

1 **HAYES PAWLENKO LLP**  
 2 MATTHEW B. HAYES (SBN 220639)  
 3 mhayes@helpcounsel.com  
 4 KYE D. PAWLENKO (SBN 221475)  
 5 kpawlenko@helpcounsel.com  
 6 1414 Fair Oaks Avenue, Unit 2B  
 South Pasadena, CA 91030  
 (626) 808-4357

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff:  
 8 LUCIANO BARRAGAN

9  
 10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 11 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

12	LUCIANO BARRAGAN,	) CASE NO.
13	individually and as a	)
14	representative of a class of	)
15	participants and beneficiaries on	) <b>CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT</b>
16	behalf of the Honeywell 401(k)	) <b>AND DEMAND FOR JURY</b>
17	Plan,	) <b>TRIAL</b>
18		)
19		)
20	Plaintiff,	)
21	v.	)
22		)
23	HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL	)
24	INC.; and DOES 1 to 10 inclusive,	)
25		)
26	Defendants.	)
27	_____	)
28		)

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 1. Plaintiff LUCIANO BARRAGAN (“Plaintiff”), a former  
2 participant in the Honeywell 401(k) Plan (“Plan” or “Honeywell Plan”),  
3 brings this Employee Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”) action  
4 on behalf of the Plan under 29 U.S.C. §§ 1132(a)(2) and (3), and under  
5 Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as a representative of a  
6 class of participants and beneficiaries of the Plan, against Defendant  
7 HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. (“Honeywell” or the “Company”)  
8 for (1) breach of ERISA’s fiduciary duties, (2) violation of ERISA’s anti-  
9 inurement provision, and (3) engaging in self-dealing and transactions  
10 prohibited by ERISA.

### 11 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12 2. This Court has federal question subject matter jurisdiction  
13 under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this is an action under 29 U.S.C. §§  
14 1132(a)(2), (a)(3) for which federal district courts have exclusive  
15 jurisdiction under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(1).

16 3. This district is the proper venue for this action under 29  
17 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(2) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part  
18 of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred here.

### 19 PARTIES

20 4. The Honeywell Plan is a defined contribution, individual  
21 account, employee pension benefit plan under 29 U.S.C. § 1002(2)(A) and  
22 § 1002(34) and is subject to the provisions of ERISA pursuant to 29 U.S.C.  
23 § 1003(a).

24 5. Defendant Honeywell is a global technology and  
25 manufacturing company with offices in Torrance, California. Honeywell  
26 is both the Plan sponsor under 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(B) and, through its  
27 Vice President – Human Resources, Compensation and Benefits, the  
28

1 Plan administrator under 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(A) with broad authority  
2 over the administration and management of the Plan and its assets.

3 6. Honeywell is a fiduciary of the Plan within the meaning of 29  
4 U.S.C. § 1002(21)(A) because it exercised authority and control  
5 respecting the management and disposition of Plan assets and  
6 discretionary responsibility in the administration of the Plan with  
7 respect to the matters alleged herein.

8 7. Plaintiff is a resident of California, was previously employed  
9 by Honeywell in Torrance, California, and until last year, was a  
10 participant in the Honeywell Plan whose account has been charged with  
11 a share of the Plan's administrative expenses.

12 8. The defendants sued by the fictitious names DOES 1 through  
13 10, inclusive, are Plan fiduciaries unknown to Plaintiff who exercise or  
14 exercised discretionary authority or discretionary control respecting the  
15 management of the Plan, exercise or exercised authority or control  
16 respecting the management or disposition of its assets, or have or had  
17 discretionary authority or discretionary responsibility in the  
18 administration of the Plan and are responsible or liable in some manner  
19 for the conduct alleged in the complaint. Plaintiff will amend this  
20 complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such fictitiously  
21 named defendants when they are ascertained. Defendants Honeywell  
22 and DOES 1 through 10 are referred to as "Defendants."

23 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

24 9. In accordance with 29 U.S.C. § 1103(a), the assets of the  
25 Honeywell Plan are held in a trust fund.

26 10. The Plan is funded by a combination of wage withholdings by  
27 Plan participants and Company contributions that are deposited into the  
28

1 Plan's trust fund. Upon their deposit into the Plan's trust fund, all  
2 participant contributions and Company contributions become assets of  
3 the Plan.

4 11. As an individual account, defined contribution retirement  
5 plan, the Honeywell Plan "provides for an individual account for each  
6 participant and for benefits solely upon the amount contributed to the  
7 participant's account, and any income, expenses, gains and losses, and  
8 any forfeiture of accounts of other participants which may be allocated to  
9 such participant's account." 29 U.S.C. § 1002(34).

10 12. Plan participants pay for the Plan's administrative expenses  
11 through a direct charge to their accounts.

12 13. The deduction of these administrative expenses from  
13 participant accounts reduces the funds available to participants for  
14 distribution and/or investing.

15 14. Participants in the Honeywell Plan are immediately vested in  
16 their own contributions and earnings thereon. Participants become 100%  
17 vested in the Company's contributions and earnings thereon upon the  
18 completion of three years of service.

19 15. When a participant has a break in service prior to full vesting  
20 of the Company's contributions, the unvested contributions are forfeited  
21 and Defendants exercise discretionary authority and control over how  
22 these Plan assets are thereafter reallocated.

23 16. Although ERISA requires Defendants to defray the Plan's  
24 expenses, *see* 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a)(1)(A)(ii), throughout the class period  
25 Defendants have consistently failed to use the forfeited funds to pay Plan  
26 administrative expenses, and thereby reduce or eliminate the amounts  
27 charged to the participants' individual accounts to cover such expenses.

28

1           17. Instead, Defendants have consistently utilized the forfeited  
2 funds in the Plan exclusively for the Company's own benefit, to the  
3 detriment of the Plan and its participants, by using these Plan assets  
4 solely to reduce Company contributions to the Plan.

5           18. In 2018, Company contributions to the Plan were reduced by  
6 approximately \$2.4 million as a result of Defendants' reallocation of  
7 forfeited funds for the Company's own benefit, and no forfeited funds  
8 were used to pay any part of the approximately \$5 million in Plan  
9 expenses charged to participants.

10           19. In 2019, Company contributions to the Plan were reduced by  
11 approximately \$3.1 million as a result of Defendants' reallocation of  
12 forfeited funds for the Company's own benefit, and no forfeited funds  
13 were used to pay any part of the approximately \$6 million in Plan  
14 expenses charged to participants.

15           20. In 2020, Company contributions to the Plan were reduced by  
16 approximately \$4 million as a result of Defendants' reallocation of  
17 forfeited funds for the Company's own benefit, and no forfeited funds  
18 were used to pay any part of the approximately \$2 million in Plan  
19 expenses charged to participants.

20           21. In 2021, Company contributions to the Plan were reduced by  
21 approximately \$7 million as a result of Defendants' reallocation of  
22 forfeited funds for the Company's own benefit, and no forfeited funds  
23 were used to pay any part of the approximately \$9 million in Plan  
24 expenses charged to participants.

25           22. In 2022, Company contributions to the Plan were reduced by  
26 approximately \$7 million as a result of Defendants' reallocation of  
27 forfeited funds for the Company's own benefit, and no forfeited funds  
28

1 were used to pay any part of the approximately \$4 million in Plan  
2 expenses charged to participants.

3 23. While Defendants' reallocation of the forfeitures in the Plan's  
4 trust fund to reduce its contributions benefitted the Company by  
5 reducing its own contribution expenses, it harmed the Plan, along with  
6 its participants and beneficiaries, by reducing Company contributions  
7 that would otherwise have increased Plan assets and by causing  
8 participants to incur deductions from their individual accounts to cover  
9 administrative expenses that would otherwise have been covered in  
10 whole or in part by utilizing forfeited funds.

### 11 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12 24. 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(2) authorizes any participant or  
13 beneficiary of the Plan to bring an action individually on behalf of the  
14 Plan to enforce a breaching fiduciary's liability to the Plan under 29  
15 U.S.C. § 1109(a).

16 25. In acting in this representative capacity and to enhance the  
17 due process protections of unnamed participants and beneficiaries of the  
18 Plan, as an alternative to direct individual actions on behalf of the Plan  
19 under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(2), Plaintiff seeks to certify this action as a  
20 class action on behalf of all Honeywell Plan participants and  
21 beneficiaries. Plaintiff seeks to certify the following class:

22 All participants and beneficiaries of the Honeywell Plan  
23 from February 13, 2018 through the date of judgment,  
24 excluding Defendants.

25 26. This action meets the requirements of Rule 23 and is  
26 certifiable as a class action for the following reasons:

27 a. The class includes over 60,000 members and is so large  
28

1 that joinder of all its members is impracticable.

