i	WILLIAM VERICK (SBN 140972) Klamath Environmental Law Center			
2	FREDRIC EVENSON (SBN 198059) Law Offices of Fredric Evenson	ENDORSED FILED San Francisco County Superior Court		
3	■ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	San Francisco County Superior Court MAR 2 6 2008		
4	Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Facsimile: (707) 268-8901	***************************************		
5		GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk BY:		
6	DAVID WILLIAMS (SBN 144479) BRIAN ACREE (SBN 202505)	Depaty otom		
7	370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5 Oakland, CA 94610			
8	Telephone: (510) 271-0826 Facsimile: (510) 271-0829			
9	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. 07-463818		
15	FOUNDATION,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT		
16	Plaintiff,	,		
17	Vs.			
18	BELL FOUNDRY COMPANY,			
19	Defendant.			
20				
21	1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>			
22				
23	("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself and the general public, filed a Complaint for civil			
24	penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 463818,			
25	against defendant, BELL FOUNDRY COMPANY ("Defendant" or "Bell Foundry"), among			
26	others. (MEJF and Bell Foundry are collectively referred to as "the Parties.") The Complaint			
27	alleges that Bell Foundry violated provisions of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement			
28	C Transfer of the state of the	oute Dinking water and Toxic Enforcement		
- 11				

CONSENT JUDGMENT

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code sections 25249.5, et seq. (Proposition 65) by, among other things, knowingly and intentionally exposing persons to products containing lead and/or lead compounds, which are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or 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, dated March 15, 2007, sent by MEJF to Bell Foundry, the California Attorney General, all District Attorneys, and all City Attorneys with populations exceeding 750,000. A copy of the 60-Day Notice letter is attached as Exhibit A to the Complaint in this action.

- 1.1 Bell Foundry filed a timely answer to the Complaint denying each and every allegation set forth therein and asserting numerous affirmative defenses.
- Defendant is a business that employs more than ten persons and allegedly 1.2 distributes, sells and/or markets within the State of California exercise mats made with leadcontaining polyvinyl chloride and/or neoprene ("Leaded 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 Leaded Materials that are manufactured, distributed, sold and/or marketed by Bell Foundry for use in California, require a warning under Proposition 65. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Covered Products" shall be defined as Leaded Materials that are: (i) distributed, sold, marketed or used within the State of California, and (ii) manufactured by any other entity acting on Bell Foundry's behalf, and distributed, marketed and/or sold by Bell Foundry or by any other entity that distributes, markets or sells Bell Foundry's Leaded Materials in California, or manufactured by any other entity for Bell Foundry, whether or not the Leaded Materials bear Bell Foundry 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 Bell Foundry as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is

11

12

10

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

23

24

25

2627

28

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 Bell Foundry 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 Bell Foundry 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 Bell Foundry.

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, Bell Foundry shall pay \$20,000 to the Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC") to cover Plaintiff's attorneys' fees and costs. Additionally, Bell Foundry shall pay \$10,000 to Californians for Alternatives to Toxics; and \$10,000 to the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, 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. Bell Foundry shall not be required to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b). The above-described payments shall be forwarded by Defendant so that they are received at least 5 days prior to the hearing date scheduled for approval of this Consent Judgment. If the Consent Judgment is not approved with 120 days of the date scheduled for approval, the above-described payments shall be returned and the provisions of this Consent judgment shall become null and void.

3. <u>ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT</u>

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

2

3

4

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

A MATTERS COMPANDED BY THE CONTRACTOR

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 its partners, servants, affiliates, devisees, representatives, agents, trustees, beneficiaries, employees, principals, members, managers, partners, directors, stockholders, officers, parents, subsidiaries, predecessors, successors, assigns, heirs and attorneys and all other entities and persons claiming rights by or through each of them and (as to those matters raised in the Notice Letter) the general public, on the one hand, and Bell Foundry and its partners, servants, affiliates, devisees, representatives, agents, trustees, beneficiaries, employees, principals, members, managers, partners, directors, stockholders, officers, parents, subsidiaries, predecessors, successors, assigns, heirs and attorneys and all other entities and persons claiming rights by or through each of them, on the other hand, 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 in law or equity, 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 Bell Foundry and its partners, servants, affiliates, devisees, representatives, agents, trustees, beneficiaries, employees, principals, members, managers, partners, directors, stockholders, officers, parents, subsidiaries, predecessors, successors, assigns, heirs and attorneys, 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 (collectively "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,

4.1 As to alleged exposures to Covered Products and other claims in the Complaint, MEJF, by and on behalf of itself, and its partners, servants, affiliates, devisees, representatives, agents, trustees, beneficiaries, employees, principals, members, managers, partners, directors, stockholders, officers, parents, subsidiaries, predecessors, successors, assigns, heirs and attorneys, waives any and all rights to institute any form of legal, equitable or administrative action, and releases all claims against the Released Entities, who may use, manufacture, market, 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 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,

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 Bell Foundry 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, Bell Foundry shall not benefit from any release from liability specified in any provision of this Consent Judgment.

6. **MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT**

6.0 This Consent Judgment may be modified only 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.

7. **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

- 7.0 On and after August 1, 2007, the Covered Products sold by Bell Foundry for resale or use in California shall meet the following criteria:
 - (a) The Covered Products shall have no lead as an intentionally added constituent;
 - A representative bulk sample of the Covered Products shall have been tested for (b) lead, and must have shown lead content by weight of less than 0.02% (200 parts per million "200 ppm"), using a test method of sufficient sensitivity to establish a limit of quantification (as distinguished from detection) of less than 200 ppm.
- 7.1 Bell Foundry may comply with the above requirements by relying on information obtained from its suppliers of the Covered Products, so long as such reliance is in good faith.

28

27

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

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. The parties, and each of them, further represent and warrant that they are the owners of, and have not sold, assigned, conveyed, or otherwise transferred, prior to the execution of this agreement, any claim, demand, cause of action, obligation, damage or liability released in or related to this agreement.

9. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

2

3

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

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,

l	negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or			
2	otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by either Party			
3	hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed			
4	to exist or to bind any of the Parties.			
5	12. <u>GOVERNING LAW</u>			
6	12.0 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be			
7	governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law			
8	provisions of California law.			
9	13. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>			
10	13.0 If this Consent Judgment, in its entirety, is not approved by the Court, it shall be of			
11	no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.			
12	14. <u>NOTICES</u>			
13	14.0 Any notices under this Consent Judgment shall be by personal delivery of First			
14	Class Mail.			
15	14.1			
16	If to MEJF: William Verick, Esq. Klamath Environmental Law Center			
17	424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501			
18	If to Bell Foundry Michael D. Stevens, Esq.			
19	Company: Parker, Milliken 555 S. Flower St., 30 th Floor			
20	Los Angeles, CA 90071			
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
, , 11				

28

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
2	DATED: 2/5/08 MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION 2	
3	D. CHAMILTON	
4	BY: WILLIAM VERICK	
5	n	
6	DATED: BELL FOUNDRY COMPANY BY:	
7	ITS:	
8		
9	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED: MAR 2 6 2008	
10	DATED: PATRICK J. MAHONEY	
11	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	-
12	TODGE OF THE SOFERIOR COOK!	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	·	
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

CONSENT JUDGMENT

	·		
1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
ż	DATED: MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
3	FOUNDATION . PLANT COLOR		
4	BY: WILLIAM VERICK		
5			
6	DATED: BELL FOUNDRY COMPANY BY: CESAR CAPPELLIN I		
7			
8	Its: CEO		
9	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:		
0	DATED:		
1	WITTON ON THE ALL THE TABLE OF		
2	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT		
3			
4	I		
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
0	·		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	·		

1 2 3	WILLIAM VERICK, CSB #140972 Klamath Environmental Law Center FREDRIC EVENSON, CSB #198059 Law Offices of Fredric Evenson 424 First Street	ENDORSED FILED San Francisco County Superior Court MAR 2 6 2008		
4	Eureka, CA 95501 Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Facsimile: (707) 268-8901	GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk BY: Deputy Clerk		
5	wverick@igc.org ecorights@earthlink.org			
6 7	DAVID H. WILLIAMS, CSB #144479 BRIAN ACREE, CSB #202505 370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5			
8	Oakland, CA 94610 Telephone: (510) 271-0826 Facsimile: (510) 271-0829			
10	davidhwilliams@earthlink.net brianacree@earthlink.net			
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOU	NDATION		
12				
13				
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
15 16	COUNTY OF S	AN FRANCISCO		
17				
18	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION,	CASE NO. 463818		
19	Plaintiff,	Interpretation of the second section of the second section of the second section of the second secon		
20	vs.	AND BELL FOUNDRY COMPANY		
21	BELL FOUNDRY COMPANY	Date: March 26, 2008 Time: 9:30 a.m.		
22	Defendant.	Dept. No.: 302		
23				
24 ¹ 25	Plaintiff's motion for approval of settler	ment and entry of Consent Judgment was heard on		
26	noticed motion on March 26, 2008. The court finds that:			
27	·	of the Consent Judgment comply with the		
28	requirements of Proposition 65;			
	Order Approving Settlement Between Plaintiff and Bell Foundry Company			

Mateel v. Bell Foundry Company, Case No. 463818

Order Approving Settlement Between Plaintiff and Bell Foundry Company Mateel v. Bell Foundry Company, Case No. 463818