1 2 3 4	Charles W. Poss (SBN 325366) Environmental Research Center, Inc. 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92108 Ph: (619) 500-3090 Email: charles.poss@erc501c3.org				
5	Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.				
6	Robert T. Petraglia (SBN 264849)				
7	BraunHagey & Borden LLP 351 California St, Fl 10 San Francisco, CA 94104				
8 9	Ph: (415) 599-0210 Email: petraglia@braunhagey.com				
10	Attorney for Defendant Simple Health LLC, ind	ividually and dba			
11	Tosi				
12					
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THI	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
14	COUNTY OF	ALAMEDA			
15 16 17	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC., a California non-profit corporation	CASE NO. RG21094359 STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT			
18	Plaintiff,	Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.			
19	vs.				
20	SIMPLE HEALTH LLC, individually and	Action Filed: April 6, 2021 Trial Date: None set			
<b>つ1</b> I	dba TOSI; and DOES 1-100	That Bate. None see			
	Defendants.	That Bate. I tone set			
22	,	That Bate. Trone set			
22 23	,	That Bate. I tone set			
21 22 23 24 25	Defendants.  1. INTRODUCTION	onmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a			
22 23 24	Defendants.  1. INTRODUCTION	onmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a			
22 23 24 25	Defendants.  1. INTRODUCTION  1.1 On April 6, 2021, Plaintiff Environment	onmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a tiated this action by filing a Complaint for			

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

27

26

28

("Proposition 65"), against Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi ("Simple Health") and Does 1-100. In this action, ERC alleges that one of the products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Simple Health contains lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and exposes consumers to this chemical at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. This product (referred to hereinafter as the "Covered Product") is: Tosi Super Greens.

- 1.2 ERC and Simple Health are hereinafter referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."
- 1.3 For the purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that ERC is a 501 (c)(3) California non-profit corporation.
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that Simple Health is a business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualifies as a "person in the course of doing business" within the meaning of Proposition 65. Simple Health manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Product.
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation dated October 15, 2020 that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Simple Health ("Notice"). A true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice dated October 15, 2020, is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and is incorporated herein by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice was served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and Simple Health and no designated governmental entity has filed a Complaint against Simple Health with regard to the Covered Product or the alleged violations.
- 1.6 ERC's Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Product by California consumers exposes them to lead without first receiving clear and reasonable warnings from Simple Health, which is in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Simple Health denies all material allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint.
- 1.7 Simple Health asserts that it ceased production of the Covered Product in October, 2021; no longer sells the Covered Product, and has no intention of manufacturing,

distributing, or selling the Covered Product in the future.

- 1.8 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation.

  Nothing in this Consent Judgment nor compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law.
- 1.9 Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.
- **1.10** The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as a Judgment by this Court.

### 2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Simple Health as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date that were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint.

### 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS

3.1 Beginning on the Effective Date, Simple Health shall be permanently enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of California," or directly selling in the State of California (collectively referred to as "California Sales Practices"), any Covered Product that exposes a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day unless it meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.

3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Simple Health knows or has reason to know will sell the Covered Product in California.

3.1.2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on the label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day. If the label contains no recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

# 3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

If Simple Health is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following warning must be utilized ("Warning"):

**WARNING:** Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including lead which is 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/food.

Simple Health shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning if Simple Health has reason to believe that the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4 or if Simple Health has reason to believe that another Proposition 65 chemical is present which may require a cancer warning.

The Warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the label of each Covered Product and it must be set off from other surrounding information and enclosed in a box. In addition, for any Covered Product sold over the internet, the Warning shall appear on the checkout page when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered Product. An asterisk or other identifying method must be utilized to identify which product on the checkout page is subject to the Warning. In no event shall any internet or website Warning

be contained in or made through a link.

The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on the website or on the label and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. No statements intended to or likely to have the effect of diminishing the impact of the Warning on the average lay person shall accompany the Warning. Further no statements may accompany the Warning that state or imply that the source of the listed chemical has an impact on or results in a less harmful effect of the listed chemical.

Simple Health must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements or designs on the label, or on its website, if applicable, to render the Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use of the product. Where a sign or label used to provide the Warning for a Covered Product includes consumer information about the Covered Product in a language other than English, the Warning must also be provided in that language in addition to English.

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "label" means a display of written, printed or graphic material that is printed on or affixed to a Covered Product or its immediate container or wrapper.

# 3.3 Conforming Covered Products

A Conforming Covered Product is a Covered Product for which the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day as determined by the exposure methodology set forth in Section 3.1.2 and the quality control methodology described in Section 3.4, and that is not known by Simple Health to contain other chemicals that violate Proposition 65's safe harbor thresholds.

# 3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology

**3.4.1** Subject to Section 3.4.7, beginning within one year of the Effective Date, Simple Health shall arrange for lead testing of the Covered Product at least once a year for a minimum of five consecutive years by arranging for testing of three (3) randomly selected samples of the Covered Product, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which Simple Health intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a consumer in California or

"Distributing into the State of California." If tests conducted pursuant to this Section demonstrate that no Warning is required for the Covered Product during each of five consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Covered Product. However, if during or after the five-year testing period, Simple Health changes ingredient suppliers for the Covered Product and/or reformulates the Covered Product, Simple Health shall test that Covered Product annually for at least four (4) consecutive years after such change is made. Simple Health shall not be obligated to test the Covered Product if it was discontinued before the Effective Date and is no longer being sold after the Effective Date unless Simple Health resumes sales of the discontinued Covered Product after the Effective Date.

- **3.4.2** For purposes of measuring the "Daily Lead Exposure Level," the highest lead detection result of the three (3) randomly selected samples of the Covered Product will be controlling.
- 3.4.3 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate for the method used, including limit of detection and limit of quantification, sensitivity, accuracy and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry ("ICP-MS") achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.005 mg/kg.
- 3.4.4 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the United States Food & Drug Administration.
- **3.4.5** Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Simple Health's ability to conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Product, including the raw materials used in their manufacture.
- **3.4.6** Within thirty (30) days of ERC's written request, Simple Health shall deliver lab reports obtained pursuant to Section 3.4 to ERC. Simple Health shall retain all test results and documentation for a period of five years from the date of each test.
  - **3.4.7** The testing requirements under this Section 3.4 do not apply during any

period in which Simple Health is not engaging in California Sales Practices as to the Covered Product. However, in the event Simple Health resumes California Sales Practices with respect to the Covered Product, Simple Health shall be required to begin complying with the testing requirements of this Section 3.4 with respect to the Covered Product within one year after the date that Simple Health resumes engaging in such California Sales Practices.

### 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement payments, attorney's fees, and costs, Simple Health shall make a total payment of \$500.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC within 5 days of the Effective Date ("Due Date"). Simple Health shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's account, for which ERC will give Simple Health the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.2 \$100.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$75.00) 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). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$25.00) of the civil penalty.
- **4.3** \$100.00 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action.
- **4.4** \$300.00 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.
- 4.5 In the event that Simple Health fails to remit the Total Settlement Amount owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Simple Health shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the delinquency to Simple Health via electronic mail. If Simple Health 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. Additionally, Simple

Health agrees to pay ERC's reasonable attorney's fees and costs for any efforts to collect the payment due under this Consent Judgment.

### 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- **5.1** This Consent Judgment may be modified only as to injunctive terms by written stipulation or joint motion of the Parties and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment, or by motion of either Party pursuant to and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment executed by the Parties.
- 5.2 If Simple Health seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then Simple Health must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC must provide written notice to Simple Health within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies Simple Health in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person, via remote meeting, or by telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent to meet and confer. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

# 6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- **6.1** This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or terminate this Consent Judgment.
- 6.2 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Conforming Covered Product (for which no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform Simple Health in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit Simple Health to identify the Covered Product at issue. Simple Health shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4 demonstrating Simple Health's compliance with the Consent Judgment. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

7.

Page 9 of 15

### STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

### Case No. RG21094359

This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to any Covered Product that is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and that is not used by California consumers.

### 8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and to the extent it is acting in the public interest, and Simple Health and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Simple Health), 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").
- 8.2 ERC, acting in the public interest, releases the Released Parties from any and all claims for violations of Proposition 65 up through the Effective Date based on exposure to lead from the Covered Product as set forth in the Notice of Violation. ERC, on behalf of itself only, 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 Product as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Product regarding lead up to and including the Effective Date.
- **8.3** ERC on its own behalf only, and Simple Health on its own behalf only, further 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 Notice and Complaint up through and including the

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28 ||

///

Effective Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

8.4 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Product, will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Simple Health 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. ERC and Simple Health acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.2 and 8.3 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 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.

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

- **8.5** Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any of the Released Parties regarding alleged exposures to lead in the Covered Product as set forth in the Notice and Complaint.
- **8.6** 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 Simple Health's products other than the Covered Product.

# 9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS

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

### 1 10. **GOVERNING LAW** 2 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California. 3 4 PROVISION OF NOTICE 5 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 first-class mail or via electronic 6 7 mail where required. Courtesy copies via email may also be sent. 8 FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.: Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Center 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92108 10 Ph: (619) 500-3090 11 Email: chris.heptinstall@erc501c3.org 12 With a copy to: Charles W. Poss 13 Environmental Research Center, Inc. 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 14 San Diego, CA 92108 Ph: (619) 500-3090 15 Email: charles.poss@erc501c3.org 16 17 FOR SIMPLE HEALTH LLC, individually and dba TOSI: Stefanie Hults, Co-Founder & CEO 18 1308 N. Patt Street Anaheim, CA 92801 19 Email: stefanie@tosi.com 20 With a copy to: 21 Robert T. Petraglia BraunHagey & Borden LLP 22 351 California St, Fl 10 San Francisco, CA 94104 23 Ph: (415) 599-0210

#### 12. COURT APPROVAL

Email: petraglia@braunhagey.com

24

25

26

27

28

12.1 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this

Consent Judgment.

- 12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment, the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible prior to the hearing on the motion.
- 12.3 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have no force or effect.

# 13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

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.

### 14. DRAFTING

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 portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

# 15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet and confer in person, via remote meeting, by telephone, and/or in writing and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

# 16. ENFORCEMENT

ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action

brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

## 17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

- 17.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, including any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related thereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.
- 17.2 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment.

# 18. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:

- (1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and
- (2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.
- (3) Retain jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 664.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, after the Consent Judgment is entered in order to enforce, modify, or terminate this Consent Judgment.

- 1		
1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
2	Dated:	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
3 4		CENTER, INC.
5		By:
6		Chris Heptinistall, Executive Director
7		
8	Dated: 12/13/2023 , 2023	SIMPLE HEALTH LLC, individually and dba TOSI
9		DocuSigned by:
10		Stefanie Hults
11		By: Stefanie Hults Its: CEO and Co-Founder
12		
13	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
14		
15	Dated: 12/15/23, 2023	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
16		CENTER, INC.
17		Ву:
18		Charles W. Poss In-House Counsel
19		
20	Dated:December 15, 2023	BRAUNHAGEY & BORDEN LLP
21		
22		By: Robert T. Petraglia
23		Attorney for Defendant Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi
24		LEC, ilidividually alid doa 10si
25		
26		
27		
28		
		Page 14 of 15

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. RG21094359

1		ORDER AN	<u>D JUDGMENT</u>	
2	Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is			
3	approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.			
4	IT IS SO	ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DEC	CREED.	
5				
6	Dated:	, 2024		
7			Judge of the Superior Court	
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
		Pag	e 15 of 15	

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. RG21094359

# **EXHIBIT A**



# **Environmental Research Center**

3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92108 619-500-3090

October 15, 2020

# NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ. (PROPOSITION 65)

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I am the Executive Director of Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"). ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the product identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with this product. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

<u>General Information about Proposition 65</u>. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is attached with the copy of this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

<u>Alleged Violator</u>. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violator") is:

### Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi

<u>Consumer Product and Listed Chemical</u>. The product that is the subject of this notice and the chemical in that product identified as exceeding allowable levels is:

# **Tosi Super Greens - Lead**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

**Route of Exposure.** The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of this product. Consequently, the route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least October 15, 2017, as well as every day since the product was introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the product. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons ingesting this product with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified product so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of this product; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above product in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

Please direct all questions concerning this notice to ERC at the above listed address and telephone number.

Sincerely,

Chris Heptinstall
Executive Director

Environmental Research Center

### Attachments

Certificate of Merit Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi and its Registered Agent for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

# **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi

# I, Chris Heptinstall, declare:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
  - 2. I am the Executive Director for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

1/14Hs

	Jan Jan Marie Contraction of the	
Dated: October 15, 2020		
,	Chris Heptinstall	

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On October 15, 2020, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi 14695 Candeda Place Tustin, CA 92780

Current President or CEO Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi 1308 N Patt St Anaheim, CA 92801 Stefanie Hults (Registered Agent for Simple Health LLC, individually and dba Tosi) 14695 Candeda Place Tustin, CA 92780

On October 15, 2020, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Post Office Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On October 15, 2020, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5** *ET SEQ.*; **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney Alameda County 7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650 Oakland, CA 94621 CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249 Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org

Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney Inyo County 168 North Edwards Street Independence, CA 93526 inyoda@inyocounty.us

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Jeannine M. Pacioni, District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Summer Stephan, District Attorney San Diego County 330 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101 SanDiegoDAProp65@sdcda.org

Mark Ankcorn, Deputy City Attorney San Diego City Attorney 1200 Third Avenue San Diego, CA 92101 CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

Alethea Sargent, Assistant District Attorney White Collar Division San Francisco District Attorney's Office 350 Rhode Island Street North Building, Suite 400N San Francisco, CA 94103 alethea.sargent@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney San Francisco City Attorney 1390 Market Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94102 Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney San Luis Obispo County County Government Center Annex, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

On October 15, 2020, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on October 15, 2020, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

## **Service List**

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street, Suite 202 Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 778 Pacific St. Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453 District Attorney, Los Angeles County Hall of Justice 211 West Temple St., Ste 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023 District Attorney,San Bernardino County 303 West Third Street San Bernadino, CA 92415

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County 100 Courthouse Square, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County 463 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012 San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor San Jose, CA 95113

### APPENDIX A

# OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

# THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html.

### WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: <a href="http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\_list/Newlist.html">http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\_list/Newlist.html</a>.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be "clear and reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

**Prohibition from discharges into drinking water.** A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

### DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

**Grace Period.** Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

**Governmental agencies and public water utilities.** All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

**Businesses with nine or fewer employees.** Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "No Significant Risk Levels" (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question.** For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level" divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food.** Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant<sup>2</sup> it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4).

### **HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?**

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.