1	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP Eric S. Somers, State Bar No. 139050					
2	Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213209 Lisa Burger, State Bar No. 239676					
3	1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122					
4	Telephone: (415) 759-4111 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112					
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
6	CENTÉR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH					
7						
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	COUNTY O	F MARIN				
10						
11						
12	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,) a non-profit corporation,	Case No. CIV 10-00626				
13	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT				
14	v.)	AS TO SCHURMAN FINE PAPERS				
15	v. 					
16	SCHURMAN FINE PAPERS; and DOES 1					
17	through 200, inclusive,					
18	Defendants.)					
19)					
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

1.1 On February 4, 2010, Plaintiff the Center for Environmental Health ("CEH"), a non-profit corporation acting in the public interest, filed a complaint entitled *Center for Environmental Health v. Schurman Fine Papers, et al.*, Marin County Superior Court Case Number CIV 10-00626, for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.* ("Proposition 65") and naming Schurman Fine Papers ("Defendant") as a defendant.

- **1.2** Defendant is a corporation that employs ten or more persons and manufactured, distributed and/or sold jeweled boxes (the "Products") in the State of California.
- public enforcement agencies with the requisite 60-day Notice (the "Notice") alleging that Defendant was in violation of Proposition 65. CEH's Notice and the Complaint in the CEH Action allege that Defendant exposes people who use or otherwise handle the Products to lead and lead compounds (collectively referred to 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 Health & Safety Code §25249.6, the warning provision of Proposition 65. Defendant disputes such allegations and asserts that all of its Products comply with all applicable laws.
- 1.4 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 Marin, 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 based on the facts alleged therein.
- 1.5 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a settlement of certain disputed claims between the Parties as alleged in the Complaint. By executing this Consent Judgment, the Parties do not admit any facts or conclusions of law. It is the Parties'

2.1

27

28

2.2

Compliance Date, Defendant shall cease shipping (1) the Heart Jeweled Box, SKU No. 414409,

Market Withdrawal of Covered Products. On or before the

which was identified in the 60-Day Notice of Violation sent by CEH to Defendant, and (2) the Dragonfly Jeweled Box, SKU No. 415196 (the "Recall Products"), to stores and/or customers in California, and Defendant shall withdraw the Recall Products from the market in California, and, at a minimum, send instructions to any of its stores and/or customers that offer the Recall Products for sale in California to cease offering such Recall Products for sale and to either return all Recall Products to Defendant for destruction, or to directly destroy the Recall Products. Any destruction of the Recall Products shall be in compliance with all applicable laws. Defendant shall keep and make available to CEH for inspection and copying records and correspondence regarding the market withdrawal and destruction of the Recall Products. If there is a dispute over the corrective action, the Parties shall meet and confer before seeking any remedy in court.

3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

- **3.1 Payments From Defendant.** Within five (5) days of entry of this Consent Judgment, Defendant shall pay the total sum of \$20,000 as a settlement payment.
- **3.2 Allocation of Payments.** The total settlement amount for Defendant shall be paid in three separate checks delivered to the offices of the Lexington Law Group (Attn: Eric Somers), 1627 Irving Street, San Francisco, California 94122, and made payable and allocated as follows:
- **3.2.1 Civil Penalty.** Defendant shall pay \$800 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code \$25249.7(b), such money to be apportioned by CEH in accordance with Health & Safety Code \$25249.12. The penalty check shall be made payable to the Center For Environmental Health.
- 3.2.2 Monetary Payment in Lieu of Civil Penalty. Defendant shall pay to CEH \$6,200 in lieu of penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code \$25249.7(b). CEH shall use such funds to continue its work protecting people from exposures to toxic chemicals. As part of this work, CEH intends to conduct periodic testing of the Products as set forth in Section 2.4. In addition, as part of its Community Environmental Action and Justice Fund, CEH will use four percent of such funds to award grants to grassroots environmental justice groups working to educate and protect people from exposures to toxic chemicals. The method of

selection of such groups can be found at the CEH web site at www.ceh.org/justicefund. The payment in lieu of penalty check shall be made payable to the Center For Environmental Health.

3.2.3 Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant shall pay \$13,000 to reimburse CEH and its attorneys for their reasonable investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, and any other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendant's attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. The attorneys' fees and cost reimbursement check shall be made payable to the Lexington Law Group.

