1 2 3 4 5 6	Evan J. Smith, Esquire (SBN 242352) Ryan P. Cardona, Esquire (SBN 302113) BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Telephone: (877) 534-2590 Facsimile: (310) 247-0160 Attorneys for Plaintiff			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA			
10	ANTHONY FERRIERO,	Cara No DC15790604		
11	Plaintiff,	Case No.: RG15789604		
12	VS.	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT  Judge: Sandra Bean		
13	TRICAM INDUSTRIES, INC.,	Dept.: 521		
14	Defendant.	Hearing Date: April 20, 2016		
15		Hearing Time: 2:30 PM		
16		Reservation #: R-1715711		
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
		-1-		
	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT			

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 On May 21, 2015, Anthony Ferreiro ("Ferreiro") served Tricam Industries, Inc. ("Tricam"), Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. ("Wal-Mart"), and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, et seq." (the "Notice"). The Notice provided Tricam and such others, including public enforcers, with notice that alleged that Tricam was in purported violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 ("Proposition 65") for failing to warn consumers and customers that Weatherguard Extreme Duty Tarp, UPC No. 7 22571009526 (the "Product"), potentially exposed users in California to the chemical Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP). No public enforcer has diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notice.
- 1.2 On October 15, 2015, Ferreiro filed a Complaint for Civil Penalties and Injunctive Relief ("Complaint") in the Alameda County court (the "Court"), Case No. RG15789604, against Tricam and Wal-Mart, alleging violations of Proposition 65 with respect to the Product (the "Action").
- 1.3 Tricam is a corporation that employs more than ten persons under California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 and allegedly offered the Product for sale within the State of California.
- 1.4 Ferreiro's Complaint alleges, among other things, that Tricam sold the Product in California and/or to California citizens, that the Product contains DEHP, and that the resulting exposure violated provisions of Proposition 65, by knowingly and intentionally exposing persons to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
  - 1.5. On February 5, 2016, defendant Wal-Mart was dismissed from the litigation.
- 1.6. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Tricam as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint.

- 17. The parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full settlement and release of disputed claims between the parties as alleged in the Complaint for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. By execution of this Consent Judgment, Tricam does not admit any violation of Proposition 65 and specifically denies that it has committed any such violation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Tricam of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Tricam of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy or defense that Tricam may have in any other future legal proceeding. However, this paragraph shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities and duties of Tricam under this Consent Judgment.
- 1.8 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court.

## 2. <u>Injunctive Relief</u>

By this Consent Judgment the parties agree that Tricam may choose to comply with the injunctive relief provisions in 2.1 to 2.2 below regarding reformulated products OR provide a Proposition 65 warning with respect to the Products in 2.3 to 2.4 below.

- 2.1 Commencing on the Effective Date, and continuing thereafter, Tricam shall only ship, sell, or offer for sale in California, reformulated Products pursuant to Section 2.2 or Products that are labeled with a clear and reasonable warning pursuant to Section 2.3. For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, "Reformulated Products" are Products that meet the standard set forth in Section 2.2 below.
- 2.2 "Reformulated Products" shall mean Products that contains less than or equal to 1,000 parts per million ("ppm") of DEHP when analyzed pursuant to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency testing methodologies 3580A and 8270C.
- 2.3 Commencing on the Effective Date, Tricam shall provide a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning for any Product that it ships, sells, or offers to ship or sell in California

labeling with the following statement:

WARNING: This product contains a sharried known to the State of California

that are not Reformulated Products. Tricam shall provide the warning affixed to the packaging or

WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

The warning shall be prominently placed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions before purchase or use. Each warning shall be provided in a manner such that the consumer or user is reasonably likely to understand to which specific Product the warning applies. Tricam may, but is not required, to use the plural "chemicals" in the above warning statement if it has knowledge that the products will expose users to other chemicals.

In the event that the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment promulgates one or more regulations requiring or permitting warning text and/or methods of transmission different than those set forth above, Tricam shall be entitled to use, at its discretion, such other warning text and/or method of transmission without being deemed in breach of this Consent Judgment.

# 3. Entry of Consent Judgment

- 3.1 The parties hereby request that the Court promptly approve and enter this Consent Judgment. Upon entry of this Consent Judgment, Ferreiro and Tricam waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint and Notice which are at issue in the Action.
- 3.2 In the event that the California Attorney General objects or otherwise comments on one or more provisions of this Consent Judgment, Ferreiro and Tricam agree to take reasonable steps to satisfy such concerns or objections.

## 4. Matters Covered By This Consent Judgment

4.1 This Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution between Ferreiro, acting on his own behalf, and on behalf of the public and in the public interest, and Tricam, and shall have preclusive effect such that no other person or entity, whether purporting to act in his, her, or its interests or the public interest shall be permitted to pursue and/or take any action with respect

to any violation of Proposition 65 that was alleged in the Complaint, or that could have been brought pursuant to the Notice. As to Plaintiff Ferreiro for and in his individual capacity only, this Consent Judgment shall have preclusive effect such that he shall not be permitted to pursue and/or take any action with respect to any other statutory or common law claim, to the fullest extent that any of the foregoing were or could have been asserted by him against Tricam or Wal-Mart based on their alleged exposure of persons to DEHP in the Products, or their alleged failure to provide a clear and reasonable warning of exposure to such individuals or, as to alleged exposures to DEHP in the Products, any other claim based on whole or in part on the facts alleged in the Complaint and the Notice, whether or not based on actions committed by Tricam or Wal-Mart. Compliance with the terms with this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to be compliance by Tricam and Wal-Mart with the warning requirement of Proposition 65 for exposures to DEHP from the Products.

4.2 As to alleged exposures to the DEHP in the Products, Ferreiro acting in his individual capacity waives all rights to institute any form of legal action, and releases all claims against Tricam, Wal-Mart and each entity to whom Tricam or Wal-Mart directly or indirectly has distributed or sold the Products, including but not limited to, downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers (including but not limited to Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and its affiliates and subsidiaries), Wal-Mart (including their respective parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell the Product) (collectively, "Releasees"), whether under Proposition 65 or otherwise, arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Product or the Action, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to, the Product (referred to collectively in this Section as the "Claims"). In furtherance of the foregoing, as to alleged exposures to the Product, Ferreiro waives any and all rights and benefits which he now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon him with respect to the Claims by virtue of the provisions of § 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 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.

Ferreiro understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code § 1542 is that even if Ferreiro suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to, the Products, Ferreiro will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Releasees.

With respect to this Section 1542 waiver, each of the parties hereto acknowledges that he/it has consulted with legal counsel regarding the implications of Section 1542 and a waiver thereof.

## 5. Enforcement of Judgment

5.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the parties hereto. The parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Court, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein. 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 this Consent Judgment.

#### 6. Modification of Judgment

- 6.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only by written agreement of the parties upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon an entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.
- 6.2 Should any court enter final judgment in a case brought by Ferreiro or the People involving the Product that sets forth standards defining when Proposition 65 warnings will or will not be required ("Alternative Standards"), or if the California Attorney General otherwise provides written endorsement (i.e., a writing that is circulated by the Attorney General that is not intended for the purpose of soliciting further input or comments) of Alternative Standards applicable to products that are of the same general type and function as the Product and

2.1

constructed from the same materials, Tricam shall be entitled to seek a modification of this Consent Judgment on forty-five (45) days' notice to Ferreiro so as to be able to utilize and rely on such Alternative Standards in lieu of those set forth in Section 7 of this Consent Judgment. Ferreiro shall not unreasonably contest any proposed application to effectuate such a modification provided that the Product for which such a modification is sought are of the same general type and function as those to which the Alternative Standards apply.

## 7. Settlement Payment

- 7.1 In settlement of all the claims referred to in this Consent Judgment, and without any admission of liability therefore, Tricam shall make the following monetary payments:
- 7.1.1 Tricam shall pay a total of \$1,500.00 in civil penalties (the "Civil Penalty") in accordance with this Section. The Civil Penalty will be allocated in accordance with California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% of the funds remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of the funds remitted to Ferreiro. Each respective portion of the Civil Penalty shall be delivered to the addresses listed in Section 7.1.3 below.
- 7.1.2 In addition to the Civil Penalty, Tricam shall pay \$13,500.00 to Brodsky & Smith, LLC ("Brodsky Smith") as complete reimbursement for Ferreiro's attorneys' fees and costs, including all investigation and laboratory costs and expert fees, incurred in the course of serving the Notice and bringing the Action, and in enforcing Proposition 65, including without limitation, preparation of the Notice letter and discussions with the California Attorney General. Payment shall be made within fifteen (15) days of the Effective Date.
- 7.1.3 Within fifteen (15) days of the Effective Date, Tricam shall issue two separate checks for the Civil Penalty amounts to (a) "OEHHA" in the amount of \$1,125.00; and (b) "Brodsky & Smith, LLC in Trust for Ferreiro" in the amount of \$375.00. Payment to Ferreiro pursuant to this Section shall be delivered to the following payment address:

Evan J. Smith, Esq. Brodsky & Smith, LLC Two Bala Plaza, Suite 510 Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004

1	Payment owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486) pursuant to this Section shall be delivered directly		
2	to OEHHA (Memo Line "Prop 65 Penalties") at one of the following address(es):		
3	For United States Postal Service Delivery:		
4	Mike Gyuries		
5	Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment		
6	P.O. Box 4010 Sacramento, CA 95812-4010		
7	For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery:		
8	Mike Gyurics		
9	Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment		
10	1001 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
11	A copy of the check payable to OEHHA shall be mailed to Brodsky & Smith, LLC at the address		
12	set forth above as proof of payment to OEHHA.		
13	8. <u>Notices</u>		
14	8.1 Any and all notices between the parties provided for or permitted under this		
15	Consent Judgment, or by law, shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (i) first-		
16	class (registered or certified mail) return receipt requested; or (ii) overnight or two-day courier on		
17	any party by the other party to the following addresses:		
18	For Tricam:		
19	Kurt A. Dreibholz		
20	Kneafsey & Friend LLP 800 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 710		
21	Los Angeles, CÁ 90017 T: 213.892.1200		
22	For Ferreiro:		
23	Evan J. Smith.		
24	BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC Two Bala Plaza, Suite 510		
25	Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004 T: 877.354.2590		
26	Any party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other party a change of address to		
27	which all notices and other communications shall be sent.		
9			

### 9. Authority to Stipulate

9.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf of the party represented and legally to bind that party.

## 10. Counterparts

10.1 This Consent Judgment may be signed in counterparts and shall be binding upon the parties hereto as if all said parties executed the original hereof.

### 11. Retention of Jurisdiction

11.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement the Consent Judgment under Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

## 12. Service on the California Attorney General

12.1 Ferreiro shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by both parties, on the California Attorney General on behalf of the parties 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.

#### 13. Entire Agreement

13.1 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 discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related thereto. 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.

### 14. Governing Law and Construction

14.1 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 under California law.

1	15.	Court Approval		
2	15.1	15.1 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or		
3	effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.			
4	16.	Intent and Purpose		
5	16.1	This Consent Judgment and the information embraced herein are intended solely		
6	for the purpos	for the purpose of: (1) a full settlement and release of disputed claims between the parties as		
7	alleged in the	alleged in the Complaint; (2) avoiding prolonged litigation; and (3) obtaining court approval of		
8	this Consent Judgment. Except as specifically set forth above, this Consent Judgment may not be			
9	used or disseminated for any other purpose, including, but not limited to, advertising, soliciting or			
10	referring business, posting on social media, press releases and the like.			
11				
12	IT IS SO STIPULATED:			
13				
14	Dated:	arch 31, 2016 Dated:		
15	- 1	nthony Ferrais By:		
16	By: Anthony Ferreiro By: Tricam Industries, Inc.			
17	COMMERCIAL	Tricain fidustries, file.		
18				
19	IT IS	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:		
20				
21	Dated:	Judge of the Superior Court		
22		Juage of the Superior Court		
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1	15.	Court Approval		
2	15.1	If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or		
3	effect, and ca	ffect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.		
4	16.	Intent and Purpose		
5	16.1	This Consent Judgment and the information embraced herein are intended solely		
6	for the purpos	for the purpose of: (1) a full settlement and release of disputed claims between the parties as		
7	alleged in the	alleged in the Complaint; (2) avoiding prolonged litigation; and (3) obtaining court approval of		
8	this Consent.	this Consent Judgment. Except as specifically set forth above, this Consent Judgment may not be		
9	used or disseminated for any other purpose, including, but not limited to, advertising, soliciting or			
10	referring business, posting on social media, press releases and the like.			
11				
12	IT IS SO STIPULATED:			
13		A 21 11		
14	Dated:	Dated: 3-31-16		
15		$\langle M (\delta_0, \zeta) \rangle$		
16	By:	Day Ferreiro By: Tricam Industries, Inc.		
17	7 KILLIN	July 1 offolio		
18	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\			
19	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:			
20				
21	Dated:	Judge of the Superior Court		
22		vongo es las sur sur sur sur sur sur sur sur sur su		
23	1			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				