

1 Benjamin A. Emmert, SBN 212157
bemmert@littler.com
2 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
50 West San Fernando Street, 7th Floor
3 San Jose, CA 95113
Telephone: 408.998.4150
4 Fax No.: 408.288.5686

5 LISA A. SCHRETER, *pro hac vice*
lschreter@littler.com
6 RICHARD W. BLACK, *pro hac vice*
rblack@littler.com
7 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
3424 Peachtree Road NE, Suite 1200
8 Atlanta, GA 30326
Telephone: 404.233.0330
9 Facsimile: 404.233.2361

10 Attorneys for Defendants
HP INC. and HEWLETT PACKARD
11 ENTERPRISE COMPANY

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14 SAN JOSE DIVISION

15 DONNA J. FORSYTH, ARUN VATTURI,
16 DAN WEILAND, SHAFIQ RAHMAN,
AND KEVIN M. ALVISO, for and on
17 behalf of themselves and other persons
similarly situated,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 HP INC. and HEWLETT PACKARD
21 ENTERPRISE COMPANY,

22 Defendants.
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 5:16-CV-04775

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY CERTIFICATION**

Date: April 15, 2021

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

Dept.: Courtroom 4 (5th Floor)

Fourth Amended Complaint Filed: July 9, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

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

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT1

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED (L.R. 7-4).....3

III. RELEVANT FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....3

 A. HP Co. and Defendants Faced Significant Financial Pressures, Causing Them To Restructure Their Businesses And Reduce Their Workforces.....3

 B. The Named and Opt-In Plaintiffs Are Not Similarly Situated To Each Other In Any Material Respect.....6

 C. The Defendants’ ERISA Plans And WFR Forms Are Not Evidence That Plaintiffs Are Alike In Any Material Aspect Of Their ADEA Claims.....8

 D. The Members Of The Broad Nationwide Putative Collectives To Which Plaintiffs Seek to Send Notice Are Not Similarly Situated.10

IV. THE APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARD IS A FLEXIBLE, CASE-SPECIFIC APPROACH COMMITTED TO THE COURT’S DISCRETION.10

V. THIS CASE IS NOT APPROPRIATE FOR JUDICIALLY SUPERVISED NOTICE.14

 A. Plaintiffs Fail To Meet Their Burden To Present Evidence That Supports The Issuance Of Notice To Any Potential Collective.16

 1. Defendants’ Respective ERISA Severance Plans Are Not Evidence Of An Overarching Plan of Age Discrimination.16

 2. The WFR Decisions Were Individualized, And Plaintiffs Were Not Replaced.....17

 3. Nothing Ties Meg Whitman’s Comments To Any Single WFR Decision.20

 B. The Authority Plaintiffs Cite Is Easily Distinguished.....21

VI. PLAINTIFFS’ PROPOSED NOTICE CONTAINS LEGAL AND PRACTICAL FLAWS THAT IGNORE RIGHTS OF PROSPECTIVE COLLECTIVE MEMBERS AND WOULD COMPROMISE THEIR DATA SECURITY.....23

 A. The Proposed Notice Fails To Inform Potential Opt-Ins Of Their Right To Obtain Separate Counsel, Litigation Obligations, And Preservation Obligations.23

 B. Any Opt-In Period Should Be Sixty Days At Most And Facilitated By A Third-Party Administrator.23

VII. CONCLUSION.....24



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

1

2

3

4 *Adams v. Inter-Con Sec. Sys.*,

5 242 F.R.D. 530 (N.D. Cal. 2007) 15, 23

6 *Anjum v. J.C. Penney Co.*,

7 2015 WL 3603973 (E.D.N.Y. June 5, 2015)..... 23

8 *Barber v. Human Contract, LLC*,

9 No. 09-cv-964, 2009 WL 10673170 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2009) 23

10 *Bishop v. Petro-Chem. Transp.*,

11 582 F. Supp. 2d 1290 (E.D. Cal. 2008) 14

12 *Blau v. Del Monte Corp.*,

13 748 F.2d 1348 (9th Cir. 1984)..... 9

14 *Brubaker v. Ensign Grp.*,

15 No. 12-cv-929, 2012 WL 12861183 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2012)..... 14

16 *Campbell v. City of Los Angeles*,

17 903 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 2018)..... *passim*

18 *City of Royal Ret. Sys. v. Juniper Networks*,

19 880 F. Supp. 2d 1045 (N.D. Cal. 2012)..... 4

20 *Coates v. Farmers Group, Inc.*,

21 No. 15-CV-01913-LHK, 2015 WL 8477918 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2015) 21, 22

22 *D’Anna v. M/ACOM, Inc.*,

23 903 F. Supp. 889 (D. Md. 1995) 13

24 *Duffy v. Sodexho, Inc.*,

25 2006 WL 3025958 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 20, 2006) 13

26 *E.E.O.C. v. MCI Int’l, Inc.*,

27 829 F. Supp. 1438 (D.N.J. 1993) 19

28 *Edwards v. City of Long Beach*,

467 F. Supp. 2d 986 (C.D. Cal. 2006) 14

Freeman v. MedStar Health, Inc.,

187 F. Supp. 3d 19 (D.D.C. 2016) 23

Gross v. FBL Fin. Servs. Inc.,

557 U.S. 167 (2009)..... 3, 13, 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

1

2

3 *Hoffmann-La Roche Inc. v. Sperling*,

4 493 U.S. 165 (1989)..... 1, 11, 12

5 *Myers v. Hertz Corp.*,

6 624 F.3d 537 (2d Cir. 2010) 13

7 *Pagliolo v. Guidant Corp.*,

8 483 F. Supp. 2d 847 (D. Minn. 2007)..... 9, 17

9 *Rabin v. PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP*,

10 No. 16-cv-02276-JST, 2019 WL 9078785 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2019)..... 22

11 *Roberts v. Target Corp.*,

12 No. CV-12-874-TUC-JGZ, 2013 WL 5256867 (W.D. Okla. Sept. 17, 2013)..... 13

13 *Rodriguez v. M.J. Bros., Inc.*,

14 No. 1:18-CV-00252-SAB, 2019 WL 1789686 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2019)..... 23

15 *Rusis v. Int’l Bus. Machines Corp.*,

16 Case No. 18-CV-8434 (VEC), 2020 WL 1151322 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 10, 2020) *passim*

17 *Sanchez v. Sephora USA*,

18 No. 11-cv-3396, 2012 WL 294575 (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2012) 23

19 *Silverman v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.*,

20 No. 06-cv-7272, 2007 WL 6344674 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2007)..... 15

21 *Swales v. KLLM Transp. Servs.*,

22 985 F.3d 430 (5th Cir. 2021) 12, 13, 14

23 *Voss v. Sutardja*,

24 2015 WL 349444 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2015) 4

25 *Zurlo v. J&J Air Conditioning*,

26 No. 16-cv-723, 2016 WL 4088887 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2016)..... 24

27

28

Statutes

29 U.S.C. § 626(f)(1)(H)..... 9

29 U.S.C. § 216(b)..... 10, 11, 12, 15

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Other Authorities

29 C.F.R. § 2510.3-1(a)(3).....8
L.R. 7-4.....3

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.