4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of CEH and Defendant, or upon motion of CEH or Defendant as provided by law.

5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 Enforcement Procedures. Prior to bringing any motion or order to show cause to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, a Party seeking to enforce shall provide the violating party thirty (30) days advanced written notice of the alleged violation. The Parties shall meet and confer during such thirty (30) day period in an effort to try to reach agreement on an appropriate cure for the alleged violation. After such thirty (30) day period, the Party seeking to enforce may, by new action, motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Marin, seek to enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Should the Party seeking to enforce prevail on any motion or application under this section, such Party shall be entitled to recover its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated with such motion or order to show cause from the non-moving Party.

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 AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS

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

1	the Complaint against Defendant (including any claims that could be asserted in connection with				
2	any of the Products covered by this Consent Judgment) or its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates,				
3	directors, officers, employees, agents, attorneys, distributors, customers or retailers (collectively,				
4	"Defendant Releasees") based on failure to warn about alleged exposures to Lead resulting from				
5	any Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Defendant ("Covered Claims") on or prior to				
6	the date of entry of this Consent Judgment. CEH, its directors, officers, employees and attorneys				
7	hereby release all Covered Claims against Defendant Releasees. Compliance with the terms of				
8	this Consent	Judgme	nt constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 for purposes of Lead		
9	exposures fro	om the P	roducts.		
10	8.	SEVE	CRABILITY		
11		8.1	In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held		
12	by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely				
13	affected.				
14	9.	GOV	ERNING LAW		
15		9.1	The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the		
16	State of California.				
17	10. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION		ENTION OF JURISDICTION		
18		10.1	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce		
19	the terms this Consent Judgment.				
20	11.	PROV	VISION OF NOTICE		
21		11.1	All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and		
22	correspondence shall be sent to the following:				
23	For CEH:				
24			Eric S. Somers		
25			Lexington Law Group 1627 Irving Street		
26			San Francisco, CA 94122		
27	For Defendant:				
28					

1 Laura McKaskle Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP 2 300 South Grand Avenue, 22nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132 3 12. **ATTORNEYS' FEES** 4 A Party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action arising out of this 5 Consent Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing Party's reasonable attorneys' fees and 6 7 costs unless the unsuccessful Party has acted with substantial justification. For purposes of this 8 Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the 9 Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure §§2016.010, et seq. 10 Notwithstanding Section 12.1, a Party who prevails in a contested 11 enforcement action brought pursuant to Section 5.1 may seek an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 against a Party that acted with substantial 12 13 justification. The Party seeking such an award shall bear the burden of meeting all of the 14 elements of §1021.5, and this provision shall not be construed as altering any procedural or substantive requirements for obtaining such an award. 15 16 Nothing in this Section 12 shall preclude a Party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law. 17 13. COURT APPROVAL 18 19 CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of Health and Safety Code §25249.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations §3003 by preparing 20 2.1 and filing a motion for approval of this Consent Judgment and Defendant shall support approval 22 of such motion. 14. **COUNTERPARTS** 23 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in 24 25 counterparts. 15. **AUTHORIZATION** 26 27 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 28

1	into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that
2	party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this
3	Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and
4	costs.
5	
6	AGREED TO:
7	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
8	Oli
10	
11	CHARLIE PIZARIO
12	[Name]
13 14	AssociATE DIRECTOR
15	[Title]
16	SCHURMAN FINE PAPERS
17	SCHURMAN FINE FAI ERS
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	[Name]
23	
24	[Title]
25	
26	·
27	
28	

1	into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that
2	party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this
3	Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and
4	costs.
5	
6	AGREED TO:
7	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	[Name]
13	
14	[Title]
15	[1e]
16	SCHURMAN FINE PAPERS
17	,
18	Ann and a second
19	with the second
20	
21	POMINIAVE SCHUEMAN [Name]
22	r j
23	(E)
24	[Title]
25	
26	
27 28	
۱O	

1	ORDER AND JUDGMENT
2	Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and Schurman Fine
3	Papers, the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with
4	the terms herein.
5	
6	Dated:
7	
8	Lada Carria Carria fila Cita of California
9	Judge, Superior Court of the State of California
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
2021	
21	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	