1	Paul F. Sorrentino (SBN 126348) John P. Nordlund (SBN 286153) JACKSON LEWIS P.C.							
2 3	JACKSON LEWIS P.C. 225 Broadway, Suite 200 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: 619.573.4900							
$\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$	Tel: 619.573.4900 Fax: 619.573.4901							
5	SorrentinoP@jacksonlewis.com John.Nordlund@jacksonlewis.com							
6	Attorneys for Defendant/Counter-Claimant JB COLLISION SERVICES, INC. dba							
7	JB COLLISION SERVICES, INC. dba J&M AUTOBODY dba EL DORADO COLLISION							
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
10								
11	THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS (COMPANY, f/k/a SHERWIN-WILLIAMS)	Case No.: 13-CV-1946 LAB (WVG) Consolidated with						
12	AUTOMOTIVE FINISHES CORP.,	13-CV-1947 LAB (WVG)						
13	Plaintiff,	COUNTER-CLAIMANTS'						
14	vs.	CONSOLIDATED SECOND						
15	JB COLLISION SERVICES, INC., dba J&M AUTOBODY, and d/b/a EL DORADO COLLISION; and DOES 1	AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM FOR DAMAGES and DEMAND FOR JURY						
16	DORADO COLLISION; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	DAMAGES and DEMAND FOR JUNI						
17	Defendant.							
18								
19 20	JB COLLISION SERVICES, INC., dba J&M AUTOBODY, and d/b/a EL DORADO COLLISION,)							
21	Counter-Claimant,							
22	vs.							
23	THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS							
24	COMPANY, f/k/a SHERWIN-WILLIAMS) AUTOMOTIVE FINISHES CORP,							
25	Counter-Defendant.							
26	}							
27	<u> </u>							
28								

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COUNTERCLAIM

Pursuant to the Court's June 10, 2014, Counter-Claimants JB COLLISION SERVICES, INC. dba J&M AUTOBODY dba EL DORADO COLLISION ("JB Collision"), JJT, INC. dba JOHN'S COLLISION CENTER ("JJT"), and JOHN TYCZKI ("John Tyczki") (collectively referred to as "Counter-Claimants") hereby submit the present [Consolidated] Second Amended Counterclaim against Counter-Defendant THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS COMPANY, f/k/a SHERWIN-WILLIAMS AUTOMOTIVE FINISHES CORP. ("Sherwin-Williams") pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 13, as follows:

I.

PARTIES

- 1. JB Collision is a California corporation with its principal places of business in San Diego and Poway, California. JB Collision is engaged in the business of repairing and painting automobiles. JB Collision does business solely in California.
- 2. JJT is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Santee, California. JJT is engaged in the business of repairing and painting automobiles. JJT does business solely in California. JJT was formed, and opened the John's Collision Center in Santee, California, in or about March 2011.
- John Tyczki is the owner and President of both JJT and JB Collision, and is, 3. and was at all times mentioned, domiciled in and a citizen of the State of California. At all times mentioned herein, John Tyczki was involved in and acted on behalf of JJT and JB Collision during all interactions with Sherwin-Williams. John Tyczki is the sole shareholder and the President of both JJT and JB Collision. John Tyczki oversees all operations and dealings of JJT and JB Collision. John Tyczki negotiated and entered into both contracts at issue in this Matter with Sherwin-Williams on behalf of JJT and JB Collision. Also, John Tyczki oversaw the performance of both contracts, and throughout the contract terms, personally communicated with the same Sherwin-Williams employees ///

28 | ///

regarding the performance of both contracts. John Tyczki had sole control in JJT's and JB Collision's course of dealings with Sherwin-Williams.

4. Sherwin-Williams is an Ohio corporation with its principal place of business in Ohio. Sherwin-Williams has offices and employees in California, and does business in California. Sherwin-Williams is engaged in the business of selling automotive paints, coatings, and related products.

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has diversity jurisdiction and supplemental jurisdiction of these Counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(a)(1), 1367(a). The amount of controversy in this case exceeds a sum of \$75,000.00. Further, the Parties are completely diverse; Sherwin-Williams is an Ohio corporation with a principal place of business in Ohio, and JB Collision and JJT are California corporations with principal places of business in California. These Counterclaims arise out of the same transactions and/or occurrences that are the subject of Sherwin-Williams's Complaints against JB Collision, JJT, and John Tyczki, and do not destroy the aforementioned diversity jurisdiction of this Court.
- 6. Venue of this action is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a), as set forth in Sherwin-Williams's Complaints.

III.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. JB Collision Agreement Terms

7. On or about September 10, 2008, JB Collision and Sherwin-Williams entered into a supply agreement ("JB Collision Agreement") under which JB Collision agreed to exclusively purchase automotive paint and related products from Sherwin-Williams until the net amount of JB Collision's purchases of products from Sherwin-Williams equaled One-Million, Three-Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,300,000.00) ("JB Collision Term").

- 8. As part of the Agreement, Sherwin-Williams agreed to provide JB Collision with an advance payment in the amount of Two-Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$275,000.00) ("JB Collision Advance"). A true and correct copy of said Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit "1" and incorporated herein by reference. Additionally, Sherwin-Williams agreed to provide JB Collision with a discount of products purchased from Sherwin-Williams. However, the discount on individual purchases made under the JB Collision Agreement was less than the discount JB Collision would have obtained on individual purchase absent the JB Collision Agreement because said "discounts" were paid upfront to JB Collision as part of the aforementioned JB Collision Advance.
- 9. Under the JB Collision Agreement's terms, if JB Collision terminated the JB Collision Agreement before the completion of the JB Collision Term, Sherwin-Williams was entitled to a "Refund" limited to the value of the product of the value of the Advance times the quotient of the value of the JB Collision Term minus the Value of Net Sales from the effective date of the Agreement divided by the value of the Term (Refund = $$275,000.00 \times ((\$1,300,000.00 \text{Net Sales}) / 1,300,000.00)))$.
- 10. The JB Collision Agreement applied to "all automotive collision repair and refinish facilities owned and/or operated by [JB Collision]...including, without limitation, the facilities located at the following addresses: [¶] (i) J & M Autobody, 9126 Dowdy Drive, San Diego, CA 92126; and [¶] (ii) El Dorado Collision, 12502 Poway Road, Poway, CA 92604."

B. JJT Agreement Terms and Guaranty

11. Following the formation of JJT and the opening of John's Collision Center in or about March 2011, on or about May 29, 2011, JJT and Sherwin-Williams entered into a (second) supply agreement ("JJT Agreement") under which JJT agreed to exclusively purchase automotive paint and related products from Sherwin-Williams until the net amount of JJT's purchases of products from Sherwin-Williams equaled Two-Hundred, Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000.00) ("JJT Term"). A true and correct copy

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

///

of said Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit "2," and is incorporated herein by reference.

- As part of the JJT Agreement, Sherwin-Williams agreed to provide JJT with 12. an advance payment in the amount of Forty Thousand Dollars (\$40,000.00) ("JJT Advance"). Additionally, Sherwin-Williams agreed to provide JJT with a discount of products purchased from Sherwin-Williams. However, the discount on individual purchases made under the JJT Agreement was less than the discount JJT would have obtained on individual purchase absent the JJT Agreement because the "discounts" were paid upfront to JJT as part of the aforementioned JJT Advance.
- 13. Under the Agreement's terms, if JJT terminated the JJT Agreement before the completion of the JJT Term, Sherwin-Williams was entitled to liquidated damages in the amount of the JJT Advance.
- On or about May 10, 2011, John Tyczki entered into a written guaranty of the JJT Agreement ("Guaranty"), which pre-dated the JJT Agreement and is therefore not enforceable. A true and correct copy of the Guaranty of the JJT Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit "3," and is incorporated herein by reference.

C. **Overview of Continued Business Interactions Between the Parties**

Because John Tyczki is the sole shareholder and the President of both JJT 15. and JB Collision, and he managed and acted on behalf of both JJT and JB Collision during all interactions with Sherwin-Williams, he, on behalf of both entities, has had a continued business relationship with Sherwin Williams since approximately June 2008. Accordingly, John Tyczki has made business decisions on behalf of both entities based upon the totality of all representations and interactions with Sherwin-Williams from the beginning of the business relationship. Consequently, in John Tyczki's, and therefore also JB Collision's and JJT's, reliance on Sherwin-Williams's representation, no particular statement by Sherwin-Williams throughout the business relationship was considered in a vacuum.

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

16. In the mid to late 2000's, the California Air Resources Board and different municipalities in California began adopting environmental regulations requiring automotive paint shops to use water-based (as opposed to solvent-based (also known as oil-based)) paint products. Prior to JB Collision entered into the JB Collision Agreement, Los Angeles adopted an ordinance requiring the use of water-based automotive paint products. It was anticipated that San Diego's ordinance would go into effect soon after. In anticipation of the new water-based paint requirement in San Diego, and because waterbased paint systems were a relatively untested and undeveloped technology, John Tyczki wanted to "get ahead of the curve" and install a fully developed, properly-functioning water-based paint system in JB Collision's shops before the regulations required waterbased paint in San Diego. John Tyczki wanted to ensure that his employees were fully trained in spraying water-based paint, that his shops were fully prepared, and the paint system was properly working before spraying water-based paint was mandated, so that the water-based paint restrictions did not affect the high quality of JB Collision's automotive paint services when the regulations were enacted.

speaking with Sherwin-Williams regarding a potential agreement regarding the installation of a water-based paint system in JB Collision's shops after he was approached by Jose Garcia (Sherwin-Williams). Three factors John Tyczki considered in entering into the JB Collision Agreement on behalf of JB Collision were Sherwin-Williams's willingness to provide the JB Collision Advance, Sherwin-Williams's Sales Representative's, Jose Garcia, specific representations regarding what was covered by the JB Collision Term (Term of the JB Collision Agreement), and Jose Garcia's express representations regarding the performance and quality of Sherwin-Williams water-based automotive paint products. John Tyczki told Jose Garcia that he would not enter into the JB Collision Agreement on behalf of JB Collision if all purchased products did not count toward the running of the JB Collision Term. Mr. Garcia specifically represented to John Tyczki that all products JB Collision purchased under the JB Collision Agreement, not

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

just paint, would count toward the running of the JB Collision Term, and he stated to John Tyczki that the calculation of the JB Collision Term was "everything you buy from us is included to count toward the \$1.3 million" (referring to Sherwin-Williams), or words to that effect. John Tyczki understood the JB Collision Agreement to so provide and intended that it do so, and he would not have entered into the JB Collision Agreement if it did not include the purchase of all products toward the \$1.3 million contract amount, and Mr. Garcia specifically was aware of this. Sherwin-Williams is now claiming that not all product purchases counted towards the \$1.3 million JB Collision Term, and that JB Collision is in breach of the Agreement. Should the JB Collision Agreement somehow be interpreted in this manner, then Mr. Garcia specifically and fraudulently misrepresented the terms of the JB Collision Agreement to induce John Tyczki to enter into said Agreement.

Additionally, during discussions between JB Collision and Sherwin-18. Williams in or about August and September 2008 regarding entering the JB Collision Agreement, Sherwin-Williams also made numerous specific representations regarding the quality of its paint products, upon which John Tyczki reasonably relied and which induced JB Collision to enter into the JB Collision Agreement. As stated below, in response to John Tyczki's specific questions, Sherwin-Williams stated to JB Collision, through John Tyczki, that its water-based automotive paint products were tested, proven, and perfected products that had been in use in other shops, and were free of certain specific defects. Specifically, Sherwin-Williams, specifically through Jose Garcia, and also Kurt Hammond, stated to John Tyczki that its water-based paint products provided a perfect color match and did not have any defects that would cause problematic physical characteristics such as "dye back" (also sometimes referred to as "loss of gloss"), "sanding scratches," "color fading," color match problems, "solvent popping," paint "shrinkage," and "orange peel." Dye back is a defect in the paint in which the paint loses its shine and looks dull and flat; hence the term loss of gloss. Sanding scratches are a defect where the marks from the body work performed prior to the application of the

paint are exposed through the paint; an observer can see the scratches from the sanding of the body work through the outer paint coat. Color fading, which is similar to dye back, is where the colors lose their brilliance, as if the color is being sucked out of the paint. Color match problems are where one batch, can, or mix of paint of a specific color, does not match others of the same color, or more specifically, upon repairing a vehicle, the fresh paint of the same type does not match the factory and/or existing paint on the vehicle. Solvent popping is where small, pinhole-like deformities appear on the outer layer (or clear coat) of the paint job. Shrinkage is where the primer sucks up the paint, causing a dry, matted finish, and also makes sanding scratches and other underlying impurities visible. Finally, orange peel is the development of a lumpy, yet still smooth, texture in the paint (rather than a flat surface) which causes the appearance of the paint to look like the outside of an orange peel.

- 19. Sherwin-Williams also stated to JB Collision that its new water-based automotive paint (as opposed to solvent-based paint), which was going to be legally required to be used in San Diego in the near future due to local environmental regulation, was of the same quality as the solvent-based paint. However, unlike the solvent-based paint, with which JB Collision never had any issues, Sherwin-Williams water-based paint had all of the defects stated above.
- 20. Specific representations and misrepresentations made by Sherwin-Williams to induce JB Collision to enter the JB Collision Agreement, and then subsequently to refrain from terminating the JB Collision Agreement, and for John Tyczki to enter into JJT Agreement on behalf of JJT, despite many instances of the above-mentioned problems, included, but are not limited to, the following interactions:
- a. From August/September 2008 through 2012, Jose Garcia (Sherwin-Williams) made numerous and specific misrepresentations concerning the quality of Sherwin-Williams water-based products and service, first to induce JB Collision to enter into the JB Collision Agreement, and subsequently to avoid cancellation of the JB Collision Agreement, and then to induce John Tyczki to enter into the JJT Agreement.

Throughout that timeframe, John Tyczki, on behalf of JB Collision, had at least twenty
(20) telephone conversations from his office with Mr. Garcia, and met with Mr. Garcia in
a JB Collision shop on a number of other occasions. Specifically, in or about August
2008 through early September 2008, over the telephone and at JB Collision's shops, in
response to John Tyczki's specific questions concerning color match, dye back, and
shrinkage, Mr. Garcia expressly stated to JB Collision, to John Tyczki, that Sherwin-
Williams water-based automotive paint was already tested, proven, and perfected, was as
good as Sherwin-Williams solvent-based paint products, and that that water-based
products did not have color match problems, color fading, shrinkage, sanding scratches,
solvent popping, and dye back. Mr. Garcia also stated that a vehicle could be painted
"prime to shine in 50 minutes" in response to John Tyczki's specific questions regarding
the use of the products and JB Collision's volume of work; however, this was also not
true. Mr. Garcia made all of these specific misrepresentations to induce JB Collision to
enter into the JB Collision Agreement. Contrary to Mr. Garcia's statements, Sherwin-
Williams water-based paint was not perfected, and was poor quality paint, and it
exhibited all of the defects stated above when purchased and used by Counter-Claimants,
including dye back, color fading, shrinkage, sanding scratches, orange peel, and solvent
popping. Further, JB Collision began using Spies Hecker/Dupont paint when it ceased its
exclusive use of Sherwin-Williams paint in March 2013, and also during specific times
when authorized by Sherwin-Williams to use Spies Hecker/Dupont paint to fix problems
caused by Sherwin-Williams paint, and did not experience these problems. JB Collision
is informed and believes Mr. Garcia knew about the problems with Sherwin-Williams's
paint products when he made the statements, and that he purposely misrepresented the
quality of Sherwin-Williams paint in order to induce JB Collision into entering into the
Agreement, because the color match problem occurred during the first week of the JB
Collision Agreement in September 2008, and Mr. Garcia then admitted that these
problems with the Sherwin-Williams paint products existed prior to JB Collisions' use of
the products during the first week of the Agreement.

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Also during initial discussions with Mr. Garcia in or about August b. 2008, John Tyczki told Mr. Garcia that his intent was to comply with the imminent local regulations requiring use of water-based paints. John Tyczki further told Mr. Garcia that he wanted to use a perfected water-based paint system, and that he did not want JB Collision's shops to be an experimental or "guinea pig" shop for Sherwin-Williams to test new technology. Mr. Garcia stated John Tyczki that Sherwin-Williams's water-based paint had been perfected, and that JB Collision's shops would not be test shops. However, contrary to Mr. Garcia's representations, use of Sherwin-Williams's waterbased paint did result in the aforementioned problems, including color match problems, color fading, sanding scratches, solvent popping, shrinkage, and dye back, beginning with color match problems immediately after JB Collision began using the water-based paint products, and Mr. Garcia, and Mr. Hammond and later Derrick King, repeatedly promised to fix these problems, but they were never fixed.

After approximately only one week of using Sherwin-Williams's c. water-based paint products, John Tyczki complained to Mr. Garcia about the color match problems. John Tyczki told Mr. Garcia that he trusted Mr. Garcia and that he felt that Mr. Garcia had lied to him, and that JB Collision would not have entered into the JB Collision Agreement if Mr. Garcia had not represented that Sherwin-Williams's water-based paint system was tested, proven, and perfected. In response, Mr. Garcia admitted that Sherwin-Williams's water-based paint products did have problems, admitted that the problems were "company-wide" and not due to JB Collision's workmanship, and that, contrary to Mr. Garcia's prior representations that Sherwin-Williams's water-based products had been perfected, the problems existed before JB Collision and Sherwin-Williams entered into the JB Collision Agreement. Mr. Garcia stated that, to induce John Tyczki not to cancel the JB Collision Agreement, JB Collision allow Sherwin-Williams time to fix the admitted problems given that the water-based paint requirement was not yet in effect, even though it was John Tyczki's intention to enter into the JB Collision Agreement in order to preempt and "get ahead of the curve" of the imminent water-based paint

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

requirement in San Diego and begin using water-based paint immediately, that Mr. Garcia would, and did, provide JB Collision with solvent-based paint products in lieu of the defective water-based paint products. Therefore, within one week of entering into the JB Collision Agreement, Sherwin-Williams had JB Collision spraying its solvent-based paint products instead of the water-based paint products, because the Sherwin-Williams water-based paint products were defective.

- d. Shortly thereafter, also in September 2008, Kurt Hammond (Sherwin-Williams), along with Jose Garcia, met with John Tyczki at the Brigantine Restaurant in Poway, California, and initially repeated the same misrepresentations concerning color match of the water-based products, but then, after being confronted by John Tyczki and hearing Mr. Garcia's admission concerning the color match problems, Mr. Hammond admitted to the prior misrepresentations and promised that the problems with the Sherwin-Williams water-based paint products would be corrected, in order to induce JB Collision to agree to allow Sherwin-Williams time to correct the problems, but which were never corrected, and to refrain from terminating the JB Collision Agreement. JB Collision believes both Mr. Hammond and Mr. Garcia knew these representations were false at the time they made them, given the fact that Mr. Garcia had admitted that the problems existed even while he was making representations to the contrary to induce John Tyczki to enter into the JB Collision Agreement, and Mr. Hammond admitted that Sherwin-Williams needed time to fix the color match problem which existed before the parties entered into the JB Collision Agreement.
- e. After Mr. Garcia switched out the water-based paint products for the solvent-based paint products, JB Collision was forced to use the Sherwin-Williams solvent-based paint products for approximately six (6) months until Sherwin-Williams informed John Tyczki that the problems with the water-based paint products had been solved. However, within a few months after resuming use of the water-based paint products, JB Collision continued to have problems with the still-defective water-based paint products, which lasted until the Agreement terminated. The defective products

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

caused color fading, sanding scratches to show through the paint, solvent popping, shrinkage, and dye back. No vehicle could or ever was painted "prime to shine in 50" minutes." John Tyczki continued using Sherwin-Williams products under the JB Collision Agreement (and later JJT Agreement) in order to complete the Term of the JB Collision Agreement, in reliance upon Sherwin-Williams's repeated but false representations that it would resolve the admitted problems with the water-based paint products.

- Within the first week of the JB Collision Agreement in September f. 2008, Mr. Lowry (Sherwin-Williams) met with and admitted to John Tyczki that there were serious and numerous problems concerning the poor quality of the Sherwin-Williams water-based products, including dye back, color fading, shrinkage, and solvent popping, and that these were misrepresentations made to John Tyczki to induce him to enter into the JB Collision Agreement. Contrary to what John Tyczki had been told by all Sherwin-Williams representatives, Sherwin-Williams water-based paint products had not been adequately tested, proven, or perfected, and were not ready for use in high quality shops like JB Collision. Mr. Lowry also admitted that those problems could not be corrected because there were problems with the paint formula. Mr. Lowry further admitted to John Tyczki that he had informed Sherwin-Williams management, including Jose Garcia and possibly Kurt Hammond, that Sherwin-Williams should not have induced John Tyczki to enter into the JB Collision Agreement because Sherwin-Williams's water-based paint products were not ready, were not perfected, and were not up to John Tyczki's standards because JB Collision's shops perform high quality services, which were not compatible with the poor quality of the Sherwin-Williams water-based paint products.
- Subsequent to the re-installment and use of Sherwin-Williams waterg. based paint products after the six (6) month period of using Sherwin-Williams solventbased products, John Tyczki continued to complain about dye back, loss of gloss, shrinkage, sanding scratches, color fading, and solvent popping, to Sherwin-Williams

16

20

21

19

2223

24

2526

27

28 || ///

representatives at various times, including specifically Jose Garcia, Derrick King, and Hilary Castro (all of Sherwin-Williams), who admitted there were problems with their product and repeatedly made promises that Sherwin-Williams would correct the defects with the water-based paint products. After San Diego enacted a water-based requirement in approximately June, 2010, JB Collision could no longer use Sherwin-Williams solvent-based products in lieu of the water-based products and could not use a competitor's water-based products or else be in breach of the JB Collision Agreement with Sherwin-Williams, so JB Collision was forced to continue relying on Sherwin-Williams's representations that the problems with its water-based paint products were corrected and/or being corrected, although JB Collision continued to experience the same problems, including dye back, color fading, shrinkage, loss of gloss, sanding scratches, and solvent popping. Mr. Garcia, throughout the course of the relationship, would provide John Tyczki with "goodwill adjustments" which were paint products free-ofcharge for the re-painting of vehicles necessitated by the poor quality of and the said problems caused by the Sherwin-Williams paint products, but John Tyczki had to absorb the labor costs of repainting the vehicles.

h. In or about March 2011 to May 2011, John Tyczki informed Jose Garcia that he was forming JJT and opening the John's Collision Center in Santee, California. Mr. Garcia stated that Sherwin-Williams considered John's Collision Center to be included under the JB Collision Agreement so JJT was also required to exclusively use Sherwin-Williams paint products. Mr. Garcia promised that Sherwin-Williams was close to having the defects in their paint products resolved and thereby induced John Tyczki to enter into the JJT Agreement. Mr. Garcia continued to promise John Tyczki that Sherwin-Williams was working on a solution to fix the problems with its water-based paint system. Counter-Claimants believe that Jose Garcia knew that Sherwin-Williams was not putting forth the effort, or did not have the ability, to correct the problems with Sherwin-Williams's water-based products, and was merely making these

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

statements to induce Counter-Claimants to enter into the JJT Agreement and continue the exclusive relationship with Sherwin-Williams.

- i. During 2012, David Sowell (Sherwin-Williams) and Jose Garcia met with John Tyczki at his office at John's Collision Center, and Mr. Sowell made additional misrepresentations that Sherwin-Williams was fixing the poor quality of the Sherwin-Williams products, including the dye back, color fading, shrinkage, and solvent popping problems. Mr. Sowell stated that "I will take care of all of these issues" and that Sherwin-Williams would specifically correct the defects in reference to the problems with dye back, loss of gloss, color fading, the appearance of sanding scratches, shrinkage, and solvent popping. However, John Tyczki never heard from Mr. Sowell again. Contrary to Mr. Sowell's and Mr. Garcia's representations, the defects in Sherwin-Williams paint products were not corrected.
- In or about October 2012, Derrick King (Sherwin-Williams) told John Tyczki that "I am going to fix your problems," that Sherwin-Williams would correct the paint products defects, and admitted that there were and had been continuing defects in the Sherwin-Williams products which was causing dye back, loss of gloss, color fading, appearance of sanding scratches, solvent popping, and shrinkage. John Tyczki discussed with Mr. King that the \$1.3 million purchase number would be hit in about six months, showed Mr. King the numbers, and Mr. King promised that these problems would be fixed in those six months; however, they were not.
- As referenced above, from September 2008 through February 2013, k. John Tyczki, on behalf of JB Collision and JJT, made numerous and repeated complaints concerning all of the aforementioned problems to Jose Garcia, David Cardenas, Kurt Hammond, Derrick King, Hilary Castro, Jack Lowry, and David Sowell (all Sherwin-Williams), as well as currently unidentified Sherwin-Williams technicians, all of whom responded with misrepresentations similar to those described above with the intent to induce Counter-Claimants to enter into the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement, and/or to induce Counter-Claimants to refrain from terminating the Agreements. JB

6

11 12

14 15

13

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25 26

27

28

Collision believes that each of these representations were made with concurrent knowledge of their falsity, and with the intent to induce Counter-Claimants to refrain from terminating the Agreements.

- 1. On February 6, 2013, after continued and repeated complaints from John Tyczki concerning these problems with the Sherwin-Williams products, specifically dye back, loss of gloss, color fading, appearance of sanding scratches, solvent popping, and shrinkage, Hilary Castro (Sherwin Williams) proposed a 30/60/90 day plan to purportedly correct the repeated problems about which the prior misrepresentations regarding the quality of Sherwin-Williams paint and corrections regarding the problems were made, which plan, in and of itself, is an admission as to the existence of the defective products. However, it appears that Ms. Castro did not implement the plan.
- On or about February 28, 2013, Sherwin-Williams sent JB Collision and JJT letters (separately) stating that Sherwin-Williams was "informed and believed" that JB Collision and JJT had discontinued exclusive use of Sherwin-Williams products. However, JB Collision did not discontinue exclusive use of until March 2013, after JB Collision was certain it had satisfied the \$1.3 million purchase/sales requirement. Further, JJT did not terminate the JJT Agreement until April 8, 2013, as John Tyczki sent Sherwin-Williams a letter dated April 5, 2013 which enclosed a check for \$40,000.00 to refund the JJT Advance pursuant to the JJT Agreement, and stating that JJT was terminating the JJT Agreement as of April 8, 2013. Counter-Claimants terminated the Agreements as a result of the numerous customer complaints and necessary re-repairs and re-paintings of customer vehicles due to the low quality of Sherwin-Williams's products, and failure of Sherwin-Williams to effectively correct the quality issues.
- 22. Counter-Claimants believe that the time each of the above representations were made, Sherwin-Williams's intended to induce and, in fact, did induce Counter-Claimants to enter into the Agreements and to not terminate the Agreements, Sherwin-Williams knew that its representations were false, and Counter-Claimants detrimentally relied upon those misrepresentations in conducting themselves in entering into and

performing under the Agreements. In truth, the quality of the Sherwin-Williams products was substandard, and continued to be substandard and generally poor, which resulted in defects in paint jobs including dye back, sanding scratches, color fading, color match problems, solvent popping, paint shrinkage, and orange peel, which has resulted and continues to result in customers returning vehicles to correct the paint defects.

