Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981) 1 Daniel D. Cho (SBN 105409) Ben Yeroushalmi (SBN 232540) 2 YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES 3 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W Beverly Hills, California 90212 4 Telephone: 310.623.1926 Facsimile: 310.623.1930 5 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. 7 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 11 12 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC., CASE NO. BC482586 13 in the public interest, CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED] 14 Plaintiff, Dept: 24 15 v. Judge: Honorable Robert L. Hess 16 Complaint filed: April 9, 2012 EARHUGGER, INC., a Utah Corporation, 17 EMPIRE BRANDS. INC., a Utah Corporation, M-SQUARED, INC., a Utah 18 Corporation, BIG LOTS STORES, INC., an 19 Ohio Corporation, and DOES 1-50 20 Defendants. 21 1. INTRODUCTION 22 This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between plaintiff Consumer 1.1 23 Advocacy Group, Inc. ("CAG") acting on behalf of itself and in the interest of the public and 24 defendants Earhugger, Inc., Empire Brands, Inc. (recently renamed to Wicked Audio, Inc.), M-25 Squared, Inc., Big Lots Stores, Inc. and Does 1-50 ("Defendants"), with each a "Party" and 26 collectively referred to as "Parties." 27 28

CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]

20

21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

It is alleged that Defendants employ ten or more persons, are persons in the 1.2 course of doing business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986. California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), and manufacture, distribute, and/or sell Headsets, including but not limited to EarHugger® All-in-One Cellular Headset, Model # C-8110 and Headphones, including but not limited to EarHugger® Stereo Headphones, Model # A-1000 and all other Headsets and Headphones of Defendants sold into California before the effective date of this Consent Judgment ("Alleged Products").

1.3 Notice of Violation.

- On or about July 6, 2011, CAG served Defendants and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "July 6. 2011 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to Lead contained in Alleged Products.
- 1.3.2 No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the July 6, 2011 Notice.

1.4 Complaint.

On April 9, 2012, CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC482586. The Complaint alleges, among other things, that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by failing to give clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to Lead from Alleged Products.

1.5 **Consent to Jurisdiction**

While otherwise disputed, for purposes of this Consent Judgment, the parties consent that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the City and County of Los Angeles and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and of

all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the prior conduct of the parties or on the facts alleged in the Complaint or arising therefrom or related to.

1.6 No Admission

This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material allegation of the Complaint, each and every allegation of which Defendants denies including jurisdiction, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Defendants.

2. **DEFINITIONS**

- 2.1 "Covered Products" means Headsets and Headphones manufactured, sold, and/or distributed by only Earhugger, Inc., Empire Brands, Inc., and M-Squared, Inc.; and such Headsets and Headphones sold by Big Lots Stores, Inc. ("Defendants") prior to Effective Date of this Consent Judgment.
- 2.2 "Effective Date" means the date that this Consent Judgment is approved by the Court.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF/REFORMULATION

3.1 Within 60 days of the Effective Date Defendants shall not sell or offer for sale in California Covered Products that contain Lead with more than 100 ppm.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

Total Payment: Defendant Empire Brands shall mail by certified mail, payments totaling fifty-eight thousand dollars (\$58,000.00) as follows:

4.1 Reimbursement of Attorneys' Fees and Costs: Defendant Empire Brands shall pay \$55,000.00 to "Yeroushalmi & Associates" as reimbursement for the investigation fees and

CONSENT	JUDGMENT	[PROPOSED]

costs, testing costs, expert fees, attorney fees, and other litigation costs and expenses for all work performed through the approval of this Consent Judgment.

- total amount of two thousand dollars (\$2,000.00) as penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code \$ 25249.12: (a) one check made payable to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) in the amount of \$1,500 representing 75% of the total penalty; and (b) one check to Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. in the amount of \$500, representing 25% of the total penalty. Two separate 1099s shall be issued for the above payments: The first 1099 shall be issued to OEHHA, P.O. Box 4010, Sacramento, CA 95184 (EIN: 68-0284486) in the amount of \$1,500. The second 1099 shall be issued in the amount of \$500 to CAG and delivered to: Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, California 90212.
- 4.3 Payment In Lieu of Civil Penalties: Defendant Empire Brands shall pay \$1,000 in lieu of civil penalties to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc." CAG will use this payment for investigation of the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals through various means, laboratory fees for testing for Proposition 65 listed chemicals, expert fees for evaluating exposures through various mediums, including but not limited to consumer product, occupational, and environmental exposures to Proposition 65 listed chemicals, and the cost of hiring consulting and retained experts who assist with the extensive scientific analysis necessary for those files in litigation, as well as administrative costs incurred during the litigation, in order to reduce the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals by notifying those persons and/or entities believed to be responsible for such exposures and attempting to persuade those persons and/or entities to reformulate their products or the source of exposure to completely eliminate or lower the level of Proposition 65 listed chemicals, thereby addressing the same public harm as allegedly in the instant Action. Further, should the court require it, CAG will submit under seal, an accounting of these funds as described above as to how the funds were

used. The check shall be made payable to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc." and delivered to Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, California 90212.

4.4 Payments pursuant to 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 shall be delivered to: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 610W, Beverly Hills, CA 90212 within the time agreed upon by the Parties.

5. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CAG on behalf of itself and in the public interest and Defendants and its officers, directors, insurers, employees, parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, affiliates, sister companies, agents, contractors, vendors, and their successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), including but not limited to each of their suppliers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person in the course of doing business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell Covered Products ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), for all conduct of Defendants prior to the Effective Date based on alleged exposure to Lead from Covered Products as set forth in the Notice. Defendants and Defendant Releasees' compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to Lead from Covered Products.
- 5.2 CAG on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, 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) of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims"), against Defendants, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any allegations of violation of Proposition 65 or

any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead from Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Defendants and Defendant Releasees. In furtherance of the foregoing, as to alleged exposures to Lead from Covered Products, CAG hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with respect to the Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead from Covered Products by virtue of the provisions of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM, MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

CAG understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code section 1542 is that even if CAG suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Claims arising from any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead from Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to Lead from the Covered Products, CAG will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Defendants or the Defendant Releasees or Downstream Defendant Releasees. Furthermore, CAG acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such Claims arising from any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead from Covered Products as may exist as of the date of this release but which CAG does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

6.

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

- 6.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the Parties hereto. Except as otherwise agreed by the Parties, the Parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of California, City and County of Los Angeles, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein. A Party may enforce any of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment only after that Party first provides notice to the Party allegedly failing to comply with the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment and provide 60 days in which the Parties shall attempt to resolve such Party's failure to comply in an open and good faith manner.
- Notice of Violation. Prior to bringing any motion, order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce any alleged violation of Section 3.1 of this Consent Judgment, CAG shall provide a Notice of Violation ("NOV") to Defendants. The NOV shall include for each of the Newly Alleged Products: the date(s) the alleged violation(s) was observed and the location at which the Newly Alleged Products were offered for sale, and shall be accompanied by all test data obtained by CAG regarding the Newly Alleged Products, including an identification of the component(s) of the Newly Alleged Products that were tested. Before any destructive testing of any Newly Alleged Products is conducted by or on behalf of CAG, CAG shall give Defendant(s) an opportunity to inspect and verify at reasonable times and places the authenticity of any Newly Alleged Product in violation of this Consent Judgment.
 - 6.2.1 **Non-Contested NOV.** CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation if, within 60 days of receiving such NOV, Defendants serves a Notice of Election ("NOE") that meets one of the following conditions:
 - (a) The Newly Alleged Products were shipped by Defendants for sale in California before the Effective Date, or
 - (b) Since receiving the NOV Defendants have taken corrective action by either (i) requesting that its customers in California remove the Newly Alleged

Products identified in the NOV from sale in California and destroy or return the Newly Alleged Products to Defendants, or (ii) providing a clear and reasonable warning for the Newly Alleged Products identified in the NOV pursuant to 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25603.

- 6.2.2 **Contested NOV.** Defendants may serve an NOE informing CAG of its election to contest the NOV within 60 days of receiving the NOV.
- (a) In its election, Defendants may request that the sample(s) Covered Products tested by CAG be subject to additional confirmatory testing at an EPA-accredited laboratory.
- (b) If the confirmatory testing establishes that the Newly Alleged Products do not contain Lead in excess of the level allowed in Section 3.1, CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation. If the testing does not establish compliance with Section 3.1, Defendants may withdraw its NOE to contest the violation and may serve a new NOE pursuant to Section 6.2.1.
- (c) If Defendants do not withdraw an NOE to contest the NOV, the Parties shall meet and confer for a period of no less than 30 days before CAG may seek an order enforcing the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 6.3 In any proceeding brought by either Party to enforce this Consent Judgment, such party may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties or remedies as may be provided by law for any violation of Proposition 65 or this Consent Judgment.

7. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 7.1 CAG shall file a motion seeking approval of this Consent Judgment pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, CAG and Defendants waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint.
- 7.2 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, (a) this Consent Judgment and any and all prior agreements between the parties merged herein shall terminate and become null and void, and the actions shall revert to the status that existed prior to the execution date of

this Consent Judgment; (b) no term of this Consent Judgment or any draft thereof, or of the negotiation, documentation, or other part or aspect of the Parties' settlement discussions, shall have any effect, nor shall any such matter be admissible in evidence for any purpose in this Action, or in any other proceeding; and (c) the Parties agree to meet and confer to determine whether to modify the terms of the Consent Judgment and to resubmit it for approval.

8. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT AND RIGHTS THEREUNDER

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any Party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court. Any Party may waive in writing any right it may have under this Consent Judgment.
- 8.2 Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with the other Party prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

9. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

9.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

10. DUTIES LIMITED TO CALIFORNIA

This Consent Judgment shall have no effect on Covered Products sold outside the State of California.

11. SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

California Attorney General so that the Attorney General may review this Consent Judgment prior to its submittal to the Court for approval. No sooner than forty five (45) days after the Attorney General has received the aforementioned copy of this Consent Judgment, and in the absence of any written objection by the Attorney General to the terms of this Consent Judgment, the Parties may then submit it to the Court for approval.

12. ATTORNEY FEES

CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]

12.1 Except as specifically provided in Section 4.1 and 6.3, each Party shall bear its own costs and attorney fees in connection with this action.

13. GOVERNING LAW

- 13.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law provisions of California law.
- 13.2 The Parties, including their counsel, have participated in the preparation of this Consent Judgment and this Consent Judgment is the result of the joint efforts of the Parties. This Consent Judgment was subject to revision and modification by the Parties and has been accepted and approved as to its final form by all Parties and their counsel. Accordingly, any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in this Consent Judgment shall not be interpreted against any Party as a result of the manner of the preparation of this Consent Judgment. Each Party to this Consent Judgment agrees that any statute or rule of construction providing that ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting Party should not be employed in the interpretation of this Consent Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive California Civil Code § 1654.

14. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

14.1 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (PDF), which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

15. NOTICES

15.1 Any notices under this Consent Judgment shall be by personal delivery or First Class Mail.

If to CAG:

Reuben Yeroushalmi 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (310) 623-1926

1	If to Earhugger, Inc., Empire Brands, Inc., and M-Squared, Inc.:
2	Earhugger, Inc.
	874 West 325 North
3	Lindon, UT 84042
4	Empire Brands, Inc. (now Wicked Audio. Inc.)
5	874 West 325 North Lindon, UT 84042
6	
7	M-Squared, Inc. 874 West 325 North
8	Lindon, UT 84042
- 1	With a copy to:
9	
10	Todd Zenger, Esq. Kirton McConkie
11	60 East South Temple, Suite 1800
12	Salt Lake City, UT 84111
	(For Earhugger, Empire and M-Squared)
13 14	If to Big Lots Stores, Inc.
- 1	Big Lots Stores. Inc.
15	300 Philipi Road
16	Columbus, OH 43228
17	With a copy to
18	Michael E. Delehunt
19	FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 555 California Street
20	Suite 1700
21	San Francisco, CA 94104
i	16. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE
22	
23	de la company de
24	by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf
25	of the party represented and legally to bind that party.
26	
27	
28	
	CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]
ľ	·

i	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:	
2	Date:, 2013	Date:,	2013
3			
4			
5	Ву:	By:	Table Line Company (1995)
6	Plaintiff, CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.	Defendant, EARHUGGER, INC	2.
7	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:	
8	Date:, 2013	Date:,	2013
9			
10			
11	Ву:	By:	
12	Defendant, EMPIRE BRANDS, INC.	Defendant, M-SQUARED, INC	ı •
13	(now Wicked Audio, Inc.)		
14 15	AGREED TO:		
16	Date: <u>January</u> 23 , 2014		
10 17	•		
18	By: Chaluck P. Royall	EGA	
19	Chadwick P. Reynolds, Vice President, Deputy		
20	General Counsel and Assistant Corporate	` <i>-</i>	
21	Secretary	·	
22	Defendant, BIG LOTS STORES, INC.		
23			
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.	•	
25			
26	Date:		
27		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COU	RT
28		10	
	CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]		

4834-4744-2967.1

1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
2	Date: 1-2/ 2014	Date: 2013
3		
4		
5	By:	By:
6	Plaintiff, CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.	Defendant, EARHUGGER, INC.
7	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
8	Date:	Date: 2013
9		
10		
	By:	By:
12	Defendant, EMPIRE BRANDS, INC.	
13	(now Wicked Audio, Inc.)	
14		
15	By	
16 17	Defendant, BIG LOTS STORES, INC.	
18		
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20		
21	Date:	
22		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	- Anna Carlotte	
28		12
A\$QK-K)		IDGMENT (PROPOSED)

.

1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
2	Date:, 2013	Date: $\frac{\sqrt{2}/27}{2}$, 2013
3		,
4		
5	Ву:	By:
6	Plaintiff, CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.	Defendant, EARHUGGER, INC.
7	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
8	Date: 12/27 , 2013	Date: $\frac{12}{27}$, 2013
9		
10		
11	By:	By
12	Defendant, EMPIRE BRANDS, INC.	Defendant M-SQUARED, DVC.
13	(now Wicked Audio, Inc.)	
14	(now wrones range)	
15	Ву:	·
16	Defendant, BIG LOTS STORES, INC.	
17	Defendant, Bid Edit of Cites, ince.	·
18	IT IS SO OPPEDED	·
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20	ъ.	
21	Date:	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
22		JUDGE OF THE SOFERIOR COOK!
23		
24 25		
26		
27		·
28		
_ -	CONSENT JU	DGMENT [PROPOSED]
4834-47	4-2967.1	