CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]

*An Independent Association of Law is deemed a person in the course of doing business in California and subject to the provisions of the Proposition 65.

1.2.2 CAG alleges that Settling Defendant manufactures, sells, and/or distributes consumer products in California.

1.3 Listed Chemicals

- 1.3.1 Di (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate ("DEHP"), also known as Diethyl Hexyl Phthalate and Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate, has been listed by the State of California under Proposition 65 as a chemical known to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.
- 1.3.2 Diisononyl Phthalate ("DINP") has been listed by the State of California under Proposition 65 as a chemical known to cause cancer.

1.4 Notices of Violation

- 1.4.1 On or about August 12, 2019, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2019-01530") ("August 12, 2019 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain backpacks sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the August 12, 2019 Notice.
- 1.4.2 On or about September 6, 2019, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2019-01731") ("September 6, 2019 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain cosmetic bags/travel bags sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the September 6, 2019 Notice.
- 1.4.3 On or about November 12, 2019, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2019-02123")

YEROUSHALMI & YEROUSHALMI *An Independent Association of Law Corporations ("November 12, 2019 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DINP contained in certain cosmetic cases sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the November 12, 2019 Notice.

- 1.4.4 On or about November 15, 2019, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2019-02155") ("November 15, 2019 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain cosmetic cases sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the November 15, 2019 Notice.
- 1.4.5 On or about November 19, 2019, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2019-02163") ("November 19, 2019 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain satchel bags sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the November 19, 2019 Notice.
- 1.4.6 On or about December 9, 2019, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2019-02282") ("December 9, 2019 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain cosmetic cases sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the December 9, 2019 Notice.

1	
2	1
3	(
4	,
5	(
6	1
7	(
8	
9	7
10	(
11]
12]
13	j

On or about February 10, 2020, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2020-00323") ("February 10, 2020 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP and DINP contained in certain cosmetic bags/travel bags sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the February 10, 2020 Notice.

1.4.8 On or about May 18, 2020, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2020-01299") ("May 18, 2020 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain wallets sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the May 18, 2020 Notice.

1.4.9 On or about March 11, 2021, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2021-00633") ("March 11, 2021 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain makeup cases sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the March 11, 2021 Notice.

1.4.10 On or about November 20, 2020, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2020-03151") ("November 20, 2020 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain wallets sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by

27

YEROUSHALMI & YEROUSHALMI *An Independent Association of Law Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the November 20, 2020 Notice.

1.4.11 On or about July 9, 2021, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2021-01678") ("July 9, 2021 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain wallets sold, manufactured, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the July 9, 2021 Notice.

1.4.12 On or about July 16, 2021, CAG served a "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986" ("AG# 2021-01769") ("July 16, 2021 Notice") that provided Settling Defendant with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in certain satchel bags sold, manufacturer, and/or distributed by Settling Defendant in California. No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the July 16, 2021 Notice.

1.5 Complaints

- 1.5.1 On May 15, 2020, CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint 1") in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV18693 against Ross Stores, Inc. Complaint 1 alleges, among other things, that Proposition 65 was violated for alleged failure to give clear and reasonable warnings of alleged exposure to DEHP in backpacks and cosmetic bags distributed and/or sold by Ross Stores, Inc.
- 1.5.2 On August 20, 2020, CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint 2") in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV32288 against The TJX Companies, Inc. Complaint 2 alleges, among other things, that Proposition 65 was violated for alleged failure to give clear and reasonable warnings of alleged exposure to DEHP and DINP in cosmetic cases and/or bags distributed and/or sold by The TJX Companies, Inc.

16

1718

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

YEROUSHALMI & YEROUSHALMI *An Independent Association of Law

- 1.5.4 On August 17, 2020, CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint 4") in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV31340 against Ross Stores, Inc. Complaint 4 alleges, among other things, that Proposition 65 was violated for failure to allegedly give clear and reasonable warnings of alleged exposure to DEHP in cosmetic bags distributed and/or sold by Ross Stores, Inc.
- 1.5.5 On June 24, 2021 CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint 5") in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV23590 against Ross Stores, Inc. Complaint 5 alleges, among other things, that Proposition 65 was violated for alleged failure to give clear and reasonable warnings of alleged exposure to DEHP in wallets distributed and/or sold by Ross Stores, Inc.

1.6 **Consent to Jurisdiction**

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles, and that this Court has jurisdiction to approve and enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations as alleged against Settling Defendant, 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 facts alleged in the Notices therein or arising therefrom or related thereto.

1.7 **No Admission**

Settling Defendant denies the material allegations contained in the Notices and Complaints, and maintains that it has not violated Proposition 65, and that all of the products that it has sold or

23

22

24 25

26

27

28

EROUSHALMI & YEROUSHALMI *An Independent Association of Law

distributed for sale in California, including the Covered Products, have been, and are, in compliance with all laws. 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. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any material allegation in the Notice or the Complaint, or of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law of any kind, including without limitation, any admission concerning any alleged or actual violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory, regulatory, common law, or equitable doctrine, including but not limited to the meaning of the terms "knowingly and intentionally expose" or "clear and reasonable warning" as used in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Nothing in this Consent Judgment, nor compliance with its terms, shall constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law, or of any fault, wrongdoing, or liability by Settling Defendant, or any of its officers, directors, employees, or parent, subsidiary or affiliated corporations. Neither this Consent Judgment itself, nor any portion of this Consent Judgment, nor the fact that the Parties have entered into a settlement to resolve all claims between them may be offered or admitted as evidence in any administrative or judicial proceeding or litigation in any court, agency, or forum. Furthermore, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding, except as expressly provided in this Consent Judgment.

2. **DEFINITIONS**

- 2.1 "Covered Products" means (1) backpacks, (2) cosmetic/travel bags and/or cosmetic cases, (3) satchel/tote bags, and (3) wallets/ wallet key chain, including but not limited to the exemplar products identified in the Notices outlined in Section 1.4.
- 2.2 "Effective Date" means the date that this Consent Judgment is approved and entered by the Court.

mark; provided however, the pictogram may be in black and white instead of yellow if the Covered Product label does not contain the color yellow.

3.4 Covered Products already manufactured, distributed, or shipped to Downstream Releasees prior to the Effective Date may continue to be sold through as is.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 **Total Settlement Payment and Due Date**: Settling Defendant shall pay a total of one hundred and eighty thousand dollars and zero cents (\$180,000.00) in full and complete settlement of any and all claims for civil penalties, damages, attorney's fees, expert fees or any other claim for costs, expenses or monetary relief of any kind for claims that were or could have been asserted in the Notices or Complaints, as set forth in Sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.9, below.
- 4.1.1 **Civil Penalty**: BRE shall pay twenty-eight thousand five hundred and eighty dollars (\$28,580.00) as a Civil Penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), to be apportioned in accordance with California Health & Safety Code § 25192, with 75% of these funds remitted to OEHHA and the remaining 25% of the Civil Penalty remitted to CAG, as provided by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.12(d).

Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Seetling Defendant shall issue two separate checks for the civil penalty payment to (a) the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") in the amount of twenty-one thousand four hundred and thirty-five dollars (\$21,435.00) representing 75% of the total civil penalty and (b) to CAG in the amount of seven thousand one hundred and forty-five dollars (\$7,145.00) representing 25% of the total civil penalty. Separate 1099s shall be issued for each of the above payments: (a) to OEHHA, P.O. Box 4010, Sacramento, CA 95812 (EIN: 68-0284486) in the amount of \$21,435.00 Settling Defendant will also issue a 1099 to CAG in the amount of \$7,145.00 and deliver it to CAG c/o Yeroushalmi & Yeroushalmi, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, California 90212.

4.1.2 **Additional Settlement Payments:** Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall also issue one check for to twenty-one thousand four hundred and twenty

5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	

dollars (\$21,420.00) to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc." pursuant to Health & Safety Code §	
25249.7(b) and California Code of Regulations, Title 11 § 3203(d). CAG intends and agrees to	
use this portion of the Total Settlement Payment as follows, (a) eighty five percent (85%) for fees	
CAG allegedly incurred related to the investigation, purchase, testing, and related expert	
evaluation for of the Covered Products and to offset the costs of future litigation enforcing	
Proposition 65 but excluding attorney fees; and (b) fifteen percent (15%) for administrative costs	
ncurred during investigation and litigation to reduce the public's exposure to the 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 of	r
the source of exposure to completely eliminate or lower the level of the Proposition 65 Listed	
Chemicals, including but not limited to costs of documentation and tracking of products	
nvestigated, storage of products, website enhancement and maintenance, computer and software	
maintenance, investigative equipment, CAG's member's time for work done on investigations,	
office supplies, mailing supplies and postage. Within 30 days of a request from the Attorney	
General, CAG shall provide to the Attorney General copies of documentation demonstrating how	
the above funds have been spent. CAG shall be solely responsible for ensuring the proper	
expenditure of such additional settlement payment.	

- Reimbursement of Attorney Fees and Costs: Settling Defendant shall issue a payment in the amount of one hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$130,000) payable to "Yeroushalmi & Yeroushalmi" as complete reimbursement for any and all reasonable investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, expert fees, and any and all other costs and expenses incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Settling Defendant's attention, litigating, negotiating a settlement in the public interest, and seeking and obtaining court approval of this Consent Judgment.
- 4.2 Other than the payment to OEHHA described above, all payments referenced in paragraphs 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3 above, shall be delivered to: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Yeroushalmi, 9100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 240W, Beverly Hills, CA 90212. The

*An Independent Association of Law

22

23

24

25

26

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

YEROUSHALMI & YEROUSHALMI *An Independent Association of Law

5. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT & RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

5.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CAG, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Settling Defendant and its owners, officers, directors, insurers, employees, parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, affiliates, sister companies, predecessors, and their successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities to whom Settling Defendant directly or indirectly distributes, ships or sells Covered Products to, including, but not limited to, downstream distributors, downstream wholesalers, customers, retailers, marketplace hosts, franchisees, cooperative members, licensees, including but not limited to, The TJX Companies Inc., The TJX Operating Companies, Inc., Ross Stores, Inc., Ross Dress for Less, Inc., Ross Procurement, Inc., Burlington Coat Factory Direct Corporation, and each of their parents, shareholders, members, directors, officers, managers, employees, representatives, agents, attorneys, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, sister companies, and affiliates, and their predecessors, successors and assigns ("Downstream Releasees"), of all claims for alleged or actual violations of Proposition 65 based on exposures to: (a) DEHP in Backpacks, Cosmetic Bags and/or Cases, Wallets, or Satchel Bags; and (b) DINP in Cosmetic Bags and/or Cases, any of which are manufactured, distributed or sold by Settling Defendant up through the Effective Date as set forth in the Notices and Complaints. Settling Defendant and Defendant Releasees' compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to alleged exposures to: (a) DEHP in Backpacks, Cosmetic Bags and/or Cases, Wallets, or Satchel Bags; and (b) DINP in Cosmetic Bags and/or Cases, any of which are sold by Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, or Downstream Releasees after the Effective Date. Nothing in this Section affects CAG's right to

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

2728

YEROUSHALMI
&
YEROUSHALMI
*An Independent
Association of Law
Corporations

commence or prosecute an action under Proposition 65 against any person other than Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, or Downstream Releasees.

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 manner of actions, causes of action, charges, rights, promises, 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, in law or in equity, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims"), against Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees related to or arising from any actual or alleged violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claim regarding the Covered Products manufactured, distributed or sold by the Settling Defendant or Defendant Releasees through the Effective Date, regarding any actual or alleged failure to warn about exposure to the Listed Chemicals from the Covered Products. In furtherance of the foregoing, CAG on behalf of itself only, hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with respect to Claims regarding the Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Settling Defendant or Defendant Releasees through the Effective Date arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to the Listed Chemicals from the 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 THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

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

Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, or Downstream Releases through the Effective Date regarding the failure to warn about actual or alleged exposure to the Listed Chemicals from the Covered Products, CAG will not be able to make any claim for those damages, penalties or other relief against Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees or Downstream Releasees. Furthermore, CAG acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to the Listed Chemicals from the Covered Products as may exist as of the Effective Date 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. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT 6.1

6.

- CAG shall file a motion seeking approval of this Consent Judgment pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f).
- 6.2 Upon entry of an order approving this Consent Judgment, the Complaint in this action shall be deemed amended to include defendant B.R.E Industries, Inc. and the claims raised in the Notices as detailed in Section 1.4.
- 6.3 Within five (5) days of the payments of all amounts outlined in Section 4, CAG will file a Request for Dismissal without prejudice for the causes of action or claims asserted in the Complaints, outlined in Section 1.5.
- 6.4 If this Consent Judgment is not approved in full 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

22

23

24

25

26

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.

7. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

- 7.1 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 seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to 7.2 meet and confer with the other Party prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

8.1 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 California, 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 30 days' notice to the Party allegedly failing to comply with the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment and attempts to resolve such Party's failure to comply in an open and good faith manner.

9. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

- This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the 9.1 terms of this Consent Judgment under Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.
- 9.2 In any proceeding brought by either Party to enforce this Consent Judgment, the prevailing Party shall be entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

10. SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

10.1 CAG shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by both parties, on the California Attorney General so that the Attorney General may review this Consent Judgment prior to its submittal to the Court for approval. After forty-five (45) days after the Attorney

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

'EROUSHALMI & EROUSHALMI *An Independent Association of Law General has received the aforementioned copy of this Consent Judgment, CAG may submit it to the Court for approval.

11. **ATTORNEY FEES**

11.1 Except as specifically provided in Sections 4.1.3 and 8.2, each Party shall bear its own attorneys' fees and costs in connection with the claims resolved in this Consent Judgment.

12. GOVERNING LAW

- The validity, construction, terms, 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.
- In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, preempted, or is otherwise rendered 12.2 inapplicable by reason of law generally, or if any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are rendered inapplicable or are no longer required as a result of any such repeal or preemption, or rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally as to the Covered Products or Listed Chemicals, then Settling Defendant may provide written notice to CAG of any asserted change in the law, and shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, the Covered Products are so affected. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be interpreted to relieve Settling Defendant from any obligation to comply with any other pertinent state or federal law or regulation.
- 12.3 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 section 1654.

1	AGREED TO:	GREED TO:	
2			
3	Date: 6/27, 2022 Da	te: <u>6/17/</u> , 2022	
4	Michael Marcus	Z. Mh	
5	Pruenal Prancis	- Truck	
6 7	Name: Michael Mayous Na	me: LAMIN MEHRARA	
8			
9	Title: Director Tit	ile: President.	
10	CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. B.J	R.E INDUSTRIES, INC.	
11			
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
14			
15	Date:	OF OF THE CHIPPHON COURT	
16	JUDO	GE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
ROUSHALMI &	1 age 17	of 17	
ROUSHALMI An Independent ociation of Law porations	CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]		