1 LEXINGTON LAW GROUP, LLP Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Eric S. Somers, State Bar No. 139050 2 ENDORSED FILED Lisa Burger, State Bar No. 239676 3 1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122 DEC 11 2008 4 Telephone: (415) 759-4111 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk 5 BY: JOCELYN C. ROQUE Attorneys for Plaintiff Deputy Clerk 6 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 7 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 11 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL 12 Case No. CGC-08-473477 HEALTH, a non-profit corporation, (JUR) 13 Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: 14 ANSELL HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS, INC. AND ANSELL HEALTHCARE 15 PRODUCTS LLC ANSELL HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS, INC., and Defendant DOES 1 through 200, 16 inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: ANSELL - CASE NO. CGC-08-473477

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On March 19, 2008, plaintiff the Center for Environmental Health ("CEH"), a non-profit corporation acting in the public interest, filed a complaint entitled *Center for Environmental Health v. Ansell Healthcare Products, Inc., et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case Number CGC-08-473477 (the "CEH Action"), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq*. ("Proposition 65"), naming Defendants Ansell Healthcare Products, Inc. and Ansell Healthcare Products LLC (collectively, "Defendants") as defendants.
- 1.2 Defendants are corporations that employ 10 or more persons and manufactured, distributed and/or sold vinyl gloves (the "Products") in the State of California.
- public enforcement agencies with the requisite 60-day Notice (the "Notice") alleging that

 Defendants were in violation of Proposition 65. CEH's Notice and the Complaint in the CEH

 Action allege that Defendants expose people who use or otherwise handle the Products to di(2ethylhexyl) phthalate ("DEHP"), a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer,
 birth defects and other reproductive harm, without first providing clear and reasonable warning to
 such persons regarding the carcinogenicity and reproductive toxicity of DEHP. The Notice and
 Complaint allege that Defendants' conduct violates Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, the warning
 provision of Proposition 65. Defendants dispute such allegations and assert that all of their

 Products are safe and comply with all applicable laws.
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the violations alleged in CEH's Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendants as to the acts alleged in CEH's 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 and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.

1.5 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a settlement of certain disputed claims between the Parties as alleged in the Complaint. By executing this Consent Judgment, the Parties do not admit any facts or conclusions of law. It is the Parties' intent that nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument or defense the Parties may have in this or any other or future legal proceedings.

2. COMPLIANCE - REFORMULATION

- 2.1 Reformulation Standard Removal of DEHP. As of March 1, 2009, Defendants shall not manufacture, distribute, ship, or sell, or cause to be manufactured, distributed or sold, any Product that contains in excess of trace amounts of DEHP. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, "in excess of trace amounts" is more than 600 parts per million ("ppm"). In reformulating the Products to remove DEHP, Defendants may not use butyl benzyl phthalate ("BBP"), di-n-hexyl phthalate ("DnHP"), di-n-butyl phthalate ("DBP") or di-isodecyl phthalate ("DIDP") in excess of trace amounts. DEHP, BBP, DnHP, DBP and DIDP are together referred to herein as "Listed Phthalates."
- 2.2 Certification From Suppliers. Defendants shall issue specifications to its suppliers requiring that the Products shall not contain DEHP or any other Listed Phthalate in excess of trace amounts. Defendants shall obtain written certification from its suppliers of the Products certifying that the Products do not contain DEHP.

2.3 Defendants' Testing. In order to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 2.1, Defendants shall cause to be conducted testing to confirm that the Products do not contain in excess of trace amounts of DEHP. Testing shall be conducted in compliance with Section 2.1. All testing pursuant to this section shall be performed by an independent laboratory in accordance with the following test protocol, Health Canada Protocol, Method C-34, Test Method Section, Book 5 of Laboratory Policies & Procedures, amendment number 46, effective date 2007-07-26, "Determination of Phthalates in Polyvinyl Chloride Consumer Products [referred to as Health Canada Protocol]. At the request of CEH, the results of the testing performed pursuant to this section shall be made available to CEH on a confidential basis.

2.3.1 Testing Frequency. For each of the first two orders of Products purchased from each of Defendants' suppliers after the Compliance Date, Defendants shall randomly select and test the greater of 0.1% (one-tenth of one percent) or eight, but in no case more than ten, of the total Products purchased from each supplier of the Products intended for sale in California. Following the testing of the first two orders as described above, Defendants shall, for each subsequent order, randomly select and test the greater of 0.05% (one-twentieth of one percent) or four, but in no case more than five, of the total Products purchased in that calendar year for sale in California from each supplier of the Products.

2.3.2 Products That Contain Listed Phthalates Pursuant to

Defendants' Testing. If the results of the testing required pursuant to Section 2.3 show Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts in a Product, Defendants shall: (1) refuse to accept all of the Products that were purchased under the particular purchase order; (2) send a notice to the supplier explaining that such Products do not comply with the suppliers' certification; and (3) apply the testing frequency set forth in 2.3.1 as though the next shipment from the supplier were the first

-1

testing of the Products. Any such testing shall be conducted by CEH at an independent laboratory, in accordance with the Health Canada Protocol. In the event that CEH's testing demonstrates that the Products contain Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts subsequent to the Compliance Date, CEH shall inform Defendants of the test results, including information sufficient to permit Defendants to identify the Product(s). Defendants shall, within 30 days following such notice, provide CEH, at the address listed in Section 11, with the certification and testing information demonstrating its compliance with Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of this Consent Judgment. Defendants may provide CEH with information demonstrating that it complied with Sections 2.2 and/or 2.3. The burden of proof re: questions of compliance shall be on CEH not on the defendants. If CEH proves non compliance, defendants shall be liable for stipulated payments in lieu of penalties for Products for which CEH produces tests demonstrating the presence of Listed Phthalates in the Products. The payments shall be made to CEH and used for the purposes described in Section 3.1.

2.4.1 Stipulated Payments In Lieu of Penalties. If stipulated payments in lieu of penalties are warranted under Section 2.4, the stipulated payment amount shall be as follows for each order of Product as described in paragraph 2.3.1 above, for which CEH produces a test result proving that Defendants sold a Product containing Listed Phthalates in excess of 600 ppm after the Compliance Date:

First Occurrence:

\$500

Second Occurrence:

\$750

Third Occurrence:

\$1,000

Thereafter:

\$2,500

2.5 Products in the Stream of Commerce. Defendants' Products that have been manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold, or that are otherwise in the stream of commerce prior to the Compliance Date shall be released from any claims that were brought or that could be brought by CEH or others in the Complaint, as though they were Covered Claims within the meaning of Section 7.1, below.

3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

- \$21,000 in lieu of any penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b). CEH shall use such funds to continue its work protecting people from exposures to toxic chemicals. As part of this work, CEH intends to conduct periodic testing of the Products as set forth in Section 2.4. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to CEH.
- 3.2 Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendants shall pay \$44,000 to reimburse CEH and its attorneys for their reasonable investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, and any other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendants' attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to Lexington Law Group, LLP.
- 3.3 Delivery of Payments. All payments made pursuant to this Section 3 shall be delivered to the Lexington Law Group, LLP at the address set forth in Section 11.1 and shall be delivered within 10 days of entry of this Consent Judgment.

4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 4.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of CEH and Defendants, or upon motion of CEH or Defendants as provided by law.
- 4.2 Should any other defendant obtain more favorable settlement terms, the terms of this settlement may, on application of defendant, be modified to encompass such terms.

Any change or repeal in the law governing this matter, by legislation or regulating action, shall constitute good cause for defendant to seek modification of the judgment.

5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 Either party may, by motion or application for an order to show cause, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. The prevailing party on any such motion shall be entitled to recover its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated with any enforcement proceedings regarding the Consent Judgment or resisting any order to show cause.

6. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

6.1 This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon the Parties hereto, their divisions, subdivisions and subsidiaries, and the successors or assigns of any of them.

7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS

and Defendants of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Defendants (including any claims that could be asserted in connection with any of the Products covered by this Consent Judgment) or its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, directors, officers, employees, agents, attorneys, distributors, customers or retailers (collectively, "Defendant Releasees") based on failure to warn about alleged exposures to DEHP resulting from any Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Defendants ("Covered Claims") on or prior to the date of entry of this Consent Judgment. CEH, its directors, officers, employees and attorneys hereby release all Covered Claims against Defendant Releasees. CEH, its directors, officers, employees and attorneys on both their own behalf and on behalf of the Public Interest pursuant to the Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b) hereby release all Covered Claims against Defendants.

1	Compliance v	Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65					
2	for purposes of DEHP exposures from the Products.						
3	8.	SEVERABILITY					
4		8.1	In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by				
5	a court to be	a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely					
7	affected.						
8	9.	GOVERNING LAW					
9		9.1	The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the				
10	State of California.						
11	10.						
12		10.1	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce				
13	the terms this Consent Judgment.						
14							
15	11.	PRO	VISION OF NOTICE				
16		11.1	All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and correspondence				
17	shall be sent to the following:						
18	For CEH:						
19		•	Mark N. Todzo				
20			Lexington Law Group, LLP				
21 22			1627 Irving Street				
23			San Francisco, CA 94122				
24	For Defendants:						
25			Michael J. Bonesteel				
26			Haight Brown & Bonesteel LLP				
27							
28			6080 Center Drive, Suite 800				
	11		- X -				

- 11	•						
1			Los Angeles, CA 90045	:			
2			and				
3			Ansell Legal Department	:			
4	•	-	200 Schulz Drive	: : :			
5			Red Bank, New Jersey 07701				
7	12.	COU	RT APPROVAL	:			
8		12.1	CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of He	ealth and			
9	Safety Code §	25249	.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations § 300	3.			
10		13.	EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS	1			
11		13.1	The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed:	in counterparts			
12	and by means	and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document					
13	14.		HORIZATION	:			
14	14.			i i iho ia fully			
15		14.1	Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or				
16	authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter in						
17	and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that party.						
18	The undersign	ned hav	e read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions	of this			
19	Consent Judg	ment.]	Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its o	wn fees and			
20 21	costs.						
22	AGREED TO	Э:					
23	CENTER FO)R EN	VIRONMENTAL HEALTH				
24		11 -		:			
25	Michael Green, Executive Director Center for Environmental Health						
26							
27				<u>:</u>			

1	ANSELL HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS, INC. ANSELL HEALTHCARE PRODUCTS LLC
2	
3	The Marie October 8 2008
4	Dated: October 8, 2008
5	William C. Dailly, In
6	William G. Reilly, Jr. [Name]
7	
8	Senior Vice President & General Counsel [Title]
9	Little
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
l	