SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

COMMUNITY SCIENCE INSTITUTE,

Plaintiff.

PLUM, INC. dba PLUM ORGANICS and PLUM, PBC,

Defendants.

Case No.:

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1. **DEFINITIONS**

v.

- 1.1. The "Complaint" means the operative complaint in the above-captioned matter.
- 1.2. "Covered Products" means the following products: (i) 2 Grow Well Tummy Prune, Pear, Peach & Pumpkin with Chia; (ii) Mighty Dinos Cheddar Organic Baked Crackers;
- (iii) Mighty Sticks Berry Beet Whole Grain Snacks; (iv) Mighty Snack Bars Strawberry;
- (v) Mighty Sticks Apple Carrot Whole Grain Snacks; (vi) Mighty Snack Bars Blueberry; and (vii) Little Yums Pumpkin & Banana Organic Teething Wafers.
- 1.3. The "Effective Date" of this Stipulated Consent Judgment ("Consent Judgment") is the date the Court approves and enters this Consent Judgment.
 - 1.4. The "Compliance Date" is the date that is four (4) months after the Effective Date.

US:164036384VI

11 12

10

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 2.1

22 23

24

25 26

27

2. INTRODUCTION

- The Parties to this Consent Judgment are Plaintiff Community Science Institute 2.1. ("CSI") and Defendants Plum, Inc., dba Plum Organics and Plum PBC (collectively, "Plum"). CSI and Plum (collectively, the "Parties" and individually, a "Party") enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain claims asserted by CSI against Plum as set forth in the Complaint.
- 2.2. CSI is an unincorporated association whose mission is to unite consumers and industrial neighbors to reform government and industry practices for a toxic free future.
 - 2.3. Plum manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Products.
- 2.4. On May 16, 2018, CSI served a 60-day Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 on the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000, and to Plum, alleging that Plum violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons in California to acrylamide contained in Covered Products without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning (the "Notice"). A true and correct copy of the Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- Based on information exchanged between the Parties, CSI agrees not to dispute that 2.5. the following Covered Products comply with Proposition 65: Mighty Snack Bars – Strawberry, Mighty Snack Bars – Blueberry, and Little Yums - Pumpkin & Banana Organic Teething Wafers.
- More than 60 days have passed since the Notice was served on the Attorney General, 2.6. public enforcers, and Plum and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Plum with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.
- 2.7. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has iurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Plum 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 and in the Notices with respect to Covered Products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by or on behalf of Plum.

2.8. Plum denies the allegations in the Notice and Complaint, and 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.

3. PLUM'S DUTIES

- 3.1. Beginning on the Compliance Date, Plum shall not manufacture, or purchase from another manufacturer, for "Distribution in California" the following products: 2 Grow Well Tummy Prune, Pear, Peach & Pumpkin with Chia, Mighty Dinos Cheddar Organic Baked Crackers, Mighty Sticks Berry Beet Whole Grain Snacks, and Mighty Sticks Apple Carrot Whole Grain Snacks (the "Discontinued Products").
- 3.2. As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distribution in California" shall mean to directly ship a Discontinued Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Discontinued Product to a distributor that Plum knows or has reason to know will sell the Discontinued Product in California.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1. **Total Settlement Amount.** In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement payments, attorney's fees and costs (including, but not limited to, fees and costs incurred by attorneys, experts, and investigators), Plum shall make a total payment of \$125,000 ("Total Settlement Amount") to CSI within fifteen (15) calendar days of the Effective Date ("Due Date"). Plum shall make this payment by a check made payable to Lozeau Drury LLP and delivered to Lozeau Drury LLP, 410 12th Street, Suite 250, Oakland, California 94607. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.2. **Allocation of Payments.** The Total Settlement Amount shall be allocated as follows:

4.2.1. Civil Penalty. \$48,715.05 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). CSI shall remit 75% (\$36,749.95) of the civil penalty to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety Code section 25249.12(c). CSI will retain the remaining 25% (\$11,965.10) of the civil penalty.

- 4.2.2. Additional Settlement Payment. \$36,749.95 shall be considered an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP") pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3204. These funds shall be distributed as follows:
- 4.2.2.1. Clean Label Project. \$27,006.94 of the ASP funds shall be distributed to the Clean Label Project ("CLP"), a nonprofit focused on health and transparency in consumer product labeling. CLP will utilize the ASP for activities that address the same public harm as allegedly caused by Defendant in this matter. These activities are detailed below and support CLP's overarching goal of health and transparency in consumer product labeling and its vision is to reduce contamination across all consumer products. CLP will restrict use of the ASP received from this Consent Judgment to the following purposes:
- 4.2.2.2. ASP funds will be used by CLP for research and educational purposes associated with reducing or remediating exposures to acrylamide and other toxic chemicals contained in consumer products sold in California and/or to increase consumer awareness of the health hazards posed by acrylamide and other toxic chemicals in consumer products sold in California and how such hazards may be mitigated. Specifically, CLP will use the ASP funds to support its activities that educate the public about the potential harms of acrylamide and other toxic chemicals in food and ways to reduce those harms. As part of these educational efforts, CLP will create infographics that explain in an easy to understand manner the hazards of acrylamide and other toxic chemicals, and ways to reduce those hazards. In addition, CLP will also present this information through webinars for California residents. In addition, CLP will use the ASP funds to test additional products and create a California-specific webpage analyzing toxic chemical levels of products sold in California.

4.2.2.3. CLP's activities will have a direct and primary effect within the State of California because they funds will be used to educate California consumers about the harms of acrylamide and other toxic contaminants contained in foods, and ways to reduce those hazards. CLP's activities will also have a direct and primary effect within the State of California because CLP will create a web page that specifically analyzes Proposition 65 toxic contaminants in foods and other products that are sold in California.

4.2.2.4. CLP shall be fully accountable in that it will maintain adequate records to document and will be able to demonstrate how the ASP funds will be spent and can assure that the funds are being spent only for the proper, designated purposes described in this Consent Judgment. CLP shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty days of any request, copies of documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.

4.2.2.5. **Community Science Institute.** \$9,743.01 of the ASP funds shall be distributed to Plaintiff CSI. CSI will restrict use of the ASP received from this Consent Judgment to the following purposes:

4.2.2.6. CSI will use the funds to obtain, analyze, and test additional food products that may contain acrylamide and other toxic chemicals and are sold to California consumers, and investigate those companies that are manufacturing and selling those products that violate Proposition 65. CSI's use of the ASP funds will have a direct and primary effect within the State of California because California consumers will be benefitted by the reduction and/or elimination of exposure to acrylamide and/or other toxic chemicals in food products by providing clear and reasonable warnings to California consumers prior to ingestion of the products.

4.2.2.7. CSI shall be held fully accountable in that it will maintain adequate records to document and will be able to demonstrate how the ASP funds will be spent and can assure that the funds are being spent only for the proper, designated purposes described in this Consent Judgment. CSI shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty days of any request, copies of documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.

4.2.3. **Attorneys' Fees.** \$39,535.00 shall be distributed to Lozeau Drury LLP as reimbursement of CSI's attorney's fees and reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

5. ENFORCEMENT

- 5.1. In the event that Plum fails to remit the Total Settlement Amount owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Plum shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. CSI shall provide written notice of the delinquency to Plum via electronic mail. If Plum fails to deliver the Total Settlement Amount within five (5) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Amount shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the California Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010.
- 5.2. The Parties agree that any legal action to enforce this Consent Judgment shall be brought in Alameda County Superior Court. The Parties agree that Alameda County Superior Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the enforcement of this Consent Judgment and personal jurisdiction over Plum, and that venue is proper in Alameda County.
- 5.3. If CSI purchases a Discontinued Product in California that has a best-by or sell-by (or equivalent) date or other code that reflects that the Discontinued Product was manufactured by or for Plum on or after the Compliance Date, or if the manufacture date is not apparent from the label, CSI shall inform Plum in a reasonably prompt manner, including information sufficient to permit Plum to identify the alleged violation of this Consent Judgment. Plum shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide CSI with documentation that the Discontinued Products are in fact being discontinued in the State of California or other information to demonstrate that Plum is in compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to CSI taking any further legal action.
- 5.4. Any Party that fails to meet and confer or otherwise attempt in good faith to resolve any dispute arising under this Consent Judgment prior to seeking judicial enforcement, shall forfeit any attorney's fees and cost to which that Party may otherwise be entitled.

6. APPLICATION

6.1 This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, attorneys, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Agreement shall have no application to any Covered Product which is distributed or sold outside the State of California.

7. BINDING EFFECT; CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- 7.1. This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CSI, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Plum and its officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers, manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"). CSI, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, hereby fully releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding acrylamide for Discontinued Products manufactured, distributed, or sold prior to the Compliance Date.
- 7.2. CSI, on behalf of itself, hereby fully releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding acrylamide for Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold prior to the Compliance Date.
- 7.3. CSI and Plum each waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing

enforcement of Proposition 65 in connection with the claims in the Notice and Complaint with respect to Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold prior to the Compliance Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 7 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

7.4. It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice or Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be discovered. CSI on behalf of itself only, and Plum, 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 rights of action therefore. CSI and Plum acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 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.

CSI on behalf of itself only, and Plum on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

7.5. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any Released Party regarding alleged exposures to acrylamide in the Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold on or after the Compliance Date. Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Plum's products other than the Covered Products.

8. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS

8.1 In the event that any of the provisions of this Agreement are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

9. GOVERNING LAW

9.1 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

10. MODIFICATION

- 10.1. This Consent Judgment after its entry by the Court may be modified upon written agreement of the Parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon.
- 10.2. Plum may request that CSI agree to modify this Consent Judgment to substitute an acrylamide concentration standard that CSI agrees to in a future consent judgment or settlement agreement applicable to products manufactured by other companies that are similar to the Discontinued Products. If a dispute should arise concerning the applicability of this provision, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith to attempt to resolve the dispute, but if it cannot be resolved in that manner, either Party may present the dispute to the Alameda County Superior Court for resolution.
- 10.3. If a final decision of a court determines that warnings for acrylamide exposures or that enforcement of Proposition 65 claims for acrylamide exposures are preempted or otherwise unlawful or unconstitutional with respect to products similar to the Discontinued Products, then Plum may request that CSI agree to modify this Consent Judgment to conform to such ruling in order to avoid unfair, inconsistent, or anti-competitive results. If a dispute should arise concerning the applicability of this provision, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith to attempt to resolve the dispute, but if it cannot be resolved in that manner, either Party may present the dispute to the Alameda County Superior Court for resolution.
- 10.4. If there is any other change in law for which Plum believes a modification to this Consent Judgment is appropriate, then Plum may request that CSI agree to modify this Consent Judgment accordingly. If a dispute should arise concerning the applicability of this provision, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith to attempt to resolve the dispute, but if it cannot be resolved in that manner, either Party may present the dispute to the Alameda County Superior Court for resolution.

25

26

27

28

10.5. In any stipulated modification to the Consent Judgment, the Party requesting the modification shall prepare the draft motion or application to modify the Consent Judgment.

11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

11.1. All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below via email and first-class mail.

For Community Science Institute:

Rebecca L. Davis LOZEAU | DRURY LLP 410 12th Street, Suite 250 Oakland, CA 94607 Ph: 510-836-4200

Fax: 510-836-4205

Email: rebecca@lozeaudrury.com

For Plum:

Sarah Esmaili
ARNOLD & PORTER
Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 471-3283
Facsimile: (415) 471-3400
Email: sarah.esmaili@arnoldporter.com

12. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

12.1. This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid as the original signature.

13. DRAFTING

13.1. The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn, and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any

Judge of the Superior Court

1		
2	Dated: January 24, 2019	PLUM, INC. dba PLUM ORGANICS and
3		PLUM, PBC
4		11+5-12-
5		Signature
6		
7		MARK TUMELTY Printed Name
8		rinted Name
9		VICE PRESIDENT - MARKETING
10		Title
11	Dated: _Feb. 1, 2019	COMMUNITY SCIENCE INSTITUTE
12		Denny a- Jaren
13		Signature
14		Denny Larson
15		Printed Name
16		Executive Director
17		Title
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	III	