1 2 3 4	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 CHANLER LAW GROUP 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 New Canaan, CT 06840 Tel: (203) 966-9911 Fax: (203) 801-5222	ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY
5	Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711 Stephen S. Sayad, State Bar No. 104866	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
6	Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319 PARAS LAW GROUP	Deputy
7	655 Redwood Highway, Suite 216 Mill Valley, CA 94941	
8	Tel: (415) 380-9222 Fax: (415) 380-9223	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
10	WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, Ph.D.	
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF A	LAMEDA – HAYWARD BRANCH
13		
14	UNLIMITED CIV	IL JURISDICTION
15	WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, Ph.D.,	Case No. HG- 04188887
16	Plaintiff)	a a
17		[PROPOSED] ORDER PURSUANT TO TERMS OF STIPULATION AND
18	v.)	ORDER RE: CONSENT JUDGMENT
19	LONGS DRUG STORES CORPORATION;) and DOES 1 through 150,	Date: July 5, 2005
20	Defendants.	Time: 10:00 a.m. Dept: 607
21	Detendants.	Judge: Hon. Richard O. Keller
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	32
23	
24	
25	

27

28

In the above-entitled action, Plaintiff Whitney Leeman, Ph. D., Defendant Longs Drug Stores Corporation and Cross-Defendant Red-Carpet Studios, LLC, having agreed through their respective counsel that judgment be entered pursuant to the terms of the Consent Judgment entered into by the above-referenced parties and attached hereto as Exhibit A; and after consideration of the papers submitted and the arguments presented, the Court finds that the settlement agreement set out in the attached Consent Judgment meets the criteria established by Senate Bill 471, in that:

- 1. The health hazard warning that is required by the Consent Judgment complies with Health & Safety Code section 25249.7 (as amended by Senate Bill 471);
- 2. The reimbursement of fees and costs to be paid pursuant to the parties' Consent Judgment is reasonable under California law; and
- 3. The civil penalty amount to be paid pursuant to the parties' Consent Judgment is reasonable,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that judgment be entered in this case, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 5, 2005

Hon. Richard O. Keller

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

EXHIBIT /A

1	Daniel Bornstein, (State Bar No. 181711) Laralei S. Paras, (State Bar No. 203319	
2	PARAS LAW GROUP	
3	655 Redwood Highway, Suite 216 Mill Valley, CA 94941	
4	Telephone: (415) 380-9222 Facsimile: (415) 380-9223	
5		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph. D.	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	IN AND FOR THE COU	NTY OF ALAMEDA
10	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
11		
12	WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, Ph. D.,	Case No. HG- 04188887
13	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
14	v.	ORDER RE: CONSENT JUDGMENT
15	LONGS DRUG STORES CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150,	
1617	Defendants.	
18	1. INTRODUCTION	
19	1.1 Plaintiff and Settling Defendant.	This Consent Judgment is entered into by and
20	between plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman Ph.D. (herea	after "Dr. Leeman" or "Plaintiff"), Defendant
21	Longs Drug Stores California, Inc, (hereafter "Longs"), and Cross-Defendant Red Carpet Studios,	
22	LLC. (hereafter "Red Carpet"), (collectively "Defendants"). Plaintiff and Defendants are	
23	collectively referred to as the "Parties" and each party being a "Party".	
24	1.2 Plaintiff. Dr. Leeman represents that she is an individual residing in Sacramento,	
25	California, who seeks to promote awareness of expe	osures to toxic chemicals and improve human
26	health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substan	nces contained in consumer and industrial
27	products.	
28		
20		
	STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER RE CONSENT JUDG Case No. HG-04188887	MENT
•	Case No. HG-04188887	

- 1.3 **General Allegations.** Plaintiff alleges that Longs has distributed and/or sold in the State of California glass and metal terrariums with materials that contain lead (and/or lead compounds) that are listed pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5 *et seq.*, also known as Proposition 65. Lead and lead compounds are known to the State of California to cause birth defects and/or other reproductive harm. Lead and/or lead compounds are referred to herein as "Listed Chemicals."
- 1.4 **Product Descriptions.** The products that are covered by this Consent Judgment are defined as follows: all glass and metal terrariums sold and/or distributed by Defendants in the State of California, including, by way of example and without limitation, the products contained in the items listed at Exhibit A. Such products collectively are referred to herein as the "Products."
- 1.5 **Notices of Violation.** Beginning on September 3, 2004, Dr. Leeman served Longs and various public enforcement agencies with documents, entitled "60 Day Notice of Violation" ("Notice"), that provided Longs and such public enforcers with notice that Longs was allegedly in violation of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn purchasers that the Products expose users in California to lead and/or lead compounds.
- 1.6 Complaint and Cross Complaint. On December 8, 2004, Dr. Leeman, representing that she was acting in the interest of the general public in California, filed a complaint (hereafter referred to as the "Complaint" or the "Action") in the Superior Court in and for the County of Alameda against Longs and Does 1 through 150, alleging violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failure to warn of alleged exposures to lead and/or lead compounds contained in the Products sold by Longs. On or about February 2, 2005, Longs filed a Cross-Complaint against Red Carpet in the Action.
- 1.7 **No Admission.** Defendants deny the material factual and legal allegations contained in Plaintiff's Notice and Complaint and maintain that all products they have sold or distributed in California, including the Products, have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Defendants of any fact, finding, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment

constitute or be construed as an admission of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law or violation of law. This Consent Judgment is a settlement of disputed claims, allegations and defenses intended by the Parties to avoid the time, expense and uncertainty of litigation, with no admission of liability, or the validity of any claim, allegation or defense, by any Party. However, this section shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities and duties of Defendants under this Consent Judgment.

- 1.8 **Consent to Jurisdiction.** For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and Cross-Complaint, of all claims which were or could have been raised based on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom, and to enforce the provisions thereof.
- 1.9 **Effective Date.** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Effective Date" shall be April 20, 2005.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: PROPOSITION 65

- 2.1 Warnings and Reformulation Obligations.
- (a) **Required Warnings.** After the Effective Date, Defendants shall not transmit to any retailer to sell or otherwise offer for sale in California any Products containing lead and/or lead compounds, unless warnings are given in accordance with one or more provisions in subsection 2.2 below.
- (b) **Exceptions.** The warning requirements set forth in subsections 2.1(a) and 2.2 shall not apply to any Reformulated Products as defined in subsection 2.3 below.
 - 2.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings.
- (a) **Product Labeling.** A warning is affixed to the packaging, labeling or directly to or on a Product by Defendants, their agents, or the manufacturer, importer, wholesaler or distributor of the Product that states:

WARNING: This product contains lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

Warnings issued for Products pursuant to this subsection shall be prominently placed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of use or purchase. Any changes to the language or format of the warning required by this subsection shall only be made following: (1) approval of Plaintiff; (2) approval from the California Attorney General's Office, provided that written notice of at least fifteen (15) days is given to Plaintiff for the opportunity to comment; or (3) Court approval.

- (b) **Point-of-Sale Warnings.** In lieu of Product labels, Defendants may execute their warning obligations, where applicable, through the posting of signs at retail outlets in the State of California at which Products are sold, in accordance with the terms specified in subsections 2.2(b)(i), 2.2(b)(ii) and 2.2(b)(iii).
- (i) Point of Sale warnings may be provided through one or more signs posted at or near the point of sale or display of the Products that state:

WARNING: This product contains lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

or

WARNING: The materials used in these products contain lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

(ii) A point of sale warning provided pursuant to subsection 2.2(b)(i) shall be prominently placed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of use or purchase and shall be placed or written in a manner such that the consumer understands to which *specific* Products the warnings apply so as to minimize if not eliminate the chances that an overwarning situation will arise. Any changes to the language or format of the warning required for Products by this subsection shall only be made

1

2

3

4

following: (1) approval of Plaintiff; (2) approval from the California Attorney General's Office, provided that written notice of at least fifteen (15) days is given to Plaintiff for the opportunity to comment; or (3) Court approval.

(iii) If any Defendant intends to utilize point of sale warnings to comply with this Consent Judgment, it must provide written notice as required by this Consent Judgment to each retail outlet to which such Defendant ships the Products for sale in California, and obtain the written consent of such retail outlet before shipping the Products and secure their agreement to ensure that such warnings will be posted at the point of sale in California. Such notice shall include a copy of this Consent Judgment and any required warning materials (including, as appropriate, signs and/or stickers). If any Defendant has obtained the consent of a retailer, such Defendant shall not be found to have violated this Consent Judgment if it has complied with the terms of this Consent Judgment and has proof that it transmitted the requisite warnings in the manner provided herein.

2.3 **Reformulation Standards.** Products referred to as "Reformulated Products" are defined as follows:

Any Product which contains one-tenth of one percent (0.1%) lead or less (by weight) in any materials used in the Product is deemed lead free and, thus, does not require any warnings mandated by paragraph 2.2.

3. MONETARY PENALTIES

In light of the fact that only three Products have been sold by Longs, the parties agree that no monetary payment in the form of civil penalties is appropriate.

4. REIMBURSEMENT OF FEES AND COSTS

4.1 Fees And Costs. The Parties acknowledge that Plaintiff and her counsel offered to resolve this dispute without reaching terms on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed to them, thereby leaving this issue to be resolved after the material terms of the agreement had been settled. The Parties then attempted to (and did) reach an accord on the compensation due to Plaintiff and her counsel under the private attorney general doctrine, codified at Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 for all work performed through the Effective Date of the Agreement. Under

the private attorney general doctrine codified at Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, the Parties agree that Red Carpet, on behalf of Longs, shall reimburse Plaintiff and her counsel for fees and costs, incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendants' attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. Red Carpet, on behalf of Longs, shall pay Plaintiff and her counsel \$10,000.00 for all attorneys' fees, expert and investigation fees, and litigation costs, including but not limited to all attorneys' fees and costs (including those incurred and to be incurred to obtain Court approval and the entry of this Consent Judgment), expert and investigative fees and costs and other litigation expenses relating to this Action. The payment shall be made by Red Carpet on behalf of all Defendants, payable to the "Chanler Law Group" and shall be delivered to Plaintiff's counsel on or before April 20, 2005, at the following address:

CHANLER LAW GROUP Attn: Clifford A. Chanler 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 New Canaan, CT 06840

- 4.2 **Return of Funds.** In the event that the Consent Judgment is not thereafter approved and entered by the Court, the Chanler Law Group shall return the full amount of the fees and costs paid under this Consent Judgment, by check payable to Red Carpet, LLC, on behalf of Longs, within fifteen (15) days of receipt of a written request from counsel for Defendants following notice of the issuance of the Court's decision.
- 4.3 **Further Obligation.** Except as specifically provided in this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall have no further obligation with regard to reimbursement of Plaintiff's attorney's fees and costs with regard to the Products covered in this Action.

5. RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

5.1 **Plaintiff's Releases of Defendants.** As to the Products, this Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between the Plaintiff, acting on behalf of the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code §25249.7(d), on the one hand, and Defendants, on the other hand, of any violation of Proposition 65, of all clams made or which could have been made in the Notice and/or the Complaint, and of any other statutory, regulatory or common law claim that

could have been asserted against Defendants and/or their affiliates, subsidiaries, divisions, successors, assigns, and/or customers for failure to provide clear, reasonable, and lawful warnings of exposure to lead or lead compounds contained in or otherwise associated with the Products manufactured, sold or distributed by, for, or on behalf of Defendants. As to the Products, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by Defendants and/or their affiliates, subsidiaries, divisions, successors, and assigns with the requirements of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products.

5.2 In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, and for the payments to be made pursuant to section 3, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself, her past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and/or assignees, and in the interest of the general public, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and hereby releases all claims, including, without limitation, all actions, causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses or expenses (including, but not limited to, investigation fees and costs, expert fees and costs and attorneys' fees and costs) of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims"), against Defendants and each of Defendants' retail outlets, dealers, customers, owners, purchasers, users, parent companies, corporate affiliates, subsidiaries and their respective officers, directors, attorneys, representatives, shareholders, agents, and employees (collectively, "Defendants Releasees") arising under Proposition 65, related to each Defendant's and each Defendant's Releasees' alleged failure to warn of exposures to or identification of Listed Chemicals contained in the Products.

It is specifically understood and agreed that the Parties intend that each Defendant's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves all issues and liability, now and in the future (so long as Defendants comply with the terms of the Consent Judgment) concerning compliance with the requirements of Proposition 65 by Defendants and Defendants' Releasees, as to the Listed Chemicals in the Products.

5.3 **Defendants' Release of Plaintiff.** Defendants waive all rights to institute any form of legal action against Plaintiff, or her attorneys or representatives, for all actions taken or

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

statements made by Plaintiff and her attorneys or representatives, in the course of seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 in this Action.

6. COURT APPROVAL

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by all Parties, in which event the monies that have been provided to Plaintiff or her counsel pursuant to Section 3 above shall be refunded within fifteen (15) days.

7. SALES DATA

Longs and Red Carpet understand that the sales data provided to counsel for Dr. Leeman by Longs and Red Carpet was a material factor upon which Dr. Leeman has relied to determine the amount of payments made pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b) in this Agreement. To the best of Longs' and Red Carpet's knowledge, the sales data provided is true and accurate. In the event that Dr. Leeman discovers facts that demonstrate to a reasonable degree of certainty that the sales data is materially inaccurate, the parties shall meet in a good faith attempt to resolve the matter within ten (10) days of Longs and Red Carpet's receipt of notice from Dr. Leeman of her intent to challenge the accuracy of the sales data. If this good faith attempt fails to resolve Dr. Leeman's concerns, Dr. Leeman shall have the right to re-institute an enforcement action against Longs, for those additional Products, based upon any existing 60 Day Notices of violation served on Longs and Red Carpet. In such case, all applicable statutes of limitation shall be deemed tolled for the period between the date Dr. Leeman filed the instant action and the date Dr. Leeman notifies Longs that she is re-instituting the action for the additional Products; provided, however, that Longs and Red Carpet shall have no additional liability, and Dr. Leeman waives any claims that might otherwise be asserted, from the Effective Date until the date that Dr. Leeman provides notice under this Paragraph 8, so long as Longs and Red Carpet have complied with the requirements of Sections 2.1 through 2.4 for the sale all of the Products before the Effective Date of this Agreement.

8. SEVERABILITY

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

If, subsequent to Court approval of this Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected.

9. ATTORNEY'S FEES

In the event of an action to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, the prevailing Party shall, except as otherwise provided herein, be entitled to recover reasonable and necessary costs and reasonable attorney's fees incurred in that enforcement action.

10. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to its choice of law provisions. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to the Products specifically, then Defendants shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, those Products are so affected.

11. NOTICES

All correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (1) registered, certified mail, return receipt requested, or (ii) overnight delivery to the representatives of each Party as listed below:

To Defendant Longs:

Alan J. Pope, Esq. Vice-President and Assistant General Counsel 141 North Civic Drive Walnut Creek, CA 94596

With a copy to:

Richard C. Jacobs, Esq. Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Falk & Rabkin. Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-4065

27

1	To Defendant Red Carpet:
2	Paul Schenz
3	Chief Financial Officer Red Carpet Studios
4	4325 Indeco Court
5	Cincinnati, OH 45241
6	With a copy to: Star Lightner, Esq.
7	Farella, Braun & Martel
8	Russ Building 235 Montgomery Street
9	San Francisco, CA 94101
10	To Plaintiff:
11	Clifford A. Chanler, Esq.
12	Chanler Law Group 71 Elm Street, Suite 8
13	New Canaan, CT 06840
14	12. NO ADMISSIONS
15	Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by
16	Defendants of any fact, allegation, claim, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall
17	compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Defendants
18	of any fact allegation, claims, issue, or violation of law, all of Plaintiff's claims and allegations
19	being expressly denied by Defendants. Each Defendant reserves all of its rights and defenses
20	with regard to any claim or allegation, including but not limited to those contained in Plaintiff's
21	Notice and Complaint. However, this section shall not diminish or otherwise affect Defendants'
22	obligations, responsibilities and duties under this Consent Judgment.
23	13. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE SIGNATURES
24	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile, each of which
25	shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the
26	same document.
27	

14. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f)

Plaintiff agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Pursuant to regulations promulgated under that section, Plaintiff shall present this Consent Judgment to the California Attorney General's Office within five (5) days after receiving all of the necessary signatures. A noticed motion to enter the Consent Judgment will then be served on the Attorney General's Office at least forty-five (45) days prior to the date a hearing is scheduled on such motion in the Superior Court for the City and County of San Francisco unless the Court allows a shorter period of time.

15. ADDITIONAL POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

The Parties shall mutually employ their best efforts to support the entry of this Agreement as a Consent Judgment and obtain approval of the Consent Judgment by the Court in a timely manner; however, the motion and supporting documents necessary to obtain such approval shall be prepared by Plaintiff. The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment. Accordingly, the Plaintiff agrees to file a Motion to Approve the Agreement ("Motion"), within a reasonable period of time after the Execution. Except as provided in Section 4 herein, Defendants shall have no additional responsibility to Plaintiff's counsel pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure. § 1021.5 or otherwise with regard to reimbursement of any fees and costs incurred with respect to the preparation and filing of the Motion or with regard to Plaintiff's counsel appearing for a hearing or related proceedings thereon.

16. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified only by: (1) written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or (2) motion of any Party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court. The Attorney General shall be served with notice of any proposed modification to this Consent Judgment at least fifteen (15) days in advance of its consideration by the Court.

1 2 3 4		execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their d and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this
5	8	
6	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
7 8	Date: 4/7/105	Date:
9 10 11	By: Wiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.	By:
12 13	Date:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
14 15 16	By:	Date: HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY,
17		FALK & RABKIN By:
18		Richard C. Jacobs
19 20		Attorneys for Defendant Longs Drug Stores California, Inc.
21		and a second cuminomia, mo.
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

with the second of the second

A COMPANIE AND A COMP

The second of the second of

	respective Parties and have read, understood Consent Indgment AGREED TO: Date:	execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their od and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this AGREED TO:
10	Plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.	Ву:
11		Defendant Longs Drug Stores California, Inc.
12	Date: 1/20/5	
13		APPROVED AS TO FORM:
14	By Menel fol	Date:
15	Defendant Red Carpet Studios, LLC	
16		HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY, FALK & RABKIN
17	_	:
18	-	Ву:
19	9	Richard C. Jacobs Attorneys for Defendant
2]		Longs Drug Stores California, Inc.
22		
23		
24		a a
25		
26		•
27	•	
28		E.
	STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER RE CONSENT Case No. HG-04188887	13

1 2 3 4 5		execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their d and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this
6	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
7	Date:	Date: April 20, 2005
9 10 11	By:Plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.	By: Defendant Longs Drug Stores California, Inc.
12 13	Date:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
14 15	By:	Date: April 20, 2005
16	Red Carpet Studios, LLC	HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY, FALK & RABKIN
17 18		By: Silsc. Jawki
19		Richard C. Jacobs
20		Attorneys for Defendant Longs Drug Stores California, Inc.
21		
22		
23		
24		
2526		
27	or and the state of the state o	
28		

		150
1	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	ADDROVED AS TO FORM.
2	APPROVED AS TO FORM.	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
3	Date: 4/25/55	Date: 4/21/05
4		X.
5	PARAS LAW GROUP	FARELLA BRAUN & MARTEL LLP
6	By: Mayny Level	Ву:
7	Daniel Bornstein	Star Lightner
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.	Attorneys for Defendant Red Carpet Studios, LLC
9	Windley K. Domaii, Th.D.	
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	*:
12	*	
13	Date:	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
14	z.	JODGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
15	,	
16		Exhibit A
17	All glass and metal terrariums, including but not limited to:	
18	Terrarium (#8 09048 10911 5)	
19	, 4	,
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	×	
25		
26	**	
27		
- 11		

1 2 3	Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 CHANLER LAW GROUP 71 Elm Street, Suite 8 New Canaan, CT 06840 Tel: (203) 966-9911 Fax: (203) 801-5222	ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY
5 6 7 8	Daniel Bornstein, State Bar No. 181711 Stephen S. Sayad, State Bar No. 104866 Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319 PARAS LAW GROUP 655 Redwood Highway, Suite 216 Mill Valley, CA 94941 Tel: (415) 380-9222 Fax: (415) 380-9223	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By Deputy
9 10	Attorneys for Plaintiff WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, Ph.D.	
11 12 13	8	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA F ALAMEDA – HAYWARD BRANCH
14	UNLIMITED C	IVIL JURISDICTION
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	WHITNEY R. LEEMAN, Ph.D., Plaintiff v. LONGS DRUG STORES CORPORATION; and DOES 1 through 150, Defendants.	Case No. HG- 04188887 PROPOSED JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF CONSENT JUDGMENT Date: July 5, 2005 Time: 10:00 a.m. Dept: 607 Judge: Hon. Richard O. Keller
23		3

In the above-entitled action, Plaintiff Whitney Leeman, Ph. D., Defendant Longs Drug Stores Corporation and Cross-Defendant Red-Carpet Studios, LLC, having agreed through their respective counsel that judgment be entered pursuant to the terms of the Consent Judgment entered into by the parties, and after issuing an Order Approving Proposition 65 Settlement Agreement and Consent Judgment on July 5, 2005.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 664.5, judgment is entered in accordance with the terms of the Order Approving Proposition 65 Settlement Agreement and Consent Judgment, between the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 5, 2005

Hon. Richard O. Keller

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT