	d				
1	WILLIAM VERICK, CSB #140972 Klamath Environmental Law Center				
2	FREDRIC EVENSON, CSB #198059 Law Offices of Fredric Evenson 424 First Street				
4	Eureka, CA 95501 Telephone: (707) 268-8900				
5	Facsimile: (707) 268-8901				
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION				
7	TOUNDATION				
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - UNLIMITED JURISDICTION				
10					
11	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE Case No. 04-429922 FOUNDATION,				
12	Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT				
13	vs.				
14	ATICO INTERNATIONAL USA, INC.;				
15	RITE AID CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 100 inclusive,				
16 17	Defendants.				
18	1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>				
19	1.1. Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation ("Plaintiff or "Mateel"), and				
20	defendant Atico International USA, Inc. ("Atico") are party to an earlier consent judgment				
21	entered by the San Francisco County Superior Court on July 26, 2001, covering the same				
22	subject matter as this Consent Judgment (Exhibit A hereto). The July 26, 2001 consent				
23	judgment was entered in Mateel v. Atico et al, San Francisco Superior Court Case No.				
24	315868. As to Atico, this Consent Judgment is intended to modify and supersede in its				
25	entirety the July 26, 2001 judgment, but the entry of this Consent Judgment is not intended to				
26	otherwise affect that earlier judgment.				
27	1.2. On March 25, 2004, Mateel, acting on behalf of itself and the general				
28	public, filed a complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief in San Francisco County				
- 1	Page				

12

13

11

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

Superior Court, Case No. 04-429922, against defendants Atico, Rite Aid Corp. ("Rite Aid") (collectively "Defendants") and Does 1 through 100 (the "Complaint"). The Complaint alleges, among other things, that Defendants violated Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65") and Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq. (the "Unfair Competition Act") by knowingly and intentionally exposing persons to certain brass irrigation products containing lead and/or lead compounds, which are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals. The Complaint was based upon a 60-day notice letter (the "Notice Letter") sent by Mateel to Atico, Rite Aid, the California Attorney General, all District Attorneys, and all City Attorneys with populations exceeding 750,000.

- 1.3. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Covered Products" shall be defined as irrigation and garden watering products, such as hose nozzles, sprinklers, wands, shower heads, sprayers, hose couplings, connectors, quick connects, caps, converters, valves, shut offs, unions and hose ends, made from leaded brass, or for which leaded brass is a component, to the extent such irrigation and garden watering products are distributed and sold within the state of California, and are manufactured, imported, distributed and/or marketed by Atico, or any entity that distributes, markets or sells Covered Products manufactured or distributed by Atico, including but not limited to Rite Aid, regardless of whether Atico or another party's label is on the Covered Products.
- 1.4. Defendants are businesses that employ 10 or more persons and that distribute and/or market Covered Products within the State of California. Lead and lead compounds are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, and lead is a chemical known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.9. Plaintiff alleges that Covered Products manufactured, distributed, sold and/or marketed by Defendants for use in California containing lead and/or lead compounds require a warning under Proposition 65, and violate the Proposition 65 prohibition on the discharge of lead and/or lead compounds into drinking water.

1.5. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, Mateel and Atico (collectively the "parties") stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint, and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity related in any way to the facts alleged therein. All releases for Covered Products provided by this Consent Judgment shall apply to any Proposition 65 claim that could have been asserted against Atico or the Atico Releasees (as that term is defined in paragraph 4.1) related to Covered Products.

action that are denied and disputed. The parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. By execution of this Consent Judgment, Atico does not admit any violations of Proposition 65, the Unfair Competition Act, or any other law of any kind, specifically denies that it has committed any violations of any such laws, and maintains that all Covered Products it has sold and distributed in California have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Atico of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law. Neither this Consent Judgment nor Atico's compliance with it may be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Atico or the Atico Releasees as defined in paragraph 4.1.

2. <u>SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS</u>

2.1. In settlement of all of the claims that are alleged, or could have been alleged, in the Complaint concerning Atico and Rite Aid, within ten (10) days following the Court's entry of a final judgment, Atico shall pay \$17,500 to the Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC") to cover Plaintiff's attorneys' fees and costs. Additionally, within ten (10) days following the Court's entry of a final judgment, Atico shall pay \$3,750 to Californians for Alternatives to Toxics; and \$3,750 to the Ecological Rights foundation for use toward

reducing exposures to toxic chemicals and other pollutants, and toward increasing consumer, worker and community awareness of health hazards posed by lead and other toxic chemicals. The parties agree and acknowledge that the charitable contributions made pursuant to this section shall not be construed as a credit against personal claims absent third parties may make for restitution against Atico, which claims (if any are brought) Atico is free to dispute. Atico shall not be required to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b).

2.2. Rite Aid shall not be required to make any monetary payments under this Consent Judgment.

3. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

3.1. The parties hereby request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment. Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, Atico and Plaintiff waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint, and any rights they may have to appeal the judgment.

4. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 This Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution between Plaintiff Mateel, acting on behalf of itself and the general public, as to those matters described in the Notice Letter, and Atico of: (i) any violation of Proposition 65 or the Unfair Competition Act with respect to Covered Products, (ii) any other statutory or common law claim, to the fullest extent that any of the foregoing described in (i) or (ii) were or could have been asserted by any person or entity against Atico based upon, arising out of or relating to Atico's compliance with Proposition 65, or regulations promulgated thereunder, and Business and Professions Code Sections 17200, et seq., with respect to the Covered Products, and (iii) as to alleged exposures to Covered Products, any alleged discharges or releases to sources of drinking water from Covered Products, and any other claim based in whole or part on the facts alleged in the Complaint, whether based on actions committed by Atico and/or any of its manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, licensors, licensees, auctioneers, retailers (including but not limited to Rite Aid, Walgreen Co. and East West Distributing Co.), dealers, customers, owners, purchasers, users,

2i

parent companies, corporate affiliates, subsidiaries and their respective officers, directors, attorneys, representatives, shareholders, agents, and employees or any other person in the course of doing business who may use, maintain, distribute, manufacture or sell Covered Products (collectively the "Atico Releasees"). As to alleged exposures to Covered Products and to discharges or releases to drinking water from Covered Products, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by the Atico Releasees, with the requirements of Proposition 65 and the Unfair Competition Act, with respect to Covered Products and any alleged exposures to lead in violation of Proposition 65.

4.2 As to alleged exposures to Covered Products and as to alleged discharges or releases to sources of drinking water from Covered Products, Plaintiff Mateel and the Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC"), by and on behalf of the general public, themselves, and their respective agents, successors and assigns, waive all rights to institute any form of legal action, and release all claims against the Atico Releasees, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell Covered Products, whether under Proposition 65 or the Unfair Competition Act or otherwise, relating in any way to Covered Products and the claims identified in Plaintiff's Notice Letter. In furtherance of the foregoing, Plaintiff Mateel and KELC hereby waive any and all rights and benefits which they now have, or in the future may have, conferred upon them with respect to Covered Products by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

"A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR."

Mateel and KELC understand and acknowledge that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542 is that even if Mateel or KELC suffer future damages relating in any way to Covered Products, they will not be able to make any claim for

those damages against the Atico Releasees. Furthermore, Plaintiff Mateel and KELC acknowledge that they intend these consequences for any such claims which may exist as of the date of this release but which Mateel or KELC do not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether its lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

4.4. Release of Plaintiff. Defendants waive all rights to institute any form of legal action against Plaintiff or its attorneys or representatives, for all actions taken or statements made by Plaintiff and its attorneys or representatives, in the course of seeking enforcement of Proposition 65, the Unfair Competition Act, or any other law in this action.

5. **DISMISSAL OF DEFENDANT RITE AID**

After notice of entry of this Consent Judgment and simultaneously at the time of receipt of the monetary payments required by paragraph 2.2, Plaintiff shall dismiss Rite Aid with prejudice and its attorneys shall provide to counsel for Defendants the executed dismissal of all claims in the Complaint against Rite Aid with prejudice for filing with the Court.

6. <u>ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT</u>

6.1. The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the parties hereto except as set forth in paragraph 6.3 below. The parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of San Francisco County, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein. In any proceeding brought by either party to enforce this Consent Judgment, such party may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties or remedies as may be provided by law for any violation of the Consent Judgment. Additionally, if in such a proceeding the Court finds that Atico failed to make all reasonable good faith efforts to comply with the warning requirements specified in Section 8 of this Consent Judgment, and notwithstanding any other provision of this Consent Judgment, then as to Covered Products for which warnings were not provided pursuant to Section 8 of this Consent Judgment, and only as to such Covered Products, it shall not benefit from any release from liability specified in any provision of this Consent Judgment.

11

8

13

14

15

12

16 17

18 19

2021

22

2324

2526

27

28

- 6.2. Before moving to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment or filing any new action against Atico or the Atico Releasees with respect to Covered Products, the parties (and any other enforcers) must follow the procedures set forth in paragraph 6.3.
- 6.3. Should Plaintiff and/or its attorneys, agents, assigns or any other person ("Notifying Party") identify one or more failures to comply with paragraph 8.2 of this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff or its attorneys shall notify Atico, in writing of such alleged failure(s) to warn ("Notice"). The Notice must be sent by certified mail or Federal Express, with proof of service, to the persons identified in paragraph 12 to receive Notices for Atico, and must be served within sixty (60) days of the date the alleged violation(s) was/were observed. The Notice must, at a minimum, set forth the date(s) the alleged violation(s) was/were observed, where the violation(s) was/were observed, and a description of Covered Products and the alleged violation(s) with sufficient detail to allow the receiving party to determine the basis of the claim being asserted. If the receiving party corrects the alleged violation(s) within sixty (60) days of receipt of the Notice, the parties agree to engage in good faith negotiations, given the facts and circumstances, to resolve issues raised by the Notice without resorting to litigation or an enforcement proceeding under the Consent Judgment. In the event the parties are able to mutually resolve the issues raised by the Notice, then Plaintiff, the notifying party, and/or their attorneys shall notify the Attorney General of the "Supplemental Settlement" and shall prepare and file a noticed motion for approval of the ("Supplemental Settlement"). Any monetary payment agreed to as part of the settlement shall cover the Plaintiff's, or notifying party's, attorneys' fees and costs accrued in the matter with the remainder paid as a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b). Civil penalties shall be apportioned pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25192. The payments shall be made within twenty (20) days of the court's approval of the Supplemental Settlement. Once the court approves the Supplemental Settlement, Plaintiff, the notifying party, and/or their attorneys shall take no further enforcement action with respect to such violation(s), and waive any claims with respect thereto. Atico will provide to Plaintiff upon written request evidence of correction of any alleged violations within 60 days of receipt of

the Notice. After meeting and conferring in good faith, if Plaintiff does not agree that the alleged violations have been corrected, or if the parties cannot reach an agreement on settlement, then Plaintiff may move to enforce this Consent Judgment and/or bring a new enforcement action for the alleged violations.

7. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

- 7.1. If Proposition 65 warnings for lead and lead compounds should no longer be required, then Atico shall have no further warning obligations pursuant to Section 8 of this Consent Judgment. If the manner of warning or warning language different from that set forth in this Consent Judgment is required because of a change or changes in law or regulations, then Atico's obligations pursuant to Section 8 of this Consent Judgment shall conform to any such changes in law or regulations by operation of law.
- 7.2. This Consent Judgment may be modified only pursuant to this Section, or upon written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or the refusal to consent thereto by Plaintiff, the warning provisions of Section 8 may be modified upon a showing that the Attorney General's office consents in writing to such modification, and upon written consent by the Attorney General's office, such modified warnings will be deemed to comply with this Consent Judgment whether or not the parties bring a motion to modify the Consent Judgment. Any request by Atico to the Attorney General to modify this Consent Judgment must be simultaneously served on Plaintiff with an opportunity for Plaintiff to provide its views on any proposed modification to the Attorney General.

8. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF - CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNING

8.1. As to any Covered Products which are made of brass containing lead (hereafter "leaded brass") or which have a component made of leaded brass, and for which the normally intended use of the product involves the user gripping or holding the product by gripping or holding a component made from leaded brass, a warning as described in

 paragraph 8.2 below shall be provided on any units of such Covered Products that Atico manufactures, imports, markets, sells or distributes for sale in the State of California, or that Atico distributes to its customers (including but not limited to Rite Aid, Walgreen and East West) for sale in the State of California.

8.2. All units of Covered Products manufactured, imported, marketed, sold or distributed for sale in the State of California by Atico or distributed by Atico to its customers (including but not limited to Rite Aid, Walgreen and East West) for sale in California shall contain a Proposition 65 warning as follows:

WARNING: This product contains lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. Wash your hands after handling.

The word "WARNING" shall be in bold and capital letters. The words "Wash your hands after handling" shall be in bold and italicized. Atico, on behalf of itself and its customers for or to whom Covered Products are manufactured, imported, marketed, sold or distributed for sale in California, shall provide such warning by printing the warning on the unit package of the Covered Products or by affixing the warning (such as by sticker or hang tag) to the unit package of the Covered Products. Such warning shall be prominently printed on or affixed to each Covered Product, its label or package, and displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices on the Covered Product, its label or package, so as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use. The warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other safety warnings, if any, on the Covered Product, its package or label. If printed on the label itself, the warning shall be contained in the same section of the label that states other safety warnings, if any, concerning the use of the Covered Product.

8.3. The warning requirements set forth in paragraph 8.2 above shall not apply to: (a) Covered Products in Atico's or any of its customers' inventory as of the date of entry of this Consent Judgment; (b) Covered Products manufactured, distributed, marketed, sold or shipped for sale or use outside the State of California; and/or (c) Covered Products for which the normally intended use does not involve the user gripping or holding a leaded brass

 component of the Covered Product.

- 8.4. If Atico customers (rather than Atico) are responsible for the packaging on Covered Products, Atico may: (1) send a letter to such customers advising them that if they sell Covered Products in California, they must comply with the warning requirements contained in paragraph 8.2; and (2) must obtain written approval that such entities will comply with the warning requirements in paragraph 8.2 before selling or distributing to any such customer Covered Products for sale in California. Atico shall fully and completely satisfy its obligation to provide a warning under this Consent Judgment by providing the foregoing notification and obtaining the foregoing consent, and will provide any such consents to Plaintiff within thirty (30) days upon Plaintiff's written request. Atico customers who do not comply with the warning requirements of this Section after providing the written consent specified herein shall not benefit from any release from liability specified in any provision of this Consent Judgment for those products for which they do not provide the required warnings.
- 8.5. The requirement for product labeling set forth in paragraph 8.2 above is imposed pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment. The parties recognize that product labeling is not the exclusive method of providing a warning under Proposition 65 and its implementing regulations.
- 8.6. Except as provided in Section 7 of this Consent Judgment, in the event that Atico ceases to implement or modifies the warnings required by this Consent Judgment, it shall provide written notice to Plaintiff of its intent to do so, and of the basis for its intent, no less than thirty (30) days in advance. Plaintiff shall notify Atico in writing of any objection within thirty (30) days of its receipt of such notice, or such objection by Plaintiff shall be waived.
- 8.7 Atico does not need to provide the warnings for Covered Products under this Consent Judgment where Atico obtains and relies in good faith on testing information that such Covered Products do not contain detectable amounts of lead. If Atico believes one or more of its products meet the lead-free requirement of this exemption, it shall produce a

sample of each such product and, if requested by Mateel, any supporting test results to Mateel within thirty (30) days of the products' sale or distribution in the State of California.

9. <u>AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE</u>

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

10. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

10.1. This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement the Consent Judgment.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.7(f)

- 11.1. Plaintiff agrees to comply with the reporting requirements referenced in California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Pursuant to the regulations promulgated under that section, Plaintiff shall present this Consent Judgment to the California Attorney General's Office within ten (10) days after receipt of all necessary signatures. The parties acknowledge that, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, a noticed motion must be filed to obtain judicial approval of the Consent Judgment. Accordingly, the parties agree to file a joint motion for approval of the settlement, which shall be prepared by Plaintiff within a reasonable period of time after the date this agreement is signed by all parties. Plaintiff agrees to serve a copy of the noticed motion to approve and enter the Consent Judgment on the Attorney General's Office and Defendants at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date set for hearing of the motion in the Superior Court of the City and County of San Francisco.
- 11.2. It is expressly understood and agreed by the parties hereto that the rights and obligations contained in this Consent Judgment are expressly conditioned on the non-opposition by the California Attorney General's Office to this Consent Judgment. Should the Attorney General object to the Consent Judgment within fourteen (14) days of submission thereto, the parties shall negotiate in good faith to modify the Consent Judgment in a manner that resolves the objection of the Attorney General. If the parties cannot agree on appropriate

modifications within 15 days of receiving the Attorney General's objections, this Consent Judgment shall, at any party's option, be deemed null and void as to both parties, shall not bind either party, shall not be construed as an admission or waiver of any claim or defense either party may have, and cannot be used for any purpose.

12. NOTICES

12.1. All notices required pursuant to this Judgment and all correspondence shall be sent to the following by regular mail unless otherwise specified:

For Plaintiff:

William Verick, Esq. 424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501

For Defendants:

General Counsel Atico International USA, Inc. 501 S. Andrews Ave. P.O. Box 14368 Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33302

14. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

14.1. 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, and as to defendant Atico entirely supercedes the Consent Judgment entered by the Court in Mateel v. Atico, et al, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. 315868. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party hereto. No other agreements between Plaintiff and Atico not specifically referred to herein,

1	oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.		
2	15. GOVERNING LAW		
3	15.1. The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment		
4	shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of		
5	law provisions of California law.		
6	16. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>		
7	16.1. If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no		
8	force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.		
9	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
10			
11	Dated: 10/24/05 KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER		
12	70. Ala.		
13	Jalley What		
14	William Verick Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation		
15	•		
16	Dated: ATICO INTERNATIONAL USA, INC.		
17			
18			
19	BY:		
20	ITS:		
21			
22	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:		
23			
24	Dated: 12/14/05 RONALD E. QUIDACHAY		
25	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR		
26			
27			
28			

.1	or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.				
2	15. <u>GOVERNING LAW</u>				
3	15.1. The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment				
4	shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of				
5	law provisions of California law.				
. 6	16. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>				
7	16.1. If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no				
. 8	force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.				
.9	IT IS SO STIPULATED:				
10					
1İ	Dated: KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER				
12	il. Ala 1				
13	Jallew What				
14	William Verick Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation				
15	AMILLOON EMPHICALISMS TO WARRANT STATE OF THE STATE OF TH				
16	Dated: <u>09/24/05</u> ATICO INTERNATIONAL USA, INC.				
17					
18					
19					
20	BY: Step Feltowitz ITS: CEO				
21					
22	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:				
-23	11 15 50 OKODKOD, ADJUDUCED AND DECKCED.				
24	Dated:				
25	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR				
26					
27					
28					

			· ·			
1	WILLIAM VERICK, CSB #140972					
2	Klamath Environmental Law Center FREDRIC EVENSON, CSB #198059					
3	Law Offices of Fredric Evenson 424 First Street		ENDORSED			
3	Eureka, CA 95501	Sa	FILE D			
4	Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Facsimile: (707) 268-8901		DEC 14 2005			
5						
6	DAVID H. WILLIAMS, CSB #144479 BRIAN ACREE, CSB #202505	GC BY: _	PHILOMENA DIAS			
7	370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5		Deputy Clerk			
	Oakland, CA 94610 Telephone: (510) 271-0826					
8	Facsimile: (510) 271-0829					
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
10	MATEĚL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOU	NDATION				
11						
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
	COUNTY OF SA	AN FRANCISC	CO			
13						
14			•			
15	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION,	CASE NO. 429922				
16	. ,	[proposed] ORDER APPROVING PROPOSITION 65 SETTLEMENT				
17	Plaintiff,					
18	vs.	Date:	December 14, 2005			
	ATICO INTERNATIONAL USA, INC., et	Time: Dept. No.:	9:30 a.m. 302			
19	al.,	•				
20	Defendants.					
21						
22	Plaintiff's motion for approval of settlem	ent and entry o	f Consent Judgment was heard on			
23	noticed motion on December 14, 2005. The court finds that:					
24	1. The warning requirements of the		ent comply with the requirements			
25	of Proposition 65;		I -^			
26		alter anacidical :	the Concept Independent			
	Y J		_			
27	reasonable based on the criteria in	Cal Health &	Safety Code §25249.7(b)(2); and			
28						

Order Approving Settlement

3.	The attorneys' rates and fees awarded under the Consent Judgment are reason	nable
	under California law.	

Based upon these findings, the settlement and Consent Judgment are approved.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:	12/14	105
Dated:	12/17	ر ا

RONALD E. QUIDACHAY

Judge of the Superior Court