2           b. There are questions of law and fact common to the class  
3 because Defendants owed fiduciary duties to the Plan and to all  
4 participants and beneficiaries and took the actions alleged herein as to  
5 the Plan and not as to any individual participant. Thus, common  
6 questions of law and fact include the following, without limitation: Who  
7 are the fiduciaries liable for the remedies provided by 29 U.S.C. §  
8 1109(a)? Did the fiduciaries of the Plan breach their fiduciary duties to  
9 the Plan with respect to their management and allocation of Plan assets?  
10 Did fiduciaries of the Plan engage in prohibited transactions with Plan  
11 assets? Did fiduciaries of the Plan violate the anti-inurement provision  
12 of ERISA by using Plan assets for their own benefit? What are the losses  
13 to the Plan resulting from each alleged breach of ERISA? What Plan-  
14 wide equitable and other relief should the Court impose to remedy  
15 Defendants' alleged breaches?

16           c. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the class  
17 because Plaintiff was a participant of the Plan during the class period  
18 and all participants in the Plan were harmed by the same alleged  
19 misconduct by Defendants.

20           d. Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class  
21 because he was a participant of the plan during the class period, has no  
22 interests that conflict with any other members of the class, is committed  
23 to the vigorous representation of the class, and has engaged experienced  
24 and competent attorneys to represent the class.

25           e. Prosecution of separate actions for these breaches of  
26 fiduciary duties and prohibited transactions by individual participants  
27 and beneficiaries would create the risk of (A) inconsistent or varying  
28

1 adjudications that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for  
2 Defendants with respect to their discharge of their fiduciary duties to the  
3 Plan and personal liability to the Plan under 29 U.S.C. § 1109(a), and (B)  
4 adjudications by individual participants and beneficiaries regarding  
5 these breaches of fiduciary duties, prohibited transactions, and remedies  
6 for the Plan would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests  
7 of the participants and beneficiaries not parties to the adjudication or  
8 would substantially impair or impede those participants' and  
9 beneficiaries' ability to protect their interests. Therefore, this action  
10 should be certified as a class action under Rule 23(b)(1)(A) or (B).

11 27. A class action is the superior method for the fair and efficient  
12 adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all participants and  
13 beneficiaries is impracticable, the losses suffered by individual  
14 participants and beneficiaries may be small and impracticable for  
15 individual members to enforce their rights through individual actions,  
16 and the common questions of law and fact predominate over individual  
17 questions. Given the nature of the allegations, no class member has an  
18 interest in individually controlling the prosecution of this matter, and  
19 Plaintiff is aware of no difficulties likely to be encountered in the  
20 management of this matter as a class action. Alternatively, then, this  
21 action may be certified as a class under Rule 23(b)(3) if it is not certified  
22 under Rule 23(b)(1)(A) or (B).

23 28. Plaintiff's counsel, Hayes Pawlenko LLP, will fairly and  
24 adequately represent the interests of the Class and is best able to  
25 represent the interests of the class under Rule 23(g).

26 ///

27 ///

28



1 **FIRST CLAIM**

2 **BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY OF LOYALTY**

3 **(29 U.S.C. 1104(a)(1)(A))**

4 29. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each  
5 and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this  
6 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

7 30. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a)(1)(A), Defendants were  
8 required to discharge their duties to the Honeywell Plan “solely in the  
9 interest of the participants and beneficiaries” and “for the exclusive  
10 purpose of: (i) providing benefits to participants and their beneficiaries;  
11 and (ii) defraying reasonable expenses of administering the plan.”

12 31. Defendants have continually breached this duty of loyalty  
13 with respect to their control and management of the Plan’s assets  
14 throughout the class period by utilizing forfeited funds in the Plan for the  
15 benefit of the Company rather than solely in the interest of the  
16 participants and beneficiaries.

17 32. Instead of acting solely in the interest of Plan participants by  
18 utilizing forfeited funds in the Plan to reduce or eliminate the  
19 administrative expenses charged to their individual accounts,  
20 Defendants used these Plan assets for the purpose of reducing its own  
21 contributions to the Plan, thereby saving the Company millions of dollars  
22 each year at the expense of the Plan which received decreased Company  
23 contributions and its participants and beneficiaries who were forced to  
24 incur avoidable expense deductions to their individual accounts.

25 33. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ fiduciary  
26 breaches described herein, the Plan suffered injury and loss for which  
27 they are personally liable and are subject to appropriate equitable relief,  
28

1 pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1109, including, without limitation, the  
2 disgorgement of all ill-gotten profits to Defendants resulting from the  
3 breach of their duty of loyalty.

