1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436 Rachel Doughty, State Bar No. 255904 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118  Attorneys for Plaintiff ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		
11	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION		
12	-		
13	ANTHONY E. HELD, PH.D., P.E.,	Case No. RG11580568	
14	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT	
15	v.		
16	LARRY HANSEL CLOTHING, LLC; BIG STRIKE, INC.; CHARLOTTE RUSSE, INC.;	Health & Safety Code § 25249.6	
17	CHARLOTTE RUSSE HOLDING, INC.; JODI		
18	KRISTOPHER, INC.; ROGER GARMENTS INC.; TANTRUM APPAREL, LLC; TRIXXI		
19	CLOTHING COMPANY, INC.; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,		
20	Defendants.		
21	-		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27 28			
20			
	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT		

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Parties

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between plaintiff Anthony E. Held, Ph.D., P.E. ("Plaintiff" or "Held") and Big Strike, LLC, formerly known as Big Strike, Inc. ("Big Strike"), Charlotte Russe, Inc. and Charlotte Russe Holding, Inc. (collectively "Charlotte Russe"), Jodi Kristopher, Inc. ("Jodi Kristopher"), Tantrum Apparel, LLC ("Tantrum"), Roger Garments, Inc. ("Roger"), and Trixxi Clothing Company, Inc. ("Trixxi"), collectively the "Settling Defendants," with Held and the Settling Defendants collectively referred to as the "Parties."

Held is an individual residing in the State of California who invokes the private plaintiff attorney general rights under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code section 25249.6, *et seq.* ("Proposition 65").

Each of the Settling Defendants employ ten or more persons and is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of Proposition 65.

## 1.2 General Allegations

Held alleges that each Settling Defendant has sold Covered Products, as that term is defined with respect to each Settling Defendant in Section 1.3, containing di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP" or the "Listed Chemical"), without the requisite Proposition 65 warnings in California.

#### 1.3 Covered Products

The term "Covered Products" means:

- 1.3.1 As to Big Strike, belts containing DEHP that are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Big Strike, Inc. in California, including but not limited to, *Heart Soul Shirt and Belt Set, Style # 72511TRK (#6 13204 07935 4)*;
- **1.3.2** As to Charlotte Russe, handbags containing DEHP that are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Charlotte Russe in California, including but not limited to, *Quilted PU Satchel*, #301066695, JP05127NSBLK-WH;

- 1.3.3 As to Jodi Kristopher, belts containing DEHP, that are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Jodi Kristopher in California, including but not limited to, *City Triangles Junior Dress*, *Style:* 9302-X948;
- **1.3.4** As to Tantrum, belts containing DEHP, that are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Tantrum in California, including but not limited to, *L8TER Dress with Belt, Style* #*CPN53002A*:
- **1.3.5** As to Roger, belts containing DEHP that are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by sold by Roger in California, including but not limited to, *Stooshy Skirt with Belt*, *Style S30828-03*, (#8 45439 01800 0); and
- **1.3.6** As to Trixxi, belts containing DEHP that are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Trixxi in California, including but not limited to, *Trixxi Top with Belt*, #1130990U3X, #640-4409 (#8 89387 37419 1).

## 1.4 Notices of Violation

- 1.4.1 On April 8, 2011, Held served Big Strike and various public enforcement agencies with a document titled 60-Day Notice of Violation that informed Big Strike and the public enforcers that Big Strike was alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that its Covered Products expose users to the Listed Chemical. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in this Notice.
- 1.4.2 On April 25, 2011, Held served Charlotte Russe and various public enforcement agencies with a document titled 60-Day Notice of Violation that informed Charlotte Russe and the public enforcers that Charlotte Russe was alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that its Covered Products expose users to the Listed Chemical. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in this Notice.
- 1.4.3 On May 4, 2011, Held served Jodi Kristopherand various public enforcement agencies with a document titled 60-Day Notice of Violation that informed Jodi Kristopher and the public enforcers that Jodi Kristopher was alleged to be in violation of

Proposition 65 for failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that its Covered Products expose users to the Listed Chemical. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in this Notice.

