

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
6

7 JESSE BLACK,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 T-MOBILE USA, INC,  
11 Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-04151-HSG

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF  
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Re: Dkt. No. 51

12  
13 Pending before the Court is the unopposed motion for preliminary approval of class action  
14 settlement filed by Plaintiff Jesse Black. Dkt. No. 51. The parties have reached a settlement  
15 regarding Plaintiff's claims and now seek the required court approval. For the reasons set forth  
16 below, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's motion for preliminary approval of class action settlement.

17 **I. BACKGROUND**

18 **A. Factual Background**

19 On January 31, 2017, Plaintiff filed this putative labor and employment class action in  
20 Alameda Superior Court. See Dkt. No. 1, Ex. A ("Compl."). Plaintiff alleges that he worked for  
21 Defendant T-Mobile USA, Inc. ("T-Mobile") as a Senior Field Technician and was denied  
22 adequate overtime compensation as well as meal and rest periods from approximately 2008  
23 through 2015. See id. ¶ 4.

24 According to Plaintiff, Defendant had "a company-wide" policy of scheduling technicians  
25 for rotating "on-call" weeks in which they "had to be available 24/7 to respond to service calls"  
26 and "could not use that time freely for their own purpose." Id. ¶¶ 46, 56. An on-call week would  
27 run from Monday at 5:00 p.m. through the following Monday at 7:59 a.m. Id. ¶ 46. Defendant  
28 paid technicians \$22.47 per day during these on-call weeks, but "failed to pay Plaintiff and class

1 members for the remainder of the time during which they were not free to use their time for their  
2 own purposes.” Id. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant did not have a policy permitting its  
3 employees to take a second 30-minute meal period on days they worked in excess of 10 hours. Id.  
4 ¶ 48.

5 On the basis of these facts, Plaintiff asserts nine causes of action on behalf of himself and  
6 the putative class for: (1) unpaid overtime; (2) unpaid minimum wage; (3) failure to provide meal  
7 periods; (4) failure to provide rest periods; (5) failure to provide accurate wage statements and  
8 maintain payroll records; (6) failure to pay wages upon termination; (7) failure to provide  
9 reporting time pay; (8) unlawful business practices; and (9) unfair business practices. See id.  
10 ¶¶ 39–115. On July 21, 2017, Defendant removed the state court action to this court. Dkt. No. 1.

11 **B. Settlement Agreement**

12 Following extensive formal discovery and with the assistance of a mediator, the parties  
13 eventually entered into a settlement agreement on October 10, 2018. Dkt. No. 51-1 ¶¶ 4–6, Ex. 1  
14 (“SA”). The key terms are as follows:

15 Class Definition: The settlement includes all means all persons who have worked for  
16 Defendant as non-exempt, hourly-paid field technicians in California at any time from February 1,  
17 2013 through the date of Preliminary Approval. SA ¶ 5.

18 Settlement Benefits: Defendant will pay a total settlement amount of \$980,000, including  
19 settlement payments to all Class Members totaling an estimated \$594,580, administrative costs  
20 estimated at \$10,000, incentive awards, any attorneys’ fees and costs award, and a payment of  
21 \$18,750 to the Labor Workforce Development Agency pursuant to the Private Attorneys General  
22 Act of 2004 (PAGA). SA ¶¶ 8, 13, 25; Dkt. No. 51 at 1. Individual settlement payments will be  
23 calculated proportionately based on the number of workweeks a class member worked during the  
24 class period. SA ¶ 35. Individual settlement amounts will average approximately \$2,970. Dkt.  
25 No. 51 at 2.

26 Release: All settlement class members will release:

27 all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, arising  
28 from, or related to, the claims alleged or which could have been  
alleged in the proposed First Amended Complaint based on the same

1 set of operative pleaded facts, including: (i) all claims for unpaid  
2 wages, including overtime; (ii) all claims for meal and rest break  
3 violations; (iii) all claims for unpaid minimum wages; (iv) all claims  
4 for the failure to timely pay wages upon termination; (v) all claims  
5 for the failure to timely pay wages during employment, including but  
6 not limited to any on call time alleges to be compensable but not paid;  
7 (vi) all claims for wage statement violations; (vii) all claims for failure  
8 to pay reporting time compensation or paid sick leave; and (viii) all  
9 claims asserted through California Business & Professions Code §§  
10 17200, et seq., and California Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq. based on  
11 the preceding claims.

12 SA ¶ 21.

13 Class Notice: A third-party settlement administrator will send class notices via U.S. mail  
14 to each member of the class, using a class list provided by Defendant. SA ¶ 39. The notice will  
15 include: the nature of the action, a summary of the settlement terms, and instructions on how to  
16 object to and opt out of the settlement, including relevant deadlines. See Dkt. No. 51-1, Ex. A  
17 (proposed notice).

18 Opt-Out Procedure: The parties propose that any putative class member who does not  
19 wish to participate in the settlement must sign and postmark a written request for exclusion to the  
20 settlement administrator no later than 30 days after the date notice is mailed. SA ¶¶ 24, 44.

21 Incentive Award: The Named Plaintiff will apply for an incentive award of no more than  
22 \$10,000, subject to the approval of the Court. SA ¶¶ 7, 31.

23 Attorneys' Fees and Costs: Plaintiff will file an application for attorneys' fees not to  
24 exceed one third of the settlement fund (\$326,667), and costs not to exceed \$20,000. SA ¶ 2.

## 25 **II. PROVISIONAL CLASS CERTIFICATION**

26 The Court first considers whether provisional class certification is appropriate because it is  
27 a prerequisite to preliminary approval of a class action settlement.

### 28 **A. Legal Standard**

Plaintiff bears the burden of showing by a preponderance of the evidence that class  
certification is appropriate under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v.*  
*Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338, 350–351 (2011). Class certification is a two-step process. First, a plaintiff  
must establish that each of the four requirements of Rule 23(a) is met: numerosity, commonality,  
typicality, and adequacy of representation. *Id.* at 349. Second, he must establish that at least one

1 of the bases for certification under Rule 23(b) is met. Where, as here, a plaintiff seeks to certify a  
2 class under Rule 23(b)(3), he must show that “questions of law or fact common to class members  
3 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and that a class action is  
4 superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Fed.  
5 R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3).

6 **B. Analysis**

7 To determine whether provisional certification is appropriate, the Court considers whether  
8 the requirements of Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) have been met. As discussed in more detail  
9 below, the Court finds those requirements have been met in this case.

10 **i. Rule 23(a) Certification**

11 **a. Numerosity**

12 Rule 23(a)(1) requires that the putative class be “so numerous that joinder of all members  
13 is impracticable.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). The Court finds that numerosity is satisfied here  
14 because joinder of the approximately 200 class members would be impracticable. See Dkt. No. 51  
15 at 5.

16 **b. Commonality**

17 Rule 23(a)(2) requires that “there are questions of law or fact common to the class.” Fed.  
18 R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2). A contention is sufficiently common where “it is capable of classwide  
19 resolution—which means that determination of its truth or falsity will resolve an issue that is  
20 central to the validity of each one of the claims in one stroke.” *Dukes*, 564 U.S at 350.  
21 Commonality exists where “the circumstances of each particular class member vary but retain a  
22 common core of factual or legal issues with the rest of the class.” *Parra v. Bashas’, Inc.*, 536 F.3d  
23 975, 978–79 (9th Cir. 2008). “What matters to class certification . . . is not the raising of common  
24 ‘questions’—even in droves—but rather the capacity of a classwide proceeding to generate  
25 common answers apt to drive the resolution of the litigation.” *Dukes*, 564 U.S at 350. Even a  
26 single common question is sufficient to meet this requirement. *Id.* at 359.

27 The central questions in this action are: (1) whether “on-call” time is compensable; (2)  
28 whether “call-in” shifts are considered reporting to work under California Labor Code section

1 1198; (3) the appropriate rate at which employees should be compensated for meal periods; (4)  
2 whether Defendant’s policies authorized and permitted rest breaks; (5) and whether Defendant’s  
3 wage statements were properly formatted. See Dkt. No. 51 at 7–11. Those questions are common  
4 to all class members and do not require an individualized analysis. Accordingly, the Court finds  
5 that the commonality requirement is met in this case.

6 **c. Typicality**

7 Rule 23(a)(3) requires that “the claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical  
8 of the claims or defenses of the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3). “The test of typicality is whether  
9 other members have the same or similar injury, whether the action is based on conduct which is  
10 not unique to the named plaintiffs, and whether other class members have been injured by the  
11 same course of conduct.” *Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.*, 976 F.2d 497, 508 (9th Cir. 1992)  
12 (internal quotation marks omitted). That said, under the “permissive standards” of Rule 23(a)(3),  
13 the claims “need not be substantially identical.” *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1020  
14 (9th Cir. 1998).

15 Plaintiff’s claims are both factually and legally similar to those of the putative class  
16 because Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a Senior Field Technician during the relevant time  
17 periods. Compl. ¶ 4. Both Plaintiff and the class members were subject to Defendant’s alleged  
18 policies regarding compensation. *Id.* ¶¶ 18, 20. This is sufficient to satisfy the typicality  
19 requirement.

20 **d. Adequacy of Representation**

21 Rule 23(a)(4) requires that the “representative parties will fairly and adequately represent  
22 the interests of the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). The Court must address two legal questions:  
23 (1) whether Named Plaintiff and counsel have any conflicts of interest with other class members,  
24 and (2) whether Named Plaintiff and counsel will prosecute the action vigorously on behalf of the  
25 class. See *In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 213 F.3d 454, 462 (9th Cir. 2000). This inquiry  
26 “tend[s] to merge” with the commonality and typicality criteria. *Gen. Tel. Co. of Sw. v. Falcon*,  
27 457 U.S. 147, 158 n.13 (1982). In part, these requirements determine whether “the named  
28 plaintiff’s claim and the class claims are so interrelated that the interests of the class members will

1 be fairly and adequately protected in their absence.” Id.

2 The Court is unaware of any actual conflicts of interest in this matter and no evidence in  
3 the record suggests that either Plaintiff or proposed class counsel have a conflict with other class  
4 members. Dkt. No. 51 at 12. Plaintiff’s counsel has been appointed class counsel in multiple state  
5 and federal class actions. Id.; Dkt. No. 51-1 ¶ 9. The Court finds that proposed class counsel and  
6 Plaintiff have prosecuted this action vigorously on behalf of the class to date and will continue to  
7 do so. The adequacy of representation requirement is therefore satisfied.

8 **ii. Rule 23(b)(3) Certification**

9 To certify a class, Plaintiff must also satisfy the two requirements of Rule 23(b)(3). First,  
10 “questions of law or fact common to class members [must] predominate over any questions  
11 affecting only individual members.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). And second, “a class action [must  
12 be] superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Id.  
13 The Court finds that both are met in this case.

14 **a. Predominance**

15 “The predominance inquiry tests whether proposed classes are sufficiently cohesive to  
16 warrant adjudication by representation.” *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo*, 136 S. Ct. 1036, 1045  
17 (2016) (internal quotation marks omitted). The Supreme Court has defined an individual question  
18 as “one where members of a proposed class will need to present evidence that varies from member  
19 to member . . . .” Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). A common question, on the other hand,  
20 “is one where the same evidence will suffice for each member to make a prima facie showing [or]  
21 the issue is susceptible to generalized, class-wide proof.” Id. (internal quotation marks omitted).

22 Here, the Court finds for purposes of settlement that the common questions raised by  
23 Plaintiff’s claims predominate over questions affecting only individual members of the proposed  
24 class. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant undercompensated its employees in the same way as to all  
25 class members through the same set of actions and decisions. See Dkt. No. 51 at 7–12.

26 **b. Superiority**

27 The superiority requirement tests whether “a class action is superior to other available  
28 methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). The

1 Court considers four non-exclusive factors: (1) the interest of each class member in individually  
2 controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions; (2) the extent and nature of any  
3 litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against the class; (3) the  
4 desirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and (4) the  
5 difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action. *Id.*

6 Here, because common legal and factual questions predominate over individual ones, and  
7 taking into account the large size of the proposed class, the Court finds that the judicial economy  
8 achieved through common adjudication renders class action a superior method for adjudicating the  
9 claims of the proposed class.

10 **iii. Class Representative and Class Counsel**

11 Because the Court finds that Plaintiff meet the commonality, typicality, and adequacy  
12 requirements of Rule 23(a), the Court appoints Plaintiff as class representative. When a court  
13 certifies a class, it must also appoint class counsel. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(1)(B). Factors that  
14 courts should consider when making that decision include:

- 15 (i) the work counsel has done in identifying or investigating potential  
16 claims in the action;
- 17 (ii) counsel’s experience in handling class actions, other complex  
18 litigation, and the types of claims asserted in the action;
- 19 (iii) counsel’s knowledge of the applicable law; and
- 20 (iv) the resources that counsel will commit to representing the class.

21 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(A).

22 In light of Plaintiff’s counsel’s extensive experience litigating class actions in federal  
23 court, Dkt. No. 51-1 ¶ 9, and their diligence in prosecuting this action to date, the Court appoints  
24 Capstone Law APC as class counsel.

25 **III. PRELIMINARY SETTLEMENT APPROVAL**

26 **A. Legal Standard**

27 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e) provides that “[t]he claims, issues, or defenses of a  
28 certified class—or a class proposed to be certified for purposes of settlement— may be settled . . .  
only with the court’s approval.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e). “The purpose of Rule 23(e) is to protect  
the unnamed members of the class from unjust or unfair settlements affecting their rights.” In re

1 Syncor ERISA Litig., 516 F.3d 1095, 1100 (9th Cir. 2008). Accordingly, before a district court  
2 approves a class action settlement, it must conclude that the settlement is “fundamentally fair,  
3 adequate and reasonable.” In re Heritage Bond Litig., 546 F.3d 667, 674–75 (9th Cir. 2008).

4 Where the parties reach a class action settlement prior to class certification, district courts  
5 apply “a higher standard of fairness and a more probing inquiry than may normally be required  
6 under Rule 23(e).” Dennis v. Kellogg Co., 697 F.3d 858, 864 (9th Cir. 2012) (internal quotation  
7 marks omitted). In those situations, courts “must be particularly vigilant not only for explicit  
8 collusion, but also for more subtle signs that class counsel have allowed pursuit of their own self-  
9 interests and that of certain class members to infect the negotiations.” In re Bluetooth Headset  
10 Prods. Liab. Litig., 654 F.3d 935, 947 (9th Cir. 2011).

11 Courts may preliminarily approve a settlement and direct notice to the class if the proposed  
12 settlement: (1) appears to be the product of serious, informed, non-collusive negotiations; (2) has  
13 no obvious deficiencies; (3) does not grant improper preferential treatment to class representatives  
14 or other segments of the class; and (4) falls within the range of possible approval. See In re  
15 Tableware Antitrust Litig., 484 F. Supp. 2d 1078, 1079 (N.D. Cal. 2007). Courts lack the  
16 authority, however, to “delete, modify or substitute certain provisions. The settlement must stand  
17 or fall in its entirety.” Hanlon, 150 F.3d at 1026.

18 **B. Analysis**

19 **i. Settlement Process**

20 The first factor the Court considers is the means by which the parties settled the action.  
21 “An initial presumption of fairness is usually involved if the settlement is recommended by class  
22 counsel after arm’s-length bargaining.” Harris v. Vector Mktg. Corp., No. 08-cv-5198, 2011 WL  
23 1627973, at \*8 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2011).

24 Here, class counsel believes, based on significant discovery, that the settlement is fair,  
25 adequate, and reasonable. Dkt. No. 51-1 ¶¶ 4–6. The Court consequently finds that this factor  
26 weighs in favor of preliminary approval.

27 **ii. Preferential Treatment**

28 The Court next considers whether the settlement agreement provides preferential treatment



1 to any class member. The Ninth Circuit has instructed that district courts must be “particularly  
2 vigilant” for signs that counsel have allowed the “self-interests” of “certain class members to  
3 infect negotiations.” In re Bluetooth., 654 F.3d at 947. For that reason, courts in this district have  
4 consistently stated that preliminary approval of a class action settlement is inappropriate where the  
5 proposed agreement “improperly grant[s] preferential treatment to class representatives.”  
6 Tableware, 484 F. Supp. 2d at 1079.

7 Although the Settlement Agreement implicitly authorizes Plaintiff Black to seek an  
8 incentive awards of no more \$10,000 for his role as named plaintiff in this lawsuit, see SA ¶¶ 7,  
9 31, the Court will ultimately determine whether Named Plaintiff is entitled to such an award and  
10 the reasonableness of the amount requested. Incentive awards “are intended to compensate class  
11 representatives for work done on behalf of the class, to make up for financial or reputational risk  
12 undertaken in bringing the action.” *Rodriguez v. West Publ’g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 958–59 (9th  
13 Cir. 2009). Plaintiff must provide sufficient evidence to allow the Court to evaluate Plaintiff  
14 Black’s award “individually, using relevant factors includ[ing] the actions the plaintiff has taken to  
15 protect the interests of the class, the degree to which the class has benefitted from those actions,  
16 . . . [and] the amount of time and effort the plaintiff expended in pursuing the litigation . . . .”  
17 *Stanton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 977 (9th Cir. 2003) (internal quotation marks omitted). The  
18 Court will consider the evidence presented at the final fairness hearing and evaluate the  
19 reasonableness of any incentive award request. Nevertheless, because incentive awards are not  
20 per se unreasonable, the Court finds that this factor still weighs in favor of preliminary approval.  
21 See *Rodriguez*, 563 F.3d at 958 (finding that “[i]ncentive awards are fairly typical in class action  
22 cases” and “are discretionary”) (emphasis omitted).

23 **iii. Settlement within Range of Possible Approval**

24 The third factor that the Court considers is whether the settlement is within the range of  
25 possible approval. To evaluate whether the settlement amount is adequate, “courts primarily  
26 consider plaintiffs’ expected recovery balanced against the value of the settlement offer.”  
27 Tableware, 484 F. Supp. 2d at 1080. This requires the Court to evaluate the strength of Plaintiff’s  
28 case.

1 Here, each individual class member’s recovery will be proportional to that class member’s  
2 claim. SA ¶ 35. The individual settlement amounts are expected to average approximately  
3 \$2,970. Dkt. No. 51 at 2. There is substantial risk Plaintiff would face in litigating the case given  
4 the nature of the asserted claims. Id. at 16–17. Plaintiff acknowledges, for example, that Plaintiff  
5 and the class members would face the risk that class certification would be denied based on  
6 individualized inquiries into the practical effect of Defendant’s policies on individual Plaintiffs.  
7 Id. The Court finds that the settlement amount, given this risk, weighs in favor of granting  
8 preliminary approval.

9 **iv. Obvious Deficiencies**

10 The fourth and final factor that the Court considers is whether there are obvious  
11 deficiencies in the settlement agreement. The Court finds no obvious deficiencies, and therefore  
12 finds that this factor weighs in favor of preliminary approval.

13 \* \* \*

14 Having weighed the relevant factors, the Court preliminarily finds that the settlement  
15 agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and **GRANTS** preliminary approval.

16 **IV. MOTION FOR FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL AND ATTORNEYS’ FEES**

17 The Court **DIRECTS** the parties to include both a joint proposed order and a joint  
18 proposed judgment when submitting their motion for final approval.

19 **V. PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE PLAN**

20 For Rule 23(b)(3) class actions, “the court must direct notice to the class members the best  
21 notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who  
22 can be identified through reasonable effort.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).

23 With respect to the content of the notice itself, the notice must clearly and concisely state  
24 in plain, easily understood language:

- 25
- 26 (i) the nature of the action;
  - 27 (ii) the definition of the class certified;
  - 28 (iii) the class claims, issues, or defenses;
  - (iv) that a class member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires;
  - (v) that the court will exclude from the class any member who requests

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

- exclusion;
- (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and
- (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members[.]

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).

The Court finds that the proposed notice, Dkt. No. 51-1, Ex. A, is the best practicable form of notice under the circumstances.

**VI. CONCLUSION**


For the foregoing reasons, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary approval of class action settlement. The parties are **DIRECTED** to meet and confer and stipulate to a schedule of dates for each event listed below, which shall be submitted to the Court within seven days of the date of this Order:

| <b>Event</b>   | <b>Date</b> |
|--|-------------|
| Deadline for Settlement Administrator to mail notice to all putative class members   |             |
| Filing Deadline for attorneys’ fees and costs motion   |             |
| Filing deadline for incentive payment motion   |             |
| Deadline for class members to opt-out or object to settlement and/or application for attorneys’ fees and costs and incentive payment |             |
| Filing deadline for final approval motion  |             |
| Final fairness hearing and hearing on motions  |             |

The parties are further **DIRECTED** to implement the proposed class notice plan.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 2/8/2019

  
HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge