1 2 3	RICHARD DRURY (CBN 163559) DOUGLAS J. CHERMAK (CBN 233382) LOZEAU   DRURY LLP 410 12 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 250 Oakland, CA 94607 Telephone: (510) 836-4200	ALAMEDA COUNTY  JUL 0 9 2015
4 5	Fax: (510) 836-4205 Email: richard@lozeaudrury.com doug@lozeaudrury.com	K. McCoy, Exec. Off./Clerk
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, II	NC.
8 9 10	ANN G. GRIMALDI (CBN 160893) GRIMALDI LAW OFFICES 50 California Street, Suite 1500 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 463-5186	
11 12	Facsimile: (415) 358-4467 Email: ann.grimaldi@grimaldilawoffices.com	
13 14	Attorney for Defendant UNICITY INTERNATIONAL, INC.	
15	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
16	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
17	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC. a California non-profit	CASE NO. RG 15768771
18	corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT;
19	Plaintiff, v.	Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.
21	UNICITY INTERNATIONAL, INC., a	Action Filed: June 9, 2014
22	Delaware Corporation	Trial Date: None set
23	Defendant.	
24		
25	1. INTRODUCTION	
26	1.1 On May 1, 2015, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("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 and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint")	

CASE NO.

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT; [PROPOSED] ORDER

pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 *et seq*. ("Proposition 65"), against Unicity International, Inc. ("Unicity"). In this action, ERC alleges that a number of products manufactured, distributed or sold by Unicity contain lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and expose consumers to this chemical at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These products (referred to hereinafter individually as a "Covered Product" or collectively as "Covered Products") are: (1) Unicity International Inc. Bios Life BM&C Plus, (2) Unicity International Inc. Unicity Balance, (3) Unicity International Inc. Bios Life Bios Life Slim, (6) Unicity International Inc. Soy Protein, (5) Unicity International Inc. Bios Life Slim, (6) Unicity International Inc. SIG, (7) Unicity International Inc. Unicity Paraway Plus, (8) Unicity International Inc. Cardio-Essentials, (9) Unicity International Inc. ChloroPlasma Plus, (10) Unicity International Inc. Enzygen Plus, (11) Unicity International Inc. Red Clover Plus, and (12) Unicity International Inc. Bios Life Vascular Complete.

- 1.2 ERC and Unicity are hereinafter referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that Unicity 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. Unicity distributes and sells the Covered Products.
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation dated August 29, 2014, that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Unicity ("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 against Unicity with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.

- 1.6 ERC's Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products exposes persons in California to lead without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Unicity denies all material allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint.
- 1.7 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 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 for the representations made above, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, at any time, for any purpose.
- 1.8 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.
- 1.9 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 Unicity as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, 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, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS

- 3.1 Beginning on the Effective Date, Unicity shall not manufacture for sale in the State of California, "Distribute into the State of California", or directly sell in the State of California, any Covered 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 "Distribute into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Unicity knows 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 Unicity is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, one of the following warnings must be utilized:

[California] [Proposition 65] WARNING: This product contains lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm.

The bracketed words may, but are not required to, be used except that Unicity shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the warning if it knows or has reason to know the Covered Product has more than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in

Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3.

OR, to comply with Proposition 65 as to other listed chemicals in the Covered Products:

[California] [Proposition 65] WARNING: This product contains chemicals known to the

State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm.

The bracketed words may, but are not required to, be used except that Unicity shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the warning if it knows or has reason to know the Covered Product has greater than the No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) for any of the listed chemicals as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3.

Unicity shall provide the warning via the following methods: 1) for Covered Products sold online through Unicity's website to consumers in the state of California: (a) on Unicity's website, prior to the consumer's completing purchase of the Covered Products, upon the consumer entering a California delivery address and (b) on the packing slip and/or insert accompanying the shipment of Covered Products to a California purchaser; or 2) for Covered Products, if any, sold via authorized retail stores in the State of California, on the label or container of Unicity'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 Unicity's product packaging and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. No other statements contradicting the Proposition 65 warning may accompany the warning.

Unicity must display the above warnings 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.

If the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment or other governmental body with authority promulgates regulations setting forth warning text and/or methods of transmission required or permitted to be used under Proposition 65 for exposures to

listed chemicals in Covered Products, then at its sole discretion Unicity may use such other warning text and/or method of transmission without being deemed in breach of this Consent Judgment.

## 3.3 Reformulated Covered Products

A Reformulated Covered Product is one for which the Daily Exposure Level when the maximum suggested dose is taken as directed on the Reformulated Covered Product's label, contains no more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day as determined by the quality control methodology described in Section 3.4.

## 3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology

- **3.4.1** The testing requirements discussed in this Section 3.4 are not applicable to any Covered Product for which Unicity has provided the warning as specified in Section 3.2.
- 3.4.2 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate for the method used, including limit of detection, qualification, accuracy, and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS) achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.010 mg/kg or any other testing method subsequently agreed upon in writing by the Parties.
- 3.4.3 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an independent third-party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the United States Food & Drug Administration. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Unicity's ability to conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including the raw materials used in their manufacture.
- 3.4.4 Unicity shall arrange, at least once per year for at least five consecutive years, for the lead testing of five randomly selected samples of each Covered Product in the form intended for sale to the end-user to be distributed or sold to California. Unicity shall

continue testing for the five-year period so long as the Covered Products are sold in California or sold to a third party, if any, for authorized retail sale in California. If tests conducted pursuant to this Section demonstrate that no warning is required for a Covered Product during each of five consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Covered Product. However, if after the five-year period, Unicity changes ingredient suppliers for any of the Covered Products and/or reformulates any of the Covered Products, Unicity shall test that Covered Product at least once after such change is made.

3.4.5 Beginning on the Effective Date and continuing for a period of five years thereafter, Unicity shall arrange for copies of all laboratory reports with results of testing for lead content under Section 3.4 to be automatically sent by the testing laboratory directly to ERC within ten working days after completion of that testing. These reports shall be deemed and treated by ERC as confidential information under the terms of the confidentiality agreement entered into by the Parties. For the testing required under this Section 3.4, Unicity shall retain all test results and documentation for a period of five years from the date of each test.

## 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, payment in lieu of civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs, Unicity shall make a total payment of \$200,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC within 5 days of the Effective Date. Unicity shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's escrow account, for which ERC will give Unicity the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.2 \$96,900.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code \$25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$72,675.00) 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% (\$24,225.00) of the civil penalty.

- 4.3 \$1,958.27 shall be distributed to Environmental Research Center as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action; and \$73,967.42 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 \$3,690.00 to the Natural Resources Defense Council to address reducing toxic chemical exposures in California.
- **4.4** \$15,270.00 shall be distributed to Lozeau|Drury LLP as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees while \$11,904.31 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees.

#### 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only (i) by written stipulation of the Parties and entry of such stipulation by order of the Court; or (ii) upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment.
- 5.2 If Unicity seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then Unicity 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 Unicity within thirty days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies Unicity 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 Unicity 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 Unicity 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, Unicity 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.
- 6.2 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Reformulated Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform Unicity in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit Unicity to identify the Covered Products at issue. Unicity shall, within thirty days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, demonstrating Unicity's compliance with the Consent Judgment, if warranted. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

## 7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their

28

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 to consumers who do not identify a California shipping address.

## 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 Unicity, 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 and releases Unicity and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Unicity), 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 Unicity 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 Unicity, 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 Unicity 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 Unicity, 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 Unicity'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.

#### 1 11. PROVISION OF NOTICE 2 All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall 3 be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below by: (a) first-class, registered, or certified 4 mail; (b) overnight courier; or (c) personal delivery. Courtesy copies via email may also be sent. 5 FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.: Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Center 6 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92108 7 Tel: (619) 500-3090 Email: chris erc501c3@yahoo.com 8 9 With a copy to: 10 11 RICHARD DRURY DOUGLAS J. CHERMAK 12 LOZEAU | DRURY LLP 410 12th Street, Suite 250 13 Oakland, CA 94607 14 Telephone: (510) 836-4200 Fax: (510) 836-4205 15 Email: richard@lozeaudrury.com doug@lozeaudrury.com 16 17 UNICITY INTERNATIONAL, INC. 18 Clayton Barton, COO Unicity International, Inc. 19 1201 N. 800 E Orem, Utah 84097 20 Email: clayton.barton@unicity.com 21 With a copy to: 22 ANN G. GRIMALDI 23 **GRIMALDI LAW OFFICES** 50 California Street, Suite 1500 24 San Francisco, CA 94111 25 Telephone: (415) 463-5186

27

26

Email: ann.grimaldi@grimaldilawoffices.com

Facsimile: (415) 358-4467

## 12. COURT APPROVAL

- 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 Consent Judgment.
- 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 if possible prior to the hearing on the motion.
- 12.3 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have no force or effect.

## 13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf 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 and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn, and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

## 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 reasonably 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 amenable to providing 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.
- 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:

1	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	
2	Dated:, 2015 CENTER, INC.	
3	By:	
4	1 11/10	
5	Dated: UNICITY INTERNATIONAL, INC.	
6	By:	
7	Its: 60	
8	APPROVED AS TO FORM	
9	Dated: May 1, 2015 LOZEAU DRURY LDR	
10	By:	
11	Richard T. Drury Douglas J. Chermak	
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.	
13		
14	Dated: May 8 , 2015 GRIMALDI LAW OFFICES	
15	By: Aun Dinnel	
16	Ann G. Grimaidi	
17	Attorney for Defendant Unicity International, Inc.	
19		
20		
21	ORDER AND JUDGMENT	
22	Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is	
23	approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.	
24	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.	
25	700	
26	Dated: // Judge of the Superior Court	
27		
20		
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT; [PROPOSED] ORDER CASE NO.  15	