SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
Senator Sabrina Cervantes, Chair
2025 - 2026 Regular Session

AB 2597 (Wicks) - Claims against the state: appropriation

Version: June 30, 2026
Urgency: Yes
Hearing Date: August 27, 2026

Policy Vote:
Mandate: No
Consultant: Mark McKenzie

Bill Summary: AB 2597, an urgency measure, would appropriate approximately $7.4 million from the General Fund to the Attorney General (AG) for the payment of eight specified claims, settlements, or judgments against the state. Any funds appropriated in excess of the amounts required for payment of the claims would revert to the General Fund.

Fiscal Impact:
- One-time General Fund appropriation of $2,775,000 to the AG in 2026-27 for the payment of claims, settlements or judgments against the state arising from *California Chamber of Commerce v. Bonta (United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:19-cv-02019-DJC-JDP).*

- One-time General Fund appropriation of $1.5 million to the AG in 2026-27 for the payment of claims, settlements or judgments against the state arising from *The Personal Care Products Council v. Bonta (United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:23-cv-01006-TLN-JDP).*

- One-time General Fund appropriation of $900,000 to the AG in 2026-27 for the payment of claims, settlements or judgments against the state arising from *Junior Sports Magazines Inc., et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:22-cv-04663-CAS-AYP)*.

- One-time General Fund appropriation of $887,685.38 to the AG in 2026-27, with $595,954.03 available to the Catholic Medical Mission Board, and $291,731.35 available to Food for the Poor, Inc., for the payment of claims, settlements or judgments against the state arising from *Catholic Medical Mission Board, Inc. v. The Attorney General of the State of California; Registrar of the Registry of Charitable Trusts (Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCP01520),* and *Food for the Poor, Inc. v. The Attorney General of the State of California; Registrar of the Registry of Charitable Trusts (Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCP01626).*

- One-time General Fund appropriation of $553,159.23 to the AG in 2026-27 for the payment of claims, settlements or judgments against the state arising from *California Chaparral Institute, et al. v. Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00005203-CU-TT-CTL, Fourth District Court of Appeal, Case No. D083484).*

- One-time General Fund appropriation of $481,749.72 to the AG in 2026-27 for the payment of claims, settlements or judgments against the state arising from *Safari Club International, et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:22-cv-01395-DAD-JDP).*

- One-time General Fund appropriation of $165,000 to the AG in 2026-27 for the payment of claims, settlements or judgements against the state arising from *Hoffman, et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:24-cv-00664-CAB-MMP).*

- One-time General Fund appropriation of $128,206.50 to the AG in 2026-27 for the payment of claims, settlements or judgments against the state arising from *California Rifle and Pistol Association, et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:23-cv-10169-SPG-ADS).*

Background: Existing law, Government Code Section 965 (b), requires the AG to report to the chairperson of the Assembly or Senate Appropriations Committee any claims, settlements, or judgments against the state arising from an action in which the state is represented by the AG and for which there is no sufficient appropriation for the payment of those claims, settlements, or judgments. The chairperson of the relevant Appropriations Committee must introduce legislation appropriating funds for the payment of those claims, settlements, or judgments.

This bill is one of several annual bills carried by the chairs of the Appropriations Committees to provide appropriation authority for legal settlements approved by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Department of Finance (DOF). These settlements were entered into lawfully by the state upon advice of counsel (DOJ). They are binding state obligations.

Proposed Law: AB 2597, an urgency measure, would appropriate $7,391,650.83 from the General Fund to the AG to pay the eight specified claims, settlements, or judgments against the state.

Staff Comments: This bill would provide appropriation authority to pay for claims, settlements, or judgments against the state related to the following actions:

(1) *California Chamber of Commerce v. Bonta (United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:19-cv-02019-DJC-JDP).* $2,775,000 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund.

Proposition 65 requires businesses to warn people before exposing them to a significant amount of a chemical listed under Proposition 65 for cancer or reproductive toxicity. Plaintiff California Chamber of Commerce (CalChamber) filed a complaint against the AG, as the State's chief law enforcer on October 7, 2019 under 42 U.S.C section 1983 seeking declaratory and injunctive relief, arguing that the cancer warnings compelled by Proposition 65 for dietary acrylamide in food and beverage products violates its members' First Amendment rights because the warnings were controversial (subject to scientific debate) and misleading.

CalChamber and the AG stipulated that a private Proposition 65 enforcer, the Council for Environmental Research on Toxics (CERT), could intervene as a defendant in 2019. The parties then engaged in six years of litigation that included several motions to dismiss by the AG and CERT, and a motion for preliminary injunction by Calchamber in 2021, which was granted by court, but appealed to the Ninth Circuit by CERT, alleging the ruling was an unlawful prior restraint of its rights to enforce. A Ninth Circuit panel decided in favor of CalChamber in 2022. After additional unsuccessful motions by CERT in the district court, and after the close of expert discovery, CalChamber filed a motion for summary judgment and permanent injunction in October 2024, which the Attorney General and CERT opposed. On May 2, 2025, the court granted CalChamber's motion and permanently enjoined the AG and all in privity with him from enforcing Proposition 65's warning requirement for acrylamide in foods against CalChamber's members. The court also declared Proposition 65's warning requirement unconstitutional as applied to dietary acrylamide, and the final judgment was entered on May 12, 2025.

On June 2, 2025, the AG filed a notice of appeal with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, but later that month, the parties agreed to participate in the Ninth Circuit's mediation program to mediate CalChamber's demand of $6,045,986.45 in attorneys' fees and unpaid costs as a prevailing party. The Ninth Circuit mediator stayed the appeal pending mediation. To avoid further litigation, the parties negotiated a settlement agreement under which the Attorney General agreed to pay $2,775,000 and dismiss the appeal without prejudice, and subject to a legislative appropriation of funds in a claims bill. Interest will not begin to accrue on any unpaid portion of the settlement amount until December 31, 2026, as specified.

On May 20, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving this settlement and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $2,775,000 from the General Fund in the annual claims bill to cover this settlement.

(2) *The Personal Care Products Council v. Bonta (United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:23-cv-01006-TLN-JDP).* $1.5 million settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund.

Under Proposition 65, businesses are required to warn consumers about an exposure to any substance that has been identified by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) as "known to the State to cause cancer," unless an exemption or affirmative defense to the warning requirement applies. Titanium dioxide is a mineral used as an ingredient in cosmetic and personal care products, including color cosmetics (such as eye shadow, blush, foundation, setting powder, pressed powder, loose powder, bronzer, and other makeup products), sunscreens, and toothpastes.

Plaintiff, the Personal Care Products Council (PCPC) filed a complaint against the AG on May 26, 2023 under 42 U.S.C section 183 seeking declaratory and injunctive relief, arguing that the Proposition 65 warning requirement for airborne titanium dioxide in cosmetic and personal care products violates its members' First Amendment rights because the warnings were controversial and misleading.

In October 2023, PCPC filed a motion for preliminary injunction, which was opposed by the AG, but granted by the court on June 12, 2024. After the close of expert discovery, in September 2024, PCPC filed a motion for summary judgment, and after full briefing and oral argument the court granted summary judgment on August 12, 2025, permanently enjoining the AG and all those in privity with him from enforcing Proposition 65's warning requirement for airborne titanium dioxide in cosmetics and personal care products, and declaring the warning requirement unconstitutional as applied to airborne titanium dioxide. The AG did not appeal the decision.

In January 2026, the parties requested that the court refer them to a settlement conference before a magistrate judge to negotiate PCPC's demand of $2,643,000 in attorneys' fees and costs as a prevailing party. On April 8, 2026, the parties participated in a settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge. To avoid further litigation, the parties entered into a settlement agreement pursuant to which the AG will pay $1,500,000 in full satisfaction of PCPC's demand for fees and costs, and PCPC will waive all pre- and post-judgment interest. The settlement payment is contingent upon approval by DOF, the AG, and the State Legislature, as specified.

On June 17, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving this settlement, and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $1.5 million from the General Fund in the annual claims bill to cover this settlement.

(3) *Junior Sports Magazines Inc., et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:22-cv-04663-CAS-AYP).* $900,000 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund.

A coalition of firearm-related organizations successfully challenged the constitutionality of California Business and Professions Code section 22949.80, which generally prohibits the advertising and marketing of any "firearm-related product in a manner that is designed, intended, or reasonably appears to be attractive to minors." (In addition to this lawsuit, the California Attorney General's Office simultaneously litigated and settled a similar, but separate constitutional challenge to section 22949.80 in *Safari Club v. Bonta*, No. 2:22-cv- 01395-DAD-JDP, as described in (6) below.)

The *Junior Sports* plaintiffs alleged that section 22949.80 violated their First Amendment rights to free speech and free association and their rights to equal protection. The district court denied the plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction but the plaintiffs prevailed in their appeal, where the Ninth Circuit held that they were likely to prevail on their free speech claim. Following remand, a second round of proceedings occurred in the district court and the Ninth Circuit regarding whether the injunction should prohibit enforcement of a separate provision in the statute related to the disclosure of minors' personal information. Ultimately, the entire statute was preliminarily enjoined.

Following the Ninth Circuit rulings, the parties entered into settlement negotiations. Because the plaintiffs had filed suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, they were entitled to attorneys' fees and costs as the prevailing party. The parties reached a settlement that included an award of $900,000 in attorneys' fees and costs. The district court formally adopted these terms by entering a stipulated judgment on March 17, 2026. Under the terms of the judgment, no interest is currently accruing, but it will begin to accrue on December 13, 2026. Because the plaintiffs were represented by two separate law firms, the judgment requires a separate payment to each firm: one for $550,000 and one for $350,000.

On May 29, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving this settlement and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $900,000 from the General Fund in the annual claims bill to cover this settlement.

(4) *Catholic Medical Mission Board, Inc. v. The Attorney General of the State of California; Registrar of the Registry of Charitable Trusts (Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCP01520),* $595,954.03 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund; and *Food for the Poor, Inc. v. The Attorney General of the State of California; Registrar of the Registry of Charitable Trusts (Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCP01626),* $291,731.35 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund.

The AG has responsibility for the administration of the Supervision of Trustees and Fundraisers for Charitable Purposes Act (Supervision Act, Gov. Code Sec 12580, et seq.), and the Registrar of the Registry of Charities and Fundraisers administers the AG's statutory registration program on behalf of the Registry. The Catholic Medical Mission Board (CMMB) is an international Catholic nonprofit corporation based in New York that provides medical aid to impoverished countries. CMMB operates in California and is exempt from registration with the Registry. Food for the Poor, Inc (FFP) is a faith-based nonprofit corporation based in Florida that provides direct relief assistance to the poor through churches and charities operating in the Caribbean and Latin America. FFP solicits contributions in California and holds Charity Registration number 086331 with the Registry.

In March of 2018 the AG issued separate cease-and-desist orders and notices of assessment of penalties against both CMMB and FFP, as well as a notice of revocation of charity registration against FFP, alleging various violations of the Supervision Act, including that the charities' expense efficiency ratio stated in its charitable solicitations was misleading and created a likelihood of confusion or misunderstanding. The administrative hearing was consolidated to include the CMMB and FFP cases, as well as a case against MAP International, and heard in late 2018. The Administrative Law Judge issued a Proposed Decision affirming violations and penalties regarding certain charitable solicitations used by CMMB and FFP, and denying certain violations regarding their use of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). DOJ adopted the Proposed Decision on September 6, 2019.

CMMB and FFP (plaintiffs) each filed a writ of mandate and declaratory relief claim for review of the administrative decisions. The trial court ruled that Gov. Code section 12591.1 (b)(4) is an unconstitutional prior restraint on speech, and Gov. Code section 12599.6 (f)(2) is invalid under the First Amendment as it does not survive strict scrutiny. Because charitable solicitations are deemed fully protected noncommercial speech under the First Amendment, the trial court held that the regulation of charitable solicitations is subject to strict scrutiny review. On July 6, 2021, the trial court entered judgments that declared the specified sections of the Supervision Act to be facially unconstitutional and permanently enjoined the AG from enforcing those sections against any party. The judgment also reformed Gov. Code section 12591.1 (b)(4) to prohibit the

AG from issuing cease-and-desist orders for violations of section 12599.6. Plaintiffs were awarded attorneys' fees in a collective amount of $621,166.

The AG filed a notice of appeal to the judgment on September 10, 2021, and the CMMB and FFP each filed notices of cross-appeals later that month. The AG also issued a notice of appeal to the attorneys' fee award on January 27, 2022. On March 5, 2025, the Court of Appeal vacated the permanent injunction and attorneys' fees award and remanded the cases to the trial court to determine whether Plaintiffs could prove they are entitled to a permanent injunction as to nonparties. The opinion provided direction to Plaintiffs and to the trial court as to how to obtain and grant a permanent injunction against the AG. On remand, the court appeared inclined to again grant a permanent injunction against the AG's enforcement of sections 12591.1 (b)(4) and 12599.6 (f)(2).

To avoid further litigation, the parties negotiated a settlement agreement that allows for the Attorney General's continued enforcement of section 12599.6 (f)(2), in a manner that is consistent with First Amendment caselaw and allows cease-and-desist orders to be issued under section 12591.1 (b)(4), for violations other than violations of section 12599.6 (f)(2). Pursuant to the settlement agreement, the AG agreed to pay attorneys' fees and costs in the amount of $595,954.03 to CMMB, and $291,731.35 to FFP. The amounts represent the initial attorneys' fee awards plus post-judgment attorneys' fees incurred. The parties agreed that interest will not accrue on the agreed amounts, and that payment is contingent upon certification of the availability of funds, approval by DOF, and enactment by the Legislature and Governor of an appropriation that includes the agreed upon amounts.

On May 29, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving this settlement and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $887,685.38 from the General Fund in the annual claims bill to cover these settlements.

(5) *California Chaparral Institute, et al. v. Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00005203-CU-TT-CTL, Fourth District Court of Appeal, Case No. D083484)*. $553,159.23 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, including interest, payable from the General Fund.

This claim involves a challenge under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to a programmatic environmental impact report (PEIR) prepared by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board) for the California Vegetation Treatment Program (CalVTP). The Board is responsible for determining the areas within California in which the state has the financial responsibility for preventing and suppressing fires. The Board must also regulate forestry activities within those areas and develop policies and regulations to contribute to fire prevention and recovery efforts. In 2019, the Board certified the PEIR and approved the CalVTP—a program that directs the implementation of vegetation treatments to help address California's wildfire crisis, reduce the risk of loss of lives and property, reduce fire suppression costs, and protect natural resources.

On January 28, 2020, two environmental non-profits, the California Chaparral Institute and the Endangered Habitats League, filed a petition for writ of mandate in the Superior Court for San Diego County challenging the Board's certification of the PEIR and approval of the CalVTP for failure to comply with CEQA. The trial court found in favor of the Board and dismissed the petition on November 9, 2023, but the petitioners appealed and prevailed on appeal (case number D083484). In an unpublished decision issued on May 30, 2025 and modified on June 30, 2025, the Fourth District Court of Appeal held that substantial evidence did not support the Board's conclusions in the PEIR regarding the potential for type conversion of chaparral and coastal sage scrub and associated effects, particularly as to increased wildfire risk. The Court of Appeal reversed and remanded to the trial court with directions to grant the petition for writ of mandate consistent with the appellate decision. The trial court accordingly issued the writ and entered judgment in the petitioners' favor on November 14, 2025, and directed the Board to take appropriate steps to address the CEQA deficiencies identified in the appellate court decision. The judgment also specified that the petitioners were entitled to costs under specified statutes and California Rules of Court, to be determined and set forth in a subsequently filed memorandum of costs, and that the petitioners could also seek attorneys' fees by motion.

To avoid further litigation, the parties opted to negotiate the petitioners' demand for attorneys' fees and costs incurred in the action, including the appeal. The parties ultimately agreed to a settlement, executed on December 23, 2025, in the amount of $543,300.03, which covers attorneys' fees and costs associated with both the trial court and appellate court phases in this matter. The settlement agreement stipulates that payment is subject to an appropriation of funds by the Legislature in annual legislation for claims against the state, and preserves the petitioners' right to file a motion for attorneys' fees and costs in the event such legislative appropriation of funds is not enacted.

On May 26, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving payment of the settlement amount, plus $9,859.20 in potential interest, and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $553,159.23 from the General Fund in the annual claims bill.

(6) <u>*Safari Club International, et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:22-cv-01395-DAD-JDP).*</u> $481,749.72 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund.

A coalition of firearm-related organizations successfully challenged the constitutionality of California Business and Professions Code section 22949.80, which generally prohibits the advertising and marketing of any "firearm-related product in a manner that is designed, intended, or reasonably appears to be attractive to minors." (In addition to this lawsuit, the California Attorney General's Office simultaneously litigated and settled a similar, but separate constitutional challenge to section 22949.80 in *Junior Sports Magazines, et.al. v. Bonta*, No. 2:22-cv- 04663-CAS-AYP, as described in (3) above.)

The *Safari Club* plaintiffs alleged that section 22949.80 violated their First Amendment rights to free speech and free association and their rights to equal protection. The district court denied the plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction but the plaintiffs prevailed in their appeal, where the Ninth Circuit held that they were likely to prevail on their free speech claim. Ultimately, the entire statute was preliminarily enjoined.

Following the Ninth Circuit rulings, the parties entered into settlement negotiations. Because the plaintiffs had filed suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, they were entitled to attorneys' fees and costs as the prevailing party. The parties reached a settlement that included an award of $481,749.72 in attorneys' fees and costs. The district court formally adopted these terms by entering a stipulated judgment on March 23, 2026. Under the terms of the judgment, interest shall accrue immediately at a rate of 3.5% per annum, compounded annually, but no interest will be required as long as the settlement amount is paid within 270 days of entry of judgment (interest will apply as of December 16, 2026).

On May 29, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving this settlement and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $481,749.72 from the General Fund in the annual claims bill to cover this settlement.

(7) <u>*Hoffman, et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:24-cv-00664-CAB-MMP).*</u> $165,850 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund.

Plaintiffs, a firearms organization and individual firearms owners, challenged non-California-residents' inability to secure concealed carry weapon (CCW) licenses, arguing that the practice violates the Second Amendment and the Privilege and Immunities Clause of Article IV. Under California law at the time Plaintiffs brought suit, non-Californians had no effective means of obtaining a CCW permit and thus being able to carry firearms in public while in California.

In July 2025, the court granted Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. It found that the Second Amendment applied to Plaintiffs' proposed conduct, and that non-residents were within the "people" covered by the Amendment's text. It also found that the State's assembled historical laws did not support the ban on non-resident applicants. It granted the Plaintiffs injunctive relief. Of note, the court's reasoning largely tracked the reasoning in a similar case in the Central District of California, *California Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bonta* (C.D. Cal. No. 2:23-cv-10169-SPG), as described in (8) below, where a different district court granted preliminary injunctive relief, allowing non-residents who were members of the four plaintiff firearms groups to apply for California CCW permits as of April 2025.

After Plaintiffs prevailed on summary judgment, the AG entered into a settlement agreement with them to resolve the attorneys' fees issues since, under 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b), Plaintiffs were entitled to attorneys fees for prevailing on their Second Amendment cause of action. The AG negotiated with Plaintiffs to settle the case for the fees Plaintiffs had accrued up until that point, which was $155,000. The claimed rates were well within the range district courts routinely approve in fee award cases like this one, and the claimed hours were substantially lower than those our office expended in opposing Plaintiffs' motions. The DOJ concluded that litigating the reasonableness of the fee award would incur further fees, plus interest, as Plaintiffs would be entitled to payment of their fees for time spent litigating the fee award, and post judgment interest is mandatory. Under the terms of the agreement, the Plaintiffs would be paid $155,000 if no claims bill were required, and $165,850 if a claims bill was required. The court adopted the terms of the settlement in the stipulated judgment on October 17, 2025.

On January 28, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving this settlement and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $165,850 from the General Fund in the annual claims bill to cover this settlement.

(8) *California Rifle and Pistol Association, et al. v. Bonta (United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:23-cv-10169-SPG-ADS).* $128,206.50 settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, payable from the General Fund.

Plaintiffs, a group of firearms organizations and individual firearm owners, challenged non-California residents' inability to secure CCW licenses, arguing that it violates the Second Amendment, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Privilege and Immunities Clause of Article IV. Before Plaintiffs brought this suit, non-Californians had no effective means of obtaining a CCW license and thus being able to carry firearms in public while in California.

In mid-2024, the Central District of California granted Plaintiffs a preliminary injunction, finding Plaintiffs likely to succeed on their Second Amendment claim that California cannot bar non-residents from applying for California CCW permits solely based on their non-resident status. The Court applied the test from the Supreme Court's 2022 decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* that asks whether proposed conduct is covered by the Second Amendment and, if so, whether the State has shown a history and tradition of analogous regulation of such content. The Court concluded that the Second Amendment applies to Plaintiffs' proposed conduct (non-residents who seek to apply to lawfully carry firearms for self-defense while in public), citing *Bruen*'s explanation that the Second Amendment generally covers the public carry of firearms. The Court also held that the State's assembled historical laws did not support the ban on non-resident applicants.

The AG elected not to appeal the January 22, 2025 preliminary injunction decision to avoid the risk of generating unfavorable appellate precedent concerning this outlier statute (when Plaintiffs initiated this suit, only California and Hawaii offered non-residents no path to legal carry). Instead, the Legislature proposed and eventually adopted a bill, AB 1078 (Berman), Chap. 570/2025, to create a path for non-residents to apply for CCW licenses.

After losing the preliminary injunction decision, the AG sought to cut off fee exposure that would have arisen from summary-judgment briefing before a judge who preliminarily had ruled against us on the merits. The DOJ, with the Attorney General's approval, executed a conditional settlement with plaintiffs' counsel that stayed the case while the Legislature considered AB 1078, and settled the case for a pre-determined amount if the bill passed. With the bill passed, signed, and enacted, the DOJ requests an appropriation from the General Fund to pay that pre-negotiated settlement amount of $128,206.50. The Court adopted the stipulated judgment regarding attorney fees on February 5, 2026. The judgment also included a dismissal of all other claims against the AG, and an automatic vacatur of the preliminary injunction upon entry of judgment. The parties agreed that no interest shall accrue on the settlement amount.

On February 26, 2026, DOF issued a letter to DOJ, approving this settlement and requesting the inclusion of a total appropriation of $128,206.50 from the General Fund in the annual claims bill to cover this settlement.

-- END --