1	Fredric Evenson (State Bar No. 198059) ECOLOGY LAW CENTER		
2	P.O. Box 1000 Santa Cruz, California 95061		
3	Telephone: (831) 454-8216 Email: evenson@ecologylaw.com		
4	Christopher Sproul (Bar No. 126398)		
5	ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES 5135 Anza Street		
6	San Francisco, California 94121 Telephone: (415) 533-3376, (510) 847-3467		
7	Facsimile: (415) 358-5695 Email: csproul@enviroadvocates.com		
8	Counsel for Flamuii,		
9	ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION		
10			
11			
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
13			
14	ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION,	Case No. CGC-18-567068	
15	Plaintiff, v.	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT	
16	CLARK ASSOCIATES, INC., et al.,	AS TO CLARK ASSOCIATES, INC.	
17			
18	Defendants.		
19			
20	1 NYTHOONY CTYON		
21	1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>		
22	1.1 On June 8, 2018, the Ecological Rights Foundation (" <u>ERF</u> ") acting on behalf of		
23	itself and the general public, filed a complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief in San		
24	Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-567068 ("Complaint"), against, among others,		
25	defendant Clark Associates, Inc., (also referred to herein as "Clark" or "Defendant"). ERF and		
26	Clark may each be referred to individually as a "Party" and/or collectively as the "Parties." The		
27	Complaint alleges, among other things, that Defendant violated provisions of the Safe Drinking		
28			

24 25

26 27

28

Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5, et seq. ("Proposition 65") by failing to give clear and reasonable warnings to residents of California who use charcoal grills, including but not limited to, the Backyard Pro 30" Heavy-Duty Steel Charcoal Grill, manufactured, distributed, imported, sold, and/or offered for sale in California by Clark ("Covered Products"), and that use of the Covered Products causes exposures to carbon monoxide. Carbon monoxide is a chemical known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity. The Complaint is based upon a 60-Day Notice letter, sent by ERF on December 4, 2017, to Clark, the California Attorney General, all District Attorneys, and all City Attorneys with populations exceeding 750,000 (the "Notice").

- 1.2 Defendant is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of Proposition 65, that manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and/or offers for sale Covered Products. ERF alleges that the intended use of Covered Products causes carbon monoxide to be released into the air from the combustion of charcoal fuel, causing inhalation exposures to consumers when they use the Covered Products. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.8, carbon monoxide is a chemical known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity. ERF alleges that Covered Products that are manufactured, distributed, imported, sold, and/or offered for sale in California by Defendant and others require a warning under Proposition 65, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Clark, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and Notice.
- 1.3 This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the Parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material, factual, and legal allegation in the Complaint or Notice, each and every allegation of which Clark denies. Nor may this Consent

23

24 25

26

27 28 Judgment, or compliance with it, be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Clark or its affiliated companies. Clark has been providing Proposition 65-compliant warnings on its products, including the Covered Products, since February 2018.

1.4 The term "Effective Date" means the date that Defendant's counsel receives notice from ERF's counsel that this Consent Judgment was approved and entered by the Court.

#### **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF** 2.

#### 2.1 **Warnings on Covered Products**

Commencing no later than one hundred twenty (120) days after the Effective Date, Clark shall provide clear and reasonable warnings for all Covered Products offered for sale in California as set forth in this section 2.1(a)-(b). There shall be no obligation for Clark to provide a warning for Covered Products that enter the stream of commerce prior to the Effective Date.

## (a) Long Form Warning<sup>1</sup>

**WARNING**: This product can expose you to carbon monoxide [and/or other chemical], which is[are] known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

# (b) Short Form Warning<sup>2</sup>

▲ WARNING: [Cancer and ]Reproductive Harm - www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

#### 2.2 **Warning Placement**

The warning shall be affixed to, or printed on packaging for, Covered Products. Further, to the extent Clark provides instruction booklets with Covered Products, Clark shall affix such warnings inside Covered Products' instruction booklets on the earlier of either: (i) one year after the Effective Date, or (ii) when new instruction booklets are printed or reprinted. Any warnings provided in accordance with this Consent Judgment shall be displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices as to render

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Bracketed content is optional.

them likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use. The word "WARNING:" shall be in upper case letters and bold text as shown above. The warning symbol to the left of the word "WARNING" must be a black exclamation point in a yellow equilateral triangle with a black outline, except if the packaging does not use the color yellow, then Defendant may utilize a black exclamation point in a white triangle with black border.

#### 2.3 Compliance with Warning Regulations

Clark shall be deemed to be in compliance with this Consent Judgment by either adhering to sections 2.1(a)-(b) and 2.2, or by complying with warning requirements adopted by the California Office of Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), or as they may be amended, under Article 6 of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations.

### 2.4 **Reporting**

No later than 150 days after the Effective Date, Defendant shall provide a certification signed by an officer or director of Defendant to ERF confirming its compliance with the warning requirements of paragraph 2.1, and the payment to OEHHA pursuant to paragraphs 3.1.

#### 3. <u>SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS</u>

#### 3.1 Civil Penalties and Payments In Lieu of Penalties

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(2), Clark shall pay \$2,000 in civil penalties. The penalty payment will be allocated in accordance with California Health and Safety Code section 25249.12(c)(1) & (d), with 75% of the penalty amount remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of the penalty amount paid to Ecological Rights Foundation. Defendant will provide these payments in two checks for the following amounts made payable to: 1) "OEHHA" in the amount of \$1,500, and 2) "Ecological Rights Foundation" in the amount of \$500.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### 3.2 Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Costs

In settlement of all of the claims that are alleged, or could have been alleged, in the Complaint or Notice concerning Covered Products, Clark shall pay \$17,500 to the Ecology Law Center to cover Plaintiff's attorneys' fees and costs.

#### 3.3 Payments

All Payments shall be sent no later than ten (10) business days after the Effective Date via USPS certified mail, return receipt requested or by UPS or FedEx Two-Day or Overnight Delivery, to the following addresses: All payments to Ecological Rights Foundation and Ecology Law Center shall be delivered to:

Fredric Evenson Ecology Law Center P.O. Box 1000 Santa Cruz, CA 95061

The payment to OEHHA shall be delivered to:

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

or

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

# 4. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 As to Covered Products, this Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERF, acting on behalf of itself and acting in the public interest, and Clark, and its parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, shareholders, officers, employees, representatives, agents, all of their suppliers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers (including, but not limited to The Webstaurant Store, Inc.), and their respective parents, affiliates, subsidiaries,

shareholders, officers, employees, representatives, agents, or any other person in the course of doing business, and the successors, predecessors, and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute directly or indirectly, or sell Covered Products (including, but not limited to Amazon.com, Inc.) ("Released Entities"), of all claims for violations of Proposition 65 based on exposures to carbon monoxide from Covered Products as set forth in the Notice, with respect to any Covered Products manufactured, distributed, sold, or offered for sale prior to one hundred twenty (120) days after the Effective Date. This Consent Judgment shall have preclusive effect such that no other person or entity, whether purporting to act in his, her, or its interests or the public interest shall be permitted to pursue and/or take any action with respect to any violation of Proposition 65 that was alleged in the Complaint, or that could have been brought pursuant to the Notice against Clark or any of the Released Entities. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with regard to carbon monoxide exposures from Covered Products.

- 4.2 In addition to the foregoing, ERF, on behalf of itself, successors and/or assignees, and not its representative capacity, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action against and releases Clark and Released Entities from any and all manner of actions, causes of actions, claims, demands, rights suits, obligations, debts, contracts, agreements, promises, liabilities, damages, charges, losses, costs, expenses, attorney's fees, of any nature whatsoever, known or unknown, in law or equity, fixed or contingent, now or in the future, with respect to any alleged violations of Proposition 65 arising from Clark's Covered Products. Notwithstanding the above, nothing herein shall limit ERF's ability to enforce this Consent Judgment pursuant to Section 6 below.
- 4.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice or the Complaint and relating to the Covered Product, will develop or be discovered. ERF on behalf of itself only, and Clark on behalf of itself only, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through

and including the Effective Date, including all causes of action, claims, demands, rights, suits, obligations, debts, contracts, agreements promises, liabilities, damages, charges, losses, costs, expenses, of any nature, known or unknown, in law or equity, now or in the future, with respect to any alleged violations of Proposition 65 relating to the Covered Products. ERF and Clark acknowledge that the claims released above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive 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.

ERF on behalf of itself only, and Clark on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542.

## 5. <u>ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT</u>

5.1 The Parties hereby request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment.

## 6. ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

- 6.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the Parties hereto. The Parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of San Francisco County, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein.
- 6.2 In any proceeding brought by either Party to enforce this Consent Judgment, such Party may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties or remedies as may be provided by law for any violation of Proposition 65 or this Consent Judgment.

#### 7. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

7.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of both Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon a

successful motion of any Party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.

#### 8. <u>AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE</u>

8.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf of the Party represented and legally to bind that Party.

### 9. <u>SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL</u>

9.1 ERF shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment on the California Attorney General within five (5) days after it is executed by both Parties or concurrently with service of the motion for judicial approval of this Consent Judgment (whichever is sooner), consistent with Title 11, Section 3003 of the California Code of Regulations. Plaintiff shall also serve the motion for approval of this Consent Judgment, and all supporting papers, on the Attorney General no later than forty-five (45) days prior to the date of the hearing on the motion, consistent with Title 11, Section 3003 of the California Code of Regulations.

### 10. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

10.1 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 and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties.

## 11. GOVERNING LAW

11.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law provisions of California law.

1	12.	EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS			
2		12.1 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts which taken	n together		
3	shall be deemed to constitute one document.				
4	13.	COURT APPROVAL			
5		13.1 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court within one year	after it is		
6	executed by both Parties, it shall be of no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding				
7	for any purpose.				
8	14.	<u>NOTICES</u>			
9		14.1 Any notices or payments due under this Consent Judgment shall be sent	by USPS		
10	certified mail, return receipt requested, or overnight delivery via FedEx or UPS.				
11					
12		If to Ecological Rights Foundation:			
13		Fredric Evenson Ecology Law Center			
14		P.O. Box 1000 Santa Cruz, CA 95061			
15		Suitu Cluz, Cli 70001			
16		If to Clark Associates, Inc.:			
17		Malcolm C. Weiss ( <u>mweiss@huntonak.co</u>	<u>m</u> )		
18		Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP 550 South Hope Street			
19		Suite 2000 Los Angeles, CA 90071			
20		Jamie L. Pereyda (jpereyda@huntonak.com	m)		
21		Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP 50 California Street	<u></u> )		
22		Suite 1700			
23		San Francisco, CA 94111			
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
2			
3	DATED: January 24, 2019	ECOLOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION	
4		Ecological Rights Foundation	
5		Ecological Rights Foundation  BY: James Kungut, EXEC. DIR.	
6		JAMES LAMPORT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
7			
8			
9	DATED:	CLARK ASSOCIATES, INC.	
10		BY:MARK H. ZESWITZ, CFO	
11		MARK H. ZESWIIZ, CFO	
12			
13			
14	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:		
15	DATED:		
16		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25 26			
26 27			
28			

1	1 IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
2	2	
3	200	LOGICAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION
4	4 E	James Kanjut, EXEC. DIR.
5	5 Pur	Danies La tous
6	BY:	JAMES LAMPORT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
7	7	
8	8	
9	9 DATED: <u>January</u> 25, 2019 CLAF	RK ASSOCIATES, INC.
10	B1	11-47
11	1	ARK H. ZESWITZ, CFO
12	2	
13		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:	
15	5 DATED:	
16	5	TUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
17	7	
18	8	
19		
20	1	
21		
22		
23		
25		
26		
27		
28		

CONSENT JUDGMENT (CLARK ASSOCIATES, INC.)