

Jonathan D. Weissglass (Bar No. 185008) 1 Barbara J. Chisholm (Bar No. 224656) 2 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP DEC 4 0 2010 177 Post Street, Suite 300 3 San Francisco, CA 94108 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Telephone: (415) 421-7151 Fax: (415) 362-8064 Michael E. Wall (Bar No. 170238) NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC. 111 Sutter Street, 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 875-6100 Fax: (415) 875-6161 Attorneys for Plaintiff Natural Resources Defense Council SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 11 12 NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE Case No. 09487873 13 COUNCIL, INC., #PROPOSED|-CONSENT JUDGMENT 14 Plaintiff, (Health and Safety Code § 25249 et seq.) 15 16 PETCO ANIMAL SUPPLIES STORES, INC.; CENTRAL GARDEN & PET 17 COMPANY; FARNAM COMPANIES, INC.; SERGEANT'S PET CARE 18 PRODUCTS, INC.; VIRBAC CORPORATION; WELLMARK 19 INTERNATIONAL; ALBERTSONS, INC.; NEW ALBERTSON'S, INC.; DRS. 20 FOSTER & SMITH, INC.; FINS, FURS & FEATHERS, INC. d/b/a 21 PETSTORE.COM; JEFFERS, INC.; KV VET SUPPLY, INC.; LEE'S PET CLUB, 22 INC. d/b/a/ PET CLUB STORES; RED CART MARKET, INC. d/b/a PET CLUB 23 STORES; ORCHARD SUPPLY HARDWARE LLC; PET FOOD 24 EXPRESS LTD.; PETSMART, INC.; PETSMART STORE SUPPORT GROUP, 25 INC.; RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY; and DOES 1-10, 26 Defendants. 27

28

014176.0041\1559436.4

TPROPOSEST CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 1.1 Plaintiff. The Plaintiff is Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. ("NRDC" or "Plaintiff"), a non-profit environmental organization with more than 480,000 members nationwide. NRDC is dedicated to, among other causes, protecting the environment, improving human health, and supporting environmentally sound practices.
- 1.2 Settling Defendants. The Settling Defendants are Central Garden & Pet Company; Inc. ("Central"); Farnam Companies, Inc. ("Farnam"); Petco Animal Supplies Stores, Inc. ("Petco"); Drs. Foster & Smith, Inc. ("Foster & Smith"); Fins, Furs & Feathers, Inc. d/b/a Petstore.com ("Petstore"); Ralphs Grocery Company ("Ralphs"); Jeffers, Inc. ("Jeffers"); KV Vet Supply, Inc. ("KV"); Lee's Pet Club, Inc. d/b/a Pet Club Stores ("Pet Club"); Red Cart Market, Inc. d/b/a Pet Club Stores ("Pet Club"); Orchard Supply Hardware LLC ("Orchard"); Pet Food Express LTD; Petsmart Inc. ("Pet Food"); Petsmart Store Support Group, Inc. ("Petsmart"); and Wellmark International. Inc. ("Wellmark").
- 1.3 The Parties. Plaintiff and Settling Defendants are sometimes referred to herein as the "Parties."
- name for California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Cal. Health and Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. (sometimes referred to as "the Act"). Plaintiff proceeds under Section 25249.7(d) as a "person in the public interest." Solely for purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that Plaintiff's Notices of Intent to Sue, listed as Exhibit A to this Consent Judgment ("Plaintiff's Notices") were served upon Defendants and public prosecutors, including the Attorney General and all district attorneys and city attorneys authorized to prosecute an action to enforce the Act, accompanied by certificates of merit, in compliance with Section 25249.7(d)(1) of the Act. Plaintiff is allowed to proceed pursuant to Section 25249.7(d)(2), because none of those public officials commenced an action pursuant to Plaintiff's Notices.
- 1.5 The Complaint. On December 7, 2009, Plaintiff filed a complaint against
  Settling Defendants and others ("Defendants") in the Superior Court for the County of Alameda
  ("Complaint") alleging that Defendants violated Proposition 65 by exposing individuals in

California to a chemical known as propoxur which has been designated under the Act as "known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity" within the meaning of Section 25249.8(b) (the "Covered Chemical"), without providing Proposition 65 warnings to such individuals, as alleged to be required under Section 25249.6. According to the Complaint, the alleged exposures to the Covered Chemical occur when individuals in California place propoxur containing flea and tick collars on dogs and cats and subsequently have contact with these animals. These flea and tick collars are manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed and/or sold by Settling Defendants for use in California. These products are identified with specificity in Plaintiff's Notices and the Complaint. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, "Covered Products" shall refer to products manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed or sold by Defendants Central, Farnam and Wellmark, as identified in Plaintiff's Notices to these three defendants and the retailer defendants who resold those products.

- 1.6 Jurisdiction. Solely for purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that the Court has personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Action; that venue is proper in the County of Alameda; that the claims in the Action present a live controversy as to the application of Proposition 65 to the Covered Products and the Covered Chemical therein; that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a resolution of all claims relating to the Covered Products alleged in the Action against Settling Defendants; and that the Court shall retain jurisdiction to implement the Consent Judgment.
- Required. Section 25249.6 of Proposition 65 provides that "[n]o person in the course of business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual, except as provided in Section 25429.10." Section 25249.10(c), under the heading "Exemptions from Warning Requirement," provides that Section 25249.6 "shall not apply" to an "exposure for which the person responsible can show that the exposure poses no significant risk assuming lifetime exposure at the level in question for substances known to the state to cause cancer, and that the exposure will have no observable effect assuming exposure at one thousand

11

12

24

25

26

27

28

(1000) times the level in question for substances known to the state to cause reproductive toxicity, based on evidence and standards of comparable scientific validity to the evidence and standards which form the scientific basis for the listing of such chemical . . . . In any action brought to enforce Section 25249.6, the burden of showing that an exposure meets the criteria of this subdivision shall be on the defendant." Proposition 65 thus makes it unlawful for a person subject to the Act to expose an individual in California to a Proposition 65-listed chemical without first providing a Proposition 65 warning unless an exemption to this requirement applies. Where the defendant asserts an exemption because the alleged exposure is beneath the level that would require a warning, the burden of proof is on the defendant to establish that the exemption applies.

Settlement. After Plaintiff's Notices were issued, the Parties began engaging in 1.8 informal discovery and have been engaged in extensive negotiations almost continually since that time. As a result of this exchange of information, the Parties agree on some aspects of the allegations, but disagree as to several other aspects, and thus disagree as to whether Settling Defendants have violated Proposition 65. Specifically, the Parties agree that each of the Covered Products contains the Covered Chemical, and that the Settling Defendants did not include Proposition 65 warnings with respect to the Covered Products for some period of time within one year of the filing of the Complaint. The Settling Defendants dispute, however, that the manufacture, packaging, distribution, marketing, sale or use of the Covered Products results in the exposure of individuals in California (or elsewhere) to the Covered Chemical in amounts, if any, that would require a warning under Proposition 65. Settling Defendants contend they began the required applications to change labels prior to Plaintiff's 60 Day Notices in this case. Settling Defendants also assert other affirmative defenses. Settling Defendants contend that they have scientific evidence to demonstrate that any exposure to the Covered Chemical that results from any reasonably anticipated use of the Covered Products, in the words of Section 25249.10(c), "poses no significant risk assuming lifetime exposure at the level in question for substances known to the state to cause cancer, and that the exposure will have no observable effect assuming exposure at one thousand (1000) times the level in question for substances known to the state to

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

cause reproductive toxicity, based on evidence and standards of comparable scientific validity to the evidence and standards which form the scientific basis for the listing of such chemical . . . . "

Plaintiff disputes Settling Defendants' assertions. In support of its position, Plaintiff contends it has evidence to dispute Settling Defendants' contention with respect to the Covered Chemical and Covered Products, and asserts that this evidence also demonstrates that Settling Defendants' evidence with respect to the Covered Chemical and Covered Products does not satisfy Settling Defendant's burden under Section 25249.6. Therefore, in order to avoid prolonged litigation and the waste of private and judicial resources that would arise from prosecuting, defending, and adjudicating the issues of which the Plaintiff and Settling Defendants disagree, the Parties have agreed, subject to the approval of the Court to compromise their disputed claims and defenses, and entered into a settlement agreement, the terms of which are embodied in this Consent Judgment.

