Richard T. Drury (State Bar No. 163559) Douglas J. Chermak (State Bar No. 233382) 2 LOZEAU | DRURY LLP 410 12th Street, Suite 250 3 Oakland, CA 94607 Telephone: 510-836-4200 4 Fax No.: 510-836-4205 Email: richard@lozeaudrury.com 5 doug@lozeaudrury.com MAR - 1 2018 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff CLEPKOR THE SURERIOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC. 7 Margaret Carew Toledo (State Bar No. 181227) Peg Carew Toledo, Law Corporation 8 3001 Douglas Blvd., Suite 340 9 Roseville, CA 95661-3853 Telephone: (916) 462-8950 Fax No.: (916) 791-0175 10 Email: peg@toledolawcorp.com 11 Attorneys for Defendants WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION, LLC, 12 WEIDER HEALTH AND FITNESS and WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION II, LLC 13 14 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 15 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 16 17 CASE NO. RG 15784036 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, ) 18 INC., a non-profit California corporation, STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT 19 Plaintiff, Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq. 20 ٧. Action Filed: August 31, 2015 21 Trial Date: None Set WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, WEIDER 22 HEALTH AND FITNESS, a Nevada corporation, and WEIDER GLOBAL 23 NUTRITION II, LLC, a Nevada limited 24 liability company, 25 Defendants. 26 27 28

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

CASE NO. RG15784036

#### INTRODUCTION 1.

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

On August 31, 2015, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer, and in the public interest, initiated this action by filing a Complaint for Injunctive Relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint") pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), against WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION, LLC, WEIDER HEALTH AND FITNESS, and WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION II, LLC (collectively, "Weider"). In this action, ERC alleges that a number of products manufactured, distributed or sold by Weider contain lead (1-12 below) or both lead and cadmium (product number (3) below), which are chemicals listed under Proposition 65 as carcinogens and reproductive toxins, and expose consumers to these chemicals at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These products (referred to hereinafter individually as a "Covered Product" or collectively as "Covered Products") are:

- Weider Global Nutrition LLC WFit Nutrition VO2-100 (1)
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC 100% Whey Double Chocolate (2)
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Dynamic Weight Gainer Smooth Chocolate (3)
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Anabolic Mass Gainer Mega Mass 2000 (4) Creamy Vanilla
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Red Yeast Rice Plus (5)
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Garcinia Cambogia (6)
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Dynamic Muscle Builder Smooth Chocolate (7)
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Dynamic Muscle Builder Creamy Vanilla (8)
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Anabolic Mass Gainer Mega Mass 2000 (9) Smooth Chocolate
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Anabolic Mass Gainer Mega Mass 4000 (10)Creamy Vanilla
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC Anabolic Mass Gainer Mega Mass 4000 (11)Smooth Chocolate
- Weider Global Nutrition LLC 100% Whey Chocolate Caramel Coconut (12)

- 1.2 ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.
- 1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the parties agree that Weider is a business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualify as a "person in the course of business" within the meaning of Proposition 65. Weider Global Nutrition, LLC manufactures, distributes and sells the Covered Products.
- 1.4 ERC and Weider are referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation dated April 10, 2015, that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Weider ("Notice"). A true and correct copy of the Notice is attached as Exhibit A and is hereby incorporated by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice was mailed and uploaded to the Attorney General's website, and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Weider with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.
- 1.6 ERC's Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products exposes persons in California to lead and cadmium without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Weider denies all material allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint.
- 1.7 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties, or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers. Except for the representations made above, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, issue of law, or

violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, at any time, for any purpose.

- 1.8 Except as expressly set forth herein, 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 unrelated to these proceedings.
- 1.9 The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as a Judgment by this Court.

### 2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, personal jurisdiction over Weider as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date which were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint.

## 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION AND WARNINGS

- 3.1 Beginning on the Effective Date, Weider shall be permanently enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of California," or directly selling in the State of California, any Covered Product which exposes a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms per day of lead or a "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" of more than 4.10 micrograms per day of cadmium when the maximum suggested dose is taken as directed on the Covered Product's label, unless the requirements under Section 3.2 are satisfied.
- 3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Weider knows will sell the Covered Product in California.

3.1.2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" and "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead or cadmium per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of servings in a recommended dosage appearing on the product label), which equals micrograms of lead or cadmium exposure per day.

3.1.3 For the purposes of this Consent Judgment and determining Weider's compliance with Proposition 65, Weider shall be afforded a naturally occurring allowance of up to one (1) part per million of lead for any cocoa powder in the Covered Products, pursuant to the letter dated September 28, 2001 from the Attorney General to Roger Lane Carrick and Michele Corash. If Weider seeks to utilize the cocoa allowance, it must provide ERC with the amount of cocoa in each of the Covered Products for which it seeks to use the allowance prior to the Effective Date.

## 3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

3.2.1 If Weider is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following warning must be utilized:

[California Residents Proposition 65] WARNING: This product contains [a] chemical[s] known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm.

Weider shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the warning only if the maximum daily dose recommended on the label contains more than 15 micrograms of lead.

The warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the container or label of each Covered Product. In addition for Covered Products sold over Weider's website, the warning shall appear on Weider's checkout page on its website when a California shipping address is provided by the customer. The warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on its website or on the label or container and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print.

3.2.2 Weider shall send a letter from Weider to each current distributor and retailer supplying Covered Products that require a warning as set forth above, with a signature acknowledgement block, apprising the distributor and retailer of how they must comply with Proposition 65 for the Covered Products. Weider will provide ERC with a copy of the original letter and signed letters upon ERC's written request within 30 days of such request. This provision does not apply if the warning set forth in Section 3.2.1 is affixed to or on the product label of the Covered Products.

#### 3.3 Reformulated Covered Products

A Reformulated Covered Product is one for which the Daily Lead Exposure Level or Daily Cadmium Exposure Level when the maximum suggested dose is taken as directed on the Reformulated Covered Product's label, contains no more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day or 4.1 micrograms of cadmium per day as determined by Section 3.1.2.

### 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, payment in lieu of civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs, Weider shall make a total payment of \$80,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC no later than 10 days after the Notice of Entry of the Consent Judgment. Weider shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's escrow account, for which ERC will give Weider the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.2 \$17,474.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code \$25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$13,105.50) of the civil penalty to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety Code \$25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$4,368.50) of the civil penalty.
- 4.3 \$7,992.13 shall be distributed to Environmental Research Center as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action; and \$13,182.83 shall be distributed to ERC in lieu of further civil penalties, for the day-to-day business activities such as (1) continued enforcement of Proposition 65, which includes, but is not limited to work

analyzing, researching and testing consumer products that may contain Proposition 65 chemicals, focusing on the same or similar type of ingestible products that are the subject matter of the current action; (2) the continued monitoring of past consent judgments and settlements to ensure companies are in compliance with Proposition 65; and (3) giving a donation of \$660.00 to Natural Resource Defense Council to address reducing toxic chemical exposures in California.

4.4 \$25,000.00 shall be distributed to Lozeau Drury LLP as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees, while \$16,351.04 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees.

## 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only (i) by written stipulation of the Parties or pursuant to Section 5.4 and (ii) upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment.
- must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC must provide written notice to Weider within thirty days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies Weider in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person or via telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the proposed modification, ERC shall provide to Weider a written basis for its position. The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any remaining disputes. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.
- 5.3 In the event that Weider initiates or otherwise requests a modification under Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a joint motion or application of the Consent Judgment, Weider shall reimburse ERC its costs and reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing the motion or application.
- 5.4 Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or application in support of a modification of the Consent Judgment, then either Party may seek judicial relief

on its own. In such a situation, the prevailing party may seek to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees. As used in the preceding sentence, the term "prevailing party" means a party who is successful in obtaining relief more favorable to it than the relief that the other party was amenable to providing during the Parties' good faith attempt to resolve the dispute that is the subject of the modification.

## 6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 6.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify or terminate this Consent Judgment.
- 6.2 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Reformulated Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform Weider in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit Weider to identify the Covered Products at issue. Weider shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with information demonstrating Weider's compliance with the Consent Judgment, if warranted. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

## 7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to Covered Products which are distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and which are not used by California consumers.

## 8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Weider. ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, hereby discharges Weider and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, franchisees, licensees,

customers (not including private label customers of Weider), distributors, wholesalers, retailers and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered 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 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead and cadmium up to and including the Effective Date.

- 8.2 ERC on its own behalf only, on one hand, and Weider on its own behalf only, on the other, 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 Notice or Complaint up through and including the Effective Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 8.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice or the Complaint and relating to the Covered Products will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, on one hand, and Weider, 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. ERC and Weider acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such unknown 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.

ERC on behalf of itself only, on the one hand, and Weider, on the other hand, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

- 8.4 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 and cadmium in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notice and the Complaint.
- 8.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Weider's products other than the Covered Products.

## 9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS

In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

#### 10. GOVERNING LAW

The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

### 11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below by: (a) first-class, registered, or certified mail; (b) overnight courier; or (c) personal delivery. Courtesy copies via email may also be sent.

## FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.:

Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director
Environmental Research Center
3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400

3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92108

Tel: (619) 500-3090

Email: chris\_erc501c3@yahoo.com

With a copy to:

24

26

27

28

Douglas Chermak
Lozeau Drury LLP

410 12th Street, Suite 250

Oakland, CA 94607 Tel: (510) 821-3474

Email: doug@lozeaudrury.com

WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION, LLC, WEIDER HEALTH AND FITNESS, and

1	WEIDER GLODAL RUI RITION 11, LDC.						
2	David Neeley, COO Weider Global Nutrition LLC 2212 East Williams Field Road, Suite 230 Gilbert, AZ 85295						
4	With a copy to:						
5	Margaret Carew Toledo						
6	Peg Carew Toledo, Law Corporation 3001 Douglas Blvd., Suite 340 Roseville, CA 95661-3853 Telephone: (916) 462-8950						
7							
8	Facsimile: (916) 791-0175 Email: peg@toledolawcorp.com						
9	12. COURT APPROVAL						
10	12.1 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a						
11	Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this						
12	Consent Judgment.						
13	12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,						
14	the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible						
15	prior to the hearing on the motion.						
16	12.3 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void						
17	and have no force or effect.						
18	13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS						
19	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be						
20	deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed as valid as						
21	the original signature.						
22	14. DRAFTING						
23	The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each						
24	Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms with						
25	counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent						
26	Judgment entered thereon, the terms and provisions shall not be construed against any Party.						
27	15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES						

If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent

Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet in person or by telephone and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand. In the event an action or motion is filed, however, the prevailing party may seek to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees. As used in the preceding sentence, the term "prevailing party" means a party who is successful in obtaining relief more favorable to it than the relief that the other party was amenable to providing during the Parties' good faith attempt to resolve the dispute that is the subject of such enforcement action.

## 16. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

- 16.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, 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. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.
- 16.2 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

# 17. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:

(1) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.

### IT IS SO STIPULATED:

4	
Dated: 12/29/ ,2015	V2 ******
1	ENVIRONMENTAL BESEARCH CENTER, INC.
2	Later and Aut Min
3	By A State of the
1	15: Expose Norme
5	The state of the s
YÉ	
6 Dated:, 2015	WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION, LLC
7	Bv:
8	By:
5	195:
10 Dated: 12 29, 2015	WEIDER HEALTH AND FITNESS
11	
	By Secret Arg
13	lis: Secpet-Ang
Dated	3
14 Dated:2015	WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION II, LLC
15 %	By:
16	
17 APPROVED AS TO FORM:	(2) The control of the second
, 2013	LOZEAU DRURY LLP
19 ]	
20	Ву
31	Donglas J. Chermak Attorneys for Plaintiff
11	Environmental Research Center, Inc.
22 Dated: Dearly 39, 2015	
23	PEG CAREW TOLEDO, LAW CORPORATION
24	on my the
25	By: Margaret Carew Toledo
26	Attorneys for Defendants Weider Global Nutrition, LLC,
27	Weider Health and Filnese and
	Weider Global Nutrition II, LLC
28	
∳ } !'	
PROPOSEDO	OMEGNET IS PRODUCTION
i (From OSED) (	CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	Dated: 12/29/ .2015	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.					
2		White Health					
3		By Harry Korne					
4		is. Training finalis.					
5	Dated: 12/30_,2015	WEIDER GLOBAN NUTRITION, LLC					
6	Dailot	0-111/					
7		Ву:					
8		Its: 600-600					
9	Dated:, 2015	WEIDER HEALTH AND FITNESS					
10		Ву:					
12		its:					
13	_	1637					
14	Dated: 12 (30, 2015	WEIDER GLOBAL NUTRITION II, LLC					
15		Ву: //-					
16	·	is: 600-690					
17	APPROVED AS TO FORM:						
18	Dated: A'i Dec. , 2015	LOZEAU DRURY LLP					
19		Dy: Douglas J. Chermak					
20		Attorneys for Plaintill					
21		Environmental Research Center, Inc.					
- 1	Dated: Deurson 29, 2015	PEG CAREW TOLEDO, LAW CORPORATION					
23   24		By: Marent Cow Fled					
25		Margaret Carew Toledo Attorneys for Defendants					
26		Weider Global Nutrition, LLC, Weider Health and Fitness, and					
27		Weider Global Nutrition II, LLC					
28		; ;					
i		2					
1	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT :						

## ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Based upon the Parties	Stipulation,	and good	cause	appearing,	this	Consent	Judgment	15
approved and Judgment is here	by entered ac	cording to	its te	nzas (	÷			

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.