Medlock v. Taco B	ell Corp., et al. Doc. 344
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6 7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	DUDE TA CO DELL WA CE AND HOUR CAGENO OVE 07 1214 LIO DUD
11	IN RE TACO BELL WAGE AND HOUR CASE NO. CV F 07-1314 LJO DLB
12 13	ORDER TO ADOPT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON CLASS CERTIFICATION
14	(Doc. 341.)
15	INTRODUCTION
16	U.S. Magistrate Judge Dennis L. Beck issued November 27, 2012 findings and recommendations
17	("f and r's") to certify the following class
18	Meal Break Subclass:
19	All persons who work or worked as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee at a
20	corporate-owned Taco Bell restaurant in California from September 7, 2003, until the resolution of this lawsuit who worked for a period of time in excess of six hours and who
21	worked for periods longer than five hours without a meal period of not less than thirty minutes as reflected in Defendants' employees' time records.
22	The parties filed objections to the f and r's. Defendants Taco Bell Corp. and Taco Bell of
23	America, Inc. (collectively "defendants") object that:
24	1. The late meal break class was not properly pled in plaintiffs' operative complaint;
25	2. Members of the late meal class are not ascertainable;
26	3. Plaintiffs fail to satisfy commonality requirements;
27	4. Litigating late meal period claims as a class is neither manageable nor superior;
28	5. The named plaintiffs fail to satisfy typicality requirements;
	1
	Docksto Justia com

27

28