4 34. Each Defendant knowingly participated in the breach of the  
5 other Defendants, knowing that such acts were a breach, enabled other  
6 Defendants to commit a breach by failing to lawfully discharge its own  
7 fiduciary duties, knew of the breach by the other Defendants and failed  
8 to make any reasonable effort under the circumstances to remedy the  
9 breach. Thus, each Defendant is liable for the losses caused by the breach  
10 of its co-fiduciary under 29 U.S.C. § 1105(a).

## 11 **SECOND CLAIM**

### 12 **BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY OF PRUDENCE**

#### 13 **(29 U.S.C. 1104(a)(1)(B))**

14 35. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each  
15 and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this  
16 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

17 36. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a)(1)(B), Defendants were  
18 required to discharge their duties with respect to the Honeywell Plan  
19 “with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances  
20 then prevailing that a prudent man acting in a like capacity and familiar  
21 with such matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like  
22 character and with like aims.”

23 37. Defendants have continuously breached their duty of  
24 prudence under 29 U.S.C. § 1104(a)(1)(B) throughout the class period by  
25 failing to use the forfeited funds in the plan to eliminate or reduce the  
26 administrative expenses charged to participant accounts and instead  
27 using such Plan assets to reduce the Company’s own contributions to the  
28

1 Plan.

2 38. Defendants failed to engage in a reasoned and impartial  
3 decision-making process to determine that using the forfeited funds in  
4 the Plan to reduce the Company's own contribution expenses, as opposed  
5 to the administrative expenses charged to participant accounts, was in  
6 the best interest of the Plan's participants or was prudent, and failed to  
7 consider whether participants would be better served by another use of  
8 these Plan assets after considering all relevant factors.

9 39. By failing to use forfeited funds in the Plan to eliminate or  
10 reduce the administrative expenses charged to participant accounts, and  
11 instead using such Plan assets to reduce the Company's own contribution  
12 expenses, Defendants caused the Plan to receive fewer contributions that  
13 would otherwise have increased Plan assets and caused participants to  
14 incur expense deductions from their individual accounts that would  
15 otherwise have been covered in whole or in part by utilizing the forfeited  
16 funds to pay Plan expenses.

17 40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' fiduciary  
18 breaches, the Plan suffered injury and loss for which Defendants are  
19 personally liable and are subject to appropriate equitable relief, pursuant  
20 to 29 U.S.C. § 1109, including, without limitation, the disgorgement of all  
21 ill-gotten profits to Defendants resulting from the breach of their duties.

22 41. Each Defendant knowingly participated in the breach of the  
23 other Defendants, knowing that such acts were a breach, enabled other  
24 Defendants to commit a breach by failing to lawfully discharge its own  
25 fiduciary duties, knew of the breach by the other Defendants and failed  
26 to make any reasonable effort under the circumstances to remedy the  
27 breach. Thus, each Defendant is liable for the losses caused by the breach  
28

1 of its co-fiduciary under 29 U.S.C. § 1105(a).

2 **THIRD CLAIM**  
3 **BREACH OF ERISA’S ANTI-INUREMENT PROVISION**  
4 **(29 U.S.C. 1103(c)(1))**

5 42. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each  
6 and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this  
7 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

8 43. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1103(c)(1), “the assets of a plan shall  
9 never inure to the benefit of any employer and shall be held for the  
10 exclusive purpose of providing benefits to participants in the plan and  
11 their beneficiaries and defraying reasonable expenses of administering  
12 the plan.”

13 44. The balance in a participant’s accounts that a participant  
14 forfeits when incurring a break in service prior to full vesting of the  
15 Company’s contributions to the participant’s account is an asset of the  
16 Honeywell Plan.

17 45. By utilizing these Plan assets as a substitute for the  
18 Company’s own contributions to the Plan, thereby saving the Company  
19 millions of dollars in contribution expenses, Defendants caused the  
20 assets of the Plan to inure to the benefit of Honeywell, an employer, in  
21 violation of 29 U.S.C. § 1103(c)(1).

22 46. Each Defendant is personally liable under 29 U.S.C. § 1109(a)  
23 to make good to the Plan any losses to the Plan resulting from violation  
24 of ERISA’s anti-inurement provision as alleged in this claim and to  
25 restore to the Plan all profits secured through their use of Plan assets,  
26 and is subject to other equitable or remedial relief as appropriate.

27 ///

**FOURTH CLAIM**  
**PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS**  
**(29 U.S.C. 1106(a)(1))**

1  
2  
3  
4 47. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each  
5 and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this  
6 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

7 48. 29 U.S.C. § 1106(a)(1) provides that “[a] fiduciary with respect  
8 to a plan shall not cause the plan to engage in a transaction, if he knows  
9 or should know that such transaction constitutes a direct or indirect . . .  
10 exchange . . . of any property between the plan and a party in interest . .  
11 . or use by or for the benefit of a party in interest, of any assets of the  
12 plan.”

13 49. Honeywell and the Vice President are parties in interest, as  
14 that term is defined under 29 U.S.C. §1002 (14), because they are Plan  
15 fiduciaries and because Honeywell is the employer of Plan participants.

16 50. By using forfeited funds in the Plan as a substitute for  
17 employer contributions to the Plan, and thereby saving the Company  
18 millions of dollars in contribution expenses, Defendants caused the Plan  
19 to engage in transactions that constituted a direct or indirect exchange  
20 of existing Plan assets for future employer contributions and/or a use of  
21 Plan assets by or for the benefit of a party in interest.

22 51. As a result of these prohibited transactions, Defendants  
23 caused the Plan to suffer losses in the amount of the Plan assets that  
24 were substituted for future employer contributions and the lost  
25 investment returns on those assets.

26 52. Each Defendant is personally liable under 29 U.S.C. § 1109(a)  
27 to make good to the Plan any losses to the Plan resulting from the  
28

1 prohibited transactions alleged in this claim, to reverse and/or correct the  
2 prohibited transactions, to restore to the Plan all assets and profits  
3 obtained through the use of Plan assets and is subject to other equitable  
4 or remedial relief as appropriate.

5 **FIFTH CLAIM**  
6 **PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS**  
7 **(29 U.S.C. 1106(b)(1))**

8 53. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein by reference each  
9 and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this  
10 Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

11 54. 29 U.S.C. § 1106(b) provides that “[a] fiduciary with respect  
12 to a plan shall not,” among other things, “deal with the assets of the plan  
13 in his own interest or for his own account.”

14 55. Defendants violated this prohibition in their management  
15 and control of forfeiture funds in the Plan. By utilizing these Plan assets  
16 as a substitute for employer contributions to the Plan, thereby saving the  
17 Company millions of dollars in contribution expenses, Defendants dealt  
18 with the assets of the Plan in their own interest and for their own  
19 account.

20 56. As a result of this prohibited conduct, Defendants caused the  
21 Plan to suffer losses in the amount of the Plan assets that were  
22 substituted for future employer contributions and the lost investment  
23 returns on those assets.

24 57. Each Defendant is personally liable under 29 U.S.C. § 1109(a)  
25 to make good to the Plan any losses to the Plan resulting from the  
26 prohibited conduct alleged in this claim, to restore to the Plan all assets  
27 and profits obtained through the use of Plan assets and is subject to other  
28

1 equitable or remedial relief as appropriate.

2 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

3 For these reasons, Plaintiff, on behalf of the Plan and all similarly  
4 situated Plan participants and beneficiaries, respectfully requests that  
5 the Court:

- 6 • find and declare that Defendants have breached their  
7 fiduciary duties and engaged in prohibited conduct and  
8 transactions as described above;
- 9 • find and adjudge that Defendants are personally liable to  
10 make good to the Plan all losses to the Plan resulting from  
11 each violation of ERISA described above, and to otherwise  
12 restore the Plan to the position it would have occupied but  
13 for these violations;
- 14 • order the disgorgement of all assets and profits secured by  
15 Defendants as a result of each violation of ERISA described  
16 above;
- 17 • determine the method by which Plan losses under 29  
18 U.S.C. § 1109 should be calculated;
- 19 • order Defendants to provide all accounting necessary to  
20 determine the amounts Defendants must make good to the  
21 Plan under 29 U.S.C. § 1109(a);
- 22 • remove the fiduciaries who have breached their fiduciary  
23 duties and enjoin them from future ERISA violations;
- 24 • surcharge against Defendants and in favor of the Plan all  
25 amounts involved in any transactions which such  
26 accounting reveals were improper, excessive and/or in  
27 violation of ERISA;

28

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

- certify the class, appoint Plaintiff as a class representative, and appoint Hayes Pawlenko LLP as class counsel;
- award to Plaintiff and the class their attorneys’ fees and costs under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g)(1) and the common fund doctrine;
- order the payment of interest to the extent it is allowed by law; and
- grant other equitable or remedial relief as the Court deems appropriate.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby demands trial of these claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

DATED: February 13, 2024

**HAYES PAWLENKO LLP**

By: /s/Kye D. Pawlenko  
Matthew B. Hayes  
Kye D. Pawlenko  
Attorneys for Plaintiff