State of California - Department of Justice - Attorney General's Office - Proposition 65 Enforcement Reporting

FORM JUS 1501 (03-01)

Attention: Prop 65 Coordinator, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000, Oakland, CA 94612

PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT FILING - Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(e) and (f)

REPORT OF SETTLEMENT

Please _i	print or type required information	Original Filing Suppler	nental Filing	Corrected Filing		
	PLAINTIFF(S) Shefa LMV LLC					
PARTIES TO THE ACTION	Galderma Laboratori	es LP				
SE -O	COURT DOCKET NUMBER CIV 1504055	,		unty Superior Co	ourt	
ວ≧	SHORT CASE NAME Shefa LMV LLC vs. Galderma Laboratories LP					
ORT INFO	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF Reformulation					
	SUBMITTED TO COURT? COURT, RE	PAYMENT: ATTORNEYS FEES \$22,000 TER ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BY EPORT OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT SUBMITTED TO ATTORNEY GENERA	6 /8	MENT SIGNED /2016	For Internal Use Only	
		ETTLEMENT MUS	T BE ATT	ACHED	For In	
FILER	NAMEOFCONTACT Daniel N. Greenbaum					
	ORGANIZATION Law Office of Danie	el Greenbaum			ONE NUMBER 18 809-2199	
	ADDRESS 7120 Hayvenhurst Ave., Suite 320			FAX NUM	MBER 243-7698	
	CITY Van Nuys	STATE ZIP CA 91406	E-MAIL ADDF dgreen	RESS nbaum@greenbaum	lawfirm.com	

FILING INSTRUCTIONS: This form can be completed online and printed. If electronic filing is not available, mail the completed form with a copy of the settlement to the attention of the Prop 65 Coordinator at the address shown above. If you need additional space to complete this form please use an attachment.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL N. GREENBAUM Daniel N. Greenbaum, Esq. (SBN 268104) The Hathaway Building 7120 Hayvenhurst Avenue Suite 320 Van Nuys, CA 91406 Telephone: (818) 809-2199 Facsimile: (424) 243-7689 Email: dgreenbaum@greenbaumlawfirm.com Attorney for Plaintiff SHEFA LMV, LLC DENTONS US LLP Gary Roberts, Esq. (SBN 132452) Sarah Choi, Esq. (SBN 222261) 601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2500 Los Angeles, CA 90017 gary.roberts@dentons.com						
12	sarah.choi@dentons.com						
13	Attorneys for Defendant GALDERMA LABORATORIES LP						
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA						
15		COUNTY OF MARIN					
16			IL JURISDICTION				
17		CIVERVITED CIVI	E JORIODIC HOIV				
18	SHEFA LMV, LL	.C.,) Case No. CIV 1504055				
19	Plaintiff,) [PROPOSED] MODIFIED CONSENT				
20	vs.		JUDGMENT AS TO GALDERMA LABORATORIES LP				
21	GALDERMA LABORATORIES LP; and)				
22	DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,		Action Filed: Nov. 6, 2015				
23	Defendants.		3				
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
	Page 1						

WHEREAS Plaintiff has issued a Notice and filed a Complaint against Settling Defendant regarding the presence of benzophenone in Covered Products, as further described in

WHEREAS the Parties acknowledge that the Notice to Settling Defendant was intended to cover all of Settling Defendant's Covered Products; and

WHEREAS the Parties, therefore, wish to resolve all Proposition 65 claims regarding benzophenone in Settling Defendant's Covered Products, they hereby agree as follows:

This consent judgment ("Consent Judgment") is entered into by and between plaintiff Shefa LMV, LLC ("Shefa" or "Plaintiff") and Defendant Galderma Laboratories, LP ("Settling Defendant"), with Shefa and Settling Defendant collectively referred to as the "Parties" and

Shefa is a California Limited Liability Company that seeks to promote awareness of exposure to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer and commercial products. Shefa alleges Settling Defendant employs ten or more persons and is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code

27

28

Settling Defendant manufactures, and/or distributes, and/or sells personal care products that are labeled as having a Sun Protection Factor Value ("SPF Products"). (See 21 C.F.R. § 352.3). One ingredient used in such products to enhance their ability to provide protection from the sun is octocrylene, an active ingredient approved for use in sunscreens by the Federal Food & Drug Administration ("FDA"). (See 76 Fed. Reg. 35620; 21 C.F.R. §§ 352.10, 352.20 (stayed)). Octocrylene can at times contain benzophenone. Benzophenone (CAS # 119-61-9) is a chemical listed under The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.* (commonly known as "**Proposition 65**") as a chemical "known to the state to cause cancer" as Proposition 65 defines that phrase. 27 CCR § 25000.

1.4 Products Covered

This Consent Judgment covers and applies to all SPF Products that are manufactured and/or distributed for sale in California and/or sold in California and that contain benzophenone. All sizes, types, brands, packaging, formulations, delivery forms (e.g., sprays or lotions applied by hand), intended uses (e.g., "faces," children's products, "sport," "moisturizing," cosmetic purposes) are included. Examples of the products subject to this Consent Judgment are Cetaphil w/ SPF, including but not limited to Cetaphil w/SPF 15. The products described in this Section 1.4 shall be referred to herein as "Covered Products". The Parties agree that the Notice to Settling Defendant covers all of Settling Defendant's Covered Products. This Consent Judgment, and all of its terms, applies to all Covered Products, including without limitation new products and brands introduced, developed, or acquired in the future by Settling Defendant which would today meet the definition of Covered Products if they currently were being manufactured or distributed for sale, or being sold, in California. The term Covered Product, as used hereafter in this Consent Judgment, includes such future products and brands.

1.5 General Allegations

Plaintiff alleges in the Complaint that Settling Defendant manufactured, and/or distributed for sale in California, and/or sold in California, Covered Products containing benzophenone without "a clear and reasonable warning" as Proposition 65 defines that phrase, and continues to do so. Plaintiff asserts this settlement is necessary to assure compliance with Proposition 65 now and in the future and to settle Plaintiff's alleged claims.

1.6 Notice of Violation

On April 15, 2015, Plaintiff served Settling Defendant and the requisite public enforcement agencies with a 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice"), alleging that Settling Defendant was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn consumers in California that its personal care

products exposed users to benzophenone. The Notice applicable to Settling Defendant or its Covered Products is attached at Exhibit A. To the best of the Parties' knowledge, no public enforcer has commenced and is diligently prosecuting the allegations set forth in the Notice.

1.7 Complaint

On September 10, 2015 Plaintiff filed a complaint in the Superior Court in and for the County of Marin against Concept II Cosmetics, LLC and DOES 1-150, alleging violations of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, based on exposures to benzophenone contained in personal care products sold by Settling Defendant in the State of California. The complaint shall be deemed amended by this Consent Judgment to include the allegations set forth in the Supplemental Notices on the day that the sixty-day notice period has passed if no authorized public prosecutor has, prior to that date, filed a Proposition 65 enforcement action with respect to the allegations in the Supplemental Notices. On November 6, 2015, Shefa filed the present action in the Superior Court in and for the County of Marin, *Shefa LMV*, *LLC v. Galderma Laboratories*, *LP*, et al., Marin Superior Court Case No. CIV 1504055 alleging violations of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6, based on the alleged exposures to benzophenone contained in personal care products sold in the State of California.

1.8 No Admission

Settling Defendant denies all the respective material, factual, and legal allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint. Settling Defendant maintains that all of its Covered Products have been and are in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission against interest by Settling Defendant of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission against interest by Settling Defendant of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law. This Section shall not, however, diminish or otherwise affect Settling Defendant's obligations, responsibilities, and duties under this Consent Judgment.

1.9 Consent to Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the allegations in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Marin, Settling Defendant agrees that it employs or has employed ten or more persons during time periods relevant to the Complaint, and that this Court has jurisdiction over the Parties to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment pursuant to Proposition 65 and Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6.

1.10 Effective Date

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date that Plaintiff serves notice on Settling Defendant that this Consent Judgment is approved and entered by the Court.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: REFORMULATION STANDARD; NOTIFICATION

2.1 Reformulation Standard

- (a) Whereas, Settling Defendant, based on inquiry for purposes of this Consent Judgment, has not identified any ingredient in its Covered Products other than octocrylene that is a source of detectable benzophenone in such Covered Products. Further, based upon inquiry for purposes of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant represents that it has investigated and concluded that there are only a few major suppliers of octocrylene for the domestic market and that time and phasing is needed for the marketplace of octocrylene suppliers to make the adjustments necessary to deliver octocrylene with benzophenone meeting the Octocrylene Reformulation Standards.
- (b) As of June 1, 2018, Settling Defendant shall only manufacture, or cause to be manufactured, either Covered Products containing no more than (i) 50 parts per million ("ppm") benzophenone in the finished Covered Products; or (ii) 500 ppm of benzophenone in the ingredient octocrylene used in the finished Covered Products. These first standards are interim standards.

- (c) As of June 1, 2020, Settling Defendant shall only manufacture or cause to be manufactured, either Covered Products containing no more than (i) 35 ppm benzophenone in the finished Covered Product; or (ii) 350 ppm of benzophenone in the ingredient octocrylene used in the finished Covered Products. These second standards are the "Final Reformulation Standards."
- (d) The dates and reformulations of the Covered Products as listed in Section 2.1 (b) and (c) shall be referred to collectively as the "Reformulation Standards," consisting of either the Sections 2.1 (b)(i) and (c)(i) (the "Finished Product Reformulation Standards") or Sections 2.1 (b)(ii) and (c)(ii) (the "Octocrylene Reformulation Standards"). Settling Defendant may at any time, at its own election, comply with either, both, or any combination of the applicable Finished Product Reformulation Standard or the Octocrylene Reformulation Standard with respect to any Covered Product.
- (e) The Reformulation Standards shall apply to Covered Products which are manufactured by or on behalf of Settling Defendant on or after the applicable Reformulation Standard dates.

2.2. Notifications

Settling Defendant shall provide, no later than fourteen (14) days after the Effective Date, written notice (the "Octocrylene Supplier Letter") to its current respective octocrylene supplier or suppliers, informing said supplier or suppliers of the Octocrylene Reformulation Standard and urging each supplier to use reasonable efforts to provide expeditiously only octocrylene which complies with the Octocrylene Reformulation Standards. Settling Defendant shall not include statements in the Octocrylene Supplier Letter that will encourage a supplier to delay compliance with the Octocrylene Reformulation Standards. Settling Defendant shall include a statement in its Octocrylene Supplier Letter requesting that its supplier use any and all commercially reasonable efforts to achieve an Octocrylene Reformulation Standard of 200 ppm by June 1, 2020.

2.3 Compliance with Reformulation Standard

- (a) Should Settling Defendant elect to meet the Finished Product Reformulation
 Standard, it may, at its option, either (i) test the Covered Product pursuant to a scientifically
 appropriate application of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency testing methodologies 3580A,
 8270C, or any other scientifically appropriate methodology for determining the benzophenone
 content in a substance of the form of the specific Covered Product being tested, or (ii) may use
 the appropriate mathematical calculation based on octocrylene percentage in the Covered
 Product and the benzophenone concentration in the lot of octocrylene used in the finished
 Covered Product, based either on testing of the octocrylene lot or on a certificate of analysis
 documenting benzophenone content from the octocrylene supplier (the "Certificate of
 Analysis") at Settling Defendant's option.
- (b) Should Settling Defendant elect to meet the Octocrylene Reformulation Standard, it shall obtain a Certificate of Analysis or analytical testing report for each lot of octocrylene used in the manufacture of Covered Products. If, after Settling Defendant has advised its octocrylene suppliers to include a Certificate of Analysis with each lot of delivered octocrylene, an octocrylene supplier fails to include a Certificate of Analysis, Settling Defendant may correct the lapse upon discovery.
- (c) Settling Defendant may, absent grounds to question the accuracy, demonstrate compliance with either Reformulation Standard by relying in good faith on an octocrylene supplier's Certificate of Analysis or comparable verified quantitative benzophenone content information. Such good faith reliance establishes compliance with the Reformulation Standards. Octocrylene suppliers shall rely on any scientifically appropriate testing methodology for determining the benzophenone content of octocrylene.
- (d) Settling Defendant shall retain compliance documentation for three years after delivery of a lot of octocrylene and compliance documentation shall be made available within 30 days of a written request by Plaintiff, who may make no more than two such requests annually.

3. MONETARY PAYMENTS

3.1 Civil Penalty

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), Settling Defendant shall pay initial civil penalties of \$16,000.00 and, if applicable, final civil penalties in the amounts identified in Section 15.1. Settling Defendant shall issue two (2) separate checks for the total amount of \$16,000.00 penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.12: (a) one check made payable to the State of California's Office of Environmental Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") in the amount of \$12,000.00, representing 75% of the total penalty; and (b) one check to Shefa LMV, LLC in the amount of \$4,000.00, representing 25% of the total penalty. The payment to OEHHA shall be delivered to: Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Attn.: Mike Gyurics, Fiscal Operations Branch Chief, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, P.O. Box 4010 Sacramento, CA 95812-4010. The payment to Shefa shall be delivered to: Shefa LMV, LLC c/o Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum, 7120 Hayvenhurst Avenue, Suite 320, Van Nuys, CA 91406.

