State of California - Department of Justice - Attorney General's Office - Proposition 65 Enforcement Reporting

FORM JUS 1502 (03-01) Attention: Prop 65 Coordinator, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000, Oakland, CA 94612

PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT FILING - Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(e) and (f)

REPORT OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

Please	print or type required information	☐ Original Filing ☐ Supplement	ntal Filing		
PLAINTIFF(S)					
PARTIES TO THE ACTION					
	DEFENDANT(S) INVOLVED IN JUDGMENT				
ж о	COURT DOCKET NUMBER		COURT NAME		
CAS	SHORT CASE NAME				
	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF				
REPORT INFO	PAYMENT: CIVIL PENALTY	PAYMENT: ATTORNEYS FEES	PAYMENT: OTHER	Á l'O	
R	DATE SUBMITTED TO COURT	IS JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO SETTLEMENT?	IF YES, DATE SETTLEMENT WAS REPORTED TO ATTORNEY GENERA	AI S	
l PC	/ /	☐ Yes ☐ No	/ / /		
8	COPY OF JUDGMENT MUST BE ATTACHED			For Internal Use Only	
	NAME OF CONTACT				
照 o	ORGANIZATION			TELEPHONE NUMBER	
FILER	ADDRESS			FAX NUMBER	
	CITY	STATE ZIP	E-MAIL ADDRESS		

FILING INSTRUCTIONS: This form can be completed online and printed. If electronic filing is not available, mail the completed form with a copy of the judgment to the attention of the Prop 65 Coordinator at the address shown above. If you need additional space to complete this form please use an attachment.

1	DANIEL N. GREENBAUM - 268104					
2	LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL N. GREENBAUM 14752 Otsego Street					
	Telephone: (310) 200-2631					
3	Facsimile: (424) 243-7689 Email: danielgreenbaumesq@gmail.com					
4						
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff Shefa LMV LLC	e				
6	Attorney for Plaintiff					
7	GARY A. PETERS HOWARD & HOWARD	OCT - 7 2014				
	450 West Fourth Street	and the state of t				
8	Royal Oak MI 48067 Telephone: (248) 723-0490	YOLANDA ESTRADA				
9	Facsimile: (248) 645-1568					
10	gpeters@HowardandHoward.com;					
11	Attorneys for Defendant Personal Care Products, Inc.					
	1 Gronal Care i louders, inc.					
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
13	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA					
14	COUNTION	ALAMBOA				
15	Coordination Proceeding) JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION				
16	Special Title (Rule 3.350)	PROCEEDING NO: 4765				
17	PROPOSITION 65 COCAMIDE DEA)) [Shefa LMV, LLC v. Ross Stores, et al.,				
	CASES	Los Angeles County Superior Court No. BC521400				
18)				
19) PROPOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS,				
20) INC.				
21	8	Judge: Hon. George C. Hernandez, Jr.				
22		Action filed: October 11, 2013				
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
31	Page 1	of 14				
32	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS, INC.					
	JCCP N	0. 4765				
1						

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Parties. This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between plaintiff Shefa LMV, LLC ("Shefa LMV") and Personal Care Products, Inc. ("PC") with Shefa LMV and PC collectively referred to as the "Parties," and individually as "Party." Shefa LMV is an entity organized in the State of California, which has asserted that it seeks to promote awareness of exposure to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer and commercial products. Shefa LMV alleges that PC employs ten or more persons and is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code \$25249.6, et seq. ("Proposition 65").
- 1.2 General Allegations. Shefa LMV alleges that PC has manufactured, imported, distributed and/or sold soap products that contain Cocamide Diethanolamine ("Cocamide DEA") without the requisite Proposition 65 warnings. Cocamide DEA is on the Proposition 65 list as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
- 1.3 Product Description. As used in this Consent Judgment, "Products" shall mean soap products containing Cocamide DEA, including, but not limited to, anti-bacterial hand soap, that are manufactured, imported, distributed and/or sold by PC for sale in the State of California.
- 1.4 Notice of Violation. On June 22, 2013, Shefa LMV served PC and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "Notice") that provided recipients with notice of Shefa LMV's allegation that PC was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn consumers and customers that the Products exposed users in California to Cocamide DEA. No public enforcer has diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notice.
- 1.5 Complaint. On or about September 16, 2013, Shefa LMV filed a complaint in the Superior Court in and for the County of Los Angeles against Personal Care Products, Inc. and other entities, Shefa LMV, LLC v. Ross Stores, Inc., Case No. BC521400, alleging violations of Proposition 65, based on the alleged exposures to Cocamide DEA contained in certain products sold by PC ("Complaint"). On or about, October 17, 2013, Shefa LMV filed a First Amended Complaint alleging violations of Proposition 65 and Business and Professions code section Page 2 of 14

17200. On or about December 4, 2013, the Hon. George C. Hernandez issued an order coordinating the *Shefa LMV LLC v. Ross, et al.* action with other Cocamide DEA cases in the Superior Court in and for the County of Alameda, *Proposition 65 Cocamide DEA Cases*, Case No. JCCP No. 4765.

- 1.6 No Admission. PC denies the material, factual and legal allegations contained in Shefa LMV's Notice and Complaint and maintains that it has at all times been in compliance with all laws and all products that it has sold, manufactured, imported and/or distributed in California, including the Products. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by PC of any fact, finding, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by PC of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law or violation of law. However, this Section shall not diminish or otherwise affect PC's obligations, responsibilities and duties under this Consent Judgment.
- 1.7 Consent to Jurisdiction. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over PC as to the allegations contained in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment.
- 1.8 Execution Date. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Execution Date" shall mean the date this Consent Judgment is signed by both parties.
- 1.9 Effective Date. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date the Court enters Judgment pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: REFORMULATION

- 2.1 Reformulation of Covered Products. As of the Effective Date, PC shall not manufacture, distribute, sell or offer for sale any Covered Product that contains Cocamide DEA and that will be sold or offered for sale to California consumers. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, a product "contains Cocamide DEA" if Cocamide DEA is an intentionally added ingredient in the product and/or part of the product formulation.
- 2.2 Suppliers. No more than 30 days after the Effective Date, PC shall issue specifications to its suppliers of Covered Products requiring that Covered Products not contain

Covered Products containing Cocamide DEA on a nationwide basis.

2.3 Sell Through Period. PC's Products that were manufactured and distributed for

any Cocamide DEA, and shall instruct each supplier to use reasonable efforts to eliminate

2.3 Sell Through Period. PC's Products that were manufactured and distributed for retail sale prior to the Effective Date shall be subject to the release of liability pursuant to Section 5 of this Consent Judgment, without regard to when such Products were, or are in the future, sold to consumers. As a result, the obligations of PC as set forth in this Consent Judgment, including but not limited Section 2.1, do not apply to these products.

3. ENFORCEMENT

Shefa may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Prior to bringing any motion or application to enforce the requirements of Section 3 above, Shefa shall provide the Defendant with Notice of Violation and a copy of any test results which purportedly support Shefa's Notice of Violation. The Parties shall then meet and confer regarding the basis for Shefa's anticipated motion or application in an attempt to resolve the matter informally, including providing Settling Defendant a reasonable opportunity of at least thirty (30) days to cure any alleged violation. Should such attempts at informal resolution fail, Shefa may file its enforcement motion or application. The prevailing party on any motion to enforce this Consent Judgment shall be entitled to its reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application.

4. MONETARY PAYMENTS

PC agrees to a total settlement payment of Nine Thousand Nine Hundred and 50/100 Dollars (\$9,950.00) to be paid as set forth below.

4.1 Civil Penalty Payment Pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b)

PC shall pay a total civil penalty payment of \$2,950.00 within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, as follows: the civil penalty shall be apportioned in accordance with California Health & Safety Code § 25249.12 (c) and (d), with 75% of these funds remitted to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of the penalty remitted to Shefa LMV, both pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 4.3.

4.2 Reimbursement of Shefa LMV's Fees and Costs

The parties acknowledge that Shefa LMV and its counsel offered to resolve this dispute without reaching terms on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed to them, thereby leaving this fee issue to be resolved after the material terms of the agreement had been settled. PC expressed a desire to resolve the fee and cost issue after the other settlement terms had been agreed. The Parties then attempted to (and did) reach an accord on the compensation due to Shefa LMV and its counsel under general contract principles and the private attorney general doctrine codified at California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, for all work performed in this matter, except fees that may be incurred on appeal. Under these legal principles, PC shall pay the amount of \$7,000.00 for fees and costs incurred investigating, litigating and enforcing this matter, including the fees and costs incurred (and yet to be incurred) negotiating, drafting, and obtaining the Court's approval of this Consent Judgment in the public interest.

4.3 Payment Procedures

All payments required by Sections 4.1 and 4.2 shall be within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, in three checks made payable as follows:

- (a) one check to "OEHHA" in the amount of \$2,212.50;
- (b) one check to "Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum in Trust for Shefa LMV, LLC" in the amount of \$737.50;
 - (c) one check to "Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum" in the amount of \$7,000.00;

4.4 Issuance of 1099 Forms

After the settlement funds have been transmitted to Shefa LMV's counsel, PC shall issue separate 1099 forms, as follows:

- (a) one 1099 form to the "Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment" (EIN: 68-0284486) in the amount of \$2,212.50;
- (b) a second 1099 form to "Shefa LMV, LLC" in the amount of \$737.50, whose address and tax identification number shall be furnished upon request;
- (c) a third 1099 to "Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum" (EIN: 46-4580172) in the amount of \$7,000.00;

4.5 Issuance of Payments.

 All payments owed shall be delivered to the following payment address:

Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq. Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum 14752 Otsego Street Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

All payments owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486), pursuant to Section 4.1, shall be delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo line "Prop 65 Penalties") at the following addresses:

Mike Gyrics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
P.O. Box 4010
Sacramento, CA 95812-4010

With a copy of the checks payable to OEHHA mailed to the Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum at the address set forth above, as proof of payment to OEHHA.

5. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

5.1 Full and Binding Resolution of Proposition 65 Allegations. This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution of the Action as set forth in this Section 5. Shefa, on behalf of itself, its attorneys, agents, representatives, successors and assigns, and in the public interest and in its representative capacity, waives all rights to participate in any action and releases and discharges with regard to: (a) PC, its parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, sister companies, and affiliates, and their successors and assigns (collectively, the "Defendant Releasees"), and (b) finished product or ingredient manufacturers, distributors, and suppliers, and all entities to whom any Defendant Releasee directly or indirectly distributed or sold any Covered Products, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers (including but not limited to Ross Stores, Inc. or 99¢ Only Stores, franchisees, cooperative members, licensors, and licensees), franchisees, cooperative members, and Defendant Releasees' licensors and licensees (collectively, "Additional Releasees"), with respect to all claims, including, without limitation, causes of action (in law or in equity), suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, expenses (including, but not

limited to, investigation fees, expert fees and attorneys' fees) or losses (collectively "Claims") regarding any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about alleged exposures to cocamide DEA in any Covered Products shipped, distributed or sold by PC prior to the Effective Date.

- 5.2 Individual Release. Shefa, on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, and successors and/or assignees, and not in its representative capacity, hereby provides a release that shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction, as a bar to all Claims under Proposition 65,Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq., or any other statutory or common law, that are or may be asserted against Defendant Releasees and Additional Releasees, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, arising out of alleged exposures to, and/or failure to warn of alleged exposures to, cocamide DEA or diethanolamine in the Covered Products shipped, distributed or sold by PC prior to the Effective Date.
- 5.3 Compliance. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by PC shall be deemed to constitute compliance by any Defendant Releasee or Additional Releasee with Proposition 65 regarding alleged exposures to cocamide DEA in the Covered Products.
- 5.4 PC's Release. On behalf of itself and Defendant Releasees, PC waives all rights to institute any form of action against Shefa or Shefa's attorneys, consultants and representatives for all actions taken or statements made in the course of this Action prior to the date of the execution of this Consent Judgment.

6. COURT APPROVAL

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by all parties.

7. SEVERABILITY

If, subsequent to the execution of this Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected.

Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq.

To Shefa LMV:

- 8.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and shall apply only to Covered Products that are sold or offered for sale in the State of California.
- 8.2 In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, preempted or otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to the Covered Products, then PC shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, any Covered Products that are so affected.
- 8.3 This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon Shefa and PC and their respective, divisions, subdivisions, and subsidiaries, successors and assigns.
- 8.4 The Parties, including their counsel, have participated in the preparation of this Consent Judgment and this Consent Judgment is the result of the joint efforts of the Parties.
- 8.5 This Consent Judgment was subject to revision and modification by the Parties and has been accepted and approved as to its final form by all Parties and their counsel.
- 8.6 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 shall not be employed in the interpretation of this Consent Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive California Civil Code § 1654.

9. NOTICES

Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and (i) personally delivered, (ii) sent by first-class, (registered or certified mail) return receipt requested, or (iii) sent by overnight courier to one party from the other party at the following addresses:

To PC:

Gary A. Peters Howard & Howard 450 West Fourth Street Royal Oak MI 48067

Page 8 of 14

31

32

Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum 14752 Otsego Street Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Any party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other party a change of address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.

10. ATTORNEYS' FEES

- 10.1 A Party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action arising out of this Consent Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing Party's reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
- 10.2 For purposes of this Section 10.1, the prevailing Party refers to the Party that was successful in obtaining relief more favorable to it than the relief that the other Party was amenable to providing during the Parties' good faith attempt to resolve the dispute under Section 5.1.
- 10.3 Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a Party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

11. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE/PDF SIGNATURES

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or pdf signature, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute on and the same document. A facsimile or pdf signature shall be as valid as the original.

12. COURT APPROVAL

- 12.1 This Consent Judgment shall not be effective until the Effective Date.
- 12.2 Shefa shall prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Harbor shall make no objections to entry of this Consent Judgment.
- 12.3 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect.
- 12.4 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.

.50

13. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f)

- 13.1 Shefa LMV and PC agree to mutually employ their, and their counsel's, best efforts to support the entry of the agreement as a Consent Judgment and obtain approval of the Consent Judgment by the Court in a timely manner.
- 13.2 The parties acknowledge that, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment, which Shefa LMV shall draft and file, and PC shall not oppose.
- 13.3 If any third party objection to the noticed motion is filed, Shefa LMV and PC shall work together to file a joint reply or separate replies if the parties so desire and appear at any hearing before the Court.
- 13.4 This provision is a material component of the Consent Judgment and shall be treated as such in the event of a breach.
- 13.5 If the Court does not grant the motion to approve this Consent Judgment, and if the parties choose not to pursue a modified Consent Judgment within 30 days after the Court's denial of the motion to approve, then, upon remittitur, any and all payments made pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment will be returned to PC.

14. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified only: (1) by written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon; or (2) upon a successful motion of any party and entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.

15. AUTHORIZATION

- 15.1 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 and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally bind that Party.
- 15.2 The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment.
 - 15.3 Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party is to bear its own fees and costs.

JCCP No. 4765

1		
2	AGREED TO:	
3	Dated: 6/30/14	SHEFA LMV, LLC
4		ales
5		By: [name]
7		
8		Approved as to form:
9		Almila-
10		Daniel Greenbaum, Esq. Attorney for Shefa LMV, LLC
11		
12	Dated:	PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS, INC.
13		Photo Williamst
14		Philip Goldsmith
15		
16		Approved as to form:
17		HALITED
18		Gary Peters, Esq. Howard & Howard
19		Attorney for Personal Care Products, Inc.
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		8
26		
27		
28		
31		
32	P: [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMEN	age 12 of 14 T AS TO PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS, INC. CP No. 4765
jā.	JC	CP No. 4765

1	
2	ORDER AND JUDGMENT
3	Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between Shefa LMV, LLC and Personal
4	Care Products, Inc., the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in
5	accordance with the terms herein.
6	
7	Dated:
8	
9	GEONGE C. HERNANDEZ, JR.
0	Judge of the Superior Court
1	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
ا7	
18	
9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
31	
32	Page 13 of 14 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS, INC.
3	JCCP No. 4765