- 1.4.4 On May 4, 2011, Held served Tantrum and various public enforcement agencies with a document titled 60-Day Notice of Violation that informed Tantrum and the public enforcers that Tantrum was alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that its Covered Products expose users to the Listed Chemical. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in this Notice.
- enforcement agencies with a document titled 60-Day Notice of Violation that informed Larry Hansel and the public enforcers that Larry Hansel was alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that its Covered Products expose users to the Listed Chemical. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in this Notice.
- agencies with a document titled 60-Day Notice of Violation that informed Roger and the public enforcers that Roger was alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that its Covered Products expose users to the Listed Chemical. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in this Notice.
- agencies with a document titled 60-Day Notice of Violation that informed Trixxi and the public enforcers that Trixxi was alleged to be in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that its Covered Products expose users to the Listed Chemical. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in this Notice.

## 1.5 Complaint

On June 14, 2011, Held filed the instant action in the Alameda County Superior Court ("Complaint"), stating a cause of action against Larry Hansel for the violations of California Health & Safety Code section 25249.6 alleged in the Notice issued to Larry Hansel on April 8, 2011.

On September 16, 2011, Held filed a First Amended Complaint adding as defendants in this action each of the other Settling Defendants and stating a cause of action against each for the violations of Proposition 65 alleged in their respective Notices.

#### 1.6 No Admission

Settling Defendants deny the material, factual and legal allegations contained in Held's Notices, Complaint, and First Amended Complaint and maintain that all of the products they have sold, including the Covered Products have been, and are, in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by any Settling Defendant of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Settlement Agreement constitute or be construed as an admission by any Settling Defendant of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by each Settling Defendant. However, this section shall not diminish or otherwise affect any Settling Defendant's obligations, responsibilities, or duties under this Consent Judgment.

#### 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: REFORMULATION

## 2.1 Implementation of the 3P Standard for Covered Products

Commencing on December 15, 2011, each Settling Defendant and its corporate affiliates shall only manufacture, or accept from a manufacturer or other supplier, for sale in California, Covered Products that meet or exceed the "3P Standard." For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the 3P Standard is a maximum concentration of 1,000 parts per million ("ppm") (0.1%), by weight, each of DEHP, butyl benzyl phthalate ("BBP"), and/or di-n-butyl phthalate ("DBP") in any accessible component (*i.e.*, any component that is reasonably likely to be handled, touched or mouthed during reasonably foreseeable use) of a Covered Product, when analyzed pursuant to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency testing methodologies 3580A and 8270C.

## 2.2 Extension of Implementation Deadline

The deadline for implementing the 3P Standard imposed pursuant to Section 2.1 shall be extended to December 31, 2012, with respect to any Settling Defendant requiring such an extension, if the Settling Defendant provides written notification on or before December 15, 2011, to Plaintiff indicating its intent to exercise such election. Thereafter, such Settling Defendant shall pay the additional penalty set forth in Section 3.1 below.

## 3. PENALTIES PURSUANT TO HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(b)

## 3.1 Initial Civil Penalty

On or before November 15, 2011, each Settling Defendant shall make a payment of \$10,000, pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subsection (b). Upon election pursuant to Section 2.2 to extend the implementation deadline until December 31, 2012, each Settling Defendant shall pay a second civil penalty of \$12,000.

All civil penalty payments shall be apportioned in accordance with Health & Safety Code section 25249.12, subdivisions (c)(1) and (d), with 75% of these funds earmarked for the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of these penalty monies earmarked for Dr. Held.

#### 3.2 Reimbursement of Plaintiff's Fees and Costs

The Parties acknowledge that Held and his counsel offered to resolve this dispute without reaching terms on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed to them, thereby leaving this fee issue to be resolved after the material terms of the agreement had been settled. Held then expressed a desire to resolve the fee and cost issue shortly after the other settlement terms had been finalized. The Parties then attempted to (and did) reach an accord on the compensation due to Held and his counsel under general contract principles and the private attorney general doctrine codified at California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, for all work performed in this matter, except fees that may be incurred on appeal. Under these legal principles, each Settling Defendant shall pay the amount of \$33,000, on or before November 15, 2011, for fees and costs incurred investigating, litigating and enforcing this matter, including the fees and costs incurred (and yet to be incurred) negotiating, drafting, and obtaining the Court's approval of this

## 4. RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

4.1 Full, Final, and Binding Resolution of Proposition 65 Allegations

This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between Plaintiff on behalf of himself and on behalf of the general public in California, and each Settling Defendant, and its parents, subsidiaries, and affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), based on the failure to warn about exposures to DEHP contained in Covered Products sold in California as alleged in the Notice received by each Settling Defendant. The benefits of this agreement extend to each entity to whom each Defendant Releasee directly distributes or sells Covered Products, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, cooperative members, licensors, and licensees ("Downstream Releasees").

## 4.2 Plaintiff's Public Release of Proposition 65 Claims

In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, Plaintiff on behalf of himself, his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, and in the interest of the general public, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases all claims, including, without limitation, all actions, and causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses, or expenses (including, but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees, and attorneys' fees, exclusive of fees and costs on appeal) of any nature whatsoever, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims") against Settling Defendant, each of its Defendant Releases, and each of its Downstream Defendant Releases, arising under Proposition 65 with respect to DEHP in the Covered Products sold by Settling Defendants in California.

## 4.3 Plaintiff's Individual Release of Claims

Plaintiff, in his individual capacity only and *not* in his representative capacity, provides a release herein which shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction, as a bar to all Claims, liabilities and demands of any nature, character or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, against Settling Defendant, each of its Defendant Releasees, and each

of its Downstream Defendant Releases, limited to past violations arising out of Proposition 65 or alleged or actual exposure to DEHP, DBP, and/or BBP in all products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Settling Defendant.

#### 4.4 Settling Defendants' Release of Held

Each Settling Defendant, on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against Held, his attorneys, and other representatives for any and all actions taken or statements made (or those that could have been taken or made) by Held and his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims or otherwise seeking to enforce of Proposition 65 against them in this matter, and/or with respect to the Covered Products.

## 5. ENFORCEMENT OF NONCONFORMING NON-COVERED PRODUCTS

## 5.1 Plaintiff's Obligation to Notify

If, on or after the Effective Date, Plaintiff newly discovers and then alleges that a Settling Defendant offered for retail sale to California consumers, or to a distributor for the purpose of retail sales in California, a product not primarily intended for use by persons ages twelve and younger that is not a Covered Product, and that contains DEHP, BBP, and/or DBP in an amount that exceeds the 3P Standard ("Nonconforming Non-Covered Product"), then prior to Plaintiff's serving a 60-Day Notice under Proposition 65 on such Settling Defendant, Plaintiff shall provide a letter to the Settling Defendant and the Parties shall then proceed pursuant to this Section 5.

The letter shall contain the following information: (a) the date the alleged violation was observed and the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product was purchased, including a copy of the sales receipt; (b) the location or website at which the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product was offered for sale; (c) a description of the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product, including a picture of the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product and a picture of identifying information appearing on the tag or label, if any; and (d) data obtained by Plaintiff regarding the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product such as laboratory results associated with the testing of the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product.

#### 5.2 Notice of Election

Within 30 days of receiving a letter pursuant to Section 5.1, the Settling Defendant shall serve a Notice of Election on Plaintiff. The Notice of Election shall:

- a) Identify to Plaintiff (by proper name, address of principal place of business and telephone number) the person or entity that sold the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product to the Settling Defendant;
- Identify the manufacturer and other distributors in the chain of distribution of the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product; and
- c) Include either: (i) a statement that the Settling Defendant elects not to proceed under this Section 5, in which case Plaintiff may take further action including issuance of a 60-Day Notice under Proposition 65; (ii) a statement that the Settling Defendant elects to proceed under this Section 5, or (iii) a statement that the Settling Defendant contends that the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product is released from liability by a Qualified Settlement under Section 5.4(a) along with a copy of such Qualified Settlement.

## 5.3 Confidentiality

A party's disclosure pursuant to this Section 5 of any (i) test reports, (ii) confidential business information, or (iii) other information that may be subject to a claim of privilege or confidentiality, shall not constitute a waiver of any such claim of privilege or confidentiality, provided that the Party disclosing such information shall clearly designate it as confidential. Any Party receiving information designated as confidential pursuant to this Section 5 shall not disclose such information to any unrelated person or entity, and shall use such information solely for purposes of resolving any disputes under this Consent Judgment.

## 5.4 Relief from Liability

No further action is required of the Settling Defendant under this Consent Judgment, and Plaintiff shall not serve a 60-Day Notice on the Settling Defendant regarding the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product, if either:

- a) The Nonconforming Non-Covered Product is otherwise released from liability for alleged violations of Proposition 65 with respect to DEHP, DBP, and/or BBP by the terms of a separate settlement agreement or consent judgment entered into under Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7 and, if an authorized public prosecutor of Proposition 65 is not a party, reported to the California Attorney General's Office ("Qualified Settlement"); or
- b) At least one of the person(s) identified by the Settling Defendant pursuant to Sections 5.2(a) or 5.2(b) (i) is a person in the course of doing business as defined in Health & Safety Code section 25249.11(b), (ii) has a principal place of business located within the United States, and (iii) sold the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product identified by the Plaintiff within two years of the Settling Defendant's Notice of Election that was served on Plaintiff pursuant to Section 5.2 above.

#### 5.5 Nonelection

If the Settling Defendant elects not to proceed under Section 5, then neither the Settling Defendant nor Plaintiff have any further duty under this Section 5 and either may pursue any available remedies under Proposition 65 or otherwise.

## 5.6 Defendant's Obligations on Election

If the Settling Defendant elects to proceed under this Section 5 and is not relieved of liability under Section 5.4, the Settling Defendant shall within sixty (60) days: (i) terminate its further distribution for sale of the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product in California, (ii) pay a statutory penalty in the amount of \$4,000 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), and (iii) pay \$25,800 in reimbursement of a portion of attorneys' fees and costs incurred by Plaintiff with respect to the notice.

#### 5.7 Refund

If a Settling Defendant makes payments pursuant to Section 5.6 and at a later date Plaintiff resolves the alleged violation with the direct or indirect Vendor, identified in Sections 5.2(a) or 5.2(b), of the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product, Plaintiff shall notify the Settling Defendant and the Settling Defendant shall be entitled to a refund of the lesser amount of its

contribution or the settlement amount paid by such Vendor. If the settlement or consent judgment between Plaintiff and the direct or indirect Vendor of the Nonconforming Non-Covered Product does not provide for the refund to be paid directly by the Vendor to the Settling Defendant, then Plaintiff shall pay the refund to the Settling Defendant within 15 days of receiving the Vendor's settlement payment.

#### 5.8 Limits of Election

Nothing in this Section 5 affects Plaintiff's right to issue a 60-Day Notice under Proposition 65 against any entity other than a Settling Defendant, except as to a Settling Defendant's customer of a Nonconforming Non-Covered Product that is subject to the Settling Defendant's election under Section 5.2(c)(ii) above.

#### 6. SEVERABILITY

If, subsequent to the execution of this Settlement Agreement, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected.

#### 7. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Settlement Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the state of California and apply within the state of California.

#### 8. NOTICES

Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this settlement agreement shall be in writing and: (i) personally delivered; (ii) sent by first-class, registered or certified mail, return receipt requested; or (iii) sent by overnight courier on any party by the other party at the following addresses:

To a Settling Defendant:

At the address shown in Exhibit A, with a copy to:

Russell L. Allyn, Esq. Michael B. Fisher, Esq. Buchalter Nemer, APC 1000 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1000 Los Angeles, CA 90017

To Plaintiff:

Proposition 65 Coordinator The Chanler Group 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565

Any Party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other Party a change of address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.

## 9. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE SIGNATURES

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or portable document format (pdf) signature, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

#### 10. POST-EXECUTION ENFORCEMENT

Should Held prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce a violation of this Consent Judgment, Held shall be entitled to his reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application, consistent with Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5. Should any Settling Defendant prevail on any motion or application for an order to show cause or other proceeding that it brings, such Settling Defendant may be awarded its reasonable attorney's fees and costs as a result of such motion or application upon a finding by the court that Held's defense of the motion or application lacked substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in Civil Discovery Act, Code of Civil Procedure section 2016.010 et seq.

Except as specifically provided in this agreement, each Party shall bear its own costs and attorney's fees in connection with this action. Nothing in this agreement shall preclude a Party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

#### 11. ADDITIONAL POST-EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

Held agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in California Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(f). The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to Health &

Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment. In furtherance of obtaining such approval, Held's counsel shall prepare a motion for this Consent Judgment's approval by the Court, and Held and the Settling Defendants, and their respective counsel, agree to mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this agreement as a Consent Judgment and obtain approval of the Consent Judgment by the Court in a timely manner. For purposes of this Paragraph, "best efforts" shall include, at a minimum, joining in Plaintiff's motion for judicial approval, if requested, and supporting Plaintiff's efforts to obtain judicial approval of, and an entry of judgment pursuant to the terms of, this Consent Judgment.

#### 12. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified only by: (i) by written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court thereon; or (ii) upon a successful motion or application of any party and entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court.

#### 13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties. This Consent Judgment may be modified only by stipulation of the Parties and an order of the Court or upon a motion by any Party that is granted by the Court.

23 ///

24 | ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1	14.	AUTHORIZATION		2
2		The undersigned are authorized to execu	te this Consent Judgment on behalf of the	eir
3	resp	ective parties and have read, understood, an	d agree to all of the terms and conditions	of this
4	Con	sent Judgment.		<b>5</b>
5				B.
6	AG	REED TO:	AGREED TO:	1.00mm
7	Plai	ntiff, ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D.	BIGSTRIKE, INC.	<u>.</u>
8	(	lnihony & Hell		in the state of th
9		Signature		
10	Date	: APPROVED	Signature	ļ Ļ
11		By Tony Held at 4:56 pm, Oct 10, 2011	By: LARS VIKLUND Signatory's Name	1
12				
13			Its: PRESIDENT Signatory's Title	<u>i</u>
14			Date:	rian de la companya d
15			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
16				# 6.
17				
18				1
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				-
25				
26				e I
27				
28				
			14	! 
į		[PROPOSED]	CONSENT JUDGMENT	

3

4

#### 14. AUTHORIZATION

Plaintiff, ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D.

Signature

By Tony Held at 4:56 pm, Oct 10, 2011

AGREED TO:

Date: APPROVED

8588750333

The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment.

5

6 7

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

AGRI	ED	TO:
------	----	-----

CHARLOTTE RUSSE

Defendant

D. Zina

A KABINOVICH

Signatory's Name

is: SUP (

Date:\_\_

10/18/11

14

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	14. AUTHORIZATION		
2	The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their		
3	respective parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this		
4	Consent Judgment.		
5			
6	AGREED TO:		
7	Plaintiff, ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D.  JUDI KRISTOPHER, WC  Defendant		
8			
9	Signature Viz Signature		
10	Date:		
11	By: IRA ROSBABERC- Signatory's Name		
12	Its:CEO		
13	Signatory's Title		
14	Date: 10 / 11 / 11		
15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	14		
	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT		

## AUTHORIZATION 14. The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment. AGREED TO: AGREED TO: ROSER CARMENTS ZAC Defendant Plaintiff, ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D. Date: APPROVED Yorz Kassay Signatory's Name By Tony Held at 4:56 pm, Oct 10, 2011 Signatory's Title Its: 10-14-11 Date:

1	14. AUTHORIZATION		
2	The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their		
_3_	respective parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this		
4	Consent Judgment.		
5			
6	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:	
7	Plaintiff, ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D.	TANTRUM APPARAL, LLC  Refendant	
8		Referidant	
9	Signature	In Some day	
10	Date:	Signature	
11	-	By: IRA ROSENBERC- Signatory's Name	
12		Its: MAMBER MANACHER	
13		Signatory's Title	
14		Date: 10/11/11	
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		14	
	- Innoncorni o		

1	14. AUTHORIZATION			
2	The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their			
3	respective parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this			
4	Consent Judgment.			
5				
6	AGREED TO:			
7	Plaintiff, ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D.    Tix Xi (lothing lompar)   Defendant   Plaintiff, ANTHONY E. HELD, Ph.D.	/rc		
8	- Alivery			
9	Signature Signature			
0	Date:By: Janet Edwards			
1	Signatory's Name			
3	Its: (hie Financie ) Hiers	-		
4	Date: \0(14\1)			
5	Date. (1 11.1)			
6				
7				
8				
9				
0				
1		İ		
2		L.		
3		ı I		
4				
.5				
.6				
7				
8				
	14			
ĺ	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT			

**EXHIBIT A** Person(s) to receive Notices Pursuant to this Consent Judgment Jeffen, Kapie Name

Atterny
Title Bry Strike, inc.
Company Name Duchevlace Nemero Company Name 1000 Wilshire Blud, Enterson Address Line 1 151 West Reserves Ave Address Line 1 Gardena CA 90248 LOS Angules CA 90017 Address Line 2 TKapura Buchatter. com. Email Address **Email Address** 

**EXHIBIT A** Person(s) to receive Notices Pursuant to this Consent Judgment Jeffrey Kapor Name Attorney SUP Corporate Controller CharloHe Russe Company Name Company Name 1000 Wilshire, Seite 1500 Address Line 1 4645 Morena Blyd. Address Line 1 San Diego, CA 92217 Thapor @ Buchalter. com Email Address **Email Address** 

#### 1 EXHIBIT A 2 3 Person(s) to receive Notices Pursuant to this Consent Judgment 4 5 JEFF HAPUR IRA FOCEL MAN 6 Name Name 7 ATTURNEY CFO 8 Title Title 9 BUCHALTER NEMER JUDI KRISTOPHER, INC 10 Company Name Company Name 11 1000 WILSHIRE BLVD #1500 GUIS BAVOWI BLVD 12 Address Line 1 Address Line 1 13 90040 LOS ANCIPLIES, CA 90017 COMMERCE, CA 14 Address Line 2 Address Line 2 15 JKAPURE BUCHALTER. COM IRAF & CITYTRIANGLES COM 16 Email Address Email Address 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 15

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

**EXHIBIT A** Person(s) to receive Notices Pursuant to this Consent Judgment Jeffrey Hupor

Name

Attorney

Title

Buchelter Nomer

Company Name

1000 Wilshire, Suite 1500

Address Line 1

Los Angles, (A. 90017

Address Line 2

JKofor @ Buchalter. (Ord)

Email Address Rogar Garmend Mr.
Company Name

1524 Gage Road

Address Line 1

Montehello, CA 90640 **Email Address** 

## 1 **EXHIBIT A** 2 3 Person(s) to receive Notices Pursuant to this Consent Judgment 4 5 JEFF HAPUR IRA FOURLMAN 6 Name Name 7 ATTORNEY CFO 8 Title Title 9 TANTRUM APPAREL, LLC BUCHALTER NEMBER 10 Company Name Company Name 11 1000 WILSHIRE BLUD #1500 GUIS BONDINI BLUD 12 Address Line 1 Address Line 1 13 COMMERCE, CA 90040 LUS ANCALAS, CA 90017 14 Address Line 2 Address Line 2 15 THAPOR Q BUCHALTBR. COM IRA, FOCALMAND HOTTAMPARAD. 16 Email Address Email Address 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 15 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	EXHIBIT A		
2	2		
3	Person(s) to receive Notices Pursuant to this Consent Judgment		
4			
5	Janet Edwards -	leffrey H. Kapr, Est	<u>'</u>
6	Name Name		
7	(FO)	Attorney	
8		<u> </u>	
9	Trixxi Clothing Company ne. Be	ICHALTER NEMER, APG	
10	Company Name Company Inc.	INVERTIER NEMER, APCINING NAME  OF WILSHIRE Blud. #150	_
11	2014 E 15th St. 10	00 Wilshire Blud. #1310	٥ر
12	Address Line   Address	is Line 1	17
13 14		s Angeles, A god	/
15	Addwood imp 7 \ Addwo	s Line 2 Kapura buchaltera	
16			
17	Bran Address Email	Address	
18	3		
19			
20	· ·		
21			
22	2		
23	;		
24			
25	5		
26	5		
27			
28	1		
	15		