| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 | Lucas Novak (SBN 257484) LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069 Telephone: (323) 337-9015 Email: lucas.nvk@gmail.com |                               | FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 10/17/2024  David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court By: A. Williams Deputy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5                | Attorney for Plaintiff, APS&EE,  | LLC                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6                | STIDEDIOD  | COLDT OF                      | ei ii.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7                | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8                | FOR  | FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9                |  | 9                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10               | APS&EE, LLC, a limited liabilit  | y company,                    | )  | CASE NO. 24STCV00027                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11               |  | Plaintiff,                    | )  | [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT                |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12               | v.   |                               | )  | Judge: Hon. Stephen P. Pfahler             |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13               | JMLE, LLC, a limited liability of<br>ROSS STORES, INC., a corpora<br>DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,  | ompany,<br>ition, and         | )  | Dept.: 68<br>Compl. Filed: January 2, 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14               | DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,   |                               | )  | Unlimited Jurisdiction                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15               | 8  | Defendants.                   | )  | Ommitted Jurisdiction                      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16               |  |                               | _)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17               | 111  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18               | 111  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19               | 111  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20               | 111  |                               | ii   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21               | 111  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22               |  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23               | ///  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24               |  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25               | ///  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25<br>26         | ///  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27               |  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28               |  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                  |  |                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### 1. RECITALS

### 1.1 The Parties

- 1.1.1 This Consent Judgment ("Consent Judgment") is entered into by and between APS&EE, LLC ("Plaintiff") and Ross Stores, 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 "PerfectCuisine" brand of nonstick fry pans Style EZ06D002CHAR, 8" 2.5MM HMRD FRY CHAR (hereinafter, the "Products"), in the State of California causing users in California to be exposed to hazardous levels of Perfluorooctanoic Acid ("PFOA") without providing "clear and reasonable warnings", in violation of Proposition 65. PFOA is potentially subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements because it is listed as known to cause cancer and reproductive harm.
- 1.2.2 On October 19, 2023, Plaintiff sent a Sixty-Day Notice of Violation (the "Notice") to Defendant, JMLE, LLC, and the various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products. On January 2, 2024, 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.

#### 1.3 No Admissions

Defendant denies all allegations in Plaintiff's 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

11 12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

28

26 27

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.

#### 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

#### 2.1 Reformulation Standard

As of 120 days after Effective Date, Defendant shall not sell Products in California, unless (a) the Products contain no intentionally-added PFOA and no more than 100 parts per million total organic fluorine ("Reformulated Product"), or (b) the Products are distributed, sold, or offered for sale with a clear and reasonable warning as described below in Section 2.2. This reformulation requirement shall not apply to Products that Defendant has in distribution centers or in inventory in California retail stores prior to 120 days after the Effective Date. Such Products are subject to the release in Section 4 of this Consent Judgment.

#### 2.2 Clear And Reasonable Warnings

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 to Perfluorooctanoic Acid ("PFOA") which is known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to <a href="https://www.P65Warnings.ca.gov">www.P65Warnings.ca.gov</a>.

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". Additionally, if the Product contains consumer information in a foreign language, the warning must be provided in the foreign language.

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 comply with 27 CCR section 25600.2(b) and include an instruction that the entity comply with the warning requirements of this section.

### 3. PAYMENTS

#### 3.1 Civil Penalty Pursuant To Proposition 65

In settlement of all claims referred to in this Consent Judgment, Defendant shall collectively pay a total civil penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00) to be apportioned in accordance with *Health and Safety Code* section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% (\$3,000.00) for State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining 25% (\$1,000.00) for Plaintiff.

Defendant shall issue these payments collectively as part of the total payment described

2.7

below in Section 3.2 via wire transfer to Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak. After receipt of the wire transfer, Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak shall be responsible for forwarding the respective payments to OEHHA and APS&EE.

## 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 and approval of this Consent Judgment, in the amount of twenty-eight thousand dollars (\$28,000.00). Accordingly, Defendant shall remit total payment via wire transfer to Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in the amount of thirty-two thousand dollars (\$32,000.00), which includes the civil penalty described in Section 3.1, within ten (10) business days of the Effective Date. Wire instructions have been exchanged between the Parties' counsel.

#### 4. RELEASES

#### 4.1 Plaintiff's Release Of Defendant

Plaintiff, acting in its individual capacity, and in the public interest, in consideration of the promises and monetary payments contained herein, hereby releases Defendant, it parents, subsidiaries, shareholders, directors, members, officers, employees, attorneys, successors and assignees, including, but not limited to JMLE, LLC, and its downstream distributors, retailers, and franchisees (all of the foregoing, collectively "Released Parties"), from any alleged Proposition 65 violation claims asserted or that could have been asserted in Plaintiff's Notice or Complaint regarding failure to warn about PFOA exposure from the Products sold by Defendant before and up to 120 days after Effective Date and any Products Defendant has in its distribution centers or in inventory in California retail stores prior to 120 days the Effective Date, even if sold by Defendant after 120 days after Effective Date (collectively "Released Products").

Plaintiff, for itself and its agents, successors, and assigns, releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims against Defendant and Released Parties arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted by Plaintiff regarding the failure to warn about exposure to PFOA arising in connection with the Released Products.

Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Defendant shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Defendant and any Released Parties with respect to any alleged failure to warn about PFOA in Products sold or offered for sale by Defendant after 120 days after the Effective Date. However, Released Parties that do not comply with the warning requirements of Section 2.2 after being instructed to do so are not released from future liability with respect to the failure to warn about exposure to PFOA from the Products.

#### 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. 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. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, exclusive of its conflict of law rules. This Consent Judgment is entered into in the State of California and may only be enforced in the State of California.

## 7. NOTICES

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:

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

| 17 | TO DEFENDANT:                         |
|----|---------------------------------------|
| 18 | General Counsel                       |
| 19 | Ross Stores, Inc. 5130 Hacienda Drive |
| 20 | Dublin, CA 94568                      |
| 21 | WITH CORVEO                           |

# WITH COPY TO:

Lauren Shoor, Esq. Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP 555 South Flower Street, Forty-First Floor

24 Cos Angeles, California 90071

25

26

27

28

22

23

# 8. <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

#### TO PLAINTIFF:

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

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.

## **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 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:

| $\mathbf{D}$ | a | + | Δ |  |
|--------------|---|---|---|--|

8/19/24

By:

Authorized Representative of APS&EE, LLC

AGREED TO:

Date:

By:

19

25

26 27

28

Authorized Representative of Ross Stores, Inc.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 10/17/2024

Stephen P. Pfahler/Judge JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT