

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 03/12/2012

TIME: 09:00:00 AM

DEPT: C-75

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Richard E. L. Strauss

CLERK: Herlinda Chavarin

REPORTER/ERM: Not Reported

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: Don Nicholas

CASE NO: **37-2011-00100778-CU-NP-CTL** CASE INIT.DATE: 11/08/2011

CASE TITLE: **Parker vs. Dyno LLC [IMAGED]**

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Non-PI/PD/WD tort - Other

EVENT TYPE: Motion Hearing (Civil)

MOVING PARTY: Maureen Parker

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion - Other to Consent Judgment, 01/09/2012

APPEARANCES

THIS BEING THE TIME SET FOR ORAL ARGUMENT ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

There is no appearance by either party.

The Court CONFIRMS the tentative ruling as follows:

The unopposed Motion to Approve Proposition 65 Settlement and Stipulation and Order Re: Consent Judgment is GRANTED. The Court has reviewed the Motion and finds that the proposed settlement meets the requirements set forth in Health & Safety Code §25249.7(f)(4)(A)-(C). The injunctive terms/warning required by the settlement comply with Proposition 65, and the penalty and requested attorneys' fees are reasonable. Thus, the settlement is approved and the Consent Judgment is entered.



Judge Richard E. L. Strauss

JAN 09 12 PM 02:19

Stephen Ure, Esq., (CSB# 188244)
LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN URE, PC
1518 Sixth Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619-235-5400
Facsimile: 619-235-5404

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Maureen Parker

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

MAUREEN PARKER,

Plaintiff

**DYNO, LLC dba
DYNO MERCHANDISE**

Defendant.

CASE NO.:
37-2011-00100778-CU-NP-CTL

**[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING
STIPULATION AND ORDER RE:
CONSENT JUDGMENT**

Date: February 24, 2012
Time: 09:00 AM
Dept. C-75
Hon. Richard E.L. Strauss
Action Filed: November 8, 2011

Plaintiff, Maureen Parker and Defendant, Dyno, LLC, d/b/a Dyno Merchandise, having agreed through their respective counsel that judgment be entered pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation and Order Re: Consent Judgment entered into by the parties, and attached to the Judgment pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation and Order Re: Consent Judgment as Exhibit 1. After consideration of the papers submitted and arguments presented, the Court finds that the settlement agreement set out in the attached Consent Judgment meets the criteria established by Health & Safety Code §25249.7, in that:

- 1 a) the health hazard warning required by the Stipulation and Order Re: Consent
2 Judgment complies with Health & Safety Code §25249.7;
3 b) the reimbursement of fees and costs to be paid pursuant to the parties'
4 Stipulation and Order Re: Consent Judgment is reasonable under California
5 law; and
6 c) the civil penalty amount to be paid pursuant to the parties' Stipulation and
7 Order Re: Consent Judgment is reasonable
8

9 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that pursuant to Code of Civil
10 Procedure §664.6, judgment is entered in accordance with the Consent Judgment attached hereto
11 as Exhibit 1.
12

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
14

15 **Dated:** _____

_____ **JUDGE OF THE SAN DIEGO SUPERIOR COURT**
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Stephen Ure, Esq., (CSB# 188244)
LAW OFFICES OF STEPHEN URE, PC
1518 Sixth Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619-235-5400
Facsimile: 619-235-5404

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Maureen Parker

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION

MAUREEN PARKER,

Plaintiff

and

**DYNO, LLC dba
DYNO MERCHANSIDE**

Defendant.

CASE NO.:

37-2011-00100778-CU-NP-CTL

[PROPOSED]

**JUDGMENT APPROVING
PROP 65 STIPULATION AND
CONSENT JUDGMENT**

(Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq.)

Date: February 24, 2012

Time: 09:00 AM

Dept. C-75

Hon. Richard E.L. Strauss

Action Filed: November 8, 2011

In the above entitled action, Plaintiff, Maureen Parker and Defendant, Dyno LLC, 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 [Proposed] Consent Judgment entered into by the parties, and following issuance of an order approving this Proposition 65 settlement agreement and entering this Consent Judgment on February 24, 2012.

1 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that pursuant to
2 Code of Civil Procedure§664.6, judgment is entered in accordance with the Consent Judgment
3 attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
4

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
6

7 **Dated:** _____

8 **JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT**
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28