1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	KAMALA HARRIS, Attorney General J. MATTHEW RODRIQUEZ, Chief Assistant At JANILL RICHARDS, Supervising Deputy Attorn JAMIE JEFFERSON, State Bar No. 197142 Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 622-2254 Fax: (510) 622-2270 Attorneys for Plaintiff PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP	
	MARK N. TODZO, State Bar No. 168389	
10 11	LISA BURGER, State Bar No. 239676 503 Divisadero Street	
12	San Francisco, CA 94117 Telephone: (415) 913-7800	
13	Fax: (415) 759-4112	
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	
15		LOE CALIEODNIA
	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	TOD WITE COVIN	W. OF AV ANCED A
16 17	FOR THE COUNT	Y OF ALAMEDA
16 17 18	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	Case No. RG 10-530436
17		Case No. RG 10-530436
17 18	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G.	
17 18 19	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General,	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO
17 18 19 20	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General, Plaintiff, v. BAY AREA JUMP, et al.,	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO
17 18 19 20 21	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General, Plaintiff, v.	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO
17 18 19 20 21 22	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General, Plaintiff, v. BAY AREA JUMP, et al.,	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General, Plaintiff, v. BAY AREA JUMP, et al.,	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General, Plaintiff, v. BAY AREA JUMP, et al.,	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General, Plaintiff, v. BAY AREA JUMP, et al.,	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General, Plaintiff, v. BAY AREA JUMP, et al.,	Case No. RG 10-530436 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO

CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT MAGIC JUMP, INC. - Case Nos. RG 530300 & RG 530436

	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, a non-profit corporation,	Case No. RG 10-530300
	Plaintiff,	
	v.	
'	CUTTING EDGE CREATIONS, INC., et al.,	
	Defendants	

17

18

21 22

23

25

2627

28

1.1 On August 11, 2010, the People of the State of California ("People"), by and through the Attorney General of the State of California ("Attorney General") filed a complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief for violations of Proposition 65 and unlawful business practices in the Superior Court for the County of Alameda. The People's Complaint alleges that the named Defendants failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings that their inflatable structures made with vinyl such as, but not limited to, bounce houses, slides, games, ball ponds, combos, obstacle courses and interactives (the "Products") contain lead and lead compounds (together "Lead"), and that use of, and contact with, those Products results in exposure to Lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive harm. 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 these chemicals, and that the Defendants failed to do so. The Complaint further alleges that the Lead levels in the Products exceed the standards set by the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act ("CPSIA") of 2008. The Complaint also alleges that the violations of Proposition 65 and the CPSIA constitute unlawful acts in violation of the Unfair Competition Law, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq.

1.2 The Center for Environmental Health ("CEH") first brought the issue of Lead exposures from the Products to the attention of the Attorney General by issuing its first 60-Day Notice of Violation on February 19, 2010 ("Notice"). The Notice alleges that defendant Magic Jump, Inc. ("Magic Jump") and others were violating Proposition 65 by introducing the Products into the stream of commerce thereby exposing individuals to Lead. CEH filed its case, Center for Environmental Health v. Cutting Edge Creations, LLC, et al., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG 19-530300, on August 11, 2010. CEH also seeks civil penalties and injunctive relief for alleged violations of Proposition 65. On October 25, 2010, the People's action was coordinated with CEH's action. The People and CEH are together referred to as "Plaintiffs."

1.3 Both CEH and the People's complaints name Magic Jump, Inc. ("Settling Defendant") as a defendant.

- 1.4 Settling Defendant is a corporation that employs more than ten (10) persons and employed ten or more persons at certain times relevant to the allegations of the Complaints, and manufactures, distributes and/or sells Products (as defined below) in the State of California and/or has done so in the past four years. Settling Defendant contends that, at all relevant times prior to January 2009, Settling Defendant had less than 10 employees and was therefore exempt from Proposition 65.
- 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the People, CEH and the Settling Defendant stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Notice and Complaints and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Notice and Complaints, that venue is proper in Alameda County, 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 Complaints based on the facts alleged therein.
- 1.6 The People, CEH and Settling Defendant enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of all claims relating to the Products (as that term is defined below) arising from the alleged failure to warn regarding the presence of Lead in such Products, and of all claims that were or could have been raised in the Notice and Complaints. 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 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 against any Non-Parties to this Settlement Agreement in this or any other future legal proceedings. By execution of this Consent Judgment and agreeing to provide the relief and remedies specified herein, Settling Defendant does not admit any violations of Proposition 65 or the Business and Professions Code, the federal Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act or any other law or legal duty. Settling Defendant expressly asserts that

whatsoever.

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

2.1 The "Actions" shall collectively mean the People of the State of California v. Bay Area Jump, et al., Case No. RG 10-530436, Alameda County Superior Court (filed August 11, 2010) and the Center for Environmental Health v. Cutting Edge Creations, LLC, et al., Case No. RG 10-530300, Alameda County Superior Court (filed August 11, 2010).

its Products do not require a warning under Proposition 65 and denies any wrongdoing or liability

- 2.2 "Products" shall mean all inflatable structures made with vinyl, including but not limited to bounce houses, slides, games, ball ponds, combos, obstacle courses and interactives manufactured, distributed or sold by Settling Defendant.
- 2.3 The "Effective Date" of this Consent Judgment shall be the date on which this Consent Judgment is entered as a judgment by the trial court.
- 2.4 "Parties" shall mean the following entities: People of the State of California ex rel. Edmund G. Brown, Jr., CEH and Settling Defendant.
- 2.5 "Plaintiffs" shall mean People of the State of California ex rel. Kamala Harris, , Attorney General and CEH.
- 2.6 "Old Products" means any Products, located in the state of California, manufactured by Settling Defendant during the following time periods: (1) from September 26, 2006 through April 26, 2007; (2) from September 2, 2008 and December 12, 2008; and (3) after January 2009 and prior to September 2010, which are the time periods during which Settling Defendant is alleged to have sold Products with levels of Lead exceeding 1000 ppm.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: LEAD REDUCTION

3.1 <u>Immediate Product Reformulation</u>. Immediately upon the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall not manufacture, distribute or sell Products with lead levels that exceed the Federal Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act ("CPSIA") levels or 100 ppm, whichever is lower ("Compliance Level") as determined pursuant to total Lead testing, EPA Method 3050B or CPSIA method CPSC-CH-E1001-08 (the "Test Protocols").

3.2 Specification and Certification of Vinyl. For so long as Settling Defendant manufactures, distributes, or ships the Products for sale in California, Settling Defendant shall issue specifications to its vinyl suppliers requiring that the vinyl supplied to it for the Products shall not contain Lead in excess of the Compliance Level. Defendant shall obtain and maintain written certification from its suppliers of the vinyl certifying that the vinyl used in the Products does not contain Lead in excess of the Compliance Level.

- 3.3 Settling Defendant's Independent Testing. In order to ensure compliance with Section 3.1, Settling Defendant shall conduct (or cause to be conducted) testing to confirm Products sold in California comply with the Compliance Level. Settling Defendant shall either conduct the testing of the vinyl used in the Products using an X-Ray Fluorescence Analyzer or shall cause to have the testing performed by an independent, CPSIA-approved laboratory in accordance with the Test Protocol. Settling Defendant shall perform the testing described in this Section on a minimum of one roll of each color of vinyl contained in each shipment purchased from its suppliers.
 - (a) <u>Vinyl That Exceeds the Compliance Level.</u> If the results of the testing required pursuant to Section 2.3 show Lead levels in excess of the Compliance Level in the vinyl, Defendant shall: (1) refuse to accept all the vinyl contained in each container that contained any rolls that tested above the Compliance Level; and (2) send a notice to the supplier explaining that such vinyl does not comply with either Settling Defendant's specifications for Lead or the supplier's certification.

4. <u>INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS</u>

- 4.1 Plaintiffs allege that warnings are necessary as to certain of the Old Products in the state of California because these products purportedly cause continuing exposures to Lead. While expressly denying such allegations, Settling Defendant agrees to implement the following programs to provide clear and reasonable warnings to persons who come into contact with Old Products sold before the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment:
 - (a) <u>Informational Program</u>. Settling Defendant shall mail the warnings and informational materials attached hereto as Exhibit A, in English and Spanish, to the known

addresses of all parties within the State of California who purchased Old Products. The informational materials provided pursuant to this section shall include an offer to perform testing on the Old Products paid for by Settling Defendant. The purchasers of Old Products referred to herein shall have six (6) months from the date of mailing by Settling Defendant of the warnings and informational materials attached hereto as Exhibit A to initiate the Testing referred to in paragraph 5.1, and Replacement and credit, referred to in paragraph 5.2, or they will have no rights under paragraph 5.1 and/or 5.2.

5. ADDITIONAL ACTIONS BY SETTLING DEFENDANT

- any Old Product which is located in the state of California, Settling Defendant shall perform testing on all Old Products purchased and located in the state of California by the individual or entity that requests testing. The testing pursuant to this section may be performed by X-Ray Fluorescence or pursuant to the Test Protocol. This request for testing by an individual or entity that purchased any Old Product which is located in the state of California must be initiated no later than six (6) months from the date of mailing of the warning and informational materials referred to in paragraph 4.1(a). In the event that testing is not initiated within said time period, said individuals or entities shall have no further rights pursuant to this provision. All testing shall be performed only in accordance with the terms set forth in Exhibit A hereto. Settling Defendant shall provide CEH and the Attorney General with the results of the testing described in this Section.
- Lead levels in excess of 1,000 ppm and the Product was purchased after January 1, 2009, Settling Defendant shall, at its own cost, either (1) provide the present owner of any such Old Product with a credit of between 75% and 100% of the original purchase price of the affected Product toward the purchase of a new product from Settling Defendant based on the present condition of the Old Product provided that possession and title to the Old Product be turned over to Settling Defendant, or (2) provide the present owner of any Old Product with a Notice in compliance with Proposition 65 that the present owner must agree to place on the Old Product. Assuming they otherwise

qualify, the present owner of Old Products shall decide which of the alternatives set forth in this Paragraph they wish to receive. A request for replacement or credit hereunder is only valid to the extent it results from the testing and timing provisions set forth in Section 5.1 and in Exhibit A hereto.

6. PAYMENTS

- **6.1** Payment Timing. Payments under the Consent Judgment shall be made in two parts: A first payment totaling \$18,750 shall be due within thirty (30) days following the Effective Date and a second payment totaling \$18,750 shall be due no later than ninety (90) days following the Effective Date. Accordingly, the total settlement payment required hereunder is \$37,500 allocated as follows:
- **6.2** <u>Civil Penalties</u>. Settling Defendant shall pay a civil penalty of \$10,000 pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §\$ 25249.7(b) and 25249.12. Pursuant to § 25249.12, 75% of these funds shall be remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining 25% apportioned evenly among the Attorney General and CEH.
- 6.3 <u>Cy pres- Product Testing</u>. Settling Defendant shall make the following payment in lieu of additional civil penalties. Settling Defendant shall pay _\$5,000_ to CEH to be used exclusively for testing and/or replacement of inflatable structures made with vinyl such as bounce houses, combos, obstacle courses and interactives. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to CEH.
 - 6.4 Other Payments. Settling Defendant shall also make the following payments:
- Attorney General. Settling Defendant shall pay the sum of \$5,000 to the Attorney General, to reimburse the fees and costs his office has expended with respect to this matter. Funds paid pursuant to this paragraph shall be placed in an interest-bearing Special Deposit Fund established by the Attorney General. These funds, including any interest, shall be used by the Attorney General, until all funds are exhausted, for the costs and expenses associated with the enforcement and implementation of Proposition 65, including investigations, enforcement actions, other litigation or activities as determined by the Attorney General to be reasonably necessary to carry out his duties and authority under Proposition 65. Such funding

may be used for the costs of the Attorney General's investigation, filing fees and other court costs, payment to expert witnesses and technical consultants, purchase of equipment, travel, purchase of written materials, laboratory testing, sample collection, or any other cost associated with the Attorney General's duties or authority under Proposition 65. Funding placed in the Special Deposit Fund pursuant to this paragraph, and any interest derived therefrom, shall solely and exclusively augment the budget of the Attorney General's Office and in no manner shall supplant or cause any reduction of any portion of the Attorney General's budget.

- (b) <u>CEH's Attorney Fees</u>. Settling Defendant shall pay \$17,500 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 the attention of Settling Defendant and the People, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to Lexington Law Group.
- **6.5** Each payment required by this Consent Judgment shall be made through the delivery of separate checks payable to the applicable person, as follows:
- (a) <u>Attorney General</u>. Payments due to the Attorney General shall be made payable to the "California Department of Justice," and sent to the attention of Robert Thomas, Legal Analyst, Department of Justice, 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612.
- (b) <u>CEH/Lexington Law Group.</u> The payments due to CEH and the Lexington Law Group shall be made payable as set forth above and sent to: Mark N. Todzo, Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.
- (c) <u>Copies of checks</u>. Settling Defendant will cause copies of each check issued by it pursuant to this Consent Judgment to be sent to: Jamie Jefferson, Deputy Attorney General, 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor, Oakland, California 94612.

7. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 7.1 This Consent Judgment may only be modified by express written agreement of the Parties with the approval of the Court; by an order of this Court on noticed motion from the People, CEH or Settling Defendant in accordance with law; or by the Court in accordance with its inherent authority to modify its own judgments.
- 7.2 Before filing an application with the Court for a modification to this Consent Judgment, the Party seeking modification shall meet and confer with the other parties to determine whether the modification may be achieved by consent. If a proposed modification is agreed upon, then the Parties will present the modification to the Court by means of a stipulated modification to the Consent Judgment.

8. ENFORCEMENT

- 8.1 Enforcement by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs may, by noticed motion in compliance with CCP Sec. 1005 before this Court, seek to enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment or seek resolution of any dispute arising under this Consent Judgment. In any proceeding to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, Plaintiffs may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. However, Plaintiffs may not seek any fees or costs if Settling Defendant agrees to take the action demanded by Plaintiffs during the meet and confer process described in section 8.3, below, and implements such action in a prompt manner.
- 8.2 Enforcement by Separate Action. Where violations of this Consent Judgment are based on subsequent alleged violations of Proposition 65 or other laws occurring subsequent to the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment, the Attorney General is not limited to enforcement of the Consent Judgment, but may instead elect to 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 the Attorney General alleging subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws, Settling Defendant may assert any and all defenses that are available, including the *res judicata* or collateral estoppel effect of this Consent Judgment. The Attorney General

must elect whether (a) to use the enforcement provisions of section 8.1 of this Consent Judgment or (b) to bring a new action pursuant to this subsection 8.2.

- **8.3** Meet and Confer Required. Before any party files any motion or institutes any proceeding or separate action based on an alleged violation of the Consent Judgment, the moving or enforcing party (Moving Party) shall provide the other party (Other Party) with at least thirty (30) days written notice during which the Parties will meet and confer in good faith in an attempt to informally resolve the alleged violation.
- **8.4** The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the Parties hereto.

9. <u>AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT</u>

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

10. CLAIMS COVERED

resolution between the Plaintiffs, CEH, and Settling Defendant and its parents, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, sister companies, affiliates, cooperative members, licensors and licensees, distributors, wholesalers, officers, directors, shareholders, affiliates, customers, agents, employees, attorneys, successors and assigns, and all entities to whom they have distributed or sold Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Settling Defendant, of any violation of Proposition 65., the Business & Professions Code, including but not limited to sections 17200 *et seq.*, and 17500 *et seq.*, and any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted in the public interest or by or on behalf of the people of the State of California in the Notice or Complaints regarding or relating to the presence of lead and lead compounds in the Products manufactured by or for Settling Defendant and/or the failure to warn about exposure to lead or lead compounds in the Products. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue now, in the past, and in the future, concerning the presence of lead and lead compounds in Products manufactured or distributed by or for Settling Defendant, and the failure

For the Center for Environmental Health

Robert.Thomas@doj.ca.gov

Mark N. Todzo

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Lexington Law Group, LLP 503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117 mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com

For the Settling Defendant:

J. Robert Maxwell ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL 311 California Street, 10th fl San Francisco, CA 94104 jmaxwell@rjo.com

11.3 <u>Written Notification</u>. Within 15 days of completing the actions required by sections 3.1 (Immediate Product Reformulation), and also on Plaintiffs' written request with respect to any other action required by this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall provide Plaintiffs with written notification that the required action has been completed.

12. <u>COURT APPROVAL AND DISMISSAL OF THE ACTIONS</u>

12.1 This Consent Judgment shall be submitted to the Court for entry by noticed motion or as otherwise may be required or permitted by the Court. If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and may not be used by the Plaintiffs or Settling Defendant for any purpose.

13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

13.1 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.

14. <u>RETENTION OF JURISDICTION</u>

14.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the Consent Judgment, and to resolve any disputes that may arise as to the implementation of this Judgment.

1	15. <u>EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS</u>
2	15.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by
3	means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.
4	
5	IT IS SO ORDERED and ADJUDGED:
6	D.A. III D.
7	DATED: JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26 27	
28	
2 0	

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	•
2	i 1	
3	DATED: 7/22/11	KAMALA HARRIS Attorney General
4		Attorney General J. MATTHEW RODRIQUEZ Chief Assistant Attorney General SALLY MAGNANI KNOX
5	· ·	SALLY MAGNANI KNOX Senior Assistant Attorney General
6		
7		By: multiple of the
9		AMIE JEFFERSON / Deputy Attorney General For People of the State of California
10		Tot reopie of the Black of Carronna
11	DATED:	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
12	UALLU.	OBITIES ON MATTER STATE OF THE
13		D
14		By:CHARLIE PIZARRO
15		Assistant Director
16	DATED: 7/15/201/	MAGIC JUMP, INC.
17		,
18		
19 20		By:
21		
22	·	
23		
24	·	
25		
26	·	
27		
28		
	CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFEN	1.5 IDANT MAGIC JUMP, INC Case Nos. RG 530300 & RG 530436

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
2 3 4 5	DATED:	KAMALA HARRIS Attorney General J. MATTHEW RODRIQUEZ Chief Assistant Attorney General SALLY MAGNANI KNOX Senior Assistant Attorney General
7 8 9		By: JAMIE JEFFERSON Deputy Attorney General For People of the State of California
11 12	DATED: 7/22/11	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
13 14 15		By: CHARLIE PIZARRO Assistant Director
16 17 18	DATED:	MAGIC JUMP, INC.
19 20		By:
21		
24		
26 27 28		
		15

Exhibit A

Letter to Customers of Unreformulated Products

Dear Customer:

Our records show that you purchased products from us during one of the following time periods: (1) from September 26, 2006 through April 26, 2007; (2) from September 2, 2008 and December 12, 2008; or (3) after January 2009 and prior to September 2010. This letter is written to inform you that some of the products manufactured by Magic Jump during those time periods may contain levels of lead which require a warning notice under Proposition 65 as follows:

WARNING –Lead is a chemical known to the state of California to cause cancer and reproductive harm.

All of our products have now been formulated to reduce the amount of lead to levels below those that are of concern or that may require a Proposition 65 warning. However, some of our older products manufactured during the time periods identified above may have lead levels that would require a warning notice under Proposition 65.

We would like to provide you with the opportunity to have the products you purchased from us during those time periods tested to determine if such products contain levels of lead that require a Proposition 65 warning. If you purchased a product or products from us that were manufactured during one of the time periods listed above that are still in use, please contact [Name] at [telephone number] to arrange for testing of those products. Magic Jump will arrange to conduct or pay for all testing of the products on the terms described below.

If the product was purchased after September 1, 2009 and the testing of any of the products reveals lead levels in excess of 1,000 parts per million, Magic Jump will either: (1) provide you with a credit of between 75% and 100% of the original purchase price of the affected product toward the purchase of a new product from Magic Jump based on the present condition of your existing product, and provided you transfer title to the old product to Magic Jump; or (2) provide you with a Notice in Compliance with Proposition 65 that you will be required to place on your existing product. Assuming that you otherwise qualify, it will be your choice to decide which of the foregoing alternatives you wish to receive. You must initiate testing within 6 months from the date of this letter, in order to obtain credit towards the purchase of a new product from Magic Jump hereunder.

For any testing hereunder, Magic Jump will provide an opportunity for testing from___to __at the following address in the San Francisco Bay Area:_____. Magic Jump will also provide an opportunity for testing in the Los Angeles area from ___to __at the following address:____. Magic Jump's obligations to provide and pay for testing hereunder are limited to these two offerings. At its discretion, magic Jump will also pay for testing for products shipped to it at the owner's expense at Magic Jump's place of business, provided the owner's contact Magic Jump in advance and make mutually agreeable arrangements for the timing of such tests within the 6 month period from the date of this letter.

If the product was purchased between September 26, 2006 and April 26, 2007 or from September 2, 2008 and December 12, 2008 you do not qualify for a credit from Magic Jump. However, there may be funds available to assist you in replacing the product. Such funds, if

1 2

5

1	available, will be administered by the Center for Environmental Health and/or the Attorney General's Office. In order to determine whether you qualify for such a credit, please contact:	
2	[Insert AG/CEH Contact info]	
3	In the meantime, you can reduce exposures to lead from these products by employing the	
4	following practices: a. Keeping the products clean;	
5	b. Having children wash their hands after playing in or on one of the products;	
6	c. Food, beverages and other ingestible items should not be allowed in or on the products; and	
7	d. Clothing worn when playing on the products should be cleaned after use.	
8	For further information, please call [name] at [number].	
9	Sincerely, Name	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	17	