1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
3 4 5	HECTOR GARCIA, ROBERT CAHIGAL, BRIAN HOLLIDAY, and TINA DIEMER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	Case No. 3:15-cv-00319-WHO ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
6	Plaintiffs,	
7	v.	
8	PPG INDUSTRIES, INC.,	
9	Defendant.	
10		
11	Before the Court is the Plaintiffs' M	otion for Preliminary Approval of Class and Collective
12	Action Settlement ("Motion") and the pertinent materials filed with that motion. For good cause	
13		
14	shown, and as more fully explained below, the Motion is GRANTED. The Court ORDERS as	
15	follows:	
	1. Preliminary Certification of the Settlement Classes.	
16	·	
16 17	California Rule 23 Class. For the pu	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds
17	California Rule 23 Class. For the pu	
17 18	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class,	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds
17 18 19	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds , as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the
17 18 19 20	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds , as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es:
17 18 19 20 21	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPC	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds , as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the
 17 18 19 20 21 22 	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPO (including PPG Architectural (including Akzo Nobel Paints	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds , as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es: G Industries, Inc. and/or any subsidiary Finishes, Inc.) and/or any predecessor LLC) in California during the period of
17 18 19 20 21	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPO (including PPG Architectural (including Akzo Nobel Paints January 22, 2011, through	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds , as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es: G Industries, Inc. and/or any subsidiary Finishes, Inc.) and/or any predecessor
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPO (including PPG Architectural (including Akzo Nobel Paints January 22, 2011, through classified as non-exempt, excl FLSA Class Members.	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds , as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es: G Industries, Inc. and/or any subsidiary Finishes, Inc.) and/or any predecessor LLC) in California during the period of September 15, 2015, and who were luding, however, all Opt-in Plaintiffs and
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPO (including PPG Architectural (including Akzo Nobel Paints January 22, 2011, through classified as non-exempt, excl FLSA Class Members.	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es: G Industries, Inc. and/or any subsidiary Finishes, Inc.) and/or any predecessor LLC) in California during the period of September 15, 2015, and who were luding, however, all Opt-in Plaintiffs and
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPO (including PPG Architectural (including Akzo Nobel Paints January 22, 2011, through classified as non-exempt, excl FLSA Class Members.	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds , as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es: G Industries, Inc. and/or any subsidiary Finishes, Inc.) and/or any predecessor LLC) in California during the period of September 15, 2015, and who were luding, however, all Opt-in Plaintiffs and
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPO (including PPG Architectural (including Akzo Nobel Paints January 22, 2011, through classified as non-exempt, excl FLSA Class Members.	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es: G Industries, Inc. and/or any subsidiary Finishes, Inc.) and/or any predecessor LLC) in California during the period of September 15, 2015, and who were luding, however, all Opt-in Plaintiffs and
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	California Rule 23 Class. For the put that the proposed California Rule 23 Class, Parties (the "Settlement Agreement"), meets Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. According following proposed California Rule 23 Classe Individuals employed by PPO (including PPG Architectural (including Akzo Nobel Paints January 22, 2011, through classified as non-exempt, excl FLSA Class Members.	urposes of settlement only, the Court preliminarily finds as defined in the Settlement Agreement between the the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) of the gly, the Court certifies for settlement purposes only the es: G Industries, Inc. and/or any subsidiary Finishes, Inc.) and/or any predecessor LLC) in California during the period of September 15, 2015, and who were luding, however, all Opt-in Plaintiffs and

1 after the date of this Order, Defendant will provide the Claims Administrator with an Excel chart 2 listing the names and last known addresses of the Covered California Rule 23 Class Members. 3 FLSA Class. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), the Court preliminarily certifies, for settlement 4 purposes only, the following proposed FLSA Class (as set forth in Exhibit A-2 of the Settlement 5 Agreement): Individuals identified by Named Plaintiffs as being entitled to 6 supplemental overtime wages earned in connection with the payment of incentive compensation associated with work performed from 2012 7 through 2015, excluding, however, all California Rule 23 Class Members and Opt-in Plaintiffs. 8 9 Not later than fourteen (14) days after the date of this Order, Defendant will provide the Claims 10 Administrator with an Excel chart listing the names and last known addresses of the FLSA Class Members. 12 **Opt-in Plaintiffs** are the Named Plaintiffs and those other individuals who filed (and did not withdraw) written consents to join this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Class Counsel and 14 Defense Counsel have agreed upon a list of all Opt-in Plaintiffs, which is attached to the Settlement 15 Agreement as **Exhibit A-1**. 16 2. Nullification. This Order will be null and void and of no force or effect, and this action will proceed as though a class had never been certified, if the Settlement Agreement is not 18 finally approved by the Court or if the Settlement Agreement, after being finally approved by the Court, is invalidated on appeal or terminated pursuant to its own terms. 20 3. Class Representatives. With respect to the California Rule 23 Class, the Court grants preliminary approval to Named Plaintiffs Hector Garcia, Robert Cahigal, and Tina Diemer, to 22 serve as the Class Representatives. 23 4. **Class Counsel.** The Court conditionally appoints as Class Counsel for the California 24 Rule 23 Class Laura L. Ho, Byron Goldstein, William C. Jhaveri-Weeks, of the law firm of 25 Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarian & Ho (300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000, Oakland, CA 94612) and 26 Bruce Fox and Andrew Horowitz of the law firm of Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell and Hippel LLC (BNY Mellon Center 500 Grant Street Suite 5240 Pittsburgh, PA 15219).

11 13 17 19 21 27 28 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 50 W. San Fernando, 15th Floor San Jose, CA 95113.2303 408 998 4150

1 5. Preliminary Approval of the Settlement Agreement. The proposed settlement set 2 forth in the Settlement Agreement appears, upon preliminary review, to be fair, reasonable and 3 adequate and is therefore preliminarily approved subject to further consideration thereof at the Final 4 Approval Hearing, as provided in Paragraph 7 below. It is found that the Notice of the proposed Settlement should be given as provided in the Settlement Agreement and set forth in Paragraph 8 below.

6. KCC Class Action Services, LLC (the "Claims Claims Administrator. Administrator"), is approved as administrator of the claims process as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

7. Fairness Hearing. Under Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a Fairness Hearing will be held on July 20, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. to consider final approval of the Settlement Agreement. The date and time of the Final Approval Hearing shall be set forth in the Notice, but the Final Approval Hearing shall be subject to adjournment by the Court without further notice to the Class Members other than that which may be posted by the Court. Plaintiffs shall file

their motion for final approval no later than July 6, 2016.

16 8. Notice to the Classes. The Notice of Proposed Settlement of Class Action Lawsuit 17 and Fairness Hearing (the "Notice") attached as Exhibit D to the Settlement Agreement, the Notice 18 of Settlement of Collective Action Lawsuit attached as Exhibit E, and the Opt-in Settlement Claim 19 Form and Release of Claims, attached as **Exhibit F** (collectively, the "Notice Materials") are 20 approved, with the alterations specified by the Court at the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for 21 Preliminary Approval, as filed by Plaintiffs in redlined form following that hearing. The Court 22 orders that the Claims Administrator mail the Notice Materials as set forth in the Settlement 23 Agreement to the members of the FLSA Class and Covered California Rule 23 Classes who are not 24 already a Named or Opt-in Plaintiff (as listed on Exhibit A-1 of the Settlement Agreement), as set 25 forth in the Settlement Agreement.

9. **Participation in the Settlement.** Any Member of the FLSA Class, who is not already a Named or Opt-in Plaintiff as listed in Exhibit A-1, who wishes to participate in the settlement, must execute and return an Opt-in Settlement Claim Form and Release of Claims

LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 50 W. San Fernando, 15th Floor San Jose, CA 95113.2303 408 998 4150

26

27

28

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

(Exhibit F) to the Claims Administrator postmarked within sixty days of the initial mailing of the
Notice Materials. Such individuals who timely return and file an executed FLSA Opt-in Settlement
Claim Form and Release of Claims shall be deemed to have filed a written consent to join this
Collective Action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). All Members of the Covered California Rule 23
Classes who do not request exclusion from the settlement are deemed Participating Claimants in the
Lawsuit.

10. Exclusion from the Settlement. Any member of the California Rule 23 Class who is not already a Named or Opt-in Plaintiff as listed on Exhibit A-1 of the Settlement Agreement, who wishes to not participate in the settlement may request exclusion from the class by submitting a signed request for exclusion to the Claims Administrator. To be effective, such request for exclusion must include the individual's name and an unequivocal statement that the individual requests to be excluded from the class, and it must be post-marked within sixty (60) days following the date of the initial mailing of the Rule 23 Notice Packet.

14 **Objections.** Any Covered California Rule 23 Class Members, who are not already a 11. 15 Named or Opt-in Plaintiff as listed on **Exhibit A-1**, who wish to present objections to the proposed 16 settlement at the Fairness Hearing should do so first in writing. To be considered, such objections 17 should (a) clearly identify the case name and number (Garcia et al. v. PPG Industries, Inc., Case 18 Number 3:15-cv-00319-WHO), (b) be submitted to the Court either by mailing them to the Class 19 Action Clerk, United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco, or 20 by filing them in person at any location of the United States District Court for the Northern District 21 of California, and (c) be filed or postmarked on or before sixty (60) days after the initial mailing of 22 the Notice by the Claims Administrator.

An objector who timely submits a written objection may appear at the Fairness Hearing either in person or through counsel hired by the objector. An objector may withdraw his or her objections at any time. No California Rule 23 Class Member may appear at the Fairness Hearing or appeal from the Final Approval Order unless he or she has filed a timely objection that complies with the procedures provided herein. Any California Rule 23 Class Member who requests exclusion from the class may not submit objections to the settlement. The Parties may file with the Court

LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 50 W. San Fernando, 15th Floor San Jose, CA 95113.2303 408.998.4150

23

24

25

26

27

28

written responses to any filed objections no later than fourteen (14) calendar days before the Fairness Hearing.

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

12. At least 14 days before the deadline to object to or opt out of the Settlement, Class Counsel shall file their motion for attorneys' fees, costs, and class representative enhancements.

13. Effect of the Settlement Agreement. All Named and Opt-in Plaintiffs shall be bound by the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement (if the Settlement Agreement is finally approved by the Court). All members of the Covered California Rule 23 Class who do not timely and properly exclude themselves from the class and FLSA class members that opt-in will be bound conclusively by all of the terms of the Settlement Agreement, if finally approved, and by any judgment entered upon final approval. Class Counsel will file returned exclusion statements with the Court as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

14. Voiding the Settlement Agreement. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, if 10% or more of the members of the Covered California Rule 23 Class elect to be excluded from the Covered California Rule 23 Class, Defendant will have the right, in its sole discretion, to void this Settlement Agreement by filing with the Court a notice as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. If Defendant files a timely notice, then this Settlement Agreement becomes null and void and this action will resume as it existed immediately prior to the execution of the Settlement Agreement.

18 15. Order for Settlement Purposes. The findings and rulings in this Order are made for
 19 the purposes of settlement only and may not be cited or otherwise used to support the certification of
 20 any contested class or subclass in this action or any other action.

16. **Stay.** All proceedings in this action, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to carry out the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement, are stayed and suspended until further order of the Court.

17. Use of Settlement Agreement and Ancillary Items. Neither the Settlement Agreement (whether or not it is finally approved), nor any ancillary documents, actions, statements, or filings in furtherance of settlement (including matters associated with the mediation) will be admissible or offered into evidence in this action or any related or similar action for the purposes of

28

1	establishing, supporting, or defending against any claims that were raised or could have been raised
2	in this action or are similar to such claims.
3	
4	So ordered.
5	Date: March 23, 2016
6	San Francisco, California
7	Hon. William H. Orrick United States District Judge
8	Childed States District Judge
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 50 W. San Fernando, 15th Floor San Jose, CA 95113.2303 408.998.4150	616336.1