		·
1	[	
2	BARON & BUDD, P.C. 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100 Dallas, TX 75219	
\ 3	Telephone (214) 521-3605 Facsimile (214) 520-1181	
. 4		
6	Mountain View, CA 94040	
7	Telephone 650-281-7081 Facsimile 408-774-1906	
. 9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Chris Manthey and Benson Chiles	
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
12	CHRIS MANTHEY and BENSON CHILES,	Case No.: CGC-10-497334
. 13	Plaintiffs,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS
14	vs.	TO SOLGAR, INC, NBTY, INC. et al.; ORDER
15	CVS PHARMACY, INC.; GENERAL	
16	NUTRITION CORPORATION; NOW ) HEALTH GROUP, INC.; OMEGA PROTEIN, INC.; PHARMAVITE LLC; RITE )	
17	PROTEIN, INC.; PHARMAVITE LLC; RITE ) AID CORPORATION; SOLGAR, INC.; and TWINLAB CORPORATION,	
19	Defendants.	
20		
21	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
22	1.1 On March 2, 2010, Chris Manthey and Benson Chiles (collectively, "Plaintiffs"),	
· 23	acting in the public interest, filed a complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief in San	
24 25	Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 497334 ("Complaint") against CVS Pharmacy, Inc.,	
26	General Nutrition Corp., NOW Health Group, Inc., Omega Protein, Inc., Rite Aide Corp.,	
27	Solgar, Inc., and Twinlab Corp. (collectively, "Defendants"). In their Complaint, Plaintiffs	
28	allege that Defendants manufactured, packaged,	distributed, marketed and/or sold dietary
	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO S	SOLGAR, INC., NBTY, INC., et al.; ORDER - 1
	·	
ı	I	

supplements made from fish oils, fish liver oils, shark oils, and/or shark liver oils ("Products") for human consumption containing the Proposition 65 listed chemical polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs") in an amount that violated the provisions of Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65") by knowingly and intentionally exposing persons to a chemical known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity and cancer, namely PCBs, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals. This Consent Judgment resolves Plaintiffs' claims against Solgar, Inc., and NBTY, Inc., including its direct and indirect subsidiaries, expressly including without limitation all Dietary Supplement Products sold under the brand names Nature's Bounty and Good 'N Natural, including those identified in the notice letters listed below in Section 1.2 (collectively, "Settling Defendants"). The Products covered by this Consent Judgment are described in Exhibit A attached hereto (the "Dietary Supplement Products"). If a Plaintiff in the future inquires whether a Product is a Dietary Supplement Product subject to this Consent Judgment, a Settling Defendant shall respond promptly (and in any event within fourteen (14) days of the inquiry) to Plaintiff's inquiry.

- (hereinafter referred to as the "Parties"), stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over the Settling Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a resolution of all claims which could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein. More than sixty (60) days have lapsed since Plaintiff issued a notice of violation of Proposition 65 letter dated August 6, 2009, and additional notice of violation of Proposition 65 letters dated August 5, 2011 and February 1, 2012. No public prosecutor has commenced a legal action respecting any of the notice of violation letters or intervened in Plaintiffs' suit. A copy of the notice of violation letters and the Complaint appear at Exhibit B.
  - 1.3 Each Settling Defendant denies the allegations set forth in the Complaint.
- 1.4 For the purpose of avoiding prolonged and costly litigation, the Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full settlement of all claims that were raised in the Complaint based

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

. 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

1

or affect the responsibilities and duties of the Parties under this Consent Judgment.

II. MONITORING

2.1

are exposed in the Dietary Supplement Products. In monitoring such levels, Settling
Defendants shall be entitled to conduct, or have conducted on their behalf, laboratory testing for
PCBs, rely on the test results their raw, intermediate or bulk material suppliers provide, rely on
test results their contract manufacturers provide and rely on additional relevant information
(such as whether oils have been subject to molecular distillation or other processing to reduce
impurities) to establish PCBs levels for purposes of this Consent Judgment in the Dietary
Supplement Products. The laboratory testing for purposes of this Section 2.1 may be conducted
pursuant to US EPA Method 8082A, US EPA Method 1668 or 1668A or any other laboratory
test method routinely employed in the United States, Canada or European countries to document
PCBs levels (or specific PCB congeners) in Products. The data and information on which a
Settling Defendant relies shall be maintained for at least two (2) years after a Dietary

on the facts alleged therein, or which could have been raised in the Complaint arising out of the

facts alleged therein. By execution of this Consent Judgment, no Settling Defendant admits

any violation of Proposition 65 or any other law and specifically denies that it has committed

sold and distributed in California have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in

this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by any Settling Defendant of any

monitoring, testing, or labeling obligations herein have any applicability except with respect to

compliance with Proposition 65 respecting those Dietary Supplement Products sold within the State of California or sold to California consumers. However, this paragraph shall not diminish

Settling Defendants shall monitor PCBs levels to which California consumers

fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, nor as an admission that any

any such violations and maintains that all dietary supplement products that it has manufactured,

2.2 A determinative level of PCBs in any Dietary Supplement Product for purposes of this Consent Judgment shall be established if a Settling Defendant conducts, or has

Supplement Product is manufactured, distributed or sold (whatever is the latest date) by a

Settling Defendant.

conducted on its behalf, testing of a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of ten (10) samples (at a Settling Defendant's discretion) from different lots or bulks using US EPA Method 8082A. The determinative level shall be the arithmetic mean (average) of the samples so tested. The determinative level shall be the level evaluated to determine compliance with the obligations of this Consent Judgment, including Section 3.1 below. The determinative level for a given Dietary Supplement Product may be established at any time and the Parties expressly contemplate that in the event of a dispute regarding the determinative level, the Settling Defendant shall be afforded an opportunity prior to enforcement of this Consent Judgment to supplement the existing test data and information on hand pursuant to Section 2.1 as set forth in this Section 2.2.

