

By: Vickie Fogerson
Deputy Clerk
02/23/2026

ARCH LEGAL, P.C.
Graham S.P. Hollis (SBN 120577)
ghollis@archlegal.com
Dawn M. Berry (SBN 292335)
dberry@archlegal.com
Samara A. Bahu (SBN 351440)
sbahu@archlegal.com
3555 Fifth Avenue Suite 200
San Diego, California 92103
Telephone: 619.692.0800

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jay Patel and the Class
(Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF KERN

Coordination Proceeding Special Title
(Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.550)

**AMF BOWLING WAGE AND HOUR
CASES**

INCLUDED ACTIONS:

JAY PATEL, on behalf of himself and all other
aggrieved employees of Defendants in the State
of California,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMF BOWLING CENTERS, INC., a Virginia
Corporation, and DOES 1 THROUGH 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

SHEILACY OWENS, individually, and on
behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to
the California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff,

v.

AMF BOWLING CENTERS, INC., a Virginia
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: JCCP 5278

Patel Case No.: BCV-20-10523
Kern County Superior Court

Owens Case No.: 23CV025902
Alameda County Superior Court

Van Horn Case No.: 24CECG00030
Fresno County Superior Court

[Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable Bernard
C. Barmann Jr., Division H]

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA
SETTLEMENT; JUDGMENT**

Date: February 23, 2026

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Division: H

Judge: Hon. Bernard C. Barmann Jr.

Complaint Filed: July 2, 2020

FAC Filed: September 16, 2020

SAC Filed: March 18, 2025

Trial Date: None Set

ARCH LEGAL, P.C.
3555 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 200
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92103

ARCHLEGAL, P.C.
3555 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 200
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92103

1 SARA VAN HORN, on behalf of herself and all
2 others similarly situated, and on behalf of the
3 general public,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

6 AMF BOWLING CENTERS, INC., a Virginia
7 Corporation, AMF BOWLING CENTERS, INC.
8 DBA BOWLMOR AMF CENTERS, and DOES
9 1 through 10, inclusive

10 Defendants.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **Additional Counsel:**

2 Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
3 Yasmin Hosseini (SBN 326399)
Selena Matavosian (SBN 348044)
4 **LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC**
450 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 900
5 Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

6 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sheilacy Owens and Pablo Gonzalez and the Class*

7 **OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM**

8 Roman Otkupman (SBN 249423)
roman@olfla.com
9 Nidah Farishta (SBN 312360)
nidah@olfla.com
10 5743 Corsa Avenue, Suite 123
Westlake Village, California 91362
11 Telephone: 818.293.1310

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Sara Van Horn and the Class*

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 This matter has come before the Honorable Bernard C. Barmann, Jr. in Division H of the above-
2 entitled Court, located at 1215 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, California 93301, on Plaintiffs Jay Patel,
3 Sheilacy Owens, Pablo Gonzalez, and Sara Van Horn’s (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) Motion for Final
4 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Motion for Final Approval”). ARCH Legal, P.C.
5 appeared on behalf of Plaintiff Jay Patel and the Class, Lawyers *for* Justice, PC appeared on behalf of
6 Plaintiffs Owens and Gonzalez and the Class, Otkupman Law Firm appeared on behalf of
7 Plaintiff Sara Van Horn and the Class, and O’Hagan Meyer appeared on behalf of
8 Defendant AMF Bowling Centers, Inc. (“AMF” or “Defendant”) (collectively, the “Parties”).

9 On August 18, 2023, the actions entitled *Jay Patel v. AMF Bowling Centers, Inc.*, Superior Court
10 of California for the County of Kern, Case No. BCV-20-101523 (“Patel Action”) and *Sheilacy Owens, et*
11 *al. v. AMF Bowling Centers, Inc.*, Superior Court of California for the County of Alameda, Case No.
12 23CV025902 (“Owens Action”), were coordinated. On July 17, 2024, the action entitled *Sara Van Horn*
13 *v. AMF Bowling Centers, Inc.*, Superior Court of California for the County of Fresno, Case No.
14 24CECG00030, was coordinated with the Owens Action and Patel Action. Collectively, the Patel Action,
15 Owens Action, and Van Horn Action are the included actions in the coordination proceeding entitled
16 *AMF Bowling Wage and Hour Cases*, Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 5278.

17 On August 25, 2025, the Court entered an Order Granting Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary
18 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Preliminary Approval Order”), thereby preliminarily
19 approving the settlement of the above-entitled actions in accordance with the Stipulation of Class and
20 PAGA Representative Action Settlement (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”), and
21 certifying the following provisional Class:

22 All current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant AMF who
23 worked for AMF in California at any time between April 27, 2019 and
24 August 25, 2025.

25 That Order further directed the Parties to provide notice to the Class, which informed absent class
26 members of: (a) the proposed Settlement, and the Settlement’s key terms; (b) the date, time and location
27 of the Final Approval Hearing; (c) the right of any Class Member to object to the proposed Class
28 Settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to exercise that right; (d) the right of any Class Member
to exclude themselves from the proposed Class Settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to

1 exercise that right; and (e) an explanation of the procedures for class members to participate in the
2 proposed settlement.

