1 2 3 4 5	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP, LLP Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Eric S. Somers, State Bar No. 139050 Lisa Burger, State Bar No. 239676 1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122 Telephone: (415) 759-4111 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALS	ENDORSED FILED San Francisco County Superior Court JUN 2 4 2009 GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk BY: Deputy Clerk					
6 7	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEAL.	in .					
8							
9							
10	COUNTY OF	F SAN FRANCISCO					
11							
12	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, a non-profit corporation,	Case No. CGC-08-482792					
13 14	Plaintiff,	TPROPOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: IMPACT PRODUCTS, LLC					
15	V.	,					
16	ACME UNITED CORPORATION; ADENNA INC.; BECTON, DICKINSON & COMPANY; BETTY DAIN						
17	CREATIONS, INC; DURASAFE INC.; IMPACT PRODUCTS, LLC; INVACARE						
18 19	CORPORATION; MICROFLEX CORPORATION; SHELBY GROUP INTERNATIONAL DBA MCR SAFETY;						
20	UNITED STATIONERS SUPPLY CO.; and defendant DOES 1 through 200,						
21	inclusive,						
22	Defendants.	* .					
23							
24							
25		·					
26							
27							
28							
	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: IM	1PACT PRODUCTS LLC – CASE NO. CGC-08-482792					

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On December 9, 2008, plaintiff the Center for Environmental Health ("CEH"), a non-profit corporation acting in the public interest, filed a complaint titled *Center for Environmental Health v. Acme United Corporation.*, et al., San Francisco County Superior Court Case Number CGC-08-482792 (the "Action"), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. ("Proposition 65"). Impact Products LLC ("Defendant") is named as a defendant in the Action.
- 1.2 Defendant is a corporation that employs 10 or more persons and manufactured, distributed and/or sold vinyl gloves in the State of California. (As used in this Consent Judgment, "Products" refers to vinyl gloves manufactured, distributed and/or sold by Defendant in the State of California.)
- appropriate 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 this Action allege that Defendant exposes people who use or otherwise handle the Products to di(2-ethylhexyl) 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 DEHP. 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 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.

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

entry of this Consent Judgment (the "Compliance Date"), Defendant shall not manufacture for sale or distribution in California, distribute, ship, or sell in the State of California, or knowingly cause to be manufactured for sale or distribution in California or cause to be distributed or sold in California, 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, Defendant 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."

2.1.1 Certification from Suppliers. Defendant shall issue specifications

to its suppliers of product for sale in California ("hereafter "suppliers") requiring that the Products shall not contain DEHP or any other Listed Phthalate in excess of trace amounts.

Defendant shall obtain written certification from its suppliers of the Products certifying that the Products do not contain DEHP.

2.1.2 Defendant's Testing. In order to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 2.1, Defendant shall require its suppliers to provide Defendant with certification of testing confirming that the Products do not contain Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts. Testing shall be conducted in compliance with Section 2.1.2.1. All testing pursuant to this Section shall be performed by an independent laboratory in accordance with one of the following test protocols: (1) EPA SW8270C and EPA SW3580A, (2) ASTM D3421-75, or (3) an equivalent protocol (referred to as the "Test Protocols"). At the request of CEH, the results of the testing performed pursuant to this section shall be made available to CEH within a reasonable time on a confidential basis.

2.1.2.1 Testing Frequency – Current Supplier. For the first, second, tenth, twentieth, thirtieth, fiftieth and seventieth orders of Products purchased from Defendant's current supplier for sale in California after the Compliance Date (assuming that these numbers of orders are placed and received between the Compliance Date and April 15, 2013), Defendant shall require such supplier to randomly select and test three gloves from each order. As used in this Consent Judgment, the "Current Supplier" is a supplier who provided Products to Defendant for sale in California before the Compliance Date.

