

PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Albert Walker
 DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: The Chrysalis Center

CASE NUMBER:
 22STCV22659 (Lead) / Dept. 1
 Consolidated w/ Case No. 22STCV22510 (PAGA)

**PROOF OF SERVICE BY FIRST-CLASS MAIL
 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OR ORDER**

(NOTE: You cannot serve the Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order if you are a party in the action. The person who served the notice must complete this proof of service.)

1. I am at least 18 years old and **not a party to this action**. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing took place, and my residence or business address is (*specify*):

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED PROOF OF SERVICE.

2. I served a copy of the *Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order* by enclosing it in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid and (*check one*):

- a. ☐ deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service.
 b. ☐ placed the sealed envelope for collection and processing for mailing, following this business's usual practices, with which I am readily familiar. On the same day correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service.

3. The *Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order* was mailed:

- a. on (*date*):
 b. from (*city and state*):

4. The envelope was addressed and mailed as follows:

- a. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

- b. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

- c. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

- d. Name of person served:

Street address:

City:

State and zip code:

☐ Names and addresses of additional persons served are attached. (*You may use form POS-030(P).*)

5. Number of pages attached:

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: April 17, 2026

Isabel Yang

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)



(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)

EXHIBIT A

Electronically Received 04/16/2026 01:32 PM

Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827)
Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479)
Brian St. John (SBN 304112)
Yasmin Hosseini (SBN 326399)
Selena Matavosian (SBN 348044)
Erica Stepanian (SBN 362054)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900
Glendale, California 91203
Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiff Albert Walker and the Class

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

04/17/2026

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: A. Morales Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

ALBERT WALKER, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE CHRYSALIS CENTER, an unknown
business entity; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

ALBERT WALKER, individually, and on
behalf of other aggrieved employees under the
California Private Attorney General Act of
2004;

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE CHRYSALIS CENTER, an unknown
business entity; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Lead Case No.: 22STCV22659
[*Consolidated with* Case No. 22STCV22510]

Honorable Samantha P. Jessner
Department 7

CLASS ACTION

**[REVISED ~~PROPOSED~~] FINAL
APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

Date: April 16, 2026
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Department: 7

Complaint Filed: July 12, 2022
Trial Date: None Set

1 This matter has come before the Honorable Samantha P. Jessner in Department 7 of
2 the above-entitled Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, on
3 April 16, 2026 at 10:00 a.m., on Plaintiff Albert Walker’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion for Final
4 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel
5 Litigation Expenses Payment, and Class Representative Service Payment (“Motion for Final
6 Approval”). Lawyers *for* Justice, PC, appeared on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class, and
7 Mitchell, Silberberg, and Knupp, LLP appeared on behalf of Defendant The Chrysalis Center
8 (“Defendant”).

9 On October 22, 2025, the Court entered the Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion for
10 Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Preliminary Approval Order”),
11 thereby preliminarily approving the settlement of the above-entitled actions in accordance with
12 the First Amended Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice
13 (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or “Settlement Agreement”), which, together with the exhibits
14 annexed thereto set forth the terms and conditions for settlement of the Actions.

15 Having reviewed the Settlement Agreement and duly considered the parties’ papers and
16 oral argument, and good cause appearing,

17 **THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS, ADJUDGES, AND DECREES AS FOLLOWS:**

18 1. The Motion for Final Approval is granted in its entirety.

19 2. This Final Approval Order and Judgment incorporates by reference the
20 definitions in the Settlement Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order, and all capitalized
21 terms used herein, but not defined, shall have the same meanings as in the Settlement
22 Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order.

23 3. Unless otherwise specified, all citations and references to the Private Attorneys
24 General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) are to the version
25 of that statute prior to the recent amendment effective July 1, 2024; the amended statute does
26 not apply to the Actions or the Settlement pursuant to California Labor Code section
27 2699(v)(1), as amended, because the notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
28 (“LWDA”) was filed prior to June 19, 2024.

1 4. This Court has jurisdiction over the Class Members as it pertains to the Actions
2 and the claims asserted in the Actions. The Court also has jurisdiction over all parties to the
3 Actions as it pertains to the Actions and the claims asserted in the Actions.

4 5. The Court finds that the applicable requirements of California Code of Civil
5 Procedure section 382 and California Rule of Court 3.769, *et seq.* have been satisfied with
6 respect to the Class and the Settlement. The Court hereby makes final its earlier provisional
7 certification of the Class for purposes of the Class Settlement, as set forth in the Preliminary
8 Approval Order. The Class is hereby defined to include: all current and former hourly paid or
9 non-exempt employees who worked for Chrysalis in California during the Class Period (i.e., the
10 period from July 12, 2018 through October 22, 2025), except that all settlement class members'
11 claims that arose from events that occurred before January 31, 2021 and were covered and
12 released by the *Jones vs. The Chrysalis Center* settlement shall be excluded from the Settlement
13 Class in the Actions, except and unless they were employed by Chrysalis in California in hourly
14 paid or non-exempt positions at any time after January 31, 2021, in which case, only their post-
15 January 31, 2021, workweeks shall be included in the Class Period Workweeks calculations
16 ("Class" or "Class Members").

17 6. The aggrieved employees for purposes of the PAGA Settlement are hereby
18 defined to consist of the following individuals: all current and former hourly paid or non-
19 exempt employees who worked for Chrysalis in California during the PAGA Period (i.e., the
20 period from April 20, 2021 through October 22, 2025) ("Aggrieved Employees").

21 7. The Court finds that the Court-approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and
22 Hearing Date for Final Court Approval ("Class Notice") that was provided to the Class
23 Members, fully and accurately informed the Class Members of all material elements of the
24 Settlement, of their opportunity to participate in the Settlement, object to or comment on the
25 Class Settlement, or to seek exclusion from the Class Settlement; the Class Notice was the best
26 notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class
27 Members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of California, the United States
28 Constitution, due process and other applicable law. The Class Notice fairly and adequately

described the Settlement and provided the Class Members with adequate instructions and a variety of means to obtain additional information.

8. Pursuant to California law, the Court hereby grants final approval to the Settlement and finds that it is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of the Class as a whole. More specifically, the Court finds that the Settlement was reached following meaningful formal and informal discovery and investigation conducted by Lawyers *for* Justice, PC (“Class Counsel”), and that the Settlement is the result of serious, informed, adversarial, and arms-length negotiations between the parties. In so finding, the Court has considered all of the evidence presented, including evidence regarding the strength of Plaintiff’s claims; the risk, expense, and complexity of pursuing the claims presented; the likely duration of further litigation; the amount offered in the Settlement; the extent of investigation and discovery completed; and the experience and views of Class Counsel. The Court finds that the Settlement, including the monetary allocations and payments, appear within the range of reasonableness, and that the monetary recovery to the Class is fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to certification, liability, and damages issues. The Court has further considered the absence of any objections by the Class Members to the Class Settlement. Accordingly, the Court hereby directs that the Settlement be affected in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the following terms and conditions.

9. A full opportunity has been afforded to the Class Members to participate in the Final Approval Hearing, and all Class Members and other persons wishing to be heard have been heard. The Class Members also have had a full and fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the Class Settlement. The Court finds that the following eleven (11) individuals submitted a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Class Settlement: (1) Jairo Espinoza, (2) Steve Anthony, (3) Anthony Ingalls, (4) Darnell Lambert, (5) Carlos Orona, (6) Arthur Ortiz, (7) Jermaine Reese, (8) Robert Resvaloso, (9) Michael Saito, (10) Johany Zuniga, and (11) Lucille Taylor. Accordingly, the Court determines that Plaintiff and all Class Members who did not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Class Settlement (“Participating Class Members”), individually and on behalf of their respective former and present

representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, are bound by the Class Settlement and by this Final Approval Order and Judgment, and thereby, as of the Effective Date and the date that Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and the employer's share of payroll taxes owed on the wage portion of Individual Class Payments, shall fully and finally release and discharge the Released Parties (as defined below), and each of them, from the Released Claims (as defined below).

10. Release Parties shall mean Chrysalis and each of its former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, members, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, assigns, subsidiaries, affiliates and agents (including, without limitation, any investment bankers, accountants, insurers, reinsurers, attorneys and any past, present or future officers, directors, employees), any payroll companies, alleged joint employers, and any other persons or entities who could be alleged to be liable for the wage and hour or PAGA violations asserted in the Actions.

11. Released Claims shall include all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the Class Period facts stated in the Operative Complaints including but not limited to any claims for: (1) Violation of California Labor Code; §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime); (2) Violation of California Labor Code; §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums); (3) Violation of California Labor Code; § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums); (4) Violation of California Labor Code; §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages); (5) Violation of California Labor Code; §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid); (6) Violation of California Labor Code; § 204 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment); (7) Violation of California Labor Code; § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements); (8) Violation of California Labor Code; §1174(d) (Failure To Keep Requisite Payroll Records); (9) Violation of California Labor Code; §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses); (10) Violation of California Business & Professions Code; §§ 17200, et seq. (collectively, the "Released Claims"). Except as set forth in the Released Claims, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act,

unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period

12. The Court finds that Plaintiff has satisfied the prerequisites under PAGA, including, and not limited to, providing the LWDA and Defendant with notice of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including, and not limited to, the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, in conformity with California Labor Code § 2699.3(a). The Court also finds that the Settlement Agreement has been submitted to the LWDA in conformity with California Labor Code § 2699(l)(2). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(l)(2), the Court has also considered and reviewed the PAGA Settlement and the allocation of \$200,000.00 toward civil penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA Penalties"), and the Court finds that they are fair, reasonable, and appropriate, and hereby approved. The Administrator shall distribute the PAGA Penalties as follows: the amount of \$150,000.00 to the LWDA ("LWDA PAGA Payment"), and the amount of \$50,000.00 to the Aggrieved Employees, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Agreement.

13. The Court determines that, Plaintiff, the State of California (with respect to Aggrieved Employees), and all Aggrieved Employees, individually and on behalf of their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, are bound by the PAGA Settlement and this Final Approval Order and Judgment, and thereby, as of the Effective Date and the date that Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and the employer's share of payroll taxes owed on the wage portion of Individual Class Payments, shall fully and finally release and discharge the Released Parties, and each of them, from the Released PAGA Claims (as defined below).

14. Released PAGA Claims shall include all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the PAGA Period facts stated in the Operative Complaints, and the PAGA Notice, including but not limited to, any and all PAGA claims based on the claims identified in the Released Claims.

1 15. The Court hereby directs that the Settlement be affected in accordance with the
2 Settlement Agreement, Preliminary Approval Order, and the terms and conditions set forth
3 herein.

4 16. The Court finds that payment of the Administration Expenses Payment in the
5 amount of \$32,498.00 to Simpluris, Inc. (“Simpluris” or “Administrator”), is appropriate for the
6 services performed and costs incurred and to be incurred for the notice and settlement
7 administration process, and is hereby approved. It is hereby ordered that the Administrator shall
8 issue payment to itself in the amount of \$32,498.00, in accordance with the terms and
9 methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

10 17. The Court finds that the Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of
11 \$7,500.00 to Plaintiff Albert Walker is fair and reasonable, and hereby approved. It is hereby
12 ordered that the Administrator issue payment in the amount of \$7,500.00 to Plaintiff Albert
13 Walker for his Class Representative Service Payment, according to the terms set forth in the
14 Settlement Agreement.

15 18. The Court finds that attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$483,333.33 to Class
16 Counsel falls within the range of reasonableness and that the results achieved justify the award
17 sought, and is hereby approved. It is hereby ordered that the Administrator issue payment in the
18 amount of \$483,333.33 to Class Counsel for attorneys’ fees, in accordance with the terms and
19 methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

20 19. The Court finds that reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the
21 amount of \$40,000.00 to Class Counsel is reasonable, and hereby approved. It is hereby ordered
22 that the Administrator issue payment in the amount of \$40,000.00 to Class Counsel for
23 reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, in accordance with the terms and methodology
24 set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

25 20. The Court finds that, on or about November 21, 2025, Defendant deposited
26 Payment 1 of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$483,333.33) into an account established by
27 the Administrator, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement
28 Agreement.

