1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Brian C. Johnson, State Bar No. 235965 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710-2565 Telephone:(510) 848-8880 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118  Attorneys for Plaintiff MARK MOORBERG	MAY 1 3 2015  DAVID H. YAMASAKI Chief Executive Officer/Obert Supply: Resussaid County of Genta Clera DEPUTY  DEPUTY		
8				
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10	COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA			
11	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION			
12	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION			
13				
14				
15	MARK MOORBERG,	Case No. 115CV275597		
16	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO TERMS OF PROPOSITION 65		
17	V.	SETTLEMENT AND CONSENT JUDGMENT		
18	RGH ENTERPRISES, INC., et al.,	Date: May 12, 2015		
19	Defendants.	Time: 9:00 AM Dept. 9		
20		Judge: Honorable Mary E. Arand		
21				
22				
23				
24 25				
25 26				
20 27				
28				
-~				

Plaintiff Mark Moorberg and Defendant RGH Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Invacare Supply Group ("RGH"), having agreed through their respective counsel that Judgment be entered pursuant to the terms of their settlement agreement in the form of a consent judgment, and following this Court's issuance of an order approving their Proposition 65 settlement and Consent Judgment on \_\_\_\_\_, 2015, and for good cause being shown, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4) and Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, judgment is hereby entered in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment attached hereto as Exhibit 1. By stipulation of the parties, the Court will retain jurisdiction to

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Judge Beth McGowen

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Brian C. Johnson, State Bar No. 235965 Josh Voorhees, State Bar No. 241436 THE CHANLER GROUP 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710 Telephone: (510) 848-8880 Facsimile: (510) 848-8118 Attorneys for Plaintiff LAURENCE MOORBERG  SUPERIOR COURT OF T	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA	
10	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION	
11		
12 13	MARK MOORBERG  Plaintiff,	Case No. 115CV275597  PROPOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT
14	V.	,
15 16	RGH ENTERPRISES, INC; and DOES 1-150, inclusive,	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. and Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6)
17	Defendants.	
18		
19	·	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	· I	

CONSENT JUDGMENT

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Parties

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Mark Moorberg ("Moorberg") and RGH Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Independence Medical, successor by merger to Invacare Supply Group, Inc. ("RGH"), with Moorberg and RGH each individually referred to as a "Party" and collectively as the "Parties."

#### 1.2 Plaintiff

Moorberg is an individual residing in the State of California who seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances used in consumer products.

#### 1.3 Defendant

RGH employs ten or more persons and is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65").

# 1.4 General Allegations

Moorberg alleges that RGH manufactures, sells, and/or distributes for sale in California, vinyl/PVC pants that contain di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate ("DEHP"). DEHP is listed pursuant to Proposition 65 as a chemical known to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm. Moorberg alleges that RGH failed to provide the health hazard warning required by Proposition 65 for exposures to DEHP from its vinyl/PVC pants.

# 1.5 Product Description

The products that are covered by this Consent Judgment are vinyl/PVC pants containing DEHP manufactured, sold and/or distributed for sale in California by RGH, including, but not limited to, the *Invacare Waterproof Vinyl Pull-On Pant, ISG-3024870, UPC #0 16167 97487 0* (collectively, "Products").

#### 1.6 Notice of Violation

On September 30, 2014, Moorberg served RGH and the requisite public enforcement agencies with a 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice"), alleging that RGH violated Proposition 65

by failing to warn its customers and consumers in California that the 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 January 14, 2015, Moorberg commenced the instant action, naming RGH as a defendant for the alleged violations of Proposition 65 that are the subject of the Notice.

#### 1.8 No Admission

RGH denies the material, factual, and legal allegations contained in the Notice and maintains that all of the products that it has sold and distributed in California, including the Products, have been, and are, in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by RGH of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by RGH of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, the same being specifically denied by RGH. This Section shall not, however, diminish or otherwise affect RGH's 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 RGH as to the allegations contained in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Santa Clara, and that this 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.

#### 1.10 Effective Date

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date that the Court grants the motion for approval of this Consent Judgment contemplated by Section 5.

#### 2. INJUNCTIVE SETTLEMENT TERMS

#### 2.1 Reformulated Standard

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, "Reformulated Products" are defined as Products that contain less than 1,000 ppm (0.1%) DEHP content when analyzed pursuant to Environmental

Protection Agency testing methodologies 3580A and 8270C, or equivalent methodologies used by state or federal agencies for purposes of determining DEHP content in a solid substance.

#### 2.2 Commitment to Reformulate or Warn

Commencing on March 2, 2015 and continuing thereafter, RGH shall only purchase for sale or manufacture for sale in California, Reformulated Products, or Products that are sold with a clear and reasonable warning pursuant to Section 2.3.

# 2.3 Health Hazard Warnings

Commencing on March 2, 2015 and continuing thereafter, for all Products that are not Reformulated Products (i.e. Products that contain more than 1,000 ppm DEHP), RGH agrees that it will only ship, sell, or offer such Products for sale in California with a clear and reasonable warning utilized pursuant to this Section. RGH further agrees that the warning will be prominently placed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions before purchase or use. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, a clear and reasonable warning shall consist of a warning affixed to the packaging, label, tag, or directly to a Product sold in California containing the following statement:

WARNING: This product contains DEHP, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm.

In the event that RGH conducts any sales of Products in or into California online via the internet, the warning shall be me made visible to the purchaser(s) of the Products prior to the time at which the purchase is completed and shall meet the requirements specified above with regard to the prominence, size and visibility of the warning message.

# 3. MONETARY SETTLEMENT TERMS

# 3.1 Civil Penalty Payments

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(2), and in settlement of all claims alleged in the Notice and referred to in this Consent Judgment, RGH agrees to pay \$9,000 in civil

The regulatory safe harbor warning language specified in tit. 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25603.2(a)(2) may also be used if RGH employed it for Products prior to the Effective Date.

OEHHA's portion of any penalty payment(s) made under this Consent Judgment.

- 3.1.1 Initial Civil Penalty. Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, RGH shall pay an initial civil penalty in the amount of \$3,000. RGH will provide its payment in a single check made payable to: "Mark Moorberg, Client Trust Account" in the amount of \$3,000.
- 3.1.2 Final Civil Penalty. On June 15, 2015, RGH shall pay a final civil penalty of \$6,000 (the "Final Civil Penalty"). The Final Civil Penalty shall be waived in its entirety if, by June 1, 2015, an officer of RGH provides Moorberg's counsel with written certification that, as of the date of such certification, all Products purchased for sale or distributed for sale in California are Reformulated Products as defined by this Consent Judgment and that it will continue to only offer Reformulated Products in the future. Alternatively, RGH may certify that it is no longer offering the Products for sale in California and that, if it recommences sales in California, it will only offer Reformulated Products. The option to provide a written certification of reformulation (or cessation of sales) in lieu of making the Final Civil Penalty payment otherwise required by this Agreement is a material term, and time is of the essence. If RGH, within one year of having provided a certification pursuant to this Section, recommences sales of non-Reformulated Products in California, it shall provide written notice to Moorberg, and tender the \$6,000 Final Civil Penalty payment in a check made payable to "Mark Moorberg, Client Trust Account." RGH agrees that it will not recommence sales of non-Reformulated Products more than one year post-certification unless it has previously paid the Final Civil Penalty.

## 3.2 Reimbursement of Moorberg's Attorneys' Fees and Costs

The Parties acknowledge that Moorberg and his counsel offered to resolve this dispute without reaching terms on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed to them, thereby leaving the issue to be resolved after the material terms of the agreement had been settled. Shortly after the other settlement terms had been finalized, RGH expressed a desire to resolve Moorberg's fees

and costs. The Parties then negotiated a resolution of the compensation due to Moorberg and his counsel under general contract principles and the private attorney general doctrine codified at California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5. For all work performed through the mutual execution of this agreement and the Court's approval of the same, but exclusive of fees and costs on appeal, if any, RGH shall pay \$28,500. RGH's payment shall be due within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, and delivered to the address in Section 3.4 in the form of a check payable to "The Chanler Group." The reimbursement shall cover all fees and costs incurred by Moorberg investigating, bringing this matter to RGH's attention, litigating, and negotiating a settlement of the matter in the public interest.

#### 3.3 Payments Held In Trust

With the exception of the Final Civil Penalty payment required by Section 3.1.2, RGH shall deliver all payments required by this Consent Judgment to its counsel within thirty (30) days of the date that this agreement is fully executed by the Parties. RGH's counsel shall confirm receipt of settlement funds in writing to Moorberg's counsel and, thereafter, hold the amounts paid in trust until such time as the Court grants the motion for approval of the Parties' settlement contemplated by Section 5. Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, RGH's counsel shall deliver all settlement payments it has held in trust to Moorberg's counsel at the address provided in Section 3.4. In the event the Final Civil Penalty payment required by Section 3.1.2 becomes due prior to the Effective Date, then RGH shall deliver the Final Civil Penalty payment to its attorney to be held in trust until, and disbursed within ten (10) days after, the Effective Date.

#### 3.4 Payment Address

All payments required by this Consent Judgment shall be delivered to the following address:

The Chanler Group Attn: Proposition 65 Controller 2560 Ninth Street Parker Plaza, Suite 214 Berkeley, CA 94710

1

# 4.1 Moorberg's Release of RGH

3

4

5 6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

1617

18

19 20

21 22

23

2425

26 27

28

# 4.1.1 Moorberg's Release of Proposition 65 Claims

This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between Moorberg and RGH, of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted by Moorberg in the public interest, on his own behalf, or on behalf of his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, as alleged in the Notice and as alleged or as could have been alleged in the Complaint against: (a) RGH, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, directors, officers, employees, attorneys, and assigns; and (b) RGH's downstream distributors, wholesalers, retailers and/or customers, including, without limitation, each entity to which RGH directly or indirectly distributed, distributes, sold or sells the Products, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may have used, maintained, distributed or sold the Products (the "Released Parties"), based on the alleged failure to warn, including, without limitation, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, about exposures to DEHP from Products manufactured, distributed, sold or offered for sale by RGH in California before the Effective Date. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65. The Parties further agree and understand that this release extends to those upstream entities that manufactured or supplied the Products to RGH, or from which RGH directly or indirectly purchased the Products, but only to the extent said upstream manufacturer(s) or supplier(s) Products were/are ultimately sold or distributed for sale by RGH.

# 4.1.2 Moorberg's Individual Release of Claims

Moorberg, in his individual capacity only and *not* in his representative capacity, also provides a release to RGH and the Released Parties 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 Moorberg of any nature, character or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, arising out of alleged or actual exposures to DEHP in Products manufactured, imported, distributed or sold by RGH before the Effective Date.

# 4.2 RGH's Release of Moorberg

RGH, on its own behalf and on behalf of its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and/or assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against Moorberg and his attorneys and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made (or those that could have been taken or made) by Moorberg and his attorneys and other representatives in the course of investigating claims, seeking to enforce Proposition 65 against it in this matter, or with respect to the Products.

#### 4.3 Mutual California Civil Code Section 1542 Waiver

The Parties, including Moorberg in his individual capacity only and *not* in any representative capacity and RGH, each acknowledge that he/it is familiar with Section 1542 of Civil Code, which provides 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.

The Parties, each on his/its own behalf, and on behalf of his/its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, expressly waives and relinquishes any and all rights and benefits which he/it may have under, or which may be conferred on him/it by the provisions of Civil Code § 1542 as well as under any other state or federal statute or common law principle of similar effect, to the fullest extent that he/it may lawfully waive such rights or benefits pertaining to the released matters, which are defined as RGH's alleged or actual failure to warn about exposures to DEHP from the Products, and Moorberg and Moorberg's counsel's statements and actions made or taken in connection with the investigation or enforcement of Moorberg's claims with respect to the Products, as alleged in the Notice and Complaint.

#### 5. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by all Parties. Moorberg and RGH agree to support the entry of this

agreement as a judgment, and to obtain the Court's approval of their settlement 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 Moorberg shall draft and file and RGH shall support, appearing at the hearing if so requested. If any third-party objection to the motion is filed, Moorberg and RGH 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.

#### 6. APPLICATION OF JUDGMENT

The obligations of this Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon all plaintiffs acting in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d), and RGH, and its successors and assigns. The terms contained in this Consent Judgment shall be submitted to the California Attorney General's office prior to the entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court.

## 7. COMPLIANCE WITH SERVICE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Moorberg and his attorneys agree to comply with the reporting and service requirements referenced in California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f), and Title 11, California Code of Regulations, section 3003, et seq., providing the Attorney General's Office receive a form reporting of the settlement, and service of the Consent Judgment and all moving papers in support of the approval motion at least 45 days before the Court hears the motion.

## 8. SEVERABILITY

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

#### 9. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California and apply within 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 Products, then RGH may provide Moorberg with written 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 Products

-	are so affected. Nothing in this Consent studgment shan be interpreted to refleve ROH from its		
2	obligation to comply with any pertinent state or federal law or regulation.		
3	10. NOTICE		
4	Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notice required by this Consent Judgment		
5	shall be in writing and sent by: (i) personal delivery, (ii) first-class registered or certified mail,		
6	return receipt requested; or (iii) a recognized overnight courier to any Party by the other at the		
7	following addresses:		
8	For RGH: For Moorberg:		
9 10	Steven Eisenberg Proposition 65 Coordinator AssuraMed The Chanler Group 1810 Summit Commerce Park 2560 Ninth Street		
11	Twinsburg, OH 44087  Parker Plaza, Suite 214  Berkeley, CA 94710-2565  with copy to:		
<ul><li>12</li><li>13</li></ul>	John F. Cermak, Jr. Baker & Hostetler LLP		
14	11601 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90025-0509		
15 16	Any Party may, from time to time, specify in writing to the other Party a change of address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.		
17			
18	11. <u>COUNTERPARTS, FACSIMILE AND PDF SIGNATURES</u>		
19	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or portable		
20	document format (pdf) signature, each of which shall be deemed an original and, all of which, when		
21	taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.		
22	12. <u>COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS</u>		
23	Moorberg and his counsel agree to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced		
24	in California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f).		
25	13. MODIFICATION		
26	This Consent Judgment may be modified only: (1) upon written agreement of the Parties		
27	and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon; or (2) upon a successful		
28			
	1		

motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.

#### 14. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

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, and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties.

#### 15. **AUTHORIZATION**

Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf of the party represented and legally to bind that party.

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
2	
3	Dated: 3 2 15 , 2015 THE CHANLER GROUP
4	Por C
5	By: Brian C. Johnson
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff MARK MOORBERG
7	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
8	
9	Dated: 2/2.7/, 2015 BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
10	BARER & HOSTETLER LLP
11	By: John F. Cermak, Jr.
12	Attorneys for Defendant RGH ENTERPRISES, INC.
13	ROH ENTERPRISES, INC.
14	AGREED TO: AGREED TO:
15	14.0
16	MARK MOORBERG RGH, INC.
17	X / PSG ES LO
18	Dated: 3.15  By: Steve Eisenberg (Print Name)  Its: Vice President (Title)
19	Title)
20	Dated: 2/27/15
21	
22	
23	·
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	, 11
	CONSENT JUDGMENT 11