

aubing

FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY OCT 2 9 2014

CLERK OF THE SURERIOR COURT

Depuny

5

3

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

al.,

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

2526

27

28

DOCUMENT PREPARED
ON RECYCLED PAPER

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

Case No. RG14733545

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO JELLY BELLY CANDY COMPANY, SWEET CANDY, LLC AND DALLO & CO., INC.

Kry

Defendants.

CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,

KOOKABURRA LICORICE COMPANY, et

Plaintiff,

٧.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Parties to this Consent Judgment are the Center For Environmental Health, a California non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and the companies identified on Exhibit A (collectively, the "Settling Defendants"). Exhibit A further identifies the Settling Defendants as either Manufacturer Settling Defendants or Retailer/Distributor Settling Defendants. Plaintiff and Settling Defendants are defined as the "Parties." The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment

-1-

to settle certain claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendants as set forth in the operative complaint (the "Complaint") in the above-captioned matter. This Consent Judgment covers confectionery licorice products ("Licorice Products") sold or offered for sale by Settling Defendants.

- 1.2 Beginning in late 2012 and continuing through the present, CEH has served multiple 60-day Notices of Violation under Proposition 65, alleging that entities including Settling Defendants violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to lead and lead compounds ("Lead") contained in Licorice Products without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.3 Each Settling Defendant is a corporation that manufactures, distributes, sells or offers for sale Licorice Products in the State of California or has done so in the past.
 - On or about July 17, 2014, CEH filed the original Complaint in this matter.
- 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, CEH and Settling Defendants (the "Parties") stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, 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 with respect to Licorice Products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Settling Defendants.
- 1.6 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is or 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 any other pending or future legal proceedings. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties solely for purposes of settling, compromising, and resolving issues disputed in this Action.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

2.1 **Reformulation Level.** The Reformulation Level for Licorice Products is 35 parts per billion ("ppb") or less of Lead by weight. Such concentrations shall be determined by use of a test using ICP-MS equipment with a level of detection of at least 20 ppb that meets standard laboratory QA/QC requirements ("Test Protocol").¹

2.2 Specification Notice to Vendors of Reformulation Level. To the extent it has not already done so, no more than thirty (30) days after the date of entry of this Consent Judgment ("Effective Date"), each Settling Defendant that purchases Licorice Products from a third party shall provide the Reformulation Levels to each of its Licorice Products suppliers that are not Settling Defendants and shall instruct each such Licorice Products supplier to provide it with Licorice Products that do not exceed the Reformulation Levels. If during the next five (5) year period, a Settling Defendant purchases Licorice Products from a third party that it has not previously provided with instructions regarding the Reformulation Levels, the Settling Defendant shall provide the Reformulation Levels to the new Licorice Product supplier when placing an initial order for Licorice Products and instruct the new Licorice Product supplier to provide it with Licorice Products that do not exceed the Reformulation Levels. Each Settling Defendant shall retain records of communications sent to and received from suppliers that reflect its compliance with the communication requirements of this Section for a period of three (3) years and shall make such records available to CEH on reasonable request.

2.3 **Reformulation of Licorice Products**: After the Effective Date, Manufacturer Settling Defendants shall not manufacture, purchase, ship, offer for sale, sell or otherwise introduce into the California marketplace any Licorice Products that do not meet the Reformulation Level. In addition, Manufacturer Settling Defendants and CEH agree that after December 1, 2014, Manufacturer Settling Defendants shall not ship, offer for sale, sell or otherwise introduce into the United States marketplace outside California any Licorice Products

¹ Sampling to assess compliance with the Reformulation Levels shall be based on testing of either an aggregate of all licorice contained in a single and discrete package, bag or box as is typically sold in retail, or the average results of any multiple test results from the same aggregate sample.

that do not meet the Reformulation Level.

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

2.4 Good Faith Commitment to Further Lead Reduction: During the three (3) years following the Effective Date, each Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall continue in good faith to attempt to further reduce the Lead content of its Licorice Products until such Licorice Products have a consistent Lead content of less than 13 ppb. These efforts shall include, at a minimum, efforts to further adjust recipes and formulas that will reduce Lead content in finished Licorice Products and attempts to secure Licorice Product ingredients with lower Lead content. On each of the first three anniversaries of the Effective Date, each Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall submit to CEH a written report of the activities it has undertaken to effectuate its good faith commitment to further reduction of the Lead content of its Licorice Products. If a Manufacturer Settling Defendant has test results demonstrating that all of its Licorice Products have a consistent Lead content of less than 13 ppb, it shall provide such documentation to CEH and the parties shall meet and confer and if CEH and the Manufacturer Settling Defendant agree that all of the Manufacturer Settling Defendant's Licorice Products have a consistent Lead content of less than 13 ppb, that Manufacturer Settling Defendant need not submit any subsequent annual report to CEH regarding further reduction of Lead content of its Licorice Products. If the Parties fail to agree, the Manufacturer Settling Defendant may seek relief from the Court upon a showing consistent with this Section.

3. ENFORCEMENT

3.1 **General Enforcement Provisions.** CEH may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Any action to enforce alleged violations of Section 2.3 by a Settling Defendant shall be brought exclusively pursuant to this Section 3, and as applicable be subject to the meet and confer requirement of Section 3.2.4.

3.2 **Enforcement of Reformulation Commitment.**

3.2.1 **Notice of Violation.** In the event that, at any time following the relevant dates set out in Section 2.3, CEH identifies a Licorice Product manufactured, distributed,

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

or sold by a Manufacturer Settling Defendant for which CEH has laboratory test results showing that the Manufacturer Settling Defendant violated Section 2.3, CEH may issue a Notice of Violation pursuant to this Section.

3.2.2 Service of Notice of Violation and Supporting Documentation.

3.2.2.1 Subject to Section 3.2.1, the Notice of Violation shall be sent to the person(s) identified in Exhibit A to receive notices for the Manufacturer Settling Defendant, and must be served within 45 days of the date the Licorice Products at issue were purchased or otherwise acquired by CEH, provided, however, that CEH may have up to an additional 45 days to send the Notice of Violation if, notwithstanding CEH's good faith efforts, the test data required by Section 3.2.2.2 below cannot be obtained by CEH from its laboratory before expiration of the initial 45 day period.

3.2.2.2 The Notice of Violation shall, at a minimum, set forth: (a) the date the alleged violation was observed, (b) the location at which the Licorice Products were offered for sale, (c) a description of the Licorice Products giving rise to the alleged violation, including the name and address of the retail store where the sample was obtained and if available information that identifies the product lot, such as the "best by" or "sell by" date, and (d) all test data² obtained by CEH regarding the Licorice Products and supporting documentation sufficient for validation of the test results, including any laboratory reports, quality assurance reports and quality control reports associated with testing of the Licorice Products. Such Notice of Violation shall be based upon the Test Protocol. Wipe, swipe, swab and X-ray fluorescence testing are not sufficient to support a Notice of Violation. As an alternative, CEH may rely on testing conducted and published by the California Department of Public Health ("CDPH") to support a Notice of Violation, so long as CEH first obtains a full description of the Licorice Product tested, including any information that is available from CDPH that would identify the product lot, such as a "best by" or "sell by" date, and makes a good faith attempt to obtain information on the location at which the Licorice Product was offered for sale, and the date the product was obtained by CDPH.

25

26

To support a Notice of Violation, CEH shall provide a minimum of two tests per Notice of Violation.

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

CEH shall share any such information with the Manufacturer Settling Defendant. Should CEH be
unable to obtain any such information, the Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall contact CDPH
and request such information and shall share such information with CEH upon receipt from
CDPH.

3.2.3 **Notice of Election of Response.** No more than 30 days after service of a Notice of Violation, the Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall provide written notice to CEH whether it elects to contest the allegations contained in a Notice of Violation ("Notice of Election"). Failure to provide a Notice of Election within 30 days of service of a Notice of Violation shall be deemed an election to contest the Notice of Violation.

3.2.3.1 If a Notice of Violation is contested, the Notice of Election shall include all then-available documentary evidence regarding the alleged violation, including all test data, if any. If the Manufacturer Settling Defendant or CEH later acquires additional test or other data regarding the alleged violation, it shall notify the other party and promptly provide all such data or information to the party. Any test data used to contest a Notice of Violation shall meet the criteria of Section 3.2.2.2.

3.2.4 **Meet and Confer.** If a Notice of Violation is contested, CEH and the Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall meet and confer to attempt to resolve their dispute. Within 30 days of serving a Notice of Election contesting a Notice of Violation, and if no enforcement action or application has been filed by CEH pursuant to Section 3.1, the Manufacturer Settling Defendant may withdraw the original Notice of Election contesting the violation and serve a new Notice of Election conceding the violation, provided however that the Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall pay \$2,500 in addition to any payment required under this Consent Judgment. At any time, CEH may withdraw a Notice of Violation, in which case for purposes of this Section 3.2 the result shall be as if CEH never issued any such Notice of Violation. If no informal resolution of a Notice of Violation results within 30 days of a Notice of Election to contest, CEH may file an enforcement motion or application pursuant to Section 3.1. In any such proceeding, CEH may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, attorneys' fees or other

remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment.

3.2.5 **Non-Contested Matters.** If the Manufacturer Settling Defendant elects not to contest the allegations in a Notice of Violation, it shall identify on a confidential basis to CEH (by proper name, address of principal place of business and telephone number) the person or entity that sold the Licorice Products to the Manufacturer Settling Defendant and the manufacturer and other entities in the chain of distribution of the Licorice Product, provided that such information is reasonably available. In addition, the Settling Defendant shall undertake corrective action and make payments, if any, as set forth below.

3.2.5.1 If the test data provided by CEH in support of the Notice of Violation reports a Lead content in a Licorice Product above the Reformulation Level but less than 70 ppb, then the Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall take the following corrective action and make the following payments, if any:

(a) The Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall include in its Notice of Election a detailed description with supporting documentation of the corrective action that it has undertaken or proposes to undertake to address the alleged violation. Any such correction shall, at a minimum, provide reasonable assurance that the Manufacturer Settling Defendant has stopped selling or offering for sale in California all Licorice Products having the same lot number or lot identifier, such as "best by" or "sell by" date, as that of the Licorice Products identified in CEH's Notice of Violation. The Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall make available to CEH for inspection and/or copying records and correspondence regarding the corrective action. If there is a dispute over the corrective action, the Manufacturer Settling Defendant and CEH shall meet and confer pursuant to Section 3.2.4 before seeking any remedy in court. Provided, that in no case shall Plaintiffs issue more than one NOV per manufacturing lot of Licorice Products.

(b) If the Notice of Violation is the first or second Notice of Violation received by a Manufacturer Settling Defendant under Section 3.2.5.1 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, no payment shall be required by that Manufacturer Settling Defendant. If the Notice of Violation is the third, fourth or fifth Notice of Violation received by a

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	

Manufacturer Settling Defendant under Section 3.2.5.1 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall pay \$2,500 for each Notice of Violation. If a Manufacturer Settling Defendant has received more than five Notices of Violation under Section 3.2.5.1 that were not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall pay \$5,000 for each subsequent Notice of Violation. If a Manufacturer Settling Defendant produces with its Notice of Election Test Data from the manufacturer or supplier of the Licorice Product that: (i) was conducted prior to the date CEH purchased the Licorice Product that is the subject of the Notice of Violation; (ii) was conducted on Licorice Product that was from the same manufacturing lot as the Licorice Product that is the subject of the Notice of Violation; and (iii) demonstrates Lead levels below the Reformulation Level, then any payment under this Section shall be decreased by fifty percent.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 3.2.5.1(b), if the Notice of Violation was based on a Licorice Product that was sold outside of California, there shall be no payment pursuant to this Section.

3.2.5.2 If the test data provided by CEH in support of the Notice of Violation reports a Lead content in a Licorice Product of more than 70 ppb, then the Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall take the following corrective action and make the following payments:

(a) The Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall include in its Notice of Election a detailed description with supporting documentation of the corrective action that it has undertaken or proposes to undertake to address the alleged violation. Any such correction shall, at a minimum, provide reasonable assurance that the Manufacturer Settling Defendant has stopped selling or offering for sale all Licorice Products having the same lot number or lot identifier, such as "best by" or "sell by" date, as that of the Licorice Product identified in CEH's Notice of Violation (the "Noticed Licorice Products"), removed the Noticed Licorice Product from the market and sent instructions to any of its stores and/or customers that offer the Noticed Licorice Products for sale to cease offering the Noticed Licorice Products for sale and to either return all Noticed Licorice Products to the Manufacturer Settling Defendant for destruction, or to directly

1	dest
2	avai
3	with
4	corr
5	seek
6	man
7	
8	rece
9	cont
10	the I
11	Man
12	with
13	a Ma
14	3.2.5
15	shal
16	with
17	that:
18	the l
19	man
20	dem
21	shal
22	
23	chec
24	Noti
25	inve
26	attoı

destroy the Noticed Licorice Products. The Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall keep and make available to CEH for inspection and copying records and correspondence regarding the market withdrawal and destruction of the Noticed Licorice Products. If there is a dispute over the corrective action, the Manufacturer Settling Defendant and CEH shall meet and confer before seeking any remedy in court. In no case shall Plaintiff issue more than one NOV per manufacturing lot of Licorice Product.

(b) If the Notice of Violation is the first Notice of Violation received by a Manufacturer Settling Defendant under Section 3.2.5.2 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, no payment shall be required by that Manufacturer Settling Defendant. If the Notice of Violation is the second, third or fourth Notice of Violation received by a Manufacturer Settling Defendant under Section 3.2.5.2 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall pay \$8,000 for each Notice of Violation. If a Manufacturer Settling Defendant has received more than four Notices of Violation under Section 3.2.5.2 that were not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Manufacturer Settling Defendant shall pay \$12,000 for each Notice of Violation. If a Manufacturer Settling Defendant produces with its Notice of Election Test Data from the manufacturer or supplier of the Licorice Product that: (i) was conducted prior to the date CEH purchased the Licorice Product that is the subject of the Notice of Violation; (ii) was conducted on Licorice Product that was from the same manufacturing lot as the Licorice Product that is the subject of the Notice of Violation; and (iii) demonstrates Lead levels below the Reformulation Level, then any payment under this Section shall be decreased by fifty percent.

3.2.6 **Payments.** Any payments under Section 3.2 shall be made by check payable to the "Lexington Law Group" and shall be paid within 30 days of service of a Notice of Election triggering a payment and which shall be used as reimbursement for costs for investigating, preparing, sending and prosecuting Notices of Violation, and to reimburse attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with these activities.

3.2.7 **Repeat Violations**. If a Manufacturer Settling Defendant has

received four or more Notices of Violation that were not successfully contested or withdrawn in any 12-month period then, at CEH's option, CEH may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, attorneys' fees or other remedies that are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. Prior to seeking such relief, CEH shall meet and confer with the Manufacturer Settling Defendant for at least 30 days to determine if the Manufacturer Settling Defendant and CEH can agree on measures that the Manufacturer Settling Defendant can undertake to prevent future violations.

4. PAYMENTS

- 4.1 **Payments by Settling Defendants.** Within five (5) days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, payment shall be made in the amount provided for that Settling Defendant on Exhibit A as further set forth in this Section.
- Allocation of Payments. The total settlement amount for each Settling Defendant shall be paid in three separate checks in the amounts specified on Exhibit A and delivered to the offices of the Lexington Law Group (Attn: Eric S. Somers), 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, California 94117. Any failure by a Settling Defendant to comply with the payment terms herein shall be subject to a stipulated late fee in the amount of \$100 for each day after the delivery date the payment is received. The late fees required under this Section shall be recoverable, together with reasonable attorneys' fees, in an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment. The funds paid by each Settling Defendant shall be allocated as set forth on Exhibit A for each Settling Defendant between the following categories and made payable as follows:
- 4.2.1 A civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b). CEH shall apportion this payment in accordance with Health & Safety Code § 25249.12 (25% to CEH and 75% to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). Accordingly, the civil penalty payment check for the amount designated for each Settling Defendant on Exhibit A as Civil Penalty shall be made payable to the "Center for Environmental Health" and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981.

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

1

4.2.2 A payment in lieu of civil penalty to CEH pursuant to Health & Safety
Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3203(b). CEH shall use such
funds to continue its work educating and protecting people from exposures to toxic chemicals,
including heavy metals. In addition, as part of its Community Environmental Action and Justice
Fund, CEH will use four percent of such funds to award grants to grassroots environmental justice
groups working to educate and protect people from exposures to toxic chemicals. The method of
selection of such groups can be found at the CEH web site at www.ceh.org/justicefund. The
payment pursuant to this Section shall be made payable to the Center For Environmental Health
and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981.

