1 2 3 4	GLICK LAW GROUP, P.C. Noam Glick (SBN 251582) 225 Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, California 92101 Tel: (619) 382-3400 Fax: (619) 393-0154 Email: noam@glicklawgroup.com	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	NICHOLAS & TOMASEVIC, LLP. Craig M. Nicholas (SBN 178444) Jake Schulte (SBN 293777) 225 Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, California 92101 Tel: (619) 325-0492 Email: cnicholas@nicholaslaw.org Email: jschulte@nicholaslaw.org Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Health Advocates, Inc.	
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
13 14	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVOCATES, INC.,	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA Case No. RG21091505 [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT
15 16	Plaintiff, v.	(Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. and Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6)
17 18	FRESH GOURMET COMPANY LLC, a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	
19	Defendants.	
2021		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

1.1 Parties

This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between Environmental Health Advocates, Inc., ("Plaintiff" or "EHA") and Sugar Foods Corporation, which manufactures food products under several trademarks including but not limited to "Kitchen Fixin's" and "Fresh Gourmet" ("Defendant," "SFC," "FG," and "KF" are used interchangeably herein), with EHA and SFC each individually referred to as a "Party" and collectively referred to as the "Parties."

1.2 Plaintiff

EHA alleges it is a corporation organized in the state of California, acting in the interest of the general public. EHA alleges it seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and to improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer products.

1.3 Defendants

EHA alleges FG employs ten or more individuals and is a "person in the course of doing business" for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Proposition 65").

1.4 General Allegations

EHA alleges that FG manufactures, imports, sells, and/or distributes for sale FG Garlic Pepper Crispy Onions that contain acrylamide. EHA further alleges that FG does so without providing a sufficient health hazard warning as required by Proposition 65 and related regulations (Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25600, *et seq.*). Pursuant to Proposition 65, acrylamide is listed as a chemical known to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.

1.5 Notices of Violation

On December 31, 2020, EHA served Food 4 Less of Southern California, Inc., The Kroger Co., FG, the California Attorney General, and all other required public enforcement agencies with a 60-Day Notice of Violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 *et seq.* ("Notice"). The Notice alleged that FG had violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn consumers in California of the health hazards associated with exposures to acrylamide contained in its FG Crispy

Onions.

No public enforcer has commenced or is otherwise prosecuting an action to enforce the violations alleged in the Notice.

1.6 Covered Products

The products covered by this Consent Judgment are fried vegetable products, including but not limited to Crispy Onions and Crispy Beets manufactured or processed by SFC including under its trademark brands (including but not limited to FG and KF) that allegedly contain acrylamide and are imported, sold, shipped, delivered or distributed for sale to consumers in California by Releasees (as defined in Section 4.1) ("Covered Products").

1.7 State of the Pleadings

Plaintiff filed a complaint against FG on March 11, 2021 for the alleged violations of Proposition 65 that are the subject of the Notice in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Alameda, Case No. RG21091505 ("Complaint").

FG timely filed an answer to EHA's Complaint on or about July 30, 2021 responding to the alleged violations of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 that are subject to the Notice ("Answer").

1.8 No Admission

FG denies the material factual and legal allegations of the Notice and Complaint. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment be construed as an admission of any fact, finding, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. This Section shall not, however, diminish or otherwise affect FG's obligations, responsibilities, and duties under this Consent Judgment.

1.9 Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and the Complaint only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over SFC as to the allegations in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, and that the Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce the provisions of this Consent Judgment pursuant to Proposition 65 and Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

1.10 Effective Date and Compliance Date

For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Effective Date" means the date on which the Court grants the motion for approval of this Consent Judgment, as discussed in Section 5. The "Compliance Date" is the date that is one hundred and eighty (180) days after the Effective Date ("Initial Compliance Date"), plus an additional ninety (90) days if, despite reasonable best efforts, SFC is unable to achieve reformulation levels set forth in Section 2.1 by the Initial Compliance Date.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: REFORMULATION OF PRODUCTS

2.1 Except as otherwise provided herein, any Covered Products that are manufactured by SFC on and after the Compliance Date that SFC sells in California or distributes for sale in California shall not exceed 350 parts per billion ("ppb") for acrylamide, using tests performed by a laboratory accredited by the State of California, a federal agency, or a nationally recognized accrediting organization, using LC-MS/MS (Liquid Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometry), unless such Covered Products comply with the warning requirements of Section 2.2. As used in this Section 2, "distributed for sale in California" means to directly ship Covered Products into California or to sell Covered Products to a distributor SFC actually knows will sell Covered Products in California. To the extent SFC is unable to achieve the aforementioned acrylamide level by the Compliance Date despite reasonable, good-faith efforts to reformulate, SFC will have the option of filing a motion to modify this Consent Judgment and seek a reformulation level consistent with the "lowest level currently feasible."

2.2 Warnings

2.2.1 If SFC provides warnings under Section 2.1, Covered Products may be sold in California with any warning that satisfies the "safe harbor" content and methods for providing a warning that have been determined "clear and reasonable" under Proposition 65 (including under Title

27, California Code of Regulations, section 25600, et seq.) on or after the Compliance Date, including, but not limited to, one of the following warning statements:

Option 1:

MARNING: This product can expose you to chemicals including Acrylamide, which is known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

Option 2:



WARNING: Cancer and Reproductive Harm – <u>www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.</u>

The warning in Option 2 may only be used if the warning appears on the product container or labeling. The word "WARNING" shall be displayed in all capital letters and bold print. This warning statement shall be prominently displayed on the Covered Products, on the packing of the Covered Products, or on a placard, shelf tag, or sign provided that the statement is displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, or designs as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual prior to sale. If a short form warning statement (i.e., Option 2) is displayed on the Covered Products' packaging, it must be in a type size no smaller than the largest type size used for other consumer information on the product. In no case shall a short form warning statement appear in a type size smaller than 6-point type.

2.2.2 The warning requirements set forth herein are imposed pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment and are recognized by the Parties as not being the exclusive manner of providing a warning for the Covered Products. Warnings may also be provided as specified in the Proposition 65 regulations for food in effect as of the Compliance Date (Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25600, et seq.) or as such regulations may be amended in the future, or pursuant to a settlement agreement or consent judgment involving acrylamide. In addition, SFC may follow the notification procedure set out in Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25600.2 or a similar procedure where SFC instructs its distributor or retailer customers, if any, to provide warnings for the Covered

26

24

25

27

28

45

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

14

13

16

15

17 18

1920

2122

23

2425

2627

28

The address for these two entities are:

Noam Glick Glick Law Group 225 Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

Craig Nicholas Nicholas & Tomasevic, LLP. 225 Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

4. <u>CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED</u>

4.1 EHA's Public Release of Proposition 65 Claims

Plaintiff acting on its own behalf and in the public interest releases SFC and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities under common ownership, its directors, officers, principals, agents, employees, attorneys, insurers, accountants, predecessors, successors, and assigns ("Defendant Entities"), each entity to whom the Defendant Entities directly or indirectly distribute, ship, or sell the Covered Products including but not limited to downstream distributors, wholesalers, customers, and retailers (including but not limited to Food 4 Less of Southern California, Inc. and The Kroger Co.), franchisees, franchisors, cooperative members, suppliers, licensees, and licensors, and all of the foregoing entities' owners, directors, officers, agents, principals, employees, attorneys, insurers, accountants, representatives, predecessors, successors, and assigns (collectively referred to as the "Releasees") from all claims for violations of Proposition 65 up through the Compliance Date based on exposure to acrylamide from Covered Products. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to exposures to acrylamide from Covered Products.

4.2 EHA's Individual Release of Claims

EHA, in its individual capacity, also provides a release to SFC and/or Releasees, which shall be a full and final accord and satisfaction of, as well as a bar to, all actions, causes of action, obligations, costs, expenses, attorneys' fees, damages, losses, claims, liabilities, and demands of every nature, character, and kind, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, arising out of alleged or

actual exposures to acrylamide in Covered Products manufactured, imported, sold, or distributed by SFC before the Compliance Date.

4.3 SFC's Release of EHA

SFC on its own behalf, and on behalf of Releasees as well as its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and assignees, hereby waives any and all claims against EHA and its attorneys and other representatives, for any and all actions taken or statements made by EHA and its attorneys and other representatives, whether in the course of investigating claims, otherwise seeking to enforce Proposition 65 against them, in this matter or with respect to the Covered Products.

4.4 Mutual Release of Known and Unknown Claims

The Parties certify that they have read the following provisions of California Civil Code Section 1542:

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.

The Parties expressly waive and relinquish all rights and benefits which they may have under California Civil Code Section 1542 to the full extent such provisions may lawfully be waived. The Parties acknowledge that this Section 4.4 applies only as between the parties and does not extend to the general public.

5. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>

This Consent Judgment is not effective until it is approved by the Court and shall be null and void if it is not approved by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by the Parties, or by such additional time as the Parties may agree to in writing.

6. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>

Subsequent to the Court's approval and entry of this Consent Judgment, if any provision is held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the remaining provisions shall not be adversely affected.

7. GOVERNING LAW AND CHANGES IN LAW

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the state of California as applied within the state of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, modified, or is otherwise rendered inapplicable for reasons, including but not limited to changes in the law, then SFC may provide written notice to EHA of any asserted change, and shall have no further injunctive obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment (including but not limited to those stated in Section 2) with respect to, and to the extent that, the Covered Products are so affected.

In the event OEHHA adopts a regulation or safe use determination, or issues an interpretive guideline that exempts Covered Products from meeting the requirements of Proposition 65 or those set forth in this Consent Judgment; or if Proposition 65 is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be preempted by federal law or a burden on First Amendment rights with respect to acrylamide in Covered Products or products substantially similar to Covered Products, then SFC shall be relieved of its obligation to comply with Section 2 herein.

8. **NOTICE**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

26

27

28

Unless otherwise specified herein, all correspondence and notice required by this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and sent by: (i) personal delivery; (ii) first-class, registered, or certified mail, return receipt requested; (iii) a recognized overnight courier; or (iv) email to the following addresses:

If to EHA:

If to SFC:

Sherry Jackman	Noam Glick	
Greenberg Glusker Fields Claman &	Glick Law Group, PC	
Machtinger LLP	225 Broadway, 19th Floor	
2049 Century Park East Suite 2600	San Diego, CA 92101	
Los Angeles, CA 90067		
sjackman@greenbergglusker.com		

Any Party may, from time to time, specify in writing to the other, a change of address to which

24 notices and other communications shall be sent. 25

9. COUNTERPARTS; DIGITAL SIGNATURES

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

10. POST EXECUTION ACTIVITIES

EHA agrees to comply with the reporting form requirements referenced in Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f). The Parties further acknowledge that, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f), a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of the settlement, which motion EHA shall draft and file subject to the SFC's review and approval. In furtherance of obtaining such approval, the Parties agree to mutually employ their best efforts, including those of their counsel, to support the entry of this agreement as judgment, and to obtain judicial approval of their settlement in a timely manner. For purposes of this Section, "best efforts" shall include, at a minimum, supporting the motion for approval, responding to any objection that any third-party may make, and appearing at the hearing before the Court if so requested.

11. MODIFICATION

This Consent Judgment may be modified by: (i) a written agreement of the Parties and entry of a modified consent judgment thereon by the Court; or (ii) a successful motion or application of any Party, and the entry of a modified consent judgment thereon by the Court.

12. AUTHORIZATION

The undersigned are authorized to execute this Consent Judgment and acknowledge that they have read, understand, and agree to all of the terms and conditions contained herein.

13. 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, or 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.

27 ///

28 ///

14. ENTIRE AGREEMENT This Consent Judgment cor

1

2

3

4

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

5	implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral	
6	otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.	
7		
8	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
9		
10	Date: 10/4/2021	Date: $\frac{10/1/2}{2}$
11	By: Lialy	By: Myren Wester VP
12	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	SUGAR FOODS CORPORATION
13	ADVOCATES, INC.	
14		
15		
16	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
17		
18	Date:	
19		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		