated by reference into this
16 Consent Judgment and made a part hereof.

17 **4. COUNTERPARTS**

18 This Agreement may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or e-mail, each
19 of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one
20 and the same document.

21 **5. AUTHORIZATION**

22 The undersigned are authorized to stipulate to entry of this Consent Judgment on
23 behalf of their respective Parties and have read, understood and agree to all of the terms and
24 conditions of this Consent Judgment.
25
26
27
28

1 DATED: December 12, 2008

GRAHAM & MARTIN

2
3 By: Anthony Graham by TDE
4 Anthony Graham
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

5 DATED: December __, 2008

LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA

6
7 By: _____
8 Roy Penuela
Attorneys for Plaintiff
9 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

10 DATED: December 12, 2008

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

11
12 By: Rich Rothman by TDE
13 R Raymond Rothman
Attorneys for Defendants
14 AIR CANADA, AIR WISCONSIN AIRLINES CORP.,
15 ALASKA AIRLINES, INC., AMERICA WEST AIRLINES,
16 INC., AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., AMERICAN EAGLE
17 AIRLINES, INC., CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.,
18 DELTA AIR LINES, INC., FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.,
19 HAWAIIAN AIRLINES INC., HORIZON AIR
INDUSTRIES, INC., JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORP., MESA
20 AIR GROUP INC., MIDWEST AIR GROUP INC. (A.K.A.
21 MIDWEST AIRLINES), MN AIRLINES, LLC DBA SUN
22 COUNTRY, SKY WEST, INC., SOUTHWEST AIRLINES
23 CO., AND UNITED AIR LINES, INC.
24
25
26
27
28

1 DATED: December __, 2008

CONDON & FORSYTH LLP

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

By: _____
Rod D. Margo
Attorneys for Defendants
AER LINGUS, LIMITED, AIR FRANCE, AIR INDIA,
LTD., AIR NEW ZEALAND, LTD., AIR TAHITI NUI, ALL
NIPPON AIRWAYS, ASIANA AIRLINES, BRITISH
AIRWAYS, PLC, AIR CHINA, AEROMEXICO,
AEROLITORAL, AIR JAMAICA, AIR PACIFIC,
AIRTRAN AIRWAYS, CATHAY PACIFIC AIRWAYS
LTD., COPA, EL AL ISRAEL AIRLINES, EVA AIRWAYS
CORP., KOREAN AIR LINES, LAN AIRLINES,
LUFTHANSA GERMAN AIRLINES, LTU
INTERNATIONAL, MALAYSIA AIRLINES, PHILIPPINE
AIR LINES, SPIRIT AIRLINES, TACA INTERNATIONAL
AIRLINES, S.A., THAI AIRWAYS, WESTJET, CHINA
AIRLINES, LTD., HMY AIRWAYS, INC., JAPAN
AIRLINES INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LTD., KLM
ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES, MEXICANA AIRLINES,
QANTAS AIRWAYS LIMITED, SINGAPORE AIRLINES,
LIMITED, SWISS INTERNATIONAL AIR LINES, LTD.,
AND VIRGIN ATLANTIC AIRWAYS LIMITED

DATED: December 12, 2008

AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP

By: Gregory R. McClintock
Gregory R. McClintock
Attorneys for Defendant
AEROFLOT-RUSSIAN AIRLINES

DATED: December __, 2008

ARCHER NORRIS

By: _____
John L. Kortum
Attorneys for Defendant
CHINA EASTERN AIRLINES CO., LTD.

Of Counsel:
Evelyn D. Sahr, Esq.
Laura G. Stover, Esq.
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT, LLC
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
12th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202 659 6622
Fax : 202 659 6699

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

DATED: December __, 2008 REED SMITH LLP

By: _____
Jesse L. Miller
Attorneys for Defendant
CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES, INC.

DATED: December 12, 2008 STANZLER FUNDERBURK & CASTELLON LLP

By: William Funderburk, Jr.
William W. Funderburk, Jr.
Attorneys for Defendant
ALLEGIANT AIRLINES

DATED: December __, 2008 YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

By: _____
Reuben Yeroushalmi
YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

DATED: December __, 2008 LEE & GAFNI, LLP

By: _____
Robert Y. Lee
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:


JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

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

DATED: December __, 2008 GRAHAM & MARTIN

By: _____
Anthony Graham
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

DATED: December 9, 2008 LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA

By:  _____
Roy Penuela
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

DATED: December __, 2008 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

By: _____
R Raymond Rothman
Attorneys for Defendants
AIR CANADA, AIR WISCONSIN AIRLINES CORP.,
ALASKA AIRLINES, INC., AMERICA WEST AIRLINES,
INC., AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., AMERICAN EAGLE
AIRLINES, INC., CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.,
DELTA AIR LINES, INC., FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.,
HAWAIIAN AIRLINES INC., HORIZON AIR
INDUSTRIES, INC., JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORP., MESA
AIR GROUP INC., MIDWEST AIR GROUP INC. (A.K.A.
MIDWEST AIRLINES), MN AIRLINES, LLC DBA SUN
COUNTRY, SKY WEST, INC., SOUTHWEST AIRLINES
CO., AND UNITED AIR LINES, INC.

1 DATED: December 9, 2008

CONDON & FORSYTH LLP

2
3 By: Rod D. Margof

Rod D. Margof

Attorneys for Defendants

4 AER LINGUS, LIMITED, AIR FRANCE, AIR INDIA,
LTD., AIR NEW ZEALAND, LTD., AIR TAHITI NUI, ALL
5 NIPPON AIRWAYS, ASIANA AIRLINES, BRITISH
AIRWAYS, PLC, AIR CHINA; AEROMEXICO,
6 AEROLITORAL, AIR JAMAICA, AIR PACIFIC,
AIRTRAN AIRWAYS, CATHAY PACIFIC AIRWAYS
7 LTD., COPA, EL AL ISRAEL AIRLINES, EVA AIRWAYS
CORP., KOREAN AIR LINES, LAN AIRLINES,
8 LUFTHANSA GERMAN AIRLINES, LTU
INTERNATIONAL, MALAYSIA AIRLINES, PHILIPPINE
9 AIR LINES, SPIRIT AIRLINES, TACA INTERNATIONAL
AIRLINES, S.A., THAI AIRWAYS, WESTJET, CHINA
10 AIRLINES, LTD., HMY AIRWAYS, INC., JAPAN
AIRLINES INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LTD., KLM
11 ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES, MEXICANA AIRLINES,
QANTAS AIRWAYS LIMITED, SINGAPORE AIRLINES,
12 LIMITED, SWISS INTERNATIONAL AIR LINES, LTD.,
AND VIRGIN ATLANTIC AIRWAYS LIMITED
13

14 DATED: December __, 2008

AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP

15
16 By: _____

Gregory R. McClintock

Attorneys for Defendant

AEROFLOT-RUSSIAN AIRLINES
17

18 DATED: December __, 2008

ARCHER NORRIS

19
20 By: _____

John L. Kortum

Attorneys for Defendant

CHINA EASTERN AIRLINES CO., LTD.
21
22

23 DATED: December __, 2008

REED SMITH LLP

24
25 By: _____

Jesse L. Miller

Attorneys for Defendant

CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES, INC.
26
27
28

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

DATED: December __, 2008

CONDON & FORSYTH LLP

By:

Rod D. Margo
Attorneys for Defendants
AER LINGUS, LIMITED, AIR FRANCE, AIR INDIA,
LTD., AIR NEW ZEALAND, LTD., AIR TAHITI NUI, ALL
NIPPON AIRWAYS, ASIANA AIRLINES, BRITISH
AIRWAYS, PLC, AIR CHINA; AEROMEXICO,
AEROLITORAL, AIR JAMAICA, AIR PACIFIC,
AIRTRAN AIRWAYS, CATHAY PACIFIC AIRWAYS
LTD., COPA, EL AL ISRAEL AIRLINES, EVA AIRWAYS
CORP., KOREAN AIR LINES, LAN AIRLINES,
LUFTHANSA GERMAN AIRLINES, LTU
INTERNATIONAL, MALAYSIA AIRLINES, PHILIPPINE
AIR LINES, SPIRIT AIRLINES, TACA INTERNATIONAL
AIRLINES, S.A., THAI AIRWAYS, WESTJET, CHINA
AIRLINES, LTD., HMY AIRWAYS, INC., JAPAN
AIRLINES INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LTD., KLM
ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES, MEXICANA AIRLINES,
QANTAS AIRWAYS LIMITED, SINGAPORE AIRLINES,
LIMITED, SWISS INTERNATIONAL AIR LINES, LTD.,
AND VIRGIN ATLANTIC AIRWAYS LIMITED

DATED: December __, 2008

AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP


By:

Gregory R. McClintock
Attorneys for Defendant
AEROFLOT-RUSSIAN AIRLINES

DATED: December ¹² __, 2008

ARCHER NORRIS

By:


John L. Kortum
Attorneys for Defendant
CHINA EASTERN AIRLINES CO., LTD.

Of Counsel:
Evelyn D. Sahr, Esq.
Laura G. Stover, Esq.
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT, LLC
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
12th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202 659 6622
Fax : 202 659 6699

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

DATED: December __, 2008 CONDON & FORSYTH LLP

By: _____
Rod D. Margo
Attorneys for Defendants
AER LINGUS, LIMITED, AIR FRANCE, AIR INDIA,
LTD., AIR NEW ZEALAND, LTD., AIR TAHITI NUI, ALL
NIPPON AIRWAYS, ASIANA AIRLINES, BRITISH
AIRWAYS, PLC, AIR CHINA; AEROMEXICO,
AEROLITORAL, AIR JAMAICA, AIR PACIFIC,
AIRTRAN AIRWAYS, CATHAY PACIFIC AIRWAYS
LTD., COPA, EL AL ISRAEL AIRLINES, EVA AIRWAYS
CORP., KOREAN AIR LINES, LAN AIRLINES,
LUFTHANSA GERMAN AIRLINES, LTU
INTERNATIONAL, MALAYSIA AIRLINES, PHILIPPINE
AIR LINES, SPIRIT AIRLINES, TACA INTERNATIONAL
AIRLINES, S.A., THAI AIRWAYS, WESTJET, CHINA
AIRLINES, LTD., HMY AIRWAYS, INC., JAPAN
AIRLINES INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LTD., KLM
ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES, MEXICANA AIRLINES,
QANTAS AIRWAYS LIMITED, SINGAPORE AIRLINES,
LIMITED, SWISS INTERNATIONAL AIR LINES, LTD.,
AND VIRGIN ATLANTIC AIRWAYS LIMITED


DATED: December __, 2008 AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP

By: _____
Gregory R. McClintock
Attorneys for Defendant
AEROFLOT-RUSSIAN AIRLINES

DATED: December __, 2008 ARCHER NORRIS

By: _____
John L. Kortum
Attorneys for Defendant
CHINA EASTERN AIRLINES CO., LTD.

DATED: December 10, 2008 REED SMITH LLP


By:  _____
Jesse L. Miller
Attorneys for Defendant
CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES, INC.

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

DATED: December __, 2008 STANZLER FUNDERBURK & CASTELLON LLP

By: _____
William W. Funderburk, Jr.
Attorneys for Defendant
ALLEGiant AIRLINES

DATED: December 9, 2008 YERUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

By: _____

Reuben Yerushalmi
YERUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

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

DATED: December __, 2008 STANZLER FUNDERBURK & CASTELLON LLP

By: _____

William W. Funderburk, Jr.
Attorneys for Defendant
ALLEGIANT AIRLINES


DATED: December __, 2008 YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

By: _____

Reuben Yeroushalmi
YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

DATED: December __, 2008 LEE & GAFNI, LLP

By: _____


Robert Y. Lee
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE

Plaintiffs Environmental World Watch, Inc. ("EWW") and Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ("CAG"), each on its own behalf and in the interest of the public, Yeroushalmi & Associates, and the undersigned air carriers ("Defendants") (collectively, "Parties" and, individually, a "Party") enter into this Settlement Agreement and Release ("Agreement") concerning the settlement of all pending actions, claims and potential claims among the Parties. Following the execution of this Agreement, the Parties will execute a proposed stipulation and consent judgment to which the Agreement shall be attached as an exhibit ("Proposed Consent Judgment"). The "Effective Date" is the date on which the Court approves and enters the Proposed Consent Judgment.

RECITALS

- A. WHEREAS, EWW and CAG are corporations registered with the State of California, formed for furthering environmental causes;
- B. WHEREAS, Defendants have employees working at airports in California and plaintiffs allege Defendants have operated aircraft at airports in California. Any airports in California where Defendants operate or have operated one or more aircraft are "Covered Facilities;"
- C. WHEREAS, Cal. Health and Safety Code sections 25249.5 *et seq.* (hereafter "Proposition 65") prohibits, among other things, a company of ten or more employees from knowingly and intentionally exposing an individual to chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals;
- D. WHEREAS, the State of California has officially listed various chemicals pursuant to Cal. Health and Safety Code section 25249.8 as chemicals known to the State to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity;

E. WHEREAS, EWW and CAG allege that Defendants have exposed individuals to chemicals in jet engine exhaust that are listed as known to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity under Proposition 65. EWW and CAG allege that Defendants have caused these exposures without providing required Proposition 65 warnings;

F. WHEREAS, EWW and CAG, respectively, served Defendants and various public enforcement agencies with documents entitled "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue Under Health & Safety Code section 25249.6" (collectively, the "Notices"). The Notices claim that Defendants violated Cal. Health & Safety Code section 25249.6 by failing to warn employees and individuals of exposures to chemicals listed under Proposition 65 as causing cancer and/or reproductive toxicity, which are allegedly present in jet engine exhaust from aircraft. While the Notices generally allege that Defendants have caused exposures to all Proposition 65-listed chemicals in jet engine exhaust, the Notices also more specifically identify Benz[a]anthracene, Chrysene, Benzo[a]pyrene, Indeno[1,2,3-cd]pyrene, Formaldehyde (gas), Acetaldehyde, Napthalene, Benzene, Ethylbenzene, Benzo[b]fluoranthene, Benzo[k]fluoranthene, Dibenz[a,h]anthracene, Toluene, and Carbon Monoxide (collectively, "Covered Exposures");

G. WHEREAS, EWW filed complaints in the public interest (the "EWW Actions") in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco against Defendants and other airline carriers. CAG also filed a complaint in the public interest (the "CAG Action") in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco against Defendants and other airline carriers. The Complaints in the EWW and CAG Actions allege that Defendants violated Cal. Health & Safety Code section 25249.6 by failing to provide Proposition 65 warnings to employees and other individuals regarding alleged Covered Exposures;

H. WHEREAS, Defendants denied the allegations in the EWW and CAG Actions and, furthermore, alleged that the CAG Action was duplicative of the EWW Action and not justiciable, which CAG disputes;

I. WHEREAS, Yeroushalmi & Associates was formerly counsel of record for EWW in the EWW Actions, and incurred unreimbursed fees and costs in connection with the EWW and CAG Actions;

J. WHEREAS, on February 22, 2008 the Parties participated in a mediation before Mr. Lester Levy at JAMS offices in Los Angeles, CA;

K. WHEREAS, in order to avoid continued and protracted litigation, the Parties desire to enter into a full settlement of all claims that were or could have been raised in the EWW Actions, CAG Action, or any consolidated action of the EWW and CAG Actions (collectively referred to herein as the "Actions") based upon the facts alleged therein and to resolve those actions with finality; and

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing and the covenants and agreements set forth below, the Parties agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

I. NO ADMISSION OF LIABILITY

I.1 No Admission. For the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation, the Parties enter into this Agreement as a full settlement of all claims that were or could have been raised in the Actions based upon the facts alleged therein. By execution of this Agreement and the Proposed Consent Judgment, Defendants do not admit any violation of Proposition 65 or any other law, and Defendants specifically deny that they have committed any such violations. EWW and CAG dispute Defendants' denial. Nothing in this Agreement, as incorporated in the Proposed Consent Judgment, shall be construed as an admission of any fact, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Agreement constitute or be construed as an admission of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law. Based on the foregoing, no one shall construe anything contained in this Agreement as an admission by anyone that any alleged action or failure to act by Defendants violated Proposition 65 or any other statute, regulation, or principle of common law.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF/CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS

2.1 **Work Area Warning Signage.** Defendants shall provide warning signage at each Covered Facility in the manner set forth herein no later than thirty (30) business days (meaning excluding weekends and court holidays) after the Effective Date.

2.1.1 For each Covered Facility, Defendants shall ensure posting of a warning sign proximate to the primary entrance[s] to the Defendants' Work Areas where jet engines are operating. "Work Areas" means areas on the ramp, tarmac, or maintenance facility where employees routinely and in the ordinary scope of their employment come within 200 feet from operating jet engine of an aircraft. Defendants shall place prominently all signs posted under this section with such conspicuousness as to render it likely that employees will see and read the same. A warning sign under this subsection shall state:

WARNING: This area contains chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

2.1.2 **Non-Exclusive Control.** If Defendants do not have exclusive control over the area proximate to the primary entrance to a Work Area where a warning is required under Section 2, Defendants shall make reasonable and good faith efforts to obtain permission to post a warning sign at or near such an entrance. If, despite reasonable and good faith efforts, Defendants cannot obtain permission to post the required warning required at or near that entrance, Defendants shall have no obligation to provide such a warning at such entrance, so long as Defendants contacted EWW and CAG, through counsel, and discussed with EWW's and CAG's counsel the good faith efforts undertaken to address the issue.

2.2 **Proposition 65 Information Statements.** For each Covered Facility, Defendants will ensure a Proposition 65 Information Statement is posted, within thirty (30) business days of the Effective Date, in each breakroom used by its employees who work in Work Areas. The provision regarding "Non-Exclusive Control" in Section 2.1.2 applies to this requirement as well. The Proposition 65 Information Statement is attached as Exhibit A hereto.

2.3 Jetway Warning Signage. For each Covered Facility, the Defendants that operate a jetway at that facility shall ensure a warning sign is posted in or at the entrance to each jetway where it has control over the signage in or at that jetway. The sign required under this subsection shall be posted within thirty (30) business days of the Effective Date. A sign posted under this subsection shall be prominently placed such and with such conspicuousness as to render it likely to be seen and read by passengers. A warning sign under this subsection shall state:

WARNING: This area contains chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

2.3.1 Non-Exclusive Control. If a Defendant does not have exclusive control over a jetway leading to its aircraft where warning signage is required under subsection 2.3, it must use reasonable and good faith efforts to obtain permission to post a warning there. If, through reasonable and good faith efforts, a Defendant cannot obtain permission to post a warning required in subsection 2.3 in a jetway, it is not required under this Agreement to provide such a warning in such jetway, so long as Defendant contacted EWW and CAG, through counsel, and discussed with EWW's and CAG's counsel the good faith efforts undertaken to address the issue.

2.4 Duration of Warning Obligations. Defendants' responsibilities to provide the warnings in this section shall continue for such period as Proposition 65 remains in full force and effect, except as provided below.

2.4.1 Defendants have no obligation to provide warnings as to a Covered Facility if it ceases to operate aircraft at that Covered Facility.

2.4.2 If the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHHA") issues a "Safe Use Determination" (22 Cal. Code Regs., § 12204) or otherwise determines that any Covered Exposures do not require Proposition 65 warnings, Defendants shall have no further obligation to provide the warnings described in this Agreement for such exposures.

2.4.3 If a Defendant performs a quantitative risk assessment in accordance with 22 Cal. Code Regs., § 12703 that results in a determination that any Covered Exposures do not require a warning under Cal. Health & Safety Code section 25249.5, Defendant may seek a Court Order that Defendant will have no further obligation to provide the warnings for such exposures described in this Agreement.

3. RELEASE AND CLAIMS COVERED

3.1 Release of Defendants. This Agreement is a final and binding resolution and release between Defendants and their past, present and future officers, directors, trustees, agents, employees, contractors, attorneys, parents, subsidiaries, or affiliates that operate at the Covered Facilities, divisions, successors and assigns, and its independent contractors who manufacture, repair or sell aircraft jet engines, fuel or otherwise service an aircraft for Defendants (collectively, "Releasees"), on the one hand, and EWW and CAG on behalf of themselves and their respective past, present, and future attorneys, officers, employees, directors, members, representatives, agents and assigns, on the other hand, of all claims for violation of Proposition 65, the provisions of Proposition 65 incorporated in California's Hazard Communication provisions (8 Cal. Code of Regs. § 5194(b)), and any other statutory or common law claim that EWW and CAG could have asserted against any Releasee regarding alleged exposures to Proposition 65-listed chemicals at the Covered Facilities, including, but not limited to, the failure by any Releasee to provide clear and reasonable warnings of exposures to Proposition 65-listed chemicals in jet engine exhaust (collectively, "Released Claims"). Yeroushalmi & Associates on behalf of itself and its past, present, and future attorneys (including but not limited to Reuben Yeroushalmi), officers, employees, directors, members, partners, shareholders, contractors, representatives, agents and assigns, hereby releases and waives all claims against any Releasee for expenses (including but not limited to attorneys' fees, investigative fees, consultant or expert fees), costs, liabilities, damages, injunctive relief, and relief of any other kind arising out of or related to Actions in any way (such claims are included within the term "Released Claims," as

used in this Agreement). A Defendant's compliance with the terms of this Agreement resolves all issues of liability regarding the Released Claims, now and in the future, as to all Releasees.

EWW, CAG, and Yeroushalmi & Associates, on behalf of themselves and their respective past, present, and future attorneys, officers, employees, directors, members, partners, representatives, shareholders, contractors, agents and assigns, covenant not to sue nor to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, arising out of any claims in the EWW and CAG Actions, any form of legal action against any Releasees and releases all Released Claims against any Releasees. Except however, EWW, CAG, and Yeroushalmi & Associates shall remain free to institute any form of legal action to enforce the provisions of this Agreement.

3.2 **Defendant's Release.** Defendant waives all rights to institute any form of legal action against EWW, CAG, and Yeroushalmi & Associates, and each of their respective attorneys or representatives, for all actions and statements that EWW, CAG, and Yeroushalmi & Associates and each of their respective past and present attorneys or representatives, have taken or made in the course of investigating and/or seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 against it in the Actions. Provided however, the Defendant retains the right to institute any form of legal action to enforce the provisions of this Agreement.

3.3 **Waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542.** The Parties waive all rights and benefits that they now have, or in the future may have, conferred upon it by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

EWW, CAG, and Yeroushalmi & Associates understand and acknowledge, in particular, that the significance and consequence of its waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542 is that even if EWW, CAG, Yeroushalmi & Associates, with respect to the matters alleged in the Actions, any person or entity on whose behalf EWW, CAG, or Yeroushalmi & Associates

purports to act, suffers future damages or harm arising out of or resulting from the Released Claims, EWW, CAG, Yeroushalmi & Associates, and anyone on whose behalf each purports to act, will not be able to make any claim for relief against any Defendant; provided however, CAG, EWW, and Yeroushalmi & Associates cannot and expressly do not release any claims for personal injury that could be brought by any other individual or organization.

EWW, CAG, and Yeroushalmi & Associates acknowledge that they intend these consequences for any relief, which may exist as of the date of this release but which they do not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect EWW's, CAG's, or Yeroushalmi & Associates' decision to enter into the Agreement, regardless of whether its lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause, no matter how justifiable such cause may be.

3.4 Court Approval. Neither this Agreement nor the Proposed Consent Judgment is effective until the Effective Date. This Agreement shall be null and void if, for any reason, the Court does not enter an appropriate form of the Proposed Consent Judgment approving all aspects of this Agreement within one year after the Proposed Consent Judgment has been lodged with the Court.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

4.1 Each Defendant shall pay a total settlement amount of Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) in full and final settlement of all claims that EWW and CAG (including but not limited to each of their current and former attorneys) brought or could have brought in connection with the Actions, including all costs and attorneys' fees incurred by EWW and CAG, and in lieu of any civil penalties that allegedly were claimed or could have been recovered in the Actions, as set forth below. Subject to Court approval of the Agreement and entry of the Proposed Consent Judgment, payment shall be made as follows:

4.1.1 Payment to EWW

4.1.1.1 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, Defendant shall pay Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) to EWW (an organization dedicated to furthering Proposition 65 compliance) for projects and purposes related to environmental protection, worker health and safety, or reduction of human exposure to hazardous substances, as EWW may choose. EWW, including its attorneys, agents, representatives, members, officers, employees, or investigators, may not use any part of this payment to finance any future Proposition 65 litigation or investigative activities regarding potential Proposition 65 issues, compliance, or litigation arising out of or against Defendant or the airline industry. Defendant shall make payment payable to EWW within 30 days after the Effective Date to "Graham & Martin LLP Trust Account", at the following address: Graham & Martin LLP, 950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220, Costa Mesa, CA 92626.

4.1.2 EWW and Defendants shall each be responsible for and shall bear their own attorneys' fees and costs. EWW, for itself and its past, present, and future attorneys, officers, employees, directors, members, representatives, agents and assigns hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action, and releases any and all claims of any nature whatsoever, against Defendants and their past, present and future officers, directors, trustees, agents, employees, contractors, attorneys, parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, for reimbursement or payment of any and all of EWW's fees and costs. Defendants shall have no obligation to EWW to reimburse EWW or EWW's past, present, and future attorneys (including but not limited to Yeroushalmi & Associates), officers, employees, directors, members, shareholders, representatives, contractors, agents and assigns, for any fees and costs associated with the Actions.

4.1.3 Payment to CAG.

4.1.3.1 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, Defendant shall pay CAG a total of two thousand Dollars (\$2000), which represents a payment in lieu of civil penalties. The payment in lieu of a civil penalty shall be used for projects and purposes related to environmental protection, worker health and safety, or reduction of human exposure to hazardous substances, as CAG may choose. CAG, including its attorneys, agents, representatives, members, officers, employees, or investigators, may not use any part of this payment to finance any future Proposition 65 litigation or investigative activities regarding potential Proposition 65 issues, compliance, or litigation arising out of or against Settling Defendants. Defendant shall make payment within 30 days after the Effective Date payable to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc.", at the following address: c/o Law Firm of Roy Penuela, 4555 Ellenboro Way, Woodland Hills, CA 91364-5666.

4.1.3.2 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, Defendant shall pay attorneys fees and costs to the Law Firm of Roy Penuela a total of two thousand Dollars (\$2000), pursuant to application to the Court as part of the Proposed Consent Judgment, which represents reimbursement of past, present, and future attorneys' fees and costs relating to or arising out of any of the Actions. Defendant shall make payment within 30 days after the Effective Date payable to "Law Firm of Roy Penuela", at the following address: c/o Law Firm of Roy Penuela, 4555 Ellenboro Way, Woodland Hills, CA 91364-5666.

4.1.3.3 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, Defendant shall pay attorneys fees and costs to the Lee Law Firm a total of one thousand Dollars (\$1000), pursuant to application to the Court as part of the Proposed Consent Judgment, which represents reimbursement of past, present, and future attorneys' fees and costs relating to or arising out of any of the Actions. Defendant shall make payment

within 30 days after the Effective Date payable to "Lee Law Firm", at the following address: c/o Lee Law Firm, 3700 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 920 Los Angeles, CA 90010-3005.

4.1.3.4 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, Defendant shall pay attorneys fees and costs to Yeroushalmi & Associates a total of fifteen thousand Dollars (\$15,000), pursuant to application to the Court as part of the Proposed Consent Judgment, which represents reimbursement of past, present, and future attorneys' fees and costs relating to or arising out of any of the Actions. Defendant shall make payment within 30 days after the Effective Date payable to "Yeroushalmi & Associates", at the following address: 3700 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 480, Los Angeles, CA 90010.

4.1.3.5 Defendant shall have no further obligation to reimburse CAG or CAG's past, present, and future attorneys (including but not limited to Yeroushalmi & Associates), officers, employees, directors, members, shareholders, representatives, contractors, agents and assigns, for any fees and costs associated with the Actions.

4.1.3.6 Upon request by the Court or the California AG's Office, EWW and CAG shall provide an accounting of all disbursements of funds allocated as "in lieu of penalties" to ensure compliance with California regulations.

4.1.3.7 EWW and CAG, and their respective past and current attorneys, agree that they will not seek payment of attorneys fees from each other or its lawyers.

5. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

This Court shall retain jurisdiction of the EWW and/or CAG Action to enforce this Agreement.

6. DISPUTES UNDER THE AGREEMENT

Any Party to this Agreement may, by motion or order to show cause before the court, seek to enforce the terms and conditions contained in the Agreement upon a breach of any term or condition by another Party, but in no event will any Party seek to set aside any terms or conditions in this Agreement once the court has approved the Agreement and entered the Proposed Consent Judgment. In any such enforcement proceeding, the Parties may seek whatever equitable or legal remedies to which they are entitled for failure to comply with this Agreement, including their attorneys' fees and costs.

6. SUBSEQUENT SETTLEMENTS

If another party enters into a settlement agreement with EWW or CAG with respect to any allegations that such party caused exposures to Proposition 65-listed chemicals in jet engine exhaust without a Proposition 65 warning, the settling EWW or the settling CAG shall use good-faith efforts to ensure that no terms, conditions, or monetary payments of that settlement agreement are more favorable to such other party than those under this Agreement.

7. NOTICES

All correspondence or notices required to be provided pursuant to this Agreement shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (1) first-class, registered, certified mail, return receipt requested, or (2) overnight courier to the following addresses: (A Party, from time to time, may, pursuant to the methods prescribed above, specify a change of address to which all future notices and other communications shall be sent.)

To Defendants:

Counsel of Record for Each Defendant.
As provided on the signature pages.

To EWW:

Anthony G. Graham
Graham & Martin LLP
950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

To CAG:

Roy Penuela
Law Firm of Roy Penuela
4555 Ellenboro Way
Woodland Hills, CA 91364-5666

To EWW's Former Counsel (Yeroushalmi & Associates):

Reuben Yeroushalmi
Yeroushalmi & Associates
3700 Wilshire Blvd.
Suite 480
Los Angeles, CA 90010

8. INTEGRATION

This Agreement constitutes the final and complete agreement of the Parties, as incorporated in the Proposed Consent Judgment, with respect to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous negotiations, promises, covenants, agreements or representations concerning any matters directly, indirectly or collaterally related to the subject matter of this Agreement. The Parties have included, expressly and intentionally, in this Agreement all collateral or additional agreements that may, in any manner, touch or relate to any of the subject matter of this Agreement and, therefore, all promises, covenants and agreements, collateral or otherwise, are included herein and therein. The Parties intend that this Agreement shall constitute an integration of all their agreements, and each understands that in the event of any subsequent litigation, controversy or dispute concerning any of its terms, conditions or provisions, no party hereto shall be permitted to offer or introduce any oral or extrinsic evidence concerning any other collateral or oral agreement between the Parties not included herein.

9. TIMING

Time of Essence. Time is of the essence in the performance of the terms hereof.

10. COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Reporting Forms; Presentation to Attorney General. EWW and CAG shall comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Cal. Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f).

11. COUNTERPARTS

Counterparts. This Agreement may be signed in counterparts and shall be binding upon the Parties as if all Parties executed the original hereof.

12. WAIVER

No Waiver. No waiver by any Party of any provision hereof shall be deemed to be a waiver of any other provision hereof or of any subsequent breach of the same or any other provision hereof.

13. POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

13.1 Within fifteen (15) days following execution by the Parties of the Agreement, the Parties shall seek consolidation of the EWW Action and CAG Action (if such actions have not already been consolidated), and shall use good faith efforts to obtain an order from the Court consolidating the actions.

13.2 The Parties shall submit a Proposed Consent Judgment to the Superior Court, County of San Francisco for approval on noticed motion pursuant to Cal. Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f) no later than sixty (60) days following execution of the Agreement by the Parties. All Parties shall cooperate in good faith in the submission of the Proposed Consent Judgment to the Court.

13.3 All Parties agree to cooperate in good faith in implementing the terms of this Agreement and in seeking judicial approval of the Proposed Consent Judgment and all terms of this Agreement.

14. AMENDMENT

In Writing. No Party may amend or modify this Agreement except by a writing executed by the Parties that expresses, by its terms, an intention to modify this Agreement.

15. SUCCESSORS

Binding Upon Successors. This Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of, and be enforceable by, the Parties and their respective administrators, trustees, executors, personal representatives, successors and permitted assigns.

16. CHOICE OF LAWS

California Law Applies. Any dispute regarding the interpretation of this Agreement, the performance of the Parties pursuant to the terms of this Agreement, or the damages accruing to a Party because of any breach of this Agreement shall be determined under the laws of the State of California, without reference to principles of choice of laws.

17. NO ADMISSIONS

The Parties have reached this Agreement to avoid the costs of prolonged litigation. By entering into this Agreement, the Parties do not admit any issue of law, including any violation of Proposition 65. No one shall deem this Agreement to be an admission or concession of liability or culpability by any Party, at any time, for any purpose. EWW and CAG do not foreclose any right to demand warnings from other airline entities that are more expansive and/or comprehensive than those described herein. No one shall construe this Agreement, any document referred to herein, or any action taken to carry out this Agreement, as giving rise to any presumption or inference of admission or concession by Defendants as to any fault, wrongdoing, or liability.

18. REPRESENTATION

Construction of Agreement. The Parties each acknowledge and warrant that independent counsel of its own selection represented it in connection with the prosecution and defense of the Actions, the negotiations leading to this Agreement and the drafting of this

Agreement; and that in interpreting this Agreement, the terms of this Agreement will not be construed either in favor of or against any Party.

19. ADDITIONAL POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

The Parties agree to mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this Agreement and obtain approval of the Proposed Consent Judgment by the Court in a timely manner. The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §25249.7, a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment. Accordingly, the Parties agree to file a Motion to Approve the Agreement (“Motion”). Defendants shall have no additional responsibility to counsel for EWV or CAG or to Yeroushalmi & Associates pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 or otherwise with regard to reimbursement of any fees and costs incurred with respect to the preparation and filing of the Motion or with regard to counsel appearing for a hearing thereon.

20. COUNTERPARTS

This Agreement may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or e-mail, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

21. AUTHORIZATION

Authority to Enter Agreement. Each of the signatories hereto certifies that he or she is authorized by the party he or she represents to enter into this Agreement, to stipulate to the Agreement, and to execute and approve the Agreement on behalf of the party represented.

THE SPACE BELOW IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK:

PROPOSITION 65

The California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, also known as Proposition 65, requires that businesses provide warnings about exposures to chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm. A list of chemicals that are known to the State to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm is published by the Governor. The list can be found at

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html

Materials at or around [Airline] facilities, such as jet engine exhaust, contain chemicals that are on the State's Proposition 65 list. Additional information regarding chemicals at this facility can be found in the Material Safety Data Sheets.

Warning signs are posted in certain areas pursuant to Proposition 65. These warnings state:

WARNING: This area contains chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

EXHIBIT 2

ORIGINAL

RECD JUL 07 2009

1 GRAHAM & MARTIN, LLP
2 Anthony G. Graham (SBN 148682)
3 Michael J. Martin (SBN 171757)
4 950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220
5 Costa Mesa, CA 92626
6 Telephone: (714) 850-9390
7 Facsimile: (714) 850-9392
8 AnthonyGGraham@msn.com

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

11 LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA
12 Roy Penuela (SBN 107267)
13 3303 Castleman Lane
14 Burbank Hills, CA 91504-1630
15 Telephone: (818) 843-8435
16 lalawyer@lawyer.com

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff
18 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

19 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

20 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

21 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 AEROFLOT, et al.,

25 Defendants.

26 AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS.

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

JUL 27 2009

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk

BY: *Magdalena M. Martinez*
Deputy Clerk

LEE LAW GROUP
Robert Y. Lee (SBN 213848)
3699 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Telephone: (213) 383-5400
admin@lgcounsel.com

Case Nos.: 06-455658 (Consolidated
with Case Nos. 05-439749, 05-447903,
06-452413, 07-462756)

~~PROPOSED~~ STIPULATED
JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO
AMENDED TERMS OF
STIPULATION AND ORDER RE:
CONSENT JUDGMENT
(PASSENGER)

Date: January 27, 2009
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Department: 220
Judge: Hon. A. James Robertson

1 In the above-entitled action, Plaintiff Environmental World Watch, Inc.,
2 (“EWW”), Plaintiff Consumer Advocacy Group (“CAG”), Yeroushalmi & Associates (former
3 counsel of record for EWW), and Defendants Air Canada, Air Wisconsin Airlines Corp., Alaska
4 Airlines, Inc., America West Airlines, Inc., American Airlines, Inc., American Eagle Airlines,
5 Inc., Continental Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., Eva Airways Corp., Frontier Airlines, Inc.,
6 Hawaiian Airlines Inc., Horizon Air Industries, Inc., JetBlue Airways Corp., Mesa Air Group
7 Inc., Midwest Air Group Inc. (a.k.a. Midwest Airlines), MN Airlines, LLC dba Sun Country,
8 Sky West, Inc., Southwest Airlines Co., United Air Lines, Inc., Aer Lingus, Limited, Air France,
9 Air India, Ltd., Air New Zealand, Ltd., Air Tahiti Nui, All Nippon Airways, Asiana Airlines,
10 British Airways, Plc, Air China; Aeromexico, Aerolitoral, Air Jamaica, Air Pacific, AirTran
11 Airways, Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd., COPA, El Al Israel Airlines, Korean Air Lines, LAN
12 Airlines, Lufthansa German Airlines, LTU International, Malaysia Airlines, Philippine Air
13 Lines, Spirit Airlines, TACA International Airlines, S.A., Thai Airways, WestJet, China Airlines,
14 Ltd., HMY Airways, Inc., Japan Airlines International Company, Ltd., KLM Royal Dutch
15 Airlines, Mexicana Airlines, Qantas Airways Limited, Singapore Airlines, Limited, Swiss
16 International Air Lines, Ltd., Virgin Atlantic Airways Limited, China Southern Airlines, Inc.,
17 China Eastern Airlines Co., Ltd., Aeroflot-Russian Airlines, and Allegiant Airlines (collectively
18 with plaintiffs, referred to as “Parties”), having agreed through their respective counsel that
19 judgment be entered pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Re: Consent
20 Judgment entered into by the Parties and lodged concurrently herewith, and after consideration
21 of the papers submitted and the arguments presented, the Court finds that when modified as set
22 forth herein, the settlement agreement set out in the Consent Judgment meets the criteria
23 established by Senate Bill 471, in that:

- 24 1. The health hazard warning that is required by the Stipulation and
25 [Proposed] Order Re: Consent Judgment complies with Health & Safety Code section 25249.7;
- 26 2. The reimbursement of fees and costs to be paid pursuant to the Parties’
27 Consent Judgment is reasonable under California law; and
- 28 3. The payment pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(b) is

1 reasonable.

2 The parties stipulate that the Settlement Agreement and Release from March 2008
3 be modified as follows.

4 • **Section 2.3 (not including section 2.3.1) is stricken in its entirety, and**
5 **replaced with the following:**

6 **2.3 Jetway Warning Signage.** For each Covered Facility, the Defendants
7 that operate a jetway at that facility shall ensure a warning sign is posted in or at
8 the entrance to each jetway where it has control over the signage in or at that
9 jetway. The sign required under this subsection shall be posted within thirty (30)
10 business days of the Effective Date. A sign posted under this subsection shall be
11 posted in the jetway, as close to the door of the airplane as can be done without
12 interfering in jetway or airplane operations. The warning shall be on an 8 1/2" by
13 11" sign, in black and white or equally contrasting colors, in the largest font that
14 will fit while leaving a one-inch margin. The word "WARNING" will be
15 centered at the top.

16 A warning sign under this subsection must conform to one of the
17 following options:

18 Option 1: WARNING
19 Chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects,
20 and other reproductive harm are present in jet engine exhaust, fumes from
jet fuel, and exhaust from equipment used to service airplanes. Sometimes
these chemicals enter this jetway.

21 Option 2: WARNING
22 The air in and around this jetway sometimes contains jet engine exhaust,
23 fumes from jet fuel, and exhaust from equipment used to service airplanes.
Those substances contain chemicals known to the state to cause cancer,
birth defects and other reproductive harm.

24 As to both options, use of the phrase "known to the state to cause" may be
25 replaced by "known to cause" or "that cause," at the defendant's option.

26 In addition to containing the text from either option 1 or option 2, the
27 warning may also include at the bottom of the sign the following
28 additional language: "Given pursuant to California Proposition 65."

1 • A new Section 3.5 is added, which provides as follows:

2 3.5 Additional Releases

3 3.5.1 Covenant Not to Sue and Release of Yeroushalmi & Associates and
4 Reuben Yeroushalmi

5 3.5.1.1 For and in consideration of the terms and conditions stated in the
6 Settlement Agreement and Release, on behalf of themselves and their past, present, and future
7 attorneys (including but not limited to Reuben Yeroushalmi), partners, associates, proprietors,
8 co-venturers, joint venturers, officers, employees, directors, members, shareholders, contractors,
9 representatives, agents and assigns, Yeroushalmi & Associates and Reuben Yeroushami hereby
10 covenant not to sue nor to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, arising out of or
11 related in any way to the EWW and CAG Actions, any form of legal action against CAG, Roy
12 Penuela and their past, present, and future partners, associates, proprietors, co-venturers, joint
13 venturers, officers, employees, directors, members, shareholders, contractors, representatives,
14 agents and assigns, and hereby release and forever discharge CAG, Roy Penuela and their past,
15 present, and future partners, associates, proprietors, co-venturers, joint venturers, officers,
16 employees, directors, members, shareholders, contractors, representatives, agents and assigns
17 from any and all claims of any nature without limitation, liens, demands, indemnity, damages,
18 actions, causes of action or suits or appeals of any kind or nature whatsoever, both known or
19 unknown, which have resulted in the past or may develop in the future arising out of or related in
20 any way to the EWW and CAG Actions. This Release of all claims is specifically intended to
21 include, but shall not be limited to, any and all claims for expenses (including, but not limited to,
22 attorney's fees, deposition costs, filing fees, law clerk expenses, secretarial expenses, rent
23 expenses, computer expenses, legal research expenses, library expenses, investigative fees,
24 consultant or expert fees, photocopy expenses, telephone expenses, fax expenses, travel
25 expenses, lodging and food expenses, mileage expenses,) costs, indemnity in all its forms,
26 negligence, professional negligence, fraud, damages of any nature, past, present, or future,
27 including contractual, compensatory, general, special, punitive, and injunctive relief, and relief
28 of any other kind arising out of or in any way related to the EWW and CAG Actions.

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

3.5.1.2 Yeroushalmi & Associates and Reuben Yeroushalmi expressly waive and relinquish all rights and benefits which they have, or in the future may have, conferred upon them by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

Yeroushalmi & Associates and Reuben Yeroushalmi understand and acknowledge, in particular, that the significance and consequence of their waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542 is that even if Yeroushalmi & Associates and Reuben Yeroushalmi, with respect to the matters in the EWW and CAG Actions and to the matters in any way related to the EWW and CAG Actions, any person or entity on whose behalf Yeroushalmi & Associates or Reuben Yeroushalmi purports to act, suffers future damages or harm arising out of or resulting from the Released Claims, Yeroushalmi & Associates, Reuben Yeroushalmi, and anyone on whose behalf each purports to act, will not be able to make any claim for relief against CAG or Roy Penuela or any person or entity benefitting from this Release.

3.5.1.3 Yeroushalmi & Associates and Reuben Yeroushalmi acknowledge that they intend these consequences for any relief, which may exist as of the date of this release but which they do not know to exist, and which, if known would materially affect Yeroushalmi & Associates' or Reuben Yeroushalmi's decision to enter into this Settlement Agreement and Release, regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause, no matter how justifiable such cause may be.

3.5.1.4 Yeroushalmi & Associates and Reuben Yeroushalmi further acknowledge that Yeroushalmi & Associates and Reuben Yeroushalmi may later discover facts and law in addition to or different from those facts and law now known or believed to be true, but it is Yeroushalmi & Associates, and Reuben Yeroushalmi's intention to fully and forever release any

1 and all matters, disputes and differences, known and unknown, suspected and unsuspected,
2 which now exist, may later exist, or may previously have existed. This Release shall remain in
3 effect as a full and complete general release notwithstanding the discovery or existence of any
4 such additional or different facts or law.

5 **3.5.2 Covenant Not to Sue and Release of Roy Penuela**

6 **3.5.2.1** For and in consideration of the terms and conditions stated in the
7 Settlement Agreement and Release, on behalf of himself and his past, present, and future
8 attorneys, partners, associates, proprietors, co-venturers, joint venturers, officers, employees,
9 directors, members, shareholders, contractors, representatives, agents and assigns, Roy Penuela
10 and the Law Firm of Roy Penuela hereby covenant not to sue nor to institute or participate in,
11 directly or indirectly, arising out of or related in any way to the EWW and CAG Actions, any
12 form of legal action against Yeroushalmi & Associates, Reuben Yeroushalmi, and their past,
13 present, and future partners, associates, proprietors, co-venturers, joint venturers, officers,
14 employees, directors, members, shareholders, contractors, representatives, agents and assigns,
15 and hereby releases and forever discharges Yeroushalmi & Associates, Reuben Yeroushalmi,
16 and their past, present, and future partners, associates, proprietors, co-venturers, joint venturers,
17 officers, employees, directors, members, shareholders, contractors, representatives, agents and
18 assigns from any and all claims of any nature without limitation, liens, demands, indemnity,
19 damages, actions, causes of action or suits or appeals of any kind or nature whatsoever, both
20 known or unknown, which have resulted in the past or may develop in the future arising out of or
21 related in any way to the EWW and CAG Actions. This Release of all claims is specifically
22 intended to include, but shall not be limited to, any and all claims for expenses (including, but
23 not limited to, attorney's fees, deposition costs, filing fees, law clerk expenses, secretarial
24 expenses, rent expenses, computer expenses, legal research expenses, library expenses,
25 investigative fees, consultant or expert fees, photocopy expenses, telephone expenses, fax
26 expenses, travel expenses, lodging and food expenses, mileage expenses,) costs, indemnity in all
27 its forms, negligence, professional negligence, fraud, damages of any nature, past, present, or
28 future, including contractual, compensatory, general, special, punitive, and injunctive relief, and

1 relief of any other kind arising out of or in any way related to the EWW and CAG Actions.

2 3.5.2.2 Roy Penuela and the Law Firm of Roy Penuela expressly waive and
3 relinquish all rights and benefits which they have, or in the future may have, conferred upon
4 them by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as
5 follows:

6 A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS
7 WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT
8 TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF
9 EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM
 OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR
 HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

10 3.5.2.3 Roy Penuela understands and acknowledges, in particular, that the
11 significance and consequence of his waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542 is that even if
12 Roy Penuela and the Law Firm of Roy Penuela, with respect to the matters in the EWW and
13 CAG Actions and to the matters in any way related to the EWW and CAG Actions, any person
14 or entity on whose behalf Roy Penuela purports to act, suffers future damages or harm arising
15 out of or resulting from the Released Claims, Roy Penuela, and anyone on whose behalf each
16 purports to act, will not be able to make any claim for relief against Yeroushalmi & Associates
17 and Reuben Yeroushalmi or any person or entity benefitting from this Release.

18 3.5.2.4 Roy Penuela acknowledges that he intends these consequences for any
19 relief, which may exist as of the date of this release but which they do not know to exist, and
20 which, if known would materially affect Roy Penuela's decision to enter into this Settlement
21 Agreement and Release, regardless of whether his lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance,
22 oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause, no matter how justifiable such cause may be.

23 3.5.2.5 Roy Penuela and the Law Firm of Roy Penuela further acknowledge that
24 Roy Penuela and the Law Firm of Roy Penuela may later discover facts and law in addition to or
25 different from those facts and law now known or believed to be true, but it is Roy Penuela's and
26 the Law Firm of Roy Penuela's intention to fully and forever release any and all matters,
27 disputes and differences, known and unknown, suspected and unsuspected, which now exist,
28 may later exist, or may previously have existed. This Release shall remain in effect as a full and

1 complete general release notwithstanding the discovery or existence of any such additional or
2 different facts or law.

3 • **The first sentence of Section 4.1.1.1 is stricken in its entirety, and**
4 **replaced with the following:**

5 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, each Defendant
6 shall pay Three Thousand Three-Hundred Eight Dollars and 83 Cents
7 (\$3,308.83) to EWW (an organization dedicated to furthering Proposition
8 65 compliance). The funds to be paid to Plaintiff EWW are to be used to
9 reimburse Mr. Dunlap.

10 • **Section 4.1.2 is stricken in its entirety, and replaced with the**
11 **following:**

12 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, each Defendant
13 shall pay Two Thousand Five Hundred Seventy -Three Dollars and Fifty-
14 Three Cents (\$2,573.53) to Graham & Martin LLP. Defendant shall make
15 payment payable to EWW within 30 days after the Effective Date to
16 "Graham & Martin LLP", at the following address: Graham & Martin
17 LLP, 950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220, Costa Mesa, CA 92626.
18 Defendant shall have no further obligation to reimburse EWW or EWW's
19 past, present, and future attorneys (including but not limited to
20 Yeroushalmi & Associates), officers, employees, directors, members,
21 shareholders, representatives, contractors, agents and assigns, for any fees
22 and costs associated with the Actions.

23 • **The first sentence of section 4.1.3.4 is stricken in its entirety, and**
24 **replaced with the following:**

25 From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, each Defendant
26 shall pay attorneys fees and costs to Yeroushalmi & Associates a total of
27 Thirteen Thousand Five Hundred Twenty-Nine Dollars and Forty-One
28 Cents (\$13,529.41), pursuant to application to the Court as part of the

1 Proposed Consent Judgment, which represents reimbursement of past,
2 present, and future attorneys' fees and costs relating to or arising out of
3 any of the Actions.

- 4 • A new section 4.1.4 is added, which provides as follows:


5 **4.1.4 Payment to Public Health Trust**

6 **4.1.4.1** From the total settlement payment set out in Section 4.1, each
7 Defendant shall pay Five Thousand Five Hundred Eighty-Eight Dollars
8 and Twenty-Four Cents (\$5,588.24) to Public Health Trust, which
9 represents a payment in lieu of civil penalties. The payment in lieu of a
10 civil penalty shall be used for projects and purposes related to
11 environmental protection, worker health and safety, or education of human
12 exposure to hazardous substances, as Public Health Trust may choose.
13 Public Health Trust, including its attorneys, agents, representatives,
14 members, officers, employees, or investigators, may not use any part of
15 this payment to finance any future Proposition 65 litigation or
16 investigative activities regarding potential Proposition 65 issues,
17 compliance, or litigation arising out of or against Defendant or the airline
18 industry. Defendant shall make payment payable to Public Health Trust
19 within 30 days after the Effective Date, mailed to Brenda Drake, Director,
20 Public Health Trust, 2201 Broadway, Suite 502, Oakland, CA 94612.

21 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that judgment be entered in this case, in accordance
22 with the terms of the Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Re: Consent Judgment, lodged
23 concurrently herewith, as modified herein.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: JUL 27 2009

26 
A. JAMES ROBERTSON, II
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

27 A. JAMES ROBERTSON, II
28

1 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

2 DATED: June 29, 2009

GRAHAM & MARTIN

3

By:

Anthony G. Graham

Anthony G. Graham
Attorneys for Plaintiff

ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

5

6

7 DATED: June __, 2009

LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA

8

By:

Roy Penuela
Attorneys for Plaintiff

CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

9

10

11 DATED: June __, 2009

LEE LAW GROUP

12

13

By:

Robert Y. Lee
Attorneys for Plaintiff

CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

14

15

16

17

DATED: June __, 2009

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

18

19

By:

R Raymond Rothman
Attorneys for Defendants

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

AIR CANADA, AIR WISCONSIN AIRLINES CORP.,
ALASKA AIRLINES, INC., AMERICA WEST AIRLINES,
INC., AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., AMERICAN EAGLE
AIRLINES, INC., CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.,
DELTA AIR LINES, INC., FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.,
HAWAIIAN AIRLINES INC., HORIZON AIR
INDUSTRIES, INC., JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORP., MESA
AIR GROUP INC., MIDWEST AIR GROUP INC. (A.K.A.
MIDWEST AIRLINES), MN AIRLINES, LLC DBA SUN
COUNTRY, SKY WEST, INC., SOUTHWEST AIRLINES
CO., AND UNITED AIR LINES, INC.

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

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: June __, 2009

GRAHAM & MARTIN


By: _____

Anthony G. Graham
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

DATED: June 27, 2009

LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA


By: _____


Roy Penuela
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

DATED: June 30, 2009

LEE LAW GROUP

By: _____


Robert Y. Lee
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

DATED: June __, 2009

BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

By: _____

R Raymond Rothman
Attorneys for Defendants
AIR CANADA, AIR WISCONSIN AIRLINES CORP.,
ALASKA AIRLINES, INC., AMERICA WEST AIRLINES,
INC., AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., AMERICAN EAGLE
AIRLINES, INC., CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.,
DELTA AIR LINES, INC., FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.,
HAWAIIAN AIRLINES INC., HORIZON AIR
INDUSTRIES, INC., JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORP., MESA
AIR GROUP INC., MIDWEST AIR GROUP INC. (A.K.A.
MIDWEST AIRLINES), MN AIRLINES, LLC DBA SUN
COUNTRY, SKY WEST, INC., SOUTHWEST AIRLINES
CO., AND UNITED AIR LINES, INC.

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

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: June __, 2009 GRAHAM & MARTIN

By: _____
Anthony G. Graham
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.

DATED: June __, 2009 LAW FIRM OF ROY PENUELA

By: _____
Roy Penuela
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

DATED: June __, 2009 LEE LAW GROUP

By: _____
Robert Y. Lee
Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.

DATED: ^{July} ~~June~~ 7, 2009 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

By: Rich Rothman, JES
R Raymond Rothman
Attorneys for Defendants
AIR CANADA, AIR WISCONSIN AIRLINES CORP.,
ALASKA AIRLINES, INC., AMERICA WEST AIRLINES,
INC., AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC., AMERICAN EAGLE
AIRLINES, INC., CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.,
DELTA AIR LINES, INC., FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.,
HAWAIIAN AIRLINES INC., HORIZON AIR
INDUSTRIES, INC., JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORP., MESA
AIR GROUP INC., MIDWEST AIR GROUP INC. (A.K.A.
MIDWEST AIRLINES), MN AIRLINES, LLC DBA SUN
COUNTRY, SKY WEST, INC., SOUTHWEST AIRLINES
CO., AND UNITED AIR LINES, INC.

1 DATED: June 29, 2009

CONDON & FORSYTH LLP

2
3 By:

Rod D. Margo

Rod D. Margo

Attorneys for Defendants

4 AER LINGUS, LIMITED, AIR FRANCE, AIR INDIA,
5 LTD., AIR NEW ZEALAND, LTD., AIR TAHITI NUI, ALL
6 NIPPON AIRWAYS, ASIANA AIRLINES, BRITISH
7 AIRWAYS, PLC, AIR CHINA; AEROMEXICO,
8 AEROLITORAL, AIR JAMAICA, AIR PACIFIC,
9 AIRTRAN AIRWAYS, CATHAY PACIFIC AIRWAYS
10 LTD., COPA, EL AL ISRAEL AIRLINES, EVA AIRWAYS
11 CORP., KOREAN AIR LINES, LAN AIRLINES,
12 LUFTHANSA GERMAN AIRLINES, LTU
13 INTERNATIONAL, MALAYSIA AIRLINES, PHILIPPINE
14 AIR LINES, SPIRIT AIRLINES, TACA INTERNATIONAL
15 AIRLINES, S.A., THAI AIRWAYS, WESTJET, CHINA
16 AIRLINES, LTD., HMY AIRWAYS, INC., JAPAN
17 AIRLINES INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LTD., KLM
18 ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES, MEXICANA AIRLINES,
19 QANTAS AIRWAYS LIMITED, SINGAPORE AIRLINES,
20 LIMITED, SWISS INTERNATIONAL AIR LINES, LTD.,
21 AND VIRGIN ATLANTIC AIRWAYS LIMITED

13 DATED: June __, 2009

AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP

14
15 By:

Gregory R. McClintock

Attorneys for Defendant

AEROFLOT-RUSSIAN AIRLINES

16
17 DATED: June __, 2009

ARCHER NORRIS

18
19 By:

John L. Kortum

Attorneys for Defendant

CHINA EASTERN AIRLINES CO., LTD.

20
21
22 Of Counsel:

Evelyn D. Sahr, Esq.

Laura G. Stover, Esq.

ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT, LLC

1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

12th Floor

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: 202 659 6622

23
24
25
26 Fax : 202 659 6699
27
28

1 DATED: June __, 2009

CONDON & FORSYTH LLP

2
3 By:

Rod D. Margo


Attorneys for Defendants

4 AER LINGUS, LIMITED, AIR FRANCE, AIR INDIA,
5 LTD., AIR NEW ZEALAND, LTD., AIR TAHITI NUI, ALL
6 NIPPON AIRWAYS, ASIANA AIRLINES, BRITISH
7 AIRWAYS, PLC, AIR CHINA; AEROMEXICO,
8 AEROLITORAL, AIR JAMAICA, AIR PACIFIC,
9 AIRTRAN AIRWAYS, CATHAY PACIFIC AIRWAYS
10 LTD., COPA, EL AL ISRAEL AIRLINES, EVA AIRWAYS
11 CORP., KOREAN AIR LINES, LAN AIRLINES,
12 LUFTHANSA GERMAN AIRLINES, LTU
13 INTERNATIONAL, MALAYSIA AIRLINES, PHILIPPINE
14 AIR LINES, SPIRIT AIRLINES, TACA INTERNATIONAL
15 AIRLINES, S.A., THAI AIRWAYS, WESTJET, CHINA
16 AIRLINES, LTD., HMY AIRWAYS, INC., JAPAN
17 AIRLINES INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LTD., KLM
18 ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES, MEXICANA AIRLINES,
19 QANTAS AIRWAYS LIMITED, SINGAPORE AIRLINES,
20 LIMITED, SWISS INTERNATIONAL AIR LINES, LTD.,
21 AND VIRGIN ATLANTIC AIRWAYS LIMITED

13 DATED: *July 6*
~~June~~ 2009

AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP

15 By:



Gregory R. McClintock
Attorneys for Defendant

ABROFLOT-RUSSIAN AIRLINES

18 DATED: June __, 2009

ARCHER NORRIS

19 By:

John L. Kortum

Attorneys for Defendant

CHINA EASTERN AIRLINES CO., LTD.

