



Annual Workplace Class Action Litigation Report

2013 EDITION

Important Disclaimer

The material in this report is of the nature of general commentary only. It is not offered as legal advice on any specific issue or matter and should not be taken as such. The views expressed are exclusively those of the authors. The authors disclaim any and all liability to any person in respect of anything and the consequences of anything done or omitted to be done wholly or partly in reliance upon the contents of this report. Readers should refrain from acting on the basis of any discussion contained in this publication without obtaining specific legal advice on the particular facts and circumstances at issue. Any sort of comprehensive legal advice on any particular situation is beyond the scope of this report. While the authors have made every effort to provide accurate and up to date information on laws, cases, and regulations, these matters are continuously subject to change. Furthermore, the application of the laws depends on the particular facts and circumstances of each situation, and therefore readers should consult with an attorney before taking any action. This publication is designed to provide authoritative information relative to the subject matter covered. It is offered with the understanding that the authors are not engaged in rendering legal advice or other professional services.

- From a Declaration of Principles jointly adopted by a Committee of the American Bar Association and a Committee of Publishers and Associations.

Writer's direct phone

(312) 460-5893

Writer's e-mail

spoor@seyfarth.com

131 South Dearborn Street

Suite 2400

Chicago, Illinois 60603

(312) 460-5000

fax (312) 460-7000

www.seyfarth.com

January 2013

Dear Clients:

The last few years have seen an explosion in class action and collective action litigation involving workplace issues. This came to a head in 2011 and 2012 with several major class action rulings from the U.S. Supreme Court. Likewise, the present economic climate is likely to fuel even more lawsuits. The stakes in these types of employment lawsuits can be extremely significant, as the financial risks of such cases are enormous. More often than not, class actions adversely affect the market share of a Corp. and impact its reputation in the marketplace. It is a legal exposure which keeps corporate counsel and business executives awake at night.

Defense of corporations in complex, high-stakes workplace litigation is one of the hallmarks of Seyfarth Shaw's practice. Through that work, our attorneys are on the forefront of the myriad of issues confronting employers in class action litigation.

In order to assist our clients in understanding and avoiding such litigation, we are pleased to present the 2013 Edition of the Seyfarth Shaw Annual Workplace Class Action Litigation Report. This edition, authored by the class action attorneys in our Labor & Employment Department, contains a circuit-by-circuit and state-by-state review of significant class action rulings rendered in 2012, and analyzes the most significant settlements over the past twelve months in class actions and collective actions. We hope this Annual Report will assist our clients in understanding class action and collective action exposures and the developing case law under both federal and state law.

Very truly yours,



J. Stephen Poor
Firm Managing Partner

Author's Note

Our Annual Report analyzes the leading class action and collective action decisions of 2012 involving claims against employers brought in federal courts under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"), the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA"), and a host of other federal statutes applicable to workplace issues. The Report also analyzes class action and collective action rulings involving claims brought against employers in all 50 state court systems, including decisions pertaining to employment laws, wage & hour laws, and breach of employment contract actions. The key class action and collective action settlements over the past year are also analyzed, both in terms of gross settlement dollars in private plaintiff and government-initiated lawsuits as well as injunctive relief provisions in consent decrees. Finally, the Report also discusses important federal and state court rulings in non-workplace cases which are significant in their impact on the defense of workplace class action litigation. In total, there are 1,059 decisions analyzed in the Report.

The cases decided in 2012 foreshadow the direction of class action litigation in the coming year. One certain conclusion is that employment law class action and collective action litigation is becoming ever more sophisticated and will continue to be a source of significant financial exposure to employers well into the future. Employers also can expect that class action and collective action lawsuits increasingly will combine claims under multiple statutes, thereby requiring the defense bar to have a cross-disciplinary understanding of substantive employment law as well as the procedural peculiarities of opt-out classes under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the opt-in procedures in FLSA and ADEA collective actions.

This report represents the collective contributions of a significant number of our colleagues at Seyfarth Shaw LLP. We wish to thank and acknowledge those contributions by Richard L. Alfred, Lorie Almon, Raymond C. Baldwin, Brett C. Bartlett, Edward W. Bergmann, Daniel Blouin, Rebecca Bromet, William M. Brown, Michael J. Burns, Robert J. Carty, Jr., Mark A. Casciari, John L. Collins, Ariel Cudkowicz, Catherine M. Dacre, Joseph R. Damato, Christopher J. DeGroff, Pamela Devata, Gilmore F. Diekmann, Jr., Alex Drummond, William F. Dugan, Noah A. Finkel, Timothy F. Haley, David D. Kadue, Lynn Kappelman, Raymond R. Kepner, Daniel B. Klein, Mary Kay Klimesh, Ronald J. Kramer, Richard B. Lapp, Kari Erickson Levine, Richard P. McArdle, Ian H. Morrison, Camille A. Olson, Andrew Paley, Katherine E. Perrelli, Thomas J. Piskorski, George E. Preonas, David Ross, Jeffrey K. Ross, David J. Rowland, Alfred L. Sanderson, Jeremy Sherman, Frederick T. Smith, Diana Tabacopoulos, Joseph S. Turner, Peter A. Walker, Timothy M. Watson, Robert S. Whitman, and Kenwood C. Youmans.

Our goal is for this Report to guide clients through the thicket of class action and collective action decisional law, and to enable corporate counsel to make sound and informed litigation decisions while minimizing risk. We hope that you find the Seyfarth Shaw Annual Workplace Class Action Litigation Report to be useful.

Gerald L. Maatman, Jr./General Editor
Co-Chair, Class Action Litigation Practice Group of
Seyfarth Shaw LLP

January 2013

Guide To Citation Formats

As corporate counsel utilize the Report for research, we have attempted to cite the West bound volumes wherever possible (e.g., *Lane, et al. v. Facebook, Inc.*, 646 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2012)). If a decision is unavailable in bound format, we have utilized a LEXIS cite from its electronic database (e.g., *Scott, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4669 (W.D.N.C. Jan. 13, 2012)), and if a LEXIS cite is not available, then to a Westlaw cite from its electronic database (e.g., *In Re Live Concert Antitrust Litigation*, 2012 WL 1021081 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2012)). If a ruling is not contained in an electronic database, the full docketing information is provided (e.g., *Duran, et al. v. Sara Lee Corp.*, No. 11-CV-313 (W.D. Mich. Mar. 23, 2012)).

Search Functionality

This Report is fully searchable. Case names, Rule 23 terms, and class action topics can be searched by selecting Edit and then Find (or Ctrl+F), and then by typing in the word or phrase to be searched, and then either selecting Next or hitting Enter.

eBook Features

The 2013 Workplace Class Action Report is also be available for the first time as an eBook. The downloaded eBook is accessible via freely available eBook reader apps like iBook, Kobo, Aldiko, etc. The eBook provides a rich and immersive reading experience to the users.

Some of the notable features include:

1. The eBook is completely searchable.
2. Users can increase or decrease the font sizes.
3. Active links are set for the table of contents to their respective sections.
4. Bookmarking is offered for notable pages.
5. Readers can drag to navigate through various pages.

A Note On Class Action And Collective Action Terms And Laws

References are made to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) throughout this Report. These are the two main statutory sources for class action and collective action decisional law. Both are procedural devices used in federal court for determining the rights and remedies of litigants whose cases involve common questions of law and fact. The following summary provides a brief overview of Rule 23 and § 216(b).

Class Action Terms

The Report uses the term *class action* to mean any civil case in which parties indicated their intent to sue on behalf of themselves as well as others not specifically named in the suit at some point prior to the final resolution of the matter. This definition includes a case in which a class was formally approved by a judge (a *certified* class action), as well as a *putative* class action, in which a judge denied a motion for certification, in which a motion for certification had been made but a decision was still pending at the time of final resolution, or in which no formal motion had been made but other indications were present suggesting that class treatment was a distinct possibility (such as a statement in a complaint that the plaintiffs intended to bring the action on behalf of others similarly-situated).

Although certified class actions may receive considerable attention if they are reported publicly, defendants also must confront putative class actions that contain the potential for class treatment as a result of filing a motion for certification or because of allegations in the original complaint that assert that the named plaintiffs seek to represent others similarly-situated. Even if such cases are never actually certified, the possibility of the litigation expanding into a formal class action raises the stakes significantly, perhaps requiring a more aggressive (and costlier) defense or resulting in a settlement on an individual basis at a premium.

Rule 23

Rule 23 governs class actions in federal courts, and typically involves lawsuits that affect potential class members in different states or that have a nexus with federal law. Rule 23 requires a party seeking class certification to satisfy the four requirements of section (a) of the rule and at least one of three conditions of section (b) of the rule. Under U.S. Supreme Court precedent, a district court must undertake a “rigorous analysis of Rule 23 prerequisites” before certifying a class. *General Telephone Co. of Southwest v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 161 (1982). More often than not, plaintiffs will support their motion for class certification with deposition testimony, declarations of putative class members, and expert opinions in the form of affidavits of expert witnesses. Courts often observe that the appropriate analysis in reviewing this evidence is not equivalent to an examination of the merits or a battle between the parties’ experts. Rather, the salient issue is whether plaintiffs’ legal theories and factual materials satisfy the Rule 23 requirements.

The Rule 23(a) requirements include:

- Numerosity – The individuals who would comprise the class must be so numerous that joinder of them all into the lawsuit would be impracticable.
- Commonality – There must be questions of law and fact common to the proposed class.

- Typicality – The claims or defenses of the representative parties must be typical of the claims and defenses of putative class members.
- Adequacy of Representation – The representative plaintiffs and their counsel must be capable of fairly and adequately protecting the interests of the class.

The standards for analyzing the commonality requirement of Rule 23(a)(2) were tightened in 2011 with the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, et al.*, 131 S. Ct. 2541 (2011). As a result, a "common" issue is one that is "capable of class-wide resolution – which means that determination of its truth or falsity will resolve an issue that is central to the validity of each of the claims in one stroke." *Id.* at 2551.

Once a plaintiff establishes the four requirements of Rule 23(a), he or she must satisfy one of the three requirements of Rule 23(b). In practice, a plaintiff typically establishes the propriety of class certification under either Rule 23(b)(2) or Rule 23(b)(3) in an employment-related case.

Because application of each rule depends on the nature of the injuries alleged and the relief sought, and imposes different certification standards on the class, the differences between Rule 23(b)(2) and (b)(3) are critical in employment-related class action litigation. In the words of the rule, a class may be certified under Rule 23(b)(2) if the party opposing the class "has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole." In other words, plaintiffs seeking to certify class actions under Rule 23(b)(2) are restricted to those cases where the primary relief sought is injunctive or declaratory in nature. Rule 23(b)(2) does not extend to cases in which the appropriate final relief relates exclusively or predominantly to money damages. Rule 23(b)(2) provides for a binding litigation order as to all class members without guarantees of personal notice and the opportunity to opt-out of the suit.

Rule 23(b)(3) is designed for circumstances in which class action treatment is not as clearly called for as in Rule 23(b)(1) and Rule 23(b)(2) situations, when a class action may nevertheless be convenient and desirable. A class may be certified under Rule 23(b)(3) if the court finds that questions of law or fact common to the members of the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. Pertinent considerations include the interest of the members of the class in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions; the extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by members of the class; the desirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in one particular forum; and the difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

To qualify for certification under Rule 23(b)(3), therefore, a class must meet not only the requirements of Rule 23(a), but also two additional requirements: "(1) common questions must predominate over any questions affecting only individual members; and (2) class resolution must be superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy." *Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 615 (1997). While the common question requirement of Rule 23(a)(2) and the predominance requirement of Rule 23(b)(3) overlap, the predominance requirement is more stringent than the common question requirement. Thus, even though a case may present common questions of law or fact, those questions may not always predominate and class certification would be inappropriate.

Rule 23(b)(3) applies to cases where the primary relief sought is money damages. The Supreme Court has determined – in *Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 527 U.S. 815 (1999) – that unlike in Rule 23(b)(2) class actions, each class member in a Rule 23(b)(3) class action for money damages is entitled as a matter of due process to personal notice and an opportunity to opt-out of the class action. Accordingly, Rule 23(c)(2) guarantees those rights for each member of a class certified under Rule 23(b)(3). There are no comparable procedural guarantees for class members under Rule 23(b)(2).

29 U.S.C. § 216(b)

This statute governs multi-plaintiff lawsuits under the ADEA and the FLSA. Generally, such lawsuits are known as collective actions (as opposed to class actions).

Under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), courts generally recognize that plaintiffs and other “non-party” individuals may not proceed collectively until they establish that they should be permitted to do so as a class. Under § 216(b), courts have held that “similarly-situated” individuals may proceed collectively as a class. The federal circuits have not agreed on the standard according to which such a class should be certified. Two competing standards for certification are recognized.

The first approach adopts the view that the “similarly-situated” inquiry is coextensive with the procedure used in class actions brought pursuant to Rule 23. Using this methodology, the court analyzes the putative class for factors including numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy of representation. This typically occurs after some discovery has taken place. This approach is unusual and is not favored.

The second approach is a two-tiered approach involving a first stage conditioned certification process and a second stage potential decertification process. It is more commonly used and is the prevailing test in federal courts. In practice, it tends to be a “plaintiff-friendly” standard.

In the context of the first stage of conditional certification, plaintiffs typically move for conditional certification and permission to send notices to prospective class members. This generally occurs at an early stage of the case, and often before discovery even commences. Courts have held that a plaintiff’s burden at this stage is minimal. A ruling at this stage of the litigation often is based upon allegations in the complaint and any affidavits submitted in favor of or in objection to conditional certification.

Courts have not clearly defined the qualitative or quantitative standards of evidence that should be applied at this stage. Courts are often reluctant to grant or deny certification on the merits of a plaintiff’s case. This frustrates defendants with clearly meritorious arguments in defense of the litigation, such as those based on compelling proof that would establish the exempt status of the plaintiffs and other employees alleged to be similarly-situated.

Instead, courts appear to find the most convincing proof that certification is improper based on evidence that putative class members perform different jobs in different locations or facilities, under different supervisors, and potentially pursuant to differing policies and practices. Courts also have held that certification is inappropriate when individualized inquiries into applicable defenses are required, such as when the employer asserts that the relevant employees are exempt.

Where conditional certification is granted, a defendant has the opportunity to request that the class be decertified after discovery is wholly or partially completed in the subsequent, second stage of decertification. Courts engage in a more rigorous scrutiny of the similarities and differences that exist amongst members of the class at the decertification stage. The scrutiny is based upon a more developed, if not entirely complete, record of evidence. Upon an employer's motion for decertification, a court assesses the issue of similarity more critically and may revisit questions concerning the locations where employees work, the employees' supervisors, their employment histories, the policies and practices according to which they perform work and are paid, and the distinct defenses that may require individualized analyses.

Opt-In/Opt-Out Procedures

Certification procedures are different under Rule 23 and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Under Rule 23(b)(2), a court's order binds the class; under Rule 23(b)(3), however, a class member must opt-out of the class action (after receiving a class action notice). If he or she does not do so, they are bound by the judgment. Conversely, under § 216(b), a class member must opt-in to the lawsuit before he or she will be bound. While at or near 100% of class members are effectively bound by a Rule 23 order, opt-in rates in most § 216(b) collective actions typically range from 10% to 30%.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR IN WORKPLACE CLASS ACTION LITIGATION.....	1
A.	Significant Trends In Workplace Class Action Litigation In 2012.....	3
B.	Impact Of Changing Rule 23 Standards.....	6
C.	Implications Of These Developments For 2013	7
II.	SIGNIFICANT CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS IN 2012.....	11
A.	Top Ten Private Plaintiff-Initiated Monetary Settlements.....	11
B.	Top Ten Government-Initiated Monetary Settlements.....	15
C.	Noteworthy Injunctive Relief Provisions In Class Action Settlements	17
III.	SIGNIFICANT FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION CLASS ACTION AND EEOC PATTERN OR PRACTICE RULINGS.....	21
A.	Employment Discrimination Class Actions Under Title VII Of The Civil Rights Act Of 1964	21
(i)	First Circuit	21
(ii)	Second Circuit	21
(iii)	Third Circuit.....	23
(iv)	Fourth Circuit.....	24
(v)	Fifth Circuit	26
(vi)	Sixth Circuit	26
(vii)	Seventh Circuit	27
(viii)	Eighth Circuit.....	30
(ix)	Ninth Circuit.....	30
(x)	Tenth Circuit	34
(xi)	Eleventh Circuit	34
(xii)	District Of Columbia Circuit.....	35
(xiii)	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	35
B.	EEOC Pattern Or Practice Cases	36
(i)	First Circuit	36
(ii)	Second Circuit	37
(iii)	Third Circuit.....	38
(iv)	Fourth Circuit.....	41
(v)	Fifth Circuit	51
(vi)	Sixth Circuit	60
(vii)	Seventh Circuit	66
(viii)	Eighth Circuit.....	76

(ix)	Ninth Circuit.....	80
(x)	Tenth Circuit.....	98
(xi)	Eleventh Circuit.....	104
(xii)	District Of Columbia Circuit.....	107
(xiii)	U.S. Supreme Court.....	107
IV.	SIGNIFICANT COLLECTIVE ACTION RULINGS UNDER THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT.....	109
A.	Cases Certifying Or Refusing To Certify ADEA Collective Action Claims.....	109
(i)	First Circuit.....	109
(ii)	Second Circuit.....	109
(iii)	Third Circuit.....	110
(iv)	Fourth Circuit.....	110
(v)	Fifth Circuit.....	111
(vi)	Sixth Circuit.....	111
(vii)	Seventh Circuit.....	111
(viii)	Eighth Circuit.....	111
(ix)	Ninth Circuit.....	112
(x)	Tenth Circuit.....	112
(xi)	Eleventh Circuit.....	112
(xii)	District Of Columbia Circuit.....	112
B.	Other Federal Rulings Affecting The Defense Of ADEA Collective Actions.....	112
(i)	Burdens Of Proof In Litigation Over Reductions-In-Force.....	112
(ii)	Older Workers Benefit Protection Act Litigation Issues.....	112
(iii)	Employee Benefit Plan Litigation Under The ADEA.....	114
(iv)	Arbitration Of ADEA Pattern Or Practice Claims.....	116
(v)	Involuntary RIF Collective Action Litigation.....	116
V.	SIGNIFICANT COLLECTION ACTION RULINGS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT.....	119
A.	Cases Certifying Or Refusing To Certify FLSA Collective Action Claims.....	119
(i)	First Circuit.....	119
(ii)	Second Circuit.....	123
(iii)	Third Circuit.....	134
(iv)	Fourth Circuit.....	141
(v)	Fifth Circuit.....	147

(vi)	Sixth Circuit	156
(vii)	Seventh Circuit	159
(viii)	Eighth Circuit	172
(ix)	Ninth Circuit.....	178
(x)	Tenth Circuit	209
(xi)	Eleventh Circuit	215
(xii)	District Of Columbia Circuit.....	221
B.	Other Federal Rulings Affecting The Defense Of FLSA Collective Actions	222
(i)	Notice Issues In FLSA Collective Actions	223
(ii)	Mootness In The FLSA Collective Actions	224
(iii)	Individual Executive Liability In FLSA Collective Actions.....	226
(iv)	Awards Of Attorneys' Fees In FLSA Collective Actions.....	226
(v)	Application Of <i>Twombly</i> Pleading Standards In FLSA Collective Actions	230
(vi)	FLSA Collective Actions For Donning And Doffing.....	236
(vii)	Exemption Issues In FLSA Collective Actions.....	238
(viii)	Discovery In FLSA Collective Actions	257
(ix)	Public Employee FLSA Collective Action Litigation.....	260
(x)	Preemption Issues In FLSA Collective Actions	266
(xi)	Independent Contractor Issues In Wage & Hour Class Actions	271
(xii)	Communications With Class Members In FLSA Collective Actions	275
(xiii)	Venue Issues In FLSA Collective Actions	276
(xiv)	Pay Policies In FLSA Collective Actions	278
(xv)	Litigation Over The Motor Carrier Exemption In FLSA Collective Actions	285
(xvi)	Class Arbitration Of Wage & Hour Claims.....	285
(xvii)	Releases In FLSA Collective Actions.....	299
(xviii)	Settlement Of Wage & Hour Class Actions And Collective Actions	299
(xix)	Disqualification Of Class Counsel In Wage & Hour Class Actions And Collective Actions	311
(xx)	DOL Wage & Hour Enforcement Actions	312
(xxi)	Application Of Statute Of Limitations In FLSA Collective Actions	318
(xxii)	Concurrent State Law Claims In Wage & Hour Class Actions.....	319

