SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION RUSSELL BRIMER, Plaintiff, V. POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. Case No. C10-00171 REVISED PROPOSED JUDGMENT Date: January 19, 2011 Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 Action Filed: January 21, 2010	1 2 3 4 5 6	Jennifer Henry, State Bar No. 208221 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, California 94710-2565 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118	D. Water, Caputy Clerk
FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION RUSSELL BRIMER, Plaintiff, v. POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. Case No. C10-00171 REVISED PROPOSED JUDGMENT Date: January 19, 2011 Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 Action Filed: January 21, 2010			
10 11 12 RUSSELL BRIMER, 13 Plaintiff, v. POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive, 17 Defendants. Pofendants. Case No. C10-00171 REVISED PROPOSED JUDGMENT Date: January 19, 2011 Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
RUSSELL BRIMER, Plaintiff, v. POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. Case No. C10-00171 REVISED PROPOSED JUDGMENT Date: January 19, 2011 Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 Action Filed: January 21, 2010	10	FOR THE COUNTY	OF CONTRA COSTA
RUSSELL BRIMER, Plaintiff, v. POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. Poefendants. Case No. C10-00171 REVISED PROPOSED JUDGMENT Date: January 19, 2011 Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 Action Filed: January 21, 2010		UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
Plaintiff, v. POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. Plaintiff, v. POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. REVISED PROPOSED] JUDGMENT Date: January 19, 2011 Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 Action Filed: January 21, 2010 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	12		
Date: January 19, 2011 Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010	13		
POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DoEs 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. Time 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 33 Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	14	Í	Y)
DOES 1-150, inclusive, Defendants. Defendants. Judge: Hon. Steve Austin Action Filed: January 21, 2010 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	15		Time 9:00 a.m.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	16	DOES 1-150, inclusive,	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	17	Defendants.	Action Filed: January 21, 2010
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	18		<u>.</u>
21 22 23 24 25 26 27	19		
 22 23 24 25 26 27 	20		
 23 24 25 26 27 			
 24 25 26 27 			
252627	23		
26 27			•
27			
	ŀ	· ·	
28			
	28		

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

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

Now come Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER and Defendant POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC., having agreed through their respective counsel that judgment be entered pursuant to the terms of the Proposition 65 settlement agreement in the form of a Consent Judgment executed by the above-referenced parties, and following issuance of an order approving this Proposition 65 settlement agreement on January 19, 2011.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f)(4) and Code of Civil Procedure §664.6, judgment is entered in accordance with the terms of the Revised Consent Judgment attached hereto as Exhibit 1. By stipulation of the parties, the Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the settlement under Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _	MAR	01	2011	
----------	-----	----	------	--

STEVEN K. AUSTIN

Judge of the Contra Costa County Superior Court

1 2 3 4 5	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 Jennifer Henry, State Bar No. 208221 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565 Tel: (510) 848-8880 Fax: (510) 848-8118		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff RUSSELL BRIMER		
7 8 9	Andrew Lichtman, State Bar No. 71682 ATTORNEY AT LAW 255 South Grand Avenue #215 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Telephone: (949) 586-6666		
10	Attorneys for Defendant		
11	POWEŘMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.		
12	average cover of		
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
14	FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA		
15	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION		
16			
17	RUSSELL BRIMER,) Case No. C10-00171	
18	Plaintiff,) [PROPOSED] REVISED CONSENT) JUDGMENT	
19	v		
20	POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,))	
21	Defendants.))	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

[PROPOSED] REVISED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Russell Brimer and Powermax Battery (U.S.A.) Inc.

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Russell Brimer, who was and is, acting in the interest of the general public in California, (hereinafter "Brimer") and Powermax Battery (U.S.A.) Inc. (hereinafter "Powermax"), with Brimer and Powermax collectively referred to as the "Parties." The Parties also intend for this Consent Judgment to provide, to the maximum extent permitted by law, res judicata and/or collateral estoppel protection for Defendant against any and all other claims based upon the same or similar allegations to the Products and the Listed Chemical. This Consent Judgment was revised on or about December 10, 2010, in consultation with the California Office of the Attorney General for the Consent Judgment to unconditionally require that Powermax either reformulate the Products (as defined in Section 1.5 below) or provide Proposition 65-compliant warnings as described in Section 2 below.

1.2 Plaintiff

Brimer is an individual residing in California who seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer products.

1.3 Defendant

The Parties disagree whether Powermax is or has been, for purposes of this case, a person in the course of doing business under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"); i.e. whether Powermax has employed 10 or more persons, including full time and part-time employees. The last time Powermax employed more than nine persons was before July, 2009. The parties also disagree whether any such past time that Powermax employed more than nine persons was a time material to this case, such that Brimer could enforce Proposition 65 against Powermax in this case solely on the basis of those times.

1.4 General Allegations

Brimer alleges that, in addition to Powermax having sufficient employees to be subject to Proposition 65, Powermax has manufactured, distributed and/or sold in the State of California

flashlights that exposed people to an excessive amount of lead such that it was required to provide Proposition 65 warnings on its products. Lead is listed pursuant to Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm. Lead is referred to herein as the "Listed Chemical."

1.5 Product Description

The products that are covered by this Consent Judgment are defined as follows: flashlights containing the Listed Chemical such as, but not limited to, ACDelco Industrial Flashlight, Item #AC305/848026 (#6 83969 99243 4) and ACDelco Industrial Flashlight, Item #AC303. All such flashlights containing the Listed Chemical are referred to hereinafter as the "Products".

1.6 Notice of Violation

On or about September 30, 2009, Brimer served Powermax and various public enforcement agencies with documents entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" ("Notice") that provided Powermax and public enforcers with notice of alleged violations of Proposition 65 for failing to warn consumers that the Products that Powermax sold exposed users in California to the Listed Chemical. To the best of the parties' knowledge, no public enforcer (such as an attorney general) has diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notices. After receipt of the Notice, Powermax determined that it was not required to sell the Products in California with a Proposition 65 warning because it employed fewer than 10 persons.

1.7 Complaint

On or about January 21, 2010, Brimer, in the Superior Court in and for the County of Contra Costa, filed a complaint against Powermax Battery (U.S.A.) Inc. alleging violations of Proposition 65 by Powermax based on the alleged exposures to the Listed Chemical contained in the Products manufactured, distributed and/or offered for sale in California by Powermax ("Complaint"). On or about March 24, 2010, Brimer effected service of the complaint on Powermax.

1.8 No Admission

Powermax denies the material, factual and legal allegations contained in Brimer's Notice and maintains that all Products that it has manufactured, sold and/or distributed in California have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as

an admission by Powermax of any fact, finding, issue of law, or violation of law; nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Powermax of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by Powermax. However, this section shall not diminish or otherwise affect Powermax's obligations, responsibilities, or duties under this Consent Judgment.

1.9 Consent to Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over Powermax as to the allegations contained in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Contra Costa, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment.

1.10 Effective Date

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, except as otherwise noted, the term "Effective Date" shall mean July 30, 2010.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: WARNINGS AND REFORMULATION

2.1 Product Warnings

Beginning on January 14, 2011 (the "Compliance Date"), Powermax shall not sell, ship, or offer to be shipped for sale in California any Products containing lead unless at the time of such selling, shipping, or offering to sell, such Products are either: 1) sold or shipped with one of the clear and reasonable warnings required by the law at that time under Proposition 65 in compliance with the warnings set forth in subsections 2.1(a) and (b) below; or 2) in compliance with the reformulation standard set forth in Section 2.3. In achieving either option, Powermax shall be deemed in due compliance with Proposition 65. Beginning with the Compliance Date, each downstream customer of Powermax also shall be deemed in due compliance with Proposition 65 regarding such Products to the extent that either option has been achieved at the time of its selling, shipping, or offering any of them for sale in California.

(a) Retail Store Sales.

Each warning shall be prominently placed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices as to render it likely to be read and understood by an

(i)

Mail Order Catalog Warning. Any warning provided in a mail

28

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

2

order catalog must be in the same type size or larger than the Product description text within the catalog. The following warning shall be provided on the same page and in the same location as the display and/or description of the Product:

WARNING:

This product contains Lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

Where it is impracticable to provide the warning on the same page and in the same location as the display and/or description of the Product, Powermax may utilize a designated symbol (▼) to cross reference the applicable warning and shall define the term "designated symbol" with the following language on the inside of the front cover of the catalog or on the same page as any order form for the Product(s):

WARNING:

Certain products identified with this symbol ▼ and offered for sale in this catalog contain Lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

The designated symbol must appear on the same page and in close proximity to the display and/or description of the Product. On each page where the designated symbol appears, Powermax must provide a header or footer directing the reseller to the warning language and definition of the designated symbol.

If Powermax elects to provide warnings in the mail order catalog, then the warnings must be included in all catalogs offering to sell one or more Products printed after the date of entry of this Consent Judgment.

(ii) Internet Website Warning. A warning may be given in conjunction with the sale of the Product via the Internet, provided it appears either: (a) on the same web page on which the Product is displayed; (b) on the same web page as the order form for the Product; (c) on the same page as the price for any Product; or (d) on one or more web pages displayed to a purchaser during the checkout process. The following warning statement shall be used and shall appear in any of the above instances adjacent to or immediately following the display, description,

or price of the Product for which it is given in the same type size or larger than the Product description text:

WARNING:

This product contains Lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

Alternatively, the designated symbol may appear adjacent to or immediately following the display, description, or price of the Product for which a warning is being given, provided that the following warning statement also appears elsewhere on the same web page, as follows:

WARNING:

Products identified on this page with the following symbol contain Lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm: ▼

2.2 Exceptions To Warning Requirements

The warning requirements set forth in Section 2.1 shall not apply to Reformulated Products (as defined in Section 2.3 below).

2.3 Reformulation Standards

Reformulated Products are defined as those that contain no more than 100 parts per million ("ppm") of lead in any component that may be handled, touched or mouthed by a consumer, when analyzed pursuant to Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") testing methodologies 3050B and 6010B or any other method allowed by a federal or state agency to assess the content of lead in a solid substance and which yield less than 1.0 micrograms of lead when using a wipe test pursuant to NIOSH Test Method 9100.

3. MONETARY PAYMENTS

In settlement of all claims related to the Products and Listed Chemical referred to in the Complaint, and this Consent Judgment, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), Powermax shall pay a civil penalty totaling \$2,000 as follows: Powermax shall issue two separate checks for the Civil Penalty payment pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25192: (a) one check made payable to "The Chanler Group in Trust For The State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)" in the amount of \$1,500, representing 75% of the total penalty; and

1	
2	
3	ı
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	1

(b) one check to "The Chanler Group in Trust for Russell Brimer" in the amount of \$500, representing 25% of the total penalty. Two separate 1099s shall be issued for the above payments: (a) OEHHA, P.O. Box 4010, Sacramento, CA, 95814 (EIN: 68-0284486); and (b) Russell Brimer, whose information shall be provided five (5) calendar days before the payment is due.

Payment shall be delivered to Brimer's counsel on or before August 6, 2010 at the following address:

The Chanler Group
Attn: Proposition 65 Controller
2560 Ninth Street
Parker Plaza, Suite 214
Berkeley, CA 94710

4. REIMBURSEMENT OF FEES AND COSTS

4.1 Attorney Fees and Costs.

The Parties reached an accord on the compensation due to Brimer and his counsel under the private attorney general doctrine and principles of contract law. Under these legal principles, Powermax shall reimburse Brimer's counsel for fees and costs, incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Powermax's attention, negotiating a settlement in the public interest, and obtaining court approval of the settlement. Powermax shall pay Brimer and his counsel \$23,000 for all attorneys' fees, expert and investigation fees, and related costs. The payment shall be issued in a third separate check made payable to "The Chanler Group" and shall be delivered on or before August 6, 2010, at the following address:

The Chanler Group Attn: Proposition 65 Controller 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710

Powermax shall issue a separate 1099 for fees and cost paid in the amount of \$23,000 to The Chanler Group, 2560 Ninth Street, Parker Plaza, Suite 214, Berkeley, California, 94710 (EIN: 94-3171522).

2

3

5.

5.1 Brimer's Release of Powermax

RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, and for the payments to be made pursuant to Sections 3 and 4 above, Brimer on behalf of himself and in his representative capacity, his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, and in the interest of the general public, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases, as of the Compliance Date, all claims, including, without limitation, all actions, and causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses, or expenses (including, but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees, and attorney's fees) of any nature whatsoever. whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "claims"), against Powermax and its manufacturers, importers, wholesalers, licensors, licensees, auctioneers, retailers, distributors, franchisees, dealers, customers, owners, purchasers, users, parent companies, predecessors, successors, corporate affiliates, subsidiaries, and their respective officers, directors, attorneys, representatives, shareholders, agents, and employees, specifically including, but not limited to, Big Lots Stores, Inc., 99 Cent Only Stores, Inc., Dollar Tree, Inc., and Fry's Electronics, Inc. (collectively "Releasees"), that arise under Proposition 65, as such claims relate to Powermax's and/or the Releasees' alleged failure to warn about exposures to the Listed Chemical contained in the Products.

5.2 Powermax's Release of Brimer

Powermax, on behalf of itself and its Releasees, waives any and all claims against Brimer, his attorneys, and other representatives for any and all actions taken by Brimer and his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims or otherwise seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 against them in this matter, and/or with respect to the Products.

6. COURT APPROVAL

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by all Parties, in which event any monies that have been provided to

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

For Brimer: Proposition 65 Coordinator The Chanler Group 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214

Brimer, or his counsel pursuant to Section 3 and/or Section 4 above, shall be refunded within fifteen (15) days after receiving written notice from Powermax that the one year period has expired.

7. **SEVERABILITY**

If, subsequent to the execution of this Revised Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected, subject to the monetary refund provision of Section 6 above, if applicable.

GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and apply within the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, preempted, or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to the Products specifically, then Powermax may provide written notice to Brimer of any asserted change in the law, and shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, the Products are so affected.

9. NOTICES

Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (i) first-class, registered or certified mail, return receipt requested; or (ii) overnight courier on any party by the other party at the following addresses:

For Powermax:

Andrew Lichtman, Esq. Attorney at Law 255 South Grand Avenue #215 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Berkeley, CA 94710

Any party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other party a change of address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent. The Parties intend and agree that this Consent Judgment shall be given full effect for purposes of precluding claims regarding the Products against Powermax or the Releasees under Proposition 65 as covered under the release in Section 5 of this Consent Judgment.

10. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE SIGNATURES

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile and by electronic signature or pdf, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(f)

Brimer agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(f) and any applicable provisions of the Occupational Safety Health Act ("OSH Act").

12. ADDITIONAL POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7 and any applicable provisions of the OSH Act, a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment. In furtherance of obtaining such approval, Brimer, Powermax and their respective counsel agree to mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this agreement as a Consent Judgment and obtain approval of the Consent Judgment by the Court in a timely manner. Brimer shall prepare and file all documents necessary to obtain court approval of this Consent Judgment. For purposes of this paragraph, best efforts shall include, at a minimum, cooperating on the drafting and filing any papers in support of the required motion for judicial approval.

13. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified only: (1) by written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court thereon; or (2) upon a successful motion of any party and entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court.

1	14 AUTHORIZATION	
2	The undersigned are authorized to	execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their
3	respective Parties and have read, understoo	od, and agree to all of the terms and conditions hereof.
4	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
5	Date: /2 - 13 10	Date:
6		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7 8	By:	By:
9	Russell Brimer	, President
10		POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC.
11	·•	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
13		
14	Date:	
15		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
16		
17		/
18		
19		•
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

[PROPOSED] REVISED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	14 AUTHORIZATION	
2	The undersigned are authorize	ed to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their
3	respective Parties and have read, unde	erstood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions hereof.
4	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO: /
5	Date: 2	Date: 12/13/2016
6		AGREED TO: 13/2016
7	By: K	$=$ \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim
8		By:
()	Russell Brimer	, President
10	5.	POWERMAX BATTERY (U.S.A.) INC
11		
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
13		
14	Date:	The state of the s
15		JUDGE OF HIL SUPERIOR COURT
16		
17		/
19		
20		
21		
22		•
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

(PROPOSI DI RI VISI D CONSENT JUDGMENT