Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981) Daniel D. Cho (SBN 105409) Ben Yeroushalmi (SBN 232540) YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212 Telephone: 310-623-1926 Facsimile: 310-623-1930 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT 10 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC., in **CASE NO. BC 442078** 11 the public interest, [PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT 12 Plaintiff. JUDGMENT AND [PROPOSED] ORDER 13 Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq. v. 14 CONCORD BUYING GROUP, INC., a ACTION FILED: July 22, 2010 15 New Hampshire Corporation; A.J. TRIAL DATE: None set WRIGHT, a New Hampshire 16 Corporation; THE TJX COMPANIES, INC., a Delaware Corporation; POWER 17 DEVICES LLC, a Ohio Limited Liability 18 Company; and DOES 1-50; 19 Defendants. 20 1. INTRODUCTION 21 1.1 On July 22, 2010, Plaintiff, the Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ("CAG"), filed a 22 complaint in the Los Angeles Superior Court entitled Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. v. Concord 23 Buying Group, Inc., A.J. Wright, The TJX Companies, Inc., Power Devices, LLC, Case No. BC 24 442078 (the "Action), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of 25 California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. ("Proposition 65"). Power Devices, LLC **26** shall be referred to hereinafter as "Power Devices" or "Defendant." CAG and Defendant 27 collectively to be referred to hereinafter as "Parties." 28

[PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT AND [PROPOSED] ORDER

27

28

- Defendant is a limited liability company. Defendant allegedly has made available 1.2 for distribution in the State of California an allegedly lead-containing product, handheld flashlights (the "Product"). The Product allegedly contains Lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.
- On or about December 18, 2009, CAG served Defendant and the appropriate public 1.3 enforcement agencies with notice claiming that Defendant was in violation of Proposition 65 in regard to the Product. CAG's notice and the Complaint in this Action allege that Defendant exposed people who handle the Product to Lead, without first providing clear and reasonable warnings, in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6. Also, on or about January 12, 2011, CAG served a "Sixty-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("Sixty-Day Notice") on Aurora Wholesalers, LLC dba The Mazel Company, MZ Wholesale Acquisition, LLC, The Powerhouse Group, MZ Targetco, LLC (collectively referred to for brevity as the "Mazel Entities") claiming that the Mazel Entities also were in violation of Proposition 65 in regard to the Product. The contentions in CAG's Sixty-Day Notice to the Mazel Entities are identical to the contentions in the notice to Defendant: namely, that the Mazel Entities exposed people who handle the Product to Lead, without first providing clear and reasonable warnings, in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6. The Sixty-Day Notice was served on the Mazel Entities by CAG, with the intent by CAG of adding the Mazel Entities as additional defendants to the Action although they have not yet been added as defendants.
- 1.4 Defendant denies the material allegations of the notices and the Complaint, and denies liability for the cause of action alleged in the Complaint and in connection with the Action. The Mazel Entities deny the material allegations of the Sixty-Day Notice. Defendant and the Mazel Entities maintain that the Product manufactured, distributed, and sold by them in California has at all times been in compliance with all applicable laws. Defendant and the Mazel Entities reserve all of their rights and defenses with regard to any claim by any person under Proposition 65 or otherwise.
 - Defendant has previously filed a Motion to Quash Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of 1.5

24

25

26

28

Personal Jurisdiction. The Motion to Quash has not yet been ruled on by the Court, and the Court has ordered supplemental briefing. However, in order to informally resolve this issue and to avoid incurring further legal expenses, for purposes of this Stipulated Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in CAG's Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in CAG's Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Stipulated Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.

- 1.6 The Parties enter into this Stipulated Consent Judgment pursuant to a settlement of certain disputed claims as alleged in the Complaint and the Sixty-Day Notice for the purpose of avoiding prolonged and costly litigation, including without limitation the expenditure of significant funds by Defendant or the Mazel Entities for scientific analysis and related proceedings before the Office of Environmental Hazard Assessment and/or the Courts related to the Product, and similar expenditures by CAG to oppose such analysis and proceedings.
- Nothing in this Stipulated Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by 1.7 the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, including without limitation, any admission concerning any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory, regulatory, common law, or equitable doctrine, or the meaning of the terms "knowingly and intentionally expose" or "clear and reasonable warning" as used in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Nothing in this Stipulated Consent Judgment, nor compliance with its terms, shall constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law, or of fault, wrongdoing, or liability by Defendant or the Mazel Entities, or their respective officers, directors, employees, or parent, subsidiary or affiliated corporations, or be offered or admitted as evidence in any administrative or judicial proceeding or litigation in any court, agency, or forum.
- 1.8 Nothing in this Stipulated Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding, except as expressly provided in this Stipulated Consent Judgment.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

purposes related to environmental protection, worker health and safety, or reduction of human exposure to hazardous substances (including administrative and litigation costs arising from such projects), as CAG may choose. The check shall be delivered to: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 610E, Beverly Hills, California 90212. CAG shall provide its address and federal tax identification number to Defendant prior to such payment.

