1	Daniel N. Greenbaum, State Bar No. 268104	
2	Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum 14752 Otsego Street	
3	Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 Phone: (310) 200-2631	
4	Facsimile: (424) 243-7689 Email: danielgreenbaumesq@gmail.com	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff SHEFA LMV, LLC	
6	SHEFA LMV, LLC	
7	Rebecca Nittle, AZ State Bar No.010545	
8	Law Office or Rebecca Nittle 221 E. Marconi Ave	
9	Phoenix, AZ 85022 Phone: 602.564.1200	
10	Email: saintlaw@aol.com	
11	Attorneys for Defendant	
12	Rich Brands, LLC	
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
14	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
15	CENTR	AL DISTRICT
16	CHEEN LMW LLC	LUDICIAL COLINCII COODDINATION
17	SHEFA LMV, LLC,	) JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION ) PROCEEDING NO: 4765
18	Plaintiff,	) [Shefa LMV, LLC v. Ross Stores, et al.,
19	V.	<ul><li>Los Angeles County Superior Court</li><li>No. BC521400]</li></ul>
20	Rich Brands, LLC	) [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS
21	Defendant.	TO RICH BRANDS, LLC
22		) Judge: Hon. George C. Hernandez, Jr.
23	·-	<del>_</del>
24		
25		
26		
27		

# 1. INTRODUCTION

# 1.1. Shefa LMV, LLC and Rich Brands, LLC

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between plaintiff Shefa LMV, LLC ("Plaintiff") and RICH BRANDS, LLC ("Defendant"), collectively referred to as the "parties," and individually as a "party." Plaintiff is an entity organized in the State of California, which has asserted that it seeks to promote awareness of exposure to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer and commercial products. Plaintiff alleges that DEFENDANT is a "person" in the 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").

#### 1.2. General Allegations

Plaintiff alleges that DEFENDANT has manufactured, imported, distributed and/or sold moisturizing bath and shower gelee products that contain cocamide diethanolamine ("Cocamide DEA") without the requisite Proposition 65 warnings. Cocamide DEA is on the Proposition 65 list as known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

#### **1.3. Product Description**

As used in this Consent Judgment, "Products" shall mean products containing Cocamide DEA including, but not limited to, *Vitabath* Moisturizing Bath and Shower Gelee, that are manufactured, imported, distributed and/or sold by DEFENDANT for sale in the State of California. It is understood and agreed that "Products" shall not mean: (a) in the event California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") establishes a "safe harbor" limit for Cocamide DEA, any products thereafter manufactured, imported, distributed and/or sold by DEFENDANT for sale in the State of California which fall within such "safe harbor" limits so established; and (b) in the event California's OEHHA removes Cocamide DEA from its list of Proposition 65 chemicals, any products thereafter manufactured, imported, distributed and/or sold by DEFENDANT for sale in the State of California which contain Cocamide DEA.

#### 1.4. Notice of Violation

On July 1, 2013, Plaintiff served DEFENDANT and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "Notice") that provided recipients with notice alleging that DEFENDANT was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn consumers and customers that the Products exposed users in California to Cocamide DEA. No public enforcer has diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notice.

#### 1.5. No Admission

DEFENDANT denies the material factual and legal allegations contained in Plaintiff's Notice and maintains that all its products have at all times been in compliance with all laws, including Proposition 65, that it has sold, manufactured, imported and/or distributed in California, including the Products. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by DEFENDANT of any fact, finding, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by DEFENDANT of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law or violation of law, such being specifically denied by DEFENDANT. However, this Section shall not diminish or otherwise affect DEFENDANT's obligations, responsibilities and duties under this Consent Judgment.

#### 1.6. Consent to Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT as to the allegations contained in the Notice, that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment.

#### 1.7. Execution Date

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Execution Date" shall mean the date this Consent Judgment is signed by both parties.

#### 1.8. Effective Date

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date the Court enters Judgment pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment.

# 2. <u>INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: WARNING OR REFORMULATION</u>

# **2.1.** Warning Obligation For Cocamide DEA-Containing Products

Commencing on December 1, 2013, DEFENDANT shall sell, distribute or otherwise deliver, or cause to be sold, distributed or otherwise delivered into California, only Products reformulated to contain no Cocamide DEA, unless such Products are sold or shipped with a clear and reasonable warning as required by Proposition 65.

Each warning required by Section 2.1 shall be prominently placed upon a product's label or other labeling or displayed at the retail outlet with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices in the label, labeling or display as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use. Each warning shall be provided in a manner such that the consumer or user understands to which specific Product the warning applies, so as to minimize the risk of consumer confusion.

DEFENDANT shall provide Proposition 65 warnings on the products as follows:

WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

The word "WARNING" shall be in bold. DEFENDANT may elect to include the words "Wash hands after handling" on the warning but it is not required to do so. DEFENDANT shall provide such warnings with the unit package of the products. Such warnings shall be prominently affixed to or printed on each product's label or package. The font of the warning shall be at least the same size as the font of other safety warnings, if any, on the product container.

# 3. MONETARY PAYMENTS

# 3.1. Civil Penalty Payment Pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b)

DEFENDANT shall pay a total civil penalty payment of \$4,150.00 within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date, as follows: the civil penalty shall be apportioned in accordance with California Health & Safety Code § 25249.12 (c) and (d), with 75% of these funds remitted to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of the penalty remitted to Plaintiff, both pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 3.3.

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

The Parties reached an accord on the compensation due to Plaintiff and its counsel under general contract principles and the private attorney general doctrine codified at California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, for all work performed in this matter. Notwithstanding the work performed by Plaintiff's counsel, should grounds arise for an appeal to be brought or defended against by Plaintiff or Defendant, any fees or costs incurred for working on such an appeal are not included in the fees stated herein. Moreover, before bringing or defending any such appellate actions, Plaintiff's counsel shall discuss the matter with Defendant's counsel and will secure the advance written approval of Defendant before incurring any fees and costs that can be charged to Defendant.

Under these legal principles, DEFENDANT shall pay the amount of \$4,850.00 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 Consent Judgment in the public interest.

#### **3.3. Payment Procedures**

All payments required by Sections 3.1 and 3.2 shall be within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date, in three checks made payable as follows:

- (a) one check to "OEHHA" in the amount of \$3,112.50;
- (b) one check to "Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum in Trust for Plaintiff, LLC" in the amount of \$1,037.50;
- (c) one check to "Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum" in the amount of \$4,850.00.

#### 3.4. Issuance of 1099 Forms

After the settlement funds have been transmitted to Plaintiff's counsel, DEFENDANT shall issue separate 1099 forms, as follows:

- (a) one 1099 form to the "Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment" (EIN: 68-0284486) in the amount of \$3,112.50;
- (b) a second 1099 form to "Shefa LMV, LLC" in the amount of \$1,037.50, whose address and tax identification number shall be furnished upon request;

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

27

28

(c) a third 1099 to "Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum" (EIN: 46-4580172) in the amount of \$4,850.00;

# 3.5. Issuance of Payments.

**3.5.1.** All payments owed to Plaintiff, pursuant to Section 3.1, shall be delivered to the following payment address:

Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq. Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum 14752 Otsego Street Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

**3.5.2.** All payments owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486), pursuant to Section 3.1, shall be delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo line "Prop 65 Penalties") at the following addresses:

Mike Gyrics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment P.O. Box 4010 Sacramento, CA 95812-4010

With a copy of the checks payable to OEHHA mailed to the Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum at the address set forth above in 3.5.1, as proof of payment to OEHHA.

## 4. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

#### 4.1. Plaintiff's Release of DEFENDANT

Plaintiff, on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, including without limitation, Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq., successors and assigns, and in the public interest, hereby releases, effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction, DEFENDANT, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, and each entity to whom DEFENDANT directly or indirectly distributes or sells Products, including, but not limited to, downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, including specifically, but not limited to TJ Maxx, Ross Stores, Inc., franchisees, cooperative members, licensors, and licensees, and any other person or entity in the course of doing business, and the successor and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute, advertise, market or sell Products, and the directors, officers, employees, managers, members, agents, and representatives of each of the foregoing ("Releasees"), from all claims, including, without limitation, all actions and causes of actions in law or equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, losses, fines, penalties or

expenses (including but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees and attorneys' fees) of any nature, character or kind whatsoever, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, fixed or contingent that were brought or could have been brought against DEFENDANT or any Releasees based on or arising out of alleged or actual exposure to Cocamide DEA from the Products. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to exposures to Cocamide DEA from the Products.

#### 4.2. DEFENDANT's Release of Plaintiff

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

#### 5. COURT APPROVAL

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by all parties

#### 6. SEVERABILITY

If, subsequent to the execution of this Consent Judgment, 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 Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and the obligations of DEFENDANT hereunder as to the Products apply only within the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, preempted or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or if any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are rendered inapplicable or no longer required as a result of any such repeal or preemption or

1	rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally as to the Products, including, without limitation,	
2	the removal of Cocamide DEA from OEHHA's list of Proposition 65 chemicals, then	
3	DEFENDANT shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to,	
4	and to the extent that, the Products are so affected.	
5	8. NOTICES	
6	Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to	
7	this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and (i) personally delivered, (ii) sent by first-class,	
8	(registered or certified mail) return receipt requested, or (iii) sent by overnight courier to one party	
9	from the other party at the following addresses:	
10		
11	To DEFENDANT: To Plaintiff:	
12	Richard Neill Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq.	
13	Rich Brands, LLC Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum 1819 E. Morten Ave 14752 Otsego Street	
14	Ste 110 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 Phoenix, Arizona 85020	
15	With a copy to:	
16	Rebecca Nittle, Esq.	
17	Law Office of Rebecca Nittle 221 E. Marconi Ave	
18	Phoenix, AZ 85022	
19	Any party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other party a change of address to	
20	which all notices and other communications shall be sent.	
21		
22	9. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE/PDF SIGNATURES	
23	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or pdf signature,	
24	each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute	
25	one and the same document. A facsimile or pdf signature shall be as valid as the original.	
26	10. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f)	
27	Plaintiff and its attorneys agree to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced	
28	in California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f).	

# 11. ADDITIONAL POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

Plaintiff and DEFENDANT agree to mutually employ their, and their counsel's, 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. The parties acknowledge that, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment, which Plaintiff shall draft and file, and DEFENDANT shall not oppose. If any third party objection to the noticed motion is filed, Plaintiff and DEFENDANT shall work together to file a joint reply or separate replies if the parties so desire and appear at any hearing before the Court. This provision is a material component of the Consent Judgment and shall be treated as such in the event of a breach. If the Court does not grant the motion to approve this Consent Judgment, and if the parties choose not to pursue a modified Consent Judgment within 30 days after the Court's denial of the motion to approve, then, payments, if any, made pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment will be returned to DEFENDANT.

# 12. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified only: (1) by written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon; or (2) upon a successful motion of any party and entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.

#### 13. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>

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

# 14. <u>REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF</u> <u>CONSENT JUDGMENT</u>

This Consent Judgment came before this Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to review this Consent Judgment and to make the following findings pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f)(4):

The injunctive relief required by the Consent Judgment complies with Cal. Health
 & Safety Code § 25249.7;

ı	1	
1	2. The reimbursement of fee	es and costs to be paid pursuant to the Consent Judgment is
2	reasonable under Californ	nia law; and
3	3. The civil penalty amount	to be paid pursuant to Consent Judgment is reasonable.
4		
5	A CREED TO	A CINTING THE
6	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
7	Date: 2/18/14	Date: Ebruary 14, 2014
8	Plaintiff,	Defendant,
9	Shefa LMV, LLC	Rich Brands, LLC
10	By: Olas	By: Reill
11	Print: Alisa Fried	Print:Richard Neill
12	Its: Managing Member	Its: President
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

	ORDER AND JUDGMENT
Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between Shefa LMV, LLC and Rich Brands, LLC, the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with the	
Dated:	
	Judge of the Superior Court
	stage of the superior court