1	HOWARD A. SLAVITT (State Bar # 172840)		
2	COBLENTZ, PATCH, DUFFY & BASS, LLP 222 Kearny Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, California 94108-4510 Telephone: (415) 391-4800 Facsimile: (415) 989-1663		
3			
4			
5	Attorneys for Defendants American Greetings Corporation and Carlton Cards Retail, Inc.		
6			
7	STEPHEN S. SAYAD (State Bar # 104866) DAVID D. STEIN (State Bar # 112074)		
8	CLIFFORD A. CHANLER (State Bar #135534) LARALEI C. SCHMOHL (State Bar # 203319) CHANLER LAW GROUP 655 Redwood Highway, Suite 216		
9			
10	Mill Valley, California 94941 Tel: (415) 380-9222 Fax: (415) 380-9233		
11			
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.		
13			
14			
15	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
16	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, HAYWARD BRANCH		
17	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURSIDICTION		
18			
19	WHITNEY R. LEEMAN,) No. HG04147341	
20	Plaintiff,))	
21	v.) CONSENT JUDGMENT	
22	CARLTON CARDS RETAIL, INC.;	<i>)</i> }	
23	AMERICAN GREETINGS CORPORATION; DOES 1 through 150,))	
24	Defendants.))	
25)	
26			

This Consent Judgment ("Agreement" or "Consent Judgment") is entered into by and between Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D. (hereinafter "Leeman"), Carlton Cards Retail, Inc. and American Greetings Corporation as of August 25, 2004 (the "Effective Date"). The parties agree to the following terms and conditions:

WHEREAS:

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 <u>Plaintiff</u>. Leeman is an individual residing in Sacramento,

 California, who seeks to promote awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and
 improve human health by reducing or eliminating hazardous substances contained
 in consumer and industrial products;
- 1.2 <u>Defendants</u>. Carlton Cards Retail, Inc. ("Carlton") and American Greetings Corporation ("AGC") (sometimes collectively referred to herein as "Defendants"), are engaged in the retail sale of greeting cards, social expression items and various novelty items.
- 1.3 Notice. On or about April 25, 2003, Leeman served to the Defendants and each appropriate public enforcement agency in Oakland, California, a document entitled: "60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue Under Health & Safety Code Section 22459.6." The Notice alleges that Defendants were in violation of California Health & Safety Code Section 22459.6. by virtue of they having sold certain Tiffany-Style Lamps that contain lead or lead compounds (the "Listed Chemical"), a substance known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects (or other reproductive harm);
- 1.4 <u>Covered Products</u>. A list of such Tiffany Style Lamps that

 Leeman alleges contain Listed Chemical, which are sold or offered for sale in

 California and which are covered by this Agreement, is provided in Exhibit A (all

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

such Defendants' products to be collectively referred to hereinafter as the "Products");

- 1.5 Complaint. On March 24, 2004, Leeman filed a complaint entitled Whitney R. Leeman v. Carlton Cards Retail, Inc., American Greetings

 Corporation, et al., Case Number HG04147341, in the Alameda County Superior

 Court, naming the Defendants as having violated the Business & Professions Code §17200 and §17500 as well as Health & Safety Code §25249.6 on behalf of individuals in California who allegedly have been exposed to the Listed Chemical, listed pursuant to Proposition 65, contained in certain products that Defendants offer for sale (the "Action").
- 2.0 Purpose Of Consent Decree. The Parties enter into this Stipulation to Entry of Consent Judgment ("Consent Judgment") as a full and final resolution of all claims and allegations that were or that could have been alleged by Plaintiff in the Notice, Complaint and Action, and in order that the Parties may avoid protracted litigation on such claims and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, provide Defendant res judicata protection against future claims based on the same or substantially similar allegations for the Products at issue. This Consent Judgment is not and shall not be construed as an admission by Defendants of any allegation or issue of fact or law asserted in the Notice, Complaint, or Action. Defendants expressly deny any alleged violation of Proposition 65 and/or Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq. For the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation, the parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full settlement of all claims that were or could have been raised in the Complaint based upon the facts alleged therein, or which could have been raised in the Action arising out of the facts alleged therein. However, this paragraph shall not diminish or otherwise

affect the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of Defendants under this Agreement.

3.0 <u>Jurisdiction</u>. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendants as to the conduct alleged. The Parties further stipulate that venue is proper in the County of Alameda and that the Court may enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of the Action with respect to Defendants, and all claims that were or could have been asserted by Plaintiff against Defendants.

4.0 Entry of Consent Judgment

4.1 <u>Prompt Entry</u>. The Parties hereby request that, pursuant to the relevant statutory provisions, the Court enter this Consent Judgment as a final resolution of the Action between Plaintiff and Defendants. Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, the Parties waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint.

4.2 Stipulation Void Absent Entry Of Consent Judgment.

Notwithstanding anything in this Stipulation, in the event that the Court does not enter judgment in accordance with the terms of this Consent Judgment within 12 months, then (a) this Stipulation shall be null and void and shall be inadmissible for any purpose in any proceeding relating in any way to the allegations of the Notice or Complaint and/or to this Action; (b) Defendant shall not be deemed to have made any admission of any kind with respect to the Notice, the Action, or this Stipulation; and (c) the Parties shall retain all rights, remedies, and defenses that were available to them prior to entering this Stipulation.

5.0 Injunctive Relief

5.1 Product Warnings.

(a) No later than thirty days after the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment, neither Carlton nor AGC shall offer any Products for sale in California unless they are reformulated pursuant to the conditions of Paragraph 5.0(c), or bear the following warning statement:

"WARNING: This product contains LEAD, a substance known to the State of California to cause birth defects (or other reproductive harm).

(b) The warning stated above may be placed on: (1) a product label; (2) on the accompanying packaging as a sticker; or (3) on a store sign sufficiently near the Products' point of sale so that it is likely to be read by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase for the Products. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, a warning sticker placed on product packaging that is not available to the consumer before purchase, or on product packaging that does not accompany the Products when purchased, is not reasonably calculated to transmit the requisite warning and, thus, may not be used to comply with this paragraph.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, no warning for exposure to lead shall or need be provided by Carlton or AGC for: (1) any Product containing 0.1 percent (.1%) lead or less (by weight) in each material used in the Products (such as solder or came); (2) any Product, for which the reasonably foreseeable exposure to the Listed Chemical from the product is indirect, that yields a result of less than 5 micrograms (ugs) of lead by a Ghost WipeTM test conducted on all metal portions of the perimeter or other surface area of the Product, performed as outlined in NIOSH method of detection 9100; or (3)

any Product, for which the reasonably foreseeable exposure to the Listed Chemical from the product is direct, that yields a result of less than .5 micrograms (ugs) of lead by a Ghost Wipe™ test conducted on all metal portions of the perimeter or other surface area of the Product, performed as outlined in NIOSH method of detection 9100.

- 5.2 Reformulation, Inventory and Future Sales Carlton and AGC represent that they withdrew the Products from inventory in California after receiving plaintiff's 60-day notice and, to the best of its knowledge, no longer has any of the Products in its inventory or any of its retail outlets in California. Carlton and AGC agree that they will not order any additional quantities of the Products, for purposes of selling the Products in any of its California stores, unless each Product, as shipped, is lead-free (containing 0.1% lead or less by weight) in the came.
- 6.0 Payment Pursuant To Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b). Pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), Carlton, on behalf of itself and AGC shall deliver a check for a civil penalty of \$6,000 made payable to "Chanler Law Group ("Chanler") In Trust For Whitney R. Leeman" within 5 business days of the Effective Date. All penalty monies shall be apportioned by Leeman in accordance with Health & Safety Code §25192, with 75% of these funds remitted to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the remaining 25% of these penalty monies retained by Plaintiff as provided by Health and Safety Code § 25249.12(d).
- 7.0 Reimbursement of Fees And Costs. The parties acknowledge that

 Leeman and his counsel offered to resolve this dispute which resolution includes
 an agreement on the amount of fees and costs to be reimbursed to them, under
 the private attorney general doctrine codified at C.C.P. §1021.5 for all work

performed through the Effective Date of the Agreement.

Under the private attorney general doctrine codified at C.C.P. §1021.5, AGC shall reimburse Leeman and her counsel for her fees and costs, incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Carlton's and AGC's attention, litigating and negotiating a settlement in the public interest. Carlton, on behalf of itself and AGC, shall pay Leeman and her counsel the total amount of \$29,000, for all attorneys' fees, expert and investigation fees, and litigation costs, on or within 5 business days of the Effective Date.

7.1 Except as specifically provided in this Consent Judgment, neither Carlton nor AGC shall have any further obligation with regard to reimbursement of plaintiff's attorney's fees and costs, including for any proceedings to obtain approval of this Consent Judgment, and each party shall bear its own costs and attorneys fees.

In the event that any third party, including the Attorney General or any other public enforcer, objects or otherwise comments to one or more provisions of this Agreement, Carlton and AGC agree to undertake best efforts to satisfy such concerns or objections and support the terms of this Agreement.

8.0 <u>Post-Execution Activities</u>. The Parties acknowledge that, pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7, a noticed motion is required to obtain judicial approval of this Agreement. Accordingly, the Parties agree to use their best efforts to file a *Joint Motion to Approve the Agreement* ("Joint Motion"), the first draft of which CARLTON CARDS shall prepare, within a reasonable period of time after execution of this Agreement (i.e., not to exceed fourteen (14) days unless otherwise agreed to by Leeman's counsel based on unanticipated circumstances). Leeman's counsel shall prepare a declaration in support of the Joint Motion which shall, *inter*

24

25

26

alia, set forth support for the fees and costs to be reimbursed pursuant to Paragraph 3. CARLTON CARDS shall have no additional responsibility to Leeman or Leeman's counsel pursuant to C.C.P. §1021.5 or otherwise with regard to reimbursement of any fees and costs incurred with respect to the preparation and filing of the Joint Motion and its supporting declaration or with regard to Leeman's counsel appearing for a hearing or related proceedings thereon.

Leeman's Release of Carlton and AGC. Leeman, by this Agreement, on 9.0 behalf of herself, her agents, representatives, attorneys, assigns, and in the interest of the general public ("Releasing Parties"), waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action, and releases all claims, liabilities, obligations, losses, costs, expenses, fines, penalties, fees, and all rights to damages, restitution, injunctive relief, and any other form of relief, whether legal or equitable (collectively the "Claims"), against Carlton and AGC and their directors, officers, employees, parents, subsidiaries, customers, successors and assigns, whether under Proposition 65, the Business & Profession Code §17200 et seq., Business & Profession Code §17500 et seq., or other constitutional, statutory or common law Claims based solely on their alleged failure to warn about exposure to the Listed Chemical contained in any of the Products. This Agreement is a full, final, and binding resolution between Leeman, on behalf of herself and in the interest of the general public, and Carlton and AGC (and the above named parties), of any violation of Proposition 65, Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 or 17500 or any other claim that was or could have been asserted based on alleged failure to warn for exposure to lead in the Products (collectively the "Released Claims"), or other facts alleged in the Complaint. The parties intend that compliance with this Agreement to resolve any issue now, in the past, or in the future concerning the Products' past and present, and future (up to the date of compliance established in Paragraph 5, above, and in the future so long as Carlton and AGC comply with this Agreement) compliance with Proposition 65 as such compliance pertains to the Products at issue. In addition, Leeman, on behalf of herself, her attorneys, and her agents, waives all rights to institute any form of legal action against Carlton and AGC and their attorneys or representatives, for all actions or statements made by Carlton and AGC or their attorneys or representatives, in the course of responding to violations of Proposition 65 or Business & Profession Code §17200 and §17500 by Carlton and AGC alleged in the Complaint.

10.0 Carlton and AGC's Release of Leeman. Carlton and AGC, by this

Agreement, waive all rights to institute any form of legal action against Leeman and
her attorneys or representatives, for all actions or statements made by Leeman or
her attorneys or representatives, in the course of seeking enforcement of

Proposition 65 or Business & Profession Code §17200 and §17500 against Carlton
and AGC in this litigation. Provided, however, that Carlton and AGC shall remain
free to institute any form of legal action to enforce the provisions of this Consent
Judgment.

any reason, it is not approved and entered by the Court within one year after it has been fully executed by all Parties, in which event any monies that have been provided to Plaintiff or his counsel pursuant to Sections 6.0 and 7.0 above, shall be refunded within fifteen (15) days.

///

Safety Code § 25249.7(f) apply to this Consent Judgment. Counsel for Leeman shall comply with that Paragraph by submitting the required reporting form to, and serving a copy of this Consent Judgment on, the California Attorney General's Office when noticing the *Motion to Approve* hearing.

- 17.0 <u>Duties Limited to California</u>. This Consent Judgment shall have no effect on Products sold by Carlton and AGC for use outside the State of California.
- 18.0 Entire Agreement. This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitment and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.
- 19.0 <u>Modification</u>. This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.
- 20.0 <u>Counterparts and Facsimile</u>. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts and facsimile, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same document.
- 21.0 <u>Authorization</u>. The undersigned are authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of their respective parties and have read, understood and agree to all of the terms and conditions of this Agreement.
- 22.0 <u>Binding Effect</u>. This Consent Judgment shall inure to the benefit of, and shall be binding upon, the Parties and their respective agents, alter egos,

attorneys, directors, divisions, employees, heirs, legal predecessors, licensees, officers, parent companies, partners, representatives, shareholder, subsidiaries, successors, and any trustee or other officer appointed in the event of bankruptcy.

- 23.0 <u>No Previous Assignment</u>. Plaintiff represents and warrants that it has not previously assigned or transferred, or purported to assign or transfer, to any third party any Released Claim.
- 24.0 No Admissions. This Consent Judgment represents a settlement of disputed claims and has been reached by the Parties to avoid the costs of prolonged litigation and to ensure that the objectives of Proposition 65 are expeditiously carried out. No Party admits any allegation or issue of fact or law addressed herein or set forth in the Notice, Complaint or Action, and Defendant expressly denies any alleged violation of Proposition 65 and/or the Unfair Competition Act. The settlement of claims herein shall not be deemed to be an admission or concession of liability or culpability by any Party at any time for any purpose. Neither this Consent Judgment, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out this Consent Judgment shall be construed as giving rise to any presumption or inference of admission or concession by Defendant, or of any fault, wrongdoing or liability whatsoever. Neither this Consent Judgment, nor any of its terms or provisions, nor any of the negotiations or other proceedings connected with it, shall be referred to, offered as evidence or received in evidence in any pending or future civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding, except in a proceeding to enforce this Consent Judgment or to defend against the assertion of any Released Claims or liability, or as otherwise required by law.

24

25

25.0 Representation. The Parties acknowledge and warrant that they have been represented by counsel of their own choosing through all negotiations which preceded the execution of this Agreement. 26.0 Authority To Stipulate. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment individually certifies and warrants that he or she is authorized to enter into this Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party he or she represents, and to bind that Party with respect to the matters contained herein.

		,
1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
2	_ ,	
3	date: <u>\$123/04</u>	DATE:
4		CARLTON CARDS RETAIL, INC. and AMERICAN GREETINGS CORPORATION
5		DEFENDANTS
6	15.0 /	
7 8	Whitney R./Leeman, Ph.D. PLAINTIFF	By: Michelle B. Creger
9	A LAMBOUR AND A	
10	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
11	DATE: 8/23/04	DATE:
12	Lasino	
13	Clifford A. Chanler	John M. Riccione
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.	Attorneys for Defendants CARLTON CARDS RETAIL, INC.
15		andAMERICAN GREETINGS CORPORATION
16	NODE ETT	
17	#326556	
18		
19		
20 21		
21 22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
20		CONSENT JUDGMENT
		ALCO TOTAL A L JULICALITATIA A A

26

1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
2		
3	DATE:	DATE: 8/23/04
	DAIE.	·
4		CARLTON CARDS RETAIL, INC. and AMERICAN GREETINGS CORPORATION
5		DEFENDANTS
6		\
7		By: Misselle B Cregn
8	Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D. PLAINTIFF	Michelle B. Creger
9		
10	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
11	DATE:	DATE: 8/24/04
12		1/1/
13		
14	Clifford A. Chanler Attorneys for Plaintiff	John M. Riccione Attorneys for Defendants
15	Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.	CARLTON CARDS RETAIL, INC. andAMERICAN GREETINGS
16		CORPORATION
17	#326556	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

CONGENIT IT IT CLARKIT

1	Exhibit A	
2	PRODUCTS ALLEGED TOXINS	
3	Tiffany-Style Lamps Lead and lead compounds. (Triangular and round)	
4	including Carlton Cards Tiffany Lamp*	
5	(#090000 06863 6/#2-34-228A and B) SKU # 215037-9 and 215038-7	
6	*This specifically identified example of the type of product subject to this	
7	Consent Judgment is not meant to be an exhaustive or comprehensive list of each allegedly offending product covered herein.	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

CONSENT JUDGMENT 14

1	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:
2		
3	DATE: <u>\$123/04</u>	DATE:
4		CARLTON CARDS RETAIL, INC. and AMERICAN GREETINGS CORPORATION
5		DEFENDANTS
6		
7	Withunkeenn	By: Michelle B. Creger
8	PLAINTIFF	Michelle B. Creger
9		
10	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
11	DATE:	DATE:
12		
13	Clifford A. Chanler	John M. Riccione
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff Whitney R. Leeman, Ph.D.	Attorneys for Defendants CARLTON CARDS RETAIL, INC.
15	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	andAMERICAN GREETINGS CORPORATION
16		CORTORATION
17	#326556	
18		
19		
20		
2 1		
22		
23		:
24		
25		
26		
		CONSENT JUDGMENT