4.2.3 A reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The attorneys' fees and costs reimbursement check shall be made payable to the Lexington Law Group and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3317175.

5. MODIFICATION AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- 5.1 **Modification.** This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties, with the approval of the Court, or by an order of this Court upon motion and in accordance with law.
- 5.2 **Notice; Meet and Confer.** Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with all affected Parties prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

6. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

6.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and each Settling Defendant, and their parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, shareholders and their successors and assigns, and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities other than those listed in Exhibit B to which a Settling Defendant distributes or sells Licorice Products, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, repackagers, franchisees, licensors and licensees ("Downstream Releasees"), of any violation of

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to Lead contained in Licorice Products that were sold by a Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.

- 6.2 The release set forth in Section 6.1 shall also apply to Licorice Products sold by a Retailer/Distributor Settling Defendant that were purchased prior to April 1, 2014 but sold thereafter.
- 6.3 CEH, acting in the public interest, releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims against each Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 that has been or could have been asserted regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead arising in connection with Licorice Products manufactured, distributed or sold by a Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 6.4 CEH, for itself only, releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims against each Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claim that has been or could have been asserted regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead arising in connection with Licorice Products manufactured, distributed or sold by a Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 6.5 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by a Manufacturer Settling Defendant and that Settling Defendant's Defendant Releasees shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by such Settling Defendant, that Settling Defendant's Defendant Releasees and that Settling Defendant's Downstream Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to warn about Lead in Licorice Products manufactured, distributed or sold by that Settling Defendant after the Effective Date.
- 6.6 Nothing in this Consent Judgment affects CEH's right to commence or prosecute an action under Proposition 65 against any person other than a Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, or Downstream Releasees. Nothing in this Consent Judgment affects CEH's right to commence or prosecute an action under Proposition 65 against a Settling Defendant related to exposure to Lead from Licorice Products that do not meet the Reformulation Levels

1	after the dates set out in Section 2.3.
2	7. PROVISION OF NOTICE
3	7.1 When CEH is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment,
4	the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to: Eric S. Somers
56	Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117
7	esomers@lexlawgroup.com
8	7.2 When a Settling Defendant is entitled to receive any notice under this
9	Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to the person(s)
10	identified in Exhibit A for each such Settling Defendant.
11	7.3 Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be
12	sent by sending the other Party notice by first class and electronic mail.
13	8. COURT APPROVAL
14	8.1 This Consent Judgment shall become effective on the Effective Date. CEH
15	shall prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendants
16	shall support approval of such Motion.
17	8.2 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force
18	or effect and shall not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any
19	purpose, other than to allow the Court to determine if there was a material breach of Section 8.1.
20	9. GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION
21	9.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the
22	State of California.
23	10. ATTORNEYS' FEES
24	10.1 A Party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action arising out of this
25	Consent Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing Party's reasonable attorneys' fees and
26	costs unless the unsuccessful Party has acted with substantial justification. For purposes of this
27	Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the
28	

Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure §§2016.010, et seq.

10.2 Notwithstanding Section 10.1, a Party who prevails in a contested enforcement action brought pursuant to Section 3 may seek an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 against a Party that acted with substantial justification. The Party seeking such an award shall bear the burden of meeting all of the elements of §1021.5, and this provision shall not be construed as altering any procedural or substantive requirements for obtaining such an award.

10.3 Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

11.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all 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 in this Consent Judgment have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto. Any agreements specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto only to the extent that they are expressly incorporated herein. 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.

12. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

12.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.

AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT 13. 2 13.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into 3 and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally to bind that 4 5 Party. 6 14. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any 7 14.1 claim against an entity that is not a Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those 8 9 contained in this Consent Judgment. 10 15. **EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS** 11 15.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be 12 13 deemed to constitute one document. 14 IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED 15 16 17 Judge of the Superior Court of the State of California 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

- 15 -

CONSENT JUDGMENT -- CASE NO. RG14733545

DOCUMENT PREPAREI

ON RECYCLED PAPER

ì	IT IS SO STIPULATED:
2	Dated: Ty 3, 2014 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
3	
4	Ci
5	
6	Connecte Pizmono
7	Printed Name
8	
9	ASSOCIATEDINETOR
10	Title
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
26	
26 27	
28	
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	- 16 -
	CONSENT JUDGMENT CASE NO.

1	Dated: 7/25, 2014 JELLY BELLY CANDY COMPANY
2	
3	By: John Di Suisto
4	
5	
6	John DiGiusto
7	Printed Name
8	General Course 1
9	Title Counse!
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	- 17 CONSENT JUDGMENT CASE NO.

	1	Dated: 83, 2014 SWEET CANDY, LLC
	2	Cut-
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	John S Kim
	7	Printed Name
	8	CEO
	9	Title
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	• .
	15	· · ·
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20,	
	21	
	22	-
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27 28	%
DOCUMENT PO		- 18 -

	DALLO & CO. INC.
1	Dated: Aucum 8, 2014
2	
3	
4	MNhel
5	
6	MIKE DOLLD
7	Printed Name
8	Drestara
9	PRESEDENT Title
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	
	CONSENT JUDGMENT CASE NO. RG14733545

1	EXHIBIT A Settling Defendants
2	Settling Defendant: Jelly Belly Candy Company
3	
4	1. Type of Defendant:
5	Manufacturer Defendant
6 7	2. Defendant's Settlement Payment and Allocation:
8	Total Settlement Payment \$ 70,000
9	Civil Penalty \$ 9,250
10	Payment in Lieu of Civil Penalty \$ 13,900
11	Attorneys' Fees and Costs \$ 46,850
12	
13	3. Person(s) to Receive Notices Pursuant to Section 7:
14	John E. Di Giusto General Counsel
15	Jelly Belly Candy Company One Jelly Belly Lane
16	Fairfield, CA 94533-6741 <u>jdigiusto@jellybelly.com</u>
17	Robert D. Swanson
18	Boutin Jones Inc. 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1500
19	Sacramento, CA 95814 rswanson@boutinjones.com
20	James T. Dufour
21	Dufour Law Group 819 F Street
22	Sacramento, CA 95814 dufourlawgroup@sbcglobal.net
23	
24	4. Date of Service of 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65:
25	February 3, 2014
26	
27	
28	
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	EXHIBIT A

1	EXHI Settling D	
2	Settling Defendant: Sweet Candy, LLC	
3		
4	1. Type of Defendant:	
5	Retailer/Distributor Settling Defendants	
6		
7	2. Defendant's Settlement Payment and A	llocation:
8		7,500
9	·	2,270
10		3,400
11		1,830
12		
13	3. Person(s) to Receive Notices Pursuant t	o Section 7:
14	Joe R. Abramson Law Offices of Joe. R. Abramson	
15		
16	*** ** ****** *****	
17	jraiaw i @ pacocii.nici	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		. –
PARED	EXHI	BIT A

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

1	EXHIBIT A Settling Defendants
2	Settling Defendant: Dallo & Co., Inc.
3	
4	4. Type of Defendant:
5	Retailer/Distributor Settling Defendants
6	
7	5. Defendant's Settlement Payment and Allocation:
8	
9	Total Settlement Payment \$ 9,300
10	Civil Penalty \$ 1,150 Payment in Lieu of Civil Penalty \$ 1,700
11	Payment in Lieu of Civil Penalty \$ 1,700 Attorneys' Fees and Costs \$ 6,450
12	7ποποχό 1 ees una costo ψ 0,π30
13	6. Person(s) to Receive Notices Pursuant to Section 7:
14	Michael Dallo
15	Dallo Law Group 406 Ninth Ave., Ste 212
16	San Diego, CA 92101 mdallo@dallolawgroup.com
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	- 3 -
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	EXHIBIT A

1	EXHIBIT B
2	LIST OF ENTITIES NOT SUBJECT TO DOWNSTREAM RELEASE
3	Amazon.com, Inc.
4	Aria Candy LLC
5	Buisson, Inc.
6	Cloetta A.B.
7	Cloetta Holland B.V.
8	CVS Pharmacy, Inc.
9	Ercus Group
10	Gerrit J. Verburg Co.
11	Grupo Ercus, S.A. de C.V.
12	In-Store Distributors, Inc.
13	John Sommer, Inc.
14	King Regal, SA
15	Kookaburra Licorice Co.
16	New Zealand Natural Goods, Inc.
17	Tangerine Confectionery Ltd.
18	The Hershey Company
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER