1 2 3 4 5 6 7	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP, LLP Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213209 Lisa Burger, State Bar No. 239676 1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122 Telephone: (415) 759-4111 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STA	ATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO			
10				
11				
12 13	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,) Can a non-profit corporation,	ase No. CGC-08-482792		
14		PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT		
15)	E: BETTY DAIN CREATIONS, INC.		
16	V.)			
17	ACME UNITED CORPORATION; ADENNA) INC.; BECTON, DICKINSON & COMPANY;) BETTY DAIN CREATIONS, INC.;)			
18 19	DURASAFE INC.; IMPACT PRODUCTS,) LLC; INVACARE CORPORATION;) MICROFLEX CORPORATION; SHELBY)			
20	GROUP INTERNATIONAL DBA MCR) SAFETY; UNITED STATIONERS SUPPLY)			
21	CO.; and Defendant DOES 1 through 200, inclusive,			
22	Defendants.			
23)			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1.1 On December 9, 2008, 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. Acme United Corporation, et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case Number CGC-08-482792 (the "CEH Action"), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"). The Complaint in the CEH Action named Betty Dain Creations, Inc. ("Defendant") as a defendant.

- 1.2 Defendant is a corporation that employs 10 or more persons and manufactured, distributed and/or sold vinyl gloves (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 di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate ("DEHP"), a chemical 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 DEHP. 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 are safe and 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 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 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 for the purpose of

avoiding prolonged litigation. By executing this Consent Judgment, the Parties do not admit any facts or conclusions of law and Defendant does not admit to any violation of Proposition 65 or any other law. Furthermore, 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 by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument or defense the Parties may have in this or any other or future legal proceedings.

2. **COMPLIANCE - REFORMULATION**

- 2.1 Reformulation Standard Removal of DEHP. After 60-days following the entry of this Consent Judgment (the "Compliance Date"), Defendant shall not manufacture, distribute, ship, or sell, or cause to be manufactured, distributed or sold, any Product that contains in excess of trace amounts of DEHP. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, "in excess of trace amounts" is more than 600 parts per million ("ppm"). In reformulating the Products to remove DEHP, Defendant may not use butyl benzyl phthalate ("BBP"), di-n-hexyl phthalate ("DnHP"), di-n-butyl phthalate ("DBP") or di-isodecyl phthalate ("DIDP") in excess of trace amounts. DEHP, BBP, DnHP, DBP and DIDP are together referred to herein as "Listed Phthalates."
- 2.2 Certification From Suppliers. Defendant shall issue specifications to its suppliers requiring that the Products shall not contain any Listed Phthalate in excess of trace amounts. Defendant shall obtain written certification from its suppliers of the Products certifying that the Products do not contain any Listed Phthalate in excess of trace amounts.
- 2.3 Defendant's Testing. In order to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 2.1, Defendant shall cause to be conducted testing to confirm that the Products do not contain any Listed Phthalate in excess of trace amounts. All testing pursuant to this Section shall be performed by an independent laboratory in accordance with both of the following test protocols: (1) EPA SW8270C; and (2) EPA SW3580A (together referred to as the "Test Protocols"). At the request of CEH, the results of the testing performed pursuant to this

2.3.1 Testing Frequency. For each of the first two orders of Products purchased from each of Defendant's suppliers after the Compliance Date, Defendant shall randomly select and test the greater of 0.1% (one-tenth of one percent) or eight, but in no case more than ten, of the total units of Products purchased from each supplier of the Products. Following the testing of the first two orders as described above, Defendant shall, for each subsequent order, randomly select and test the greater of 0.05% (one-twentieth of one percent) or four, but in no case more than five, of the total units of Products purchased in that calendar year from each supplier of the Products.

2.3.2 Products That Contain Listed Phthalates Pursuant to

Defendant's Testing. If the results of the testing required pursuant to Section 2.3 show Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts in a Product, Defendant shall: (1) refuse to accept any further units of Products that were purchased under the same purchase order; (2) send a notice to the supplier explaining that such Products do not comply with the suppliers' certification; and (3) apply the testing frequency set forth in Section 2.3.1 as though the next shipment from the supplier were the first one following the Compliance Date.

testing of the Products. Any such testing shall be conducted by CEH at an independent laboratory, in accordance with both of the Test Protocols. In the event that CEH's testing demonstrates that the Products contain Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts subsequent to the Compliance Date, CEH shall inform Defendant of the test results, including information sufficient to permit Defendant to identify the Product(s). Defendant shall, within 30 days following such notice, provide CEH, at the address listed in Section 11.1, 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 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 the presence of Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts in the Products. The payments shall be made to CEH and

used for the purposes described in Section 3.1.

2.4.1 Stipulated Payments In Lieu of Penalties. If stipulated payments in lieu of penalties are warranted under Section 2.4, the stipulated payment amount shall be as follows for each unit of Product for which CEH produces a test result showing that Defendant sold a Product containing Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts after the Compliance Date:

First Occurrence: \$500

Second Occurrence: \$750

Third Occurrence: \$1,000

Thereafter: \$2,500

3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

3.1 Monetary Payment in Lieu of Penalty. Defendant shall pay to CEH \$5,000 in lieu of any penalty allegedly due 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. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to CEH.

- 3.2 Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant shall pay \$10,000 to reimburse CEH and its attorneys for the investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, and any other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this claim to Defendant's attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to Lexington Law Group, LLP.
- 3.3 Delivery of payments. All payments made pursuant to this Section 3 shall be delivered to the Lexington Law Group at the address set forth in Section 11.1, and shall be delivered as follows: (1) the first payment of \$5,000, payable to CEH, shall be delivered within 15 days of mutual execution of this Consent Judgment; (2) the second payment of \$5,000, payable to the Lexington Law Group, shall be delivered within 90 days of mutual execution of this Consent Judgment; and (3) the final payment of \$5,000, payable to the Lexington Law Group, shall be delivered within 180 days of mutual execution of this Consent Judgment.

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 Either Party may, by motion or application for an order to show cause, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. The Party that prevails on any such motion or application shall be entitled to recover its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated with enforcing the Consent Judgment.

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

- CEH and Defendant of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the 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, customers or retailers (collectively, "Defendant Releasees") based on failure to warn about alleged exposures to DEHP resulting from any Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Defendant ("Covered Claims") on or prior to 60-days following the date of entry of this Consent Judgment. CEH, its directors, officers, employees and attorneys hereby release all Covered Claims against Defendant Releasees. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 for purposes of DEHP exposures from the Products.
- 7.2 In furtherance of the foregoing, CEH, its directors, officers, employees and attorneys hereby waive any and all rights and benefits which they now have, or in the future may have, conferred upon them with respect to DEHP exposures from the Products by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

ı						
1 2	"A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST BY HIS OR HER FAMOR AT THE TRUE OF					
3		TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM				
4		OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR."				
5	8.	SEVERABILITY				
6		8.1	In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held			
7	by a court to	be unen	forceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely			
8	affected.					
9	9. GOVERNING LAW					
10		9.1	The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the			
11	State of California.					
12	10.	RETE	ENTION OF JURISDICTION			
13		10.1	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce			
14	the terms this Consent Judgment.					
15	11.	11. PROVISION OF NOTICE				
16		11.1	All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and			
17	correspondence shall be sent to the following:					
18	For CEH:					
19			Mark N. Todzo			
20			Lexington Law Group, LLP 1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 04122			
21	San Francisco, CA 94122 For Defendant:					
22			Gregory R. McClintock Akerman Senterfitt LLP			
2324			725 South Figueroa Street, 38th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017-5433			
25	12.	COU	RT APPROVAL			
26		12.1	CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of Health and			
27	Safety Code	§ 25249	2.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations § 3003.			
- '						

1	13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS
2	13.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in
3	counterparts and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one
4	document.
5	14. AUTHORIZATION
6	14.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully
7	authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter
8	into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally bind that
9	Party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this
10	Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party is to bear its own fees and
11	costs.
112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 1	AGREED TO: CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH Dated: 3/30/09/ CMARLIZ PIZMENO [Name] ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR [Title] BETTY DAIN CREATIONS, INC.
222 223 224 225 226 227 228	[Name] [Title]

1	is. Execution in production
2	13.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in
3	counterparts and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one
4	document.
5	14. AUTHORIZATION
6	14.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully
7	authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter
8	into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally bind that
9	Party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this
.0	Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party is to bear its own fees and
.1	costs.
2	AGREED TO:
.3	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
4	Dated:
.5	
6	[Name]
7	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
8	
9	[Title]
20	
21	BETTY DAIN CREATIONS, INC.
22	- helmed Lieban Dated: 3/20/09
23	RICHARD LEEBOW Dated: 3/20/09
24	[Name]
25 26	1/0
26	[Title]
28	
-U I	

ORDER AND JUDGMENT Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and Betty Dain Creations, Inc., the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with the terms herein. Dated: _____ Judge, Superior Court of the State of California