3 Having duly considered all papers, evidence, and oral arguments in this matter to date, including
4 Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby **ORDERS AS**
5 **FOLLOWS:**

6 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Actions and over all Parties to the
7 Actions, including all members of the Class.

8 2. Unless otherwise specified, all citations and references to the Private Attorneys General
9 Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) are to the version of that statute prior
10 to the recent amendment effective July 1, 2024; the amended statute does not apply to the Actions or the
11 Settlement pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(v)(1), as amended, because the notice to the
12 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) was filed prior to June 19, 2024.

13 3. The Court finds that the Class is properly certified as a class for settlement purposes only.

14 4. The Class Notice provided to the Class conforms with the requirements of California Code
15 of Civil Procedure section 382, California Civil Code section 1781, California Rules of Court 3.766 and
16 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the
17 best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing individual notice to all Class Members who
18 could be identified through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings
19 and of the matters set forth therein to the other Class Members. The Class Notice fully satisfied the
20 requirements of due process.

21 5. The Court finds the settlement was entered into in good faith, that the settlement is fair,
22 reasonable and adequate, and that the settlement satisfies the standards and applicable requirements for
23 final approval of this class action settlement under California law, including the provisions of California
24 Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769.

25 6. The Court also confirms the following appointments: Plaintiffs Jay Patel, Sheilacy Owens,
26 Pablo Gonzalez, and Sara Van Horn as the Class Representatives; ARCH Legal, P.C., Lawyers *for* Justice,
27 PC, and Otkupman Law Firm as Class Counsel; and Apex Class Action, LLC as the Settlement
28 Administrator.

1 7. Based on the Declaration of Stacey Shims Regarding Notice and Settlement
2 Administration, the Court finds that no Class Members have objected to the Class Settlement or requested
3 to be excluded from it.

4 8. In accordance with California law, the Court hereby GRANTS final approval of the
5 Settlement and finds it fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interest of the Class Members as a
6 whole. Specifically, the Court finds that the Settlement is the result of serious, informed, adversarial, and
7 arm’s-length negotiations between the parties and that the terms of the Settlement are, in all respects, fair,
8 adequate, and reasonable. In so finding, the Court has considered all the evidence presented, including
9 evidence regarding the strength of Plaintiffs’ case; the risks, expense, and complexity of claims presented;
10 the likely duration of further litigation; the amount offered in the Settlement; the extent of investigation
11 and discovery completed; and the experience and views of Class Counsel. The Court ORDERS and directs
12 that the Settlement be effectuated in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the following terms
13 and conditions.

14 9. The Court finds that a full opportunity has been afforded to the Class Members to
15 participate in the hearing on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval, and all Class Members and other
16 persons wishing to be heard, have been heard. The Class Members have had a full and fair opportunity to
17 exclude themselves from the Settlement. Therefore, the Court ORDERS that, pursuant to the Settlement
18 Agreement, and as of the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and all Class Members will release the AMF Releasees
19 of all claims, actions, demands, causes of action, suits, debts, obligations, demands, rights, liabilities, or
20 legal theories of relief, that are based on the facts and legal theories asserted in the operative complaint,
21 or which relate to the primary rights asserted in the operative complaint, including without limitation
22 claims of violations of California’s meal and rest period law, failure to pay minimum, regular, and/or
23 overtime wages, failure to pay reporting time pay, failure to indemnify for necessary business expenses,
24 failure to provide a place of employment that is safe and healthful, and violations of California Labor
25 Code sections 226, 201-204, 1174, including without limitation all related claims for restitution and other
26 equitable relief arising under the PAGA, California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq, the
27 California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 5-2001, including waiting time
28 penalties, PAGA penalties, interest on unpaid wages, unpaid wages, attorneys’ fees or litigation costs, and

1 any other related claims and/or penalties of any nature whatsoever.

2 10. It is ORDERED that Class Members shall be prohibited and permanently enjoined from
3 pursuing in any fashion the Released Claims against the AMF Releasees.

4 11. Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval is GRANTED.

5 12. Pursuant to Rule 3.769, subdivision (h), of the California Rules of Court, this Court retains
6 exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over this action and the parties for the purposes of: (a) supervising
7 the implementation, enforcement, construction, and interpretation of the Settlement Agreement, and the
8 Order of Final Approval and Judgment; and (b) supervising distribution of amounts paid under this
9 Settlement.

10 13. The Court sets a compliance hearing regarding the distribution of the Gross Settlement
11 Sum for November 24, 2026, at 8:30 a.m./~~p.m.~~ in Division H of the Kern County Superior
12 Court. At least 10 calendar days before the hearing, Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator shall
13 submit a summary accounting of the Net Settlement Amount identifying distributions made as ordered
14 herein, the number and value of any uncashed checks, the status of the redistributed funds, the status of
15 any unresolved issues, and any other matters appropriate to bring to the Court's attention. Counsel may
16 appear at the compliance hearing remotely.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED AND JUDGMENT IS HEREBY ENTERED.**

18
19 Date: **February 23, 2026**

20 
21 _____
22 Hon. Bernard C. Barmann Jr.
23 Judge of the Superior Court
24
25
26
27
28