

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

Electronically
FILED
By Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
ON 08/31/2026
By /s/ Singh, Padmani
Deputy Clerk

Electronically
RECEIVED
8/12/2026

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
SAN MATEO COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

ANGEL PADILLA, on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

DISCOVERY PRACTICE MANAGEMENT,
INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1-
50, inclusive.

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 23-CIV-00637

Assigned to the Hon. Nancy L. Fineman

NF

~~[PROPOSED]~~ PAGA SETTLEMENT
APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

- 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

Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS, ADJUDGES, AND DECREES as follows:

1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Action and over all Parties to the Action.
2. This Approval Order incorporates the terms of the Settlement Agreement entered into by Plaintiff, acting on behalf of himself, the State of California, and Aggrieved Employees, and Defendant Discovery Practice Management, Inc. (“Defendant”), on behalf of themselves and the Released Parties. Unless otherwise specified, all capitalized terms in this Order shall have the meaning as defined in the Settlement Agreement.
3. The Court finds that Plaintiff notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) of the Settlement at the time the motion for approval was filed, as required under Labor Code § 2699(s)(2). The Court has received no objection or comment from the LWDA regarding the Settlement.
4. The Court finds that the Settlement is the product of serious, informed, and non-collusive, arm’s-length negotiations. After considering the nature of the claims, the risks of continued litigation, the procedural history of the Action, the terms of the Settlement, and the allocation of the settlement proceeds between the LWDA and the Aggrieved Employees, the Court finds that the Settlement resolves a bona fide dispute and is fair, adequate, and reasonable under the PAGA. The Court therefore approves the Settlement and directs the Parties to carry out its terms.
5. Defendant shall not be required to pay any additional amounts to settle the Action

beyond the Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,102,500, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

6. The Court approves a PAGA Counsel Fees Payment of \$367,500, allocated as follows: \$183,750 to Bokhour Law Group, P.C., and \$183,750 to Falakassa Law, P.C., to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount as full compensation for all attorneys' fees incurred or to be incurred in connection with the Settlement.

7. The Court approves a PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of \$18,239.16 to Bokhour Law Group, P.C., to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount as full reimbursement of actual, out-of-pocket litigation costs reasonably incurred in the prosecution and resolution of the Action.

8. The Court approves a Service Award in the amount of \$7,500 to Plaintiff Angel Padilla for his time, effort, and service in representing the interests of the State of California and Aggrieved Employees. This amount shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

9. The Court appoints Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions as the Settlement Administrator and approves an Administration Expenses Payment of \$12,500.00, to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, as reasonable and necessary to administer the Settlement.

10. The remaining PAGA Penalties, totaling \$696,760.84, shall be allocated as follows: 75% (\$522,570.63) to the LWDA; and 25% (\$174,190.21) to the Aggrieved Employees, to be distributed pro rata based on the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

11. The Court approves Legal Aid at Work as the cy pres recipient for any funds attributable to uncashed settlement checks. Legal Aid at Work shall use those funds solely for programs and services that benefit San Mateo County and its residents, consistent with Code of Civil Procedure section 384. This paragraph amends and supersedes any inconsistent provision of the Settlement Agreement concerning the disposition of unclaimed funds or funds attributable to uncashed settlement checks.

12. Upon Defendant's full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, the releases set forth in the Settlement Agreement shall become effective and binding on the Parties. The Court confirms the following:

1 The LWDA, State of California, and all Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release, on
2 behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents,
3 attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims
4 for PAGA Penalties that were alleged or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the
5 facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice.

6 13. Neither this Order, the Judgment, nor the Settlement Agreement shall be construed
7 as an admission or concession of liability or wrongdoing by Defendant or the Released Parties. The
8 Settlement is entered into solely for the purpose of compromise and resolution. This Order and
9 Judgment shall not be used or admissible in any other proceeding, except as necessary to enforce its
10 terms or to support defenses such as res judicata or release.

11 14. The Court reserves continuing jurisdiction over the implementation, enforcement,
12 interpretation, and administration of the Settlement Agreement, this Order, and the Judgment
13 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6.

14 15. Within ten (10) days of entry of this Order and Judgment, Plaintiff shall submit a
15 copy to the LWDA, as required by Labor Code § 2699(s)(3). Within seven (7) days thereafter,
16 PAGA Counsel shall file a declaration confirming compliance with that requirement.

17 16. The Court hereby enters final judgment in this Action pursuant to the terms of the
18 Settlement Agreement and this Order.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED.** Electronically

20 **SIGNED**

21 DATED: _____

By /s/ Fineman, Nancy

08/21/2026

HON. NANCY L. FINEMAN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

23 APPROVED AS TO FORM:

24 /s/ Zachary M. Schwartz

26 The minutes of the August 11, 2026 hearing are incorporated by reference as if set
27 forth fully herein.

28 NF