

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

TYLER NUNALEY, an individual and on
behalf of all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

SIZEWISE RENTALS LLC, DOES 1-50
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-20-587743

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA
SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF
JUDGMENT**

1 The Court has considered MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF
2 JUDGMENT, including the Settlement Agreement, and the record in this action (“the
3 Litigation”). The matter having been submitted and good cause appearing,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED AS FOLLOWS:

5 1. All defined terms contained herein shall have the same meaning as set forth in the
6 Settlement Agreement and the MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY
7 OF JUDGMENT. The Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, codified at California Labor
8 Code section 2698 et sec. is referred to herein as “PAGA.”

9 2. The Action consists of (a) a representative action by Tyler Nunaley (the “PAGA
10 Representative”) against Sizewise Rentals LLC (“Sizewise”) under PAGA for penalties on behalf
11 of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt employees of Sizewise employed
12 as non-exempt employees, and substantially similar roles from August 18, 2020 through the date
the Court grants approval of the Settlement.

13 3. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Litigation, the PAGA
14 Representatives, the Aggrieved Employees, and Sizewise. This Judgment shall be binding not
15 only on the named parties to the litigation but also on all Aggrieved Employees and the State of
16 California, who are hereby barred by the doctrine of res judicata from re-litigating the Released
17 Claims. *See Arias v. Superior Court*, 46 Cal. 4th 969, 986 (2009) (holding that a judgment in a
18 representative action brought by an aggrieved employee under PAGA is binding not only on the
19 named employee Plaintiff but also on state labor law enforcement agencies and any aggrieved
employee not a party to the proceeding).

20 4. In accordance with the Settlement Agreement, which the Court hereby approves
21 based on good cause showing for the reasons set forth in the Motion for Approval of PAGA
22 Settlement and with no objection received from the LWDA: (a) The Gross Settlement Amount
23 under this Settlement Agreement is Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00), which includes any and
24 all payments that shall be made pursuant to the PAGA to the Labor Workforce Development
25 Agency, the Aggrieved Employees and all third-party costs of settlement administration; (b)
26 ILYM Settlement Administrators is hereby approved to administer this Settlement; and (c) the
27 LWDA and all Aggrieved Employees are hereby permanently enjoined from pursuing, or seeking
28 to reopen, any Released Claims against any Released Parties.

1 5. Pursuant to PAGA and Labor Code section 2699(l) in particular, the Court
2 approves the Settlement and finds that it is fair, just, reasonable and adequate. The Settling Parties
3 are directed to perform their duties in accordance with the terms set forth in the Settlement
4 Agreement.

5 6. All of the Released Claims are deemed adjudicated and extinguished with
6 prejudice as to the PAGA Representative, all of the other Aggrieved Employees, and the State of
7 California.

8 7. Settlement Administrator shall make the payments to the LWDA, the Aggrieved
9 employees, the Named Plaintiff and to the Settlement Administrator as provided for in the
10 Settlement Agreement.

11 8. The Court finds that, under California law (which is applicable here), class action
12 procedural rules are not required when litigating representative PAGA actions. (See *Arias v.*
13 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969.) The differences between a traditional class action and a
14 PAGA suit are well summarized in *Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail North America, Inc.*, 803 F.3d 425,
15 435-436 (9th Cir. 2015) *en banc review denied* (2016). Following the California Supreme
16 Court's decision in *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014), the Ninth Circuit
17 explained:

18 The class action is a procedural device for resolving the claims of absent parties
19 on a representative basis. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 23; *Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 527
20 U.S. 815, 832- 33 (1999); *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 613-
21 17 (1997). By contrast, a PAGA action is a statutory action in which the
22 penalties available are measured by the number of Labor Code violations
23 committed by the employer. An employee bringing a PAGA action does so "as
24 the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies," *Iskanian*, 59
25 Cal.4th at 380 (quoting *Arias v. Superior Court*, 46 Cal.4th 969, 986 (2009)),
26 who are the real parties in interest, *see id.* at 382. As the state's proxy, an
27 employee-plaintiff may obtain civil penalties for violations committed against
28 absent employees, Cal. Lab.Code § 2699(g)(l), just as the state could if it
brought an enforcement action directly. However, by obtaining such penalties,
the employee-plaintiff does not vindicate absent employees' claims, for the
PAGA does not give absent employees any substantive right to bring their
"own" PAGA claims. See *Amalgamated Transit Union. Local 1756, AFL-CIO v.*
Superior Court, 46 Cal .4th 993. 1003 (2009); *see also Iskanian*, 59 Cal.4th at
381 (explaining that "[t]he civil penalties recovered on behalf of the state under
the PAGA are distinct from the statutory damages to which employees may be
entitled in their individual capacities").

Sakkab, supra at 435-436.

1 9. The Court finds that the notice requirements and other procedures applicable to
2 class action settlements do not apply to the settlement approval process for this PAGA Action.

3 10. The Court further finds that Plaintiff's counsel has sufficiently demonstrated that
4 notice of the Settlement has been provided to the LWDA as required by PAGA and Labor Code
5 section 2699, subdivision (l)(2), in particular.

6 11. Neither the Settlement Agreement nor any act performed or document executed
7 pursuant to or in furtherance of the Settlement (a) is or may be deemed to be or may be used as
8 an admission of, or evidence of, the validity of any Released Claims, or of any wrongdoing or
9 liability of the Released Parties, or any of them; or (b) is or may be deemed to be or may be used
10 as an admission of, or evidence of, any fault or omission of the Released Parties, or any of them,
11 in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency or other
12 tribunal. Sizewise Rentals LLC or any of the Released Parties may file the Settlement and/or the
13 Judgment from this Litigation in any other action that may be brought against it or them in order
14 to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel,
15 release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction or any theory of claim preclusion or
16 issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim.

17 12. The Court reserves exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the Action, the PAGA
18 Representative, the Aggrieved Employees and Sizewise Rentals LLC for the purposes of
19 supervising the implementation, enforcement, construction, administration and interpretation of
20 the Settlement Agreement and this Judgment.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.**

22 Dated: _____

Hon. Ethan P. Schulman
Judge of the Superior Court