2.3 All data generated in compliance with Sections 2.1 and 2.2 herein shall be available to Plaintiffs within thirty (30) days of request therefor by Settling Defendant's delivering the information to Laura Baughman at Baron & Budd, P.C., 3102 Oak Lawn Ave., Suite 1100, Dallas, TX 75219 (<a href="mailto:lbaughman@baronbudd.com">lbaughman@baronbudd.com</a>). Plaintiffs shall not request such data more often than once per calendar year, unless good cause is shown to request data more frequently. No test data or other information need be maintained or delivered to Plaintiff corresponding to the time period a Dietary Supplement Product carries a warning as provided for in Section 3.1. Plaintiffs shall keep all such information and data confidential except as is necessary to contest whether the warning obligation of Section 3.1 below has been violated, and if such data or information is required to be presented to the Court, Plaintiff shall do so under seal or take alternative measures to preserve the confidentiality of the data or information.

## III. <u>CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS</u>

### 3.1 Warning Standard

Beginning with the date that is ninety (90) days after the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment (the "Compliance Date"), each Settling Defendant shall not manufacture for sale in the State of California, distribute into the State of California, or sell directly to a consumer in the State of California any Dietary Supplement Product that exceeds an exposure limit for polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs") of 290 nanograms per day for birth defects and

11 12

13

14

10

15 16

18 19

17

20 21

22 23

242526

2<u>7</u> 28 reproductive harm, or exceeds the exposure limit for PCBs of 350 nanograms per day for cancer, based on the maximum daily dosage recommended on the Dietary Supplement Product label, unless a warning is placed on the packaging, labeling or directly to or on the Product that states;

## "[CALIFORNIA PROPOSITION 65] WARNING:

This product contains polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs"), a chemical known [to the State of California] to cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm."

(hereinaster, "Product Label Warning"). The text in [brackets] is optional in a Settling Defendant's sole discretion. To ensure accuracy in the warning text, a Settling Defendant may omit either the word "cancer" or the phrase "birth defects, or other reproductive harm" depending on whether the level of PCBs in the Dietary Supplement Product exceed only the warning trigger level for cancer, or exceed only the warning trigger level for birth defects and reproductive harm, or exceed the warning trigger levels for both cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. The Parties acknowledge that the warning trigger levels for PCBs may change over time and a Settling Defendant accordingly may adjust the warning text for purposes of accuracy. Product Label Warnings shall be placed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs and/or devices on the labeling as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of use or purchase. If the warning is displayed on the Product's container or labeling, the warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings on the Product's container or labeling, and the word "warning" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. If printed on the labeling, the warning shall be contained in the same section of the labeling that states other safety warnings concerning the use of the Product. A Settling Defendant may affix a sticker or a hang tag on each unit of a Dietary Supplement Product packaged in final form for consumer purchase to deliver the warning, if required, provided the sticker is affixed in a location a consumer is likely to see prior to first use.

### 3.2 Mail Order Sales

For any mail order sales by a Settling Defendant, the warning language required under this Consent Judgment shall also be included in the mail order catalogue, either on the same page as any order form, or on the same page upon which the Dietary Supplement Product's price is listed, in the same type size as the surrounding, non-heading text. Required warning text, if any, shall be added in the next print run of a catalogue which is scheduled in the ordinary course of business at least forty-five (45) days after entry of this Consent Judgment.

### 3.3 Internet Sales

For internet sales by a Settling Defendant of Dietary Supplement Products subject to the warning requirements of Section 3.1, the warning language required under this Consent Judgment shall be displayed in the same type size as the surrounding, non-heading text, either:

(a) on the same page upon which the Dietary Supplement Product is displayed or referenced; (b) on the same page as the order form for the Dietary Supplement Product; (c) on the same page as the price for the Dietary Supplement Product is displayed; or (d) in a dialogue box which appears when a California address for delivery is provided by the consumer, so long as the dialogue box appears prior to the completion of the internet sale and requires the consumer to affirmatively accept receipt of the warning set forth in the dialogue box (which shall be displayed in the same type size as the surrounding, non-heading text on the screen at the time of the appearance of the dialogue box), as a condition precedent to completing the sale.

3.4 Any non-discretionary changes to the language or format of the warnings required herein shall be made only after Court approval or obtaining Plaintiffs' and the California Attorney General's approval. If any Settling Defendant requests a non-discretionary change in language or format of the warnings and neither Plaintiffs nor the Attorney General respond to that request within forty-five (45) days, then that Settling Defendant may move the Court via a noticed motion to modify this Consent Agreement. The Parties agree that adjustments to the warning text for accuracy if warning trigger levels for PCBs change due to either Plaintiff or the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment adopting (as set forth

AB JW QM

in Section 3.6) final "safe harbor" figures which are higher than 290 ug/day shall be deemed a discretionary change.

- 3.5 Each Settling Defendant's compliance with Sections 3.1 through 3.4 of this Consent Judgment shall fully and completely satisfy such Settling Defendant's obligations under Proposition 65 with respect to PCBS in the Dietary Supplement Products and, additionally, all sales to California consumers of such Dietary Supplement Products by any person shall be deemed to be in compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to PCBs. For the avoidance of doubt, the Parties expressly agree sales of any Dietary Supplement Products any Settling Defendant already has manufactured, distributed or sold prior to the Compliance Date shall not constitute a violation of this Consent Judgment, even if sales of such Dietary Supplement Products to California consumers occur after the Compliance Date.
- 3.6 In the event that either a) one or both of the Plaintiffs subsequently agree in a settlement or judicially-entered injunction or consent judgment pursuant to Proposition 65 to a less stringent standard for PCBs in Products than set forth in Paragraph 3.1 above, or b) the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") subsequently establishes "safe harbor" warning trigger levels for PCBs in Products (including the Dietary Supplement Products) that are higher than the level set forth in Paragraph 3.1 above, Settling Defendants shall automatically, with no further action needed on Settling Defendants' part, be entitled to adopt such higher warning trigger level with respect to sales to California consumers of the Dietary Supplement Products by Settling Defendants or any other person.

## IV. MONETARY RELIEF

4.1 Within fifteen (15) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling

Defendants shall pay Plaintiffs a total of \$137,500 ("Settlement Proceeds"). The Settlement

Proceeds shall be made payable to Baron & Budd, P.C. and delivered to Laura Baughman at

Baron & Budd, P.C., 3102 Oak Lawn Ave., Suite 1100, Dallas, Texas 75219. Of the Settlement

Proceeds, \$3,000 shall be deemed a Civil Penalty. Plaintiffs shall bear all responsibility for
apportioning and paying to the State of California any portion of the Settlement Proceeds as

1 2

3 4

> б 7

5

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

23 24

22

26

25

27 28 in Section 3.6) final "safe harbor" figures which are higher than 290 we day shall be deemed a discretionary change.

- Each Settling Defendant's compliance with Sections 3.1 through 3.4 of this 3.5 Consent Judgment shall fully and completely satisfy such Settling Defendant's obligations under Proposition 65 with respect to PCBS in the Dietary Supplement Products and, additionally, all sales to California consumers of such Dietary Supplement Products by any person shall be deemed to be in compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to PCBs. For the avoidance of doubt, the Parties expressly agree sales of any Dietary Supplement Products any Settling Defendant already has manufactured, distributed or sold prior to the Compliance Date shall not constitute a violation of this Consent Judgment, even if sales of such Dietary Supplement Products to California consumers occur after the Compliance Date.
- In the event that either a) one or both of the Plaintiffs subsequently agree in a 3.6 settlement or judicially-entered injunction or consent judgment pursuant to Proposition 65 to a less stringent standard for PCBs in Products than set forth in Paragraph 3.1 above, or b) the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") subsequently establishes "safe harbor" warning trigger levels for PCBs in Products (including the Dietary Supplement Products) that are higher than the level set forth in Paragraph 3.1 above, Settling Defendants shall automatically, with no further action needed on Settling Defendants' part, be entitled to adopt such higher warning trigger level with respect to sales to California consumers of the Dietary Supplement Products by Settling Defendants or any other person.

#### MONETARY RELIEF IV.

Within fifteen (15) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling 4.1 Defendants shall pay Plaintiffs a total of \$137,500 ("Settlement Proceeds"). The Settlement Proceeds shall be made payable to Baron & Budd, P.C. and delivered to Laura Baughman at Baron & Budd, P.C., 3102 Oak Lawn Ave., Suite 1100, Dallas, Texas 75219. Of the Settlement Proceeds, \$3,000 shall be deemed a Civil Penalty. Plaintiffs shall bear all responsibility for apportioning and paying to the State of California any portion of the Settlement Proceeds as

required by California Health & Safety Code § 25249.12(d), and no Settling Defendant shall have any liability if payments to the State of California are not made by Plaintiffs.

4.2 The payment made pursuant to Section 4.1 shall be the only monetary obligation of the Settling Defendants with respect to this Consent Judgment, including as to any fees, costs, or expenses Plaintiffs have incurred in relation to this action and Plaintiffs hereby jointly and severally expressly release claims, if any, for any additional sums from Settling Defendants.

## V. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f)

Plaintiffs agree to comply with the reporting requirements referenced in California
Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Pursuant to the regulations promulgated under that section,
Plaintiffs shall present this Settlement to the California Attorney General's Office within five
(5) days after receipt of all necessary signatures. The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to
Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, a noticed motion must be filed to obtain judicial approval of
the Consent Judgment. Accordingly, a motion for approval of the settlement shall be prepared
and filed by Plaintiffs within a reasonable period of time after the date this Consent judgment is
signed by all Parties. Plaintiffs agree to serve a copy of the noticed motion to approve and enter
the Consent Judgment on the Attorney General's Office at least forty-five (45) days prior to the
date set for hearing of the motion in the Superior Court of the City and County of San
Francisco.

### VI. MODIFICATION OF SETTLEMENT

This Settlement may be modified by: (1) written agreement among the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or (2) motion of Plaintiffs or any of the Settling Defendants as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon. All Parties and the California Attorney General's Office shall be served with notice of any proposed modification to this Consent Judgment at least fifteen (15) days in advance of its consideration by the Court.

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO SOLGAR, INC., NBTY, INC., et al.; ORDER - 8

### VII. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 7.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party that he or she represents to enter into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally bind that Party.
- 7.2 This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon Plaintiffs and each of the Settling Defendants, their officers, directors, and shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, parent entities or subsidiaries, and successors or assigns of each of them.

### VIII. CLAIMS COVERED

8.1 This Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution between Plaintiffs, including Plaintiffs in their representative capacity in the interest of the general public, and the Settling Defendants of any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claim that could have been asserted against the Settling Defendants for failure to provide clear, reasonable and lawful warnings of exposures to PCBs that result from ingestion of the Dietary Supplement Products. No claim is reserved as between the Parties hereto, and Plaintiffs in their individual capacities and Settling Defendants expressly waive any and all rights which they may have under the provisions of Section 1542 of the Civil Code of the State of California, which provides:

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.

### 8.2 Plaintiffs' Release of Settling Defendants

In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, and for the payment to be made pursuant to Section 4.1, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves, their past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and/or assignees, and Plaintiffs, in their representative capacity in the interest of the general public, hereby release and waive all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action addressing any and all claims occurring on or before the entry of this Consent Judgment, and release all claims occurring on or before the entry of this Consent Judgment, including, without limitation, all

1 2 3

actions, causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses or expenses, including, but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees and attorneys' fees of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent against each of the Settling Defendants and each of their suppliers, contract manufacturers, owners, parent companies, corporate affiliates, subsidiaries, distributors, retailers and their respective officers, directors, attorneys, representatives, shareholders, agents, and employees arising under Proposition 65 related to each Settling Defendant's alleged failure to warn about exposures to or identification of PCBs contained in the Dietary Supplement Products.

Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves, their past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and/or assignees, and Plaintiffs, in their representative capacity in the interest of the general public, and the Settling Defendants further agree and acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution of any violations occurring on or before the entry of this Consent Judgment by each of the Settling Defendants and each of their suppliers, contract manufacturers, owners, parent companies, corporate affiliates, subsidiaries, distributors, retailers and their respective officers, directors, attorneys, representatives, shareholders, agents, and employees, of Proposition 65 that have been or could have been asserted for the failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to or identification of PCBs contained in the Dietary Supplement Products manufactured, or distributed or sold by a Settling Defendant.

In addition, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves, their attorneys and agents, release and waive all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action addressing any and all claims occurring on or before the entry of this Consent Judgment, and release all claims occurring on or before the entry of this Consent Judgment against the Settling Defendants arising under Proposition 65 related to each of the Settling Defendants' alleged failure to warn about exposures to or identification of PCBs contained in the Dietary Supplement Products and for all actions or statements regarding the alleged failures to warn about exposures to or identification of PCBs contained in the Dietary Supplement Products

 made by each of the Settling Defendants or its attorneys or representatives in the course of responding to those alleged violations of Proposition 65 as alleged in the Complaint. For the avoidance of doubt, Plaintiffs expressly agree that all of the foregoing releases, waivers, agreements and acknowledgments in Sections 8.1 and 8.2, including those made by Plaintiffs in their representative capacity in the interest of the general public, apply to sales of any Dietary Supplement Products any Settling Defendant already has manufactured, distributed or sold prior to the Compliance Date, even if sale or use of such Dietary Supplement Products to California consumers occur after the Compliance Date.

Without limiting the foregoing, and for further avoidance of doubt, all of Plaintiffs' foregoing releases, waivers, resolutions and settlements shall apply to Dietary Supplement Products sold by or on behalf of Wal-Mart and its affiliates and subsidiaries.

## 8.3 Release of Plaintiffs

Each Settling Defendant waives all rights to institute any form of legal action against Plaintiffs or their officers, employees, agents, attorneys or representatives, for all actions taken or statements made or undertaken by Plaintiffs and their officers, employees, agents, attorneys or representatives, in the course of seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 in this action.

### IX. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement this Consent Judgment.

## X. COURT APPROVAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE

If this Consent Judgment is not approved by this Court, it shall be of no force or effect and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose. This Consent Judgment shall become effective on the date entered by the Court (the "Effective Date").

## XI. ENFORCEMENT

In the event that a dispute arises with respect to any provisions of this Consent Judgment, the Parties shall meet and confer within thirty (30) days of receiving written notice of the alleged violation from another party. In the event that the Parties are unable to resolve their dispute through the meet and confer process, this Consent Judgment may be enforced using any available provision of law.

## XII. GOVERNING LAW

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

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to the Dietary Supplement Products specifically, then the Settling Defendants shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to those Products that are so affected.

## XIII. EXCHANGE IN COUNTERPARTS

Stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall be deemed to constitute one document.

## XIV. NOTICES

All correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent
Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (a) first-class, registered,
certified return receipt requested, or (b) by overnight courier on Plaintiffs or a Settling
Defendant by the others at the addresses set forth below. Either Plaintiffs or a Settling
Defendant may specify in writing to the other Parties a change of address to which all notices
and other communications shall be sent.

Whenever notice or a document is required to be sent to Plaintiffs, it shall be sent to:

Laura J. Baughman, Esq. Baron & Budd, P.C. 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100 Dallas, TX 75219.

Whenever notice or a document is required to be sent to a Settling Defendant, it shall be sent to:

Judith M. Praitis, Esq. Sidley Austin, LLP 555 West Fifth St., Suite 4000 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Christine McInerney, Esq. Deputy General Counsel Litigation NBTY, Inc. 2100 Smithtown Avenue Ronkonkoma, New York 11779

27

28

## XV. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

 If, subsequent to court approval of this Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected.

### XVI. 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. 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.

## XVII. <u>ASSIGNMENT</u>

A Settling Defendant may assign its obligations under this Consent Judgment, subject to approval by the Court on a noticed motion. Notice of a request for assignment shall be served on Plaintiffs and the Attorney General of the State of California.

17	APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:	A / \
18	, .	
19	Dated: 9/6/12	
20		Sølgatk Inc.
21	Dated: 9/6/12	N/
22		NBTY Inc., including its direct and indirect
23	_	subsidiaries
24	Dated: 97/12	
25		Chris Manthey
26	9/7-117	11/15/1
27	Dated:	WHENS
28	,	Benson Chiles

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO SOLGAR, INC., NBTY, INC., et al.; ORDER - 13

LA1 2540783v.2

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
2	11	
3		ARON & BUDD, P.C.
4		AW OFFICE OF APRIL STRAUSS
5	В	Van bourd
6 7		Laura Baughman
8		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
9		
10	Dated: Si	dley Austin, LLP
11 -		
12	B	y: Judith M. Praitis
ı		Attorneys for Defendants
13 14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	APPROVED AND ORDERED:	
20		
21	Dated:	Honorable Richard A. Kramer
22		Judge of the Superior Court
23		Department 304
24		
25		
26		•
27		
28		
	EDD OD OTED I CONTENT WID ON THE TO TO	GOLOTO INC. NIDAN INC 1 CADADO
	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO	SOLGAR, INC., NBTY, INC., et al.; ORDER - 14
·	LAT 2340/639.2	

.		
		·
,		
2	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
3		:
,	Dated:	BARON & BUDD, P.C. LAW OFFICE OF APRIL STRAUSS
5		
5		Ву:
7		Laura Baughman
- 11	• .	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
3 .		
`∥	Dated:	Sidley Austin, LLP
)	,	0.011
		By: /ytith/M. Praitis
·		Attorneys for Defendants
		•
′ ∥		
	APPROVED AND ORDERED:	
·		•
	Dated:	
		Honorable Richard A. Kramer Judge of the Superior Court
	• • •	Department 304
	•	
		·
		•
-	[PROPOSED] CONSENT HIDGMENT A	AS TO SOLGAR, INC., NBTY, INC., et al.; ORDER - 14
	[1 KOT OSED] COMBENT 70000MENT 7	E TO COMMENT ALLON AND A 1 JULY OF WHICH CAMPAIN - 14

### **EXHIBIT A - "DIETARY SUPPLEMENT PRODUCTS"**

2

The Dietary Supplement Products shall be all fish oils, fish, shark or cod liver oils, shark or squid oils, krill oil, algae oils and other oils containing eicosapentaenoic acid ("EPA") and / or docosahexaenoic acid ("DHA") for human consumption containing the Proposition 65 listed chemical polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs") which are manufactured, distributed or sold by or on behalf of a Settling Defendant, whether manufactured, distributed or sold prior to, or subsequent to entry of, this Consent Judgment.

5

6 Dietary Supplement Products include those sold under a brand or trademark owned or licensed

for use by a Settling Defendant, and those "private label" products which a Settling Defendant manufactures, distributes or sells to third parties; provided, however, that for products sold to third parties the Settling Defendant prepares or approves the dose, serving size or consumer use instructions on the label which appear on the containers sold for direct consumer use of such products.

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO SOLGAR, INC., NBTY, INC., et al.; ORDER - 15

# EXHIBIT B-NOTICE LETTERS AND COMPLAINT [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO SOLGAR, INC., NBTY, INC., et al.; ORDER - 16

LAI 2540783v.2



August 6, 2009

'EDWARD G. WEIL DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 70550 OAKLAND CA 94612-0550

Re: Notice of Violation of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 (PCB Exposure)

Greetings:

The Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation ("Mateel"), Chris Manthey and Benson Chiles give you notice that the private businesses listed on the attached Service List have been, are, will be and threaten to be in violation of Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.6, Matcel, Mr. Manthey and Mr. Chiles are private enforcers of Proposition 65, all may be contacted at the below listed address and telephone number. I am a responsible individual at Mateel. The Noticing Parties are also represented by David Roe, Mr. Roe may be reached at: Law Offices of David Roe, 1061 Walker Ave, Oakland, CA 94610, (510) 465-5860. The above referenced violations occur and have occurred when people ingest dietary supplements that are made wholly, or partly, from fish oil ("fish oil dietary supplements"). Some examples of these types of products are: cod liver oil, Omega -3 oils, supplements made from fish body oils, BPA fish oil concentrates, fish oil concentrates, and DHA fish oil supplements. Specific examples of these types of products are listed in the enclosed Product List. Though a specific variety or brand is mentioned, or an item, SKU or product number is provided as an example, this notice pextains to all kinds, and all variations, of the specific type of fish oil supplement of which the named variety is an example. These fish oil dietary supplements come in caplet form or are spooned out of a bottle. Bach and every one of these fish oil dietary supplements exposes the people who take them to polychlorinated blphenyls ("PCBs") via the ingestion, dermal absorption and absorption through mucous membrane routes. The listed companies did not and do not provide people with clear and reasonable warnings before they expose them to PCBs. The above referenced violations have occurred every day since at least August 6, 2006 and will continue every day until the PCBs are taken out of these products or until warnings are given.

countily,

William Verick

424 First Street, Bureka, CA 95501 \* 707.268.8900 (phone) 707.268.8901 (fax)

### SERVICE LIST

BDWARD G, WELL DENDTY ATTORNEY OTHERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 70350 OAKLAND CA 916120350

OFFICE OF THEICITY ATTORNEY City of Oakland Sos Hyr ot 12th Moor Oakland, Ca 94612

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY CITY OF BAN FRANCISC CITY HALL ROOM 206 400 van Ness 8an francisco, ca 94102

Office of the city attorney City of Sacramento PD Box 1946 Sacramento, Ca 915(2-1948

Office of the city attorney City of San Jose 200 Bast Santa Clara Street Ban Jose, Ca 95113

office of the city attorney city of los angeles 240 H, Main et. Los angeles, ca 2012

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORIESY CITY OF SAN DIECHO CONSUMER & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 100 SANDIEGO, CA 9210

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT Attorney County of Alameda 1225 Pallon Street Room 903 Oakland, Ca 94612

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT Attornby County of Alpinb P.O. Box 248 Marklbbyillb, Ca 95120

office of the district attornby County of Amador 708 COURT STREET JACKSON, CA 95642

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNBY COUNTY OF DUTTS 25 COUNTY OBSTER DR. OROVILLE, CA 95165

OPPICE OF THE DISTRICT Attorney County of Calaverae Government Obnter By Mointain Hanch Road San Andreas, Cass219

OPPICA OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF COLUSA
347 MARKET STREET
COLUSA, CA 95932

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA P.O. DOX 670 MARTINEZ, CA PISSS

office of the district Attornby County of Del Norte 450 HST #171 Crescent City, CA 95511

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COLNIYOUR MIKOFAL DORADO SIS MANIST. PLACERVILLE, CA 95667

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT Attorney County of Fresho 2220 Tulare et 1/1000 Fresho, CA 93/21

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT Attorney Edunty Ofglenn F.O. Hox 410 Willows, CA 93911

( ,

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT OVICE OF THE DESTRUCT

ATTORNEY

S355TH ST.

EUREKA, CA 95501

County Of Imperial Courthoush, Floor 2 919 W. Main'st Dl. Gentro/Ca 91211

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MYO F.O. DRAWER D INDEFERDUNCU, CA 93526

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT Attornby County Opkbry 1215 Tructur Ave. Floor 4 Bakbrefibld, Ca 9330)

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT Attorney County of Kinos 1400 W, Lacey Blyd. Ilahtord, Ca93230

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF LAKE 255 H. FORGES ST #424 LAKEFORT, CASS(3)

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF LASSIN 220 SOUTH LASSENST, STAT SUSANVILLE, CA 96130

Offichof The District Attorney attornby County of Los Angeles 11000 Criminal Courts DATE Building 210 W. Temple St. Los Anorles, Ca 20012

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT officially the distant Attorney County of Madera 209 W. Yosenite Avil Madera, CA 93617

Difficit of the district Attorney County of Marin Hall of Ristics #143 HALL OF RISTICS #144 H

office of the district Attorney County of Marifosa Ro. Box 110 Marifosa, CA 91918

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT COUNTY OF RUNDOCINO Po box 1000 Ukiaii, ca 95102

Office of the district Attorney County of Mercad 3112 N/BT. MBRCBD, CA 94310

Office of the district Attorney County of Modoc 2015 Quiti Court Street Auturas, Ca 16101

Office of the district Attorney County of Mono P.O. Box 617 Bridoefort, CA 93517

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF MONTRERY
2/0 CHUNCH STREET
PO. BOX 111
SALENAS, CA 93902

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF SISKIYOU
PO. BOX 101
PREKA, CA 94001

Cuunty of Napa 911 Parkway Mall P.O. 110X 110 Napa, Ca 94339-0120

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF MAYADA NO UNION STREET NEVADA CITY, CA91919

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF ORANGO 401 CIVIC CONTER DR WEST SANTA ANA, CA 92701

opfice of the district attorney County of placer 11567 h ave Aveurn, ca 95601-2657

OPPICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF PLUMAS \$10 MAIN STREET #404 QUINCY, CA 91971

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF REVERSIDE 4075 MATH ST. RIVERSIDE, GA 92501

OPFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO SOLO STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN DEVITO 419 4TH ST HOLLISTER, CA 95023

Office of tim district attorney County of ban dernarding tigmt. View ave. Ean dernarding, ca 91415-4664

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO SAN DIEGO, CA 93101

Office of the district attorney County of 8am francisco B30 Dryant at 8322 BAN Francisco, Ca 24(03

Office of the district attorney County of San Joaquin 212 B. Weder ave 2102 Brockton, Ca 95201

odfice of the district attorney County of ean luis odlero County government center #450 Ean luis odlero, ca 93404

Office of the district attorney County offan Mateo Hall of Iustice and Records Regwood City, Ca 9466

Ortice of the district attorney County of Santa Darbara 1112 Santa Barbara St. Santa Barbara, Ca 91101

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SMITA CLARA to W. Judding St. Ean 1088, Ca 95110

OFFICE OF THE DISTINCT ATTORNEY SHUM UCHIDA, CEO COURTY OF BANKA CRUZ PRARMAVI B LLC SIGNATURE BLO BANKA CRUZ, CA,91960 NORTHERDOR, CA, 91

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNBY
COUNTY OF SHAFTA
123 COURTST,
REDDENG, CA 2001
NORTHREDGE, CA 591121

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICUT ATTORNISY
COURTY OF SIRPA
PO, DOX479
DOWNLEVILLE, CA 99916
CARP PULL, PA 17011

Office of the district attokingy County of Solano Gounion Avb Fairfield, ca pass)

Office of the district attornby County of Condma 600 Administration dr. #2123 8anta Rosa, Ca 95103

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY -COUNTY OF STANISLAUS 1100 f S.T. 1703 MODESTO, CA 95334

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF SUTTER DLVD. NA
YUDA CITY, CA 95993

Office of the district attornity County of terama P.O. Box 519 RDDBLUFF, Ca 96040

office of the district attorney county of trinity ro. Box 310 Wrayerville, Ca 96093

Diffice of the district attorney Cointy of Tuland Courthouse 1274 Viealia, Ca 93291

uffice of the district attorney County of Tuolumke 25, green st. 50nora, CA 93170

Ventura county district attornay's office 800 south victoria ave Ventura, ca 93009

Office of the district attorney County of Yolo 301 Second Etreet Woodland, Ca 93695

OWNER OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY COUNTY OF YUBA 213 STH ST. MAXYSVILLE, CA 93901

THOMAS M RYAN, CEO CV8 PHARMACY, INC. ONE CV5 DRIVE WOONSOCKET, RI 62895

THOMAS IN RYAN, CEO LONGS DRUG STORES, L.L.C. CO CVS PILARMAGY, INC. ONE CVS DRIVE WOONSOCKET, ILL 02895

Joseph Fortunato, Ceo General Nutrition Corporation 300 Euch ava Pittsdurph, pa 13222

Albert P Powors, presiding now imalific oroup, inc. 1915 Glun Ellyn Rd Bloowingdale, 11 60104

Joseph L. Yon Rosenberg III, President Omega Protein, Dio. 2101 City West Blvd, Dldi 3, 218 500 Houston, Tx 77012

BIOBACHDA BLVD STII (00 NORTHRIDGO, CA 91335

XARLPISOBL PRESIDENT KOHKOHKOMA, MY 11779 SOLUAN, INC. SOLUAN, INC. SOLUAN, INC. SOLUAN, INC. SOLUAN, INC.

WILLIAM W NICHOLSON, CEO TWINIAN CORPORATION 632 BROADWAY 11TH FL MBW YORK, NY 10012

### PRODUCT LIST

### CVS PHARMACY, INC. .

NATURE MADE COD LIVER OIL 100 SOFTGBLE UPC CODE; 031604 013257; NATURE MADE ODORLESS FISH OIL 1200 MG 60 SOFTGBLE UPC CODE; 031604 014162 These product descriptions pertain not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish oils,

### GENERAL NUTRITION CORPORATION

GNC CHOLESTEROL FREE FISH BODY OILS WITH GLA UPC CODE: 048107 073312; GNC LIQUID COD LIVER OIL 16 PL OZ UPC CODE: 049107 057657; GNC CHOLESTEROL FREE FISH BODY OILS WITH GLA 1000 MG 180 SOFTGELS UPC CODE: 048107 073305; GNC LIQUID NORWEGIAN COD LIVER OIL 16 PL OZ UPC CODE: 048107 057657 These product descriptions petiain not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish oils.

#### NOW HEALTH GROUP, INC.

DOUBLE STRENGTH COD LIVER OIL 650 MG/100 SOFTGELS UPC CODE: 733739 017406; NOW FOODS SALMON OIL 100 SOFTGELS UPC CODE: 733739 016706; SHARK LIVER OIL 400 MG 120 SOFTGELS UPC CODE: 733739 003256; NOW FOOD MOLECULARLY DISTILLED OMEGA-3 100 SOFTGELS UPC CODE: 733739 016508 These product descriptions pertain not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish oils.

#### OMEGA PROTEIN, INC.

OMEGAPURE OMEGA-3 DIETARY SUPPLEMENT 1000MG 90 CAPSULES These product descriptions pertain not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish oils.

### PHARMAVITE LLC

NATURE MADE COD LIVER OIL 100 SOFTGBLS UFC CODE: 031604 013257; NATURE MADE ODORLESS FISH OIL 1200 MG 60 SOFTGBLS UFC CODE: 031604 014162; NATURE MADE COD LIVER OIL 100 SOFTGBLS UFC CODE: 031604 013257 These product descriptions pertain not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish oils.

### RITE AID CORPORATION

NATURE MADE COD LIVER OIL 100 SOFTGELS UPC CODE; 031604 013257; NATURE MADE ODORLESS FISH OIL 1200MG 60 SOFTGELS UPC CODE; 031604 014162 These product descriptions pertain not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish oils.

### SOLGAD INC.

SOLGAR 100% PURE NORWEGIAN SHARK LIVER OIL COMPLEX 500 MG 60 SOFTGELS UPC CODE: 033984 025660; SOLGAR NORWEGIAN COD LIVER OIL 100 SOFTGELS UPC CODE: 033984 009400 These product descriptions perialn not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish oils.

### TWINLAB CORPORATION

TWINLAH HMULSIPHED NORWEGIAN COD LIVER OIL 12 PL OZ UPC CODE: 027434 012102; TWINLAH NORWEGIAN COD LIVER OIL 12 PL OZ UPC CODE: 027434 012249 These product descriptions pertain not only to the specific types of the products listed, but also for all units of all types of similar products made out of fish of the color.

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

I, William Verick, hereby declare: This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixly-day notice(s) in which it is alleged the parties identified in the notices have violated Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 by falling to provide clear and reasonable warnings. I am the attorney for the noticing party. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the action. Based on the information obtained through those consultations, and on all other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. Lunderstand that 'reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiffs' case can be established and the information did not prove that the alleged violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute. The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this vertificate, including the information identified in Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the person(s) consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: August 6, 2009

William Verick

This notice alleges the violation of Proposition 65 with respect to occupational exposures governed by the California State Plan for Occupational Safety and Health. The State Plan incorporates the provisions of Proposition 65, as approved by Federal OSHA on June 6, 1997. This approval specifically placed certain conditions on Proposition 65, including that it does not apply to the conduct of manufacturers occurring outside the State of California. The approval also provides that an employer may use the means of compliances in the general hazard communication requirements to comply with Proposition 65. It also requires that supplemental enforcement is subject to the supervision of the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Accordingly, any settlement, civil complaint, or substantive court orders in this matter must be submitted to the Attorney General.

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Nicole Frank, declare:

If called, I could and would testify as follows: I am over eighteen. My business address is 424 First Street, Eureka, California, 95501. On August 6, 2009, I caused the attached 60-DAY NOTICE LETTER, or a letter identical in substance, to be served by U.S. Mail on those public enforcement agencies listed on the attached SERVICE LIST; in addition on the same date and by U.S. Mail I caused the attached 60-DAY NOTICE LETTER and PROPOSITION 65; A SUMMARY to be sent by Certified U.S. Mail to the private business entities also listed on the attached SERVICE LIST. I deposited copies of these documents in envelopes, postage pre-paid, with the U.S. Postal Service on the day on which the mail is collected. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on August 6, 2009, at Eureka, California.

Nicolo Frank

WILLIAM VERICK, CSB #140972 Klamath Environmental Law Center 424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501 Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Fax: (707) 268-8901 wverick@igc.org ecorights@earthlink.net DAVID ROE, CSB #62552 Law Offices of David Roe 1061 Walker Ave Oakland, CA 94610 Telephone: (510) 465-5860 daavidroe@mail.com

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$ 

ENDORSED San Francisco County Superior

MAR 0 2 2010

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: DEBORAH STEPPE

Debug Cod

CASEMANACTUTE CONFETANCE SET

JUL 3 0 2010 \_ 920 AM

DEPARTMENT 212

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, CHRIS MANTHEY, BENSON CHILES and MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (Unlimited Jurisdiction)

CHRIS MANTHEY; BENSON CHILES and MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION,

CASENO CGC-10-497334

Plaintiffs,

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

TOXIC TORT/ENVIRONMENTAL

٧.

19

3

5

9 10 11

12

13 -14

15

16 17

18

CVS PHARMACY, INC.; GENERAL NUTRITION CORPORATION; NOW HEALTH GROUP, INC.; OMEGA PROTEIN, INC.;

PHARMAVITE LLC; RITE AID

· Defendants,

CORPORATION; SOLGAR, INC.; and TWINLAB CORPORATION

24

25

23

26 27

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION
AND CIVIL PENALTIES

CHRIS MANTHEY, BENSON CHILES and MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

1

28

.20 

## INTRODUCTION

- 1. This Complaint seeks civil penalties and an injunction to remedy the continuing failure of defendants CVS PHARMACY, INC.; GENERAL NUTRITION CORPORATION; NOW HEALTH GROUP, INC.; OMEGA PROTEIN, INC.; PHARMAVITE LLC; RITE AID CORPORATION; SOLGAR, INC.; and TWINLAB CORPORATION, (hereinafter "Defendants"), to give clear and reasonable warnings to those residents of California, who handle, ingest and use dictary supplements that are, or that are made from, fish oil, fish liver oil, shark oil or shark liver oil (hereinafter "fish oil supplements"), that ingestion of these products causes those residents to be exposed to polychlorinated biphenyls (hereinafter, collectively, "PCBs"). PCBs are known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects.

  Defendants manufacture, distribute, and/or market fish oil supplements. Defendants' products cause exposures to PCBs, which are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.
- 2. Defendants are businesses that manufacture, market, and/or distribute fish oil supplements. Defendants intend that residents of California ingest fish oil supplements that Defendants manufacture, market, and/or distribute. When these products are ingested in their normally intended manner, they expose people to PCBs. In spite of knowing that residents of California were and are being exposed to PCBs when they ingest Defendants' fish oil supplements, Defendants did not and do not provide clear and reasonable warnings that these products cause exposure to chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm. The fish oil supplements to which this Complaint pertains are those

referenced in the Products List that accompanied the 60 Day Notice Letter, which is appended to and incorporated by reference in this Complaint.

- 3. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7 to compel Defendants to bring their business practices into compliance with section 25249.5 et seq. by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who has been and who in the future may be exposed to the above mentioned toxic chemicals from the reasonably anticipated and intended use of Defendants' products.
- 4. In addition to injunctive relief, plaintiff seeks civil penalties to remedy the failure of Defendants to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposure to chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm. Plaintiff also seeks an order that Defendants identify and locate each individual person who in the past has purchased Defendants' fish oil supplements and to provide to each such purchaser a clear and reasonable warning that those fish oil supplements cause exposures to chemicals known to cause cancer and birth defects.

### **PARTIES**

5. Plaintiffs Christopher Manthey and Benson Chiles are individuals concerned about human health and environmental protection. Plaintiff MATEBL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION ("Mateel") is a non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, the protection of the environment, promotion of human health, environmental education, and consumer rights. Mateel is based in Eureka, California, and is incorporated under the laws of the State of California. All plaintiffs are "persons" pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 25118. Plaintiffs bring this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety

Code §25249.7(d). Residents of California are regularly exposed to PCBs from fish oil supplements manufactured, distributed or marketed by Defendants and are intentionally so exposed without a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.

- 6. Each Defendant is a person doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code Section 25249.11. Each defendant is a business that manufactures, distributes, and/or markets fish oil supplements in California, including in the City and County of San Francisco. Manufacture, distribution and/or marketing of these products in the City and County of San Francisco, and/or to people who live in San Francisco, causes people to be intentionally exposed to PCBs while they are physically present in the City and County of San Francisco.
- 7. Plaintiffs bring this enforcement action against Defendants pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(d). Attached hereto and incorporated by reference is a copy of the 60-day Notice letter, dated August 6, 2009, which Plaintiffs sent to California's Attorney General. Letters identical in substance were sent to every District Attorney in the state, and to the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000. On the same date, Plaintiffs sent an identical 60 Day Notice letter to Defendants. Attached to the 60-Day Notice Letter sent to the Defendants was a summary of Proposition 65 that was prepared by California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. In addition, the 60-Day Notice Letter Plaintiffs sent was accompanied by a Certificate of Service attesting to the service of the 60-Day Notice Letter on each entity which received it. Pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), a Certificate of Merit attesting to the reasonable and meritorious basis for the action was also sent with the 60-Day Notice Letter. Pactual information sufficient to establish the basis of the Certificate of Merit was enclosed with the 60-Day Notice letter

Plaintiffs sent to the Attorney General.

Each Defendant is a business that employs more than ten people.

### **JURISDICTION**

- 9. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7. California Constitution Article VI, Section 10 grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." Chapter 6.6 of the Health & Safety Code, which contains the statutes under which this action is brought, does not grant jurisdiction to any other trial court.
- 10. This Court also has jurisdiction over Defendants because they are businesses that have sufficient minimum contacts in California and within the City and County of San Francisco. Defendants intentionally availed themselves of the California and San Francisco County markets for fish oil supplements. It is thus consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice for the San Francisco Superior Court to exercise jurisdiction over them.
- 11. Venue is proper in this Court because Defendants market their products in and around San Francisco and thus intentionally cause people to ingest PCBs while those people are physically present in San Francisco. Liability for Plaintiffs' causes of action, or some parts thereof, has accordingly arisen in San Francisco during the times relevant to this Complaint and Plaintiffs accordingly seek civil penalties and forfeitures imposed by statutes.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Claim for Injunctive Relief)

- 12. Plaintiff's reallege and incorporate by reference into this First Cause of Action, as if specifically set forth herein, paragraphs 1 through 11, inclusive.
  - 13. The People of the State of California have declared by referendum under

Proposition 65 (California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.) their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and reproductive harm."

- 14. To effectuate this goal, Section 25249.6 of the Health and Safety Code mandates that persons who, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer or birth defects, must first provide a clear and reasonable warning to such individual prior to the exposure.
- 15. Since at least August 6, 2006, Defendants have engaged in conduct that violates Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6 et seq. This conduct includes knowingly and intentionally exposing to PCBs, those California residents who ingest fish oil supplements. The normally intended use of fish oil supplements causes people to ingest PCBs, which are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.

  Defendants have not provided clear and reasonable warnings within the meaning of Health & Safety Code Sections 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 16. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants knew that the fish oil supplements they manufactured, distributed or marketed were causing exposures to PCBs. Defendants intended that residents of California ingest fish oil supplements thereby causing significant exposures to these chemicals.
- 17. By the above described acts, Defendants have violated Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 and are therefore subject to an injunction ordering them to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers, and to provide warnings to their past customers who purchased Defendants' products without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Claim for Civil Penalties)

- 18. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference into this Second Cause of Action, as if specifically set forth herein, paragraphs 1 through 17, inclusive.
- 19. By the above described acts, Defendants and each of them are liable, pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500.00 per day for each exposure of an individual to PCBs without proper warning from the use of Defendants' fish oil supplements.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiff prays for judgment against DEFENDANTS, as follows:

- A. Pursuant to the First Cause of Action, that Defendants be enjoined, restrained, and ordered to comply with the provisions of Section 25249.6 of the California Health & Safety Code;
- B. Pursuant to the Second Cause of Action, that Defendants be assessed a civil penalty in an amount equal to \$2,500.00 per individual knowingly and intentionally exposed per day, in violation of Section 25249.6 of the California Health & Safety Code, to PCBs as the result of Defendants' manufacturing, distributing or marketing of fish oil supplements;
- C. That Defendants be ordered to identify and locate each individual who purchased their fish oil supplements and to provide a warning to each such person that the purchased fish oil supplements have exposed, or will expose, that person to chemicals known to cause cancer and birth defects.

- D. That, pursuant to Civil Procedure Code § 1021.5, Defendants be ordered to pay to Plaintiffs the attorneys fees and costs it incurred in bringing this enforcement action.
  - 5. For such other relief as this court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 24, 2010

KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER

William Veriok

Attorney for Plaintiffs Christopher Manthey, Benson Chiles and the Mateel Environmental Justice

**Foundation**