

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Hayward Hall of Justice

The California Labor and
Workforce Development
Agency et al

Plaintiff/Petitioner(s)

vs.

Coast Counties Truck &
Equipment Company, a
California corporation

Defendant/Respondent

(s)

No. RG21088933

Date: 03/26/2024

Time: 2:30 PM

Dept: 517

Judge: Keith Fong

ORDER re: Hearing on Motion -

Other Notice of Motion for
Approval of Private
Attorneys General Act
(PAGA) Settlement; filed
by Darrell Honrine
(Plaintiff) +; Case
Management Conference
filed by The California
Labor and Workforce
Development Agency
(Plaintiff); Darrell Honrine
(Plaintiff) on 03/06/2024

Prior to the hearing, the Court issued a tentative ruling, which was uncontested and is affirmed as set forth below.

The Motion re: Notice of Motion and Motion for Approval of Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) Settlement filed by Darrell Honrine, The California Labor and Workforce Development Agency on 01/09/2024 is Granted.

Plaintiffs The California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and Darrell Honrine's

ORDER re: Hearing on Motion - Other Notice of Motion for Approval of
Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) Settlement; filed by
Darrell Honrine (Plaintiff) +; Case Management Conference
filed by The California Labor and Workforce Development
Agency (Plaintiff); Darrell Honrine (Plaintiff) on 03/06/2024

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Hayward Hall of Justice

unopposed Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement is GRANTED.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs The California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Darrell Honrine (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) brings this action against Defendant Coast Counties Truck & Equipment Company (“Defendant” or “Coast Counties”) for various Labor Code violations.

Plaintiffs originally filed this Motion on January 9, 2024. On February 27, 2024, the Court continued the hearing on this matter for Plaintiffs to file and serve an amended settlement agreement compliant with Labor Code § 2699 et seq. regarding the agreement’s release of claims and the requested attorneys’ fees. On March 6, 2024, Plaintiffs submitted supplemental papers and an amended settlement agreement (“Amended Settlement Agreement”) that addresses the Court’s concerns. (Von Rock Supp. Dec. Exh. B.) The motion is unopposed.

LEGAL STANDARD

Plaintiff asserts the PAGA claim as proxy or agent of the State of California’s Labor Workforce Development Agency. “An employee plaintiff suing ... under the [PAGA] does so as the proxy or agent of the state’s labor law enforcement agencies.” (*ZB, N.A. v. Superior Court of San Diego County* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, 185; *Iskanian v. CLS Transp. Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 348, 381.)

A person asserting a claim on behalf of the LWDA under PAGA must obtain court approval for any settlement. Labor Code 2699(1)(2) states: “The superior court shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed pursuant to this part. The proposed settlement shall be submitted to the agency at the same time that it is submitted to the court.”

Regarding the standard for review, *Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 549, states “PAGA settlements are subject to trial court review and approval, ensuring that any negotiated resolution is fair to those affected.” In *O’Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc.* (N.D. Cal., 2016) 201 F.Supp.3d 1110, 1133, the LWDA filed a brief that stated, “It is thus important that when a PAGA claim is settled, the relief provided for under the PAGA be genuine and meaningful, consistent with the underlying purpose of the statute to benefit the public.”

Regarding the evidence required for the court to evaluate a settlement under Labor Code 2699(1)(2), the court is not required to undertake a comprehensive “what would have happened if the litigation had proceeded” analysis. The standard of review is similar to the standard for review of class action settlements under *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, and the standard for approval of good faith settlements under CCP 877.6 and *Tech-Bilt, Inc. v. Woodward-Clyde & Associates* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 488.

The court can consider the value of any effective injunctive relief that a PAGA plaintiff obtains through settlement even though Labor Code 2699(a) permits a PAGA plaintiff to recover only

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Hayward Hall of Justice

penalties on behalf of the LWDA. The primary purpose of LWDA law enforcement proceedings is to ensure compliance with the law and not to impose and collect penalties. In enacting PAGA, “The Legislature declared that adequate financing of labor law enforcement was necessary to achieve maximum compliance with state labor laws.” (*Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, 980.)

The analysis of whether a proposed settlement will be “fair to those affected” concerns only fairness to the LWDA. If a PAGA plaintiff settles a claim on behalf of the LWDA for less than the maximum settlement value, the only injured person is the LDWA. The statute requires notice of a settlement to the LWDA so it can protect its interests and in addition, it requires court approval. (Labor Code 2699(1).) The aggrieved employees retain whatever private claims they had before the settlement.

