ENDORSED Robert B. Hancock, Esq. (Bar No. 179438) 肛即 PACIFIC JUSTICÉ CENTER ALAMEDA COUNTY 50 California Street, Suite 1500 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 310-1940 JUL 0 7 2017 3 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR GOURT Email: rbh@lawyer.com DY DAN WILLIAMS 4 Attorneys for Plaintiff 5 Arny Chamberlin б 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 10 11 AMY CHAMBERLIN, in the public interest, Case No. RG16829495 12 Plaintiff, (PROPOSED/STIPULATED CONSENT 13 JUDGMENT VS. 14 [Cal. Health and Safety PENNINGTON SEED, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 500, Code § 25249.6, et seq.] 15 inclusive, Action Filed: August 31, 2016 16 Defendant. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

[PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

014176.0047\4626359.1

 1.1 This Action arises out of the alleged violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5, et seq. (also known as and hereinafter referred to as "Proposition 65") regarding the Defendant's "Nature's Heat Wood Pellets" (the "Covered Product").

- 1.2 Plaintiff AMY CHAMBERLIN ("Chamberlin") is a California resident acting as a private enforcer of Proposition 65. Chamberlin alleges that she brings this Action in the public interest pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5, et seq., asserts that she is 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 Defendant Pennington Seed, Inc., is a Delaware corporation, hereinafter referred to as "Defendant" or "Pennington."
- 1.4 Chamberlin and Pennington are hereinafter sometimes referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."
  - 1.5 Pennington acquires, distributes and/or sells the Covered Product.
- 1.6 On or about June 24, 2016, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d)(1), Chamberlin served a 60-Day Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers and Pennington alleging that Pennington violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons in California to wood dust in connection with the use of the Covered Product without first providing a Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.7 After more than sixty (60) days passed since service of the Notices of Violation, and no designated governmental agency having filed a complaint against Pennington with regard to the Covered Product or the alleged violations, Chamberlin filed a complaint (the "Complaint") for injunctive relief and civil penalties. The Complaint, dated August 31, 2016, is based on the allegations in the Notice of Violation.
- 1.8 The Complaint alleges that Pennington manufactured, distributed, and/or sold in California the Covered Product, which allegedly contain wood dust, a substance listed under

Proposition 65 as being known by the State of California to cause cancer, requiring a Proposition 65 warning. Further, the Complaint alleges that use of the Covered Product expose persons in California to wood dust without first providing clear an reasonable warnings, in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Pennington generally denies all material and factual allegations of the Notice of Violations and the Complaint, and specifically denies that the Plaintiff or California consumers have been harmed or damaged by its conduct. Pennington and Chamberlin each reserve all rights to allege additional facts, claims, and affirmative defenses if the Court does not approve this Consent Judgment.

- 1.9 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise and resolve disputed claims and avoid prolonged and costly litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment, nor compliance with its terms, 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, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, distributors, wholesalers, customers, or retailers ("Party Affiliates"), of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, violation of law, fault, wrongdoing, or liability, including without limitation, any admission concerning any alleged violation of Proposition 65. Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties or Party Affiliates may have in any other or future legal proceeding. Provided, however, nothing in this Section shall affect the enforceability of this Consent Judgment.
- 1.10 The "Effective Date" of this Consent Judgment shall be the date this Consent Judgment is entered as a Judgment.

#### 2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2.1 The Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Action and personal jurisdiction over the Parties, that venue is proper in this Court, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment pursuant to the terms set forth herein.

#### 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND WARNINGS

3.1 Beginning on the Effective Date, and except as provided in Section 3.2 below,
Pennington shall be permanently enjoined from offering for sale to a consumer in California,

directly selling to a consumer in California, or "Distributing into California" any of the Covered Product, unless the label of the Covered Product contains a Proposition 65 compliant warning, consistent with Section 3.3, below. "Distribution into California" means to ship any of the Covered Product to California for sale by others. Provided, however, that Pennington may manufacture or package and sell Covered Product without providing a Proposition 65 compliant warning so long as such products are only for sale to distributors located outside of California or Pennington does not Distribute them into California.

3.2 All Covered Product that have been or will have been produced, distributed, shipped, or sold, or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce through and including 60 days after the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment are exempt from the provisions of Sections 3.1 and 3.3 and are included within the release in Sections 8.1 through 8.4.

# 3.3 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

(A) For the Covered Product that is subject to the warning requirement of Section 3.1,:

WARNING. Drilling, sowing, sanding or machining wood products one expose you to wood dust, a substance known to the State of Caldonia to cause center. This product contains wood dust. Avoid inhaling wood dust or use a dust mask or other saleguards for personal protection. Carbon moreoidle, which is a by-product of combination of this product, is known by the State of California to come birth defects or other reproductive harm.

For more information go to www.P65Viernings.ca.gov/wood.

Pennington shall provide a Compliant Warning. The Parties agree the foregoing constitutes a clear and reasonable warning:

(B) The Warning shall be permanently affixed to or printed on (at the point of manufacture, or distribution, but prior to shipment into California, or prior to distribution within California) the outside packaging or container of each bag of the Covered Product. The Warning shall be displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs or devices on the outside packaging or labeling, as to render it likely be to read and understood by an ordinary individual prior to use. If the Warning is displayed on the product packaging or

labeling, the Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings on the product packaging or labeling, and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters. If printed on the label itself, the Warning shall be contained in the same section of the labeling that states other safety warnings concerning the use of Covered Product, if any. The Parties acknowledge that Pennington is currently utilizing a safe harbor warning as specified in Cal. Code Reg. section 25603.2 in connection with the Covered Product. That warning is set from in Section 3.3(A) and is agreed to satisfy the warning obligation.

(C) Notwithstanding paragraphs (A) and (B) above, if modifications or amendments to Proposition 65 of its regulations adopted after the Effective Date are inconsistent with, or provide warnings specifications or options different from, the specifications in this Agreement, Pennington may modify the content and delivery methods of its warnings to conform to the clear and reasonable warning provisions of Proposition 65 or its regulations as modified or amended, and such warnings shall constitute Compliant Warnings under this Agreement.

#### 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 Pennington shall make a total payments of \$64,500.00. The payments shall be within ten days of the Effective Date. The payments shall be in full and final satisfaction of any and all civil penalties, payment in lieu of civil penalties, and attorneys' fees and costs.
- 4.2 The payment shall be in the form of three separate checks sent to counsel for Plaintiff, Robert B. Hancock, Pacific Justice Center, 50 California Street, San Francisco, California 94111. The checks shall be payable to the following parties and the payment shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.3 An aggregate of \$22,500.00 (Twenty-Two Thousand and Five Hundred Dollars) as civil penalties pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). Of this amount, one check shall be payable to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), in the sum of \$16,875.00 and a second check shall be payable to Chamberlin in the sum of \$5,625.00. (Cal. Health & Safety Code section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d)). Chamberlin

10

11

12

13

16 17

15

19

18

20 21

2223

24

25

2627

28

waives any statutory right to share in the penalties awarded to any further extent. Chamberlin's counsel will forward the civil penalty to OEHHA.

- 4.4 The third check shall be for \$42,000.00 (Forty-Two Thousand Dollars) payable to Robert B. Hancock as reimbursement of Chamberlin's attorneys' fees, costs, investigation and litigation expenses ("Attorneys' Fees and Costs").
- 4.5 Any failure by Pennington to remit payments on or before its due date shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement, entitling Plaintiff to rescind. In such event, the Parties agree to cooperate in taking any and all steps necessary to vacate and/or set aside any Judgment or dismissal entered, and this Agreement and the Consent Judgment shall be deemed null, void and not admissible at trial in this proceeding.

#### 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only by: (i) Written agreement and stipulation of the Parties and upon having such stipulation entered as a modified Consent Judgment by the Court; or (ii) upon entry of a modified Judgment by the Court pursuant to a motion by one of the Parties after exhausting the meet and confer process set forth as follows. If either Party requests or initiates a modification, then it shall meet and confer with the other Party in good faith before filing a motion with the Court seeking to modify it. Chamberlin is entitled to reimbursement of all reasonable attorneys' fees and costs regarding the Parties' meet and confer efforts for any modification requested or initiated by Pennington. Similarly, Pennington is entitled to reimbursement of all reasonable attorneys' fees and costs regarding the Parties' meet and confer efforts for any modification requested or initiated by Chamberlin. If, despite their meet and confer efforts, the Parties are unable to reach agreement on any proposed modification the party seeking the modification may file the appropriate motion and the prevailing party on such motion shall be entitled to recover its reasonable fees and costs associated with such motion. One basis, but not the exclusive basis, for Pennington to seek a modification of this Consent Judgment is if Proposition 65 is changed, narrowed, limited, or otherwise rendered inapplicable in whole or in part to the Covered Product or wood dust due to legislative change, a change in the implementing regulations, court decisions or other legal basis.

# 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, if the Agreement is not rescinded.
- 6.2 Subject to Section 6.3, any Party may, by motion or application for an order to show cause filed with this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. The prevailing party in any such motion or application may request that the Court award its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated with such motion or application.
- 6.3 Before filing a motion or application for an order to show cause, Chamberlin shall provide Pennington with 30 (thirty days' written notice of any alleged violations of the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. As long as Pennington cures any such alleged violations within the 30-day period (or if any such violation cannot practicably be cured within 30 days, it expeditiously initiates a cure within 30 days and completes it as soon as practicable) and Pennington provides proof to Chamberlin that the alleged violation(s) were the result of good faith mistake or accident, then Pennington shall not be in violation of the Consent Judgment. Pennington shall have the ability to avail itself of the benefits of this Section two (2) times following the Effective Date.

#### 7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

7.1 This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, successors, and assigns, and it shall benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, franchisees, licenses, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns.

#### 8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between Chamberlin, on behalf of herself and in the public interest, and Pennington, of any and all direct or derivative violations (or claimed violations) of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings of exposure from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Product and fully resolves all claims that have been or could have been asserted in this

Action by any person up to and including the Effective Date for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings for the Covered Product. Chamberlin, on behalf of herself and in the public interest, hereby forever releases and discharges Pennington and its past and present officers, directors, owners, shareholders, employees, agents, attorneys, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers, distributions, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities and persons in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, including but not limited to Walmart, Inc., and Blue Mountain Lumber, and the predecessors, successors and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"), from any and all claims and causes of action and obligations to pay damages, restitution, fines, civil penalties, payment in lieu of civil penalties and expenses (including but not limited to expert analysis fees, expert fees, attorneys' fees and costs) (collectively, "Claims") arising under, based on, or derivative of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations up through the Effective Date relating to actual or potential exposure to chemicals known by the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm, from the Covered Product and/or failure to warn about wood dust, as set forth in the Notices of Violation and the Complaint.

- 8.2 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance by any Released Party with Proposition 65 regarding alleged exposures from the Covered Product as described above or set forth in the Notice of Violations and the Complaint.
- 8.3 It is possible that other Claims not known to Chamberlin arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice of Violations or the Complaint and relating to the Covered Product that were manufactured, sold or distributed into California before the Effective Date will develop or be discovered. Chamberlin, on behalf of herself only, acknowledges that the Claims released herein include all known and unknown Claims and waives 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."

Chamberlin, on behalf of herself only, acknowledges and understands the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

8.4 Chamberlin, on one hand, and Pennington, on the other hand, each release and waive all Claims they may have against each other for any statements or actions made or undertaken by them in connection with the Notice of Violations or the Complaint. However, this shall not affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

#### 9. CONSTRUCTION AND SEVERABILITY

- 9.1 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for the Parties prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms and conditions with its counsel. In any subsequent interpretation or construction of this Consent Judgment, the terms and conditions shall not be construed against any Party.
- 9.2 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.
- 9.3 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

#### 10. 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, (b) certified mail, (c) overnight courier, or (d) personal delivery to the following:

#### For Chamberlin:

Melvin B. Pearlston Robert B. Hancock PACIFIC JUSTICE CENTER 50 California Street, Suite 1500 San Francisco, California 94111

26 /// 27 ///

25

28 ///

### For Pennington Seed:

Daniel Rapaport WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN LLP 1111 Broadway, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor Oakland, California 94607

#### 11. COURT APPROVAL

- 11.1 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, Chamberlin shall notice a Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this Consent Judgment.
- 11.2 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.
- 11.3 If, despite the Parties' best efforts, the Court does not approve this Stipulated Consent Judgment, it shall be null and void and have no force or effect.

#### 12. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

This Stipulated Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be deemed one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed as valid as the original signature.

### 13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

- 13.1 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.
- 13.2 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.

# 1 14. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS AND FOR APPROVAL 2 This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. 3 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: 4 Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a good faith 5 (a) settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint, that the matter has been б diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and 7 8 (b) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), and approve the Settlement, and this Consent Judgment. IT IS SO STIPULATED. 11 Dated: 3/9/2017 12 13 Amy Chamberlin 14 Dated: \_\_ 15 16 17 Pennington Seed, Inc. By: Dan Pennington 18 APPROVED AS TO FORM: PACIFIC JUSTICE CENTER 20 21 22 Robert B. Hancock 23 Attorneys for Plaintiff 24 AMY CHAMBERLIN 25 26 27

28

014176,004744626359,1

# I 14. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS AND FOR APPROVAL 2 14.1 This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. 3 The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed 4 regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to: 5 Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a good faith (a) 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 8 Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), and approve the Settlement, and this Consent Judgment. IT IS SO STIPULATED. 10 Dated: 11 12 13 Amy Chamberlin 14 Dated: 3/14/17 15 16 17 Pennington Seed, Inc. By: George A. Yuhas 18 Secretary of Pennington Seed, Inc. 19 APPROVED AS TO FORM: 20 Dated: \_\_ PACIFIC JUSTICE CENTER 21 22 By: 23 Robert B. Hancock 24 Attorneys for Plaintiff AMY CHAMBERLIN 25 26 27 28 [PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

014176.0047\4626359.1

WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN LLP

Daniel Rapaport

Attorneys for Defendant Pennington Seed, Inc.

[PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

014176.0047\4626359.1

# **JUDGMENT**

Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing therefor, this Consent Judgment is approved and judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.

IOANA PETROU

Judge of the Superior Court