- **3.1.1 Initial Civil Penalty.** Within ten (10) business days of the Effective Date Settling Defendant shall issue checks in the amounts identified in 3.1 as the Initial Civil Penalty.
- 3.1.2 Final Civil Penalty. On or before June 30, 2018 Settling Defendant shall pay a final civil penalty (the "Final Civil Penalty") in the amount of \$16,000.00. However, the Final Civil Penalty shall be waived in its entirety if Settling Defendant certifies that all Covered Products subject to this Consent Judgment manufactured by or on behalf of that Settling Defendant on or after June 1, 2018 meets a Final Reformulation Standard. A responsible official with personal knowledge, after due inquiry, of Settling Defendant that has exercised this election shall provide Plaintiff with a written certification confirming compliance with the above conditions on or before June 15, 2018.

3.2 Reimbursement of Fees and Costs

The Parties acknowledge that Shefa and its counsel offered to resolve this dispute without reaching terms on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed to them, thereby

4. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

4.1 Plaintiff's Public Release of Proposition 65 Claims

This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution of all claims that were or could have been asserted in the Complaint arising out of Settling Defendant's alleged failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings for exposures to benzophenone in its Covered Products.

Plaintiff, acting on its own behalf and in the public interest, releases Settling Defendant and its respective parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities under (full or partial) common ownership, manufacturers, suppliers and the directors, officers, employees, attorneys, and predecessors, successors or assigns of each of them ("Releasees") and each entity to whom Settling Defendant directly or indirectly distributes or sells the Covered Products including, but not limited to, its downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisers, cooperative members, licensors and licensees, and including, without limitation, and including any and all subsidiaries, parents, marketplace retailers and/or affiliates of the foregoing retailers (collectively, the "Distribution Chain Releasees") for violations arising under Proposition 65 for unwarned exposures to benzophenone from the Covered Products by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date. Plaintiff's release of claims applies to all Covered Products which Settling Defendant (or its manufacturer) either manufactured, and/or distributed and/or sold prior to the

Effective Date, regardless of the date any person distributes or sells the subject Covered Products.

Upon entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court, going forward, Settling Defendant's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to benzophenone in that Settling Defendant's prior, current and future Covered Products.

4.2 Plaintiff's Individual Release of Claims

Plaintiff, in its individual capacity only and *not* in its representative capacity, also provides a release to Settling Defendant, Releasees, and Distribution Chain Releasees, which release shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction, as a bar to all actions, causes of action, obligations, costs, expenses, attorneys' fees, damages, losses, claims, liabilities and demands of Plaintiff of any nature, character or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, arising out of alleged or actual exposures to benzophenone in Settling Defendant's Covered Products prior to the Effective Date.

4.3 <u>Settling Defendant's Release of Shefa</u>

Settling Defendant, on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against Shefa and its attorneys and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made by Shefa and its attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims, otherwise seeking to enforce Proposition 65 against it in this matter, or with respect to the Covered Products up through the Effective Date.

4.4 Release and Dismissal of Retailer Defendant

This Consent Judgment provides a "downstream" release which resolves all claims in the Complaint for all Covered Products manufactured by, or on behalf of, distributed, or sold by Settling Defendant. Any retailer who has been named in the Complaint (a "Retailer Defendant") due to its sale of one or more such Covered Products shall be dismissed without prejudice unless, prior to the date this Consent Judgment was lodged, that Retailer Defendant

Ш

had also received a Notice that identified an exemplar product not manufactured or supplied by either Settling Defendant or an entity that has previously resolved Plaintiff's claims with a downstream release.

5. FORCE MAJEURE

In the event that it is not feasible for Settling Defendant to obtain conforming octocrylene necessary so as to comply with any Reformulation Standard due to an Act of God (including fire, flood, earthquake, storm, hurricane or other natural disaster) or loss of adequate supplier ability to supply octocrylene on an uninterrupted basis compliant with the applicable Octocrylene Reformulation Standard, the provisions of this paragraph will dictate whether the applicable dates for meeting the Reformulation Standards shall be extended. The criteria for determining whether it is feasible to obtain conforming octocrylene shall include the following factors: availability and reliability of supply that meets the applicable Octocrylene Reformulation Standard, cost of such conforming octocrylene and resulting increase in manufacturers' prices resulting from the use of conforming octocrylene, performance characteristics of conforming octocrylene and of the resulting Covered Products, including but not limited to formulation, performance, safety, efficacy, consumer acceptance, and stability.

Settling Defendant shall provide notice to Plaintiff and to JAMS mediator Judge James Warren, or if he is not available, another mediator from JAMS mutually agreed to by the Parties or, if necessary, as referred by the Court. Included in the notice shall be the specific reason or reasons for invoking the Force Majeure clause, along with a reasonable estimate of the time period during which Settling Defendant will be unable to comply with the applicable Reformulation Standard. During the time invoked by Settling Defendant, the Reformulation Standard shall be revised to 100 ppm for the Finished Product Reformulation Standard and 1,000 ppm for the Octocrylene Reformulation Standard.

If the Parties disagree as to whether Settling Defendant has a valid reason to invoke the Force Majeure clause or disagree as to the length of time necessary for Settling Defendant to comply with the Reformulation Standard, they shall attempt to resolve their differences through

6. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>

deems necessary.

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if, for any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by the Parties, or by such additional time as the Parties may agree in writing.

7. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

If, subsequent to the execution of this Consent Judgment, any provision of this Consent Judgment is held by a court to be void or unenforceable, or the Parties agree to modify any terms due to input from the Office of the Attorney General or after a hearing before the Court in connection with Shefa's Motion to Approve, or for other good cause, each Party to be bound by any such modified terms must re-execute the modified Consent Judgment and such modified Consent Judgment then shall be presented to the Court for approval by Shefa; provided, however, that if a provision of this Consent Judgment declared void or unenforceable is material to the Party for whom such term provided a benefit or protection, that Party can seek other remedies, including, without limitation, rescission or reformation, based on the provision being declared void or unenforceable.

8. GOVERNING LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of

California and apply within the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or as to the Covered Products, including without limitation the delisting of benzophenone, then Settling Defendant may provide written notice to Plaintiff of any asserted change in the law, and with the exception of Sections 3.1 and 3.2 above, have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment, with respect to, and to the extent that, the Covered Products are so affected. None of the terms of this Consent Judgment shall have any application to Covered Products sold outside of the State of California.

9. <u>FUTURE FEDERAL REGULATION OF OCTOCRYLENE OR</u>

BENZOPHENONE

If FDA adopts new regulations or Congress enacts new laws governing octocrylene and/or benzophenone content in any Covered Products, then the Parties shall meet and confer regarding the effect of such changes in the law on the obligations of this Consent Judgment. If necessary to reach agreement, the Parties may refer any specific issue for consideration by Judge Warren or other JAMS mediator agreed to by the Parties or, if necessary, as appointed by the Court.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, if FDA authorizes the percentage of octocrylene to increase above the current limit of 10% in Covered Products, then this Consent Judgment shall by operation of law be amended to allow benzophenone in finished Covered Products to rise in proportion to the percentage increase. Settling Defendant shall notify Plaintiff of the date this Section operates to change any Finished Product Reformulation Standard. This notice obligation shall sunset on June 1, 2023. Even if FDA changes the level of permissible octocrylene prior to June 1, 2018, the civil penalty provisions of Section 3.1.2 shall apply as written, not to any standards as modified by this Section 9. Settling Defendant represent that other than as described in the proceedings and papers referenced in their briefs in these consolidated cases, they are not aware that the FDA currently has published or made public plans to raise the allowable levels of octocrylene in the Covered Products.

10. NOTICE 1 Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notice required to be provided pursuant 2 to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and sent by: (i) personal delivery; (ii) first-class 3 registered or certified mail, return receipt requested; or (iii) overnight courier on any party by the 4 other at the following addresses: 5 6 To Shefa: To Settling Defendant: 7 Gary Roberts, Esq. Daniel N. Greenbaum Law Office of Daniel N. Greenbaum 8 Dentons US LLP 601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2500 7120 Hayvenhurst Avenue, Suite 320 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Van Nuys, CA 91406 9 Any Party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other Party a change of address to 10 which all notices and other communications shall be sent. 11 11. 12 COUNTERPARTS: FACSIMILE AND PDF SIGNATURES 13 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by facsimile or pdf 14 signature, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, 15 shall constitute one and the same document. A facsimile or pdf signature shall be as valid as the original. 16 17 12. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f) Plaintiff agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in California 18 19 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). 13. ADDITIONAL POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES 20 The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f), 21 22 Shefa is obligated to file a noticed motion to obtain judicial approval of this Consent Judgment. Settling Defendant agrees to urge the Court to approve this Consent Judgment. If any third party 23 objection to the noticed motion is filed, Plaintiff and Settling Defendant agree to work together 24 25 to the extent appropriate, and shall appear at any hearing before the Court to urge the Court to approve the Consent Judgment. 26

27

14. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may only be modified by a written instrument executed by the Party or Parties to be bound thereby, and after approval by the Court upon a noticed motion.

Any motion to modify shall be served on all Parties and the Office of the Attorney General.

15. ENFORCEMENT

15.1 Settling Defendant

In order to assert a potential violation of the Consent Judgment, Plaintiff shall provide notice to Settling Defendant as set forth in this paragraph ("Notice of Breach"): (a) Plaintiff shall provide all results of testing conducted on a specific Covered Product during the three month period for which the violation is alleged; (b) such testing must be of no less than five (5) of the same Covered Product (irrespective of the volume size of the container) collected within the three (3) month period, from five different retail vendors; (c) the average of all test results for that period exceed the Finished Product Reformulation Standard; and (d) Plaintiff shall provide the alleged violator a copy of (i) the purchase information for the allegedly violating Covered Product and (ii) a digital image of the allegedly violating Covered Product showing the SKU/UPC and, if present on the container, the Lot/Batch number(s).

Settling Defendant and Plaintiff shall, within thirty (30) days of receipt of the Notice of Breach, meet and confer regarding the alleged violation, during which time Plaintiff shall not file any motion, application, action, or pleading regarding the alleged violation.

For the first alleged violation as to any specific Covered Product for which Plaintiff provides Notice of Breach, Settling Defendant may demonstrate compliance by providing (1) a Certificate of Analysis or comparable verified quantitative benzophenone content information for five (5) units of the Covered Product or for the lot(s) of octocrylene from the supplier(s) of the octocrylene in the Covered Product at issue showing levels of benzophenone meeting the Octocrylene Reformulation Standard, or (2) a prior test result, using scientifically appropriate test methodologies, of the lot(s) of octocrylene used in the finished product which is the subject of the Notice of Breach, showing levels of benzophenone meeting the Octocrylene

Reformulation Standard. If Settling Defendant cannot demonstrate compliance, it must pay a stipulated civil penalty of \$25,000 to be allocated according to Section 3.1.

In the event that, thereafter, Plaintiff provides a Notice of Breach pertaining to a second alleged violation for the same Covered Product, he must do so in accordance with this Section. For the second alleged violation noticed by Plaintiff of the same Covered Product, Settling Defendant may demonstrate compliance with the terms of the Consent Judgment by providing test results, using scientifically appropriate test methodologies, conducted on five (5) units of the Covered Product or on the first three (3) lots of octocrylene received more than 30 days after receipt of the written response showing compliance with the Octocrylene Reformulation Standard received from the supplier of the octocrylene used to make the finished product which was the subject of the first Notice of Breach, and used to manufacture that finished product. If fewer than three (3) lots are received during the relevant time period, testing is required only for such lots as were received. Such a showing shall constitute compliance.

In the event that Settling Defendant cannot demonstrate compliance in the manner set forth above after receipt of a second Notice of Breach for the same Covered Product, and Plaintiff thereafter provides notice in accordance with the provisions in this Section of a third alleged violation for the same Covered Product, Settling Defendant shall pay a stipulated penalty of \$50,000 for each such second or subsequent violation.

15.2 Retailer Defendant

If Plaintiff sends a Notice of Breach to a Retailer Defendant, that Retailer Defendant shall be allowed to tender such notice to the manufacturer, distributor or seller of the subject Covered Product who is Settling Defendant. Thereafter, Plaintiff shall proceed with such Settling Defendant in accordance with Section 15.1 in lieu of the Retailer Defendant.

24 | ///

| | ///

///

26 | ///

27 |

1	16. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>				
2	The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their				
3	respective Parties and have read, understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this				
4	Consent Judgment.				
5	AGREED TO: AGREED TO:				
6	Date: 6/7/2016 Date: 6-7-16				
7	By: It was blooked By: It was				
8	Shefa LMV, LLC GALDERMA LABORATORIES LP				
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20 21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	Page 17				

ORDER AND JUDGMENT Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between Shefa LMV, LLC and Galderma Laboratories LP, the settlement is approved and the clerk is directed to enter judgment in accordance with the terms herein. Dated: Judge of the Superior Court

Page 18