

Matthew S. Da Vega (SBN 195443)
Matthew H. Fisher (SBN 229532)
DAVEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP
232 E. Anapamu St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Telephone: (805) 232-4471
Facsimile: (877) 535-9358
mdavega@mdmflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

JOANNA MAGPIONG, on behalf of herself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CARELINX, INC., and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 21-CIV-03038

CLASS and REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**DECLARATION OF MATTHEW S.
DA VEGA IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
SETTLEMENT and ATTORNEY FEES and
COSTS**

Assigned For All Purposes to the Honorable
Marie S. Weiner (Dept. 2)

Date: August 23, 2022

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Location: Dept. 2 (Hon. Marie S. Weiner)

I, Matthew S. Da Vega, hereby declare as follows:

1. I make this Declaration based on personal knowledge. If called and sworn as a witness, I would testify competently as to the facts in this Declaration.

2. I am an attorney admitted to practice law in the State of California.

3. I am a named and Managing Partner of Da Vega Fisher Mechtenberg, LLP ("DFM LLP").

4. DFM LLP is lead and only counsel for the Plaintiff in this Lawsuit. ("Class Counsel.")

1 5. I have been intimately involved in all aspects of this dispute and the resulting
2 settlement. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class
3 Settlement and Attorney Fees and Costs.

4 **I. LEAD COUNSEL BACKGROUND and COMPETENCY**

5 6. **DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP ("DFM LLP")** is a small
6 plaintiff-side predominantly contingency fee based law firm representing individuals who could
7 not otherwise afford legal counsel. Each case the firm takes, including this one, runs the risk of an
8 uncertain outcome and possibility of little or no recovery for the client or the firm. Many cases
9 the firm takes can require years of litigation and thousands of hours of attorney time and costs.
10 To represent our clients in this case on a contingent fee basis, our firm had to forego compensable
11 hourly work on other cases to devote the necessary time and resources to this case. In so doing,
12 our firm gave up work that a firm receives more immediate payment for in exchange for risky
13 contingent fee work in this case. This firm has previously invested in similar cases which resulted
14 in little or no recovery due to various issues, including but not limited to bankruptcy, change in
15 prevailing law, and/or lengthy appeals.

16 7. **Plaintiff's Counsel Matthew S. Da Vega:** I am a graduate of the University of
17 California, Santa Barbara (1993) and the University of San Francisco School of Law (1997). I
18 became a member of the State Bar of California in 1998. After passing the bar I started working
19 in private practice as a Plaintiff's attorney. During my entire career I have always practiced as a
20 Plaintiff's lawyer representing individuals and/or groups of individuals, specializing in
21 employment, personal injury, mass torts, and product defect matters. I have done so now for
22 approximately 23 years. I first worked for Brayton & Purcell in Novato, CA representing
23 individuals injured from exposure to asbestos and other toxins. I then worked for Lieff Cabraser
24 Heimann & Bernstein in San Francisco, CA while representing individuals and class members in
25 mass torts, product defects, and in employment matters. I then worked for the firm of Cappello &
26 Noel in Santa Barbara, again representing individual and class action Plaintiffs in employment
27 claims, lender liability, and antitrust matters. In 2012, I started my own law firm, Da Vega Fisher
28 Mechtenberg LLP ("DFM LLP"), originally with an office in the San Francisco Bay Area then

1 later opening additional offices in Santa Barbara, Ventura, and the Sacramento area. I am one of
2 the firm's two founding partners and the current managing partner. I personally manage the
3 firm's Mt. View offices and Santa Barbara offices and travel back and forth between the two on a
4 regular basis. I currently have cases all over the state of California including as far north as
5 Sonoma County and as far South as San Diego County and as far east as Stanislaus County. The
6 majority of my practice and cases are in the San Francisco South Bay area although I maintain my
7 primary residence in Santa Barbara, California. DFM LLP has always been a Plaintiff-side
8 contingency based law firm representing clients predominantly in employment and personal injury
9 matters in both individual and class actions. DFM LLP is experienced counsel in matters such as
10 this and has worked on significant employment cases such as *Salvatierra v. Intuitive Surgical,*
11 *Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 2014-1-CV-272069 (2016) (\$4.6M gross
12 settlement for class of 208 misclassified class member employees); *Gibbins/Leal v. Hismeh*
13 *Enterprises, Inc.*, *Ventura County Superior Court*, Case No. 56-2015-00468352 (2017) (\$1M
14 gross settlement for class of 4000+ delivery driver members reimbursements); *Sena v. Facebook,*
15 *Inc.*, *San Mateo County Superior Court*, Case No. 16CIV00496 (2018) (\$4.25M gross settlement
16 for class of 900+ class member employees for unpaid overtime wage); and *Fregoso v. Eat Club,*
17 *Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18-CV-330433 (2021) (\$900K gross settlement
18 for class of 1815 class member employees for unpaid overtime wages) to name but a few.

19 **II. CLASS COUNSEL AWARD OF ATTORNEY FEES and COSTS**

20 8. **Common Fund Settlement:** In this matter DFM LLP negotiated a Class action
21 settlement providing a common fund settlement with a payout of **\$1,925,620.00** which includes
22 the Gross Settlement Amount (\$1,888,000) plus the Additional Estimated Substitute Amount
23 (\$37,620) (which is the amount estimated equivalent of employer-side payroll tax). Class Counsel
24 is seeking as a Class Counsel Award a percentage of this common fund.

25 9. **Attorney Fees of 33% Percent of Common Fund is Reasonable:** Class Counsel
26 requests the Court grant its application for an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of \$623,000
27 (33%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (\$1,888,000) created on behalf of the Class. The requested
28 award is fair, reasonable, and well within the common range for attorney fees of 20% to 50% in a

1 common fund settlement. The requested award also compares favorably to the overall lodestar
2 incurred to date. Therefore, the attorneys respectfully requests approval of the agreed fee award.

3 10. **Contingency Fee Matter:** As this is a contingency matter, Class Counsel litigated
4 this action without receiving any payment for their services or reimbursement of their costs
5 incurred for the benefit of the Class. To represent the Class on a contingent fee basis, Class
6 Counsel had to forego compensable hourly work on other cases to devote the necessary time and
7 resources to this contingent case. In so doing, Class Counsel gave up work that a firm receives
8 more immediate payment for in exchange for risky class action contingent fee work in this case
9 which could have paid the Class and its Counsel nothing. A number of difficult issues, the
10 adverse resolution of any one of which could have barred the successful prosecution of the action,
11 were present here. Attorneys' fees in this case were not only contingent but risky, with a very real
12 chance that Class Counsel would receive nothing at all for their efforts, having devoted time and
13 advanced costs. Class Counsel has previously invested in similar cases which resulted in little or
14 no recovery due to various issues, including but not limited to bankruptcy, failed
15 certification/decertification, other overlapping class matters, and/or lengthy appeals.

16 11. **Contingency Fee Market:** I am familiar with the contingent fee market
17 throughout California and in particular as it pertains to complex employer, wage and hour, and
18 class action litigation. On behalf of my firm, I have negotiated hundreds of contingency fee
19 agreements with Plaintiffs, both as individuals and as representatives in class action suits. Many of
20 those agreements provide that counsel will receive between 33% to 40%+ of any recovery that is
21 obtained, and, in addition that counsel be reimbursed for the costs they incurred out of the
22 recovery amount. These are typical and standard percentages in employment-related contingency
23 fee agreements throughout California. The Class Members in this complex wage and hour case
24 would not be likely to obtain competent counsel in California, for any amount less than these
25 standard fee percentages. Class Counsel has also advanced all costs in this matter and not been
26 paid any attorney's fees to date.

27 12. **Class Counsel's Hours and Hourly Rates:** I will have worked on this matter for
28 151 hours at the time of this motion and my current billable rate as of 2022 is \$750/hr. for class

1 action work (\$750/hr. x 151 hours = \$113,250 in lodestar). Matthew H. Fisher is an equity
2 partner of the DFM LLP and worked 67 hours on this case and his billing rate is \$650/hr. for class
3 action work (\$650 /hr. x 67 hours = \$43,550 in lodestar). (See Declaration of Matthew H. Fisher
4 ISO of Motion). Ted D. Mechtenberg is an equity partner of the DFM LLP and worked 33 hours
5 on this case and his billing rate is \$625/hr. for class action work (\$625/hr. x. 33 hours = \$20,625 in
6 lodestar). (See Declaration of Ted D. Mechtenberg ISO of Motion). These rates are comparable
7 to, but are less than, those of counsel with the same education and experience in the relevant legal
8 communities in which I practice including the San Francisco Bay Area and Southern California.
9 Attached are various surveys of billing rates showing higher hourly rates than DFM LLP currently
10 charges for attorneys with less experience. (See Exhibits 4, 5, and 6).

11 13. **Class Counsel Lodestar Cross-Check:** I have reviewed my firm's lodestar in this
12 matter and believe the charges are reasonable and were reasonably necessary to the conduct of the
13 case. These rates are in line with the prevailing rates of attorneys in the California legal
14 community for similar work. In this case, the reasonableness of the requested for \$623,000 in
15 attorneys' fees is further supported by a crosscheck using attorney's lodestar in this matter. Class
16 Counsel has spent a significant amount of hours investigating, researching, and litigating this
17 matter, including but not limited to the following: interviewing Plaintiffs and flushing out facts
18 and issues; researching employer and causes of action; developing facts and investigating
19 Defendant's ownership structure (Secretary of State, etc.); investigating and discussing job
20 functions, duties, compensation, policies and procedures, etc.; regularly meeting and/or
21 communicating with our clients who are the Class Representatives; drafting pleadings (Complaint,
22 case management statements, mediation briefs); drafting and responding to informal discovery;
23 reviewing information produced in formal and informal discovery (payroll data, etc.); researching
24 private right of action for employee misclassification and various impact on class actions;
25 participating in Court-ordered hearings and conferences; attending mediation; retention of expert
26 witnesses; discussion with expert witnesses issues related to damage model calculations;
27 preparing and analyzing damage models; negotiating the terms of the Settlement; reviewing and
28 making changes to Settlement Agreement; and coordinating and overseeing all the administration

of the Settlement. The contemporaneous billing records evidence that the attorneys' lodestar is \$177,425 with additional fees still to be incurred for preparation and attending the final approval hearing, managing post approval settlement distribution with the claims administrator, responding to class member inquiries, and handling any potential appeal of the matter. As a result, the current lodestar amount understates the total attorneys' fees ultimately incurred in this action. Class Counsel lodestar crosscheck of attorney fees is as follows:

Attorney Name	Hours	Hourly Rate	Totals
Matthew S. Da Vega	151	\$750	\$113,250
Matthew H. Fisher	67	\$650	\$43,550
Ted Mechtenberg	33	\$625	\$20,625
TOTAL	251		\$177,425

The requested fee award of \$623,000 represents a **positive multiplier of 3.5** which is well within the range warranted under California law of a 1 to 4 multiplier. “Multipliers of 1 to 4 are commonly found to be appropriate in complex class action cases.” *Destefano v. Zynga, Inc.*, 2016 WL 537946, at *21 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2016) (quoting *Hopkins v. Stryker Sales Corp.*, 2013 WL 496358, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013)); see *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d United States District Court Northern District 1043, 1051 n.6 (9th Cir. 2002)(citing survey finding most multipliers range from 1.0 to 4.0). As a result, this Court should have no trouble concluding that an award is supported by the lodestar cross-check is fair and reasonable and is justified under California law. “[T]he lodestar method better accounts for the amount of work done, while the percentage of the fund method more accurately reflects the results achieved.” *Rawlings v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc.* (6th Cir. 1993) 9 F.3d 513, 516.

14. **Class Counsel's Costs:** The Settlement Agreement permits up to \$20,000 in reimbursement (actual costs = \$19,781). Therefore Class Counsel requests the Court award it \$19,781 in costs, the actual costs to date related to filing fees, service fees, mediation fees, travel costs, mediation fees, and expert fees which could not have been recovered if this case had been lost. Class Counsel was required to advance all costs in this litigation. In this type of litigation where the corporate defendant and their attorneys are well funded, this can prove to be very expensive, risky, and therefore cost prohibitive to many attorneys. The financial burdens

undertaken by Plaintiff and Class Counsel in prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class were substantial. Plaintiff undertook the risk of liability for Defendant's costs and even fees had this case not succeeded, as well as other potential negative financial ramifications from having come forward to sue Defendant on behalf of the Class. Accordingly, the contingent nature of the fee and the financial burdens on Class Counsel and Plaintiff also support the requested awards. The following list itemizes Class Counsel's costs and expenses to date:

Filings/Service/Court Fees:	\$ 3,335
Travel (Flights, Lodging, Rentals, Meals):	\$ 5,504
Mediation Fees/Costs:	\$ 7,450
<u>Experts Fees/Costs:</u>	<u>\$ 3,429</u>
TOTAL	\$ 19,781

15. I am presently unaware of any opposition to the final approval of this settlement.

16. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Court's April 12, 2022 Preliminary Approval of Class and Representative Action Settlement and Provisional Class Certification Order ("Preliminary Approval Order").

17. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Laura Singh (on behalf of CPT Group, Inc.) with Respect to Notification and Administration ("CPT Decl.").

18. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is the true and correct copies of the Declarations of Class Representatives Joanna Magpiong.

19. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** is a true and correct copy of the NALFA 2020 Litigation Hourly Rate Range Growth (demonstrating that average rates for lawyers who have been practicing for 21-24 years [i.e. Matthew S. Da Vega] are between \$751-\$1000/hour and from 17-20 years [i.e. Matthew H. Fisher] are between \$651-900/hour).

20. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** is a true and correct copy of the Laffey Matrix (demonstrating current average rates for lawyers practicing 20+ years at \$919/hour and those practicing 11-19 years at \$764/hour).

21. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** is a true and correct copy of National Law Journal Billing Survey 2017 (demonstrating the *average* partner rates at various California defense firms

1 in 2017 were: Cooley LLP (\$1,100/hr.), Sheppard Mullin (\$760/hr.), Lobel Weiland Golden
2 Friedman LLP (\$750/hr.), Winthrop Couchot Golubow Hollander, LLP (\$595/hr.), Morris, Polich
3 & Purdy, LLP (\$575./hr.); Leslie Cohen Law PCS (\$575/hr.)(See 2017 - National Law Journal
4 Annual Survey on Billing Rates).

5 22. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** is a true and correct copy of the Proof of Submission
6 to the LWDA of this motion and the supporting papers via the LWDA's website

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

9
10 **DATED:** August 1, 2022

DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP

11
12 

13 By: _____

14 Matthew S. Da Vega
15 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Class
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1
(PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER)

**ENDORSED FILED
SAN MATEO COUNTY**

APR 12 2022

Clerk of the Superior Court
By ANDREA DALEY
DEPUTY CLERK

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

JOANNA MAGPIONG, on behalf of herself
and all similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

CARELINX, INC. and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 21-CIV-03038

**[PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
SETTLEMENT AND PROVISIONAL CLASS
CERTIFICATION ORDER**

FAC Filed: August 10, 2021

On March 29, 2022, this Court heard Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of class action settlement and provisional class certification under California Rule of Court 3.769, as filed by Plaintiff Joanna Magpiong (the "Plaintiff"). This Court reviewed the motion, including the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release (the "Agreement," "Settlement," or "Settlement Agreement"). Based on this review, the hearing, and the findings below, the Court finds good cause to GRANT the motion.

FINDINGS:

1. Unless otherwise specified, defined terms in this Preliminary Approval of Class and Representative Action Settlement and Provisional Class Certification Order (the "Preliminary Approval Order") have the same definition as the defined terms in the Agreement.

1 2. The Court determines there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Agreement
2 (including the Class Representative Enhancement Payment, Class Counsel's fees and costs, the
3 Settlement Administration Costs, and the allocation of payments to Settlement Class Members)
4 falls within the range of possible approval that could ultimately be given final approval by this
5 Court as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and that the final determination of these issues will be
6 made at the Final Approval Hearing (referred to in the Agreement as the "Fairness Hearing").
7 More specifically, the Court finds on a preliminary basis that:

8 (a) The Settlement provides for a Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,700,000.00
9 plus an Additional Estimated Substitute Amount of \$37,620.00, such that Defendant will pay a
10 total of \$1,737,620.00 into the settlement fund pursuant to the terms and timing specified in the
11 Agreement. The Settlement further provides that the Net Settlement Fund shall be calculated by
12 subtracting the following amounts from the total of the Gross Settlement Amount and the
13 Additional Estimated Substitute Amount: (1) the Class Counsel Award (estimated at \$561,000.00
14 in attorneys' fees and \$20,000.00 in attorney costs); (2) all Settlement Administration Costs
15 (estimated not to exceed \$21,000.00); (3) the Class Representative Enhancement Payment
16 (estimated at \$10,000.00); and (4) the amount allocated under the Private Attorneys General Act
17 of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698 et seq. ("PAGA") (i.e., \$170,000.00), including the
18 payment to the California Labor Workforce and Development Agency ("LWDA") and the PAGA
19 amount distributed to the Class Members. The Net Settlement Fund, to be disbursed to Settlement
20 Class Members who have not excluded themselves from the Settlement, is presently anticipated to
21 be approximately \$998,120.00. If the Settlement is approved, the full amount of the Net Settlement
22 Fund will be paid out to Settlement Class Members who do not exclude themselves from the
23 Settlement in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.

24 (b) The Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable as to all Class Members
25 when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to liability and damages
26 issues.
27
28

1 (c) Settlement at this time will avoid substantial additional costs by all parties,
2 as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of this class
3 action.

4 (d) The Settlement does not improperly grant preferential treatment to class
5 representatives or segments of the class, supporting a presumption of fairness.

6 (e) Adequate inquiry, investigation and discovery have been conducted so that
7 counsels for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions, supporting a
8 presumption of fairness.

9 (f) The Agreement has been reached as a result of intensive, serious and non-
10 collusive, arms-length negotiations, supporting a presumption of fairness.

11 3. The Court finds that distribution of the Notice of Class Action Settlement,
12 substantially in the form attached hereto as "**Exhibit 1**", via first class U.S. postal mail to Class
13 Members (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, (b) constitutes valid,
14 due, and sufficient notice to all members of the Class, and (c) complies fully with the requirements
15 of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the
16 California and United States Constitutions, and other applicable law.

17 4. For settlement purposes only, the Court finds the Class is so numerous that joinder
18 of all Class Members is impracticable, Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class's claims, there are
19 questions of law and fact common to the Class, which predominate over any questions affecting
20 only individual Class Members, the Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class, and class
21 certification is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the
22 controversy.

23 5. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (l)(2), the Court notes that
24 Plaintiff provided a copy of the Agreement to the LWDA at the same time that Plaintiff provided
25 it to the Court, and the Court has reviewed the Settlement's provisions relating to settlement of
26 claims under PAGA. The Court tentatively finds that the payment of \$170,000.00 for settlement
27 of any and all claims for which civil penalties under PAGA may be sought or are otherwise
28 available (the "PAGA Penalty Payment"), is fair and adequate. Further, the Court tentatively finds

1 that the PAGA Penalty Payment satisfies the requirements of California Labor Code section 2699,
2 subdivision (i), because \$127,500.00 (75%) of the PAGA Penalty Amount is allocated to the
3 LWDA for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers, and \$42,500.00 (25%) is
4 allocated for distribution to all Class Members, i.e., the allegedly “aggrieved employees.”

5 **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

6 **1. Settlement Preliminary Approval.** The Settlement Agreement and the Notice of
7 Class Action Settlement are preliminarily approved. The Court further preliminarily approves the
8 formulas provided in the Settlement for calculating Individual Settlement Payments to the Class
9 Members using a shift-based calculation methodology.

10 **1.1 Provisional Certification.** The Settlement Class is provisionally certified for
11 settlement purposes only as a class of: “All current and former Nurses who have worked at least
12 one Nursing Shift in California through use of Defendant’s Nurse OnDemand platform application
13 at any time during the Class Period.” “Class Period” refers to the period of time from June 3,
14 2017 through the date the Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement. As a practical
15 matter, there were no Nursing Shifts worked by any Class Member prior to January 1, 2020.
16 Excluded from the Settlement Class are putative Class Members who submit a timely and valid
17 Request for Exclusion (as defined by the Agreement and paragraph 8 below).

18 **2. Appointment of Class Representative and Class Counsel.** Plaintiff Joanna
19 Magpiong is conditionally appointed as the Class Representative to implement the Parties’
20 Settlement in accordance with the Agreement. Matthew S. Da Vega and Matthew Fisher of Da
21 Vega Fisher Mechtenberg LLP are conditionally appointed as Class Counsel. Class Counsel is
22 conditionally authorized to act on behalf of the Class with respect to all acts or consents required
23 by, or which may be given, pursuant to the Settlement, and such other acts necessary to finalize
24 the Settlement Agreement and its terms. Any Class Member may enter an appearance through his
25 or her own counsel at such Class Member’s own expense. Any Class Member who does not enter
26 an appearance or appear on his or her own behalf will be represented by Class Counsel for
27 settlement purposes only. Plaintiff and Class Counsel must fairly and adequately protect the
28 Class’s interests.

1 **3. Appointment of Settlement Administrator.** CPT Group, Inc. is hereby appointed
2 as the Settlement Administrator for this case.

3 **4. Provision of Class Notice.** Within ten (10) calendar days after entry of this
4 Preliminary Approval Order, Defendant shall provide the Class List to the Settlement
5 Administrator. On or before thirty (30) calendar days of entry of this Preliminary Approval Order,
6 the Settlement Administrator shall mail the Notice of Class Action Settlement (which shall be
7 substantially similar to the form attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**) to all Class Members via regular
8 First-Class U.S. Mail in the manner specified under Section 4 of the Agreement.

9 **5. Response Deadline.** The Response Deadline shall be **sixty (60)** calendar days
10 from the initial mailing of the Class Notice to Class Members pursuant to Section 4. In the event
11 of a re-mailed Class Notice, the Response Deadline will be extended an additional fifteen (15)
12 calendar days for that individual Class Member.

13 **6. Objection to Settlement.** Settlement Class Members who have not submitted a
14 timely and valid Request for Exclusion pursuant to the Agreement and paragraph 8 below and who
15 want to object to the Agreement must sign and submit by U.S. Mail or other delivery service a
16 valid written Objection to the Settlement Administrator on or before the Response Deadline. The
17 Settlement Administrator will provide copies of all such Objections to Class Counsel and
18 CareLinx's counsel weekly and will also provide a Final Response Report within five (5) calendar
19 days of the Response Deadline. For an Objection to be valid, it must: (a) state the case name and
20 number ("*Joanna Magplong v. CareLinx, Inc.*, Case No. 21-CIV-03038"), (b) contain the Class
21 Member's name, current mailing address, most current telephone number, and last four digits of
22 his or her Social Security number, (c) state the basis for the objection, (d) be signed ^{and dated} by the Class
23 Member, (e) be submitted to the Settlement Administrator at the address specified in the Class
24 Notice; and (f) be submitted with proof of the submission date (such as a U.S. Postal Service
25 postmark or another delivery service date stamp) on or before the Response Deadline. The date
26 the Objection is sent, as evidenced by the postmark or other delivery service date stamp, shall be
27 the exclusive means to determine whether an Objection has been timely submitted. If a Class
28 Member intends to speak at the Final Approval Hearing, they are requested to include with their

1 Objection the statement, "Notice of Intention to Appear at Final Approval Hearing," or otherwise
2 provide to the Settlement Administrator a "Notice of Intention to Appear" indicating their intent
3 to appear at the Final Approval Hearing. Any Settlement Class Member will be permitted to
4 appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing in order to have an Objection heard by the Court.

5 **7. Failure to Object to Settlement.** Class Members who fail to timely object to the
6 Agreement in the manner specified above will: (1) be deemed to have waived their right to object
7 to the Agreement; and (2) be foreclosed from objecting (whether by appeal or otherwise) to the
8 Agreement.

9 **8. Requesting Exclusion.** Any Class Member wishing to opt-out from the
10 Agreement must sign and submit by U.S. Mail or other delivery service a valid written Request
11 for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator on or before the Response Deadline containing all
12 the information required by the Agreement. To be valid, the Request for Exclusion must: (a)
13 state the case name and number ("*Joanna Magpiong v. CareLinx, Inc.*, Case No. 21-CIV-
14 03038"); (b) set forth the name, address, and telephone number of the Class Member requesting
15 exclusion; (c) be signed ^{and dated} by the Settlement Class Member; (d) be addressed to the Settlement
16 Administrator; and (e) be postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. The date the Request
17 for Exclusion is sent, as evidenced by the postmark or other delivery service date stamp, shall be
18 the exclusive means to determine whether a Request for Exclusion has been timely submitted.

19 **9. Shift Dispute.** If a Settlement Class Member wishes to dispute the number of
20 Nursing Shifts with which he or she has been credited, the Settlement Class Member must submit
21 to the Settlement Administrator, by U.S. Mail or other delivery service, a Shift Dispute on or
22 before the Response Deadline. The Shift Dispute must: (a) state the case name and number
23 ("*Joanna Magpiong v. CareLinx, Inc.*, Case No. 21-CIV-03038"), (b) set forth the Class
24 Member's name, address, and telephone number; (c) be signed by the Class Member; (d) include
25 any documentary evidence showing that the Nursing Shift information is inaccurate, and (e) be
26 postmarked or submitted to the Settlement Administrator on or before the Response Deadline.
27 The submission date is deemed to be, in the case of submission by U.S. Mail or other delivery
28

1 service, the date the Shift Dispute is sent, as evidenced by the postmark or other delivery service
2 date stamp.

3 **10. Termination.** If the Agreement terminates, the following will occur: (a) the
4 Preliminary Approval Order, and/or Final Approval Order and Judgment, and all of its or their
5 provisions will be vacated by its or their own terms, including, but not limited to, vacating
6 conditional certification of the Class; (b) Plaintiff will stop functioning as the Class Representative
7 and Class Counsel will stop serving as counsel for the proposed class; and (c) the Action will revert
8 to its previous status in all respects as it existed immediately before the Parties executed the
9 Memorandum of Understanding. No term or draft of the Memorandum of Understanding or the
10 Agreement, or any part of the Parties' settlement discussions, negotiations or documentation will
11 have any effect or be admissible into evidence for any purpose in the Action or any other
12 proceeding. This Preliminary Approval Order will not waive or otherwise impact the Parties' rights
13 or arguments.

14 **11. No Admissions.** Nothing in this Preliminary Approval Order is, or may be
15 construed as, an admission or concession on any point of fact or law by or against any Party.

16 **12. Stay of Dates and Deadlines.** All discovery and pretrial proceedings and deadlines
17 in the Action are stayed and suspended until further notice from the Court, except for such actions
18 as are necessary to implement the Agreement and this Preliminary Approval Order.

19 **13. Final Approval Hearing.** On **August 23, 2022, at 2:00 PM**, this Court will hold
20 a Final Approval Hearing to determine whether the Agreement should be finally approved as fair,
21 reasonable, and adequate. Plaintiff's motion for final approval of the Settlement and all papers
22 supporting the Class Counsel Award and Class Representative Enhancement Payment must be
23 filed by August 9, 2022. Any additional papers supporting final approval, including the Settlement
24 Administrator declaration and any response to Objections to the Agreement must be filed by no
25 later than August 16, 2022.

1 14. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the Final Approval
2 Hearing and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to the Class, and retains
3 jurisdiction to consider further applications concerning the Settlement.
4

5
6 DATED: 4/12/22



JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

EXHIBIT 1

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

JOANNA MAGPIONG,

v.

Case No. CIV-03038

CARELINX, INC.,

NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

TO: All current and former Nurses who have worked at least one Nursing Shift in California through use of Defendant's Nurse OnDemand platform application at any time from June 3, 2017 through [April 4, 2022].

IF YOU ARE A MEMBER OF THIS CLASS OF PERSONS, YOU SHOULD READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY BECAUSE IT WILL AFFECT YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS.

A settlement ("Settlement") has been proposed in a class action lawsuit pending in San Mateo County Superior Court ("Court") titled *Joanna Magpiong v. Carelinx, Inc.* Case No. CIV-03038 (the "Action"). If the Court gives final approval to the Settlement, Carelinx, Inc. ("Defendant") will provide each Settlement Class Member a payment as set forth in this notice. Here is a summary of your rights and options; they are described in more detail later in this document. If you have any questions, please contact the Carelinx Settlement Administration, c/o [_____].

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is \$[] based on the [] Nursing Shifts you worked during the Class Period, as shown in Defendant's records.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT

GET A PAYMENT	If you do nothing, you will automatically receive a payment if the Settlement is finally approved by the Court.	N/A
SUBMIT A SHIFT DISPUTE	If you believe that the number of Nursing Shifts with which you have been credited is incorrect, you must submit a Shift Dispute to the Settlement Administrator. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 10 below.	Deadline: _____
EXCLUDE YOURSELF	If you wish to exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must submit to the Settlement Administrator a valid Request for Exclusion. If you exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will not receive a payment under the Settlement. Excluding yourself is the only option that allows you to bring or maintain your own claims or lawsuit against Defendants regarding the allegations in the Action. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 17 below.	Deadline: _____
OBJECT	If you wish to object to the Settlement, you must submit your objections to the Settlement Administrator. Submitting an objection does not exclude you from the Settlement. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 18 below.	Deadline: _____
APPEAR AT THE "FINAL APPROVAL HEARING"	The Court will hold a "Final Approval Hearing" to consider the Settlement, the request for attorneys' fees and costs by counsel representing the Class in the Action, and the Representative Plaintiff's request for service award for bringing the Action. You may, but are not required to, speak at the Final Approval Hearing about any objection to the Settlement that you submitted. If you intend to speak at the Final Approval Hearing, we ask that you also provide to the Settlement Administrator a "Notice of Intention to Appear" indicating your intent to do so. Instructions for this option are set forth in Section 18 below.	Hearing Date: August 23, 2022 at 2:00 PM

The Court in charge of this Action has preliminarily approved the Settlement and must decide whether to give final approval to the Settlement. The relief provided to Class Members will be provided only if the Court gives final approval to the Settlement and, if there are any appeals, after the appeals are resolved in favor of the Settlement. *Please be patient.*

WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION	X
1. Why did I get this notice?	
2. What is this lawsuit about?	
3. Why is this a class action?	
4. Why is there a Settlement?	
5. How do I know if I am part of the Settlement?	
6. I'm still not sure if I am included.	
THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT	X
7. What relief does the Settlement provide to the Class Members?	
PAYMENT TO THE CLASS	X
8. How can I get a payment?	
9. When will I get a payment?	
10. What if I disagree with the calculation regarding my estimated Settlement payment?	
11. If I receive a Settlement payment will I have to pay taxes on it?	
12. No retaliation or discrimination.	
THE LAWYERS IN THIS CASE AND THE REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF	X
13. Do I have a lawyer in this case?	
14. How will the lawyers be paid?	
15. Will the Representative Plaintiff receive any compensation for their efforts in bringing this Action?	
RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS	X
16. What am I giving up to obtain relief under the Settlement?	
HOW TO EXCLUDE YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT	X
17. How do I exclude myself from the Settlement?	
HOW TO OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT	X
18. How do I tell the Court that I do not like the Settlement?	
19. What is the difference between excluding myself and objecting to the Settlement?	
FINAL APPROVAL HEARING	X
20. What is the Final Approval Hearing?	
21. When and where is the Final Approval Hearing?	
22. May I speak at the hearing?	
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	X
23. How do I get more information?	
24. What if my address or other information has changed?	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Why did I get this notice?

You received this Notice because a Settlement has been reached in this Action. According to Defendant's available records you are a member of the Class and may be eligible for the relief detailed below.

This Notice explains the nature of the Action, the general terms of the proposed Settlement, and your legal rights and obligations. To obtain more information about the Settlement, including information about how you can see a copy of the Settlement Agreement (which defines the capitalized terms used in this Notice), see Section 23 below.

2. What is this lawsuit about?

Plaintiff Joanna Magpiong (the "Plaintiff" or "Representative Plaintiff") filed a lawsuit against CareLinx, Inc. ("Defendant") on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated. The lawsuit alleges that Defendant violated California law by, among other things, failing to classify Nurses as employees, failing to pay overtime and minimum wage, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to timely pay wages, including at termination, failing to provide expense reimbursement, and failing to provide compliant wage statements. The lawsuit also asserts claims under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code section 2698, et seq. ("PAGA").

Defendant denies each and every one of the allegations of unlawful conduct, any wrongdoing, and any liability whatsoever, and no court or other entity has made any judgment or other determination of any liability. Defendant further denies that any Class Member is entitled to any relief and, other than for Settlement purposes, that this Action is appropriate for certification as a class action.

The issuance of this Notice is not an expression of the Court's opinion on the merits or the lack of merits of the Plaintiff's claims in the Action.

For information about how to learn about what has happened in the Action to date, please see Section 23 below.

3. Why is this a class action?

In a class action lawsuit, one or more people called "Plaintiff" (in this Action, Joanna Magpiong) sues on behalf of other people who allegedly have similar claims. For purposes of this proposed Settlement, one court will resolve the issues for all Class Members. The company sued in this case, Carelinx, Inc., is called the Defendant.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

The Plaintiff has made claims against Defendant. Defendant denies that they have done anything wrong or illegal and admit no liability. **The Court has not decided that the Plaintiff or the Defendant should win this Action. Instead, both sides agreed to a Settlement.** That way, they avoid the cost of a trial, and the Class Members will receive payment now rather than years from now, if at all.

5. How do I know if I am part of the Settlement?

The Court has decided that everyone who fits the following description is a Class Member for purposes of the proposed Settlement: "All current and former Nurses who have worked at least one Nursing Shift in California through use of Defendant's Nurse OnDemand platform application at any time during the Class Period." "Nurse" refers to a licensed healthcare professional who works as a Certified Nursing Assistant ("CNA"), Medical Assistant, Licensed Vocational Nurse ("LVN"), Licensed Practical Nurse ("LPN"), Registered Nurse ("RN"), and/or Nurse Practitioner ("NP"). "Nursing Shift" means a shift at a skilled nursing or similar facility in California that was sourced, accepted, and paid through use of Defendant's Nurse OnDemand platform application. All Class Members will be credited with at least one (1) Nursing Shift. "Class Period" refers to the period of time from June 3, 2017 through [April 4, 2022]. As a practical matter, there were no Nursing Shifts worked by any Class Member prior to January 1, 2020.

6. I'm still not sure if I am included.

If you are still not sure whether you are included, you can write to the Settlement Administrator for free help. The address of the Settlement Administrator is: Carelinx Settlement Administration, c/o [_____].

THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

7. What relief does the Settlement provide to the Class Members?

Defendant has agreed to fund a Settlement with a maximum value of \$1,737,620. The Settlement amount will be used to pay the claims of Settlement Class Members, the cost of providing notice to the Class and administering the Settlement (i.e., \$21,000); to pay any awards of the Court for attorneys' fees (i.e., \$561,000) and costs (i.e., \$20,000) to Plaintiff's counsel; any service award the Court awards to the Representative Plaintiff (i.e., \$10,000); and the amount allocated under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698 et seq. ("PAGA") (i.e., \$170,000.00, the "PAGA Penalty Amount"), which includes the 75% payment to the California Labor Workforce and Development Agency ("LWDA") (i.e., \$127,500) and the 25% PAGA Group Amount distributed to the Class Members.

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is \$[] based on the [] Nursing Shifts you worked during the Class Period, as shown in Defendant's records. Your estimated payment was calculated using Defendant's records. Individual Settlement Payments will be calculated and apportioned as follows:

(a) The "Net Settlement Fund" shall be calculated by subtracting, from the total of \$1,737,620, the payments to Class Counsel, the Representative Plaintiff, and the Settlement Administrator, and the PAGA Penalty Amount.

(b) For each Class Member, the Settlement Administrator shall determine the number of Nursing Shifts worked by them during the Class Period based on Defendant's records. The sum of the Nursing Shifts for all Class Members shall be the "Total Shifts."

(c) The Net Settlement Fund shall be divided by the number of Total Shifts; the resulting figure is the "Shift Point Value."

(d) For each Settlement Class Member (i.e., Class Members who do not request to be excluded from the Settlement), the Settlement Administrator will multiply the number of Nursing Shifts he or she worked during the Class Period by the Shift Point Value. The resulting figure shall be the "Individual Settlement Amount" for each such Settlement Class Member.

(e) The Settlement Administrator shall divide the PAGA Group Amount by the total number of PAGA Group members (i.e., the total number of Class Members); the resulting figure shall be each Class Member's pro rata share of the PAGA Group Amount.

PAYMENT TO THE CLASS

8. How can I get a payment?

If you wish to remain a Settlement Class Member and obtain any share of the Settlement that you may be entitled to receive, then you do not have to do anything and you will automatically receive a Settlement Payment check in the mail if the Court approves the proposed Settlement. You are not required to go to court or pay anything to the lawyers in this case. The Settlement Payment you will receive will be a full and final settlement of your Released Claims described below.

9. When will I get a payment?

As described in Sections 20 and 21, the Court will hold a hearing on August 23, 2022 at 2:00 PM, to decide whether to approve the Settlement. If the Court approves the Settlement, after that, there may be appeals. It is always uncertain whether these appeals can be resolved, and resolving them can take time, perhaps more than a year. *Please be patient.*

10. What if I disagree with Defendant's calculation regarding my estimated Settlement payment?

If you believe that the number of Nursing Shifts with which you have been credited is incorrect, you may produce evidence to the Settlement Administrator by _____ showing that such information is inaccurate. The Settlement Administrator shall decide the dispute. Defendant's records will be presumed correct, but the Settlement Administrator will evaluate the evidence submitted by you and will make the final decision as to the merits of the dispute. You can submit a Shift Dispute by mail to the Settlement Administrator at: Carelinx Settlement Administration, c/o [_____].

11. If I receive a Settlement payment will I have to pay taxes on it?

Your Settlement payment will be reported on IRS Form 1099. You should consult a tax professional for more information about your own specific situation.

12. No retaliation or discrimination.

Defendant respects your right to participate in this lawsuit and will take no adverse action against you should you accept payment under the Settlement.

THE LAWYERS IN THIS CASE AND THE REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF

13. Do I have a lawyer in this case?

The Court has ordered that the law firm of Da Vega, Fisher, Mechtenberg LLP ("Class Counsel") will represent the interests of all Class Members. You will not be separately charged for these lawyers. If you have a question about the Settlement, you may contact the Class Counsel by writing them at 232 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101, or emailing them at (mdavega@mdmflaw.com) or (mfisher@mdmflaw.com), or calling them at (805) 232-4471. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

14. How will the lawyers be paid?

Defendant has agreed to pay Class Counsel's attorneys' fees up to \$561,000 and costs and expenses of up to \$20,000 for their services in litigating the Action, subject to approval by the Court. You will not be required to pay any attorneys' fees or costs yourself.

15. Will the Representative Plaintiff receive any compensation for their efforts in bringing this Action?

The Representative Plaintiff will request a service award (also known as an "incentive" award) of up to \$10,000 for her service as class representative and her effort in bringing the Action. The Court will make the final decision as to the amount to be paid to the class representative.

RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

16. What am I giving up to obtain relief under the Settlement?

If the Court approves the proposed Settlement, unless you exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will be releasing your claims against Defendant. This generally means that you will not be able to file a lawsuit, continue prosecuting a lawsuit, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendant regarding the allegations in the Action. The Settlement Agreement, which is available by contacting the Settlement Administrator as described in Section 23 below, contains the full terms of the release.

HOW TO EXCLUDE YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

17. How do I exclude myself from the Settlement?

You may exclude yourself from the Class and the Settlement. If you want to be excluded, you must send a letter or postcard (also known as a "Request for Exclusion") via U.S. Mail or other delivery service that states: **(a)** the case name and number of the Action "*Joanna Magpiong v. Carelinx, Inc.* Case No. CIV-03038"; **(b)** your full name, address, and telephone number; and **(c)** a statement that you do not wish to participate in the Settlement. You must sign and date the letter or postcard for it to be valid. The letter or postcard must be sent (i.e., postmarked or delivery date stamped) by no later than _____ and sent to the Settlement Administrator at: Carelinx Settlement Administration, c/o [_____].

If you timely request exclusion from the Class, you will be excluded from the Class, you will not be bound by the judgment entered in the Action, you will not be precluded from prosecuting any timely, individual claim against Defendant based on the conduct complained of in the Action, and you will not receive an Individual Settlement Payment.

Even if you request exclusion from the Class, however, you will still be bound by the Settlement Agreement's release of PAGA Claims upon final approval of the Settlement Agreement and judgment. Requests for Exclusion do not apply to PAGA Claims. All Class Members will be sent a check for their pro rata share of the PAGA Group Amount, which are civil penalties enforced on behalf of the State of California.

HOW TO OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT

18. How do I tell the Court that I do not like the Settlement?

At the date, time, and location stated in Section 21 below, the Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing to determine if the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and to also consider Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and costs, and service award to the Representative Plaintiff.

If you wish to object to the fairness, reasonableness, or adequacy of the Settlement Agreement or the proposed Settlement, you must submit via U.S. Mail or other delivery service a valid, written Objection to the Settlement Administrator at the address set forth below by no later than (i.e., postmarked or delivery date stamped by) _____.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

CPT Group, Inc.

[_____]

To be valid, any objections must: **(a)** state the name and case number of the Action "*Joanna Magpiong v. Carelinx, Inc.* Case No. CIV-03038"; **(b)** state your full name, current mailing address, most current telephone number, and last four digits of your Social Security number; **(c)** state your objection to the Settlement and the legal and/or factual arguments supporting the objection; **(d)** be submitted to the Settlement Administrator via U.S. Mail or other delivery service with proof of submission date (such as a U.S. Postal Service postmark or another delivery service date stamp) no later than _____. You must sign and date the objection for it to be valid. You may, but need not, submit your objection through counsel of your choice. If you make your objection through counsel, you will be responsible for your attorney's fees and costs. **If you wish to appear at the Final Approval Hearing to object to the Settlement, either in person or through personal counsel hired at your expense, we ask that you include in your Objection the statement, "Notice of Intention to Appear at Final Approval Hearing," or that you otherwise provide to the Settlement Administrator a "Notice of Intention to Appear" indicating your intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing. Doing so, however, does not obligate you to appear.**

IF YOU DO NOT TIMELY MAKE YOUR OBJECTION, YOU WILL BE DEEMED TO HAVE WAIVED ALL OBJECTIONS.

