1					
2		EIII			
3	Para and RAD (QUIN CA)	FILE D San Francisco County Superior Court			
4	FREP ARED BY COUNSEL	AUG 3 0 2021			
5		CLERK OF THE COURT			
6		BY: Deputy Clerk			
7					
8	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE S	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF S	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO			
10					
11	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,	Case No. CGC-20-586195			
12	Plaintiff,	[P <del>ROPOSE</del> D] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO S.P. RICHARDS			
13	V.	CO.			
14	S.P. RICHARDS CO., et al.,				
15	Defendants.				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21	·				
22					
23	,				
24					
25					
26					
27					
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED	-1-				
ON RECYCLED PAPER	CONSENT JUDGMENT – S.P. RICHARDS CO. – CASE NO. CGC-20-586195				

28
DOCUMENT PREPARED
ON RECYCLED PAPER

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Parties to this Consent Judgment are the Center for Environmental Health, a California non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and S.P. Richards Co., a Georgia Corporation (referred to as, "Settling Defendant"). The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendant as set forth in the operative complaint ("Complaint") in the above-captioned matter. This Consent Judgment covers thermal paper that is sold, offered for sale or distributed by Settling Defendant ("Thermal Paper"). Thermal Paper is used in thermal printers to create transactional documents such as cash register and ATM receipts. Plaintiff alleges that Thermal Paper sold by Settling Defendant to its customers is or has been coated with bisphenol A ("BPA"), a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm.
- 1.1 On April 17, 2020, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to Settling Defendant, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California and the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000, alleging that Settling Defendant violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to BPA from Thermal Paper without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.2 On August 18, 2020, CEH filed the Complaint in the above-captioned matter, which names Settling Defendant.
- 1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein with respect to Thermal Paper provided to customers by Settling Defendant.
- 1.4 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is or shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with

the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument or defense the Parties may have in any other pending or future legal proceedings including matters related to the Cross Complaint filed in this proceeding by Settling Defendant. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties solely for purposes of settling, compromising and resolving issues disputed in the Complaint.

#### 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

2.1 Reformulation of Thermal Paper. After the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall not purchase, sell, offer for sale, ship, distribute, use or provide to any employee or customer any Thermal Paper that contains BPA that was intentionally added to the Thermal Paper in the manufacturing process. Thermal Paper that contains less than 20 parts per million ("ppm") BPA by weight is deemed to contain no intentionally added BPA, such concentration to be determined by use of a test performed by an accredited laboratory using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) equipment.

# **ENFORCEMENT**

3.1 Enforcement Procedures. This Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all matters regarding enforcement of the Consent Judgment. Prior to bringing any motion or order to show cause to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, a Party seeking to enforce shall provide the violating party thirty (30) days advanced written notice of the alleged violation. The Parties shall meet and confer during such thirty (30) day period in an effort to try to reach agreement on an appropriate cure for the alleged violation. After such thirty (30) day period, the Party seeking to enforce may, by new action, motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of San Francisco, seek to enforce Proposition 65 and the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.

26

27

#### 4. PAYMENTS

- 4.1 Payments by Settling Defendant. On or before five (5) days after the entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall be liable for payment of the total sum of \$38,000 as a settlement payment as further set forth in this Section.
- 4.2 Allocation of Payments. The total settlement amount shall be paid in four (4) separate checks in the amounts specified below and delivered as set forth below. Any failure by Settling Defendant to comply with the payment terms herein shall be subject to a stipulated late fee to be paid by Settling Defendant in the amount of \$100 for each day the full payment is not received after the applicable payment due date set forth in Section 4.1. The late fees required under this Section shall be recoverable, together with reasonable attorneys' fees, in an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment. CEH shall provide W-9s for each check recipient as a condition prior to payment. The funds paid by Settling Defendant shall be allocated as set forth below between the following categories and made payable as follows:
- 4.2.1 Settling Defendant shall pay \$6,300 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code \$25249.7(b). The civil penalty payment shall be apportioned in accordance with Health & Safety Code \$25249.12 (25% to CEH and 75% to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA")). Accordingly, Settling Defendant shall pay the OEHHA portion of the civil penalty payment for \$4,725 by check made payable to OEHHA and associated with taxpayer identification number 68-0284486. This payment shall be delivered as follows:

For United States Postal Service Delivery: Attn: Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment P.O. Box 4010, MS #19B Sacramento, CA 95812-4010

For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery: Attn: Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment

DOCUMENT PREPARED

ON RECYCLED PAPER

# 1001 I Street, MS #19B Sacramento, CA 95814

Settling Defendant shall pay the CEH portion of the civil penalty payment for \$1,575 by check made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

4.2.2 Settling Defendant shall pay \$4,700 as an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP") to CEH pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3204. CEH intends to place these funds in CEH's Toxics in Food Fund and use them to support CEH programs and activities that seek to educate the public about BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, to work with the food industry and agriculture interests to reduce exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, and to thereby reduce the public health impacts and risks of exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food sold in California. CEH shall obtain and maintain adequate records to document that ASPs are spent on these activities and CEH agrees to provide such documentation to the Attorney General within thirty days of any request from the Attorney General. The payments pursuant to this Section shall be made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. These payments shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

- 4.2.3 Settling Defendant shall pay \$27,000 as a reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The attorneys' fees and cost reimbursement shall be made by check payable to the Lexington Law Group and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3317175. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.
- 4.2.4 To summarize, Settling Defendant shall deliver checks made out to the payees and in the amounts set forth below:

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Payee	Туре	Amount	Deliver To
ОЕННА	Penalty	\$4,725	OEHHA per Section 4.2.1
Center For Environmental Health	Penalty	\$1,575	LLG
Center For Environmental Health	ASP	\$4,700	LLG
Lexington Law Group	Fees and Costs	\$27,000	LLG

4.3 Failure to Comply With Payment Obligations. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Enforcement of Judgments Law and California Code of Civil Procedure § 708.160, in the event that Settling Defendant does not comply fully with its payment obligations under Section 4, in addition to any other enforcement mechanism available to CEH, CEH may obtain an order requiring Settling Defendant to submit to a debtor exam. In the event that Settling Defendant fails to submit to any such debtor exam ordered by the Court, CEH may seek an order holding Settling Defendant in contempt of Court.

# 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 **Modification.** This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties, with the approval of the Court or by an order of this Court upon motion and in accordance with law.
- 5.2 **Notice; Meet and Confer.** Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with all affected Parties prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

#### 6. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

6.1 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under Section 4, this Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and Settling Defendant and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, agents, shareholders, successors, assigns and attorneys, as well as Iconex, LLC and NCR Coproation (together "Defendant Releasees"), and all entities to which Settling Defendant directly or indirectly distributes or sells Thermal Paper, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers,

ON RECYCLED PAPER

26

customers, retailers, franchisees, licensors and licensees ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about exposure to BPA contained in Thermal Paper that was sold, offered for sale, shipped, or distributed by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date. By entering into this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant does not intend to and does not release, dismiss nor discharge Iconex, LLC nor NCR Corporation from any of Settling Defendant's claims allged in its Cross Complaint against said parties to the litigation, nor for any of its claims for express indemnity or any cause of action alleged in the Cross Complaint filed by Settling Defendant.

- 6.2 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under Section 4, CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives and forever discharges any and all claims against Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted by CEH regarding the failure to warn about exposure to BPA contained in Thermal Paper that was sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed, used or otherwise provided to employees or customers by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 6.3 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under Section 4, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Settling Defendant shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Settling Defendant, its Defendant Releasees and its Downstream Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to warn about BPA contained in Thermal Paper sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed, used or otherwise provided to employees or customers by Settling Defendant after the Effective Date.

# 7. PROVISION OF NOTICE

7.1 When CEH is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:

Eric S. Somers Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117 esomers@lexlawgroup.com

7.2 When Settling Defendant is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:

Tina Mangarpan Ford, Walker, Haggerty & Behar LLP One World Trade Center, 27th Floor Long Beach, CA 90831 tmangarpan@fwhb.com

7.3 Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by sending the other Party notice by first class and electronic mail.

#### 8. COURT APPROVAL

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment shall become effective as a contract upon the date signed by CEH and Settling Defendant, whichever is later, provided however, that CEH shall also prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendant shall support approval of such Motion.
- 8.2 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no further force or effect and shall not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose.

# 9. GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION

9.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

# 10. ATTORNEY'S FEES

10.1 Should CEH prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce a violation of this Consent Judgment, CEH shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application. Should Settling Defendants prevail on any motion application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding, Settling Defendants may be awarded their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as a

6

7

4

9

13

14

12

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

result of such motion or application upon a finding by the Court that CEH's prosecution of the motion or application lacked substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2016, et seq.

Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

#### 11. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT**

11.1 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 or understandings related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein. There are no warranties, representations or other agreements between the Parties except as expressly set forth herein. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those specifically referred to in this Consent Judgment have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto. Any agreements specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto only to the extent that they are expressly incorporated herein. No supplementation, modification, waiver or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any of the other provisions hereof whether or not similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.

#### 12. SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS

This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon CEH and Settling Defendant, and their respective divisions, subdivisions and subsidiaries, and the successors or assigns of any of them.

# 13. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

13.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.

# 14. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

14.1 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 and to enter into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and to legally bind that Party.

# 15. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS

15.1 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim against an entity that is not Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained in this Consent Judgment.

#### 16. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

16.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

1		
1	IT IS SO STIPULATED: CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL	
2	Dated: June 4, 2021 HEALTH	
3	Michael C	
4	Signature	
5		
6	Michael Green	
7	Printed Name	
* 8	CEO	
9	Title	
10		
11	Dated: P1AY 27, 2021 S.P. RICHARDS CO.	
12		
13	Duk R Ry	
14	Signature	
15	C. k Q Q L+)	
16	Printed Name  Exc. L. V. P.	
17	9 110	
18	Title	
19		
20		
21	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED,	
22	AND DECREED:	
23	DOM TITT DOM	
24	Dated: Au. 30, Voi & Many, Jan	
25	Judge of the Superior Court of California	
26	ETHAN P. SCHULMAN	
27		
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED		
ON RECYCLED PAPER	-11- CONSENT JUDGMENT - S.P. RICHARDS CO CASE NO. CGC-20-586195	