



FILED

Superior Court of California
County of San Francisco

JUN 12 2026

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: *Adam Kane*
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

JONATHAN TAI DONG, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

FREENOME HOLDINGS, INC.;
PROCLINICAL STAFFING, INC.; and DOES
1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-24-613979

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL AND
APPROVING ATTORNEY'S FEES, COSTS,
AND A SERVICE AWARD

Before the court is an unopposed motion by plaintiff Jonathan Tai Dong for final approval of the \$100,000 settlement of wage-and-hour claims, including a claim under PAGA, reached with defendants Freenome Holdings, Inc. ("Freenome") and Proclinical Staffing, Inc. ("Proclinical") along with a request for approval of attorney's fees, costs, and a service award. The motion was heard on June 12, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. in Department 613, the Honorable Jeffrey S. Ross presiding. Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan (Moon Law Group, PC) appeared for plaintiff. Nate Jenkins (Littler Mendelson PC) appeared for defendant Proclinical Staffing, Inc. Andrea Fellion (Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP) appeared for defendant Freenome Holdings, Inc. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for final approval is **GRANTED** with approved attorney's fees of **\$27,000**, costs of **\$21,000**, and a service award of **\$1,000**. A compliance hearing is **RESERVED** for **January 15, 2027, at 9:00 a.m.** with an interim compliance

1 statement containing an accounting of all settlement funds due by **September 15, 2026**, and an updated
2 compliance statement due by **January 8, 2027**. The court otherwise **ORDERS** as follows:

3 1. Except as otherwise specified here, the court adopts and incorporates by reference the
4 terms and definitions of the settlement agreement.

5 2. The following Settlement Class is certified for settlement purposes (ASA, § 1.5): *All*
6 *current and former non-exempt employees who are/were employed by Proclinical, and placed to work at*
7 *Freenome, a third-party client of Proclinical, in the State of California from April 16, 2020, through May*
8 *31, 2025.*

9 3. The court finds that the Settlement Class meets the requirements for certification under
10 Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because: (1) the proposed Settlement Class is numerous and
11 ascertainable; (2) common questions of law and fact predominate; (3) Dong's claims are typical of the
12 claims of the members of the proposed Settlement Class; and (4) a class action is superior to other
13 methods to efficiently adjudicate this controversy.

14 4. The notice and plan of distribution approved by this court met the requirements of due
15 process and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. As set forth in the declaration
16 of Cassandra Polites, ILYM Group, Inc. distributed notice in compliance with this court's preliminary
17 approval order and the settlement agreement. The court finds the administration process to date was
18 adequate and comported with due process, reaching nearly all class members. (Polites Decl., ¶ 10).

19 5. No class members requested to exclude themselves from the settlement. (Polites Decl.,
20 ¶ 11.)

21 6. No class members objected to the settlement. (Polites Decl., ¶ 12.)

22 7. The court has considered the *Dunk/Kullar* factors and finally approves the settlement as a
23 fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement.

24 8. The court hereby approves payment of administration expenses to ILYM Group, Inc. in the
25 amount of **\$5,950**. ILYM Group, Inc. shall continue to serve as settlement administrator and shall, *inter*
26 *alia*, disburse payments to class members, aggrieved employees, and the LWDA in accordance with the
27 terms of the settlement agreement and this final approval order.

1 9. Plaintiff seeks a service award of \$5,000 and \$33,330 for attorneys' fees, which represents
2 33.33 percent of the \$100,000 fund. Were the court to grant the motion as framed, an award of these
3 amounts together with the litigation costs of \$21,000 and administrative costs, only 35 percent of the
4 settlement fund would be allocated to the class members, aggrieved employees, and the LWDA. The court
5 finds this outcome disproportionate and contrary to the purposes of PAGA and the interests of the class
6 members. This circumstance results from the parties' original settlement, which the court was unable to
7 approve for the reasons stated in its tentative decision and reflected in the order filed April 30, 2025. The
8 court was concerned by the inclusion of released parties that did not employ plaintiff and the attendant
9 scope of the release which encompassed potential claims not investigated by plaintiff and his counsel.
10 Therefore, the court reduces the amount of the service award and the attorneys' fees to create a more
11 proportionate allocation between the litigation expenses and the recovery.

12 10. For settlement purposes only, Jonathan Tai Dong is appointed as class representative. The
13 court approves an award of **\$1,000** for his service to the class. (See generally *Cellphone Termination Fee*
14 *Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1394–95.)

15 11. For settlement purposes only, Moon Law Group, PC is appointed as Class Counsel.

16 12. The court authorizes reimbursement of class counsel's expenses in the requested amount
17 of **\$21,000**.

18 13. The court approves an award of reasonable attorneys' fees in the amount of **\$27,000**, which
19 is 27 percent of the settlement fund.


20 14. The Court reserves a compliance hearing for **January 15, 2027, at 9:00 a.m.** No later
21 than **January 8, 2027**, the parties shall submit a compliance statement setting forth an
22 updated accounting of funds, including the number and value of any uncashed settlement checks, and any
23 other matters the parties need to bring to the court's attention. The compliance statement must be
24 accompanied by a declaration from a representative of ILYM Group, Inc. The parties must also submit an
25 interim compliance statement setting forth all disbursements made by **September 15, 2026**.

26 15. Class Counsel shall serve the LWDA with a copy of this order within **5 court days**.

27 16. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, and Rule 3.769(h) of the California
28

1 Rules of Court—and without impacting the finality of this order—the court retains jurisdiction over
2 plaintiff, all members of the Settlement Class, and defendants for the purpose of supervising the
3 implementation, enforcement, construction, administration, and interpretation of the settlement agreement
4 and this order.

5
6 Dated: June 12, 2026



7 JEFFREY S. ROSS
8 Judge of the Superior Court
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE
(CCP 1010.6 & CRC 2.251)

I, Sean Kane, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.

On June 12, 2026, I electronically served the attached document via File & ServeXpress on the recipients designated on the Transaction Receipt located on the File & ServeXpress website.

Dated: June 12, 2026

Brandon E. Riley, Court Executive Officer

By: 
Sean Kane, Deputy Clerk