1 2	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP, LLP Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Eric S. Somers, State Bar No. 139050 Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213200					
3	Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213209 1627 Irving Street					
4	San Francisco, CA 94122 Telephone: (415) 759-4111 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112					
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
6	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH					
7						
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	COUNTY OF MARIN					
10						
11						
12	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, )	Case No. CV083678				
13	a non-profit corporation,					
14	Plaintiff, )	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: EASTSPORT, INC.				
15	v. )	,,				
16	BABY BOOM CONSUMER PRODUCTS, )					
17	INC., et al.,					
18	Defendants.					
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>						
26						
27						
28						
20						

# 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On July 29, 2008, plaintiff Center for Environmental Health ("CEH"), a non-profit corporation acting in the public interest, filed a complaint in San Francisco County Superior Court, entitled *Center for Environmental Health v. Baby Boom Consumer Products, Inc., et al.*, Marin County Superior Court Case Number CV083678 (the "CEH Action"), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.* ("Proposition 65").
- 1.2 Defendant EastSport, Inc. ("Defendant") is a corporation that employs 10 or more persons and manufactured, distributed and/or diaper bags in the State of California (the "Products") that contain Lead.
- enforcement agencies with the requisite 60-day notice alleging that Defendant was in violation of Proposition 65 ("Notice"). CEH's Notice and the Complaint in this Action allege that Defendant exposes people who use or otherwise handle the Products to lead and/or lead compounds (referred to interchangeably herein as "Lead"), chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm, without first providing clear and reasonable warning to such persons regarding the carcinogenicity and reproductive toxicity of Lead. The Notice and Complaint allege that Defendant's conduct violates Proposition 65, including Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.6. Defendant disputes such allegations and asserts that all of its Products are safe and comply with all applicable laws, including Consumer Product Safety Commission and Federal Food and Drug Administration standards.
- 1.4 Upon receipt of CEH's Notice, Defendant took immediate measures to address the allegations set forth therein and to investigate the substance of CEH's allegations.
- 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the violations alleged in CEH's Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in CEH's 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 and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint and Notice based on the facts alleged therein.

1.6 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a settlement of certain disputed claims between the Parties as alleged in the Notice and/or Complaint. By executing this Consent Judgment, the Parties do not admit any facts or conclusions of law. It is the Parties' intent that nothing in this Consent Judgment 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 of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law.

# 2. **COMPLIANCE - REFORMULATION**

- **2.1 Level.** Defendant shall not manufacture, distribute, ship, or sell, or cause to be manufactured, distributed, or sold, any Product with Lead concentrations exceeding the following Reformulation Standard: (a) within ninety (90) days of entry of this Consent Judgment (the "Compliance Date"), 200 parts per million ("ppm"); and (b) within three years after the Compliance Date, 100 ppm.
- 2.2 Certification. Defendant shall obtain written certification from its suppliers of the Products certifying that the Products do not contain Lead concentrations exceeding the Reformulation Standard. Defendant shall obtain written certification with corresponding test results from its suppliers of the Products certifying that neither the Products nor any materials of which the Products are comprised contain Lead concentrations exceeding the Reformulation Standard.
- 2.1, Defendant shall conduct (or cause to be conducted) testing to confirm that the Products do not contain Lead concentrations exceeding the Reformulation Standard. All testing pursuant to this Section shall be performed by an independent laboratory in accordance with EPA Method 3050B for the fabric of the Products, and either EPA Method 3050B (the "Test Protocol"). The results of all testing performed pursuant to this Section 2 shall be made available to both CEH and Defendant on a confidential basis.

6

9

1112

1314

15 16

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

2526

27

28

**2.3.1 Random Testing.** Testing pursuant to this Section 2 shall be performed on randomly selected units in accordance with Defendant's usual testing practices. At a minimum, Defendant shall test at least 5 units of Product from each of the first two shipments from each supplier following the Compliance Date. For the remainder of the shipments following the Compliance Date, Defendant shall test at least 2 units per shipment.

# 2.3.2 Products that Exceed Stipulated Levels Pursuant to

**Defendant's Testing.** If the results of the testing required pursuant to Section 2.3 show levels of lead exceeding the Reformulation Standard, Defendant shall: (1) refuse to accept all of the Products that were purchased under the particular purchase order; (2) send a notice to the supplier explaining that such Products do not comply with the supplier's certification; and (3) apply the testing frequency pursuant to Section 2.3.1 for the next order purchased from the supplier as if such purchase were the first shipment following the Compliance Date.

2.4 Confirmatory Testing by CEH. CEH intends to conduct periodic testing of the Products. Any such testing will be conducted by CEH at an independent laboratory, in accordance with the Test Protocol. In the event that CEH's testing demonstrates Lead levels in excess of the Reformulation Standard for two or more Products, CEH shall inform Defendant of the test results, including information sufficient to permit Defendant to identify the Product(s). Within thirty (30) days following such notice, Defendant shall provide CEH, at the address listed in Section 11, with the certification and testing information demonstrating its compliance with Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of this Consent Judgment. If Defendant fails to provide CEH with certification and testing information demonstrating that it complied with Sections 2.2 and/or 2.3, Defendant shall be liable for stipulated payments in lieu of penalties for Products for which CEH produces tests demonstrating Lead levels exceeding the Reformulation Standard, as set forth below. In addition, Defendant shall then apply the testing frequency set forth in Section 2.3.1 for the next two orders of Products from the supplier(s) of the Products at issue as if such orders were the first ones following the Compliance Date. The payments shall be made to CEH and used for the purposes described in Section 3.1.

1	2.4.1 Stipulated Payments In Lieu of Penalties. If stipulated		
2	payments in lieu of penalties are warranted under Section 2.4, the stipulated payment amount		
3	shall be as follows:		
4	First Occurrence: \$1,250		
5	Second Occurrence: \$1,500		
6	Third Occurrence: \$1,750		
7	Thereafter: \$2,500		
8	Notwithstanding the foregoing, the maximum stipulated payment amount in a calendar year,		
9	regardless of the number of units of Defendant's Products tested by CEH with exceedances of		
10	the Lead levels set forth in this Consent Judgment, shall be \$3,500.		
11	2.4.2 Products in the Stream of Commerce. Defendant's Products		
12	that have been manufactured, shipped, sold, or that are otherwise in the stream of commerce		
13	prior to the Compliance Date shall be released from any claims that were brought or that could		
14	have been brought by CEH in its Complaint, as though they were Covered Claims within the		
15	meaning of Section 7, below.		
16	3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS		
17	3.1 In consideration of the mutual covenants and releases provided in this		
18	Consent Judgment, within 10 days of execution of this Consent Judgment, Defendant shall pay a		
19	total of \$12,500 as a settlement payment. This total shall be paid in two separate checks		
20	delivered to the address set forth in Section 12.1 within 10 days of execution of this Consent		
21	Judgment and shall be made payable and allocated as follows.		
22	3.2 Monetary Payment in Lieu of Penalty. Defendant shall pay to CEH		
23	\$4,200 in lieu of any penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code §25249.7(b). CEH shall use		
24	such funds to continue its work protecting people from exposures to toxic chemicals. As part of		
25	this work, CEH intends to conduct periodic testing of the Products as set forth in section 2.4.		
26	This payment shall be made payable to CEH.		
27	3.3 Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant shall pay \$8,300 to reimburse		

other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendant' attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. This payment shall be made payable to Lexington Law Group, LLP

# 4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- **4.1** This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of the parties.
- 4.2 CEH intends to enter into agreements with other entities that manufacture, distribute and/or sell Products. Should Defendant determine that the provisions of any such agreement with a similarly situated manufacturer or distributor of products are less stringent, Defendant may obtain a modification of this Consent Judgment to conform with the terms of the later signed agreement.

# 5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

Judgment shall be brought in the Superior Court of California in San Francisco County. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, notwithstanding Section 1.5 above, the Parties agree that the Superior Court of California in San Francisco County has subject matter jurisdiction over any disputes arising from this Consent Judgment and personal jurisdiction over each of the Parties, and that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco. Should CEH prevail on any action to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment it shall be entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated with such enforcement.

# 6. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

**6.1** This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon the parties hereto, their divisions, subdivisions and subsidiaries, and the successors or assigns of any of them.

### 7. CLAIMS COVERED

7.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH and Defendant of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Notice of Complaint against Defendant (including any claims that could be asserted in

connection with any of the Products covered by this Consent Judgment) or its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, directors, officers, employees, agents, attorneys, distributors, or customers (collectively, "Defendant Releasees") based on failure to warn about alleged Proposition 65 exposures with respect to any Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Defendant ("Covered Claims") on or prior to the date of entry of this Consent Judgment.

Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 for purposes of Lead exposures from the Products.

#### 8. SEVERABILITY

**8.1** In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

# 9. SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE

9.1 The parties expressly recognize that Defendant's obligations under this Consent Judgment are unique. In the event that any Defendant is found to be in breach of this Consent Judgment for failure to comply with the provisions of Section 2 hereof, the parties agree that it would be extremely impracticable to measure the resulting damages and that such breach would cause irreparable damage. Accordingly, CEH, in addition to any other available rights or remedies, may sue in equity for specific performance, and Defendant expressly waive the defense that a remedy in damages will be adequate.

# 10. GOVERNING LAW

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

# 11. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

11.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the terms this Consent Judgment.

# 12. PROVISION OF NOTICE

**12.1** All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and correspondence shall be sent to the following:

1	For CEH:					: :
2			Mark N. Todzo Lexington Law Group, L 1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122			:
4	For Defendant	t:				
5			Charlie Epstein			
6			27 Warren Street Hackensack, NJ 07601			:
7	13.	EXEC	CUTION AND COUNTE	RPARTS		:
8		13.1	The stipulations to this C	Consent Judgment i	nay be executed in	: 
9	counterparts a	nd by r	neans of facsimile, which	taken together sha	ll be deemed to co	nstitute one
10	document.		•			£
11	14.	AUTI	HORIZATION			
12		14.1	Each signatory to this Co	onsent Judgment co	ertifies that he or s	he is
13	fully authorize	ed by th	ne party he or she represen	ts to stipulate to th	is Consent Judgmo	ent and to
14	enter into and	execut	e the Consent Judgment or	n behalf of the part	ry represented and	legally bind
15	that party. Th	ie unde	rsigned have read, underst	and and agree to a	ll of the terms and	conditions of
16	this Consent J	ludgme	nt. Except as explicitly pr	ovided herein, eac	h party is to bear it	s own fees
17	and costs.					
18	AGREED TO	<b>D:</b>		N.		
19	CENTER FO	R ENV	IRONMENTAL HEALTI	H		:
20			<b>-</b> ≟.			
21	Michael			Dated	1: <u>ID/30/08</u>	<del>:</del> .
22	Charlie Pi	r for Er	ivironmental Health			
23	EASTSPOR'			••		:
24	EASISI OK	1, 1110	• •	Dated	·	
25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Dato		:
26		[Nam	e]			i
27		[Title	;			
28						

1	For CEH:	
2	Mark N. Todzo Lexington Law Group, LLP	
3	3 1627 Irving Street	
4	San Francisco, CA 94122	
5	For Defendant:	
6	Charlie Epstein	
7	7 13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPART	S
8	8 13.1 The stipulations to this Consent Ju	adgment may be executed in
9	<b>Ⅱ</b>	- ·
10		
11	14. AUTHORIZATION	
12	The state of the	dement certifies that he or she is
13	fully authorized by the party he or she represents to stipu	
14	· ·	
15		
16	<b>■</b>	
17	· · ·	, <b>, ,</b>
18	AGREED TO:	
19	19 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	
20	<b>Ⅱ</b>	
21	21	Dated:
22	Michael Green, Executive Director Center for Environmental Health	Dated.
23	■ III	
24	EASTSPORT, INC.	00
25	25 June - Magngha	Dated: 10/20/08
26	26 AGRORA MAYUGBA	
27	[Name]	
28		
- 1	II	

Con a Richard

1	OF	RDER AND JUDGMENT			
1 2	Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and EastSport, Inc.,				
3	the settlement is approved and the clerk is hereby instructed to enter judgment in accordance				
4		·			
5					
6	Datada	_			
7					
8					
9		Judge, Superior Court of the State of California			
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					