1 2	Law Office of Michael Freund	
3	Berkeley, CA 94704 Telephone: (510) 540-1993	
4	Facsimile: (510) 540-5543	
5	Attorney for Plaintiff DAVID STEINMAN	
6		
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
10		
11	DAVID STEINMAN,	Case No.
12	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT
13	V.	JUDGMENT
14	THE DIAL CORPORATION and DOES 1 to 100,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
2223		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
-		

3 4

5 6

8

9

7

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

- 1.1 On April _____, 2010, Plaintiff David Steinman ("Plaintiff") as a private attorney general and in the public interest filed a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties against Defendant The Dial Corporation ("Dial," and collectively the "Parties"). The Complaint alleges that Dial violated the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq., also known as "Proposition 65," through the sale of Dial Clean & Soft Aloe Antibacterial Hand Soap (the "Covered Product"), by knowingly and intentionally exposing consumers to 1,4-dioxane, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning. Dial denies the allegations in the Complaint, and further denies that the Covered Product requires a Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.2 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in a Notice of Violation dated March 5, 2009, served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Dial. A true and correct copy of the Notice of Violation is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 1.3 Plaintiff states that he is a committed environmentalist, journalist, consumer health advocate, publisher, and author, whose major books include *Diet for a Poisoned Planet* (1990, 2007), The Safe Shopper's Bible (1995), Living Healthy in A Toxic World (1996), and Safe Trip to Eden: Ten Steps to Save the Planet Earth from Global Warming Meltdown (2007); through this legal action, Plaintiff seeks to eliminate exposure to 1,4-dioxane and to protect the public health by reducing or eliminating the public's exposure to toxic chemicals; he is, and at all times set forth herein has been, acting in the public interest under provisions of Proposition 65, as set forth at Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d).
- 1.4 Dial is a business entity that employs ten or more persons and manufactures, distributes and/or sells the Covered Product to consumers within the State of California.
- 1.5 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full settlement of disputed claims between the Parties as alleged in the Complaint for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. Plaintiff has diligently prosecuted this matter and is settling this case in the public interest.
- Nothing in the Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Dial of any 1.6 fact, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or

duties of Dial under the Consent Judgment.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and personal jurisdiction over the Parties, that venue is proper in this Court, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter a Consent Judgment pursuant to the terms set forth herein.

III. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF — REFORMULATION AND TESTING

3.1 Reformulation of Dial Clean & Soft Aloe Antibacterial Hand Soap

As of the Effective Date, Dial shall not ship for sale in California any Covered Product without the Proposition 65 warning described in Section 3.2, unless the Covered Product has been manufactured so that it will contain no more than 10 parts per million ("ppm") of 1,4-dioxane, as defined in, and verified by, the Certification Protocol described in Section 3.3. To the extent Dial is in compliance with the obligations imposed by the Section 3.3, a Proposition 65 warning is not required for the Covered Product.

3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warning

To the extent that any Covered Product for sale in California requires a Proposition 65 warning, Dial shall provide the following clear and reasonable warning to consumers:

WARNING: This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

The warning shall be prominently affixed to or printed on the container of the Covered Product with such conspicuousness, as compared with other statements or designs on the container, as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary purchaser or user of the Covered Product.

3.3 Certification Requirements

Commencing no more than ten days after the Effective Date, Dial shall commence selection of samples and testing of the Covered Product at either (1) its analytical chemistry laboratory, which is qualified to conduct assays on FDA-regulated products and is subject to inspection by the FDA, or (2) at any laboratory that is certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program. Dial shall use either of the two testing protocols described in Exhibit B. Dial may choose, in its sole discretion, either of the two testing protocols or locations for the testing required by this Consent Judgment.

Following entry of this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff may, at his option, access and observe Dial's analytical chemistry laboratory. Plaintiff agrees to submit a written request to obtain access to Dial's laboratory at least sixty days prior to the anticipated visit, and Dial shall make commercially reasonable efforts to accommodate Plaintiff's requested date. Plaintiff further agrees to comply with Dial's safety, security and other procedures during his visit (including, without limitation, execution of a confidentiality agreement) to be determined in Dial's sole discretion. Plaintiff agrees that he will be able to access Dial's laboratory once, and that the visit will not involve discussion of methodology, instrumentation, or raw materials. Plaintiff shall be responsible for all fees, costs and expenses associated with his visit to Dial's laboratory. All correspondence regarding the visit shall be directed to the addresses listed in Section 16.

Testing shall be conducted in each of four consecutive quarters.¹ Dial shall maintain certifications from the Senior Vice President of Research and Development attesting that randomly selected samples from three lots of the Covered Product have levels of 1,4-dioxane that are below 10 ppm when analyzed using the methods referenced above. Dial shall be required to conduct no further testing as long as no single quarterly sample tested contains a concentration of 1,4-dioxane in excess of 10 ppm.

¹ In no way does this Consent Judgment require Dial to manufacture the Product each quarter. To the extent the Product is not manufactured in any particular quarter, there is no testing requirement. If the Product is not manufactured in one or more quarters, the next quarter in which the product is manufactured shall be deemed a "consecutive quarter" for purposes of Section 3.3. If Dial ceases to manufacture the Product, there shall be no further testing obligation.

In the event that a single quarterly sample contains a concentration in excess of 10 ppm, Dial shall test and maintain certifications for four additional quarters, or until all of the samples measured in four consecutive quarters contain concentrations of 10 ppm or less of 1,4-dioxane, whichever occurs first. If Dial changes the formulation or processing of the Covered Product in any manner that would reasonably be expected to result in an increase in the levels of 1,4-dioxane after testing has been discontinued, Dial shall test randomly selected samples from three lots of the new formulation of the Covered Product to ensure that those samples contain a 1,4-dioxane concentration of 10 ppm or less.

3.4 Maintenance of Records

Dial shall retain copies of the certifications referenced in Section 3.3 for a period of four years from the date testing commenced and shall provide such certifications to Plaintiff upon written request. Dial shall also retain copies of the test results for a period of four years from the date of testing and shall provide copies of the quarterly test reports to the Attorney General upon his written request.

IV. PAYMENT

In full and final satisfaction of Plaintiff's costs of litigation, attorney's fees and all other expenses, Dial shall make a total payment of \$25,000, payable within fifteen (15) business days of receipt of the Notice of Entry of Consent Judgment by Defendant. Said payments shall be for the following:

- A. \$13,000 as a payment in lieu of penalties, payable to Freedom Press, which includes \$10,000 for reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, and \$3,000 for the purpose of testing consumer products for 1,4-dioxane, formaldehyde and other toxic chemicals; and research into alternatives to the use of toxic chemicals, the promotion of those alternatives. The Tax Identification No. for Freedom Press is 95-4736088.
- B. \$12,000 payable to Michael Freund as reimbursement of Plaintiff's reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

The foregoing payments shall be mailed to the Law Office of Michael Freund at the address in Section 16 of this Consent Judgment.

V. RELEASE AND CLAIMS COVERED

This Consent Judgment entered by the Court is a final and binding resolution between and among Plaintiff, his agents, employees, attorneys, successors, and assigns, acting on behalf of the general public, and Dial, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, attorneys, successors, customers, and assigns ("Released Entities"), of any and all claims, known or unknown, that have been or could have been asserted by Plaintiff for violations of Proposition 65 by Dial or by any other entity arising from the presence of Proposition 65 chemicals in the Covered Product. Except for such rights and obligations as have been created under this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff, on his own behalf and in bringing an action in the public interest pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d) with respect to the matters alleged in the complaint, does hereby fully, completely, finally, and forever release, relinquish and discharge Dial and ("Released Entities") from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, demands, rights, debts, agreements, promises, liabilities, damages, accountings, costs, and expenses, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, of every nature whatsoever which Plaintiff has or may have against Dial and the Released Parties, arising directly or indirectly out of the failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings pursuant to Proposition 65 of exposure to 1,4dioxane in the Covered Product ("Released Claims"). Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to be compliance with Proposition 65 as applied to the Covered Product.

It is the intention of the Parties to this release that, upon entry of Consent Judgment and conclusion of any litigation relating to (i) this Consent Judgment and the Consent Judgment entered by the Court and (ii) and the lawsuit itself, that this Consent Judgment and Consent Judgment entered by the Court shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction and Release of every released claim up to and including the date of entry of the Consent Judgment. In furtherance of this intention, Plaintiff acknowledges that it is familiar with California Civil Code section 1542, 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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

Plaintiff hereby waives and relinquishes all of the rights and benefits that Plaintiff has, or may have, under California Civil Code section 1542 (as well as any similar rights and benefits which they may have by virtue of any statute or rule of law in any other state or territory of the United States). Plaintiff hereby acknowledges that it may hereafter discover facts in addition to, or different from, those which it now knows or believes to be true with respect to the subject matter of this Consent Judgment and the Consent Judgment entered by the Court and the released claims, but that notwithstanding the foregoing, it is Plaintiff's intention hereby to fully, finally, completely and forever settle and release each, every and all Released Claims, and that in furtherance of such intention, the release herein given shall be and remain in effect as a full and complete general release as to Dial and the Released Entities, notwithstanding the discovery or existence of any such additional or different facts. Plaintiff hereby warrants and represents to Dial and the Released Parties that (a) he has not previously assigned any released claim, and (b) he has the right, ability and power to release each released claim.

VI. EFFECTIVE DATE

As used herein, "Effective Date" shall mean January 31, 2010 or 15 days after this Consent Judgment becomes final, whichever is later.

VII. CONTINUING OBLIGATIONS

Except as set forth in section V of this Consent Judgment, nothing herein shall be construed as diminishing Dial's continuing obligations to comply with Proposition 65.

VIII. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCED PROVISIONS

In the event that any of the provisions hereof are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

IX. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

Plaintiff may, by motion or order to show cause before this Superior Court of the State of California, enforce the terms and conditions contained in the Consent Judgment entered by the Court.

X. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment entered by the Court shall apply to, be binding upon and inure to the benefit of Dial and the Released Entities, and upon Plaintiff on his own behalf and on behalf of the general public, as well as his employees, agents, successors, attorneys and assigns.

XI. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment entered by the Court may be modified only upon written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon a regularly-noticed motion of any Party to the Consent Judgment as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.

XII. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify or terminate the Consent Judgment.

XIII. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

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.

XIV. COURT APPROVAL

Pursuant to Health & Safety code section 25249.7, Plaintiff shall prepare and file a motion to approve the Consent Judgment, together with all supporting papers, within 15 days of execution by all parties. The Consent Judgment shall be effective only after it has been executed by the Court.

Otherwise, it shall be of no force or effect and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.

XV. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and/or by facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

XVI. NOTICES

All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be sent to the following agents, which may be changed from time to time following written notice to all parties:

For Plaintiff David Steinman:

- 2 David Steinman
 - Freedom Press, Inc.
- 3 | 120 N. Topanga Canyon, Suite 107 Topanga, CA 90290
- 4

7

1

- Michael Bruce Freund
- 5 Law Offices of Michael Freund
 - 1915 Addison Street
- 6 Berkeley, CA 94704

For Defendant The Dial Corporation:

- 8 Brad Gazaway
 - The Dial Corporation
- 9 19001 N. Scottsdale Road
- Scottsdale, AZ 85255
- 10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Michèle Corash
- 11 Morrison & Forester LLP
 - 425 Market Street
- 12 San Francisco, CA 94105-2482

XVII. GOVERNING LAW

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

XVIII. DRAFTING

The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for the Parties to this Settlement prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms with counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment entered thereon, the terms and provisions shall not be construed against either Party.

XIX. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

In the event a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet either in person or by telephone and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand. In the event an action is filed, however, the prevailing party may seek to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees. As used in the preceding sentence, the term "prevailing party" means a party who is successful in obtaining relief more

favorable to it than the relief that the other party was amenable to providing during the parties' good	
faith attempt to resolve the dispute that is the subject of such enforcement action.	
XX. ENTIRE AGREEMENT	
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. Except as set forth herein, no representations, oral	
or otherwise, express or implied, 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.	
IT IS SO STIPULATED:	THE DIAL CORPORATION
Dated:, 2010	Drad Coroway
	Brad Gazaway The Dial Corporation
Dated:, 2010	David Steinman
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
	Michèle B. Corash
	Attorney for Defendant
	The Dial Corporation
Dated:, 2010	LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL FREUND
	Michael Freund
	Attorney for Plaintiff David Steinman
IT IS SO ORDERED:	
Dated:, 2010	JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT
	faith attempt to resolve the dispute that XX. ENTIRE AGREEMENT This Consent Judgment contain Parties with respect to the entire subject commitments and understandings relator of otherwise, express or implied, have specifically referred to herein, oral or IT IS SO STIPULATED: Dated: