

SEP 10 2007

LOS ANGELES
SUPERIOR COURT

ATTORNEY GENERAL - OFFICE COPY

1 RAPHAELE METZGER
 Metzger Law Group
 2 401 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 800
 Long Beach, CA 90802
 3 Attorneys for Plaintiff Council for Education
 And Research on Toxics
 4 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
 Attorney General
 5 THOMAS GREENE
 Chief Assistant Attorney General
 6 THEODORA BERGER
 Senior Assistant Attorney General
 7 EDWARD G. WEIL (Ca. Bar No. 88302)
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
 8 LAURA ZUCKERMAN
 Deputy Attorney General
 10 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
 Oakland, CA 94612
 11 Telephone: (510) 622-2149
 12 Fax: (510) 622-2270
 Attorneys for People of the State of California.
 13 ex rel. Edmund G. Brown Jr., Attorney General of the
 State of California
 14

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ON TOXICS

Plaintiff,

v.

McDONALD'S CORPORATION; BURGER KING CORPORATION

Defendants.

Case No.: ~~BC 338956~~ BC280980

CONSENT JUDGMENT BETWEEN PLAINTIFFS PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ON TOXICS, AND DEFENDANT BURGER KING CORPORATION

Dept: 307
Judge: Hon. Wendell Mortimer, Jr.
Trial Date: January 15, 2008
Action Filed: August 26, 2005

1 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
2 ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Attorney
3 General of the State of California,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

6 FRITO-LAY, INC., PEPSICO, INC., H.J.
7 HEINZ, COMPANY, KETTLE FOODS, INC.,
8 KFC CORPORATION, LANCE, INC., THE
9 PROCTER & GAMBLE DISTRIBUTING
10 COMPANY, THE PROCTER & GAMBLE
11 MANUFACTURING COMPANY, WENDY'S
INTERNATIONAL, INC., MCDONALD'S
CORPORATION, BURGER KING
CORPORATION and DOES 1 through 100,

12 Defendants.

Case No: BC338956

13 1. INTRODUCTION

14 1.1. On September 3, 2002, plaintiff Council for Education and Research on Toxics,
15 "CERT" filed a complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief for violations of Proposition 65
16 and unlawful business practices in the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles. On August
17 26, 2005, the People of the State of California ("People"), filed a complaint for civil penalties
18 and injunctive relief for violations of Proposition 65 and unlawful business practices in the
19 Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles. CERT's and the People's Complaints allege that
20 the Defendants failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings that ingestion of the Covered
21 Products (as defined in Paragraph 2.1), would result in exposure to acrylamide, a chemical
22 known to the State of California to cause cancer. The Complaints further allege that under the
23 Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code section
24 25249.6, also known as "Proposition 65," businesses must provide persons with a "clear and
25 reasonable warning" before exposing individuals to these chemicals, and that the Defendants
26 failed to do so. The People's Complaint also alleges that these acts constitute unlawful acts in
27 violation of the Unfair Competition Law, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections
28

1 17200 *et seq.* The two cases were ordered related and assigned to the Honorable Wendell
2 Mortimer, Jr., although they were not consolidated. This judgment shall be entered in each of
3 the two related cases and shall serve as the judgment as to defendant Burger King Corporation in
4 each case.

5
6 1.2. Burger King Corporation ("Burger King") or , the "Settling Defendant" is among the
7 defendants named in both complaints.

8 1.3. The Settling Defendant is a corporation that employs more than 10 persons, or
9 employed ten or more persons at some time relevant to the allegations of the complaint, and
10 which manufactures, distributes and/or sells Covered Products in the State of California or has
11 done so in the past.

12 1.4. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the parties stipulate that this Court has
13 jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the People's and CERT's Complaints
14 and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the People's
15 Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles, and that this Court has jurisdiction
16 to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims which were or could
17 have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.

18
19 1.5 The People, CERT, and Settling Defendant enter into this Consent Judgment as a
20 full and final settlement of all claims that were raised in the Complaint (except as specified in
21 Paragraph 7.1), arising out of the facts or conduct alleged therein. By execution of this Consent
22 Judgment and agreeing to provide the relief and remedies specified herein, Settling Defendant
23 does not admit any violations of Proposition 65 or Business and Professions Code sections 17200
24 *et seq.*, or any other law or legal duty. Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this
25 Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, or defense the Attorney
26 General, CERT, and Settling Defendant may have in any other or in future legal proceedings
27
28

1 unrelated to these proceedings. However, this paragraph shall not diminish or otherwise affect
2 the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of the parties under this Consent Judgment.

