1 2 3 4 5	MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES Michael Freund (State Bar No. 99687) Ryan Hoffman (State Bar No. 283297) 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105 Berkeley, CA 94704 Tel: (510) 540-1992 Fax: (510) 540-5543 Email: freund1@aol.com Attorneys for Plaintiff		
7 8 9	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER Ryan M. Andrews (SBN 274106) Dan Chammas (SBN 204825) Venable LLP 2049 Century Park East, Suite 2100 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: (310) 229-0344 Fax: (310) 229-9901		
11 12 13	Email: RMAndrews@Venable.com Attorney for Defendant FIRST FITNESS INTERNATIONAL, INC.		
14 15	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, a California non-profit corporation, Plaintiff, v. FIRST FITNESS INTERNATIONAL, INC., Defendant.	CASE NO. CGC-13-532166 [PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT; [PROPOSED] ORDER Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq. Action Filed: June 17, 2013 Trial Date: None set	
25 26 27 28	 INTRODUCTION 1.1 On June 17, 2013 Plaintiff Environment of the profit corporation, as a private enforcer, and in the [PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT; [PROPOSED] 		
[]	CASE NO. COC-13-532100		

by Defendant, as more fully described below, contain lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and that such products expose consumers at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These products are: FirstFitness RejuvaCel with Glucosanol; FirstFitness LipoMax Liver Cleanse; FirstFitness Renu Ultimate Colon Cleanse; FirstFitness Slim 'N Up! Xtreme; FirstFitness Vital Green Plus; and FirstFitness Suddenly Slim Body FX Tropical Crème Weight Control Beverage Mix (collectively the "Covered Products"). ERC and Defendant are referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."

1.2 ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and

a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint")

pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq.

("Proposition 65"), against FIRST FITNESS INTERNATIONAL, INC. ("First Fitness" or

"Defendant"). In this action, ERC alleges that the products manufactured, distributed or sold

1.3 Defendant is a business entity that employed ten or more persons. Defendant arranges the manufacture, distribution and sale of the Covered Products.

1.4 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation, dated August 5, 2011 that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Defendant. A true and correct copy of the Notice of Violation is attached as Exhibit A. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice of Violation was mailed, and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Defendant with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.

encouraging corporate responsibility.

- Products exposes persons in California to lead without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Defendant denies all material allegations contained in the Notice of Violation and Complaint and specifically denies that the Covered Products required a Proposition 65 warning or otherwise caused harm to any person. Except for the representations made above, nothing in the Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Defendant 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 Defendant of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, at any time, for any purpose.
- 1.6 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties, or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchises, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers.
- 1.7 Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.
- 1.8 The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as a Judgment by this Court.
- 1.9 Subsequent to ERC's Notice of Violation, First Fitness discontinued sales of Slim 'N Up to California.

 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in San Francisco 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 asserted in his action based on the facts alleged in the Notice of Violation and the Complaint.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS

3.1 On and after the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment, Defendant shall not distribute into the State of California or sell in the State of California any Covered Product for which the maximum daily dose recommended on the label contains more than 0.5 micrograms (mcg) of lead, unless the warnings are provided as set forth in section 3.2.

3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

For Covered Products that cause exposures in excess of that permitted by Paragraph 1, Defendant shall provide the following warning (the language in brackets in the warning below is optional):

[California Proposition 65] WARNING: This product contains lead, a chemical known [to the State of California] to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm.

Defendant shall use the term "cancer and" in the warning only if the maximum daily dose recommended on the label contains more than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4. The words "California Proposition 65" may be included at Defendant's option.

First Fitness shall provide the warning on all of the following: 1) on First Fitness's checkout page on its website for California consumers; 2) on First Fitness's insert in boxes of Covered Products shipped to California; and 3) on First Fitness's receipt/order confirmation provided to California customers for Covered Products.

The warning shall appear with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices on the labeling, website, package insert, or receipt/order confirmation provided as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use of the product. The warning shall not exceed the language specified in Section 3.2. However, this provision does not prohibit First Fitness from including information about the Proposition 65 warning separately from the warning on its website (e.g., on a Frequently Asked Questions page). The warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings on the product container or labeling, website, package insert, or receipt/order confirmation provided, and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. The warning shall be contained in the same section that states other safety warnings concerning the use of the Covered Product, if there are any.

3.3 Naturally-Occurring Lead Levels

If appropriate, First Fitness may exclude the sum of the amount of lead contained in each ingredient listed in Table 1 present in the maximum daily serving recommended by First Fitness in each Covered Product. If First Fitness seeks to subtract out the amount of lead pursuant to this Section, upon calculating lead content, First Fitness shall provide ERC with the name of the Covered Product that First Fitness contends contains naturally-occurring lead, the exact ingredient(s) listed below in Table 1 in the Covered Product, the percentage of each ingredient in the Covered Product (in grams), and the amount (in grams) in the maximum daily serving recommended by First Fitness of each ingredient in Table 1.

 First Fitness may update this list from time to time. First Fitness will be entitled to submit this information to ERC confidentially.

TABLE 1

INGREDIENT	NATURALLY-OCCURRING AMOUNT OF LEAD	
Calcium (elemental)	0.8 mcg lead per gram of elemental calcium	
Ferrous Fumarate	0.4 mcg lead per gram of ferrous fumarate	
Zinc Oxide	8.0 mcg lead per gram of zinc oxide	
Magnesium Oxide	0.4 mcg lead per gram of magnesium oxide	
Potassium Chloride	1.1 mcg lead per gram of potassium chloride	
Cocoa powder	1.0 mcg lead per gram of cocoa powder	

3.4 Reformulated Covered Products

A Reformulated Covered Product is one for which the maximum recommended daily serving on the label contains no more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day as determined by the quality control methodology described in Section 3.5. As used in this Consent Judgment, "no more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day" means that the samples of the testing performed by Defendant under Section 3.5 yield a daily exposure of no more than 0.5 micrograms of lead (with daily exposure calculated pursuant to Section 3.5 of this Consent Judgment), after excluding levels of naturally occurring lead pursuant to Section 3.3. For products that cause exposures in excess of 0.5 micrograms of lead per day, Defendant shall provide the warning set forth in Section 3.2.

Defendant may reformulate the Covered Products to reduce the lead content to below levels requiring a Proposition 65 warning, in which case the Parties agree that the Covered Products may be offered for sale in California without the warnings discussed in this Consent Judgment. If Defendant contends that a Covered Product has been so reformulated, then at

least once each year, Defendant shall undertake testing of any reformulated Covered Product on which it does not intend to place a warning label discussed in Section 3.2 above.

Defendant shall arrange for testing of at least three (3) randomly-selected samples of each such reformulated Covered Product for lead content, to confirm whether the daily dose is more or less than 0.5 micrograms of lead when taken as directed on the Covered Product's label. For purposes of determining whether a warning, if any, is required pursuant to Section 3.2, the highest lead detection result of the three (3) randomly-selected samples of the reformulated Covered Products will be controlling.

3.5 Testing and Quality Control Methodology

In the event that First Fitness chooses to classify a Covered Product as a Reformulated Product under Section 3.4 (as opposed to meeting the warning requirements set out in Section 3.2), the below testing requirements apply.

3.5.1 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, daily lead exposure levels shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead per gram of the Covered Product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the Covered Product (using the largest serving size appearing on the Covered Product label), multiplied by servings of the Covered Product per day (using the largest number of servings in a recommended dosage appearing on the Covered Product label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day.

3.5.2 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate for the method used, including limit of detection, limit of qualification, accuracy, and precision and meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS)

achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.010 mg/kg or any other testing method agreed upon in writing by the Parties.

3.5.3 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by a laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or a laboratory that is registered with the United States Food & Drug Administration, a federal agency, the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program, or similar nationally-recognized accrediting organization for the analysis of heavy metals or a laboratory that is approved by, accredited by, or registered with the United States Food & Drug Administration for the a federal agency, the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program, or similar nationally-recognized accrediting organization to perform analysis of heavy metals First Fitness may test the Covered Products if First Fitness is a qualified laboratory as described above. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Defendant's ability to conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including the raw materials used in their manufacture.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, payment in lieu of civil penalties, attorney's fees and costs (which includes, but is not limited to, filing fees and costs of attorneys and testing nutritional health supplements), Defendant shall make a total payment of \$60,000.00. Said payment shall be for the following:
- 4.2 \$10,488.00 shall be payable as civil penalties pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). Of this amount, \$7,866.00 shall be payable to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and \$2,622.00 shall be payable to Environmental Research Center. California Health and Safety Code section

25249.12(c)(1) & (d). Defendant shall send both civil penalty payments to ERC's counsel who will be responsible for forwarding the civil penalty.

- 4.3 \$26,919.00 shall be payable to Environmental Research Center as reimbursement to ERC for (A) reasonable costs associated with the enforcement of Proposition 65 and other costs incurred as a result of work in bringing this action; and (B) \$6,991.00 shall be payable to Environmental Research Center in lieu of further civil penalties, for the day-to-day business activities such as (1) continued enforcement of Proposition 65, which includes analyzing, researching and testing consumer products that may contain Proposition 65 chemicals, focusing on the same or similar type of ingestible products that are the subject matter of the current action; (2) the continued monitoring of past consent judgments and settlements to ensure companies are in compliance with Proposition 65
- 4.4 \$10,395.00 shall be payable to Michael Freund as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees and \$5,207.00 shall be payable to Ryan Hoffman as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees.
- Payment shall be made in twelve equal installments. The first installment of the Payment, in the amount of \$5,000.00, is due on the First of the month following the Effective Date. The remaining eleven payments are due on the First of each month thereafter. Each installment of the Payment shall be in the form of a check sent to counsel for ERC, Michael Freund, Michael Freund & Associates at 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105, Berkeley, CA. 94704 and shall be delivered on or before the deadline set forth herein for that installment. The checks shall be made payable to "Michael Freund & Associates."
 - 4.6 In the event that any payments owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment are

not remitted on or before the due date, Defendant shall be in default of its obligations under this Settlement Agreement. ERC shall provide written notice to Defendant of any default at: First Fitness International Inc., 1430 Bradley Lane Suite 196, Carrolton, TX. 75007. If Defendant fails to remedy the default within five (5) business days of receiving such notice, then all future payments due herein shall become immediately due and payable.

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only (i) by written stipulation of the Parties; and (ii) upon entry by the Court of a modified Consent Judgment.
- the Party requesting the modification must provide written notice to the other Party of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If the Party receiving the Notice of Intent seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification, then the Party must provide written notice to the other Party within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If such notice is provided in a timely manner, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person or on the telephone within thirty (30) days of notification of intent to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if the Party receiving the Notice of Intent disputes the proposed modification, that Party shall provide the other Party a written factual basis for its position. The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any remaining disputes. The Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.
- 5.3 In the event that Defendant initiates or otherwise requests a modification under Section 5.1, Defendant shall reimburse ERC its costs and reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing a joint motion or

application in support of a modification of the Consent judgment, as well as ERC's reasonable costs.

5.4 Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or application in support of a modification of the Consent Judgment, then either Party may seek judicial relief on its own. In such a situation, 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 the modification.

6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 6.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify or terminate this Consent Judgment.
- 6.2 Only after it complies with Section 15 below may any Party, by motion or application for an order to show cause filed with this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.
- 6.3 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Reformulated Covered Product (and for which ERC alleges that no warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform First Fitness in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit First Fitness to identify the Covered Products at issue. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action pursuant to Section 15.

7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their

respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to Covered Products which are exclusively distributed and/or or sold outside the State of California. With respect to Covered Products that are distributed and/or sold both inside and outside of California, the requirements contained in this Consent Judgment apply to the Covered Products only to the extent that the distribution and/or sales occur in California. This Consent Judgment shall terminate without further action by any Party when Defendant no longer manufactures, distributes or sells all of the Covered Products and all of such Covered Products previously "distributed for sale in California" have reached their expiration dates and are no longer sold.

8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Defendant, of any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings of exposure to lead from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products and fully resolves all claims that have been or could have been asserted in this action up to and including the date of entry of Judgment for Defendant's failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings for the Covered Products as asserted in the Notice of Violation and the Complaint. ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, hereby discharges Defendant and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, customers (not including private label customers of Defendant), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, General Research Laboratories, American Nutritional Corporation and all other entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors and assigns of

any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"), from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead as stated in the Notice of Violation and the Complaint.

8.2 ERC, on behalf of itself only, hereby releases and discharges the Released Parties from all known and unknown claims for alleged violations of Proposition 65, or for any other statutory or common law claims, arising from or relating to alleged exposures to in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notice of Violation. It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice of Violation or the Complaint and relating to the Covered Products will develop or be discovered. ERC, on behalf of itself only, acknowledges that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims, including all rights of action therefore. ERC has full knowledge of the contents of California Civil Code section 1542. ERC, on behalf of itself only, acknowledges that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waives California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such unknown claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

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

ERC, on behalf of itself only, acknowledges and understands the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

24

25

26

27

28

8.3 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance by any Released Party with Proposition 65 regarding alleged exposures to lead in the Covered Products.

8.4 ERC and Defendant each release and waive all claims they may have against each other for any statements or actions made or undertaken by them in connection with the Notice of Violation or the Complaint; provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS

In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment is held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

10. GOVERNING LAW

The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below by: (a) first-class, registered, or certified mail; (b) overnight courier; or (c) personal delivery. Courtesy copies via email may also be sent.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER:

Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director Environmental Research Center 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92108

With a copy to:

Michael Freund Ryan Hoffman

CASE NO. CGC-13-532166

Party to this Settlement prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms with counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment entered thereon, the terms and provisions shall not be construed against any Party.

15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

If 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 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.

16. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

16.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, 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. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

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

This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment 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 California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.

	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	•	
Ź	2		
đ	Dated:, 2014	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	
5	5	By: Main Market	
	6	Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director	
7 8 9 10	8 Dated: 6/4/20192014	FIRST FITNESS INTERNATIONAL, INC. By: Nigel Branson Resident	
11		THE STORY	
12	2		
13	Dated: _6/5, 2014	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER	
14		CHNIER MILLY	
15	<u> </u>	By: Michael Freund	
16		Attorney for Plaintiff	
17	1/5/	VENABLELLP	
19			
20		By: Myan M. Andrews	
21		Attorney for Defendant	
22			
23	-		
24			
25			
26			
28			
- 4	(PROPOSED) STIPILI ATED CONCENTUDO CARDO	2002001.000	
	[PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT; [PROPOSED] ORDER CASE NO. CGC-13-532166		

JUDGMENT Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms. Dated: ______, 2014 Judge of the Superior Court

MICHAEL FREUND

ATTORNEY AT LAW 1915 ADDISON STREET BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704-101

TEL 510/540-1992 FAX 510/540-5543 EMAIL FREUND1@AOL.COM

August 5, 2011

NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ. (PROPOSITION 65)

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center ("ERC"), 5694 Mission Center Road #199, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 309-4194. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq., with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

General Information about Proposition 65. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is an attachment with the copy of this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

Alleged Violator. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter "the Violator") is:

First Fitness International, Inc.

Consumer Products and Listed Chemicals. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

FirstFitness RejuvacCel with Glucosanol - Lead FirstFitness LipoMax Liver Cleanse - Lead FirstFitness Renu Ultimate Colon Cleanse - Lead FirstFitness Slim 'N Up! Xtreme - Lead

Exhibit A

> FirstFitness Vital Green Plus -Lead FirstFitness Suddenly Slim Body FX Tropical Crème Weight Control Beverage Mix -Lead

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of these products. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to these chemicals has been and continues to be through ingestion, but may have also occurred and may continue to occur through inhalation and/or dermal contact.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least August 5, 2008, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons handling and/or using these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; and (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as an expensive and time consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violations to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead.

Sincerely,

Michael Freund, Esq.

Attachments

Certificate of Merit
Certificate of Service
OEHHA Summary (to First Fitness International, Inc. and its Registered Agent for
Service of Process only)
Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center's Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by First Fitness International, Inc.

I, Michael Freund, declare:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged the parties identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
 - 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemicals that are the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: August 5, 2011

Michael Freund

Who Freund

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742

On August 5, 2011 I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current CEO or President First Fitness International, Inc. 1430 Bradley Lane, Suite 196 Carrollton, TX 75007 Nigel P. Branson First Fitness International, Inc.'s (Registered Agent for Service of Process) 1430 Bradley Lane, Suite 196 Carrollton, TX 75007

On August 5, 2011 I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a US Postal Service Office for delivery by Certified Mail:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Post Office Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On August 5, 2011 I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on August 5, 2011 in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Chris Heptinstall

Service List

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Room 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, #202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 547 Market Street Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Ste. 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, #1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street Eureka, CA 9550t

District Attorney, Imperial County 939 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County 230 W. Line Street Bishop, CA 93514

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Traxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301 District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Lassen County 220 South Lassen Street, Ste. 8 Susanville, CA 96130

District Attorney, Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street, Rm 345 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosensie Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendecine County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 2222 M Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Monterey County 230 Church Street, Bldg 2 Salinas, CA 93901

District Attorney, Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559

District Attorney, Nevada County 110 Union Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 Civic Center Drive West Santa Ana, CA 92701

> District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, Riverside County 4075 Main Street, 1st Floor Riverside, CA 92501

District Attorney, Sacramento County 901 "G" Street Sacramento, CA 9581

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Room 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Francisco County 850 Bryant Street, Room 325 San Francisco, CA 94103

District Attorney, San Joaquin County Pest Office Box 990 Stockton, CA 95201

District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County 1050 Monterey Street, Room 450 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1105 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Santa Clara County 70 West Hedding Street San Jose, CA 95110

District Attorney, Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 Santa Cruz, CA 95060

District Attorney, Shasta County 1525 Court Street, Third Floor Redding, CA 96001-1632

District Attorney, Sierra County PO Box 457 Downieville, CA 95936 District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Pairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Sonoma County 600 Administration Drive, Room 2121 Santa Rosa, CA 95403

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95353

District Attorney, Sutter County 446 Second Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Atterney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tulare County 221 S. Mooney Avenue, Room 224 Visalia, CA 93291

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Ventura County 800 South Victoria Avenue Ventura, CA 93009

District Attorney, Yolo County 301 2st Street Woodland, CA 95695

District Atterney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Half East 200 N. Main Street, Rm 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Diego City Attorney's Office 1200 3rd Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101

San Francisco City Attorney's Office City Half, Room 234 1 Drive Carlton B Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street San Jose, CA 95113