1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA				
10					
11	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,	Case No. RG-16-834949			
12	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO HANSOL			
13	V.	JUDGMENT AS TO HANSOL AMERICA, INC.			
14	DEL TACO RESTAURANTS, INC., et al.,				
15	Defendants.				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25 26					
27					
28					
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	-1-				
	CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO HANSOL AMERICA, INC. – CASE NO. RG-16-834949				

ON RECYCLED PAPER

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Parties to this Consent Judgment are the Center for Environmental Health, a California non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and Hansol America, Inc., a California Corporation headquartered in New Jersey (referred to as, "Settling Defendant"). The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendant as set forth in the operative complaint ("Complaint") in the above-captioned matter. This Consent Judgment covers thermal paper that is sold, offered for sale or distributed by Settling Defendant ("Thermal Paper"). Thermal Paper is used in thermal printers to create transactional documents such as cash register and ATM receipts. Thermal Paper sold by Settling Defendant to its customers is or has been coated with bisphenol A ("BPA"), a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm.
- 1.2. On March 20, 2017, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to Settling Defendant, 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, alleging that Settling Defendant 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 13, 2016, CEH filed the 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 Settling Defendant on June 26, 2017.
- 1.4. 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 Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper 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 containing BPA sold by Settling Defendant.

1.5. 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.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 2.1. **Reformulation of Thermal Paper**. After the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall not purchase, sell, offer for sale, ship or distribute any 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 (the "Reformulation Level") 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.
- 2.2. Additional Efforts to Reduce Use of Phenol Based Thermal Paper. CEH believes that some of the possible alternatives to BPA used in Thermal Paper including bisphenol-S have potentially adverse health effects. Accordingly, Settling Defendant agrees, in coordination with its parent company Hansol Paper Co., Ltd., to use commercially reasonable efforts to research alternatives to phenol based thermal paper. Settling Defendant shall prepare a written report detailing the efforts made and results from this work on the use of safer non-phenol based Thermal Paper that shall be submitted to CEH within thirty (30) days of the day that is one (1) year after the Effective Date.

3. ENFORCEMENT

3.1. **Enforcement Procedures.** This Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all matters regarding enforcement of the Consent Judgment. 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 Defendant.** On or before five (5) days after the entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall be liable for payment of the total sum of \$205,000 as a settlement payment as further set forth in this Section.
- 4.2. **Allocation of Payments.** The total settlement amount shall be paid in five (5) separate checks in the amounts specified below and delivered as set forth below. Any failure by Settling Defendant to comply with the payment terms herein shall be subject to a stipulated late fee to be paid by Settling Defendant 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 fees required under this Section shall be recoverable, together with reasonable attorneys' fees, in an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment. The funds paid by Settling Defendant shall be allocated as set forth below between the following categories and made payable as follows:
- 4.2.1. Settling Defendant shall pay \$27,248 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code \$25249.7(b). The civil penalty payment shall be apportioned in accordance with Health & Safety Code \$25249.12 (25% to CEH and 75% to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA")). Accordingly, Settling Defendant shall pay the OEHHA portion of the civil penalty payment for \$20,571 by check made payable to OEHHA and associated with taxpayer identification number 68-0284486. This payment shall be delivered as follows:

1 For United States Postal Service Delivery: Attn: Mike Gyurics 2 Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment 3 P.O. Box 4010, MS #19B Sacramento, CA 95812-4010 4 For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery: 5 Attn: Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief 6 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment 1001 I Street, MS #19B 7 Sacramento, CA 95814 8 Settling Defendant shall pay the CEH portion of the civil penalty payment for \$6,857 by check 9 made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification 10 number 94-3251981. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero 11 Street, San Francisco, CA 94117. 12 4.2.2. Settling Defendant shall pay \$20,572 as an Additional Settlement Payment 13 ("ASP") to CEH pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of 14 Regulations, Title 11, § 3204. CEH intends to place these funds in CEH's Toxics in Food Fund 15 and use them to support CEH programs and activities that seek to educate the public about BPA 16 and other toxic chemicals in food, to work with the food industry and agriculture interests to 17 reduce exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, and to thereby reduce the public 18 health impacts and risks of exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food sold in California. 19 CEH shall obtain and maintain adequate records to document that ASPs are spent on these 20 activities and CEH agrees to provide such documentation to the Attorney General within thirty 21 (30) days of any request from the Attorney General. The payment pursuant to this Section shall 22. be made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer 23 identification number 94-3251981. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 24 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117. 25 4.2.3. Settling Defendant shall pay \$157,000 as a reimbursement of a portion of 26 CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The attorneys' fees and cost reimbursement shall be 27 -5-