Attorneys' Fees and Costs: Thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) of such payment shall be paid to Yeroushalmi & Associates, as CAG's attorneys, for reasonable investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, and any other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendant's attention, litigating, and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. The check shall be delivered to: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 610E, Beverly Hills, California 90212. Yeroushalmi & Associates shall provide its address and federal tax identification number to Defendant prior to such payment.

MODIFICATION OF STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT 4.

This written Stipulated Consent Judgment may only be modified by written 4.1 agreement of CAG and Defendant upon stipulation and Order of the Court, or after noticed motion, and upon entry of a Stipulated Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of CAG or Defendant as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Stipulated Consent Judgment by the Court.

5. ENFORCEMENT OF STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 Any of the Parties may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 of this Stipulated Consent Judgment, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Stipulated Consent Judgment. The prevailing party shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated with such motion or application.

6. APPLICATION OF STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Stipulated Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon the 6.1

7

9 10 11

8

14

12

13

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Parties hereto, their divisions, subdivisions and subsidiaries, officers, directors, employees, agents and their successors or assigns, and to the extent allowed by law, on the general public.

7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

Waiver and Release of Claim Against Defendant: CAG, on behalf of itself and in 7.1 the public interest, hereby releases and discharges Defendant and the Mazel Entities, including their subsidiaries, affiliates and related companies, predecessors, successors and assigns, and all officers, directors, employees, agents, representatives, attorneys, licensors, members, managers, suppliers, authorized dealers, and shareholders of them, (collectively, "Released Parties") from any and all claims asserted, or that could have been asserted, in this or other litigation arising from the alleged failure of any of the Released Parties to provide Proposition 65 warnings for the Product regarding the exposure of individuals to Lead in the Product. CAG, on behalf of itself only, hereby releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all known and unknown past, present, and future rights, claims, causes of action, damages, suits, penalties, liabilities, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and attorney fees, costs, and expenses related to or arising out of the facts and claims asserted, or that could have been asserted, under state or federal law in this or other litigation arising from or related to the Product or the facts alleged in Plaintiff's Proposition 65 Notice or the Complaint, including without limitation any and all claims concerning exposure of any person to Lead in the Product. Compliance with the terms of this Stipulated Consent Judgment shall constitute compliance by the Released Parties with Proposition 65 with respect to exposures to Lead contained in the Product. This release does not limit or affect the obligations of any party that are created under this Stipulated Consent Judgment.

7.2 Waiver and Release of Claims Against Downstream Persons.

CAG, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, hereby releases and discharges each distributor, wholesaler, retailer, customer, purchaser, seller, dealer, owner, operator, lessor, lessee, licensee, or user of the Product manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by the Released Parties, and all their subsidiaries, affiliates and related companies, and the officers, directors, employees, agents, representatives, attorneys, licensors, members, managers, suppliers, authorized dealers, and shareholders of them (collectively, "Downstream Persons"), from any and all claims asserted,

or that could have been asserted, in this litigation arising from the alleged failure of any of the Released Parties or the Downstream Persons to provide Proposition 65 warnings for the Product 2 regarding the exposure of individuals to Lead in the Product. "Downstream Persons" is 3 specifically defined herein to include defendants Concord Buying Group, Inc., A.J. Wright, and 4 5 Downstream Persons from any and all known and unknown past, present, and future rights, 6 claims, causes of action, damages, suits, penalties, liabilities, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, 7 and attorney fees, costs, and expenses related to or arising out of the facts and claims asserted, or that could have been asserted, under state or federal law in this litigation arising from or related to 9 10 11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

Stipulated Consent Judgment.

Matters Covered By This Consent Judgment/Release of Future Claims. 7.3

This release does not limit or affect the obligations of any party that are created under this

the Product or the facts alleged in Plaintiff's Proposition 65 Notice or the Complaint, including

without limitation any and all claims concerning exposure of any person to Lead in the Product.

The TJX Companies, Inc. CAG, on behalf of itself only, hereby releases and discharges the

As to the Product, this Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CAG, acting on behalf of itself and, as to those matters raised in CAG's Notice, the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), on the one hand, and the Released Parties and Downstream Persons on the other hand, for the alleged failure to provide clear, reasonable, and lawful warnings of exposure to lead used or contained in the Product. As to the Product, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by the Released Parties and Downstream Persons with existing requirements of Proposition 65 to provide clear and reasonable warning about exposure to lead in the Product.

7.4 Unknown Claims. It is possible that other injuries, damages, liability, or claims not now known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Complaint and relating to the Product will develop or be discovered, and this Stipulated Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such injuries, damages, liability, and claims, including all rights of action therefor. CAG has full knowledge of the contents of Section 1542 of the Civil Code. CAG, on

9.2 Within 30 days of receiving the notice described in Section 9.1, Defendant or the Mazel Entities shall either (1) withdraw the product, or (2) refute the information provided under Section 9.1. Should the parties be unable to resolve the dispute, either party may seek relief under Section 5.

10. GOVERNING LAW

22

23

24

25

26

27

10.1 The terms of this Stipulated Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

All notices required pursuant to this Stipulated Consent Judgment and correspondence shall be sent to the following:

For CAG:

11.1

For Power Devices, LLC or the Mazel Entities:

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

4

Reuben Yeroushalmi YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES 9100Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 610E Beverly Hills, CA 90212

T: 310-623-1926

F: 310-623-1930

Stacie D. Yee

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY (US) LLP

555 S. Flower Street, Suite 3100 Los Angeles, CA 90071

T: 213-624-2500 F: 213-623-4581

12. COURT APPROVAL

12.1 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no further force or effect.

- 12.2 CAG shall comply with Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f) and with Title 11 California Code of Regulations section 3003. Within a reasonable time of receiving all necessary signatures to this Consent Judgment, and consistent with Health & Safety Code §25249.7(f), Plaintiff shall notice a Motion to Approve Settlement and for Entry of Consent Judgment ("Motion") in the Los Angeles Superior Court for a hearing scheduled not earlier than forty-five (45) days later. Plaintiff shall serve this Consent Judgment and the noticed Motion on the California Attorney General's office within a reasonable time of receiving all necessary signatures.
- 12.3 It is expressly understood and agreed by the Parties hereto that the rights and obligations contained in this Consent Judgment are expressly conditioned on the non-opposition by the California Attorney General's Office to this Consent Judgment. Should the Attorney General object to the Consent Judgment, the Parties shall negotiate in good faith to modify the Consent Judgment in a manner that resolves the objection of the Attorney General. If the Parties cannot agree on appropriate modifications within thirty (30) days of receiving the Attorney General's objections, this Consent Judgment shall, at any Party's option, be deemed null and void

	1					
1	as to that Party, shall not bind that Party, and shall not be construed as an admission or waiver of					
2	any claim or defense and cannot be used for any purpose.					
3	12.4	If the Court enters this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff shall, within ten (10) working				
4	days after ent	ry, electronically provide or otherwise serve a copy of it and the report required				
5	pursuant to 11 Cal. Code Regs. § 3004 to/on the California Attorney General's Office, and shall					
6	dismiss the complaint as against defendants Concord Buying Group, Inc., A.J. Wright, and The					
7	TJX Companies, Inc.					
8	12.5	The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment shall be the later of either the date this				
9	Consent Judgment is entered by the Court or October 1, 2011.					
10						
11	13.	EXECUTION AND COUNTER PARTS				
12	13.1	This Stipulated Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means				
13	of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. Facsimile or pdf					
14	signatures shall be construed as valid as the original.					
15	14.	AUTHORIZATION				
16	14.1	14.1 Each signer of this Stipulated Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully				
17	authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to the terms and conditions of this					
18	Stipulated Consent Judgment and to enter into and execute the Stipulated Consent Judgment on					
19	behalf of the party represented and legally bind that party. The undersigned have read, understand					
20	and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Stipulated Consent Judgment. Except as					
21	explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and costs.					
22	Dated:	CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.				
23	Duted.	CONSOMER AD VOCACT GROOT, INC.				
24						
25	Name and Title:					
26						
27						
28						
		10 [PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT				
		[PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT				

PROPOSEDI STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1

2

3

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24 25

26 27 28

1	Dated:	6/20/11		POWER DEV	ICES, LLC	
2	Daica.				,	
3				1 426	UN -	
4				11000		
5				Name and Title	e: <u>REUVEN I</u> OWNER)ESSLER
6					OWNER	-
7						
8						
9						
10			•			
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16			-			
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22			٠			
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
- 1	1					

11

IPROPOSEDI STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	ORDER AND JUDGMENT								
2	Based upon the Stipulated Consent Judgment between Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc.								
3	and Power Devices, LLC, the Consent Judgment is approved and judgment is hereby entered								
4	according to the terms herein.								
5									
6	Dated:								
7									
8	Judge, Superior Court of the State of California								
9									
10	LOSANGELES/326933.1								
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
۱7									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
	10								