

1 Brendan P. Cullen (194057)
2 cullenb@sullcrom.com
3 Sverker K. Hogberg (244640)
4 hogbergs@sullcrom.com
5 SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
6 1870 Embarcadero Road
7 Palo Alto, California 94303
8 Telephone: (650) 461-5600
9 Facsimile: (650) 461-5700

7 Christopher M. Viapiano (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
8 viapianoc@sullcrom.com
9 SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
10 1700 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
11 Washington, D.C. 20006
12 Telephone: (202) 956-7500
13 Facsimile: (202) 956-7056

11 *Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Wells Fargo & Co.*

14 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

15 **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

17 IN RE WELLS FARGO & COMPANY
18 AUTO INSURANCE DERIVATIVE
19 LITIGATION

20 This Document Relates to:
21 ALL ACTIONS.

Lead Case No. CGC-17-561118

**MEMORANDUM REGARDING THE
INAPPLICABILITY OF CALIFORNIA RULE
OF COURT 3.769(h) TO THE PROPOSED
DERIVATIVE SETTLEMENTS**

1 Pursuant to the Court’s instructions during the July 3, 2019 hearing on Plaintiffs’ Renewed
2 Motions for Preliminary Approval of Settlement, nominal defendant Wells Fargo & Company
3 (“Wells Fargo” or “the Company”) and the individual Defendants hereby submit this
4 Memorandum Regarding the Inapplicability of California Rule of Court 3.769(h) to the Proposed
5 Derivative Settlements.¹

6 **ARGUMENT**

7 In the Court’s Tentative Rulings re Plaintiffs’ Renewed Motions for Preliminary Approval
8 of the proposed sales practices derivative settlement and the proposed CPI derivative settlement
9 (“Tentative Rulings”), the Court asked whether the language in each Stipulation and Agreement of
10 Compromise, Settlement and Release (“Settlements”) requiring dismissal of the instant actions
11 (the “Actions”) with prejudice is inconsistent with Rule 3.769(h) of the California Rules of Court
12 (“Rule 3.769(h)” or “the Rule”). (*See* Tentative Rulings, at 6.) It is not. Rule 3.769(h) prohibits
13 California courts from dismissing class action lawsuits following approval of a settlement
14 agreement, but by its terms Rule 3.769 applies only to “class actions” (*see* Rule 3.769 Settlement
15 of class actions), not derivative actions such as the Actions.

16 Neither Rule 3.769 itself, nor the history of the amendment of subsection (h) of the Rule,
17 so much as mentions derivative actions as falling within its ambit. According to the Civil and
18 Small Claims Advisory Committee of the Judicial Council, subparagraph (h)’s prohibition on
19 dismissal was added to protect the ability of “absent class members who did not participate in
20 settlement negotiations” to enforce their individual rights under a settlement in a class action. *See*
21 Exhibit A, Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee, Report, Class Actions: Entry of
22 Judgment Following Final Approval of Settlement (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.769 and
23 3.770), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/102408itema25.pdf> (last visited July 10, 2019)
24 (“purpose of requiring court approval of a class settlement and court approval of the dismissal of a
25 class action is to protect the interests of the class and its members”; “[r]ules prohibiting the

26 _____
27 ¹ An identical brief (apart from adjusted signature blocks, caption page, and other case-
28 identifying information) is being filed concurrently in the sales practices derivative action, *Wells
Fargo Derivative Cases*, Case No. CJC-18-004966.

1 concurrent entry of judgment following settlement with retention of jurisdiction and entry of
2 dismissal will advance this purpose”). Here — unlike in a typical class action case, where absent
3 class members are entitled to individual benefits under a class settlement — there are no absent
4 class members who have individual rights that need to be protected. The benefits of the
5 Settlements in these derivative Actions belong and go to Wells Fargo directly, not to its
6 shareholders individually. *See, e.g., Lewis v. Chiles*, 719 F.2d 1044, 1048 (9th Cir. 1983) (“The
7 difference [between derivative suits and class actions] lies in the nature of the right sought to be
8 enforced. A class action is not brought on behalf of the corporation but rather to assert primary
9 individual rights of each member of the [] class.”); *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Bolger*, 2 F.3d 1304,
10 1307 n.4 (3d Cir. 1993) (“In derivative suits, unlike [] class actions, recoveries belong to the
11 corporation on whose behalf the suit was brought [S]hareholders normally cannot opt out of
12 the class and pursue their own individual action.”) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).
13 As such, there is no risk here that any absent shareholder will forgo any of its rights if the Actions
14 are dismissed. Notably, all of the parties who are affected by the Settlements — the named
15 Plaintiffs, Wells Fargo and the individual Defendants — are signatories to the Settlements, are
16 represented by counsel in the Actions, and have been active participants in the Actions and the
17 Settlements. Moreover, the proposed Final Judgments and Orders of Dismissal in the sales
18 practices and CPI Actions provide that this Court will “retain[] jurisdiction over all matters
19 relating to the administration and consummation of the Settlement and all Parties hereto” (*see*
20 ¶ 20 and ¶ 19, respectively), so there is no danger that any issue that may arise with regard to the
21 Settlements cannot be addressed by the Court, if necessary.²