22 Of Counsel:

23 Evelyn D. Sahr, Esq.

Laura G. Stover, Esq.

24 ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT, LLC

1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

12th Floor

25 Washington, DC 20006

26 Telephone: 202 659 6622

27 Fax : 202 659 6699

1 DATED: June __, 2009

CONDON & FORSYTH LLP

2

By: _____

3

Rod D. Margo

Attorneys for Defendants

4

AER LINGUS, LIMITED, AIR FRANCE, AIR INDIA,
LTD., AIR NEW ZEALAND, LTD., AIR TAHITI NUI, ALL
5 NIPPON AIRWAYS, ASIANA AIRLINES, BRITISH
AIRWAYS, PLC, AIR CHINA; AEROMEXICO,
6 AEROLITORAL, AIR JAMAICA, AIR PACIFIC,
AIRTRAN AIRWAYS, CATHAY PACIFIC AIRWAYS
7 LTD., COPA, EL AL ISRAEL AIRLINES, EVA AIRWAYS
CORP., KOREAN AIR LINES, LAN AIRLINES,
8 LUFTHANSA GERMAN AIRLINES, LTU
INTERNATIONAL, MALAYSIA AIRLINES, PHILIPPINE
9 AIR LINES, SPIRIT AIRLINES, TACA INTERNATIONAL
AIRLINES, S.A., THAI AIRWAYS, WESTJET, CHINA
10 AIRLINES, LTD., HMY AIRWAYS, INC., JAPAN
AIRLINES INTERNATIONAL COMPANY, LTD., KLM
11 ROYAL DUTCH AIRLINES, MEXICANA AIRLINES,
QANTAS AIRWAYS LIMITED, SINGAPORE AIRLINES,
12 LIMITED, SWISS INTERNATIONAL AIR LINES, LTD.,
AND VIRGIN ATLANTIC AIRWAYS LIMITED

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 DATED: June __, 2009

AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP

14

15

By: _____

Gregory R. McClintock

Attorneys for Defendant

AEROFLOT-RUSSIAN AIRLINES

16

17

18 DATED: ^{July 2} June __, 2009

ARCHER NORRIS

18

19

By: _____

John L. Kortum

Attorneys for Defendant

CHINA EASTERN AIRLINES CO., LTD.

20

21

22

Of Counsel:

Evelyn D. Sahr, Esq.

Laura G. Stover, Esq.

ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN & MELLOTT, LLC

1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

12th Floor

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: 202 659 6622

Fax : 202 659 6699

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 DATED: June 24 2009

REED SMITH LLP

2
3 By: Molly [Signature]
4 Jesse L. Miller
Attorneys for Defendant
CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES, INC.

5
6 DATED: June __, 2009

STANZLER FUNDERBURK & CASTELLON LLP

7 By: _____
8 William W. Funderburk, Jr.
Attorneys for Defendant
9 ALLEGIANT AIRLINES

10 DATED: June __, 2009

YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

11 By: _____
12 Reuben Yeroushalmi
13 YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 DATED: June __, 2009

REED SMITH LLP

2

By: _____

3

Jesse L. Miller

Attorneys for Defendant

CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES, INC.

4

5

DATED: June __, 2009

STANZLER FUNDERBURK & CASTELLON LLP

6

By: _____

7

William W. Funderburk, Jr.

Attorneys for Defendant

ALLEGiant AIRLINES

8

9

10 DATED: June __, 2009

YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

11

By: _____

12

Reuben Yeroushalmi

YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 DATED: June __, 2009

REED SMITH LLP

2

By: _____

3

Jesse L. Miller
Attorneys for Defendant
CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES, INC.

4

5

DATED: June __, 2009

STANZLER FUNDERBURK & CASTELLON LLP

6

By: _____

7

William W. Funderburk, Jr.
Attorneys for Defendant
ALLEGIANT AIRLINES

8

9


10 DATED: June __, 2009

YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

11

By: _____

12


Reuben Yeroushalmi
YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
R. Raymond Rothman (SBN 142437)
2 Todd O. Edmister (SBN 179085)
Seth Weisburst (SBN 259323)
3 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 4400
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3106
4 Telephone: 213.680.6400
Facsimile: 213.680.6499
5 Email: rick.rothman@bingham.com

ENDORSED
FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court
AUG 25 2009
GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk
BY: VERA MU
Deputy Clerk

6 Attorneys for Passsenger Carrier Defendants
AIR CANADA, AIR WISCONSIN AIRLINES
7 CORP., ALASKA AIRLINES, INC., AMERICA
WEST AIRLINES, INC., AMERICAN AIRLINES,
8 INC., AMERICAN EAGLE AIRLINES, INC.,
CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC., DELTA AIR
9 LINES, INC., EVERGREEN INTERNATIONAL
AIRLINES, INC., FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.,
10 HAWAIIAN AIRLINES INC., HORIZON AIR
INDUSTRIES, INC., JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORP.,
11 MESA AIR GROUP, INC., MIDWEST AIR GROUP,
INC. (A.K.A. MIDWEST AIRLINES), MN
12 AIRLINES, LLC DBA SUN COUNTRY AIRLINES,
SKY WEST, INC., SOUTHWEST AIRLINES CO.,
13 AND UNITED AIR LINES, INC.

14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
16

17 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.
18 Plaintiff,
19 v.
20 AEROFLOT, et al.,
21 Passenger Carrier Defendants.
22

Case No.: 06-455658 (consolidated with
case nos. 05-439749, 05-447903, 06-
452413, 07-462756)
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER MODIFYING
LANGUAGE IN CONSENT
JUDGMENT (PASSENGER)
Date: August 25, 2009
Time: 11:45 a.m.
Department: 502
Judge: Hon. A. James Robertson

23 AND CONSOLIDATED ACTIONS.
24
25
26

27 The Court, having fully considered the unopposed *ex parte* application of
28 Passenger Carrier Defendants Air Canada, Air Wisconsin Airlines Corp., Alaska Airlines, Inc.,
A/73115909.1/3002922-0000312672

1 America West Airlines, Inc., American Airlines, Inc., American Eagle Airlines, Inc., Continental
2 Airlines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Inc., Frontier Airlines, Inc., Hawaiian Airlines Inc., Horizon Air
3 Industries, Inc., JetBlue Airways Corp., Mesa Air Group Inc., Midwest Air Group Inc. (a.k.a.
4 Midwest Airlines), MN Airlines, LLC dba Sun Country, Sky West, Inc., Southwest Airlines Co.,
5 United Air Lines, Inc. (passenger carriers represented by Bingham McCutchen LLP), Aer
6 Lingus, Limited, Air France, Air India, Ltd., Air New Zealand, Ltd., Air Tahiti Nui, All Nippon
7 Airways, Asiana Airlines, British Airways, Plc, Air China; Aeromexico, Aerolitoral, Air
8 Jamaica, Air Pacific, AirTran Airways, Cathay Pacific Airways Ltd., COPA, El Al Israel
9 Airlines, Korean Air Lines, LAN Airlines, Lufthansa German Airlines, LTU International,
10 Malaysia Airlines, Philippine Air Lines, Spirit Airlines, TACA Airlines, Thai Airlines, WestJet,
11 China Airlines, Ltd., EVA Airways Corp., HMY Airways, Inc., Japan Airlines, KLM Royal
12 Dutch Airlines, Mexicana Airlines, Qantas Airways Limited, Singapore Airlines, Limited, Swiss
13 International Air Lines, Ltd., and Virgin Atlantic Airways Limited (international passenger
14 carriers represented by Condon & Forsyth LLP), and Aeroflot-Russian Airlines (a passenger
15 carrier represented by Akerman Senterfitt LLP), (collectively, "Passenger Carrier Defendants")
16 for an order modifying the "Passenger" consent judgment so as to replace the term "jetway" in
17 the agreed-upon warning signage with the term "jet bridge," upon good cause showing,
18 HEREBY ORDERS THAT:

19 1. Passenger Carrier Defendants' *ex parte* application for an order modifying
20 the "Passenger" consent judgment (order entered on July 21, 2009, Consent Judgment entered
21 July 27, 2009) to replace the trademarked term "jetway" with the generic term "jet bridge" in the
22 warning signs required by section 2.3 of the "Passenger" consent judgment is granted.

23 The warning sign language of section 2.3 ("**Jetway Warning Signage**") is
24 hereby modified *nunc pro tunc* to replace the two options formerly present in that Section with
25 the following two options:

26
27
28