3 **2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF; CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS**

4 2.1. Settling Defendant shall provide warnings in the manner required by this Consent
5 Judgment for all Covered Products sold at its restaurants located in the State of California.

6 "Covered Products" means all potato products containing acrylamide, including fried or baked
7 potato products, sold in restaurants owned and operated by Settling Defendant ("Company
8 Restaurants") or restaurants owned and operated by third parties pursuant to franchise or license
9 agreements with Settling Defendant ("Franchise Restaurants"), whether commonly called french
10 fries, curly fries, or potato wedges.

11 2.2 Warning message. The warning message provided, under any of the permitted
12 warning methods, shall be any one of the following:

13 a.

14 **WARNING:**

15
16
17 Chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, or birth defects or other
18 reproductive harm may be present in foods or beverages sold or served here. Cooked
19 potatoes that have been browned, such as french fries, hash browns, and cheesy tots,
20 contain acrylamide, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

21 This chemical is not added to our foods, but is created when certain foods are browned.

22 Other foods sold here, such as hamburger buns, biscuits, croissants, and coffee
23 also contain acrylamide, but generally in lower concentrations than fried potatoes.
24 Your personal cancer risk is affected by a wide variety of factors. The FDA has
25 not advised people to stop eating baked or fried potatoes. For more information
26 see www.fda.gov.

27 [The following language is optional.] Some other chemicals that may be present
28 in foods or beverages served here and known to the State of California to cause
cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm are, like acrylamide, by-
products of cooking. [Settling Defendant may, but need not, identify specific
chemicals such as Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and PhiP (2-Amino-1-
methyl-6-phenylimidazol[4,5-b]pyridine)].

1 b.

2 WARNING

3 Cooked potatoes that have been browned, such as french fries, hash browns, and
4 cheesy tots, contain acrylamide, a chemical known to the State of California to
cause cancer.

5 This chemical is not added to our foods, but is created when certain foods are
6 browned.

7 Your personal cancer risk is affected by a wide variety of factors.

8 The FDA has not advised people to stop eating baked or fried potatoes. For more
9 information see www.fda.gov.

10 [The following language is optional.] Some other chemicals that may be present
11 in foods or beverages served here and known to the State of California to cause
12 cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm are, like acrylamide, by-
13 products of cooking. [Settling Defendant may, but need not, identify specific
chemicals such as Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and PhiP (2-Amino-1-
methyl-6-phenylimidazol[4,5-b]pyridine)].

14 c.

15 WARNING:

16 Chemicals known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm
may be present in foods or beverages sold or served here.

17 Cooked potatoes that have been browned, such as french fries, hash browns, and
18 cheesy tots, contain acrylamide, a chemical known to the State of California to
cause cancer.

19 This chemical is not added to our foods, but is created when certain foods are
20 browned.

21 Your personal cancer risk is affected by a wide variety of factors.

22 The FDA has not advised people to stop eating baked or fried potatoes. For more
23 information see www.fda.gov.

24 d. Wherever any warning language in this Consent Judgment uses the phrase
25 "chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer," Settling Defendant, at its
26 option, may use either the phrase "chemical known to cause cancer" or chemical that
27 causes cancer."
28

1 2.3. Warning Method. The warning shall be provided through any of the three
2 methods set forth in paragraphs 2.3.1, 2.3.2, or 2.3.3. Whichever warning method is
3 used, any sign must be:

4 (a) located at or on the counter where food is purchased, on a wall either
5 adjacent and parallel to or clearly visible to consumers standing at the counter where food
6 is purchased; or

7 (b) located or at any other place that is reasonably likely to be seen and
8 read by customers entering the restaurant to order food;

9 (c) not located at any of the following locations: On an entrance or exit
10 door, on a window, on a restroom door, in a restroom, in a hallway that leads only to
11 restrooms, on a refuse container.

12 2.3.1. Sign Warning: A warning set forth on a sign at least 10 inches high by 10
13 inches wide, with the word "WARNING" centered three-quarters of an inch from the top
14 of the sign in ITC Garamond bold condensed type fact all in one-inch capital letters.