19. What is the difference between excluding myself and objecting to the Settlement?

Objecting is telling the Court that you don't like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Settlement Class. Excluding yourself is telling the Court that you don't want to be part of the Settlement Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the Settlement no longer affects you.

FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

20. What is the Final Approval Hearing?

The Court has preliminarily approved the Settlement meaning only that it concluded that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Agreement falls within the range of possible approval as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and that the final determination of these issues will be made at the Final Approval Hearing. The purpose of the Final Approval Hearing will be for the Court to determine whether the Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class; to consider the award of attorneys' fees and expenses to Class Counsel; and to consider the request for service awards to the Representative Plaintiff.

21. When and where is the Final Approval Hearing?

On August 23, 2022 at 2:00 PM, a hearing will be held on the fairness of the proposed Settlement. At the hearing, the Court will be available to hear any objections and arguments concerning the proposed Settlement's fairness. The hearing will take place before the Honorable Marie S. Weiner in Department 2 of the California Superior Court, for the County of San Mateo, located at the Southern Branch, Courtroom 2E, 400 County Center, Redwood, CA 94063. The hearing may be postponed to a different date or time or location without notice.

22. May I speak at the hearing?

At that hearing, the Court will be available to hear any Objections and arguments concerning the fairness of the Settlement. You may attend, but you do not have to.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

23. How do I get more information?

To see a copy of the Settlement Agreement, the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and the operative Complaint filed in the Action, please contact Class Counsel by writing them at 232 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101, or emailing them at (mdavega@mdmflaw.com) or (mfisher@mdmflaw.com), or calling them at (805) 232-4471.

This description of this Action is general and does not cover all of the issues and proceedings that have occurred. In order to see the complete file you may visit the Clerk's office at the Southern Branch, 400 County Center, Redwood, CA 94063, to obtain the file for inspection and copying at your own expense. Some documents are also available online for a fee at: <https://www.sanmateocourt.org/>

24. What if my address or other information has changed?

It is your responsibility to inform the Settlement Administrator of your updated information. You may make corrections to your address by contacting the Settlement Administrator at: Carelinx Settlement Administration, c/o [_____].

PLEASE DO NOT ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT OR THE LITIGATION TO THE CLERK OF THE COURT OR THE JUDGE.



SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

400 County Center 800 North Humboldt Street
Redwood City, CA 94063 San Mateo, CA 94401
(650) 261-5100
www.sanmateocourt.org

(ENDORSED)

FILED

SAN MATEO COUNTY

4/12/2022

Clerk of the Superior Court

/s/ Andrea Daley

DEPUTY CLERK

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

Date: 4/12/2022
JOANNA MAGPIONG, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED
In the Matter of: vs Carelinx, Inc.
Case No.: 21-CIV-03038
Documents: PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT AND
PROVISIONAL CLASS CERTIFICATION ORDER

The documents were served by the following means:

By U.S. Mail. I enclosed the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the person(s) at the address(es) listed below and deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.

☒ Placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following the Court's ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business' practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day the correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

Executed on: 4/12/2022

Neal I Taniguchi, Court Executive Officer/Clerk

By: /s/ Andrea Daley

Andrea Daley, Deputy Clerk

Copies Mailed To:

MATTHEW S. DA VEGA
MATTHEW FISHER
DA VEGA FISHER MECHTENBERG LLP
232 EAST ANAPAMU STREET
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101

SUMMER J. WYNN
EILEEN LEMAN
COOLEY LLP
1333 2ND STREET
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401

NORMAN BLUMENTHAL/KYLE NORDREHAUG
APARAJIT BHOWMIK/NICHOLAS DE BLOUW
BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CA 92037

EXHIBIT 2
(CPT Settlement Administrator Declaration)

MATTHEW S. DA VEGA (SBN 195443)
MATTHEW FISHER (SBN 229532)
DA VEGA FISHER MECHTENBERG LLP
232 E. Anapamu St.
Santa Barbara, California 93101
Telephone: (805) 232-4471
Facsimile: (877) 535-9358

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Plaintiff Class

SUMMER J. WYNN (SBN 240005)
(swynn@cooley.com)
EILEEN M. LEMAN (SBN 323232)
(elemen@cooley.com)
COOLEY LLP
4401 Eastgate Mall
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (858) 550-6000
Facsimile: (858) 550-6420

Attorneys for Defendant
CARELINX, INC

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

JOANNA MAGPIONG, on behalf of herself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

CARELINX, INC., and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 21-CIV-03038

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF LAURA SINGH
(ON BEHALF OF CPT GROUP, INC.)
WITH RESPECT TO
NOTIFICATION AND
ADMINISTRATION**

Hon. Marie S. Weiner

Date: August 23, 2022
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Dept.: 2

1 I, Laura Singh, declare as follows:

2 1. I am employed by CPT Group, Inc. the Court-approved class action Settlement
3 Administrator for *Magpiong v. Carelinx* as a Case Manager. I have personal knowledge of the
4 facts set forth in this Declaration, and if called as a witness, I could and would testify
5 competently thereto.

6 2. CPT Group, Inc. ("Settlement Administrator") has extensive experience in
7 providing notice of class actions and administering class action settlements. In the past 30-plus
8 years, we have provided notification and/or claims administration services in thousands of class
9 action cases.

10 3. CPT was selected by the parties to administer the settlement in this action. In this
11 capacity, CPT was charged with (a) printing and mailing to Class Members the *Notice of Class*
12 *Action and Proposed Settlement*, (herein referred to as "Notice"), (b) processing undeliverable
13 mail and locating updated addresses for Class Members; (c) receiving other communications
14 about the settlement; (d) notifying the parties of the number of Class Members who filed timely
15 requests for exclusion; (e) notifying the parties of the number of Class Members who filed
16 untimely or deficient requests for exclusion and taking steps to cure the deficiencies; (f)
17 establishing and maintaining a toll free case hotline where Class Members can speak to case
18 representatives regarding case specific questions; and (g) will be responsible for calculating and
19 mailing the Settlement Class checks to Settlement Class Members.

20 4. CPT received the Court-approved text for the Notice from Counsel on April 18,
21 2022. CPT prepared a draft of the Notice for mailing to the class members. Attached hereto as
22 Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the Notice.

23 5. On April 25, 2022, CPT received a class data file from Defense Counsel that
24 contained names, last known mailing addresses, phone numbers, social security numbers, and
25 estimated number of nursing shifts. The finalized class list contained 2,058 Class Members.

26 6. On May 16, 2022, CPT caused a National Change of Address (NCOA) database
27 search to be performed in attempt to update the addresses on the class list and ensure it was
28 accurate as possible. A search of this database provides updated addresses for any individual

1 who had moved in the previous four years and notified the U.S. Postal Service of their change
2 of address.

3 7. The Notices were enclosed in envelopes with the Class Member's name and
4 known address printed on the envelope. On May 17, 2022, the Notices were mailed via U.S.
5 first class mail to all Settlement Class Members.

6 8. As of the date of this declaration, 106 Notices have been returned to our office by
7 the Post Office, none of which were provided a new address by the Post Office. CPT performed
8 a Skip Trace to locate a better address using Accurant, one of the most comprehensive address
9 databases available. It utilizes hundreds of different databases supplied by credit reporting
10 agencies, public records, and a variety of other national databases.

11 9. As a result of a skip trace effort or request from Counsel or the Class Members
12 themselves, a total of 103 Notices have been re-mailed to date. As of this date, there are
13 ultimately 21 Notices undeliverable with no forwarding address, where no new address could be
14 found through skip trace.

15 10. The Notice indicated a deadline date of July 16, 2022, to dispute the number of
16 work weeks, to object or request exclusion from the settlement.

17 11. As of the date of this declaration, CPT has not received any objections.

18 12. As of the date of this declaration, CPT has not received any disputes of shifts.

19 13. As of the date of this declaration, CPT has received 1 request for exclusion from
20 Jed Odalley Manayon.

21 14. On July 14, 2022, CPT received a request from a potential class member
22 requesting to be added to the case. The request was reviewed by defense and determined as a
23 valid request. As a result, the class member was added to the case.

24 15. As of the date of this declaration, CPT will report a total of 2,058 Participating
25 Class Members, representing a 99.95 % participation rate.

26 16. Pursuant to the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release:
27 Defendant has represented that there were approximately 1,700 Class Members as of
28 September 23, 2021. If the number of Class Members increases by more than 10% (i.e., more

than 170 class members) through the date of the Preliminary Approval Order, then the Gross Settlement Amount shall be increased by the same number of percentage points above 10% by which the actual number of Class Members exceeds 1,700. Based on the class list information provided, there were a total of 2,058 class members. Per CPT's calculations, and in consultation with Counsel, the escalator amount was \$188,000.00, bringing the Maximum Settlement Amount from \$1,700,000.00 to \$1,925,620.00. The entire Net Settlement Amount was used to calculate the estimated amount for each Settlement Class Members:

Gross Settlement Amount	\$1,925,620.00
Less Class Counsel Fees	\$623,000.00
Less Class Counsel Costs	\$19,781.00
Less Enhancement Award	\$10,000.00
Less LWDA Payment	\$127,500.00
Less PAGA Employee Payment	\$42,500.00
<u>Less Settlement Administration Costs</u>	<u>\$21,000.00</u>
Net Settlement Amount	\$1,081,839.00

17. Based on estimated settlement calculations at this time, the average gross payment to each Settlement Class Member is \$525.42 and the highest is \$5,569.56, and minimum \$14.62.

18. CPT will charge a total of \$21,000.00 in costs associated with the administration of the Settlement. This includes all costs incurred to date, as well as estimated costs involved in completing the Settlement.

19. Prior to the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, CPT will provide a supplemental declaration with updated reporting, to the extent there are any updates to the information provided above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed July 29, 2022, at Irvine, California.



Laura Singh

EXHIBIT A

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

JOANNA MAGPIONG,

v.

CARELINX, INC.,

Case No.21-CIV-03038

NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

TO: All current and former Nurses who have worked at least one Nursing Shift in California through use of Defendant's Nurse OnDemand platform application at any time from June 3, 2017 through April 12, 2022 :

IF YOU ARE A MEMBER OF THIS CLASS OF PERSONS, YOU SHOULD READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY BECAUSE IT WILL AFFECT YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS.

A settlement ("Settlement") has been proposed in a class action lawsuit pending in San Mateo County Superior Court ("Court") titled *Joanna Magpiong v. Carelinx, Inc.* Case No. 21-CIV-03038 (the "Action"). If the Court gives final approval to the Settlement, Carelinx, Inc. ("Defendant") will provide each Settlement Class Member a payment as set forth in this notice. Here is a summary of your rights and options; they are described in more detail later in this document. If you have any questions, please contact the *Magpiong v. Carelinx*, c/o CPT Group Inc. 50 Corporate Park, Irvine, CA 92606.

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is «estAmount» based on the «Shifts» Nursing Shifts you worked during the Class Period, as shown in Defendant's records.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT

GET A PAYMENT	If you do nothing, you will automatically receive a payment if the Settlement is finally approved by the Court.	N/A
SUBMIT A SHIFT DISPUTE	If you believe that the number of Nursing Shifts with which you have been credited is incorrect, you must submit a Shift Dispute to the Settlement Administrator. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 10 below.	Deadline: July 16, 2022
EXCLUDE YOURSELF	If you wish to exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must submit to the Settlement Administrator a valid Request for Exclusion. If you exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will not receive a payment under the Settlement. Excluding yourself is the only option that allows you to bring or maintain your own claims or lawsuit against Defendants regarding the allegations in the Action. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 17 below.	Deadline: July 16, 2022
OBJECT	If you wish to object to the Settlement, you must submit your objections to the Settlement Administrator. Submitting an objection does not exclude you from the Settlement. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 18 below.	Deadline: July 16, 2022
APPEAR AT THE "FINAL APPROVAL HEARING"	The Court will hold a "Final Approval Hearing" to consider the Settlement, the request for attorneys' fees and costs by counsel representing the Class in the Action, and the Representative Plaintiff's request for service award for bringing the Action. You may, but are not required to, speak at the Final Approval Hearing about any objection to the Settlement that you submitted. If you intend to speak at the Final Approval Hearing, we ask that you also provide to the Settlement Administrator a "Notice of Intention to Appear" indicating your intent to do so. Instructions for this option are set forth in Section 18 below.	Hearing Date: August 23, 2022 at 2:00 PM

The Court in charge of this Action has preliminarily approved the Settlement and must decide whether to give final approval to the Settlement. The relief provided to Class Members will be provided only if the Court gives final approval to the Settlement and, if there are any appeals, after the appeals are resolved in favor of the Settlement. ***Please be patient.***

WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION	2
1. Why did I get this notice?	
2. What is this lawsuit about?	
3. Why is this a class action?	
4. Why is there a Settlement?	
5. How do I know if I am part of the Settlement?	
6. I'm still not sure if I am included.	
THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT	3
7. What relief does the Settlement provide to the Class Members?	
PAYMENT TO THE CLASS	4
8. How can I get a payment?	
9. When will I get a payment?	
10. What if I disagree with the calculation regarding my estimated Settlement payment?	
11. If I receive a Settlement payment will I have to pay taxes on it?	
12. No retaliation or discrimination.	
THE LAWYERS IN THIS CASE AND THE REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF	4
13. Do I have a lawyer in this case?	
14. How will the lawyers be paid?	
15. Will the Representative Plaintiff receive any compensation for their efforts in bringing this Action?	
RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS	5
16. What am I giving up to obtain relief under the Settlement?	
HOW TO EXCLUDE YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT	5
17. How do I exclude myself from the Settlement?	
HOW TO OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT	5
18. How do I tell the Court that I do not like the Settlement?	
19. What is the difference between excluding myself and objecting to the Settlement?	
FINAL APPROVAL HEARING	6
20. What is the Final Approval Hearing?	
21. When and where is the Final Approval Hearing?	
22. May I speak at the hearing?	
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	6
23. How do I get more information?	
24. What if my address or other information has changed?	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Why did I get this notice?

You received this Notice because a Settlement has been reached in this Action. According to Defendant's available records you are a member of the Class and may be eligible for the relief detailed below.

This Notice explains the nature of the Action, the general terms of the proposed Settlement, and your legal rights and obligations. To obtain more information about the Settlement, including information about how you can see a copy of the Settlement Agreement (which defines the capitalized terms used in this Notice), see Section 23 below.

2. What is this lawsuit about?

Plaintiff Joanna Magpiong (the “Plaintiff” or “Representative Plaintiff”) filed a lawsuit against CareLinx, Inc. (“Defendant”) on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated. The lawsuit alleges that Defendant violated California law by, among other things, failing to classify Nurses as employees, failing to pay overtime and minimum wage, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to timely pay wages, including at termination, failing to provide expense reimbursement, and failing to provide compliant wage statements. The lawsuit also asserts claims under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code section 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”).

Defendant denies each and every one of the allegations of unlawful conduct, any wrongdoing, and any liability whatsoever, and no court or other entity has made any judgment or other determination of any liability. Defendant further denies that any Class Member is entitled to any relief and, other than for Settlement purposes, that this Action is appropriate for certification as a class action.

The issuance of this Notice is not an expression of the Court’s opinion on the merits or the lack of merits of the Plaintiff’s claims in the Action.

For information about how to learn about what has happened in the Action to date, please see Section 23 below.

3. Why is this a class action?

In a class action lawsuit, one or more people called “Plaintiff” (in this Action, Joanna Magpiong) sues on behalf of other people who allegedly have similar claims. For purposes of this proposed Settlement, one court will resolve the issues for all Class Members. The company sued in this case, Carelinx, Inc., is called the Defendant.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

The Plaintiff has made claims against Defendant. Defendant denies that they have done anything wrong or illegal and admit no liability. **The Court has not decided that the Plaintiff or the Defendant should win this Action. Instead, both sides agreed to a Settlement.** That way, they avoid the cost of a trial, and the Class Members will receive payment now rather than years from now, if at all.

5. How do I know if I am part of the Settlement?

The Court has decided that everyone who fits the following description is a Class Member for purposes of the proposed Settlement: “All current and former Nurses who have worked at least one Nursing Shift in California through use of Defendant’s Nurse OnDemand platform application at any time during the Class Period.” “Nurse” refers to a licensed healthcare professional who works as a Certified Nursing Assistant (“CNA”), Medical Assistant, Licensed Vocational Nurse (“LVN”), Licensed Practical Nurse (“LPN”), Registered Nurse (“RN”), and/or Nurse Practitioner (“NP”). “Nursing Shift” means a shift at a skilled nursing or similar facility in California that was sourced, accepted, and paid through use of Defendant’s Nurse OnDemand platform application. All Class Members will be credited with at least one (1) Nursing Shift. “Class Period” refers to the period of time from June 3, 2017 through April 12, 2022. As a practical matter, there were no Nursing Shifts worked by any Class Member prior to January 1, 2020.

6. I’m still not sure if I am included.

If you are still not sure whether you are included, you can write to the Settlement Administrator for free help. The address of the Settlement Administrator is: *Magpiong v. Carelinx, c/o CPT Group Inc. 50 Corporate Park, Irvine, CA 92606.*

THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

7. What relief does the Settlement provide to the Class Members?

Defendant has agreed to fund a Settlement with a maximum value of \$1,925,620.00. The Settlement amount will be used to pay the claims of Settlement Class Members, the cost of providing notice to the Class and administering the Settlement (i.e., \$21,000); to pay any awards of the Court for attorneys’ fees (i.e., \$623,000) and costs (i.e., \$20,000) to Plaintiff’s counsel; any service award the Court awards to the Representative Plaintiff (i.e., \$10,000); and the amount allocated under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698 et seq. (“PAGA”) (i.e., \$170,000.00, the “PAGA Penalty Amount”), which includes the 75% payment to the California Labor Workforce and Development Agency (“LWDA”) (i.e., \$127,500) and the 25% PAGA Group Amount distributed to the Class Members.

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is «estAmount» based on the «Shifts» Nursing Shifts you worked during the Class Period, as shown in Defendant’s records. Your estimated payment was calculated using Defendant’s records. Individual Settlement Payments will be calculated and apportioned as follows:

(a) The “Net Settlement Fund” shall be calculated by subtracting, from the total of \$1,925,620.00, the payments to Class Counsel, the Representative Plaintiff, and the Settlement Administrator, and the PAGA Penalty Amount.

(b) For each Class Member, the Settlement Administrator shall determine the number of Nursing Shifts worked by them during the Class Period based on Defendant’s records. The sum of the Nursing Shifts for all Class Members shall be the “Total Shifts.”

(c) The Net Settlement Fund shall be divided by the number of Total Shifts; the resulting figure is the “Shift Point Value.”

(d) For each Settlement Class Member (i.e., Class Members who do not request to be excluded from the Settlement), the Settlement Administrator will multiply the number of Nursing Shifts he or she worked during the Class Period by the Shift Point Value. The resulting figure shall be the “Individual Settlement Amount” for each such Settlement Class Member.

(e) The Settlement Administrator shall divide the PAGA Group Amount by the total number of PAGA Group members (i.e., the total number of Class Members); the resulting figure shall be each Class Member’s pro rata share of the PAGA Group Amount.

PAYMENT TO THE CLASS

8. How can I get a payment?

If you wish to remain a Settlement Class Member and obtain any share of the Settlement that you may be entitled to receive, then you do not have to do anything and you will automatically receive a Settlement Payment check in the mail if the Court approves the proposed Settlement. You are not required to go to court or pay anything to the lawyers in this case. The Settlement Payment you will receive will be a full and final settlement of your Released Claims described below.

9. When will I get a payment?

As described in Sections 20 and 21, the Court will hold a hearing on August 23, 2022 at 2:00 PM, to decide whether to approve the Settlement. If the Court approves the Settlement, after that, there may be appeals. It is always uncertain whether these appeals can be resolved, and resolving them can take time, perhaps more than a year. *Please be patient.*

10. What if I disagree with Defendant’s calculation regarding my estimated Settlement payment?

If you believe that the number of Nursing Shifts with which you have been credited is incorrect, you may produce evidence to the Settlement Administrator by July 16, 2022 showing that such information is inaccurate. The Settlement Administrator shall decide the dispute. Defendant’s records will be presumed correct, but the Settlement Administrator will evaluate the evidence submitted by you and will make the final decision as to the merits of the dispute. You can submit a Shift Dispute by mail to the Settlement Administrator at: *Magpiong v. Carelinx, c/o CPT Group Inc. 50 Corporate Park, Irvine, CA 92606.*

11. If I receive a Settlement payment will I have to pay taxes on it?

Your Settlement payment will be reported on IRS Form 1099. You should consult a tax professional for more information about your own specific situation.

12. No retaliation or discrimination.

Defendant respects your right to participate in this lawsuit and will take no adverse action against you should you accept payment under the Settlement.

THE LAWYERS IN THIS CASE AND THE REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFF

13. Do I have a lawyer in this case?

The Court has ordered that the law firm of Da Vega, Fisher, Mechtenberg LLP (“Class Counsel”) will represent the interests of all Class Members. You will not be separately charged for these lawyers. If you have a question about the Settlement, you may contact the Class Counsel by writing them at 232 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101, or emailing them at (mdavega@mdmflaw.com) or (mfisher@mdmflaw.com), or calling them at (805) 232-4471. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

14. How will the lawyers be paid?

Defendant has agreed to pay Class Counsel's attorneys' fees up to \$623,000 and costs and expenses of up to \$20,000 for their services in litigating the Action, subject to approval by the Court. You will not be required to pay any attorneys' fees or costs yourself.

15. Will the Representative Plaintiff receive any compensation for their efforts in bringing this Action?

The Representative Plaintiff will request a service award (also known as an "incentive" award) of up to \$10,000 for her service as class representative and her effort in bringing the Action. The Court will make the final decision as to the amount to be paid to the class representative.

RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS**16. What am I giving up to obtain relief under the Settlement?**

If the Court approves the proposed Settlement, unless you exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will be releasing your claims against Defendant. This generally means that you will not be able to file a lawsuit, continue prosecuting a lawsuit, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendant regarding the allegations in the Action. The Settlement Agreement, which is available by contacting the Settlement Administrator as described in Section 23 below, contains the full terms of the release.

HOW TO EXCLUDE YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT**17. How do I exclude myself from the Settlement?**

You may exclude yourself from the Class and the Settlement. If you want to be excluded, you must send a letter or postcard (also known as a "Request for Exclusion") via U.S. Mail or other delivery service that states: **(a)** the case name and number of the Action "*Joanna Magpiong v. Carelinx, Inc.* Case No. 21-CIV-03038"; **(b)** your full name, address, and telephone number; and **(c)** a statement that you do not wish to participate in the Settlement. You must sign and date the letter or postcard for it to be valid. The letter or postcard must be sent (i.e., postmarked or delivery date stamped) by no later than July 16, 2022 and sent to the Settlement Administrator at: *Magpiong v. Carelinx, c/o CPT Group Inc.* 50 Corporate Park, Irvine, CA 92606.

If you timely request exclusion from the Class, you will be excluded from the Class, you will not be bound by the judgment entered in the Action, you will not be precluded from prosecuting any timely, individual claim against Defendant based on the conduct complained of in the Action, and you will not receive an Individual Settlement Payment.

Even if you request exclusion from the Class, however, you will still be bound by the Settlement Agreement's release of PAGA Claims upon final approval of the Settlement Agreement and judgment. Requests for Exclusion do not apply to PAGA Claims. All Class Members will be sent a check for their pro rata share of the PAGA Group Amount, which are civil penalties enforced on behalf of the State of California.

HOW TO OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT**18. How do I tell the Court that I do not like the Settlement?**

At the date, time, and location stated in Section 21 below, the Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing to determine if the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and to also consider Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and costs, and service award to the Representative Plaintiff.

If you wish to object to the fairness, reasonableness, or adequacy of the Settlement Agreement or the proposed Settlement, you must submit via U.S. Mail or other delivery service a valid, written Objection to the Settlement Administrator at the address set forth below by no later than (i.e., postmarked or delivery date stamped by) July 16, 2022.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

Magpiong v. Carelinx,
c/o CPT Group Inc.
50 Corporate Park
Irvine, CA 92606

To be valid, any objections must: **(a)** state the name and case number of the Action "*Joanna Magpiong v. Carelinx, Inc.* Case No. 21-CIV-03038"; **(b)** state your full name, current mailing address, most current telephone number, and last four

digits of your Social Security number; **(c)** state your objection to the Settlement and the legal and/or factual arguments supporting the objection; **(d)** be submitted to the Settlement Administrator via U.S. Mail or other delivery service with proof of submission date (such as a U.S. Postal Service postmark or another delivery service date stamp) no later than July 16, 2022. You must sign and date the objection for it to be valid. You may, but need not, submit your objection through counsel of your choice. If you make your objection through counsel, you will be responsible for your attorney's fees and costs. **If you wish to appear at the Final Approval Hearing** to object to the Settlement, either in person or through personal counsel hired at your expense, we ask that you include in your Objection the statement, "Notice of Intention to Appear at Final Approval Hearing," or that you otherwise provide to the Settlement Administrator a "Notice of Intention to Appear" indicating your intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing. Doing so, however, does not obligate you to appear.

IF YOU DO NOT TIMELY MAKE YOUR OBJECTION, YOU WILL BE DEEMED TO HAVE WAIVED ALL OBJECTIONS.

19. What is the difference between excluding myself and objecting to the Settlement?

Objecting is telling the Court that you don't like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Settlement Class. Excluding yourself is telling the Court that you don't want to be part of the Settlement Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the Settlement no longer affects you.

FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

20. What is the Final Approval Hearing?

The Court has preliminarily approved the Settlement meaning only that it concluded that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Agreement falls within the range of possible approval as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and that the final determination of these issues will be made at the Final Approval Hearing. The purpose of the Final Approval Hearing will be for the Court to determine whether the Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class; to consider the award of attorneys' fees and expenses to Class Counsel; and to consider the request for service awards to the Representative Plaintiff.

21. When and where is the Final Approval Hearing?

On August 23, 2022 at 2:00 PM, a hearing will be held on the fairness of the proposed Settlement. At the hearing, the Court will be available to hear any objections and arguments concerning the proposed Settlement's fairness. The hearing will take place before the Honorable Marie S. Weiner in Department 2 of the California Superior Court, for the County of San Mateo, located at the Southern Branch, Courtroom 2E, 400 County Center, Redwood, CA 94063. The hearing may be postponed to a different date or time or location without notice.

22. May I speak at the hearing?

At that hearing, the Court will be available to hear any Objections and arguments concerning the fairness of the Settlement. You may attend, but you do not have to.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

23. How do I get more information?

To see a copy of the Settlement Agreement, the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and the operative Complaint filed in the Action, please contact Class Counsel by writing them at 232 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101, or emailing them at (mdavega@mdmflaw.com) or (mfisher@mdmflaw.com), or calling them at (805) 232-4471.

This description of this Action is general and does not cover all of the issues and proceedings that have occurred. In order to see the complete file you may visit the Clerk's office at the Southern Branch, 400 County Center, Redwood, CA 94063, to obtain the file for inspection and copying at your own expense. Some documents are also available online for a fee at: <https://www.sanmateocourt.org/>

24. What if my address or other information has changed?

It is your responsibility to inform the Settlement Administrator of your updated information. You may make corrections to your address by contacting the Settlement Administrator at: *Magpiong v. Carelinx*, c/o CPT Group Inc. 50 Corporate Park, Irvine, CA 92606.

PLEASE DO NOT ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT OR THE LITIGATION TO THE CLERK OF THE COURT OR THE JUDGE.

EXHIBIT 3
(Declaration of Class Representative
Joanna Magpiong)

Matthew S. Da Vega (SBN 195443)
Matthew H. Fisher (SBN 229532)
DAVEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP
232 E. Anapamu St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Telephone: (805) 232-4471
Facsimile: (877) 535-9358
mdavega@mdmflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

JOANNA MAGPIONG, on behalf of herself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CARELINX, INC., and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,
Defendants.

Case No.: 21-CIV-03038

CLASS and REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**DECLARATION OF CLASS
REPRESENTATIVE JOANNA MAGPIONG
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT and
ENHANCEMENT PAYMENT**

Assigned For All Purposes to the Honorable
Marie S. Weiner (Dept. 2)

Date: August 23, 2022

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Location: Dept. 2 (Hon. Marie S. Weiner)

I, **JOANNA MAGPIONG**, hereby declare as follows:

1. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. **Named Class Representative Joanna Magpiong:** I am the named Plaintiff and proposed Class Representative in the above-captioned action. I submit this declaration in support of the Motion for Final Approval of the Class Action Settlement and in support of my application for an Enhancement Payment.

3. **Work History with Defendants:** I am a single adult 24 year old Asian-American female. I am a resident and citizen of Hayward, CA. I was employed as a LVN ("Nurse") by Defendants from approximately April 28, 2021 to August 2021. CareLinx classified myself, and

1 other Nurses, as “Independent Contractors”. CareLinx also classified myself and other Nurses as
2 non-exempt hourly workers. My hourly rate was \$38.00 per hour. While employed by Defendants
3 I would often work overtime hours but was only paid my flat hourly rate plus a small premium
4 based on the distance to the third-party client facility (i.e. additional \$1/hr. for locations within 25-
5 35 miles of my home address; additional \$2/hr. for locations within 35-50 miles of my home
6 address, etc.). I was not paid the overtime rate of one and one half times (1.5x) or double time
7 (2x) my flat hourly rate for overtime hours worked. I was also denied duty-free meal and/or rest
8 periods on a regular basis. I was not reimbursed for necessary business expenses. I was also not
9 provide compliant itemized wage statement in writing showing gross wages, total hours worked,
10 all deductions, net wages, applicable hourly rates, etc.

11 **4. Class and PAGA Group Claims:** The action was filed on behalf of a Class of
12 current and former California-based CareLinx Nurses (Certified Nursing Assistant ["CNA"],
13 Medical Assistant ["MA"], Licensed Vocational Nurse ["LVN"], Licensed Practical Nurse
14 ["LPN"], Registered Nurse ["RN"], and/or Nurse Practitioner ("NP"). The Class and PAGA
15 Group alleges that Defendant failed to pay overtime hours at correct rates, not paying minimum
16 wage, failed to provide duty-free meal and rest breaks; failed to furnish accurate wages
17 statements, failed to pay waiting time penalties, failed to reimburse necessary business expenses,
18 and were involved in unfair business practices.

19 **5. My Claims Are Typical of The Class and PAGA Group:** My claims are typical
20 of the claims asserted on behalf of the Class. I, like other Nurses have been subjected to
21 Defendant’s employment policies and practices at issue in this class action lawsuit including
22 misclassification of Nurses as independent contractors, requiring Nurses to work numerous
23 overtime hours without paying them the correct overtime rates, not paying minimum wage, failing
24 to provide duty-free meal and rest breaks; failing to furnish accurate wages statements, failing to
25 pay waiting time penalties, failing to reimburse necessary business expenses, and were involved in
26 unfair business practices. I am therefore similarly situated to all the other Class Members.

27 **6. No Conflicts with Class or PAGA Group:** I am not aware of any conflict of
28 interest that prevents me from being confirmed as a Class or PAGA Representative in this lawsuit.

1 I am not related in any way to my attorneys or to any other member of the firm that is representing
2 me. I have no business dealings or other involvement with my attorneys beyond this lawsuit and
3 this representation. I have not been promised any money or inducement to serve as Class or
4 PAGA Representative in this action.

5 7. **My Work on the Case:** I have been involved in this case from its inception
6 working directly with my attorneys because of what I believed to be an injustice regarding
7 Defendants' failure to pay Nurses wages correctly. I have remained committed to prosecuting this
8 case on behalf of the Class, and myself. I have spent dozens of hours of my own time to help
9 gather information by searching/reviewing documents. I also spent hours on the phone and in
10 person with my legal counsel answering questions and explaining Defendant's policies and
11 practices. In deciding to litigate my claims as part of this class action, I agreed to pursue not only
12 my claims, but the claims of all similarly situated class members, and if necessary, to put the
13 interests of the Class of other Nurses ahead of my own interests. I also agreed to actively
14 participate in the lawsuit and to assume the risks of serving as a named Plaintiff in this case. I felt
15 that it was important to pursue the claims on behalf of all Nurses because I believed that many of
16 them were not aware of their rights under California laws.

17 8. I located my attorneys Matthew Da Vega of **DA VEGA | FISHER |**
18 **MECHTENBERG LLP** to represent me because it's my understanding they have a good
19 reputation in the community as Plaintiff's lawyers. I was in contact with my attorneys on a
20 regular basis from the start of the case through the mediation and settlement. I provided my
21 attorneys with documents, and relevant information regarding my experience working as a Nurse
22 for CareLinx. I also provided my attorneys with relevant and helpful information about
23 Defendants' alleged practices of misclassification of Nurses as exempt and confirmed the alleged
24 widespread nature of overtime work. I also attended a daylong in-person mediation with JAMS. I
25 actively participated in settlement negotiations after the mediation providing both my attorneys
26 and Defendant's attorneys specific and relevant information about the claims and actual practices
27 related to the claims. I believe the information I provided was instrumental in helping prosecute
28 the case and in the eventual settlement.

10. **Request for Enhancement Award:** I request that the Court award a reasonable Enhancement Payment to compensate me for the work performed in my role as Class Representative, for the risk I took on behalf of many others, and the disruption to my work and personal life that has resulted from service as a Class Representative. I was aware that being a Class Representative in a class action lawsuit could impact my career and future employment, because I might be “blackballed” or viewed differently for suing a former employer. I was also aware that by filing the lawsuit, I might be responsible for some or all of Defendants’ legal costs if the case was not successfully litigated. As a Class Representative, I actively participated in the litigation and have always maintained the best interests of the Class while performing my representative duties. Therefore based on the effort, risk, delay in payment, and time spent on the matter I believe that the requested enhancement Enhancement Payment of **\$10,000** (ten thousand dollars) is fair, reasonable and compensates me for such an great result for so many people who would have otherwise likely never received any compensation at all.

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

23 **DATED:** August 1, 2022

DocuSigned by:
JOANNA MAGPIONG
47C0D33D4B5627

EXHIBIT 4
(NALFA 2020 Litigation Hourly Rate
Range Growth)

Fee Dispute Hotline **(312) 907-7275**

News Blog

NALFA Releases 3 Models of Growth for Litigation Hourly Rates

August 10, 2020 | Posted in : Fee Award, Fee Calculation Method, Fee Data / Fee Analytics, Fee Request, Hourly Rate Survey, Hourly Rates, Lodestar, NALFA News, Study / Report

NALFA conducts custom hourly rate surveys for law firms, corporate legal departments, and government agencies. Our hourly rate surveys provide our clients with the most current and accurate hourly rates within a given geography and practice area. Starting this year, 2020, NALFA is conducting hourly rate surveys in 5 key practice areas. These billing rate surveys show the current average hourly rate range for both plaintiffs' and defense counsel at partner and associate levels.

NALFA has released 3 different models of growth (linear, logarithmic, and logistic) for hourly rate ranges in litigation. These growth curves are based on the universally accepted principle that hourly rates increase with experience (i.e. partner rates are greater than associate rates). Linear growth is consistent straight-line growth. Generally, logarithmic growth rises sharply then levels off. Generally, logistic (S-shaped) growth starts slowly, rises sharply, then levels off. We did not use exponential (J-shaped) growth because an ever-increasing, very steep curve does not fit hourly rate billing economics.

"These growth models do not account for the factors that effect hourly rates such as geography, practice area, party to litigation, complexity of case, size of law firm, and economics that our surveys do," said Terry Jesse, Executive Director of NALFA. "Those variables were not a part of this purely mathematical exercise," Jesse emphasized.

From these growth curves, we learn 2 key concepts:

1. Logarithmic growth seems to represent the economics of hourly rates and the career span of litigators the best. Generally, the growth starts rapidly, then increases slower, then eventually levels off. Here, the highest rate of billing growth takes place in early-career.
2. Logistic growth is another model that has some appeal to the economics of hourly rates and

the career span of litigators. Generally, the growth starts slowly, then increases rapidly, then eventually levels off. Here, the highest rate of billing growth takes place in mid-career.

NALFA's 2020 Litigation Hourly Rate Range Growth Matrix			
Litigation Experience	Linear Growth	Logarithmic Growth	Logistic Growth
35+ Years	Over \$1,200	\$901-\$950	\$901-\$950
30-35 Years	\$1,101-\$1,200	\$901-\$950	\$851-\$900
25-29 Years	\$1,001-\$1,100	\$851-\$900	\$801-\$850
21-24 Years	\$901-\$1,000	\$801-\$850	\$751-\$800
17-20 Years	\$801-\$900	\$751-\$800	\$651-\$750
14-16 Years	\$701-\$800	\$701-\$750	\$551-\$650
11-13 Years	\$601-\$700	\$651-\$700	\$451-\$550
8-10 Years	\$501-\$600	\$601-\$650	\$351-\$450
6-7 Years	\$401-\$500	\$501-\$600	\$301-\$350
4-5 Years	\$301-\$400	\$401-\$500	\$251-\$300
2-3 Years	\$200-\$300	\$301-\$400	\$200-\$250
Less Than 2 Years	Less than \$200	\$200-\$300	Less than \$200

The parameters of these models include the number of years continuously practicing litigation (12 data points), plotted along the x axis and hourly rate ranges (20 data points) along the y axis. The litigation experience data sets range (less than 2 Years-35+ years) has a variance of 1 year to 5 years. The hourly rate ranges (less than \$200-over \$1,200) include a variance of \$50 and \$100.

EXHIBIT 5
(Laffey Matrix)

LAFFEY MATRIX

[History](#)
[Case Law](#)
[See the Matrix](#)
[Contact us](#)
[Home](#)

			Years Out of Law School *				
Year	Adjustmt Factor**	Paralegal/ Law Clerk	1-3	4-7	8-10	11-19	20 +
6/01/21- 5/31/22	1.006053	\$208	\$381	\$468	\$676	\$764	\$919
6/01/20- 5/31/21	1.015894	\$206	\$378	\$465	\$672	\$759	\$914
6/01/19- 5/31/20	1.0049	\$203	\$372	\$458	\$661	\$747	\$899
6/01/18- 5/31/19	1.0350	\$202	\$371	\$455	\$658	\$742	\$894
6/01/17- 5/31/18	1.0463	\$196	\$359	\$440	\$636	\$717	\$864
6/01/16- 5/31/17	1.0369	\$187	\$343	\$421	\$608	\$685	\$826
6/01/15- 5/31/16	1.0089	\$180	\$331	\$406	\$586	\$661	\$796
6/01/14- 5/31/15	1.0235	\$179	\$328	\$402	\$581	\$655	\$789
6/01/13- 5/31/14	1.0244	\$175	\$320	\$393	\$567	\$640	\$771
6/01/12- 5/31/13	1.0258	\$170	\$312	\$383	\$554	\$625	\$753
6/01/11- 5/31/12	1.0352	\$166	\$305	\$374	\$540	\$609	\$734
6/01/10- 5/31/11	1.0337	\$161	\$294	\$361	\$522	\$589	\$709
6/01/09- 5/31/10	1.0220	\$155	\$285	\$349	\$505	\$569	\$686
6/01/08- 5/31/09	1.0399	\$152	\$279	\$342	\$494	\$557	\$671
6/01/07-5/31/08	1.0516	\$146	\$268	\$329	\$475	\$536	\$645
6/01/06-5/31/07	1.0256	\$139	\$255	\$313	\$452	\$509	\$614
6/1/05-5/31/06	1.0427	\$136	\$249	\$305	\$441	\$497	\$598
6/1/04-5/31/05	1.0455	\$130	\$239	\$293	\$423	\$476	\$574
6/1/03-6/1/04	1.0507	\$124	\$228	\$280	\$405	\$456	\$549
6/1/02-5/31/03	1.0727	\$118	\$217	\$267	\$385	\$434	\$522
6/1/01-5/31/02	1.0407	\$110	\$203	\$249	\$359	\$404	\$487
6/1/00-5/31/01	1.0529	\$106	\$195	\$239	\$345	\$388	\$468
6/1/99-5/31/00	1.0491	\$101	\$185	\$227	\$328	\$369	\$444
6/1/98-5/31/99	1.0439	\$96	\$176	\$216	\$312	\$352	\$424
6/1/97-5/31/98	1.0419	\$92	\$169	\$207	\$299	\$337	\$406
6/1/96-5/31/97	1.0396	\$88	\$162	\$198	\$287	\$323	\$389
6/1/95-5/31/96	1.032	\$85	\$155	\$191	\$276	\$311	\$375
6/1/94-5/31/95	1.0237	\$82	\$151	\$185	\$267	\$301	\$363

The methodology of calculation and benchmarking for this Updated Laffey Matrix has been approved in a number of cases. See, e.g., *DL v. District of Columbia*, 267 F.Supp.3d 55, 69 (D.D.C. 2017)

* “Years Out of Law School” is calculated from June 1 of each year, when most law students graduate. “1-3” includes an attorney in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of practice, measured from date of graduation (June 1). “4-7” applies to attorneys in their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th years of practice. An attorney who graduated in May 1996 would be in tier “1-3” from June 1, 1996 until May 31, 1999, would move into tier “4-7” on June 1, 1999, and tier “8-10” on June 1, 2003.

** The Adjustment Factor refers to the nation-wide Legal Services Component of the Consumer Price Index produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT 6
(National Law Journal)



2017 NLJ Billing Report

Source: National Law Journal

Category: National Law Journal

ALM Legal Intelligence collected 2017 hourly billing rates for partners, associates and of counsel from the published rates in the 20 largest federal bankruptcy jurisdictions. High, low and average attorney billing rates are reported for 948 firms, in 31 states and the U.S. Territory Puerto Rico.

Copyright © ALM Media Properties, LLC. All rights reserved.

