

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

LUIS M. SALAS RAZO, on his own behalf of and all others similarly situated,)	Case No.: 1:20-cv-0172 JLT HBK
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT
)	
v.)	(Doc. 75)
)	
AT&T MOBILITY SERVICES, LLC, and DOES 1 through 100,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Luis Salas Razo asserts AT&T Mobility Services failed to comply with California’s wage and hour laws by failing to pay all wages due and provide proper meal and rest breaks. Razo now seeks preliminary approval of a settlement reached in this action. Specifically, Razo seeks: (1) conditional certification of the settlement class; (2) preliminary approval of the settlement terms; (3) appointment of Razo as the class representative; (4) appointment of the firm of Bradley/Grombacher LLP as class counsel; (5) approval of the class notice materials; (6) appointment of Atticus Administration, LLC, as the settlement administrator; and (7) scheduling for final approval. (Doc. 75.)

The Court reviewed the proposed settlement between the parties, as well as the moving papers, and finds the matter suitable for decision without oral arguments pursuant to Local Rule 230(g) and General Order 618. For the following reasons, the motion for preliminary approval of the class settlement is **GRANTED**.

BACKGROUND

1
2 Razo was employed a sales representative at the AT&T Mobility Store located in Madera,
3 California. (Doc. 41 at 4, ¶ 11.) Razo asserts he worked for AT&T “for approximately eleven years”
4 until his termination in June 2018. (*Id.*) He alleges AT&T “routinely failed to properly calculate the
5 overtime and double time rate of pay.” (*Id.* at 6, ¶ 25.) Razo asserts AT&T “failed to include its
6 employees’ total compensation including bonuses and commissions when calculating the regular rate
7 for the purposes of determining overtime wages owed and thus routinely underpaid employees for
8 overtime wages owed.” (*Id.*) Razo contends this underpayment was “evidenced in [his] paycheck and
9 accompanying wage statement issued June 13, 2018.” (*Id.*, ¶ 26.)

10 He alleges the wage statements also “failed to properly list all hours worked which again resulted
11 in an underpayment of wages including overtime and double time wages to employees.” (Doc. 4 at 6,
12 ¶ 27.) He contends, “[t]his resulted in failure to pay wages for all hours worked at appropriate rates,
13 and overtime violations for work performed over eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per
14 week.” (*Id.*) For example, Razo asserts his wage statement from June 13, 2018, “incorrectly reflects
15 that the total hours worked because the hours associated with all of the line items add up to 106.08, but
16 the total hours worked line item only lists 81.98 hours.” (*Id.* at 7, ¶ 27.)

17 Razo asserts he and others “received paychecks without proper wages, as meal period
18 premiums were not paid at the proper rate, and the regular rate of pay was miscalculated.” (Doc. 41 at
19 7, ¶ 28.) Razo contends AT&T paid premiums for missed meal periods at his “base hourly rate, rather
20 than the regular rate of pay.” (*Id.*) According to Razo, the miscalculation was “evidenced in [his]
21 paycheck and accompanying wage statement issued June 1, 2018, which shows the untaken meal
22 break premium is paid at [the] base hourly rate,” without incorporating his commission in the premium
23 rate paid. (*Id.*)

24 Razo contends “on routine basis he and all other aggrieved employees received wage
25 statements in violation of Labor Code §226, as hours and rates were not properly shown on wage
26 statements.” (Doc. 41 at 7, ¶ 29 (emphasis omitted).) He alleges, “where there are payments for items
27 such as cash awards, commission, taxable non-cash-awards, miscellaneous payment, or overtime ‘true
28 up’ payments, there are no specific details as to rate or hours in the description or analysis that make

1 up the payment.” (*Id.*) He asserts the wage statements also violated California law because:
2 “premium pay for meal period violations were paid at the... base hourly rate, rather than his regular
3 rate of pay; the total hours listed are incorrect because the hours associated with the wage statement’s
4 line items exceed the number of total hours worked listed; and the wage statements list improper
5 overtime rates because [AT&T] omitted items such as ‘COMMISSION (MOBILITY)’ when
6 calculating its employee’s regular rate of pay.” (*Id.* at 7-8, ¶ 31.)

7 According to Razo, due to the miscalculated wages, AT&T also failed “to pay for all wages due
8 prior to termination.” (Doc. 41 at 8, ¶ 32.) In addition, Razo alleges that his “last day of work was in
9 June 2018, but since such date four additional payments were made with the latest payment made as
10 late as August 2018 well more than thirty (30) days after he ceased employment.” (*Id.*, ¶ 35.) He
11 reports these “payments consisted of the final payment of wages described as (1) Cash Awards, (2)
12 Commission, (3) Taxable non-cash Awards, (4) Misc. Payment, and (5) recalculation of overtime
13 differential pay.” (*Id.* at 9, ¶ 36.) Razo contends that AT&T “knew or should have known, that all
14 other employees, including Plaintiff, were entitled to receive all wages at appropriate rates, all overtime
15 at appropriate rates, and all commissions due at the time their employment ceased,” and knowingly and
16 willfully failed to pay the wages due upon termination. (*Id.*, ¶¶ 36-37.)

17 On May 29, 2019, Razo provided notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and
18 AT&T “of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including
19 the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.” (Doc. 41 at 9, ¶ 42 (emphasis omitted).) He
20 asserts the LWDA did not respond to the notice. (*Id.*, ¶ 43.)

21 On August 27, 2019, Razo initiated this action by filing a class complaint in Madera County
22 Superior Court, Case No. MCV081925. (Doc. 1-4 at 5.) Razo filed an amended complaint in the state
23 court on January 8, 2020. (Doc. 1-9.) AT&T initiated the matter before this Court by filing a notice
24 of removal on January 31, 2020. (Doc. 1.) Razo further amended the pleadings on July 30, 2020, and
25 October 15, 2021. (Docs. 9, 41.) The Third Amended Complaint is now the operative pleading.

26 Razo identifies the following causes of action in the TAC: (1) failure to pay for all hours
27 worked; (2) failure to pay overtime wages; (3) failure to pay wages due at termination in violation of
28 Cal. Labor Code §§ 201-203; (4) failure to furnish accurate, itemized wage statement in violation of

1 Cal. Labor Code § 226; (5) unlawful and unfair conduct in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §
2 17200, *et seq.*; and (6) civil penalties under California’s Private Attorney General Act. (Doc. 41 at 13-
3 23.) Razo asserted the claims were brought on behalf of himself and classes including:

- 4 1. “The Plaintiff Class”: All persons who have been, or currently are,
5 employed by Defendant and who held, or hold, job positions which
6 Defendant have classified as “non-exempt” personnel in the State of
7 California. (The Class Period is the period from August 27, 2015,
8 through and including the date judgment is rendered in this matter).
- 9 2. “The Terminated Sub Class”: All members of the Plaintiff Class
10 whose employment ended during the Class Period (The Class Period is
11 the period from August 27, 2015, through and including the date
12 judgment is rendered in this matter).

13 (*Id.* at 10.) AT&T filed its answer on October 28, 2021. (Doc. 46.)

14 While this matter was pending, AT&T settled a separate class action addressing “the same
15 claims” as those raised by Razo, in *Samuel Wallack, et al. v. AT&T Mobility Services, LLC*, San
16 Bernardino County Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2117915.¹ (Doc. 72 at 4; *see also* Doc. 50 at 2.)
17 The *Wallack* court denied Razo’s motion to intervene. (Doc. 49.) The settlement in *Wallack* received
18 final approval on March 18, 2022, and an “Amended Order Nunc Pro Tunc Granting Joint Motion for
19 Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Judgment” was issued on April 19, 2022. The *Wallack*
20 class was confirmed to include: “All persons who worked for AT&T Mobility Services LLC in the
21 State of California, while classified as non-exempt, at any time from August 1, 2015 through November
22 2, 2021.” (*Wallack*, Case No. CIVSB2117915, *Amended Order*, p. 2.)

23 On March 8, 2022, Razo filed a motion for preliminary approval of the settlement with AT&T
24 in this action. (Doc. 72.) In seeking approval, Razo acknowledged: “[o]nce the *Wallack* Court

25 ¹ The Court may take judicial notice of a fact that “is not subject to reasonable dispute because it (1) is generally known
26 within the trial court’s territorial jurisdiction; or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy
27 cannot reasonably be questioned.” Fed. R. Evid. 201; *see also United States v. Bernal-Obeso*, 989 F.2d 331, 333 (9th Cir.
28 1993). The official records of the Superior Court of San Bernardino County, as contained in the court’s official website, are
sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned, and judicial notice may be taken of documents on the website of
a state court. *See Harris v. County of Orange*, 682 F.3d 1126, 1132 (9th Cir. 2012) (judicial notice may be taken of
“undisputed matters of public record, including documents on file in federal or state courts”); *O’Toole v. Northrop*
Grumman Corp., 499 F.3d 1218, 1225 (10th Cir. 2007) (“It is not uncommon for courts to take judicial notice of factual
information found on the world wide web”). Accordingly, the Court takes judicial notice of the San Bernardino County
Superior Court docket in Case No. CIVSB2117915, including the filing dates and documents publicly available. This
docket is available at <https://www.sb-court.org>, and through the court’s online portal at <https://cap.sb-court.org>.

1 grant[ed] final approval, the only remaining claims in this matter will be those Razo has asserted on
2 behalf of those who worked for Defendant in a non-exempt role in California from November 2, 2021,
3 onwards.” (*Id.* at 6.) Thus, Razo and AT&T agreed settle the claims of a class defined as: “All persons
4 who worked for AT&T Mobility Services LLC in the State of California, while classified as non-
5 exempt, at any time from November 2, 2021, to the date the Court grants preliminary approval of this
6 Settlement.” (*Id.* at 7; *see also* Doc. 72-4 at 4, Settlement ¶ 2.) On May 2, 2022, the Court determined
7 Razo was not a member of the proposed settlement class, and the conditional class could not be
8 certified. (Doc. 74.) Consequently, approval of the settlement was denied.

9 Following the Court’s determination, the parties executed a “Revised Class Action and PAGA
10 Action Settlement Agreement.” (Doc. 75-2.) On May 27, 2022, Razo filed a motion for preliminary
11 approval of the parties’ revised settlement. (Doc. 75.) AT&T did not oppose or otherwise respond to
12 the motion.

13 **THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT**

14 Pursuant to the proposed “Class Action and PAGA Action Settlement Agreement (“the
15 Settlement”), the parties agree to a gross settlement amount of \$575,000.00 for a class including:

16 All persons who either or both: (1) worked for AT&T Mobility Services
17 LLC in the State of California, while classified as non-exempt, at any time
18 from November 2, 2021, to the date the Court grants preliminary approval
19 of this Settlement; and/or (2) filed a timely Request for Exclusion from the
20 class action settlement in the matter of *Samuel Wallack, et. al. v. AT&T
Mobility Services, LLC*, Case Number CIVSB2117915, pending in the
Superior Court for the State of California, County of California County of
San Bernardino.

21 (Doc. 75-2 at 4-5, ¶¶ 2, 6.) The settlement funds are non-reversionary, and AT&T shall also pay “the
22 employer’s share of payroll taxes ... separately from and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount.”
23 (*Id.* at 8, ¶ 22.)

24 **I. Payment Terms**

25 The parties agree the settlement fund shall cover payments to class members, including
26 enhanced compensation to Razo as the Class Representative. (Doc. 75-2 at 9, Settlement ¶¶ 22-24.) In
27 addition, the Settlement provides for payments to Class Counsel for attorneys’ fees and costs, to the
28 Settlement Administrator, and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency. (*Id.* at 5, ¶ 6.)

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.