1 21. It is hereby ordered that by October 22, 2026, Defendant shall deposit Payment 2
2 of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$483,333.00) and the employer's share of payroll taxes
3 owed on the wage portion of Individual Class Payments into an account established by the
4 Administrator, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement
5 Agreement.

6 22. It is hereby ordered that by October 22, 2027, Defendant shall deposit Payment 3
7 of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$483,334.00) into an account established by the
8 Administrator, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement
9 Agreement.

10 23. It is hereby ordered that within fifteen (15) calendar days following the funding
11 of the Payment 2 of the Gross Settlement Amount or fifteen (15) calendar days after the
12 Settlement becomes Final, whichever is later, the Administrator will issue payments due under
13 the Settlement and approved by the Court as follows: (a) Individual Class Payments to
14 Participating Class Members, (b) Individual PAGA Payments to Aggrieved Employees, (c)
15 LWDA PAGA Payment to the LWDA, (d) Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff,
16 and (e) Administration Expenses Payment to the Administrator, in accordance with terms and
17 methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

18 24. It is hereby ordered that within fifteen (15) calendar days following the funding
19 of Payment 3 of the Gross Settlement Amount, or fifteen (15) calendar days after the Settlement
20 becomes Final, whichever is later, the Administrator will issue the payments due under the
21 Settlement and approved by the Court as follows: Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class
22 Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment to Class Counsel.

23 25. Each check issued to a Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee
24 for his or her Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment shall be valid for a
25 period of one hundred eighty (180) calendar days from the date of issuance of the check, and
26 after this time period, the check(s) shall be cancelled. For any Participating Class Member
27 and/or Aggrieved Employee whose Individual Class Payment check and/or Individual PAGA
28 Payment check is uncashed and canceled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit

1 the funds represented by such checks to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property
2 Division in the name of the Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee, and in
3 their respective payment amount, thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the
4 requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b). All Participating
5 Class Members shall be bound by the terms and conditions of the Class Settlement regardless of
6 whether or not they cash or otherwise negotiate their Individual Class Payment checks. All
7 Aggrieved Employees shall be bound by the terms and conditions of the PAGA Settlement
8 regardless of whether or not they cash or otherwise negotiate their Individual PAGA Payment
9 checks.

10 26. After entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment, pursuant to California
11 Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(h), the Court shall retain jurisdiction to construe, interpret,
12 implement, and enforce the Settlement Agreement, Preliminary Approval Order, and this Final
13 Approval Order and Judgment, to hear and resolve any contested challenge to a claim for
14 settlement benefits, and to supervise and adjudicate any dispute arising from or in connection
15 with the distribution of settlement benefits.

16 27. Individualized notice of this Final Approval Order and Judgment is not required.
17 The Administrator shall post a copy of the Final Approval Order and Judgment on the
18 Administrator's website for a period of at least sixty (60) calendar days after the date of entry of
19 this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

20 28. A Non-Appearance Case Review is set for November 15, 2027 at 9:00 a.m. in
21 Department 7. Class Counsel shall submit the Administrator's accounting report regarding the
22 status of the funding and disbursement of the Settlement and a supporting declaration by
23 November 8, 2027.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 DATE: 04/17/2026
26 _____



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Samantha Jessner".

Samantha Jessner / Judge

The Honorable Samantha P. Jessner
Judge of the Los Angeles County Superior
Court of California

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 450 North Brand Blvd., Suite 900, Glendale, California 91203.

On April 17, 2026, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

1. REVISED FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

on interested parties in this action by Electronic Service as follows:

Kevin Gaut, Esq. (keg@msk.com)
Hayward Kaiser, Esq. (hjk@msk.com)
Te'Aira Law, Esq. (tla@msk.com)
MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP
2049 Century Park East, 18th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067

Attorneys for Defendant The Chrysalis Center

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE

Pursuant to the Court's Order regarding Electronic Service, I caused the documents described above to be E-Served through **Case Anywhere** by electronically mailing a true and correct copy through **Case Anywhere** to the individual(s) listed above.

State of California, Labor & Workforce Development Agency Web URL:
<http://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

[X] BY ONLINE SUBMISSION

The foregoing documents were transmitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency through the online system established for the submission of notices and documents, in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(l). I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on April 17, 2026, at Glendale, California.



Isabel Yang