RECEIVED
BY SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF KINGS COUNTY
10/06/2026
NOCONA SOBOLESKI, CLERK OF THE COURT
KAYA GODINEZ, DEPUTY

Electronically Submitted on 10/06/2026 06:57 PM

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.
Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218)
jm@melmedlaw.com
Laura Supanich (SBN 314805)
lms@melmedlaw.com
Trishta Dordi (SBN 351883)
td@melmedlaw.com
1801 Century Park East, Suite 850
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: (310) 824-3828
Fax: (310) 862-6851

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, the Putative Class, and the Aggrieved Employees

FILED
BY SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF KINGS
10/30/2026
NOCONA SOBOLESKI, CLERK OF THE COURT
JULIENNE DE SANTOS, DEPUTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF KINGS

JUAN A CHAVEZ MARTINEZ, TIMEKA R. THORP, and CHRISTOPHER ALLEN COFFEY, individuals, on behalf of themselves, the State of California, as private attorneys general, and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WOLD AMUSEMENTS INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 TO 50,

Defendants.

Case Number: 23CU0364

[Proposed] Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Final Judgment

Date:	October 30, 2026
Time:	8:15 a.m.
Dept.:	2
Judge:	Hon. Robert S. Burns
Complaint Filed:	September 25, 2023
FAC Filed:	December 4, 2023
SAC Filed:	November 21, 2025

On October 30, 2026, the Court held a hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement.

In conformity with California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769, with due and adequate notice having been given to Class Members, and the Court having considered the Settlement Agreement and Release of Class Action (the "Settlement Agreement"), all of the legal authorities and documents submitted in support thereof, all papers filed and proceedings has herein, all oral and written comments received regarding the proposed settlement, and having reviewed the record in this litigation, and good cause appearing, the Court GRANTS final approval of the Settlement and **ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS AND ENTERS FINAL JUDGMENT AS FOLLOWS:**

1. All terms used in this Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement (the "Order") shall have the same meanings given as those terms are used and/or defined in the parties' Settlement Agreement.

2. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Parties to this litigation and subject matter jurisdiction to approve this Settlement and all exhibits thereto.

3. For settlement purposes only, the Court finally certifies the Class, as defined in the Agreement and as follows:

> all individuals who are or were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees in California from September 25, 2019, through January 14, 2026

4. The Court deems this definition sufficient for the purpose of California Rule of Court 3.765(a), and solely for the purpose of effectuating the Settlement.

5. The Court finds that an ascertainable class of 262 class members exists and a well-defined community of interest exists on the questions of law and fact involved because in the context of the Settlement: (i) all related matters, predominate over any individual questions; (ii) the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of claims of the Class Members; and (iii) in negotiating, entering into and

implementing the Settlement, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interest of the Class Members.

6. The Court is satisfied that Apex Class Action, LLC, which functioned as the Settlement Administrator, completed the distribution of Class Notice and Share Form to the Class in a manner that comports with California Rule of Court 3.766. The Class Notice informed 262 Class Members of the Settlement terms, their rights to do nothing and receive their settlement share, their rights to submit a request for exclusion, their rights to comment on or object to the Settlement, and their rights to appear at the Final Approval Hearing and be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time to respond and to act were provided by each of these procedures. No Class Members filed written objections to the Settlement as part of this notice process, no Class Member filed a written statement of intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and no Class Member submitted a request for exclusion.

7. The Court hereby approves the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement and finds that the Settlement Agreement is, in all respects, fair, adequate, and reasonable, consistent and compliant with all applicable requirements of the California Code of Civil Procedure, the California and United States Constitutions, including the Due Process clauses, the California Rules of Court, and any other applicable law, and in the best interests of each of the Parties and Class Members.

8. The Court directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms and declares the Settlement Agreement to be binding on all Class Members.

9. The Court finds that the Settlement Agreement has been reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations. The Court further finds that the Parties have conducted extensive investigation and research, and their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions.

10. The Court also finds that the Settlement now will avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks of the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. Additionally, after considering the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement in light of the

challenges posed by continued litigation, and Court concludes that Class Counsel secured significant relief for Class Members.

11. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this Order a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant. Neither this Order, the Settlement Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement Agreement, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission of any fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant.

12. The Class Notice mailed to Class Members informed the Class Members of the Settlement terms, their right to opt out from the Settlement, object to the Settlement, or do nothing, and the implications of each such action. The Class Notice also advised Class Members of applicable deadlines and other events, including the Final Approval Hearing, and how Class Members can obtain additional information. A dedicated toll-free phone number and email address were maintained, which provided Class Members the ability to obtain additional information regarding the Settlement.

