1 2	George Rikos (State Bar No. 204864) LAW OFFICES OF GEORGE RIKOS 555 West Beech Street, Suite 500		
3	San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (858) 342-9161		
4	Facsimile: (858) 724-1453 Email: george@gerorgerikoslaw.com		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff,		
6	BRAD VAN PATTEN		
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO		
10	BRAD VAN PATTEN, an individual	Case No. 37-2020-00043693-CU-MC-CTI	
11	Plaintiff,		
12	V.	[PROPOSED] AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT	
13	INKA CROPS, S.A. a Peruvian Corporation; and DOES 1 through 10		
14			
15	Defendants.		
16	1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>		
17	1.1 The Parties. This Consent Judgr	ment ("Consent Judgment") is entered into by	
18	and between VAN PATTEN ("PLAINTIFF") and INKA CROPS, S.A, ("DEFENDANT").		
19	Together, PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT are	e collectively referred to as the "Parties."	
20	PLAINTIFF is an individual that reside in the State of California and seeks to promote awareness		
21	of exposures to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous		
22	substances contained in consumer products. DEFENDANT is a person in the course of doing		
23	business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Cal. Health		
24	& Safety Code § 25249.6, et seq. ("Proposition 65").		
25	1.2 General Allegations. PLAINTIFF alleges acrylamide is listed pursuant to		
26	Proposition 65 as a chemical known to t	he State of California to cause cancer.	
27			
20	CONSENT JUDGMENT		

CONSENT JUDGMENT

PLAINTIFFS allege that DEFENDANT has exposed individuals to acrylamide from its sales of Plantain Chips without first providing users and consumers of the product with a clear and reasonable cancer warning as required pursuant to Proposition 65.

- 1.3 Product Description. The products covered by this Consent Judgment are Plantain Chips, including, without limitation, all varieties and pack sizes of Plantain Chips, including all flavors, cut types (crinkle, flat cut, cubed, etc.), and styles (croutons, tostones, etc.), that have been manufactured, imported, distributed, offered for sale, and/or sold in California by DEFENDANT or its affiliates (the "Products"), whether sold under the Inka Crops brand, any other brand, or private label at all grocery, retail and other locations and sales channels, including on the internet. This Consent Judgment covers the Products to the extent that they are incorporated as an ingredient in any food product made or sold by others.
- August 6, 2020, respectively, PLAINTIFF served DEFENDANT and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq." (the "Notice"). The Notice provided DEFENDANT and such others, including public enforcers, with notice that alleged that DEFENDANT was in violation of Proposition 65 for failing to warn California consumers and customers that use of the Products will expose them to acrylamide. No public enforcer has diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the Notice. On November 30, 2020, based on the Notice and the absence of any authorized public prosecutor of Proposition 65 having filed a suit based on the allegations contained therein, PLAINTIFF filed a complaint in the Superior Court of and for San Diego County (the "Court"), Case No. 37-2020-00043693-CU-MC-CTL (the "Action"). For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that the Court has jurisdiction over the allegations in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over DEFENDANT, that venue is proper in the County of San Diego, and that

the Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of the claims and allegations which were or could have been raised in the Action based on the facts alleged therein and/or in the Notice.

- 1.5 No Admission. This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of any and all claims between the Parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. DEFENDANT denies each and every material allegation contained in the Notices and the Action and maintains that it has not violated Proposition 65 and/or is not subject to that law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by DEFENDANT of any fact, finding, issue of law, or violation of law; nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by DEFENDANT of any fact, finding, conclusion, issue of law, or violation of law, such being specifically denied by DEFENDANT. However, this Section 1.5 shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of DEFENDANT under this Consent Judgment.
- 1.6 Effective Date. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" shall mean the date this Consent Judgment has been approved by the Court and PLAINTIFFS have provided notice to DEFENDANT that it has been entered in the Court's records as a consent judgment.
- **1.7 Compliance Date**. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Compliance Date" shall mean August 1, 2021.

2. <u>INJUNCTIVE RELIEF</u>

2.1 Reformulation of Product

Subject to Section 2.2, any Products that DEFENDANT elects to manufacture, import, distribute, sell, or offer for sale in California manufactured after the Compliance Date shall not exceed 260 parts per billion ("ppb") on average for acrylamide ("Reformulation Level"), as set forth in Section 2.3. As used in this Section 2.1, "for sale in California" means to directly ship a Product into California or to sell a Product to a

distributor that DEFENDANT knows will sell the Product in California.

2.1.1. Sell-Through Provision. Notwithstanding anything else in this Consent Judgment, Defendant shall not be subject to further liability for any Products that were manufactured before the Compliance Date, regardless of when such Products were, or are in the future, distributed or sold to customers.

2.2 Reformulation Level and Changes in Proposition 65

- (a) Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be interpreted to mean that the Reformulation Level is the lowest feasible level for acrylamide in the Products or that it is even a feasible level for the Products.
- (b) Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice DEFENDANT from, at its option, establishing that an alternative acrylamide concentration level is more appropriate based on the criteria set forth under Proposition 65 and its implementing regulations.
- (c) If (i) Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations are changed from their terms as they exist on the date the Parties stipulated to this Consent Judgment with respect to levels of acrylamide that trigger Proposition 65's warning obligations; or (ii) a California agency in charge of overseeing Proposition 65 (*e.g.*, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment) takes some other final regulatory action concerning acrylamide and products similar to the Products, including but not limited to establishing whether and when there is any exposure to acrylamide from products similar to the Products and/or that alternative acrylamide levels trigger warning requirements for products similar to the Products, then: DEFENDANT, at its sole and absolute discretion, shall be entitled to comply with such law, regulation, or action or the requirements of this Consent Judgment.

2.3 Testing

(a) Compliance with the Reformulation Level is determined by randomly selecting and testing at least one sample each from at least four (4) and up to eight (8)

different lots of a particular Covered Product (or the maximum number of lots available for testing if fewer than four), during a testing period of at least 365 days, for a total of ten (10) samples. The mean and standard deviation shall be calculated using the sampling data. Any data points or outliers that are more than three standard deviations outside the mean shall be discarded, and the mean and standard deviation recalculated using the remaining data points. The mean determined in accordance with this procedure shall be deemed the "Average Level." Compliance with the Reformulation Level shall be determined using:

- i. GC/MS (Gas Chromatograph/Mass Spectrometry),
- ii. LC-MS/MS (Liquid Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometry), or
- iii. any other testing method agreed upon by the Parties.

Any testing for purposes of this Consent Judgment shall be performed by Eurofins, Silliker, KPrime, or any laboratory accredited by the State of California, a federal agency, or a nationally recognized organization.

3. CONSENT JUDGMENT PAYMENTS

3.1 Civil Penalties

DEFENDANT shall pay \$10,000 as a civil penalty, allocated in accordance with Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.12(c)(1) and (d), with 75% of the penalty to be remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and the remaining 25% of the Penalty remitted to PLAINTIFF no later than ten (10) calendar days following the Effective Date. More specifically, DEFENDANT shall issue two separate checks for the civil penalty payment to (a) "Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment" in the amount of \$7,500 (75%); and to (b) "Law Offices of George Rikos in Trust" in the amount of \$2,500 (25%). Within ten (10) calendar days of the Effective Date, DEFENDANT shall deliver these payments as follows:

(i) The penalty payment owed to PLAINTIFFS shall be delivered to the following address:

George Rikos
Law Offices of George Rikos
555 West Beech, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92101

(ii) The penalty payment owed to OEHHA (EIN: 68-0284486) shall be delivered directly to OEHHA (Memo Line "Prop 65 Penalties") at the following address:

Mike Gyurics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
Attn. Prop 65 Penalties – PLAINTIFFS v. DEFENDANTS Consent Judgment
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

DEFENDANT shall provide PLAINTIFFS' counsel with a copy of the check it sends to OEHHA with its penalty payment to PLAINTIFFS.

3.2 Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Costs

Within ten (10) calendar days of the Effective Date, DEFENDANT shall reimburse PLAINTIFF's counsel \$100,000 for fees and costs incurred as a result of investigating and bringing this matter to DEFENDANT'S attention, negotiating a Consent Judgment in the public interest, and obtaining the Court's approval of the Consent Judgment and its entry as a consent judgment. DEFENDANT shall issue a check for this amount payable to "Law Offices of George Rikos" and deliver it to the address identified in Section 3.1 above. DEFENDANT'S payment obligations shall be tolled until it receives an IRS W-9 form for this payee.

4. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 Release of DEFENDANT and Downstream Customers and Entities.

This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between PLAINTIFFS, acting on his own behalf and in the public interest, and DEFENDANT of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted by PLAINTIFFS or on behalf of his past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, predecessors, successors, and/or assigns

(collectively, "Releasors") for failure to provide warnings for alleged exposures to acrylamide contained in the Products, and Releasors hereby release any such claims against DEFENDANT and their parents, shareholders, members, directors, officers, managers, employees, representatives, agents, attorneys, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, partners, sister companies, and affiliates, and their predecessors, successors, and assigns (collectively, "DEFENDANT Releasees"), and each entity to whom DEFENDANT directly or indirectly distributes or sells the Products, including but not limited to, downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, and retailers, and their respective subsidiaries, affiliates and parents, franchisees, cooperative members, licensees, and all other entities in the distribution chain of the Product (collectively, "Downstream Releasees"), from all claims for violations of Proposition 65 with respect to any Products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by DEFENDANT prior to the Compliance Date based on failure to warn of alleged exposure to the chemical acrylamide from the Products.

In further consideration of the promises and agreements herein contained, and for the payments to be made pursuant to Section 3 above, PLAINTIFFS, on behalf of themself, their past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, hereby covenants not to sue and waives any right to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action and releases all claims that he may have, including without limitation, all actions and causes of action in law and in equity, all obligations, expenses (including without limitation all attorneys' fees, expert fees, and investigation fees, and costs), damages, losses, liabilities and demands against any of the DEFENDANT Releasees and/or Downstream Releasees of any nature, character, or kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, limited to and arising out of the alleged or actual exposure to chemicals contained in DEFENDANT'S Product.

4.2 DEFENDANT'S Release of PLAINTIFFS. DEFENDANT, on behalf of themselves, their past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or

CONSENT JUDGMENT

assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against PLAINTIFFS, their attorneys, and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made by PLAINTIFF and/or his attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims or otherwise seeking to enforce Proposition 65 against it in this matter.

4.3 California Civil Code Section 1542. It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice and relating to the Products will develop or be discovered. PLAINTIFF on behalf of himself only, on one hand, and DEFENDANT, on the other hand, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through the Compliance Date, including all rights of action therefor. The Parties acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, 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 THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT each acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542.

4.4 Deemed Compliance with Proposition 65. Compliance by DEFENDANT with this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to exposure to acrylamide from the Products. Products distributed by DEFENDANT prior to the Compliance Date may be sold through as previously manufactured and labeled.

5.

234-

CONSENT JUDGMENT

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

a consent judgment based on the motion for its approval PLAINTIFF will be making

pursuant to Section 10 below. Upon entry of the Consent Judgment as a consent judgment,

PLAINTIFF and DEFENDANT waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the

allegations contained in the Complaint.

ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

6. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

If, subsequent to the execution of this Consent Judgment, any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are deemed by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions remaining shall not be adversely affected but only to the extent the deletion of the provision deemed unenforceable does not materially affect, or otherwise result in the effect of the Consent Judgment being contrary to, the intent of the Parties in entering into this Consent Judgment.

7. GOVERNING LAW/ENFORCEMENT

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the law of the State of California and apply within the State of California. The rights to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment are exclusively conferred on the Parties hereto. Any Party may, after providing sixty (60) days' written notice and meeting and conferring within a reasonable time thereafter to attempt to resolve any issues, by motion or application for an order to show cause before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In the event that Proposition 65 or its regulations applicable to the Products are repealed, or are otherwise rendered inapplicable or invalid, including but not limited to by reason of law generally, due to federal preemption, or the First Amendment commercial speech rights of the U.S. Constitution, as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction of an agency of the federal government, then DEFENDANT shall provide written notice to PLAINTIFF of any asserted repeal or determination. Upon DEFENDANT'S written

	notice, DEFENDANT shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment			
	to the extent such repeal or determination affects DEFENDANT'S obligations with respec			
to the Product.				
	8. <u>NOTICES</u>			
	Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided			
	pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by			
	(i) first-class (registered or certified mail) return receipt requested; or (ii) overnight or two-			
	day courier on any Party by the other Party to the following addresses:			
For DEFENDANT:				
	Mr. Andres Abusada Inka Crops S.A. Av. El Santuario 1127, Urb. Zarate San Juan de Lurigancho Lima 15427 - PERU With copies to: Mr. John Angerer Inka Foods, Inc. 7011 Sylvan Rd., Ste. B Citrus Heights, CA 95610 Email: JAngerer@inkafoods.com Meredith Jones-McKeown, Esq. Jasmine Wetherell, Esq. Perkins Coie LLP 1888 Century Park East, Suite 1700 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Ph: (310) 788-9900 Email: MJonesMcKeown@perkinscoie.com JWetherell@perkinscoie.com			
	For PLAINTIFF:			
	George Rikos, Esq. Law Offices of George Rikos 555 West Beech, Suite 500 San Diego, CA 92101 Email: george@georgerikoslaw.com Either Party, from time to time, may specify in writing to the other Party a change of			

CONSENT JUDGMENT

address to which all notices and other communications shall be sent.

9. <u>COUNTERPARTS: SIGNATURES</u>

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

10. COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 25249.7(f)

PLAINTIFF agrees to comply with the reporting requirements referenced in Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(f) and to seek, by formal and properly noticed motion (including with service to the Office of the California Attorney General being fully effectuated at least forty-five (45) days prior to a requested hearing thereon), approval of this Consent Judgment's terms pursuant to Proposition 65 and its associated entry as a consent judgment by the Court.

11. MODIFICATION

Unless otherwise provided for herein, this Consent Judgment may be modified only by a written agreement of the Parties and the approval of the Court or upon a duly noticed motion of either Party for good cause shown. A showing of technical infeasibility or commercial unreasonableness in meeting the requirements of Section 2 with respect to the Products shall be deemed to constitute good cause for a modification to substitute an alternative no significant risk level on the basis of 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25703(b) in place of the cancer risk level and presumptive ppb average concentration threshold set forth in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, and such a modification shall not be opposed by PLAINTIFFS. Any proposed modification shall be sent to the Office of the California Attorney General in advance of its submission to the Court such that the Attorney General has a reasonable opportunity to review and comment thereon.

12. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement of the Parties and

any and all prior negotiations and understandings related hereto shall be deemed to have been merged within it. No representations or terms of agreement other than those contained herein exist or have been made by any Party with respect to the other Party or the subject 4 matter hereof. This Consent Judgment shall have no effect if it is not approved by the Court and entered as a consent judgment. 13. **AUTHORIZATION** The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment and have read, understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. APPROVED AS TO FORM: APPROVED AS TO FORM: 10 Date: March 4, 2021 Date: March 4, 2021 12 By: George Rikos George Rikos Counsel to PLAINTIFF Counsel for DEFENDANT 14 **AGREED TO: AGREED TO:** 16 Date:_____ Date:____ 17 18 By: ______ By: _____ 19 INKA CROPS S.A. Brad Van Patten 20 IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT THE CONSENT 22 JUDGMENT SET FORTH ABOVE SHALL PROMPTLY BE ENTERED AS A CONSENT JUDGMENT BY THIS COURT: 23 24 DATED: 25 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT 26 27

CONSENT JUDGMENT

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15

21

any and all prior negotiations and understandings related hereto shall be deemed to have been merged within it. No representations or terms of agreement other than those contained herein exist or have been made by any Party with respect to the other Party or the subject matter hereof. This Consent Judgment shall have no effect if it is not approved by the Court and entered as a consent judgment.

AUTHORIZATION 13.

The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment and have read,

8	understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment		
9	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
10	ATTROVED AS TO FORM:	AFFROVED AS TO FORM:	
11	Date:	Date:	
12			
13	By: George Rikos	By: Jasmine Wetherell	
14	Counsel to PLAINTIFF	Counsel for DEFENDANT	
15			
16	AGREED TO: AGREED TO:		
17	By: Brad Van Patten	Date: 03/04/2021	
18			
19	By: H	By:	
20	Brad Van Patten	INKA CROPS S.A.	
21			
22	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT THE CONSENT JUDGMENT SET FORTH ABOVE SHALL PROMPTLY BE ENTERED AS A		
23	CONSENT JUDGMENT BY THIS COURT:		
24	DATED:		
25	_	UDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
26	·		
27			
28	CONSENT JUDGMENT		

any and all prior negotiations and understandings related hereto shall be deemed to have					
been merged within it. No representations or terms of agreement other than those contained					
herein exist or have been made by any Party	with respect to the other Party or the subject				
matter hereof. This Consent Judgment shall	matter hereof. This Consent Judgment shall have no effect if it is not approved by the				
Court and entered as a consent judgment.					
13. <u>AUTHORIZATION</u>					
The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment and have read					
understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment					
APPROVED AS TO FORM:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:				
Date:	Date:				
By: George Rikos Counsel to PLAINTIFF	By: Jasmine Wetherell Counsel for DEFENDANT				
AGREED TO:					
Date: 03/04/202/ Date:					
Date: 03/04/202/ Date:					
Brad Van Patten	INKA CROPS S.A.				
IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT THE CONSENT JUDGMENT SET FORTH ABOVE SHALL PROMPTLY BE ENTERED AS A CONSENT JUDGMENT BY THIS COURT:					
DATED:					
JU	DGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT				

CONSENT JUDGMENT