

The Honorable Robert Lasnik

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MOHAMED A. HUSSEIN, an individual, and  
HASSAN HIRSI, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AIR SERV CORPORATION, a foreign  
corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:16-cv-00278 RSL

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING  
STIPULATED MOTION FOR CLASS  
CERTIFICATION AND APPOINTMENT  
OF CLASS COUNSEL AND  
REPRESENTATIVES

Before the Court is the Parties' Stipulated Motion for Class Certification, Appointment of Class Counsel and Class Representatives (the "Stipulated Motion"). The Court has considered the Stipulated Motion, together with its supporting declarations and exhibits.

**I. MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION.**

UPON CONSIDERATION, the Court finds the Motion for Class Certification should be and hereby is GRANTED.

The Court makes the following Finding with respect to the Stipulated Motion:

**A. Standard of Review**

A party seeking to certify a class must establish that the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 are met. *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 617 (1997). A court must engage in a

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED  
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND  
APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND  
REPRESENTATIVES- 1  
2:16-cv-00278

**BADGLEY MULLINS TURNER PLLC**  
19929 Ballinger Way NE, Suite 200  
Shoreline, WA 98155  
TEL 206.621.6566  
FAX 206.621.9686

1 “rigorous analysis” to determine whether the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 are satisfied.  
2 *Gen. Tel. Co. of the Southwest v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 161 (1982). However, the evidentiary  
3 showing need not be extensive. *Blackie v. Barrack*, 524 F. 2d 891, 901 (9th Cir. 1975).

4 **B. Plaintiff has satisfied Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)**

5 To be certified under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3), Plaintiffs and the proposed Class must first  
6 satisfy all the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a):

7 One or more members of a class may sue or be sued as representative parties on  
8 behalf of all only if (1) the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is  
9 impracticable, (2) there are questions of law or fact common to the class, (3) the  
10 claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or  
11 defenses of the class, and (4) the representative parties will fairly and adequately  
12 protect the interests of the class.

13 **1. Numerosity.**

14 The Class’s size is sufficiently numerous to meet the requirement of numerosity. There  
15 are, at least, hundreds of Class members in the Class. As a general rule a potential class of 40  
16 members is considered impractical to join. *Cox v. Am. Cast Iron Pipe Co.*, 784 F.2d 1546, 1553  
17 (11th Cir.1986). Accordingly, Plaintiffs have met their burden of showing that the proposed  
18 Class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable.

19 **2. Commonality**

20 A class meets the commonality requirement when “the common questions it has raised  
21 are ‘apt to drive the resolution of the litigation’ no matter their number. *Jiminez v. Allstate Ins.*  
22 *Co.*, 765 F.3d 1161, 1165 (9th Cir. 2014). Here, Plaintiffs have alleged that the Defendant  
23 engaged in a common course of conduct by failing to pay the minimum wage mandated by City  
24 of SeaTac Ordinance 7.45.

The Class's common questions include:

- Whether the Defendant had a duty to pay its non-managerial employees who qualify as Transportation Workers under the Ordinance the minimum hourly wages provided within the Ordinance prior to February 12, 2016.
- Whether the Defendant willfully withheld the minimum hourly wages provided within the Ordinance.
- Whether the Defendant's alleged failure to pay its employees who qualify as Transportation Workers under the Ordinance the minimum hourly wages provided within the Ordinance constituted a statutory violation.
- Whether the Defendant was unjustly enriched by withholding the minimum hourly wages provided within the Ordinance.
- Whether employees who qualify as Transportation Workers under the Ordinance are entitled to receive double damages as result of the Defendant's alleged willful withholding of the minimum hourly wages provided within the Ordinance.

Any one of these common questions of fact and law is sufficient to satisfy the Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) commonality requirement.

### 3. Typicality

The proposed Class Representatives' claims are typical of the Class because Plaintiffs' claims arise from the same alleged course of conduct and are based on the same legal theories regarding the Defendant's allegedly wrongful conduct. Each Class member has claims based on the same legal theories as Plaintiffs, i.e., alleged failure to pay the prevailing minimum wage. Typicality has been interpreted to mean that "a class representative must be part of the class and 'possess the same interest and suffer the same injury' as the class members." *Falcon*, 457 U.S. at 156 (quoting *East Texas Motor Freight Sys., Inc., v. Rodriguez*, 431 U.S. 395, 403 (1977)). Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims satisfy the typicality requirement of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

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

**4. Adequacy**

The proposed Class Representatives and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiffs have no antagonistic or conflicting interests with absent Class members and Class counsel are experienced in employment litigation and class action practice.

**5. The Requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) Are Met.**

This dispute for every member of the proposed Class revolves around questions common to the Class, listed above. Answering those common questions will determine the liability (or lack thereof) of the Defendant to every member of the proposed Class. Accordingly, common questions predominate over individual questions and answering these questions in a single forum “would achieve economies of time, effort, and expense, and promote uniformity of decision as to persons similarly situated, without sacrificing procedural fairness or bringing about other undesirable results.” 1966 Advisory Committee Notes, Rule 23(b)(3). In addition, a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) recites that a court should consider: (A) the interest of members of the class in individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions; (B) the extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against members of the class; (C) the desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; (D) the difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action. All of these factors favor certification here. Hundreds of Class members bringing individual claims would not conserve time, effort and expense or provide a forum for claimants like those here. Absent Class members are unlikely to have any interest in individually controlling their claims, and the claims of former employees might go unaddressed but for their

1 inclusion in a class action. The Defendant has substantial contacts in Washington state and all of  
2 the Class members live (or have lived) here; therefore, this jurisdiction has a particular interest in  
3 this matter, making this a desirable location to litigate these claims.

4 IT is, accordingly, hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

- 5 1. This action shall be maintained as a Class Action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) and  
6 on behalf of the following Class:

7 All employees of Air Serv who have been Transportation Workers and who  
8 worked one or more hours within the City of SeaTac at any time during the  
9 time period from January 1, 2014, to February 12, 2016 who can be  
10 ascertained from Air Serv's records as having been paid less than the  
11 prevailing minimum wage prescribed by City of SeaTac Ordinance 7.45.050  
12 050 and who have not recovered back wages under separate legal action.

- 12 2. Plaintiffs are appointed Class Representatives.  
13 3. Plaintiffs' Counsel are hereby appointed and designated as counsel for the above-  
14 mentioned Class and are authorized to act on behalf of the members of the Class.

15  
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

17  
18  
19 DATED: March 1, 2017



\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Robert S. Lasnik  
U.S. District Judge

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED  
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND  
APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND  
REPRESENTATIVES- 5  
2:16-cv-00278

**BADGLEY MULLINS TURNER PLLC**  
19929 Bellinger Way NE, Suite 200  
Shoreline, WA 98155  
TEL 206.621.6566  
FAX 206.621.9686

1  
2 PRESENTED BY:

3 BADGLEY MULLINS TURNER PLLC

4 /s/ Duncan C. Turner

5 Duncan C. Turner, WSBA # 20597  
6 19929 Ballinger Way NE, Suite 200  
7 Seattle, WA 98155

8 Telephone: (206) 621-6566

9 Facsimile: (206) 621-9686

10 Email: [duncanturner@badgleyturner.com](mailto:duncanturner@badgleyturner.com)

11 **Attorney for Plaintiffs**

12 LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL R. WHITMORE

13 /s/Daniel R. Whitmore

14 Daniel R. Whitmore, WSBA No. 24012  
15 2626 15th Avenue West, Suite 200  
16 Seattle, WA 98119

17 Telephone: (206) 329-8400

18 Facsimile: (206) 329-84001

19 Email: [dan@whitmorelawfirm.com](mailto:dan@whitmorelawfirm.com)

20 **Attorney for Plaintiffs**

21 SEBRIS BUSTO JAMES

22 /s/Jeffrey A. James

23 Jeffrey A. James, WSBA #18277

24 Darren A. Feider, WSBA #22430

25 14205 SE 36<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 325

26 Bellevue, WA 98006

27 Telephone: (425) 454-4233

Email: [jaj@sebrisbusto.com](mailto:jaj@sebrisbusto.com)

Email: [dfeider@sebrisbusto.com](mailto:dfeider@sebrisbusto.com)

**Attorneys for Defendant**

28 ~~(PROPOSED)~~ ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED  
29 MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND  
30 APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL AND  
31 REPRESENTATIVES- 6  
32 2:16-cv-00278

**BADGLEY MULLINS TURNER PLLC**

19929 Ballinger Way NE, Suite 200  
Shoreline, WA 98155  
TEL 206.621.6566  
FAX 206.621.9686