

RECEIVED

APR 26 2016

Clerk of the Circuit Court
Montgomery County, Md.

QUAN-EN YANG

On His Own Behalf and on Behalf
of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

G & C GULF, INC. d/b/a
G&G TOWING, *et al.*

Defendants.

* IN THE
* CIRCUIT COURT
* FOR
* MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.
* Case No. 403885V
*
* TRACK VI
* Hon. Ronald Rubin,
* Specially Assigned
*

* * * * *

**PETITION FOR INCENTIVE AWARD TO THE
NAMED CLASS REPRESENTATIVES**

Pursuant to ¶ 17 of the Agreement in this case, Plaintiffs hereby request that the Court approve a single incentive award of \$7,500⁰⁰ for Class Representative Quan-en Yang, to be paid from the Common Fund described in ¶ 17 of the Agreement. The requested award is reasonable based on the agreement achieved for the Class as a direct result of the Class Representative's efforts. Further support for this award is set forth in the accompanying Memorandum of Law.

Dated: April 26, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

Richard S. Gordon
Benjamin H. Carney
GORDON, WOLF & CARNEY, CHTD.
102 West Pennsylvania Avenue, Suite 402
Baltimore, Maryland 21204
(410) 825-2300

Attorneys for Named Plaintiff and the Class

By:



Richard S. Gordon

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify, this 26th day of April 2016, that I served a copy of the foregoing Petition for Incentive Award to the Named Class Representatives and accompanying Memorandum of Law via e-mail and first-class mail, postage pre-paid, on the following:

Ronald S. Canter
The Law Offices of Ronald S. Canter, LLC
200A Monroe Street, Suite 104
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Frederic J. Einhorn
27 West Jefferson Street
Rockville, Maryland 20850



Richard S. Gordon

QUAN-EN YANG	*	IN THE
On His Own Behalf and on Behalf	*	CIRCUIT COURT
of All Others Similarly Situated,	*	FOR
Plaintiffs,	*	MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD.
v.	*	Case No. 403885V
G & C GULF, INC. d/b/a	*	
G&G TOWING, <i>et al.</i>	*	TRACK VI
Defendants.	*	Hon. Ronald Rubin,
	*	Specially Assigned

* * * * *

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR AN INCENTIVE AWARD
TO THE NAMED CLASS REPRESENTATIVE**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to ¶17 of the Agreement, Class Counsel ask this Court to approve an incentive award of \$7,500⁰⁰ for the Class Representative in this case – Quan-en Yang (“Dr. Yang”) – to be paid from the Common Fund. This type of award is both permissible and reasonable where, as here, a class action has achieved a significant benefit for a large number of people.

There would not have been an agreement and recovery in this action without the participation of Dr. Yang. It bears reiteration here that the \$22 million judgment in favor of the Class, the \$335,000⁰⁰ payment paid into the Common Fund, as well as the equitable relief provided for in the Agreement – *i.e.*, G&C Gulf, Inc. d/b/a G&G Towing’s representation that it is winding up its entire business operations in 2016 – are all excellent results.

The proposed \$7,500⁰⁰ incentive award is modest considering that, unlike the absent Class members, the Class Representative cooperated with Class Counsel and expended substantial effort to see this case through to resolution. The Class Representative provided

valuable documentation and information to counsel relating to the legal violations in this case, gave deposition testimony and was prepared to testify at trial. In addition, Dr. Yang's participation in this case is not yet over. He intends to continue his participation in this matter, all for the benefit of the Class, as Class Counsel proceed against the owners of the Parking Lots who are derivatively liable in this matter.

II. ARGUMENT

A. Courts Have Traditionally Awarded Incentive Payments in Class Actions

The award of incentive payments to named class representatives has been approved in a long line of cases under circumstances similar to those in this case. Two themes occur repeatedly in the many opinions approving incentive payments: First, it is important to encourage named representatives to bring class actions because of the benefits they confer; and second, it is just to reward named class representatives for their work and effort on behalf of the class.

Both of these themes were articulated in *In re Southern Ohio Correctional Facility*, 175 F.R.D. 270 (S.D. Ohio 1997), in which the court approved a \$25,000⁰⁰ incentive payment to each of the class representatives from a recovery of \$4.1 million. In *In re Southern Ohio Correctional Facility*, the court noted that:

[I]ncentive awards are not uncommon in class action litigation and particularly where, as here, a common fund has been created for the benefit of the entire class. Courts routinely approve incentive awards to compensate named plaintiffs for the services they provided and the risks they incurred during the course of the class action litigation.

Id. at 272. The court continued:

[M]any of the reasons given for approving incentive awards relate to the services rendered and the risks incurred by the class representatives on behalf of the class during the course of the litigation and settlement. As long as the services rendered are reasonable and relevant to the furtherance of the class' interests in the litigation, such compensation given to named plaintiffs is not unlike the fee awards given to experts, consultants or investigators which are reimbursable as a litigation expense

from common funds; both compensate non-lawyers for services rendered in aid of the litigation.

Id. at 275.

Likewise, in *Meredith v. Mid-Atlantic Coca-Cola Bottling Co.*, Nos. 89-00302 and 89-00525, 13 Class Action Rep. 498 (E.D. Va. May 1 and June 18, 1990), Judge Merhige approved an \$18,000⁰⁰ incentive bonus payment to the named representatives, from a \$4.6 million recovery, declaring that without the named representatives' efforts, "no class member . . . would have recovered anything." Judge Merhige noted that "each worked closely with counsel" and that such awards have "been approved in a number of cases under circumstances similar to" those in *Meredith*. More significantly, Judge Merhige explained that "[i]f we are going to break up conduct such as what was alleged in this case, somebody has got to do something about it," and we must "encourage the little people to come forward"

The significant benefits conferred by class representatives was also stressed by the court in *Enterprise Energy Corp. v. Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.*, 137 F.R.D. 240, 251 (S.D. Ohio 1991), where the court approved incentive awards of \$50,000⁰⁰ to each of six class representatives as "fair, reasonable and warranted." The court noted:

In this case, the Class Representatives have taken actions which have protected the interests of the Class Members and which have resulted in a Settlement that provides substantial economic and noneconomic benefits for the Class Members.

Id. See also *Gray v. Fountainhead Title*, Civil Action No. WMN 03-cv-01675 (D. Md. 2004)

(Nickerson, J.) (approving \$5,000⁰⁰ incentive payments to named plaintiffs); *Naughton v. Millennium Escrow and Title*, Civil Action No. WMN 02-cv-3238 (D. Md. 2003) (Nickerson, J.) (same); *Cullen v. Whitman Med. Corp.*, 197 F.R.D. 136, 145 (E.D. Pa. 2000) (approving incentive award in excess of \$60,000⁰⁰ to be awarded to seven named plaintiffs and noting that "courts routinely approve incentive awards to compensate named plaintiffs for the services they provided and the risks they

incurred during the course of the class action litigation”); *Roberts, et al. v. Texaco*, 979 F. Supp. 185 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) (approving incentive awards of \$50,000⁰⁰ to \$85,000⁰⁰ to the named plaintiffs who initiated the lawsuit); *Van Vranken v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*, 901 F. Supp. 294 (N.D. Calif. 1995) (awarding \$50,000⁰⁰ to class representatives, where there was a \$76 million settlement fund); *In re Domestic Air Transp. Antitrust Litigation*, 148 F.R.D. 297, 357-58 (N.D. Ga. 1993) (awarding \$142,500⁰⁰ to class representatives, where there was a \$50 million settlement fund); *In re Dun & Bradstreet Credit Serv. Customer Litigation*, 130 F.R.D. 366, 373-374 (S.D. Ohio 1990) (approving incentive awards of \$35,000⁰⁰ to \$55,000⁰⁰ for class representatives).

Likewise, in *In re Jackson Lockdown/MCO Cases*, 107 F.R.D. 703, 710 (E.D. Mich. 1985), the court stated:

[T]he Sixth Circuit has recognized the propriety of rewarding members of a class who protested and helped bring rights to a group who had been victims of discrimination. Active protesters were contrasted to protesters who were merely passive and indicated no particular desire to bring an end to a discriminatory policy.

(citations omitted). The court thus approved an incentive award, stating: “The Named Plaintiffs who stepped forward are responsible for the results achieved in the settlement of this litigation and are entitled in the proposed consent judgment to be preferred over the class as a whole.” *Id.*

B. The Maryland Courts Are in Line with Other Jurisdictions in Awarding Incentive Payments to Class Representatives

Maryland courts likewise have agreed with the sound policies underlying the award of incentive payments to named class representatives. The state courts throughout Maryland have consistently awarded incentive payments to named plaintiffs in class litigation. *See, e.g., McNab v. Pohanka Auto North*, case no. 349467V (Cir. Ct. Mont. Co. April 2012) (Rubin, J.) (**Exhibit 11** to the Final Approval Memo) (approving incentive award of \$7,500⁰⁰ to class representative); *Ferrell v. JK III*, Case No. 13-C-03-56836 (Cir. Ct. Howard Co. 2011) (Leasure, J.) (**Exhibit 5** to the Final Approval Memo) (approving total incentive awards of \$30,000⁰⁰ - \$7,500⁰⁰ to each of four

class representatives); *Jones v. Pohanka Auto North*, Case No. 316574V (Cir. Ct. Mont. Co. May 16, 2011) (Rubin, J.) (**Exhibit 6** to the Final Approval Memo) (approving total incentive awards of \$37,500⁰⁰, \$7,500⁰⁰ to each of five class representatives); *Rogers v. Criswell Chevrolet, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 356716V (Cir. Ct. Mont. Co. Nov. 19, 2012) (Mason, J.) (**Exhibit 7** to the Final Approval Memo) (approving incentive award of \$7,500⁰⁰); *Sekuler v. Financial Freedom Acquisition, LLC*, Case No. 360327V (Cir. Ct. Mont. Co. Feb. 5, 2013) (**Exhibit 8** to the Final Approval Memo) (approving incentive award of \$2,500⁰⁰ to class representative); *Baker v. Antwerpen Motorcars Ltd.*, Case No. 03-C-12-004806 (Cir. Ct. Balt. Co. Mar. 27, 2013) (**Exhibit 4** to the Final Approval Memo) (approving two incentive awards of \$7,500⁰⁰ to class representatives).

Maryland's federal court has also approved similar incentive payments in consumer class actions. *See, e.g., Decohen*, 299 F.R.D. 469 (D.Md. 2014) (**Exhibit 10** to the Final Approval Memo) (approving \$10,000⁰⁰ incentive award to class representative).

The basis for the award of the incentive fees in the state court cases was based upon the same principles guiding the Federal courts. As stated recently in *Sheppard v. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.*, 2002 WL 20033206, *6 (E.D.N.Y. 2002):

In awarding these payments as part of a settlement, a court must ensure that the named plaintiffs, as fiduciaries to the class, have not been tempted to receive high incentive awards in exchange for accepting suboptimal settlements for absent class members.

In this case, the Agreement provides for the entry of a judgment of \$22 million, for G&G Towing to partially satisfy the judgment by creating a Common Fund of \$335,000⁰⁰, and a road map for the Class to collect the remainder of the Judgment against other entities that may have derivative liability. The Agreement also provides that G&G Towing will be winding down its business operations and closing its doors in 2016. This result is anything **but** suboptimal.

III. CONCLUSION

The Class Representative pursued this case – and will continue to do so – vigorously and successfully on behalf of the Class. He participated fully in the discovery and investigative process and was instrumental in bringing about a judgment which, we expect, will significantly benefit 26,000 Class members whose vehicles were trespass towed by G&G Towing. The amount requested is also well within bounds that have been approved in other courts which have considered the issue. For all these reasons, the requested incentive award is reasonable and Class Representative requests that it be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 26, 2016

Richard S. Gordon
rgordon@GWCfirm.com
Benjamin H. Carney
bcarney@GWCfirm.com
GORDON, WOLF & CARNEY, CHTD.
102 West Pennsylvania Ave., St. 402
Baltimore, Maryland 21204
(410) 825-2300
(410) 825-0066 (facsimile)

Attorneys for Named Plaintiff and the Class

By:


Richard S. Gordon