THE CARRICK LAW GROUP A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION Roger Lane Carrick (State Bar No. 096342) 350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2930 Los Angeles, California 90071-3406 Telephone: (213) 346-7930 Facsimile: (213) 346-7931

Attorneys for Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.



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

ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC., a DELAWARE corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

SCHERING-PLOUGH HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS, INC., a DELAWARE corporation,

Defendant.

ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC., a DELAWARE corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

NOVARTIS CONSUMER HEALTH, INC., a DELAWARE corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. BC 312642

[Hon. Judith C. Chirlin]

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF REVISED PROPOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT

2nd Amended Complaint Filed: July 1, 2004

Hearing Date:

None Set

Time:

None Set

Location:

Dept. 89, Room 532

Related Case No. BC 312643

TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on August 30, 2005, the Los Angeles County Superior Court, the Honorable Judith C. Chirlin, presiding, GRANTED Plaintiff Environmental World Watch, Inc.'s ("Plaintiff") motion for judicial approval of the Revised [Proposed] Consent Judgment, and ENTERED the Revised [Proposed] Consent Judgment as lodged in this matter. A file stamped copy of the entered Revised [Proposed] Consent Judgment, as interlineated on page 3 and then adopted by the Court as its final ruling, is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and is incorporated herein by this reference.

Date: August 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

THE CARRIER LAW GROUP P.C.

ROGER LANE CARRIE

Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental World Watch, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

CEIGINAL FILED

AUG 3 0 2005

REC'D JUL 13 2005 FILING WINDOW

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Case No. BC 312642 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC., a DELAWARE corporation, [Hon. Judith C. Chirlin] 12 Plaintiff, [PDOPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AND ORDER 13 ٧. 14 2nd Amended Complaint Filed: July 1, 2004 SCHERING-PLOUGH HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS, INC., a DELAWARE corporation, 15 Hearing: August 29, 2005 Time: 8:30 a.m. Defendant. 16 Location: Dept. 89 17 Related Case No. BC 312643 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC., a DELAWARE corporation, 19 Plaintiff, 20 21 NOVARTIS CONSUMER HEALTH, INC., a DELAWARE corporation, 22 Defendant. 23 24 25 26 27 28 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT K:\t00114-005\Pleadings\Final Proposed Consent Judgment 05-29-05.doc

Printed on Recycled Paper

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC., plaintiff in this matter ("EWW" or "Plaintiff"), and defendants SCHERING-PLOUGH HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS, INC. ("Schering-Plough") and Novartis Consumer Health, Inc. ("Novartis") (collectively "Defendants").

1. Definitions

As used in this Consent Judgment, the following definitions shall apply:

- 1.1 "Products" are (a) topical foot care products manufactured, distributed or sold by Schering-Plough; and (b) Lamisil AT Odor Guard Deodorant Powder and Desenex Antifungal Powder products manufactured, distributed or sold by Novartis.
- 1.2 Except as specified in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 of this Consent Judgment, all Products of each Defendant subject to this Consent Judgment, including Products which are manufactured by or on behalf of each Defendant for sale to California consumers within 120 days after the date of entry of this Consent Judgment, shall be collectively known as the "Products."
- 1.3 "Acrylamide" means the chemical acrylamide listed as subject to Proposition 65 regulation in Title 22, California Code of Regulations, section 12000.
- 1.4 "Lead" means the chemicals lead and lead compounds listed as subject to Proposition 65 regulation in Title 22, California Code of Regulations, section 12000.
 - 1.5 "ppm" means parts-per-million.
- 1.6 Plaintiff and each Defendant will be referred to herein collectively as the "Parties" or individually as a "Party."

2. Background

- 2.1 EWW is a Delaware corporation acting pursuant to Proposition 65, California Health & Safety Code section 25249.7(d).
- 2.2 On or about July 24, 2003 and April 21, 2004 respectively, EWW served two 60-Day "Notice of Violation of Proposition 65" (the "Notices") on the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000, and on each Defendant, alleging that each Defendant

.24

was in violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65") for failing to warn purchasers of Defendants' Products sold in California, that use of these Products exposes users to Acrylamide and/or Lead. None of the public enforcement agencies responded to EWW's Notices or otherwise filed a lawsuit.

- 2.3 On March 24, 2004, EWW filed a complaint against Schering-Plough entitled Environmental World Watch, Inc. v. Schering-Plough HealthCare Products, Inc., in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, No. BC 312642 (the "Schering-Plough Action"), as well as a complaint against Novartis entitled Environmental World Watch, Inc. v. Novartis Consumer Health, Inc., L.A. Sup. Ct. Case No. BC 312643 (the "Novartis Action"). On July 1, 2004 EWW filed second amended complaints in both the Schering-Plough Action and the Novartis Action.
- 2.4 On September 28, 2004, the Schering-Plough Action and Novartis Action were determined and ordered by the Court to be related cases.
- 2.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of the violations contained in the Notices and the Complaints and personal jurisdiction over Defendants as to the acts or omissions alleged in the Complaints; that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles; and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment. No public prosecutor has commenced an action regarding the matters raised in the Notices or the Complaints.
- 2.6 Each Defendant denies that its Products have been or are in violation of Proposition 65 or any other law, and further contends that all its Products have been and are safe for use as directed. However, each Defendant wishes to resolve this matter without further litigation or cost.
- 2.7 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain disputed claims as alleged in the Notices and the Complaints, to avoid prolonged and costly litigation, and to promote the public interest. By executing and complying with this Consent Judgment, no Party admits any facts or conclusions of law including, but not limited to, any facts or conclusions of

law regarding any violations of Proposition 65, the Unfair Competition Law or any other statutory, common law or equitable claim or requirement relating to or arising from Defendants' respective Products. This Consent Judgment shall not be construed as an admission by either Defendant as to any of the allegations in the Notices or the Complaints.

3. Injunctive Relief

3.1 Reformulation

Each Defendant agrees, within sixty (60) days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, to establish new, revised ingredient specifications for the ingredients in each of its Products that contain either Acrylamide and/or Lead, as follows:

- (a) For Acrylamide: From 5 ppm to no more than 4.5 ppm; and
- (b) For Lead: From 10 ppm to no more than 7 ppm.
- (c) The specification for lead set forth in paragraph 3.1(b) shall not apply to: (1) zinc oxide, which the parties agree for purposes of this Consent Judgment alone is governed by the consent judgment previously entered in Center for Environmental Health v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., et al.; San Francisco Superior Court No. 307981, filed April 23, 2003; or (2) Minor Ingredients, which are those ingredients that are present at concentrations of ten percent (10%) or less in the finished Product (e.g., kaolin and healtrite). Minor Ingredients shall contain no intentionally added Lead.

3.2 No Warning Required

Subject to compliance with paragraphs 3.1 or 8, no Proposition 65 warning is required for any Product.

4. Settlement Payments

In keeping with the concept of, but in lieu of, the statutory penalties and/or restitution required under the statutes set forth in the Complaints, Defendants jointly shall pay to the Trust Account of the Carrick Law Group P.C., by wire transfer in immediately available funds, the sum of \$180,000.00. This settlement amount shall be due and payable within five (5) business

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

days from service of the notice of entry of this Consent Judgment, and, in that regard, all Parties hereto waive the right to appeal or other review of this Consent Judgment. The sum of \$180,000.00 shall be disbursed by the Carrick Law Group P.C. as follows:

4.1 <u>To EWW</u>

\$25,000.00, to be used by EWW for its on-going compliance monitoring costs of this Consent Judgment, and to reimburse EWW for EWW's enforcement efforts on behalf of the public interest and the general public in conformity with Health and Safety Code §25192(a)(2).

4.2 To The Carrick Law Group

\$14,851.00 in costs and \$140,149.00 in attorneys' fees.

5. <u>Termination of All Claims</u>

5.1 Claims Covered and Release

This Consent Judgment includes the resolution of actual and potential claims that were considered or could have been brought by EWW in the public interest and on behalf of the general public regarding Acrylamide and/or Lead in each Defendant's Products. This Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution between EWW in the public interest and on behalf of the general public, and each Defendant, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, successors, predecessors and assigns, and the directors, officers, employees, counsel, and agents of each of them, of any and all alleged violations of Proposition 65 and Civil Code sections 1750 et seq. (the Consumer Legal Remedies Act), or any other claim relating to alleged failure to warn about or disclose the presence of Lead and/or Acrylamide that was or could have been asserted in the Notices or Complaint by EWW in the public interest and on behalf of the general public against any Defendant, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, successors, predecessors and assigns, all suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, customers and contract manufacturers, and all of their respective directors, officers, employees, counsel, and agents, arising from or related to the Products up through the date of entry of this Consent Judgment. EWW, in the public interest and on behalf of the general public, hereby releases each Defendant, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, successors, predecessors and assigns, all suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, customers

and contract manufacturers, and all of their respective directors, officers, employees, counsel, and agents, from and against the claims described in this paragraph to the extent such claims do, did, or could arise from or relate the Products; however, EWW cannot and does not release any claims, including specifically any personal injury or directly related claims, that could be brought by any individual or organization other than EWW. Each Defendant hereby releases EWW from and against any claims arising out of its filing or prosecution of this action.

5.2 Waiver and Release of Unknown Claims

To the extent that California Civil Code section 1542 or similar provisions of law are deemed to apply to the release by EWW set forth above, EWW acknowledges and agrees that the release set forth above applies to all its claims for injuries, damages, restitution, penalties or losses related to or arising from Defendants' Products, whether those for injuries, damages, restitution, penalties or losses are known or unknown, foreseen or unforeseen, or patent or latent. EWW certifies that it has read California Civil Code section 1542. EWW hereby knowingly and expressly waives its rights, on behalf of the public interest and the general public, under California Civil Code section 1542, 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.

To the extent that California Civil Code section 1542 or similar provisions of law are deemed to apply to the release by each Defendant set forth above, each Defendant separately acknowledges and agrees that the release set forth above applies to any claim for malicious prosecution, abuse of process, damages, or other similar claim related to or arising out of EWW's filing or prosecution of this action. Each Defendant hereby knowingly and expressly waives any rights under California Civil Code section 1542, the text of which is set forth above.

6. Covenant Not To Sue

EWW and each Defendant covenant and agree that with regard to those matters that

EWW has herein released and that are described above, neither EWW nor either Defendant will

ever institute a lawsuit or administrative proceedings against another Party, its parents,

subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, successors, predecessors and assigns, all suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, customers and contract manufacturers, and all of their respective directors, officers, employees, counsel, and agents, nor shall any Party assert any claim of any nature against any person or entity hereby released with regard to any such matters which have been released. Nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted to preclude enforcement of this Consent Judgment pursuant to Section 7 below.

7. Enforcement of Consent Judgment

Any Party may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Los Angeles, enforce this Consent Judgment. To enforce this Consent Judgment, any Party must first give written notice of any violation of this Consent Judgment alleged to have occurred to the Party alleged to be in violation, with a copy to all other Parties. The involved Parties shall meet and confer in good faith and attempt to resolve the alleged violation. If a resolution is not reached within sixty (60) days of the date of the notice, the aggrieved Party may move the Court to hear and resolve the dispute. The Party moving to enforce this Consent Judgment bears the initial burden of proof, absent any express provision to the contrary in this Consent Judgment.

8. <u>Modification/Termination of Consent Judgment</u>

This Consent Judgment may be modified or terminated upon written agreement of the Defendants and EWW, with approval of the Court, or upon noticed motion for good cause shown. Such "good cause" shall include, but not be limited to, any change in applicable law or the entry of any judgment, including, but not limited to, a consent judgment, relating to Proposition 65 within the State of California that, should its terms be applicable to products similar to the Products or to ingredients of the Products, would materially alter the obligations of Defendant hereunder in a manner more favorable to Defendant than the terms of this Consent Judgment. If any of the statutes at issue in this action are individually or collectively amended by the California Legislature in the future, or if regulations implementing these statutes are lawfully adopted and/or amended by the appropriate administrative agency, each Defendant shall comply with that provision of law or regulation as then-amended, and if that provision of law or regulation is repealed by the California Legislature, the appropriate administrative agency or by

appellate court order, this stipulated Consent Judgment's injunctive relief that relies upon such provisions of law or regulation as set forth in this Consent Judgment shall become void and of no effect on the effective date of the repeal of that provision of law or regulation, or on the effective date of the appellate court order. If the appropriate administrative agency modifies the regulations implementing Proposition 65 to increase the no significant risk level for acrylamide above 0.2 micrograms per day, the injunctive relief relating to acrylamide shall become void and of no effect on the effective date of the modified regulation. If any of the statutes at issue in this action are individually or collectively amended by the California Legislature in the future, or if regulations implementing these statutes are lawfully adopted and/or amended by the appropriate administrative agency, Defendants shall comply with that provision of law or regulation as then-amended.

9. Governing Law

This Consent Judgment shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with, the laws of the State of California.

10. Entire Agreement

The Parties declare and represent that no promise, inducement or other agreement has been made conferring any benefit upon any party except those contained herein and that this Consent Judgment contains the entire agreement pertaining to the subject matter hereof. This Consent Judgment supersedes any prior or contemporaneous negotiations, representations, agreements and understandings of the Parties with respect to such matters, whether written or oral. Parole evidence shall be inadmissible to show agreement by, between or among the Parties to any term or condition contrary to or in addition to the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. The Parties acknowledge that each has not relied on any promise, representation or warranty, expressed or implied, not contained in this Consent Judgment except for those contained in the Confidentiality Undertaking.

11. Challenges

Subject to their rights to apply for a modification of this Consent Judgment for good cause shown under paragraph 8 hereof, or Defendant's right to terminate the same under Section

III

9 hereof, the Parties agree that they, individually or collectively, will not seek to challenge or to have determined invalid, void or unenforceable any provision of this Consent Judgment or this Consent Judgment itself. The Parties understand that this Consent Judgment contains the relinquishment of legal rights and each Party has, as each has deemed appropriate, sought the advice of legal counsel, which each of the Parties has encouraged the other to seek. Further, no Party has reposed trust or confidence in any other Party so as to create a fiduciary, agency or confidential relationship.

12. Construction

This Consent Judgment has been jointly negotiated and drafted. The language of this Consent Judgment shall be construed as a whole according to its fair meaning and not strictly for or against any Party.

13. Authority to Stipulate to Consent Judgment

Each signatory to this Consent Judgment represents and warrants that each signatory has all requisite power, authority and legal right necessary to execute and deliver this Consent Judgment and to perform and carry out the transactions contemplated by this Consent Judgment. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment represents that each has been duly authorized to execute this Consent Judgment. No other or further authorization or approval from any person will be required for the validity and enforceability of the provisions of this Consent Judgment.

14. Cooperation and Further Assurances

The Parties hereby will execute such other documents and take such other actions as may be necessary to further the purposes and fulfill the terms of this Consent Judgment.

15. Counterparts

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and has the same force and effect as if all the signatures were obtained in one document.

16. Notices

16.1 All correspondence and notices required by this Consent Judgment to Plaintiff EWW shall be sent to:

i	Consent Judgment, the execution thereof by Defendant or EWW shall not be construed as an			
,	admission by Defendant or EWW of any fact, issue of law or violation of law.			
3	18. <u>Jurisdiction</u>			
4	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement this Consent Judgment.			
5	19. Compliance with Reporting Requirements			
6	EWW shall comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Health and Safety			
7	Code section 25249.7(f) and established in 11 California Code of Regulations §§ 3000-3008.			
8	Copies of all such reports shall be supplied as provided in Section 17.2.			
9	20. Non-Interference in Settlement Approval Process	20. Non-Interference in Settlement Approval Process		
0:	EWW will seek and Defendants will support securing approval of this Consent Judgment			
1	by the Attorney General and the Court			
2	IT IS SO STIPULATED.			
3	DATED: July 15, 2005 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.			
4				
l5 l6	WILLIAM P. DUNEAP			
17	ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC	7 		
18				
19				
20	By:			
21 22	SCHERING-PLOUGH HEALTHCARE			
23				
24				
25 26 27	By: [NAME] [TITLE]			
2 i				
	K-300114-005-Pleadings/Fixed Proposed Concent Jodgment 10-23-05.doc 10 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGI Printed on Recycled Paper	MEN		

1	Consent Judgment, the execution thereof by Defendant or EWW shall not be construed as an			
2	admission by Defendant or EWW of any fact, issue of law or violation of law.			
3	18. <u>Jurisdiction</u>			
4	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement this Consent Judgment.			
5	19. Compliance with Reporting Requirements			
6	EWW shall comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Health and Safety			ļ
7	Code section 25249.7(f) and established in 11 California Code of Regulations §§ 3000-3008.			١.
8	Copies of all such reports shall be supplied as provided in Section 17.2.			
9	20. Non-Interference in Settlement Approval Process			
10	EWW will seek and Defendants will support securing approval of this Consent Judgment			
11	by the Attorney General and the Court			
12	IT IS SO STIPULATED.			
13	DAT	ED: June, 2005	ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.	
14				
15			By: WILLIAM P. DUNLAP	
16			PRESIDENT ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.	
17				
18	DAT	ED: June <u>30</u> , 2005	SCHERING-PLOUGH LABORATORIES, INC.	
19			Ci Mant	
20	By: John Miller for			
21	İ		[TTTLE] Senior VIQ President SCHERING-PLOUGH HEALTHCARE	
22			PRODUCTS, INC.	
23	DAT	ED: June, 2005	NOVARTIS CONSUMER HEALTH, INC.	
24	ļ	•		
25			Ву:	
26			[NAME] [TITLE] NOMARTIC CONGUNER DE ALTIL INC	
27	, 		NOVARTIS CONSUMER HEALTH, INC.	
28		• .	•	
	K:\00114	1-0051Ploadbygs/Final Proposed Consont Judgmant 08-29-05.doc	10 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT	Т

KARO114-005PleadingsFinal Proposed Consent Judgment 06-28-05.doc Printed on Recycled Paper

1	19. Compliance with Reporting Requirements			
2	EWW shall comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Health and Safety			
3	Code section 25249.7(f) and established in 11 California Code of Regulations §§ 3000-3008.			
4	Copies of all such reports shall be supplied as provided in Section 17.2.			
5	20. Non-Interference in Settlement Approval Process			
6	EWW will seek and Defendants will support securing approval of this Consent Judgment			
7	by the Attorney General and the Court			
8	IT IS SO STIPULATED.			
9	DATED: June, 2005 ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.			
0				
1	Ву:			
ι2	WILLIAM P. DUNLAP PRESIDENT			
13	ENVIRONMENTAL WORLD WATCH, INC.	Ì		
14	DATED: June, 2005 SCHERING-PLOUGH LABORATORIES, INC.			
15				
16	By:			
17	[TITLE] SCHERING-PLOUGH HEALTHCARE			
18				
19	DATED: June 23, 2005 NOVARTIS CONSUMER HEALTH, INC.			
20				
21	Ву:			
22	[NAME] Clobal QA + Compliance, or	re		
23				
24	1			
25	APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM			
26				
27				
28	B .			
	ICADD 114-0054Floatilings4Float Proposed Content Andgimant BB-15-05.doc 10 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGME	_ N'I		
	Printed on Recycled Paper			

- 1. To effectuate the settlement set forth in the foregoing stipulated Consent Judgment, the Court consolidates Environmental World Watch, Inc. v. Novartis Consumer Health, Inc., L.A. Sup. Ct. Case No. BC 312643, ("EWW v. Novartis") and Environmental World Watch, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Healthcare Products, Inc., L.A. Sup. Ct. Case No. BC 312642, ("EWW v. Schering-Plough") for the purpose of entering the foregoing stipulated Consent Judgment.
- Because no warnings are required by the foregoing stipulated Consent Judgment, this Court does not have to make any finding regarding compliance with warnings under the provisions of Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5-25249.13.
- 3. The Parties' agreement that no civil penalties are warranted is in accord with the criteria set forth in Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b)(2), in that payments totaling \$25,000.00 in lieu of such penalties to EWW provides the funds for its compliance monitoring of this Consent Judgment, as well as for its future investigational and enforcement activities regarding toxic chemicals and Proposition 65, in a manner that is consistent with the private enforcement mechanism and funds allocation scheme established by Health & Safety Code § 25192 and § 25249.7 et. seq.
- 4. The Court finds that from the total of \$180,000.00 being paid in this settlement, the Plaintiff will pay its attorneys' fees in the amount of \$140,149.00 plus its attorneys' costs of \$14,851.00. The Court finds that these attorneys' fees and costs are reasonable and appropriate in this action.
- This Consent Judgment is hereby adopted as the ORDER and JUDGMENT of this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED.

JUDITH C. CHIRLIN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

wellte C. Chirlin

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

PROOF OF SERVICE (CCP §1013, et seq.; CCP §2015.5)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I, Kimberly A.K. Burgo, declare as follows:

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of Los Angeles; I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to the within action or proceeding. I am employed by the law firm of The Carrick Law Group, a Professional Corporation, located at 350 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2930, Los Angeles, California 90071.

On August 30, 2005, I served the foregoing document(s) described as **NOTICE OF** ENTRY OF REVISED (PROPOSED) CONSENT JUDGMENT upon the interested parties in said cause, by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a envelope(s) addressed as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

- X BY ELECTRONIC MAIL (E-MAIL): By transmitting a true and copy of the document(s) described above via e-mail using imaged files in .pdf format to the e-mail addresses for all counsel of record as listed on the attached service list (if an e-mail address was not available for a counsel of record at the time of service, then service was completed by first-class U.S. Mail as noted below). The document(s) was served electronically and the transmission was reported as complete and without error. If this document(s) contains attachments or exhibits that could not be rendered in imaged files in .pdf format, then a complete hard copy has also been served on all counsel of record, by regular U.S. Mail.
- X BY MAIL: I am "readily familiar" with The Carrick Law Group's business practice for collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice envelopes will be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the same day, with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California, in the ordinary course of business.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on August 30, 2005, at Los Angeles, California.

N	ame	Representing
A P R 1: O A	tate of California – Department of Justice Attorney General's Office ROPOSITION 65 ENFORCEMENT EPORTING 515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Pakland, California 94612 Attn: Prop 65 Coordinator -mail: ed.weil@doj.ca.gov	California State Attorney General's Office
M P 50 Si T F	fichael J. Steel, Esq. fark E. Elliott, Esq. ILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW ITTMAN LLP 0 Freemont Street, 5th Floor an Francisco, California 94105 el.: (415) 983-1000 ax: (415) 983-1200 -mail: michael.steel@pillsburylaw.com mark.elliott@pillsburylaw.com	Attorneys for Defendant SCHERING-PLOUGH HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS, INC.
L L C 1. Si T	iene Livingston, Esq. farc B. Koenigsberg, Esq. isa Halko, Esq. IVINGSTON & MATTESICH LAW CORPORATION 201 K Street, Suite 1100 acramento, CA 95814-3938 fel.: (916) 442-1111 ax: (916) 448-1709 -mail: glivingston@lmlaw.net	Attorneys for Defendant NOVARTIS CONSUMER HEALTH, INC.