

1 Bret A. Stone (State Bar No. 190161)  
 2 John R. Till (State Bar No. 178763)  
 3 PALADIN LAW GROUP® LLP  
 3757 State Street, Suite 201  
 4 Santa Barbara, California 93105  
 Telephone: (805) 898-9700  
 Facsimile: (805) 880-0499

5 *Counsel for Spaulding*

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 7 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

8 ESTATE OF VIOLA B. SPAULDING, *et al.*,

Case No. C 08-00672

9 *Plaintiffs,*

10 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER RE GOOD FAITH  
 SETTLEMENT DETERMINATION AS TO  
 11 MARTIN FRANCHISES, INC. AND  
 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MILLER AVENUE  
 12 REMEDIATION TRUST

11 v.

12 YORK CLEANERS, INC., *et al.*

13 *Defendants.*

14 Hearing:  
 April 17, 2009  
 10:00 a.m.  
 Court Rm. 8 on the 19th Floor  
 Hon. Charles R. Breyer

16 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS,  
 17 CROSS-CLAIMS, AND THIRD-PARTY  
 CLAIMS

19 Plaintiffs and Counter-Defendants the Estate of Viola B. Spaulding, Florence Spaulding, Lynn  
 20 Spaulding doing business as Spaulding Enterprizes, Tina Spaulding Ward doing business as Spaulding  
 21 Enterprizes, and the Conservatorship of Eileen Spaulding’s (collectively, “Spaulding”) Motion for  
 22 Good Faith Settlement Determination and Establishment of the Miller Avenue Remediation Trust came  
 23 on regularly for hearing by this Court on April 17, 2009, in Courtroom 8, before the Honorable Charles  
 24 R. Breyer. After full consideration of the papers submitted, the oral representations of all interested  
 25 parties and good cause appearing therefore, the motion is GRANTED as set forth below:

26 1. The Court finds and determines that the settlement has been entered into in good faith  
 27 within the meaning of Sections 877 and 877.6 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and is hereby  
 28



1 approved as a good faith settlement.

2 2. Section 4 of the Uniform Comparative Fault Act (“UCATA”), § § 1-9, 12 U.L.A. 63-107  
3 (1996), in pertinent part, is hereby adopted as the federal and state common law in this case for the  
4 purpose of determining the legal effect of the settlement on non-settling entities.

5 3. The Court finds that the second amended complaint, third party complaints, and answers  
6 assert claims for contribution and indemnity as to Martin Franchises, Inc., either directly or through  
7 alternative theories seeking damages for the environmental contamination.

8 4. Consistent with Sections 877 and 877.6 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and  
9 Section 4 of the UCATA, all claims herein for contribution and indemnity as to Martin Franchises, Inc.,  
10 no matter how denominated, are barred. Accordingly, those portion of Spaulding’s second amended  
11 complaint and those portions of the third party complaints of York Cleaners, Inc. and David Victor  
12 Lewis against Martin Franchises, Inc. are hereby dismissed with prejudice.

13 5. The Court retains continuing jurisdiction over the settlement and the settling parties to  
14 resolve any action, adjudication, or dispute related to the settlement.

15 6. The Court further finds that a settlement fund should be, and hereby is, established, and  
16 shall be operated so as to qualify either as a “Designated Settlement Fund” or “Qualified Settlement  
17 Fund” pursuant to section 468B of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. § 468B, and the regulations  
18 promulgated pursuant thereto and codified at 26 C.F.R. § 1.468B and in accordance with the terms and  
19 conditions of the Declaration of Trust for the Miller Avenue Remediation Trust attached hereto as  
20 Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.

21  
22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 DATED: May 11, 2009