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	A.O.E Law & Associates, Apc	Los Angeles	CA					\$300	\$350	\$350		
2017	Abarbanel Law Offices	Fort Lauderdale	FL							\$350*		
2017	Ackerman Fox	East Meadow	NY				\$425*	\$350	\$475	\$413		
2017	Acree Law Firm	Springfield	MO				\$275*					
2017	Adam Law Group	Jacksonville	FL				\$350			\$250		
2017	Adams, Morris & Sessing	Germantown	MD				\$365*					
2017	Adelman & Gettleman Ltd	Chicago	IL		\$395	\$525	\$465			\$325		
2017	Affinity Law Group	St. Louis	MO					\$185	\$315	\$250		
2017	Agilis Legal, PC	Denver	CO				\$350*			\$295*		
2017	Akerman LLP	Miami	FL	76			\$350*			\$275*		
2017	Albert H.Barkey,Attorney at Law	New York	NY							\$360		
2017	Allan D. Newdelman	Phoenix	AZ					\$315	\$395	\$355		
2017	Allen Barnes & Jones PLC	Phoenix	AZ		\$345	\$595	\$510	\$275	\$295	\$285		\$480
2017	Allen Turnage, P.A.	Tallahassee	FL							\$400*		
2017	Allen Vellone Wolf Helfrich & Factor P.C.	Denver	CO					\$215	\$450	\$323		
2017	Allied Legal Group Inc	Los Angeles	CA							\$250*		
2017	Almeida & Davila PSC	San Juan	PR				\$200	\$175	\$200	\$188		
2017	Andersen Law Firm, Ltd.	Las Vegas	NV							\$285		
2017	Andrew M. Ellis Law	Phoenix	AZ							\$285*		
2017	Andrews Myers PC	Houston	TX								\$325	\$375
2017	Anthony O. Egbase & Associates Attorneys At Law	Los Angeles	CA							\$150*		
2017	Antonik Law Offices	Mount Vernon	IL				\$275*					
2017	Antonio Martinez	McAllen	TX				\$250			\$175		
2017	Anyama Law Firm	Cerritos	CA				\$400	\$175	\$200	\$188		
2017	Arboleda Brechner	Phoenix	AZ				\$400*					
2017	Arlene Gordon-Oliver	White Plains	NY							\$485*		
2017	Armstrong Teasdale LLP	St. Louis	MO	181	\$370	\$660	\$590	\$225	\$285	\$250		
2017	Ast & Schmidt, P.C.	Morristown	NJ							\$395*		
2017	Atkinson Law Associates Ltd	Las Vegas	NV							\$520*		
2017	Attorney Justin Oliverio, LLC	Decatur	GA							\$275*		
2017	Attorney Robert H. Holber PC	Media	PA							\$250		
2017	Avanesian Law Firm	Glendale	CA					\$250	\$375	\$313		
2017	B. Weldon Ponder Jr.	Austin	TX							\$350*		
2017	Babcoke Law Office	Miller Beach	IN							\$350		
2017	Bach Law Offices	Northbrook	IL				\$425	\$300	\$425	\$300		
2017	Backenroth Frankel & Krinsky, LLP	New York	NY		\$505	\$550	\$528	\$485	\$550	\$505		
2017	Baker & Associates	Houston	TX				\$450	\$300	\$375	\$305	\$350	\$450
2017	Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC	Nashville	TN	55			\$405					\$400
2017	Ballard Spahr LLP	Washington	DC	85	\$650	\$1,195	\$895	\$395	\$510	\$453		\$505
2017	Bankruptcy Law Center	San Diego	CA							\$425*		
2017	Barrick Switzer Long Balsley & Van Evera, LLP	Rockford	IL					\$225	\$275	\$250		
2017	Barron & Newburger, P.C.	Austin	TX				\$495			\$495		
2017	Barry Scott Miller, Esq	Newark	NJ							\$250*		
2017	Bartolone Legal Group, PA	Orlando	FL							\$325*		
2017	Bass Berry & Sims	Nashville	TN	165			\$525*			\$425*		
2017	Bast Amron LLP	Miami	FL				\$525*					
2017	Baumeister Denz LLP	Buffalo	NY		\$275	\$300	\$288			\$175		
2017	Bayard, P.A.	Wilmington	DE		\$475	\$675	\$525			\$305		
2017	Beall and Burkhardt, APC	Santa Barbara	CA		\$400	\$475	\$438			\$300*		
2017	Beard & Savory, PLLC	Memphis	TN							\$275		
2017	Behar, Gutt & Glazer, P.A.	Fort Lauderdale	FL				\$400			\$335		
2017	Belden Blaine Raytis LLP	Bakersfield	CA				\$330*					
2017	Bell, Davis & Pitt, PA	Winston-Salem	NC				\$300*					
2017	Bella Rose Skin Care PLLC	Midland	MI							\$125		
2017	Belvedere Legal, APC	San Mateo	CA				\$495*			\$395*		
2017	Benari & Nguyen LLP	Irvine	CA				\$350*			\$350*		
2017	Benjamin Brand, LLP	Chicago	IL				\$425	\$250	\$395	\$395		
2017	Bereliani Law Firm	Los Angeles	CA							\$300*		
2017	Berg Hill Greenleaf & Ruscitti, LLP	Denver	CO				\$400*					
2017	Berger Singerman	Miami	FL	496			\$695*					
2017	Berman DeLeve Kuchan and Chapman	Kansas City	MO				\$300			\$300		
2017	Bernstein-Burkley	Pittsburgh	PA			\$300	\$545	\$350	\$235	\$300	\$270	

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Bielli & Klauder, LLC	Wilmington	DE				\$325			\$205*		\$325
2017	Bigas & Bigas	Ponce	PR							\$250*		
2017	BKN Murray LLP	St. Petersburg	FL							\$375*		
2017	Black Square Financial	Coral Springs	FL							\$500*		
2017	Blake D. Gunn	Mesa	AZ					\$175	\$300	\$238		
2017	Blanchard Law, PA	Largo	FL							\$225		
2017	Blank Rome LLP	Philadelphia	PA	78	\$310	\$725	\$615	\$435	\$470	\$453		
2017	Bohnhoff & Mahoney	Lansing	MI							\$215*		
2017	Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC	Syracuse	NY	164	\$360	\$400	\$380					
2017	Bononi & Company, P.C.	Greensburg	PA				\$400*	\$185	\$280	\$195	\$635	\$650
2017	Bosley Till Neue & Talerico LLP	Newport Beach	CA				\$595*				\$350	\$595
2017	Boul & Associates, P.C.	Columbia	MO				\$250*			\$250*		
2017	Bracewell LLP	Houston	TX	114	\$1,000	\$1,100	\$1,050	\$550	\$755	\$653		
2017	Bradley Arant Boult Cummings LLP	Birmingham	AL	93			\$570*					
2017	Brian K. McMahon, P.A.	West Palm Beach	FL				\$400*					
2017	Broege, Neumann, Fischer & Shaver	Manasquan	NJ					\$275	\$590	\$500		
2017	Bronson Law Offices	Harrison	NY					\$275	\$400	\$375		
2017	Broussard Poche LLP	Lafayette	LA				\$220*					
2017	Brown Rudnick LLP	Boston	MA	203	\$905	\$1,245	\$1,075			\$515*		
2017	Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP	Denver	CO	192			\$655*			\$330*		
2017	Bruce W. Radowitz, Esq. P.A.	Union	NJ							\$300*		
2017	Bruner Wright, P.A.	Tallahassee	FL					\$225	\$350	\$288		
2017	Brutzkus Gubner Rozansky Seror Weber LLP	Woodland Hills	CA		\$235	\$850	\$625	\$325	\$500	\$485	\$495	\$675
2017	Bryan Cave LLP	St. Louis	MO	37	\$594	\$660	\$627	\$369	\$625	\$487		
2017	Bryan Diaz Law, APC	Ventura	CA							\$350*		
2017	Buddy Ford, P.A.	Tampa	FL					\$300	\$375	\$338		
2017	Buechler & Garber LLC	Denver	CO				\$350					
2017	Bufete Negron García, C.S.P	Guaynabo	PR							\$150*		
2017	Burger Law Firm	Houston	TX				\$300*	\$350	\$440	\$395		
2017	Burke, Warren, MacKay & Serritella, P.C.	Chicago	IL				\$510*			\$325*		
2017	Bush Kornfeld LLP	Seattle	WA					\$285	\$365	\$325		
2017	Byrd & Wiser	Biloxi	MS							\$300*		
2017	C Conde & Associates	San Juan	PR					\$175	\$275	\$200		
2017	Cairncross & Hempelmann	Seattle	WA							\$560*		
2017	Calaiao Valencik	Pittsburgh	PA		\$300	\$375	\$350	\$250	\$350	\$250		
2017	Campbell and Coombs	Mesa	AZ				\$500					
2017	Canterbury Law Group	Scottsdale	AZ					\$150	\$400	\$275		
2017	Cardwell & Chang P.L.L.C	Houston	TX					\$250	\$400	\$400		
2017	Carkhuff & Radmin	North Plainfield	NJ				\$400					
2017	Carlos J Cuevas Esq	Yonkers	NY				\$450*			\$495*		
2017	Carman Law Firm	Prescott	AZ				\$250*					
2017	Carmody MacDonald PC	St. Louis	MO				\$350*					
2017	Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP	New York	NY	458			\$900*	\$285	\$700	\$493		
2017	Catalyst Lifestyles Sport Resort, LLC	Indianapolis	IN							\$350*		
2017	CBG Law Group	Bellevue	WA				\$320*					
2017	Center City Law Offices LLC	Philadelphia	PA				\$250*					
2017	CGA Law Firm	York	PA				\$345*	\$200	\$270	\$235		
2017	Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C.	Chattanooga	TN		\$245	\$385	\$290	\$150	\$350	\$298		
2017	Charles A Curpill, PSC Law Office	San Juan	PR					\$250	\$350	\$300		
2017	Charles M Wynn Law Offices PA	Marianna	FL					\$200	\$325	\$250		
2017	Charles R. Chesnutt	Dallas	TX					\$250	\$450	\$350		
2017	Chase Bylenga Hulst, PLLC	Grand Rapids	MI				\$350*			\$275*		
2017	ChildersLaw, LLC	Gainesville	FL					\$275	\$375	\$325		
2017	Christopher C. Gautschi Attorney At Law	Santa Barbara	CA							\$400*		
2017	Ciardi Ciardi & Astin	Philadelphia	PA				\$515*	\$300	\$350	\$350		
2017	Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP	New York	NY	18				\$445	\$490	\$468		
2017	Clinton A Block Attorney At Law	Kewanee	IL							\$150*		
2017	Coats Rose	Houston	TX	362	\$475	\$650	\$563			\$325		
2017	Cohen & Krol	Chicago	IL		\$505	\$515	\$510			\$350		
2017	Cohen, Baldinger & Greenfeld, LLC	Rockville	MD					\$295	\$450	\$425		
2017	Cohen Pollock Merlin & Small, P.C.	Atlanta	GA					\$305	\$385	\$345		
2017	Cole & Cole Law, P.A	Sarasota	FL					\$300	\$400	\$350		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Cole Schotz P.C.	Hackensack	NJ	330	\$495	\$915	\$658	\$280	\$445	\$305		
2017	Collins, Vella & Casello	Manasquan	NJ				\$400*			\$250*		
2017	Connolly, Rosania and Lofstedt	Louisville	CO				\$340*			\$375*		
2017	Consumer Action Law Group PC	Los Angeles	CA				\$425	\$225	\$425	\$325		
2017	Cooley LLP	Palo Alto	CA	39			\$1,100	\$595	\$835	\$735	\$850	\$1,065
2017	Coon & Cole, LLC	Towson	MD				\$350*					\$998
2017	Cooper & Scully, P.C.	Dallas	FL							\$435*		\$350*
2017	Cooper, Pautz, Weiermiller & Daubner, LLP	Horseheads	NY							\$250*		
2017	Copeland Law Firm, P.C.	Abingdon	VA							\$300		
2017	Corash & Hollender PC	Staten Island	NY				\$450*			\$425*		\$425*
2017	Cordova Ayuso Law Office LLC	San Juan	PR				\$100			\$100		
2017	Corral Tran Singh, LLP	Houston	TX		\$275	\$325	\$300					
2017	Correa Business Consulting Group, Llc	San Juan	PR							\$150*		
2017	Cozen O'Connor	Philadelphia	PA	79	\$550	\$730	\$710			\$405*		
2017	Craig & Lofton, P.C.	Memphis	TN				\$50*					
2017	Crain, Caton & James	Houston	TX				\$400*			\$325*		
2017	Crane Heyman Simon Welch & Clar	Chicago	IL		\$445	\$510	\$510			\$325*		\$400*
2017	Crowley, Liberatore, Ryan & Brogan, P.C.	Norfolk	VA							\$330*		
2017	Cunningham, Chericoff & Warshawsky, P.C.	Harrisburg	PA				\$350					
2017	Curtis Castillo PC	Dallas	TX				\$425*	\$195	\$225	\$210		
2017	Dallas W Jolley, Jr Attorney at Law	Tacoma	WA				\$325*					
2017	Dana M. Douglas Attorney At Law	Granada Hills	CA				\$200*			\$200*		
2017	Daniel J. Rylander, P.C.	Tucson	AZ					\$200	\$300	\$250		
2017	Daniels & Taylor, PC	Lawrenceville	GA							\$300*		
2017	Dann & Merino, P.C.	East Rutherford	NJ							\$425*		
2017	Danoff & King, P.A	Towson	MD							\$350*		
2017	Danowitz & Associates, P.C.	Atlanta	GA					\$275	\$350	\$300		
2017	David C. Jones, Jr., P.C.	Fairfax	VA				\$350*					
2017	David Dunn Law Offices PC	Allentown	PA				\$300*					
2017	David E. Lynn, P.C.	Rockville	MD							\$425*		
2017	David E. Mullis, P.C.	Valdosta	GA							\$250*		
2017	David P. Lloyd, Ltd	LaGrange	IL				\$400*			\$400*		
2017	David R. Shook, Attorney at Law, PLLC	Clarkston	MI				\$350*					
2017	David R. Softness, PA	Miami	FL				\$550*					
2017	David Rosenthal Law Firm	Lafayette	IN							\$300*		
2017	David Schroeder Law Offices, PC	Springfield	MO				\$300*					
2017	David T Cain Law Offices	San Antonio	TX				\$300*					
2017	David W Steen, P.A.	Tampa	FL				\$450*	\$300	\$450	\$300		
2017	Davis Miles McGuire Gardner	Tempe	AZ				\$380*			\$240*		
2017	Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	New York	NY	35						\$1025*		
2017	Davis, Ermis & Roberts, P.C	Arlington	TX							\$350*		
2017	Dean G. Sutton, Esq	Sparta	NJ							\$400*		
2017	Dean W. Greer, Attorney at Law	San Antonio	TX				\$300*					
2017	Deborah Lawson, Attorney At Law, P.L.L.C.	Ventura	CA							\$35*		
2017	DeCaro & Howell PC	Upper Marlboro	MD				\$425*			\$380*		
2017	Deiches & Ferschmann	Haddonfield	NJ							\$425*		
2017	DelBello Donnell Weingarten Wise & Wiederkehr LLP	White Plains	NY		\$410	\$620	\$515					\$375*
2017	DeMarco-Mitchell, LLC	Plano	TX		\$285	\$350	\$350			\$125*		
2017	Dent Law Office, Ltd	Effingham	IL							\$300*		
2017	Dentons US LLP	Atlanta	GA		\$575	\$675	\$625			\$345*		
2017	Diamond McCarthy LLP	Houston	TX		\$420	\$750	\$585	\$320	\$340	\$330		
2017	Dibble & Miller	Rochester	NY							\$300*		
2017	Dilworth Paxson LLP	Philadelphia	PA	422	\$375	\$895	\$533	\$300	\$330	\$315		
2017	Dishbak Law Firm	Beverly Hills	CA				\$400*					
2017	DLA Piper	New York	NY	2	\$725	\$1,120	\$985	\$265	\$850	\$595	\$720	\$805
2017	Donahoe & Young LLP	Santa Clarita	CA		\$375	\$500	\$438	\$60	\$500	\$300		
2017	Doran & Doran, P.C.	Wilkes-Barre	PA					\$285	\$300	\$293		
2017	Dorsey & Whitney LLP	Minneapolis	MN	89	\$555	\$980	\$680	\$410	\$515	\$463	\$480	\$555
2017	Dougherty and Guenther	Salinas	CA							\$395*		
2017	Douglas Haun and Heidemann, P.C.	Springfield	MO							\$250*		
2017	Drake Law Firm PLC	Scottsdale	AZ				\$300*	\$125	\$300	\$213		
2017	Drescher & Associates	Baltimore	MD							\$350*		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Dsouza Law Group, P.A.	Plantation	FL							\$350*		
2017	Dunn Law, P.A.	Miami	FL				\$325*			\$325*		
2017	Durand & Associates, P.C.	Lewisville	TX				\$300*					
2017	E. P. Bud Kirk, Attorney at Law	El Paso	TX							\$300*		
2017	E. Waters & Associates, P.C.	North Bergen	NJ				\$400*			\$300		
2017	Eason & Tamborini, A Law Corporation	Sacramento	CA				\$400*	\$250	\$400	\$250		
2017	Edmiston Cambron, PLLC	Knoxville	TN				\$250*			\$250		
2017	Elizabeth A Haas Esq PLLC	New City	NY				\$400*			\$400*		
2017	Elkington Shepherd LLP	Oakland	CA							\$400		
2017	Ellett Law Offices, P.C	Phoenix	AZ					\$275	\$525	\$405		
2017	EPTMS, INC	El Paso	TX							\$300*		
2017	Eric A. Liepins	Dallas	TX							\$275*		
2017	Eric Slocum Sparks PC	Tucson	AZ					\$275	\$375	\$325		
2017	Estabrook & Company	Baltimore	MD							\$125*		
2017	Estudio Legal 1611 Corp	San Juan	PR							\$225*		
2017	Eubanks Law Firm, PC	Seymour	TN							\$250*		
2017	Fabian Law Office	San Juan	PR					\$190	\$375	\$305		
2017	Fedoroff Firm, LLC	Howell	NJ				\$350*					
2017	Financial Relief Law Center	Irvine	CA		\$325	\$300	\$313	\$295	\$350	\$300		
2017	Finestone Hayes LLP	San Francisco	CA				\$435*	\$370	\$435	\$403		
2017	Fisher and Associates	Houston	TX				\$395*	\$240	\$395	\$240		
2017	Fisher Rushmer, PA	Orlando	FL									\$475*
2017	FisherBroyles, LLP	Atlanta	GA		\$350	\$375	\$350	\$350	\$375	\$363		
2017	Flaster Greenberg	Cherry Hill	NJ		\$490	\$500	\$495					
2017	Foley & Lardner LLP	Milwaukee	WI	43			\$795*					\$630*
2017	Forrester & Worth PLLC	Phoenix	AZ				\$450*			\$400*		
2017	Forshey & Prostok, LLP	Fort Worth	TX		\$425	\$575	\$575			\$400*		
2017	Foster Law Offices	Sayrem	PA							\$250*		
2017	Foster Legal Services PLLC	Orland Park	IL							\$420*		
2017	Fox Rothschild LLP	Philadelphia	PA	49			\$725*	\$300	\$585	\$450		
2017	Francis E. Corbett, Attorney at Law	Pittsburgh	PA							\$250*		
2017	Frank A. Principe	Tampa	FL							\$300*		
2017	Frank Lyon Law Offices	Austin	TX				\$395			\$305		
2017	Franklin Hayward LLP	Dallas	TX				\$400*					
2017	Fuentes Law Offices, LLC	San Juan	PR							\$250*		
2017	Fuqua & Associates, PC	Houston	TX					\$225	\$500	\$250		
2017	Gagnon Eisele and Rigby, PLLC	Winter Park	FL				\$350*					
2017	Gainey Law Offices	Pittsburgh	PA							\$250*		
2017	Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP	Dallas	TX	194	\$640	\$725	\$640	\$280	\$385	\$360		
2017	Gardner Law Offices, PLLC	Raleigh	NC							\$275*		
2017	Garman Turner Gordon LLP	Las Vegas	NV		\$395	\$775	\$435			\$385*		
2017	Garvey Cushner & Associates PLLC	White Plains	NY				\$500			\$350*		
2017	Garvey Tirelli & Cushner Ltd	White Plains	NY				\$500			\$350*		
2017	Gary W. Short	Pittsburgh	PA					\$300	\$350	\$325*		
2017	Geiger Law LLC	Atlanta	GA							\$330*		
2017	George M. Geeslin	Atlanta	GA							\$350*		
2017	Gerald B. Stewart Attorney & Counselor at Law	Jacksonville	FL							\$300*		
2017	Gerald K. Smith and John C. Smith Law Offices	Tucson	AZ		\$250	\$600	\$350	\$350	\$250	\$350	\$300	
2017	Gerdes Law Firm, L.L.C	Hammond	LA							\$200*		
2017	Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	New York	NY	17	\$925	\$1,195	\$1,150	\$250	\$875	\$685		
2017	Gillman & Gillman, LLC	Edison	NJ				\$350*					
2017	Giordano Halleran & Ciesla, P.C	Red Bank	NJ				\$425			\$250		
2017	Glankler Brown PLLC	Memphis	TN				\$400*					
2017	Gleichenhaus Marchese & Weishaar PC	Buffalo	NY					\$250	\$350	\$325		
2017	Goe & Forsythe LLC	Irvine	CA		\$300	\$395	\$395	\$295	\$315	\$300		
2017	Goetz Fitzpatrick	New York	NY					\$550	\$580	\$565		
2017	Gold, Lange & Majoros PC	Southfield	MI		\$325	\$395	\$340	\$230	\$260	\$235		
2017	Goldberg Weprin Finkel Goldstein LLP	New York	NY				\$550*			\$550*		
2017	Goldman & Beslow, LLC	East Orange	NJ				\$400*			\$375*		
2017	Goldsmith & Guymon, P.C.	Las Vegas	NV				\$425*			\$425*		
2017	Goldstein and McClintock	Chicago	IL		\$435	\$525				\$285*		
2017	Goldstein Bershad & Fried PC	Southfield	MI							\$400		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Gonzalez Cordero Law Offices	Guaynabo	PR							\$250*		
2017	Goodman Law Offices, APC	Encino	CA				\$395*					
2017	Goodrich Postnikoff & Associates, LLP	Fort Worth	TX							\$200*		
2017	Gorski & Knowlton PC	Hamilton	NJ				\$400					
2017	Gouveia and Associates	Merrillville	IN					\$275	\$400	\$275		
2017	Grasl PLC	Farmington Hills	MI				\$350*					
2017	Gratacos Law Firm, PSC	Caguas	PR							\$200*		
2017	Gray Reed & McGraw LLP	Houston	TX	336			\$685*	\$375	\$455	\$415		\$575*
2017	Greenberg & Bass	Encino	CA				\$450*	\$350	\$400	\$400		\$495
2017	Greenberg Traurig, LLP	New York	NY	8	\$625	\$1,080	\$790	\$450	\$475	\$475		\$795
2017	Greene Infuso, LLP	Las Vegas	NV		\$325	\$450	\$388	\$225	\$450	\$338		
2017	Gregory K. Stern, P.C	Chicago	IL				\$465*	\$325	\$465	\$445		
2017	Grier Furr & Crisp, PA	Charlotte	NC		\$360	\$550	\$445	\$250	\$340	\$295		
2017	Grossbart, Portney & Rosenberg	Baltimore	MD							\$445*		
2017	Guarino Law, LLC	Montclair	NJ							\$250*		
2017	Gudeman and Associates	Royal Oak	MI				\$350*			\$300*		
2017	Guerra & Smeberg, PLLC	San Antonio	TX							\$275		
2017	Haberbush & Associates LLP	Long Beach	CA					\$90	\$450	\$225		\$175*
2017	Halabu Law Group, P.C	Birmingham	MI				\$300*					
2017	Harold M Somer PC	Westbury	NY							\$350*		
2017	Harrell & Associates	Memphis	TN							\$200*		
2017	Harris Law Practice LLC	Reno	NV							\$400*		
2017	Harriss Hartmann Law Firm PC	Rossville	GA							\$175*		
2017	Hartman & Hartman	Reno	NV							\$450*		
2017	Harvell and Collins, P.A.	Morehead City	NC					\$195	\$260	\$228		
2017	Hatillo Law Office, PSC	Bayamon	PR							\$250*		
2017	Haynes and Boone, LLP	Dallas	TX	82	\$500	\$960	\$675	\$288	\$660	\$472		
2017	Hayward, Parker, O'Leary & Pinsky	Middletown	NY				\$400*			\$400*		
2017	Heidi McLeod Law Office, PLLC	San Antonio	TX							\$300*		
2017	Heller, Draper, Patrick, Horn & Dabney, LLC	Baton Rouge	LA		\$375	\$400	\$388	\$275	\$400	\$350		
2017	Henry D Paloci III PA	Thousand Oaks	CA							\$300*		
2017	Henshaw Law Office	San Jose	CA		\$350	\$400	\$375			\$250		
2017	Herbert C. Broadfoot II, PC	Atlanta	GA					\$350	\$375	\$363		
2017	Heritage Pacific Law Group, PC	Murrieta	CA				\$250*			\$175*		
2017	Herren, Dare & Streett	St. Louis	MO				\$300*					
2017	Herron Hill Law Group, PLLC	Orlando	FL							\$300*		
2017	Hester Baker Krebs, LLC	Indianapolis	IN				\$350*	\$275	\$375	\$373		
2017	Heyboer Law PLC	Fort Gratiot	MI							\$250*		
2017	Hirschler, Fleischer	Richmond	VA				\$425*			\$250*		
2017	Hodges, Doughty & Carson PLLC	Knoxville	TN		\$250	\$325	\$288			\$200*		
2017	Hodgson Russ LLP	Buffalo	NY	206			\$360*					
2017	Hoffman & Saweris, P.C.	Houston	TX		\$235	\$335	\$285					
2017	Hoffman, Larin and Agnetti	Miami	FL							\$325*		
2017	Holly E. Estes, Esq	Reno	NV							\$350*		
2017	Homady & Corcoran, LLC	Hollidaysburg	PA							\$210*		
2017	Homel Antonio Mercado Justiniano	Mayaguez	PR							\$250*		
2017	Hook & Fatovich, LLC	Wayne	NJ				\$350					
2017	Hoover Penrod PLC	Harrisonburg	VA				\$300*			\$250*		
2017	Hoover Slovacek LLP	Houston	TX				\$475*			\$320*	\$300	\$350
2017	Horowitz Law Group, PLLC	New York	NY							\$375*		\$343
2017	Hughes, Watters & Askanase	Houston	TX									\$350*
2017	Hunter Parker LLC	Las Vegas	NV							\$450*		
2017	Hunton & Williams LLP	Richmond	VA	61	\$625	\$775	\$730	\$350	\$535	\$515		
2017	Husch Blackwell LLP	St. Louis	MO	70			\$450*			\$315*	\$395	\$450
2017	Ice Miller LLP	Indianapolis	IN	152	\$477	\$698	\$554			\$324*		\$423
2017	Imblum Law Offices, PC	Harrisburg	PA							\$295*		\$235*
2017	Ivey, McClellan, Gattton, & Talcott, LLP	Greensboro	NC		\$150	\$480	\$338					
2017	J.M. Cook, P.A	Raleigh	NC							\$300*		
2017	Jackson Walker LLP	Dallas	TX	124	\$545	\$750	\$695	\$465	\$515	\$490		
2017	Jake Blanchard Law, PA	Largo	FL				\$250*					
2017	James & Haugland, P.C	El Paso	TX				\$350	\$250	\$350	\$300		
2017	James F. Kahn, P.C.	Phoenix	AZ				\$400			\$250		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	James H. Henderson, P.C.	Charlotte	NC							\$450*		
2017	James L. Drake, Jr. P.C.	Savannah	GA					\$285	\$300	\$293		
2017	Janvier Law Firm, PLLC	Raleigh	NC					\$200	\$450	\$300		
2017	Jay Lauer, Attorney at Law	South Bend	IN							\$200*		
2017	Jay S. Kalish & Associates, P.C	Farmington	MI				\$225*					
2017	Jeffrey A. Cogan, Esq., Ltd	Las Vegas	NV							\$400*		
2017	Jeffrey C. Alandt	Traverse City	MI							\$240*		
2017	Jeffrey M Pitchford, CPA	Denver	CO							\$350*		
2017	Jeffrey Strange & Associates	Wilmette	IL				\$450*			\$395*		
2017	Jesse Blanco and Associates	San Antonio	TX							\$450*		
2017	Jimenez Vazquez & Associates, PSC	San Juan	PR							\$145*		
2017	Joel D. Russman, Attorney at Law	Denver	CO							\$395*		
2017	John A. Vos	San Rafael	CA							\$495*		
2017	John E. Dunlap, Attorney at law	Memphis	TN							\$200*		
2017	John M. Brunson, Attorney at Law	St. Petersburg	FL							\$200*		
2017	John M. Mcauliffe & Associates, P.C.	Newton	MA				\$350*	\$150	\$300	\$300		\$300
2017	Johnny W. Thomas, Attorney at Law	San Antonio	TX							\$310*		
2017	Johnson & Gubler, P.C	Las Vegas	NV							\$245		
2017	Johnson Pope Bokor Ruppel & Burns, LLP	Tampa	FL		\$325	\$395	\$373					
2017	Johnston & Street	Franklin	TN							\$300*		
2017	Jones Day	Washington	DC	5	\$700	\$1,050	\$950	\$300	\$800	\$525		\$850*
2017	Jones Walker LLP	New Orleans	LA	117	\$285	\$475	\$388			\$235*		
2017	Jordan Price Wall Gray Jones & Carlton, PLLC	Raleigh	NC							\$250*		
2017	Joseph V. Meyers, Esq	Hackensack	NJ							\$350*		
2017	Joyce W. Lindauer Attorney, PLLC	Dallas	TX				\$350*	\$185	\$395	\$195		
2017	Juan C Bigas Law Office	Ponce	PR							\$250*		
2017	Justiniano's Law Office	Mayaguez	PR					\$125	\$250	\$188		
2017	Kahn & Ahart Plc	Phoenix	AZ				\$425*	\$300	\$425	\$300		
2017	Kane Russell Coleman Logan PC	Dallas	TX	423	\$375	\$575	\$475			\$260*		
2017	Kasen & Kasen	Cherry Hill	PA		\$350	\$500	\$425			\$350*		
2017	Kasey C. Nye, Lawyer, PLLC	Tucson	AZ					\$200	\$275	\$238		
2017	Kasuri & Levy, LLC	Edison	NJ							\$425*		
2017	Kasuri Byck, LLC.	Edison	NJ							\$450*		
2017	Katz, Flatau, Popson and Boyer, LLP	Macon	GA							\$325*		
2017	Kell C. Mercer, PC	Austin	TX				\$400*					
2017	Keller & Almassian PLC	Grand Rapids	MI				\$350*			\$295*		
2017	Kelley & Clements LLP	Gainesville	GA				\$400*					
2017	Kelley and Fulton P.L.	West Palm Beach	TX				\$425*			\$425		
2017	Kelly / Warner, PLLC	Scottsdale	AZ				\$325*					
2017	Kelly G. Black, PLC	Mesa	AZ							\$300*		
2017	Kelly Hart Hallman	Fort Worth	TX	252	\$405	\$495	\$450	\$235	\$320	\$265		
2017	Kenneth H.J. Henjum, Law Offices	Ventura	CA				\$350*			\$195*		
2017	Kera & Graubard	Flushing	NY				\$450*					
2017	Kerney Law Office	Gallatin	TN							\$350*		
2017	Khang & Khang LLP	Irvine	CA				\$350*					
2017	Kilmer Crosby & Walker PLLC	Houston	TX		\$325	\$425	\$375					
2017	King & Spalding LLP	Atlanta	GA	23	\$775	\$1,435	\$1,000	\$525	\$790	\$525		
2017	King Law Offices, P.C	Dublin	TX									\$300*
2017	Kinkead Law Offices	Amarillo	TX							\$350*		
2017	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	Chicago	IL	12	\$235	\$1,410	\$1,115	\$210	\$955	\$735		
2017	Klein & Associates, LLC	Annapolis	MD				\$275*			\$325*		
2017	Klein, Denatale, Goldner, Cooper, Rosenlieb & Kimball	Bakersfield	CA				\$315*					
2017	Klestadt Winters Jureller Southard & Stevens, LLP	New York	NY		\$575	\$675	\$625					
2017	Klug Law Firm	Okemos	MI				\$300*	\$185	\$225	\$205		
2017	Kogan Law Firm APC	Los Angeles	CA							\$300*		
2017	Koh Law Firm, LLC	Bethesda	MD							\$300*		
2017	Kornfield, Nyberg, Bendes, Kuhner & Little P.C	Oakland	CA				\$385*	\$375	\$425	\$390		
2017	Kudman Trachten Aloe LLP	New York	NY				\$550*					
2017	Kung & Associates	Las Vegas	NV				\$450					
2017	Kurt Stephen, PLLC	McAllen	TX							\$375*		
2017	Kurtzman Matera, PC	Spring Valley	NY							\$525*		
2017	Kurtzman Steady LLC	Philadelphia	PA				\$480*			\$325*		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	KutnerBrinen, PC	Denver	CO		\$400	\$500	\$465	\$260	\$340	\$300		
2017	Lake & Cobb PLC	Tempe	AZ					\$200	\$300	\$238		
2017	Lamberth, Cifelli, Ellis & Nason, P.A	Atlanta	GA		\$360	\$495	\$450	\$250	\$360	\$350		
2017	LaMonica Herbst & Maniscalco, LLP	Wantageh	NY				\$595			\$415		
2017	Landrau Rivera & Assoc	San Juan	PR				\$200*			\$175*		
2017	Lane & Wilkinson, LLC	Chattanooga	TN							\$250*		
2017	Langley & Banack, Inc	San Antonio	TX		\$350	\$495	\$350	\$275	\$375	\$325		
2017	Larry Vick, Attorney at Law	Houston	TX							\$375*		
2017	Latham, Shuker, Barker, Eden & Beaudine LLP	Orlando	FL							\$550*		
2017	Law at Tyson Law Firm, P.C	Greenwood	IN							\$130*		
2017	Law firm of Berger Singerman LLP	Miami	FL				\$625					
2017	Law Firm of Brian W. Hofmeister, LLC	Trenton	NJ							\$425		
2017	Law Firm of Dean W Greer	San Antonio	TX				\$300*					
2017	Law Firm Of Homel Mercado Justiniano	Mayaguez	PR							\$125*		
2017	Law Firm of Joel M. Aresty, Esq	Tierra Verde	FL							\$400*		
2017	Law Firm of Jose R Cintron	San Juan	PR							\$150*		
2017	Law Office Emily D Davila Rivera	San Juan	PR							\$200*		
2017	Law Office of Alan C Stein PC	Woodbury	NY				\$400*					
2017	Law Office of Albert G. Reese, Jr	Pittsburgh	PA							\$225*		
2017	Law Office of Aldo Caller	Overland Park	KS							\$250*		
2017	Law Office of Allen P. Turnage	Tallahassee	FL							\$300*		
2017	Law Office of Antonio I Hernandez Santiago	San Juan	PR							\$250*		
2017	Law Office of Bethany A. Ralph	Amenia	NY				\$300*			\$250*		
2017	Law Office of Carl M. Barto	Laredo	TX							\$350		
2017	Law Office of Craig D. Robins	Melville	NY					\$275	\$385	\$330		
2017	Law Office of Craig K. Welch	Petaluma	CA					\$275	\$420	\$348		
2017	Law Office of Daren M Schlechter	Los Angeles	CA							\$350*		\$275*
2017	Law Office Of David A. Scholl	Newtown Square	PA							\$300*		
2017	Law Office of David Cahn, LLC	Silver Spring	MD							\$300*		
2017	Law Office of David M. Serafin	Denver	CO							\$325*		
2017	Law Office of David W. Cohen	Baltimore	MD							\$275*		
2017	Law Office of Dick Harris, PC	Abilene	TX							\$290*		
2017	Law Office of Dino S. Mantzas	Marlton	NJ							\$300*		
2017	Law Office of Edward Gonzalez, P.C.	Washington	DC				\$450*	\$350	\$410	\$380		
2017	Law Office of Ehsanul Habib	Forest Hills	NY							\$275		
2017	Law Office of Erik G. Soderberg	Rockville	MD							\$400*		
2017	Law Office of Gary W. Cruickshank	Boston	MA							\$400		
2017	Law Office Of Gina M. Corena, Esq	Las Vegas	NV				\$400*			\$400*		
2017	Law Office of Gregory Messer PLLC	Brooklyn	NY					\$350	\$575	\$463		
2017	Law Office of H. Anthony Hervol	San Antonio	TX				\$285*			\$285*		
2017	Law Office of Harvey I. Marcus	Saddle Brook	NJ							\$350*		
2017	Law Office Of Jackie R. Geller	San Diego	CA							\$325*		
2017	Law Office of Jacqueline E. Hernandez Santiago, Esq	San Juan	PR							\$250*		
2017	Law Office of Jeffrey L. Smoot	Seattle	WA				\$300*					
2017	Law Office of Jeffrey L. Zimring	Albany	NY							\$275*		
2017	Law Office of Jerome M. Douglas, LLC	Hawthorne	NJ				\$425	\$350	\$425	\$400		
2017	Law Office of Jonathan A. Backman	Bloomington	IL							\$325*		
2017	Law Office of Jonathan H. Stanwood, LLC	Philadelphia	PA							\$325*		
2017	Law Office Of Jonathan J. Sobel	Philadelphia	PA							\$250*		
2017	Law Office of Judith A. Descalso	Escondido	CA				\$400*			\$300*		
2017	Law Office of Kim Y. Johnson	Laurel	MD							\$205*		
2017	Law Office of Lee M. Perlman	Cherry Hill	NJ				\$350*	\$250	\$350	\$275		
2017	Law Office of Lewis R. Landau	Calabasas	CA							\$495*		
2017	Law Office of Margaret Maxwell McClure	Houston	TX				\$400*			\$400*		
2017	Law Office of Mark B. French	Bedford	TX					\$50	\$350	\$112		
2017	Law Office Of Mark J. Giunta	Phoenix	AZ				\$425*	\$175	\$225	\$200		
2017	Law Office of Mark S. Roher, P.A.	Fort Lauderdale	FL							\$300*		
2017	Law Office Of Marvin Levy	Studio City	CA							\$250*		
2017	Law Office of Michael A King	Brooklyn	NY							\$250*		
2017	Law Office of Michael J. Harker	Las Vegas	NV					\$275	\$325	\$325		
2017	Law Office Of Michael J. O'Connor	San Antonio	TX				\$300*					
2017	Law Office of Michael Y Lo	Alhambra	CA				\$475*	\$375	\$475	\$425		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Law Office of Nelson M. Jones III	Houston	TX					\$250	\$375	\$312		
2017	Law Office of O. Allan Fridman	Northbrook	IL				\$425*			\$425*		
2017	Law Office of Olga Zlotnik, PLLC	Scottsdale	AZ				\$220*					
2017	Law Office of Rachel S. Blumenfeld	Brooklyn	NY							\$450		\$400*
2017	Law Office of Raquel S. White, LLC	Largo	MD							\$295*		
2017	Law Office Of Robert M Aronson	Los Angeles	CA							\$400		
2017	Law Office of Rowena N. Nelson, LLC	Largo	MD							\$325*		
2017	Law Office of Scott B. Riddle, LLC	Atlanta	GA				\$350*			\$350*		
2017	Law Office of Scott M. Hare	Pittsburgh	PA				\$400*			\$200*		
2017	Law Office of Sheila Durant	Baltimore	MD							\$375*		
2017	Law Office of Stan L Riskin P A	Aventura	FL							\$375*		
2017	Law Office of Steven M. Olson	Santa Rosa	CA					\$275	\$475	\$375		
2017	Law Office Of Thomas B. Gorrill	San Diego	CA							\$400*		
2017	Law Office of Thomas W. Lynch	Hickory Hills	IL							\$275*		
2017	Law Office of Timothy G. Niarhos	Nashville	TN					\$250	\$350	\$250		
2017	Law Office Of Timothy M. Mauser	Danvers	MA				\$420*					
2017	Law Office of Toni Campbell Parker	Memphis	TN							\$300*		
2017	Law Office of W. Derek May	Upland	CA							\$250*		
2017	Law Office of W. Thomas Bible, Jr.	Chattanooga	TN							\$250		
2017	Law Office of Warren J. Fields	Katy	TX							\$325*		
2017	Law Office of Will B. Geer, LLC	Atlanta	GA							\$325*		
2017	Law Office of William F. Kunofsky	Dallas	TX							\$350*		
2017	Law Office of William P. Fennell, APLC	San Diego	CA							\$375*		
2017	Law Office Of Yasha Rahimzadeh	Sacramento	CA							\$250*		
2017	Law Offices Lefkovitz & Lefkovitz	Nashville	TN					\$325	\$485	\$405		
2017	Law Offices of Adam Farber, P.A.	West Palm Beach	FL							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices of Alan M Lurya	Irvine	CA							\$375*		
2017	Law Offices of Alla Kachan P.C.	Brooklyn	NY							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices of Allen A. Kolber, Esq	Suffern	NY							\$450*		
2017	Law Offices of Andrew A. Moher	San Diego	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices Of Andrew H. Griffin, III	El Cajon	CA					\$250	\$350	\$300		
2017	Law Offices of Anthony O Egbase & Associates	Los Angeles	CA				\$450*	\$150	\$350	\$325		
2017	Law Offices of Binder and Malter	Santa Clara	CA		\$395	\$525	\$475	\$225	\$475	\$400		
2017	Law Offices of Brooks, Frank & De La Guardia	Miami	FL				\$475*					
2017	Law Offices of Buddy D. Ford, PA	Tampa	FL				\$425	\$300	\$425	\$375		
2017	Law Offices Of C. Conde & Assoc.	San Juan	PR				\$300*			\$250*		
2017	Law Offices Of C.R. Hyde	Tucson	AZ					\$250	\$295	\$272		
2017	Law Offices of Charles B. Greene	San Jose	CA							\$495*		
2017	Law Offices of Christopher S. Moffitt	Alexandria	VA				\$450*					
2017	Law Offices of Craig A. Diehl	Camp Hill	PA				\$250*			\$150*		
2017	Law Offices of Craig M. Geno, PLLC	Ridgeland	MS				\$375*			\$225*		
2017	Law Offices of Craig V. Winslow	San Mateo	CA				\$350*					
2017	Law Offices of David A Tilem	Glendale	CA				\$600*	\$400	\$500	\$450		
2017	Law Offices of David A. Arietta	Walnut Creek	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of David Carlebach, Esq	New York	NY				\$450*					\$485*
2017	Law Offices of David H. Lang	Media	PA							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices Of David N. Chandler	Santa Rosa	CA					\$420	\$520	\$470		
2017	Law Offices of David W. Meadows	Los Angeles	CA							\$550*		
2017	Law Offices of Dimitri L. Karapelou, LLC	Philadelphia	PA					\$225	\$350	\$287		
2017	Law Offices of Douglas Jacobson, LLC	Cumming	GA				\$300*					
2017	Law Offices of Douglas T Tabachnik, PC	Freehold	NJ				\$500*			\$500*		
2017	Law Offices of Drew Henwood	San Jose	CA							\$250*		
2017	Law Offices Of Eric J. Gravel	San Francisco	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices Of Francisco Javier Aldana Law Firm, LLP	San Diego	CA							\$450*		
2017	Law Offices of Gabriel Del Virginia	New York	NY				\$650*			\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Gabriel Liberman, APC	Sacramento	CA				\$250*					
2017	Law Offices of George J. Paukert	Palm Desert	CA				\$200*					
2017	Law Offices Of Gold & Gold	Hatboro	PA							\$150*		
2017	Law Offices of Henry F. Sewell, Jr	Atlanta	GA				\$350*					
2017	Law Offices of Ira Benjamin Katz, A Professional Corpor	Los Angeles	CA				\$595*					
2017	Law Offices of James E Hurley Jr	New York	NY							\$400*		
2017	Law Offices of James J. Joyce PLLC	Lancaster	NY							\$250*		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Law Offices Of James Yan	Pasadena	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices Of Janet A. Lawson	Ventura	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Jeffrey M Sherman	Arlington	MD							\$500*		
2017	Law Offices of Joann M. Hennessey, PL	Miami	FL							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices Of Joel Schechter	Chicago	IL				\$450*					
2017	Law Offices of John C. Hanrahan, LLC	Frederick	MD				\$300*			\$300*		
2017	Law Offices of John D. Moore, P.A.	Ridgeland	MS					\$375	\$425	\$400		
2017	Law Offices of Kevin Michael Madden PLLC	Houston	TX							\$275*		
2017	Law Offices of Konstantine Sparagis, P.C	Chicago	IL							\$250*		
2017	Law Offices of L. William Porter III	Orlando	FL				\$400*			\$400*		
2017	Law Offices of Lawrence G. Papale	Dillsburg	PA							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices Of Lawrence L. Szabo	Oakland	CA							\$450*		
2017	Law Offices of Lewis Phon	Antioch	CA				\$300*					
2017	Law Offices of Lionel E Giron	Ontario	CA				\$350*			\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Louis J. Esbin	Stevenson Ranch	CA					\$250	\$550	\$375		
2017	Law Offices of Love & Dillenbeck, PLLC	Rural Hall	NC				\$300*					
2017	Law Offices of Marc A. Duxbury	Carlsbad	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Marc R. Kivitz	Baltimore	MD							\$400		
2017	Law Offices of Marc Voisenat	Alameda	CA							\$400*		
2017	Law Offices of Marilyn D. Garner	Arlington	TX					\$375	\$400	\$388		
2017	Law Offices of Mark E Goodfriend	Encino	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Mark S Martinez	Fountain Valley	CA				\$350*			\$200		
2017	Law Offices of Martha J. Simon	San Francisco	CA					\$350	\$450	\$400		
2017	Law Offices Of Marvin H. Gold	Hatboro	PA					\$250	\$500	\$400		
2017	Law Offices of Michael G. Spector	Santa Ana	CA							\$410*		\$380*
2017	Law Offices of Michael J. Henny	Pittsburgh	PA				\$300*					
2017	Law Offices of Michael Jay Berger	Beverly Hills	CA		\$495	\$525	\$510	\$265	\$495	\$373		
2017	Law Offices of Michael K. Mehr	Santa Cruz	CA							\$400*		
2017	Law Offices of Moses S. Bardavid	Encino	CA					\$275	\$350	\$313		
2017	Law Offices of Nicholas Gebelt	Whittier	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Norman and Bullington, P.A.	Tampa	FL				\$300*					
2017	Law Offices of Oxana Kozlov	Sunnyvale	CA				\$350*					
2017	Law Offices of Paul R. Torre	Encino	CA				\$400*					
2017	Law Offices of Perez & Bonomo, LLC	Hackensack	NJ				\$475*					
2017	Law Offices of Perry Ian Tischler	Bayside	NY							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices of Ray Battaglia, PLLC	San Antonio	TX							\$450*		
2017	Law Offices of Raymond B. Rounds	East Orange	NJ							\$150*		
2017	Law Offices of Raymond C Stilwell	Amherst	NY							\$250*		
2017	Law Offices of Raymond H Aver APC	Los Angeles	CA				\$525*			\$375*		
2017	Law Offices of Richard D. Gaines Esq.	Newton	NJ				\$350*					
2017	Law Offices of Richard F. Fellrath	Troy	MI				\$200*					
2017	Law Offices of Robert M. Yaspan	Woodland Hills	CA					\$300	\$550	\$435		
2017	Law Offices of Robert N. Bassel	Clinton	MI							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices of Robert O Lampl	Pittsburgh	PA							\$275*		
2017	Law Offices of Russell King, PC	Dublin	TX							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices Of Ruth Elin Auerbach	San Francisco	CA							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Scott J. Sagaria	San Jose	CA				\$500*			\$450*		
2017	Law Offices Of Selwyn D. Whitehead	Oakland	CA				\$400*					
2017	Law Offices of Sheila Esmaili, Esq	Los Angeles	CA							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices of Stephen J. Kleeman	Towson	MD							\$350*		
2017	Law offices of Steven T Stanton	Maryville	IL				\$225*					
2017	Law Offices of Susan J. Cofano	Montrose	CO							\$250		
2017	Law Offices of Timothy P. Thomas, LLC	Las Vegas	NV							\$350*		
2017	Law Offices of Todd B Becker	Long Beach	CA				\$400*			\$400*		
2017	Law Offices of W. Steven Shumway	Roseville	CA							\$300*		
2017	Law Offices of William F. McLaughlin	Oakland	CA				\$350*					
2017	Law Offices of William S. Katchen, LLC	Florham Park	NJ							\$850*		
2017	Law Offices of Yvette V. Dudley, P.C	Springfield Gardens	NY							\$300*		
2017	LawCare Ltd	Greensburg	PA					\$275	\$325	\$300		
2017	Ledford, Wu & Borges, LLC	Chicago	IL		\$350	\$400	\$400			\$250*		
2017	Leech Tishman Fuscaldo & Lampl, Inc	Los Angeles	CA		\$290	\$595	\$428	\$200	\$215	\$208		\$215*
2017	Leiderman Shelomith, P.A	Fort Lauderdale	FL		\$325	\$425	\$375					

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Leonard, Key & Key PLLC	Wichita Falls	TX							\$300*		
2017	Leslie Cohen Law PC	Santa Monica	CA				\$575	\$297	\$390	\$350		\$390*
2017	Lesnick Prince & Pappas LLP	Los Angeles	CA		\$395	\$495	\$495			\$275*		
2017	Lester & Associates, P.C.	Garden City	NY				\$375*					
2017	Levene Neale Bender Yoo & Brill LLP	Los Angeles	CA		\$515	\$595	\$575	\$335	\$555	\$425	\$515	\$595
2017	Levitt & Stafkes, P.C.	Maplewood	NJ				\$400*					
2017	Liskow & Lewis	New Orleans	LA	324						\$200*		
2017	Litt Law Group LLC	Rockville Centre	NY									\$525*
2017	Little & Milligan, PLLC	Knoxville	TN							\$300		
2017	Lobel Weiland Golden Friedman LLP	Costa Mesa	CA		\$550	\$850	\$750					\$650*
2017	Lohr & Associates, Ltd	West Chester	PA				\$300*					\$250*
2017	Lube & Soto Law Offices PSC	San Juan	PR				\$250					
2017	Lugo Mender Group, LLC	Guaynabo	PR					\$175	\$300	\$238		
2017	Lusky and Associates	Dallas	TX							\$350*		
2017	Lyssette Morales Law Office	Mayaguez	PR					\$125	\$275	\$225		
2017	M Jones & Associates, PC	Santa Ana	CA		\$300	\$400	\$350	\$300	\$400	\$350		
2017	M. Denise Dotson, LLC	Atlanta	GA							\$250*		
2017	Macdonald Fernandez LLP	San Francisco	CA				\$450			\$350*		
2017	Macey, Wilensky & Hennings, LLC	Atlanta	GA		\$350	\$450	\$425	\$195	\$450	\$398		
2017	Maciag Law, LLC	Princeton	NJ					\$465	\$475	\$470		
2017	Magee Goldstein Lasky & Sayers, P.C.	Roanoke	VA				\$375*	\$200	\$275	\$238		
2017	Mahady & Mahady	Greensburg	PA							\$275*		
2017	Malaise Law Firm	San Antonio	TX				\$275*			\$275		
2017	Malone Akerly Martin PLLC	Dallas	TX				\$350*					
2017	Mansfield Law Corporation	Oxnard	CA							\$360*		
2017	Marc A. Duxbury	Murrieta	CA							\$350*		
2017	Marc A. Zaid Esq., P.C	Woodbury	PA							\$300*		
2017	Marcos D. Oliva, PC	McAllen	TX				\$250*			\$250*		
2017	Mark E. Cohen Bankruptcy Law Firm	Forest Hills	NY				\$400*					
2017	Mark M. Jones & Associates, P.C.	Santa Ana	CA					\$300	\$425	\$350		
2017	Markus Williams, Young & Zimmermann LLC	Denver	CO				\$445*			\$315*		
2017	Marshall Socarras Grant, P.L.	Boca Raton	FL							\$275*		
2017	Martin Keith Thomas, Attorney at Law	Dallas	TX							\$400*		
2017	Maxwell Dunn, PLC	Southfield	MI		\$300	\$350	\$325			\$200*		
2017	Mayerson & Hartheimer PLLC	New York	NY				\$600			\$350*		
2017	Mazur & Brooks, A P.L.C.	Las Vegas	NV							\$350*		
2017	McAllister Garfield, P.C.	Denver	CO		\$415	\$435	\$425	\$200	\$250	\$225	\$175	\$375
2017	McAuliffe Law Firm	Melville	NY				\$350*					
2017	McBreen & Kopko	Jericho	NY				\$400*					
2017	McBryan, LLC	Atlanta	GA							\$400*		
2017	McCallar Law Firm	Savannah	GA					\$290	\$390	\$300		
2017	McCann Garland Ridall & Burke	Pittsburgh	PA							\$350*		
2017	McCrystal Law Office	Emmaus	PA				\$275*					
2017	McCullough Eisenberg, LLC	Warminster	PA							\$350		
2017	McDonald Hopkins	Cleveland	OH	292	\$415	\$72	\$720	\$568				
2017	McDonald, Sutton & Duval, PLC	Richmond	VA					\$225	\$395	\$310		
2017	McDowell Posternock Apell & Detrick, PC	Maple Shade	NJ				\$400	\$250	\$300	\$275		
2017	McElwee Firm, PLLC	North Wilkesboro	NC							\$250*		
2017	McGuire, Craddock & Strother	Dallas	TX				\$450*					
2017	McKinley Onua & Associates PLLC	Brooklyn	NY							\$250*		\$350*
2017	McKool Smith PC	Dallas	TX	230	\$620	\$1,200	\$800	\$325	\$345	\$335		\$545*
2017	McMillan Law Group	San Diego	CA							\$375*		
2017	McNally & Busche, L.L.C.	Newton	NJ							\$350*		
2017	McNamee, Hosea, Jernigan, Kim, Greenan & Lynch, P.A	Greenbelt	MD		\$375	\$500	\$438	\$325	\$350	\$338		
2017	McQueen & Ashman LLP	Irvine	CA		\$390	\$450	\$410				\$350	\$365
2017	McWhorter, Cobb & Johnson, LLP	Lubbock	TX							\$300		
2017	Medina Law Firm LLC	New York	NY					\$385	\$425	\$405		\$425
2017	Mellinger, Sanders & Kartzman, LLC	Morris Plains	NJ					\$335	\$395	\$365		
2017	Meridian Law	San Jose	CA							\$250*		
2017	Meridian Law, LLC	Baltimore	MD		\$300	\$325	\$313			\$250*		
2017	Merrill & Stone, LLC	Swainsboro	GA							\$285		
2017	Merrill PA	West Palm Beach	FL							\$450		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low		Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Mesch Clark & Rothschild	Tucson	AZ		\$400	\$575	\$450	\$275	\$395	\$335			
2017	Messana PA	Fort Lauderdale	FL							\$350*			
2017	Mestone & Associates LLC	North Andover	MA		\$350	\$400	\$400			\$275*			
2017	Meyer, Suozzi, English & Klein, PC	Garden City	NY				\$550*						
2017	Michael A King, Attorney at Law	New York	NY							\$250*			
2017	Michael J. Davis	Denver	CO				\$350*						
2017	Michael J. Goldstein & Associates	San Francisco	CA					\$425	\$550	\$488			
2017	Michael W. Carmel, Ltd.	Phoenix	AZ							\$600*			
2017	Micheal J. Brock, LLC	Las Vegas	NV				\$250*			\$180*			
2017	Middlebrooks Shapiro, P.C.	Springfield	NJ		\$350	\$400	\$375	\$250	\$350	\$300			
2017	Millan Law Offices	San Juan	PR							\$200*			
2017	Miller & Martin PLLC	Chattanooga	TN	353			\$295						
2017	Miller and Miller, LLP	Westminster	MD							\$225*			
2017	Miller, Johnson, Snell & Cumiskey, P.L.C	Grand Rapids	MI		\$370	\$460	\$420						\$300*
2017	Mincin Law, PLLC	Las Vegas	NV				\$350*			\$360*			
2017	Minden Lawyers, LLC	Minden	NV		\$325	\$400	\$363	\$150	\$225	\$200			
2017	Minion & Sherman	West Caldwell	NJ				\$325*						
2017	Mitchell A. Sommers ESQ, P.C.	Ephrata	PA							\$225*			
2017	Moher Law Group	San Francisco	CA							\$350*			
2017	Montez & Williams PC	Waco	TX					\$225	\$350	\$288			
2017	Moon Wright & Houston, PLLC	Charlotte	NC					\$240	\$350	\$350			
2017	Moretsky Law Firm	Huntingdon Valley	PA				\$220*			\$125*			
2017	Morgan & Bley, Ltd	Chicago	IL				\$450*			\$265*			
2017	Morris, Nichols, Arsh & Tunnell LLP	Wilmington	DE	421	\$650	\$1,050	\$775	\$395	\$625	\$415			\$595*
2017	Morris, Polich & Purdy, LLP	Los Angeles	CA	472			\$575*			\$575*			
2017	Moses & Singer	New York	NY	413			\$895*						
2017	Morrison-Tenenbaum PLLC	New York	NY				\$495*			\$350			
2017	Motschenbacher & Blattner LLP	Portland	OR				\$375*	\$315	\$375	\$345			
2017	MRO Attorneys at Law, LLC	San Juan	PR							\$250*			
2017	Ms Lozada Law Office	San Juan	PR		\$150	\$200	\$175			\$150*			
2017	Mullin Hoard & Brown, LLP	Lubbock	TX		\$275	\$420	\$348						
2017	Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr PC	Dallas	TX	360	\$480	\$650	\$565			\$300*			
2017	Murphy Mahon Keffler & Farrier, L.L.P	Fort Worth	TX				\$450*			\$400*			
2017	Nathan Sommers Jacobs PC	Houston	TX				\$550*			\$330*			
2017	Neeleman Law Group	Everett	WA					\$275	\$360	\$318			
2017	Neeley Law Firm Plc	Chandler	AZ							\$300*			
2017	Neff & Boyer, P.C.	Tucson	AZ					\$200	\$350	\$275			
2017	Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP	Atlanta	GA	86	\$410	\$570	\$450	\$300	\$390	\$335			
2017	Newman & Newman, PC	Ridgeland	MS							\$300*			
2017	Niarhos & Waldron, PLC	Nashville	TN		\$250	\$350	\$300			\$250*			
2017	Nicolas A. Wong Law Offices	San Juan	PR					\$200	\$225	\$213			
2017	Noble Law Firm, P.A	Boca Raton	FL				\$300*						
2017	Noonan & Lieberman Ltd	Chicago	IL				\$150*						
2017	Norgaard O'Boyle, Attorneys At Law	Englewood	NJ		\$400	\$525	\$463	\$300	\$350	\$325			
2017	Nuti Hart LLP	Oakland	CA				\$575			\$575*			
2017	Nutovic & Associates	New York	NY				\$560*						
2017	Oaktree Law	Cerritos	CA					\$250	\$400	\$400			
2017	Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP	Philadelphia	PA	367						\$350*			
2017	Odin, Feldman & Pittleman	Reston	VA				\$485*						
2017	Offit Kurman, PA	Bethesda	MD	308			\$440*						
2017	Okin & Adams, LLP	Houston	TX				\$425*				\$295	\$345	\$320
2017	Olshan Frome Wolosky LLP	New York	NY	431			\$730*			\$360*			
2017	Olson Nicoud & Gueck, LLP	Dallas	TX				\$400			\$400*			
2017	Onukwugha & Associates, LLC	Baltimore	MD							\$375*			
2017	Orantes Law Firm PC	Los Angeles	CA				\$500*			\$500			
2017	Orenstein Law Group	Dallas	TX				\$425*			\$225*			\$350*
2017	Ortiz & Ortiz LLP	Astoria	NY		\$400	\$450	\$425	\$325	\$350	\$325			\$325*
2017	Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl, and Jones LLP	Wilmington	DE		\$850	\$1,095	\$1,050	\$240	\$1,195	\$438			
2017	Palm Harbor Law Group	Palm Harbor	FL							\$200*			
2017	Pamela G. Magee, Attorney at Law	Baton Rouge	LA							\$325*			
2017	Pamela Jan Zylstra, A Professional Corporation	Irvine	CA							\$425*			
2017	Parker & DuFresne, P.A	Jacksonville	FL							\$300			

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein LLP	Charlotte	NC	219	\$380	\$475	\$428			\$575*		
2017	Parry Tyndall White	Chapel Hill	NC				\$325*			\$200*		
2017	Pasquale Menna, Esq.	Red Bank	NJ							\$250*		
2017	Paul D. Bradford, PLLC	Cary	NC							\$350*		
2017	Paul Reece Marr, P.C.	Atlanta	GA							\$325		
2017	Paul Weiss Rifkind Wharton Garrison LLP	New York	NY	28	\$1,220	\$1,395	\$1,320	\$820	\$1,040	\$995		
2017	Penachio Malara LLP	White Plains	NY		\$325	\$450	\$388	\$325	\$400	\$363		
2017	Pendergraft & Simon LLP	Houston	TX				\$450*	\$200	\$250	\$225		
2017	Pepper Hamilton LLP	Philadelphia	PA	92	\$555	\$835	\$765	\$330	\$485	\$475		
2017	Perkins Coie LLP	Seattle	WA	31			\$695*					
2017	Phil Rhodes Law Corporation	Fair Oaks	CA				\$350*	\$300	\$350	\$325		
2017	Phillabaum Ledlin Matthews Sheldon PLLC	Spokane	WA							\$300*		
2017	Phillip K. Wallace, PLC	Mandeville	LA							\$250*		
2017	Pick & Zabicki LLP	New York	NY		\$325	\$425	\$375			\$250*		
2017	Pillar+Aught	Harrisburg	PA							\$395*		
2017	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	Washington	DC	73	\$790	\$1,235	\$830			\$680*		
2017	Pletz and Reed, P.C.	Jefferson City	MO					\$150	\$200	\$175		
2017	Pollan Legal	Jacksonville	FL							\$200		
2017	Polsinelli PC	Kansas City	MO	51	\$400	\$625	\$513	\$260	\$360	\$310		
2017	Porter Hedges LLP	Houston	TX	383			\$485*			\$320*		
2017	Porter Law Network	Chicago	IL		\$400	\$450	\$425					
2017	Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP	San Diego	CA	255			\$525*	\$350	\$525	\$438		
2017	Pronske Goolsby & Kathman, P.C.	Dallas	TX				\$600*	\$195	\$225	\$210		
2017	Proskauer Rose LLP	New York	NY	57			\$1200*					
2017	Pulman, Cappuccio, Pullen, Benson & Jones LLP	San Antonio	TX		\$350	\$425	\$350			\$200*		
2017	Purcell Krug and Haller	Harrisburg	PA				\$300*			\$250*		
2017	Rafool Bourne & Shelby	Peoria	IL				\$250*					
2017	Randal R Leonard Law Firm	Las Vegas	NV							\$350*		
2017	Randall S D Jacobs PLLC	New York	NY					\$300	\$600	\$450		
2017	Rattet PLLC	White Plains	NY					\$400	\$650	\$525		
2017	Rayman & Knight	Kalamazoo	MI		\$250	\$325	\$293					
2017	Redman Ludwig PC	Indianapolis	IN				\$250*					
2017	Reed Smith, LLP	New York	NY	15	\$820	\$902	\$880	\$425	\$675	\$528		
2017	Reganyan Law Firm	Glendale	CA							\$300*		
2017	Renan Buendia Hinojosa	Annandale	VA							\$400*		
2017	Reynolds Law Corporation	Davis	CA				\$350*					
2017	Richard L Hirsh, P.C.	Lisle	IL					\$75	\$400	\$238		
2017	Richard S. Feinsilver, Esq.	Carle Place	NY				\$350*					
2017	Richard W. Martinez, APLC	New Orleans	LA				\$350*					
2017	Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A	Wilmington	DE	256	\$250	\$850	\$738	\$295	\$465	\$360		
2017	Rick L. Sponaugle CPA LLC	Denver	CO							\$125*		
2017	Riggi Law Firm	Las Vegas	NV				\$400*	\$195	\$400	\$298		
2017	Riley & Dever, P.C.	Lynnfield	MA					\$50	\$350	\$200		
2017	Ritter Spencer PLLC	Addison	TX							\$350*		
2017	Rivera-Velez & Santiago LLC	San Juan	PR					\$75	\$200	\$150		
2017	Roach, Leite & Manyin, LLC	Philadelphia	PA				\$250*					
2017	Robert A Angueira, PA	Miami	FL					\$260	\$450	\$355		
2017	Robert Altman, PA	Palatka	FL							\$400*		
2017	Robert C. Bruner, Attorney at Law	Tallahassee	FL							\$350		
2017	Robert O Lampl Law Office	Pittsburgh	PA					\$350	\$450	\$388		
2017	Robinson, Bradshaw & Hinson, P.A.	Charlotte	NC	320	\$330	\$565	\$425	\$175	\$565	\$310		
2017	Robl Law Group LLC	Tucker	GA				\$350*	\$250	\$350	\$300	\$250	\$300
2017	Rodriguez & Asociados	Vega Baja	PR					\$175	\$250	\$213		
2017	Rogers Law Offices	Atlanta	GA				\$350*			\$295*		
2017	Ronald D. Weiss, PC	Melville	NY							\$350*		
2017	Rosen, Kantrow & Dillon, PLLC	Huntington	NY							\$425*		
2017	Rosenberg Musso & Weiner LLP	Brooklyn	NY				\$625*			\$575*		
2017	Rosenstein & Associates	Temecula	CA				\$375*					
2017	Rosenthal, Levy, Simon & Ryles	West Palm Beach	FL									\$400*
2017	Rounds & Sutter, LLP	Ventura	CA				\$350			\$275*		
2017	Roussos, Lassiter, Glanzer & Barnhart	Norfolk	VA		\$325	\$390	\$358					
2017	Ruben Gonzalez	Bayamon	PR							\$250*		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Rubin and Rubin, P.A.	Jacksonville	FL				\$575					
2017	Ruddy, King & Petersen Law Group, LLC	Aurora	IL		\$270	\$280	\$275					
2017	Rudov & Stein P.C.	Pittsburgh	PA				\$400*			\$185*		\$280*
2017	Ruff and Cohen	Gainesville	FL							\$300*		
2017	Ruta Soulios Stratis LLP	New York	NY				\$440*					
2017	Sabaratnam and Associates	Oakland	CA				\$280*			\$360*		
2017	Sandground, West, Silek & Raminpour, PLC	Vienna	VA				\$350*					
2017	Santiago & Gonzalez Law	Yauco	PR				\$200*			\$125*		
2017	Santos Berrios Law Offices LLC	Humacao	PR					\$150	\$200	\$175		
2017	Sasser Law Firm	Cary	NC				\$300*			\$290*		
2017	Saul Ewing LLP	Philadelphia	PA	171	\$695	\$780	\$710			\$395*		
2017	Scarborough & Fulton	Chattanooga	TN							\$375*		
2017	Scaringi & Scaringi, PC	Harrisburg	PA				\$275			\$175*		
2017	Schachter Harris LLP	Dallas	TX					\$160	\$300	\$210		
2017	Schafer and Weiner, PLLC	Bloomfield Hills	MI		\$310	\$465	\$373	\$245	\$295	\$275		
2017	Scheef & Stone, LLP	Frisco	TX		\$400	\$450	\$400			\$300*		
2017	Schian Walker, P.L.C.	Phoenix	AZ				\$560*			\$220*		
2017	Schneider & Onofry, P.C.	Phoenix	AZ				\$385*					
2017	Schneider & Stone	Skokie	IL							\$350*		
2017	Schneider Miller, P.C.	Detroit	MI					\$175	\$390	\$270		
2017	Schwartz & Shaw LLC	Bethlehem	PA							\$300*		
2017	Scott E. Kaplan, LLC	Allentown	NJ					\$250	\$300	\$275		
2017	Scura, Wigfield, Heyer, Stevens & Cammarola, LLP	Wayne	NJ				\$425	\$350	\$425	\$375		
2017	Seabrook Law Offices	San Jose	CA				\$300*					
2017	Serratelli, Schiffman, & Brown P.C.	Harrisburg	PA				\$300*			\$250*		
2017	Severaid & Glahn, Pc	Sacramento	CA				\$375*					
2017	Sferrazza & Keenan PLLC	Melville	NY				\$300*					
2017	SFS Law Group	Charlotte	NC				\$400*					
2017	Shafferman & Feldman, LLP	New York	NY					\$325	\$360	\$343		
2017	Shapiro, Croland, Reiser, Apfel & Di Iorio, LLP	North Haledon	NJ							\$375		
2017	ShapiroSchwartz LLP	Houston	TX							\$375*		
2017	Sheehan Law Firm, PLLC	Ocean Springs	MS				\$300*					
2017	Sheils Winnubst PC	Richardson	TX					\$225	\$350	\$288		
2017	Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP	Los Angeles	CA	64			\$760*	\$585	\$630	\$608		
2017	Sherman Silverstein Kohl Rose & Podolsky	Moorestown	NJ		\$415	\$650	\$533					
2017	Shevitz Law Firm	Los Angeles	CA							\$350*		
2017	Shipkevich PLLC	New York	NY				\$500*			\$350*		\$500*
2017	Shraiberg, Landau & Page, P.A.	Boca Raton	FL		\$375	\$500	\$438			\$325*		
2017	Shulman Hodges & Bastian LLP	Irvine	CA		\$395	\$575	\$550	\$275	\$425	\$350	\$425	\$650
2017	Sichenzia Ross Friedman Ference LLP	New York	NY				\$575*					
2017	Sidley Austin LLP	Chicago	IL	10	\$965	\$1,180	\$1,135					
2017	Siegel & Siegel, P.C.	New York	NY				\$400*					
2017	Sills Cummis & Gross P.C.	Newark	NJ	311	\$695	\$775	\$735			\$495*		\$525*
2017	Simbro & Stanley, PLC	Scottsdale	AZ							\$500*		
2017	Simon Resnik Hayes LLP	Sherman Oaks	CA		\$385	\$425	\$405			\$350		\$485
2017	Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP	New York	NY	27	\$1,340	\$1,360	\$1,350	\$740	\$1,080	\$900	\$1,115	\$1,170
2017	Slipakoff & Slomka, PC	Atlanta	GA							\$300*		\$1,143
2017	Smaha Law Group, APC	San Diego	CA				\$425*			\$285		
2017	Smith Conerly LLP	Carrollton	GA				\$325*			\$270*		
2017	Snow Spence Green LLP	Houston	TX					\$500	\$650	\$575		
2017	Southwell & O'Rourke P.S.	Spokane	WA					\$300	\$400	\$350		
2017	Speckman & Associates	San Diego	CA				\$250*					
2017	Spector and Johnson	Dallas	TX		\$325	\$350	\$338					
2017	Spence Custer Saylor Wolfe & Rose, LLC	Johnstown	PA				\$250*			\$250		
2017	Spence Law Office, P.C.	Jericho	NY				\$450*					
2017	Spigner & Associates, PC	Plano	TX				\$450*			\$200*		
2017	Springer Brown, LLC	Wheaton	IL				\$405*	\$315	\$375	\$350		
2017	St. James Law, P.C.	San Francisco	CA				\$595*					
2017	Stan L. Riskin, P.A.	Plantation	FL							\$375*		
2017	Stanley A Kirshenbaum, Attorney at Law	Pittsburgh	PA							\$250*		
2017	Starr & Starr, PLLC	New York	NY				\$400*	\$90	\$380	\$235		
2017	Steidl & Steinberg	Pittsburgh	PA				\$300*					

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Steinberg & Associates Esqs	Kew Gardens	NY				\$450*					
2017	Steinberg Nutter & Brent	Calabasas	CA				\$450*			\$250*		
2017	Stephen C. Hinze, Counselor At Law	Vista	CA				\$275*					
2017	Steven L. Yarmy, Esq.	Las Vegas	NV							\$450*		
2017	Steven M. Fishman P.A.	Clearwater	FL							\$300*		
2017	Steven R Fox Law Offices	Encino	CA				\$450*					
2017	Steven T. Mulligan	Denver	CO					\$236	\$325	\$293		
2017	Stevenson & Bullock, P.L.C	Southfield	MI		\$275	\$375	\$325	\$275	\$300	\$300		
2017	Stewart McArdle & Sorice, LLC	Greensburg	PA				\$225*					
2017	Stewart Robbins & Brown, LLC	Baton Rouge	LA		\$285	\$370	\$360					
2017	Stichter, Riedel, Blain & Postler, P.A.	Tampa	FL				\$350*			\$225*		
2017	Stillman & Associates, P.C.	Miami Beach	FL							\$500*		
2017	Stone and Baxter, LLP	Macon	GA							\$135*		
2017	Strawn & Edwards, PLLC	Dyersburg	TN							\$285*		
2017	SulmeyerKupetz	Los Angeles	CA		\$550	\$800	\$595	\$175	\$550	\$475	\$525	\$560
2017	Suzy Tate, P.A.	Tampa	FL		\$300	\$325	\$313			\$260*		
2017	Tang & Associates, P.C.	Los Angeles	CA				\$325*	\$250	\$400	\$325		
2017	Tarbox Law, P.C.	Lubbock	TX							\$300*		
2017	Tarpy, Cox, Fleischman & Leveille, PLLC	Knoxville	TN					\$200	\$300	\$275		
2017	Tarter Krinsky & Drogin	New York	NY				\$590*					
2017	Tavener & Beran, PLC	Richmond	VA		\$405	\$415	\$410			\$235*		
2017	Thaler Law Firm PLLC	Westbury	NY				\$500*					
2017	The Ballstaedt Law Firm	Las Vegas	NV							\$300		
2017	The Bankruptcy Group, P.C	Roseville	CA					\$200	\$400	\$200		
2017	The Batista Law Group, PSC	San Juan	PR					\$75	\$225	\$150		
2017	The Burns Law Firm, LLC	Greenbelt	MD				\$495*			\$355*		
2017	The Callins Law Firm, LLC	Atlanta	GA				\$215*					
2017	The Cowart Law Firm, PC	Madison	GA				\$250*					
2017	The Coyle Law Group LLC	Columbia	MD				\$400*					
2017	The De Leo Law Firm, LLC	Mandeville	LA							\$300*		
2017	The DeLorenzo Law Firm	Schenectady	NY									\$350*
2017	The Derbes Law Firm, L.L.C.	Metairie	LA		\$300	\$375	\$350	\$160	\$200	\$180		\$275*
2017	The Dorf Law Firm LLP	Mamaroneck	NY				\$495*			\$375*		\$850*
2017	The Dragich Law Firm PLLC	Grosse Pointe Woods	MI				\$375*			\$250*		
2017	The Dribusch Law Firm	East Greenbush	NY							\$300*		
2017	The Feldman Law Group	San Diego	CA							\$375*		
2017	The Fuller Law Firm, PC	San Jose	CA		\$395	\$505	\$475					
2017	The Furnier Muzzo Group, Llc	Las Vegas	NV							\$300*		
2017	The Guard Law Group, PLLC	Lakeland	FL							\$300*		
2017	The Harvey Law Firm	Dallas	TX				\$400*					
2017	The Kelly Firm, PC	Spring Lake	NJ				\$400			\$275		
2017	The Law Firm Of Ann Shaw, P.A.	Salisbury	MD							\$345*		
2017	The Law Firm of Florida Bankruptcy Advisors, P.L.	Fort Lauderdale	FL				\$300*					
2017	The Law Office of Barry S. Miller	Newark	NJ							\$350*		
2017	The Law Office Of Corey B. Beck, P.C.	Las Vegas	NV							\$375*		
2017	The Law Office of David F. Mills	Smithfield	NC					\$150	\$250	\$200		
2017	The Law Office of Jay Meyers	Staten Island	NY							\$450*		
2017	The Law Office of Robert Eckard and Associates, PA	Palm Harbor	FL							\$250*		
2017	The Law Office of William J. Factor, Ltd	Northbrook	IL		\$275	\$375	\$325					
2017	The Law Offices of Eric N. McKay	Jacksonville Beach	FL				\$350*					
2017	The Law Offices Of Hector Eduardo Pedrosa Luna	San Juan	PR							\$175*		
2017	The Law Offices of Jason A. Burgess, LLC	Atlantic Beach	FL		\$295	\$300	\$295	\$195	\$300	\$248		
2017	The Law Offices of Jeffrey L. Weinstein	New York	NY							\$500*		
2017	The Law Offices of Oliver & Cheek, PLLC	New Bern	NC				\$175*					
2017	The Law Offices of Richard B. Rosenblatt	Rockville	MD					\$295	\$300	\$350		
2017	The Law Offices of Robert M. Fox, Esq.	New York	NY					\$275	\$375	\$325		
2017	The Law Offices of Robert S. Lewis P.C	Nyack	NY							\$400*		
2017	The Law Offices of Stephen R Wade	Claremont	CA		\$125	\$415	\$270			\$250*		
2017	The Law Office of Tuella O. Sykes	Seattle	WA							\$310*		
2017	The Lewis Law Group, P.C.	Arlington	VA							\$350*		
2017	The Milledge Law Firm, PLLC	Houston	TX							\$350*		
2017	The Mitchell Law Firm, L.P	Dallas	TX		\$325	\$375	\$325			\$225		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	The Perez Law Firm	Corpus Christi	TX				\$250*			\$150*		
2017	The Phillips Law Offices, LLC	Saugus	MA				\$300*					
2017	The Pope Firm	Johnson City	TN							\$250*		
2017	The Pope Law Firm	Houston	TX				\$300*			\$300*		
2017	The Schofield Law Firm, P.C.	Brunswick	GA							\$225*		
2017	The Shinbrot Firm	Beverly Hills	CA					\$465	\$525	\$495		
2017	The Spears & Robt Law Firm, LLC	Decatur	GA				\$350*			\$350*		
2017	The Tracy Firm, Ltd	Chicago	IL							\$350*		\$350*
2017	The Turoci Firm	Riverside	CA					\$275	\$500	\$400		
2017	The Vida Law Firm, PLLC	Bedford	TX							\$350*		
2017	The Wiley Law Group, PLLC	Dallas	TX							\$375*		
2017	The Wright Law Office, PC	Decatur	GA							\$285*		
2017	Thomas B. Woodward, Attorney at Law	Tallahassee	FL				\$400*					
2017	Thomas E. Crowe, Professional Law Corporation	Las Vegas	NV				\$425*					
2017	Thomas F. Quinn, PC	Denver	CO				\$250*					
2017	Thomas J. Dwyer & Associates, LLC	New York	NY				\$350*					
2017	Thompson & Knight LLP	Dallas	TX	162			\$695*					
2017	Thompson Burton PLLC	Franklin	TN				\$395	\$225	\$395	\$310		
2017	Thompson Law Group, P.C.	Pittsburgh	PA							\$250*		
2017	Timothy W Gensmer, PA	Sarasota	FL							\$300*		
2017	Togut, Segal & Segal	New York	NY		\$875	\$990	\$933					
2017	Totaro & Shanahan	Pacific Palisades	CA					\$500	\$550	\$525		
2017	Trenk, DiPasquale, Della Fera & Sodono, P.C.	West Orange	NJ		\$245	\$580	\$563	\$240	\$615	\$275		
2017	Trodella & Lapping LLP	San Francisco	CA				\$500*					
2017	Tsao-Wu and Yee, LLP	San Jose	CA							\$300*		
2017	Tucker Hester Baker & Krebs, LLC	Indianapolis	IN				\$350*			\$350*		
2017	Tully Rinckey PLLC	Albany	NY				\$350*			\$180*		
2017	Tyler S. Van Voorhees Law, LLC	Clermont	FL							\$250*		
2017	Underwood, Perkins and Ralston	Dallas	TX					\$225	\$450	\$338		
2017	Van Dam Law LLP	Newton	MA							\$350*		
2017	Van Horn Law Group, PA	Fort Lauderdale	FL				\$400*	\$350	\$400	\$350		
2017	Villeda Law Group	McAllen	TX					\$250	\$375	\$313		
2017	Vincent D. Commisa, Esq.	Warren	NJ							\$350*		
2017	Vogel Bach & Horn, P.C.	New York	NY				\$225*					
2017	Vokshori Law Group	Los Angeles	CA							\$300*		
2017	Vorndran Shilliday PC	Denver	CO							\$300*		
2017	Vortman & Feinstein	Seattle	WA				\$425*			\$310*		
2017	Wadsworth Warner Conrardy, P.C.	Denver	CO		\$285	\$400	\$300			\$200*		
2017	Walsh, Becker, Wood & Rice	Bowie	MD				\$300*					
2017	Warner Norcross & Judd LLP	Grand Rapids	MI	182	\$410	\$555	\$518	\$285	\$345	\$315		\$550*
2017	Warshaw Burstein, LLP	New York	NY		\$175	\$375	\$275			\$275*		
2017	Wasserman, Jurista & Stolz, P.C.	Basking Ridge	NJ		\$375	\$675	\$450				\$500	\$550
2017	Wauson Probus	Sugar Land	TX				\$450*	\$250	\$450	\$400		
2017	Wayne Greenwald, P.C.	New York	NY				\$600*			\$550*		
2017	Weinberg Zareh & Geyerhahn, LLP	New York	NY				\$575			\$325*		
2017	Weinman & Associates, PC	Denver	CO				\$475*			\$475*		
2017	Weintraub & Selth APC	Los Angeles	CA		\$495	\$550	\$523	\$395	\$550	\$430		\$435*
2017	Weiss & Spees, LLP	Los Angeles	CA		\$350	\$500	\$500					
2017	Weissberg & Associates, Ltd	Chicago	IL				\$450*					
2017	Wells And Jarvis, P.S	Seattle	WA							\$360*		
2017	Weyer, Kaplan, Pulaski & Zuber, P.C.	Arlington	TX				\$385*			\$195*		
2017	White & Wolnerman, PLLC	New York	NY					\$250	\$400	\$400		
2017	Whiteford, Taylor & Preston	Baltimore	MD	265	\$530	\$570	\$550			\$340*		
2017	Whitelaw & Fango	Syracuse	NY				\$225*					
2017	Wilcox Law Firm	Ponte Vedra Beach	FL				\$325*					
2017	William E. Jamison Jr., Attorney at Law	Chicago	IL							\$350*		
2017	William E. Maddox Jr., L.L.C.	Knoxville	TN							\$200*		
2017	William F. Davis & Associates, PC	Albuquerque	NM				\$475*	\$225	\$250	\$238		
2017	William H. Brownstein & Associates, Professional Corpo	Santa Monica	CA				\$525*					
2017	Willis & Wilkins, LLP	San Antonio	TX				\$375*					
2017	Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP	New York	NY	74	\$1,150	\$1,425	\$1,350	\$625	\$965	\$800		
2017	Wilson, Harrell, Farrington	Pensacola	FL							\$150*		

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low		Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Winegarden Haley Lindholm & Robertson PLC	Grand Blanc	MI				\$225*						
2017	Winstead PC	Dallas	TX	130	\$550	\$625	\$588	\$335	\$450	\$375			
2017	Winston & Cashatt, Lawyers	Spokane	WA							\$280*			
2017	Winston & Strawn LLP	Chicago	IL	46			\$930*	\$560	\$750	\$655			
2017	Winthrop Couchot Golubow Hollander, LLP	Newport Beach	CA		\$595	\$750	\$595			\$425*			\$750
2017	Wiss & Freemyer, LLP	Dallas	TX							\$375*			
2017	Wollmuth Maher & Deutsch LLP	New York	NY		\$695	\$795	\$695			\$595*			
2017	Womac Law	Houston	TX							\$225*			
2017	Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, LLP	Winston-Salem	NC	97			\$525*	\$350	\$400	\$375			\$450
2017	Woods Rogers PLC	Roanoke	VA				\$355*	\$185	\$200	\$193			
2017	Wright Law Offices	Phoenix	AZ							\$300*			
2017	Wyatt & Mirabella PC	The Woodlands	TX				\$600*			\$600*			
2017	Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP	Wilmington	DE	408	\$520	\$890	\$805	\$285	\$540	\$430			
2017	Yumkas, Vidmar, Sweeney & Mulrenin, LLC	Columbia	MD		\$295	\$420	\$358						
2017	Zack A. Clement PLLC	Houston	TX							\$600*			
2017	Zalkin Revell, PLLC	Santa Rosa Beach	FL				\$300*	\$265	\$300	\$300			
2017	Zolkin Talerico LLP	Los Angeles	CA				\$495*						
2017	Zousmer Law Group PLC	Bloomfield Hills	MI				\$395						

* Not an average - represents one rate/one position.

EXHIBIT 7
(LWDA POS of Submission)