

DMS Notice QC – 09 – 09

October 19, 2009 Discard: Retain

TO WEIGHTS AND MEASURES OFFICIALS

SUBJECT: SIREA, Inc. (formerly known as AERIS, Inc.) Settlement

Attached is a stipulated final judgment issued by the District Attorney's Office of Santa Cruz County, in conjunction with the District Attorney's Offices of Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, and Sonoma Counties. A Final Judgment and Injunction against SIREA, Inc, formerly AERIS was filed on September 29, 2009 for selling short measure industrial and medical cylinder gas, improper labeling of cylinders, and improper computation of value.

We are very pleased with the excellent work done on behalf of the people, by the prosecution team representing the Santa Cruz County, Santa Clara County, Sonoma County and Santa Barbara County District Attorney's Offices as well as the State and county investigators that tested these products. SIREA, Inc. was assessed \$308,244 in civil penalties, costs, restitution and cy pres restitution. \$51,293.61 was for all investigative costs and \$25,000 in cy pres restitution was paid to the California Agriculture Commissioner and Sealer's Association's Quantity Control Trust Fund. This fund is used to benefit the citizens of the State of California by aiding in the training, investigation and prosecution of pricing-accuracy and quantity control cases. Santa Cruz County should be sure to report these penalties in the County Monthly Report (CMR). All participating counties should separately record their individual investigative cost reimbursements in the appropriate columns in the report.

Sincerely,

Edmund E. Williams

Cc PQV Special Investigators



BOB LEE. District Attorney, County of Santa Cru William Atkinson (SBN 88933) SEP 2 9 2009 Assistant District Attorney 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 3 ALEX CALVO, CLERK BY MICHELLE IRIS Santa Cruz, CA 95060 DEPUTY, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY Tel: (831) 454-2400 4 Fax: (831) 454-2227 5 (For list of additional plaintiff's counsel, see attached Exhibit 1) 6 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ CASE NO. CV 1653-THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 10 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL 11 PENALTIES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF 12 -vs-Business and 13 Professions Code § SIREA, INC., and Does 1 through 10, 17200 & 17500 14 15 16 Defendant(s). 17

INTRODUCTION

The People of the State of California, by and through Bob Lee, District Attorney for the County of Santa Cruz, Christie Stanley, District Attorney for the County of Santa Barbara, Stephan Passalacqua, District Attorney for the County of Sonoma and Dolores Carr, District Attorney for the County of Santa Clara, allege on information and belief the following:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The District Attorneys' authority to bring this action is derived from the statutory law of the State of California,

H:\WRA Files\Aeris\Aeris complaint 8 29 09.wpd

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

including but not limited to, Business and Professions Code sections 17203, 17204, 17206, 17535 and 17536.

2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants have transacted and continue to transact business within the County of Santa Cruz and elsewhere within the State of California and that the violations of law described below have been carried out within the County of Santa Cruz and elsewhere in the State of California. Unless enjoined by an Order of the Court, Defendants will continue to engage in the unlawful acts, practices and courses of conduct set forth below.

DEFENDANTS

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times mentioned herein, defendant Sirea, Inc.(hereinafter referred to as "Sirea") was a corporation, doing business in Santa Cruz County and elsewhere throughout the State of California. Sirea's principal address in California is located at 140 S. Montgomery St. San Jose, CA 94560.
- 4. DOES 1 through 10 are business entities, organizations, and or individuals who engaged in, furthered, encouraged, promoted, authorized, ratified, participated in, or are otherwise responsible in some manner for the events, transactions and activities described below. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10 are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10 when their true identities have been ascertained.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each defendant is/was the officer, agent, employee, partner, or

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

22 23

21

25

24

26 27

28

course and scope of the agency, employment, partnership, conspiracy or representation and each defendant has ratified and approved the actions of each of the other defendants alleged herein.

- Whenever, in this complaint, reference is made to any act of Defendants, such allegations shall be deemed to mean the act of each defendant acting individually and jointly with the other defendants named in that cause of action.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each named Doe Defendant is responsible in some manner for the acts, occurrences and liability hereinafter alleged and referred to.
- 8. Whenever, in this complaint, reference is made to any act of a Defendant, such allegation shall be deemed to mean the act of each Defendant, acting individually, jointly and severally.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Business and Professions Code § 17200)

- 9. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference all allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 8 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- Beginning at an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at least within four years prior to the filing of this complaint, defendants, and each of them, engaged in a course of conduct constituting acts of unfair competition, as defined by Business and Professions Code §17200, including but not limited to the following:
 - Selling or offering for sale compressed gas products having (a) a quantity net weight that is less than as represented on the package, cylinder or container, or as represented elsewhere in violation of Business and Professions Code § 12024.

- (b) Failing to insure that all commercial weighing and measuring devices conform to the latest requirements set forth in the National Institute of Standards and Technology Handbook 44, "Specifications, Tolerances and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices".
- (c) Charging at the time of sale of a commodity an amount greater than the lowest price that is advertised, posted, marked, displayed or quoted for that item in violation of Business and Professions Code §12024.2.
- (d) Selling or distributing compressed gas products without the a proper label in violation of Business and Professions Code §12603.
- (e) Selling or distributing compressed gas products without a statement of net quantity appearing thereon in violation of Business and Professions Code § 12607.
- (f) Violating Business and Professions Code § 17500 by committing acts as described in the Second Cause of Action herein.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Business and Professions Code § 17500)

- 11. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference all allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 10 as though fully set forth herein.
- 12. Beginning on an exact date unknown to Plaintiff, but at least within the last three years prior to the filing of the complaint herein and continuing to the present, defendants have made untrue or misleading representations in the course of packaging and selling

compressed gas products by representing that the cylinders contained amounts of gas greater than the actual quantity contained within the cylinders.

.

DEMAND FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays that:

- 1. Defendants be preliminarily and permanently restrained and enjoined from engaging in any act constituting unfair or unlawful competition as defined in Business and Professions Code §§17200and 17500 including but not limited to the acts set forth in paragraphs 10 and 12, above, as provided pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§17203, 17204 and 17535.
- 2. Defendants be assessed a civil penalty of TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$2,500.00) for each act of unfair or unlawful competition as defined by Business and Professions Code § 17200 pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17206.
- 3. Defendants be assessed a civil penalty of TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$2,500.00) for each violation of Business and Professions Code § 17500 pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17536.
- 4. Defendants be ordered to make full and complete restitution to all victims of defendant's acts of unfair competition.
- 5. Plaintiff recover its costs of suit, including but not limited to, costs of investigation, pursuant to Business and Professions Code § 17206.
- 6. Plaintiff have such other and further relief as the nature of this case requires and that this Court may deem just and proper.

BOB LEE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

WILLIAM R. ATKINSON
Assistant District Attorney

EXHIBIT 1

CHRISTIE STANLEY District Attorney, County of Santa Barbara Allan Kaplan (SBN 76946) Deputy District Attorney

Deputy District Attorney 1112 Santa Barbara St.

Carta Darlana CA 02101

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Telephone: (805) 568-2300

STEPHAN PASSALACQUA

District Attorney, County of Sonoma

Matthew T. Cheever (SBN 191783)

Deputy District Attorney

2300 County Center Dr.

Suite B-170

Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Telephone: (707) 565-3161

DOLORES CARR

District Attorney, County of Santa Clara

Matthew Harris (SBN 136462)

Deputy District Attorney

70 W. Hedding St. West Wing

San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 299-7500

1 BOB LEE, DISTRICT ATTORNEY WILLIAM R. ATKINSON, ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY 2 STATE BAR NUMBER 88933 COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ 3 701 OCEAN STREET, ROOM 200 SANTA CRUZ CALIFORNIA 95060 4 TELEPHONE: (831) 454-2400 SEP 2 9 2009 5 ATTORNEYS FOR THE PEOPLE ALEX CALVO, CLERK BY MICHELLE IRIS 6 DEPUTY, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ NO. CV165347 10 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 11 Plaintiff. STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT 12 -vs-13 SIREA INC. (formerly known as AERIS 14 INC.), Defendant.

