SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL,

Plaintiff,

v.

PETCO ANIMAL SUPPLIES STORES, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. RG09487873

CONSENT JUDGMENT WITH SERGEANT'S PET CARE PRODUCTS, INC. AND RELATED RETAILER DEFENDANTS

Date: Time: Dept: 2

Judge: Hon. Robert Freedman Complaint Filed: April 23, 2009

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On December 2, 2009, Plaintiff Natural Resources Defense Council ("NRDC") filed a complaint (the "Complaint") initiating this action (the "Action") for civil penalties and injunctive relief in the Superior Court for the County of Alameda. The Complaint named several defendants, including Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc. ("Sergeant's) and several retailers, and alleged that each had manufactured, distributed, and/or sold flea and tick collars containing the chemical propoxur (the "Products") in California. The Complaint further alleges that under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, also known as "Proposition 65," businesses must provide persons with a "clear and reasonable warning" before exposing individuals to propoxur, and that the defendants failed to do so.

28

- 1.2 Sergeant's is a corporation that employs more than 10 persons, and at some time relevant to the allegations of the Complaint manufactured Products, and shipped Products for sale in California.
- 2517-61, issued to Sergeant's by the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act ("FIFRA"), 7 U.S.C. § 136 et seq. ("Sergeant's Registered Products"). Registration Number 2517-61 sets forth the language and information that can appear on the label of a Registered Product. EPA has reviewed and approved an amendment to Registration Number 2517-61 that allows the packaging for the Registered Products to carry the following Proposition 65 warning:

NOTICE: This product contains a chemical (o-Isoproxyphenyl methylcarbamate) (propoxur) known to the State of California to cause cancer.

(the "Sergeant's Warning"). Sergeant's asserts that it changed the packages for the Sergeant's Registered Products to include this warning language, and began shipping packaging containing the Sergeant's Warning into California in March 2008.

1.4 Other Products carrying the Sergeant's brand name are covered under FIFRA
Registration Numbers 2724-491 and 2724-493, which are held by Wellmark International, another
defendant to this Action (the "Wellmark Registered Products"). Sergeant's requested that Wellmark
International, as the registrant for Registration Numbers 2724-491 and 2724-493, seek amendment of
its registration to allow Sergeant's to include the Warning on the Wellmark Registered Products. In
December 2009, after it received confirmation that Wellmark International had done so, Sergeant's
began shipping the Wellmark Registered Products with the following Proposition 65 warning:

Notice: This product contains propoxur, a chemical known to the State

of California to cause cancer.

(the "Wellmark Warning"). Sergeant's asserts that, as of the Effective Date of this Consent

Judgment, all Sergeant's Registered Products and Wellmark Registered Products shipped by

Sergeant's carry the Sergeant's Warning or the Wellmark Warning.

- 1.5 Sergeant's asserts that products carrying the "Zema" brand name that were formerly sold in California (the "Zema Products"), were discontinued in December 2008.
- 1.6 Sergeant's Registered Products, Wellmark Registered Products, and Zema Products are hereinafter sometimes collectively referred to as the "Covered Products."
- 1.7 Albertsons, Inc., New Albertsons, Inc., PETCO Animal Supplies Stores, Inc., Petsmart, Inc., Petsmart Store Support Group, Inc., Lee's Pet Club, Inc., d/b/a Pet Club Stores, Red Cart Market, Inc., d/b/a Pet Club Stores, and Ralphs Grocery Co. are retailers named as defendants in the Complaint that sold and/or sell Covered Products. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, these defendants, only to the extent they sold and/or sell Covered Products, are referred to collectively as "Retailers."
- 1.8 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, NRDC, Sergeant's and the Retailers (collectively, the "Parties") stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Sergeant's and the Retailers as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, 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 against Sergeant's and the Retailers in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.
- this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of all claims relating to the Covered Products arising from the alleged failure to warn regarding the presence of propoxur in such Covered Products. Sergeant's and the Retailers deny the material factual and legal allegations contained in the Complaint and maintain that all Covered Products they have sold in California and/or shipped for sale in California at all times relevant to the Complaint have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment, including Sergeant's and the Retailers' execution of the Consent Judgment and agreement to provide the relief and remedies specified herein, shall be construed as an admission by Sergeant's or the Retailers of any fact, finding, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Sergeant's or the Retailers of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, such

19.

being specifically denied by Sergeant's and the Retailers. This Consent Judgment shall not be admissible in any action or proceeding except for proceedings to enforce or modify this Consent Judgment as set forth herein. However, this Paragraph shall not diminish or otherwise affect Sergeant's and the Retailers' obligations, responsibilities and duties to comply with this Consent Judgment.

1.10 The effective date of this Consent Judgment shall be the date on which the Consent Judgment is entered as a judgment by the Superior Court ("Effective Date").

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: PROPOSITION 65 WARNINGS

- 2.1 Sergeant's shall assure that Covered Products manufactured and/or shipped for distribution to or sale in California on or after the Effective Date carry a warning, the language, location, and appearance of which is substantially similar to the Sergeant's Warning or the Wellmark Warning, consistent with Proposition 65 and the requirements of applicable FIFRA registrations issued by the EPA.
- 2.2 Beginning on the Effective Date, Sergeant's agrees that it shall not manufacture, distribute, or sell in California any Product pursuant to a FIFRA registration held by another individual or entity unless such FIFRA registration allows the inclusion of a Proposition 65 warning that is substantially similar in content and form to that set forth in section 2.1 of this Consent Judgment.

3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

- 3.1 Sergeant's shall pay to NRDC the collective sum of \$30,000 as settlement proceeds ("Settlement Proceeds"). Settlement Proceeds shall be made payable to the Altshuler Berzon LLP Attorney-Client Trust Account and delivered to Altshuler Berzon LLP, at 177 Post Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, CA 94108, within ten (10) business days after the Effective Date, and shall be applied as follows:
- 3.1.1 <u>Civil Penalty:</u> Sergeant's shall pay civil penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.12 in the amount \$16,292.53. This amount shall be allocated between NRDC and the State of California as directed by Health & Safety Code section 25249.12(c)-(d). NRDC's portion shall be distributed to the Rose Foundation.

3.1.2 Attorneys' Fees and Costs: \$13,703.47 shall be paid to reimburse NRDC for attorneys' fees and costs incurred by NRDC in litigating this matter as to the Covered Products and negotiating this Consent Judgment on behalf of itself and the general public. Sergeant's and the Retailers agree to bear their own attorneys' fees, expenses and costs associated with this Action and with NRDC v. Albertsons, Inc., et al., Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG 09448605.

4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

A.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of the Parties after noticed motion and upon entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of either Party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court. Before filing an application with the Court for a modification to this Consent Judgment, the moving Party shall meet and confer with the other Party to determine whether the other Party will consent to the proposed modification, and shall submit any proposed modification to the California Attorney General for comment. If a proposed modification is agreed upon between the Parties, then the Parties will jointly present the modification to the Court by means of a stipulated modification to the Consent Judgment.

4.2 Regulatory Requirements.

Sergeant's shall notify NRDC in the event that a change to any state or federal statute or regulation governing the Covered Products or to the FIFRA registration for any Covered Product requires a change to the language or placement of the warnings required described in sections 1.3 and 1.4. Where such changes are (1) nonmaterial, or (2) are imposed by the EPA but not requested by Sergeant's, the Parties shall stipulate that this Consent Judgment will be modified to correspond to such new requirement. Any other modification of the warnings will be governed by section 4.1.

4.3 Other Settlements.

4.3.1 If NRDC agrees or has agreed in a settlement or judicially entered consent judgment with Wellmark or any other defendant to this Action that allows a Product to be shipped for sale and/or sold in California without a Proposition 65 warning; then the Parties shall stipulate that this Consent Judgment will be modified to correspond to such terms as provided in such other settlement or judicially entered consent judgment.

4.3.2 If NRDC agrees or has agreed in a settlement or judicially entered consent judgment that some or all Products (as sold by other companies) do not require a warning under Proposition 65 (based on the presence of propoxur), or if a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final judgment and the judgment becomes final, that some or all Products (as sold by other companies) do not require a warning for propoxur under Proposition 65, Sergeant's may seek a modification of this Consent Judgment to eliminate its duty to warn.

5. ENFORCEMENT

5.1 NRDC may, after meeting and conferring with Sergeant's and/or the Retailers, by motion or application for an order to show cause before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment against Sergeant's and/or the Retailers. In any such proceeding, NRDC may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment and where said violations of this Consent Judgment constitute subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws independent of the Consent Judgment and/or those alleged in the Complaint, NRDC is not limited to enforcement of the Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided for by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws. In any action brought by NRDC alleging subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws, Sergeant's and/or the Retailers may assert any and all defenses that are available.

6. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally to bind that party.

7. CLAIMS COVERED

This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between the Parties of any violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Sergeant's and the Retailers for failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to propoxur from the use of the Covered Products, or any other claim that was or could have been raised based on the facts or

10. COURT APPROVAL

- 10.1 NRDC agrees to comply with the reporting requirements referenced in California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f). Pursuant to the regulations promulgated under that section, NRDC shall present this Consent Judgment to the California Attorney General's Office within five (5) days after receipt of all necessary signatures.
- 10.2 The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, a noticed motion must be filed to obtain judicial approval of the Consent Judgment. Accordingly, NRDC shall file a motion for approval of the settlement within a reasonable period of time after the date this agreement is signed by all parties. NRDC also agrees to serve a copy of the noticed motion to approve and enter the Consent Judgment on the California Attorney General's Office, consistent with the requirements set forth in California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 3000(a).
- 10.3 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT; MUTUAL DRAFTING

11.1 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.

,	41.0 ml C
1	11.2 This Consent Judgment is the result of mutual drafting and no ambiguity found herein
2	shall be construed in favor of or against any party.
3	12. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS
4	The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of
5	facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.
6	
7	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
8	Dated: 9(30/2010 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP JONATHAN WEISSGLASS
10	By: feel like
11	Joriathan Weissglass / For Plaintiff Natural Resources Defense Council
12	
13	
14	Dated: MICHELL B. CORASH MORRISON & FOERSTER
15	/// AD (K/ //
16	By: / Julie Will
17	Modele B. Corash For Defendants Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc., Albertsons, Inc., New Albertsons, Inc., PETCO Animal
18	Supplies Stores, Inc., Petsmart, Inc., PetSmart Store Support Group, Inc., Lee's Pet Club, Inc., d/b/a Pet Club
19	Stores, Red Cart Market, Inc., d/b/a Pet Club Stores, and Ralphs Grocery Co.
20	Kaipiis Glocely Co.
21	IT IS SO STIPULATED:
22	
23	Dated:
24	
25	n
26	Ву:
27	For Plaintiff Natural Resources Defense Counsel
28	
!!	

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
2	Dated:		
. 3			
4		By:	Tim falmon
5			For Plaintiff Natural Resources Defense Counsel
6	Dated:		
7		By:	For Defendant Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc.
8	_		For Defendant Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc.
9	Dated:		
10		By: _	For Albertsons, Inc.,
11	Dated:		For Albertsons, Inc.,
12			
13		By: _	For New Albertsons, Inc.,
1415	Dated:		, , , , , , , ,
16		Ву: _	
17		<i>-</i> 2,7	For PETCO Animal Supplies Stores, Inc.
18	Dated:		
19		D	
20		By: _	For Petsmart, Inc.
21	Dated:		
22	· ·		
23		By: _	For PetSmart Store Support Group, Inc.
24			••
25	Dated:		
26		Ву: _	For Lee's Pet Club, Inc., d/b/a Pet Club Stores
27			1 of 200 of ot Oldo, illo., dioid for Oldo Biolos
28			

1	Dated:	9 22 10		
2		9-27-10		KI/Ker
3			By: _	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
4				For Defendant Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc.
5	Dated:			
6				2 mm. Co.
7	ı		Ву: _	Ronald T. Mendes
8				Vice President For Defendants New Albertsons, Inc. and
9	Dated:			SUPERVALU INC.
11				ar a
12			Ву:	Marin S
13				Paul G. Rowan Sr. Vice President and General Counsel
14				For Defendant Albertson's, Inc. and its affiliates, by Albertson's LLC (successor by conversion to
15				Albertson's, Inc.)
16	Dated:			
17				
18			Ву:	
19				For Defendant PETCO Animal Supplies, Inc.
20	Dated:			
21			_	
22			Ву:	
23				For Defendants Petsmart, Inc., Petsmart Store Support
24	_			Group, Inc.,
25	Dated:			
26			Ву:	
27				D. D. C. Jan & D. Lake Cons. 11 Co.
28				For Defendant Ralphs Grocery Co.,

				`
1	Dated:			
2				
3			By:	
4				For Defendant Consense? - Det Cons Designate Inc.
5				For Defendant Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc.
6	Dated:			
7			•	
8			By:	
9				
10				For Defendants New Albertsons, Inc. f/k/a/ Albertsons, Inc., and SUPERVALU INC.
11		0 1 1		
12	Dated:	9/10/10		
13				Ω Ω .
14			By:	Hancof J. Lavis
15				For Defendant PETCO Animal Supplies, Inc.
16				
17	Dated:			
18			_	
19			Ву:	
20 21				For Defendants Petsmart, Inc., Petsmart Store Support
22				Group, Inc.,
23	Dated:			•
24				
25			By:	
26				For Defendant Baluba Crassery Co
27				For Defendant Ralphs Grocery Co.,
28				
ı	l	•		

1	Dated:	
2		
3		Ву:
4		For Defendant Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc.
5	Dated:	For Defendant Sergeant's Fet Care Froducts, the.
6		
7		Ву:
8		For Defendants New Albertsons, Inc. f/k/a/ Albertsons,
9	Dated:	Inc., and SUPERVALU INC.
10	Dated.	
11		Ву:
12		
13		For Defendant Albertson's, Inc. and its affiliates, by Albertson's LLC (successor by conversion to
14 15		Albertsons, Inc.)
16	Dated:	·
17	Dated.	
18		Ву:
19		For Defendant PETCO Animal Supplies, Inc.
20	Dated: 9/24/10	
21	1/21/14	A(A R)
22		By: Jeble flent
23		For Defendants Petsmart, Inc., Petsmart Store Support
24		Group, Inc.,
25	Dated:	
26		Ву:
27		
28		For Defendant Ralphs Grocery Co.,
		10

1	Dated:		
2			
3		Ву: _	
4			For Defendant Sargagnt's Dat Care Braduats Inc
5	•		For Defendant Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc.
6	Dated:		
7			
8	•	Ву: _	The state of the s
9			D. D. C. J. at. Nov. Alberton. To Clinial Albertons
10			For Defendants New Albertsons, Inc. f/k/a/ Albertsons, Inc., and SUPERVALU INC.
11			
12	Dated:		
13			
14		Ву: _	,
15			For Defendant PETCO Animal Supplies, Inc.
16			
17	Dated:		
18			
19		Ву: _	
20			For Defendants Petsmart, Inc., Petsmart Store Support
21			Group, Inc.,
22	Dated:		
23			
24 25		By: <u></u>	
25 26			V
20 27			For Defendant Ralphs Grocery Co.,
28			

1	Dated: 8,23,2010
2	By: Ormmal
3	By: <u>UNIMML</u> TAMM LEE
4	For Defendant Lee's Pet Club, Inc. d/b/a Pet Club Stores and Red Cart Market, Inc. d/b/a Pet Club Stores
5	
7	Dated:
8	By:
9	Dy:
10	For Defendant KV Vet Supply, Inc.
11	
12	
13	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:
15	Dated:
16	Hon. Anthony Robert Freedman Judge of the Superior Court
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	Dated:
2	
3	By:
4	Бу.
5	For Defendant Lee's Pet Club, Inc. d/b/a Pet Club Stores and Red Cart Market, Inc. d/b/a Pet Club Stores
6	
7 8	19/9/2010 By Jung A 2 by
9	By Jung A hoy
10	For Defendant KV Vet Supply, Inc.
11	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:
13	Dated:
14	Hon. Anthony Robert Freedman Judge of the Superior Court
15	Judge of the Superior Court
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	·
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	