FILED Superior Court of California

County of Los Angeles	
05/20/2025	

Lucas Novak (SBN 257484)	David W. Stayfor, Exect blue Officer / Clerk of Cot		
LAW OFFICES OF LUCAS T. NOVAK	Ву:	A. Robledo	Deputy
8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217			
Los Angeles, CA 90069			
Telephone: (323) 337-9015 Email: lucas.nvk@gmail.com			
Attorney for Plaintiff, APS&EE, LLC			
SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CA	LIFORNIA	
FOR THE COUNTY	OF LOS ANGEL	LES	
APS&EE, LLC, a limited liability company,	CASE NO. 245	STCV19136	
Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT		
v. )	Judge:	Hon. Rupert A. E	Syrdsong
ALCOBRA METALS, INC., a corporation,	Dept.:	28	, .
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	Compl. Filed:	July 31, 2024	
Defendants. )	Un	limited Jurisdiction	on
///			
///			
///			
///			
///			
///			
///			
///			

# 1. RECITALS

#### 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, Alcobra Metals, 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.
- **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 Brass Bars, including but not limited to flat bars, round bars, hex, and square bars (hereinafter, the "Products"), in the State of California causing users in California to be exposed to hazardous levels of Lead without providing "clear and reasonable warnings", in violation of Proposition 65. Products containing lead are potentially subject to Proposition 65 warning requirements because it is listed by the State of California as known to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.
- 1.2.2 On March 12, 2024, Plaintiff sent a Sixty-Day Notice of Violation (the "March 12th Notice") to Defendant and the various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products. On May 20, 2024, Plaintiff sent an Amended Sixty-Day Notice of Violation (the "May 20th Notice") to Defendant and the various public enforcement agencies regarding the alleged violation of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products. The March 12th Notice and May 20th Notice shall hereinafter collectively be referred to as the "Notices". On July 31, 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 Notices and Complaint and maintains that there was only one sale of Products in California that potentially violated Proposition 65.

Plaintiff disputes this allegation. Defendant further maintains that it no longer distributes, markets or sells its Products in California as a result of the Complaint. 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.

# 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

#### 2.1 Reformulation Standard

After the Effective Date, Defendant shall not distribute for sale in California, sell or offer for sale the Products in California unless (a) the Products contain no more than 100 parts per

million (0.01%) of Lead, and the Products produce a test result no higher than 1.0 microgram of lead based on a wipe sample collected using NIOSH Method 9100 or equivalent ("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.

# 2.2 Clear And Reasonable Warnings

For any Products marketed, distributed or sold in California that are not Reformulated Products, such Products shall be accompanied by a clear and reasonable warning. Defendant shall provide a warning statement as follows:

**WARNING:** This product can expose you to Lead which is known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to 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". 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 pay a total civil penalty of one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) to be apportioned in accordance with *Health and Safety Code* section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% (\$750.00) for State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining 25% (\$250.00) for Plaintiff.

Defendant shall issue these payments collectively as part of the total payment described 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 seven thousand dollars (\$7,000.00). Accordingly, Defendant shall remit total payment via wire transfer to Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak in the amount of eight thousand dollars (\$8,000.00), which includes the civil penalty described in Section 3.1, within five (5) business days of the Effective Date. Wire instructions have been exchanged between the Parties' counsel.

### 4. <u>RELEASES</u>

#### 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, its parents, subsidiaries, shareholders, directors, members, officers, employees, attorneys, successors and assignees, and their downstream distributors, retailers, and franchisees (all of the foregoing, collectively "Released Parties"), from any alleged Proposition 65 violation claims asserted in Plaintiff's Notice or Complaint regarding failure to warn about Lead exposure from the Products sold by Defendant before and up to the Effective Date.

## 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, 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.

# 8. 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:

# TO DEFENDANT: Rudy Perrino Kutak Rock LLP 777 S. Flower Street, Suite 4550 Los Angeles, CA 90017 TO PLAINTIFF: Lucas T. Novak, Esq. Law Offices of Lucas T. Novak 8335 W Sunset Blvd., Suite 217 Los Angeles, CA 90069

# 9. 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.

26 ||///

///

27 ||///

28 ||///

#### **AUTHORIZATION** 10.

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:

By:

27.99

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

12 AGREED TO: .13

Date:

By:

15 16

Authorized Representative of Alcobra Metals, Inc.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

€Í EDSEEDSEGÍ Dated:

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

8