No Admissions. Neither the Consent Judgment nor any of its provisions shall be construed as an admission by any Party of any fact, finding, issue of law, or violation of law, including Proposition 65 or any other statute, regulation, or common law requirement related to exposure to the Covered Chemical or other chemicals listed under Proposition 65 from the Covered Products. By executing this Consent Judgment and agreeing to provide the relief and remedies specified herein, Settling Defendants do not admit that this Action is not preempted by Federal law, or that Settling Defendants have committed any violations of Proposition 65, or any other law or legal duty and specifically deny that they have committed any such violations. Settling Defendants maintain that all Covered Products distributed, marketed and/or sold by Settling Defendants in California have at all times been in compliance with Proposition 65. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, or defense that Plaintiff and Settling Defendants may have in any other or in future legal proceedings unrelated to these proceedings. Settling Defendants reserve all of their rights and defenses with regard to any claim by any person under Proposition 65 or otherwise. Nevertheless, this paragraph shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities, waivers, releases, and/or duties provided for under this Consent Judgment.

28

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

17

.19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

these measures with the mutual understanding and expectation that as to such Covered Products, such measures will provide notice so as to mitigate potential individual exposure to the Covered Chemical. Each Settling Defendant is only responsible under this Consent Judgment for measures specifically agreed to by that Party below and has no obligation to ensure compliance by any other Party. Central, Farnam and Wellmark have agreed to the following measures with respect 2.1 to the Covered Products:

In the spirit of settlement and compromise, and in order to promote the public interest,

Settling Defendants have agreed to continue to take certain measures to enhance the safe use of

Covered Products by providing a notice as described hereinafter. The Parties have agreed to

Subject to paragraph 2.2 of this Consent Judgment, Central, Farnam and Wellmark state that they have changed the precautionary statements on the label for the Covered Products, that may be marketed for use in California, to include the following statement:

> NOTICE: This product contains propoxur, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

- Central, Farnam and Wellmark have agreed to take such actions as may be 2.2 necessary to cease their distribution of Covered Products not containing a Proposition 65 warning statement (such as that delineated in Section 2.1) to distributors or retailers in California following notice that this Consent Judgment has been approved and has become a final order of the Court ("Effective Date"); provided, in no event shall said Defendants be deemed in violation of this Consent Judgment or Proposition 65 where Covered Products not containing a Proposition 65 warning statement (such as that delineated in Section 2.1) were distributed or sold by said Defendants before the Effective Date (even if stocked in shelves, sold to consumers, or otherwise within the chain of distribution after the Effective Date.)
- Defendants Petco, Foster & Smith, Petstore, Ralphs, Jeffers, KV, Pet Club, 2.3 Orchard, Pet Food, and Petsmart agree they will remove any and all Covered Products not containing a Proposition 65 warning statement (such as that delineated in Section 2.1) which were

manufactured, sold, distributed, or packaged by Central, Farnam and Wellmark, from sale in California by no later than the Effective Date.

## 3. MONETARY PAYMENTS.

- 3.1 In settlement of this matter, Settling Defendants collectively have agreed to make the monetary payments totaling \$120,000, as described in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below.
- 3.2 Civil Penalties. Within thirty (30) days following notice of approval and entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court, Settling Defendants shall pay \$80,000 representing Civil Penalties, and shall do so in the form of a check made payable to the Altshuler Berzon LLP Attorney-Client Trust Account, to be delivered to Plaintiff's counsel of record at 177 Post Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California 94108. This amount shall be allocated between NRDC and the State of California as directed by Health and Safety Code Section 25249.12(c)-(d). NRDC's portion shall be distributed to the Rose Foundation.
- 3.3 Reimbursement of Attorneys Fees and Costs. Within thirty days (30) following notice of approval and entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendants shall pay \$40,000 as reimbursement for the investigation fees and costs, testing costs, expert witness fees, attorneys fees, and other litigation costs and expenses, and shall do so in the form of a check made payable to the Altshuler Berzon LLP Attorney-Client Trust Account, to be delivered to Plaintiff's counsel of record at 177 Post Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California 94108.

# 4. WAIVER AND RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS.

Maiver And Release Of Claims Against Settling Defendants. As to those matters raised or which could have been raised in this Action, the Complaint, or in Plaintiff's Notices (and without regard to any potential disputes about the adequacy of such Notices), as to Covered Products and Covered Chemical for Central, Farnam and Wellmark and as to the Covered Products as to Defendants, Petco, Foster & Smith, Petstore, Ralphs, Jeffers, KV, Petclub, Orchard, Petfood and Petsmart, and any related actions, Plaintiff, on behalf of itself and (to the extent permitted by law) on behalf of the general public, hereby releases Settling Defendants and waives any claims against Settling Defendants for injunctive relief or damages, penalties, fines, sanctions, mitigation, fees (including fees of attorneys, experts, and others), costs, expenses or

any other sum incurred or claimed, for any claims under Proposition 65 or any related actions arising from the marketing, sale, packaging, distribution or use in California of the Covered Products, including all claims that may arise from the acts relating to the Covered Products and the Covered Chemical in any flea and tick collar manufactured by Central, Farnam or Wellmark. It is expressly understood that this waiver does not apply to flea and tick collars containing propoxur not manufactured, distributed, sold or packaged by Central, Farnam, Wellmark or their subsidiaries or affiliates.

- 4.2 Defendants' Waiver And Release Of Plaintiff. Settling Defendants hereby release Plaintiff from and waive any claims against Plaintiff for injunctive relief or damages, penalties, fines, sanctions, mitigation, fees (including fees of attorneys, experts, and others), costs, expenses, or any other sum incurred or claimed or which could have been claimed for matters related to the Action or in action RG09448605.
- 4.3 Matters Covered By This Consent Judgment/Release of Future Claims. This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between the Plaintiff, acting on behalf of itself and on behalf of the general public in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), and Central, Farnam Wellmark, and the other Settling Defendants, as to all claims arising from Settling Defendants' alleged failure to provide clear, reasonable, and lawful warnings of exposure to the Covered Chemical in Covered Products. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issues, now and in the future, concerning compliance by the Settling Defendants with existing requirements of Proposition 65 with respect to the Covered Products and the Covered Chemical in any flea and tick collar manufactured by Central, Farnam or Wellmark.
- 4.4 Waiver of Civil Code Section 1542. Subject to Sections 4.1 and 4.3 above, this Consent Judgment is intended as a full settlement and compromise of all claims arising out of or relating to the Plaintiffs' Notices and/or the Action regarding Covered Products, except as set forth herein. No other claim is reserved as between the Parties hereto, and each Party expressly waives any and all rights which it may have under the provisions of Section 1542 of the Civil Code of the State of California, which provides:

·23

014176.0041\1559436.4

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.

4.5 For purposes of this section 4, the terms "Plaintiff" and "Settling Defendants" are defined as follows. The term "Plaintiff" includes the Plaintiff as defined at paragraph 1.1 above, and also includes its subsidiaries, successors, and assigns and its directors, officers, agents, attorneys, representatives, and employees. The term "Settling Defendants" includes the Settling Defendants, as that term is defined in paragraph 1.2 above, and also includes their corporate affiliates, including any and all corporate parents and subsidiaries and their directors, officers, agents, attorneys, representatives, employees, licensors, heirs, predecessors, successors, and assigns, their suppliers, distributors and customers.

