1	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP	
2	Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213209	
3	Abigail Blodgett, State Bar No. 278813 503 Divisadero Street	ENDORSED
4	San Francisco, CA 94117 Telephone: (415) 913-7800	ALAMÉDA COUNTY
5	Facsimile: (415) 759-4112	MAR 3 0 2016
6	mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com hhirsch@lexlawgroup.com ablodgett@lexlawgroup.com	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By Christina Momon, Deputy
7	Counsel for Plaintiff	
8	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	
9		
10		
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
12	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
13		
14	Coordination Proceeding Special Title:) Judicial Council Coordination
	<u> </u>) Proceeding
15	PROPOSITION 65 COCAMIDE DEA CASES) Case No. 4765
16))
17	This Document Relates To:	
18 19	CEH v. Accessory Zone, LLC, et al., A.C.S.C. Case No. RG 13-699752	COAT FACTORY WAREHOUSE CORPORATION
20		ý
21		
22	1. INTRODUCTION	
23	1.1 The parties to this Consent Judgment ("Parties") are the Center for	
	Environmental Health ("CEH") and defendant Burlington Coat Factory Warehouse Corporation	
24	("Settling Defendant"). CEH and Settling Defendant are referred to collectively as the "Parties."	
25	1.2 Settling Defendant is a corporation that employs ten (10) or more persons and	
26	that manufactures, distributes and/or sells shampoo and liquid soaps that contain coconut oil	
27	•	
28		
ON RECYCLED PAPER	- I CONSENT JUDGMENT - BURLINGTON CO	
J	CONSTRUIO GMENT DOREMOTOR CO	art are out and are are

OCUMENT PREPARED

ON RECYCLED PAPER

diethanolamine condensate (cocamide diethanolamine) (hereinafter, "cocamide DEA") in the State of California or has done so in the past.

- 1.3 On August 7, 2013, CEH served a 60-Day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 (The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq.) (the "Notice") to Settling Defendant, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every County in the State of California, and the City Attorneys for every City in the State of California with a population greater than 750,000. The Notice alleges violations of Proposition 65 with respect to the presence of cocamide DEA in shampoo and liquid soaps manufactured, distributed and/or sold by Settling Defendant.
- 1.4 On October 18, 2013, CEH filed the action entitled *CEH v. Accessory Zone*, *LLC*, *et al.*, Case No. RG 13-699752, in the Superior Court of California for Alameda County, naming Settling Defendant as a defendant in that action. On December 4, 2013, the *Accessory Zone* action was coordinated with several other related Proposition 65 actions in the *Proposition 65 Cocamide DEA Cases*, Case No. JCCP 4765, currently pending before this Court.
- 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that: (i) this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the operative Complaint applicable to Settling Defendant (the "Complaint") and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint; (ii) that venue is proper in the County of Alameda; and (iii) that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment.
- 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 legal proceeding. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties for purposes of settling, compromising and resolving issues disputed in this action.

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

2. **DEFINITIONS**

- 2.1 "Covered Products" means shampoo and liquid soaps manufactured, distributed and/or sold by Elegant Home Design Ltd., International Design Associates Ltd., and SJ Creations, Inc. dba RRYSpa.
- 2.2 "Effective Date" means the date on which this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 3.1 **Reformulation of Covered Products.** As of the Effective Date, Settling Defendant 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.
- 3.2 **Specification to Suppliers.** No more than 30 days after the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall issue specifications to its suppliers of Covered Products requiring that Covered Products not contain any cocamide DEA, and shall instruct each supplier to use reasonable efforts to eliminate Covered Products containing cocamide DEA on a nationwide basis.

3.3 Action Regarding Specific Products.

3.3.1 On or before the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall cease selling the following specific products in California: (i) Peppermint Bubble Bath, SKU No. 09-116-92948484-3; (ii) the Apothecary Bath & shower Gel Original Formula No. 016 Lemon Verbena, SKU No. 09-116-31901246-1, Style No. ABSGLV; and (iii) the RRYSpa Sweet Water Bubble Bath, Item No. SJ12043SW (collectively, the "Section 3.3 Products"). On or before the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall also: (i) cease shipping the Section 3.3 Products to any of its stores and/or customers that resell the Section 3.3 Products in California, and (ii) send instructions to its stores and/or customers that resell the Section 3.3 Products in California instructing them either to: (a) return all the Section 3.3 Products to Settling Defendant for destruction; or (b) directly destroy the Section 3.3 Products.

DOCUMENT PREPARED

3.3.2 Any destruction of Section 3.3 Products shall be in compliance with all applicable laws.

3.3.3 Within sixty (60) days of the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall provide CEH with written certification from Settling Defendant confirming compliance with the requirements of this Section 3.3.

4. ENFORCEMENT

4.1 CEH 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, CEH shall provide Settling Defendant with a Notice of Violation and a copy of any test results which purportedly support CEH's Notice of Violation. The Parties shall then meet and confer regarding the basis for CEH's anticipated motion or application in an attempt to resolve it 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, CEH may file its enforcement motion or application. This Consent Judgment may only be enforced by the Parties.

5. PAYMENTS

- Date, Settling Defendant shall pay the total sum of \$15,000 as a settlement payment. The total settlement amount for Settling Defendant shall be paid in four separate checks delivered to counsel for CEH at the address set forth in Section 8.1 below. The funds paid by Settling Defendant shall be allocated between the following categories:
- 5.1.1 \$1,650 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), such money to be apportioned by CEH 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). The civil penalty check shall be made payable to the Center For Environmental Health.
 - 5.1.2 \$2,250 as a payment in lieu of civil penalty to CEH pursuant to Health &

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3203(b). CEH will use such funds to continue its work educating and protecting people from exposures to toxic chemicals. CEH may also use a portion of such funds to monitor compliance with this Consent Judgment and to purchase and test Settling Defendant's products to confirm compliance. In addition, as part of its Community Environmental Action and Justice Fund, CEH will use four percent (4%) 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.

5.1.3 \$11,100 as reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. This check shall be made payable to the Lexington Law Group.

6. MODIFICATION

- 6.1 Written Consent. 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.
- 6.2 **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.

7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and Settling Defendant, and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees") of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Settling Defendant and Defendant Releasees, based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to cocamide DEA contained in Covered Products that were sold by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 7.2 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Settling Defendant and the Defendant Releasees shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Settling

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

shall support entry of this Consent Judgment.

9.2 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and shall never be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose other than to allow the Court to determine if there was a material breach of Section 9.1.

10. ATTORNEYS' FEES

- other proceeding to enforce a violation of this Consent Judgment, CEH shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application. Should Settling Defendant prevail on any motion application for an order to show cause or other proceeding, Settling Defendant may be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as a result of such motion or application upon a finding by the Court that CEH's prosecution of the motion or application lacked substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure § 2016, et seq.
- 10.2 Except as otherwise provided in this Consent Judgment, each Party shall bear its own attorneys' fees and costs.
- 10.3 Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a Party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

11. OTHER TERMS

- The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.
- This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon CEH and Settling Defendant, and its respective divisions, subdivisions, and subsidiaries, and the successors or assigns of any of them.
- 11.3 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. 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.

- Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall release, or in any way affect any rights that Settling Defendant might have against any other party, whether or not that party is a Settling Defendant.
- This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.
- 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 deemed to constitute one document.
- 11.7 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 to bind that Party.
- 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. 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. Accordingly, any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in this Consent Judgment shall not be interpreted against any Party as a result of the manner of the preparation of this Consent Judgment. 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

1	Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive California Civil Code § 1654.	
2		
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
4		
5	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	
6		
7	11/2	
8	Charlie Pizarro	
9	Associate Director	
10		
11	BURLINGTON COAT FACTORY WAREHOUSE CORPORATION	
. 12		
13		
14	Signature	
15	Signature .	
16	·	
17 18	Printed Name	
19		
20	Title	
21		
22		
23		
24	IT IS SO ORDERED:	
25		
26	Data I. (2016)	
27	Dated:, 2016 Judge of the Superior Court	
28		
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	9	
	CONSENT JUDGMENT - BURLINGTON COAT FACTORY - CASE NO. JCCP 4765	

1	Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive California Civil Code § 1654.	
2		
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
4		
5	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	
6		
7		
8		
9	Charlie Pizarro Associate Director	
10		
11	BURLINGTON COAT FACTORY WAREHOUSE CORPORATION	
12	DOMESTON COAT PACTORT WARRINGSE COR ORATION	
13		
14	Soften	
15	Signature	
16	- Sophin Chen	
17	Printed Name	
18	and a second	
19	Title VIO/OMM-Ladid Accord	
20		
21		
22 23		
	IT IS SO ORDERED:	
24 25		
26	MAR 3 0 2016	
27	Dated: GEORGE C. HERNANDEZ, JR. Judge of the Superior Court	
28		
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	-9-	

CONSENT JUDGMENT – BURLINGTON COAT FACTORY – CASE NO. JCCP 4765