

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Roy Woods v. Securitas Technology Corporation, et al.

Woods · No. 25-cv-00810-AJB-AHG · Decided October 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California approved a settlement of Roy Woods’s individual claims against Securitas Technology Corporation and granted his request to dismiss the PAGA cause of action. The court dismissed the PAGA claim with prejudice as to Woods and without prejudice as to other allegedly aggrieved employees, while taking no action on the remaining causes of action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	October 22, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-00810-AJB-AHG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, after removal of his employment-related action from California state court and amendment to add a PAGA claim, requested dismissal of the PAGA cause of action following settlement discussions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the proposed settlement under California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2) and considered whether the settlement structure appeared fair and reasonable under PAGA.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Roy Woods v. Securitas Technology Corporation, et al.

TOPICS

- wage and hour
- civil procedure
- employment law

PRACTICE AREAS

- employment law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2) required the court to review and approve the proposed settlement associated with dismissal of the PAGA cause of action.
2. Whether the proposed settlement was sufficiently fair and reasonable to approve under PAGA.
3. Whether Woods's PAGA claim should be dismissed with prejudice as to his individual claims and without prejudice as to other allegedly aggrieved employees.

HOLDINGS

1. California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2) requires the court to review and approve a settlement of a civil action filed under PAGA.
2. The court approved the settlement because its structure appeared fair and reasonable under PAGA and released only Woods's individual claims without affecting other potentially aggrieved employees or the State of California.
3. The PAGA claim was dismissed with prejudice as to Woods himself and without prejudice as to any other allegedly aggrieved employee.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The plain text of California Labor Code § 2699(s)(2) provides that “[t]he superior court shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed pursuant to [California Labor Code Part 13].”” (at 2)

“Upon a review of the settlement, the Court finds that its structure appears fair and reasonable under the California Private Attorneys General Act.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Woods asserted employment discrimination, retaliation, wage, expense-reimbursement, wage-statement, and unfair-business-practices claims against Securitas. After removal and amendment, he added a representative PAGA cause of action. The parties reached a settlement addressing Woods's individual claims and sought dismissal of the PAGA cause of action; the settlement released Securitas from Woods's individual claims but did not affect other potentially aggrieved employees or the State of California.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Woods filed the action in the Superior Court of California for San Diego County on February 4, 2025. Securitas removed the action to federal court after being served, and Woods filed a First Amended Complaint adding a PAGA cause of action. After settlement discussions, Woods requested dismissal of the PAGA cause of action; the court required submission of the proposed settlement for review and approved the settlement, dismissed Woods's individual PAGA claim with prejudice, and dismissed the PAGA claim as to other allegedly aggrieved employees without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kulik v. NMCI Med. Clinic Inc., No. 21-cv-03495-BLF, 2023 WL 2503539, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2023)
- Hudson v. Libre Tech. Inc., No. 3:18-cv-01371-GPC-KSC, 2020 WL 2467060, at *8 (S.D. Cal. May 13, 2020)
- Sandoval v. Brigantine, Inc., No. 20-cv-00189-JLS-MSB, 2020 WL 6504914, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2020)
- Olivo v. Fresh Harvest, Inc., No. 17-cv-02153-L-WVG, 2019 WL 6329227, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2019)
- Ortega v. UnitedHealth Grp., Inc., No. 23-cv-05596-JST, 2025 WL 1906789, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 10, 2025)

OPINION

Woods

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 ROY WOODS, Case No.: 25-cv-00810-AJB-AHG 12 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S

13 v. REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL OF

PAGA CAUSE OF ACTION

14 SECURITAS TECHNOLOGY

CORPORATION, ET AL.,

15 (Doc. No. 15) Defendants. 16 17 18 Before the Court is Plaintiff Roy Woods' ("Woods")
Request for Dismissal of 19 PAGA Cause of Action. (Doc. No. 15.) Upon a review of the record
and Woods' filings, 20 the Court GRANTS Woods' request. 21 On February 4, 2025, Woods
initiated the present action in the Superior Court of the 22 State of California for the County of
San Diego. (Doc. No. 1-2 at 5–15.1) Woods raised six 23 causes of action: (1) employment
discrimination and retaliation pursuant to California 24 Government Code sections 12940, et seq.;
(2) failure to pay all compensation owed, in 25 violation of California Labor Code section 204; (3)
failure to provide accurate itemized 26 27 28 1 wage statements, in violation of California Labor
Code section 226; (4) failure to reimburse 2 Plaintiff for necessary business expenditures incurred
in the discharge of his duties, in 3 violation of California Labor Code section 2802; (5) failure to
pay Plaintiff all wages 4 earned and unpaid, in violation of California Labor Code sections 201
through 203; and 5 (6) engaging in unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business acts or practices, in
violation of 6 California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. (Doc. No. 1-2 at
9–14 7 ¶¶ 22–56.) The following month, Woods served the Summons and Complaint on Defendant
8 Securitas Technology Corporation ("Securitas"), which timely removed the action to 9 federal

court. (Id. at 2 ¶ 3; see also Doc. No. 1.) 10 On April 24, 2025, Woods filed the operative First Amended Complaint to add a 11 seventh, Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) cause of action under California Labor 12 Code section 2698 (the “PAGA Claim” or “PAGA Cause of Action”). (Doc. No. 5 at 12– 13 14 ¶¶ 65–74.) 14 Following settlement discussions, including an Early Neutral Evaluation Conference 15 held before Magistrate Judge Allison H. Goddard (see Doc. No. 13), “the parties agreed to 16 settle the claims brought by Mr. Woods in a representative capacity.” (Doc. No. 15-1 at 2 17 ¶¶ 3–4.) 18 On October 1, 2025, Woods filed the present Request for Dismissal of PAGA Cause 19 of Action. (Doc. No. 15.) 20 Because California Labor Code § 2699(s)(2) requires that the presiding court “shall 21 review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed pursuant to [California Labor 22 Code Part 13],” the Court ordered the parties to submit the proposed settlement to the Court 23 for its review. (Doc. No. 16.) 24 Although the parties maintain that “this Labor Code provision only applies when 25 there is a settlement – as opposed to a dismissal – of PAGA claims,” they nevertheless 26 provided the Court with a copy of their settlement agreement. (Doc. No. 17 at 2 ¶ 5, 4–17.) 27 The plain text of California Labor Code § 2699(s)(2) provides that “[t]he superior 28 court shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed pursuant to 1 || [California Labor Code Part 13].” (Emphasis added.) However, “[w]hile PAGA requires a 2 court to approve a PAGA settlement, district courts have noted there is no governing 3 standard to review PAGA settlements.” *Kulik v. NMCI Med. Clinic Inc.*, No. 21-cv-03495- 4 BLF, 2023 WL 2503539, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2023) (quoting *Hudson v. Libre Tech. 5 || Inc.*, No. 3:18-cv-01371-GPC-KSC, 2020 WL 2467060, at *8 (S.D. Cal. May 13, 2020)). 6 || Further, “[t]he parties do not cite, and the Court is not aware of any legal authority requiring 7 court approval of individual offers of settlement.” *Sandoval v. Brigantine, Inc.*, No. 20-cv- 8 || 00189-JLS-MSB, 2020 WL 6504914, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2020) (quoting *Olivo v. 9 || Fresh Harvest, Inc.*, No. 17-cv-02153-L-WVG, 2019 WL 6329227, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 10 2019)). Accordingly, “the Court does not believe it necessary or appropriate to engage 11 a detailed analysis of the fairness and reasonableness of the settlement terms, or the 12 || appropriateness of the attorneys’ fees.” *Jd.* 13 Upon a review of the settlement, the Court finds that its structure appears fair and 14 ||/reasonable under the California Private Attorneys General Act. The settlement releases 15 || Securitas from Woods’ individual claims. (See Doc. No. 17 at 9-10 4 6.) It does not impact 16 ||/any other potentially aggrieved employees or the State of California. (See generally *id.* at 17 5-17; see also *id.* at 2 42; *Ortega v. UnitedHealth Grp., Inc.*, No. 23-cv-05596-JST, 2025 18 || WL 1906789, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 10, 2025).) 19 Accordingly, the Court APPROVES the settlement of Woods’ claims against 20 || Securitas and GRANTS Woods’ request to dismiss with prejudice the PAGA Claim as it 21 relates to Woods himself. The Court further GRANTS Woods’ request to dismiss without 22 || prejudice the PAGA Claim as it relates to any other allegedly aggrieved employee. The 23 Court takes no action on Woods’ other causes of action at this time. 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 Dated: October 22, 2025 27 United States District Judge 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-fo/2025/roy-woods-v-securitas-technology-corporation-et-al-1pz1ki7c>