

68568558 Dec 09 2022 04:24PM

CLERK OF THE COURT

Assigned For All Purposes To The Honorable Ethan P. Schulman, Dept. 304

JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT BIOWORLD MERCHANDISING,

ON RECYCLED PAPER

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The parties to this Consent Judgment ("Parties") are the Center for Environmental Health ("CEH") and Defendant Bioworld Merchandising Inc. ("Settling Defendant"). CEH and Settling Defendant are referred to collectively as the "Parties."
- 1.2 CEH alleges that Settling Defendant manufactures, distributes, and/or sells socks made primarily of polyester with spandex that contain Bisphenol A ("BPA") in the State of California or has done so in the past.
- 1.3 On November 10, 2021, CEH served a 60-Day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 (The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5, et seq.) ("Notice") to Settling Defendant, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every County in the State of California, and the City Attorneys for every City in the State of California with a population greater than 750,000. The Notice alleges violations of Proposition 65 with respect to the presence of BPA in socks made primarily of polyester with spandex.
- 1.4 On February 4, 2022 CEH filed the original complaint. On March 21, 2022 CEH filed the operative First Amended Complaint ("FAC"). Settling Defendant is named in the FAC. CEH filed the Complaint naming Settling Defendant as a defendant ("Complaint").
- 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that: (i) this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the operative Complaint applicable to Settling Defendant and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaints; (ii) venue is proper in the County of Alameda; and (iii) this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment.
- 1.6 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 legal proceeding. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and

is accepted by the Parties for purposes of settling, compromising, and resolving issues disputed in this action.

## 2. **DEFINITIONS**

- 2.1 "Covered Products" means socks made primarily of polyester with spandex that are manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by each Settling Defendant.
- 2.2 "Effective Date" means the date on which this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court.
- 2.3 "Test Protocol" means a standard method for measuring total BPA content as set forth in Exhibit A.

## 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 3.1 Reformulation of Covered Products. On or before the date that is six months following the Effective Date ("Compliance Date"), Settling Defendants shall not manufacture, distribute, sell, or offer for sale any Covered Product in California that contains BPA except as provided in Section 3.3 below. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, a product "contains BPA" if BPA is an intentionally added ingredient in either the Covered Product or a component of the Covered Product and contains in excess of 1 part per million BPA as measured by the Test Protocol. Settling Defendants shall not replace the BPA with any other phenol (such as Bisphenol S or BPS) in quantities in excess of 1 part per million as measured by the Test Protocol.
- 3.2 Specification to Suppliers. No more than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date, Settling Defendants shall issue specifications to their suppliers of Covered Products requiring that Covered Products not contain BPA or any other phenol (such as Bisphenol S ("BPS"). In the event that Settling Defendant learns either through Plaintiff or another means that the Covered Products contain BPA or another phenol in excess of the requirements set forth herein, Settling Defendant shall notify its supplier that it has breached its specification. In the event that this happens more than two (2) times, Settling Defendant must change suppliers.
- 3.3 **Sell-Through for Existing Inventory.** The reformulation requirements of Section 3.1 shall not apply to Covered Products that Settling Defendant had purchased or entered

10

7

11 12

13

14 15

17

16

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

into a binding agreement to purchase prior to the Effective Date, including but not limited to Covered Products in transit, in distribution centers, in inventory, or at third-party retail locations.

#### **ENFORCEMENT** 4.

- Plaintiff may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before the 4.1 Superior Court of San Francisco County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Prior to bringing any motion or application to enforce the requirements of Section 3 above, Plaintiff shall provide Settling Defendant(s) with a Notice of Violation and a copy of any test results which purportedly support the Notice of Violation. The Parties shall then meet and confer regarding the basis for the anticipated motion or application in an attempt to resolve it informally, including providing Settling Defendant(s) with a reasonable opportunity of at least thirty (30) days to cure any alleged violation. During the meet and confer process, upon request from Settling Defendant, CEH will provide Settling Defendant with a sample of the Covered Product or Products that form the basis of the Notice of Violation. Should Settling Defendant obtain a test result of that sample from an independent accredited laboratory based in the United States that is below the 1 ppm reformulation level, CEH may either withdraw the Notice of Violation or request that the Parties obtain a test result from a third laboratory, a test which would be paid for jointly by the Parties. The test result from the third laboratory will then serve as determinative of whether or not there was a violation of the 1 ppm standard. Should such attempts at informal resolution fail, Plaintiff may file an enforcement motion or application, provided that no enforcement motion or application will be filed during the pendency of any additional testing described herein. This Consent Judgment may only be enforced by the Parties.
- 4.2 The first two times Plaintiff's Notice of Violation involves BPS or any phenol other than BPA in excess of 1 part per million as measured by the Test Protocol, Settling Defendant must provide notice to its supplier as set forth in Section 3.2, but shall have no further liability for violating the terms of this Consent Judgment. However, any subsequent Notice of Violation involving BPS or any phenol other than BPA in excess of 1 part per million BPA as measured by the Test Protocol shall be governed by Section 4.1.

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 payment pursuant to this Section shall be 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.

5.1.3 Settling Defendant shall pay \$55,500 as a reimbursement of a portion of Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The attorneys' fees and cost reimbursement shall be made in two separate checks as follows: (a) \$46,800 payable to the Lexington Law Group and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3317175; and (b) \$8,700 payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. Both of these payments shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

5.1.4 To summarize, Settling Defendants shall deliver checks made out to the payees and in the amounts set forth below:

Payee	Туре	Amount	Deliver To
ОЕННА	Penalty	\$7,350	OEHHA per Section 5.1.1
Center For Environmental Health	Penalty	\$2,450	LLG
Center For Environmental Health	ASP	\$7,200	LLG
Lexington Law Group	Fee and Cost	\$46,800	LLG
Center For Environmental Health	Fee and Cost	\$8,700	LLG

5.2 Failure to Comply With Payment Obligations. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Enforcement of Judgments Law and Code of Civil Procedure §708.160, in the event that Settling Defendant does not comply fully with its payment obligations under Section 5, in addition to any other enforcement mechanism available to CEH, CEH may obtain an order requiring Settling Defendant to submit to a Debtors Exam. In the event that Settling Defendant

fails to submit to any such Debtors Exam ordered by the Court, CEH may seek an order holding Settling Defendant in contempt of Court.

## 6. MODIFICATION

- 6.1 **Written Consent.** 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.
- 6.2 **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.

## 7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- 7.1 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under Section 5, 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 ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities to which Settling Defendant distributes or sells Covered Products, such as distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers as well as franchisees, suppliers, licensors and licensees ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to BPA contained in Covered Products that were sold by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date. For purposes hereof, Defendant Releasees and Downstream Defendant Releasees shall be collectively referred to as "Releasees".
- 7.2 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under Section 5, CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives, covenants not to sue, and forever discharges any and all claims against Settling Defendant and all 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 individually regarding the failure to warn about exposure to BPA contained in Covered Products (i) sold by Settling Defendant prior to the Compliance Date or (ii) which Settling Defendants purchased or entered into binding

DOCUMENT PREPARED

ON RECYCLED PAPER

9.2 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and shall never be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose other than to allow the Court to determine if there was a material breach of Section 9.1.

#### 10. GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION

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

## 11. ATTORNEYS' FEES

- Should Plaintiff prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce a violation of this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application. Should a Settling Defendant prevail on any motion application for an order to show cause or other proceeding, that Settling Defendant may be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs against Plaintiff as a result of such motion or application upon a finding by the Court that Plaintiff'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.
- Except as otherwise provided in this Consent Judgment, each Party shall bear its own attorneys' fees and costs.
- 11.3 Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a Party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

## 12. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

12.1 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.

## 13. SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS

13.1 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.

## 14. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

## 15. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

15.1 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 legally to bind that Party.

## 16. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS

- 16.1 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim against an entity other than Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained in this Consent Judgment.
- 16.2 If CEH enters into any consent judgment ("Settlement Document") with any other entity with respect to an alleged failure to warn of alleged exposures to BPA in socks made primarily of polyester with spandex in which it agrees to different injunctive terms (including without limitation a different Test Protocol), it shall provide Settling Defendant with notice thereof by serving the Settlement Document on the Attorney General for posting on its public website, and

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER Dated: <u>Defo Def AD</u>, 2022

## BIOWORLD MERCHANDISING INC.

IV Signature

AMATCA Printed Name

\_(LO

-12-

## **EXHIBIT A**

"Test Protocol" as defined in Section 2.3 of the Consent Judgment means the following test

a. Obtain homogenized 1-gram sample of the sock by shredding the entire sock and taking a

•	

 method:

representative 1-gram sample of the shreds. b. Add the 1-gram sock sample to 10 ml of acetonitrile

c. Heat the solution using a hot plate for 3 hours at 40 degrees Celsius

Analytical method - Isotope dilution LC-Tandem MS (LC-MS)

Limit of detection 1 ppm

f. Reporting -- BPA concentration in mg of BPA per kg of sample