15 Three-sixteenths of an inch from the base of the word "warning" shall be a line extending
16 from left to right across the width of the sign one-sixteenth of an inch in thickness.

17 Centered one-half inch below the line shall be the body of the warning message in ITC
18 Garamond bold condensed type face. For the body of the warning message, left and right
19 margins of at least one-half of an inch, and a bottom margin of at least one-half inch shall
20 be observed. Larger signs shall bear substantially the same proportions of type size and
21 spacing to sign dimension as the sign 10 inches high by 10 inches wide.

22 2.3.2. Sign and Brochure Combination: A combination of a sign and brochure
23 meeting the following requirements:

24 2.3.2.1. The sign is at least 10 inches by 10 inches, with the word "WARNING"
25 centered three-quarters of an inch from the top of the sign in ITC Garamond bold

1 condensed type face all in one-inch capital letters. Three-sixteenths of an inch from the
2 base of the word "warning" shall be a line extending from left to right across the width of
3 the sign one-sixteenth of an inch in thickness. Centered one-half inch below the line shall
4 be the body of the warning message in ITC Garamond bold condensed type face. For the
5 body of the warning message, left and right margins of at least one-half of an inch, and a
6 bottom margin of at least one-half inch shall be observed. Larger signs shall bear
7 substantially the same proportions of type size and spacing to 10 inches high by 10 inches
8 wide.
9

10 2.3.2.2. The sign contains the following text:

11 WARNING

12 Chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, or birth defects or
13 other reproductive harm may be present in foods or beverages sold or served here.
14 For more specific information, see the brochure [located at the cashier] [next to
15 this sign]

16 2.3.2.3. The brochure:

17 The brochure or handout must meet the following requirements:

- 18 (a) It must be at least 8 inches by 3 2/3 inches.
- 19 (b) It must contain the text set forth in Paragraph 2.2.
- 20 (c) If it contains warnings about acrylamide in fried potatoes only, then the
21 text shall be at least 12 points in size. If it contains warnings about other
22 foods, the text may be smaller than 12 points in size but must be equal for
23 each warning, and may be no smaller than necessary to be readable.
- 24 (d) If Settling Defendant chooses to provide additional Proposition 65
25 warnings not required by this Consent Judgment in the brochure, such
26 additional warnings may not be on the same page or more prominent than
27 the required acrylamide warning without the prior approval of the
28 Attorney General.

2.3.3. Combination with Nutrition Information: If Settling Defendant provides "nutrition

1 facts", i.e., information concerning the nutritional contents of the foods served in its restaurants,
2 the warning may be provided within that sign or poster and accompanying materials, if all of the
3 following requirements are satisfied:

- 4 (a) The sign or poster indicates that it describes the nutritional content of
5 foods served in the restaurant either by a title or heading using words such
6 as "nutrition facts", "nutrition information," or similar heading or title.
- 7 (b) The Proposition 65 warning is clearly visible to anyone reading the sign or
8 poster. It will be set off by a distinctive border, and the word "Warning"
9 shall be in print no smaller than other sectional headings in the sign or
10 poster.
- 11 (c) If the specific nutritional information about individual products is
12 provided on the sign itself, then the section 2.2 Proposition 65 warning
13 shall be provided on the sign unless there also is a brochure with specific
14 nutritional information, in which event, the Settling Defendant has the
15 option to place the section 2.3.2.2 warning on the sign or poster and a
16 section 2.2 warning in the brochure, provided, however, that if the Settling
17 Defendant elects to place the section 2.2 warning on the poster, if the
18 brochure includes specific nutritional information, the brochure also must
19 include the section 2.2 warning. If the specific nutritional information
20 about individual products is only provided in a brochure, then the section
21 2.2 Proposition 65 warning set forth above may be provided in the
22 brochure only.
- 23 (d) Subject to subsection (c) above, the section 2.2 warning may be provided
24 in the brochure if (1) the brochure indicates that it describes the nutritional
25 content of foods served in the restaurant either by a title or heading using
26 words such as "nutrition facts", "nutrition information," or similar heading
27 or title; and (2) the Proposition 65 warning is set forth in type of at least
28 the same size and visibility as the nutritional information.

1 2.4 Settling Defendant may, but are not required to, submit signs and/or brochures for a
2 determination that it satisfies the requirements of this Consent Judgment. The sign
3 attached as Exhibit A to this Consent Judgment are deemed to satisfy the terms of
4 this Judgment regarding the content and appearance of warnings. No sign shall be
5 deemed to comply with this Consent Judgment unless it has been submitted to and
6 approved by the Attorney General.

7 2.5 Periodic Modification of Warning Message

8 2.5.1. The warning message may be modified, with the approval of the Attorney
9 General, to include other foods or beverages.

10 2.6 Implementation of Warning

11 2.6.1. Settling Defendant shall provide its own stores and all franchisees with sufficient
12 supply of signs, and, if that method of warning is selected, brochures, to meet the requirements
13 of this Consent Judgment.

14 2.6.2. Company Restaurants. Burger King currently does not own any restaurants in the
15 State of California. If it acquires any restaurants in the State of California, within 60 days of
16 entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall send a letter to its Company
17 Restaurants within the State of California, directing them to post the warning in the manner
18 described above. In addition, Settling Defendant shall include inspection for compliance with
19 these requirements in its existing inspection programs. Settling Defendant will maintain
20 inspection, reporting and follow up programs that result in inspection of each of its Company
21 Restaurants in California at least every 6 months. Where inspection shows that a Company
22 Restaurant has not complied, Settling Defendant shall take all reasonably available steps to
23 assure compliance within 75 days.

24 2.6.3. Franchise Restaurants. Within 60 days of entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling
25 Defendant shall send a letter, in substantially the form and content set forth in Exhibit B, to its
26 Franchise Restaurants within the State of California, instructing them to post the warning in the
27 manner described above. This letter shall state that the franchisee is released from liability for
28 past violations and it is in compliance with future requirements with respect to sale of the

1 Covered Products only if the franchisee complies with the warning requirements. In addition,
2 Settling Defendant shall include inspection for compliance with these requirements in its existing
3 inspection, reporting and follow-up programs.

4 2.7. Nothing in this Consent Judgment requires that warnings be given for Covered
5 Products sold outside the State of California.

6 **3. PAYMENTS**

7 3.1.(a) Settling Defendant shall pay the following total amount of \$1,250,000, within
8 thirty days of entry of this Consent Judgment, as follows:

9 1. \$350,000 in civil penalties pursuant to Health and Safety Code section
10 25249.7(b). The 25% plaintiff's share of the penalty (\$87,000) shall be apportioned \$60,000 to
11 CERT and \$17,000 to the Attorney General.

12 2. \$200,000 to be used by the Attorney General for the enforcement of
13 Proposition 65, as further set forth in Paragraph 3.1.(b).

14 3. \$700,000 in attorney fee and cost reimbursement to CERT.

15 (b) Funds paid pursuant to paragraphs (a)(3) shall be placed in an interest-bearing
16 Special Deposit Fund established by the Attorney General. These funds, including any interest,
17 shall be used by the Attorney General, until all funds are exhausted, for the costs and expenses
18 associated with the enforcement and implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic
19 Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), including investigations, enforcement actions,
20 other litigation or activities as determined by the Attorney General to be reasonably necessary to
21 carry out his duties and authority under Proposition 65. Such funding may be used for the costs
22 of the Attorney General's investigation, filing fees and other court costs, payment to expert
23 witnesses and technical consultants, purchase of equipment, travel, purchase of written materials,
24 laboratory testing, sample collection, or any other cost associated with the Attorney General's
25 duties or authority under Proposition 65. Funding placed in the Special Deposit Fund pursuant to
26 this paragraph, and any interest derived therefrom, shall solely and exclusively augment the
27 budget of the Attorney General's Office and in no manner shall supplant or cause any reduction
28 of any portion of the Attorney General's budget.

1 3.2. Each payment to the Attorney General required by this consent judgment shall be
2 made through the delivery of separate checks payable to "California Department of Justice," to
3 the attention of Edward G. Weil, Supervising Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice,
4 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor, Oakland, CA, 94612.

5 3.3. Payment of CERT's share of the civil penalties shall be made by check payable to
6 "Council for Education and Research on Toxics." Payment of CERT's attorney's fees and costs
7 shall be made payable to "Metzger Law Group Attorney-Client Trust Account." Both checks
8 shall be delivered to Raphael Metzger, Metzger Law Group, 401 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 800,
9 Long Beach, CA 90802.

10 **4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT**

11 4.1. This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of the Attorney
12 General, CERT, and Settling Defendant, after noticed motion, and upon entry of a modified
13 consent judgment by the court thereon, or upon motion of the Attorney General or Settling
14 Defendant as provided by law and upon entry of a modified consent judgment by the court.
15 Before filing an application with the court for a modification to this Consent Judgment, CERT,
16 and Settling Defendant may meet and confer with the Attorney General to determine whether the
17 Attorney General will consent to the proposed modification. If a proposed modification is
18 agreed, then Settling Defendant, CERT, and the Attorney General will present the modification
19 to the court by means of a stipulated modification to the Consent Judgment.

20 4.2 If the Attorney General or CERT subsequently agrees in a settlement or judicially
21 entered injunction or consent judgment that the Covered Products (as sold by other companies)
22 do not require a warning under Proposition 65 (based on the presence of acrylamide), or that
23 imposes an injunctive relief warning for Covered Products different from that imposed under this
24 Consent Judgment; or if a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final judgment, and the
25 judgment becomes final, in a case brought by the Attorney General, that Covered Products do
26 not require a warning under Proposition 65, or otherwise imposes an injunctive relief warning
27 different from that imposed by this Consent Judgment, then Settling Defendant shall be entitled
28 to seek to modify this Consent Judgment to eliminate or modify the injunctive relief set forth in

1 Paragraph 2, consistent with the Attorney General's or CERT's agreement or with the court
2 judgment as described herein. Settling Defendant shall not be entitled to and may not seek a
3 modification of the judgment simply because a court orders another company to use any "safe
4 harbor" warning methods set out in California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 12601,
5 subdivision (b).

6 4.3 If a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final judgment, and the judgment
7 become final, in a case brought by the Attorney General or against the State of California, that
8 federal law precludes the Settling Defendant from providing the warnings set forth in this
9 Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant may seek to modify this Consent Judgment to bring the
10 injunctive relief imposed herein into compliance with federal law.

11 4.4 If an agency of the federal government, including, but not limited to the U.S.
12 Food and Drug Administration, states through any communication, regulation, or legally binding
13 act, that federal law precludes the Settling Defendant from providing all of the warnings set forth
14 in this Consent Judgment or the manner in which the warnings are given, Settling Defendant may
15 seek to modify this Consent Judgment to bring the warnings into compliance with federal law,
16 but the modification shall not be granted unless this Court concludes, in a final judgment or
17 order, that federal law precludes the Settling Defendant from providing the warnings set forth in
18 this Consent Judgment. A determination that the provision of some, but not all, forms of
19 warning described in section 2 above (e.g., warnings in conjunction with provision of nutritional
20 information) is not permitted shall not relieve Settling Defendant of the duty to provide one of
21 the other warnings described under this judgment for which such determination has not been
22 made.

23 4.5 If Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations are changed from their terms as
24 they exist on the date of entry of judgment, the parties may seek modifications in the Consent
25 Judgment as follows:

26 a. If the change establishes that warnings for acrylamide in the Covered Products are not
27 required, Settling Defendant may seek a modification of this Consent Judgment to relieve it of
28 the duty to warn.

1 b. If the change establishes that the warnings provided by this Consent Judgment would
2 not comply with the law, either party may seek a modification of the Consent Judgment to
3 conform the judgment to the change in law.

4 c. If the change would provide a new form or manner of an optional or safe-harbor
5 warning, a Settling Defendant may seek a modification to provide a warning in the newly
6 permitted form, but the modification shall not be granted unless the court finds that the new
7 warning would not be materially less informative or likely to be seen, read, and understood than
8 the warnings provided under this Consent Judgment.

9 4.6 If a Settling Defendant corresponds in writing to an agency or branch of the
10 United States Government in connection with the application of Proposition 65 to Acrylamide in
11 fried or baked potato products, then, so long as such correspondence is not confidential and
12 would be retrievable by the Attorney General under the Freedom of Information Act, Settling
13 Defendant originating such communication shall provide the Attorney General with a copy of
14 such communication as soon as practicable, but not more than 10 days after sending or receiving
15 the correspondence; provided, however, that this section shall not apply to correspondence to or
16 from trade associations or other groups of which Settling Defendant is a member.

17 **5. ENFORCEMENT**

18 5.1. The People or CERT may, by motion or application for an order to show cause
19 before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any
20 such proceeding, the People may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided
21 by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment and where said violations of this
22 Consent Judgment constitute subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws independent
23 of the Consent Judgment and/or those alleged in the Complaint, the People or CERT are not
24 limited to enforcement of the Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action, whatever fines,
25 costs, penalties, or remedies are provided for by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or
26 other laws. In any action brought by the People alleging subsequent violations of Proposition 65
27 or other laws, Settling Defendant may assert any and all defenses that are available.

1 **6. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT**

2 6.1. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized
3 by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and
4 execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally to bind that party.

5 **7. CLAIMS COVERED**

6 7.1. This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between the People,
7 CERT, and Settling Defendant, of any violation of Proposition 65, Business & Professions Code
8 sections 17200 *et seq.*, or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have
9 been asserted in the complaint against Settling Defendant for failure to provide clear and
10 reasonable warnings of exposure to acrylamide from the use of the Covered Products, or any
11 other claim based on the facts or conduct alleged in the Complaint, whether based on actions
12 committed by Settling Defendant or by any entity to whom it distributes or sells Covered
13 Products, and for any franchisee who sells or has sold Covered Products in the State of
14 California, if that franchisee complies with Paragraph 2.6.3. As to Covered Products,
15 compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue now, in the past, and in
16 the future concerning compliance by Settling Defendant, their parents, shareholders, divisions,
17 subdivisions, subsidiaries, sister companies, affiliates, franchisees, cooperative members, and
18 licensees; their distributors, wholesalers, and retailers who sell Covered Products; and the
19 predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them; with the requirements of Proposition 65.

20 **8. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION**

21 8.1. This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement the Consent
22 Judgment.

23 **9. PROVISION OF NOTICE**

24 9.1. When any party is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the
25 notice shall be sent by overnight courier service to the person and address set forth in this
26 Paragraph. Any party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by
27 sending each other party notice by certified mail, return receipt requested. Said change shall take
28

1 effect for any notice mailed at least five days after the date the return receipt is signed by the
2 party receiving the change.

3 9.2. Notices shall be sent to the following when required:

4 For the Attorney General:

5 Edward G. Weil, Supervising Deputy Attorney General
6 1515 Clay St., 20th Flr.
7 Oakland, CA 94612
8 Telephone: (510) 622-2149
9 Facsimile: (510) 622-2270

10 For CERT:

11 Raphael Metzger
12 Metzger Law Group
13 401 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 800
14 Long Beach, CA 90802

15 9.3 Notices for the Settling Defendant shall be sent to:

16 For Burger King:

17 Michele Corash
18 Robin Stafford
19 Morrison & Foerster
20 425 Market Street
21 San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
22 Telephone: 415 268-7124
23 Facsimile: 415 268-7522

24 **10. COURT APPROVAL**

25 10.1. This Consent Judgment shall be submitted to the Court for entry by noticed motion.
26 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and may
27 not be used by the Attorney General or Settling Defendant for any purpose.

28 **11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT**

11.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding
of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions,
negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or
otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party
hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be
deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.

1
2
3
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

12. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

12.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

Dated: July 30, 2007

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General
TOM GREENE
Chief Assistant Attorney General
THEODORA BERGER
Assistant Attorney General
LAURA ZUCKERMAN
Deputy Attorney General

By: Edward G. Weil
Edward G. Weil
Deputy Attorney General
For Plaintiffs People of the State of California

Dated: MORRISON & FOERSTER
Michele Corash
Robin Stafford
Brooks Beard

By: _____
Michele Corash
Attorney for Defendant Burger King Corporation

Dated: By: _____
for Defendant Burger King Corporation

Dated: By: _____
Raphael Metzger
Metzger Law Group
Attorney for Plaintiff CERT

Dated: By: _____
For Plaintiff CERT

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

Hon. Wendell Mortimer, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court

1 **12. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS**

2 12.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by
3 means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

