



Issue Date: 12 May 2017

CASE NO. 2017-SOX-00005

In the Matter of

DANIEL ORMSON,
Complainant,

v.

SPRINT CORPORATION,
Respondent.

ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT

This claim arises under the whistleblower protection provisions of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1514A, and its implementing regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 1980 (2013). On April 12, 2017, the parties filed a proposed settlement agreement to resolve the case. I notified the parties that certain language was overbroad and that I would need the parties to modify their proposed settlement agreement if I was to approve it. On May 10, 2017, the parties submitted one page that narrowed the relevant language. I have physically removed the page initially submitted and substituted the revised page.

As modified, I find the proposed settlement proper, and I approve it with a caveat concerning the settlement of matters beyond the scope of the Act.¹ Some language in the agreement purports to settle, release, or otherwise address claims or potential claims that go beyond the scope of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. I limit my review to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act claim only; anything beyond that exceeds this Office's jurisdiction.

Order

The proposed settlement agreement is fair and reasonable as to the claim under the Sarbanes-

¹ With a Sarbanes-Oxley case in an adjudicatory phase (as is the present case), a settlement requires the approval of the administrative law judge. See 29 C.F.R. § 1980.111(d)(2). Once approved, the settlement will "constitute the final order of the Secretary and may be enforced pursuant to [29 C.F.R.] § 1980.113." 29 C.F.R. § 1980.111(e).

Oxley Act. None of the terms are against public interest. The proposed settlement is APPROVED, and the parties are ORDERED to comply with its terms.

SO ORDERED.

STEVEN B. BERLIN
Administrative Law Judge