1 2 3 4 5 6 7		THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
8	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA  KIM EMBRY, an individual   Case No. HG18908165				
10	KIM EMBRY, an individual  Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT			
11	V.	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. and			
12	BLUE DIAMOND GROWERS, and DOES 1	Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6)			
13	through 100, inclusive				
14	Defendants.				
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>					
25 26					
27					
28					

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Parties

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Kim Embry ("Embry") and Blue Diamond Growers ("BDG") with Embry and BDG each individually referred to as a "Party" and collectively referred to as the "Parties."

#### 1.2 Plaintiff

Embry is an individual residing in California and acting in the interest of the general public. She seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer products.

#### 1.3 Defendant

BDG employs ten or more individuals and is a "person in the course of doing business" for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Proposition 65").

## 1.4 General Allegations

Embry alleges that BDG manufactures, imports, sells, and distributes for sale Blue Diamond Almonds that contain acrylamide. Embry further alleges that BDG does so without providing a sufficient health hazard warning as required by Proposition 65 and related Regulations. Pursuant to Proposition 65, acrylamide is listed as a chemical known to cause cancer and reproductive harm.

#### 1.5 Notice of Violation

On October 18, 2017, Embry served BDG, Ralph's, the California Attorney General, and all other required public enforcement agencies with a 60-Day Notice of Violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Notice"). The Notice alleges that BDG violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to acrylamide contained in its "Blue Diamond Almonds - roasted salted" which include BDG roasted almonds.

No public enforcer has commenced or is otherwise prosecuting an action to enforce the violations alleged in the Notice.

///

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 1.6 Product Description

For purposes of this Consent Judgment "Product" or "Products" are defined as BDG roasted almonds containing acrylamide that are manufactured, imported, sold, or distributed for sale in California by BDG and Releasees, defined *infra*.

#### 1.7 Other Releasees

This Consent Judgment expressly encompasses all of the subject Products, whether sold under BDG's own brand name, or some other private label, at all grocery, retail, and other locations and sales channels, as well as derivative products containing other ingredients made with the Products.

# 1.8 BDG Response to the Notice

The material, factual, and legal allegations in the Notice are based upon Embry's testing of one sample of the Products indicating a concentration of 272 parts per billion ("ppb") of acrylamide. Consistent with Section 1.10, BDG denies that this single sample is adequately representative or scientifically reliable to prove a violation of Proposition 65 given the unique characteristics of the Products and expected variability in testing results across samples. Further, BDG denies that this single sample is demonstrative of a Proposition 65 violation that is based upon appropriate consumption rates. Subject to this denial and notwithstanding the limitations presented by Embry's one test result, BDG nonetheless commits itself hereto to reducing average concentrations of acrylamide in the Products in a commercially reasonable and viable manner in order to accomplish at least 20% reduction in average concentrations of acrylamide as compared to historical observations regarding the Products, including but not limited to Embry's one test.

#### 1.9 Complaint

On June 8, 2018, Embry filed a Complaint against BDG for the alleged violations of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 that are the subject of the Notice ("Complaint").

#### 1.10 No Admission

BDG denies the material, factual, and legal allegations in the Notice and Complaint, and maintains that all of the products it has manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed for sale in California, including the Products, have been, and are, in compliance with all laws. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of

law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment be construed as an admission of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. This Section shall not, however, diminish or otherwise affect BDG's obligations, responsibilities, and duties under this Consent Judgment.

#### 1.11 Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and the Complaint only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over BDG as to the allegations in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, and that the Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment pursuant to Proposition 65 and Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

#### 1.12 Effective Date

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" means the date on which the Court grants the motion for approval of this Consent Judgment, as discussed in Section 5.

#### 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

#### 2.1 Reformulation of the Product

Commencing on the Effective Date, and continuing thereafter, BDG shall not manufacture any Product that will be sold or offered for sale in California that exceeds the following acrylamide concentration limits, such concentration to be determined by use of a test performed by an laboratory accredited by the State of California, a federal agency, or a nationally recognized accrediting organization, using LC-MS/MS (Liquid Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometry): the average acrylamide concentration shall not exceed 225 ppb by weight (the "Average Level") for the Products. The Average Level is determined by randomly selecting and testing at least one sample each from five different lots of the Products (or the maximum number of lots available for testing if less than five) during a testing period of at least 60 days.

# 2.2 Sell-Through Period

Notwithstanding anything else in this Settlement Agreement, the Products that were manufactured prior to the Effective Date and six (6) months thereafter shall be subject to the release of liability pursuant to this Consent Judgment, without regard to when such Products were, or are in the

28

future, distributed or sold to customers. As a result, the obligations of BDG, or any Releases, do not apply to these Products manufactured prior to the Effective Date and six (6) months thereafter.

#### 3. MONETARY SETTLEMENT TERMS

#### 3.1 Settlement Amount

BDG shall pay seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00) in settlement and total satisfaction of all the claims referred to in the Notice, the Complaint, and this Consent Judgment. This includes civil penalties in the amount of eight thousand dollars (\$8,000.00) pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b) and attorney's fees and costs in the amount of sixty-seven thousand dollars (\$67,000.00) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

# 3.2 Civil Penalty

The portion of the settlement attributable to civil penalties shall be allocated according to Health and Safety Code section 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with seventy-five percent (75%) of the penalty paid to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining twenty-five percent (25%) of the penalty paid to Embry.

All payments owed to Embry shall be made payable to the Glick Law Group Client Trust Account, and shall be delivered to the following address:

Noam Glick Glick Law Group 225 Broadway, Suite 2100 San Diego, CA 92101

All payments owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486) shall be delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo Line "Prop 65 Penalties") at the following addresses:

For United States Postal Service Delivery:

Mike Gyurics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
P.O. Box 4010
Sacramento, CA 95812-4010

For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery:

Mike Gyurics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
1001 I Street

#### Sacramento, CA 95814

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

BDG agrees to provide Embry's counsel with a copy of the check payable to OEHHA, simultaneous with its penalty payments to Embry.

The Parties will exchange completed IRS 1099, W-9, or other forms as required. Relevant information for Glick Law Group and N&T are set out below:

- "Glick Law Group" (EIN: 47-1838518) at the address provided in Section 3.2(a)(i);
- "Nicholas & Tomasevic" (EIN: 46-3474065) at the address provided in Section 3.2(a)(i); and
- "Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment" at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

## 3.3 Attorney's Fees and Costs

The portion of the settlement attributable to attorney's fees and costs shall be paid to Embry's counsel, who are entitled to attorney's fees and costs incurred by her in this action, including but not limited to investigating potential violations, bringing this matter to BDG's attention, as well as litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest.

BDG shall provide its payment to Embry's counsel in two checks, divided equally, payable to Glick Law Group, PC (\$33,500) and Nicholas & Tomasevic, LLP (\$33,500) respectively. The addresses for these two entities are:

Noam Glick Glick Law Group 225 Broadway, Suite 2100 San Diego, CA 92101

Craig Nicholas Nicholas & Tomasevic, LLP 225 Broadway, 19th Floor San Diego, CA 92101

# 3.4 Timing

The above mentioned checks will be issued within fourteen (14) days of the Effective Date.

# 4. <u>CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED</u>

# 4.1 Embry's Public Release of Proposition 65 Claims

For any claim or violation arising under Proposition 65 alleging a failure to warn about

2

3

4

exposures to acrylamide from Products manufactured, imported, sold, or distributed by BDG prior to the Effective Date, Embry, acting on her own behalf and in the public interest, releases BDG of any and all liability. This includes BDG's parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities under common ownership, its directors, officers, principals, agents, employees, attorneys, insurers, accountants, predecessors, successors, and assigns, and each entity to whom BDG directly or indirectly distributes, ships, or sells the Products, including but not limited to, downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, cooperative members, and licensees, and their owners, directors, officers, agents, principals, employees, attorneys, insurers, accountants, representatives, predecessors, successors, and assigns (collectively, the "Releasees"). Releasees include Ralph's. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to the alleged or actual failure to warn about exposures to acrylamide from Products manufactured, imported, sold, or distributed by BDG after the Effective Date. This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution of all claims that were or could have been asserted against BDG and/or Releasees for failure to provide warnings for alleged exposures to acrylamide contained in Products.

# 4.2 Embry's Individual Release of Claims

Embry, in her individual capacity, also provides a release to BDG and/or Releasees, which shall be a full and final accord and satisfaction of as well as a bar to all actions, causes of action, obligations, costs, expenses, attorney's fees, damages, losses, claims, liabilities, and demands by Embry of any nature, character, or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, arising out of alleged or actual exposures to acrylamide in Products manufactured, imported, sold, or distributed by BDG before the Effective Date.

#### 4.3 BDG's Release of Embry

BDG, on its own behalf, and on behalf of Releasees as well as its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against Embry and her attorneys and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made by Embry and her 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 Products.

#### 4.4 Mutual Release of Known and Unknown Claims

Embry, on behalf of herself and her agents, attorneys, representatives, successors, and assigns, in her respective individual capacity only and not in her representative capacity, and BDG, each provide a general release of the other including the Releasees herein which shall be effective as a full and final accord and satisfaction, as a bar to all claims of any nature, character or kind, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, arising out of alleged violations of Proposition 65 with respect to the Products. Embry and BDG each acknowledge that they are each familiar with Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides 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.

## 5. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved and entered by the Court and shall be null and void if 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 to in writing.

# 6. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

Subsequent to the Court's approval and entry of this Consent Judgment, if any provision is held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the remaining provisions shall not be adversely affected.

# 7. 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 for reasons, including but not limited to changes in the law, or if the state of California's No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) for acrylamide is increased by OEHHA or through other legal process to a level greater than or equal to 1.0 mcg/day, then BDG may provide written notice to Embry of any asserted change, and shall have no further injunctive obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, the Products are so affected.

///

#### 8. NOTICE

Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notice required by this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and sent by: (i) personal delivery; (ii) first-class, registered, or certified mail, return receipt requested; or (iii) a recognized overnight courier to the following addresses:

5	For BDG:	For Embry:
6	Merton A. Howard	Noam Glick

Merton A. Howard

Hanson Bridgett LLP

425 Market Street, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94115

Noam Glick
Glick Law Group, PC
225 Broadway, 21st Floor
San Diego, CA 92101

Any Party may, from time to time, specify in writing to the other, a change of address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.

#### 9. COUNTERPARTS; FACSIMILE SIGNATURES

This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by signature through facsimile or portable document format (PDF), each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.

#### 10. POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

Embry agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f). The Parties further acknowledge that, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f), a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of the settlement, which motion Embry shall draft and file. In furtherance of obtaining such approval, the Parties agree to mutually employ their best efforts, including those of their counsel, to support the entry of this agreement as judgment, and to obtain judicial approval of their settlement in a timely manner. For purposes of this Section, "best efforts" shall include, at a minimum, supporting the motion for approval, responding to any objection that any third-party may make, and appearing at the hearing before the Court if so requested.

#### 11. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified only by: (i) a written agreement of the Parties and entry of a modified consent judgment thereon by the Court; or (ii) a successful motion or application of any Party, and the entry of a modified consent judgment thereon by the Court.

1	12. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>				
2	The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment and acknowledge that they				
3	have read, understand, and agree to all of the terms and conditions contained herein.				
4					
5	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:			
6					
7	Date: June 13, 2018	Date: 15 2018			
8	By: 2-6-20	By: Sentablee			
9	KIM EMBRY	Dean La Ualle [print name] Blue Diamond Growers			
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27	II				