CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles THE TIDRICK LAW FIRM LLP 1 STEVEN G. TIDRICK, SBN 224760 2 JOEL B. YOUNG, SBN 236662 1300 Clay Street, Suite 600 MAR 13 2020 3 Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 788-5100 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court 4 Facsimile: (510) 291-3226 By: Aldwin Lim, Deputy E-mail: sgt@tidricklaw.com 5 E-mail: jby@tidricklaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs NATHAN 6 FLOWERS and DONDAY ORR 7 JONES DAY 8 Christopher Lovrien (SBN 230546) 555 South Flower Street 9 Fiftieth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-2300 10 Telephone: (213) 489-3939 Facsimile: (213) 243-2539 RECEIVED 11 LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT JONES DAY 12 Cindi L. Ritchey (State Bar No. 216899) MAR 10 2020 4655 Executive Drive, Ste. 1500 13 San Diego, California 92121 Telephone: (858) 314-1200 S. DREW Facsimile: (844) 345-3178 14 15 Attorneys for Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY 16 ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON NEXT PAGE 17 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 18 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** 19 20 NATHAN FLOWERS and DONDAY ORR, Civil Case No. BC515136 on behalf of themselves and all others similarly 21 situated, Class Action 22 ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO THE Plaintiffs, HONORABLE WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, 23 **DEPARTMENT 10** V. 24 STIPULATION AND PROPERTY LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION ORDER REGARDING SETTLEMENT 25 AUTHORITY; and DOES 1 TO 50, Trial Date: None Set 26 Defendants. 27 28 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING SETTLEMENT Flowers et al. v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transp. Auth., Civil Case No. BC515136

1	ADDITIONAL COUNSEL
2	OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
3	Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel Charles M. Safer (SBN 82771)
5	Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel Charles M. Safer (SBN 82771) Assistant County Counsel Ronald W. Stamm (State Bar No. 91919) Principal Deputy County Counsel One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012 Telephone: (213) 922-2525
6	One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles CA 90012
7	Telephone: (213) 922-2525 Facsimile: (213) 922-2530
8	Attorneys for Defendant LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
9	LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIT
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	3
25	
26	
27	
28	2
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING SETTLEMENT Flowers et al. v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transp. Auth., Civil Case No. BC515136

Plaintiff Donday Orr ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Defendant" or "LACMTA") (collectively the "Parties"), through their respective counsel of record, having considered the guidance provided by the Court at the hearings on Plaintiff's motion for preliminary approval of class settlement on December 4, 2019 and February 7, 2020, hereby stipulate and agree as follows, subject to Court approval:

- 1) Plaintiffs' claims under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code § 2698 et seq. ("PAGA") are dismissed with prejudice, in light of authorities cited by Defendant in its February 7, 2020 filing indicating that PAGA is inapplicable to public entity employers;
- 2) The Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement, filed October 1, 2019, is modified as follows:
 - a. For All Class Members (i.e., both former employees and current employees):
 - There shall be no waiver of rights and benefits under California
 Civil Code Section 1542; and
 - ii. There shall be no release of unknown claims;
 - iii. There shall be no release of PAGA claims, because there are no such claims to release given that they are dismissed with prejudice;
 - b. For All Former Employees:
 - i. There shall be no release of any damages claims; and
 - ii. Former employees shall constitute a subclass certified for injunctive relief only;
 - 3) For All Current employees: Damages claims will be released as set forth in the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement, filed October 1, 2019, except as modified above for all class members, and except as to any class members who opt out (who will release no claims). The release of damages claims by current employees is reasonable because current employees: (1) will obtain substantial financial benefit from the injunctive relief; and (2) have the right to opt out.

23

24

26

27

28

1

2

3

Indeed, courts recognize that injunctive relief can have monetary value. See In re Netflix Privacy Litig., 2013 WL 1120801, *7 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2013) ("the settlement amount . . . includes the size of the cash distribution, the cy pres method of distribution, and the injunctive relief"). Accordingly, courts have approved injunctive relief-only class action settlements that released claims for damages. See, e.g., Cellphone Termination Fee Cases, 180 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1115-17 (2009); Goldkorn v. County of San Bernardino, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17934, at *6-8 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 13, 2012).

4) This action has not resulted in the tolling of any damages claims of any individuals currently or formerly employed by Defendant as bus or train operators, per Jolly v. Eli Lilly & Co., 44 Cal. 3d 1103 (1988).

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

THE TIDRICK LAW FIRM LLP Dated: March 10, 2020 Steven G. Tidrick, SBN 224760 Joel B. Young, SBN 236662 Attorneys for Plaintiff JONES DAY Dated: March 10, 2020 /s/ Cindi L. Ritchey Cindi L. Ritchey, SBN 216899

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Attorneys for Defendant

Having considered the stipulation of the Parties, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court adopts and orders the foregoing, and grants preliminary approval of the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement, filed October 1, 2019, as modified herein.

SO ORDERED: 25

WILLIAM F. HIGHBERGER, JUDGE

Hon. William F. Highberger Los Angeles Superior Court Judge