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, appears through its attorneys, Bob Lee, District Attorney of Santa Cruz County, by William Atkinson, Assistant District Attorney, Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney of Sonoma County, by Matthew T. Cheever, Deputy District Attorney, Christie Stanley, District Attorney of Santa Barbara County, by Allan Kaplan Deputy District Attorney, Delores Carr, District Attorney of Santa Clara County, by Matt Harris Deputy District Attorney, and Defendant, Sirea Inc., (formerly known as Aeris, Inc.) appearing through its attorneys the Hannig Law Firm, LLP, by John H. Blake and Daniel Guerra its President hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. That the proposed Final Judgment, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1, and by this reference made a part hereof, may be signed by any judge of the Superior Court of the State of California, for the County of Santa Cruz, and entered by the clerk without notice, provided that this Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment has been executed by counsel and the parties listed below;

C:\Documents and Settings\mcheever\Local Settings\Temporary Internet Files\Content.Outlook\59I3E2PV\Stip Sirea Inc 8 31 09.wpd

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

- 2. That Defendant acknowledges that it has been represented by legal counsel throughout all of the negotiations which preceded the execution of this stipulation and that it has executed this stipulation with the consent and on the advice of such counsel.
- 3. That Defendant waives its right to appeal or attempt to set aside or vacate the Final Judgment entered pursuant to this Stipulation;
- 4. That the parties consent to the entry of the Final Judgment prior to the taking of any proof, without trial or adjudication of any issues of law or fact and without this Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment substituting evidence or an admission of liability or wrongdoing by SIREA, Inc;
- 5. That the complaint on file in the above-captioned action states facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action upon which relief may be granted;
- 6. That SIREA, Inc. agrees to be bound as of the date of the Court's signing of the Final Judgment in the form attached as Exhibit 1 and that the signatures of this Stipulation on behalf of SIREA, Inc. constitute notice to SIREA, Inc. of the Final Judgment and all of its terms and SIREA, Inc. waives any further notice or service of the Final Judgment;
- 7. That this Stipulation may be executed in counterparts and be facsimile, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

PLAINTIFF

Dated: 9.28.09

Bob Lee

Santa Cruz County District Attorney

William Atkinson

Assistant District Attorney

1	Dated: 9 22 09	Stephan R. Passalacqua
2		Sonoma County District Attorney
3		
4		By: Works T. Cl
5		Matthew T. Cheever
6		Deputy District Attorney
7		
8	Dated:	Christie Stanley
9		Santa Barbara County District Attorney
10		
11		By:
12		Allan Kaplan
13		Deputy District Attorney
14		
15	Dated:	Delores Carr Santa Clara County District Attorney
16		Santa Clara County District Attorney
17		D ₁₁ ,
18		By: Matt Harris
19		Deputy District Attorney
20		
21		DEFENDANT
22		
23	Dated:	Hannig Law Firm LLP
24		
25		\mathbf{p}_{w}
26		By: John H. Blake
27		Attorney for Defendant Sirea, Inc.
28		onou, no.

1	
2	Ву:
3	William Atkinson Assistant District Attorney
4	, tosisiani Biomer itterior,
5	·
6	
Dated:	Stephan R. Passalacqua
8	Sonoma County District Attorney
9	
	By:
10	Matthew T. Cheever
11	Deputy District Attorney
12	
13 Dated: 8/31/0 g	Christie Stanley
14	Santa Barbara County District Attorney
15	
16	By: By
17	Allan Kaplan
18	Deputy District Attorney
19	
20 Dated:	Delores Carr
21	Santa Clara County District Attorney
22	,
23	By: Matt Harris
24	Deputy District Attorney
25	
26	DEFENDANT
27	
28	3

1	Dated:	Stephan R. Passalacqua
2		Sonoma County District Attorney
3		
4		By:
5		Matthew T. Cheever
6		Deputy District Attorney
7		
8	Dated:	Christie Stanley
9		Santa Barbara County District Attorney
10		
11		By:
12		Allan Kaplan
13		Deputy District Attorney
14	to 1 - 1 -	
15	Dated: 3/31/01	Delores Carr Santa Clara County District Attorney
16		
17		Ву: 2
18		Matt Harris
19		Deputy District Attorney
20		
21		DEFENDANT
22		IIi. I Ei II D
23	Dated:	Hannig Law Firm LLP
24		
25		By:
26		John H. Blake
27		Attorney for Defendant Sirea, Inc.
28		·

1	Dated:	Stephan R. Passalacqua
2		Sonoma County District Attorney
3		
4		Ву:
5		Matthew T. Cheever
6		Deputy District Attorney
7		
8	Dated:	Christie Stanley
9		Santa Barbara County District Attorney
10		
11		By:
12		Allan Kaplan
13		Deputy District Attorney
14		
15	Dated:	Delores Carr
۱6		Santa Clara County District Attorney
۲7		D.
18		By: Matt Harris
۱9		Deputy District Attorney
20		
21		DEFENDANT
22		
23	Dated: 9-14-09	Hannig Law Firm LLP
24	•	
25		By: L Villami Wahust for
26		By: Wallam Wahnt for John H. Blake
27		Attorney for Defendant
ο Ω		Sirea, Inc.

Dated: 9-9-09

Sirea, Inc. Defendant

Daniel Guerra - President

EXHIBIT "1"

```
2
   BOB LEE, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
   WILLIAM R. ATKINSON, ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY
 3
    STATE BAR NUMBER 88933
    COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ
    701 OCEAN STREET, ROOM 200
 5
   SANTA CRUZ CALIFORNIA
                            95060
   TELEPHONE: (831) 454-2400
 6
   ATTORNEYS FOR THE PEOPLE
 7
 8
                        SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
 9
                            COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ
   THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
11
                           Plaintiff,
                                                 FINAL JUDGMENT
                                                 PURSUANT TO
12
                                                 STIPULATION
         -vs-
13
   SIREA INC., (formerly known as AERIS
14
   INC.),
15
    Defendant.
```

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, appears through its attorneys, Bob Lee, District Attorney of Santa Cruz County, by William Atkinson, Assistant District Attorney, Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney of Sonoma County, by Matthew T. Cheever, Deputy District Attorney, Christie Stanley, District Attorney of Santa Barbara County, by Allan Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney, Delores Carr, District Attorney of Clara County, by Matt Harris, Deputy District Attorney, and Defendant, Sirea, Inc. (formerly known as Aeris, Inc.) appearing through its attorneys the Hannig Law Firm LLP, by John H. Blake and Daniel Guerra, its President. It appears to the Court that this final judgment is a final resolution of this matter, that the parties hereto have stipulated and consented to the entry of this final judgment without the taking of proof, that this final judgment does not constitute evidence or an admission by defendants regarding any issue of fact alleged in the complaint, and the Court having considered the matter and good cause appearing therefore,

28 ///

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

H:\WRA Files\Aeris\Exhibit 1 8 31 09.wpd

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter hereof and of the parties hereto.
- 2. This judgment is applicable to defendant Sirea, Inc., a California corporation, and to each of its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, representatives, managers, and to all persons, employees, and other entities who are acting in concert or participating with defendant, with actual or constructive notice of this judgment (hereinafter referred to as "Defendants").

PERMANENT INJUNCTION

- 3. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§17203, 17204 and 17535 Defendants are hereby enjoined and restrained from doing, directly or indirectly, any of the following:
- (A) Selling or offering for sale compressed gas products having a quantity or net weight that is less than as represented on the package, cylinder or container, or as represented elsewhere in a location intended, or likely, to be displayed to any consumer or potential consumer.
- (B) Failing to insure that all commercial weighing and measuring devices conform to the latest requirements set forth in the National Institute of Standards and Technology Handbook 44, "Specifications, Tolerances and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices," except where otherwise noted in Title 4, Division 9 of the California Code of Regulations, as required by 4 CCR §4000.
- (C) Making any misleading or untrue statement, or failing to disclose any material fact, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500 with respect to any insurance surcharge, or net-weight statement on any package, cylinder or container of any compressed gas packaged or sold by the Defendant.
- (D) Charging at the time of sale of a commodity an amount greater than the lowest price that is advertised, posted, marked, displayed or quoted for that item in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12024.2.
- (E) Advertising, soliciting, or representing by any means, a product for sale or purchase if it is intended to entice a consumer into a transaction different from that originally represented in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12024.6.

- (F) Selling or distributing any compressed gas product without a proper label in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12603.
- (G) Selling, offering for sale, or exposing for sale any compressed gas product without a statement of net quantity appearing thereon in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12607.
- (H) Failing, while engaged in the packaging, selling or distributing of any packaged or labeled compressed gas product, to establish and maintain adequate controls and procedures reasonably designed to achieve compliance with Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 17500, 12024 and 12600, et seq., such controls and procedures to include reasonable check-fill protocols (to achieve accuracy in filling, packaging and labeling) and other reasonable quality-control protocols.

MONETARY RELIEF

- 4. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17536, Defendant shall on or before the date of the approval of this Judgment, pay civil penalties, costs, restitution and *cy pres* restitution in the total amount of \$308,244.00. Said payment shall be made in the form of a certified check made payable to the Santa Cruz District Attorney, and delivered to William Atkinson, Santa Cruz District Attorney's Office, 701 Ocean St., Room 200, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 and shall be delivered and distributed by the Santa Cruz District Attorney as follows:
- A. Civil penalties in the amount of \$231,595.39, in equal amounts to the District Attorney's Office of Santa Clara, Santa Barbara, Sonoma and Santa Cruz.
 - B. \$355.00 payable to the clerk of the court for Defendant's filing fees.
- C. Costs of fifty one thousand two hundred ninety three dollars 61/100 (\$51,293.61), to the following state and local regulatory and law enforcement agencies that contributed resources to this investigation:

Santa Clara County Agricultural Commissioner	\$3,771.17
San Luis Obispo County Agricultural Commissioner	\$1,320.00
Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioner	\$5,984.00
Santa Cruz County Agricultural Commissioner	\$1,820.00

4 5 6

7

9

12

13

14

11

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

26 27

28

25

Mendocino County Agricultural Commissioner \$1,186.20

California Division of Measurement Standards \$37,212.34

> \$51,293.61 Total:

- C. Cy Pres restitution: The parties having recognized the impossibility of identifying aggrieved consumers who suffered actual loss, and the impracticality of providing direct restitution to said consumers, and the disproportionate cost of making restitution to individual consumers which would far exceed the benefit consumers would gain, the Court therefore orders that cy pres restitution, in the amount of \$25,000.00, shall be paid to the California Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer's Association's Quantity Control Trust Fund established pursuant to the Judgment in the People of the State of California v. Safeway Inc., et al, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. 233008 filed July 7, 2003. This cy pres restitution is intended to benefit the citizens of the State of California by aiding in the training, investigation and prosecution of pricing-accuracy and quantitycontrol case.
- 5. Jurisdiction is retained so that the injunctive provisions of the Final Judgment may be modified, as appropriate, upon application by either party, for the purpose of conforming them to any addition, modification, deletion or other change to Division 5, Chapter 6, Section 12601, et seq., of the Business and Professions Code cited as and commonly known as the California "Fair Packaging and Labeling Act," or any successor statute, or any provision of the California Code of Regulations adopted pursuant to said act, or for the purpose of conforming them to any provision of the United States Code or Code of Federal Regulations which may supercede California law or regulation pursuant to the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.
- 6. Jurisdiction is further retained for the purpose of enabling either party to apply to the Court for such further orders, directions, modifications or terminations as may be necessary or appropriate for the construction, carrying out, modification, or termination of any of the injunctive provisions of this Final Judgment, for the enforcement of compliance herewith; or for punishment of violations hereunder, except that Defendant shall not apply for a termination of the injunctive portion of this Final Judgment at any time prior to the expiration of five (5) years from the date of execution of this Final Judgment.

BOB LEE, DISTRICT ATTORNEY 1 WILLIAM R. ATKINSON, ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY 2 STATE BAR NUMBER 88933 COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ 701 OCEAN STREET, ROOM 200 3 SANTA CRUZ CALIFORNIA TELEPHONE: (831) 454-2400 4 5 ATTORNEYS FOR THE PEOPLE ALEX CALVO, CLERK 6 BY MICHELLE IRIS DEPUTY SANTA CRUZ COUNTY 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ CVI 65347 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 10 Plaintiff. 11 FINAL JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO 12 STIPULATION -vs-13 SIREA INC., (formerly known as AERIS 14 INC.),

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, appears through its attorneys, Bob Lee, District Attorney of Santa Cruz County, by William Atkinson, Assistant District Attorney, Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney of Sonoma County, by Matthew T. Cheever, Deputy District Attorney, Christie Stanley, District Attorney of Santa Barbara County, by Allan Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney, Delores Carr, District Attorney of Clara County, by Matt Harris, Deputy District Attorney, and Defendant, Sirea, Inc. (formerly known as Aeris, Inc.) appearing through its attorneys the Hannig Law Firm LLP, by John H. Blake and Daniel Guerra, its President. It appears to the Court that this final judgment is a final resolution of this matter, that the parties hereto have stipulated and consented to the entry of this final judgment without the taking of proof, that this final judgment does not constitute evidence or an admission by defendants regarding any issue of fact alleged in the complaint, and the Court having considered the matter and good cause appearing therefore,

| | ///

H:\WRA Files\Aeris\Exhibit 1 9 28 09.wpd

27 28

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Defendant.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter hereof and of the parties hereto.
- 2. This judgment is applicable to defendant Sirea, Inc., a California corporation, and to each of its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, representatives, managers, and to all persons, employees, and other entities who are acting in concert or participating with defendant, with actual or constructive notice of this judgment (hereinafter referred to as "Defendants").

PERMANENT INJUNCTION

- 3. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§17203, 17204 and 17535 Defendants are hereby enjoined and restrained from doing, directly or indirectly, any of the following:
- (A) Selling or offering for sale compressed gas products having a quantity or net weight that is less than as represented on the package, cylinder or container, or as represented elsewhere in a location intended, or likely, to be displayed to any consumer or potential consumer.
- (B) Failing to insure that all commercial weighing and measuring devices conform to the latest requirements set forth in the National Institute of Standards and Technology Handbook 44, "Specifications, Tolerances and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices," except where otherwise noted in Title 4, Division 9 of the California Code of Regulations, as required by 4 CCR §4000.
- (C) Making any misleading or untrue statement, or failing to disclose any material fact, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17500 with respect to any insurance surcharge, or net-weight statement on any package, cylinder or container of any compressed gas packaged or sold by the Defendant.
- (D) Charging at the time of sale of a commodity an amount greater than the lowest price that is advertised, posted, marked, displayed or quoted for that item in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12024.2.
- (E) Advertising, soliciting, or representing by any means, a product for sale or purchase if it is intended to entice a consumer into a transaction different from that originally represented in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12024.6.

- (F) Selling or distributing any compressed gas product without a proper label in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12603.
- (G) Selling, offering for sale, or exposing for sale any compressed gas product without a statement of net quantity appearing thereon in violation of Business and Professions Code section 12607.
- (H) Failing, while engaged in the packaging, selling or distributing of any packaged or labeled compressed gas product, to establish and maintain adequate controls and procedures reasonably designed to achieve compliance with Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 17500, 12024 and 12600, et seq., such controls and procedures to include reasonable check-fill protocols (to achieve accuracy in filling, packaging and labeling) and other reasonable quality-control protocols.

MONETARY RELIEF

- 4. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17536, Defendant shall on or before the date of the approval of this Judgment, pay civil penalties, costs, restitution and *cy pres* restitution in the total amount of \$308,244.00. Said payment shall be made in the form of a certified check made payable to the Santa Cruz District Attorney, and delivered to William Atkinson, Santa Cruz District Attorney's Office, 701 Ocean St., Room 200, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 and shall be delivered and distributed by the Santa Cruz District Attorney as follows:
- A. Civil penalties in the amount of \$231,595.39, in equal amounts to the District Attorney's Office of Santa Clara, Santa Barbara, Sonoma and Santa Cruz.
 - B. \$355.00 payable to the clerk of the court for Defendant's filing fees.
- C. Costs of fifty one thousand two hundred ninety three dollars 61/100 (\$51,293.61), to the following state and local regulatory and law enforcement agencies that contributed resources to this investigation:

Santa Clara County Agricultural Commissioner	\$3,771.17
San Luis Obispo County Agricultural Commissioner	\$1,320.00
Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioner	\$5,984.00
Santa Cruz County Agricultural Commissioner	\$1,820.00

Mendocino County Agricultural Commissioner

\$1,186.20

California Division of Measurement Standards

\$37,212.34

Total:

\$51,293.61

- C. Cy Pres restitution: The parties having recognized the impossibility of identifying aggrieved consumers who suffered actual loss, and the impracticality of providing direct restitution to said consumers, and the disproportionate cost of making restitution to individual consumers which would far exceed the benefit consumers would gain, the Court therefore orders that cy pres restitution, in the amount of \$25,000.00, shall be paid to the California Agricultural Commissioner and Sealer's Association's Quantity Control Trust Fund established pursuant to the Judgment in the People of the State of California v. Safeway Inc., et al, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. 233008 filed July 7, 2003. This cy pres restitution is intended to benefit the citizens of the State of California by aiding in the training, investigation and prosecution of pricing-accuracy and quantity-control case.
- 5. Jurisdiction is retained so that the injunctive provisions of the Final Judgment may be modified, as appropriate, upon application by either party, for the purpose of conforming them to any addition, modification, deletion or other change to Division 5, Chapter 6, Section 12601, et seq., of the Business and Professions Code cited as and commonly known as the California "Fair Packaging and Labeling Act," or any successor statute, or any provision of the California Code of Regulations adopted pursuant to said act, or for the purpose of conforming them to any provision of the United States Code or Code of Federal Regulations which may supercede California law or regulation pursuant to the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.
- 6. Jurisdiction is further retained for the purpose of enabling either party to apply to the Court for such further orders, directions, modifications or terminations as may be necessary or appropriate for the construction, carrying out, modification, or termination of any of the injunctive provisions of this Final Judgment, for the enforcement of compliance herewith; or for punishment of violations hereunder; except that Defendant shall not apply for a termination of the injunctive portion of this Final Judgment at any time prior to the expiration of five (5) years from the date of execution of this Final Judgment.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7

- 7. Plaintiff's failure to seek enforcement of any provisions of this Final Judgment shall in no way be deemed a waiver of such provision, nor in any way affect the validity of this Final Judgment or any term thereof. Plaintiff's failure to seek to enforce any such provision shall not preclude or estop Plaintiff from later seeking to enforce the same or any other provision of this Final Judgment.
 - 8. This Final Judgment shall take effect immediately upon entry hereof.

Date: 9.29.09

JEFF ALMQUIST

Judge of the Superior Court