

1 Jahan C. Sagafi (SB# 224887)
2 Rachel W. Dempsey (SB# 310424)
3 Laura Iris Mattes (SB# 310594)
4 OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
5 One California Street, 12th Floor
6 San Francisco, CA 94111
7 Telephone: (415) 638-8800
8 Facsimile: (415) 638-8810
9 E-mail: jsagafi@outtengolden.com
10 E-mail: rdempsey@outtengolden.com
11 E-mail: imattes@outtengolden.com

Adam T. Klein (admitted *pro hac vice*)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
685 Third Avenue, 25th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 245-1000
Facsimile: (646) 509-2060
E-mail: atk@outtengolden.com

7 Rachel M. Bien (SB# 315886)
8 OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
9 601 S Figueroa St., Suite 4050
10 Los Angeles, CA 90017
11 Telephone: (323) 673-9900
12 Facsimile: (646) 509-2058
13 E-mail: rmb@outtengolden.com

14 *Counsel for Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members*

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

18 ROXANA DEL TORO LOPEZ and ANA
19 MEDINA, on behalf of themselves, and all
20 others similarly situated,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

24 Defendant.

Case No. 4:17-cv-06255-YGR

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF
SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION**

Judge: Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
Hearing Date: November 6, 2018
Hearing Time: 2:00 pm
Courtroom: Courtroom 1, 4th Floor

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

To the Clerk of Court and all interested parties:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on November 6, 2018, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, in Courtroom 1 on the 4th Floor of this Court’s Oakland Courthouse, located at 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California, Plaintiffs Roxana del Toro Lopez and Ana Medina, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated (“Plaintiffs”) will, and hereby do, move this Court for an order: (1) granting, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e), final approval of the Parties’ proposed class action settlement (the “Settlement”), and entry of judgment in accordance with the Settlement; and (2) granting, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and 23(b)(3), and the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), final class certification and collective action designation of the Settlement Class conditionally certified in the Preliminary Approval Order (ECF No. 49). Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc. (“Uber” or “Defendant”) does not oppose this motion.

Plaintiffs make this motion on the grounds that the Settlement was reached after arms’-length negotiations by Class Counsel and Uber, is fair and reasonable, and has drawn a favorable response from the Class.

The motion is based on this notice of motion and motion; the memorandum in support of the motion; the accompanying Declaration of Jahan C. Sagafi; the Court’s Order Granting Preliminary Approval to Proposed Class Action Settlement (ECF No. 49); the Court’s record of this action; all matters of which the Court may take notice; and any oral and documentary evidence presented at the hearing on the motion.

Dated: August 20, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Jahan C. Sagafi
Jahan C. Sagafi

Jahan C. Sagafi (SB# 224887)
Rachel W. Dempsey (SB# 310424)
Laura Iris Mattes (SB# 310594)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
One California Street, 12th Floor

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

San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 638-8800
Facsimile: (415) 638-8810
E-mail: jsagafi@outtengolden.com
E-mail: rdempsey@outtengolden.com
E-mail: imattes@outtengolden.com

Rachel M. Bien (SB# 315886)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
601 S Figueroa St., Suite 4050
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (323) 673-9900
Facsimile: (646) 509-2058
E-mail: rmb@outtengolden.com

Adam T. Klein (admitted *pro hac vice*)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
685 Third Avenue, 25th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 245-1000
Facsimile: (646) 509-2060
E-mail: atk@outtengolden.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Settlement Class
Members*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND 2

 A. Class Counsel Carefully Investigated Class Members’ Claims, Conducted Significant Informal Discovery, and Engaged in Careful Analysis of Pay, Job Leveling, and Promotions Data Before Agreeing to the Settlement. 2

 B. The Settlement Classes. 3

 C. The Settlement. 4

 D. Notice Process 6

 1. The Administrator Adhered to the Class Notice Requirements 6

 2. CAFA’s Notice Requirements Were Satisfied 7

III. ARGUMENT 8

 A. The Best Practicable Notice of Settlement Has Been Provided to the Class, and No Class Member Has Objected to the Settlement. 8

 B. Final Approval Is Appropriate Under Rule 23 and the FLSA. 9

 C. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate 10

 1. Plaintiffs Faced Substantial Obstacles to Recovery 10

 2. The Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Delay of Further Litigation Support Preliminary Approval 11

 3. Plaintiffs Faced a Real Risk of Losing Rule 23 Certification and EPA Collective Certification. 11

 4. The Settlement Amount Will Fairly and Adequately Compensate Class Members 11

 5. The Extent of Discovery Supports Settlement 12

 6. Counsel’s Experience and Views Support Approval 12

 7. The Parties Participated in Arms’-Length Negotiations Before an Experienced Mediator. 12

 8. The Class Members Have Reacted Positively to the Notice 13

IV. CONCLUSION 13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Chen-Oster v. Goldman Sachs & Co.</i> , 325 F.R.D. 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)	11
<i>Chun-Hoon v. McKee Foods Corp.</i> , 716 F. Supp. 2d 848 (N.D. Cal. 2010)	13
<i>Churchill Village, L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.</i> , 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004).....	8
<i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> , 955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992).....	1, 2, 3, 11
<i>Cotter v. Lyft, Inc.</i> , 176 F. Supp. 3d 930 (N.D. Cal. 2016)	10
<i>Cotter v. Lyft, Inc.</i> , 193 F. Supp. 3d 1030 (N.D. Cal. 2016)	9
<i>Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin</i> , 417 U.S. 156 (1974).....	8
<i>Ellis v. Naval Air Rework Facility</i> , 87 F.R.D. 15 (N.D. Cal. 1980).....	12
<i>Ford v. CEC Entm't Inc.</i> , No. 14 Civ. 677, 2015 WL 11439033 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 14, 2015)	8
<i>Guilbaud v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> , No. 13-CV-04357-VC, 2016 WL 7826649 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 2016)	9
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998).....	9
<i>Hughes v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. 93 Civ. 178C, 2001 WL 34089697 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 26, 2001)	12
<i>In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 213 F.3d 454 (9th Cir. 2000).....	12
<i>Lynn's Food Stores, Inc. v. U.S.</i> , 679 F.2d 1350 (11th Cir. 1982).....	9
<i>M. Berenson Co., Inc. v. Faneuil Hall Marketplace, Inc.</i> , 671 F. Supp. 819 (D. Mass. 1987)	10
<i>Moussouris v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 2018 WL 3328418 (W.D. Wash. June 25, 2018).....	11
<i>Nat'l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.</i> , 221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. 2004)	13, 14

