

Matthew Fisher, SBN 229532
Matthew S. Da Vega, SBN 195443
DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP
850 Iron Point Road, Suite 211
Folsom, CA 95630
Telephone: 408.758.8974
Facsimile: 877.535.9358
Mfisher@mdmflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF VENTURA

GENARO CAMPOS, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RL ON-TIME DELIVERY SERVICE,
INC.; FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE
SYSTEM, INC.; and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF MATTHEW H. FISHER
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT and
ATTORNEY FEES and COSTS**

Date: September 20, 2024

Time: 8:20 AM

Dept: 40

Honorable Mark S. Borrell

Action Filed: February 17, 2023

Trial Date: TBD

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

DECLARATION OF MATTHEW H. FISHER

I, Matthew H. Fisher, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney admitted to practice law in the State of California.
2. I am a named Partner at Da Vega Fisher Mechtenberg, LLP (“DFM LLP”).
3. DFM LLP is lead and only counsel for the Plaintiffs in this Lawsuit. (“Class Counsel.”)
4. I have been intimately involved in all aspects of this case. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval of Class Settlement and Attorney Fees and Costs.

I. LEAD COUNSEL BACKGROUND

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

6. **Plaintiff’s Lead Counsel Matthew H. Fisher:** I am a graduate of the University of California, Berkeley (1998) and the USC Gould School of Law (2003), where I served on the Law Review Staff. I became a member of the State Bar of California in 2003. From 2003 to 2006, I worked in private practice for Pollak, Vida & Fisher in Los Angeles representing public entities and insurance companies in bad faith litigation. From 2006 to 2012, I worked as an associate in the nationally recognized law firm of Cappello & Noel LLP in Santa Barbara, California

1 representing plaintiffs in complex business litigation, civil rights, securities, and lender liability
2 suits. In 2012, I started my own law firm, Da Vega Fisher Mechtenberg LLP (“DFM LLP”),
3 originally with an office in the San Francisco Bay Area then later opening additional offices in
4 Santa Barbara, Ventura, and the Sacramento area. I am one of the firm’s two founding partners. I
5 personally manage the firm’s Folsom's office and travel back and forth between Sacramento and
6 the firm's Mountain View office in the Bay Area. DFM LLP has always been a Plaintiff-side
7 contingency based law firm representing clients predominantly in employment and personal
8 injury matters in both individual and class actions. DFM LLP is experienced counsel in class
9 action matters and has worked on significant cases such as *Gruber v. Yelp Inc.*, San Francisco
10 County Superior Court, Case No. CGC 16-554784 (2024) (\$15M gross settlement for 400,000+
11 call recording class); *Sena v. Facebook, Inc.*, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No.
12 16CIV00496 (2018) (\$4.25M gross settlement for class of 900+ class member employees for
13 unpaid overtime wage); *Salvatierra v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court,
14 Case No. 2014-1-CV-272069 (2016) (\$4.6M gross settlement for class of 208 misclassified class
15 member employees); *Magpiong v. CareLinx*, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 21-
16 CIV-03038 (2022) (\$1.8 M gross settlement for class of 2000+ class member employees for IC
17 misclassification /unpaid overtime wage), and *Gibbins/Leal v. Hismeh Enterprises, Inc.*, Ventura
18 County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2015-00468352 (2017) (\$1M gross settlement for class of
19 4000+ delivery driver members reimbursements) to name but a few. I have also worked on
20 several appellate matters over the course of my career such as *Pitzen v. Superior Court* (2004)
21 120 Cal.App.4th 1374 (collateral estoppel effect is afforded to claims litigated and decided
22 against a small claims plaintiff); and *AREI II Cases* (2013) 216 Cal.App.4th 1004 (construing
23 scope of aiding and abetting liability under California’s securities laws).

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

25 7. **Common Fund Settlement:** In this matter DFM LLP negotiated a Class action
26 settlement providing a common settlement fund with a payout of **\$250,000 (Two Hundred and**
27 **Fifty Thousand dollars)**. (Settlement Agreement, 3:11-22). Class Counsel is seeking as a Fee
28

1 Award of **\$83,333 (Eighty-Three Thousand, three hundred and thirty dollars)** or one-third of
2 this common settlement fund. (Settlement Agreement, 10:23-24)

3 8. **Attorney Fees of 33.33% Percent of Common Fund is Reasonable:** Class
4 Counsel requests the Court grant its application for an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of
5 **\$83,333 (Eighty-Three Thousand, three hundred and thirty dollars)**. This is equal to 1/3 of
6 the Maximum Settlement Amount of \$250,000 created on behalf of the Class. (Settlement
7 Agreement, 10:23-24.). The requested award is fair, reasonable, and well within the common
8 range for attorney fees of 20% to 50% in a common fund settlement. The requested award also
9 compares favorably to the overall lodestar incurred to date (see below). Therefore, DFM LLP
10 respectfully requests approval of the agreed upon fee award.

