1 Matthew C. Maclear, SBN 209228 **ENDORSED** FILED Aqua Terra Aeris Law Group ALAMEDA COUNTY 7425 Fairmount Ave. El Cerrito, CA 94530 JUN 2 6 2015 Telephone: 415-568-5200 3 Email: mcm@atalawgroup.com CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT 4 Attorneys for Plaintiff 5 Environmental Research Center, Inc. 6 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 7 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 8 9 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CASE NO. RG-14736271 CENTER, INC. a California non-profit 10 corporation, [PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING PROPOSITION 65 11 SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF Plaintiff, JUDGMENT 12 Assigned for All Purposes: 13 TRUESTAR HEALTH, INC., TRUESTAR HEALTH (U.S.) HOLDINGS, INC., and JUDGE: ROBERT B. FREEMAN 14 **DOES 1-100 DEPT.: 20** RESERVATION NO: R-1614067 Defendants. 15 DATE: June 26, 2015 TIME: 10:00 am 16 17 This matter having come on calendar pursuant to a regularly noticed motion and the 18 Court having reviewed all the evidence submitted in support of Plaintiff Environmental 19 Research Center, Inc.'s motion in this case, the Court hereby makes the following findings 20 pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (f)(4): 21 1) Any warnings that may be required by the Stipulated Consent Judgment fully 22 23 comply with Proposition 65. 2) The attorneys' fees provision in the Stipulated Consent Judgment is reasonable 24 under California law; and 25

Consent Judgment are reasonable based on the criteria set forth in Health & Safety Code section

25249.7, subdivision (b)(2) and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 11, section 3203, respectively.

3) The civil penalty and payments in lieu of civil penalties imposed by the Stipulated

26

27

28

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Stipulated Consent Judgment submitted in this matter is approved and will be entered in accordance with the terms of the Stipulated Consent Judgment, attached hereto as an Exhibit. DATED: June 26, 2015 

ROBERT FREEDMAN

Hon. ROBERT B. FREEMAN

ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

JUN 2 6 2015

# SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC., a California non-profit corporation,

No. RG14 736271

JUDGMENT

Plaintiff,

VS.

TRUESTAR HEALTH, INC., TRUESTAR HEALTH (U.S.) HOLDINGS, INC., and DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

On June 26, 2015, the court issued an order granting the Motion to Approve Proposition 65 Settlement and for Entry of Consent Judgment, filed by Plaintiff Environmental Research Center ("Plaintiff") on April 22, 2015.

In accordance with that order, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that judgment is entered in favor of Plaintiff
and against Defendants Truestar Health Inc. and Truestar Health (U.S.) Holdings Inc. in

accordance with the terms of the Stipulated Consent Judgment attached hereto as Exhibit

A. The defendants named as Does 1-25 are DISMISSED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated Tue 26, 100)

Hon. Robert B. Freedman Judge of the Superior Court



|          | i .  |  |  |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 1        | MATTHEW C. MACLEAR (SBN 209228)<br>AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP  |  |  |
| 2        | 7425 Fairmount Ave.<br>El Cerrito, CA 94530<br>Telephone: (415) 568-5200   |  |  |
| 4        | Email: mcm@atalawgroup.com   |  |  |
| 5        | Attorney for Plaintiff<br>ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER  |  |  |
| 6<br>7   | BRUCE NYE (SBN 77608)<br>ADAMS   NYE   BECHT LLP<br>222 Kearny Street, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor                       |  |  |
| 8        | San Francisco, CA 94108-4521<br>Telephone: (415) 982-8955<br>Facsimile: (415) 982-2042<br>Email: byne@adamsnye.com |  |  |
| 10<br>11 | Attorney for Defendants TRUESTAR HEALTH INC., TRUESTAR HEALTH (U.S.) HOLDINGS INC.                                 |  |  |
| 12       | GUIDEDIOD COURT OF TH  | IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA                           |  |
| 13       | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA  |  |  |
| 14       | COUNTYO  | FALAMEDA   |  |
| 15       | ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH<br>CENTER, a California non-profit  | CASE NO. RG14736271                              |  |
| 16       | corporation,   | STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT;<br>[PROPOSED] ORDER |  |
| 17<br>18 | Plaintiff,   | Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.           |  |
| 19       | v.   | ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO:                    |  |
| 20       | TRUESTAR HEALTH INC., TRUESTAR HEALTH (U.S.) HOLDINGS INC., and  | Judge: Robert B. Freedman<br>Dept.: 20           |  |
| 21       | DOES 1-25,   | Reservation No:                                  |  |
| 22       | Defendants.  | Date:<br>Time:                                   |  |
| 23       |  | Action Filed: August 11, 2014                    |  |
| 24       |  | Trial Date: None set                             |  |
| 25       | 1. INTRODUCTION  |  |  |
| 26       | 1.1 On August 11, 2014, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center ("ERC"), a non-                                    |  |  |
| 27       | profit corporation, as a private enforcer, and in the public interest, initiated this action by filing             |  |  |
| 28       | a Complaint for Injunctive Relief, Civil Penalties and Other Relief (the "Complaint") pursuan                      |  |  |

to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), against TRUESTAR HEALTH INC., TRUESTAR HEALTH (U.S.) HOLDINGS INC. (collectively "TRUESTAR"), and DOES 1-25. For the purposes of this Consent Judgment, ERC and TRUESTAR shall be referred to collectively as "Parties" or individually as "Party. Both Parties have stipulated and consented to entry of this Consent Judgment prior to trial. In this action, ERC alleges that a number of products manufactured, distributed or sold by TRUESTAR contain lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and expose consumers to this chemical at a level(s) requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These products (referred to hereinafter individually as a "Covered Product" or collectively as "Covered Products") are:

- 1. Truestar Health (U.S.) Holdings Inc. TrueTHERMO
- 2. Truestar Health (U.S.) Holdings Inc. TrueENERGY
- 3. Truestar Health (U.S.) Holdings Inc. TrueDETOX
- 4. Truestar Health (U.S.) Holdings Inc. TruePOWER
- 5. Truestar Health (U.S.) Holdings Inc. TrueREPAIR
- 1.2 ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.
- 1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that TRUESTAR is a business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualifies as a "person in the course of business" within the meaning of Proposition 65.
  TRUESTAR manufactured, distributed and sold the Covered Products.
- 1.4 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation dated May 23, 2014, that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and TRUESTAR ("Notice"). A true and correct copy of the Notice is attached as Exhibit A and is hereby incorporated by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice was mailed and uploaded to the Attorney General's website, and no designated

governmental entity has filed a complaint or otherwise diligently prosecuted a matter against TRUESTAR with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.

- 1.5 ERC's Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products exposes persons in California to lead, a known carcinogen and reproductive toxicant, without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.
- 1.6 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission or denial by any of the Parties, or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers. Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.
- 1.7 The "Effective Date" of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as a Judgment by this Court.

#### 2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, personal jurisdiction over TRUESTAR as to the acts alleged in the Complaint and requirements stated in this Consent Judgment, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date which were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint.

#### 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND WARNINGS

3.1 TRUESTAR represents that both defendants are currently out of the business of

selling dietary supplements. TRUESTAR acknowledges that it has voluntarily made the decision not to produce, sell or offer to sell the Covered Products in California on and after the Effective Date. Should TRUESTAR ever decide to produce, sell or offer to sell the Covered Products in California, TRUESTAR will comply with applicable Proposition 65 requirements and shall be enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of California", or directly selling in the State of California, any product which exposes a person to a "Daily Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms per day when the maximum suggested dose is taken as directed on the Covered Product's label, unless it meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.

- 3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship or cause the direct shipment of a Covered Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that TRUESTAR knows or has reason to know will sell the Covered Product in California.
- 3.1.2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of servings in a recommended dosage appearing on the product label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day.

#### 3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

If TRUESTAR is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following "warning" must be utilized:

WARNING: This product contains lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm.

TRUESTAR shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the warning only if the maximum daily dose recommended on the label contains more than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the Daily Lead Exposure Level methodology set forth in Section 3.1.2.

TRUESTAR shall provide the warning on the following: 1) on TRUESTAR's checkout

page on its website for California consumers identifying each Covered Product. A second warning shall appear prior to completing checkout on the website when a California delivery address is indicated. The purchaser shall be required to accept the warning prior to completing checkout for any of the Covered Products being sold; and 2) on the label or container of TRUESTAR's product packaging for each Covered Product distributed into the State of California as defined in Section 3.1.1.

The warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on its website or on the label or container of TRUESTAR's product packaging and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. No other statements about Proposition 65 or lead may accompany the warning.

TRUESTAR must display the above warning(s) with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, or design of the label or container, as applicable, to render the warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use of the product.

# 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, payment in lieu of civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs, TRUESTAR shall make two (2) evenly divided payments of \$32,500.00 each, for a total of \$65,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC with the first payment due and owing fifteen (15) days from the Notice of Entry of Judgment and the second payment due and owing thirty (30) days thereafter. TRUESTAR shall make these payments by wire transfer to ERC's escrow account, for which ERC will give TRUESTAR the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.2 \$17,700.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code §25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$13,275.00) of the civil penalty to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety Code §25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$4,425.00) of the civil penalty.

4.3 \$2,337.45 shall be distributed to Environmental Research Center as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action; and \$13,287.48 shall be distributed to Environmental Research Center in lieu of further civil penalties, for the day-to-day business activities such as (1) continued enforcement of Proposition 65, which includes work, analyzing, researching and testing consumer products that may contain Proposition 65 chemicals, focusing on the same or similar type of ingestible products that are the subject matter of the current action; (2) the continued monitoring of past consent judgments and settlements to ensure companies are in compliance with Proposition 65; and (3) giving a donation of \$665.00 to the Environmental Working Group to address reducing toxic chemical exposures in California.

4.4 \$17,279.59 shall be distributed to Aqua Terra Aeris Law Group as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5, while \$14,395.48 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees under the same statutory authorization.

# 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only (i) by written stipulation of the Parties or pursuant to Section 5.4 and (ii) upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment.
- TRUESTAR must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC must provide written notice to TRUESTAR within thirty days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies TRUESTAR in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person or via telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent to meet and confer. Within thirty days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the proposed modification, ERC shall provide to TRUESTAR a written basis for its position. The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any remaining disputes.

Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

- 5.3 In the event that TRUESTAR initiates or otherwise requests a modification under Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a joint motion or application of the Consent Judgment, TRUESTAR shall reimburse ERC its costs and reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing the motion or application.
- 5.4 Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or application in support of a modification of the Consent Judgment, then either Party may seek judicial relief on its own. In such a situation, the prevailing party may seek to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees. As used in the preceding sentence, the term "prevailing party" means a party who is 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 that is the subject of the modification.

# 6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

6.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify or terminate this Consent Judgment.

# 7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment applies to, is binding upon, and benefits the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to Covered Products which are distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and which are not used by California consumers, nor shall it have any preclusive effect or be raised or used as *res judicata* to bar, prevent or preclude any future enforcement against any private labelers or entity not directly under the control and management of TRUESTAR.

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20 21

2223

24

252627

28

# 8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and TRUESTAR, of any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings of exposure to lead from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products and fully resolves all claims that have been or could have been asserted in this action up to and including the Effective Date for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings for the Covered Products. ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, hereby discharges TRUESTAR and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of TRUESTAR), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"), from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead.
- 8.2 ERC on its own behalf only, on one hand, and TRUESTAR on its own behalf only, on the other, further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition 65 in connection with the Notice or Complaint up through and including the Effective Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 8.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice or the Complaint and relating to the Covered Products will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, on one hand, and TRUESTAR, on the other hand, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and

10

11 12

14 15

13

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

2324

25

26

2728

TRUESTAR acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such unknown claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

ERC on behalf of itself only, on the one hand, and TRUESTAR, on the other hand, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542.

- 8.4 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any releasee regarding alleged exposures to lead in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notice and the Complaint.
- 8.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65 nor shall it apply to any of TRUESTAR's products other than the Covered Products.

#### 9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS

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

#### 10. GOVERNING LAW

The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

# 11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below by: (a) first-class, registered, or certified mail; (b) overnight courier; or (c) personal delivery. Courtesy copies via email may also be sent.

# FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.:

Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director Environmental Research Center 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400

1 San Diego, CA 92108 Tel: (619) 500-3090 2 Email: chris erc501c3@yahoo.com 3 With a copy to: 4 MATTHEW C. MACLEAR 5 AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP 7425 Fairmount Ave. El Cerrito, CA 94530 Telephone: (415) 568-5200 Email: mcm@atalawgroup.com TRUESTAR HEALTH INC., 8 TRUESTAR HEALTH (U.S.) HOLDINGS INC. C/O Tim Mulcahy Canadian Energy Saving Corporation 10 2 Bloor Street West, Suite 717 Toronto, ON M4W 3R1 11 Canada 12 With a copy to: 13 **BRUCE NYE** ADAMS | NYE | BECHT LLP 14 222 Kearny Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108-4521 15 Telephone: (415) 982-8955 Facsimile: (415) 982-2042 Email: byne@adamsnye.com 17 12. COURT APPROVAL 18 19 12.1 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this 20 21 Consent Judgment. 22 12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment, the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and 23 if possible prior to the hearing on the motion. 24 25 12.3 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have no force or effect. 26 111 27 28 111

### 13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile, portable document format (.pdf) or digital signature shall be construed as valid as the original signature.

# 14. DRAFTING

The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms with counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment entered thereon, the terms and provisions shall not be construed against any Party.

# 15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet in person or by telephone and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand. In the event an action or motion is filed, however, the prevailing party may seek to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees. As used in the preceding sentence, the term "prevailing party" means a party who is successful in obtaining relief more favorable to it than the relief that the other party was agreeable to providing in writing during the Parties' good faith attempt to resolve the dispute that is the subject of such enforcement action.

# 16. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

16.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

28 | ///

16.2 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. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

# 17. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:

- (1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint, that the matter has been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and
- (2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.

# IT IS SO STIPULATED:

| Dated: 3/23/ , 2015   | ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH<br>CENTER      |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                       | Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director |
| Dated: MARCH 23, 2015 | TRUESTAR HEALTH INC.                  |
|                       | By: Tim MULCAHY Its: Coo              |
| Dated: MARCH 23, 2015 | TRUESTAR HEALTH (U.S.) HOLDINGS INC.  |
|                       | By: The mulcany ces                   |

| 1    | APPROVED AS TO FORM:   |  |  |
|------|--|--|--|
| 2    | Dated: MARCH 19 2015   | AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP                                       |  |
| 3    |  | By Maylo Marker  |  |
| 4.   |  | Matthew C. Maclear   |  |
| 5    |  | Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center             |  |
| 6    | 171  |  |  |
| 7    | Dated:   | ADAMS NYE BECHT LLP  |  |
| 8    |  | By: Bruce Nye  |  |
| 9:   |  | Attorney for Defondants Truestar<br>Health Inc., Truestar Health |  |
| 10:  |  | (US) Holdings Inc.   |  |
| 11   | *  |  |  |
| 12.  |  |  |  |
| 13:  | ORDER AND JUDGMENT   |  |  |
| 14   | Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, requisite findings been made and good cause |  |  |
| 15   | appearing therefor, this Consent Judgment  | is approved and Judgment is hereby entered according             |  |
| 16   | to its terms.  |  |  |
| 17   |  |  |  |
| 18:  | IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED ANI   | D DECREED.   |  |
| 19   |  |  |  |
| 20   | Dated:, 2015   | Judge of the Superior Court                                      |  |
| 21.  |  | sange of the superior Count                                      |  |
| 22   |  |  |  |
| 23   |  |  |  |
| . 24 |  |  |  |
| .25  |  |  |  |
| .26  |  |  |  |
| 27   |  |  |  |
| 28   |  |  |  |
|      | STIPILATED CONSENT HIDGMENT: IPROPOSI  | ED] ORDER CASE NO. RG1473627.1                                   |  |