# 5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT.

- 5.1 The Parties may, by motion or other application before this Court, and upon notice having been given to all Parties in accordance with paragraph 8 below, unless waived, enforce the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment and seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided by law. The prevailing party on any such motion or application shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
- 5.2 The Parties may enforce the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment pursuant to paragraph 5.1 only after the complaining party has first given 30 days notice to the Party allegedly failing to comply with the terms and conditions of the Consent Judgment and has attempted, in an open and good faith manner, to resolve such party's alleged failure to comply.

### 6. GOVERNING LAW.

- 6.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with, the laws of the State of California.
- 6.2 The Parties have participated jointly in the preparation of this Consent Judgment and this Consent Judgment is the result of the joint efforts of the Parties. This Consent Judgment was subject to revision and modification by the Parties and has been accepted and approved as to

23 24

19

20

21

22

25

26

27

28

its final form by all Parties and their counsel. Accordingly, any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in this Consent Judgment shall not be interpreted against any party as a result of the manner in which this Consent Judgment was prepared. Each Party to this Consent Judgment agrees that any statute or rule of construction providing that ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting party should not be employed in the interpretation of this Consent Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive the application of California Civil Code Section 1654.

### ENTIRE AGREEMENT. 7.

This Consent Judgment constitutes the sole and entire agreement and understanding between the Parties with respect to the subject matter hereof, and any prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, or understandings related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein. There are no warranties, representations, or other agreements between the Parties. except as expressly set forth herein. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or bind any of the Parties hereto. No supplementation, modification, waiver, or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any of the other provisions hereof, whether or not similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.

### NOTICES. 8.

All notices or correspondence to be given pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and shall be personally delivered or sent by first-class, registered, certified mail, overnight courier, and/or via facsimile transmission (with presentation of facsimile transmission confirmation) addressed to the Parties as follows:

For Plaintiff:

Altshuler Berzon LLP Attn: Jonathan Weissglass 1777 Post Street, Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94108

For Settling Defendants:

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean LLP Attn: Daniel Rapaport 1111 Broadway, 24th Floor

Oakland, CA 94607

The contacts and/or addresses above may be amended by giving notice to all Parties to this Consent Judgment. COURT APPROVAL. 9. The Court shall either approve or disapprove of this Consent Judgment in its entirety, without alteration, deletion or amendment, unless otherwise so stipulated by the Parties and their counsel. The Parties agree that they will fully support the approval of this Consent Judgment and that they will act in good faith to encourage its approval by the Court. Plaintiff will prepare and file a motion to approve this consent Judgment in full, and shall take all reasonable measures to ensure that it is entered without delay. In the event that the Court declines to approve and order entry of the Consent Judgment without any change whatsoever, this Consent Judgment shall become null and void upon the election of either party and upon written notice to all of the Parties to the Action pursuant to the notice provisions herein (unless the Parties stipulate otherwise, in writing). If the Court enters this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff shall, within 10 working days thereafter, electronically provide or otherwise serve a copy of it and the report required pursuant to 11 Cal. Code Regs. §3004 to/on the California Attorney General's Office. AUTHORIZATION. 10. The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective Parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment. 111 111 III111 IIIIII

014176.0041\1559436.4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

III

111

1	11. COUNTERPARTS/FACSIMILE SIGNING.
2	This Consent Judgment may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall
3	be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same
4	document. All signatures need not appear on the same page of the document and signature of the
5	Parties transmitted by facsimile shall be deemed binding.
6	Dated: CENTRAL GARDEN & PET COMPANY, INC.
7	11000
8	(Signature)
9	MICHAEL A . REED
10	EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
11	EVECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	Dated: July 21, 2010 FARNAM COMPANIES, INC.
17	the way of the same
18	(Signature)
19	(Name)
20	Assistant Secretary
21	(Title)
22	Dated: PETCO ANIMAL SUPPLIES STORIS, INC.
23	
24	(Signature)
25	(Name)
26	
27	(Title)
28	
39456.4	-11-
	**************************************

Gundoly Core Stack+ Dear LLP World, Koren, Stack+ Dear LLP 510 834 1928

## 11. COUNTERPARTS/FACSIMILE SIGNING. 2 This Consent Judgment may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall 3 be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document. All signatures need not appear on the same page of the document and signature of the 4 5 Parties transmitted by facsimile shall be deemed binding. 6 CENTRAL GARDEN & PET COMPANY, INC. 8 (Signature) 9 (Name) 10 11 (Title) 12 13 14 15 July 21, 2010 FARNAM COMPANIES, INC. Dated: 16 17 (Signature) 18 Barry G. Harrison 19 (Name) Assistant Secretary 20 (Title) 21 Dated: PETCO ANIMAL SUPPLIES STORES, INC. 22 23 (Signature) 24 25 (Name) 26 (Title) 27 28

(PROPOSED) CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 11 -

014176.0041\1559436.4

J. Davis

Darragh

1	11. COUNTERPARTS/FACSIMILE SIGNING.
2	This Consent Judgment may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall
3	he deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same
4	document. All signatures need not appear on the same page of the document and signature of the
5	Parties transmitted by facsimile shall be deemed banding.
6.	Dated: CENTRAL GARDEN & PET COMPANY, INC.
7	
8	(Signature)
9	(Name)
10	
11	(Title)
12	
13	
14	
15	Dated: FARNAM COMPANIES, INC.
. 16	Dates.
17	(Signature)
18	
19	(Name)
. 20	(Title)
21	Dated: 11,2010 PETCO ANIMAL SUPPLIES STORES, INC.
22	Samuel Q: Duin
23	(Signature)
24	DAKERGU J. DAVIS (Name)
25	VP and General Courses
26	(Title)
27	, <u>\</u>
28	-11-
	(PROPOSED) CONSENT JUDGINENT

	1 1	
. 1	Dated: 7/19/2010	DRS. FOSTER & SMITH, INC.
2		Of Sawers
3		(Signature)
4		Jann Foweres (Name)
5	•	VICE PRESIDENT
. 6	1	(Title)
7	Dated:	FINS, FURS & FEATHERS, INC. d/b/a/ PETSTORE.COM
8		TEIBIORE, COM
9		(Signature)
10		
-11		(Name)
12		(Title)
13		
<b>r</b> 4		
15		
16	Dated:	RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY
17		
18		(Signature)
19	. •	(Name)
20		
21		(Title)
22	Dated:	JEFFERS, INC.
23		
24		(Signature)
25		(Name)
26		
27		(Title)
28		10
014176.0041\1559436.4	(PROPA	- 12 - SEDJ CONSENT JUDGMENT
	12 105 0	

1	Dated:	DRS. FOSTER & SMITH, INC.
2		
3		(Signature)
<sup>′</sup> 4		(Name)
5		© (Idame)
6	a 25 an	(Title)
7	Dated: 6-3-200	FINS, FURS & FEATHERS, INC. d/b/a/ PETSTORE.COM
8	,	TZ P
9		(Signature)
10		BEWAMIN ROS
· 11		(Name)
12		(Title)
13		(Title)
14		
15		
16	Dated:	RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY
17		
. 18		(Signature)
19		
20		(Name)
21		(Title)
22	Dated:	JEFFERS, INC.
23		
24		(Signature)
25		Olema)
26		(Name)
27		(Title)
. 28		
014176.0041\1559436.4		- 12 -
	l f	PROPOSED) CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	Dated:	DRS. FOSTER & SMITH, INC.
2		
3		(Signature)
4		
5	•	(Name)
. 6		(Title)
7	Dated:	FINS, FURS & FEATHERS, INC. d/b/a/ PETSTORE.COM
	Datou.	PETSTORE.COM
8		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
9		(Signature)
10		(Name)
-11		
12		(Title)
13		
14		
15	Dated: 7/23/10	RAZPHS GROCERY COMPANY
16	Dated:	RALPHS GROCERT COMPTEN
17		(Si-hatture)
18		(Signature) Steven J. Prough
19		Vice President and Assistant Secretary
20	. *	
21		(Title)
22	Dated:	JEFFERS, INC.
23		
24		(Signature)
25		(Name)
26	,	
. 27		(Title)
· 28		
014176.0041\1559436.4	(	- 12 -
	n AFROLO	ALD I CONDUITE VON COMMITTE

