1 2	George Rikos (State Bar No. 204864)  LAW OFFICES OF GEORGE RIKOS  555 West Beech Street, Suite 500	ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVED Superior Court of California, County of San Diego  09/21/2021 at 07:47:08 AW
3	San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (858) 342-9161 Facsimile: (858) 724-1453	Clerk of the Superior Court By Nicole Adams, Deputy Clerk L E
4	Email: george@gerorgerikoslaw.com	Clark of the Superior Court
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff, BRAD VAN PATTEN	SEP 2 4 2021
6		By: A. TAYLOR
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE S COUNTY OF S.	
9		
10	BRAD VAN PATTEN, and individual,	Case No. 37-2020-00035232-CU-MC-CTL
11	Plaintiff, v.	AMENDED[PROPOSED] CONSENT
12	GOYA FOODS, Inc., a Delaware corporation;	JUDGMENT
13	AMAZON.COM, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive	
14	Defendants.	
15 16		
17 18	INTRODUCTION      The Parties. This Consent Judgm	nent ("Consent Judgment") is entered into by
19	and between Brad Van Patten ("Van Patten") and	Goya Foods, Inc. ("Goya"). Together, Van
20	Patten and Goya are collectively referred to as th	e "Parties." Van Patten is an individual who
21	resides in the State of California, and seeks to prom	ote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals
22	and to improve human health by reducing or eli	iminating hazardous substances contained in
23	consumer products. Goya is a person in the cours	se of doing business for purposes of the Safe
24	Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986	
25	("Proposition 65").	-, , , , , , , ,
26	(Troposition o.).	
27		

AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT

14

11

15 16

18 19

17

20 21

2223

24

25

26

27

- 1.2 General Allegations. Van Patten alleges that acrylamide is listed pursu ant to Proposi tion 65 as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. Van Patten alleges that Goya has exposed individuals to acrylamide from its sales of Goya Plantain Chips without first providing users and consumers of the product with a clear and reasonable cancer warning as required pursu ant to Proposi tion 65.
- 1.3 Product Description. The products covered by this Consent Judgment are all Non-California Compliant Goya Plantain Chips, including, without limitation, all varieties and pack sizes of Product (the "Non-Compliant California Products") that have been manufactured, imported, distributed, offered for sale, and/or sold in California by Goya or its affiliates.
- 1.4 Notice of Violation, Complaint, and Jurisdiction. On July 7, 2020, Van Patten served Goya and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "Notice of Violation of Califomia Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et scq." (the "Notice"). The Notice provided Goya and such others, including public enforcers, with notice that alleged that Goya w asin violation of Proposition 65 for failing to w am California consumers and customers that use of the Non-Compliant California Products will expose them to acryla mide. No public enforcer has diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notice. On October 2, 2020, based on the Notice and the absence of any authorized public prosecutor of Proposition 65 having filed a suit based on the allegations contained therein, Van Patten filed a complaint in the Superior Court of and for San Diego Courty (the "Count"), Case No. 37-2020-00035232-CU-MC-CTL (the "Action"). For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that the Court has jurisdiction over the allegations in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Goya, that venue is proper in the County of San Diego, and that the Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of the claims and allegations which were or could have been raised in the Action based on the facts alleged therein and/or in the Notice.

AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT

\_

1.5 No Admission. This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of any and all claims between the Parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. Goya denies each and every material allegations contained in the Notices and the Action and maintains that it has not violated Proposition 65 and/or is not subject to that law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Goya 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 Goya of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by Goya. However, this Section 1.5 shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of Goya under this Consent Judgment.

1.6 Effective Date. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date this Consent Judgment has been approved by the Court and Van Patten has provided notice to Goya that it has been entered in the Court's records as a consent judgment.

# 2. <u>INJUNCTIVE RELIEF</u>

### 2.1 California Compliant Products

Goya alleges it has two manufacturing processes. One of the processes is expressly intended to address requirements for acrylamide under Proposition 65, such that acrylamide levels are on average kept below the level requiring a cancer warning under Proposition 65 based on an average consumer's level and frequency of consumption of the chips and a 1 x 10-5 cancer risk for acrylamide based on scientific evidence equivalent or better in quality to that which formed the basis for the Proposition 65 listing of acrylamide as a carcinogen. These products are intended to be sold in California. Without any implied meaning or admission, these products will be referred herein as "California Compliant Products".

# 2.2 Non-California Compliant Products

Goya's second manufacturing process is not expressly intended to address acrylamide requirements under Proposition 65. Without any implied meaning or admission, these products are referred to herein as "Non-California Compliant Products". It is Goya's position that the products purchased by Van Patten in California were Non-California Compliant Products and never intended to be sold in California. As of the Effective Date, and continuing thereafter, Goya, will cease the import, distribution, or sale of its Non-California Compliant Products in California.

## 3. CONSENT JUDGMENT PAYMENTS

### 3.1 Civil Penalties

Goya shall pay \$5,000 as a civil penalty, allocated in accordance with Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% of the penalty to be remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of the Penalty remitted to Van Patten no later than ten (10) days following the Effective Date. More specifically, Goya shall issue two separate checks for the civil penalty payment to (a) "Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment" in the amount of \$3,750 (75%); and to (b) "Law Offices of George Rikos in Trust for Brad Van Patten" in the amount of \$1,250 (25%). Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Goya shall deliver these payments as follows:

(i) The penalty payment owed to Van Patten shall be delivered to the following address:

George Rikos Law Offices of George Rikos 555 West Beech, Suite 500 San Diego, CA 92101

(ii) The penalty payment owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486) shall be delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo Line "Prop 65 Penalties") at the following address:

.

. .

Mike Gyurics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
Attn. Prop 65 Penaltics – Van Patten v. Goya Consent Judgment
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Goya shall provide Van Patten's counsel with a copy of the check it sends to OEHHA with its penalty payment to Van Patten. Goya's payment obligations shall be tolled until it receives an IRS W-9 form for each payee. In association with the issuance of the payments under this Consent Judgment, Goya will issue IRS 1099 forms as appropriate given the payees.

## 3.2 Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Costs

Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Goya shall reimburse Van Patten's counsel \$60,000 for fees and costs incurred as a result of investigating and bringing this matter to Goya's attention, negotiating a Consent Judgment in the public interest, and obtaining the Court's approval of the Consent Judgment and its entry as a consent judgment. Goya shall issue a check for this amount payable to "Law Offices of George Rikos" and deliver it to the address identified in Section 3.1 above. Goya's payment obligations shall be tolled until it receives an IRS W-9 form for this payee.

#### 4. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 Release of Goya and Downstream Customers and Entities. This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between Van Patten, acting on his own behalf and in the public interest, and Goya of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted by Van Patten or on behalf of his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, predecessors, successors, and/or assigns (collectively, "Releasors") for failure to provide warnings for alleged exposures to acrylamide contained in the Non-Compliant California Products, and Releasors hereby release any such claims against Goya and its parents, shareholders, members, directors, officers, managers,

AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT

employees, representatives, agents, attorneys, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, sister companies, and affiliates, and their predecessors, successors, and assigns (collectively, "Goya Releasees"), and each entity to whom Goya directly or indirectly distributes or sells the Non-Compliant California Products, including but not limited to, downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, and retailers, and their respective subsidiaries, affiliates and parents, franchisees, cooperative members, and licensees (collectively, "Downstream Releasees"), from all claims for violations of Proposition 65 with respect to any Non-Compliant California Products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Goya prior to the Effective Date based on failure to warn of alleged exposure to the chemical acrylamide from the Non-Compliant California Products.

In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, and for the payments to be made pursuant to Section 3 above, Van Patten, on behalf of himself, his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, hereby covenants not to sue and waives any right to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases all claims that he may have, including without limitation, all actions and causes of action in law and in equity, all obligations, expenses (including without limitation all attorneys' fees, expert fees, and investigation fees, and costs), damages, losses, liabilities and demands against any of the Goya Releasees and/or Downstream Releasees of any nature, character, or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, limited to and arising out of the alleged or actual exposure to chemicals contained in Goya's crackers.

4.2 Goya's Release of Van Patten. Goya, on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against Van Patten, his attorneys, and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made by Van Patten and/or his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims or otherwise seeking to enforce Proposition

AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.3 California Civil Code Section 1542. It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice and relating to the Non-Compliant California Products will develop or be discovered. Van Patten on behalf of himself only, on one hand, and Goya, 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 therefor. The Parties 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 unknown claims. California Civil Code Section 1542 reads as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER CONSENT JUDGMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

Van Patten and Goya each acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542.

4.4 Deemed Compliance with Proposition 65. Compliance by Goya with this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to exposure to acrylamide from the Non-Compliant California Products. Non-Compliant California Products distributed by Goya prior to the Effective Date may be sold through as previously manufactured and labeled.

# 5. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

The Parties hereby request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment as a consent judgment based on the motion for its approval Van Patten will be making pursuant to Section 10 below. Upon entry of the Consent Judgment as a consent judgment, Van Patten and Goya waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations contained in the Complaint.

### 6. **SEVERABILITY**

If, subsequent to the execution of this Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are deemed by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected but only to the extent the deletion of the provision deemed unenforceable does not materially affect, or otherwise result in the effect of the Consent Judgment being contrary to, the intent of the Parties in entering into this Consent Judgment.

# 7. GOVERNING LAW/ENFORCEMENT

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the law of the State of California and apply within the State of California. The rights to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment are exclusively conferred on the Parties hereto. Any Party may, after providing sixty (60) days' written notice and meeting and conferring within a reasonable time thereafter to attempt to resolve any issues, by motion or application for an order to show cause before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In the event that Proposition 65 or its regulations applicable to the Non-Compliant California Products are repealed, or are otherwise rendered inapplicable or invalid, including but not limited to by reason of law generally, due to federal preemption, or the First Amendment commercial speech rights of the U.S. Constitution, as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction of an agency of the federal government, then Goya shall provide written notice to Van Patten of any asserted repeal or determination. Upon

1	Goya's written notice, Goya shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent
2	Judgment to the extent such repeal or determination affects Goya's obligations with respect
3	to the Product.
4	8. <u>NOTICES</u>
5	Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided
6	pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by:
7	(i) first-class (registered or certified mail) return receipt requested; or (ii) overnight or two-
8	day courier on any Party by the other Party to the following addresses:
9	For Goya:
10	
11	Naoki Kaneko, Esq. Shook, Hardy & Bacon
12	5 Park Plaza, Suite 1600 Irvine, California 92614
13	
14	For Van Patten:
15	George Rikos, Esq.
16	Law Offices of George Rikos 555 West Beech, Suite 500 San Diego, CA 92101
17	Sali Diego, CA 92101
18	Either Party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other Party a change of
19	address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.
20	9. <u>COUNTERPARTS: SIGNATURES</u>
21	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or .pdf
22	signature, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together,
23	shall constitute one and the same document.
24	
25	
26	
27	

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

Van Patten agrees to comply with the reporting requirements referenced in Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(f) and to seek, by formal and properly noticed motion (including with service to the Office of the California Attorney General being fully effectuated at least forty-five (45) days prior to a requested hearing thereon), approval of this Consent Judgment's terms pursuant to Proposition 65 and its associated entry as a consent judgment by the Court.

## 11. MODIFICATION

II

Unless otherwise provided for herein, this Consent Judgment may be modified only by a written agreement of the Parties and the approval of the Court or upon a duly noticed motion of either Party for good cause shown. Neither Party shall unreasonably withhold agreement to any modification requested by the other Party based on an amendment to Proposition 65 or its supporting regulations or a change in the law. If the parties reach agreement as to modification of the Consent Judgment, such stipulation shall be sent to the Office of the Attorney General at least 21 days in advance of its submission to the Court for approval.

If the parties are unable to reach agreement on a proposed modification, either Party may file a notice motion for modification with the Court for good cause shown, provided a copy of the motion is also served on the other Party and the Office of the Attorney General.

## 12. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement of the Parties and any and all prior negotiations and understandings related hereto shall be deemed to have been merged within it. No representations or terms of agreement other than those contained herein exist or have been made by any Party with respect to the other Party or the subject matter hereof. This Consent Judgment shall have no effect if it is not approved by the

Court and entered as a consent judgment.

## 13. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>

2

3

The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment and have read, 4 understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
CONTENT:	CONTENT:
Date: 9/20/21	Date: 09/20/2021
By: George Rikos George Rikas	By: Naoki Kaneko, Esq.
Counsel to Brad Van Parten AGREED TO:	Cnunsel for Goya Foods, Inc. AGREED TO:
Date: 9/28/202/	Date: 121 20 2021
Srudy lefath	Ву:
Brad Van Fatten	Goya Floods, Inc.
TIS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND UDGMENT SET FORTH ABOVE SHA ONSENT PAGMENT DATHIS COU	LE PROMPALT BEGENTERED AS A
ATED:	
, (	JUDE OF LIE SUPERIOR COORT
	**************************************
	JOEL R. WOH
MENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT	
or extractive exception is a distinct.	11