1 2 3 4 5 6	Evan Smith (Bar No. SBN 242352) BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC. 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 Tel: (877) 534-2590 Fax: (310) 247-0160 Attorneys for Plaintiff Gabriel Espinosa			
7 8				
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA			
11	GABRIEL ESPINOSA,	Case No.: RG16839767		
12	Plaintiff,	CONSENT JUDGMENT		
13	V.	Judge: Victoria S. Kolakowski		
14	PILOT AUTOMOTIVE, INC.,	Dept.: 23		
15	Defendant.	Hearing Date: March 7, 2017		
16		Hearing Time: 3:00 PM		
17		Reservation #: R-1813724		
18				
19	F			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
2627				
28				
۷٥				

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 **The Parties.** This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Gabriel Espinosa acting on behalf of the public interest (hereinafter "Espinosa") and Pilot Automotive, Inc., (hereinafter "Pilot"), with Espinosa and Pilot collectively referred to as the "Parties" and each of them as a "Party." Espinosa is an individual residing in California who seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer products. Pilot employs ten or more persons and is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of Proposition 65, Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq.
- 1.2 **Allegations and Representations.** Espinosa alleges that Pilot has exposed individuals to Diisononyl phthalate (DINP) from windshield visors without providing clear and reasonable warnings under Proposition 65. DINP is listed under Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
- 1.3 **Notices of Violation/Complaint.** On or about August 15, 2016, Espinosa served Pilot and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d) (the "Notice"), alleging that Pilot was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn consumers and customers that the windshield visors exposed users in California to DINP. No public enforcer has brought and is diligently prosecuting the claims alleged in the Notice. On November 22, 2016, Espinosa filed a complaint in the matter as captioned above ("Complaint").
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over Pilot as to the allegations contained in the complaint filed in this matter, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, and that this Court has jurisdiction to approve, enter, and oversee the enforcement of this Consent Judgment as a full and final binding resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein and/or in the Notice.

1.5 Pilot denies the material allegations contained in Espinosa's Notice and Complaint and maintains that it has not violated Proposition 65. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Pilot 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 Pilot of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by Pilot. However, this section shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of Pilot under this Consent Judgment.

2. **DEFINITIONS**

- 2.1 **Covered Products.** The term "Covered Products" means Automotive Decals, Stickers and Windshield Visors including West Coast Customs Windshield Visors.
- 2.2 **Effective Date.** The term "Effective Date" means the date this Consent Judgment is entered as a Judgment of the Court.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: WARNINGS

- 3.1 Commencing ninety (90) days after the Effective Date, Pilot shall not manufacture for sale, or distribute in California any Covered Product that contains more than 1,000 parts per million DINP, unless the Covered Product is accompanied by the following warning: "WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer." Or, \(\Delta\) WARNING: This product can expose you to chemicals including Diisononyl phthalate (DINP) which is known to the State of California to cause cancer. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov."
- 3.2 The warning provided pursuant to Section 3.1 shall be affixed to or printed on the Covered Product's packaging or labeling. The warning shall be prominently affixed to or printed on the packaging or labeling and displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, or designs as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use. A warning may be contained in the same section of the packaging, labeling, or instruction booklet that states other safety warnings, if any, concerning the use of the product and shall be at least the same size as those other safety warnings.

result of investigating, bringing this matter to Pilot's attention, litigating and negotiating and obtaining judicial approval of a settlement in the public interest, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5. Payment shall be made within ten (10) business days of the Effective Date and sent to the address for Brodsky & Smith set forth in section 4.1.1, above.

4.3 Pilot shall pay the civil penalty and attorney fees in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 within ten (10) days of the Effective Date.

5. RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

- 5.1 This consent judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between Espinosa acting in the public interest, and Pilot and its parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, sister companies, and affiliates, and their successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities from whom they obtain and to whom they directly or indirectly distribute or sell Covered Products, including but not limited to manufacturers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, customers, licensors, licensees, retailers, including but not limited to The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack of California, IEH Auto Parts LLC, The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack, and their respective parents, affiliates and subsidiaries, franchisees, and cooperative members ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of all claims for violations of Proposition 65 based on exposure to DINP from Covered Products as set forth in the Notice, with respect to any Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Pilot prior to the Effective Date. Compliance with the terms of this consent judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with regard to the Covered Products.
- 5.2 In addition to the foregoing, Espinosa, on behalf of himself, his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, and successors and/or assignees, and <u>not</u> in his representative capacity, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases any Pilot, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, claims, demands, rights, suits, obligations, debts, contracts, agreements, promises, liabilities, damages, charges, losses, costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees, of any nature whatsoever, known or unknown, in law or equity, fixed or contingent,

now or in the future, with respect to any alleged violations of Proposition 65 related to or arising from Covered Products manufactured distributed or sold by Pilot or Defendant Releasees. With respect to the foregoing waivers and releases in this paragraph, Espinosa hereby specifically waives any and all rights and benefits which she now has, or in the future may have, conferred 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.

5.3 Pilot waives any and all claims against Espinosa, his attorneys and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made (or those that could have been taken or made) by Espinosa and his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims or otherwise seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 against it in this matter, and/or with respect to Covered Products.

6. <u>INTEGRATION</u>

6.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement of the Parties and any and all prior negotiations and understandings related hereto shall be deemed to have been merged within it. No representations or terms of agreement other than those contained herein exist or have been made by any Party with respect to the other Party or the subject matter hereof.

7. GOVERNING LAW

7.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and apply within the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to Covered Products, then Pilot shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, Covered Products are so affected.

the Parties agree to meet and confer on how to proceed and if such agreement is not reached within 30-days, the case shall proceed on its normal course.

10.3 If the Court approves this Consent Judgment and is reversed or vacated by an appellate court, the Parties shall meet and confer as to whether to modify the terms of this Consent Judgment. If the Parties do not jointly agree on a course of action to take, the case shall proceed on its normal course on the trial court's calendar.

11. MODIFICATION

11.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only by further stipulation of the Parties and the approval of the Court or upon the granting of a motion brought to the Court by either Party.

12. ATTORNEY'S FEES

- 12.1 A party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action arising out of this Consent Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing party's reasonable attorney's fees and costs unless the unsuccessful party has acted with substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure Section 2016, et seq.
- 12.2 Nothing in this Section shall preclude a Party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

13. <u>RETENTION OF JURISDICTION</u>

13.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.

14. **AUTHORIZATION**

14.1 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 document and certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally bind that Party. Except as explicitly provided herein each Party is to bear its own fees and costs.

1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
2	II .	14 1 14 14 19
3	2 000	Date: 10 m COLF
4	By:GABRIEL ESPINOSA	By:
5	GABRIEL ESPINOSA	PILOT ATTOMOTIVE INC.
6		
7	II IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECKE	ED:
8		
9	Dated:	ludge of Superior Court
10		50 1
11 12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	5	
27	'	
28	;	

ı	T .	
1	AGREED TO: AGREE	D TO:
2		
3		
4	By:	TIVE. INC
5		11 v 20, 11 v 0.
6		
7	II IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECKEED:	
8		
9	Dated:	
10		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20	20	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	25	
26	26	
27	27	
28	28	