	1			
1	Michael Freund SBN 99687 Law Office of Michael Freund			
2	1915 Addison Street Berkeley, CA 94704			
3 4	Telephone: (510) 540-1992 Facsimile: (510) 540-5543			
	A., C. Di CC			
5	Attorney for Plaintiff David Steinman			
7				
8	SUPERIOR COURT	OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO			
10				
11	DAVID STEINMAN,	Case No.		
12	Plaintiff	IDD ODOGED I		
13	v.	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT		
14	THE DROCTED AND CAMPLE			
15	THE PROCTER AND GAMBLE DISTRIBUTING LLC and DOES 1-100			
16	Defendants			
17				
18	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>			
19	1.1 On or about June 2, 2010, Plaintiff David Steinman ("Plaintiff") as a private attorney			
20	general and in the public interest filed a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil			
21	Penalties against Defendant The Procter & Gamble Distributing LLC ("Procter & Gamble"). The			
22	Complaint alleges that Procter & Gamble violated Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 of the			
23	Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (also known as "Proposition 65,") through			
24 25	the sale of hair care products under the name Herbal Essences and Head and Shoulders by failing to			
26	provide a clear and reasonable warning.			
	1.2 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in Notices of Violation dated June			
27	29, 2009, and December 1, 2009, and amen	nded Notice of Violation dated March 29, 2010 served on		
28				

the California Attorney General, other public enforcers and Procter & Gamble. A true and correct copy of the Notices of Violation is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

- 1.3 Plaintiff David Steinman is an individual interested in the enforcement of Proposition 65.
- 1.4 Defendant Procter & Gamble is a business entity that employs ten or more persons in the course of doing business for purposes of Proposition 65.
- 1.5 The products that are covered by this Consent Judgment are different versions of hair care products manufactured and/or distributed by Procter & Gamble as identified in Exhibit B to this Consent Judgment (collectively "Covered Products").
- 1.6 The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment in order to achieve a full settlement of disputed claims between the Parties as alleged in the Complaint for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. Plaintiff David Steinman has diligently prosecuted this matter and is settling this case in the public interest.
- 1.7 Procter & Gamble denies the material factual and legal allegations contained in Plaintiff's Notices and Complaint and maintains that all Covered Products that Procter & Gamble has manufactured, distributed or offered for sale or use in California have been and are in compliance with all laws, including Proposition 65. Nothing in the Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Procter & Gamble of any fact, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Procter & Gamble of any fact, issue of law or violation of law, at any time, for any purpose. Nothing in the Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy or defense that Procter & Gamble may have in any other or further legal proceedings. Nothing in the Consent Judgment or any document referred to herein, shall be construed as giving rise to any presumption or inference of admission or concession by Procter & Gamble as to any fault, wrongdoing or liability whatsoever.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2.1 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and personal jurisdiction over the allegations of violation contained in the Notices and Complaint and personal jurisdiction over the Parties as to the

acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in this Court, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter a Consent Judgment pursuant to the terms set forth herein.

III. <u>INJUNCTIVE RELIEF -REFORMULATION AND TESTING</u>

3.1 **Reformulation of Covered Products**

3.1.1 **Interim Reformulation Requirements:** As of July 1, 2010, Procter & Gamble shall not manufacture for sale in California and for sale to a third party for retail sale in California any Covered Products, except for Clairol Herbal Essences Body Envy shampoo, that contain more than 10 parts per million ("ppm") of 1,4-dioxane, allowing for normal analytical variability as defined by the quality control methodology set forth in Exhibit C. To the extent P&G is in compliance with the obligations imposed by Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of this Consent Judgment, no Proposition 65 warning shall be required, except as specified therein.

3.1.2 **Final Reformulation Requirements:** As of January 31, 2011, Procter & Gamble shall not manufacture for sale in California and for sale to a third party for retail sale in California Clairol Herbal Essences Body Envy shampoo that contains more than 10 ppm of 1,4-dioxane, allowing for normal analytical variability as defined by the quality control methodology set forth in Exhibit C. To the extent P&G is in compliance with the obligations imposed by Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of this Consent Judgment, no Proposition 65 warning shall be required, except as specified therein.

3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warning

3.2.1 In the event that Procter & Gamble obtains information, through a source other than the testing set out in section 3.3 of this Consent Judgment, that one or more lots of Covered Products manufactured after January 31, 2011, for sale in California or for distribution to a third party for retail sale in California contains more than 10 ppm of 1, 4-dioxane, Procter & Gamble shall have thirty (30) days after receipt of the data, product specifications including product lot code information, and analysis substantiating such levels in which to verify such information. Hereinafter, this date shall be referred to as that "verification date." If the information is demonstrated to be accurate, through testing following the protocol specified in Exhibit C, Procter & Gamble shall take steps to ensure that further production lots of said product(s) contain no more than 10 ppm of 1, 4-

dioxane, allowing for normal analytical variability as defined by the quality control methodology set forth in Exhibit C. If Procter & Gamble cannot, within ninety (90) days of the verification date, ensure the product contains no more than 10 ppm of 1,4-dioxane, allowing for normal analytical variability as defined by the quality control methodology set forth in Exhibit C, then within 120 days of the verification date, Procter & Gamble may elect either to discontinue the distribution for sale in California of that specific product or to provide a clear and reasonable warning on any such lots in Procter & Gamble's possession which are intended for sale within California with the following language:

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

In the event that this warning is required, the warning shall be prominently affixed to or printed on the container, cap, label or unit package of Covered Products so as to be clearly conspicuous, as compared with other statements or designs on the label as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary purchaser or user of the product.

3.3 **Testing**

3.3.1 Commencing July 1, 2010, Procter & Gamble shall, on a quarterly basis, randomly select one sample of each Covered Product for testing to confirm that the product conforms to the reformulation standard set out in section 3.1. If any sample yields a test result of greater than 10 ppm of 1,4-dioxane, then Procter & Gamble will retest the same product in duplicate to determine the impact of normal analytical variability, and Procter & Gamble will also test two (2) additional random samples of that specific Covered Product.

Procter & Gamble shall perform all testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment using the protocol set out in Exhibit C to this document.

Procter & Gamble shall be required to conduct no further testing of a specific Covered Product as long as that product meets the reformulation standard set out in section 3.1.1 for four consecutive quarters.

3.3.2 If any Covered Product is found during the first four (4) consecutive quarters to not meet the reformulation standards set out in section 3.1, Procter & Gamble shall continue to test

that specific Covered Product(s) for an additional four (4) consecutive quarters or until the specific Covered Product meets the reformulation standard set out in Section 3.1 for four (4) consecutive quarters, which ever occurs first.

If after eight (8) quarters of testing, any specific Covered Product fails to comply with the reformulation standard set out in section 3.1. for four (4) consecutive quarters, then Procter & Gamble shall, within sixty (60) days of the last test, provide the warning set out in section 3.2, above or discontinue distribution for sale in California of that specific Covered Product.

Procter & Gamble shall retain copies of its test data obtained pursuant to sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 for a period of three years from the date testing commenced and shall provide all test data to David Steinman upon written request and consummation of a satisfactory confidentiality agreement that permits enforcement of this Consent Judgment and protects the information shared from non-mandatory public disclosure.

IV. PAYMENT

In full and final satisfaction of David Steinman's costs of litigation, attorney's fees and all other expenses, Procter & Gamble a shall make a total payment of \$100,000.00, payable within fifteen (15) business days of receiving the Notice of Entry of Consent Judgment. Said payments shall be for the following:

- A. \$72,144.00 payable to Freedom Press which includes:
- i) further testing of consumer products for 1,4-dioxane, formaldehyde and other toxic chemicals; and research into alternatives to the use of toxic chemicals, the and promotion of those alternatives; and ii) reimbursement of out of pocket expenses of \$26,425.00. The Tax Identification No. for Freedom Press is 95-4736088.
- B. \$27,856.00 payable to Michael Freund as reimbursement of David Steinman's attorney's fees and for reimbursement of costs advanced in this case.
 - Procter & Gamble's payments shall be mailed to the Law Office of Michael Freund.

V. <u>RELEASE AND CLAIMS COVERED</u>

This Consent Judgment entered by the Court is a final and binding resolution between and among, David Steinman, his past or current agents, representatives, employees, attorneys, successors

and assigns, acting on behalf of the general public and the public interest pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), and Procter & Gamble, and each of its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, distributors, wholesalers, customers, officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, attorneys, successors and assigns, of any and all claims, known or unknown, that have been or could have been asserted by David Steinman against Procter & Gamble in the Complaint in regard to Covered Products, up to and including the date of entry of Consent Judgment arising from the presence of 1,4-dioxane in Covered Products.

Except for such rights and obligations as have been created under this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff David Steinman, on his own behalf and on behalf of his past or current agents, representatives, employees, attorneys, successors and assigns, and in bringing an action "in the public interest" pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7 (d) with respect to the matters alleged in the this lawsuit, does hereby fully, completely, finally and forever release, relinquish and discharge Procter & Gamble and its respective parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, attorneys, suppliers, manufacturers, distributors, retailers, successors and assigns ("released parties") from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, demands, rights, debts, agreements, promises, liabilities, damages, accountings, costs and expenses, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, of every nature whatsoever, including Proposition 65 claims, which Plaintiff David Steinman has or may have against the said released parties, arising directly or indirectly out of any fact or circumstance occurring prior to the date upon which the Consent Judgment becomes final, relating to the Covered Products as identified in the Notices of Violation dated June 20, 2009 and December 1, 2009 and Amended Notice of Violation dated March 29, 2010, and the filed Complaint.

It is the intention of the Parties to this release that, upon entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court, this Consent Judgment shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction and Release of every released claim up to and including the date of entry of the Consent Judgment. In furtherance of this intention, Plaintiff acknowledges that he is familiar with California Civil Code section 1542, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS

WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

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

VI. <u>CONTINUING OBLIGATIONS</u>

Nothing herein shall be construed as diminishing Procter & Gamble's continuing obligations to comply with Proposition 65. Further, in the event of any allegation of failure to comply, both parties shall use best efforts to resolve such differences prior to seeking judicial intervention.

VII. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS

In the event that, after entry of this Consent Judgment in its entirety, any of the provisions hereof are subsequently held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

VIII. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

David Steinman may, by motion or as otherwise provided for enforcement of Judgments, seek relief from this Superior Court of the State of California to enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment after its entry by the Court.

IX. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment entered by the Court shall apply to, be binding upon and inure to the benefit of Procter & Gamble, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, subdivisions, officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, attorneys, suppliers, manufacturers, successors and assigns, and upon David Steinman on his own behalf and on behalf of the general public and the public interest, as well as Mr. Steinman's agents, representatives, employees, attorneys, successors and assigns.

X. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

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

XI. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

XII. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

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

XIII. COURT APPROVAL

This Consent Judgment shall be effective only after it has been executed by the Court.

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

XIV. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and/or by facsimile, which taken

1	together shall be deemed to constitute one document.			
2	XV. <u>NOTICES</u>			
3	All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be			
4	ent, via either (a) first-class, registered, certified mail, return receipt requested, (ii) overnight courier,			
5	or (iii) personal messenger to the following agents:			
6	FOR DAVID STEINMAN:			
7	David Steinman 120 N. Topanga Canyon, Suite 107,			
8	Topanga, CA 90290.			
9	Michael Bruce Freund			
10	Law Offices of Michael Freund 1915 Addison Street Berkeley, CA 94704			
11	Telephone: (510) 540-1992 Facsimile: (510) 540-5543			
12	FOR THE PROCTER & GAMBLE LLC:			
13	TBA			
14	Carolyn Collins NIXON PEABODY LLP			
15	One Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3600			
16	Telephone: (415) 984-8200 Facsimile: (415) 984-9300			
17	XVI. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS			
18	David Steinman agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in			
19	California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(f).			
20	XVII. GOVERNING LAW			
21	The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the			
22	laws of the State of California.			
23				
24	The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for the			
25	Parties to this Settlement prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss			
26	the terms with counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of			
27	this Consent Judgment entered thereon, the terms and provisions shall not be construed against either			
28	and consent suagment entered thereon, the terms and provisions shall not be construct against entire			

Party.

XIX. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

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

XX. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. 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.

XXI. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This settlement has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this settlement and, being fully informed regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:

- (1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint, that the matter has been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and
- (2) Make the findings pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7 (f) (4), approve the Settlement and approve this Consent Judgment.

1				
2	IT IS SO STIPULA	TED:	THE PROCTER & GAMBLE DISTRIBUTING LI	
3	Dated:	2010		
4	Dated.	, 2010		
5	Dated:	, 2010	David Steinman	
6			David Steinman	
7				
8 9	APPROVED AS TO FORM:			
10	Dated:	, 2010	NIXON PEABODY LLP	
1112			Carolyn Collins	
13			Carolyn Collins Attorney for Defendant The Procter & Gamble Distributing LLC	
13				
15				
16	Dated:	, 2010	LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL FREUND	
17				
18			Michael Freund	
19			Attorney for Plaintiff David Steinman	
20				
21				
22	IT IS SO ORDERE	D:		
23				
24	Dated:	, 2010		
25			JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT	
26				
27				
28				
			-11-	

12916975.7

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

Exhibit B **COVERED PRODUCTS**

Herbal Essences Products:

Hello Hydration

Hello Hydration 2in1

Body Envy

Body Envy 2in1

Reconditioning Hyrdalicious Self Targeting Hydralicious

Featherweight Hydralicious

Long Term Relationship

Color Me Happy

Color Me Happy 2in1

Drama Clean

Dangerously Straight

Dangerously Straight 2in1

None of Your Frizzness

Tousle Me Softly

Totally Twisted

Breaks Over

Degunkify

Head & Shoulders Product:

Extra Volume Shampoo (noticed as "advanced extra volume shampoo")

EXHIBIT C

PROTOCOL

Summary of Method:

An aliquot of sample (\sim 1 g) is accurately weighed into a vial with 5 mL water and one gram of sodium sulfate. Internal standard ($5 \mu\mu g$ 1,4-Dioxane-d8) is added. The vial is capped and heated at 95 °C for 60 minutes. A one mL aliquot of the headspace over the sample is analyzed by direct injection using the following GCMS conditions or equivalent.

GCMS Conditions

Instrument: Agilent 5973N

Column: 25 m x 0.20 mm HP-624, 1.12 micron film

Column Temp: 40 °C (hold 3 min) to 100 °C at 10 °C/min, then to 180 °C at 25 °C/min (hold 5

min)

Injector Temp: 220 [∞]C

Mass Range: Selected ion monitoring: masses 43, 58 and 88 (dioxane): 64 and 96 (dioxane-d8); 1.72

cycles per second

Quality control shall include at a minimum

- 1. Calibration using a blank and 4 standards over the range of 0.5 to 10 micrograms of 1,4-dioxane with a regression fit R squared >0.995.
- 2. A method blank analyzed just prior to the samples must be free of 1,4-dioxane (<1 ppm)
- 3. Continuing calibration standards should be analyzed after every 10or fewer samples, and the result must be within 10% of the initial calibration.
- 4. With each batch of 20 or fewer samples, one of the samples must be analyzed in duplicate and as a spiked sample. QC limits for duplicates which exceed 5 ppm is <25% relative percent difference. QC limits for spiked samples is 75-125% recovery when the amount spiked is greater than or equal to the background in the unspiked sample.