

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.: 8:20-cv-01606-SB-JDE

Date: May 25, 2021

Title: *Michael Real v. WiLine Networks Inc., et al.*Present: The Honorable **STANLEY BLUMENFELD, JR., U.S. District Judge**Victor Cruz
Deputy ClerkN/A
Court ReporterAttorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):
None AppearingAttorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):
None Appearing**Proceedings: ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT**

The case at issue includes a claim for violations of the California Labor Code and was brought pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA). The parties filed a stipulation of settlement on April 23, 2021. Dkt. No. [18](#). Under PAGA, such settlements must be reviewed and approved by the Court. [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699\(1\)\(2\)](#). However, the Court found that the parties' stipulation—by itself—was insufficient to satisfy PAGA and ordered that the parties file a properly noticed motion to approve the settlement. *See* Dkt. No. [19](#) (setting forth specific requirements for the contents of the motion). The Court further invited the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) to file a response to the proposed settlement. *See id.* at 3 (quoting [Echavez v. Abercrombie & Fitch Co.](#), 2017 WL 3669607, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2017) (“the Court finds persuasive that LWDA was invited to file a response to the proposed settlement agreement in this case and elected not to file any objections or opposition thereto. The Court infers LWDA’s non-response is tantamount to its consent to the proposed settlement terms”)).

Plaintiff's instant motion (Dkt. No. [20](#)) (Motion), a supporting memorandum from the defense (Dkt. No. [26](#)) (Memo), and other associated filings followed. In these papers, the parties established that the statutory requirements of a PAGA claim and settlement were properly met ([Mot.](#) at 2-5), explained why the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable ([id.](#) at 5-10), and provided support for the requested fees—including detailed billing entries and counsels' credentials and experience (Dkt. Nos. [21](#), [21-1](#), [22](#), [22-10](#)). What's more, while the LWDA was notified of the hearing date on this motion, it has not filed any objections or opposition to the Motion. Dkt. No. [22](#) ¶ 31.

Because the parties' supplemental filings satisfy the Court that the proposed settlement is appropriate and fair under PAGA, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion and approves the proposed settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.