-1-

[PROFOSED] ORDER RE: APPROVAL OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

7 8

9

AS YOU SOW,

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

2526

27

28

LA1 2581209v.2

Printed on Recycled Paper

RECEIVED

DEC 31 2012

ROOM 102

REC'D

AUG 19 2013

ORIGINAL FILED

DEC 022013 46

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT

# SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Plaintiff,
v.

NATURE'S SUNSHINE PRODUCTS, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. BC497900

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT NATURE'S SUNSHINE PRODUCTS, INC.

Complaint Filed: 12/21/12

Dept.: 16

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between As You Sow, plaintiff in this matter (hereinafter "AYS" or "Plaintiff"), and defendant Nature's Sunshine Products, Inc. (hereinafter "Defendant") pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et. seq. ("Proposition 65").

- 1. <u>Definitions</u>. As used in this Consent Judgment, the following definitions shall apply:
- 1.1 "Products" include consumer creams, gels and/or lotion products, manufactured by or on behalf of Defendant for sale in California or to California consumers containing progesterone as an ingredient. Progesterone is a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer ("Progesterone").
- 1.2 "Products" shall also include any future Products that are manufactured by or on behalf of Defendant for sale in California or to California consumers under any product name or brand, whether a current or new name and/or brand.

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

.

AS YOU SOW/NATURE'S SUNSHINE PRODUCTS, INC

1.3 Plaintiff and Defendants will be referred to collectively as the "Parties" or individually as a "Party"

#### 2. Background.

- 2.1 Plaintiff AYS is a non-profit California corporation dedicated to, among other causes, the protection of the environment, the promotion of human health, the improvement of worker and consumer rights, environmental education and corporate accountability. AYS is based in Oakland, California and is incorporated under the laws of the State of California. AYS represents the public interest under Proposition 65 in this matter.
  - 2.2 Defendant is a Utah corporation in good standing.
- 2.3 Defendant manufactures, distributes, and sells topical creams containing Progesterone.
- 2.4 On or about March 20, 2012 Plaintiff sent Defendant a notice letter alleging a violation of Proposition 65 due to the failure to warn regarding progesterone in "Pro G Yam" (the "Notice"). The Parties met and conferred through counsel after receipt of this Notice.
- 2.5 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff intends to file this Consent Judgment and a complaint styled As You Sow v. Nature's Sunshine Products, Inc., et al., in the Los Angeles County Superior Court (the "Complaint").
- 2.6 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of the violations contained in the Notice and the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts or omissions alleged in the Complaint; that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment.
- 2.7 Defendant denies that the Products have been or are in violation of any law, and further contends that all Products have been and are safe for use as directed. Defendant expressly denies any violation under Proposition 65. The Parties desire to resolve this matter (including the Notice, Complaint and all related matters as set forth herein) without further litigation or cost.
  - 2.8 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain disputed claims as

alleged in the Notice and the Complaint, to avoid prolonged and costly litigation, and to promote the public interest. By executing and complying with this Consent Judgment, no Party admits any facts, any violations of law, or any conclusions of law including, but not limited to, any facts or conclusions of law regarding any violations of Proposition 65, or any other statutory, common law or equitable claim or requirement relating to or arising from Defendant's Products. This Consent Judgment shall not be construed as an admission by Defendants as to any of the allegations in the Notice or the Complaint.

#### 3. Injunctive Relief.

3.1 <u>Sale of Products Requires a Warning</u>. Effective when, in the ordinary course of business, new labels for the Products are printed, or after March 1, 2013, whichever is the earlier, Defendant shall place the following warning prominently on the label of each of Defendant's Products sold to, or offered for sale to, California consumers:

"WARNING: This product contains Progesterone, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. [Consult with your physician before using this product.]"

The text in [brackets] is optional in Defendant's sole discretion.

- 3.2 No warning shall be required for the Products which are not sold to California consumers. If Defendant permanently ceases to manufacture, distribute or sell the Products to California consumers, this Consent Judgment shall terminate. Defendant need not apply the warning text in Section 3.1 to Products which already have left Defendant's possession and thus are in the stream of commerce prior to the date of entry of this Consent Judgment, or to Products sold before the new labels for those Products are printed and the Parties agree Plaintiff's release of claims in Section 5 below encompasses such Products.
- 3.3 By March 1, 2013 Defendant agrees to amend its "Nature's Sunshine Policies and Procedures" to add the following text: "Certain NSP products may not be sold to California consumers unless NSP has labeled the product for the California market. Due to the complexity and uniqueness of California laws, such as Proposition 65, the Company urges all Members to allow the

Company to fulfill orders destined for California. If a Member instead elects to sell any NSP product in California, or directly to a California consumer, that Member is responsible for meeting all legal standards, and the Member will indemnify NSP against any claims or liabilities arising from such sale. Any questions regarding whether a NSP product is labeled for the California market should be referred to the NSP Legal Department before making any sale or shipment. Orders by California consumers that are fulfilled by the Company will remain the Company's responsibility." Defendant may modify for clarity or accuracy in detail this proposed text prior to use by March 1, 2013, but any such proposed modifications shall be provided to Plaintiff for review before January 31, 2013. Defendant may amend its policies and procedures from time to time, but the foregoing text (unless modified with Plaintiff's consent prior to March 1, 2013) shall remain in the "Nature's Sunshine Policies and Procedures" until at least January 1, 2015. Thereafter, Defendant may modify the text from time to time, so long as substantially similar text with regard to Proposition 65 labeling requirements remain in the "Nature's Sunshine Policies and Procedures" while this Consent Judgment remains in effect.

3.4 Compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute compliance with Proposition65 regarding Progesterone in the Products.

### 4. Financial Settlement and Attorney's Fee Payments.

4.1 As consideration for the matters resolved herein, Defendant shall pay to AYS the sum of \$3,000.00 as a civil penalty, and \$20,500.00 in full resolution of Plaintiff's attorney's fees and costs in this matter. The payment in full shall be delivered to Gideon Kracov within fifteen (15) calendar days after the date of notice of entry of this Consent Judgment. AYS shall be responsible for compliance with Health & Safety Code Section 25249.12(d).

## 5. <u>Claims Covered and Released.</u>

This Consent Judgment includes the resolution of actual and potential claims that were considered or could have been brought by Plaintiff on its own behalf, and on behalf of the public interest, regarding the alleged failure to provide clear, reasonable and lawful warnings of exposure to Progesterone in Defendant's Products. This Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution

between Plaintiff and Defendant of any and all alleged violations of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted by Plaintiff on its own behalf and on behalf of the public interest arising from or related to Defendant's Products up through the date of entry of this Consent Judgment, including, but not limited to any claims for attorneys' fees and costs. Plaintiff accordingly hereby releases Defendant and Defendant's predecessors, successors, affiliates, assigns, suppliers, distributors, contract manufacturers, retailers, members and the officers, directors, employees, shareholders, and counsel of each of them, from and against the claims described in this paragraph or the extent such claims do, did, or could arise from or relate to Defendant's Products and, for avoidance of doubt, Plaintiff's release of claims includes sales to California consumers of those Products referenced in the final sentence of Section 3.2. Defendant hereby releases AYS from and against any and all claims arising out of AYS' filing or prosecution of this action. Each Party respectively waives any right to appeal or other review of this Consent Judgment, except as expressly provided in this Consent Judgment.

- 6. Covenant Not to Sue. Plaintiff and Defendant covenant and agree that with regard to those maters the Parties have herein released and that are described above, neither AYS nor Defendant will ever institute a lawsuit or administrative proceedings against the other, nor shall AYS or Defendant assert any claim of any nature against any person or entity hereby released with regard to any such matters which have been released. However, nothing in this paragraph shall be interpreted to preclude enforcement of this Consent Judgment pursuant to Section 7 below.
- Enforcement of Consent Judgment. Any Party may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Los Angeles, enforce this Consent Judgment. To enforce this Consent Judgment any Party must first give written notice of any violation of this Consent Judgment alleged to have occurred, to the Party alleged to be in violation. The Parties shall meet and confer in good faith and attempt to resolve the alleged violation. If a resolution is not reached within thirty (30) days of the date of the notice, the aggrieved Party may move the Court to hear and resolve the dispute. The prevailing Party in any proceeding brought to enforce this Consent Judgment shall be entitled to recover from the other Party the prevailing party's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs

.28

incurred in the investigation and prosecution of such an enforcement proceeding.

- Application of Consent Judgment. Section 3, 5 and 6 of this Consent Judgment shall apply to, be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of the Parties and their divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, affiliates, successors, predecessors and assigns, and the directors, officers, employees, legal counsel, and agents of each of them, as applicable, and will inure to the benefit of the Parties' parent companies, all suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers and contract manufacturers of Defendant's Products, and all of their respective directors, officers, employees, legal counsel, and agents.
- 9. <u>Modification/Termination of Consent Judgment</u>. This Consent Judgment may be modified or terminated upon written agreement of Defendant and AYS, with approval of the Court, or upon noticed motion for good cause shown. If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court within 120 days of execution by all Parties, it shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Parties. Any Party may withdraw from this Consent Judgment before it is entered by the Court if the Office of Attorney General objects in writing to any term herein and the Parties do not mutually agree to resolve said objection to the satisfaction of the Attorney General prior to approval of this Consent Judgment by the Court; upon such withdrawal, this Consent Judgment shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect.
- 10. <u>Governing Law.</u> This Consent Judgment shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with, the laws of the State of California. AYS shall comply with the obligations under Proposition 65 to lodge this settlement with the Office of the Attorney General.
- Entire Agreement. The Parties declare and represent that no promise, inducement or other agreement has been made conferring any benefit upon any party except those contained herein and that Consent Judgment contains the entire agreement pertaining to the subject matter hereof. This Consent Judgment supersedes any prior or contemporaneous negotiations, representations, agreements and understandings of the Parties with respect to such matters, whether written or oral. Parol evidence shall be inadmissible to show agreement by, between or among the Parties to any term or condition contrary to or in addition to the terms and conditions contained in this Consent

Judgment. The Parties acknowledge that each has not relied on any promise, representation or warranty, expressed or implied, not contained in this Consent Judgment.

- Challenges. Subject to their rights to apply for a modification of this Consent Judgment for good cause shown under Section 9 hereof, the Parties agree that they, individually or collectively, will not seek to challenge or to have determined invalid, void or unenforceable any provision of this Consent Judgment or this Consent Judgment itself. The Parties understand that this Consent Judgment contains the relinquishment of legal rights and each Party has, as each has deemed appropriate, sought the advice of legal counsel, which each of the Parties has encouraged the other to seek. Further, no Party has reposed trust or confidence in any other Party so as to create a fiduciary, agency or confidential relationship.
- Construction. This Consent Judgment has been jointly negotiated and drafted. The language of this Consent Judgment shall be construed as a whole according to this fair meaning and not strictly for or against any Party.
- Authority to Stipulate to Consent Judgment. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment represents and warrants that each signatory has all requisite power, authority and legal right necessary to execute and deliver this Consent Judgment and to perform and carry out the actions contemplated by this Consent Judgment. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment represents that each has been duly authorized to execute this Consent Judgment. No other or further authorization or approval from any person will be required for the validity and enforceability of the provisions of this Consent Judgment, except entry by the Court.
- 15. <u>Cooperation and Further Assurances</u>. The Parties hereby will execute such other documents and take such other actions as may be necessary to further the purposes and fulfill the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 16. <u>Counterparts</u>. This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and has the same force and effect as if all the signatures were obtained in one document.
- 17. Notices.

17.1 All correspondence and notices shall be delivered using an overnight delivery service

AS YOU SOW/NATURE'S SUNSHINE PRODUCTS, INC.

Printed on Recycled Paper

11		
1	mr ro go comprir i men	
2	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
3		
1	Date: 12/17, 2012	AS YOU SOW
5	Date: 10,17 , 2012	AS TOO SOW
5		By: //
,	· ·	By. // / / / /
ı		
	Date: , 2012	NATURE'S SUNSHINE, INC.
	, 2012	
-	•	Ву:
-	·	
	IT IS SO ORDERED,	AND JUDGED, AND DECREED.
	DATED:	
		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
		1000FOLTIF 201 EVIOV COOKT
,		
		9 [PROFOSED] CONSENT JUDG AS YOU SOW/NATURE'S SUNSHINE PRODUCT

1 2	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
3		
4	Date:, 2012	AS YOU SOW
5		
6		Ву:
7		
8		
9		
10	Date: December 17, 2012	NATURE'S SÜNSHINE, INC.
11	•	Q . 1
12		By: John M. Boh
13   14		
15		
16		
17	IT IS SO ORDERED	, AND JUDGED, AND DECREED.
18	DATED: Dec 7, ZO13	
- 11		
19		
į		Manil Buck
20		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
20 21		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  DANIEL BUCKIEY
20 21 22		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  DANIEL BUCKIEG
20   21   22   23		JOHNIEL BUCKIEY
20   21   22   23   24		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  DANIEL BUCKIEY
20   21   22   23   24   25		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT DANIEL BUCKIEY
20   21   22   23   24   25   26		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT DANIEL BUCKIEY
19   20   21   22   23   24   25   26   27   28		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT DANIEL BUCKIEY

# PROOF OF SERVICE

1	TROOF OF BERVICE		
2	I, Gideon Kracov, being duly sworn, deposes and says:		
3	I am a citizen of the United States and work in Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is: 801 S. Grand Ave., 11 <sup>th</sup> Fl., LA, CA 90017. The person identified below was served with the following documents on August 19, 2013:		
5 6	Motion to Approve Proposed Consent Judgment & Kracov Decl., Proposed Consent Judgment, Proposed Order  The document was served on:  Judith M. Praitis, Esq. Sidley Austin, LLP 555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000 Los Angeles, CA 90013 jpraitis@Sidley.com		
7			
8			
9			
10	Harrison Pollak		
11	Deputy Attorney General 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor P.O. Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612		
12			
13	Harrison.Pollak@doj.ca.gov		
14	X by email on August 19, 2013		
15	_X_ by placing a true copy on April 19, 2013 thereof enclosed in a sealed		
16	envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Post Office mail box at 801 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles, California, addressed		
17	as set forth above. I am readily familiar with my firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with the U.S.		
18	aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if post		
19	cancellation date of postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.		
20			
21			
22	that the foregoing is true and correct.		
23	Executed this 8/1, 2013 at Los Angeles, California.		
24			
25	Gideon Kracov		
26			
27			

28

## PROOF OF SERVICE

1				
2	I, Gideon Kracov, being duly sworn, deposes and says:			
3	I am a citizen of the United States and work in Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is: 801 S. Grand Ave., 11 <sup>th</sup> Fl., LA, CA 90017. The person identified below was served with the following documents:			
5	Signed Consent Judgment and Order			
6	The document was served on:			
7	Judith M. Praitis, Esq.			
8	Sidley Austin, LLP 555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000			
9	Los Angeles, CA 90013 jpraitis@Sidley.com			
10				
11	<u>X</u> by email on December 2, 2013			
12	_X_ by placing a true copy on December 2, 2013 thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Post			
13	Office mail box at 801 S. Grand Ave., Los Angeles, California, addressed as set forth above. I am readily familiar with my firm's practice of collection			
14	and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the same day in the ordinary course of business. I am			
15	aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date of postage meter date is more than 1 day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.			
16	deposit for mailing in amdavit.			
17				
18	I declare under penalty of perjury, according to the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.			
19	Executed this, 2013 at Los Angeles, California.			
20				
21	Gideon Kracov			
22				
23				
24				
25				
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>				
28				