(xxiii)	Affirmative Defenses In FLSA Collective Actions	324
(xxiv)	Joint Employer And Employer Status Issues In FLSA Collective Actions	325
(xxv)	Litigation Of Tip Pooling Claims Under The FLSA	328
(xxvi)	Litigation Of Service Charge Claims In Wage & Hour Litigation	330
(xxvii)	Sanctions In Wage & Hour Class Actions	331
(xxviii)	Issues With Opt-In Rights In Wage & Hour Class Actions	334
(xxix)	Wilfulness And Liquidated Damages In FLSA Collective Actions	336
(xxx)	Written Consents In FLSA Collective Action Litigation	337
(xxxi)	Trial Issues In FLSA Collective Actions	338
(xxxii)	Issues With Interns Under The FLSA	341
(xxxiii)	Retaliation Issues In Wage & Hour Class Actions	342
(xxxiv)	Summary Judgment In Wage & Hour Class Actions	344
(xxxv)	Injunctive Relief Issues In Wage & Hour Class Actions	345
(xxxvi)	Amendments In FLSA Collective Actions	346
VI.	SIGNIFICANT CLASS ACTION RULINGS UNDER THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974	347
A.	Cases Certifying Or Refusing To Certify ERISA Class Actions	347
(i)	First Circuit	347
(ii)	Second Circuit	347
(iii)	Third Circuit	351
(iv)	Fourth Circuit	351
(v)	Fifth Circuit	352
(vi)	Sixth Circuit	352
(vii)	Seventh Circuit	353
(viii)	Eighth Circuit	355
(ix)	Ninth Circuit	355
(x)	Tenth Circuit	356
(xi)	Eleventh Circuit	356
(xii)	District Of Columbia Circuit	356
B.	Other Federal Rulings Affecting The Defense Of ERISA Class Actions	357
(i)	Cash Balance Plan Issues	358
(ii)	Breach Of Fiduciary Duty Issues In ERISA Class Actions	359
(iii)	ERISA Class Action Litigation Over Retiree/Employee Benefits	366

(iv)	Attorneys' Fees In ERISA Class Actions.....	368
(v)	Settlement Approval Issues In ERISA Class Actions	369
(vi)	ERISA Class Actions Over Pay Plans.....	371
(vii)	Standing Issues In ERISA Class Actions	371
(viii)	Coverage Issues In ERISA Class Actions.....	372
(ix)	Exhaustion Principles In ERISA Class Actions.....	373
(x)	Pension Calculation Issues In ERISA Class Actions	374
(xi)	Pleading Standards In ERISA Class Actions	375
(xii)	Statute Of Limitations Issues In ERISA Class Actions	375
(xiii)	Plan Fees In ERISA Class Actions	377
(xiv)	ERISA Stock Drop Class Actions.....	378
(xv)	Independent Contractor Issues In ERISA Class Actions	380
(xvi)	Arbitration Issues In ERISA Class Actions	381
(xvii)	Claim Preclusion Issues In ERISA Class Actions.....	381
(xviii)	PBGC Issues In ERISA Class Actions	382
(xix)	Preemption Issues In ERISA Class Actions	382
(xx)	Jury Trials In ERISA Class Actions	385
(xxi)	Individual Liability Issues In ERISA Class Actions	385
(xxii)	Mootness Issues In ERISA Class Actions.....	386
(xxiii)	Anti-Cut-back Issues In ERISA Class Actions.....	387
(xxiv)	Governmental Enforcement Litigation Under The ERISA.....	389
(xxv)	Consolidation In ERISA Class Actions.....	390
(xxvi)	Summary Plan Descriptions In ERISA Class Actions.....	390
VII.	SIGNIFICANT STATE LAW CLASS ACTION RULINGS.....	393
A.	Employment Discrimination Rulings.....	393
(i)	Iowa.....	393
(ii)	Massachusetts.....	394
(iii)	New York.....	395
B.	Wage & Hour Rulings	396
(i)	California	396
(ii)	Indiana	414
(iii)	Louisiana.....	415
(iv)	New Jersey.....	416
(v)	New York.....	417

(vi)	Washington	417
C.	Rulings In Breach Of Employment Contract/Miscellaneous Workplace Claims	419
(i)	Illinois	419
(ii)	Indiana	420
(iii)	New Mexico	421
(iv)	Pennsylvania	422
(v)	Rhode Island	423
D.	Other State Law Rulings Affecting The Defense Of Workplace Class Action Litigation.....	423
(i)	Arkansas	423
(ii)	California	424
(iii)	Delaware	453
(iv)	Florida	459
(v)	Georgia.....	464
(vi)	Illinois	464
(vii)	Indiana	468
(viii)	Iowa.....	469
(ix)	Kansas	470
(x)	Kentucky.....	471
(xi)	Louisiana	473
(xii)	Minnesota.....	475
(xiii)	Mississippi	476
(xiv)	Missouri.....	477
(xv)	Montana	479
(xvi)	New Hampshire	480
(xvii)	New Jersey.....	481
(xviii)	New Mexico.....	482
(xix)	New York.....	484
(xx)	North Dakota	488
(xxi)	Ohio.....	488
(xxii)	Oregon	492
(xxiii)	Pennsylvania	493
(xxiv)	South Carolina.....	495
(xxv)	Texas	496

(xxvi)	Vermont.....	499
(xxvii)	Virginia	499
(xxviii)	Washington	500
VIII.	RULINGS ON THE CLASS ACTION FAIRNESS ACT	503
(i)	First Circuit	504
(ii)	Second Circuit	504
(iii)	Third Circuit	508
(iv)	Fourth Circuit.....	510
(v)	Fifth Circuit	514
(vi)	Sixth Circuit	516
(vii)	Seventh Circuit	516
(viii)	Eighth Circuit	520
(ix)	Ninth Circuit.....	523
(x)	Tenth Circuit	529
(xi)	Eleventh Circuit	530
(xii)	District Of Columbia Circuit.....	531
IX.	OTHER FEDERAL RULINGS AFFECTING THE DEFENSE OF WORKPLACE CLASS ACTION LITIGATION	533
(i)	Class Certification Procedural Issues And Proof Requirements.....	533
(ii)	Preemptive Motions To Strike Or Dismiss Class Allegations.....	539
(iii)	The Numerosity Requirement For Class Certification	546
(iv)	The Commonality Requirement For Class Certification.....	548
(v)	The Typicality Requirement For Class Certification	560
(vi)	The Adequacy Of Representation Requirement For Class Certification	563
(vii)	The Predominance Requirement For Class Certification	568
(viii)	The Superiority Requirement For Class Certification	579
(ix)	Workplace Class Action Arbitration Issues.....	581
(x)	Non-Workplace Class Action Arbitration Issues.....	586
(xi)	Litigation Over Class Action Consent Decrees.....	611
(xii)	Anti-Injunction Act Issues In Class Actions	614
(xiii)	Ascertainability Under Rule 23.....	615
(xiv)	Class Actions Involving Unions.....	616
(xv)	Attorneys' Fee Awards In Class Actions	618

(xvi)	Intervention Rights In Class Actions	631
(xvii)	Collateral Estoppel And Settlement Bar Concepts Under Rule 23	634
(xviii)	Notice Issues In Class Actions.....	637
(xix)	Multi-Party Litigation Over Modification Of Employee Benefits.....	638
(xx)	Civil Rights Class Actions	648
(xxi)	Class Action Discovery Issues.....	653
(xxii)	Group-Wide Remedies In Class Actions	663
(xxiii)	Class-Wide Proof In Class Actions	666
(xxiv)	Multi-Party Litigation Under The WARN Act.....	671
(xxv)	Class Definition Issues	675
(xxvi)	Claim Preclusion Issues In Class Action Litigation.....	680
(xxvii)	Settlement Approval Issues In Class Actions.....	683
(xxviii)	Mootness Issues In Class Action Litigation	697
(xxix)	Experts In Class Certification Proceedings	700
(xxx)	Sanctions Against Plaintiffs In Class Action Litigation	706
(xxxii)	Foreign Worker Class Actions	713
(xxxiii)	Issues With The Judicial Panel On Multi-District Litigation In Class Actions.....	714
(xxxiv)	Standing Issues In Class Actions.....	715
(xxxv)	Employee Testing Issues In Class Actions	732
(xxxvi)	Application Of Tolling Principles In Class Actions	732
(xxxvii)	Exhaustion Principles In Class Actions	736
(xxxviii)	Appointment Of Class Counsel And Lead Plaintiffs	738
(xxxix)	The <i>Rooker-Feldman</i> Doctrine In Class Action Litigation	740
(xl)	Workplace RICO Class Actions	741
(xli)	Public Employee Class Actions	741
(xlii)	Incentive Awards And Costs To Class Representatives.....	744
(xliii)	Injunctions In Class Actions.....	746
(xliv)	Class Actions In Bankruptcy	747
(xlv)	FACTA, FDCPA, And TCPA Class Actions.....	749
(xlvi)	The <i>cy pres</i> Doctrine In Class Actions	753
(xlvii)	Recusals In Class Actions	755
(xlviii)	Objectors In Class Actions.....	756

(xlviii)	Privacy Class Actions	759
(xlix)	Choice-Of-Law Issues In Class Actions	763
(l)	Insurance-Related Class Actions	767
(li)	Disparate Impact Issue In Class Actions.....	769
(lii)	ADA Class Actions	770
(liii)	Government Enforcement Litigation.....	775
(liv)	FMLA Class Actions	777
(lv)	Workplace Antitrust Class Actions	778
(lvi)	Stays In Class Action Litigation.....	779
(lvii)	FCRA Class Actions	781
(lviii)	Releases In Class Action Litigation.....	787
(lix)	Statutory Preemption Of Class Action Litigation.....	788
(lx)	Appeals In Class Action Litigation.....	789
(lxi)	Foreign Judgments In Class Action Litigation	792
(lxii)	Impact Of Ethical Violations By Plaintiffs' Counsel In Multi-Plaintiff Litigation	794
(lxiii)	Venue Issues In Class Actions	795
(lxiv)	Fraud Issues In Class Actions	797
(lxv)	Joinder Issues In Class Actions	798
(lxvi)	Special Masters In Class Actions.....	799
(lxvii)	Preemption Doctrine In Class Action Litigation	799
(lxviii)	<i>De minimis</i> Doctrine In Class Actions	800
(lxix)	First-To-File Rule In Class Actions.....	801
(lxx)	Pay Plan Issues In Class Actions.....	802
(lxxi)	Breach Of Contract Class Actions.....	803
(lxxii)	Pattern Or Practice Issues In Class Actions.....	805
(lxxiii)	Amendments In Class Action Litigation.....	807
(lxxiv)	All Writs Act Issues In Class Actions.....	808
(lxxv)	Relation Back Doctrine In Class Actions.....	810
(lxxvi)	Jurisdiction Issues Over Foreign-Based Employers In Class Actions	810
(lxxvii)	State Law Procedural Requirements In Class Actions	812
(lxxviii)	Enforcement Of Settlement Agreements In Class Actions	813
(lxxix)	Withdrawal Of Counsel Issues In Class Actions.....	813

APPENDIX I TABLE OF 2012 WORKPLACE CLASS ACTION AND COLLECTIVE ACTION LITIGATION RULINGS	817
---	-----

I. Overview Of The Year In Workplace Class Action Litigation

The events of the past year in the workplace class action world demonstrate that the array of bet-the-company litigation issues that businesses face continue to evolve on a landscape that is undergoing significant change. At the same time, governmental enforcement litigation and regulatory oversight of workplace issues heated up to higher levels as compared to past years, thereby challenging businesses to integrate their litigation and risk mitigation strategies to navigate these exposures.

By almost any measure, 2012 was a year of significant change for workplace class action litigation. The U.S. Supreme Court issued three landmark class action rulings in 2011 – in *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, et al.*, *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, et al.*, and *Smith, et al. v. Bayer Corp.* – that impacted all varieties of complex litigation in a profound manner in 2012.

More than any other development in 2012, the *Wal-Mart* decision had a wide-ranging impact on virtually all types of class actions pending in both federal and state courts throughout the country. In many respects, *Wal-Mart* was the “800 pound gorilla” in the courtroom in 2012 as litigants argued and judges analyzed class certification issues. Rule 23 decisions in 2012 pivoted off of *Wal-Mart*, and leverage points in class action litigation increased or decreased depending on the manner in which judges interpreted and applied *Wal-Mart*.

As is well known by now, the Supreme Court’s decision in *Wal-Mart* elucidated whether Rule 23(b)(2) could be used to recover individualized monetary relief for a class (and held it may not), established a heightened standard for the Rule 23(a)(2) commonality requirement (and determined that common questions for a class must have common answers), and rejected previous misreadings of Supreme Court precedent on Rule 23 burdens of proof (and found that to the extent factual determinations that go to the merits also overlap with the Rule 23 requirements, those factual issues must be analyzed to determine the propriety of class certification). As a result, *Wal-Mart* fostered a tidal wave of decisions in 2012, as litigants and courts grappled with the ruling’s implications in a wide variety of class action litigation contexts. As of the close of the year, *Wal-Mart* had been cited a total of 541 times in lower court rulings, a remarkable figure for a decision rendered in June of 2011.

Against this backdrop, the plaintiffs’ class action employment bar filed and prosecuted significant class action and collective action lawsuits against employers in 2012. In turn, employers litigated an increasing number of novel defenses to these class action theories, fueled in part by the new standards enunciated in *Wal-Mart*. As this Report reflects, federal and state courts addressed a myriad of new theories and defenses in ruling on class action and collective action litigation issues. The impact and meaning of “*Wal-Mart* issues” and “*Concepcion* issues” were at the forefront of these case law developments.

An overview of workplace class action developments in 2012 reveals six key trends.

First, the Supreme Court’s opinions in *Wal-Mart* and *Concepcion* had a profound influence in shaping the course of class action litigation rulings throughout 2012. *Wal-Mart* caused both federal and state courts to conduct a wholesale review of the propriety of previous class certification orders in pending cases, prompted defendants to file new rounds of motions for decertification based on *Wal-Mart* to attack all sorts of class theories (and not just those modeled after the nationwide class claims rejected in *Wal-Mart*), and reverberated in case law rulings on a myriad of Rule 23-related issues. *Concepcion* likewise fueled significant litigation over the impact of workplace arbitration agreements and the impediments such agreements may impose on employment discrimination class actions and wage & hour collective actions. The result was a year of decisions on class action issues the likes of which have never been seen before. This wave of new case law is still in its infancy. As many class action issues are in a state of flux post-*Wal-*

Mart and post-*Concepcion*, these evolving precedents are expected to continue developing in the coming year.

Second, government enforcement litigation reached new “white hot” levels in 2012. This was especially evident in terms of the systemic investigation program of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”). As an inevitable by-product of the economy’s high unemployment rates, more discrimination charges were filed with the EEOC in 2012 than in all but one previous year since the founding of the Commission in 1964 – a total of 99,412 discrimination charges against private sector employers (by comparison, the EEOC last year reported receiving a then record high of 99,922 discrimination charges). The Obama Administration’s emphasis on administrative enforcement also spawned more government-initiated investigations over workplace issues. The EEOC’s systemic investigation program – in which the Commission emphasizes the identification, investigation, and litigation of discrimination claims affecting large groups of “alleged victims” – grew to its largest level ever, and witnessed a four-fold increase over 2011. This development is of significant importance to employers, for it evidences an agency with a laser-focus on high-impact, big stakes litigation.

Third, *Wal-Mart* influenced settlement strategies in workplace class actions in a profound way. Employers settled fewer employment discrimination class actions than at any time over the past decade and at a fraction of the levels as in 2006 to 2011.¹ This reflected the impact of *Wal-Mart*, and the notion that difficulties in certifying nationwide, massive class actions impaired the ability of the plaintiffs’ bar to convert their case filings into blockbuster settlements. It also manifested the ability of defendants to dismantle large class cases, or to devalue them for settlement purposes. Simply stated, *Wal-Mart* aided employers to defeat, fracture, and/or devalue employment discrimination class actions, and resulted in fewer settlements at lower amounts. Conversely, the value of wage & hour class action settlements increased significantly, as judges were less apt to apply *Wal-Mart* to collective action certification issues under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”). Finally, government enforcement litigation prompted bigger settlements than in 2011 to a significant degree. As Rule 23 standards elucidated in *Wal-Mart* do not apply to the EEOC, its pattern or practice lawsuits spiked higher settlement values than private plaintiff employment discrimination class actions. In a certain respect, government enforcement litigators filled the void that *Wal-Mart* created for private plaintiff’s counsel.

Fourth, the continued dislocations in the economy during 2012 fueled more class action and collective action litigation over wage & hour laws. In particular, the plaintiffs’ class action bar continued the pace of filings of FLSA collective actions and class actions. Furthermore, these conditions spawned more employment-related case filings, both by laid-off workers and government enforcement attorneys. As of the close of the year, filings held steady in each of these distinct categories and increased on an aggregate basis in wage & hour cases. In turn, this resulted in more judicial rulings, as well as higher settlement numbers (especially in government-initiated enforcement lawsuits and wage & hour class action litigation). Even more workplace litigation is expected in 2013, as businesses re-tool their operations, the dust continues to settle from the economic fallout of the last several years, and the Obama Administration begins its second term with a renewed emphasis in enforcement of workplace laws.

Fifth, wage & hour litigation continued to out-pace all other types of workplace class actions. This trend was manifested by the fact that in terms of case filings, collective actions pursued in federal court under the FLSA outnumbered all other types of private class actions in employment-related cases. In addition, Rule 23 and § 216(b) decisions by federal and state court judges on wage & hour issues were more voluminous

¹ The total of \$48.65 million for the top ten largest employment discrimination class action settlements in 2012 is the lowest total since 2006; the figures for each year were as follows: 2011 – \$123.2 million; 2010 – \$346.4 million; 2009 – \$86.2 million; 2008 – \$118.36 million; 2007 – \$282.1 million; and 2006 – \$91 million.

than in any other area of workplace litigation – more than triple that for employment discrimination or ERISA class actions combined. Significant growth in wage & hour litigation also was centered at the state court level, and especially in California, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Washington. The crest of the wave of wage & hour litigation is still not in sight, and this trend is likely to continue in 2013.

Sixth, and finally, the plaintiffs' class action bar is a tight-knit community, and developments in Rule 23 and § 216(b) case law in 2012 saw rapid strategic changes based on evolving decisions and developments. This fostered quick evolution in case theories, which in turn impacted defense litigation strategies. With the Supreme Court's rulings in *Wal-Mart* and *Concepcion*, the plaintiffs' class action bar began the process of "re-booting" class-wide theories of certification, as well as establishing liability and damages on a class-wide basis. As a result, new certification approaches and cutting-edge strategies are spreading rapidly throughout the substantive areas encompassed by workplace class action law. More than any other trend, the on-going changes to strategy considerations in crafting class claims and litigating Rule 23 certification motions in the wake of *Wal-Mart* drove case law developments in 2012. As a result, workplace class action case law is in flux, and more change is inevitable in 2013.

A. Significant Trends In Workplace Class Action Litigation In 2012

While shareholder and securities class action filings and settlements witnessed a sharp downtick to record lows in 2012, employment-related class action filings increased in certain categories, especially in terms of wage & hour cases. Anecdotally, surveys of corporate counsel confirm that workplace litigation – and especially class action and multi-plaintiff lawsuits – remains one of the chief exposures driving corporate legal budget expenditures, as well as the type of legal dispute that causes the most concern for their companies.

By the numbers, workplace litigation filings stayed constant over the past year, while wage & hour cases increased. By the close of the year, ERISA lawsuits totaled 7,908 (down slightly as compared to 8,414 in 2011), FLSA lawsuits totaled 7,672 (up significantly as compared to 6,779 in 2011), and employment discrimination filings totaled 14,260 lawsuits (a decrease from 14,771 in 2011). In terms of employment discrimination cases, employers can expect a significant jump in the coming year, as the charge number totals at the EEOC in 2011 and 2012 were the highest in the 48-year history of the Commission; due to the time-lag in the period from the filing of a charge to the filing of a subsequent lawsuit, the charges in the EEOC's inventory will become ripe for initiation of lawsuits in 2013.

FLSA collective action litigation increased yet again in 2012 and far outpaced employment discrimination class action filings. Wage & hour class actions filed in state court also represented an increasingly important part of this trend. In turn, while plaintiffs continued to achieve initial conditional certification of wage & hour collective actions, employers also secured significant victories in defeating conditional certification motions and obtaining decertification of § 216(b) collective actions.² It is expected that the vigorous pursuit of nationwide FLSA collective actions by the plaintiffs' bar will continue in 2013.

A key FLSA litigation issue currently percolating in the courts is how *Wal-Mart* – to the extent it held that "trial by formula" via representative or statistical proof as to damages is inappropriate on a class-wide basis – impacts conditional certification under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and/or Rule 23 class certification in wage & hour litigation. An emerging trend suggests that employers can more readily block certification – or secure

² An analysis of rulings in employment discrimination class actions in 2012 is set forth in Chapter III, and an analysis of rulings in ADEA collective actions in 2012 is set forth in Chapter IV.

decertification – in misclassification cases by targeting and challenging plaintiffs’ representative evidence, although use of *Wal-Mart* itself has not gained traction in blocking certification § 216(b) contexts.

At the same time, the *Wal-Mart* ruling also may fuel more critical thinking and crafting of case theories in employment discrimination class action filings in 2012. The Supreme Court’s decision has had the effect of forcing the plaintiffs’ bar to “re-boot” the architecture of their class action theories.³ While the playbook on Rule 23 strategies is undergoing an overhaul, the remand of the *Wal-Mart* case is a prime example of the morphing of plaintiffs’ certification and class structuring theories. Plaintiffs’ counsel narrowed their fourth amended complaint upon remand from the U.S. Supreme Court to assert gender discrimination claims on behalf of current and former female *Wal-Mart* employees in California only. While the fourth amended complaint continues to challenge *Wal-Mart*’s allegedly discriminatory pay and promotion practices against women, Plaintiffs seek to certify an injunctive relief class under Rule 23(b)(2) and a Rule 23(b)(3) monetary relief class for back pay, front pay, and punitive damages. The new complaint scales back the proposed class size from a nationwide class to one that encompasses California-based workers only; the new proposed class has an estimated 45,000 members, about 3% of the total class size proposed and certified – and then decertified – previously. In sum, as the plaintiffs’ bar “re-boots” to take account of the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Wal-Mart*, future employment discrimination class action filings are likely to increase due to a strategy whereby state or regional-type classes are asserted rather than nationwide, mega-cases.

As much as any other area of workplace litigation, ERISA class actions took center stage in 2012 as key issues were litigated in the wake of *Wal-Mart*. Furthermore, as the financial crisis battered employees’ retirement savings, pension plan sponsors sought to recoup investment losses by initiating ERISA class actions against investment managers and trustees for engaging in imprudent behavior. Plaintiffs’ lawyers bringing ERISA class action claims pursued several broad categories of cases, including (i) “stock drop” suits in which the ERISA plan participants complained of the availability of employer stock as an investment option (after the company stock suffers a dramatic decline, resulting in losses to plan participants who were invested in the company stock); (ii) cases where pension plans cut-back or reduced benefits; and (iii) “plan administration” suits in which participants challenged excessive advisory fees and other mechanics of how the plan is run. As these ERISA cases grow in size and complexity, they also have raised numerous issues over whether many of the cases meet the requirements for class certification.⁴

Three trends dominated the ERISA litigation scene in 2012. First, courts grappled with how to apply the Supreme Court’s *Wal-Mart* decision to ERISA class actions, with mixed results for employers. Specifically, courts disagreed on whether Rule 23(b)(2) permits certification in ERISA cases, with some courts suggesting not (at least in the defined contribution plan context) and others finding that at least certain types of ERISA cases are uniquely suited for certification under that provision. Second, more federal circuits adopted the so-called Moench presumption of prudence for employer stock investments in 401(k) plans and the Supreme Court denied petitions for *certiorari* on that issue, signaling that the presumption is likely to become the law of the land and perhaps ringing the death knell to this popular type of ERISA class action. Finally, courts struggled to make sense of the Supreme Court’s previous rulings on the scope of equitable remedies allowed under the ERISA, culminating in arguments before the Court in *U.S. Airways v. McCutchen*, which is sure to be the leading ERISA decision in 2013.

³ An analysis of rulings in employment discrimination class actions in 2012 is set forth in Chapter III, and an analysis of rulings in ADEA collective actions in 2012 is set forth in Chapter IV.

⁴ An analysis of rulings in ERISA class actions in 2012 is set forth in Chapter VI.

Meanwhile, on the governmental enforcement front, both the EEOC and the U.S. Department of Labor expanded and intensified their administrative enforcement activities and litigation filings in 2012.

The EEOC continued to follow through on the enforcement and litigation strategy plan it announced in April of 2006; that plan centers on the government bringing more systemic discrimination cases affecting large numbers of workers. As 2012 demonstrated, the EEOC's prosecution of pattern or practice lawsuits is now an agency-wide priority. Many of the high-level investigations started in 2006 mushroomed into the institution of EEOC pattern or practice lawsuits in 2011 and 2012. Under the Obama Administration, increases in funding expanded the number of investigators. The Commission's 2012 Annual Report⁵ also announced that it expects to continue the dramatic shift in the composition of its litigation docket from small individual cases to pattern or practice lawsuits on behalf of larger groups of workers. The EEOC's Annual Report detailed the EEOC's activities from October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2012. The EEOC's Report indicated that:

- The Commission completed work on 240 systemic investigations in FY 2012, which resulted in 94 "probable cause" determinations, and 46 settlements or conciliation agreements that yielded a total recovery of \$36.2 million for systemic claims for 3,813 individual workers. The FY 2012 recoveries represent a four-fold increase over recoveries in FY 2011.
- The EEOC's administrative enforcement activities secured \$365.4 million in recoveries, the highest level of monetary relief in the Commission's history.
- The EEOC filed 122 lawsuits in 2012, of which 10 involved claims of systemic discrimination on behalf of more than 20 workers and 26 cases involved multiple alleged discrimination victims of up to 20 individuals. The EEOC had 309 cases on its active lawsuit docket by year end, of which 24% involved multiple aggrieved parties and 20% involved challenges to alleged systemic discrimination.
- The EEOC is also poised to enhance its regulatory and litigation enforcement programs, as it increased its headcount from 2,176 full-time equivalent employees in 2008 to 2,354 full-time equivalents in 2012. Many of these new hires were investigators and systemic case specialists.

While the inevitable by-product of these governmental enforcement efforts is that employers are likely to face even more such claims in 2013, the EEOC's systemic litigation program is not without its detractors. Several federal judges entered significant sanctions against the EEOC in 2012 – some in excess of seven figures – for its pursuit of pattern or practice cases that were deemed to be without a good faith basis in fact or law.⁶ The EEOC has showed no signs of adjusting its litigation strategy in light of those sanction rulings, and employers can expect that the coming year will entail aggressive "push-the-envelope" litigation filings and prosecutions by the EEOC, as well as the filing of larger systemic cases.

The U.S. Department of Labor ("DOL") also undertook aggressive enforcement activities in 2012. Over the past several years, the DOL's Wage & Hour Division ("WHD") has fundamentally changed the way in which it pursues its investigations. In 2012, employers finally saw the impact of these changes on the WHD's enforcement priorities, and 2013 will bring much of the same.

⁵ The EEOC's 2012 Annual Report is published at <http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/plan/index.cfm>.

⁶ An analysis of rulings in EEOC cases in 2012 is set forth in Chapter III, Section B.

- More than ever before, the WHD is focused on directed, targeted investigations. For most of the life of the agency, complaints have been the primary focus, using whatever investigative resources remained to conduct specifically-targeted investigations. The WHD now uses its investigative resources principally to address the issues, industries, and locations that the WHD has determined are priorities. Specific complaints by particular employees are pursued when those complaints fall in line with agency-determined priorities. In many cases, however, complaints that do not meet those priorities are referred to private attorneys through the ABA's Bridge to Justice program.
- The WHD, along with the DOL's Office of the Solicitor, has been more aggressive in pursuing the full panoply of remedies available to it. Liquidated (*i.e.*, double) damages are considered in virtually every case, and in cases in which the WHD seeks liquidated damages as part of the resolution of the case, it does so with the full backing of the Solicitor. Civil money penalties have been assessed with increased frequency, and the Solicitor has expressed a desire to bring high-profile criminal cases against employers.
- The focus on misclassification of independent contractors and "fissured" employment relationships continues unabated. The DOL has been working with state agencies to share information about misclassification. The WHD vigorously pursued back wages and liquidated damages under a joint employment theory against restaurants that used a third-party labor provider that violated the FLSA for the leased employees. The WHD also conducted large-scale investigative initiatives in the hotel, restaurant, and homebuilding industries, due to the use of franchise agreements and sub-contracting. For the first time ever, the DOL sought debarment (under the Davis-Bacon Act) of a prime contractor exclusively for violations committed by its sub-contractors.

B. Impact Of Changing Rule 23 Standards

The U.S. Supreme Court's seminal ruling last year in *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, et al.*, 131 S. Ct. 2541 (2011), is as significant a ruling for employers as any decision in the history of workplace class action litigation. The lessons of *Wal-Mart* are wide and varied for a myriad of issues involving workplace class action litigation. In *Wal-Mart*, the district court certified a class in 2004, which sought both injunctive relief and back pay, under Rule 23(b)(2). In overturning that order, the Supreme Court unanimously held that individualized monetary relief claims such as back pay cannot be certified under Rule 23(b)(2). In the 5-4 portion of the opinion, the Supreme Court held that plaintiffs failed to satisfy the Rule 23(a)(2) commonality requirement, which requires that plaintiffs present significant proof that an employer operated under a general policy of discrimination. The Supreme Court's majority reasoned that plaintiffs' statistical evidence was insufficient to establish that plaintiffs' theory could be proved on a class-wide basis. Plaintiffs had provided regional and national data showing pay disparities, but the majority determined that the regional disparity could be attributable to only a small set of stores, and could not by itself establish the uniform, store-by-store disparity upon which plaintiffs' theory of commonality depended.

The new strategic approaches of the plaintiffs' class action bar to "*Wal-Mart* issues" are beginning to coalesce. Throughout 2012, federal and state judges interpreted and applied *Wal-Mart* in a wide variety of circumstances. These developments focused on the new commonality requirements of Rule 23, the use of Rule 23(b)(2) in terms of recovery of individualized monetary damages, and the utility of "trial by formula" theories through statistical sampling to solve individualized damages problems. In employment discrimination class action contexts, the attack by the plaintiffs' bar on employer policies with discretion is not entirely dead, as courts are beginning to allow discretionary elements of an identifiable policy to be attacked. Suffice it to say, 2013 is likely to witness even more significant litigation over these case

structuring issues and the new approaches to “*Wal-Mart* issues” by plaintiffs’ counsel and by the defense bar. Corporate counsel can expect a “stretching-of-the-envelope” as litigants advance novel theories and defenses, and courts sort out how class certification theories are analyzed under these evolving standards.⁷

The Supreme Court’s decision last year in *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, et al.*, 131 S. Ct. 1740 (2011), also fueled significant case law developments in 2012. *Concepcion* subordinates state law to the Federal Arbitration Act (“FAA”) and opens the door for the broad use of arbitration and class action waiver clauses in consumer and employment contracts. In *Concepcion*, the Supreme Court held that the FAA preempted California state law precedent that rendered most class action waivers in consumer contracts unconscionable and thus unenforceable. The decision has been hailed by business interests, which prefers the speed and efficiency of bilateral arbitration for resolving claims arising from consumer and employment contracts. Consumer and civil rights advocates suggest the decision closes the door on many small-dollar consumer claims and allows corporations to perpetrate frauds unchecked. Today, class-wide arbitration would appear to be available only if the parties expressly contract for it. Although mandatory arbitration and class action waiver provisions are already common in retail contracts, the next major step is likely to be their broader introduction into employment contracts (where only collective bargaining agreements, at least in unionized companies, may impede their use).

Concepcion received almost as much attention as *Wal-Mart* by federal and state courts passing upon workplace arbitration issues in a class action context. Though the Supreme Court’s ruling pertained to consumer contracts, 2012 saw widespread case law rulings on its application to workplace arbitration agreements. As of the close of the year, *Concepcion* had been cited in 325 rulings. “Second generation” *Concepcion* issues are already appearing in the case law, as the plaintiffs’ class action bar asserts new angles of attack against arbitration in general and workplace arbitration agreements in particular. The key battleground issues for the future are whether class action bans in arbitration agreements should not be enforced in the limited sub-set of cases where plaintiffs’ lawyers have hard evidence that it would be too costly to pursue an individual action, and therefore a class action is the only mechanism that would effectively allow plaintiffs to vindicate their statutory workplace rights.

As these issues play out in 2013, additional chapters in the class action playbook will be written.

C. Implications Of These Developments For 2013

The one constant in workplace class action litigation is change. More than any other year in recent memory, 2012 was a year of great change in the landscape of Rule 23. So what will 2013 bring?

A certitude of the modern American workplace is that class action and collective action litigation is a magnet that attracts skilled members of the plaintiffs’ bar. The passage of the Class Action Fairness Act (“CAFA”) has had little impact on the pace and volume of overall workplace class action filings since 2005. Instead, the impact of the CAFA has been limited primarily to determine the proper venue, which often has a dramatic impact on the outcome of workplace class actions.⁸ Thus, in 2013, the *Wal-Mart* and *Concepcion* decisions are unlikely to dampen the focus of government enforcement litigators and the plaintiffs’ class action bar. Instead, case structuring theories will continue to undergo a wholesale “re-booting” process, and case law developments are expected to evolve and reflect these new creative litigation strategies.

⁷ An analysis of rulings in non-workplace class actions in 2012 is set forth in Chapter IX.

⁸ An analysis of key CAFA rulings in 2012 is set forth in Chapter VIII.

ERISA class action litigation is also expected to accelerate in 2013. The relatively negative economic conditions over the past 24 months, as well as the on-going winding down of the credit crisis and sub-prime mortgage meltdown, surely will affect the course of ERISA class action litigation in 2013, as attorneys for retirement plan participants are likely to sue over whether plan fiduciaries made prudent investments in light of the credit, sub-prime mortgage lending, and real estate crises. The precipitous market drops that occurred in 2008 to 2012 also are likely to provide the grist for the plaintiffs' bar to prosecute ERISA class actions.

On the ERISA front, corporate counsel can expect to see the following developments:

- ERISA class actions will continue to receive increased scrutiny at the class certification stage post-*Wal-Mart*, potentially making it increasingly more difficult for plaintiffs to secure certification of ERISA claims. Unlike in the employment discrimination arena, the focus is likely to be on whether it is possible to certify ERISA class actions under Rule 23(b). Plaintiffs' counsel also are apt to begin to shift their case structuring from Rule 23(b)(1) and (b)(2), which have traditionally been used in ERISA cases, to Rule 23(b)(3).
- Plaintiffs' class claims challenging 401(k) plan investment lineups likely will continue to face significant challenges at the motion to dismiss stage. Courts are becoming increasingly skeptical of imprudent investment claims where the challenged investment is "hard-wired" into the plan or the investment is one of several investments that are not challenged. Against this back-drop, plaintiffs' lawyers who have struck out in certain jurisdictions are expected to re-plead their claims, perhaps with new representative plaintiffs, and bring them in other jurisdictions. ERISA's broad venue provision makes it difficult to avoid this kind of forum shopping, but corporate counsel can expect to see more and more plan sponsors write choice-of-venue provisions into their plans.

In sum, market conditions suggest that the current wave of ERISA class actions will continue unabated.

On the wage & hour front, the deluge of FLSA filings – making wage & hour claims the most predominant type of workplace class action pursued against corporate America – is expected to continue with no end in sight. The wave of wage & hour filings has yet to crest. Corporate counsel, therefore, can expect to see a consistent level of significant litigation activity. Key areas to watch include:

- In terms of novel litigation theories, employers can expect an increase in off-the-clock litigation brought by non-exempt employees, fueled by new theories attacking employer rounding practices, and increased off-duty use of PDA's and other mobile electronic devices vis-à-vis the application of the continuous workday rule.
- Increased litigation also is expected over issues in independent contractor misclassification and joint employer liability cases, as well as off-the-clock work (including donning and doffing cases), unpaid overtime, missed or late meal and rest breaks, time-shaving, and improper tip pooling.
- Continued developments in the case law are virtually certain relative to § 216(b) certification defenses, as *Wal-Mart* continues to impact FLSA certification questions and rulings, and as some courts narrow their conception of the "similarly-situated" requirement in collective actions based on the commonality requirement as reformulated by *Wal-Mart*.

Last but not least, employment discrimination class action litigation – both in terms of private plaintiff cases and government enforcement litigation brought by the EEOC – is expected to remain “white hot” in 2013. On the employment discrimination front, corporate counsel can expect to see the following developments:

- The plaintiffs’ bar will continue to “re-boot” the architecture of employment discrimination class actions to increase their chances to secure class certification post-*Wal-Mart*. Their focus is likely to be on smaller class cases (e.g., confined to a single corporate facility or operations in one state) as opposed to nationwide, mega-class cases. In terms of certification theories, the plaintiffs’ bar is apt to pursue hybrid or parallel class certification theories where injunctive relief is sought under Rule 23(b)(2) and monetary relief is sought under Rule 23(b)(3), as well as a range of partial “issues certification” theories under Rule 23(c)(4).
- Employers and their defense counsel will use new post-*Wal-Mart* case law authorities to challenge class allegations at the earliest opportunity. An emerging trend of rulings in 2012 will continue to develop, as courts confront these pro-active defense strategies.
- The EEOC’s systemic litigation program is expected to expand in 2013, with more filings, larger cases, and bigger monetary demands as the agency continues its aggressive enforcement activities. Corporate counsel also can expect to see more systemic administrative investigations relative to hiring issues (use of criminal histories in background checks) and based on pay and promotions disparate impact theories due to alleged gender or race discrimination.
- Despite a series of set-backs for the EEOC in 2011-2012 with federal judges entering significant sanctions and fee awards against the Commission (which the government has uniformly appealed), it is expected that these rulings will embolden rather than dampen the EEOC’s aggressive enforcement of workplace bias laws.

In sum, the lesson to draw from 2012 is that the private plaintiffs’ bar and government enforcement attorneys are apt to be equally, if not more, aggressive in 2013 in bringing class action and collective action litigation against employers.

These novel challenges demand a shift of thinking in the way companies formulate their strategies. As class actions and collective actions are a pervasive aspect of litigation in Corporate America, defending and defeating this type of litigation is a top priority for corporate counsel. Identifying, addressing, and remediating class action vulnerabilities, therefore, deserves a place at the top of corporate counsel’s priorities list for 2013.

II. Significant Class Action Settlements In 2012

Similar to the trend over the last several years, the plaintiffs' bar and government enforcement attorneys obtained many significant settlements in 2012. Particularly in the areas of employment discrimination class actions, wage & hour collective actions, ERISA class actions, and governmental enforcement lawsuits, the settlements were for very significant amounts. In the areas of ERISA class actions and government enforcement lawsuits, the settlement values represented increases over settlements obtained in 2011. This Chapter evaluates the top ten private plaintiff-initiated monetary settlements, government-initiated monetary settlements, and noteworthy injunctive relief provisions in class action settlements.

A. *Top Ten Private Plaintiff-Initiated Monetary Settlements*

Plaintiffs' lawyers secured many large settlements in 2012 for employment discrimination, wage & hour, and ERISA class actions. The top ten settlements from these categories totaled over \$840.43 million in 2012. This is a decrease from 2011, when the top ten settlements in these categories totaled \$1.308 billion.

Settlements In Private Plaintiff Employment Discrimination Class Action Lawsuits

For employment discrimination class actions, the monetary value of the top ten private plaintiff settlements entered into or paid in 2012 totaled \$48.65 million. This represented a significant decrease from the prior year. By comparison, the top ten settlements in 2011 totaled \$123.2 million.

1. \$22 million – Dolgencorp, Inc.
2. \$6 million – Toyota Motor Corp.
3. \$5.8 million – New Jersey Transit
4. \$4.6 million – University of Medicine & Dentistry of New Jersey
5. \$2.5 million – Cook's Pest Control, Inc.
6. \$2 million – Allen Memorial Hospital
7. \$2 million – National Railroad Passenger Corporation
8. \$1.45 million – Gristede's Operating Corp.
9. \$1.3 million – Howard Industries, Inc.
10. \$1 million – Menard, Inc.

The biggest settlements involved nationwide classes and included four gender, four race, one disability-related, and one national origin discrimination class action.

1. **\$22 million – *Womack, et al. v. Dolgencorp, Inc.*, Case No. 06-CV-465 (N.D. Ala. July 23, 2012)** (final approval granted for settlement of a sex discrimination class action involving female store managers who claim they were victims of sex-based compensation discrimination).
2. **\$6 million – *Cookson, et al. v. Toyota Motor Corp.*, Case No. 10-CV-2931 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2012)** (final approval granted for settlement of a disability discrimination class action involving more

than 500 former disabled autoworkers who claimed they were denied severance pay after an auto plant closed).

3. **\$5.8 million – *Hester, et al. v. New Jersey Transit*, Case No. L-2614-09 (N.J. Super. Ct. Sept. 24, 2012)** (settlement of an uncertified class action brought under the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination by 10 minority police officers who claimed they were subject to a pattern of harassment and discrimination).
4. **\$4.6 million – *Wagner, et al. v. University Of Medicine & Dentistry Of New Jersey*, Case No. L-6097-07 (N.J. Super. Ct. Dec. 4, 2012)** (settlement of an uncertified class action brought under the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination by 10 female professors who claimed they were subjected to pay discrimination).
5. **\$2.5 million – *Waters, et a. v. Cook’s Pest Control, Inc.*, Case No. 07-CV-394 (N.D. Ala. July 17, 2012)** (final approval granted in settlement of class action involving hundreds of African-American job applicants who claimed they were denied employment due to the company’s discriminatory hiring practices and job application processes).
6. **\$2 million – *Meeks, et al. v. Allen Memorial Hospital Corp.*, Case No. LACV-114860 (Iowa Dist. Ct. Jan. 17, 2012)** (consent decree entered in settlement of a class action brought under state law alleging discrimination against African-American employees and job applicants).
7. **\$2 million – *Stagi, et al. v. National Railroad Passenger Corp.*, Case No. 03-CV-5702 (E.D. Pa. July 3, 2012)** (final approval granted in settlement of a class action involving a railroad rule governing when union-represented employees may apply for management jobs with adverse impact on female employees seeking promotion).
8. **\$1.45 million – *Duling, et al. v. Gristede’s Operating Corp.*, Case No. 06-CV-10197 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 15, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted in settlement of a class action involving hundreds of female workers who claimed they were steered into lower-paying, part-time jobs with management refusal to promote to management positions).
9. **\$1.3 million – *Cook, et al. v. Howard Industries, Inc.*, Case No. 11-CV-41 (S.D. Miss. Oct. 5, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted in settlement of a class action against the manufacturer that engaged in biased hiring that favored Latino workers to the exclusion of African-American and non-Latino workers).
10. **\$1 million – *Moore, et al. v. Menard, Inc.*, Case No. 11 160 02063 10 (AAA Feb. 9, 2012)** (approval granted in settlement of a class action involving hundreds of managers and assistant managers who claimed they were passed over for promotions based on race).

Settlements In Private Plaintiff Wage & Hour Class Actions

For wage & hour class actions, the monetary value of the top ten private settlements entered into or paid in 2012 totaled \$292 million. This is a significant increase from the top ten settlements in 2011, which totaled \$221.1 million.

1. \$99 million – Novartis
2. \$40 million – Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.

3. \$35 million – H&R Block Enterprises, LLC
4. \$21 million – Rite Aid Corporation
5. \$20 million – City of New York
6. \$19 million – Robert Half International Inc.
7. \$15.6 million – HSBC Bank USA, N.A.
8. \$15.5 million – ConocoPhillips Co.
9. \$14 million – Family Dollar Stores, Inc.
10. \$12.9 million – Spearmint Rhino Companies Worldwide, Inc.

The top ten settlements were split evenly between nationwide and state specific claims, and nine of the top ten settlements involved wage & hour lawsuits pending in either federal or state courts in New York and California.

1. **\$99 million – *In Re Novartis Wage & Hour Litigation*, Case No. 06-MD-1794 (S.D.N.Y. May 31, 2012)** (final approval of settlement granted in nationwide wage & hour class action involving 7,000 current and former sales employees).
2. **\$40 million – *Chambers, et al. v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.*, Case No. 10-CV-7109 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 13, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted in settlement involving class action claim against Bank of America Corp. with former Merrill Lynch & Co. financial advisers who alleged being shortchanged when the two banks merged).
3. **\$35 million – *Lemus, et al. v. H&R Block Enterprises, LLC*, Case No. 09-CV-3179 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2012)** (final approval of settlement granted in wage & hour class action involving a class of seasonal tax preparers who claimed the company violated California wage laws).
4. **\$21 million – *Craig, et al. v. Rite Aid Corp.*, Case No. 08-CV-2317 (M.D. Pa. June 15, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted in settlement of a class action involving failure to pay assistant store managers and co-managers overtime pay).
5. **\$20 million – *Mullins, et al. v. City Of New York*, Case No. 04-CV-2979 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 19, 2012)** (final approval granted in settlement of wage & hour class action involving the police department's overtime pay practices of more than 4,300 current and former police sergeants).
6. **\$19 million – *Laffitte, et al. v. Robert Half International Inc.*, Case No. BC321317 (Super. Ct. L.A. County, Cal. Oct. 19, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted in settlement of wage & hour class action involving 4,000 recruiters and other professionals who claim the staffing company failed to pay overtime and provide meal and rest breaks).
7. **\$15.6 million – *Yuzary, et al. v. HSBC Bank USA, N.A.*, Case No. 12-CV-3693 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 26, 2012)** (preliminary approval requested in class action involving bankers, managers, and specialists alleging the company withheld overtime wages).

8. **\$15.5 million – *United Steelworkers, AFL-CIO, CLC, et al. v. ConocoPhillips Co., Case No. 08-CV-2068 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2012)*** (preliminary approval granted in settlement of wage & hour class action accusing the company of failing to provide refinery workers with meal breaks stretching back to February 2004).
9. **\$14 million – *Rancharan, et al. v. Family Dollar Stores Inc., Case No. 10-CV-7580 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 11, 2012)*** (preliminary approval reached in settlement of wage & hour class action involving 1,700 store managers who claim the company failed to pay overtime wages).
10. **\$12.9 million – *Trauth, et al. v. Spearmint Rhino Companies Worldwide, Inc., Case No. 09-CV-1316 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2012)*** (final approval granted in settlement of a wage & hour class action involving exotic dancers who claimed that adult entertainment clubs denied them benefits by misclassifying them as independent contractors).

Settlements In Private Plaintiff ERISA Class Actions

For ERISA class actions, the monetary value of the top ten private settlements entered into or paid in 2012 totaled \$237 million. This amount is significantly less than in 2011, when the total monetary value of the top ten private settlements reached \$898.95 million.

1. \$120 million – Aetna, Inc.
2. \$24 million – Honeywell Retirement Earnings Plan
3. \$23.8 million – Continental Automotive Systems U.S., Inc.
4. \$15.8 million – AK Steel Corp
5. \$12.5 million – In Re Schering-Plough Corp.
6. \$10.4 million – In Re Merck & Co. Inc.
7. \$10 million – U.S. Bank Pension Plan
8. \$10 million – In Re Bear Stearns Cos., Inc.
9. \$6 million – First Horizon National Corp.
10. \$4.5 million – Gilbert G. Lundstrom

The largest ERISA class action settlements involved disputes over the breach of fiduciary duty, reducing retiree benefits, and/or investing pension or 401(k) assets into company stock.

1. **\$120 million – *In Re Aetna UCR Litigation, Case No. 07-CV-3541 (D.N.J. Dec. 7, 2012)*** (preliminary approval of settlement requested in a consolidated multi-district litigation ERISA class action in which putative classes of providers and subscribers allege that various managed care companies conspired to underpay plan benefits for out-of-network services).
2. **\$24 million – *Allen, et al. v. Honeywell Retirement Earnings Plan, Case No. 04-CV-424 (D. Ariz. July 23, 2012)*** (final approval of settlement granted in ERISA class action alleging pension plans that were unlawfully reduced without proper notification).

3. **\$23.8 million – *Beaty, et al. v. Continental Automotive Systems U.S., Inc.*, Case No. 11-CV-890 (N.D. Ala. May 21, 2012)** (final approval of settlement granted in ERISA class action involving finance health benefits for retirees of the company).
4. **\$15.8 million – *Lowther, et al. v. AK Steel Corp.*, Case No. 11-CV-877 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 21, 2012)** (final approval of settlement granted in ERISA class action involving a group of retirees and their families alleging that the steelmaker violated federal pension law by cutting their healthcare benefits).
5. **\$12.5 million – *In Re Schering-Plough Corp. Enhance ERISA Litigation*, Case No. 08-CV-1432 (D.N.J. May 31, 2012)** (final approval granted in ERISA class action involving current and former employees accusing the pharmaceutical company of mishandling its retirement plan by improperly steering employees into buying company stock).
6. **\$10.4 million – *In Re Merck & Co. Inc. Vytorin ERISA Litigation*, Case No. 08-CV-1974 (D.N.J. Oct. 26, 2012)** (final approval granted for ERISA class action settlement by employees who alleged that their retirement savings were hurt by misrepresentations about the effectiveness of its cholesterol drug Vytorin).
7. **\$10 million – *Mezyk, et al. v. U.S. Bank Pension Plan*, Case No. 09-CV-384 (S.D. Ill. Nov. 5, 2012)** (final approval granted for settlement agreement by U.S. Bancorp Inc. regarding allegations that its predecessor violated the Employee Retirement Income Security Act by making changes to its pension plan that allegedly shortchanged employees).
8. **\$10 million – *In Re Bear Stearns Cos., Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 08-MD-1963 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 9, 2012)** (final approval granted in ERISA class action involving JP Morgan Chase & Co. over allegations that the defunct investment bank's retirement plan invested in the mortgage-related securities that doomed the company).
9. **\$6 million – *Sims, et al. v. First Horizon National Corp.*, Case No. 08-CV-2293 (W.D. Tenn. Sept. 13, 2012)** (final approval of settlement granted in ERISA class action involving a class of employees claiming that the company and its officers breached their fiduciary duties by offering the company's stock as investment options for employees' retirement savings and failing to disclose material information).
10. **\$4.5 million – *Bredthauer, et al. v. Gilbert G. Lundstrom*, Case Nos. 10-CV-3132, 10-CV-3139 & 10-CV-326 (D. Neb. Oct. 12, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted in three putative class actions against officers and directors of TierOne Corp. for alleged ERISA violations).

B. Top Ten Government-Initiated Monetary Settlements

The EEOC and the U.S. Department of Labor (“DOL”) aggressively litigated government enforcement actions in 2011.

Based on preliminary figures for the U.S. Government's 2012 fiscal year, the EEOC filed 122 new lawsuits, resolved 254 pending lawsuits, and secured \$365.4 million in settlements for allegedly injured victims of job bias, an increase of \$700,000 over the previous year, and the highest level ever in the Commission's history. The EEOC also had the second highest number of discrimination charges filed in 2012 – a total of 99,412 charges – than ever before in its 48-year existence. In addition, the EEOC's docket of systemic pattern or practice cases grew to over 20% of the Commission's case load.

For all types of government-initiated enforcement actions, the monetary value of the top ten settlements entered into or paid in 2012 totaled \$262.78 million. This entailed a significant increase over 2011, as the top ten settlements in 2011 totaled \$65.078 million.

Settlements Of Government-Initiated Enforcement Actions And Pattern Or Practice Lawsuits

1. \$220 million – Beacon Associates Management Corp.
2. \$11 million – Yellow Transportation, Inc. and YRC, Inc.
3. \$10.7 million – Mattingly
4. \$5.4 million – BP Amoco Chemical Co.
5. \$4.8 million – Interstate Distributor Company
6. \$3.13 million – Pepsi Bottling Group
7. \$2.75 million – WRS Infrastructure and Environment, Inc.
8. \$2 million – Baldor Electric Co.
9. \$2 million – Dillard's Inc.
10. \$1 million – Missoula Mac, Inc.

Seven of the settlements involved EEOC pattern or practice lawsuits, and three involved DOL enforcement actions.

1. **\$220 million – *Solis v. Beacon Associates Management Corp.*, Case No. 10-CV-8000 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 30, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted in settlement involving an investment adviser and management companies that invested employee benefit plan assets into the Bernie L. Madoff Ponzi scheme).
2. **\$11 million – *EEOC v. Yellow Transportation, Inc. And YRC, Inc.*, Case Nos. 08-CV-5908 & 09-CV-7693 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 25, 2012)** (settlement approval given to EEOC pattern or practice action alleging racially hostile working environment and discriminatory terms and conditions of employment).
3. **\$10.7 million – *Solis v. Mattingly*, Case No. 09-CV-207 (E.D. Ky. Feb. 27, 2012)** (consent judgment obtained by the Department of Labor in an ERISA class action involving ESOP trustees who allegedly used ESOP assets to purchase company stock in seven separate transactions at inflated prices that caused millions of dollars of losses to the plans and their participants).
4. **\$5.4 million – *EEOC o/b/o Singleton v. BP Amoco Chemical Co.*, Case No. 12-CV-255 (N.D. Ala. Sept. 4, 2012)** (settlement of EEOC investigation into alleged gender discrimination by BP contractors participating in the response and cleanup of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill).

5. **\$4.8 million – EEOC v. Interstate Distributor Co., Case No. 12-CV-2591 (D. Colo. Nov. 8, 2012)** (approval of consent decree involving claims that the trucking company’s leave policy unlawfully denied reasonable accommodations to a class of hundreds of disabled employees).
6. **\$3.17 million – EEOC v. Pepsi Bottling Group (EEOC Jan. 11, 2012)** (conciliation agreement in EEOC systemic investigation alleging race discrimination in the use of criminal background checks for applicants).
7. **\$2.75 million – EEOC v. WRS Infrastructure And Environment, Inc., Case No. 09-CV-4272 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 23, 2012)** (approval of consent decree to resolve a race discrimination and harassment case in a class action against African-American workers).
8. **\$2 million – Department of Labor v. Baldor Electric Co. (DOL June 25, 2012)** (preliminary approval granted to Baldor Electric Co. to settle allegations that its hiring process discriminated against female and minority job applicants).
9. **\$2 million – EEOC v. Dillard’s Inc., Case No. 08-CV-1780 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2012)** (approval of consent decree in EEOC pattern or practice lawsuit to resolve disability discrimination claims relative to sick leave challenges).
10. **\$1 million – EEOC v. Missoula Mac, Inc., Case No. 11-CV-267 (W.D. Wis. July 17, 2012)** (approval of consent decree in EEOC pattern or practice lawsuit to resolve claims against restaurant owners in Wisconsin for allowing female employees to be subjected to sexual comments and physical touching by co-workers).

C. Noteworthy Injunctive Relief Provisions In Class Action Settlements

Generally, the types of relief obtained in settlements of employment discrimination class actions can be grouped into five categories, including modification of internal personnel practices and procedures; oversight and monitoring of corporate practices; mandatory training of supervisory personnel and employees; compensation for named plaintiffs and class members; and an award of attorneys’ fees and costs for class counsel. In addition to substantial payments for overtime liability, settlements of FLSA collective actions often involve changes to payroll practices and procedures. In ERISA class action settlements, the terms typically include monetary payments along with injunctive orders barring fiduciaries and third-parties from serving as plan fiduciaries or managers.

Class action settlements involving private plaintiffs generally contain one or more of these items of non-monetary injunctive relief, but rarely contain all of them. Attorneys representing the U.S. Government in enforcement litigation actions also secured several settlements in 2012 that had noteworthy injunctive relief provisions. This reflects in some measure the significant “public interest” component of government-initiated class action litigation.

Among the more novel and/or onerous non-monetary relief requirements imposed on employers in 2012 are the following:

- Priority in promotions to aggrieved class members denied promotions;
- Adoption of new testing and evaluation procedures for hiring, promotion, and compensation;

- Implementation of on-line posting and registration of interest systems, coupled with adoption of new selection and structured interview policies based on recommendations from outside experts in industrial psychology;
- Development of specific ADA reasonable accommodation policies, procedures, and training;
- Hiring of an outside ombudsperson to handle internal employee complaints, as well as the hiring of an HR manager;
- Creation of a toll-free hotline and on-line complaint service for employees to register complaints of harassment or discrimination;
- Implementation of a computer use and abuse policy to prohibit the viewing or dissemination of pornography or sexually explicit material on company computers;
- Hiring of an outside monitor to implement HR recommendations that the employer must adopt unless it petitions the Court and demonstrates that any such recommendation is infeasible or manifests unsound business judgment;
- Adoption of a new customer complaint process and database for tracking such complaints about employees; and,
- Retention of an outside investment advisor to recommend, select, and monitor employee investments or retirement savings in investment options.

The top ten settlements in 2012 involving significant injunctive relief provisions include:

1. ***EEOC v. Muskegon River Youth Home, Inc., Case No. 12-CV-1049 (W.D. Mich. Nov. 1, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from an EEOC pattern or practice lawsuit alleging Defendant maintained a policy of discriminating against pregnant employees. Defendant agreed to a 10-year consent decree to resolve this case. The durational term of the consent decree is believed to be one of the longest on record. Under the agreement, the Court ordered Defendant to rescind its pregnancy policy and prohibited it from requiring employees to inform the company when they become pregnant. The consent decree also prohibited Defendant from requiring employees to provide statements from a caregiver regarding their continued ability to work. In addition, the consent decree required Defendant to conduct training on pregnancy discrimination and provide periodic reports to the EEOC. The Court also ordered Defendant to provide written notification to all female employees that it changed its pregnancy policy.
2. ***EEOC v. Central California Foundation For Health, Case No. 10-CV-1492 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from an EEOC pattern or practice lawsuit involving national origin discrimination. As part of Defendant's obligations under the consent decree, the Court ordered the company to develop protocols for handling harassment and discrimination, and to adopt a policy that complies with Title VII. The Court also ordered Defendant to hire an outside monitor to assist with revising policies and procedures, to conduct anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training for all staff with additional training for supervisors, and to ensure the company's compliance with the consent decree's provisions. Finally, the Court ordered Defendant to submit reports to the EEOC and post a notice on the matter.

3. ***EEOC v. Dura Automotive Systems, Inc., Case No. 09-CV-59 (M.D. Tenn. Aug. 31, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from an EEOC pattern or practice case involving disability discrimination. The four-year consent decree includes terms that enjoin Defendant from making medical inquiries and conducting medical examinations that are prohibited by the ADA. Furthermore, the Court prohibited Defendant from conducting employee drug screens that are not job-related or consistent with business necessity. The Court ordered Defendant to create a written drug-testing policy that complies with federal law. As part of Defendant's obligations under the consent decree, its CEO must issue a statement confirming the company's expectation that all employees will comply with the ADA and that the company will not retaliate against any employee making a complaint under the ADA. The Court also ordered Defendant to provide training to its human resources managers. Furthermore, the Court prohibited Defendant from disclosing employees' confidential information that the company obtained through medical inquiries.
4. ***United States v. City Of Corpus Christi, Case No. 12-CV-217 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 19, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from a complaint involving allegations that the City of Corpus Christi's police department pursued policies and practices that discriminated against female job applicants by requiring them to complete an extensive physical test. In addition to providing \$700,000 as back pay to eligible female applicants who took and failed the challenged physical abilities test, the Court ordered Defendant to discontinue use of the physical abilities test used to select entry-level police officers. The Court also ordered Defendant to develop a new section procedure that complies with Title VII. Furthermore, the Court ordered Defendant to conduct training of its managerial employees on how to receive, investigate, or report harassment and retaliation. Finally, Defendant must engage a monitor to review and ensure the company's compliance with Title VII and the Court's consent decree.
5. ***EEOC v. Scully Distribution Services Inc., Case No. 11-CV-8090 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from an EEOC pattern or practice case involving discrimination based on race and national origin. The Court ordered Defendant to implement a policy and complaint procedure to address discrimination, harassment and retaliation. Furthermore, the Court ordered Defendant to provide extensive annual anti-discrimination training to managers and drivers of client accounts. Finally, the consent decree obligated Defendant to hire an outside monitor to ensure the company's compliance with the decree.
6. ***United States v. New Jersey, Case No. 10-CV-91 (D.N.J. June 12, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from a complaint involving allegations that the State of New Jersey implemented civil service exams for police sergeants that discriminated based on race. As part of the consent decree, ten jurisdictions in New Jersey are required to obtain pre-approval from the federal government before certifying candidates for sergeant promotions. The Court also ordered the Defendant to create a new examination and promotion process for police sergeants that complies with Title VII.
7. ***EEOC v. Dillard's Inc., Case No. 08-CV-1780 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from an EEOC pattern or practice case involving disability discrimination. The consent decree includes terms that enjoin Defendant from implementing a policy, procedure, or practice that requests any employee to reveal confidential medical information, or retaliate against an employee for refusing to reveal confidential medical information. The Court ordered Defendant to agree to an outside consultant to review and revise company policies and train supervisors and staff on federal disability law. The Court also ordered Defendant to create policies that prohibit employment discrimination and retaliation. Finally, the Court ordered Defendant to submit annual reports to the EEOC that verify its compliance with the decree.

8. ***United States v. Baltimore County, Case No. 12-CV-2327 (D. Md. Aug. 8, 2012).*** The Court approved a consent decree stemming from allegations of a pattern or practice of disability discrimination arising from Defendant subjecting police officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians, and other employees to improper medical examinations and disability-related inquiries. In addition to a significant settlement award, the Court's order prohibits Defendant from requiring medical exams or making medical inquiries to workers when not job-related or consistent with business necessity. The Court also ordered Defendant to guard the confidentiality of all employee medical information it receives. Furthermore, the consent decree barred Defendant from enlisting the medical services of individual medical examiners whose examinations gave rise to the complaint. In addition to revamping its policies, the consent decree requires Defendant to implement a policy ensuring that job applicants with diabetes receive an individual assessment. Finally, the Court ordered Defendant to conduct specific training of all management personnel on ADA and GINA discrimination.
9. ***Office Of Federal Contract Compliance Programs v. Lund Boat Co., Case No. 12-OFC-2 (DOL Aug. 27, 2012).*** The OFCCP approved a consent decree settling allegations that Defendant utilized a hiring process and selection procedures that discriminated against a class of female applicants based on their gender. In addition to individual settlements for the female applicants, the OFCCP ordered Defendant to offer general labor positions as they become available to 27 class members. The OFCCP also ordered Defendant to submit semiannual process reports. The reports must contain information on settlement-related monetary payments, as well as on class members who were hired by the company, who refused offers of employment, or who were not selected for positions. The reports must also include information on the sex of all applicants and new hires during the reporting time.
10. ***Office Of Federal Contract Compliance Programs v. Leprino Foods Co., Case No. 11-OFC-00008 (DOL July 12, 2012).*** The OFCCP approved a consent decree settling a race discrimination class action. As part of Defendant's obligations under the consent decree, the OFCCP ordered Defendant to offer general labor positions to 13 class members. The OFCCP also ordered Defendant to discontinue the use of its exam that tested applicants' math, workplace observation, and location skills. Finally, Defendant agreed to adhere to extensive record-keeping and reporting requirements.



Atlanta

Los Angeles

Washington, D.C.

Boston

New York

London

Chicago

Sacramento

Houston

San Francisco

www.seyfarth.com



Workplace Class Action Blog

Visit our blog: www.workplaceclassaction.com