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

24 10. **Contingency Fee Market:** I am familiar with the contingent fee market
25 throughout California and in particular as it pertains to complex employer, wage and hour, and
26 class action litigation. On behalf of my firm, I have negotiated hundreds of contingency fee
27 agreements with Plaintiffs, including both individual matters and as representatives in class action
28

1 suits. Many of those agreements provide that counsel will receive between 33% to 40%+ of any
2 recovery that is obtained, and, in addition that counsel be reimbursed for the costs they incurred
3 out of the recovery amount. These are typical and standard percentages in employment-related
4 contingency fee agreements throughout California. The Class Members in this complex wage and
5 hour case would not be likely to obtain competent counsel in California, for any amount less than
6 these standard fee percentages. Class Counsel has also advanced all costs in this matter and not
7 been paid for any attorney's fees or costs to date.

8 11. **Class Counsel's Hours and Hourly Rates:** I will have worked on this matter for
9 110 hours at the time of this motion and my current billable rate as of 2024 is \$700/hr. for class
10 action work (\$700/hr. x 110 hours = \$77,000 in lodestar). Matthew S. Da Vega is an equity
11 partner of the DFM LLP and worked 24 hours on this case and his billing rate is \$775/hr. for class
12 action work (\$775/hr. x 24 hours = \$18,600 in lodestar). (See Declaration of Matthew S. Da Vega
13 ISO of Motion). Ted D. Mechtenberg is an equity partner of the DFM LLP and worked 9 hours on
14 this case and his billing rate is \$650/hr. for class action work (\$650/hr. x. 9 hours = \$5,850 in
15 lodestar). (See Declaration of Ted D. Mechtenberg ISO of Motion). These rates are comparable to,
16 but are less than, those of counsel with the same education and experience in the relevant legal
17 communities in which I practice including the San Francisco Bay Area and Southern California.
18 Attached are various surveys of billing rates showing higher hourly rates than DFM LLP currently
19 charges for attorneys with less experience. (See Exhibits 3, 4, and 5).

20 12. **Class Counsel Lodestar Cross-Check:** I have reviewed my firm's lodestar in this
21 matter and believe the charges are reasonable and were reasonably necessary to the conduct of the
22 case. These rates are in line with the prevailing rates of attorneys in the California legal
23 community for similar work. In this case, the reasonableness of the requested for \$83,333 in
24 attorneys' fees is further supported by a cross-check using attorney's lodestar in this matter. Class
25 Counsel has spent a significant amount of hours investigating, researching, and litigating this
26 matter, including but not limited to the following: interviewing Plaintiffs and flushing out facts
27 and issues; researching employer and causes of action; developing facts and investigating
28

Defendant's ownership structure (Secretary of State, etc.); investigating and discussing job functions, duties, compensation, policies and procedures, etc.; regularly meeting and/or communicating with our the Class Representative client; drafting pleadings (complaint, case management statements, opposition to removal, mediation briefs); drafting and responding to informal discovery; reviewing information produced in formal and informal discovery (payroll data, etc.); researching employee classifications, jurisdictional issues, and various impact on class actions; participating in Court-ordered hearings and conferences; attending mediation; retention of expert witnesses; discussion with expert witnesses issues related to damage model calculations; preparing and analyzing damage models; negotiating the terms of the Settlement; reviewing and 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 \$101,450.00 (greater than the amount of fees requested) 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 H. Fisher	110	\$700	\$77,000
Matthew S. Da Vega	24	\$775	\$18,600
Ted Mechtenberg	9	\$650	\$5,850
TOTAL	143		\$101,450

13. The requested fee award of \$83,333 represents a negative multiplier. Whereas “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

1 have no trouble concluding that an award is supported by the lodestar cross-check is fair and
2 reasonable and is justified under California law. “[T]he lodestar method better accounts for the
3 amount of work done, while the percentage of the fund method more accurately reflects the
4 results achieved.” *Rawlings v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc.* (6th Cir. 1993) 9 F.3d 513,
5 516.

