		RECEIVED
1	Lucas Novak (SBN 257484) LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK	RECEIVED AUG 0 6 2015 ROOM 102 ORIGINAL FILED SEP 2 9 2015
2	1 0333 Tr Bunder Biva., Butto 217	200M 102 UNIUITIE
3	Los Angeles, CA 90069 Telephone: (323) 337-9015	
4	Email: lucas.nvk@gmail.com	LOS ANGELES
5	Attorney for Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri	SUPERIOR COURT
6		
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
8	FOR THE COUNTY	OF LOS ANGELES
9		
10	ISABEL RUGGERI, an individual,	CASE NO. BC572804
11	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT
12	v.)	Judge: Hon. Rolf M. Treu
13	SIOUX CHIEF MFG. CO., INC., a) corporation, SUPPLYHOUSE.COM, a)	Dept.: 58 Compl. Filed: February 18, 2015
14	corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,	
15	inclusive,	Unlimited Jurisdiction
16	Defendants.)	
17	.)	
18		
19	///	
20	///	
21	///	
22	///	
23	///	
24	///	
25	///	
26	///	
27	1//	
28	///	·
20	111	

1. <u>RECITALS</u>

1.1 The Parties

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri ("Plaintiff") and Defendant, Sioux Chief Mfg. Co., Inc. ("Defendant"). Plaintiff and Defendant shall hereinafter collectively be referred to as the "Parties."

Plaintiff is a citizen of the state of California with an interest in protecting the environment, improving human health and the health of ecosystems, and supporting environmentally sound practices, which includes promoting awareness of exposure to toxic chemicals and reducing exposure to hazardous substances found in consumer products.

Defendant employs ten (10) or more employees and is a person in the course of doing business as the term is defined in California *Health & Safety Code* section 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65").

1.2 Allegations

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant manufactured, distributed, supplied, and/or sold brass water hammer arresters known as "Mini-Resters" with the following item numbers: 660-2; 660-2B; 660-C; 660-CB; 660-T; 660-TA2B; 660-TB; 660-TC0; 660-TC08; 660-TC1; 660-TC1B; 660-TC2B; 660-TR; 660-TR1; 660-TR1B; 660-TR2B; 660-TR2B; 660-TR2B; 660-TR2B; 660-TR2B; 660-TR2B; 660-GTB; 660-GTB; 660-GTB; 660-GTC0; 660-GTC0B; 660-GTC1; 660-GTC1B; 660-GTR; 660-GTR0; 660-GTR0B; 660-GTR1; 660-GTRB; 660-GTR2B; 660-GTR2B; 660-GTR2B; 660-GTR2B; 660-GTR2B; 660-TS2B; 660-

On December 8, 2014, a sixty-day notice of violation ("60-Day Notice"), along with a

Certificate of Merit, was provided by Plaintiff to Defendant and various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products.

On February 18, 2015, Plaintiff filed the instant action in the Superior Court for the County of

Los Angeles, alleging violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products.

1.3 No Admissions

Defendant denies all allegations in paragraph 1.2, above, in Plaintiff's 60-Day Notice and Complaint, and maintains that at all times the Products have been, and are, in compliance with all laws, and that Defendant has not violated Proposition 65. This Consent Judgment shall not be construed as an admission of liability by Defendant, but to the contrary, as a compromise of claims that are expressly contested and denied. However, nothing in this section shall affect the Parties' obligations, duties, and responsibilities under this Consent Judgment.

1.4 Jurisdiction And Venue

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that the above-entitled Court has jurisdiction over Defendant as to the allegations of the Complaint, that venue is proper in Los Angeles County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure ("CCP") § 664.6 and Proposition 65.

1.5 Effective Date

The "Effective Date" shall be five (5) days after Plaintiff's counsel provides written notice to Defendant's counsel that this Consent Judgment has been approved and entered by the Court.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND REFORMULATION

2.1 Reformulation

As of the Effective Date, Defendant shall not sell or offer for sale in California any of the Products that contain more than 100 parts per million (0.01%) of lead when analyzed pursuant to Environmental Protection Agency testing methodologies 3050B or equivalent, without providing "clear and reasonable warnings" as described in section 2.2 below.

2.2 Clear And Reasonable Warnings

 For Products that are manufactured and/or supplied by Defendant and sold or offered for sale in California, each unit that does not meet the Reformulation standard in section 2.1 shall be accompanied by the following specific warning with the capitalized and emboldened wording:

"WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause [cancer,] birth defects and other reproductive harm."

Defendant shall use the bracketed "cancer" in the warning only if the daily exposure to lead through the reasonably anticipated use of the Product exceeds 15 micrograms of lead. Each unit shall carry said warning directly on each unit or its label or package, near the product name, price, or UPC code, in a manner reasonably calculated to be seen by the ordinary consumer.

3. PAYMENTS

3.1 Civil Penalty Pursuant To Proposition 65

In settlement of all causes of action in Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant shall pay a total civil penalty of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) to be apportioned in accordance with *Health* and Safety Code section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% (\$3,750.00) paid to State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining 25% (\$1,250.00) paid to Plaintiff.

Defendant shall issue two (2) checks for the civil penalty: (1) a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in Trust for OEHHA" in the amount of \$3,750.00; and (2) a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in Trust for Isabel Ruggeri" in the amount of \$1,250.00. Defendant shall remit the payments within five (5) business days of the Effective Date, to:

Lucas T. Novak, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

3.2 Reimbursement Of Plaintiff's Fees And Costs

Defendant shall reimburse Plaintiff's reasonable experts' and attorney's fees and costs incurred in prosecuting the instant action, for all work performed through execution of this agreement and entry of this Consent Judgment. Accordingly, Defendant shall issue a check or

8

9

10 11

13 14

12

16 17

15

18 19

20 21

22

2324

25

2627

28

money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak" in the amount of sixteen thousand five hundred dollars (\$16,500.00). Defendant shall remit the payment within five (5) business days of the Effective Date, to:

Lucas T. Novak, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

4. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding agreement between Plaintiff, 4.1 on behalf of herself and in the public interest, and Defendant, of any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings of exposure to lead from the handling, use, or consumption of the Products and fully resolves all claims that have been or could have been asserted in this action up to and including the Effective Date for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings for the Products. Plaintiff on behalf of herself and in the public interest, hereby discharges Defendant, and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers, manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Product, and the predecessors, successors and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"), from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Products regarding lead, or any other claims alleged in this action, up through and including the Effective Date.
- 4.2 Plaintiff on her own behalf only, on one hand, and Defendant on its own behalf and on behalf of the Released Parties, further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition 65 in connection with the 60-Day Notice or Complaint up through and including the Effective Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 4 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

4.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the 60-Day Notice or the Complaint and relating to the Products will develop or be discovered. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself only, on one hand, and Defendant, on the other hand, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore. Plaintiff and Defendant acknowledge that the claims released in sections 4.1 and 4.2 above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such known claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads 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."

Plaintiff on behalf of herself only, on the one hand, and Defendant, on the other hand, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

4.4 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any releasee regarding alleged exposures to lead in the Products as set forth in the 60-Day Notice and the Complaint.

5. COURT APPROVAL

Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by all Parties, Plaintiff shall file a noticed Motion for Approval and Entry of Consent Judgment in the above-entitled Court. This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court. It is the intention of the Parties that the Court approve this Consent Judgment, and in furtherance of obtaining such approval, the Parties and their respective counsel agree to mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this agreement in a timely manner, including cooperating on drafting and filing any papers in support of the required motion for judicial approval.

6. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

Subsequent to Court approval of this Consent Judgment, should any part or provision of

28

1

2

this Consent Judgment, for any reason, be declared by a Court to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining portions and provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

7. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

8. NOTICES

All correspondence and notices required to be provided under this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and delivered personally or sent by first class or certified mail addressed as follows:

TO DEFENDANT:

Kenneth E. Chyten Law Office of Kenneth E. Chyten 300 East Esplanade Drive, Suite 900 Oxnard, CA 93036

TO PLAINTIFF:

Lucas T. Novak, Esq. Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

9. <u>INTEGRATION</u>

This Consent Judgment constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof and may not be amended or modified except in writing.

10. COUNTERPARTS

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute the same document. Execution and delivery of this Consent Judgment by e-mail, facsimile, or other electronic means shall constitute legal and binding execution and delivery. Any photocopy of the executed Consent Judgment shall have the same force and effect as the originals.

11. AUTHORIZATION

The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective Parties. Each Party has read, understood, and agrees to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment. Each Party warrants to the other that it is free to enter into this

1	Consent Judgment and not subject to any conflicting obligation which will or might prevent or
2	interfere with the execution or performance of this Consent Judgment by said party.
3	
4	AGREED TO:
5	Date: July 28, 2015
6	
7	Printed Name: MICHAEL E. MEAGHER By: Meagher
8	1:006110
9	By: Meddel . Meagher
10	Authorized Officer of Defendant, Stoux Chief Mfg. Co., Inc.
11	
12	AGREED TO:
13	Date:
14	
15	By:
16	Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri
17	·
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.
19	
20	Dated:
21	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	Consent Judgment and not subject to any conflicting obligation which will or might prevent or	
2	interfere with the execution or performance of this Consent Judgment by said party.	
3		
4	AGREED TO:	
5	Date: July 28, 2015	
6		
7	Printed Name: MICHAEL E. MEAGHER	
8	By: Midal & Meagher	
9	By: Meddal . Meagher	
10	Authorized Officer of Defendant, Sloux Chief Mfg. Co., Inc.	
11		
12	AGREED TO:	
13	Date: \(\frac{\pmu u u 30, 2015}{\pmu}	
14		
15	By: Staled Jugger	
16	Plaintiff, Isabel Ruggeri	
17		
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
19	SEP 2 9 2015 STEPHEN M. MOLONEY	
20	Dated:	
21	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
22		
23		
24	, .	
25		
26		
27		
28		
ŀ		