2.1.2.2 Testing of Products from Additional Suppliers. If
Defendant purchases Products from one or more Additional Suppliers for sale in California, then
in addition to the certification required of such suppliers pursuant to section 2.1.2, Defendant
shall require such Additional Suppliers to randomly select and test three gloves from the first and

Products to Defendant for sale in California on or after, but not before the Compliance Date. This requirement will remain in effect for any Additional Suppliers from whom Defendant purchases Products from the Compliance Date, through April 15, 2013. Defendant shall have no further obligation to either test Products or require testing by its suppliers after April 15, 2013.

2.1.2.3 Traceability of Products. Beginning with the twenty-fifth order received after the Compliance Date (or earlier, should Defendant so choose), Defendant shall require its suppliers to incorporate a means of product traceability into its packaging or labeling. As used in this Consent Judgment, "product traceability" means a printed code on the packaging or other means that allows Defendant to determine the supplier of a Product from examining the packaging or labeling. Beginning with the first order from any Additional Supplier, Defendant shall require its Additional Suppliers to incorporate a means of product traceability into its packaging or labeling. Defendant shall notify CEH of the element of such coding that indicates the Products were shipped after the Compliance Date.

2.1.2.4 Inadequate Certification or Failed Tests.

Defendant shall reject any shipments that are not accompanied by certifications and testing in compliance with Section 2.1.2, and shall notify CEH of any tests that fail to establish the absence of Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts. Defendant shall continue to require its current supplier to provide test reports until that supplier has provided the seven test reports as required by section 2.1.2.1. If Defendant rejects any shipments because a required test report fails to establish the absence of Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts, it shall then require that such supplier begin the testing process anew.

2.1.3 Confirmatory Testing by CEH. CEH intends to conduct confirmatory testing of the Products at its own expense. For any testing conducted by

Defendant's suppliers pursuant to this Consent Judgment, Defendant shall provide CEH with the same number of gloves tested by the supplier, from the same lot tested, which CEH may then use for its own testing. In addition, CEH may test Products obtained from other sources. However, so long as Defendant complies with the requirements of Section 2.1.2.3 of this Consent Judgment concerning product traceability, CEH shall not base a claim of non-compliance on any tests of Products other than Products provided to it by the Defendant or Products CEH acquires from other sources and which bear package coding indicating they were manufactured after the Compliance Date. Any testing by CEH shall be conducted at an independent laboratory, in accordance with the Test Protocols. In the event that such testing demonstrates that the Products contain Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts, CEH shall provide Defendant with the test results, including information sufficient to permit Defendant to identify the Product(s). CEH shall also provide Defendant with packaging from such allegedly non-compliant Product(s), and a sample of remaining, untested Product from the same package as the allegedly non-compliant Product(s). Defendant shall, within 30 days following receipt of such notice and the remaining Product(s) and packaging, provide CEH with an explanation regarding the presence of Listed Phthalates in the Products or such other evidence as Defendant believes establishes that the allegedly non-compliant product(s) were in compliance with this Consent Judgment. Unless Defendant provides CEH with information sufficient to demonstrate that CEH's test result was incorrect, Defendant 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.

2.1.3.1 Stipulated Payments In Lieu of Penalties. If stipulated payments in lieu of penalties are warranted under section 2.1.3, the stipulated payment amount shall be as follows for each Occurrence of Defendant selling a Product in California

Defendant, or upon motion of CEH or Defendant as provided by law.

4.1.1 Change in Law. It is the intention of this Consent Judgment that Defendant's present and future obligations concerning distribution of Products containing Listed Phthalates should not remain in effect if Proposition 65 is determined by a court, legislature or other appropriate regulatory authority to no longer apply to the Products and/or Listed Phthalates.

4.1.1.1 Should a final and non-appealable published decision of any State or Federal Appellate Court rule that State or Federal legislation has effectively repealed or preempted Proposition 65 in its entirety, or should legislation or regulatory action occur which removes DEHP from the lists of chemicals established pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.8, then Defendant will have good cause to modify the Agreement such that Defendant shall have no further obligations under this Consent Judgment.

4.1.1.2 Should the obligations with respect to Listed Phthalates imposed by an agreement with CEH on a manufacturer or distributor of Products that is similarly situated with Defendant be made less stringent as a result of the amendment, repeal or preemption of Proposition 65 or any other statute, or of the lists of chemicals established pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.8, then such amendment, repeal or preemption will constitute good cause for modification of this Consent Judgment.

4.1.2 Less Stringent Settlement Provisions Involving Other

Companies. CEH intends to enter into agreements with other entities that manufacture, distribute and/or sell Products. It is the intention of this Consent Judgment that no such settlement shall place Defendant at a competitive disadvantage with other such entities. Should the provisions of a consent judgment with a similarly situated manufacturer or distributor of Products be less stringent than those contained in this Consent Judgment, Defendant may obtain a modification of this Consent Judgment to conform with the terms of the later entered consent judgment.

4.1.3 Before seeking modification of this Consent Judgment by the Court, either party shall provide the other with 30 days written notice of its intention to seek modification, together with the basis for such modification. The parties agree to informally meet and confer concerning such requests prior to seeking modification by the Court.

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 them.

7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS

7.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between 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, or customers (collectively, "Defendant Releasees") based on failure to warn about alleged exposures to DEHP 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 exposures to

1	Listed Phthalates from the Products.						
2	8.	SEVERABILITY					
3		8.1 In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by					
4	a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely						
5	affected.						
7	9.	GOVERNING LAW					
8		9.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the					
9	State of Calif	ornia.					
10	10.	RETENTION OF JURISDICTION					
11		10.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce					
12	the terms this	his Consent Judgment.					
13	11.	PROVISION OF NOTICE					
14	11.	11.1 All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and correspondence					
15	shall be gent						
16 17		to the following:					
18	For CEH:						
19		Mark N. Todzo Lexington Law Group, LLP					
20		1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122					
21	For Defendar	nt:					
22		Bruce Nye Adams Nye Trapani Becht LLP					
23		222 Kearny Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108-4521					
24	12.	COURT APPROVAL					
25		12.1 CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of Health and					
26	Cafata Cada						
27	Sarety Code	§ 25249.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations § 3003.					
28		- 10 -					
	[PROPOSED	O] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: IMPACT PRODUCTS LLC – CASE NO. CGC-08-482792473477					

1	13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS					
2	13.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts					
3	and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.					
4	14. AUTHORIZATION					
5	14.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully					
6 7	authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into					
8	and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that party.					
9	The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this					
10						
11	Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and					
12	costs.					
13	AGREED TO:					
14	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH					
15	1/7/6					
16	Charlie Pizatro, Assistant Director					
17	Center for Environmental Health MICHABL GREETOR					
18						
19 20	IMPACT PRODUCTS, LLC					
21	Dated:					
22						
23						
24	[Name]					
25						
26	[Title]					
27						
28	- 11 -					
	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: IMPACT PRODUCTS LLC – CASE NO. CGC-08-482792473477					

1	15. EAECUTION AND COUNTERIANTS						
2	13.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts						
3	and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.						
4	14. AUTHORIZATION						
5	14.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully						
6	authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into						
8	and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that party.						
9							
10	The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this						
11	Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and						
12	costs.						
13	AGREED TO:						
14	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH						
15							
16	Dated:						
17	Charlie Pizarro, Assistant Director Center for Environmental Health						
18	Contex for Environmental Frontier						
19							
20	IMPACT PRODUCTS, LLC						
21	1 - Neal Dated: 4-29-09						
22							
23	TELKY NEAL						
24	[Name]						
25	PRESIDENT & CED						
26	[Title]						
27							
28							
	- 11 -						

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: IMPACT PRODUCTS LLC – CASE NO. CGC-08-482792473477

1				ORDE	R AND JUDGMENT		
2	Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and Impact Products,						
3	LLC, the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with t						
4	terms herein.						
5		Dated:	JUN	2 4 2009			
6		Dated.			CHARLOTTE WALTER WOOLARD		
7					Judge, Superior Court of the State of California		
8							
9							
10							
11 12							
12							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20			·				
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							