13. The Court concludes that adequate notice was provided to the Class. The Administrator's Declaration explains the diligent efforts made to deliver notice directly to the Class by mail, including the Administrator conducting preliminary address verification and updating by reference to the National Change of Address database maintained by the United States Postal Service. In addition, for any notices that were returned to the Administrator as undeliverable, the Administrator attempted further means of notice that were reasonably calculated to reach those Class Members. To provide additional notice to the individuals for whom updated mailing addresses were unavailable, a short-form notice was also published in the Hanford Sentinel in both English and Spanish beginning June 24, 2026, for six (6) consecutive weeks. The Administrator also utilized an interactive banner advertising campaign through the Google Display Network, through which visual advertisements were displayed across websites, applications, and video platforms in an effort to reach potential Class Members. The Administrator made supplemental efforts by conducting computerized skip tracing to find updated mailing addresses. The Court finds these measures demonstrate the Administrator provided the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances. Accordingly, the Court accepts

the Administrator's Declaration and finds sufficient notice has been provided to satisfy due process, and all 262 individuals who did not object, opt out, or request to be excluded, are properly included within the Class.

14. The Court appoints Plaintiffs Juan A. Chavez Martinez, Timeka R. Thorp, and Christopher Allen Coffey as Class Representatives and finds them to be adequate.

15. The Court appoints Jonathan Melmed, Esq., and Laura M. Supanich, Esq. of Melmed Law Group P.C. as Class Counsel, and finds them to be adequate, experienced, and well-versed in class action litigation.

16. The terms of the Agreement, including the Gross Settlement Amount of $111,891.56 is fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class and to each Class Member, and the Court grants final approval of the Settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, subject to this Order. The Court approves the following allocations, which fall within the ranges stipulated by and through the Settlement Agreement:

1. The $11,963.54 designated for payment to Apex Class Action, LLC, the Settlement Administrator, is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Parties to make the payment to the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the Agreement.

2. The $33,333.33 amount requested by Plaintiffs and Class Counsel for the Class Counsel's attorneys' fees is fair and reasonable in light of the benefit obtained for the Class. The Court grants final approval of, awards, and orders the Class Counsel Fees Payment to be made in accordance with the Agreement.

3. The Court awards $7,730.31 in litigation costs, an amount which the Court finds to be reflective of the reasonable costs incurred. The Court grants final approval of, and order the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment in this amount to be made in accordance with the Agreement.

4. The $15,000.00 ($5,000.00 for each Plaintiff) requested by Plaintiffs for the Incentive Awards is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of and orders the Incentive Awards to be paid in accordance with the Agreement.

5. The Court approves of the $10,000.00 allocation assigned for claims under the Private Attorney General Act (PAGA), and orders 75% thereof (i.e., $7,500.00) to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

17. The Court orders the Parties to comply with and carry out all terms and provisions of the Settlement, to the extent that the terms thereunder do not contradict with this Order, in which case the provisions of this Order shall take precedence and supersede the Settlement.

18. Nothing in the Settlement or this Order purports to extinguish or waive Defendant's rights to continue to oppose the merits of the claims in this Action or class treatment of these claims in this case if the Settlement fails to become Final or effective, or in any other case without limitation.

19. All Class Members shall be bound by the Settlement and this Order, including the release of claims as set forth in the Agreement.

20. The Parties shall bear their own respective attorneys' fees and costs except as otherwise provided in the Settlement Agreement.

21. All checks mailed to the Class Members must be cashed within one hundred eighty (180) days after mailing.

22. Within 7 days after the Court has held a Final and Fairness Approval Hearing and entered a final order certifying the Class for settlement purposes only and approving the Class Settlement, the Settlement Administrator will give notice of judgment to Settlement Class Members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b) by posting a copy of said order and final judgment on its website.

23. The Court retains continuing jurisdiction over the Action and the Settlement, including jurisdiction pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h), solely for purposes of (a) enforcing the

Settlement Agreement, (b) addressing settlement administration matters, and (c) addressing such post-Judgment matters as may be appropriate under court rules or applicable law.

24. Plaintiff shall file with the Court a report regarding the status of distribution within two hundred and ten (210) days after all funds have been distributed.

25. This Final Judgment is intended to be a final disposition of the above captioned action in its entirety and is intended to be immediately appealable. This Judgment resolves and extinguishes all claims released by the Settlement Agreement, against Defendant.

26. The Court hereby sets a hearing date of October 13, 2027, at 0815 am/pm for a hearing on the final accounting and distribution of the settlement funds.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

Dated: October 30th, 2026

Judge of the Superior Court, County of Kings

Judge Robert S. Burns