	,		
1	WILLIAM VERICK (SBN 140972) Klamath Environmental Law Center		
2	FREDRIC EVENSON (SBN 198059) Law Office of Fredric Evenson		
3	424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501		
4	Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Facsimile: (707) 268-8901	_	
5	wverick@igc.org ecorights@earthlink.net		
6	DAVID WILLIAMS (SBN 144479)		
7	BRIAN ACREE (SBN 202505) 370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5		
8	Oakland, CA 94610 Telephone: (510) 271-0826		
. 9	Facsimile: (510) 271-0829 davidhwilliams@earthlink.net		
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
11	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION		
12			
13		OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
14	IN AND FOR THE CITY AN	ID COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
15			
16	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION,	Case No. 463859	
. 17	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT	
18	vs.		
19	KENNETH COLE PRODUCTIONS,		
20	INC.,		
21	Defendant.		
22	1 INTRONVICTION		
23	1. INTRODUCTION		
24 25	1.0 On May 31, 2007, the MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION ("Plaintiff or "MEIE") acting on babalf of itself and the general public, filed a Complaint for		
25 26	("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself and the general public, filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in San Francisco Superior Court, Case		
20 27			
27	No. 463859, against defendant, KENNETH COLE PRODUCTIONS, INC. ("Defendant" or "KCP"), among others. (MEJF and KCP are collectively referred to as "the Parties.") The		
20		22327\1325020.2	
	[PROPOSED]	CONSENT JUDGMENT	

· · · · ·

 $(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}) = (\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}) + (\mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{r}_{2})$ 

1 Complaint alleges that KCP violated provisions of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic 2 Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code sections 25249.5, et seq. (Proposition 65), and 3 Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. (the "Unfair Competition Act"), by, among 4 other things, knowingly and intentionally exposing persons to products containing lead and/or 5 lead compounds, which are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or 6 birth defects or other reproductive harm, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to 7 such individuals. The Complaint was based upon a 60-Day Notice letter, dated March 15, 2007, 8 sent by MEJF to KCP, the California Attorney General, all District Attorneys, and all City 9 Attorneys with populations exceeding 750,000. A copy of the 60-Day Notice letter is attached as 10 Exhibit A to the complaint in this action.

1.1 KCP filed a timely answer to the Complaint denying each and every allegation set
forth therein and asserting numerous affirmative defenses.

13 1.2 Defendant is a business that employs more than ten persons and, itself or through 14 its manufacturers, customers, licensees and business partners, manufactures, distributes and/or 15 markets within the State of California children's jackets made with lead-containing polyvinyl 16 chloride, neoprene and/or other plastic materials ("PVC Materials"). Pursuant to Proposition 65, 17 lead and lead compounds are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and 18 reproductive toxicity. Products containing lead and/or lead compounds that are sold or 19 distributed in the State of California may be, under specified circumstances, subject to the 20 Proposition 65 warning requirement set forth in Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. 21 Plaintiff alleges that children's jackets made with lead-containing PVC Materials ("PVC 22 Jackets") that are manufactured, distributed, sold and/or marketed by KCP for use in California, 23 require a warning under Proposition 65.

1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Covered Products" shall be
defined as PVC Jackets that: (i) are distributed, sold or used within the State of California, and
(ii) either (a) bear a KCP trademark, or (b) are otherwise manufactured, distributed or sold by or
on behalf of KCP.

28 /////

- 2 -[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court
 has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and
 personal jurisdiction over KCP 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 this Consent Judgment as a
 full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and of all claims
 which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly
 or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom or related to.

8 1.5 KCP disputes that it has violated Proposition 65 as described in the 60-Day Notice
9 Letter, the Complaint, or otherwise. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission
10 with respect to any material allegation of the Complaint, each and every allegation of which KCP
11 denies, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any
12 wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of KCP.

13

2.

### SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

14 2.0 In settlement of all of the claims that are alleged, or could have been alleged, in the 15 Complaint KCP shall pay \$20,000 to the Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC") to cover 16 Plaintiff's attorneys' fees. Additionally, KCP shall pay \$20,000 to the Ecological Rights 17 Foundation for use toward reducing exposures to toxic chemicals and other pollutants, and toward 18 increasing consumer, worker and community awareness of health hazards posed by lead and other 19 toxic chemicals. The parties agree and acknowledge that the charitable contributions made 20 pursuant to this section shall not be construed as a credit against personal claims by absent third 21 parties, if any, for restitution against Defendant. KCP shall not be required to pay a civil penalty 22 pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b). The above described payments shall be 23 forwarded by Defendant so that they are received at least 5 days prior to the hearing date 24 scheduled for approval of this Consent Judgment. If the Consent Judgment is not approved with 25 120 days of the date scheduled for approval, the above-described payments shall be returned and 26 the provisions of this Consent judgment shall become null and void. 27 /////

28 /////

1

3.

## ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

3.0 The Parties hereby request that the Court enter this Consent Judgment forty-five
(45) days after the Consent Judgment is served on the Attorney General in accordance with Title
11, California Code of Regulations, section 3003(a). Upon the Court's entry of a final judgment,
including any third-party appeals to the entry of the judgment, MEJF and KCP waive their
respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations in the Complaint.

7

# 4. <u>MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT</u>

4.0 This Consent Judgment, once entered by the Court, is a final and binding 8 resolution between MEJF, acting on behalf of itself and (as to those matters raised in the Notice 9 Letter) the general public, and KCP of: (i) any violation of Proposition 65 or the Unfair 10 Competition Act (including but not limited to the claims made in the Complaint); and (ii) any 11 other statutory or common law claim to the fullest extent that any of the foregoing described in (i) 12 or (ii) were or could have been asserted by any person or entity against KCP or its parents, 13 subsidiaries or affiliates, and all of their customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, licensors, 14 15 licensees, or any other person in the course of doing business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, manufacture, distribute, advertise, market or sell Covered 16 Products ("Released Entities"), based on its or their exposure of persons to Covered Products or 17 their failure to provide a clear and reasonable warning of exposure to such individuals; and (iii) as 18 to alleged exposures to Covered Products, any other claim based in whole or in part on the facts 19 20 alleged in the Complaint, whether based on actions or omissions by the Released Entities. As to alleged exposures to Covered Products, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment 21 resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by KCP and the Released 22 Entities, with the requirements of Proposition 65 and the Unfair Competition Act with respect to 23 Covered Products, and any alleged resulting exposure. 24

4.1 As to alleged exposures to Covered Products and other claims in the Complaint,
MEJF, by and on behalf of itself, and its respective agents, successors, attorneys and assigns,
waives any and all rights to institute any form of legal action, and releases all claims against KCP
and the Released Entities, and all of their respective parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, and all of

1 their customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, licensors, licensees, or any other person in the 2 course of doing business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, 3 manufacture, distribute, advertise, market or sell the Covered Products, whether, under 4 Proposition 65, the Unfair Competition Act or any other statute, provision of common law or any 5 theory or issue, arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in 6 part, the Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with 7 respect to, the Covered Products (referred to collectively in this paragraph as the "Claims"). In 8 furtherance of the foregoing, as to alleged exposures to Covered Products, MEJF hereby waives 9 any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with 10 respect to the Claims by virtue of the provisions of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, 11 which provides as follows:

> A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM, MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

16 MEJF understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of 17 California Civil Code section 1542 is that even if it suffers future damages arising out of or 18 resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Covered Products, 19 including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to, the 20 Covered Products, MEJF will not be able to make any claim for those damages against KCP or 21 the Released Entities. Furthermore, MEJF acknowledges that it intends these consequences for 22 any such Claims as may exist as of the date of this release but which MEJF does not know exist, 23 and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, 24 regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause. 25

26

5.

12

13

14

15

#### ENFORCEMENT AND PRECLUSIVE EFFECT OF JUDGMENT

5.0 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the Parties
hereto. The Parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of

1 San Francisco County, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions 2 contained herein. In any proceeding brought by either party to enforce this Consent Judgment, 3 such Party may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties or remedies as may be provided by law for 4 any violation of Proposition 65 or this Consent Judgment. Additionally, if in such a proceeding 5 the Court finds that KCP failed to comply with the reformulation requirements as specified in 6 Section 7 of this Consent Judgment, and notwithstanding any other provision of this Consent 7 Judgment, then as to such Covered Products, KCP shall not benefit from any release from liability 8 specified in any provision of this Consent Judgment.

6. <u>MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT</u>

6.0 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the
parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of
any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.

7. <u>INJUNCTIVE RELIEF</u>

9

13

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

7.0 On and after January 1, 2008, the PVC Materials in all Covered Products
manufactured by KCP, itself or through its manufacturers, licensees and business partners, for
distribution or use in California, shall meet the following criteria:

- (a) The PVC Materials shall have no lead as an intentionally added constituent;
- (b) A representative sample of the bulk PVC Materials used to manufacture the Covered Products shall have been tested for lead, and must have shown lead content by weight of less than 0.003% (30 parts per million "30 ppm"), using a test method of sufficient sensitivity to establish a limit of quantification (as distinguished from detection) of less than 30 ppm.

7.1 KCP and the Released Entities may comply with the above requirements by
relying on information obtained from its suppliers of the Covered Products, and the PVC
Materials utilized in their manufacture, so long as such reliance is in good faith. Demonstration
of good faith reliance may include, but is not limited to e-mails or other written correspondence
from suppliers attesting to compliance with the provisions of this Section.

7.2 In the event that MEJF settles another actual or potential claim concerning the
alleged failure of a business to provide adequate Proposition 65 warnings concerning its
manufacture, distribution or sale of PVC Clothing in California, and agrees to a standard for
reformulation that allows for lead content by weight of greater than 30 ppm in the PVC Materials,
KCP's compliance with the less stringent standard will be deemed to meet the requirements of
Sections 7.0(b) above. MEJF shall notify KCP of any and each such settlement by written notice
pursuant to Section 15, within 10 days of execution of such settlement or consent judgment.

8

8.

9.

## <u>AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE</u>

8.0 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.

12

## <u>RETENTION OF JURISDICTION</u>

9.0 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement the Consent
Judgment.

15

## 10. <u>SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL</u>

16 10.0 MEJF shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by both parties, on the
17 California Attorney General on behalf of the parties so that the Attorney General may review this
18 Consent Judgment. MEJF, in compliance with Title 11, California Code of Regulations,
19 section 3003(a), also shall file and serve notice of the motion for approval of this Consent
20 Judgment.

21 11.

#### . <u>ENTIRE AGREEMENT</u>

11.0 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 either 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.

28 /////

## - 7 -[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

		· · ·	
-			
1	12. <u>GOVERNING LAW</u>		
2	12.0 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall b		
3	governed by the laws of the State of	California, without reference to any conflicts of law	
. 4	provisions of California law.		
5	13. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>		
6	13.0 If this Consent Judgr	nent, in its entirety, is not approved by the Court, it shall be of	
7	no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.		
8	14. <u>NOTICES</u>		
<b>9</b> .	14.0 Any notices under th	is Consent Judgment shall be by personal delivery of First	
10	Class Mail.		
11	If to MEJF:	William Verick, Esq. Klamath Environmental Law Center	
12		424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501	
13	If to Kenneth Cole:	General Counsel	
. 14		Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc. 603 West 50 <sup>th</sup> Street	
15		New York, New York 10019	
16	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
. 17	Dated: 1/229/07	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION	
18	1 <u>.</u>	- A Wan Abril	
· _ 19		WILLIAM VERICK	
20 21	Doted		
21	Dated:	KENNETH COLE PRODUCTIONS, INC.	
22		By:	
23 24		DAVID EDELMAN , CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	
25	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER		
26 26	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJ	'S SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:	
27	Dated:		
28		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	

-	-			
1	12.	GOVERNING LAW		
2		The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be		
3	governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law			
4	provisi	ons of California law.		
5	13. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>			
6		If this Consent Judgment, in its entirety, is not approved by the Court, it shall be of		
7	no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.			
8	14.			
9		14.0 Any notices under this Consent Judgment shall be by personal delivery of First		
10	Class N	Aail.		
11		If to MEJF: William Veriek, Esq.		
12		Klamath Environmental Law Center 424 First Street		
13		Eureka, CA 95501		
14		If to Kenneth Cole: General Counsel Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc.		
15		Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc. 603 West 50 <sup>th</sup> Street New York, New York 10019		
16		IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
17	Dated:	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION		
18				
19		By:		
20		WILLIAM VERICK		
21	Dated:	KENNETH COLE PRODUCTIONS, INC.		
22		$\sim$		
23		By: 1/and f. Edm		
24		DAVIÓ EDELMAN CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER		
25				
26		IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:		
27	Dated:	·		
28		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT		
		- 8 22327\132502		
		[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT		