1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 06/28/2022 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court By: C. Wilson Deputy HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA Y OF LOS ANGELES
9		
10	APS&EE, LLC, a limited liability company,	CASE NO. 21STCV40655
11	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT
12	v.) Judge: Hon. Barbara M. Scheper
13	DD'S DISCOUNTS, INC., a corporation, ROSS STORES, INC., a corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	Dept.: 30 Compl. Filed: November 4, 2021
14		Unlimited Jurisdiction
15	Defendants.	
16 17		,
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	///	
24	///	
25	///	
26	///	
27	///	
28		
	XS01-0000001 14144069.1	1 Consent Judgment

Consent Judgment

1. <u>RECITALS</u>

1.1 The Parties

- 1.1.1 This Consent Judgment ("Consent Judgment") is entered into by and between Plaintiff APS&EE, LLC ("Plaintiff") and Defendant X-S Merchandise, Inc. ("Defendant"). Plaintiff and Defendant shall hereinafter collectively be referred to as the "Parties."
- 1.1.2 Plaintiff is an organization based in 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.
- **1.1.3** Plaintiff alleges that Defendant 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

- 1.2.1 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant sold the Hand Transplanter #6-82824-70227-0 (hereinafter, the "Product(s)") in the State of California causing users in California to be exposed to hazardous levels of Di (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate ("DEHP") and Di-n-Butyl Phthalate ("DBP," and collectively with DEHP, the "Listed Chemicals"), without providing "clear and reasonable warnings," in violation of Proposition 65. DEHP is a chemical known to the state to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity, and DBP is known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm, and therefore each chemical is subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements.
- 1.2.2 On August 24, 2021, Plaintiff sent a Sixty-Day Notice of Violation (the "Notice") to DD's Discounts, Inc., Ross Stores, Inc., and the various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products. On November 4, 2021, Plaintiff, acting in the public interest, filed the instant action (the "Complaint") in the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, alleging violations of Proposition 65. On January 12, 2022, Ross Stores, Inc. filed an Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint,

and Plaintiff dismissed DD's Discounts, Inc. without prejudice. On February 7, 2022, Plaintiff sent a Supplemental Sixty-Day Notice of Violation (the "Supplemental Notice") to Defendant, as well as DD's Discounts, Inc., Ross Stores, Inc., and the various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products. On April 13, 2022, Plaintiff filed a Doe Amendment, substituting Defendant for Doe 1.

1.3 No Admissions

Defendant denies all allegations in Plaintiff's Notice, Supplemental Notice, and Complaint, and maintains that 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 Compromise

The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment in order to resolve the controversy described above in a manner consistent with prior Proposition 65 settlements and consent judgments that were entered in the public interest and to avoid prolonged and costly litigation between them.

1.5 Jurisdiction and Venue

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that the above-entitled Court has jurisdiction over Defendant as to the allegations in 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 Section* 664.6 and Proposition 65.

1.6 Effective Date

The "Effective Date" shall be the date this Consent Judgment is approved and entered by the Court.

27 | | / / /

2.

2.1

///

XS01-0000001

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

After the Effective Date, Defendant shall not distribute for sale in California, sell, or offer for sale the Products in California unless (a) the Product contains no more than 1,000 parts per million (0.1%) of DEHP or DBP ("Reformulated Product(s)"), or (b) the Product is distributed, sold, or offered for sale with a clear and reasonable warning as described below in Section 2.2.

2.2 Clear And Reasonable Warnings

Reformulation Standard

For any Products that are not Reformulated Products, such Products shall be accompanied by a clear and reasonable warning. Defendant shall provide a warning statement substantially similar to the following:

WARNING: This product can expose you chemicals, including Di (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate, which are known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to http://www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

The warning shall be accompanied by a symbol consisting of a black exclamation point in a yellow equilateral triangle with a bold black outline. Where the label for the product is not printed using the color yellow, the symbol may be printed in black and white. The symbol shall be placed to the left of the text of the warning, in a size no smaller than the height of the word "WARNING."

The Products shall carry said warning directly on each unit, label, or package, with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements or designs as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary consumer prior to sale. A Product that is sold by Defendant on the internet to persons located in California shall also provide the warning message by a clearly marked hyperlink on the product display page, or otherwise prominently displayed to the purchaser before the purchaser completes his or her purchase of the Product. For Products that Defendant provides for a downstream entity to sell on the internet, Defendant shall include an instruction that the entity comply with the warning requirements of this section.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

2021

2223

24

2526

27

28

2.3 Compliance with Warning Regulations

Defendant shall be deemed to be in compliance with this Consent Judgment by either adhering to Section 2.2 of this Consent Judgment or by complying with warning requirements adopted by the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") after the Effective Date.

3. <u>PAYMENTS</u>

3.1 Civil Penalty Pursuant To Proposition 65

In settlement of all claims referred to in this Consent Judgment, pursuant to California *Health & Safety Code* section 25249.7, Defendant shall pay a total civil penalty of two thousand dollars and zero cents (\$2,000.00) to be apportioned in accordance with *Health & Safety Code* section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% (\$1,500.00) for State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining 25% (\$500.00) for Plaintiff.

Defendant shall send two (2) checks for the civil penalty: (1) a check or money order made payable to "OEHHA" in the amount of one thousand five hundred dollars and zero cents (\$1,500.00); and (2) a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak" in the amount of five hundred dollars and zero cents (\$500.00). Defendant shall remit these two 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

Upon receipt of the above two civil penalty checks, Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak shall forward these payments to OEHHA and Plaintiff, respectively.

3.2 Reimbursement Of Plaintiff's Fees And Costs

In order to reimburse Plaintiff's reasonable experts' and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting the instant action for all work performed through execution and approval of this Consent Judgment, pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure* section 1021.5, Defendant shall send a check or money order made payable to "Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak" in the amount

of twenty thousand five hundred dollars and zero cents (\$20,500.00). Defendant shall send this 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. <u>RELEASES</u>

4.1 Plaintiff's Release Of Defendant

Plaintiff, acting in its individual capacity and in the public interest and on behalf of itself and its past and current members, managers, agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and/or assignees, in consideration of the promises and monetary payments contained herein, hereby releases Defendant, its parents, subsidiaries, shareholders, directors, members, officers, employees, attorneys, successors and assignees, as well as its upstream and downstream manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, and franchisees, including, but not limited to, Ross Stores, Inc., its parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates (including, but not limited to, dd's DISCOUNTS), (collectively "Released Parties") from any alleged Proposition 65 violation claims asserted in Plaintiff's Notice, Supplemental Notice, or Complaint regarding the alleged failure to warn about exposure to the Listed Chemicals from the Products distributed and/or sold by Defendant before and up to the Effective Date. Within ten (10) business days after receipt of payment from Defendant as described in Section 3 above, Plaintiff shall file a request for dismissal with prejudice of Ross Stores, Inc. and Does 1 through 100.

4.2 Defendant's Release Of Plaintiff

Defendant, by this Consent Judgment, waives all rights to institute any form of legal action against Plaintiff, its shareholders, directors, members, officers, employees, attorneys, experts, successors and assignees for actions or statements made or undertaken, whether in the course of investigating claims or seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 against Defendant in this matter. If any Released Party should institute any such action, then Plaintiff's release of said Released Party in this Consent Judgment shall be rendered void and unenforceable.

///

4.3 Waiver Of Unknown Claims

Each of the Parties acknowledges that it is familiar with Section 1542 of California Civil Code, which provides 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 SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

Each of the Parties waives and relinquishes any right or benefit it has or may have under Section 1542 of California Civil Code or any similar provision under the statutory or non-statutory law of any other jurisdiction to the full extent that it may lawfully waive all such rights and benefits. The Parties acknowledge that each may subsequently discover facts in addition to, or different from, those that it believes to be true with respect to the claims released herein. The Parties agree that this Consent Judgment and the releases contained herein shall be and remain effective in all respects notwithstanding the discovery of such additional or different facts.

5. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>

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>

Should any part or provision of 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. <u>NOTICES</u>

All correspondence and notice 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:

5

6

7

8

9

1

2

3

4

TO DEFENDANT:

Stephen Squillario, Esq. Haight Brown & Bonesteel LLP 505 Sansome Street Suite 1701 San Francisco, CA 94111 TO PLAINTIFF:

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

9. <u>COUNTERPARTS</u>

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.

17

18 | | / / /

///

19 ||///

20 ||///

21 ||///

22 | | / / /

23 ||///

24 ||///

25 ||///

26 ||///

27 | | / / /

28 | | / / /

10. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>

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 Consent Judgment and is not subject to any conflicting obligation that will or might prevent or interfere with the execution or performance of this Consent Judgment by said Party.

AGREED TO:

Date: 4/19/22

By: May and

Authorized Representative of APS&EE, LLC

AGREED TO:

Date: 4-29-22

16 By: July Stury

Authorized Representative of X-S Merchandise, Inc.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 06/28/2022



JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Barbara M. Scheper/Judge

XS01-0000001 14145474.1