. 1	WILLIAM VERICK (SBN 140972) Klamath Environmental Law Center	
2	FREDRIC EVENSON (SBN 198059)	
3	Law Office of Fredric Evenson 424 First Street	ENDORSED
	Eureka, CA 95501	FILED San Francisco County Superior Court
4	Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Facsimile: (707) 268-8901	JAN 2 5 2006
5	DAVID WILLIAMS (SBN 144479)	
6	BRIAN ACREE (SBN 202505)	GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk BY: MARJORIE SCHWARTZ-SCOTT
7	370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5 Oakland, CA 94610	Deputy Clark
8	Telephone: (510) 271-0826 Facsimile: (510) 271-0829	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION	
10		
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
12	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
13		
14	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	Case No. 440570
	FOUNDATION,	
15		PROPOSEDI CONSENT HIDCMENT AS
15 16	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16	Plaintiff,	
16 17	Plaintiff, vs.	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16 17	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16 17	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al.,	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16 17 18	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16 17 18 19	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al.,	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16 17 18 19 20	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al.,	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16 17 18 19 20 21	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al., Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al., Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.0 On April 19, 2005, the MATEEL	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US, INC.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al., Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.0 On April 19, 2005, the MATEEL ("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US, INC.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al., Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.0 On April 19, 2005, the MATEEL ("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in S	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION f and the general public, filed a Complaint for civil
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al., Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.0 On April 19, 2005, the MATEEL ("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in Sagainst defendant, HELLY HANSEN US, INC	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION f and the general public, filed a Complaint for civil San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 440570,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al., Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.0 On April 19, 2005, the MATEEL ("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in Sagainst defendant, HELLY HANSEN US, INC (MEJF and Helly Hansen are collectively referred	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION f and the general public, filed a Complaint for civil San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 440570, ("Defendant" or "Helly Hansen"), among others.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Plaintiff, vs. SOUTHERN EXCHANGE LP, DBA TEXSPORT., et al., Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.0 On April 19, 2005, the MATEEL ("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in Sagainst defendant, HELLY HANSEN US, INC (MEJF and Helly Hansen are collectively referred	TO DEFENDANT HELLY HANSEN US, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION f and the general public, filed a Complaint for civil San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 440570, ("Defendant" or "Helly Hansen"), among others. ed to as "the Parties.") The Complaint alleges that

CONSENT JUDGMENT

1.1 Helly Hansen filed a timely answer to the Complaint denying each and every allegation set forth therein and asserting numerous affirmative defenses.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

- 1.2 Defendant is a business that employs more than ten persons and manufactures, distributes and/or markets within the State of California clothing made with lead-containing polyvinyl chloride, neoprene and/or other plastic materials ("PVC Materials"). Pursuant to Proposition 65, lead and lead compounds are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. Products containing lead and/or lead compounds that are sold or distributed in the State of California may be, under specified circumstances, subject to the Proposition 65 warning requirement set forth in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Plaintiff alleges that clothing made with lead-containing PVC Materials ("PVC Clothing") that is manufactured, distributed, sold and/or marketed by Helly Hansen for use in California, requires a warning under Proposition 65. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Covered **Products**" shall be defined as PVC Clothing that is: (i) distributed, marketed, or sold within the State of California, and (ii) manufactured by Helly Hansen or any other entity acting on its behalf, and distributed, marketed and/or sold by Helly Hansen or by any other entity that distributes, markets or sells Helly Hansen's PVC Clothing, or manufactured by any other entity for Helly Hansen, whether or not the clothing bears Helly Hansen labels.
- 1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and

personal jurisdiction over Helly Hansen as to the acts alleged 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 based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom or related to.

- 1.4 This Consent Judgment resolves claims 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. The Parties intend that this Consent Judgment provide, to the maximum extent permitted by law, res judicata and collateral estoppel protection for Helly Hansen against any and all other claims based on the same or similar allegations under Proposition 65 and the Unfair Competition Act.
- 1.5 Helly Hansen disputes that it has violated Proposition 65 as described in the 60-Day Notice Letter, the Complaint, or otherwise. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material allegation of the Complaint, each and every allegation of which Helly Hansen denies, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Helly Hansen.

2. <u>SETTLEMENT PAYMENT</u>

2.0 In settlement of all of the claims that are alleged, or could have been alleged, in the Complaint concerning Helly Hansen, within 10 business days following the Court's entry of a final judgment, including any third-party appeals to the entry of the judgment. Helly Hansen shall pay \$20,000 to the Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC") to cover Plaintiff's attorneys' fees. Additionally, within 10 business days following the Court's entry of a final judgment, including any third-party appeals to the entry of the judgment, Helly Hansen shall pay \$7,500 to Californians for Alternatives to Toxics; and \$7,500 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 the personal claims absent third parties for

restitution against Defendant. Helly Hansen shall not be required to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b).

3. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3.0 The Parties hereby request that the Court enter this Consent Judgment forty-five (45) days after the filing of a motion for approval of the Consent Judgment in accordance with Title 11, California Code of Regulations, section 3003(a). Upon the Court's entry of a final judgment, including any third-party appeals to the entry of the judgment, MEJF and Helly Hansen waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations in the Complaint.

4. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 4.0 This Consent Judgment, once entered by the Court, is a final and binding resolution between MEJF, acting on behalf of itself and (as to those matters raised in the Notice Letter) the general public, and Helly Hansen of: (i) any violation of Proposition 65 or the Unfair Competition Act (including but not limited to the claims made in the Complaint); and (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 Helly Hansen or its parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, and all of their customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person in the course of doing business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell Covered Products ("Released Entities"), based on its or their exposure of persons to Covered Products or their failure to provide a clear and reasonable warning of exposure to such individuals; and (iii) as to alleged exposures to Covered Products, any other claim based in whole or in part on the facts alleged in the Complaint, whether based on actions committed by the Released Entities. As to alleged exposures to Covered Products, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by Helly Hansen and the Released Entities, with the requirements of Proposition 65 and the Unfair Competition Act with respect to Covered Products, and any alleged resulting exposure.
- 4.1 As to alleged exposures to Covered Products and other claims in the Complaint, MEJF, by and on behalf of itself, and its respective agents, successors, attorneys and assigns,

waives any and all rights to institute any form of legal action, and releases all claims against Helly Hansen and the Released Entities, and all of their respective parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, and all of their customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person in the course of doing business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell the Covered Products, whether, under Proposition 65, the Unfair Competition Act or any other statute, provision of common law or any theory or issue, arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to, the Covered Products (referred to collectively in this paragraph as the "Claims"). In furtherance of the foregoing, as to alleged exposures to Covered Products, MEJF hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with respect to the Claims 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 OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

MEJF understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code section 1542 is that even if it suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to, the Covered Products, MEJF will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Helly Hansen or the Released Entities. Furthermore, MEJF acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such Claims as may exist as of the date of this release but which MEJF does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance,

oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

5. ENFORCEMENT AND PRECLUSIVE EFFECT OF JUDGMENT

- 5.0 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the Parties hereto. 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 Proposition 65 or this Consent Judgment. Additionally, if in such a proceeding the Court finds that Helly Hansen failed to comply with the reformulation requirements as specified in Section 7 of this Consent Judgment, and notwithstanding any other provision of this Consent Judgment, then as to such Covered Products, Helly Hansen shall not benefit from any release from liability specified in any provision of this Consent Judgment.
- 5.1 Entry of judgment by the Court pursuant to this Consent Judgment, and Defendant's compliance with its terms, *inter alia*:
- i) Constitutes full and fair adjudication of all claims against Helly Hansen and the Released Entities, including, but not limited to, all claims set forth in the Complaint, based upon alleged violations of Proposition 65 and the Unfair Competition Act, as well as any other statute, provision of common law or any theory or issue which arise from the alleged failure to provide warning of exposure to the Covered Products;
- ii) Bars any and all other persons, on the basis of *res judicata*, the doctrine of mootness and the doctrine of *collateral estoppel* from prosecuting against Helly Hansen and the Released Entities any Claims with respect to the Covered Products based upon alleged violations of (a) Proposition 65, or (b) the Unfair Competition Act which arise from the alleged failure to provide warning of exposure to the Covered Products which may contain lead and/or lead compounds which are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and
- iii) Constitutes full and fair adjudication of all claims against Helly Hansen and the Released Entities based upon alleged violations of Proposition 65 and the Unfair Competition Act, which arise from the alleged failure to provide warnings of exposure to the Covered Products

CONSENT JUDGMENT

28

or consent judgment.

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

8.0 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.

9. <u>RETENTION OF JURISDICTION</u>

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

10. SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

10.0 MEJF shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by both parties, on the California Attorney General on behalf of the parties so that the Attorney General may review this Consent Judgment. MEJF, in compliance with Title 11, *California Code of Regulations*, section 3003(a), also shall file and serve notice of the motion for approval of this Consent Judgment.

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

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 either 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.

12. GOVERNING LAW

13.0 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law provisions of California law.

13. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>

13.0 If this Consent Judgment, in its entirety, is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.

14. NOTICES

1	14.0 Any notices under this Consent Judgment shall be by personal delivery of First		
2			
3	14.1		
4	If to MEJF:	William Verick, Esq. Klamath Environmental Law Center	
5		424 First Street	
6	If to Helly Hansen:	Eureka, CA 95501	
7	in to ficing findiscil.	J.W. Ring, Esq. Preston Gates & Ellis LLP	
. 8		222 SW Columbia Street, Suite 1400 Portland, Oregon 97201	
9			
10	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
11	DATED: 12/2/05	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION	
12		as Wantonal	
13		BY: WILLIAM VERICK	
14	DATED:	Helly Hansen U.S.Inc.	
15 16		By: Challes Room	
10 17		Irs: Mesidaut/CFO	
18	IT IS SO OPPORTED ADDITIONED AND DESCRIPTION		
19	DATED: JAN 2 5 2006		
20		RONALD EVANS QUIDACHAY	
21		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
22			
23		RONALD EVANS QUIDACHAY	
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		-9-	
12			