ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
11/12/2026 12:56:57 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By T. Automation ,Deputy Clerk

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Conor J.D. Gómez (State Bar No. 337395)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 facsimile
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com /
conor@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jaime Padilla

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

JAIME PADILLA, on behalf of others similarly situated and the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act, Plaintiffs, vs. CLINICAS DE SALUD DEL PUEBLO, INC., DBA INNERCARE and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. 25CU009979C *Hon. Wendy M. Behan* *Dept. 66* **CLASS ACTION** **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER AND JUDGMENT GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS AND ENTERING JUDGMENT** Action Filed: February 24, 2025

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT:

1. On November 6, 2026, at 10:15 a.m. in this Department, the Court entered the Order and Judgment Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering Judgment attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
2. A conformed copy of this Notice will be submitted to the LWDA via its online electronic portal in accordance with Labor Code § 2699(s)(3).
3. Notice of the Court's final ruling and entry of judgment is hereby provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 11, 2026

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

Conor J.D. Gómez
Nicholas J. Ferraro
Lauren N. Vega
Attorneys for Plaintiff Jaime Padilla

EXHIBIT 1

#50

FILED
San Diego Superior Court
NOV 06 2026
Clerk of the Superior Court
By: B. Orihuela, Deputy

~~RECEIVED~~
~~10/15/2026 5:17:32 PM~~

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

JAIME PADILLA, on behalf of others similarly situated and the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CLINICAS DE SALUD DEL PUEBLO, INC., DBA INNERCARE and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25CU009979C

Hon. Wendy M. Behan
Dept. 66

CLASS ACTION

[~~PROPOSED~~] ORDER AND JUDGMENT GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS AND ENTERING JUDGMENT

Motion for Final Approval/Attorneys' Fees:
Date: November 6, 2026
Time: 10:15 a.m.

[Filed concurrently with Plaintiff's Notice of *Unopposed* Motion and Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaratio of Conor J.D. Gómez, Declaration of Settlement Administrator, and Declaration of Plaintiff Jaime Padilla]

Action Filed: February 24, 2025

This matter came on for hearing on November 6, 2026, at 10:15 a.m. in Department 66 of the above-captioned Court, the Honorable Wendy M. Behan presiding, on (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and (2) Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

Having received and considered the motions and supporting papers, including the Class Action and PAGA Representative Action Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement"), the evidence and documents received by the Court in connection with the Motions for Final Approval and Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and the previously decided Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Court GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL of the Settlement and ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

1. The Court, for purposes of this Order, adopts and uses all defined terms as set forth and defined in the Settlement filed in this case (the "Action").

2. The Court confirms certification, for settlement purposes only, of the Class as defined in the Settlement and approved at the preliminary approval stage.

3. Class Members are "all persons who were employed by Defendant in the State of California, as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period [June 27, 2023, through June 12, 2026]".

4. The Class Period means June 27, 2023, through June 12, 2026.

5. Aggrieved Members are "all persons who were employed by Defendant in the State of California, as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period [February 4, 2024, through June 12, 2026]".

6. The PAGA Period means February 4, 2024, through June 12, 2026.

7. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the Order Granting Preliminary Approval, and the Settlement, the Class Notice was sent to each Class Member by first-class U.S. mail. The Class Notice informed the Class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive an Individual Class Payment and Individual PAGA Payment without any required action, their right to comment upon or object to the Settlement, and their right to appear in person or by counsel at the Final Approval Hearing and to be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided for each of these procedures.

8. Zero Class Members returned a written objection to the proposed Settlement as part of the notice process or stated an intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing and there we no dissenting appearances from any Class Members at the hearing. Four Class Members requested exclusion from the Settlement: Douglas Wisdom, Claudia Gonzalez-Fuentes, Brittny Cendejas, and Rachel Zepeda. These "opt outs" are affirmatively excluded from the class settlement.

9. The Court finds and determines the Class Notice procedure afforded adequate protection to the Class and provides the basis for the Court's informed decision regarding approval of the Settlement based on the response. The Court finds and determines the Class Notice provided was the best notice practicable, satisfying the requirements of law and due process.

10. For purposes of approving this Settlement only, this Court finds and concludes: (a) the proposed Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all Class Members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest among members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the claims; (c) the claims of the Class Representative are typical of the claims of the Class; (d) the Class Representative has and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy in the context of settlement; and (f) the law firm of Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc. is qualified and adequate to serve as "Class Counsel" in this action.

11. The Court finds and determines the terms set forth in the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and, having found the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arms'-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral and experienced mediator, directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its terms. The Court further finds the Parties conducted extensive investigation, research, and informal discovery, and that their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that Settlement will enable the Parties to avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks if the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery and recognizes the significant value provided to the Class. Therefore, the Court approves the Settlement

and incorporates the terms of the Settlement in full into this Final Approval Order as though fully set forth herein.

12. The Court hereby Orders Defendant to pay the Gross Settlement Amount of $500,516.80, plus the applicable taxes, to the Administrator in accordance with the Settlement.

13. The Court finds and determines the Administration Expenses of $~~11,500~~ 10,000 WB incurred by the Administrator in administering the Settlement are fair and reasonable. The Court orders these Administration Expenses be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

14. The Court finds and determines the Service Payment of $1,500 to Plaintiff Padilla is fair and reasonable. The Court orders the Service Payment be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

15. The Court finds and determines payment to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency of $13,000, as its 65% share of the civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court orders that amount be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement and approves the settlement of claims under the Private Attorneys General Act pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(s)(2).

16. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the statutory provisions authorizing attorneys' fees under the California Labor Code and Code of Civil Procedure, as set forth in the Motion for Attorneys' Fees, the Court awards Plaintiff's Counsel payment of the Attorneys' Fees of $166,837.27 and Litigation Costs of $24,792.97. Class Counsel has sufficiently explained the basis for the fee award based on a percentage of the fund. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The Court orders the Settlement Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the Settlement.

17. The Administrator is hereby directed to distribute the Gross Settlement Amount as contemplated under the Settlement, including any unclaimed funds which shall be sent to the State of California's Unclaimed Property Division, without the need to submit a separate amended Order.

18. Without affecting the finality of this Order or the entry of judgment in any way and pursuant to C.C.P. Section 664.6, the Court retains jurisdiction of the Parties, their counsel, the Administrator, and all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation, and

enforcement of this Order and the Settlement.

19. Nothing in this Order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations under the Settlement or under this Order, including the requirement that Defendant make payments to Class Members in accordance with the Settlement.

20. The Court hereby ENTERS FINAL JUDGMENT in accordance with the terms of the Settlement, in accordance with this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

21. The Parties shall comply with Cal. Rules of Court Rule 3.771(b), by filing a Notice of Entry of Judgment with the Court.

22. _____.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 11/6/26

The Honorable Wendy M. Behan
Judge of the Superior Court