22
23 ² The Court has authority under Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6 (“Section 664.6”) to
24 dismiss the Actions following final approval of the Settlements while retaining jurisdiction to
25 enforce their terms, as requested by the Parties. Section 664.6 provides that a court “may retain
26 jurisdiction over the parties to enforce [a] settlement until performance in full of the terms of the
27 settlement” if the parties stipulate to the settlement in writing or orally before the court and ask that
28 the court retain jurisdiction to enforce its terms. This language has been interpreted to allow courts
to dismiss an action while retaining jurisdiction to enforce the terms of a settlement when the
parties request it. *See Wackeen v. Malis*, 97 Cal. App. 4th 429, 439 (2002) (“Settlement
agreements often, if not generally, require dismissals to be filed so that the litigation comes to an
end. We construe the second sentence of section 664.6 to mean, and we so hold, that even though

1 In short, therefore, neither the express language of Rule 3.769 nor the rationale for its
2 prohibition on dismissals in subsection (h), supports the application of the Rule to these Actions.

3 California’s general policy of encouraging settlement also counsels against applying Rule
4 3.769(h) to the Actions. *See, e.g., O’Hearn v. Hillcrest Gym & Fitness Ctr.*, 115 Cal. App. 4th
5 491, 499 (2004) (noting the “strong policy of encouraging settlements”). The individual
6 Defendants bargained for and obtained the provision for an order of dismissal as part of the
7 consideration for an agreed-upon resolution of these matters, and that order provides an additional
8 measure of finality to them in not having open, yet resolved lawsuits naming them as defendants
9 on the books indefinitely. Were the Court to apply Rule 3.769(h), the Parties would need to
10 renegotiate the Settlement Stipulations to remove the provisions requiring dismissal of the
11 Actions, and upend the Settlements’ terms for which Wells Fargo and the Defendants bargained.
12 Because the Court is not required to (and should not) apply Rule 3.769(h) in the derivative action
13 context (as discussed above), California’s “strong public policy in favor of settlement” supports
14 preliminary approval of the Settlements — subject to the Court’s role in providing review and
15 oversight — on the terms that the Parties negotiated. *Am. Motorcycle Ass’n v. Super. Ct.*, 20 Cal.
16 3d 578, 603 (1978).

17 Plaintiffs concur that Rule 3.769(h) does not apply to the Actions.

18 CONCLUSION

19 For the foregoing reasons, Rule 3.769(h)’s prohibition against dismissal does not apply,
20

21 a settlement may call for a case to be dismissed, or the plaintiff may dismiss the suit of its own
22 accord, the court may, nevertheless, retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement.”);
23 *Satya v. Chu*, 17 Cal. App. 5th 960, 966 (2017) (same); *DeSaulles v. Cmty. Hosp. of Monterey*
24 *Peninsula*, 62 Cal. 4th 1140, 1155 (2016) (“[W]hen a settlement pursuant to a stipulated judgment
25 disposes of the entire case, a dismissal of the action generally follows as a matter of law The
26 entry of a judgment pursuant to section 664.6 enables parties to enforce a settlement agreement
27 without having to file a separate lawsuit. This is true whether the judgment calls for a dismissal or
28 not.”) (citations omitted); 6 Witkin, Cal. Proc. 5th PWT § 125 (2008), (h) [§ 125] Retention of
Jurisdiction (noting that the 1993 amendment to Section 664.6 allowed courts to “retain
jurisdiction for purposes of enforcing [a] settlement” after the original action was dismissed, where
the parties had requested such retention of jurisdiction; collecting cases). Thus, as with other non-
class action cases, the Court may dismiss the claims in the Actions once final approval of the
Settlements is granted pursuant to Section 664.6.

1 and should not be applied, to the Actions.

2 DATED: July 10, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

3 **SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP**

4 By: /s/ Brendan P. Cullen

5 Brendan P. Cullen (194057)
6 cullenb@sullcrom.com
7 Sverker K. Hogberg (244640)
8 hogbergs@sullcrom.com
9 SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
10 1870 Embarcadero Road
11 Palo Alto, California 94303
12 Telephone: (650) 461-5600
13 Facsimile: (650) 461-5700

14 Christopher M. Viapiano (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
15 viapianoc@sullcrom.com
16 SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
17 1700 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
18 Washington, D.C. 20006
19 Telephone: (202) 956-7500
20 Facsimile: (202) 956-7056

Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Wells Fargo & Co.

15 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**

16 By: /s/ Lloyd Winawer

17 Grant P. Fondo
18 gfondo@goodwinlaw.com
19 Lloyd Winawer
20 lwinawer@goodwinlaw.com
21 Nicholas A. Reider
22 nreider@goodwinlaw.com
23 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
24 601 Marshall Street
25 Redwood City, CA 94063
26 Telephone: (650) 752-3100
27 Facsimile: (650) 853-1038

23 Richard M. Strassberg (*Pro hac vice*)
24 rstrassberg@goodwinlaw.com
25 Daniel P. Roeser (*Pro hac vice*)
26 droeser@goodwinlaw.com
27 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
28 620 8th Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Telephone: (212) 813-8800
Facsimile: (212) 355-3333

Attorneys for Defendant John G. Stumpf

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CLARENCE DYER & COHEN LLP

By: /s/ Josh A. Cohen

Nanci L. Clarence
nclarence@clarencedyer.com
Josh A. Cohen
jcohen@clarencedyer.com
CLARENCE DYER & COHEN LLP
899 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
Telephone: (415) 749-1800
Facsimile: (415) 749-1694

Attorneys for Defendant Timothy J. Sloan

SKAGGS FAUCETTE LLP

By: /s/ Jeffrey E. Faucette

Jeffrey E. Faucette
jeff@skaggsfaucette.com
SKAGGS FAUCETTE LLP
One Embarcadero Center
Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 315-1669
Facsimile: (415) 433-5994

Enu A. Mainigi (*Pro hac vice*)
emainigi@wc.com
Jennifer G. Wicht (*Pro hac vice*)
jwicht@wc.com
Brian Patrick Hagerty (*Pro hac vice*)
bhagerty@wc.com
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-5000
Facsimile: (202) 434-5029

Attorneys for Defendant Carrie Tolstedt

RAMSEY & EHRlich LLP

By: /s/ Ismail Ramsey

Miles Ehrlich
miles@ramsey-ehrllich.com
Ismail Ramsey
izzy@ramsey-ehrllich.com
RAMSEY & EHRlich LLP
803 Hearst Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94710
Telephone: (510) 548-3600

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Facsimile: (510) 291-3060

Attorneys for Defendant Franklin Codel and John R. Shrewsberry

FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

By: /s/ Douglas R. Young

Douglas R. Young
dyoung@fbm.com
C. Brandon Wisoff
bwisoff@fbm.com
FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP
Russ Building
235 Montgomery Street
17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 954-4400

Attorneys for Defendant Avid Modjtabai

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

By: /s/ Daniel Shallman

Daniel Shallman
dshallman@cov.com
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4643
Telephone: (424) 332-4800

Attorneys for Defendant Dawn Martin Harp

ARGUEDAS CASSMAN & HEADLEY LLP

By: /s/ Ted W. Cassman

Cristina C. Arguedas
arguedas@achlaw.com
Ted W. Cassman
cassman@achlaw.com
Laurel L. Headley
headley@achlaw.com
ARGUEDAS CASSMAN & HEADLEY LLP
803 Hearst Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94710
(510) 845-3000 (Tel)
(510) 845-3003 (Fax)

Attorneys for Defendant Michael J. Loughlin

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP

By: /s/ John F. Cove

John F. Cove, Jr.
john.cove@shearman.com
Emily V. Griffen
egriffen@shearman.com
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP
535 Mission Street, 25th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 616-1100
Facsimile: (415) 616-1199

Stuart Baskin
sbaskin@shearman.com
John Gueli
jgueli@shearman.com
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 848-4000
Facsimile: (212) 848-7179

