1	Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981) Daniel D. Cho (SBN 105409)	ENDORSED F.L. F.D					
2	Ben Yeroushalmi (SBN 232540)	San Francisco County Superior Court					
	YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES	JUN 1 6 2014					
3	9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W Beverly Hills, California 90212						
4	Telephone: 310.623.1926	CLERK OF THE COURT BY: GINA GONZALES					
5	Facsimile: 310.623.1930	Deputy Clerk					
6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs,						
Ū	Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc.						
7							
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA						
9	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO						
10	CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.,	CASE NO. CGC-12-519454					
11	in the public interest,	CASE NO. CGC-12-319434					
12		CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]					
,	Plaintiff,	Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.					
13	v .	Treatm & Safety Code & 25249.5 et seq.					
14							
15	KIMAYA USA, INC., a New Jersey Corporation, ROSS STORES, INC. dba dd's						
	Discounts, a Delaware Corporation, ROSS	Complaint filed: March 23, 2012					
16	DRESS FOR LESS, INC., dba dd's						
17	Discounts, a Virginia Corporation, and						
18	DOES 1-20;	DY DOM					
19	Defendants.						
20	1. INTRODUCTION						
21	1.1 This Consent Judgment is en	tered into by and between plaintiff, Consume					
22	Advocacy Group, Inc. (referred to as "CAG) a	acting on behalf of itself and in the interest of the					
23	public and defendant Kimaya USA, Inc. (refe	rred to as "Defendant") with each a Party to the					
24	action and collectively referred to as "Parties."						
25	1.2 Defendants and Products						
26	1.2.1 For purposes of this Cor	nsent Judgment, Defendant is deemed a person in					
27	the course of doing business in California and	is subject to the provisions of the Safe Drinking					
28							

CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]

4

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65").

1.3 **Chemicals Of Concern**

1.3.1 Lead and Lead Compounds are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm.

1.4 Notices of Violation.

1.4.1 On July 17, 2011, CAG served Defendant, and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" ("July 17, 2011 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to lead contained in AM/FM Radios sold by Defendant. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the July 17, 2011 Notice.

1.4.2 On May 11, 2012, CAG served Defendant, and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" ("May 11, 2012 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to lead contained in Wireless Transmitters sold by Defendant. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the May 11, 2012 Notice.

1.4.3 On January 15, 2013, CAG served Defendant, and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" ("January 15, 2013 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to lead contained in Notebook Travel Kits sold by Defendant. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the January 15, 2013 Notice.

1.5 Complaint.

On March 23, 2012, CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-519454, against Defendant.

28.

CAG filed a First Amended Complaint ("FAC") against Defendant on or about September 13, 2012. CAG filed a Second Amended Complaint ("SAC") against Defendant on or about July 22, 2013. The Complaints allege, among other things, that Defendant violated Proposition 65 by failing to give clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to lead, from AM/FM Radios, Wireless Transmitters, and Notebook Travel Kits ("Covered Products").

1.6 Consent to Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaints and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaints, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaints and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom or related thereto.

1.7 No Admission

This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the Parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any material allegation of the Complaint (each and every allegation of which Defendant denies), any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, including without limitation, any admission concerning any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory, regulatory, common law, or equitable doctrine, or the meaning of the terms "knowingly and intentionally expose" or "clear and reasonable warning" as used in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Nothing in this Consent Judgment, nor compliance with its terms, shall constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law, or of fault, wrongdoing, or liability by any Defendant, its officers, directors, employees, or parent, subsidiary or affiliated corporations, or be offered or admitted as evidence in any administrative or judicial proceeding or litigation in

13.

any court, agency, or forum. Furthermore, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding, except as expressly provided in this Consent Judgment.

2. DEFINITIONS

- 2.1 "Covered Products" means AM/FM Radios, Wireless Transmitters, and Notebook Travel Kits sold only by Defendant, Kimaya USA, Inc.
- 2.2 "Effective Date" means the date that this Consent Judgment is approved by the Court.
 - 2.3 "Lead" means lead and lead compounds.
- 2.4 "Notices" means the July 17, 2011, May 11, 2012, and January 15, 2013 Notices served on Defendant.
- 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF / REFORMULATION / CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS.
- 3.1 Defendants shall not import for sale the Covered Products in California unless they are reformulated to contain less than 100 parts per million of lead.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 Payment: Defendant shall pay a total of seventy thousand dollars and zero cents (\$70,000) in full and complete settlement of all monetary claims by CAG related to the Notices.
- 4.2 Civil Penalty: Defendant shall issue separate checks totaling one thousand dollars (\$1,000) as penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.12:
- (a) Defendant will issue a check made payable to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) in the amount of seven hundred and fifty dollars (\$750) representing 75% of the total penalty and Defendant will issue a check to CAG in the amount of two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) representing 25% of the total penalty; and
- (b) Separate 1099s shall be issued for each of the above payments: Defendant will issue a 1099 to OEHHA, P.O. Box 4010, Sacramento, CA 95184 (EIN: 68-0284486) in the

6

9 110

> 11 12

13 14

15

1617

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

amount of \$750. Defendant will also issue a 1099 to CAG c/o Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, California 90212 in the amount of \$250.

- 4.1.2 Payment In Lieu of Civil Penalties: Defendant shall pay \$1,000 in lieu of civil penalties to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc.". CAG will use this payment for investigation of the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals through various means, laboratory fees for testing for Proposition 65 listed chemicals, expert fees for evaluating exposures through various mediums, including but not limited to consumer product, occupational, and environmental exposures to Proposition 65 listed chemicals, and the cost of hiring consulting and retained experts who assist with the extensive scientific analysis necessary for those files in litigation, in order to reduce the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals by notifying those persons and/or entities believed to be responsible for such exposures and attempting to persuade those persons and/or entities to reformulate their products or the source of exposure to completely eliminate or lower the level of Proposition 65 listed chemicals, thereby addressing the same public harm as allegedly in the instant Action. Further, should the court require it, CAG will submit under seal, an accounting of these funds as described above as to how the funds were used. The check shall be made payable to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc." and delivered to Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, California 90212.
- 4.1.3 Reimbursement of Attorneys Fees and Costs: Defendant shall pay sixty-eight thousand dollars (\$68,000) to "Yeroushalmi & Associates" as reimbursement for reasonable investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, and any other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendant's attention, litigating, and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. The check shall be made payable to "Yeroushalmi & Associates" and delivered to Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 610E, Beverly Hills, California 90212.
- 4.2 Payments shall be delivered to: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, CA 90212.

ł

5.1

10

12 13 14

15

 \mathbf{I}

16 17 18

19

21 22

20

23 24

> 25 26

27

28

companies and their successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), for all claims for violations of Proposition 65 up through the Effective Date based on exposure to Lead from the Covered Products as set forth in the Notices. Defendant and Defendant Releasees' compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to Lead from the Covered Products as set forth in the Notices. Upon approval of the Consent Judgment, Ross Stores, Inc. and Ross Dress for Less, Inc. will be dismissed from the action without prejudice. 5.2 CAG on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys,

behalf of itself and in the public interest and Defendants, and their officers, directors, insurers,

employees, parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, affiliates, sister

This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CAG on

successors, and/or assignees, and in the public interest, hereby waives all rights to institute of participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases 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 attorneys' fees) of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims"), against Defendants, and Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory of common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead in the Covered Products. In furtherance of the foregoing, as to alleged exposures to Covered Products, CAG, on behalf of itself only, hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with respect to the Claims 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.

CAG understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver

of California Civil Code section 1542 is that even if CAG suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to Lead from Covered Products, CAG will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Defendant or the Defendant Releasees. Furthermore, CAG acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such Claims as may exist as of the date of this release but which CAG does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

- 6.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the Parties hereto. The Parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of California, San Francisco County, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein. A Party may enforce any of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment only after that Party first provides 90 days notice to the Party allegedly failing to comply with the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment and attempts to resolve such Party's failure to comply in an open and good faith manner.
- 6.2 Notice of Violation. Prior to bringing any motion, order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, CAG shall provide a Notice of Violation ("NOV") to Defendants. The NOV shall include for each of the Covered Products: the date(s) the alleged violation(s) was observed and the location at which the Covered Products were offered for sale, and shall be accompanied by all test data obtained by CAG regarding the Covered Products, including an identification of the component(s) of the Covered Products that were tested.
 - 6.2.1 Non-Contested NOV. CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation if, within 60 days of receiving such NOV, Defendants serves a Notice of Election ("NOE") that meets one of the following conditions:

- (a) The Covered Products were shipped by Defendants for sale in California before the Effective Date, or
- (b) Since receiving the NOV Defendants have taken corrective action by either (i) requesting that its customers or stores in California, as applicable, remove the Covered Products identified in the NOV from sale in California and destroy or return the Covered Products to Defendants or vendor, as applicable, or (ii) providing a clear and reasonable warning for the Covered Products identified in the NOV pursuant to 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25603.
- 6.2.2 Contested NOV. Defendants may serve an NOE informing CAG of its election to contest the NOV within 30 days of receiving the NOV.
- (a) In its election, Defendants may request that the sample(s) Covered Products tested by CAG be subject to confirmatory testing at an EPA-accredited laboratory.
- (b) If the confirmatory testing establishes that the Covered Products do not contain lead in excess of the levels allowed in Section 3.1, above, CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation. If the testing does not establish compliance with Section 3.1, above, Defendants may withdraw its NOE to contest the violation and may serve a new NOE pursuant to Section 6.2.1.
- (c) If Defendants do not withdraw an NOE to contest the NOV, the Parties shall meet and confer for a period of no less than 30 days before CAG may seek an order enforcing the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 6.3 In any proceeding brought by either Party to enforce this Consent Judgment, such party may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties or remedies as may be provided by law for any violation of Proposition 65 or this Consent Judgment.

ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

7.1 CAG shall file a motion seeking approval of this Consent Judgment pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, CAG,

 Defendant waives their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaints.

7.2 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, (a) this Consent Judgment and any and all prior agreements between the parties merged herein shall terminate and become null and void, and the actions shall revert to the status that existed prior to the execution date of this Consent Judgment; (b) no term of this Consent Judgment or any draft thereof, or of the negotiation, documentation, or other part or aspect of the Parties' settlement discussions, shall have any effect, nor shall any such matter be admissible in evidence for any purpose in this Action, or in any other proceeding; and (c) the Parties agree to meet and confer to determine whether to modify the terms of the Consent Judgment and to resubmit it for approval.

8. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.
- 8.2 Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with the other Party prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

9. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

9.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

10. DUTIES LIMITED TO CALIFORNIA

10.1 This Consent Judgment shall have no effect on Covered Products sold by Defendants outside the State of California.

11. SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

11.1 CAG shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by both parties, on the California Attorney General so that the Attorney General may review this Consent Judgment prior to its submittal to the Court for approval. No sooner than forty five (45) days after the Attorney General has received the aforementioned copy of this Consent Judgment, and in the absence of any written objection by the Attorney General to the terms of this Consent Judgment,

ìo

the parties may then submit it to the Court for approval.

12. ATTORNEY FEES

12.1 Except as specifically provided in Section 4.1.3, each Party shall bear its own costs and attorney fees in connection with this action.

13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

13.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties.

14. GOVERNING LAW

- 14.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law provisions of California law.
- 14.2 The Parties, including their counsel, have participated in the preparation of this Consent Judgment and this Consent Judgment is the result of the joint efforts of the Parties. This Consent Judgment was subject to revision and modification by the Parties and has been accepted and approved as to its final form by all Parties and their counsel. Accordingly, any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in this Consent Judgment shall not be interpreted against any Party as a result of the manner of the preparation of this Consent Judgment. Each Party to this Consent Judgment agrees that any statute or rule of construction providing that ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting Party should not be employed in the interpretation of this Consent Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive California Civil Code § 1654.

15. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

15.1 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to constitute

1		locurrant and have it	io simne force a	ná effort es original sign	Hiures.	
2	16.	NOTICES				
3		ic. 1 Any notice	s under this C	Sussent Judgment shall l	be by personal	delivery of Mr
4	The second	Mail.				ing the second of the second
6		If to CAG:	Rouben Ye 9100 Wilsi Beverly Hi (310) 623-	nire Bonlevard, Suite 240 Illa, CA 90212)W	
8		If to Kimaya:	Kimaya US 700 Penhor Socaucus, 1	5A, Inc. m Awame, Unit #3 New Jersey 07094		
10 11 12	Principal and Company of the Company	With a copy to:	Loon Small Law Office 16530 Vent Encino, CA	s Of Loon Small um Blvd., Sie. 306		
13	17. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE					
14	17.1 Each signmory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorize by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on beha					
15						
16	₹ 8	party represented and	and the second s	and the second s		AT THE CONTRACT OF THE CONTRAC
17 18	AGRE	ED TO:		AGREED TO:		·
19	Date:	A war Link de de commence of the commence of t	, 2014	Dote:	. 2014	
20	erini de estada da 1960 julio		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		the state of the s	
21	Name:	Mill Sike	- Paradir den er del commune er i paradir de er periodologie de Paradir .	individual states des finds and analysis arms one cover an encourage or discontinuous consensation.	naka maann 19 diriyahii Silahii Sinak eesaaniin neeriyahii indooruu neeriyahii indooru	Commands or an activating your discrimination of the Laboratory co. conscious productions of the Commands of t
22	Title	4	restor	Neme		993). Lindon old state of the s
23		UMER ADVOCACY	COROUP,	Title: KIMAYAUSA, INC	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O	
24	# ** .					
25	ms	O ORDERED.				
26	Dute:	「マグーながたためでRSA製造器DAMA」。 ・		1 100 000	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
27	Auf Wall for a supraise	er er en en en en en betær versen sich in ninne bisk finde genach ettersten en en en en en en er en er en er e	isigkiri Utsproper coentre	concerned makes the control of the c	philippine)	Marie
28	***************************************			JUDGE OF THE SUP	ERIOR COUR	

CONSENT JUDGMENT PROPOSED

	1 on	e document and have the	ie same luive a	and effect as original	cianalurse			
		one document and have the same force and effect as original signatures. 16. NOTICES						
	3 -	16.1 Any notices under this Consent Judgment shall be by personal delivery of Fir						
	4 Cla	ass Mail.		The state of the s	idir oc oy por	ZOESE DÉEL	ery of I-in	
	5	If to CAC.	Renoca Ýs					
	6	11 TO 12/1 C/L	9100 Wilsi	tire Boulevard, Suite	240W			
	7		Beveriy Hills, CA 90212 (310) 623-1926					
;	8	If to Kimaya:	Kimaya US	A, Inc.				
4	9 📗		700 Penhorn Avenue, Unit #3 Secretors. New Jersey 07094					
10)	With a copy to:	*	icw seisey 07094			•	
11		w и и в сору to:	Lean Sniell Law Cifices Of Leon Small			•		
12	: ∦		16530 Ventura Bivd., Ste. 306 Encino. CA 91436					
13	17.	AUTHORITY TO						
14		17.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized						
15	by th	by the party he or she represents to rate into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf						
16	of the	e party represented and	legally to bind	that party	Euron and fo	execute it	on benati	
17		ā.						
18	AGR	EED TO:		AGREED TO:				
19	Date:		2014	Date: APRIL	17 20	! 4		
20				Chelva	·	:		
21	Name			77		۸		
22	Title:			Name: RAJU Title: PRESIDE		<i>N</i> /		
23		UMER ADVOCACY	CROUS,	KIMAYA USA, I	2 ~/ NC.		-	
24	1.70.		. • .		*			
25	IT IS	SO ORDERED.						
26	Date:	JUN 16 2014	<u> </u>	RNECT LI O	~! F\^\ ***			
27	27000.		Alternative Control of the Control o	RNEST H. G				
28	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT							
			CONSENTAR	GMENT PROPO SCE	21			