1 *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n of City & Cty. of San Francisco*,
688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)..... 12

2 *Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp.*,
3 527 U.S. 815 (1999)..... 9, 10

4 *Rodriguez v. W. Publ’g Corp.*,
5 563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009)..... 12

6 *Staton v. Boeing Co.*,
327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003)..... 1, 9

7 **Statutes**

8 28 U.S.C. § 1715(d) 8

9 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) i

10 **Rules**

11

12 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 passim

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs Roxana del Toro Lopez and Ana Medina respectfully request final approval of the Settlement, which provides significant value to the Class Members in exchange for the release of claims asserted herein – namely, that Uber subjected Class Members to unlawful discrimination in pay and promotions, as well as harassment and a hostile work environment, on the basis of their gender, race and national origin. The Settlement is the result of arms’-length negotiations by experienced counsel under the supervision of one of the nation’s preeminent employment class action mediators, after significant investigation of the claims, including interviews of witnesses and detailed analysis of Uber’s HR data and internal documents.

The \$10,000,000 Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Class has responded extremely favorably to the Settlement. Of the 487 Class Members to whom notices were mailed (including reminder notices and supplemental outreach by Class Counsel), no one has objected, and only two have opted out.¹ *See* Declaration of Jennifer Keough of JND Legal Administration (“JND Decl.”) ¶¶ 5, 17. In addition, 56 Class Members submitted optional Claim Forms to receive a portion of Fund B, which is allocated to compensate claims of harassment, hostile work environment, and emotional distress. JND Decl. ¶ 18; Settlement Agreement § 5.5. Furthermore, Class Counsel have conducted sufficient discovery to enable them to adequately evaluate the claims and defenses in the action. Declaration of Jahan C. Sagafi (“Sagafi Decl.”) ¶¶ 11-18. Lastly, the Settlement is reasonable given the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation. *See Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 959 (9th Cir. 2003); *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268, 1291 (9th Cir. 1992).²

¹ Class Counsel will file a “reply” brief (regardless of whether any opposition is filed to this brief) supplementing these numbers by October 23, 2018, which is after the September 10, 2018 deadline for Class Members to opt out or object. ECF No. 49.

² Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order, Class Counsel have moved separately for an award of attorneys’ fees and costs, settlement administration costs, and service payments to Plaintiffs (contemporaneously filed). Uber does not oppose the motion.

1 In connection with the request for final settlement approval and consistent with the
 2 Preliminary Approval Order, Plaintiffs also request that the Court confirm as final: (1) the
 3 certification of the Class; (2) the designation of the case as a collective action under the FLSA; and
 4 (3) the appointment of Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives and of Plaintiffs' Counsel as Class
 5 Counsel. *See* ECF No. 49.

6 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

7 **A. Class Counsel Carefully Investigated Class Members' Claims, Conducted** 8 **Significant Informal Discovery, and Engaged in Careful Analysis of Pay, Job** 9 **Leveling, and Promotions Data Before Agreeing to the Settlement.**

10 Beginning several months before filing the action on October 27, 2017,³ Class Counsel
 11 conducted an in-depth investigation of Plaintiffs' claims. Sagafi Decl. ¶¶ 4-10. The investigation
 12 included an exchange of data and other information with Uber, interviews with Class Members and
 13 other witnesses, and extensive legal research regarding the jurisdictional, liability, certification,
 14 damages, and injunctive relief issues. *Id.*

15 In the months leading up to mediation, the parties exchanged classwide discovery, including:
 16 (1) Uber's policies and procedures regarding compensation, leveling, performance reviews, and
 17 promotions; (2) Uber's practices regarding hiring of female engineers and engineers of color;
 18 (3) Uber's process for handling complaints of harassment and discrimination, and harassment
 19 complaints received by Uber from Class Members during the Title VII and FEHA limitations period;
 20 (4) Uber's disciplinary process for employees accused of harassment and discrimination; and
 21 (5) diversity, fair pay, training, investigations, and other personnel process initiatives and
 22 enhancements implemented by Uber in 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 under new executive
 23 leadership. *Id.* ¶¶ 13-14. Uber produced and Plaintiffs reviewed thousands of pages of documents.
 24 *Id.* Plaintiffs also contacted many Class Members and potential witnesses and interviewed all who
 25 responded, to gather evidence to support the merits of their claims and class certification. *Id.* ¶ 9.

26 In addition, Uber produced data for every employee in the Class Positions (i.e., both Class
 27 Members and comparators) and predecessor job codes, including information on race, gender,

28 ³ A related complaint was also filed in San Francisco Superior Court on October 24, 2017 (Case No. GCG-17-52663).

1 education, seniority, pay, job level, job code, performance reviews, and promotion timeline, among
2 other data points. *Id.* ¶ 14. Plaintiffs retained an expert consultant, EconOne, to analyze the data. *Id.*
3 ¶ 15. Plaintiffs conferred with Uber and its expert directly and through EconOne, to understand the
4 data and to probe Uber’s analysis of the data. *Id.* The Parties also exchanged several iterations of
5 data analyses in the weeks leading up to mediation, to both ensure that Plaintiffs understood the data
6 and that the parties could intelligently debate the meaning of the data. *Id.*

7 On January 25, 2018, the Parties attended mediation with a private mediator, David A.
8 Rotman. *Id.* ¶ 16. Mr. Rotman is a highly respected mediator with a wealth of experience mediating
9 complex employment class actions. *Id.* Before the mediation, the parties exchanged detailed
10 mediation statements supported by rigorous data analyses, along with multiple supplements
11 responding to each other’s arguments. *Id.* ¶ 17. After a full day of negotiation, the parties agreed to a
12 settlement in principle, including monetary terms and the contours of injunctive relief. *Id.* ¶ 18. The
13 parties reduced the agreement to writing in the form of the Settlement Agreement over the next two
14 months. *Id.*

15 On April 19, 2018, this Court granted preliminary approval of the settlement, conditionally
16 certified a Rule 23 class and a 216(b) collective, and appointed Outten & Golden LLP as Class
17 Counsel. Preliminary Approval Order (“PA Order”), ECF No. 49.

18 **B. The Settlement Classes.**

19 The settlement classes are defined as follows, pursuant to this Court’s preliminary approval
20 order:

21 (1) all women (of any race or national origin) and all Latino/Latina/Hispanic, African
22 American/Black, Native American, Alaskan Native, and/or multiracial individuals (who
23 are in part one of the foregoing races) who work or worked in a Software Engineer 1 or 2,
24 Senior Software Engineer 1 or 2, or Staff Software Engineer job title (the “Covered
Software Engineer Positions”) for Uber in the United States between July 31, 2013 and
April 19, 2018 (the “Nationwide Rule 23 Class”);

25 (2) all women (of any race or national origin) and all Latino/Latina/Hispanic, African
26 American/Black, Native American, Alaskan Native, and/or multiracial individuals (who
27 are in part one of the foregoing races) who work or worked in the Covered Software
28 Engineer Positions who work or worked for Uber in California between July 31, 2013
and April 19, 2018 (the “California Rule 23 Class”);

1 (3) all women who work or worked for Uber in the Covered Software Engineer Positions
2 in the United States between July 31, 2014 and April 19, 2018 who opt in (the “Federal
EPA Collective”); and

3 (4) all women (of any race or national origin) and all Latino/Latina/Hispanic, African
4 American/Black, Native American, Alaskan Native, and/or multiracial individuals (who
5 are in part one of the foregoing races) who work or worked for Uber in Covered Software
Engineer Positions in California between June 22, 2016 and April 19, 2018 (the “PAGA
Representative Group”).

6 *Id.* at 2. Notice was provided to the 487 individuals Uber identified as being in the Settlement Class.

7 JND Decl. ¶¶ 10-15.

8 **C. The Settlement.**

9 The \$10,000,000 Settlement Amount will cover: (a) Class Member payments; (b) a \$50,000
10 PAGA allocation, 75% of which will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development
11 Agency (the “LWDA”), and 25% of which will be paid to the PAGA Representative Group; (c) Class
12 Representative Service Awards of \$50,000 for Plaintiff del Toro Lopez and \$30,000 for Plaintiff
13 Medina; (d) Class Counsel’s fees of 25% of the Settlement Amount and actual costs up to \$170,000;
14 and (e) settlement administration costs, expected to be approximately \$110,000. Settlement
15 Agreement, § 5.2.

16 The plan of allocation devotes the bulk of the settlement amount to Fund A (to be paid out
17 formulaically based on weeks worked, position, time period, geography, and whether the Class
18 Member has previously signed a release of claims), \$50,000 to the PAGA allocation, and \$1,900,000
19 set aside for Fund B (to be paid out based on Claim Forms submitted by Class Members to capture
20 non-monetary harms such as harassment and emotional distress).

21 Fund A. Fund A functions in the way that common funds typically function in employment
22 class action settlements, in that it will be paid out automatically to all Class Members who do not opt
23 out (with no need to submit a Claim Form), in proportion to the weeks they worked in each covered
24 job code (e.g., Software Engineer I, Senior Software Engineer II) during the Covered Time Periods,
25 adjusted for the strength of each Class Member’s claim, as follows: (a) 1 point for workweeks during
26 the earliest one year of the liability period (to reflect the weaker claims with four-year statutes of
27 limitations), 2 points for workweeks outside of California during the three-year limitations period,

1 and 2.5 points for workweeks in California during the three-year limitations period (to reflect the
2 California EPA's stronger liability standard relative to other claims), and (b) job code multipliers
3 ranging from 1.0 to 1.8 for the five job codes at issue (to reflect the higher total compensation for
4 higher job levels). Settlement Agreement, §§ 5.3-5.5. Individual Fund A awards range from \$28.09
5 (in the case of someone who worked 0.3 covered weeks) to \$38,929.62, averaging \$10,743.34. JND
6 Decl. ¶ 9.

7 PAGA. In addition to the Fund A benefits, Class Members who worked in California are also
8 automatically eligible to receive monetary benefits from the \$12,500 in PAGA penalties allocated to
9 the Class based on the number of weeks they worked in California during the PAGA period. *Id.*
10 Individual PAGA penalties range from \$1.24 (in the case of someone who worked 1 covered week)
11 to \$55.91, averaging \$34.44. *Id.*

12 Fund B. Fund B will be paid out to Class Members who filed valid Claim Forms, based on
13 the strength of their claims. Fifty-five Class Members filed claim forms before the deadline of July 9,
14 2018, and one Class Member submitted a claim form after that date. *Id.* ¶ 18.⁴ Class Counsel
15 contacted every single one of the 56 claimants and communicated with the vast majority of them, to
16 ensure that they understood the importance of providing sufficient information about incidents of
17 discrimination, harassment, and/or hostile work environment and connecting their experiences to
18 their race, national origin, or gender. Sagafi Decl. ¶ 28. Class counsel's aim was to ensure that each
19 Claim Form sufficiently set forth the basis for an award. Class Counsel believed that these extra
20 precautions would be helpful in light of the sensitive nature of the discrimination and harassment
21 claims at issue, as well as the importance of tying the Claim Form narratives to actionable harm
22 covered by the settlement. Once the documentation was complete, the Settlement Administrator, in
23 consultation with counsel for both parties, scored each Claim Form based on objective criteria, in
24 light of its experience administering class action settlements and counsel's instructions regarding the
25

26 ⁴ Because there was only one late Claim Form, and because the Class Member provided good cause
27 for the delay (the person was out of the country) and submitted the Claim Form before the scoring
28 process was completed, the parties request that the Court permit consideration of the late Claim Form
in awarding money from Fund B.

1 law. JND Decl. ¶ 19. To ensure fair results and consistency across claimants, the Settlement
2 Administrator awarded points in each of five categories, using the following scoring process:

- 3 • 0-30 points: The nature of the reported harassment, including the way in which the
4 harassment occurred (e.g., verbal, physical, sexual, etc.); the frequency and duration of
5 harassment; the severity of the harassment; and the location of the harassment (e.g., at
6 work, at a work event, etc.).
- 7 • 0-10 points: The offender, including whether the offender was a co-worker, supervisor,
8 or manager, and whether the offender abused a position of trust and authority.
- 9 • 0-10 points: Witnesses and documentation, including whether there were witnesses, and
10 whether they were named; whether the witnesses were in a position of authority at Uber;
11 whether the incident or incidents were reported (e.g., to a manager or HR); whether there
12 was contemporaneous or subsequent documentation; how HR responded, if at all; and
13 whether the Class Member formally filed documents with a government agency.
- 14 • 0-30 points: The nature of the impact, including whether the Class Member received
15 treatment from a doctor or therapist; whether the Class Member had medical symptoms
16 and what kind; whether the Class Member's experience had continuing effects on his or
17 her future employment.
- 18 • 0-20 points: Whether the Class Member had any special circumstances warranting
19 additional points, including, but not limited to, the nature and continuity of any
20 harassment, and the nature and impact on the Class Member and others of the Class
21 Member's response to discrimination or harassment.