6 14. **Class Counsel Attorney Costs:** The Settlement Agreement permits up to **\$20,000**
7 **in reimbursement of costs.** (Settlement Agreement, 10:25). However, Plaintiff’s actual costs are
8 \$22,514 (Twenty-Two Thousand Five-Hundred Fourteen Dollars). Therefore, Class Counsel
9 requests the Court award it \$20,000 in costs related to filing fees, service fees, mediation fees,
10 travel costs, and expert fees which could not have been recovered if this case had been lost. Class
11 Counsel was required to advance all costs in this litigation. In this type of litigation where the
12 corporate defendant and their attorneys are well funded, this can prove to be very expensive,
13 risky, and therefore cost prohibitive to many attorneys. The financial burdens undertaken by
14 Plaintiff and Class Counsel in prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class were substantial.
15 Plaintiff undertook the risk of liability for Defendant’s costs and even fees had this case not
16 succeeded, as well as other potential negative financial ramifications from having come forward
17 to sue Defendant on behalf of the Class. Accordingly, the contingent nature of the fee and the
18 financial burdens on Class Counsel and Plaintiff also support the requested awards. The
19 following list itemizes Class Counsel’s costs and expenses to date:

Filings/Service/Court Fees:	\$ 1,988.44
Travel (Flights, Lodging, Rentals, Meal):	\$ 1,038.17
Mediation Fees/Costs:	\$ 6,375.00
Experts Fees/Costs:	\$ 13,112.50
TOTAL	\$ 22,514.11

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

25 16. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of
26 Veronica Olivares (on behalf of CPT Group, Inc.) Regarding Notice and Settlement
27 Administration (“Olivares Decl.”).
28

1 17. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Class
2 Representative Genaro Campos in Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Action
3 Settlement and Enhancement Award.

4 18. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is a true and correct copy of the NALFA 2020
5 Litigation Hourly Rate Range Growth (demonstrating that average rates for lawyers who have
6 been practicing for 21-24 years [i.e. Plaintiff's counsel Matthew S. Da Vega] are between \$751-
7 \$1000/hour and for 17-20 years [i.e. Plaintiff's counsel Matthew H. Fisher and Ted Mechtenberg]
8 are between \$651-900/hour).

9 19. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** is a true and correct copy of the Laffey Matrix
10 (demonstrating current average rates for lawyers practicing 20+ years at \$919/hour and those
11 practicing 11-19 years at \$764/hour).

12 20. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** is a true and correct copy of National Law Journal
13 Billing Survey 2017 (demonstrating the average partner rates at various California defense firms
14 in 2017 were: Cooley LLP (\$1,100/hr.), Sheppard Mullin (\$760/hr.), Lobel Weiland Golden
15 Friedman LLP (\$750/hr.), Winthrop Couchot Golubow Hollander, LLP (\$595/hr.), Morris, Polich
16 & Purdy, LLP (\$575./hr.); Leslie Cohen Law PCS (\$575/hr.)(See 2017 - National Law Journal
17 Annual Survey on Billing Rates).

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

20 22. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of
21 Matthew S. Da Vega In Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Settlement and Attorneys
22 Fees and Costs.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///


26 ///

27 ///

1 23. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 8** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Ted
2 D. Mechtenberg In Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Settlement and Attorneys Fees
3 and Costs.
4

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

8 Date: August 20, 2024
9

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Fisher", written over a horizontal line.

Matthew H. Fisher

EXHIBIT 1

MATTHEW FISHER (S.B. #229532)
mfisher@mdmflaw.com
MATTHEW S. DA VEGA (S.B. #195443)
mdavega@mdmflaw.com
DA VEGA, FISHER, MECHTENBERG, LLP
850 Iron Point Road, Suite 211
Folsom, California 95630
Telephone: (408) 758-8974
Facsimile: (877) 535-9358

Attorneys for Plaintiff
GENARO CAMPOS

VICKIE V. GRASU (S.B. #224278)
vgrasu@ohaganmeyer.com
MATTHEW C. SGNILEK (S.B. #235299)
msgnilek@ohaganmeyer.com
O'HAGAN MEYER
21650 Oxnard Street, Suite 530
Woodland Hills, California 91367
Telephone: (213) 306-1610
Facsimile: (213) 306-1615

Attorneys for Defendant
RL ON-TIME DELIVERY SERVICE, INC

(Additional Counsel on Next Page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF VENTURA

GENARO CAMPOS, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

RL ON-TIME DELIVERY SERVICE, INC.;
FEDEX CORPORATION; FEDEX
GROUND PACKAGE SYSTEM, INC.; and
DOES 1 THROUGH 100, inclusive

Defendants.

Case No.: 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF VERONICA
OLIVARES REGARDING NOTICE
AND SETTLEMENT
ADMINISTRATION**

Date of Hearing: September 20, 2024
Judge: Honorable Mark S. Borrell
Dept: 40

1 SCOTT VOELZ (S.B. #181415)

svoelz@omm.com

2 ADAM KARR (S.B. #212288)

akarr@omm.com

3 **O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**

400 South Hope Street, 18th Floor

4 Los Angeles, California 90071-2899

5 Telephone: (213) 430-6000

Facsimile: (213) 430-6407

6 ALLAN GUSTIN (S.B. #305784)

7 agustin@omm.com

8 **O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**

610 Newport Center Drive, 17th Floor

9 Newport Beach, CA 92660

10 Telephone: (949) 823-6900

Facsimile: (949) 823-6994

11 Attorneys for Defendant

12 FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE SYSTEM, INC.

1 I, Veronica Olivares, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a Case Manager for CPT Group, Inc. (“CPT”), the Court-approved class action
3 Settlement Administrator for *Campos v. RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc., et al.* I have personal
4 knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called upon to testify, I could and would
5 testify competently to such facts.

6 2. CPT Group has extensive experience in providing notice of class actions and
7 administering class action settlements. For over 30 years, we have provided notification and/or
8 settlement administration services in over one thousand class action cases.

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

20 4. CPT received the Court-approved text for the Class Notice from Counsel on June 12,
21 2024. CPT prepared a draft of the Class Notice consisting of 6-pages for mailing to the class members.
22 Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Class Notice.

23 5. On June 25, 2024, CPT received a data file from Defendant RL On-Time containing
24 the Putative Class Data for the purpose of mailing the Class Notice to Class Members. The data file
25 and the finalized mailing list contained 310 Settlement Class Members

26 6. On July 11, 2024, CPT conducted a National Change of Address (NCOA) search in
27 an attempt to update the class list of addresses as accurately as possible. A search of this database
28

1 provides updated addresses for any individual who has moved in the previous four years and notified
2 the U.S. Postal Service of their change of address.

3 7. The Class Notices were enclosed in envelopes with the class member's name and
4 known address printed on them. On July 12, 2024, the Class Notices were mailed via U.S. First-Class
5 mail to all 310 class members. The Class Notice indicated a deadline date of August 26, 2024, to
6 dispute, to object or request for exclusion from the settlement.

7 8. As of the date of this declaration, 18 Class Notices have been returned to our office
8 by the U.S. Postal Service, 3 of which was provided a new address by the Post Office. For the
9 remaining 15 Class Notices, CPT performed a skip trace to locate a better address using Accurant,
10 one of the most comprehensive address databases available. Accurant utilizes hundreds of different
11 databases supplied by credit supporting agencies, public records, and a variety of other national
12 databases.

13 9. As a result of skip trace effort or re-mail request from Counsel or the class members
14 themselves, a total of 13 Class Notices have been re-mailed to date. As of the date of this
15 declaration, a total of 6 Class Notices are deemed undeliverable as no better address was provided
16 from the Post Office or obtained through skip trace.

17 10. As of the date of this declaration, CPT has received 0 requests for exclusions.

18 11. As of the date of this declaration, CPT has received 0 disputes regarding the weeks
19 worked.

20 12. As of the date of this declaration, CPT has received 0 objections to the settlement.

21 13. As of the date of this declaration, CPT reports a total of 310 Settlement Class
22 Members, representing 100% of the Settlement Class.

23 14. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Settlement Class Members will
24 receive a proportionate share of the Net Settlement Fund, currently estimated to be \$121,667.00,
25 based on the number of weeks worked during the Class Period. The total number of weeks worked
26 for the 310 participating class members is 18,534. Based on the estimated settlement calculations at
27 this time, the estimated weekly rate is \$6.56, the average Class Member Payment to each Settlement
28 Class Member is estimated to be \$392.47 and the highest payment is estimated to be \$1,824.94.

1 15. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the Aggrieved Employees will receive a
2 proportionate share of the PAGA Payment allocated to the PAGA Group, currently estimated to be
3 \$1,250.00 based on the number of pay periods worked during the PAGA Period. All Settlement Class
4 Members, including individuals who requested exclusion from the Settlement if they are PAGA
5 Members will receive a PAGA Payment. The total number of pay periods worked for 250
6 participating Aggrieved Employees is 11,531 Based on the estimated calculations at this time, the
7 estimated PAGA pay period rate is \$0.11, the average PAGA Payment to each Aggrieved Employee
8 is estimated to be \$5.00 and the highest payment is estimated to be \$13.12.

9 16. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the entire Net Settlement Fund was used to
10 calculate the settlement payment amount for each Settlement Class Member and Aggrieved
11 Employee. The Net Settlement Fund is calculated as set forth below:

Gross Settlement Fund	\$250,000.00
Less Attorneys' Fees (Requested)	- \$83,333.00
Less Attorneys' Litigation Cost	- \$20,000.00
Less Service Award to Plaintiff Campos (Requested)	- \$10,000.00
Less PAGA Payment to the LWDA	- \$3,750.00
Less PAGA Payment to Aggrieved Employees	- \$1,250.00
Less Settlement Administration Costs	- \$10,000.00
Remaining Net Settlement Fund	\$121,667.00

17 17. CPT will charge a total of \$10,000.00 in costs associated with the administration of
18 the settlement. This includes all costs incurred to date, as well as estimated costs involved in
19 completing the settlement.

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

1
2 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California the foregoing is true and
3 correct. Executed this 14th day of August 2024 in Irvine, California.

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

EXHIBIT A

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF VENTURA

GENARO CAMPOS,

v.

RL ON-TIME DELIVERY SERVICE, INC., ET AL.

Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA

NOTICE OF CLASS AND PAGA ACTION PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

TO: All current and former California based non-exempt employees who physically performed work as pick up and delivery drivers for Defendant RL On-Time in California from February 17, 2019 through the date the Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement

**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 and PAGA action lawsuit pending in Ventura County Superior Court ("Court") titled *Campos v. RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA (the "Action"). If the Court gives final approval of the Settlement, each Class Member will receive 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 Settlement Administrator at *Campos v. RL On-Time, c/o CPT Group, Inc., 50 Corporate Park, Irvine, CA 92606*.

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is «estAmount» based on the «Workweeks Total» workweeks you worked during the Class Period, as shown in Defendant RL On-Time'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 WORKWEEK DISPUTE	If you believe that the number of workweeks with which you have been credited is incorrect, you must submit a workweek dispute to the Settlement Administrator. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 10 below	Deadline: August 26, 2024
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: August 26, 2024
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: August 26, 2024
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 Class 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 (although it is not required) 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: September 20, 2024 at 8:20 AM

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 Defendant RL On-Time's calculations 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 Name Plaintiff receive any compensation for his 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 RL On-Time'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 Genaro Campos (the “Plaintiff” or “Named Plaintiff”) filed a lawsuit against RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc., (“RL On-Time”) and FedEx Ground Package System, Inc. (“FedEx Ground”) (collectively “Defendants”) on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated. The lawsuit alleges that Defendants violated California law by, among other things, failing to pay overtime wages, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, and failure to reimburse necessary business expenses. The lawsuit also asserts claims under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”).

Defendants deny 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 FedEx Ground specifically denies that it employed or jointly employed any Settlement Class Member and that Named Plaintiff, or any Settlement Class Member, was an aggrieved employee as to FedEx Ground. Defendants further deny 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, Genaro Campos) 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 companies sued in this case, RL On-Time and FedEx Ground, are called the “Defendants”.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

The Plaintiff has made claims against Defendants. Defendants deny that they have done anything wrong or illegal and admit no liability. **The Court has not decided that the Plaintiff or the Defendants 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 California based non-exempt employees who physically performed work as a pickup and delivery driver for Defendant RL On-Time Delivery Services, Inc. (‘RL On-Time’) in California from February 17, 2019 through June 11, 2024.”

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: *Campos v. RL On-Time, 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 RL On-Time has agreed to fund a Settlement with a maximum value of **\$250,000 (Two-Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars)**. The Settlement amount will be used to pay the claims of the Settlement Class, the cost of providing notice to the Class and administering the Settlement (up to \$10,000); to pay any awards of the Court for attorneys’ fees (up to \$83,333) and costs (up to \$20,000) to Plaintiff’s counsel; any enhancement award the Court awards to the Named Plaintiff (up to \$10,000); and the amount allocated under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.* (“PAGA”) (\$5,000, the “PAGA Payment”), which includes the 75% payment to the California Labor Workforce and Development Agency (“LWDA Payment”) (\$3,750) and the 25% “PAGA Group Amount” distributed to the PAGA Group (\$1,250).

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is «estAmount».

Your estimated payment was calculated using Defendant RL-On-Time’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 \$250,000 Gross Settlement Fund, the payments to Class Counsel, the Named Plaintiff, and the Settlement Administrator, and the PAGA Payment. The settlement payments will be apportioned to each Class Member from the Net Settlement Fund on a *pro-rata* basis, based on the number of workweeks worked during the Class Period.

(b) The Settlement Administrator will also calculate Individual PAGA Payments on a *pro rata* basis, based on the number of pay periods worked by members of the PAGA Group.

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 September 20, 2024 at 8:20 AM, 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 RL On-Time’s calculations regarding my estimated Settlement payment?

If you believe that the number of workweeks with which you have been credited is incorrect, you may produce evidence to the Settlement Administrator by August 26, 2024 showing that such information is inaccurate. The Settlement Administrator shall decide the dispute. To be valid, the dispute must: (a) state the case name and number of the Action (b) set forth the Class Member’s name, address, and telephone number; (c) be signed by the Class Member; (d) include any documentary evidence showing that the workweek information is inaccurate, and (e) be postmarked or submitted to the Settlement Administrator on or before the Response Deadline. RL On-Time’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 workweek dispute by mail to the Settlement Administrator at: *Campos v. RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc, 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 a W2 and/or IRS Form 1099. You should consult a tax professional for more information about your own specific situation.

12. No retaliation or discrimination.

Defendants respect 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 (mfisher@mdmflaw.com) or (mdavega@mdmflaw.com), or calling them at (408) 758-8974. 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?

All payments for Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and costs will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Fund. Class Counsel will request an award of attorneys’ fees up to **\$83,333** 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 Named Plaintiff receive any compensation for his efforts in bringing this Action?

The Named Plaintiff will request an enhancement award (also known as a “service” award) of up to **\$10,000** for his service as class representative and his 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 Defendants. 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 Defendants 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) your full name; (b) your current address and telephone number; (c) a clear written statement communicating that you elect to be excluded from the Settlement Class; (d) the last four digits of your Social Security number; and (e) the case name and case number of the Action, *Campos v. RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA. The letter or postcard must be sent (i.e., postmarked or delivery date stamped) by no later than August 26, 2024 and sent to the Settlement Administrator at: *Campos v. RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc, 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 Defendants 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 PAGA Group 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 enhancement award to the Named 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) August 26, 2024.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

*Campos v. RL On-Time
c/o CPT Group, Inc.
50 Corporate Park, Irvine, CA 92606
Toll-Free: (888) 544-9543*

To be valid, any objections must state: (a) your full name; (b) your current address and telephone number; (c) a clear written statement of your objection(s) and the reasons for each objection; (d) a statement of whether you intend to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (with or without counsel); (e) the last four digits of your Social Security number; (f) your signature; and (g) the case name and case number of the Action, *Campos v. RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA.) The letter or postcard must 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 August 26, 2024. 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 (although it is not required) 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 an enhancement award to the Named Plaintiff.

21. When and where is the Final Approval Hearing?

On September 20, 2024 at 8:20 AM, 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 Mark S. Borrell in Department 40 of the California Superior Court for the County of Ventura located at Administration Building, Hall of Justice, 800 South Victoria Ave, Ventura, CA 93009. 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 (mfisher@mdmflaw.com) or (mdavega@mdmflaw.com) or calling them at (408) 705-6320.

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 Hall of Justice, 800 South Victoria Ave, Ventura, CA 93009, to obtain the file for inspection and copying at your own expense. Some documents and information may also be available online at: <https://www.ventura.courts.ca.gov/>

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: *Campos v. RL On-Time, 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 2

Matthew Fisher, SBN 229532
Matthew S. Da Vega, SBN 195443
DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP
850 Iron Point Road, Suite 211
Folsom, CA 95630
Telephone: 408.758.8974
Facsimile: 877.535.9358
Mfisher@mdmflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF VENTURA

GENARO CAMPOS, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RL ON-TIME DELIVERY SERVICE,
INC.; FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE
SYSTEM, INC.; and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF GENARO CAMPOS IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT and ENHANCEMENT
AWARD**

Date: September 20, 2024
Time: 8:20 AM
Dept: 40

Honorable Mark S. Borrell

Action Filed: February 17, 2023
Trial Date: TBD

DECLARATION OF GENARO CAMPOS

I, GENARO CAMPOS, hereby declare as follows:

1. **Named Class Representative:** I am a named Plaintiff and Proposed Class Representative in this case. I am a former employee of RL On-Time Delivery Service, Inc. (“Defendant” or “RL On-Time”). As such, I have personal knowledge of, or am informed and believe, the following facts herein stated. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the following:

2. **Job Duties and Experience with Defendant:** I am a married 43-year old adult male and current resident of Nipomo, CA in San Luis Obispo County. During the Class Period, from approximately August 2018 until August 2022, I worked for Defendant at the FedEx Hub located at 1424 Fairway Blvd. Santa Maria, CA 93455 as a Delivery Driver, one of the job positions at issue in this case and which is included within the Settlement Class.

3. **Duties as the Class Representative:** This lawsuit is not an individual lawsuit. It is a proposed class action and PAGA case for settlement purposes. I understand that as the Class Representative and PAGA representative in this matter I have an obligation to do my best to look out for the interests of other Class Members and PAGA group (the current and former non-exempt employees) who I am seeking to represent as part of this proposed settlement. I understand that my obligations to the Class Members exist even when the Class is certified solely as part of this proposed settlement. It is my understanding that, as one part of this duty to the Class and PAGA group, I cannot agree to a settlement to benefit myself to the exclusion of the rest of the Class Members/PAGA group. To that end I have never asked my attorneys (Da Vega Fisher Mechtenberg, LLP [“DFM LLP”]) to settle this matter for my own benefit but have done my best to adequately and fairly represent all the Class Members and PAGA group. I have asked DFM LLP to obtain the best settlement they could for everyone and I believe that they have attempted to do so.

4. I have been involved with this case since its beginning and I am the proposed Class Representative for the Settlement Class. I first contacted my attorney and worked with them

1 directly to gather information and evidence in support of the class action lawsuit. I have never
2 asked to be relieved from my role as a proposed Class Representative. I understand that it is my
3 job to be “the stand-in” for other Class Members and must put their interest before my own in
4 pursuing this lawsuit and proposed settlement. I accept these duties and responsibilities and
5 request, when appropriate, that I be approved as the Class Representative for the purposes of the
6 proposed Settlement.

7
8 5. I have had long discussions with my attorneys about the proposed Settlement
9 both before, during, and after the successful mediation in this case. I am not an attorney but I
10 understand the risk factors that were considered when evaluating the Settlement including the
11 enormous effort, time, and costs to litigate such class action cases, the risk of losing the case and
12 getting nothing, and the ability of Defendants to pay the settlement versus prolonged litigation.

13 6. **Community of Interest (Typicality, Adequacy, and Lack of Conflicts):** I
14 was a non-exempt employee of Defendant and was subject to the same pay structure, policies,
15 practices, and rules as all the other Delivery Driver employees of Defendant.

16 7. I am not aware of anything different about me that would raise unique defenses
17 to my claims, as opposed to the claims of the Class Members. Rather, my claims are based upon
18 the same law and facts that relate to the rest of the Class Members.

19 8. I am not aware of any conflicts of interest I have with other Class Members
20 and/or PAGA group members included in this proposed Settlement. I do not have any personal
21 relationship or family ties to my legal counsel or any officers of this court. I am not involved with
22 any litigation involving other Class Members or PAGA group members. I have no other business
23 or legal arrangements/dealings with my legal counsel other than this lawsuit. I have never been
24 promised money to serve as the proposed Class Representative. I have never been a Class
25 Representative in another other class action lawsuit. I do not have any intention to take any action
26 that would place me in a position that is hostile to other Class Members or PAGA group
27 members.
28

1
2 9. **Service as Class Representative:** I have assumed some long-lasting risk in
3 prosecuting this case. Because it is so easy to search for information online these days, I will face
4 an increased risk that future employers will discover information about this lawsuit online and
5 have a negative reaction to learning that I sued an employer in the industry. This may make it
6 harder for me to obtain future employment or change jobs for a better opportunity.

7 10. I have actively assisted my attorney in all the phases of this litigation to
8 advance the interests of the Class and PAGA group to the best of my abilities. I have kept in
9 constant contact with them throughout this process. My participation began with contacting my
10 attorneys to confirm that I might have a case in that Defendants' policies and practices might be
11 illegal. I also reviewed hundreds of pages of documents (employment files, data, policies, etc.)
12 which I already had or were produced in this litigation by Defendants. I provided relevant
13 documents to my counsel, and I explained those documents and related facts to my counsel to
14 assist them in their review and filing of this case. I also discussed the responsibilities that I would
15 have as a Class Representative with my attorney, including my responsibility to act on behalf of
16 the interests of all proposed Class Members and PAGA group.

17 11. I have devoted a substantial amount of my own time during this litigation to
18 ensure a fair result for the Class Members and PAGA group. This involved ongoing
19 communications and participation with my counsel, reviewing documents, attending the
20 mediation, and numerous phone calls, meetings, and emails with my counsel pre and post
21 mediation through settlement.

