1. INTRODUCTION

- Espinoza acting on behalf of the public interest (hereinafter "Espinoza") and Willard Manufacturing Inc. ("Willard" or "Defendant") with Espinoza and Defendant collectively referred to as the "Parties" and each of them as a "Party." Espinoza is an individual residing in California that seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer products. Willard is alleged to be a person in the course of doing business for purposes of Proposition 65, Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq.
- 1.2 Allegations and Representations. Espinoza alleges that Defendant has exposed individuals to diethanolamine (DEA) from its sales of moisturizing lotions distributed, sold, or offered for sale in California by Willard that expose users to DEA without providing a clear and reasonable exposure warning pursuant to Proposition 65. DEA is listed pursuant to Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
- Notice of Violation/Action. On or about January 26, 2023, Espinoza served Willard and various public enforcement agencies with documents entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(d) (the "Notice"), alleging that Defendant violated Proposition 65 for failing to warn consumers and customers that use of moisturizing lotions distributed, sold, or offered for sale in California by Willard that expose users to DEA. No public enforcer has brought and is diligently prosecuting the claims alleged in the Notice. On January 25, 2024, Espinoza filed a complaint (the "Complaint").
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over Defendant as to the allegations contained in the Action filed in this matter, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to approve, enter, and oversee the enforcement of this Consent Judgment as a full and final binding resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Action based on the facts alleged therein and in the Notice.

1.5 Defendant denies the material allegations contained in Espinoza's Notice and Complaint and maintains that it has not violated Proposition 65. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Defendant of any fact, finding, issue of law, or violation of law; nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Defendant of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by Defendant. However, this section shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of Defendant under this Consent Judgment.

2. <u>DEFINITIONS</u>

- 2.1 Covered Products. The term "Covered Products" means moisturizing lotions distributed, sold, or offered for sale in California by Willard that expose users to DEA.
- 2.2 Effective Date. The term "Effective Date" means the date this Consent Judgment is entered as a Judgment of the Court.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: REFORMULATION AND/OR WARNINGS

- 2.1 Reformulation of Products. Commencing within sixty (60) days after the Effective Date, and continuing thereafter, Covered Products that Willard directly manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, or offers for sale in California shall either be: (a) reformulated Products pursuant to § 3.2, below; or (b) labeled with a clear and reasonable exposure warning pursuant to §§ 3.3 and 3.4, below. For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, a "DEA Free Reformulated Product" is a Covered Product that is in compliance with the standard set forth in § 3.2, below. The warning requirements set forth in §§ 3.3 and 3.4 shall not apply to any DEA Free Reformulated Product or to any Covered Product manufactured within 60 days after the Effective Date.
- 3.2 **DEA** Free Reformulation Standard. To qualify as a "DEA Free Reformulated Product" the Covered Product must meet the following standard: DEA content that is not detectable (i.e., zero) or below the Reporting Limit (defined herein) when analyzed pursuant to liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS), inductively coupled mass-spectroscopy (ICP-MS) or other method of analysis utilized by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) for qualitative and quantitative screening of cosmetics and cosmetic raw materials.

3.2.1 Reporting Limit. The "Reporting Limit" is 50 mg/kg.

3.3 Clear and Reasonable Warning. As of the date this Consent Judgment is signed by both Parties, and continuing thereafter, a clear and reasonable exposure warning as set forth in this §§ 3.3 and 3.4 must be provided for all Covered Products that Defendant manufacturers, imports, distributes, sells, or offers for sale in California that is not a Reformulated Product. There shall be no obligation for Defendant to provide a warning for Covered Products that enter the stream of commerce prior to the date this Consent Judgment is signed by both Parties. The warning shall consist of either the Warning or Alternative Warning described in §§ 3.3(a) or (b), respectively:

(a) Warning. The "Warning" shall consist of the statement:

WARNING: This product can expose you to chemicals including diethanolamine (DEA), which is known to the State of California to cause cancer. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

(b) Alternative Warning: Willard may, but is not required to, use the alternative short-form warning as set forth in this § 3.3(b) ("Alternative Warning") as follows:

MWARNING: Cancer - www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

"WARNING:" in all capital letters and in bold font, followed by a colon. The warning symbol to the left of the word "WARNING:" must be a black exclamation point in a yellow equilateral triangle with a black outline, except that if the sign or label for the Covered Product does not use the color yellow, the symbol may be in black and white. The symbol must be in a size no smaller than the height of the word "WARNING:". The Warning or Alternative Warning shall be affixed to or printed on the Covered Product's packaging or labeling, or on a placard, shelf tag, sign or electronic device or automatic process, providing that the Warning or Alternative Warning is displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, or designs as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of

The "Reporting Limit" the lowest concentration at which DEA can be detected in a sample of a Covered Product by an accredited testing laboratory employing LC/MS/MS analysis or other method of analysis utilized by the ISO for qualitative and quantitative screening of cosmetics and cosmetic raw materials.

purchase or use. The Warning or Alternative Warning may be contained in the same section of the packaging, labeling, or instruction booklet that states other safety warnings, if any, concerning the use of the Covered Product and shall be at least the same size as those other safety warnings. If "consumer information," as that term is defined in Title 27, California Code of Regulations, Section 25600.1(c) as it may be amended from time to time, is provided in a foreign language, Willard shall provide the Warning or Alternative Warning in the foreign language in accordance with applicable warning regulations adopted by the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA").

In addition to affixing the Warning or Alternative Warning to the Covered Product's packaging or labeling, the Warning or Alternative Warning shall be posted on websites where Willard offers Products for sale to consumers in California. The requirements of this Section shall be satisfied if the Warning or Alternative Warning, or a clearly marked hyperlink using the word "WARNING," appears on the product display page, or by otherwise prominently displaying the warning to the purchaser prior to completing the purchase. To comply with this Section, Willard shall (a) post the Warning or Alternative Warning on its own website and, if it has the ability to do so, on the websites of its third-party internet sellers; and (b) if it does not have the ability to post the Warning or Alternative Warning on the websites of its third-party internet sellers, provide such sellers with written notice in accordance with Title 27, California Code of Regulations, § 25600.2. Third-party internet sellers of the Covered Product that have been provided with written notice in accordance with Title 27, California Code of Regulations, § 25600.2 are not released in Section 5 of this Agreement if they fail to meet the warning requirements herein.

3.5 Compliance with Warning Regulations. Defendant shall be deemed to be in compliance with this Consent Judgment by either adhering to §§ 3.3 and 3.4 of this Consent Judgment or by complying with warning regulations adopted by OEHHA applicable to the Covered Product and exposures at issue within 60 days after the Effective Date.

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

2526

27

28

4.2 Attorneys' Fees. Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Willard shall pay \$40,000.00 to Brodsky Smith as complete reimbursement for Espinoza's attorneys' fees and costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to the attention of Willard, litigating and negotiating and obtaining judicial approval of a settlement in the public interest, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

5. RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between Espinoza acting on his own behalf, and on behalf of the public interest, and Willard, and its parents, shareholders, members, directors, officers, managers, employees, representatives, agents, attorneys, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, sister companies, and affiliates, and their predecessors, successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities from whom they obtain and to whom they directly or indirectly distribute or sell Covered Products, including but not limited to manufacturers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, customers, licensees retailers, including but not limited to Willard, and its parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates, franchisees, and cooperative members ("Downstream Releasees"), of all claims for violations of Proposition 65 based on exposure to DEA from use of the Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Willard within 60 days after the Effective Date as set forth in the Notice. It is the Parties' intention that this Consent Judgment shall have preclusive effect such that no other actions by private enforcers, whether purporting to act in his, her, or its interests or the public interest shall be permitted to pursue and take any action with respect to any violation of Proposition 65 based on exposure to DEA from use of the Covered Products that was alleged in the Complaint, or that could have been brought pursuant to the Notice against Willard and the Downstream Releasees ("Proposition 65 Claims"). Willard's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 by Willard with regard to exposure to DEA from use of the Covered Products.

In addition to the foregoing, Espinoza, on behalf of himself, his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, and successors and assignees, and <u>not</u> in his representative capacity, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases Willard, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Releasees from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, claims, demands, rights, suits, obligations, debts, contracts, agreements, promises, liabilities, damages, charges, losses, costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees, of any nature whatsoever, known or unknown, in law or equity, fixed or contingent, now or in the future, with respect to any alleged violations of Proposition 65 related to or arising from Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Willard, Defendant Releasees or Downstream Releasees. With respect to the foregoing waivers and releases in this paragraph, Espinoza hereby specifically waives any and all rights and benefits which he now has, or in the future may have, conferred by virtue of the provisions of § 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

5.3 Willard waives any and all claims against Espinoza, his attorneys and other representatives, for any and all actions taken, or statements made (or those that could have been taken or made) by Espinoza and his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims or otherwise seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 against it in this matter, and with respect to Covered Products.

6. INTEGRATION

6.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement of the Parties and any and all prior negotiations and understandings related hereto shall be deemed to have been merged within it. No representations or terms of agreement other than those contained herein exist or have been made by any Party with respect to the other Party or the subject matter hereof.

2

6

5

8

7

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

7.1 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 or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to Covered Products, then Defendant shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, Covered Products are so affected.

8. <u>NOTICES</u>

8.1 Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (i) first-class, (registered or certified mail) return receipt requested; or (ii) overnight courier on any party by the other party at the following addresses:

For Defendant:

L. Daniel Wilson 91 Wyndham Crescent Red Deer, Alberta T4N 7G9, Canada

And

For Espinoza:

Evan Smith Brodsky Smith 9595 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 900 Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Any party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other party a change of address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.

9. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE SIGNATURES

9.1 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

Ĭ

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>

14.1 The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective Parties and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this document and certify that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally bind that Party. Except as explicitly provided herein each Party is to bear its own fees and costs.

·	explicitly provided herein each Party is to bear its own fees and costs.				
7 8		AGREED TO:			EED TO:
9	Date:	7/9/	34	Date:	7 139 24
10		K		100	
11	By:	RIEL ESPINOZA		By:	12
12	<i>y</i>	KIBL ESPINOZA		WILLARD MANI	FACTURING, INC.
13	IT IS SO	DEPERED ADJUMCI	ED AND DECK		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:				
15		Dlank		r. a	
16	Dated	8/27/24		_CLG	
17				Judge of Superior Cour	t
				RICHARD B. U	LASER
18					
19	i.		1787)		
20			320	÷	
21					
22		•			
- 1					
23					
24					
25		9			¥
26					
27					
1					1
28	€:				