

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK**
2 **DE BLOUW LLP**

3 Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

4 Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

5 Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

6 2255 Calle Clara

7 La Jolla, CA 92037

8 Telephone: (858)551-1223

9 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

10 Email: Kyle@bamlawca.com

11 Website: www.bamlawca.com

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

15 ADAM GOMEZ, NICKLAS WHITE,
16 RICHARD ESPINOZA, and FREDDIE
17 EMMANUEL TARIN, individuals, on behalf
18 of themselves and on behalf of all persons
19 similarly situated,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 vs.

22 METRO AIR SERVICE INC., a Corporation;
23 and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

24 Defendants.

CASE NO.: **22STCV14964**

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL
NOURMAND IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL**

Hearing Date: December 2, 2025

Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl

Dept: SS-12

Date Filed: March 5, 2022

Trial Date: Not set

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

I, Michael Nourmand, say and declare, as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law, duly licensed to practice before all the Courts of the State of California and I am the principal of The Nourmand Law Firm, APC, attorneys of record for plaintiffs Nicklas White and Freddie Emanuel Tarin (“Plaintiffs”). As such, I am familiar with the file in this matter and if called as a witness I could and would competently testify to the following facts of my own personal knowledge.

8

2. I graduated from UCLA with a B.A. in Political Science (Cum Laude) in 1994. Thereafter I attended Loyal Law school and graduated in May of 1998. I became a member of the California State Bar in December 1998. In September 1999, I along with my former business partner Bruce Kokozyan, started the law firm of Kokozyan & Nourmand LLP and began to represent plaintiffs in the area of personal injury, insurance bad-faith, employment law, wage and hour, and class actions. In June 2010, I dissolved my partnership at Kokozyan & Nourmand LLP and started The Nourmand Law Firm, APC exclusively representing plaintiffs in the areas of employment law, wage and hour, and class actions. Prior to starting my own law firm, I worked for a plaintiff's law firm, Rose, Klein & Marias, Law Offices of Gary Bostwick and externed at the U.S. Attorney's Office, Civil Fraud Division and U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Honorable Judge Barry Russell. I am admitted to practice in all state courts in California, the United States District Courts of California - Central District, Southern District, Northern District, Eastern District, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal, and the United States Supreme Court. In July 2011 I was selected as one of 75 Top Labor & Employment Lawyers in California by the Daily Journal; in 2011 and 2012 I was selected as a Rising Star by Super Lawyers and in 2013-2025 I was selected as a Super Lawyer by Super Lawyers. I was selected for inclusion in The Best Lawyers in America in 2016-2025. I am also an active member of the California Employment Lawyer's Association ("CELA"), Consumer Attorneys of California ("CAOC"), National Employment Lawyer's Association ("NELA"), Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles ("CAALA"), California State Bar, Labor and Employment Section, and the Los Angeles County Bar.

1 3. My associate James A. De Sario graduated from UCI with a B.A. in Political
2 Science in 1998. Thereafter he attended University of West Los Angeles School of Law and
3 graduated in 2006. Mr. De Sario became a member of the California State Bar in March 2009. In
4 February 2009 Mr. De Sario became an associate at Kokozian & Nourmand LLP and thereafter in
5 June 2010 Mr. De Sario became a senior associate at The Nourmand Law Firm, APC. Mr. De
6 Sario exclusively represented employees in the area of employment law, wage and hour litigation
7 on an individual and class wide basis. Mr. De Sario is admitted to practice in all state courts in
8 California, the United States District Courts of California - Central District, and Ninth Circuit
9 Court of Appeal. Mr. De Sario is also an active member of the California Employment Lawyer's
10 Association ("CELA"). Mr. De Sario recently was named as a Super Lawyer.

11 4. Class Counsel are respected members of the California Bar with strong records of
12 vigorous and effective advocacy of their clients, and they are experienced in handling complex
13 class action litigation. Both Class Counsel and Plaintiffs were prepared to litigate the claims in
14 this action, but they strongly and unequivocally support the proposed settlement as being in the
15 best interest of the settlement class based on the circumstances referenced herein. Class Counsel
16 are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation. The Nourmand Law Firm, APC is acting
17 as lead counsel in at least twenty other wage and hour class actions. Class Counsel have been
18 appointed class counsel on several wage and hour class actions and one FACTA class action.
19 Thus, Class Counsel is sufficiently experienced and qualified to evaluate the Class Members'
20 claims and viability of Defendant's defenses.

21 5. In the opinion of Class Counsel, the recovery for each class member is well within
22 the acceptable range for this type of action. This settlement is also favorable given that settlement
23 class will promptly receive compensation rather than facing uncertainties inherent in further
24 litigation and waiting for years for this action to be tried. It is also telling that the settlement class
25 have overwhelmingly supported the settlement on the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
26 Based on all considerations, this settlement is highly favorable and is in the best interests of the
27 settlement class.

28 ///

1 **The Requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs are Fair, Reasonable, and Appropriate**

2 6. Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees in an amount of
3 approximately one-third of the settlement value created on behalf of the settlement class is
4 reasonable and fair. The requested fee falls on the lower end of the Ninth Circuit's historical
5 benchmark for attorneys' fees of 20% to 50% of a common fund and is fair compensation for
6 undertaking complex, risky, expensive, and time-consuming litigation on a contingent basis.

7 7. For Class Counsel, the fees here were wholly contingent in nature and the case
8 presented far more risk than the usual contingent fee case. There was the prospect of the enormous
9 cost inherent in class action litigation, as well as a long battle with a corporate defendant. That
10 prospect has previously become reality, in both trial courts and the Court of Appeal in other wage
11 and hour class litigation. Class Counsel risked not only a great deal of time, but also a great deal
12 of expense to ensure the successful litigation of this action on behalf of all Class Members.

13 8. My office will have worked approximately 182 hours. The hourly rate for The
14 Nourmand Law Firm, APC in this case for Michael Nourmand is \$975 per hour; James A. De
15 Sario is \$675 per hour; Paralegal is \$150 per hour; and Legal Assistant \$100 per hour. At Class
16 Counsel's hourly rate, this results in a lodestar amount for The Nourmand Law Firm, APC of
17 \$129,375 (105 x \$975 = \$102,375; 32 x \$675 = \$21,600; 18 x \$150 = \$2,700; and 27 x \$100 =
18 \$2,700).

19 9. A survey conducted by the National Law Journal for the year 2002 provides a
20 sample of a billing rate for California Lawyers. In that survey, six California firms provided their
21 hourly billing rates. Of those six firms, five regularly charge in excess of \$500.00 per hour for
22 their partners. In fact, four of the firms charge as high as \$600.00, \$620.00, \$650.00, and up to
23 \$850.00 per hour. These firms are located in Orange County, Los Angeles County, San Francisco
24 County and San Diego County and are the types of firms that Plaintiffs' counsel regularly opposes
25 in these class action cases. (See the National Law Journal Survey attached as Exhibit "1" to
26 Nourmand Decl.). The only difference is that these defense attorneys are paid on a monthly basis
27 and do not have to advance any costs on a case.

28 ///

1 10. Finally, Class Counsel attach the Declaration of Richard Pearl in support of the
2 Motion for Final Approval in the case of Rosa Cantu, et al v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company,
3 Case No. BC441237, dated January 4, 2011. (See Declaration Richard Pearl attached as Exhibit
4 “2” to Nourmand Decl.). Mr. Pearl specializes in issues related to cost-award attorney’s fees,
5 including the representation of parties in fee litigation and appeals, serving as an expert witness,
6 mediator and arbitrator in disputes concerning attorney’s fees and related issues. Mr. Pearl is also
7 the author of California Attorney’s Fee Awards (3d ed Cal. CEB 2010), as well as the author of the
8 Second Edition, years 1994 through 2008. He has also authored numerous other publications on
9 attorney’s fees, as set forth in his Declaration. (Id. at ¶¶4-5).

10 11. Mr. Pearl has reviewed the comparable hourly rates of attorney fees in California.
11 He confirms that courts have approved hourly rates of attorneys as follows.

- 12 ● Rates of up to \$875.00 in Savaglio, et al. v. Wal-Mart, Alameda County Superior
13 Court, Case No. C-835687-7 (before applying a 2.36 multiplier);
- 14 ● Rates of up to \$750.00 in Kashmiri et al. v. Regents of UC, San Francisco County
15 Superior Court (before applying a 3.7 multiplier); and
- 16 ● Rates of up to \$750.00 in Environmental Law Foundation v. Laidlaw Transit, Inc.,
17 San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. CGC-06-451832 (before applying a 1.25
18 multiplier). Id. at Pages 4 and 5.

19 12. Additionally, Mr. Pearl has reviewed numerous declarations, depositions and
20 surveys of legal rates on a non-contingent basis for the year 2009 and found hourly rates of up to
21 \$775.00, \$795.00, \$800.00, \$855.00, \$950.00, etc. (Id. at pages 6-12). These are non-contingent
22 rates where payment in full is expected promptly upon billing. (Id. at page 13). These rates
23 indicate that the requested hourly rate, as well as a multiplier, is reasonable in the case-at-hand in
24 view of Class Counsel’s experience, the result achieved in this case and the contingent nature of
25 the fees in class action cases.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

13. The following are the itemized litigation costs incurred by The Nourmand Law Firm, APC for the above-referenced matter:

(1)	Filing Fees	\$ 1,530.00
-----	-------------	-------------

(2)	e-Filing Fees	\$ 221.05
-----	---------------	-----------

(3)	Process Service	\$	93.50
-----	-----------------	----	-------

(4)	Mediation	\$ 3,750.00
-----	-----------	-------------

(5)	Electronic Service	\$ 1,914.30
-----	--------------------	-------------

(6)	Data Analyst Consultant	\$	720.00
-----	-------------------------	----	--------

(7)	Photocopies (593 x .20)	\$ 118.60
-----	-------------------------	-----------

(8)	Postage	<u>\$ 41.24</u>
-----	---------	-----------------

\$ 8,388.69

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct this 30th day of October 2025, at Beverly Hills, California.

/s/ Michael Nourmand
Michael Nourmand

EXHIBIT “1”



advertise
on law.com
[click here](#)

LAW.

First in Legal News and Information

LAWCATER
COM

**Stand out
from the crowd!**

LAW.

First in Legal News and Information

LAWCATER
COM

A Firm-by-Firm Sampling of Billing Rates Nationwide

The *National Law Journal* asked the respondents to its 2002 survey of the nation's 250 largest law firms to provide hourly billing rate information for partners and associates firmwide. The firms that supplied information -- including some firms that are not in the NLJ 250 -- are listed below in alphabetical or number order after a firm's name indicates the total number of attorneys at that firm. The city listed below the name of a firm is the location of the firm's principal office or largest office.

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

A B C D

Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld (1,017)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$350-\$600
Associates \$170-\$330

Alston & Bird (674)
(Atlanta)
Partners \$330-\$575
Associates \$170-\$500

Alzheimer & Gray (361)
(Chicago)
Partners \$220-\$525
Associates \$115-\$360

Andrews & Kurth (375)
(Houston)
Partners \$310-\$595
Associates \$170-\$400

Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn (249)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$215-\$560
Associates \$165-\$360

Armstrong Teasdale (230)
(St. Louis)
Partners \$210-\$310
Associates \$105-\$240

Arter & Hadden (273)
(Cleveland)
Partners \$215-\$450
Associates \$150-\$285

Baker, Donelson, Bearman & Caldwell (249)
(Memphis, Tenn.)
Partners \$175-\$480
Associates \$110-\$275

Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll (441)
(Philadelphia)

Kelley Drye & Warren (358)
(New York)
Partners \$300-\$590
Associates \$180-\$375

Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel (285)
(New York)
Partners \$440-\$625
Associates \$210-\$440

L M N

Lane Powell Spears Lubersky (175)
(Seattle)
Partners \$225-\$380
Associates \$175-\$260

Lewis, Rice & Fingersh (170)
(St. Louis)
Partners \$160-\$355
Associates \$110-\$270

Little Mendelson (395)
(San Francisco)
Partners \$220-\$440
Associates \$135-\$350

Locke Liddell & Sapp (408)
(Houston)
Partners \$300-\$595
Associates \$150-\$340

Loeb & Loeb (175)
(Los Angeles)
Partners \$350-\$650
Associates \$185-\$325

Lord, Bissell & Brook (325)
(Chicago)
Partners \$165-\$510
Associates \$140-\$285

Lowenstein Sandler (193)
(Roseland, N.J.)

Partners \$240-\$525
Associates \$145-\$300

Bell, Boyd & Lloyd (226)
(Chicago)
Partners \$250-\$550
Associates \$200-\$275

Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin (301)
(Kansas City, Mo.)
Partners \$165-\$410
Associates \$110-\$210

Blank Rome Comisky & McCauley (398)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$285-\$565
Associates \$175-\$360

Boult, Cummings, Connors & Berry (89)
(Nashville, Tenn.)
Partners \$185-\$375
Associates \$138-\$235

Bracewell & Patterson (362)
(Houston)
Partners \$210-\$600
Associates \$125-\$325

Bradley, Arant, Rose & White (181)
(Birmingham, Ala.)
Partners \$205-\$365
Associates \$150-\$275

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Liane (138)
(Chicago)
Partners \$295-\$500
Associates \$165-\$290

Bryan Cave (841)
(St. Louis)
Partners \$225-\$720
Associates \$135-\$410

Buchalter, Nemer, Fields & Younger (137)
(Los Angeles)
Partners \$310-\$450
Associates \$160-\$350

Duchonnet Ingersoll (362)
(Pittsburgh)
Partners \$225-\$720
Associates \$135-\$360

Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs (135)
(Akron, Ohio)
Partners \$205-\$360
Associates \$135-\$260

Burns, Pozna, Swicker & Mathis (37)
(Alexandria, Va.)
Partners \$300-\$550
Associates \$175-\$300

Burr & Forman (169)
(Birmingham, Ala.)
Partners \$205-\$365
Associates \$140-\$225

Butzel Long (204)
(Detroit)
Partners \$205-\$380
Associates \$135-\$215

Partners \$285-\$525
Associates \$140-\$295

Lucio, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps (202)
(San Diego)
Partners \$310-\$500
Associates \$150-\$300

Manatt, Phelps & Phillips (244)
(Los Angeles)
Partners \$375-\$600
Associates \$200-\$355

Marshall, Dennehey, Warner, Coleman & Goggin (288)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$130-\$255
Associates \$115-\$180

Mathews and Branscomb (51)
(San Antonio)
Partners \$175-\$325
Associates \$125-\$195

McCarter & English (270)
(Newark, N.J.)
Partners \$250-\$495
Associates \$140-\$285

McGuire Woods (558)
(Richmond, Va.)
Partners \$210-\$575
Associates \$85-\$325

Michael Best & Friedrich (349)
(Milwaukee)
Partners \$180-\$425
Associates \$180-\$240

Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone (301)
(Detroit)
Partners \$220-\$475
Associates \$125-\$230

Miller & Chevalier (123)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$320-\$650
Associates \$175-\$340

Miller Nash (140)
(Portland, Ore.)
Partners \$210-\$350
Associates \$125-\$225

Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough (282)
(Columbia, S.C.)
Partners \$200-\$390
Associates \$145-\$270

Nutter, McClennen & Fish (170)
(Boston)
Partners \$330-\$480
Associates \$175-\$300

O - R

Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel (110)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$300-\$475
Associates \$145-\$325

Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart (162)

Cades Schutte Fleming & Wright (59)
(Honolulu)
Partners \$185-\$325
Associates \$135-\$205

Carlton Fields (211)
(Tampa, Fla.)
Partners \$230-\$400
Associates \$130-\$270

Caso Bigelow & Lumbard (30)
(Honolulu)
Partners \$210-\$340
Associates \$125-\$210

Choate, Hall & Stewart (159)
(Boston)
Partners \$375-\$575
Associates \$195-\$345

Cooley Godward (560)
(Palo Alto, Calif.)
Partners \$330-\$600
Associates \$190-\$425

Covington & Burling (522)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$325-\$600
Associates \$160-\$390

Cozen O'Connor (440)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$185-\$450
Associates \$120-\$325

Crosby, Heafey, Roach & May (237)
(Oakland, Calif.)
Partners \$234-\$454
Associates \$170-\$320

Cummings & Lockwood (171)
(Stamford, Conn.)
Partners \$250-\$450
Associates \$155-\$290

Curtis, Mallett-Prevost, Colt & Mosie (168)
(New York)
Partners \$420-\$625
Associates \$180-\$435

Davis Graham & Stubbbs (97)
(Denver)
Partners \$200-\$425
Associates \$125-\$210

Davis Wright Tremaine (389)
(Seattle)
Partners \$225-\$525
Associates \$130-\$270

Day, Berry & Howard (231)
(Hartford, Conn.)
Partners \$275-\$450
Associates \$160-\$330

Dickinson Wright (200)
(Detroit)
Partners \$215-\$410
Associates \$130-\$210

Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky (311)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$360-\$550

(Atlanta)
Partners \$200-\$460
Associates \$170-\$265

Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly (246)
(Minneapolis)
Partners \$225-\$500
Associates \$125-\$375

Patton Boggs (366)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$235-\$700
Associates \$180-\$315

Pennie & Edmonds (233)
(New York)
Partners \$365-\$500
Associates \$190-\$360

Pepper Hamilton (389)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$245-\$525
Associates \$150-\$295

Perkins Cole (565)
(Seattle)
Partners \$160-\$650
Associates \$135-\$415

Phelps Dunbar (333)
(New Orleans)
Partners \$145-\$300
Associates \$110-\$175

Phillips, Lytle, Hitchcock, Blaine & Huber (171)
(Buffalo, N.Y.)
Partners \$185-\$350
Associates \$105-\$265

Piper Rudnick (794)
(Chicago)
Partners \$295-\$615
Associates \$140-\$405

Pitney, Hardin, Kipp & Szuch (195)
(Morristown, N.J.)
Partners \$280-\$450
Associates \$155-\$290

Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy (290)
(Atlanta)
Partners \$265-\$515
Associates \$160-\$300

Preston Gates & Ellis (386)
(Seattle)
Partners \$180-\$500
Associates \$120-\$410

Reed Smith (739)
(Pittsburgh)
Partners \$240-\$620
Associates \$100-\$435

Robinson & Cole (202)
(Hartford, Conn.)
Partners \$260-\$500
Associates \$150-\$300

Ross & Hardles (181)
(Chicago)
Partners \$260-\$465
Associates \$160-\$290

Associates \$180-\$340

Dinsmore & Shohl (254)
(Cincinnati)
Partners \$190-\$345
Associates \$125-\$235

Dow, Lohnes & Albertson (147)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$310-\$600
Associates \$160-\$335

Drinker Biddle & Reath (433)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$280-\$450
Associates \$145-\$275

Duane Morris (492)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$174.86-\$523.47
Associates \$146.97-\$394.36

Dykema Gossett (252)
(Detroit)
Partners \$210-\$380
Associates \$140-\$240

E F G

Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellors (193)
(Pittsburgh)
Partners \$210-\$425
Associates \$135-\$240

Edwards & Angell (290)
(Boston)
Partners \$300-\$550
Associates \$140-\$300

Epstein Becker & Green (333)
(New York)
Partners \$220-\$540
Associates \$150-\$350

Fish & Richardson (279)
(Boston)
Partners \$350-\$500
Associates \$185-\$360

Foster Pepper & Shofelman (106)
(Seattle)
Partners \$225-\$400
Associates \$140-\$250

Foulston Sienkin (73)
(Wichita, Kan.)
Partners \$145-\$300
Associates \$100-\$155

Fowler White Boggs Banker (180)
(Tampa, Fla.)
Partners \$175-\$350
Associates \$125-\$225

Gardere Wynne Sewell (288)
(Dallas)
Partners \$250-\$550
Associates \$130-\$320

Gibbons, Del Deo, Dojan, Griffinger & Vecchione (160)
(Newark, N.J.)
Partners \$235-\$600
Associates \$145-\$265

Rutan & Tucker (123)
(Costa Mesa, Calif.)
Partners \$250-\$425
Associates \$165-\$275

S - W

Saul Ewing (228)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$250-\$475
Associates \$145-\$265

Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis (301)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$220-\$465
Associates \$135-\$285
Soyfarth Shaw (505)
(Chicago)
Partners \$260-\$600
Associates \$160-\$265

Shaw Pittman (407)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$315-\$576
Associates \$170-\$325

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton (336)
(Los Angeles)
Partners \$305-\$525
Associates \$170-\$295

Shipman & Goodwin (137)
(Hartford, Conn.)
Partners \$235-\$360
Associates \$140-\$230

Sills Cummins Radin Tischman Epstein & Gross (155)
(Newark, N.J.)
Partners \$290-\$500
Associates \$125-\$290

Smith, Gambrell & Russell (177)
(Atlanta)
Partners \$185-\$465
Associates \$130-\$380

Steel Hector & Davis (195)
(Miami)
Partners \$240-\$600
Associates \$175-\$280

Stites & Harbison (213)
(Louisville, Ky.)
Partners \$175-\$325
Associates \$105-\$190

Stoel Rives (364)
(Portland, Ore.)
Partners \$210-\$400
Associates \$140-\$340

Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young (145)
(Philadelphia)
Partners \$200-\$465
Associates \$140-\$250

Strassburger & Price (224)
(Dallas)
Partners \$190-\$450
Associates \$155-\$250

Sughrue Mion (94)

Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich (402)
(Palo Alto, Calif.)
Partners \$310-\$620
Associates \$195-\$345

Greenbaum Doll & McDonald (172)
(Louisville, Ky.)
Partners \$190-\$365
Associates \$130-\$205

Greenberg Glusker (104)
(Los Angeles)
Partners \$325-\$850
Associates \$210-\$325

Greenberg Traurig (878)
(Miami)
Partners \$250-\$800
Associates \$150-\$375

H - K

Haight Brown & Bonesteel (91)
(Los Angeles)
Partners \$200-\$300
Associates \$115-\$175

Hale and Dorr (480)
(Boston)
Partners \$350-\$675
Associates \$230-\$395

Haynes and Boone (468)
(Dallas)
Partners \$265-\$500
Associates \$125-\$330

Hodgson Russ (189)
(Buffalo, N.Y.)
Partners \$200-\$475
Associates \$110-\$320

Hogan & Hartson (937)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$230-\$750
Associates \$90-\$405

Holland & Knight (1,273)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$200-\$575
Associates \$145-\$365

Holme Roberts & Owen (188)
(Denver)
Partners \$215-\$525
Associates \$145-\$275

Hughes Hubbard & Reed (282)
(New York)
Partners \$375-\$625
Associates \$175-\$415

Husch & Eppenhoefer (278)
(St. Louis)
Partners \$160-\$340
Associates \$115-\$186

Jackson Lewis (351)
(White Plains, N.Y.)
Partners \$245-\$450
Associates \$150-\$350

(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$300-\$450
Associates \$200-\$350

Sutherland Asbill & Brennan (356)
(Atlanta)
Partners \$275-\$545
Associates \$160-\$280

Swidler Berlin Sheroff Friedman (298)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$310-\$580
Associates \$170-\$380

Thelen Reid & Priest (440)
(New York)
Partners \$315-\$575
Associates \$165-\$390

Thompson Coburn (280)
(St. Louis)
Partners \$190-\$400
Associates \$105-\$220

Thompson & Knight (333)
(Dallas)
Partners \$260-\$475
Associates \$135-\$250

Thorp Reed & Armstrong (103)
(Pittsburgh)
Partners \$210-\$390
Associates \$175-\$230

Townsend and Townsend and Crew (151)
(San Francisco)
Partners \$415-\$525
Associates \$265-\$355

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz (213)
(Chicago)
Partners \$270-\$495
Associates \$165-\$290

Venable (448)
(Baltimore)
Partners \$250-\$670
Associates \$165-\$310

Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease (353)
(Columbus, Ohio)
Partners \$235-\$400
Associates \$125-\$250

Wiley, Rein & Fielding (221)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$300-\$525
Associates \$160-\$290

Williams & Connolly (211)
(Washington, D.C.)
Partners \$350-\$600
Associates \$185-\$330

Williams Hullen (237)
(Richmond, Va.)
Partners \$185-\$370
Associates \$125-\$225

Winstead Sechrest & Minick (333)
(Dallas)
Partners \$250-\$540
Associates \$145-\$300

Jenkins & Gilchrist (573)
(Dallas)
Partners \$275-\$525
Associates \$165-\$380

Jenner & Block (990)
(Chicago)
Partners \$350-\$625
Associates \$185-\$350

Jones, Walker, Waechter, Poitavant, Carrère &
Denègre (217)
(New Orleans)
Partners \$170-\$335
Associates \$110-\$185

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice (437)
(Winston-Salem, N.C.)
Partners \$190-\$500
Associates \$125-\$265

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs (201)
(Louisville, Ky.)
Partners \$150-\$310
Associates \$100-\$190

(The National Law Journal, December 2002)

• [About law.com](#)

• [Privacy Policy](#)

• [Terms & Conditions](#)

Copyright 2003 ALM Properties, Inc. All right

04/15/11

EXHIBIT “2”

1 JOSEPH E. JARAMILLO, CA Bar No: 178566
jjaramillo@gdblegal.com

2 ROBERTA L. STEELE, CA Bar No. 188198
rsteele@gdblegal.com

3 GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK, BALLER,
BORGES & DARDARIAN

4 300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000
Oakland, CA 94612

5 (510) 763-9800
6 (510) 835-1417 (fax)

7 GRAHAM S.P. HOLLIS, CA Bar No. 120577
ghollis@gracehollis.com

8 MARTA MANUS CA Bar No. 260132
mmanus@gracehollis.com

9 GRACEHOLLIS LLP
3555 Fifth Avenue

10 San Diego, CA 92103
(619) 692-0800

11 (619) 692-0822 (fax)

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs ROSA CANTU and
SANDRA CHU

13 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

14 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

15
16 ROSA CANTU AND SANDRA CHU,
17 individually and on behalf of others similarly
situated,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY
21 d/b/a AT&T CALIFORNIA, and Does 1 through
100, inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Case No.: BC441237

CLASS ACTION [Code Civ. Proc. § 382]

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
[Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*]

DECLARATION OF RICHARD M. PEARL
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT AND AN AWARD
OF REASONABLE ATTORNEYS' FEES
AND COSTS

Date: February 4, 2011

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept: 324

Judge: Emilie H. Elias

23
24
25
26
27
28
DECLARATION OF RICHARD M. PEARL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT AND AN AWARD OF REASONABLE ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS - CASE NO.: BC441237

234747-2

1 I, Richard M. Pearl, declare:

2 1. I make this Declaration of my own personal knowledge, and if called to testify, I could
3 and would testify competently to the matters stated herein.

4 A. Background

5 2. I am a member in good standing of the California State Bar. I am in private practice as
6 the principal of my own law firm, the Law Offices of Richard M. Pearl. I specialize in issues related to
7 court-awarded attorneys' fees, including the representation of parties in fee litigation and appeals,
8 serving as an expert witness, and serving as a mediator and arbitrator in disputes concerning attorneys'
9 fees and related issues. In this case, I have been asked by Plaintiffs' counsel to express my expert
10 opinion regarding their claim for reasonable attorneys' fees.

11 3. Briefly summarized, my background is as follows: I am a 1969 graduate of Boalt Hall
12 School of Law, University of California, Berkeley, California. After graduation, I spent fourteen years
13 in federally-funded legal services programs before going into private practice in 1982. From 1977 to
14 1982, I was Director of Litigation for California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc., a statewide legal services
15 program with more than fifty attorneys. Since April 1987, I have been a sole practitioner in the San
16 Francisco Bay Area. Martindale Hubbell rates my law firm "AV." I also have been selected as a
17 Northern California "Super Lawyer" in Appellate Law for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2010. A copy
18 of my Resume is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

19 4. Since 1982, my practice has been a general civil litigation and appellate practice, with an
20 emphasis on cases and appeals involving court-awarded attorneys' fees. I have lectured and written
21 extensively on court-awarded attorneys' fees. I have been a member of the California State Bar's
22 Attorneys Fees Task Force and have testified before the State Bar Board of Governors and the
23 California Legislature on attorneys' fee issues. I am the author of California Attorney Fee Awards, (3d
24 ed Cal. CEB 2010). I also was the author of California Attorney Fee Awards, 2d Ed. (Calif. Cont. Ed.
25 of Bar 1994), and its 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007,
26 and 2008 Supplements. This treatise has been cited by the California appellate courts on more than 35
27 occasions. I also authored the 1984, 1985, 1987, 1988, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993 Supplements to its
28 predecessor, CEB's California Attorney's Fees Award Practice. In addition, I authored a federal

1 manual on attorneys' fees entitled *Attorneys' Fees: A Legal Services Practice Manual*, published by the
2 Legal Services Corporation. I also co-authored the chapter on "Attorney Fees" in Volume 2 of CEB's
3 *Wrongful Employment Termination Practice*, 2d Ed. (1997).

4 5. More than 90% of my practice is devoted to issues involving court-awarded attorney's
5 fees. I have been counsel in over 140 attorneys' fee applications in state and federal courts, primarily
6 representing other attorneys. I also have briefed and argued more than 40 appeals, at least 25 of which
7 have involved attorneys' fees issues. In the past ten or so years, I have successfully handled four cases
8 in the California Supreme Court involving court-awarded attorneys' fees: (1) *Delaney v. Baker* (1999)
9 20 Cal. 4th 23, which held that heightened remedies, including attorneys' fees, are available in suits
10 against nursing homes under California's Elder Abuse Act; (2) *Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal. 4th
11 1122, which held, inter alia, that contingent risk multipliers remain available under California attorney
12 fee law, despite the United States Supreme Court's contrary ruling on federal law (note that in
13 *Ketchum*, I was primary appellate counsel in the Court of Appeal and "second chair" in the Supreme
14 Court); (3) *Flannery v. Prentice* (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 572, which held that in the absence of an agreement
15 to the contrary, statutory attorneys' fees belong to the attorney whose services they are based upon; and
16 (4) *Graham v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.* (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 553, which I handled, along with trial counsel,
17 in both the Court of Appeal and Supreme Court. I also successfully represented the plaintiffs in a
18 previous attorneys' fee decision in the Supreme Court, *Maria P. v. Riles* (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1281, and
19 represented amicus curiae, along with Richard Rothschild, in the Supreme Court's most recent fee
20 decision, *Vasquez v. State of California* (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 243. I also have handled several Ninth
21 Circuit attorneys' fees matters, including *Davis v. City & County of San Francisco* (9th Cir. 1992) 976
22 F.2d 1536, *Mangold v. CPUC* (9th Cir. 1995) 67 F.3d 1470, *Velez v. Wynne* (9th Cir. 2007) 2007 U.S.
23 App. LEXIS 2194, and *Camacho v. Bridgeport Financial, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2008) 523 F.3d 973. See
24 Exhibit A.

25 B. Plaintiffs' Counsel's Rates

26 6. I have been asked by Plaintiffs' counsel to submit this declaration in support of
27 Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and an Award of Reasonable
28 Attorneys' Fees and Costs. I submit this declaration to provide the Court information concerning

1 hourly rates for attorneys in the San Francisco Bay Area, and in particular to provide information
2 demonstrating that the hourly rates requested by Plaintiffs' counsel in this matter are within the range of
3 market rates being charged in the San Francisco Bay Area and the San Diego market for similar
4 services, i.e. handling and trying complex class actions on behalf of employees against large employers
5 like Pacific Bell Telephone Company in this case.

6 7. I understand that Plaintiffs' counsel are requesting an award of attorneys' fees at the
7 following rates:

8 a. Goldstein Demchak Baller Borgen & Dardarian, Oakland, CA

9

Name	Grad Year	Billing Rate
Roberta L. Steele	1993	\$600
Laura L. Ho	1994	\$600
Joseph E. Jaramillo	1995	\$550
Senior Paralegal		\$195
Paralegal		\$150

10
11
12

13 b. GraceHollis LLP, San Diego, CA

14

Name	Grad Year	Billing Rate
Graham S.P. Hollis	1985	\$600
Marta Manus	2008	\$375
Senior Paralegal		\$170

15
16

17 8. Through my writing and practice, I have become familiar with the non-contingent
18 market rates charged by attorneys in California and elsewhere. This familiarity has been obtained in
19 several ways: (1) by handling attorneys' fee litigation; (2) by discussing fees with other attorneys;
20 (3) by obtaining declarations regarding prevailing market rates in cases in which I represent attorneys
21 seeking fees; and (4) by reviewing attorneys' fee applications and awards in other cases, as well as
22 surveys and articles on attorney's fees in the legal newspapers and treatises.

23 9. The information I have gathered, some of which is summarized below, shows that the
24 rates requested by Plaintiffs' counsel in this case are well in line with the non-contingent market rates
25 charged by litigation attorneys of similar qualifications and experience in San Francisco, San Diego,
26 and similar markets.

27 ///

28 ///

c. Rates found reasonable in other cases.

Set forth below are rates that were awarded by the courts in the following cases:

2010 Rates

(1) *Savaglio, et al. v. WalMart*, Alameda County Superior Court No. C-835687-7, Order Granting Class Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees, filed September 10, 2010, a wage and hour class action, in which the court found the following hourly rates reasonable (before applying a 2.36 multiplier):

Years of Experience	Rate
51	\$875
39	\$750
38	\$600
33	\$775
25	\$550
23	\$650
21	\$625
19	\$610
18	\$600
17	\$585
16	\$570
15	\$560
14	\$550
13	\$525
12	\$515
11	\$510
10	\$505
9	\$500
7	\$460
4	\$435
Law Clerks	\$125-\$260

2009 Rates

(1) *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Fish & Game Commission*, San Francisco Superior Court No. CPF-08-508759, Order Granting Petitioners' Motion for Attorneys' Fees, filed December 1, 2009, in which the court found reasonable the following hourly rates:

Years of Experience	Rate
25	\$650
8	\$375
4	\$250
Law Clerks	\$150

1 (2) *Kashmiri et al v. Regents of U.C.*, San Francisco Superior Court, Order Granting
2 Plaintiffs' Motion for Common Fund Attorneys' Fees and Expenses, filed September 30, 2008, in
3 which the court found the following rates reasonable, plus a 3.7 lodestar multiplier:

Years of Experience	Rate
40	\$750
22	\$690
14	\$590
7	\$420
4	\$345
2	\$295
Law Clerks	\$200
Paralegals	\$195

4
5
6
7
8
9
10 (4) *Environmental Law Foundation v. Laidlaw Transit, Inc.*, San Francisco Superior
11 Court No. CGC-06-451832, Order Granting Motion for Court Approval of Parties Joint Stipulated
12 Judgment, filed September 22, 2008, in which the court found the following hourly rates reasonable in a
13 Proposition 65 action, plus a 1.25 multiplier:

