1 Christopher C. Moscone, State Bar No. 170250 Steven L. Iriki, Sate Bar No. 142533 2 Jordan M. Otis, State Bar No. 276274 MOSCONE EMBLIDGE & OTIS LLP 3 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 2100 San Francisco, CA 94104 4 Telephone: (415) 362-3599 Superior Court of California County of San Francisco Facsimile: (415) 362-2006 5 APR 29 2015 Clifford A. Chanler, State Bar No. 135534 6 THE CHANLER GROUP CLERK OF THE COURT 2560 Ninth Street 7 Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Deputy Clerk Berkeley, CA 94710 8 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff 10 MARK MOORBERG 11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 12 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION 13 MARK MOORBERG, Case No. CGC 14-543116 14 [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO Plaintiff. 15 TERMS OF PROPOSITION 65 SETTLEMENT AND CONSENT v. 16 JUDGMENT AS TO THE HARTZ GROUP. INC., HARTZ MOUNTAIN CORP. THE HARTZ GROUP, INC; THE 17 HARTZ MOUNTAIN CORPORATION and DOES 1-100, inclusive, April 29, 2015 Date: 18 9:30 a.m. Time: Defendants. Dept.: 302 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Case No.: CGC 14-543116

1	In the above-entitled action, plaintiff Mark Moorberg and defendant The Hartz Mountain			
2	Corporation having agreed through their respective counsel that Judgment be entered pursuant to			
3	the terms of their settlement agreement in the form of a [Proposed] Consent Judgment as to The			
4	Hartz Group, Inc. and The Hartz Mountain Corporation ("Consent Judgment"), and following			
5	this Court's issuance of an Order approving this Proposition 65 settlement and Consent APR 2 9 2015			
6	Judgment on			
7	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that, pursuant to California			
8	Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f)(4) and California Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6, Judgment			
9	is entered in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment attached hereto as Exhibit A .			
10	By stipulation of the parties, the Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the settlement under			
11	Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6.			
12				
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
14				
15	Ema De Colla ath			
16	Dated: APR 29 2015 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT			
17	ERNEST H. GOLDSMITH			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
2728				
40	Here we have the contract of the contract of \mathbb{R}^{n}			

2

Case No.: CGC 14-543116

1	CHRISTOPHER C. MOSCONE, SBN 170250 JORDAN M. OTIS, SBN 276274 MOSCONE EMBLIDGE SATER & OTIS LLP		
	MOSCONE EMBLIDGE SATER & OTIS LLP 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 2100 San Francisco, CA 94104		
	Tel. (415) 362-3599 Fax: (415) 362-2006		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff MARK MOORBERG		
6	MARK MOORBERG		
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF T	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
10	MARK MOORBERG,	Case No. CGC-14-543116	
11	,	•	
12	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT THE HARTZ MOUNTAIN CORPORATION	
13	THE HARTZ GROUP, INC.; THE HARTZ	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.)	
14	MOUNTAIN CORPORATION; and DOES 1 – 100, inclusive,	(Health & Salety Code & 25247.5 et seq.)	
15	Defendants.		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	[PROPOSED] CO	Case No. CGC-14-54311 NSENT JUDGMENT	
- 1	[- 1	

1 1. INTRODUCTION

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1.1 Parties

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between plaintiff Mark Moorberg ("Plaintiff") and defendant The Hartz Mountain Corporation ("Hartz Mountain" or "Defendant"), with Plaintiff and Defendant each referred to individually as a "Party" and collectively as the "Parties."

1.2 Plaintiff

Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California who seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals, and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating harmful substances contained in consumer and commercial products.

1.3 **Defendant**

Hartz Mountain and co-defendant The Hartz Group, Inc. ("Hartz Group") (Hartz Mountain and Hartz Group are, together, "Defendants") each employ ten or more persons and each is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65").

1.4 General Allegations

- 1.4.1 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants manufactured, imported, sold and/or distributed for sale in California, tie-out cables and pet toys containing Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP") without providing the clear and reasonable health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.
- 1.4.2 Plaintiff alleges that exposure to DEHP occurs via ingestion from hand to mouth transfer and via dermal contact with pet tie-out cables.

1.5 Product Description

The category of products covered by this Consent Judgment are vinyl/PVC tie-out cables including, but not limited to, Hartz Living Tie-Out Cable #503506, UPC #0 32700 91547 6 (hereinafter "Covered Products"), and pet toys including, but not limited to, small dog bones (UPC #0-02139896-1) (hereinafter "Additional Products").

1.6 Notices of Violation

On May 21, 2014, Plaintiff served Defendants and certain requisite public enforcement

agencies with 60-Day Notices of Violation ("Notice") alleging that Defendants violated Proposition 65 when they failed to warn customers, consumers, and workers in California that the Covered Products expose users to DEHP. To the best of the Parties' knowledge, no public enforcer has commenced and is diligently prosecuting the allegations set forth in the Notice.

1.7 Complaint

On December 9, 2014, Plaintiff commenced the instant action ("Complaint"), the operative pleading in this action, naming each of the Defendants as a defendant, and asserting a cause of action for the alleged violations of Proposition 65 that are the subject of the Notice.

1.8 No Admission

Defendants deny the material, factual, and legal allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint and maintain that all of the products they have sold or distributed for sale in California, including the Covered Products and the Additional Products, have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Defendants of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Defendants of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. This Section shall not, however, diminish or otherwise affect Defendants' obligations, responsibilities, and duties under this Consent Judgment.

1.9 Consent to Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over Defendants as to the allegations contained in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, and that the Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment pursuant to Proposition 65 and California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

2. <u>DEFINITIONS</u>

2.1 California Customer

"California Customer" shall mean any customer of Defendants that Defendants reasonably understand are located in California, have a California warehouse or distribution center, maintain a retail outlet in California, or have distributed Covered Products and/or Additional Products for sale

in California, online via the internet or by any other means.

2.2 Reformulated Products

2

3

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Reformulated Products" shall mean Covered Products and Additional Products that contain no more than 1000 parts per million ("ppm") (0.1%) of DEHP in any material, component, or constituent of a Product, when analyzed by a laboratory accredited by NVLAP (National Volunteer Laboratory Accreditation Program), American Association for Lab Accreditation (A2LA), ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board (ANAB) - ACLASS brand (an ANAB company), International Accreditation Service, Inc. (IAS), Laboratory Accreditation Bureau (L-A-B), Perry Johnson Laboratory Accreditation, Inc. (PJLA), or International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation(ILAC) (such laboratory referred to as an "Accredited Lab") pursuant to EPA testing methodologies 3580 and 8270C, or equivalent methodologies utilized by such Accredited Laboratory or federal or state agencies to determine the presence, or measure the amount, of DEHP in a solid substance (such methodologies referred to as "Approved Methodologies").

2.3 Effective Date

"Effective Date" shall mean the date upon which this Consent Judgment is approved and entered by the Court.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: REFORMULATION

3.1 Reformulation Commitment

Commencing six months from the Effective Date, and continuing thereafter, Hartz Mountain shall not manufacture or import for distribution or sale to California Customers for sale in California, or cause to be manufactured or imported for distribution or sale to California Customers for sale in California, any Covered Products or Additional Products that are not Reformulated Products. In addition, commencing six months from the Effective Date, Hartz Mountain shall certify that Hartz Group is not manufacturing or importing for distribution or sale to California Customers for sale in California, or causing to be manufactured or imported for distribution or selling to California Customers for sale in California, any Covered Products or Additional Products that are not Reformulated Products.

28 ////

4. MONETARY PAYMENTS

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

In settlement of all the claims referred to in this Consent Judgment, Hartz Mountain shall pay the sum of \$14,000 as civil penalties. The civil penalty payment will be allocated in accordance with California Health & Safety Code section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% of the funds remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), 25% of the penalty remitted to "Mark Moorberg, Client Trust Account." The civil penalty payment shall be delivered on the date due as set forth below at the addresses provided below. Hartz Mountain shall be liable for payment of simple interest at a rate of 10% for all amounts due and owing that are not received within seven business days of the date they are due, if any.

4.1.1 Initial Civil Penalty

Within thirty days of the date this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court, Hartz Mountain shall make an initial civil penalty payment of \$6,000.

4.1.2 Second Civil Penalty

Within six months of the date this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court, Hartz Mountain shall make a second civil penalty payment of \$4,000. The amount of the second penalty may be reduced according to the penalty waiver below.

The second civil penalty payment will be waived if Hartz Mountain provides Plaintiff with certification that commencing on Effective Date and continuing thereafter, Hartz Mountain will not, and will certify that Hartz Group is not selling to California Customers for sale in California, any Covered Products that are not Reformulated Products. An officer or other authorized representative shall provide Plaintiff with a written certification confirming compliance with this condition no later than 60 days from the Effective Date. The option to provide a written certification in lieu of making the second civil penalty payment constitutes a material term of this Consent Judgment, and with regard to such term, time is of the essence.

4.1.3 Third Civil Penalty

Within nine months of the date this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court, Hartz Mountain shall make a third civil penalty payment of \$4,000. The amount of the second penalty

may be reduced according to the penalty waiver below.

б

The third civil penalty payment will be waived if Hartz Mountain provides Plaintiff with certification that commencing nine months from the Effective Date, Hartz Mountain has commenced providing warnings on the remaining noticed items in its inventory as well as any products in Hartz Group's inventory and has sent letters/notices to all known California retailers that received non-reformulated products identifying the non-reformulated products and instructing the retailers to either label, destroy or return the non-reformulated Covered Products to Hartz Mountain to be destroyed.

4.2 Representations and Warranties

Hartz Mountain represents that the sales data and information concerning sales, knowledge of DEHP presence, and prior reformulation and/or warning efforts, provided to Plaintiff were true and accurate based on its knowledge. Hartz Mountain also represents that the Hartz Group, Inc. is not currently affiliated with Hartz Mountain or the Covered Products. If, within six months of the Effective Date, Plaintiff discovers and presents to Hartz Mountain, evidence demonstrating that the preceding representation and warranty was materially inaccurate, then Hartz Mountain shall have 30 days to meet and confer regarding Plaintiff's contention. Should this 30 day period pass without any resolution between Plaintiff and Hartz Mountain, Plaintiff reserves the right to file a formal legal claim including, but not limited to, a claim for damages for breach of contract. Hartz Mountain reserves all defenses respecting any such claim.

4.3 Reimbursement of Fees and Costs

The Parties acknowledge that Plaintiff and his counsel offered to resolve this dispute without reaching terms on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed, thereby leaving the fee issue to be resolved after the material terms of the agreement had been settled. Shortly after the other settlement terms had been finalized, Defendants expressed a desire to resolve Plaintiff's outstanding fees and costs. Under general contract principles and the private attorney general doctrine codified at California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 for all work performed through the mutual execution of this agreement, including the fees and costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendants' attention, negotiating a settlement in the public

interest, and seeking court approval of the same. Hartz Mountain agrees to pay Plaintiff, within			
thirty (30) business days of the Court's approval and entry of this Consent Judgment, fees and costs			
in the amount of \$33,500.			
4.4 Payment Procedures			
4.4.1 Payment Addresses.			
(a) All payments owed to Plaintiff and his counsel, pursuant to Sections			
4.1 and 4.3 shall be delivered to the following address:			
Moscone Emblidge & Otis LLP Attn: Proposition 65 Coordinator 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 2100			
San Francisco, ČA 94104			
(b) All payments owed to OEHHA, pursuant to Section 4.1, shall be			
delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo line "Prop 65 Penalties") at one of the following addresses, as			
appropriate:			
For United States Postal Service Delivery:			
Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief			
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment P.O. Box 4010			
Sacramento, CA 95812-4010			
For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery or Courier:			
Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief			
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment 1001 I Street			
Sacramento, CA 95814			
4.4.2 Proof of Payment to OEHHA. A copy of each check payable to OEHHA			
4.4.2 Proof of Payment to OEHHA. A copy of each check payable to OEHHA shall be mailed, simultaneous with payment, to Moscone Emblidge Sater & Otis at the address set			
forth in Section 4.3.1(a) above.			
4.4.3 Tax Documentation. Hartz Mountain shall provide a separate 1099 form for			
each payment required by this Consent Judgment to: (a) Plaintiff, whose address and tax			
identification number shall be furnished upon request after this Consent Judgment has been fully			
6 Case No. CGC-14-543116			

executed by the Parties; (b) "California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment"; and (c) Moscone Emblidge Sater & Otis LLP, and deliver such form to the payee at the payment addresses provided in Section 4.4.1, above.

5. <u>CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED</u>

5.1 Plaintiff's Release of Proposition 65 Claims

Plaintiff, acting on his own behalf and in the public interest, releases Defendants, their parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities under common ownership, directors, officers, agents employees, attorneys, and each entity to whom Defendants directly or indirectly distribute or sell the Covered Products, including, but not limited, to downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, cooperative members, and licensees (collectively, "Releasees"), from all claims alleging violations of Proposition 65 through the Effective Date based on unwarned exposures to DEHP in the Covered Products, as set forth in the Notice. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to exposures to DEHP, as set forth in the Notice.

5.2 Plaintiff's Individual Releases of Claims

Plaintiff, in his individual capacity only and *not* in any representative capacity, provides a release herein which shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction, as a bar to all actions, causes of action, obligations, costs, expenses, attorneys' fees, damages, losses, claims, liabilities, and demands of any nature, character, or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, limited to and arising out of alleged or actual exposures to DEHP in Covered Products and in Additional Products manufactured, imported, distributed, or sold by Defendants prior to the Effective Date.

5.3 Hartz Mountain's Release of Plaintiff

Hartz Mountain, on its own behalf, and on behalf of its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against Plaintiff and his attorneys and other representatives, through the Effective Date, for any and all actions taken or statements made (or those that could have been taken or made) by Plaintiff and his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims, otherwise seeking

to enforce Proposition 65 against it in this matter, or with respect to the Covered Products and Additional Products.

6. COURT APPROVAL

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved in its entirety 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. The Parties agree to support the entry of this agreement as a Consent Judgment and to obtain approval of the Consent Judgment by the Court in a timely manner. The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f), a noticed motion is required for judicial approval of this Consent Judgment, which motion Plaintiff shall draft and file and Hartz Mountain shall support, appearing at the hearing if so requested. If any third-party objection to the motion is filed, Plaintiff and Hartz Mountain agree to work together to file a reply and appear at any hearing. This provision is a material component of the Consent Judgment and shall be treated as such in the event of a breach.

If the Court does not approve the Consent Judgment, the Parties shall meet and confer as to whether to modify the language or appeal the ruling. If the Parties do not jointly agree on a course of action to take, then the case shall proceed in its normal course. If the Court's approval is ultimately overturned by an appellate court, the Parties shall meet and confer as to whether to modify the terms of this Consent Judgment. If the Parties do not jointly agree on a course of action to take, then the case shall proceed in its normal course. In the event that this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court and subsequently overturned by any appellate court, any monies that have been provided to OEHHA, Plaintiff or his counsel pursuant to Section 4, above, shall be refunded within 15 days of the appellate decision becoming final.

7. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, preempted, or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to the Covered Products, then Hartz Mountain may provide Plaintiff with notice of any asserted change in the law, and shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, the Covered Products are so affected.

Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be interpreted to relieve Defendants from their obligation to comply with any pertinent state or federal law or regulation. 2 8. NOTICE 3 Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to 4 this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and sent by: (i) personal delivery, (ii) first-class 5 registered or certified mail, return receipt requested; or (iii) a recognized overnight courier to any Party by the other at the following addresses: To Defendant: To Plaintiff: William P. Fornshell Attn: Proposition 65 Coordinator Senior Vice President Moscone Emblidge Sater & Otis LLP The Hartz Mountain Corporation 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 2100 400 Plaza Drive San Francisco, CA 94104 11 Secaucus, New Jersey 07094 with a copy to: 13 Anthony Cortez James Mattesich Greenberg Traurig, LLP 1201 K St. Suite 1100 15 Sacramento, CA 95814 16 Any Party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other Party a change of address to 18 which all notices and other communications shall be sent. 19 9. COUNTERPARTS, FACSIMILE AND PDF SIGNATURES 20 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or portable 21 document format (pdf) signature, each of which shall be deemed, and as valid as, an original, and 22 all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document. 23 | 10. COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS Plaintiff and his counsel agree to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f). 11. MODIFICATION This Consent Judgment may be modified only: (i) by written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon; or (ii) upon a successful motion

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. CGC-14-543116

24

26

27

of any party and entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court. 12. **AUTHORIZATION** The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective Parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment. **AGREED TO: AGREED TO:** Plaintiff Mark Mo Defendant The Hartz Mountain Corporation Dated: 4-17-2015 Case No. CGC-14-543116

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT