1 2	MIGUEL A. CUSTODIO, JR., STATE BAR NO. 248744 VINEET DUBEY, STATE BAR NO. 243208 CUSTODIO & DUBEY LLP	
3	448 S. Hill St., Suite 615 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 593-9095	
4	Facsimile: (213) 785-2899	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff Ecological Alliance, LLC	
6	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE S	TATE OF CALIFORNIA
7	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
8	(Unlimited Jurisdiction)	
9	ECOLOGICAL ALLIANCE, LLC, a California limited liability company,	Case No.:
11	infined habinty company,	IDDADASENI STIDIJI ATEN
12	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT
13	v.	
14	D.M. MERCHANDISING, INC., an Illinois corporation,	
1516	Defendant.	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Plaintiff Ecological Alliance, LLC ("Plaintiff"), and Defendant D.M. Merchandising, Inc. ("Defendant") hereby enter into this Stipulated Consent Judgment ("Consent Judgment") as follows:

WHEREAS: On or about July 26, 2018, Plaintiff, through Plaintiff's counsel, served a 60 Day Notice to Defendant, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every County in the State of California, and the City Attorneys for every City in the State of California with a population greater than 750,000 (collectively, "Public Prosecutor(s)") alleging that Defendant violated California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health and Safety Code § 25249.6, et seq., and its implementing regulations (collectively, "Proposition 65") and that Plaintiff intended to file an enforcement action in the public interest; and

WHEREAS: Plaintiff alleges that Defendant manufactured and/or distributed flyswatters (collectively the "Covered Products") that were sold or distributed for sale in California and further alleges that those Covered Products expose consumers in the State of California to chemicals including Di(2-ethylhexy)phthalate [DEHP], which are listed by the State of California pursuant to California Health and Safety Code § 25249.8; and

WHEREAS: Plaintiff further alleges that persons in the State of California were exposed to DEHP in Covered Products without being provided the Proposition 65 warning set out at California Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 and its implementing regulations ("Proposition 65 Warning");

WHEREAS: Defendant denies the allegations of the 60 Day Notice, and denies that it has violated Proposition 65 and expressly denies that it has engaged in any wrongdoing whatsoever,

WHEREAS: Plaintiff seeks to provide the public with Proposition 65 warnings and believes that this objective is achieved by the actions described in this Consent Judgment; and

WHEREAS: Plaintiff and Defendant wish to resolve their differences without the delay and expense of litigation.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED AND AGREED UPON AS BETWEEN PLAINTIFF ACTING IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST AND DEFENDANT AS FOLLOWS:

1. Introduction

- 1.1. On July 26, 2018, Plaintiff served the 60-Day Notice upon Defendant and on Public Prosecutors. No Public Prosecutors commenced an enforcement action. No Public Prosecutor having commenced an enforcement action, Plaintiff proceeded to file its Complaint against Defendant in the present action.
- 1.2. Defendant employs ten (10) or more persons.
- 1.3. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, Plaintiff and Defendant (the "Parties") stipulate that: 1) this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violation contained in the Complaint, and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint; 2) venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles; and 3) this Court has jurisdiction to enter 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 the Covered Products, and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged in the 60-Day Notice, in the present action, or arising therefrom or related thereto, with respect to Covered Products, including any Proposition 65 claim arising out of an exposure to Covered Products (collectively, "Proposition 65 Claims").
- 1.4. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of the Proposition 65 Claims, for the purpose of avoiding prolonged and costly litigation and of resolving the issues raised therein both as to past and future conduct. By execution of this Consent Judgment and agreeing to comply with its terms, the Parties do not admit any fact, conclusion of law, or violation of law, nor shall Defendant's compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Defendant of any fact, conclusion of law, or violation of law. Defendant denies the material, factual, and legal allegations in the 60-Day Notice and the Complaint and expressly denies any wrongdoing whatsoever.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1. "Effective Date" shall mean, with respect to this Consent Judgment, the date the Consent Judgment has been approved and entered by the Court.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 3.1. For Covered Products manufactured, imported, or purchased by Defendant after the Effective Date for sale to consumers in the State of California, Defendant agrees to undertake, or cause to be undertaken on its behalf, either (a) reformulation of the Covered Product to bring it within the Proposition 65 exemption identified in Section 3.2 below, or (b) provide a warning as prescribed in Sections 3.3-3.4 below. Compliance with this Section 3.1 will constitute compliance by Defendant with all requirements of Proposition 65 relating to DEHP exposure in the Covered Products:
- 3.2. Proposition 65 Exemption for the Covered Products
 - A Covered Product shall be deemed to comply with Proposition 65, and be exempt from any Proposition 65 warning requirements with respect to DEHP, if no "Accessible Component Part" of such Covered Product contains more than 0.1 percent (1,000 parts per million) of DEHP. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, "Accessible Component Part" shall mean components of the Covered Products to which a person would be exposed to DEHP by direct contact during normal use of the Covered Product.
- 3.3. <u>Warning Option</u>
 - Covered Products that do not meet the warning exemption standard set forth in Section 3.2 above, shall be accompanied by a warning as described in Section 3.4 below. No Proposition 65 warning shall be required as to any Covered Products that have been manufactured, imported, or purchased by Defendant or its downstream distributors (including J. C. Penney Corporation, Inc.) as of the Effective Date.
- 3.4. <u>Warning Language</u>
 - Where required to meet the criteria set forth in Section 3.3, Defendant shall provide one of the following warning statements on or within the unit packaging of the Covered

Defendant; all of Defendant's parent companies, all of Defendant's officers, directors,

members, shareholders, employees, attorneys, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, and retailers, including but not limited to J. C. Penney Corporation, Inc.; each of their parent companies, subsidiaries, and affiliates; each of their respective directors, officers, employees, agents and assigns, as well as all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain for any of the Covered Products, and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them (collectively, the "Released Parties"), for any alleged violation of Proposition 65, and its implementing regulations, for failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings for the Covered Products with respect to DEHP, and fully resolves all claims that have been brought, or which could have been brought in this action up to and including the Effective Date. Plaintiff on behalf of itself, and in the public interest, hereby 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, with respect to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings about exposures to DEHP for any or all of the Covered Products manufactured, imported, or purchased by Defendant or its downstream distributors as of the Effective Date.

5.2. It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts contained in the 60-Day Notice, or alleged in the Complaint, relating to the Covered Products, will hereafter be discovered or developed. Plaintiff, on behalf of itself only, on the one hand, and Defendant, on the other hand, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims through and including the Effective Date, including all rights of action thereon. Plaintiff acknowledges that the claims released in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 may include unknown claims, and nevertheless intend to release such claims, and in doing so waive California Civil Code § 1542 which 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

10.3. 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.

- 10.4. No supplementation, modification, waiver, or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby, and approved and ordered by the Court.
- 10.5. 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.

11. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

12. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS

12.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude Plaintiff from resolving any claim against another entity on terms that are different from those contained in this Consent Judgment.

13. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

13.1. This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which, taken together, shall constitute the same document. Execution of the Consent Judgment by e-mail, facsimile, or other electronic means, shall constitute legal and binding execution and delivery. Any photocopy of the executed Consent Judgment shall have the same force and effect as the original.

14. AUTHORIZATION

14.1. The undersigned are authorized to stipulate to, enter into, and execute this Consent Judgment on behalf of their respective parties, and have read, understood, and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment.

1			
2	15. SEVERABILITY		
3	15.1. If subsequent to Court approval of this Consent Judgment, any part or provision is		
4	declared by a Court to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining portions or		
5	provisions shall continue in full force and effect.		
6			
7	AGREED TO:		
8	Ecological Alliance LLC		
9			
10	Date:		
11	By:		
12			
13	AGREED TO:		
14	D.M. Merchandising, Inc.		
15	Date:		
16	By: hyli		
17	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
18	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that, pursuant to Health &		
19	Safety Code § 25249.7(f)(4) and Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6, judgment is hereby entered.		
20			
21	Dated:		
22	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28 I			