16

14

17

18 19

20

22

23

21

24 25 26

27

made in two separate checks as follows: (a) \$133,000 payable to the Lexington Law Group and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3317175; and (b) \$24,000 payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. Both of these payments shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

4.2.4. To summarize, Settling Defendant shall deliver checks made out to the payees and in the amounts set forth below:

Payee	Туре	Amount	Deliver To
ОЕННА	Penalty	\$20,571	OEHHA per Section 4.2.1
Center For Environmental Health	Penalty	\$6,857_	LLG
Center For Environmental Health	ASP	\$20,571	LLG
Lexington Law Group	Fees and Costs	\$133,000	LLG
Center For Environmental Health	Fees and Costs	\$24,000	LLG

MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT 5.

- 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.

CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE 6.

6.1. This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and Settling Defendant and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, agents, shareholders, successors, assigns and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees") of any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about exposure to BPA contained in Thermal Paper that was sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed, used or otherwise provided by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.

- 6.2. CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives and forever discharges any and all claims against Settling Defendant and 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 contained in Thermal Paper that was sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed, used or otherwise provided to employees or customers by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 6.3. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Settling Defendant shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Settling Defendant and its Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to warn about BPA contained in Thermal Paper sold, offered for sale, shipped, distributed, used or otherwise provided by Settling Defendant after the Effective Date.
- 6.4. Nothing in this Consent Judgment covers or releases any claim 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 including but not limited to those claims regarding the failure to warn about exposure to BPA contained in Thermal Paper by any entity other than Settling Defendant and Defendant Releasees including but not limited to all downstream entities to which Settling Defendant directly or indirectly distributed or sold Thermal Paper such as distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, licensors and licensees.

7. PROVISION OF NOTICE

7.1. When CEH is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:

Eric S. Somers Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117 esomers@lexlawgroup.com

7.2. When Settling Defendant is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:

Christopher Tayback Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017

and

Enoch H. Liang LTL Attorneys LLP 601 Gateway Blvd., Suite 1010 South San Francisco, CA 94080 enoch.liang@ltlattorneys.com

7.3. Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by sending the other Party notice by first class and electronic mail.

8. COURT APPROVAL

- 8.1. This Consent Judgment shall become effective as a contract upon the date signed by CEH and Settling Defendant, whichever is later, provided however, that CEH shall also prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendant shall support approval of such Motion.
- 8.2. If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and shall not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose.

9. GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION

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

10. ATTORNEY'S FEES

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*.

25

26

27

-8-

- 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**

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. Other agreements that are not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed neither to exist nor 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 whether or not similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.

RETENTION OF JURISDICTION 12.

12.1. This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.

27

25

26

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

1 13. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT 2 13.1. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized 3 by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and to legally bind that Party. 4 5 NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS 14. 14.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim 6 7 against an entity that is not Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained in 8 this Consent Judgment. 9 **EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS** 15. 10 15.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by 11 means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to 12 constitute one document. 13 14 IT IS SO STIPULATED: 15 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 16 17 Charlie Pizarro 18 Associate Director 19 20 HANSOL AMERICA, INC. 21 22 Signature 23 24 Printed Name 25 26 27 Title 28

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

1 13. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT 2 13.1. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized 3 by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and 4 execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and to legally bind that Party. 5 14. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS 6 14.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim 7 against an entity that is not Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained in 8 this Consent Judgment. 9 15. **EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS** 10 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by 11 means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to 12 constitute one document. 13 14 IT IS SO STIPULATED: 15 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 16 17 Charlie Pizarro 18 Associate Director 19 20 HANSOL AMERICA, INC. 21 22 Signature 23 24 Printed Name 25 26 Presiden 27

28
DOCUMENT PREPARED
ON RECYCLED PAPER

Title

1	IT IS SO ORDERED:		
2			
3			
4	Dated:	, 2018	Judge of the Superior Court of California
5			Judge of the Superior Court of Camorina
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26 27			
28			
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER			-11-

CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO HANSOL AMERICA, INC. – CASE NO. RG-16-834949