1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF	F CALIFORNIA
9	FOR THE COUNTY O	F ALAMEDA
10	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,	Case No. RG-16-834949
11	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO AMERICAN
12	V.	MULTI-CINEMA, INC., TAYLOR COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND TELEMARK CORPORATION
13	DEL TACO RESTAURANTS, INC., et al.,	TELEMARK CORPORATION
14	Defendants.	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	- 1 - CONSENT JUDGMENT – AMC, TAYLOR AND	TELEMARK – CASE NO. RG-16-834949

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Parties to this Consent Judgment are plaintiff the Center for Environmental Health, a California non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and defendants American Multi-Cinema, Inc. ("AMC"), Taylor Communications, Inc. ("Taylor") and Telemark Corporation ("Telemark") (referred to collectively as, "Settling Defendants"). The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendants as set forth in the operative complaint ("Complaint") in the above-captioned matter. This Consent Judgment covers thermal paper sold by Taylor and Telemark and thermal paper purchased by AMC for use in California as transactional documentation such as movie tickets and receipts. Some of the thermal paper provided by Settling Defendants to their customers was coated with bisphenol A, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm ("BPA").
- 1.2 On February 9, 2017, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to AMC, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California and the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000 (the "Public Enforcers"), alleging that AMC violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to BPA from thermal paper without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.3 On October 16, 2017, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to Taylor, Telemark and the Public Enforcers alleging that Taylor and Telemark violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to BPA from thermal paper without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.4 On October 13, 2016, CEH filed the initial complaint in the above-captioned matter. On November 2, 2016, CEH filed the First Amended Complaint in the above-captioned matter. The First Amended Complaint has since been amended to add additional defendants, including AMC on May 5, 2017 and Taylor and Telemark on January 10, 2018.
- 1.5 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 Settling Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper

2.

in the County of Alameda and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein with respect to thermal paper sold or provided to consumers by Settling Defendants.

1.6 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is or shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument or defense the Parties may have in any other pending or future legal proceedings. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties solely for purposes of settling, compromising and resolving issues disputed in this Action.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 2.1 Definitions
 - 2.1.1 The "Effective Date" is the date of entry of this Consent Judgment.
- 2.1.2 "California Thermal Paper" is thermal paper that has or will be used in California or otherwise provided to employees working in California or consumers located in California by a Settling Defendant or any direct or indirect downstream entity.
- 2.2 Specification Compliance Date. To the extent it has not already done so, no more than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date, before a Settling Defendant purchases any California Thermal Paper, it shall instruct in writing each of its suppliers of California Thermal Paper (a "Thermal Paper Supplier") that the California Thermal Paper supplied to that Settling Defendant must be BPA-free, as defined in Section 2.3 below. If in the future a Settling Defendant purchases California Thermal Paper from a Thermal Paper Supplier that it has not previously provided with instructions to provide BPA-free thermal paper, the Settling Defendant shall provide written instructions to such Thermal Paper Supplier prior to placing an initial order for California Thermal Paper that instructs the Thermal Paper Supplier to provide it with California Thermal Paper that is BPA-free. Each Settling Defendant shall retain and make

available to CEH upon reasonable written request records of communications sent to and received from Thermal Paper Suppliers that are related to the requirement of this Section 2.1 for a period of three (3) years from the Effective Date.

2.3 **Reformulation of Thermal Paper**. After the Effective Date, no Settling Defendant shall purchase, sell, offer for sale, ship, distribute, use or provide to any employee or customer any California Thermal Paper that contains BPA that was intentionally added to the thermal paper in the manufacturing process. Thermal paper that contains less than 20 parts per million ("ppm") BPA by weight is deemed to contain no intentionally added BPA, such concentration to be determined by use of a test performed by an accredited laboratory using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) equipment.

3. ENFORCEMENT

3.1 **Enforcement Procedures.** Prior to bringing any motion or order to show cause to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, a Party seeking to enforce shall provide the violating party thirty (30) days advanced written notice of the alleged violation. The Parties shall meet and confer during such thirty (30) day period in an effort to try to reach agreement on an appropriate cure for the alleged violation. After such thirty (30) day period, the Party seeking to enforce may, by new action, motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda, seek to enforce Proposition 65 and the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.

4. PAYMENTS

- 4.1 **Payments by Settling Defendants.** On or before five (5) days after the entry of this Consent Judgment, Taylor and Telemark ("Payment Defendants") shall be jointly and severally liable for payment of the total sum of \$180,000 as a settlement payment as further set forth in this Section.
- 4.2 **Allocation of Payments.** The total settlement amount shall be paid in four separate checks in the amounts specified below and delivered as set forth below. Any failure by Payment Defendants to comply with the payment terms herein shall be subject to a stipulated late fee to be paid jointly by Payment Defendants in the amount of \$100 for each day the full

payment is not received after the applicable payment due date set forth in Section 4.1. The late

1

BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, to work with the food industry and agriculture interests to reduce exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, and to thereby reduce the public health impacts and risks of exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food sold in California. CEH shall obtain and maintain adequate records to document that ASPs are spent on these activities and CEH agrees to provide such documentation to the Attorney General within thirty days of any request from the Attorney General. The payment pursuant to this Section shall be made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

4.2.3 Payment Defendants shall pay \$124,980 as a reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The attorneys' fees and cost reimbursement shall be made payable to the Lexington Law Group and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3317175. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

4.2.4 To summarize, Payment Defendants shall deliver checks made out to the payees and in the amounts set forth below:

Payee	Туре	Amount	Deliver To
ОЕННА	Penalty	\$23,580	OEHHA per Section 4.2.1
Center For Environmental Health	Penalty	\$7,860	LLG
Center For Environmental Health	ASP	\$23,580	LLG
Lexington Law Group	Fees and Costs	\$124,980	LLG

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 **Modification.** This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties, with the approval of the Court or by an order of this Court upon motion and in accordance with law.
 - 5.2 **Notice; Meet and Confer.** Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment

shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with all affected Parties prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

6. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

- 6.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and each Settling Defendant and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, agents, shareholders, successors, assigns and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities to which a Settling Defendant directly or indirectly distributes or sells California Thermal Paper, including but not limited to Vistar Transportation, LLC and distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, licensors and licensees ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to BPA contained in California Thermal Paper that was sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed, used or otherwise provided to employees or customers by a Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date, provided however, that nothing in this Section 6.1 release shall apply to thermal paper sold by Taylor for eventual use by Nordstrom, Inc. ¹
- 6.2 CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives and forever discharges any and all claims against each Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted by CEH individually or in the public interest regarding the failure to warn about exposure to BPA in connection with California Thermal Paper that was sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed, used or otherwise provided to employees or customers by a Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date, provided however, that nothing in this Section 6.2 release shall apply to thermal paper sold by Taylor for eventual use by Nordstrom, Inc.
- 6.3 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by a Settling Defendant shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by that Settling Defendant, its Defendant

¹ Sales of thermal paper by Taylor for eventual use by Nordstrom, Inc. are covered in a separate Consent Judgment.

1	Releasees an	d its Downstream Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to warn
2	about BPA c	ontained in California Thermal Paper sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed,
3	used or other	wise provided to employees or customers by a Settling Defendant.
4	7. PRO	VISION OF NOTICE
5	7.1	When CEH is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment,
6	the notice sha	all be sent by first class and electronic mail to:
7 8 9		Eric S. Somers Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117 esomers@lexlawgroup.com
10	7.2	When a Settling Defendant is entitled to receive any notice under this
11	Consent Judg	gment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:
12		Rohit Sabnis
13		Burnham Brown A Professional Law Corporation
14		1901 Harrison Street, 14th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 rsabnis@burnhambrown.com
15	7.2	A see Destruction and different and an advantage and a destruction of the marking in the last
16	7.3	Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be
17		ng the other Party notice by first class and electronic mail.
18		RT APPROVAL
19	8.1	This Consent Judgment shall become effective as a contract upon the date signed
20		all Settling Defendants, whichever is later, provided however, that CEH shall also
21		ile a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendants shall
22		oval of such Motion.
23	8.2	If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or
24	effect and sha	all not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any
25	purpose.	
26	9. GOV	ERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION
27	9.1	The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the

State of California.

10.1 A Party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action arising out of this Consent Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing Party's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs unless the unsuccessful Party has acted with substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2016.010, *et seq*.

- 10.2 Notwithstanding Section 10.1, a Party who prevails in a contested enforcement action brought pursuant to Section 3 may seek an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 against a Party that acted with substantial justification. The Party seeking such an award shall bear the burden of meeting all of the elements of § 1021.5, and this provision shall not be construed as altering any procedural or substantive requirements for obtaining such an award.
- 10.3 Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

11.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments or understandings related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein. There are no warranties, representations or other agreements between the Parties except as expressly set forth herein. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those specifically referred to in this Consent Judgment have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto. Any agreements specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto only to the extent that they are expressly incorporated herein. No supplementation, modification, waiver or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any of the other provisions hereof

1	wheth	er or no	ot similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.
2	12.	RET	ENTION OF JURISDICTION
3		12.1	This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the
4	Conse	ent Judg	gment.
5	13.	AUT	HORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT
6		13.1	Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully
7	autho	rized by	the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter
8	into a	nd exec	ute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and to legally bind
9	that P	arty.	
10	14.	NO E	FFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS
11		14.1	Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim
12	agains	against an entity that is not a Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained	
13	in this	Conse	nt Judgment.
14	15.	EXE	CUTION IN COUNTERPARTS
15		15.1	The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and
16	by me	ans of t	facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed
17	to con	stitute	one document.
18			
19	IT IS	SO ST	IPULATED.
20			CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
21			
22			Charlie Pizarro Associate Director
23	•		Associate Director
24			
25			
26			

1		AMERICAN MULTI-CINEMA, INC.
2		
3		
4		Signature
5		
6	à	Printed Name
7		
8	* .	SVP, General Course Secrety
9		Title 7
10		
11		TAYLOR COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
12	-	
13		
14		Signature
15		
16		Printed Name
17	2	
18		Title
19		
20	6	TELEMARK CORPORATION
21 22		
23		
24	A	Signature
25		
26	8	Printed Name
27		
28		Title
	CONSENT JUDGMENT	- 11 - - AMC, TAYLOR AND TELEMARK - CASE NO. RG-16-834949

AMERICAN MULTI-CINEMA, INC.
Signature
Printed Name
Title
TAYLOR COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
Inalla
ANTANIA
Signature
JEFF CRUMP
Printed Name
C·O· O Title
TELEMARK CORPORATION
Signature
Printed Name
Title

1	AMERICAN MULTI-CINEMA, INC.
2	
,	Signature
5	Printed Name
,	Timed Ivanie
3	
9	Title
L	TAYLOR COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2	
3	
	Signature
	,
	Printed Name
'	
3	Title
	TELLENA DIZ CORDOR ATION
	TELEMARK CORPORATION
2	Thomas J Thomasma
3	
ı	Signature
;	Thomas J Thomasma
;	Printed Name
,	
3	CEO
'	Title
	- 11 - CONSENT JUDGMENT – AMC, TAYLOR AND TELEMARK – CASE NO. RG-16-834949

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:	
AND DECREED.	
Dated:	Judge of the Superior Court of California
	radge of the Superior Court of Camforma
	- 12 - YLOR AND TELEMARK – CASE NO. RG-16-834949