Years of Experience	Rate
29	\$750
26	\$700
24	\$700
23	\$650
18	\$650
16	\$625
14	\$600
10	\$560
9	\$495-\$575
8	\$475
7	\$450
6	\$395
4	\$325
2	\$300
1	\$250
Paralegals	\$145-\$175
Interns	\$125

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 (5) *Gardner v. Schwarzenegger*, Alameda County Superior Court No. RG06-278911,
26 Order After Hearing filed April 20, 2009, aff'd by unpublished opinion, 2010 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS
27 1240, in which the court found the following 2008 rates reasonable, plus a 1.75 multiplier:
28

Years of Experience	Rate
17	\$640
14	\$590
8	\$445
Paralegal	\$170

a. Rate Information from Surveys and Other Cases:

I have reviewed numerous declarations and depositions filed in other cases, as well as various surveys of legal rates. These include the Westlaw CourtExpress Legal Billing Reports for May, August, and December 2009 (attached hereto as Exhibit B). These sources show the hourly rates for litigation undertaken on a non-contingent basis by the following California law firms, listed in alphabetical order:

Altshuler Berzon LLP

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
32	\$775
15	\$625
8	\$475
Law Clerks	\$200
Paralegals	\$195

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
23	\$700
15	\$550
5	\$325
Paralegals	\$155-\$190

Cooley Godward Kronish LLP

2008 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$525-\$980
Associates	\$285-\$570

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$470-\$875 (average \$673)
Associates	\$250-\$555 (average \$403)

Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins, LLP

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
42	\$700
19	\$650
14	\$650
14	\$600
13	\$585
11	\$510
6	\$460
5	\$285

Duane Morris LLP

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$325-\$795
Associates	\$225-\$450

Epstein Becker & Green LLP

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$350-\$855
Associates	\$180-\$475

Fenwick & West

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$500-\$775 (average \$590)
Associates	\$245-\$500 (average \$370)

Hadsell Stormer

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
35	\$775
20	\$575

Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Falk & Rabkin

2008 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$515-\$795
Associates	\$275-\$510

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$495-\$775
Associates	\$275-\$485

Litt, Estuar, Harrison & Kitson, LLP

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
39	\$800
16	\$550
3	\$320
2	\$285
Paralegals	\$125-\$235
Law Clerks	\$225

Loeb & Loeb

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$475-\$950
Associates	\$285-\$450

2008 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$450-\$925
Associates	\$260-\$500

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$475-\$875 (average \$606)
Associates	\$240-\$500 (average \$400)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Manatt, Phelps & Philips

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$495-\$850
Associates	\$250-\$505

2008 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$495-\$850
Associates	\$290-\$505

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$520-\$785 (average \$600)
Associates	\$265-\$480 (average \$395)

Morrison Foerster

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
24	\$750

2008 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
45	\$675
36	\$725
33	\$785
14	\$650
12	\$600
9	\$560
7	\$535
5	\$485
1	\$520
Paralegals	\$185- \$230

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
44	\$675
11	\$550
8	\$520
6	\$475
3	\$250

O'Melveny & Myers

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
36-37	\$860-\$950
21	\$820
16-18	\$700-\$710
14	\$595-\$675
10	\$590
8	\$565
7	\$540-\$565
5-6	\$480-\$520
2-4	\$395-450
Paralegals	\$225-310

Reed Smith

2008 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$375-\$900 (average \$626)
Associates	\$235-\$580 (average \$423)

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$350-\$825 (average \$558)
Associates	\$200-\$510 (average \$374)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Rudy, Exelrod & Zieff

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners 31	\$700
Associates 3	\$305

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners 29 12	\$700 \$500
Associates 10 8	\$400 \$330
Law Clerk	\$200
Paralegal	\$150

Schonbrun, DeSimone, Seplow, Harris & Hoffman

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
33	\$750
25	\$625
24	\$625
8	\$375
6	\$370
Paralegals	\$125

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton

2008 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$475-\$795
Associates	\$275-\$455

2007 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$425-\$795
Associates	\$260-\$550

Townsend and Townsend and Crew

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$480-\$750
Associates	\$260-\$460

Winston & Strawn

2009 Rates:

Years Experience	Rate
Partners	\$400-\$995
Associates	\$210-\$670

10. The hourly rates set forth above pertain largely to law firms headquartered in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles. To the extent those law firms handle cases in other jurisdictions, like San Diego, they almost always charge the same rates that they do for litigation in the Bay Area. To the extent Plaintiffs' claim is based upon San Diego rates, however, I also am of the opinion that they are in line with the rates charged by lawyers of comparable skill, experience, and reputation for comparable work, *i.e.*, complex representative litigation in San Diego. I base that opinion on the following facts:

a. In a report filed with the California Public Utilities Commission (attached as Exhibit C), the San Diego Gas & Electric Co. reported that in 2003, it hired outside counsel at rates of from \$477-625 per hour for partners with 13 or more years experience, \$435 per hour for partners with 8-12 years of practice, and \$239-425 per hour for associate attorneys with up to 7 years of practice. Hourly rates have increased significantly since then.

b. San Diego law firm Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps reports that in 2010, its partner rates ranged from \$350 to \$670 per hour, and its associate rates ranged from \$245 to \$445 per hour. In 2009, its partner rates ranged from \$360 to \$650 per hour, and its associate rates ranged from \$240 to \$540 per hour.

11. My research regarding attorneys' fees in California has indicated a consistent increase in fees over the last several years. Most firms increased their rates over these periods. Consistent with this market, I raised my rates in 2009 and 2010, and will raise it again in 2011, to reflect both the

1 demand for my services and inflation in costs and legal rates; my rate is still significantly less than
2 many attorneys with comparable experience, expertise, and skills at other firms.

3 12. The hourly rates set forth above are those charged where full payment is expected
4 promptly upon the rendition of the billing and without consideration of factors other than hours and
5 rates. If any substantial part of the payment were to be deferred for any substantial period of time, for
6 example, or if payment were to be contingent upon outcome or any other factor, the fee arrangement
7 would be adjusted accordingly to compensate the attorneys for those factors.

8 13. In my experience, fee awards are almost always determined based on current rates, i.e.,
9 the attorney's rate at the time a motion for fees is made, rather than the historical rate at the time the
10 work was performed. This is a common and accepted practice to compensate attorneys for the delay in
11 being paid.

12 **C. Plaintiffs' Counsel's Requested Percentage Fee**

13 14. I understand that Plaintiffs request an award of fees under the common fund doctrine as a
14 percentage of the fund recovered in this litigation sufficient to provide them with a reasonable fee. This
15 is an appropriate request because this is a fully-paid, non-reversionary settlement in which the value of
16 the class recovery is fully monetized at \$2,000,000, inclusive of fees, expenses, and settlement
17 administration costs. Under these circumstances, courts award fees as percentages of the common fund
18 where they are in line with the range of fees freely negotiated in the legal marketplace in comparable
19 litigation.

20 15. Based on the information I have gathered and my own experience and expertise, it is my
21 opinion that the 33 1/3% common fund fee recovery requested by Class Counsel is, in the
22 circumstances of this case, reasonable and consistent with awards approved by other California state
23 courts reviewing class action settlements, based on the factors discussed below.

24 16. My opinion is based in part on the fact that, as a common fund case with the fund
25 consisting of \$2 million, Plaintiffs' claimed fee of 33 1/3% is entirely consistent with the legal
26 marketplace for attorneys' services in contingency fee cases involving similar financial recoveries. In
27 the course of my practice, I have become familiar with the contingency fee percentages charged by law
28 firms to sophisticated institutional clients in large damage cases. Based on that knowledge and my

1 experience in the attorneys' fees field generally, it is my opinion that if competent and experienced
2 attorneys and a sophisticated client were to negotiate a contingency fee agreement under the
3 circumstances where (a) a high risk, complex case was being contemplated, (b) it is anticipated that the
4 opposition would be vigorous, and (c) the attorneys would not be paid unless and until they were able to
5 obtain significant relief for the client, the sophisticated client would be more than willing to enter into a
6 retainer agreement under which the client would pay only the litigation out-of-pocket costs, and the
7 attorneys could reasonably expect to recover 5% to 35% of the total value of any recovery as fees.

8 17. An award of 33 1/3% of the common fund requested by Class Counsel here is consistent
9 with legal marketplace for attorneys' services in contingency fee cases because of (a) the high risk
10 involved in litigating an incentive compensation plan case on behalf of nearly 100 California
11 employees; (b) the vigorous defense presented by the large defense firm that represents Defendant here;
12 (c) the relatively small size of the common fund, which weighs toward a higher percentage; and (d) the
13 fact that here, unlike in the paradigm market practices situation described in the previous paragraph,
14 Class Counsel were obligated to advance the substantial litigation costs on a contingent basis with risk
15 of delay in repayment as well as possible non-repayment, and to represent Plaintiffs through appeal of
16 any judgment in this case. This award would also be appropriate to encourage settlement, reward
17 counsel for maximizing their clients' recoveries, and promote the private enforcement of the wage and
18 hour laws Plaintiffs allege were violated.

19 **D. Plaintiffs' Counsel's Lodestar Multiplier**

20 18. Courts often cross-check a percentage-based fee against a lodestar based fee to determine
21 if it is reasonable. I understand that Plaintiffs' lodestar here is \$332,383.88 on non-fees work. The
22 \$666,667 fee award requested represents a 2 multiplier on the non-fees lodestar.

23 19. The expense and risk of public interest litigation has not diminished over the years; to
24 the contrary, these cases are in many ways more difficult than ever. As a result, fewer and fewer
25 attorneys and firms are willing to take on such litigation, and the few who are willing to do so can only
26 continue if their fee awards reflect true market value. Attorneys who litigate on a wholly or partially
27 contingent basis expect to receive significantly higher effective hourly rates in cases where
28 compensation is contingent on success. As the case law recognizes, this does not result in any

1 "windfall" or undue "bonus." In the legal marketplace, a lawyer who assumes a significant financial
2 risk on behalf of a client rightfully expects that his or her compensation will be significantly greater
3 than if no risk was involved (i.e., if the client paid the bill on a monthly basis), and that the greater the
4 risk, the greater the "enhancement." Adjusting court-awarded fees upward in contingent fee cases to
5 reflect the risk of recovering no compensation whatsoever for hundreds of hours of labor simply makes
6 them competitive in the legal marketplace, helping to ensure that meritorious cases will be brought to
7 enforce important public interest policies and that clients who have meritorious claims will be more
8 likely to obtain qualified counsel.


9 20. In my experience, lodestar multipliers of 2 to 4 are typical for class actions such as this
10 case. Plaintiffs' requested fee falls well within this range.

11 **E. Plaintiffs' Counsel's Out-of-Pocket Expenses.**

12 21. I have reviewed the billing practices of hundreds of attorneys in California. Based on
13 my experience and knowledge of these billing practices, I am aware that it is a common practice for
14 firms to bill their clients for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in litigation on a monthly basis as they are
15 incurred. Such expenses include, but are not limited to, charges incurred for copying, long-distance
16 telephone calls, postage, messengers, travel, deposition and hearing transcripts, legal and non-legal
17 computer research services, mediation services, and expert witnesses. I am informed that Plaintiffs
18 expended \$16,258.08 in out-of-pocket litigation expenses in this case, including \$8,000 for the services
19 of an experienced and skilled mediator, David Rotman, who brokered the settlement in this case. Based
20 on my knowledge and experience of such costs and billing practices, it is my opinion that these
21 expenses are reasonable given the complex nature of this case.

22 If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify from my personal knowledge to the
23 facts stated herein. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California the
24 foregoing is true and correct.

25 Executed this 4th day of January, 2011, at Berkeley, California.

26 
27 RICHARD M. PEARL
28