22 JND Decl. ¶ 20; Exs. B-F (Notice of Fund B Awards). The Fund B awards range from \$0 to
23 \$100,000, averaging \$33,928.57, with a median of \$33,000. JND Decl. ¶ 23.

24 The release is limited to only those claims actually asserted in the action or factually related to
25 the allegations made in the action. Settlement Agreement § 12. It does not include any other claims,
26 such as claims for retaliation, wrongful termination, or disability discrimination, all of which are
27 explicitly carved out of the Settlement Agreement. *Id.* § 12.1.

28 **D. Notice Process**

1. The Administrator Adhered to the Class Notice Requirements.

The parties have followed the Court-approved notice plan, as set forth in the Settlement and
Preliminary Approval Order. Sagafi Decl. ¶ 28; JND Decl. ¶¶ 10-15; PA Order § V.

On or about May 5, 2018, Uber provided the settlement administrator, JND Legal
Administration ("JND"), with an electronic file for each Class Member listing the Class Member's
name, last-known mailing addresses, phone numbers, email addresses, and relevant employment

1 information. JND Decl. ¶ 4. On May 24, 2018, JND sent the Class Notice and Claim Form to the
2 members of the Settlement Class. *Id.* ¶¶ 10-15.

3 The individualized Claim Forms listed the estimated Fund A award amounts for each Class
4 Member (not including PAGA amounts). *Id.* ¶ 12, Ex. C. This information put Class Members in the
5 best possible position to evaluate their options as to whether to opt out or object. The Notice
6 explained the process for objecting to the Settlement and excluding oneself from the Settlement,
7 along with contact information for Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator. *Id.*

8 The Settlement Administrator followed best practices to ensure that the Notice reached as
9 many Class Members as feasible. The Settlement Administrator disseminated the Notice to all Class
10 Members by personal e-mail (if available) and by first class mail, for a total of 487 mailed Notices
11 and 957 emailed Notices (due to many Class members having multiple email addresses). JND Decl.
12 ¶¶ 12-13. Of those, 103 mailed Notices and 133 emailed Notices were returned as undeliverable. *Id.*
13 ¶ 15. Of the mailed Notices returned as undeliverable, the Settlement Administrator performed
14 address searches and located updated address information for 76 Class Members. *Id.* The Settlement
15 Administrator re-mailed Notices to those individuals, and, of those Notices, only two were returned
16 as undeliverable. *Id.* The Settlement Administrator also maintained a toll-free telephone number and
17 a website to provide Class Members with additional information and allowed them to submit their
18 forms online. *Id.* ¶ 11. To date, the case website has received 725 unique visitors and 2,652
19 pageviews. *Id.* In addition, the settlement was widely publicized, with articles posted online by
20 mainstream outlets (e.g., Reuters, CBS News, CNN, the San Francisco Chronicle, USA Today,
21 Fortune, Slate) as well as technology-focused outlets (e.g., CNET, Recode, Engadget, Fast Company,
22 Tech Funnel) and more focused websites (e.g., the Society of Women Engineers). Sagafi Decl. ¶ 27.

23 Class Counsel also responded to all Class Member inquiries about the Settlement. *Id.* ¶ 28.

24 As of August 20, 2018, two Class Members have opted out of the Settlement, and no Class
25 Member has objected. JND Decl. ¶¶ 16-17.

26 **2. CAFA's Notice Requirements Were Satisfied.**

27 From April 3 to 17, 2018, Uber satisfied its obligation to serve the appropriate settlement
28 notice documents on the relevant federal and state attorneys general. ECF Nos. 38 and 47. The

1 Parties have not received any comments from any state or federal officials. Sagafi Decl. ¶ 29. The
2 Final Approval hearing, set for November 6, 2018, is being held more than 90 days after the issuance
3 of the CAFA notice, such that the final approval order may be entered in accordance with CAFA's
4 notice requirements if the Court finds that all other requirements are met. 28 U.S.C. § 1715(d).

5 **III. ARGUMENT**

6 **A. The Best Practicable Notice of Settlement Has Been Provided to the Class, and** 7 **No Class Member Has Objected to the Settlement.**

8 The notice here was the “best notice that is practicable under the circumstances,” Fed. R. Civ.
9 P. 23(c)(2)(B), and was provided “in a reasonable manner to all class members who would be bound
10 by the proposal.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1). Notice is satisfactory “if it generally describes the terms
11 of the settlement in sufficient detail to alert those with adverse viewpoints to investigate and to come
12 forward and be heard.” *Churchill Village, L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004)
13 (internal citation and quotation marks omitted). Notice mailed to each class member “who can be
14 identified through reasonable effort” constitutes reasonable notice. *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*,
15 417 U.S. 156, 176 (1974). For any class certified under Rule 23(b)(3), the notice must inform class
16 members “that the court will exclude from the class any member who requests exclusion,” stating
17 “the time and manner for requesting exclusion.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B)(v)-(vi).

18 As described above, the mailing and emailing of Notices to Class Members and the
19 administration of the notice process ensured that the best notice practicable was sent to Class
20 Members, as due process requires. The parties and JND have complied with the notice procedures
21 set forth in the Settlement Agreement, which the Court endorsed in its Preliminary Approval Order.
22 See PA Order § V.C. Because Class Members have been given a full and fair opportunity to consider
23 the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement and to make an informed decision on whether to
24 participate, the Court should find that notice given was adequate for purposes of establishing due
25 process. See *Ford v. CEC Entm't Inc.*, No. 14 Civ. 677, 2015 WL 11439033, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Dec.
26 14, 2015) (finding notice standards satisfied when claims administrator provided notice in accordance
27 with the procedures previously approved by the court in its preliminary approval order).

1 **B. Final Approval Is Appropriate Under Rule 23 and the FLSA.**

2 The touchstone for the final approval inquiry is whether the settlement is “fair, adequate and
3 reasonable,” recognizing that “it is the settlement taken as a whole, rather than the individual
4 component parts, that must be examined for overall fairness.” *Staton*, 327 F.3d at 952 (quoting
5 *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1998) (internal quotation marks omitted)).
6 “Assessing a settlement proposal requires [a] court to balance a number of factors: the strength of the
7 plaintiffs’ case; the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation; the risk of
8 maintaining class action status throughout the trial; the amount offered in settlement; the extent of
9 discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings; the experience and views of counsel; . . . and
10 the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.” *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1026; *accord*
11 *Guilbaud v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*, No. 13-CV-04357-VC, 2016 WL 7826649, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 15,
12 2016). Additionally, a settlement is considered fair and reasonable if it occurred as a result of arms’-
13 length negotiations before an experienced mediator. *See Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 527 U.S. 815,
14 852 (1999).

15 Similarly, under the FLSA, a settlement that results in waiver of FLSA claims should be
16 approved where it is entered as part of a “stipulated judgment [approved by the court] after
17 scrutinizing the settlement for fairness.” *Lynn’s Food Stores, Inc. v. U.S.*, 679 F.2d 1350, 1353 (11th
18 Cir. 1982).

19 Because further developments between preliminary and final approval, as well as the
20 comments of objectors, may reveal unfairness in the settlement, even a “rigorous inquiry” at the
21 preliminary approval stage does not “convert final review to a mere formality.” *Cotter v. Lyft, Inc.*,
22 193 F. Supp. 3d 1030, 1036 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (Chhabria, J.). Here, the most significant development
23 – the Supreme Court’s *Epic Systems* decision, allowing companies to require employees to sign, as a
24 condition of employment, contracts prohibiting future legal action in court and any collective or class
25 resolution of claims – confirms that the Settlement is an excellent outcome for Class Members. A
26 rigorous review of the Settlement confirms that it merits final approval.

1 **C. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.**

2 The Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, because the *Hanlon* factors support approval.
3 *See Ortiz*, 527 U.S. at 852 (holding that arms-length negotiations conducted by competent counsel
4 after appropriate discovery are *prima-facie* evidence that the settlement is fair and reasonable);
5 *M. Berenson Co., Inc. v. Faneuil Hall Marketplace, Inc.*, 671 F. Supp. 819, 822 (D. Mass. 1987)
6 (“Where, as here, a proposed class settlement has been reached after meaningful discovery, after
7 arm’s length negotiation, conducted by capable counsel, it is presumptively fair.”).

8 **1. Plaintiffs Faced Substantial Obstacles to Recovery.**

9 The Parties have balanced “plaintiffs’ expected recovery . . . against the value of the
10 settlement offer,” taking into account “the relative strengths and weaknesses of the plaintiffs’ case.”
11 *Cotter v. Lyft, Inc.*, 176 F. Supp. 3d 930, 935 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (Chhabria, J.) (internal quotations and
12 citations omitted). While Plaintiffs believe that they can prevail on all issues, to recover full
13 damages, they would have to surmount all of the following hurdles – loss on any one would eliminate
14 or significantly reduce the recovery: (1) Uber’s motion to compel arbitration, which would eliminate
15 all claims except the California PAGA claim, (2) Rule 23 class certification and FLSA conditional
16 certification and decertification, (3) liability at trial, (4) proof of damages, and (5) appeal. With
17 respect to these issues, Uber argues that: (1) Class Members are bound by arbitration agreements that
18 prohibit them from proceeding on a class or collective basis; (2) Class Members work in diverse
19 circumstances, on different teams, for different managers, in different locations and perform a myriad
20 of duties so that are not substantially similar; (3) any disparity between the compensation and
21 promotions rate of Class Members and comparators is not statistically significant, and Class
22 Members had varying and individualized experiences of hostile work environment, harassment and
23 emotional distress; (4) Class members would have difficulty proving damages for various reasons
24 including failure to mitigate; and (5) even if Plaintiffs were to prevail on all of these issues, the Ninth
25 Circuit or Supreme Court could have reversed any victory.

26 In light of these obstacles, the \$10,000,000 settlement amount is fair, reasonable, and
27 adequate. ECF No. 33 at 17-18 (describing Plaintiffs’ hurdles in this case).

1 **2. The Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Delay of Further Litigation**
2 **Support Preliminary Approval.**

3 Settlement now saves Class Members from the significant risk of no recovery, the cost of
4 individual litigation or arbitration, and the delay inherent in further litigation and possible appeals.
5 As detailed above, employment discrimination class action litigation is highly complex, both
6 procedurally and substantively. Settling Class Members' claims saves the parties from conducting
7 substantial additional discovery, including taking depositions and written discovery, and engaging in
8 expert discovery and pre-trial motion practice. For these reasons, the law strongly favors settlements,
9 particularly where complex class action litigation is concerned. *See Class Plaintiffs*, 955 F.2d at
10 1276; *see, e.g., Chen-Oster v. Goldman Sachs & Co.*, 325 F.R.D. 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2018) (gender
11 discrimination class action still pending after eight years of litigation, with class certification recently
12 decided).

13 **3. Plaintiffs Faced a Real Risk of Losing Rule 23 Certification and EPA**
14 **Collective Certification.**

15 In addition to the risk of being compelled to individual arbitration, Plaintiffs risked adverse
16 decisions as to Rule 23 class certification and EPA collective certification. Employment
17 discrimination class actions are challenging, as evidenced by two recent denials of certification under
18 Rule 23 and the California equivalent. *See, e.g., Moussouris v. Microsoft Corp.*, 2018 WL 3328418,
19 (W.D. Wash. June 25, 2018) (class certification denied in case alleging gender discrimination in
20 performance evaluations, compensation, and promotions against female technical employees, three
21 years after case filing); Sagafi Decl. ¶ 61, Ex. 4 (*Huang v. Twitter, Inc.* CGC-15-544813 (San
22 Francisco Super. Ct. July 3, 2018) (class certification denied in case alleging gender discrimination in
23 promotions against female software engineers)).

24 **4. The Settlement Amount Will Fairly and Adequately Compensate Class**
25 **Members.**

26 The settlement amount, as with any settlement, represents a compromise between receiving
27 full damages and penalties on the one hand, and total defeat (including possible imposition of defense
28 costs) on the other. “Naturally, the agreement reached normally embodies a compromise; in
exchange for the saving of cost and elimination of risk, the parties each give up something they might
have won had they proceeded with litigation.” *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n of City &*

1 *Cty. of San Francisco*, 688 F.2d 615, 624 (9th Cir. 1982). Given the risks and complexity of
 2 litigation, and the cost savings obtained through settlement, the compromise amount here is fair and
 3 adequate.

4 **5. The Extent of Discovery Supports Settlement.**

5 Adequate discovery is required to justify any class settlement. Plaintiffs have engaged in
 6 extensive fact-gathering, informal and formal discovery, and detailed discussions of the legal and
 7 factual issues before reaching the Settlement. Sagafi Decl. ¶¶ 4-17. *Cf. In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec.*
 8 *Litig.*, 213 F.3d 454, 459 (9th Cir. 2000) (emphasizing that the touchstone of the analysis is whether
 9 “the parties have sufficient information to make an informed decision about settlement,” including
 10 formal and informal discovery); PA Order § IV (finding that Class Counsel “adequately investigated
 11 Plaintiffs’ claims and became familiar with their strengths and weaknesses.”).

12 **6. Counsel’s Experience and Views Support Approval.**

13 The judgment of experienced counsel regarding the settlement is entitled to great weight.
 14 *Ellis v. Naval Air Rework Facility*, 87 F.R.D. 15, 18 (N.D. Cal. 1980), *aff’d*, 661 F.2d 939 (9th Cir.
 15 1981). Reliance on such recommendations is premised on the fact that “[p]arties represented by
 16 competent counsel are better positioned than courts to produce a settlement that fairly reflects each
 17 party’s expected outcome in litigation.” *Rodriguez v. W. Publ’g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 967 (9th Cir.
 18 2009) (quotations omitted).

19 Here, Class Counsel endorse the Settlement as fair, adequate, and reasonable. Class Counsel
 20 are some of the most experienced attorneys in the nation in representing workers in employment class
 21 actions, with extensive experience in prosecuting and litigating employment discrimination class
 22 actions like this one. Sagafi Decl. ¶¶ 31-45. The fact that qualified and well-informed counsel
 23 endorse the Settlement as being fair, reasonable, and adequate favors this Court’s approval of the
 24 Settlement.

25 **7. The Parties Participated in Arms’-Length Negotiations Before an Experienced Mediator.**

26 As set forth above, a settlement is presumed fair if it was negotiated at arm’s length by
 27 experienced, competent counsel equipped with enough information to act intelligently. *See Hughes*
 28 *v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. 93 Civ. 178C, 2001 WL 34089697, at *7 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 26, 2001) (“A

1 presumption of correctness is said to attach to a class settlement reached in arms-length negotiations
2 between experienced capable counsel after meaningful discovery.”).

3 The Settlement is presumptively fair because it is “the result of arms-length negotiations
4 between the Parties” with the “assistance of an experienced mediator.” ECF No. 49, § IV. The
5 mediator here, David A. Rotman, is one of the preeminent employment class action mediators in the
6 country.

7 **8. The Class Members Have Reacted Positively to the Notice.**

8 The reaction of the Class, which has been uniformly positive, supports the conclusion that the
9 Settlement is fair and reasonable. No Class Member has objected, and only two have opted out. JND
10 Decl. ¶¶ 16-17; Settlement Agreement ¶ 13 (If 24 or more had opted out, Uber would have had the
11 option to rescind the settlement.). The Settlement Administrator and Class Counsel have made extra
12 efforts to reach Class Members to ensure they received the Notice Packet and were aware of the
13 claim form submission deadline, including emailing Class Members and calling them individually.
14 In addition, 20 days before the Claim Form deadline, the Settlement Administrator sent a reminder
15 postcard to the 469 Class Members who had not yet filed a Claim Form. The absence of objections
16 and low number of exclusions favors final approval. *See Chun-Hoon v. McKee Foods Corp.*, 716 F.
17 Supp. 2d 848, 852 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (Walker, J.) (granting final approval where 16 of 329 class
18 members (i.e., 4.9%) opted out, and explaining that this low number of exclusions supports a
19 presumption that the class favors the settlement); *Nat’l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*,
20 221 F.R.D. 523, 529 (C.D. Cal. 2004) (“[T]he absence of a large number of objections to a proposed
21 class action settlement raises a strong presumption that the terms of a proposed class settlement
22 action are favorable to the class members.”).

23 In these, and all other respects, the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is
24 appropriate for final approval.

25 **IV. CONCLUSION**

26 The Court’s Preliminary Approval Order provisionally certified the Settlement Class
27 pursuant to Rule 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. PA Order § II.B. The
28 Court ruled that, for purposes of settlement, the Class meets the Rule 23 requirements. *Id.* The

1 Court also appointed the named Plaintiffs as Class Representatives and Plaintiffs' counsel as Class
2 Counsel. *Id.* § III. The settlement has drawn a favorable response from the Class. For these
3 reasons, and the reasons set forth in Plaintiffs' preliminary approval motion and this motion, Class
4 Counsel respectfully submit that final certification and collective action designation for purposes of
5 settlement are appropriate, including appointment of the Class Representatives and Class Counsel.

6
7 Dated: August 20, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

8 By: /s/ Jahan C. Sagafi
9 Jahan C. Sagafi

10 Jahan C. Sagafi (SB# 224887)
11 Rachel W. Dempsey (SB# 310424)
12 Laura Iris Mattes (SB# 310594)
13 OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
14 One California Street, 12th Floor
15 San Francisco, CA 94111
16 Telephone: (415) 638-8800
17 Facsimile: (415) 638-8810
18 E-mail: jsagafi@outtengolden.com
19 E-mail: rdempsey@outtengolden.com
20 E-mail: imattes@outtengolden.com

21 Rachel M. Bien (SB# 315886)
22 OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
23 601 S Figueroa St., Suite 4050
24 Los Angeles, CA 90017
25 Telephone: (323) 673-9900
26 Facsimile: (646) 509-2058
27 E-mail: rmb@outtengolden.com

28 Adam T. Klein (admitted *pro hac vice*)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
685 Third Avenue, 25th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 245-1000
Facsimile: (646) 509-2060
E-mail: atk@outtengolden.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Settlement Class
Members*

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

Jahan C. Sagafi (SB# 224887)
Rachel W. Dempsey (SB# 310424)
Laura Iris Mattes (SB# 310594)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
One California Street, 12th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 638-8800
Facsimile: (415) 638-8810
E-mail: jsagafi@outtengolden.com
E-mail: rdempsey@outtengolden.com
E-mail: imattes@outtengolden.com

Adam T. Klein (admitted *pro hac vice*)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
685 Third Avenue, 25th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Telephone: (212) 245-1000
Facsimile: (646) 509-2060
E-mail: atk@outtengolden.com

Rachel M. Bien (SB# 315886)
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP
601 S Figueroa St., Suite 4050
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (323) 673-9900
Facsimile: (646) 509-2058
E-mail: rmb@outtengolden.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION**

ROXANA DEL TORO LOPEZ and ANA
MEDINA, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Defendant.

Case Number: 17-cv-06255-YGR

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT
AND FINAL JUDGMENT**

1 On November 6, 2018, a hearing was held on the unopposed motion of Plaintiffs Roxana
2 del Toro Lopez and Ana Medina (“Plaintiffs”) for final approval of the class settlement; and on
3 the separate motions of Plaintiffs and their counsel for awards of the Class Representative
4 Service Payments and the Class Counsel Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Payment. Jahan C. Sagafi,
5 Rachel Dempsey, and Iris Mattes appeared for Plaintiffs. Nancy Abell appeared for Defendant
6 Uber Technologies, Inc. (“Uber”).

7 The Parties have submitted their Stipulation of Class Settlement and Release (the
8 “Settlement”), which this Court preliminarily approved in its April 19, 2018 order (the
9 “Preliminary Approval Order”). In accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, Class
10 Members have been given notice of the terms of the Settlement and the opportunity to submit a
11 claim form, comment on the settlement, and/or opt out of its provisions. In addition, pursuant to
12 the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715 (“CAFA”), Uber has given the Attorney
13 General of the United States and the appropriate state officials in the states in which the Class
14 Members reside timely notice of the Settlement.

15 Having received and considered the Settlement, the supporting papers filed by the Parties,
16 and the evidence and argument received by the Court at the final approval hearing on November
17 6, 2018, by means of this order (the “Final Approval Order”) the Court grants final approval to
18 the Settlement, and HEREBY ORDERS and MAKES DETERMINATIONS as follows:

19 **Definitions**

20 1. Except as otherwise specified herein, the Court for purposes of this Final
21 Approval Order adopts all defined terms set forth in the Settlement.

22 **Jurisdiction**

23 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation and all related
24 matters and all state and federal claims raised in this action and released in the Settlement, and
25 personal jurisdiction over Uber and all Class Members (except for those who timely filed opt-out
26 requests). Specifically, this Court has federal question jurisdiction over this action pursuant to
27
28

1 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29 U.S.C. §
2 216(b).

3 3. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over all state-law claims asserted by
4 Plaintiffs because the state-law claims derive from a common nucleus of operative fact and form
5 part of the same case or controversy as those claims over which the Court has primary
6 jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1367 (providing for supplemental jurisdiction over related state-
7 law claims that “form part of the same case or controversy”); *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383
8 U.S. 715, 726 (1996) (holding that federal courts have supplemental jurisdiction over state law
9 claims that arise from the same “common nucleus of operative fact” such that the parties “would
10 ordinarily be expected to try them all in one judicial proceeding”).

11 4. This Court also has jurisdiction to approve the Settlement’s release of claims by
12 Class Members over which the Court has jurisdiction, even if the Court would not independently
13 have jurisdiction over those released claims. *See Reyn’s Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc.*, 442
14 F.3d 741, 748 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268, 1287-88
15 (9th Cir. 1992) (“[A] federal court may release not only claims alleged in the complaint, but also
16 state claims arising from the same nucleus of operative facts over which the court would not
17 have jurisdictional competence.”)).

18 **Dissemination of Notice to Class Members**

19 5. Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, the notice documents were sent to
20 each Class Member by email and by first-class mail. The notice was clear and organized,
21 following the model forms provided by the Federal Judicial Center at www.fjc.gov. The notice
22 materials informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, how their settlement share of
23 Fund A would be calculated, how to submit a Claim Form, the conditions of eligibility for a
24 settlement share of Fund B, their right to comment on (including object to) the Settlement or opt
25 out of the Settlement to pursue their claims individually, and their right to appear in person or by
26 counsel at the final approval hearing and be heard regarding approval of the Settlement.
27 Adequate periods of time were provided by each of these procedures.

1 6. The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate
2 protections to Class Members and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed decision
3 regarding approval of the Settlement based on the responses of Class Members. Notice was
4 accomplished in the manner prescribed by the Settlement. The Court finds and determines that
5 the notice provided in this case was the best notice practicable, which satisfied the requirements
6 of law and due process.

7 **Notice to Attorneys General Pursuant to CAFA**

8 7. Pursuant to CAFA, within 10 days after the filing of the motion seeking
9 preliminary approval of the Settlement, Uber served upon the Attorney General of the United
10 States and the appropriate state officials of the states in which the Class Members reside a notice
11 of the Settlement consisting of: a copy of the complaint in this action; a notice of the scheduled
12 judicial hearing in this class action; copies of the Settlement; and the proposed Notice. The
13 Notice of Settlement also invited comment on the Settlement. This Final Approval Order is
14 being entered at least 90 days after the later of the dates on which the appropriate federal and
15 state officials were served with the notice of proposed settlement.

16 8. The Court finds and determines that Uber's notice of Settlement was timely,
17 adequate, and compliant with the statutory requirements of CAFA. Accordingly, 28 U.S.C.
18 §1715(e) has no application to the Settlement.

19 **Certification Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and the FLSA**

20 9. For the reasons stated in the Preliminary Approval Order, this Court finds and
21 determines that the proposed Settlement Class, as defined in Section 1 of the Settlement and in
22 Section II.A of its Preliminary Approval Order, meets all of the legal requirements for class
23 certification under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 ("Rule 23") (a) and (b)(3), and it is hereby
24 ordered that the Settlement Class is finally approved and certified as a Class for purposes of
25 settlement of this action.

26 10. This Court finds and determines that the action meets all of the legal requirements
27 for certification as a collective action under section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), for
28

1 the three-year period preceding the filing of Plaintiffs' complaint, and it is hereby ordered that
2 the action is certified as a collective action for purposes of settlement of this action.

3 **Fairness**

4 11. Pursuant to Rule 23(e), the Court further finds and determines that the terms of
5 the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Class and to each Class Member and that
6 the Class Members who have not opted out will be bound by the Settlement, that the Settlement
7 is ordered finally approved, and that all terms and provisions of the Settlement should be and
8 hereby are ordered to be consummated. The Court specifically finds that the Settlement is
9 rationally related to the strength of Plaintiffs' claims given the risk, expense, complexity, and
10 duration of further litigation. This Court also finds that the Settlement is the result of arms'-
11 length negotiations between experienced counsel representing the interests of the Class Members
12 and Uber, under the supervision of an experienced and independent third-party mediator, after
13 thorough factual and legal investigation. *Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 960 (9th Cir.
14 2003); *Class Plaintiffs*, 955 F.2d at 1291.

15 12. The Court finds and determines that the payments to be made to the Class
16 Members as provided for in the Settlement, Section 5, are fair and reasonable. The proposed
17 plan of allocation bases each Class Member's recovery on (a) the number of weeks during the
18 Covered Period the Class Member worked, (b) the Class Member's position, (c) whether the
19 Class Member worked in California, (d) when the Class Member was employed with Uber, (e)
20 whether the Class Member was full-time or part-time, (f) whether the Class Member previously
21 signed a release of claims, and (g) whether the Class Member submitted a Claim Form and the
22 contents of the Claim Form. The plan of allocation is rational. The Court hereby gives final
23 approval to the payments and orders those amounts be paid to the claimants out of the Net Fund
24 Value in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

25 **Class Member Response**

26 13. The Court further finds that the response of the Class Members to the Settlement
27 supports settlement approval. Of the 485 Class Members, only two opted out of the Settlement.
28

1 No Class Members objected to the Settlement.

2 **Appointment of Class Representatives and Class Representative Service Awards**

3 14. The Court confirms as final the appointment of Roxana del Toro Lopez and Ana
4 Medina as Class Representatives of the Rule 23 Class and the nationwide FLSA Class under
5 section 16(b). The Court finds and determines that the award of \$50,000 to Ms. del Toro Lopez
6 and \$30,000 to Ms. Medina for their services as Class Representatives, in addition to their
7 Individual Settlement Payments, is fair and reasonable.

8 15. Plaintiffs have satisfied the criteria as set forth in *Staton*, 327 F.3d 938. Under
9 *Staton*, service awards should be evaluated using “relevant factors, includ[ing] the actions the
10 plaintiff has taken to protect the interests of the class, the degree to which the class has benefitted
11 from those actions, . . . the amount of time and effort the plaintiff expended in pursuing the
12 litigation . . . and reasonabl[e] fear[s of] workplace retaliation.” *Id.* at 977 (quoting *Cook v.*
13 *Niedert*, 142 F.3d 1004, 1016 (7th Cir. 1998)) (internal quotation marks omitted) (alterations in
14 original). Here, the Class Representatives’ initiation of this suit caused them personal exposure
15 and potential adverse consequences with future employers.

16 16. Ms. del Toro Lopez and Ms. Medina were substantially involved throughout the
17 litigation, educating Class Counsel regarding Class Members’ job duties and Uber’s policies and
18 procedures. The Court hereby approves the Class Representative Service Awards as set forth
19 herein be made to Class Representatives out of the Qualified Settlement Fund in accordance with
20 the terms of the Settlement.

21 **Appointment of Class Counsel; Attorneys’ Fees and Costs**

22 17. Class Counsel attest to performing substantial work on behalf of the Class
23 Members, totaling \$_____ in lodestar. The Court finds the hours worked by Class Counsel
24 to be reasonably incurred for the benefit of the Class Members. Class Counsel’s hourly rates,
25 ranging from \$235 to \$285 for staff and \$250 to \$850 for attorneys, are reasonable in light of the
26 market for legal services of this type and quality. The Court confirms as final the appointment of
27 Adam T. Klein, Jahan C. Sagafi, Rachel Bien, Rachel Williams Dempsey, and Iris Mattes of
28

1 Outten & Golden LLP as Class Counsel for the Rule 23 and FLSA Classes. Class Counsel has
2 capably and effectively represented the Class Members' interests. The Court finds and
3 determines that the payment of \$2,500,000 in attorneys' fees and \$ _____ in litigation costs
4 and expenses, for a total payment of \$ _____ to Class Counsel, is fair and reasonable.
5 *See, e.g., Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043 (9th Cir. 2002); *Chemical Bank v. City of*
6 *Seattle (In re Washington Public Power Supply Sec. Litig.)*, 19 F.3d 1291, 1297 (9th Cir. 1994).
7 This fee is 25% of the total fund, which is consistent with the Ninth Circuit's 25% benchmark for
8 class action settlements. Under a lodestar cross-check, the lodestar multiplier of _____ supports
9 the fee award. The Court hereby gives final approval to that amount and orders that payment be
10 made to Class Counsel out of the Gross Fund Value in accordance with the terms of the
11 Settlement.

12 **Settlement Administrator Report**

13 18. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Settlement
14 Administrator will provide written certification of such completion to the Court and counsel for
15 the Parties.

16 **Release**

17 19. By operation of the entry of this Final Approval Order and pursuant to the
18 Settlement, all Qualified Claimants are permanently barred from prosecuting against Uber any
19 Claim as set forth in Section 12 of the Settlement. The Court has reviewed the release in Section
20 12 of the Settlement and finds it to be fair, reasonable, and enforceable under Rule 23, the FLSA,
21 and all other applicable law.

22 **Contingency on Finality**

23 20. If, for any reason, the Settlement ultimately does not become Final (as defined in
24 the Settlement, Section 1.10), this Final Approval Order will be vacated; the Parties will return to
25 their respective positions in this action as those positions existed immediately before the parties
26 executed the Settlement; and nothing stated in the Settlement or any other papers filed with this
27 Court in connection with the Settlement will be deemed an admission of any kind by any of the
28

1 Parties or used as evidence against, or over the objection of, any of the Parties for any purpose in
2 this action or in any other action.

3 **Final Judgment and Dismissal**

4 22. By means of this Final Approval Order, this Court hereby enters final judgment in
5 this action, as defined in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a)(1).

6 23. Without affecting the finality of the Court’s judgment in any way, the Court
7 retains jurisdiction over this matter for purposes of resolving issues relating to interpretation,
8 administration, implementation, effectuation and enforcement of the Settlement. Nothing in this
9 Final Approval Order will preclude any action to enforce the Parties’ obligations under the
10 Settlement or under this order, including the requirement that Uber make the settlement
11 payments in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

12 24. The Parties are hereby ordered to comply with the terms of the Settlement.

13 25. This action is dismissed with prejudice, each side to bear its own costs and
14 attorneys’ fees except as provided by the Settlement and the Court’s orders.

15
16
17 Dated: November ____, 2018

18 _____
The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
United States District Judge