Attorneys for Defendants John D. Baker II, Elaine L. Chao, John S. Chen, Celeste A. Clark, Theodore F. Craver, Lloyd H. Dean, Elizabeth A. Duke, Susan E. Engel, Enrique Hernandez, Jr., Donald M. James, Mackey J. McDonald, Richard D. McCormick, Cynthia H. Milligan, Nicholas G. Moore, Maria R. Morris, Karen B. Peetz, Federico F. Peña, Juan A. Pujadas, James H. Quigley, Philip J. Quigley, Howard V. Richardson, Judith M. Runstad, Stephen W. Sanger, Ronald L. Sargent, Susan G. Swenson, and Suzanne M. Vautrinot

EXHIBIT A

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee
Hon. Lee Smalley Edmon, Chair
Susan R. McMullan, Senior Attorney, 415-865-7990,
susan.mcmullan@jud.ca.gov

DATE: August 12, 2008

SUBJECT: Class Actions: Entry of Judgment Following Final Approval of Settlement
(amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.769 and 3.770) (Action Required)

Issue Statement

Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court addresses court approval of class action settlements. Under subdivision (h) of that rule, if a court approves settlement and enters judgment, it is required to retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the judgment. Following final court approval of a class settlement and entry of judgment, in some cases parties have asked the court to enter dismissal as well. There is no authority, however, for both entry of judgment following settlement and entry of dismissal. In the circumstances of a class settlement, the entry of dismissal, governed by rule 3.770, may be inconsistent with a judgment.

Recommendation

The Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2009, amend rules 3.769 and 3.770 of the California Rules of Court to provide that on the approval of a class settlement and entry of judgment, a court may not also enter dismissal of the action.

The text of amended rules 3.769 and 3.770 is attached at page 4.

Rationale for Recommendation

Rule 3.769 governs settlement of class actions. It requires a hearing and court approval of any settlement. (Cal Rules of Court, rule 3.769(a).) Subdivision (h) provides as follows:

If the court approves the settlement agreement after the final approval hearing, the court must make and enter judgment. The judgment must

include a provision for the retention of the court's jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the terms of the judgment.

Thus, the final settlement of a case with class action allegations includes court approval of the class settlement, entry of judgment, and retention of jurisdiction to enforce it. In some cases, in addition to entry of judgment, the defendant, or both sides, requests the court to enter dismissal. This is reportedly commonly done and some judges have expressed concern that settlement of the case and dismissal of the class claims are inconsistent.

The rules on settlement and dismissal of class actions do not address the situation of concurrent entry of judgment and dismissal.¹ Staff has found no case law either approving or disapproving the entry of judgment after approval of a class settlement with the retention of jurisdiction to enforce the judgment and the concurrent dismissal of a class action. A set of uniform statewide rules for class actions, of which these rules are a part, was adopted by the council, effective January 1, 2002. Neither the advisory committee materials, nor the council report addressing the class action rules from that time, discuss any interplay between entry of judgment following settlement approval with retention of jurisdiction and entry of dismissal.

Retention of jurisdiction to enforce a settlement in a non-class action case is governed by Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6. It provides that a court may retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of a settlement if the parties stipulate to the settlement, either in writing or orally before the court, and ask the court to retain jurisdiction to enforce its terms while the case is still pending. In addition, case law has clarified that the court may both retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement and enter dismissal. (See *Wackeen v. Malis* (1992) 97 Cal.App.4th 429, 439 ["We construe the second sentence of section 664.6 to mean, and we so hold, that even though a settlement may call for a case to be dismissed, or the plaintiff may dismiss the suit of its own accord, the court may nevertheless retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement, until such time as all of its terms have been performed by the parties, if the parties have requested this specific retention of jurisdiction"].)

The court's holding in *Wackeen, supra*, has not been applied to a class settlement in a published opinion. Unlike a nonrepresentative action, in a class action, because of the need to protect the absent class members who did not participate in settlement negotiations, the settlement terms are reflected in the judgment when the court approves the class settlement, and it is not necessary in a class settlement for the parties to ask the court to retain jurisdiction to enforce the court-approved settlement terms. (Cal Rules of Court, rule 3.769(h) ["The judgment must include a provision for the retention of the

¹ Rule 3.679, which governs settlement, does not address dismissal. Rule 3.770 requires court approval of a dismissal and, if the class has been certified, notice to the class.

court’s jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the terms of the judgment.”]) Moreover, a typical nonrepresentative action does not require court approval of a settlement because all the parties to the settlement are before the court and their settlement may be enforced as any other private contractual agreement may be enforced.

The purpose of requiring court approval of a class settlement and court approval of the dismissal of a class action is to protect the interests of the class and its members. (See *La Sala v. American Sav. & Loan Assn.* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 871; *In re Microsoft I-V Cases* (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 706, 723 (citing *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1800–1801).) Rules prohibiting the concurrent entry of judgment following settlement with retention of jurisdiction and entry of dismissal will advance this purpose.

Alternative Actions Considered

Rules 3.769 and 3.770 could remain unchanged. As acknowledged above, it is not known how often courts are asked to concurrently enter judgment following final approval of a class settlement and dismiss the action.

Alternatively, rule 3.769(h) could be amended to explicitly authorize the entry of dismissal in a case in which the court has entered judgment, with retention of jurisdiction to enforce the judgment, following settlement approval. The Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee believes these actions are inconsistent and recommended circulation of this proposal to prohibit it. Because commentators agreed with the proposal, the committee does not recommend this alternative.

Comments From Interested Parties

This proposal was circulated during the spring 2008 comment cycle. Five organizations submitted comments. All agreed with the proposed amendments. The State Bar of California Committee on Administration of Justice (CAJ) commented that there is confusion in the legal community about whether a dismissal can be entered along with the entry of judgment on final approval of a class settlement, even though this may result in an inconsistency between the judgment and the dismissal. CAJ noted that the proposal clears up the confusion. One commentator, a superior court judicial attorney, also noted that a dismissal concurrent with or after the final approval of a settlement is inconsistent with judgment and retention of jurisdiction. A chart summarizing the comments and the committee’s response to each is attached at pages 5–6.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

The proposal clarifies an area of class action procedure. There are no implementation requirements and it will result in no costs.

Attachments

Rules 3.769 and 3.770 of the California Rules of Court are amended, effective January 1, 2009, to read:

1 **Rule 3.769. Settlement of class actions**

2
3 (a)–(g) * * *

4
5 (h) **Judgment and retention of jurisdiction to enforce**

6
7 If the court approves the settlement agreement after the final approval
8 hearing, the court must make and enter judgment. The judgment must
9 include a provision for the retention of the court’s jurisdiction over the
10 parties to enforce the terms of the judgment. The court may not enter an
11 order dismissing the action at the same time as, or after, entry of
12 judgment.

13
14
15 **Rule 3.770. Dismissal of class actions**

16
17 (a) **Court approval of dismissal**

18
19 A dismissal of an entire class action, or of any party or cause of action in a
20 class action, requires court approval. The court may not grant a request to
21 dismiss a class action if the court has entered judgment following final
22 approval of a settlement. Requests for dismissal must be accompanied by a
23 declaration setting forth the facts on which the party relies. The declaration
24 must clearly state whether consideration, direct or indirect, is being given for
25 the dismissal and must describe the consideration in detail.

26
27 (b)–(c) * * *

SPR08-30**Class Actions: Entry of Judgment Following Final Approval of Settlement** (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.769 and 3.770)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Orange County Bar Association Cathrine Castaldi, President	A	No specific comments.	No response required.
2.	State Bar of California, Committee on Administration of Justice Saul Bercovitz Staff Attorney	A	There is some confusion in the legal community about whether a dismissal can be entered in conjunction with the entry of judgment upon final approval of a class action settlement. In certain situations, the parties to a class action settlement request that the court enter a dismissal at the time of the entry of judgment or subsequent to the entry of judgment, following the final approval of a class action settlement, even though there are times when this may result in an inconsistency between the judgment and the dismissal. This proposal clears up that confusion and makes it certain that when a judgment is entered after final approval of a class action settlement, a dismissal may not be entered concurrent with or after the entry of such a judgment.	The committee notes the commentator's agreement.
3.	Superior Court of Los Angeles County	A	No specific comments.	No response required.
4.	Superior Court of San Bernardino County Debra Meyers	A	Once the case settles and is given final approval, a judgment to that effect is currently mandated and the court must retain jurisdiction to enforce its terms. CRC 3.769(h). A dismissal concurrent therewith or thereafter is inconsistent with judgment and retained jurisdiction.	The committee notes the commentator's agreement.
5.	Superior Court of San Diego County Michael M. Roddy	A	No specific comments.	No response required.

SPR08-30

Class Actions: Entry of Judgment Following Final Approval of Settlement (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.769 and 3.770)

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (*).

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
	Executive Officer			