4 **IT IS SO STIPULATED:**


5 Dated: EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
6 Attorney General
7 TOM GREENE
8 Chief Assistant Attorney General
9 THEODORA BERGER
10 Assistant Attorney General
11 LAURA ZUCKERMAN
12 Deputy Attorney General

13 By: _____
14 Edward G. Weil
15 Deputy Attorney General
16 For Plaintiffs People of the State of California

17 Dated: MORRISON & FOERSTER
18 Michele Corash
19 Robin Stafford
20 Brooks Beard

21 By: _____
22 Michele Corash
23 Attorney for Defendant Burger King Corporation

24 Dated: By: _____
25 for Defendant Burger King Corporation

26 Dated: 7/23/07 By: 
27 Raphael Metzger
28 Metzger Law Group
Attorney for Plaintiff CERT

Dated: 7/23/2007 By: 
For Plaintiff CERT

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

Hon. Wendell Mortimer, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court

1
2
3
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

12. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

12.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

Dated: EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General
TOM GREENE
Chief Assistant Attorney General
THEODORA BERGER
Assistant Attorney General
LAURA ZUCKERMAN
Deputy Attorney General

By: _____
Edward G. Weil
Deputy Attorney General
For Plaintiffs People of the State of California

Dated: *JULY 30, 2007*
MORRISON & FOERSTER
Michele Corash
Robin Stafford
Brooks Beard

By: *Brooks Beard*
Brooks Beard
Attorney for Defendant Burger King Corporation

Dated: _____
By: _____
for Defendant Burger King Corporation.

Dated: _____
By: _____
Raphael Metzger
Metzger Law Group
Attorney for Plaintiff CERT

Dated: _____
By: _____
For Plaintiff CERT

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

Hon. Wendell Mortimer, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court

1
2
3
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

12. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

12.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.


IT IS SO STIPULATED:

Dated: EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General
TOM GREENE
Chief Assistant Attorney General
THEODORA BERGER
Assistant Attorney General
LAURA ZUCKERMAN
Deputy Attorney General

By: _____
Edward G. Weil
Deputy Attorney General
For Plaintiffs People of the State of California

Dated: MORRISON & FOERSTER
Michele Corash
Robin Stafford
Brooks Beard

By: _____
Michele Corash
Attorney for Defendant Burger King Corporation

Dated: By: 
for Defendant Burger King Corporation

Dated: By: _____
Raphael Metzger
Metzger Law Group
Attorney for Plaintiff CERT

Dated: By: _____
For Plaintiff CERT

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

SEP 10 2007
WENDELL R. MORTIMER, JR.
Hon. Wendell Mortimer, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT A



HAVE IT YOUR WAY



Nutritional Information

As of March 2007. Please check www.bk.com for the most recent nutritional information.

Table with columns: Item Name, Serving Size, Calories, Total Fat, Total Cholesterol, Sodium, Total Sugar, Total Protein, and % Daily Value. Includes items like Whopper, Big Mac, and various burgers.

Table with columns: Item Name, Serving Size, Calories, Total Fat, Total Cholesterol, Sodium, Total Sugar, Total Protein, and % Daily Value. Includes items like French-Fried Burgers, Chicken, Fish, & Veggie, and various salads.

Table with columns: Item Name, Serving Size, Calories, Total Fat, Total Cholesterol, Sodium, Total Sugar, Total Protein, and % Daily Value. Includes items like Shakes, Smoothies, and various sides.

What's Your Eating Strategy? Stay calorie conscious and eat like a king!

HAVE IT YOUR WAY® Eating Strategies with great-tasting fire-grilled food at BURGER KING® restaurants.

Try these menu ideas!

Table with columns: Calorie, Fat, Daily Value, and % Daily Value. Lists menu items like Whopper, Big Mac, and various burgers with their nutritional values.

*Percent Daily Values are based on a diet of other people's secrets. †Percent Daily Values are based on a diet of other people's secrets. ‡Percent Daily Values are based on a diet of other people's secrets.

Calorie and fat information for various menu items. Includes information about daily calorie and fat intake recommendations.

Large table with columns: Item Name, Serving Size, Calories, Total Fat, Total Cholesterol, Sodium, Total Sugar, Total Protein, and % Daily Value. Lists a wide variety of menu items including burgers, fries, and drinks.

Ingredients

Detailed list of ingredients for various menu items, including allergen information and specific product details.

Product Contents

Product content information for various menu items, including allergen information and specific product details.

WARNING

Warning text regarding allergen information and potential health risks associated with certain menu items.

Actual size 2' x 3'

EXHIBIT B



ATTENTION REQUIRED: THIS COMMUNICATION APPLIES TO RESTAURANTS LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA ONLY.

TO: All California BURGER KING® Franchisees
FROM: Lisa Giles-Klein, VP, Assistant General Counsel, BKC
DATE: _____, 2007
SUBJECT: Final Nutrition Poster – Proposition 65 Warning

Burger King Corporation ("BKC") has entered into a consent judgment with the Attorney General for the State of California and a private plaintiff regarding the presence of acrylamide in french fries sold at BURGER KING® restaurants in California. To benefit from the terms of this consent judgment, all BURGER KING® restaurants in California are required to post a new nutrition poster that has been approved by the Attorney General.

BKC will be sending to your restaurants in California, at no charge to you, the approved nutrition poster. Your restaurants should receive the new posters by _____, 2007. Please immediately replace the existing nutrition poster with this poster. The poster must be located as follows:

- The poster must be located at or on the counter where food is purchased, on a wall either adjacent and parallel to the counter or clearly visible to consumers standing at the counter to order food. It may also be placed on a wall reasonably likely to be seen and read by customers entering the restaurant to order food.
- The poster may not be located at any of the following locations: On an entrance or exit door, on a window, on a restroom door, in a restroom, in a hallway that leads only to restrooms, or on a refuse container.

Please follow-up with your Restaurant Manager(s) to ensure that the new nutrition posters are located in accordance with this instruction. If you cannot comply with this instruction due to lack of a suitable location for the poster, contact your Franchise Business Leader to discuss alternatives.

Your compliance with this instruction is mandatory if you are to benefit from the protections in the consent judgment and will be checked as part of the Operation Excellence Review process. If you need a new poster or have any questions, please contact your Franchise Business Leader immediately.

IMPORTANT: ALTHOUGH YOU WERE NOT SUED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OR THE PRIVATE PLAINTIFF, BURGER KING CORPORATION HAS OBTAINED A CONDITIONAL RELEASE ON YOUR BEHALF. FOR THAT RELEASE TO BE EFFECTIVE, YOU MUST COMPLY WITH THE TERMS OF THIS COMMUNICATION. IF YOU DO NOT, YOU RISK BEING SUED BY THE CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL OR BY PRIVATE PARTIES IN CALIFORNIA ACTING IN HIS STEAD.

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL

Case Name: *Environmental World Watch v. Procter Gamble*

Case No.: **Los Angeles County Superior Court No. BC337618**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On September 14, 2007, I served the attached:

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF (1) ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT JUDGMENTS; (2) CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO THE PEOPLE AND WENDY'S INTERNATIONAL, INC.; (3) CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO THE PEOPLE, CERT, AND BURGER KING CORPORATION

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at P.O. Box 70550, Oakland, CA 94612-0550, addressed as follows:

Trenton H. Norris, Esq.
Todd O. Edmister, Esq.
Gabriel J. Padilla, Esq.
Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Attorneys for Frito-Lay, Inc.

Forrest A. Hainline III
Robert B. Bader
Goodwin Procter LLP
101 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Attorneys for McDonald's Corporation

Michèle B. Corash, Esq.
Brooks M. Beard, Esq.
Robin S. Stafford, Esq.
Morrison & Foerster LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
Attorneys for Burger King Corporation, H.J. Heinz Company; Lance, Inc.; Wendy's International, Inc., and Kettle Foods, Inc.

Norman C. Hile, Esq.
John Murray, Esq.
Mike Weed, Esq.
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 3000
Sacramento, CA 95814-4497
Attorneys for The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Company and The Procter & Gamble Distributing Company

Gary M. Roberts, Esq.
John E. Walker, Esq.
Jennifer Yu Sacro, Esq.
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP
601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2500
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5704
Attorneys for McDonald's Corporation

Raphael Metzger, Esq.
Metzger Law Group
401 East Ocean Blvd.,
Suite 800, Los Angeles, CA 90802

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on September 14, 2007, at Oakland, California.

YEBONYA TAMBI

Declarant



Signature