

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Peter Leverman v. Honeywell International Inc.

Leverman v. Honeywell · No. 2:25-cv-04768-WLH-RAO · Decided September 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California denied Peter Leverman’s motion to remand a putative California wage-and-hour class action removed under the Class Action Fairness Act. The court held that Defendant established by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded \$5 million, accepting certain workweek, unpaid-wage, overtime, and wage-statement penalty assumptions while rejecting an inflated overtime estimate as unsupported.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Wesley L. Hsu
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	September 9, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-04768-WLH-RAO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to remand a putative class action removed from California state court under the Class Action Fairness Act. The district court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When removal jurisdiction is factually challenged, the court determines by a preponderance of the evidence whether the amount-in-controversy requirement is satisfied. A defendant may rely on a chain of reasoning containing reasonable assumptions grounded in the complaint and supported by evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Peter Leverman v. Honeywell International Inc.

TOPICS

- class actions
- subject matter jurisdiction
- wage and hour
- attorney fees
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

wage and hour

class actions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Honeywell established by a preponderance of the evidence that the amount in controversy exceeded CAFA's \$5 million jurisdictional threshold.
2. Whether Honeywell's assumptions concerning the number of relevant workweeks, unpaid straight-time on-call wages, and unpaid overtime wages were reasonable and sufficiently grounded in the complaint and evidence.
3. Whether attorney's fees could be included in the amount-in-controversy calculation and reasonably estimated at 25 percent of the recovery.

HOLDINGS

1. The amount-in-controversy requirement was satisfied because reasonable estimates of unpaid on-call wages, unpaid overtime, attorney's fees, and some amount of wage-statement penalties established an amount in controversy of at least \$5,079,984.38.
2. Honeywell reasonably calculated the relevant workweeks by using employment records and the hire and termination dates of putative class members.
3. Honeywell could reasonably assume one unpaid straight-time on-call hour and one unpaid overtime hour per workweek because those assumptions were grounded in the complaint's pattern-and-practice allegations.
4. Attorney's fees were properly included in the amount-in-controversy calculation and could reasonably be estimated at 25 percent of the recovery.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Plaintiff's Motion is DENIED for the reasons stated herein." (at 2)

"For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion to Remand." (at 17)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Peter Leverman, a former Honeywell employee, alleged that Honeywell required him and other California non-exempt employees to provide 24/7 on-call support while failing to pay all regular and overtime wages owed. He also alleged inaccurate wage statements and sought unpaid wages, statutory penalties, and attorney's fees on behalf of a putative class. Honeywell submitted employment-record evidence concerning the number of employees and workweeks, and used assumptions based on the complaint to estimate unpaid wages, overtime, wage-statement penalties, and attorney's fees.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Leverman filed a putative class action in the Superior Court of California alleging unpaid wages, unpaid overtime, inaccurate wage statements, and related violations. Honeywell removed the action under CAFA,

asserting that the amount in controversy exceeded \$5 million. After supplemental briefing and additional evidentiary submissions concerning workweeks and alleged violation rates, the district court denied the motion to remand and ordered Honeywell to file a responsive pleading within 14 days.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Jauregui v. Roadrunner Transportation Services, Inc., 28 F.4th 989, 993-994 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co., LLC v. Owens, 574 U.S. 81, 88-89 (2014)
- LaCross v. Knight Transportation Inc., 775 F.3d 1200, 1201-1202 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Ibarra v. Manheim Investments, Inc., 775 F.3d 1193, 1197, 1199 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Harris v. KM Industries, Inc., 980 F.3d 694, 700 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Perez v. Rose Hills Co., 131 F.4th 804, 808, 810 (9th Cir. 2025)
- Dobbs v. Wood Group PSN, Inc., 201 F. Supp. 3d 1184, 1188 (E.D. Cal. 2016)
- Oda v. Gucci America, Inc., 2015 WL 93335, at *3, *5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2015)
- Franklin v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., 2025 WL 1983036, at *5 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2025)
- Ray v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., 2011 WL 1790123, at *67 (C.D. Cal. May 9, 2011)
- Stevenson v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc., 2011 WL 4928753, at *4 (E.D. Cal. 2011)
- Garibay v. Archstone Communities LLC, 539 F. App'x 763, 764 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Smith v. Diamond Resorts Management, Inc., 2016 WL 356020, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2016)
- Arias v. Shyft Group GTB, LLC, 2023 WL 3559311, at *2-*3 (C.D. Cal. May 17, 2023)
- Peters v. TA Operating, LLC, 2023 WL 1070350, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2023)
- Arias v. Residence Inn by Marriott, 936 F.3d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Eleazar Santos v. The Pictsweet Co., et al., 2025 WL 2424357, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2025)