1 2 3 4	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		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
6			
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		
10	GABRIEL ESPINOSA,	Case No. RG17860441	
11	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT	
12	vs.	Judge: Stephen M. Pulido	
13	HUFFY CORP.,	Dept.: 16	
14	Defendant.	Hearing Date: August 22, 2017	
15		Hearing Time: 3:00 PM	
16		Reservation #: R-1866289	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

- 1.1 On March 15, 2017, Gabriel Espinosa ("Espinosa") served Huffy Corporation ("Huffy"), Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. ("Walmart") 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 Huffy and such others, including public enforcers, with notice that alleged that Huffy was in violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 ("Proposition 65"), for failing to warn consumers and customers that Huffy Handlebar Bags, UPC No. 0 32447 00411 2 manufactured, sold and/or distributed by Huffy in California, exposed users in California to the chemical Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP). No public enforcer has prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notice.
- 1.2 On May 16, 2017, Espinosa filed a Complaint for Civil Penalties and Injunctive Relief ("Complaint") in Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17860441, against Huffy alleging violations of Proposition 65.
- 1.3 Huffy is a corporation that employs more than ten persons under California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 and offered the products for sale within the State of California.
  - 1.4 Huffy and Espinosa are collectively referred to herein as, the "Parties."
- 1.5 Espinosa's Complaint alleges, among other things, that Huffy sold the products in California and/or to California citizens, that the products contain 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 both cancer and reproductive toxicity without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
- 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 Huffy 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.
- 1.7 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full settlement of disputed claims between the Parties as alleged in the Complaint for the purpose of avoiding

prolonged litigation. By execution of this Consent Judgment, Huffy 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 Huffy 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 Huffy 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 Huffy may have in any other future legal proceeding. However, this paragraph shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities and duties of Huffy under this Consent Judgment.

1.8 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date that the Consent Judgment is entered by the Court.

## 2. The Scope of the Consent Judgment

The scope of this Consent Judgment covers the following "Product/Products":

- Huffy Handlebar Bags UPC #032447-004112-31516AR model 00411CL;
- 2. Huffy Handlebar Bags UPC # 032447-00274-3 model 00274XX;
- 3. Huffy Handlebar Bags UPC # 032447-00737-3 model 00737CL.

In addition, the scope of the Consent Judgment covers all phthalates on the Prop 65 list ("Chemicals"), including but not limited to:

- Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP)
- Butyl benzyl phthalate (BBP)
- Di-n-butyl phthalate (DBP)
- Di-isodecyl phthalate (DIDP)
- Di-n-hexyl phthalate (DnHP)
- Di-isononyl phthalate (DINP).

# 3. Injunctive Relief

3.1 Commencing ninety (90) days after the Effective Date, and continuing thereafter, Huffy shall only ship, sell, or offer for sale in California, Reformulated Product pursuant to

Section 3.2 or Product that is labeled with a clear and reasonable warning pursuant to Section 3.3. Huffy and its downstream retailers shall have no obligation to label Products that entered the stream of commerce prior to the Effective Date or within ninety (90) days after the Effective Date. For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, a "Reformulated Product" is Product that is in compliance with the standard set forth below in Section 3.2.

- 3.2 "Reformulated Product" shall mean product that contains less than or equal to 1,000 parts per million ("ppm") of DEHP when analyzed pursuant to CPSC-CH-C1001-09.3 Standard Operating Procedure for Determination of Phthalates method.
- 3.3 Commencing ninety (90) days after the Effective Date, Huffy shall, for all Products it sells or distributes and that are intended for sale in California and that are not a Reformulated Product, provide clear and reasonable warnings as set forth in subsection 3.3(a) below. 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. Each warning shall be provided in a manner such that the consumer understands to which specific Product the warning applies, so as to minimize the risk of consumer confusion.
- (a) **Product Labeling.** Huffy shall affix a warning to the packaging, labeling or directly on each Product they sell or distribute and that is intended for sale in California and that is not a Reformulated Product that states:

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

3.4 For Products manufactured prior to August 30, 2018, Huffy may affix a clear and reasonable warning that complies with (a) the warning requirements in California Code of Regulations, Title 27, Article 6 (Section § 25601 et seq.) that are operative on the Effective Date, or (b) the warning requirements in California Code of Regulations, Title 27, Article 6 (Section § 25601 et seq.) that were approved on August 30, 2016 and become operative on August 30, 2018.

## 4. Entry of Consent Judgment

4.1 The Parties hereby request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Upon entry of this Consent Judgment, Espinosa and Huffy waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint and 60-Day Notice.

#### 5. Release

- Plaintiff's Public Release of Proposition 65 Claims. This Consent Judgment is a 5.1 final and binding resolution between Plaintiff Espinosa, acting on his own behalf, and on behalf of the public and in the public interest, and Defendant Huffy, and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, directors, officers, shareholders, successors and assigns, employees, agents, attorneys, suppliers, downstream distributors/retailers/customers (including but not limited to Walmart and SN Cycle and their respective parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, directors, officers, shareholders, successors and assigns, employees, agents, attorneys, suppliers, and downstream distributors/retailers/customers) (collectively, the "Huffy Releasees") of any claims with respect to any Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Huffy Releasees on or prior to the date of entry of this Consent Judgment, including but not limited to, any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Huffy Releasees . This Consent Judgment 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 against Huffy Releasees ("Proposition 65 Claims"). As to alleged exposures to the Chemicals in the product, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Huffy is deemed sufficient to satisfy all obligations concerning compliance by Huffy Releasees with the requirements of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products.
- 5.2 Plaintiff's Release of Additional Claims. As to Espinosa 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 such claim was or could have been asserted by him against Huffy Releasees, of the Products based on their exposure of Espinosa to Chemicals in the Products, or their failure to provide a clear and reasonable warning of exposure to Espinosa as

well as any other claim based in whole or in part on the facts alleged in the Complaint and the Notice, based on actions committed by Huffy Releasees ("Chemical Exposure Claims").

Espinosa's public release of Proposition 65 Claims set forth in Section 5.1 ("Public Release") and his individual release of Chemical Exposure Claims set forth in Section 5.2 ("Individual Release"), Espinosa, acting on his own behalf and on behalf of the public with respect to the Public Release and acting in his individual capacity with respect to the Individual Release, waives all rights to institute any form of legal action, and releases all claims against Huffy Releasees, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell the Products, for the Proposition 65 Claims and the Chemical Exposure Claims (referred to collectively in this Section as "Claims"). In furtherance of the foregoing, Espinosa, acting on his own behalf and on behalf of the public with respect to the Public Release and acting in his individual capacity with respect to the Individual Release, 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 OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

5.4 Huffy's Release of Plaintiff Espinosa. Huffy Releasees hereby waive 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 Huffy in this matter.

#### 6. Enforcement of Judgment

6.1 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 Superior Court of Alameda County, 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.

## 7. Modification of Judgment

- 7.1 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.
- or the People of California involving products that are of the same general type and function as the Products and constructed from substantially the same materials that sets forth standards defining when Proposition 65 warnings will or will not be required ("Alternative Standards"), or if the California Attorney General's office 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 Products and constructed from substantially the same materials, Huffy shall be entitled to seek a modification of this Consent Judgment on sixty (60) days' notice to Espinosa so as to be able to utilize and rely on such Alternative Standards in lieu of those set forth in Section 3 of this Consent Judgment. Espinosa shall not unreasonably contest any proposed application to effectuate such a modification provided that the Products for which such a modification is sought are of the same general type and function as those to which the Alternative Standards apply.

#### 8. Settlement Payment

- 8.1 In settlement of all the claims referred to in this Consent Judgment, and without any admission of liability therefore, Huffy shall make the following monetary payments:
- 8.1.1 Civil Penalty. Within ten (10) business days of the entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court, Huffy shall pay a total of \$3,000.00 in Civil Penalties in accordance with this Section. The Civil Penalty payment 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 civil penalty remitted to Espinosa. Within ten (10) business days of the entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court, Huffy shall issue two separate checks for the Civil Penalty payment to (a) "OEHHA" in the amount of \$2,250.00; and (b) "Brodsky & Smith, LLC in Trust for Espinosa" in the amount of \$750.00. Payment owed to Espinosa pursuant to this Section shall be delivered to the following payment address:

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

Payment owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486) pursuant to this Section shall be delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo Line "Prop 65 Penalties") at one of the following address(es):

For United States Postal Service Delivery:

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

For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery:

Mike Gyurics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
1001 | Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

A copy of the check payable to OEHHA shall be mailed to Brodsky & Smith, LLC at the address set forth above as proof of payment to OEHHA.

8.1.2 Attorney Fees and Costs. In addition to the payment above, Huffy shall pay \$34,500.00 to Brodsky & Smith, LLC ("Brodsky & Smith") as complete reimbursement for Espinosa's attorneys' fees and costs, including any investigation and laboratory costs or expert fees, incurred in the course of bringing the Complaint and in enforcing Proposition 65, including without limitation, preparation of the 60-Day Notice letter and discussions with the office of the Attorney General. Payment shall be made within ten (10) business days of the entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court and sent to the address for Brodsky & Smith set forth in Section

1 8.1.1, above. 2 9. **Notices** 9.1 Any and all notices between the Parties provided for or permitted under this 3 Agreement, or by law, shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (i) first-class 4 5 (registered or certified mail) return receipt requested; or (ii) overnight or two-day courier on any party by the other party to the following addresses: 6 7 For Huffy: 8 Cathleen Huang, Esq. Bowles & Verna, LLP 9 2121 N. California Blvd., Suite 875 Walnut Creek, CA 94596-8180 10 For Espinosa: 11 Evan J. Smith 12 BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900 13 Beverly Hills, CA 90212 14 Any party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other party a change of address to 15 which all notices and other communications shall be sent. 10. Authority to Stipulate 16 17 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 18 19 the party represented and legally to bind that party. 20 11. Counterparts 21 This Stipulation may be signed in counterparts and shall be binding upon the 22 Parties hereto as if all said Parties executed the original hereof. 23 12. Retention of Jurisdiction This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement the Consent 24 12.1 25 Judgment. Service on the Attorney General 26 13. Espinosa shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by all Parties, on the 27 13.1 California Attorney General on behalf of the Parties so that the Attorney General may review this 28

1	Consent Judgment prior to its submittal to the Court for Approval. No sooner than forty-five (45)			
2	days after the Attorney General has received the aforementioned copy of this Consent Judgment,			
3	and in the absence of any written objection by the Attorney General to the terms of this Consent			
4	Judgment, the Parties may then submit it to the Court for Approval.			
5	14. Entire Agreement			
6	14.1	14.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding		
7	of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all discussions,			
8	negotiations, commitment and understandings related thereto. No representations, oral or			
9	otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party			
10	hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed			
11	to exist or to bind any of the Parties.			
12	15.	Governing Law and Construction		
13	15.1	The validity, construction and perform	ance of this Consent Judgment shall be	
14	governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law			
15	provisions of California law.			
16	16.	Court Approval		
17	16.1	If this Consent Judgment is not approve	ved by the Court, it shall be of no force or	
18	effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.			
19	IT IS SO STIPULATED:			
20				
21	Dated:	I	Dated: June 7, 2017	
22				
23	By: By: By: Huffy Corporation		By: // Mir // ./Say4	
24	Gabrie	el Espinosa	By: Min M. ISAYL Huffy Corporation as SENIOR VICE PLESIAENT, GENERAL COUNSEL & SECRETARY	
25	YET TO	CO ODDEDED ADVIDCED AND I		
26	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:			
27	D . 10			
28	Dated: Judge of Superior Court		Judge of Superior Court	
		-10-		

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.

## 14. Entire Agreement

14.1 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, commitment 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.

## 15. Governing Law and Construction

15.1 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.

## 16. <u>Court Approval</u>

16.1 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.

## IT IS SO STIPULATED:

Dated: 1/1/2011	Dated:				
By: Gabriel Espinosa	By:Huffy Corporation				
IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:					
Dated:	Judge of Superior Court				