

Trust but Verify: How Workers' Rights Legal Group Fact-Checks Every Case It Takes

A five-attorney firm vets every client story against the evidence — in minutes



Joshua Milon
Managing Partner

CUSTOMER

Workers' Rights Legal Group
(WRLG)

WEBSITE

wrlglaw.com

CUSTOMER SIZE

Five attorneys, five to six support staff

COUNTRY OR REGION

United States

INDUSTRY

Professional services: Legal services (plaintiffs' employment litigation)

CUSTOMER PROFILE

Workers' Rights Legal Group is a California plaintiffs' firm handling plaintiff-side employment litigation for low-wage and Spanish-speaking workers. Founded by Joshua Milon in 2008, the firm secures settlements consistently reaching \$200,000 to \$1 million and more.

SOFTWARE AND SERVICES

Knool AI litigation platform

FOR MORE INFORMATION

knool.ai/case-studies

"One thing Knool does really well is immediately point out a red flag in a case. I can hone in on that issue, look at the evidence that supports it, and verify it."

Joshua Milon, Managing Partner, Workers' Rights Legal Group

Joshua Milon built Workers' Rights Legal Group (WRLG) representing California's low-wage and Spanish-speaking workers. Then he found a faster way to learn which client stories the evidence would actually support. Since moving case evaluation and litigation onto Knool, a new-case review that took one to three hours takes about five minutes, costly discovery surprises have dropped from two in three cases to fewer than one in three, and settlements consistently reach \$200,000 to \$1 million and up.

Business Needs

Milon left insurance defense to hang his own shingle in 2008. His father referred the case that decided everything: a friend fired after reporting illegal conduct. He took it, won, and kept taking employment cases until that was the whole practice, formalizing with his partner as an LLP in 2013.

The firm now runs on five attorneys and five to six support staff, serving almost entirely Spanish-speaking clients earning far under six figures. "A lot of them are minimum-wage clients, factory workers, people doing tough jobs," he says. "We really pride ourselves on sticking up for the little guy."

Milon's constraint was never hours. It was memory. "I was the guy who knew every piece of evidence across all 10,000 pages and all the deposition transcripts," he says. "Your brain only has a limited capacity." That ceiling set the firm's caseload, and the workaround was headcount: multiple attorneys remembering the same evidence.

The other risk sat at intake. "Early in my career, you tend to believe the client before verifying," he says. "A client would swear the evidence was there. And then we'd get into discovery and, uh-oh, we're in trouble now." Roughly two out of three cases carried an unpleasant surprise.

In one matter, a prospective client sent roughly 10,000 emails to back her story. Milon loaded about 370 into Knool and asked whether she had ever complained to an outside agency. "[Knool] runs through it and says, yes, here she did, on this date. I click the link, and it takes you right to the document."

Solution

A prospective client’s first call used to run one to three hours. Now Milon collects the documents first. “I take all that information, put it into Knool, and sometimes I just ask something as simple as: do I have a good case here? What are the bad facts? What are the good facts?” The evaluation takes five minutes, and it maps the gaps — “because that’s what can kill the case.”

The same discipline works in every direction. In a whistleblower matter, the documents left no room for argument: “There’s no denying she sent that email on that date, and within 60 days she was basically terminated.” And it checks his own clients too — Knool caught a date discrepancy between what a client remembered and what her documents showed, before it could end up in a complaint. When the documents kill a case instead, he doesn’t take it.

Benefits

The clearest proof is an arbitration Milon rated 95 percent likely to end in a loss. The other side would not offer a dollar, so he tried it. Running the record through Knool, he honed in on which arguments moved the arbitrator —

and Knool caught an admission in his own case file that he had missed. “This HR person admitted this great fact for you, we need to use it here. It was a lot of little things like that. Things I’d missed.”

A Case That Shouldn’t Have Been Won

He won, and the closing brief took half the labor: 40 hours instead of 80. “The quality was much higher,” he says. “It went from a big zero to a big payday for everybody.”

One Point of Entry for Every Case

The unsolved problem is adoption, not technology: getting all five attorneys and six support staff to use Knool the same way. Milon’s goal is a single point of entry for a case — “a kind of one-stop shop for everything in a case: research this, look at that, look at the evidence, all of it.”

Leveling the Field Against Mega-Firms

Against opponents with more lawyers and more money, the speed is the whole argument. When a mediator relayed what a multi-trillion-dollar corporation was claiming, “I can just run it through Knool and say, that’s not how it played out. It levels the playing field immensely against these huge mega-corporations and mega-law-firms.” Knool, he says, “really gets to the heart of the client’s case quicker.”

Results at a Glance

METRIC	BEFORE KNOOL	WITH KNOOL
New case evaluation	1 to 3 hours	About 5 minutes
Cases with a costly discovery surprise	About 2 in 3	Fewer than 1 in 3
Closing brief (arbitration case)	About 80 hours	About 40 hours
Settlement amount	\$50,000 to \$150,000	\$200,000 to \$1 million+