1 2 3	George Rikos (State Bar No. 204864)  LAW OFFICES OF GEORGE RIKOS 555 West Beech Street, Suite 500 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (858) 342-9161 Facsimile: (858) 724-1453	
4	Email: george@gerorgerikoslaw.com	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff, BRAD VAN PATTEN	
6		
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO	
10	BRAD VAN PATTEN, and individual,	Case No. 37-2020-00035232-CU-MC-CTI
11	Plaintiff,	
12	v.	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT
13	GOYA FOODS, Inc., a Delaware corporation; AMAZON.COM, Inc., a Delaware Corporation;	
14	and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive	
15	Defendants.	·
16	2	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	and between Brad Van Patten ("Van Patten") and Patten and Goya are collectively referred to as the resides in the State of California, and seeks to proround and to improve human health by reducing or econsumer products. Goya is a person in the cound Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 198 ("Proposition 65").	he "Parties." Van Patten is an individual who note awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals liminating hazardous substances contained in rese of doing business for purposes of the Safe
00	CONSENT JUDGMENT	

to Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. Van Patten alleges that Goya has exposed individuals to acrylamide from its sales of Goya Plantain Chips without first providing users and consumers of the product with a clear and reasonable cancer warning as required pursuant to Proposition 65.

- 1.3 Product Description. The products covered by this Consent Judgment are all Goya Plantain Chips, including, without limitation, all varieties and pack sizes of Product (the "Products") that have been manufactured, imported, distributed, offered for sale, and/or sold in California by Goya or its affiliates.
- 1.4 Notice of Violation, Complaint, and Jurisdiction. On July 7, 2020, Van Patten served Goya and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seg." (the "Notice"). The Notice provided Goya and such others, including public enforcers, with notice that alleged that Goya was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn California consumers and customers that use of the Products will expose them to acrylamide. No public enforcer has diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notice. On October 2, 2020, based on the Notice and the absence of any authorized public prosecutor of Proposition 65 having filed a suit based on the allegations contained therein, Van Patten filed a complaint in the Superior Court of and for San Diego County (the "Court"), Case No. 37-2020-00035232-CU-MC-CTL (the "Action"). For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that the Court has jurisdiction over the allegations in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Goya, that venue is proper in the County of San Diego, and that the Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of the claims and allegations which were or could have been raised in the Action based on the facts alleged therein and/or in the Notice.
- 1.5 No Admission. This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of any and all

28

26

24

23

24

25

26

27

28

claims between the Parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. Goya denies each and every material allegations contained in the Notices and the Action and maintains that it has not violated Proposition 65 and/or is not subject to that law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Goya 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 Goya of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by Goya. However, this Section 1.5 shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of Goya under this Consent Judgment.

Effective Date. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective 1.6 Date" shall mean the date this Consent Judgment has been approved by the Court and Van Patten has provided notice to Goya that it has been entered in the Court's records as a consent judgment.

#### 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

#### 2.1 Cease Sales

Goya contends it maintains two manufacturing processes. One of the processes is expressly intended to address requirements for acrylamide under Proposition 65, such that acrylamide levels are on average kept below the level requiring a cancer warning under Proposition 65 based on an average consumer's level and frequency of consumption of the chips and a 1 x 10-5 cancer risk for acrylamide based on scientific evidence equivalent or better in quality to that which formed the basis for the Proposition 65 listing of acrylamide as a carcinogen. These products are intended to be sold in California. Without any implied meaning or admission, these products will be referred herein as "California Compliant Products". The other manufacturing process is not expressly intended to address acrylamide requirements under Proposition 65. Without any implied meaning or admission, these products will be referred herein as "Non-California Compliant Products". It is Goya's position that the products purchased by Van Patten in California were Non-California Compliant Product and never intended to be sold in California.

As of the Effective Date, and continuing thereafter, Goya, with respect to the Non-California Complaint Products, will take all necessary and commercially reasonable measures to cease the import, distribution, or sale in California.

#### 2.2. INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

#### 2.3 CONSENT JUDGMENT PAYMENTS

#### **Civil Penalties**

Goya shall pay \$5,000 as a civil penalty, allocated in accordance with Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% of the penalty to be remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of the Penalty remitted to Van Patten no later than ten (10) days following the Effective Date. More specifically, Goya shall issue two separate checks for the civil penalty payment to (a) "Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment" in the amount of \$3,750 (75%); and to (b) "Law Offices of George Rikos in Trust for Brad Van Patten" in the amount of \$1,250 (25%). Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Goya shall deliver these payments as follows:

(i) The penalty payment owed to Van Patten shall be delivered to the following address:

George Rikos Law Offices of George Rikos 555 West Beech, Suite 500 San Diego, CA 92101

(ii) The penalty payment owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486) shall be delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo Line "Prop 65 Penalties") at the following address:

Mike Gyurics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
Attn. Prop 65 Penalties – Van Patten v. Goya Consent Judgment
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Goya shall provide Van Patten's counsel with a copy of the check it sends to OEHHA with its penalty payment to Van Patten. Goya's payment obligations shall be tolled until it receives an IRS W-9 form for each payee. In association with the issuance of the payments under this Consent Judgment, Goya will issue IRS 1099 forms as appropriate given the payees.

#### 3.2 Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Costs

Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Goya shall reimburse Van Patten's counsel \$60,000 for fees and costs incurred as a result of investigating and bringing this matter to Goya's attention, negotiating a Consent Judgment in the public interest, and obtaining the Court's approval of the Consent Judgment and its entry as a consent judgment. Goya shall issue a check for this amount payable to "Law Offices of George Rikos" and deliver it to the address identified in Section 3.1 above. Goya's payment obligations shall be tolled until it receives an IRS W-9 form for this payee.

### 3. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 Release of Goya and Downstream Customers and Entities. This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between Van Patten, acting on his own behalf and in the public interest, and Goya of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted by Van Patten or on behalf of his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, predecessors, successors, and/or assigns (collectively, "Releasors") for failure to provide warnings for alleged exposures to acrylamide contained in the Products, and Releasors hereby release any such claims against Goya and its parents, shareholders, members, directors, officers, managers, employees, representatives, agents, attorneys, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, sister companies, and affiliates, and their predecessors, successors, and assigns (collectively, "Goya Releasees"), and each entity to whom Goya directly or indirectly distributes or sells the Products, including but not limited to, downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, and retailers, and their

respective subsidiaries, affiliates and parents, franchisees, cooperative members, and licensees (collectively, "Downstream Releasees"), from all claims for violations of Proposition 65 with respect to any Products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Goya prior to the Effective Date based on failure to warn of alleged exposure to the chemical acrylamide from the Products.

In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, and for the payments to be made pursuant to Section 3 above, Van Patten, on behalf of himself, his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, hereby covenants not to sue and waives any right to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases all claims that he may have, including without limitation, all actions and causes of action in law and in equity, all obligations, expenses (including without limitation all attorneys' fees, expert fees, and investigation fees, and costs), damages, losses, liabilities and demands against any of the Goya Releasees and/or Downstream Releasees of any nature, character, or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, limited to and arising out of the alleged or actual exposure to chemicals contained in Goya's crackers.

- 4.2 Goya's Release of Van Patten. Goya, on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against Van Patten, his attorneys, and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made by Van Patten and/or his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims or otherwise seeking to enforce Proposition 65 against it in this matter.
- 4.3 California Civil Code Section 1542. It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice and relating to the Products will develop or be discovered. Van Patten on behalf of himself only, on one hand, and Goya, on the other hand, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly

intended to cover and include all such claims up through the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefor. The Parties acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, above, may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code Section 1542 as to any such unknown claims. California Civil Code Section 1542 reads 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 CONSENT JUDGMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

Van Patten and Goya each acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542.

**4.4 Deemed Compliance with Proposition 65**. Compliance by Goya with this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to exposure to acrylamide from the Products. Products distributed by Goya prior to the Effective Date may be sold through as previously manufactured and labeled.

# 5. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

The Parties hereby request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment as a consent judgment based on the motion for its approval Van Patten will be making pursuant to Section 10 below. Upon entry of the Consent Judgment as a consent judgment, Van Patten and Goya waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations contained in the Complaint.

# 6. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

If, subsequent to the execution of this Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of

CONSENT JUDGMENT

this Consent Judgment are deemed by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected but only to the extent the deletion of the provision deemed unenforceable does not materially affect, or otherwise result in the effect of the Consent Judgment being contrary to, the intent of the Parties in entering into this Consent Judgment.

## 7. GOVERNING LAW/ENFORCEMENT

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the law of the State of California and apply within the State of California. The rights to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment are exclusively conferred on the Parties hereto. Any Party may, after providing sixty (60) days' written notice and meeting and conferring within a reasonable time thereafter to attempt to resolve any issues, by motion or application for an order to show cause before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In the event that Proposition 65 or its regulations applicable to the Products are repealed, or are otherwise rendered inapplicable or invalid, including but not limited to by reason of law generally, due to federal preemption, or the First Amendment commercial speech rights of the U.S. Constitution, as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction of an agency of the federal government, then Goya shall provide written notice to Van Patten of any asserted repeal or determination. Upon Goya's written notice, Goya shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment to the extent such repeal or determination affects Goya's obligations with respect to the Product.

## 8. NOTICES

Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by:
(i) first-class (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:
For Goya:

4

5

6

7

8

For Van Patten:

George Rikos, Esq. Law Offices of George Rikos 555 West Beech, Suite 500 San Diego, CA 92101

Naoki Kaneko, Esq. Shook, Hardy & Bacon

5 Park Plaza, Suite 1600 Irvine, California 92614

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

1920

21

22

23

2425

2627

28

Either Party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other Party a change of address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.

## 9. <u>COUNTERPARTS: SIGNATURES</u>

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or .pdf signature, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

# 10. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f)

Van Patten agrees to comply with the reporting requirements referenced in Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(f) and to seek, by formal and properly noticed motion (including with service to the Office of the California Attorney General being fully effectuated at least forty-five (45) days prior to a requested hearing thereon), approval of this Consent Judgment's terms pursuant to Proposition 65 and its associated entry as a consent judgment by the Court.

# 11. MODIFICATION

Unless otherwise provided for herein, this Consent Judgment may be modified only by a written agreement of the Parties and the approval of the Court or upon a duly noticed motion of either Party for good cause shown. Neither Party shall unreasonably withhold agreement to any modification requested by the other Party based on an amendment to

CONSENT JUDGMENT

Proposition 65 or its supporting regulations or a change in the law. If the parties reach agreement as to modification of the Consent Judgment, such stipulation to the Office of the Attorney General at least 21 days in advance of its submission to the Court for approval.

If the parties are unable to reach agreement on a proposed modification, either Party may file a notice motion for modification with the Court for good cause shown, provided a copy of the motion is also served on the other Party and the Office of the Attorney General.

### 12. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

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. This Consent Judgment shall have no effect if it is not approved by the Court and entered as a consent judgment.

### 13. AUTHORIZATION

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND
CONTENT:	CONTENT:

Date: 7/29/2021 Date: July 29, 2021

By: George Rikos

By:

Counsel to Brad Van Patten

Naoki Kaneko, Esq.
Counsel for Goya Foods, Inc.

1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
2	Date:	Date: 7 - 28 . 21
3	By:	Dru
5	Brad Van Patten	By:  Joseph Perez, Sr. V.P. Goya Foods, Inc.
6	Diad van Patten	Goya Foods, Inc.
7	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND	DECREED THAT THE CONSENT
8	JUDGMENT SET FORTH ABOVE SHA CONSENT JUDGMENT BY THIS COU	ALL PROMPTLY BE ENTERED AS A
9	DATED:	
10		
11		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	CONSENT JUDGMENT	

1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:	
2	Date: 57/26/21	Date:	
3			
4	By: Budley on take	By:	
5	Brad Van Patten	Goya Foods, Inc.	
6			
7	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT THE CONSENT JUDGMENT SET FORTH ABOVE SHALL PROMPTLY BE ENTERED AS A CONSENT JUDGMENT BY THIS COURT:		
8			
9	DATED:		
10		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
11			
12			
13			
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23	,		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	CONSENT JUDGMENT		