

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

In re California Bail Bond Antitrust Litigation

Lead Case No. 4:19-CV-00717-JST (N.D. Cal. June 6, 2025) · No. 4:19-CV-00717-JST · Decided June 6, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a proposed order from the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California granting final approval of class action settlements with Lexon Insurance Company and Danielson National Insurance Company in the California bail bond antitrust litigation. The order certifies the settlement class, appoints class representatives and class counsel, retains continuing jurisdiction, and dismisses the claims against the settling defendants with prejudice. The order is dated June 6, 2025, and was entered by Judge Jon S. Tigar.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jon S. Tigar
DECIDED	June 6, 2025
DOCKET	4:19-CV-00717-JST
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for final approval of class action settlements with Lexon Insurance Company and Danielson National Insurance Company. The district court held a final approval hearing, certified the settlement class, approved the settlements, and dismissed the claims against those defendants with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the standards governing certification of a Rule 23 settlement class and the final-approval requirements of Rule 23(e)(2), assessing whether the settlements were fair, reasonable, adequate, non-collusive, and free of obvious deficiencies.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; limited precedential value
PARTIES	Shonetta Crain, Kira Monterrey, Settlement Class v. Lexon Insurance Company, Danielson National Insurance Company

TOPICS

- class actions
- commercial litigation
- insurance
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

class actions

antitrust

commercial litigation

insurance

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the proposed settlements with Lexon and DNIC should receive final approval under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(2).
2. Whether the proposed settlement class satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and 23(b)(3).
3. Whether the claims against Lexon and DNIC should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to the approved settlements.

HOLDINGS

1. The proposed settlements with Lexon and DNIC were sufficiently fair, reasonable, adequate, informed, thorough, serious, and non-collusive, and did not present obvious deficiencies or improperly favor class representatives or segments of the class; therefore, final approval was granted.
2. The proposed Settlement Class and its representatives satisfied the relevant requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and 23(b)(3), and the class was certified for settlement purposes.
3. All claims brought in the action against Lexon and DNIC were dismissed with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The proposed Settlements appear to be the product of intensive, thorough, serious, informed, and non-collusive negotiations; have no obvious deficiencies; do not improperly grant preferential treatment to the Settlement Class Representatives or segments of the Settlement Class; and appear to be fair, reasonable, and adequate.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The litigation concerned alleged conduct by bail-bond defendants in the California bail-bonds market. Plaintiffs reached proposed settlements with Lexon Insurance Company and Danielson National Insurance Company concerning claims arising from that conduct. The proposed settlement class covered persons who paid part or all of a commercial bail-bond premium in connection with a California state-court criminal proceeding between February 20, 2004, and April 25, 2024, subject to specified exclusions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had presided over the action since February 8, 2019. Plaintiffs reached separate settlements with Lexon and DNIC, neither defendant opposed final approval, and the court held a final approval hearing on May 22, 2025. The court granted final approval, certified the settlement class under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, appointed class representatives and class counsel, retained continuing jurisdiction, and dismissed the claims against Lexon and DNIC with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

CASES CITED

- In re Hyundai & Kia Fuel Econ. Litig., 926 F.3d 539, 556-67 (9th Cir. 2019)
- In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig., No. 14-cv-2058-JST, 2017 WL 565003, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 13, 2017)
- In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig., No. 07-cv-05944-JST, 2020 WL 1873554, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2020)
- In re Splunk Inc. Sec. Litig., 20-cv-08600-JST, 2024 WL 923777 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2024)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 OAKLAND DIVISION 11 12 Lead Case No. 4:19-CV-00717-JST IN RE
CALIFORNIA BAIL BOND 13 || ANTITRUST LITIGATION }PROPOSED} ORDER
GRANTING 14. FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION This Document Relates To:
SETTLEMENTS WITH DEFENDANTS 15 LEXON INSURANCE COMPANY AND ALL
ACTIONS DANIELSON NATIONAL INSURANCE 16 COMPANY 17 Judge: The Honorable
Jon S. Tigar 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 {PROPOSED} ORDER GRANTING FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENTS] Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final
Approval of Class Action Settlements with 2 || Defendants Lexon Insurance Company (“Lexon”)
and Danielson National Insurance Company 3 || (DNIC”) (the “Motion”).

4 WHEREAS, a proposed Class Action Settlement Agreement has been reached between 5 ||
Plaintiffs on behalf of a proposed Settlement Class, and Defendant Lexon (the “Lexon
Settlement”), 6 || that resolves certain claims against Lexon pertaining to its conduct in the
California bail bonds 7 || market; 8 WHEREAS, a proposed Class Action Settlement Agreement
has been reached between 9 || Plaintiffs on behalf of a proposed Settlement Class, and Defendant
DNIC (the “DNIC Settlement”), 10 || that resolves certain claims against DNIC pertaining to its
conduct in the California bail bonds 11 || market; 12 WHEREAS, the Court, for purposes of this
Order, adopts all defined terms as set forth in 13 || the Lexon Settlement and DNIC Settlement
(collectively, the “Settlements”); 14 WHEREAS, neither Defendant Lexon nor Defendant DNIC
opposes the Court’s entry of 15 || the proposed Final Approval Order; 16 WHEREAS, the Court
finds it has jurisdiction over the Action and each of the parties for 17 || purposes of Settlement and
asserts jurisdiction over the Settlement Class Representatives for 18 || purposes of considering and
effectuating the Settlements; 19 WHEREAS, the Court has presided over and managed this Action
since February 8, 2019 20 || (ECF No. 1); 21 WHEREAS, the Court held a Final Approval Hearing
on May 22, 2025; and 22 WHEREAS, the Court has considered all of the presentations and
submissions related to 23 || the Motion, as well as the facts, contentions, claims, and defenses as

they have developed in these 24 || proceedings, and is otherwise fully advised of all relevant facts in connection therewith; 25 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 26 | I. Final Approval of Class Action Settlement 27 1.

The proposed Settlements appear to be the product of intensive, thorough, serious, 28 || informed, and non-collusive negotiations; have no obvious deficiencies; do not improperly grant 1. APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENTS 1 || preferential treatment to the Settlement Class Representatives or segments of the Settlement 2 || Class; and appear to be fair, reasonable, and adequate.

3 2. Accordingly, the Motion is GRANTED. 4 | II. Certification of Settlement Class 5 3. The Court is familiar with the standards applicable to certification of a Rule 23 6 || settlement class in the Ninth Circuit. See, e.g., *In re Hyundai & Kia Fuel Econ. Litig.*, 926 F.3d 7 || 539, 556-67 (9th Cir. 2019) (detailing the standard for certifying a settlement class); see also *In re 8 || Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.*, No. 14-cv-2058-JST, 2017 WL 565003, at *3 (N.D.

9 || Cal. Feb. 13, 2017) (Tigar, J.); *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.*, No. 07-cv-05944- 10 || JST, 2020 WL 1873554, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2020) (Tigar, J.); *In re Splunk Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 11 || 20-cv-08600-JST, 2024 WL 923777 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2024) (Tigar, J). 12 4. Applying these standards, the Court approves, under Rule 23(e)(2), the proposed 13 || Settlement Class as defined below because the Settlement Class and its Representatives meet all 14 || relevant requirements of Rules 23(a) and 23(b)(3).

15 5. “Class” or “Settlement Class” is all persons who, between February 20, 2004 and 16 || April 25, 2024 (the “Settlement Class Period”), paid for part or all of a commercial bail bond 17 || premium in connection with a California state court criminal proceeding. Specifically excluded 18 || from this Class are Defendants in the Action; the officers, directors or employees of any 19 || Defendant; any entity in which any Defendant has a controlling interest; any affiliate, legal 20 || representative, heir or assign of any Defendant and any person acting on their behalf; any person 21 || who acted as a bail agent during the Settlement Class Period; any judicial officer presiding over 22 || this Action and the members of his/her immediate family and judicial staff; and any juror 23 || assigned to this Action.

24 6. Plaintiffs Shonetta Crain and Kira Monterrey are hereby appointed Settlement 25 || Class Representatives. 26 7. Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein LLP is hereby appointed Settlement Class 27 || Counsel under Rule 23(g)(3). Settlement Class Counsel and Defendants Lexon and DNIC are 28 2. APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENTS 1 || authorized to take, without further Court approval, all necessary and appropriate steps to 2 || implement the Settlements.

3} I. Continuing Jurisdiction 4 8. The Court shall maintain continuing jurisdiction over these proceedings for the 5 || benefit of the Settlement Class as defined in this Order. 6 || IV. —

Dismissal 7 9. All claims brought in this Action against Lexon and DNIC are hereby dismissed 8 ||
with prejudice. 9 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 1] 12 | DATED: June 6, 2025 C ys ‘ dheg— 13 THE
HON BLE JON S. TIGAR 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
24 25 26 27 28 3.

APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENTS

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-california/2025/in-re-california-bail-bond-antitrust-litigation-67leksc3>