SETTLEMENT TERMS

The “PAGA Members” in this action are defined as all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Coast Counties in California any time or times between December 1, 2019 through March 1, 2024. (Von Rock Supp. Dec. Exh. B, § G.)

The gross settlement amount is \$1,200,000.00. (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶ 2.)

Counsel seeks fees of 30% of the gross settlement amount, or \$360,000. (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 3.3, 5.) The Amended Settlement Agreement states that Plaintiff will seek expenses and costs reasonably incurred in connection with the litigation, not to exceed \$43,000.00. (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 3.3.) The Amended Settlement Agreement provides for a service award of \$500 to Plaintiff Darrell Honrine to be paid from the total settlement amount. (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 3.4.) Plaintiff and Defendant have separately negotiated an individual settlement agreement, to resolve the entirety of the action. (Amended Settlement Agreement § H.) The Amended Settlement Agreement further provides that they will allocate not more than \$6,000.00 towards settlement administration costs. (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶ 3.4)

The net settlement amount shall be distributed 75% to the LWDA and 25% to the PAGA Members on a pro rata basis, based upon their respective number of pay periods, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(i). (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 3.6.) The timing of the settlement payment and distribution takes place in two parts, and the distribution among the administration fees, PAGA representative award, attorneys’ fees and costs, and the net settlement amount are set forth in Paragraph 7.1 Amended Settlement Agreement.

SCOPE OF THE RELEASE

The Settlement Agreement releases claims for civil penalties and claims for attorneys’ fees. (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶ 13.1.) The Settlement Agreement, therefore, releases claims for both civil penalties under Labor Code sections 2698 et seq. and 2699, and for reasonable

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Hayward Hall of Justice

attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 2699(g).

DISPOSITION OF THE RESIDUAL

The disposition of any uncashed checks shall be paid to a mutually agreeable nonprofit organization or foundation pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 384. (Amended Settlement Agreement ¶ 4.5.)

ATTORNEYS' FEES – AMOUNT

Plaintiffs' counsel requests attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 30% of the total settlement amount, or \$360,000. This meets this Court's benchmark for fees, when using the percentage of the recovery approach. (*Lafitte v. Robert Half International, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 495.) When using the percentage of the recovery approach, this Court's benchmark for fees is 30% of the total fund. (See *Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat. Inc.*, *supra*, 1 Cal.5th at 495; see also *Schulz v. Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc.* (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 1167, 1175 in fee award involving minor, 10% too low and 31% in contract "not out of line"; *Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 557 fn 13 (citing awards of 25% and one-third); *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 fn 11 (30.3% or 27.9 % "not out of line and citing study that "... fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery.")).

The Court APPROVES fees in the amount of \$360,000.

COSTS OF LITIGATION

The Court APPROVES costs not to exceed \$43,000.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS

The Court, APPROVES settlement administration costs not to exceed \$6,000.

SERVICE AWARD

The Court APPROVES the requested service award of \$500.00 to Plaintiff Darrell Honrine.

CONCLUSION

The Court will sign the amended proposed order submitted to the Court on March 6, 2024.

A compliance hearing is SET for December 10, 2024 at 2:30 P.M. in Department 517, at which time the Court will consider evidence that the distribution process is complete and that a final accounting may be approved.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA


Hayward Hall of Justice

Compliance Hearing is scheduled for 12/10/2024 at 02:30 PM in Department 517 at Hayward Hall of Justice.

Dated : 03/26/2024



Keith Fong / Judge

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: Hayward Hall of Justice 24405 Amador Street, Hayward, CA 94544		FILED Superior Court of California County of Alameda 03/27/2024 Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court By:  Deputy K. Ortega
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: The California Labor and Workforce Development Agency et al		
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Coast Counties Truck & Equipment Company, a California corporation		
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING		CASE NUMBER: RG21088933

I, the below-named Executive Officer/Clerk of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that on this date I served the attached document upon each party or counsel named below by placing the document for collection and mailing so as to cause it to be deposited in the United States mail at the courthouse in Hayward, California, one copy of the original filed/entered herein in a separate sealed envelope to each address as shown below with the postage thereon fully prepaid, in accordance with standard court practices.

Mollie M. Burks
Gordon & Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP
1111 Broadway
Suite 1700
Oakland, CA 94607-

Randall B. Aiman-Smith
Aiman-Smith & Marcy
7677 Oakport Steet, Ste.1020
Oakland, CA 94621-

Dated: 03/27/2024

Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court

By:


K. Ortega, Deputy Clerk

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING