1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		TH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA F SAN FRANCISCO
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, a non-profit corporation, Plaintiff, v. BASIC INTERNATIONAL, INC. DBA BASIC MEDICAL INDUSTRIES, INC.; DASH MEDICAL GLOVES, INC.; AMMEX CORPORATION; BIG TIME PRODUCTS, LLC; BOSS MANUFACTURING COMPANY; GOLDMAX INDUSTRIES, INC.; PROSTAT, INC.; RITE AID CORPORATION; and Defendant DOES 1 through 200, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. CGC-09-494337 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: GOLDMAX INDUSTRIES, INC.
22 23 24 25 26 27 28		LDMAX INDUSTRIES, INC. – CASE NO. CGC-09-494337

1.1 On November 10, 2009, 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. Basic International, Inc., et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case Number CGC-09-494337 (the "Complaint"), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* ("Proposition 65"). On December 22, 2009, CEH amended the Complaint to name Goldmax Industries, Inc. ("Defendant") as a defendant (CEH and Defendant collectively referred to as the "Parties").

- **1.2** Defendant is a corporation that employs 10 or more persons and manufactured, distributed and/or sold vinyl gloves in the State of California (the "Products").
- appropriate 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 listed by the State of California as known 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. By executing this

Consent Judgment, the Parties do not admit any facts or conclusions of law. It is the Parties' intent that nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission 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. As of the date of entry of this Consent Judgment (the "Compliance Date"), Defendant shall not manufacture, distribute, ship, or sell in California, or cause to be manufactured, distributed or sold in California, 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") as identified and listed under Proposition 65 in excess of trace amounts as defined above. DEHP, BBP, DnHP, DBP and DIDP are together referred to herein as "Listed Phthalates."
- 2.2 Certification From Suppliers. Following the Compliance Date, for so long as Defendant manufactures, distributes, or ships Products for sale in California, Defendant shall issue specifications to its suppliers requiring that the Products it intends to ship to California shall not contain DEHP or any other Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts. Defendant shall obtain written certification from its suppliers of such Products certifying that they do not contain DEHP.
- **2.3 Defendant's Testing.** In order to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 2.1, Defendant shall cause to be conducted the testing described below to confirm that the Products intended for sale in California do not contain in excess of trace amounts of DEHP. 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 and/or (3) ASTM D3421 (together referred to as the "Test Protocols"). At the written request of CEH, the results of the testing performed pursuant to this section shall be made available to CEH on a confidential basis.

each of Defendant's suppliers after the Compliance Date, Defendant shall cause its supplier to randomly select and test three (3) total Products intended for sale in California at a laboratory certified to test under the federal Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act ("CPSIA").

Following the testing of the first two orders as described above, Defendant shall, beginning on January 1, 2012, at least once annually for each supplier of Products, randomly select and test three (3) of the total Products purchased in that calendar year intended for sale in California from each supplier of the Products. Should Defendant stop selling or causing to be sold Products manufactured or imported after Compliance Date in California, the testing requirements of Section 2.3 shall cease to apply. However, should Defendant begin such sales again, of Products manufactured or imported after Compliance Date, Defendant shall begin testing again, and shall apply the testing frequency set forth in 2.3.1 as though the first shipment following Defendant's re-initiation of Product sales in California were the first one following the Compliance Date.

Defendant shall have no further obligation to either test products or require testing by its suppliers after December 31, 2013.

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 all of the Products that were purchased under the particular purchase order that are intended for sale in California; (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 2.3.1 as though the next shipment from the supplier were the first one following the Compliance Date.

2.4 Confirmatory Testing by CEH. CEH intends to conduct confirmatory testing of the Products manufactured and/or imported subsequent to the compliance date, and

1 intended for sale in California. Any such testing shall be conducted by CEH at an independent 2 laboratory, in accordance with the Test Protocols. In the event that CEH's testing 3 demonstrates that the Products manufactured and/or imported subsequent to the compliance date 4 and intended for sale in California contain Listed Phthalates in excess of trace amounts 5 subsequent to the Compliance Date, CEH shall inform Defendant of the test results, including 6 information sufficient to permit Defendant to identify the Product(s). Upon written request, CEH 7 will also provide copies of any test results on the Products it is relying on to Defendant, along 8 with the Product packaging and, if requested by Defendant, a sample of any remaining, untested 9 Product from the same package as the allegedly non-compliant Product. Defendant shall, within 10 30 days following such notice, provide CEH, at the address listed in Section 11, with the 11 certification and testing information demonstrating its compliance with Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of 12 this Consent Judgment. If Defendant fails to provide CEH with information demonstrating that it 13 complied with Sections 2.2 and/or 2.3, or otherwise fails to identify an error in CEH's test results 14 which error caused CEH to erroneously conclude that a Product intended for sale in California did 15 not comply with this Consent Judgment, Defendant shall be liable for stipulated payments in lieu 16 of penalties pursuant to Section 2.4.1 below for Products for which CEH produces tests 17 demonstrating the presence of Listed Phthalates in the Products. The payments shall be made to 18 CEH and used for the purposes described in Section 3.2. If Defendant provides certification and 19 testing information demonstrating its compliance with Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, Defendant shall 20 not be liable for any such stipulated payments or for any violation of this Consent Judgment. 21 Stipulated Payments In Lieu of Penalties. If stipulated payments 22 in lieu of penalties are warranted under section 2.4, the stipulated payment amount shall be as

in lieu of penalties are warranted under section 2.4, the stipulated payment amount shall be as follows for each "Occurrence" of Defendant selling a Product containing Listed Phthalates manufactured and/or imported subsequent to the compliance date and intended for sale in California after the Compliance Date:

First Occurrence: \$500

23

24

25

26

27

28

Second Occurrence: \$750

Third Occurrence: \$1,000

CEH shall have the burden of proving noncompliance by a preponderance of the evidence. As used in this section 2.4.1, an "Occurrence" is the sale of any number of Products in California from the same lot containing Listed Phthalates.

been manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold, or that are otherwise in the stream of commerce prior to the Compliance Date shall be released from any claims that were brought or that could be brought by CEH in the Complaint, as though they were Covered Claims within the meaning of Section 7, below. As a result, the stipulated payments and other obligations of this Section 2 do not apply to these Products. As of the Effective Date, the Products will be identified with batch numbers which will be provided to CEH up through December 31, 2013. The batch number is listed on the outside of the product packaging on the bottom near the bar code.

3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

- **3.1 Civil Penalty.** Defendant shall pay \$500 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b). The penalty shall be made payable to CEH, which will apportion the penalty in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.12.
- 3.2 Monetary Payment in Lieu of Penalty. Defendant shall pay to CEH \$4,000 in lieu of any additional civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b) and 11 California Code of Regulations §3203(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.
- 3.3 Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant shall pay \$8,000 to reimburse CEH and its attorneys for their reasonable investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, and any other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendant's attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to Lexington Law Group.
 - **3.4 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 within 14 days of entry of this Consent Judgment.

4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- **4.1** This Consent Judgment may only be modified by written agreement of CEH and Defendant, or upon motion of CEH or Defendant as provided by law.
- 4.2 In the event that CEH in a subsequent settlement of a Proposition 65 action involving vinyl gloves shall define "in excess of trace amounts" of DEHP (or any Phthalate identified as a Listed Phthalate in this Consent Judgment) to be a figure higher than 600 ppm in the vinyl gloves, then Defendant may, after meeting and conferring with CEH, seek modification of this Consent Judgment upon a duly noticed motion and hearing to substitute such higher figure for the 600 ppm reformulation standard in Section 2.1 and CEH shall not oppose such motion.

5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 After meeting and conferring in an effort to resolve any dispute, either CEH or Defendant may, by motion or application of an order to show cause, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. The prevailing party on any such motion shall be entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs associated with enforcing the Consent Judgment or opposing the motion as the case may be.

6. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

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

7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS

7.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH, acting on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Defendant and its parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, affiliates and their successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), and those to whom Defendant Releasees distribute or sell the Products, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, cooperative members, and licensees ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of any violation of

1		Mark N. Todzo Lexington Law Group, LLP			
2		1627 Irving Street San Francisco, CA 94122			
3	For Defendant:				
4		Jin Nishi			
5		Lee, Bazzo & Nishi, LLP 2100 Main Street, Suite 400 Irvine, California 92614			
6		irvine, Camornia 92014			
7	12. COI	JRT APPROVAL			
8	12.1	CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of Health and			
9	Safety Code § 2524	9.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations § 3003.			
10					
11	13. EXF	CCUTION AND COUNTERPARTS			
12	13.1	The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts			
13	and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.				
14	14. AU7	THORIZATION			
15	14.1	Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully			
16	authorized by the pa	arty he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into			
17	and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally bind that party.				
18	The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this				
19	Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to bear its own fees and				
20	costs.				
21	AGREED TO:				
22		•			
23	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH				
24					
25		·			
26		Dated: Z/5///			
27	Charlie Pizarro, Ass Center for Environr	100001			
28					

1	GOLDMAX INDUSTRIES, INC.		
2			2/7/2011
3	Paul Cheng, President Goldmax Industries, Inc.	Dated: _	2/7/2011
4	Goldmax Industries, Inc.		/
5			
6	5		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

- 9
[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: GOLDMAX INDUSTRIES, INC. – CASE NO. CGC-09-494337

ORDER AND JUDGMENT Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and Goldmax Industries, Inc., the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with the terms herein. Dated: _____ JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA - 10 -