	,		
1 2	WILLIAM VERICK, SBN 140972 KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER FREDRIC EVENSON, SBN 198059		
3	LAW OFFICE OF FREDRIC EVENSON 424 First Street	·	
4	Bureka, California 95501 Telephone: (707) 268-8900		
5	Fax: (707) 268-8901 E-mail: wverick@igc.org		
6	DAVID WILLIAMS, SBN 144479	•	
7	BRIAN ACREE, SBN 202505 370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5		
8	Oakland, CA 94610 Telephone: (510) 271-0826 Fax: (510) 271-0829		
9	E-mail: dhwill7@gmail.com	·	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
11	FOUNDATION		
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
13	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
14			
15	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION,	Case No. 472189	
16	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO SAECO USA, INC., SAECO	
17	v.	INTERNATIONAL GROUP SPA, and GAGGIA SPA	
18 -	DUALIT LTD, et al.,	•	
19	Defendants.		
20		•	
21		·	
22	1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>		
23	1.1 On or about October 17, 2007, plaintiff MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
24	FOUNDATION ("Mateel"), provided a 60-day notice of violation ("Notice") to the California		
25	Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of		
26	every California city with a population greater than 750,000, and SAECO USA, INC. and		
27	SAECO INTERNATIONAL GROUP SPA (hereinafter collectively, "Saeco"), alleging that		
28		1	
	S0320001/749910-3		

7 8

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25 26

27 28

S0320001/749910-3

111

Saeco, through sales in California of espresso machines, was violating Health & Safety Code section 25249.6. Mateel provided a similar notice to GAGGIA SPA (hereinafter "Gaggia") on or about June 27, 2007. Saeco and Gaggia are referred to herein as "Defendants."

- 1.2 On or about February 14, 2008, Plaintiff Mateel, acting in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), filed a Complaint for Civil Penalties and Injunctive Relief, captioned Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation v. Dualit Ltd., et al., San Francisco Superior Court Case No. 472189 (the "Dualit Complaint"), against Saeco based on the allegations contained in the Notice. On or about November 5, 2007, Mateel filed a similar complaint naming Gaggia, captioned Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation v. Briel-Industria de Electrodomesticos SA, et al., San Francisco Superior Court Case No. 468856 (the "Briel Complaint"). The Dualit Complaint and the Briel Complaint are referred to herein as the "Complaints." The Dualit Complaint also named as defendants certain distributors and retailers for Defendants, including JC Penney Corporation Inc., Costco Wholesale Corporation, and Target Corporation (hereinafter collectively, the "Named Distributors").
- 1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaints and personal jurisdiction over Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaints, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaints and of all claims which were or could have been raised based on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom.
- 1.4 Mateel and Defendants enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of disputed claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any allegation made in the Notice or the Complaint, each and every allegation of which Defendants denies, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Defendants.

- 2.1 After one hundred eighty (180) days of entry of this Consent Judgment ("Effective Date"), Defendants may not ship for sale in California any Covered Products unless Defendants either (a) provide warnings in the manner specified in paragraph 2.2 below; or (b) the Covered Products shipped for sale in California meet the Reformulation Standard set forth in paragraphs 2.3 through 2.6 below.
- 2.2 <u>Warnings.</u> Defendants may provide a warning affixed to the packaging or labeling of each unit of the Covered Products. The warning shall state:

Notice To Purchasers Of This Product In California As Required By California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6: WARNING: This machine uses brass components which contain lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm.

The text of this warning must be in 12 point type or larger. The word "WARNING" must be capitalized and be in bold. The warning must either be on the front or top of the packaging of the Covered Product. Aside from the warnings required in this sub-paragraph, the external packaging of Covered Products may not contain any other language or information that in any way states or implies that a person using the Covered Product will not be exposed to lead, or that in any other way diminishes, confounds or confuses the warning required under this sub-paragraph. If after the Effective Date, Defendants ship Covered Products to a retailer or distributor outside of California that neither provide the warnings specified in this paragraph nor meet the Reformulation Standard specified in paragraphs 2.3 through 2.6 below ("Non-Conforming Covered Products"), and if the retailer or distributor then offers those Non-Conforming Covered Products for sale in California, then as to those Non-Conforming Covered Products, that retailer or distributor, and their customers, are not released pursuant to Sections 6 and 7 below.

2.3. <u>Reformulation Standard.</u> After the Effective Date, Defendants may ship models of Covered Products for sale in California that do not bear the warning specified in paragraph 2.2 above, provided the model of Covered Products has been tested pursuant to the protocol described

model of the particular Covered Product, the suppliers of the components that make up the components of the alloys, or any other factor that substantially affects lead leaching test results on a model of the particular

- The number of Covered Products tested shall be at least six beverage units for each model of the Covered Product, and the mean of at least six tested
- After the Effective Date, unless Defendants provide the warning specified in paragraph 2.2 above, Defendants may not ship for sale in California any model of Covered Products unless the mean of at least six tested beverage units calculated according to subparagraph k), above, is $\leq 5 \mu g/L$.
- Record Keeping. As part of the Testing Program, Defendants shall maintain the following records, or require by contract that any laboratory conducting testing shall maintain the
 - Records kept in the normal course of business showing the maintenance and calibration of equipment used to conduct the Testing Program;
 - Individual test results of all tests conducted as part of the Testing Program, provided that Defendants shall not be required to maintain the above records for any test for more than two years after that test was conducted.
- Any records required to be maintained in by Paragraph 2.5 shall be made available to the Plaintiff or the Attorney General for inspection within the State of California upon 60 days written notice. Such records shall not be made available to the public unless required by the California Public Records Act or other laws, except as part of presenting such records to a court

Within ten (10) days after entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court, Defendants shall pay seventeen thousand five hundred dollars (\$17,500) each to Californians for Alternatives to Toxics and the Ecological Rights Foundation to be used by these California non-

profit organizations to about exposure to toxic chemicals or to reduce such exposures. The foregoing settlement payments shall be mailed to the attention of William Verick, Klamath Environmental Law Center, 424 First Street, Eureka, California 95501, who shall provide them to the respective organizations within fifteen (15) days of receipt.

4. <u>ATTORNEYS' FEES</u>

- 4.1 Within ten (10) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendants shall pay forty thousand dollars (\$40,000) to the Klamath Environmental Law Center to cover Plaintiff's attorneys' fees and costs. This payment shall be mailed to the attention of William Verick, Klamath Environmental Law Center, 424 First Street, Eureka, California 95501.
- 4.2 Except as specifically provided in this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff and Defendants shall bear their own costs and attorneys' fees.

5. <u>ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT/STIPULATED REMEDIES</u>

5.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment are enforceable by and among the parties hereto, by Defendants with respect to the releases offered in this Consent Judgment, or, with respect to the injunctive relief provided for herein, by the California Attorney General. The terms of this Consent Judgment are enforceable by the Named Distributors as intended third-party beneficiaries hereto.

6. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

6.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between the Plaintiff acting on behalf of itself and, (as to those matters referenced in the Notice Letters) in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), and Defendants concerning any violation of Proposition 65 regarding any claims made or which could have been made in the Notices and/or the Complaints, or any other statutory or common law claim that could have been asserted against Defendants, and/or their affiliates, parent or subsidiary corporations, divisions, successors, officers, directors, assigns, Named Distributors, distributors, retailers, and/or customers (collectively, "Releasees") as such claims relate to Releasees' failure to provide clear, reasonable, and lawful warnings of exposure to lead contained in or otherwise associated with Covered Products manufactured, sold or distributed by, for, or on behalf of, Defendants.

Compliance by Defendants with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by Defendants and/or their affiliates, parent or subsidiary corporations, divisions, successors, officers, directors, assigns, Named Distributors, distributors, retailers, and/or customers with the requirements of Proposition 65 with respect to lead contained in or otherwise associated with Covered Products.

- 6.2 As to any claims, violations (except violations of this Consent Judgment), actions, damages, costs, penalties or causes of action which may arise or have arisen after the original date of entry of this consent judgment, compliance by Defendants with the terms of this consent judgment shall be deemed to be full and complete compliance with Proposition 65 as to claims regarding exposure to lead in Covered Products.
- 6.3 In furtherance of the foregoing, Plaintiff hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with respect to the Covered Products by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, 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."

Plaintiff understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542 is that the release hereby given shall be and remain in effect as a full and complete release notwithstanding the discovery or existence of any such additional or different claims or facts, arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the manufacture, distribution of sale of the Covered Products and Plaintiff will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Defendants, or their parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, or any of their customers, Named Distributors, distributors, wholesalers, retailers or any other person in the course of doing business who may manufacture, use, maintain, distribute, market or sell the Covered Products. Furthermore, Plaintiff acknowledges that it intends these

. 2	10.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized			
3	by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf of			
4	the party represented and legally to bind that party.			
· 5	11. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION			
6	11.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction over the matters covered herein and the			
7	enforcement and/or application of this Consent Judgment.			
8	12. ENTIRE AGREEMENT			
9	12.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire, agreement and understanding			
10	of the parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions,			
11	negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or			
12	otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party			
13	hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be			
14	deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.			
15	13. GOVERNING LAW			
16	13.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be			
17	governed by the laws of the State of California.			
18	14. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>			
19	14.1 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or			
20	effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.			
21				
22 .	IT IS SO STIPULATED:			
23	DATED: February , 2009 By:			
24	Defendants Saeco USA, Inc. and Saeco International Group SPA			
25				
26				
27	DATED: February , 2009 By:			
28	Defendant Gaggia SPA			
,	S0320001/749910-3			
	ΦΡΟΡΟΘΕΝΙ ΚΟΝΙΘΕΝΙΤΙΙΝΟΜΕΝΙΤΙΑΘΙΑΕΚΟΝΙΘΑΙΚΑΙ ΙΝΙΚΕΙΘΑΙΚΑΙ ΚΑΙΚΑΙΝΙΤΙΙΙ ΚΟΝΙΙΟ ΘΟΑΙΚΑΙΚΑΙΑ ΘΑΙΚΟΙΑ ΘΟΑΙΚΑΙΑ			

AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE

10.

10. <u>AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE</u>

10.1 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.

11. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

11.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction over the matters covered herein and the enforcement and/or application of this Consent Judgment.

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 and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any 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.

13. GOVERNING LAW

13.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

14. COURT APPROVAL

14.1 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

DATED: February 7, 2009

Defendants Saeco USA, Inc. and Saeco

International Group SPÁ

DATED: February 2009

By: Mark J. Bas

Defendant Gaggia SPA

S0320001/749910-3

27

28

10

1		
2		
3		
4	DATED: February 20, 2009 //WWWW VN UWWWWW William Verick	
5	Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation	
6		
7		
8	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:	
9		
10	DATED:, 2009	
11	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
12	,	
13		
14		
15 16	·	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	S0320001/749910-3 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO SAECO USA, INC., SAECO INT'L GROUP SPA, GAGGIA SPA	