ENDORSED FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court LEXINGTON LAW GROUP Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213209 JUL 1 2 2011 Lisa Burger, State Bar No. 239676 503 Divisadero Street CLERK OF THE COURT San Francisco, CA 94117 BY: GINA GONZALES Telephone: (415) 913-7800 4 Deputy Clerk Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com hhirsch@lexlawgroup.com 6 lburger@lexlawgroup.com 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 11 12 13 Case No. CGC-11-509403 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH.) 14 a non-profit corporation, [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT 15 Plaintiff, RE: ROYAL PAPER PRODUCTS, INC. 16 ٧. 17 ROVIN MED, INC.; ROYAL PAPER PRODUCTS INC.; and DOES 1 through 200, 18 inclusive, Defendants. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1.1 On March 22, 2011, 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. Royal Paper Products, Inc., et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case Number CGC-11-509403 (the "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 Action names Royal Paper Products, Inc. ("Defendant") as a defendant. CEH and Defendant are referred to herein individually as a "Party" and collectively as the "Parties."

- 1.2 Defendant is a corporation that employs 10 or more persons and manufactured, distributed and/or sold vinyl gloves in California (the "Products").
- 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 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 of 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

- 2.1 Reformulation Standard Removal of DEHP. Upon mutual execution of this Agreement (the "Compliance Date"), Defendant 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, 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."
- 2.2 Certification From Suppliers. Defendant shall issue specifications to its 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 any Listed Phthalate in excess of trace amounts.
- 2.3 Defendant's Testing. In order to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 2.1, Defendant shall cause to be conducted testing to confirm that Products sold do not contain any Listed Phthalate in excess of trace amounts. 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 one of the following test protocols:

(1) EPA SW8270C and EPA SW3580A, or (2) ASTM D3421-75 (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 on a confidential basis.

2.3.1 Testing Frequency. For each of the first two orders of Products purchased from each of Defendant's suppliers after the Compliance Date, but within calendar year 2011, Defendant shall randomly select and test one glove from each such supplier of the Products intended for sale. Thereafter, beginning with calendar year 2012, Defendant shall, once each year, randomly select and test one glove from each of its suppliers of the Products.

Defendant has the right to conduct additional testing, but is not obligated by the terms of this consent order to do so.

2.3.2 Products That Contain Listed Phthalates Pursuant to

Defendant's Testing. If the results of the testing required pursuant to Section 2.3 show Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts 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; and (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.

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 either of the Test Protocols. In the event that CEH's testing under either of the Testing Protocols demonstrates that the Products contain Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts subsequent to the Compliance Date, CEH shall inform Defendant in a reasonably prompt manner 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 tests demonstrating the presence of Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts in the Products. The payments shall be made to CEH and used for the purposes described in Section 3.2.

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 Occurrence of Defendant selling a Product containing Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts after the Compliance Date:

First Occurrence:

\$500

Second Occurrence:

\$750

Third Occurrence:

\$1,000

Thereafter:

\$2,500

In the event that Defendant provides information, in accordance with Section 2.4, that it believes demonstrates its compliance with Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of the Consent Judgment, and CEH disputes such a claim, CEH shall have the burden of demonstrating that stipulated penalties are warranted by proving noncompliance with Sections 2.2 and 2.3 by a preponderance of the evidence. As used in this Section 2.4.1, the sale of any number of Products from a single lot shall constitute an "Occurrence," provided however that if Products from more than one lot are tested, or are collected for testing, by or on behalf of CEH under Section 2.4 during the same Testing Period and are subject to stipulated penalties in this Section 2.4.1, all of those Products shall fall within a single Occurrence. As used this Section 2.4.1, a "Testing Period" refers to a period of 60 days or less.

3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

- 3.1 Penalty. Defendant shall pay to CEH \$1,000 as a penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b). CEH shall apportion such payment in accordance with Health and Safety Code §25249.12.
- 3.2 Monetary Payment in Lieu of Penalty. Defendant shall pay to CEH \$4,500 in lieu of any additional 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.

divisions, directors, officers, employees, agents, attorneys, distributors, wholesalers, customers

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.

26

27

28

	ļ				
1	or retailers (collectively, "Defendant Releasees") based on failure to warn about alleged				
2	exposures to DEHP resulting from any Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Defendant				
3	("Covered Claims") on or prior to the date of entry of this Consent Judgment. CEH, its				
4	directors, officers, employees and attorneys hereby release all Covered Claims against Defendant				
5	Releasees. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with				
6	Proposition 65 with regard to exposures to Listed Phthalates from the Products sold after the				
7	Compliance Date. Any alleged violation of Proposition 65 with regard to exposures to Listed				
8	Phthalates from the Products shall be resolved before the Superior Court of the State of				
9	California for the County of San Francisco that is issuing this Consent Judgment (the "Court").				
10	8.	SEVI	ERABILITY		
11		8.1	In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held		
12	by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely				
13	affected.				
14	9.	9. GOVERNING LAW			
15		9.1	The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the		
16	State of California.				
17	10.	RET	ENTION OF JURISDICTION		
18		10.1	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce		
19	the terms this Consent Judgment and to adjudicate any claims pursuant to Proposition 65				
20	regarding ex	posures	to Listed Phthalates from the Products, made by CEH, or by any other		
21	claimant.	~			
22	11.	PRO	VISION OF NOTICE		
23		11.1	All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and		
24	correspondence shall be sent to the following:				
25	For CEH:		Mark N. Todzo		
26			Lexington Law Group		
27			1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122		
28					

For Defendant: Michael J. Partos 2 Cozen O'Connor Suite 3700 3 601 S. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, California 90017 4 **COURT APPROVAL** 12. 5 CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of Health and 6 Safety Code § 25249.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations § 3003. If this 7 Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect. 8 **EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS** 13. 9 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts 10 and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. 11 14. AUTHORIZATION 12 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully 14.1 13 authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter 14 into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that 15 party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this 16 Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and 17 costs. 18 19 **AGREED TO:** 20 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 21 Dated: 5/12/11 22 23 Charlie Pizarro Associate Director 24

25

26

27

28

1	ROYAL PAPER PRODUCTS, INC.				
2	Dated: 5-10-1	1			
3					
4	[Name]				
5	5 DIRECTOR IMPORT PROBRAM [Title]				
6	6				
7	7				
8	8				
9	9				
10	10				
11					
12	12				
13	13				
14	14				
15	15				
16	16				
17	17				
18	18				
19	19				
20	20				
21	21				
22	22				
23	23				
24	24				
25	25				
26	26				
27	27				
28	28				

ORDER AND JUDGMENT Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and Defendant Royal Paper Products, Inc., the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with the terms herein. JUL 1 2 2011 Judge, Superior Court of the State of California