1	Dated:	DRS. FOSTER & SMITH, INC.
2		
3		(Signature)
. 4	·	·
5		(Name)
		(Title)
6	Details	l
7	Dated:	FINS, FURS & FEATHERS, INC. d/b/a/ PETSTORE.COM
8	·	
9	•	(Signature)
10		
-11	•	(Name)
12		(Title)
13	,	
14		
15		
16	Dated:	RALPHS GROCERY COMPANY
17		
. 18		(Signature)
19		(Name)
20	·	(Ivanie)
21		(Title)
22	Dated:	JEFFERS, INC.
23		Dorther SonoRN
24	·	(Signature)
25		Borothy deffers
26		(Name)
27		(Title)
28		•
014176.0041\1559436.4		- 12 -
	f <del>PROPOS</del>	SED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	Dated: 7/16/20/0 KV VET SUPPLY, INC.
1	Dated: 7/16/20/0 KV VET SUPPLY, INC.
2	Living A Lhyd
3	(Signature)
4	Tracie H- Woyg (Name)
5	General Manager
6	(Title)
7	Dated: LEE'S PET CLUB, INC. d/b/a PET CLUB STORES
8	
9	(Signature)
-10	
11	(Name)
12	(Title)
13	
14	
15	
16	Dated: RED CART MARKET, INC. d/b/a PET CLUB
17	Dated: RED CART MARKET, INC. WUNTER COOR STORES
18	(Signature)
19	
20	(Name)
21	(Title)
22	ODCHARD SUBDI V HARDWARF LLC
23	Dated: ORCHARD SUFFLY HARD WARE BEE
24	(Signature)
25	(Name)
26	(1 mino)
. 27	(Title)
28	
) 014176.0041\1559436.4	- 13 -
	HANGHANALII CUMBERI JUDUMERI

1	Dated:	KV VET SUPPLY, INC.
2	•	
3		(Signature)
1		
4.		(Name)
5		(Title)
6		(Title)
7	Dated: 7.14.2010	LEE'S PET CLUB, INC. d/b/a PET CLUB STORES
8	•	Dampen L.
9	* .	(Signature)
10		TAMM LEE
11		(Name)
12	•	SECRETARY (Title)
13		·
14		•
15		
16		DIG 14 / DET OF ID
17	Dated: 7. 14. 2010	RED CART MARKET, INC. d/b/a PET CLUB STORES
		Johnnel
18	·	(Signature)
19		Name)
20		VICE PRESIDENT
. 21		(Title)
22	Dated:	ORCHARD SUPPLY HARDWARE LLC
23		
24	,	(Signature)
25	•	(Name)
26		(* ·········
27		(Title)
28		
014176.0041\1559436.4		- 13 -
	. <del>(PROPO</del>	SEDJ CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	Dated:	KV VET SUPPLY, INC.
2		•
3		(Signature)
4.		
5		(Name)
		(Title)
. 6	Datadi	LEE'S PET CLUB, INC. d/b/a PET CLUB STORES
7 ·	Dated:	STORES
8		
9		(Signature)
10		(Name)
11		(1,441,10)
12		(Title)
13		
14		
15		
16	Dated:	RED CART MARKET, INC. d/b/a PET CLUB
. 17		STORES
- 18		(Signature)
19		
20		(Name)
21		(Title)
22	Dated: 7/21/10	ORCHARI) SUPPLY HARDWARE LLC
23		(South Smile
24		(Signature)
25		ROGER L. SMITH (Name)
26		VP REAL ESTATE, BEN'L COUNSEL (Title) & SECRETARY
27		(Title) & SUCKETARY
28		10
014176.0041\1559436.4		- 13 -

1	Dated: 7 15 2010		PET FOOD EXPRESS LTD
2			(Signature)
3			Michael Levy
4			(Name)
.5			(Title)
6	Dated:	ř	PETSMART INC.
7	Datos	•	
8			(Signature)
9			(Name)
10			
11			(Title)
12	Dated:		PETSMART STORE SUPPORT GROUP, INC.
13			(Signature)
14			(0.8)
15			(Name)
. 16			(Title)
17	Dated:	•	(Title) WELLMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.
18	,		
. 19			(Signature)
20			
21			(Name)
22			(Title) NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL,
. 23	Dated:	-	NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.
24			
		•	(Signature)
25			(Name)
26		,	(1 tanto)
27			(Title)
28			- 14 -
•	,	[PROPE	OSED) CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	Dated:	PET FOOD EXPRESS LTD
2	•	
3		(Signature)
		(Name)
4		
. 5		(Title)
6	Dated:	PETSMART INC
7		Jak Durk
8		(Signature)
. 9		J. Dale Broke (Name)
10		Vie President / Depty Gen. Cancel (Title)
11		(Title)
12	Dated:	PETSMART STORE SUPPORT GROUP, INC.
13		Jake But
14		(Signature)
15		J. Dale Brunk (Name)
16/		Vice President / Deputy General Course
·	Dated:	(Title) WELLMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.
17	Dated.	·
18	·	(Signature)
· 19		(O,BLANCE)
20	,	(Name)
21		
22	Dated:	(Title) NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL,
23		NC.
24		(Signature)
25		(Signature)
26		(Name)
27		
28		(Title)
014176.0041\1559436.4		- 14 -
, .	(PROPE	OSED) CONSENT JUDGMENT

•			
	·	·	
1	Dated:	PET FOOD EXPRESS LTD	
2	·	(Signature)	
3	,	(Gigilaturo)	
4		(Name)	
. 5		(TAL)	
6		(Title)	
7	Dated:	PETSMART INC.	
. 8		(Signature)	
9			
10		(Name)	
. 11		(Title)	
12	Dated:	PETSMART STORE SUPPORT GROUP, INC.	
13			
14		(Signature)	
15		(Name)	
16			
17	Dated:July 21, 2010	(Title) WELLMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.	
18		1 01	
. 19	·	(Signature)	
20	·	Barry G. Harrison	
. 21		(Name)	
22		Assistant Secretary (Title)	
23	Dated:	(Title) NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, INC.	
24		INC.	
25	,	(Signature)	
26		(Nama)	
27		(Name)	
28		(Title)	
014176,0041\1559436,4		- 14 -	
	· f <del>PRO</del>	POSEDJ CONSENT JUDGMENT	
		i .	
	•		
		·	
•		,	

		• •	•
1	Dated:	PET FOOD EXPRESS LTD	
2	·	(Signature)	
3		(Signature)	
4	•	(Name)	
5			
6		(Title)	
7	Dated:	PETSMART INC.	
8		(Signature)	<del></del>
9		(Name)	
10		(Title)	<u> </u>
11		PETSMART STORE SUPPORT GROUP,	INC
12	Dated:	PEISWART STORE SOFT ORT GROOT,	
13		(Signature)	
14		(Name)	<del> </del>
15		(Name)	
16		(Title) WELLMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.	
. 17	Dated:	WELLMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.	
18			
19		(Signature)	
20		(Name)	
. 21			<del></del>
22	Dated: Tuly 26, 2010	(Title) NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE CO	UNCIL,
23	<del>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </del>	INC.	
24	·	(Signature)	
25			MPH
26		(Name)	·
. 27		Gina Solemon, MD. (Name)  Senior Scientist (Title)	
28		` ´	
014176.0041\1559436.4	- 14 -  FPROPOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT		

# IT IS SO ORDERED:

In accordance with the stipulation of Plaintiff and Settling Defendants, the Court hereby incorporates the terms of this Consent Judgment into this Order. If a party violates the provisions of this Consent Judgment, this Court retains jurisdiction over this matter.

Dated: <u>Pec 12, 2010</u>

Judge of the Superior Court

014176.0041\1559436.4