- 23. Also throughout the Terms of the Agreements, John Tyczki, on behalf of both JB Collision and JJT, made numerous complaints to Sherwin-Williams regarding the quality of Sherwin-Williams's products, and the difficulty JB Collision and JJT were having due to the complications caused by Sherwin-Williams's products' poor quality. Sherwin-Williams failed to cure the defects in product quality. Significantly, since the termination of the Agreements, Sherwin-Williams has authorized John Tyczki to rerepair customer vehicles using a competitor's products.
- 24. On information and belief, through interactions with various other local members of the automotive repair and painting industry, Counter-Claimants understand that Sherwin-Williams has received numerous similar complaints regarding the quality of its paint and related products from other local members of the automotive repair and painting industry, and therefore had further knowledge of the defects in its automotive paint and related products, as alleged herein, even as they were making misrepresentations to John Tyczki.
- 25. As a result of the poor quality and defects of Sherwin-Williams paint and related products, throughout the Terms of the JB Collision and JJT Agreements and continuing through the present, JB Collision and JJT have received, and continue to receive, numerous customer complaints and have had to, and continue to have to, re-paint and/or re-repair many customer vehicles to honor the lifetime guarantee warranty of their work. The poor quality of Sherwin-Williams automotive and related products was not corrected and the continued use of these products resulted in customer complaints, customer returns, the need for "re-do's," the performance of warranty work, and additional damage to Counter-Claimants' goodwill.

5

11

12

13

8

1415

16

17

1819

2122

20

2324

25

27

26

28

26. Despite the fact that JB Collision satisfied the purchase/sales obligation and JJT refunded the full JJT Advance amount pursuant to the JJT Agreement, and Counter-Claimants made repeated complaints concerning the poor quality of the Sherwin-Williams products, and that Sherwin-Williams made repeated misrepresentations regarding the quality of its products and corrective measures, Sherwin-Williams has filed a suit seeking monies ignoring Counter-Claimants' substantial performance and satisfaction of the terms of the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement.

As a result of Sherwin-Williams's material breach of the JB Collision and 27. JJT Agreements due to the provision of poor quality products, Counter-Claimants have suffered significant injury. Counter-Claimants have spent, and will continue to spend, numerous labor hours and supplies correcting defects caused by Sherwin-Williams products. Over the course of the last five (5) years, Counter-Claimants combined have painted and/or repaired approximately two-hundred (200) vehicles per month using Sherwin-Williams paint and related products. Due to Sherwin-Williams's poor quality and defective products, Counter-Claimants have incurred and will incur labor and expenses for re-painting and/or re-repairing customer vehicles including, but not limited to, the cost of customers' car rental, and such tasks as de-trimming, stripping, primer, repainting, correcting damage to existing body work, and detailing the customer vehicles previously repaired or painted with Sherwin-Williams paint and related products. The average cost to re-paint and/or re-repair each vehicle painted and/or repaired with Sherwin-Williams products costs approximately \$2,000.00. Therefore, Counter-Claimants estimate that the combined total amount of their potential costs that will be incurred from re-painting and/or re-repairing customer vehicles that were serviced using Sherwin-Williams paint and related products is approximately \$20,000,000.00, without consideration for the value of lost goodwill and reputation. To date, Counter-Claimants have informed Sherwin-Williams of approximately \$50,000.00 of repair work performed on seventeen (17) vehicles in order to correct defects caused by Sherwin-Williams's paint products. Sherwin-Williams has refused to reimburse these costs based upon its failure to

respond. Counter-Claimants anticipate incurring substantial additional future costs for correcting paint jobs on more vehicles in the future.

- 28. Counter-Claimants also lost business and/or good will due to customers becoming dissatisfied with their work due to defects caused by Sherwin-Williams products. These economic damages are in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 29. Additionally, Counter-Claimants have suffered harm to their reputation amongst its customer base and within the local automotive painting and repair industry, which has led and will continue to lead to a further loss of business and good will, due to defects caused by Sherwin-Williams products.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract--JB Collision Agreement)

- 30. Counter-Claimants incorporate by reference all allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 29 of the Consolidated Second Amended Counterclaim as if fully set forth herein.
- 31. As set forth above, Sherwin-Williams owed contractual obligations to JB Collision pursuant to the JB Collision Agreement.
- 32. Sherwin-Williams materially breached the JB Collision Agreement by supplying JB Collision with substandard paint products, which caused defects in JB Collision's repairs and paintings of its customers' vehicles.
- 33. JB Collision informed Sherwin-Williams of the defects of Sherwin-Williams's paint products to give Sherwin-Williams an opportunity to cure said defects. Despite repeated notice, Sherwin-Williams continuously failed to adequately perform under the JB Collision Agreement by failing to correct the defects and continuing to provide JB Collision with poor quality products and services.
- 34. As a direct and proximate result of Sherwin-Williams's breach of the JB Collision Agreement, JB Collision has suffered actual and consequential damages including, without limitation, the costs of repeat repairs or paint jobs on JB Collision customer vehicles made necessary by the defective Sherwin-Williams products, the lost

profits caused by lost business due to loss of customers caused by Sherwin-Williams's defective products, the value of the damage to JB Collision's professional reputation in the community and amongst its customers, and the amount of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in defending against Sherwin-Williams's meritless claims against JB Collision, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract--JJT Agreement)

- 35. Counter-Claimants incorporate by reference all allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 34 of the Consolidated Second Amended Counterclaim as if fully set forth herein.
- 36. As set forth above, Sherwin-Williams owed contractual obligations to JJT pursuant to the JJT Agreement.
- 37. Sherwin-Williams materially breached the JJT Agreement by supplying JJT with substandard paint products, which caused defects in JJT's repairs and paintings of its customers' vehicles.
- 38. JJT informed Sherwin-Williams of the defects of Sherwin-Williams's paint products to give Sherwin-Williams an opportunity to cure said defects. Despite repeated notice, Sherwin-Williams continuously failed to adequately perform under the JJT Agreement by failing to correct the defects and continuing to provide JJT with poor quality products and services.
- 39. As a direct and proximate result of Sherwin-Williams's breach of the JJT, JJT has suffered actual and consequential damages including, without limitation, the costs of repeat repairs or paint jobs on JJT customer vehicles made necessary by the defective Sherwin-Williams products, the lost profits caused by lost business due to loss of customers caused by Sherwin-Williams's defective products, the value of the damage to JJT's professional reputation in the community and amongst its customers, and the amount of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in defending against Sherwin-Williams's meritless claims against JJT, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Concealment/Fraud)

- 40. Counter-Claimants incorporate by reference all allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 39 of the Counterclaim as if fully set forth herein.
- 41. Sherwin-Williams contracted to sell JB Collision automotive paint and related products for use in JB Collision's paint and repair of automobiles pursuant to the JB Collision Agreement entered into on September 10, 2008. Similarly, Sherwin-Williams subsequently contracted Sherwin-Williams contracted to sell JJT automotive paint and related products for use in JJT's paint and repair of automobiles pursuant to the JJT Agreement entered into on May 24, 2011.
- 42. Sherwin-Williams knowingly and intentionally concealed information regarding the quality of its paint and related products during the negotiation and formation of the JB Collision Agreement, which induced JB Collision to enter into the JB Collision Agreement. Sherwin-Williams expressly told John Tyczki that its water-based automotive paint products were tested, proven, and perfected prior to the formation of the JB Collision Agreement; however, this was untrue, as admitted by Jose Garcia and Jack Lowry.
- 43. Subsequent to the formation of the JB Collision Agreement, Sherwin-Williams continuously, knowingly, and intentionally misled all Counter-Claimants about Sherwin-Williams's efforts to cure the admitted defects in its water-based automotive products in order to induce JB Collision to refrain from terminating the JB Collision Agreement.
- 44. Further, because John Tyczki was engaged in all interactions with Sherwin-Williams on behalf of both JB Collision and JJT, the continued representations by Sherwin-Williams regarding its efforts to correct the defects with its water-based paint products (in conjunction with Sherwin-Williams's threats to initiate a breach of contract action under the JB Collision Agreement) induced JJT, through John Tyczki, to enter into, and subsequently refrain from terminating, the JJT Agreement.

19

15

16

17

20 21

23

22

24 25

26 27

28

- 45. Sherwin-Williams intentionally failed to disclose the poor quality and defects of Sherwin-Williams's paint and related products to JB Collision, including defects in Sherwin-Williams paint products that cause dye back, sanding scratches, color fading, color match problems, solvent popping, paint shrinkage, and orange peel. JB Collision did not know of the low quality and defects in Sherwin-Williams's paint and related products at the time of formation of the JB Collision Agreement. Oppositely, Sherwin-Williams knew about the defects with its automotive paint and related products, and acted with intent to deceive JB Collision in order to induce JB Collision to enter into the Agreement, and subsequently refrain from terminating the Agreement. Sherwin-Williams also knowingly, intentionally, and falsely represented to JB Collision that its water-based automotive paint and related products were tested, proven and protected in order to induce JB Collision to enter into the JB Collision agreement, and later knowingly, intentionally and falsely represented that it could and would correct the problems with its automotive paint and related products, while knowing that such problems could not be corrected, in order to induce JB Collision to refrain from terminating the Agreement, and to induce JJT to enter into the JJT Agreement, and subsequently refrain from terminating the JJT Agreement.
- 46. As a result of Sherwin-Williams's representations throughout the formation of the JB Collision, through the formation of the JJT Agreement, and during the entire performance of the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement, Counter-Claimants were induced to, and reasonably did, rely on Sherwin-Williams's deceptive representations regarding the quality of Sherwin-Williams's automotive paint and related products, and its efforts to correct the defects therewith, in entering into the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement, and to continue refraining from terminating either the JB Collision Agreement or JJT Agreement.
- As a direct and proximate result of Sherwin-Williams's deceit and 47. concealment, Counter-Claimants were induced to purchase, and continue purchasing, Sherwin-Williams's defective paint and related products in an amount exceeding \$1.3

million, and have suffered injury outside that envisioned by either the JB Collision Agreement or the JJT Agreement. In purchasing and using Sherwin-Williams's defective paint and related products, Counter-Claimants have suffered damages including, without limitation, the costs of repeat repairs or paint jobs on Counter-Claimants' customer vehicles made necessary by the defective Sherwin-Williams products, the lost profits caused by lost business due to loss of customers caused by Sherwin-Williams's defective products, the value of the damage to Counter-Claimants' professional community and amongst its customers, and the amount of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in defending against Sherwin-Williams's meritless claims against Counter-Claimants, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

48. Counter-Claimants are informed and believe and thereon allege that this conduct was caused and committed by Counter-Defendant with the intent to cause harm to Counter-Claimants, and/or to intentionally deceive and commit fraud upon Counter-Claimants, and/or with oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Counter-Claimants.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Misrepresentation)

- 49. Counter-Claimants incorporate by reference all allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 48 of the Consolidated Second Amended Counterclaim as if fully set forth herein.
- 50. Sherwin-Williams intentionally and falsely represented the quality of its paint and related products, and subsequently its efforts and/or ability to cure defects therewith, which harmed Counter-Claimants financially and with regard to Counter-Claimants' reputation.
- 51. Sherwin-Williams contracted to sell JB Collision automotive paint and related products for use in JB Collision's paint and repair of automobiles pursuant to the JB Collision Agreement entered into on September 10, 2008. Similarly, Sherwin-Williams subsequently contracted Sherwin-Williams contracted to sell JJT automotive

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

22 23

21

24

25

26 27

28

paint and related products for use in JJT's paint and repair of automobiles pursuant to the JJT Agreement entered into on May 24, 2011.

- 52. Sherwin-Williams made representations regarding the quality of Sherwin-Williams's automotive paint and related products to Counter-Claimants, including that its water-based automotive paint and related products were tested, proven, and perfected at the time of the formation of the JB Collision Agreement in September 2008 and that it would not cause dye back, sanding scratches, color fading, color match problems, solvent popping, paint shrinkage, and orange peel, and subsequently regarding Sherwin-Williams's efforts and/or ability to cure the aforementioned defects with said products. Sherwin-Williams knew its representations regarding the quality of its automotive paint and related products, and its efforts and/or ability to cure the aforementioned defects with said products, were false at the time it made the representations, and/or Sherwin-Williams made the representations with a reckless regard for their truth.
- At all times, Sherwin-Williams intended that Counter-Claimants rely on its misrepresentations.
- 54. Counter-Claimants were induced to, and reasonably did, rely on Sherwin-Williams's false representations regarding the quality of Sherwin-Williams's automotive paint and related products, and subsequently Sherwin-Williams's efforts and/or ability to cure defects in said products, to enter into the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement, and subsequently to not terminate those Agreements.
- 55. result of Sherwin-Williams's As direct and proximate representations, Counter-Claimants were induced to purchase, and continue purchasing, Sherwin-Williams's defective automotive paint and related products in an amount in excess of \$1.3 million, and have suffered injury outside that envisioned by either the JB Collision Agreement or the JJT Agreement. In purchasing and using Sherwin-Williams's defective paint and related products, Counter-Claimants have suffered damages including, without limitation, the costs of repeat repairs or paint jobs on Counter-Claimants' customer vehicles made necessary by the defective Sherwin-Williams

products, the lost profits caused by lost business due to loss of customers caused by Sherwin-Williams's defective products, the value of the damage to Counter-Claimants' professional reputation in the community and amongst its customers, and the amount of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in defending against Sherwin-Williams's meritless claims against Counter-Claimants, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

56. Counter-Claimants are informed and believe and thereon allege that this conduct was caused and committed by Counter-Defendant with the intent to cause harm to Counter-Claimants, and/or to intentionally deceive and commit fraud upon Counter-Claimants, and/or with oppression and in reckless disregard of the rights of Counter-Claimants.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent Misrepresentation)

- 57. Counter-Claimants incorporate by reference all allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 56 of the Consolidated Second Amended Counterclaim as if fully set forth herein.
- 58. Sherwin-Williams negligently misrepresented the quality of its automotive paint and related products, and subsequently its efforts and/or ability to cure defects therewith, which harmed Counter-Claimants financially and with regard to Counter-Claimants' reputation.
- 59. Sherwin-Williams contracted to sell JB Collision automotive paint and related products for use in JB Collision's paint and repair of automobiles pursuant to the JB Collision Agreement entered into on September 10, 2008. Similarly, Sherwin-Williams subsequently contracted Sherwin-Williams contracted to sell JJT automotive paint and related products for use in JJT's paint and repair of automobiles pursuant to the JJT Agreement entered into on May 24, 2011.
- 60. Sherwin-Williams made representations regarding the quality of Sherwin-Williams's automotive paint and related products to Counter-Claimants, including that its water-based automotive paint and related products were tested, proven, and perfected at

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

/// 28

the time of the formation of the JB Collision Agreement in September 2008 and that it would not cause dye back, sanding scratches, color fading, color match problems, solvent popping, paint shrinkage, and orange peel, and subsequently regarding Sherwin-Williams's efforts and/or ability to cure the aforementioned defects with said products. Sherwin-Williams had no reasonable basis for believing its representations regarding the quality of its automotive paint and related products, and its efforts and/or ability to cure said defects, were true at the time it made the representations.

- 61. At all times, Sherwin-Williams intended that Counter-Claimants rely on its misrepresentations.
- 62. Counter-Claimants were induced to, and reasonably did, rely on Sherwin-Williams's false representations regarding the quality of Sherwin-Williams's automotive paint and related products, and Sherwin-Williams's efforts and/or ability to correct defects in said products, to enter into the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement, and subsequently to not terminate those Agreements.
- 63. direct and proximate result of Sherwin-Williams's representations, Counter-Claimants purchased, and continued to purchase, Sherwin-Williams's defective paint and related products in an amount in excess of \$1.3 million, and have suffered injury outside that envisioned by either the JB Collision Agreement or the JJT Agreement. In purchasing and using Sherwin-Williams's defective paint and related products, Counter-Claimants have suffered damages, including, without limitation, the costs of repeat repair or paint jobs on Counter-Claimants' customer vehicles made necessary by the defective Sherwin-Williams products, the lost profits caused by lost business due to loss of customers caused by Sherwin-Williams's defective products, the value of the damage to Counter-Claimants' professional reputation in the community and amongst its customers, and the amount of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in defending against Sherwin-Williams's meritless claims against Counter-Claimants, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment)

- 64. Counter-Claimants incorporate by reference all allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 63 of the Consolidated Second Amended Counterclaim as if fully set forth herein.
- 65. As part of the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement, Counter-Claimants agreed to exclusively purchase, and paid for, Sherwin-Williams paint and related products. Counter-Claimants reasonably expected quality paint and related products, and the adequate and timely curing of defects therewith, in consideration for the terms of the Agreements.
- 66. Sherwin-Williams acknowledged, accepted, and derived benefits from the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement and Counter-Claimants' performance under the Agreements.
- 67. Counter-Claimants did indeed purchase and use Sherwin-Williams automotive paint and related products, which were poor quality and defective in that they caused dye back, sanding scratches, color fading, color match problems, solvent popping, and paint shrinkage on customer vehicles. As a result, Counter-Claimants were harmed by Sherwin-Williams financially, professionally, and in their reputation, in an exact amount not yet known, received payments in excess of \$1.3 million from Counter-Claimants for products which were worth considerably less, and did not incur the labor costs for the repainting of vehicles which were damaged by the use of the Sherwin-Williams products because Sherwin-Williams would only provide a goodwill adjustment in the form of paint products.
- 68. It is inequitable for Sherwin-Williams to enjoy the benefit of the payments pursuant to the JB Collision Agreement and JJT Agreement, while Counter-Claimants did not derive the expected benefit, and have suffered, and will continue to suffer, actual harm from the Sherwin-Williams automotive paint and defective products.

///

WHE	EREFORE, Counter-Claimants respectfully requests that the Court grant					
judgment in	their favor against Sherwin-Williams as follows:					
1.	Actual and consequential damages for breach of contract, in an amount to be					
	proved at trial;					
2.	Loss of business and/or good will and/or reputation with Counter-Claimants'					
	customers, as a result of Counter-Claimants use of Sherwin-Williams					
	products on customers' vehicles, in an amount to be proved at trial;					
3.	Actual costs of repairing customers' vehicles as a result of the use of					
	Sherwin-Williams products on customers' vehicles, including but not limited					
	to, honoring warranties on said vehicles, in an amount to be proved at trial;					
4.	Punitive damages, in an amount to be proved at trial;					
5.	Pre-judgment interest at the legal rate;					
6.	Attorneys' fees as may be applicable;					
7.	Costs of suit; and,					
8.	All other relief as the Court deems just and proper.					
JURY DEMAND						
Counter-Claimants demand trial by jury on all issues so triable.						
DATED: Ju	ne 24, 2014 JACKSON LEWIS P.C.					
	By: <u>/s/Paul F. Sorrentino</u> Paul F. Sorrentino, Esq. SorrentinoP@jacksonlewis.com					
	John P. Nordlund, Esq. John.Nordlund@jacksonlewis.com					
	Attorneys for COUNTER-CLAIMANT JB COLLISION SERVICES, INC. dba J&M AUTOBODY dba EL DORADO					
	COLLISION					
4849-8526-3899, v.	2					
	judgment in 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. Coun					

EXHIBIT 1

Pages 27-29

(JB Collision Agreement)

TO COUNTER-CLAIMANTS' CONSOLIDATED SECOND AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM FOR DAMAGES and DEMAND FOR JURY

USDC CASE NO.: 13-CV-1946 LAB (WVG)

SUPPLY AGREEMENT

"Sherwin-Williams"
Sherwin-Williams Automotive
Finishes Corp.
4440 Warrensville Center Road
Warrensville Heights, Ohio 44128
Attn: Controller

"Effective Date": September 10. 2008

1. <u>TERM OF AGREEMENT</u>. The term of this Supply Agreement ("Agreement") shall commence on the Effective Date and shall continue until the date upon which Net Sales (as hereinafter defined) is equal to One Million Three Hundred Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$1,300,000.00) (the "Term"). For the purposes of this Agreement, "Net Sales" shall mean the gross sales of SW Paint Products (as hereinafter defined) by Sherwin-Williams to Customer during the period commencing on the Effective Date of this Agreement and continuing thereafter, minus all credits, discounts, rebates, incentives, allowances, returns, freight, bad debt, sales taxes and/or similar taxes.

2. <u>SALE OF PRODUCTS.</u>

- (A) During the Term, Customer shall use automotive paints and coatings manufactured and sold by Sherwin-Williams under the "Sherwin-Williams" label ("SW Paint Products").
- (B) During the Term, Customer shall purchase from Sherwin-Williams all of Customer's requirements for all Products (defined below) used by Customer at all automotive collision repair and refinish facilities owned and/or operated by Customer, now or in the future, including, without limitation, the facilities located at the following addresses:
 - (i) J&M Autobody, 9126 Dowdy Drive, San Diego, CA 92126; and
 - (ii) El Dorado Collision, 12502 Poway Road, Poway, CA 92064;
- (individually referred to herein as a "Body Shop" and collectively referred to herein as the "Body Shops").

 (C) "Products" shall mean all automotive points continue and all automotive points continue and all automotive points.
- (C) "Products" shall mean all automotive paints, coatings and related products, including, without limitation, the following:
 - (i) primers (including, without limitation, solvent-based, water-based, single component, two component, urethane, epoxy and surface treatment);
 - top coats (including, without limitation, solvent-based, water-based, single stage, base coats, low VOC single stage and low VOC base coats);
 - (iii) hardeners;
 - (iv) solvents (including, without limitation, reducers, accelerators and retarders);
 - (v) abrasives, tapes, adhesives; and
 - (vi) all other associated products.
- 3. PRICE FOR PRODUCTS. The price for the SW Paint Products purchased by Customer shall be the prices specified on the Refinisher Price List of Sherwin-Williams in effect at the time of purchase. The price for those associated products listed on the 3M Yellow Price Sheet shall be the prices set forth under the single user full case column of such price sheet at the time of purchase, less thirty percent (30%). The price for all other Products shall be the prices in effect at the time of purchase. Customer shall be responsible for the payment of all applicable federal, state and local sales, use and similar taxes.
- 4. PAYMENT. The payment terms for all Products purchased by Customer pursuant to this Agreement shall be thirty (30) days from the date of Sherwin-Williams' statement. Customer shall remit all payments for Products in the form of cash or a check. Customer shall be entitled to a two percent (2%) discount on all invoices for which payment in full is received by Sherwin-Williams within fifteen (15) days following the date of the statement upon which such invoices first appear.

5. <u>ADVANCE</u>

- (A) Within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date, Sherwin-Williams shall provide an advance to Customer in the amount of Two Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$275,000.00) ("Advance").
- (B) Upon the occurrence of any of the following events ("Acceleration Event(s)"), Customer shall pay the amount of the Refund (as hereinafter defined) to Sherwin-Williams, without notice or demand:
 - (i) if Customer fails to pay any amount owing pursuant to this Agreement or breaches any other covenant or obligation under this Agreement;
 - (ii) if Customer terminates this Agreement for any reason prior to the expiration of its Term (provided, however, that nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as giving Customer the right to terminate this Agreement prior to the expiration of its Term);
 - if there is any affirmative act of insolvency by Customer, or any filing by or against Customer under any bankruptcy or insolvency law or statute or any law for the relief of, or relating to, debtors;
 - (iv) if any Body Shop ceases or substantially curtails operations;
 - (v) if Customer sells or otherwise disposes of all or a substantial portion of any Body Shop's business or assets;

- if there occurs a change in the ownership or control of more than ten percent (10%) of the business or (vi) assets of or ownership interests in Customer (whether in a single transaction or in a series of transactions); or
- if Customer for any reason ceases purchasing (or purchasing its requirements for) Products from (vii) Sherwin-Williams, or is purchasing merely a de minimis amount of Products for the primary purpose of avoiding operation of this provision.
- For the purposes of this Agreement, the amount of the Refund shall be calculated as follows. (C)

Refund = \$275,000.00

[(\$1,300,000.00 - the Net Sales during the period commencing on the Effective Date and ending on the date of the Acceleration Event)

\$1,300,000,001

- REBATE. Each month during the Term of this Agreement, Sherwin-Williams shall issue a rebate to Customer. of each monthly rebute shall be equal to Five Hundred and 00/100 Dollars (\$500.00). Sherwin-Williams shall issue each monthly rebate within thirty (30) days following the end of the applicable month. Each rebate shall be insued in the form of a sestionalise credit to Oustomer's account with Shorwin-Williams.
- REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES; COVENANTS. Customer represents, warrants and/or covenants each of the following to Sherwin-Williams and acknowledges that Sherwin-Williams is relying on such representations, warranties and
 - Customer is a corporation, duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the State of (A) California. Customer has the corporate power and authority to:

enter into this Agreement; and

- execute, deliver and perform this Agreement and each other agreement and document delivered by (ii) Customer to Sherwin-Williams in connection herewith.
- Neither the execution and delivery by Customer of this Agreement, nor the fulfillment of or compliance by (B) Customer with the terms and provisions of this Agreement will, with the passage of time, the giving of notice, or otherwise:
 - conflict with, result in the breach of, constitute a default under or result in violation of, the Articles (i) of Incorporation or Bylaws of Customer; or
 - conflict with, result in a breach of, constitute a default under, or result in any violation of any (ii) agreement, contract, instrument, statute, law, rule or regulation to which Customer is a party or is otherwise subject or bound.
- Customer shall comply with all applicable federal, state, local, and foreign laws, statutes, executive orders, (C) licensing and/or permitting requirements, governmental orders, rules and regulations (collectively referred to herein as "Laws") relating in any way to this Agreement and/or the conduct of its business including, but not limited to, all Laws relating to the:

labor, equipment, and facilities used in connection with the conduct of its business; and (i) (ii) protection of the public health and safety and of the environment.

- There is no action, suit, investigation, or proceeding pending or, to the knowledge of Customer, threatened (D) against or involving Customer, which could have a material effect on Customer's business, property, assets, financial condition, or ability to transact business. There is no state of facts or events that could reasonably be expected to form the basis for such a claim, litigation, investigation, or proceeding. No arbitration, award, judgment, order, decree or similar restriction is outstanding against Customer or any of its assets, businesses, or products.
- . Customer shall at all times maintain, protect, and preserve its property used or useful in the conduct of its (E) business and will keep the same in good condition and repair (normal wear and tear excepted). (F)

Customer shall promptly give notice to Sherwin-Williams of:

the occurrence of any Acceleration Event;

any default or event of default under any contractual obligation of Customer which, if not cured or if (ii) adversely determined, as the case may be, could have a material effect on the business, operations, property or financial or other condition of Customer or the ability of Customer to continue to transact business:

(iii) any default of Customer under this Agreement;

any litigation, investigation or proceeding which may exist at any time between Customer and any (iv) governmental authority or third party which, if not cured or if adversely determined, as the case may be, could have a material effect on the business, operations, property or financial or other condition of Customer or on Customer's ability to transact business; and

any material change in the business, operations, property, or financial or other condition of Customer. Each notice pursuant to this Section 7(F) shall be in accordance with Section 10 and shall be accompanied by a statement of Customer setting forth details of the occurrences referenced to therein and stating what action Customer proposes to take with respect thereto.

- (G) Customer shall keep proper books of record and account in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles and the requirements of all Laws shall be made of all dealings and transactions in relation to its condition of Customer as Sherwin-Williams may reasonably request from time-to-time.

 (H) Customer agrees to indemnify defend and hald something the financial customer agrees to indemnify defend and hald something the financial customer agrees to indemnify defend and hald something the financial customer agrees to indemnify defend and hald something the financial customer agrees to indemnify defend and hald something the financial customer agrees to indemnify defend and hald something the financial customer agrees to indemnify defend and hald something the financial customer agrees to indemnify defend and account in conformity with generally accepted accounting business and activities.
- (H) Customer agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold Sherwin-Williams and each of its affiliates (collectively, "Indemnified Parties") harmless from and against any claim, loss, damage, liability (whether strict or otherwise), fine penalty, assessment or expense (including reasonable attorneys fees)(collectively "Losses") incurred by any incurred by any
 - (i) any inaccuracy in or breach of any representation or warranty by Customer in this Agreement; and any breach or nonperformance of any covenant or obligation made or incurred by Customer in this Agreement.

Anything to the contrary contained in this Agreement notwithstanding, the indemnification obligations set forth in this Section 7(H) shall continue indefinitely.

- (I) Customer shall maintain all information relating to this Agreement in strict confidence and shall not disclose the information contained in this Agreement to any person, corporation, firm or entity except as required by law or by generally accepted accounting principles.
- (J) Customer has received an offer to purchase products of like grade and quality to the Products from another supplier upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement and acknowledges and agrees that Sherwin-Williams has offered the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement in order to meet such competitive offer.
- 8. WARRANTIES. Customer will be entitled to participate in any product warranty program offered by Sherwin-Williams for which Customer qualifies. EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN A WARRANTY PROGRAM REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING SENTENCE IN WHICH CUSTOMER IS PARTICIPATING, SHERWIN-WILLIAMS DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, ORAL OR WRITTEN, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY AND THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. IN NO EVENT SHALL SHERWIN-WILLIAMS BE LIABLE FOR SPECIAL, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES.
- 9. NOTICES. Any communication between Sherwin-Williams and Customer regarding the terms of this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be sent by reputable overnight courier or by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the appropriate party at the address set forth at the beginning of this Agreement. Either party may change the address for notice by sending a notice in the manner provided herein.
- 10. MISCELLANEOUS. The only manner in which this Agreement may be amended or modified is by a written document, signed by an authorized officer of Sherwin-Williams and signed on behalf of Customer, that specifically states it is an amendment or signed by an authorized officer of Sherwin-Williams and signed on behalf of Customer. The waiver of a breach of any provision of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of a prior, concurrent or subsequent breach of the same provision or of any other provision. This Agreement shall be governed by the internal laws of the State of Ohio. In the event any provision of this Agreement and the behalf of customer and provision of this Agreement, but the entire Agreement shall not fail on account thereof, and the balance of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect. In no event shall limitation of remedies. This Agreement constitutes the entire understanding and agreement between the parties hereto with reference to its subject matter. No statement or agreement, oral or written, made prior to this Agreement shall vary or modify the written terms hereof. The preprinted terms and conditions contained on any purchase order or other document submitted by Customer to Sherwin-Williams shall not apply to any purchase of Products.

THIS AGREEMENT WILL NOT BE BINDING UPON SHERWIN-WILLIAMS UNTIL SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT OR A VICE PRESIDENT OF SHERWIN-WILLIAMS AND BY CUSTOMER.

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS AUTOMOTIVE FINISHES CORP.	JB COLLISION SERVICES, INC. dba J & M AUTOBODY and EL DORADO COLLISION
By:	By: John Tyff
Title; V.P Controller	Title: presoched

EXHIBIT 2 Pages 30-31

(JJT Agreement)

TO COUNTER-CLAIMANTS' CONSOLIDATED SECOND AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM FOR DAMAGES and DEMAND FOR JURY

USDC CASE NO.: 13-CV-1946 LAB (WVG)

SUPPLY AGREEMENT

"Sherwin-Williams"

The Sherwin-Williams Company dba Sherwin-Williams Automotive Finishes 4440 Warrensville Center Road Warrensville Heights, Ohio 44128 Attn: Controller

"Effective Date": 5/21, 201

"Customer"

JJT Inc.
dba John's Collision Center
10806 Prospect Avenue, Suite 5
Santee, California 92071

Attn:

1. TERM OF AGREEMENT. The term of this Supply Agreement ("Agreement") shall commence on the Effective Date and shall continue until the date upon which Net Sales (as hereinafter defined) is equal to Two Hundred Fifty Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$250,000.00) (the "Term"). For the purposes of this Agreement, "Net Sales" shall mean the gross sales of SW Paint Products (as hereinafter defined) by Sherwin-Williams to Customer during the Term of this Agreement, minus all credits, discounts, rebates, incentives, allowances, returns, freight, bad debt, sales taxes and/or similar taxes.

2. <u>SALE OF PRODUCTS</u>.

- (A) During the Term, Customer shall purchase from Sherwin-Williams all of Customer's requirements for all Products (as hereinafter defined) used by Customer at all automotive collision repair and refinish facilities owned and/or operated by Customer, now or in the future, including, without limitation, the body shop located at the address for Customer set forth at the beginning of this Agreement (individually referred to herein as a "Body Shop" and collectively referred to herein as the "Body Shops"). The automotive paints and coatings purchased by Customer shall be automotive paints and coatings manufactured and sold by Sherwin-Williams under the "Sherwin-Williams" label ("SW Paint Products").
- (B) "Products" shall mean all automotive paints, coatings and related products, including, without limitation, the following:
 - (i) primers (including, without limitation, solvent-based, water-based, single component, two component, urethane, epoxy and surface treatment);
 - (ii) top coats (including, without limitation, solvent-based, water-based, single stage, base coats, low VOC single stage and low VOC base coats);
 - (iii) hardeners;
 - (iv) solvents (including, without limitation, reducers, accelerators and retarders);
 - (v) abrasives, tapes, adhesives; and
 - (vi) all other associated products.
- 3. PRICE FOR PRODUCTS. The price for the SW Paint Products purchased by Customer shall be the prices specified on the Refinisher Price List of Sherwin-Williams in effect at the time of purchase, less fifteen percent (15%). The price for all other Products shall be the prices in effect at the time of purchase. Customer shall be responsible for the payment of all applicable federal, state and local sales, use and similar taxes.
- 4. PAYMENT. The payment terms for all Products purchased by Customer pursuant to this Agreement shall be twenty-five (25) days from the date of Sherwin-Williams' statement. Customer shall remit all payments for Products in the form of cash or a check. Customer shall be entitled to a two percent (2%) discount on all invoices for which payment in full is received by Sherwin-Williams within fifteen (15) days following the date of the statement upon which such invoices first appear.

ADVANCE.

- (A) Within thirty (30) days after the Sherwin-Williams' Signing Date (as hereinafter set forth), Sherwin-Williams shall provide an advance to Customer in the amount of Forty Thousand and 00/100 Dollars (\$40,000.00) ("Advance").
- (B) Upon the occurrence of any of the following events ("Acceleration Event(s)"), Customer shall pay the entire amount of the Advance to Sherwin-Williams, without notice or demand:
 - if Customer fails to pay any amount owed pursuant to this Agreement or breaches any other covenant or obligation under this Agreement;
 - (ii) if Customer terminates this Agreement for any reason prior to the expiration of the Term (provided, however, that nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as giving Customer the right to terminate this Agreement prior to the expiration of the Term);
 - (iii) if there is any affirmative act of insolvency by Customer, or any filing by or against Customer under any bankruptcy or insolvency law or statute or any law for the relief of, or relating to, debtors;
 - (iv) if any Body Shop ceases or substantially curtails operations;
 - (v) if Customer sells or otherwise disposes of all or a substantial portion of any Body Shop's business or assets;
 - (vi) if there occurs a change in the ownership or control of more than ten percent (10%) of the business or assets of or ownership interests in Customer (whether in a single transaction or in a series of transactions); or

EXHIBIT 2 PAGE 30

- (vii) if Customer for any reason ceases purchasing (or purchasing its requirements for) Products from Sherwin-Williams, or is purchasing merely a *de minimis* amount of Products for the primary purpose of avoiding operation of this provision.
- 6. COMPETITIVE PRICING; NO CONFLICT; CONFIDENTIALITY. Customer: (A) represents and warrants to Sherwin-Williams that the execution and performance of this Agreement by Customer does not and will not constitute a breach of any existing contract to which Customer is a party; (B) covenants that Customer shall maintain all information relating to this Agreement in strict confidence and shall not disclose the information contained in this Agreement to any person, corporation, firm or entity except as required by law or by generally accepted accounting principles; (C) represents and warrants to Sherwin-Williams that it has received an offer to purchase products of like grade and quality to the Products from another supplier upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement; and (D) acknowledges and agrees that Sherwin-Williams has offered the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement in order to meet such competitive offer.
- 7. WARRANTIES. Customer will be entitled to participate in any product warranty program offered by Sherwin-Williams for which Customer qualifies. EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN A WARRANTY PROGRAM REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING SENTENCE IN WHICH CUSTOMER IS PARTICIPATING, SHERWIN-WILLIAMS DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, ORAL OR WRITTEN, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY AND THE IMPLIED WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. IN NO EVENT SHALL SHERWIN-WILLIAMS BE LIABLE FOR SPECIAL, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES.
- 8. NOTICES. Any communication between Sherwin-Williams and Customer regarding the terms of this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be sent by reputable overnight courier or by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the appropriate party at the address set forth at the beginning of this Agreement. Either party may change the address for notice by sending a notice in the manner provided herein.
- MISCELLANEOUS. The only manner in which this Agreement may be amended or modified is by a written document, signed by an authorized officer of Sherwin-Williams and signed on behalf of Customer that specifically states it is an amendment or modification of this Agreement. No waiver of either party's rights under this Agreement shall be effective unless made in a writing signed by an authorized officer of Sherwin-Williams and signed on behalf of Customer. The waiver of a breach of any provision of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of a prior, concurrent or subsequent breach of the same provision or of any other provision. This Agreement shall be governed by the internal laws of the State of Ohio. In the event any provision of this Agreement is held to be illegal or otherwise unenforceable for any reason, such provision shall be severed from this Agreement, but the entire Agreement shall not fail on account thereof, and the balance of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect. In no event shall the provisions in this Agreement relating to the repayment of the Advance be construed as liquidated damages or as an election or limitation of remedies. This Agreement constitutes the entire understanding and agreement between the parties hereto with reference to its subject matter. No statement or agreement, oral or written, made prior to this Agreement shall vary or modify the written terms hereof. The preprinted terms and conditions contained on any purchase order or other document submitted by Customer to Sherwin-Williams shall not apply to any purchase of Products.

THIS AGREEMENT WILL NOT BE BINDING UPON SHERWIN-WILLIAMS UNTIL SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT OR A VICE PRESIDENT OF THE AUTOMOTIVE DIVISION OF SHERWIN-WILLIAMS AND BY CUSTOMER.

THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS COMPANY

dba Sherwin-Williams Automotive Finishes

Name:

Sherwin-Williams' Signing Date:

JJT INC.

dba John's Collision Center

Name Title:

EXHIBIT 3 Page 32

(Guaranty)

TO COUNTER-CLAIMANTS' CONSOLIDATED SECOND AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM FOR DAMAGES and DEMAND FOR JURY

USDC CASE NO.: 13-CV-1946 LAB (WVG)

Guaranty

- A. For and in consideration of the agreement of The Sherwin-Williams Company, dba Sherwin-Williams Automotive Finishes ("Sherwin-Williams") to extend credit to JJT Inc., dba John's Collision Center ("Customer"), the undersigned, John Tyczki ("Guarantor"), hereby absolutely, irrevocably and unconditionally guarantees the prompt and complete payment and performance by Customer of all of Customer's obligations to Sherwin-Williams under the Supply Agreement by and between Customer and Sherwin-Williams and/or under any other agreement or arrangement, now or hereafter owing (collectively referred to herein as the "Obligations"). Upon the failure by Customer to pay to Sherwin-Williams the full amount that is due and payable under any of the Obligations. This guaranty is a primary, absolute, irrevocable and unconditional obligation of Guarantor and is enforceable by Sherwin-Williams, its successors and assigns, before or after proceeding against Customer, any other guarantor and/or any collateral securing the Obligations, and regardless of any insolvency, receivership or bankruptcy of Customer or any other guarantor, or any discharge, reduction, extension or other modification of Customer's indebtedness and/or the Obligations.
- The obligations of Guarantor under this Guaranty are in addition to and shall not prejudice or be prejudiced by any other agreement, instrument, surety or guaranty (including any other agreement, instrument, surety or guaranty signed by Guarantor) which Sherwin-Williams may now or hereafter hold relative to any of the Obligations. Without notice to Guarantor, Sherwin-Williams may: (i) obtain personal credit history and current debt information of Guarantor as required; (ii) release, compromise, or agree not to sue, in whole or in part, Customer or any other obligor, guarantor, endorser or surety upon any of the Obligations; (iii) waive, rescind, renew, extend, modify, increase, decrease, delete, terminate, amend, or accelerate in accordance with its terms, either in whole or in part, any of the Obligations, any of the terms thereof, or any agreement, covenant, condition, or obligation of or with Customer or any other obligor, guarantor, endorser or surety upon any of the Obligations; (iv) apply any payment received from Customer, Guarantor or any other obligor, guarantor, endorser or surety upon any of the Obligations to any of the Obligations which Sherwin-Williams may choose; (v) enter into any accord and satisfaction agreement as deemed advisable by Sherwin-Williams; and (vi) surrender, release or receive any property or other security of any kind or nature whatsoever held by it or any person or entity on its behalf or for its account securing any indebtedness of Customer or any Obligation, or substitute any collateral so held by Sherwin-Williams for other collateral of like kind, or of any kind, or adjust, compromise and receive less than the amount due upon any such collateral. Sherwin-Williams shall be under no duty to undertake to collect upon any collateral or any part thereof, and shall not be liable for any negligence or mistake in judgment in handling, disposing of, obtaining, or failing to collect upon, or perfecting or maintaining a security interest in, any such collateral. None of the actions described in this paragraph shall release Guarantor from any obligation or otherwise affect the obligations of Guarantor under this Guaranty.
- C. Guarantor irrevocably waives and releases any claim or defense to this Guaranty based upon lack of consideration or any other defense provided by law, including, without limitation, defenses based upon any of the following: (i) notice of acceptance of this Guaranty by Sherwin-Williams and of the creation, extension or renewal of any Obligation to which it relates and of any default by Customer; (ii) notice of presentment, demand for payment, notice of dishonor or protest of any of Customer's obligations or the obligation of any person or entity held by Sherwin-Williams as collateral security for any Obligation; (iii) notice of the failure of any person or entity to pay to Sherwin-Williams any indebtedness held by Sherwin-Williams as collateral security for any Obligation; (iv) failure of Sherwin-Williams to obtain and perfect or maintain the perfection or priority of any security interest or lien on property to secure any Obligation; (v) the failure of Sherwin-Williams to have any other person or entity execute any guaranty relating to the extension of credit to Customer; (vi) any failure promptly to commence suit against any party or to give any notice to or make any claim or demand upon Guarantor or Customer; (vii) offsets and counterclaims which Guarantor may at any time have to any claim of Sherwin-Williams against Customer; and (viii) any defense to any of the Obligations which may be available to or could be asserted by Customer, except for payment. No act, failure to act, or omission of any kind on the part of Guarantor, Customer, Sherwin-Williams or any person or entity shall be a legal or equitable discharge or release of Guarantor hereunder unless agreed to hereafter in writing by Sherwin-Williams.
- D. Guarantor's execution of this Guaranty was not based upon any facts or materials provided on behalf of Sherwin-Williams, and Guarantor was not induced to execute this Guaranty by any representation, statement or analysis made on behalf of Sherwin-Williams. Guarantor assumes sole responsibility for independently obtaining any information or reports deemed advisable by Guarantor with regard to Customer, and Guarantor agrees to rely solely on the information or reports so obtained in reaching any decision to execute this Guaranty.

TOUN TYCZKI

Date: 5-10-11

EXHIBIT 3 PAGE 32

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DIST. OF CALIFORNIA					
2	CASE NAME: Sherwin-Williams v. JB Collision					
3	CASE NUMBER: 13-CV-1946 LAB (WVG)					
4	Consolidated with					
5	CASE NAME: Sherwin-Williams v. JJT, Inc.					
6	CASE NUMBER: 13CV1947 LAB (WVG)					
7						
8	PROOF OF SERVICE					
9	I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 225 Broadway, Suite 200, San Diego, California 92101					
10	200, San Diego, California 92101					
11	On June 24, 2014, I served following document(s) described as: COUNTER-CLAIMANTS' CONSOLIDATED SECOND AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM FOR DAMAGES and DEMAND FOR JURY					
12 13						
14	on the parties in this action listed below in the manner designated below:					
15 16 17 18 19 20	Christopher M. Cullen, Esq. Michael K. Murray, Esq. LANAK & HANNA 625 The City Drive South, Suite 190 Orange, CA 92868 Tel: 714-550-0418 Fax: 714-703-1610 Email: cmcullen@lanak-hanna.com mkmurray@lanak-hanna.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jeffrey D. Wilson Michael M. Jacob Eddie Woodworth YOUNG BASILE HANLON & MacFARLANE 3001 West Big Beaver Road, Suite 624 Troy, MI 48084 Tel: 248-649-3333 Email: Wilson@youngbasile.com Jacob@youngbasile.com woodworth@youngbasile.com woodworth@youngbasile.com					
21222324252627	BY NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING. The above-listed counsel have consented to electronic service and have been automatically served by the Notice of Electronic Filing, which is automatically generated by CM/ECF at the time said document was filed, and which constitutes service pursuant to FRCP 5(b)(2)(D). □ BY U.S. MAIL by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in United States mail in the State of California at San Diego, addressed as set forth below.					
28						
	CASE NO.: 13-CV-1946 LAB (WVG) Consolidated with 13CV1947 LAB (WVG)					

3	Executed	l on June	24, 201	4, at Sa	an Diego, (Californ	ıia.	-		
4						7/	\/	7		
5					Van	eus M	Preciado			
6				•	v all	icosa IVI.	, i icciau(J		
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12					,					
13							·			
14 15 		•								
16									•	
17										
18										
19										
20			·						•	
21						-	· ·			
22										
23	7									
24										
25										
26										
27										
28	,									