1 LEXINGTON LAW GROUP Eric S. Somers, State Bar No. 139050 2 Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213209 Lisa Burger, State Bar No. 239676 MAR 3 0 2010 3 1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122 KIM TURNER, Court Executive Officer MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT 4 Telephone: (415) 759-4111 By: K. Main, Deputy Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTÉR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF MARIN 10 11 12 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, ) Case No. CIV 09-0989 a non-profit corporation, 13 Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT 14 AS TO SWING LTD V. 15 ASPEN PET PRODUCTS, INC.; DOSKOCIL MANUFACTURING CO., INC.; PETSMART, 16 17 INC.; SWING LTD.; and Defendant DOES 1 through 200, inclusive, 18 19 Defendants. 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

- 1.1 On March 4, 2009, 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. Aspen Pet Products, Inc., et al.*, Marin County Superior Court Case Number CIV 09-0989 (the "CEH Action"), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"). The Complaint in the CEH Action named Swing Ltd. ("Defendant") as a defendant.
- 1.2 Defendant is a corporation that manufactured, distributed and/or sold keychains (the "Products") in the State of California.
- public enforcement agencies with the requisite 60-day Notice (the "Notice") alleging that Defendant was in violation of Proposition 65. CEH's Notice and the Complaint in the CEH Action allege that Defendant exposes people who use or otherwise handle the Products to lead and lead compounds (collectively referred to herein as "Lead"), chemicals 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 Lead. The Notice and Complaint allege that Defendant's conduct violates Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, the warning provision of Proposition 65. Defendant disputes such allegations and asserts that all of its 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 Defendant as to the acts alleged in CEH's Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Marin, 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.** From and after October 1, 2009 (the "Effective Date"), Defendant shall not manufacture, distribute, ship, or sell, or cause to be manufactured, distributed or sold, any Product in the United States that is made of any material, or contains any component, that is more than 0.02 percent Lead by weight (200 parts per million ("ppm")) (the "Reformulation Standard")
- 2.2 Certification From Suppliers. Defendant shall issue specifications to its suppliers requiring that the Products comply with the Reformulation Standard. Defendant shall obtain written certification from its suppliers of the Products certifying that the Products meet and comply with the Reformulation Standard.
- 2.3 Defendant's Testing. In order to ensure compliance with the Reformulation Standard, Defendant shall cause to be conducted testing to confirm compliance. Such testing shall be conducted by an independent laboratory using the most recent version of United States Environmental Protection Agency Method 3050B or 3051, the most recent version of National Food Laboratory Method MN5013, or any replacements thereof (the "Test Protocol"). At the request of CEH, the results of the testing performed pursuant to this section shall be made available to CEH.
- 2.3.1 Testing Frequency. Defendant shall arrange for testing of a random sample of each of the first two lots of vinyl material used in manufacturing the Products by each of its suppliers that is acquired after the Effective Date. Following the testing of the first

two lots as described above, Defendant shall, arrange for testing of a random sample from every fifth lot of vinyl material used in manufacturing the Products by each of its suppliers. Defendant shall also randomly select and test two sample finished Products from each of (a) the first shipment received in the United States after the date six months after Effective Date, (b) then one year after the Effective Date, (c) then annually thereafter. Such testing shall be conducted at a United Stated laboratory. Defendant's obligation to test vinyl material and finished Product under this Consent Judgment shall continue until such time as Defendant has accumulated four consecutive years of test data demonstrating compliance with the reformulation requirements of the Consent Judgment (and showing no failed tests during such time).

2.3.2 Products That Contain Lead Pursuant to Defendant's Testing. If the results of the testing required pursuant to Section 2.3 show Lead in excess of 200 ppm in a Product, Defendant 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; (3) apply the testing frequency set forth in Section 2.3.1 as though the next shipment from the supplier were the first one following the Compliance Date; and (4) send notice of the failed test and subsequent actions taken pursuant to this Section to CEH.

2.4 Confirmatory Testing by CEH. CEH intends to conduct confirmatory testing of the Products. Any such testing shall be conducted by CEH at an independent laboratory, in accordance with the Test Protocols. In the event that CEH's testing demonstrates that the Products contain Lead in excess of 200 ppm subsequent to the Compliance Date, CEH shall inform Defendant of the test results, including information sufficient to permit Defendant to identify the Product(s). Defendant shall, within 30 days following such notice, provide CEH, at the address listed in Section 11.1, with the certification and testing information demonstrating its compliance with Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of this Consent Judgment. If Defendant fails to provide CEH with information demonstrating that it complied with Sections 2.2 and/or 2.3, Defendant shall be liable for stipulated payments in lieu of penalties for Products for which CEH produces

| <b>3.2.1</b> On or before December 1, 2009, Defendant shall deliver three                         |
|---|
| separate checks as follows: (1) a check in the amount of \$500 made payable to the Center For     |
| Environmental Health as a civil penalty; (2) a check in the amount of \$2,650 made payable to the |
| Center For Environmental Health as a payment in lieu of additional civil penalty; and (3) a check |
| in the amount of \$6,850 made payable to the Lexington Law Group as reimbursement of              |
| attorneys' fees and costs.  |

- 3.2.2 On or before March 1, 2010, Defendant shall deliver three separate checks as follows: (1) a check in the amount of \$500 made payable to the Center For Environmental Health as a civil penalty; (2) a check in the amount of \$2,650 made payable to the Center For Environmental Health as a payment in lieu of additional civil penalty; and (3) a check in the amount of \$6,850 made payable to the Lexington Law Group as reimbursement of attorneys' fees and costs.
- 3.2.3 On or before June 1, 2010, Defendant shall deliver two checks as follows: (1) a check in the amount of \$2,500 made payable to the Center for Environmental Health as a payment in lieu of additional civil penalty; and (2) a check in the amount of \$2,500 made payable to the Lexington Law Group as reimbursement of attorneys' fees and costs.

## 4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of CEH and Defendant, or upon motion of CEH or Defendant as provided by law.

## 5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 CEH may, by motion or application for an order to show cause, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Should CEH prevail on any such motion, it shall be entitled to recover its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated with enforcing the Consent Judgment.

### 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

## 7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS

CEH and Defendant of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Defendant (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 Lead resulting from any Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Defendant ("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. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 for purposes of Lead exposures from the Products.

## 8. SEVERABILITY

**8.1** In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

#### 9. GOVERNING LAW

9.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

#### 10. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

10.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the terms this Consent Judgment.

#### 11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

11.1 All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and correspondence shall be sent to the following:

For CEH:

| 2        |  | Eric S. Somers Lexington Law Group 1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122                                 |  |
|----------|--|---|--|
| 3        | For Defendant:   |   |  |
| 4        |  | Bruce Nye   |  |
| 5        |  | Adams   Nye   Trapani   Becht LLP<br>222 Kearny Street, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor<br>San Francisco, CA 94108-4521 |  |
| 6        | 12. COURT APPROVAL   |   |  |
| 7        |  | 12.1 CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of Health and                                      |  |
| 8        | Safety Code §  | 25249.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations § 3003.   |  |
| 9        | 13.  | COUNTERPARTS  |  |
| 10       |  | 13.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in   |  |
| 11       | counterparts.  |   |  |
| 12       | 14.  | AUTHORIZATION   |  |
| 13<br>14 |  | 14.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully                                |  |
| 15       | authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that |   |  |
| 16       |  |   |  |
| 17       | party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this  |   |  |
| 18       | Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and   |   |  |
| 19       | costs.   |   |  |
| 20       | AGREED TO:   |   |  |
| 21       | CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH  |   |  |
| 22       | MADI   |   |  |
| 23       | Dated: 11/21/09  |   |  |
| 24       | MICHAEZ GROON  |   |  |
| 25       |  | [Name]  |  |
| 26       |  |   |  |
| 27       | Title]   |   |  |
| 28       |  |   |  |

| 1        |   |
|----------|---|
| 2        | SWING LTD                                 |
| 3        | () 10 1/2                                 |
| 4        | Collei Chaly Dated: 1/19/09 William Haley |
| 5        | William Haley President                   |
| 6        | , .                                       |
| 7        |   |
| · 8      |   |
| 10       |   |
| 11       |   |
| 12       |   |
| 13       |   |
| 14       |   |
| 15       |   |
| 16       |   |
| 17       | ·   |
| 18       |   |
| 19       |   |
| 20       |   |
| 21       |   |
| 22<br>23 |   |
| 24       |   |
| 25       |   |
| 26       |   |
| 27       |   |
| 28       |   |
| - 1      | •   |

CONSENT JUDGMENT – SWING – Case No. CIV 09-0989

# ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and Swing Ltd., the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with the terms herein.

Dated: MAR 3 0 2010

-11

VERNA ADAMS

Judge, Superior Court of the State of California