

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Company is involved in various legal proceedings, including the proceedings specifically discussed below. Management of the Company believes that any liability to the Company that may arise as a result of these proceedings will not have a material adverse effect on the financial condition of the Company and its subsidiaries taken as a whole.

Carpenters

On October 27, 2000, a class action lawsuit (*Carpenters Health & Welfare Fund of Philadelphia & Vicinity v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al.*) was filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia alleging that the Company, M. Douglas Ivester, Jack L. Stahl and James E. Chestnut violated antifraud provisions of the federal securities laws by making misrepresentations or material omissions relating to the Company's financial condition and prospects in late 1999 and early 2000. A second, largely identical lawsuit (*Gaetan LaValla v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al.*) was filed in the same court on November 9, 2000. The complaints allege that the Company and the individual named officers: (1) forced certain Coca-Cola system bottlers to accept "excessive, unwanted and unneeded" sales of concentrate during the third and fourth quarters of 1999, thus creating a misleading sense of improvement in our Company's performance in those quarters; (2) failed to write down the value of impaired assets in Russia, Japan and elsewhere on a timely basis, again resulting in the presentation of misleading interim financial results in the third and fourth quarters of 1999; and (3) misrepresented the reasons for Mr. Ivester's departure from the Company and then misleadingly reassured the financial community that there would be no changes in the Company's core business strategy or financial outlook following that departure. Damages in an unspecified amount are sought in both complaints.

On January 8, 2001, an order was entered by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia consolidating the two cases for all purposes. The Court also ordered the plaintiffs to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint. On July 25, 2001, the plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Amended Complaint, which largely repeated the allegations made in the original complaints and added Douglas N. Daft as an additional defendant.

On September 25, 2001, the defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss all counts of the Consolidated Amended Complaint. On August 20, 2002, the Court granted in part and denied in part the defendants' Motion to Dismiss. The Court also granted the plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Amend the Complaint. On September 4, 2002, the defendants filed a Motion for Partial Reconsideration of the Court's August 20, 2002 ruling. The motion was denied by the Court on April 15, 2003.

On June 2, 2003, the plaintiffs filed an Amended Consolidated Complaint. The defendants moved to dismiss the Amended Complaint on June 30, 2003. On March 31, 2004, the Court granted in part and denied in part the defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint. In its order, the Court dismissed a number of the plaintiffs' allegations, including the claim that the Company made knowingly false statements to financial analysts. The Court permitted the remainder of the allegations to proceed to discovery. The Court denied the plaintiffs' request for leave to further amend and replead their complaint. The fact discovery closed on March 23, 2007, pursuant to the Court's order. However, there remain certain unresolved issues relating to discovery pending before the Court.

In August 2007, the Court heard oral argument on plaintiffs' motion to certify the class and the Company's opposition thereto. A ruling on that motion is currently pending before the Court. In October 2007, the Company filed various motions for summary judgment and related relief. Briefing on the Company's motions is ongoing.

The Company believes it has substantial legal and factual defenses to the plaintiffs' claims.

Aqua-Chem Litigation

On December 20, 2002, the Company filed a lawsuit (*The Coca-Cola Company v. Aqua-Chem, Inc., Civil Action No. 2002CV631-50*) in the Superior Court, Fulton County, Georgia (the "Georgia Case"), seeking a declaratory

judgment that the Company has no obligation to its former subsidiary, Aqua-Chem, Inc., now known as Cleaver-Brooks, Inc. (“Aqua-Chem”), for any past, present or future liabilities or expenses in connection with any claims or lawsuits against Aqua-Chem. Subsequent to the Company’s filing but on the same day, Aqua-Chem filed a lawsuit (*Aqua-Chem, Inc. v. The Coca-Cola Company, Civil Action No. 02CV012179*) in the Circuit Court, Civil Division of Milwaukee County, Wisconsin (the “Wisconsin Case”). In the Wisconsin Case, Aqua-Chem sought a declaratory judgment that the Company is responsible for all liabilities and expenses not covered by insurance in connection with certain of Aqua-Chem’s general and product liability claims arising from occurrences prior to the Company’s sale of Aqua-Chem in 1981, and a judgment for breach of contract in an amount exceeding \$9 million for costs incurred by Aqua-Chem to date in connection with such claims. The Wisconsin Case initially was stayed, pending final resolution of the Georgia Case, and later was voluntarily dismissed without prejudice by Aqua-Chem.

The Company owned Aqua-Chem from 1970 to 1981. During that time, the Company purchased over \$400 million of insurance coverage, of which approximately \$350 million is still available to cover Aqua-Chem’s costs for certain product liability and other claims. The Company sold Aqua-Chem to Lyonnaise American Holding, Inc. in 1981 under the terms of a stock sale agreement. The 1981 agreement, and a subsequent 1983 settlement agreement, outlined the parties’ rights and obligations concerning past and future claims and lawsuits involving Aqua-Chem. Cleaver-Brooks, a division of Aqua-Chem, manufactured boilers, some of which contained asbestos gaskets. Aqua-Chem was first named as a defendant in asbestos lawsuits in or around 1985 and currently has more than 100,000 claims pending against it.

The parties agreed in 2004 to stay the Georgia Case pending the outcome of insurance coverage litigation filed by certain Aqua-Chem insurers on March 26, 2004. In the coverage action, five plaintiff insurance companies filed suit (*Century Indemnity Company, et al. v. Aqua-Chem, Inc., The Coca-Cola Company, et al., Case No. 04CV002852*) in the Circuit Court, Civil Division of Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, against the Company, Aqua-Chem and 16 insurance companies. Several of the policies that are the subject of the coverage action were issued to the Company during the period (1970 to 1981) when the Company owned Aqua-Chem. The complaint seeks a determination of the respective rights and obligations under the insurance policies issued with regard to asbestos-related claims against Aqua-Chem. The action also seeks a monetary judgment reimbursing any amounts paid by the plaintiffs in excess of their obligations. Two of the insurers, one with a \$15 million policy limit and one with a \$25 million policy limit, asserted cross-claims against the Company, alleging that the Company and/or its insurers are responsible for Aqua-Chem’s asbestos liabilities before any obligation is triggered on the part of the cross-claimant insurers to pay for such costs under their policies.

Aqua-Chem and the Company filed and obtained a partial summary judgment determination in the coverage action that the insurers for Aqua-Chem and the Company were jointly and severally liable for coverage amounts, but reserving judgment on other defenses that might apply. During the course of the Wisconsin coverage litigation, Aqua-Chem and the Company reached settlements with several of the insurers, including plaintiffs, who have paid or will pay funds into an escrow account for payment of costs arising from the asbestos claims against Aqua-Chem. On July 24, 2007, the Wisconsin trial court entered a final declaratory judgment regarding the rights and obligations of the parties under the insurance policies issued by the remaining defendant insurers, which judgment was not appealed. The judgment directs, among other things, that each insurer whose policy is triggered is jointly and severally liable for 100 percent of Aqua-Chem’s losses up to policy limits.

The court’s judgment concludes the Wisconsin insurance coverage litigation. The Georgia Case remains subject to the stay agreed to in 2004.

European Union Parallel Trade Matter

The Company has had discussions with the Competition Directorate of the European Commission (the “European Commission”) about issues relating to parallel trade within the European Union arising out of comments received by the European Commission from third parties. The Company has fully cooperated with the European Commission and has provided information on these issues and the measures taken and to be taken to address them.

The Company is unable to predict at this time with any reasonable degree of certainty what action, if any, the European Commission will take with respect to these issues.

Selbst and Amalgamated

In May and July 2005, two putative class action lawsuits (*Selbst v. The Coca-Cola Company and Douglas N. Daft and Amalgamated Bank, et al. v. The Coca-Cola Company, Douglas N. Daft, E. Neville Isdell, Steven J. Heyer and Gary P. Fayard*) alleging violations of the anti-fraud provisions of the federal securities laws were filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia against the Company and certain current and former executive officers. These cases were subsequently consolidated, and an amended and consolidated complaint was filed in September 2005. The purported class consists of persons, except the defendants, who purchased Company stock between January 30, 2003, and September 15, 2004, and were damaged thereby. The amended and consolidated complaint alleges, among other things, that during the class period the defendants made false and misleading statements about (a) the Company's new business strategy/model, (b) the Company's execution of its new business strategy/model, (c) the state of the Company's critical bottler relationships, (d) the Company's North American business, (e) the Company's European operations, with a particular emphasis on Germany, (f) the Company's marketing and introduction of new products, particularly Coca-Cola C2, and (g) the Company's forecast for growth going forward. The plaintiffs claim that as a result of these allegedly false and misleading statements, the price of the Company stock increased dramatically during the purported class period. The amended and consolidated complaint also alleges that in September and November of 2004, the Company and E. Neville Isdell acknowledged that the Company's performance had been below expectations, that various corrective actions were needed, that the Company was lowering its forecasts, and that there would be no quick fixes. In addition, the amended and consolidated complaint alleges that the charge announced by the Company in November 2004 should have been taken early in 2003 and that, as a result, the Company's financial statements were materially misstated during 2003 and the first three quarters of 2004. The plaintiffs, on behalf of the putative class, seek compensatory damages in an amount to be proved at trial, extraordinary, equitable and/or injunctive relief as permitted by law to assure that the class has an effective remedy, award of reasonable costs and expenses, including counsel and expert fees, and such other further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. On November 21, 2005, the Company and the individual parties filed a motion to dismiss the amended and consolidated complaint. The plaintiffs filed their response to that motion on January 27, 2006. On September 29, 2006, the Court entered its order granting the Company's motion to dismiss the amended complaint in its entirety and granted the plaintiffs 20 days from its date of entry within which to seek leave to file a second amended complaint to attempt to correct deficiencies noted therein. On October 23, 2006, plaintiffs advised the Court that they would not seek leave to file a second amended complaint. The Court entered its final order of judgment on March 23, 2007. On April 16, 2007, plaintiffs filed notice of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit of the Court's order dismissing this case. On December 4, 2007, the Court of Appeals heard argument on the appeal. On January 10, 2008, the Court of Appeals issued an opinion affirming the dismissal of the case.

The plaintiffs may file a petition of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court; however, barring the U.S. Supreme Court granting such a petition, this matter will be considered closed.

Chapman

On June 30, 2005, Maryann Chapman filed a purported shareholder derivative action (*Chapman v. Isdell, et al.*) in the Superior Court of Fulton County, Georgia, alleging violations of state law by certain individual current and former members of the Board of Directors of the Company and senior management, including breaches of fiduciary duties, abuse of control, gross mismanagement, waste of corporate assets and unjust enrichment, between January 2003 and the date of filing of the complaint that have caused substantial losses to the Company and other damages, such as to its reputation and goodwill. The defendants named in the lawsuit include Neville Isdell, Douglas Daft, Gary Fayard, Ronald Allen, Cathleen Black, Warren Buffett, Herbert Allen, Barry Diller, Donald McHenry, Sam Nunn, James Robinson, Peter Ueberroth, James Williams, Donald Keough, Maria Lagomasino, Pedro Reinhard, Robert Nardelli and Susan Bennett King. The Company is also named a nominal defendant. The complaint further alleges that the

September 2004 earnings warning issued by the Company resulted from factors known by the individual defendants as early as January 2003 that were not adequately disclosed to the investing public until the earnings warning. The factors cited in the complaint include (i) a flawed business strategy and a business model that was not working; (ii) a workforce so depleted by layoffs that it was unable to properly react to changing market conditions; (iii) impaired relationships with key bottlers; and (iv) the fact that the foregoing conditions would lead to diminished earnings. The plaintiff, purportedly on behalf of the Company, seeks damages in an unspecified amount, extraordinary equitable and/or injunctive relief, restitution and disgorgement of profits, reimbursement for costs and disbursements of the action, and such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. The Company's motion to dismiss the complaint and the plaintiff's response were filed and fully briefed. The Court heard oral argument on the Company's motion to dismiss on June 6, 2006. Following the hearing, the Court took the matter under advisement and the parties are awaiting a ruling. There were no material developments in this case during 2007.

The Company intends to vigorously defend its interests in this matter.

CCE Shareholders Litigation

In February 2006, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, a purported shareholder of CCE, filed a derivative suit (*International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al.*) in the Delaware Court of Chancery for New Castle County naming the Company and current and former CCE board members, including certain current and former Company officers who serve or served on CCE's board, as defendants. The plaintiff alleged that the Company breached fiduciary duties owed to CCE shareholders based upon alleged control of CCE by the Company. The complaint also alleged that the Company had actual control over CCE and that the Company abused its control by maximizing its own financial condition at the expense of CCE's financial condition. Subsequently, two lawsuits virtually identical to *Teamsters* were filed in the same court: *Lang v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al.*, filed March 30, 2006, and *Gordon v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al.*, filed April 10, 2006. On April 6, 2006, the Company moved to dismiss *Teamsters* or, in the alternative, for a stay of discovery. On May 19, 2006, the Chancery Court entered an order consolidating *Teamsters*, *Lang* and *Gordon* under the caption *In re Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc. Shareholders Litigation* and requiring the plaintiffs to file an amended consolidated complaint in the consolidated action as soon as practicable.

On September 29, 2006, plaintiffs filed their Consolidated Amended Shareholders' Derivative Complaint (the "Amended Complaint"). The Amended Complaint omits certain former Company officers from the group of individual defendants and defines the "relevant time period" for purposes of the claims as October 15, 2003, through the date of the filing. The original complaint did not identify any specific dates. The Amended Complaint also includes additional allegations about the conduct of the Company and certain of its executive officers, including new allegations about the Company's purported control over CCE and allegations of improper conduct in connection with the establishment of a warehouse delivery system to supply Powerade to a major customer. On December 7, 2006, the Company filed its motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint and accompanying brief. The plaintiffs' reply brief was filed on January 22, 2007. On October 17, 2007, the Chancery Court dismissed plaintiffs' Amended Complaint. The plaintiffs appealed the Chancery Court's decision to the Delaware Supreme Court.

The Company will vigorously defend its interests on appeal.

American Canyon Matter

The Company has received notices of violations from local environmental authorities alleging that certain violations of the United States Clean Water Act (the "CWA") and applicable local law have occurred at the Company's production plant in American Canyon, California. That plant treats and discharges wastewater under permit authority issued under the CWA and local law. The alleged violations relate to handling of wastewater discharge and required regulatory reporting. The Company believes that the regulatory authorities may pursue enforcement action against the Company and may seek potential monetary and/or other sanctions, although the Company believes that any sanctions that may be imposed on the Company as a result of these alleged violations will not be material to the Company's business or financial condition.

The Company is working with the local environmental authorities to resolve and settle the matter.

ITEM 4. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS

Not applicable.