22 12. **Class and PAGA Settlement:** After a mediation and approximately a year of
23 litigation the parties negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and then a long-form
24 settlement agreement (Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release
25 ["Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement"]). I have been informed of, reviewed, approved of the
26 terms of, and executed the proposed settlement, which is before the Court. After reviewing and
27 discussing the terms of the proposed settlement with my attorneys and considering the issues in
28

1 the case and the value of the claims, I have concluded that the proposed settlement obtained on
2 behalf of the Class is fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class members and PAGA group.

3 13. In sum, I believe that I have diligently, adequately, and fairly represented the
4 Class Members and PAGA group. I have not placed my own interests above those of any member
5 of the Class but have always and will continue to keep the Class Members' and PAGA groups'
6 best interests in this litigation until its conclusion. I have provided approximately 40+ hours of my
7 time to date and during the course of this lawsuit to ensure a good outcome and Settlement for the
8 best interest of the Class Members and PAGA group. I believe that I have fairly represented the
9 absent Class members and herein request that the Court finally approve this settlement.

10 14. **Requested Enhancement Award:** I request that the Court award me a
11 reasonable Enhancement Award to compensate me for the work performed in my role as Class
12 Representative. I believe taking on the role and my service as a Class Representative had inherent
13 risks which I took on behalf of others and has caused me a small, but not insignificant, disruption
14 to my work and personal life. I was aware that being a Class Representative in a class action
15 lawsuit could impact my career and future employment because I might be "blackballed" or
16 viewed differently for suing a former employer. I was also aware that by filing the lawsuit, I
17 might be responsible for some or all of Defendant's legal costs if the case was not successfully
18 litigated. As a Class Representative, I actively participated in the litigation and have always
19 maintained the best interests of the Class and PAGA group while performing my representative
20 duties.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

Therefore based on the effort, risk, delay in payment, and time spent on the matter I believe that the requested Enhancement Award of **\$10,000 (ten thousand dollars)** is fair, reasonable and compensates me for such a positive result for so many people who would have otherwise likely never received any compensation at all.

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

DATED: 8/16/2024


By: 
Genaro Campos
Plaintiff / Proposed Class Representative

EXHIBIT 3

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 4

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 5



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*		
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, Fleishman & 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 6

EXHIBIT 7

Matthew Fisher, SBN 229532
Matthew S. Da Vega, SBN 195443
DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP
850 Iron Point Road, Suite 211
Folsom, CA 95630
Telephone: 408.758.8974
Facsimile: 877.535.9358
Mfisher@mdmflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF VENTURA

GENARO CAMPOS, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RL ON-TIME DELIVERY SERVICE,
INC.; FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE
SYSTEM, INC.; and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA

CLASS ACTION

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

Date: September 20, 2024

Time: 8:20 AM

Dept: 40

Honorable Mark S. Borrell

Action Filed: February 17, 2023

Trial Date: TBD

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

DECLARATION OF MATTHEW S. DA VEGA

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

1. I am an attorney admitted to practice law in the State of California.
2. I am a named Partner at Da Vega Fisher Mechtenberg, LLP (“DFM LLP”).
3. DFM LLP is lead and only counsel for the Plaintiffs in this Lawsuit. (“Class Counsel.”)
4. I have been intimately involved in all aspects of this case. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval of Class Settlement and Attorney Fees and Costs.

I. LEAD COUNSEL BACKGROUND

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

6. **Plaintiff’s Counsel Matthew S. Da Vega:** I am a graduate of the University of California, Santa Barbara (1993) and the University of San Francisco School of Law (1997). I became a member of the State Bar of California in 1998. After passing the bar I started working in private practice as a Plaintiff’s attorney. During my entire career I have always practiced as a Plaintiff’s lawyer representing individuals and/or groups of individuals, specializing in employment, personal injury, mass torts, and product defect matters. I have done so now for

1 approximately 26 years. I first worked for Brayton & Purcell in Novato, CA representing
2 individuals injured from exposure to asbestos and other toxins. I then worked for the class action
3 firm of Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein in San Francisco, CA representing individuals and
4 class members in mass torts, product defects, and in employment matters. I then worked for the
5 firm of Cappello & Noel in Santa Barbara, again representing individual and class action
6 Plaintiffs in employment claims, lender liability, and antitrust matters. In 2012, I started my own
7 law firm, Da Vega Fisher Mechtenberg LLP (“DFM LLP”), originally with an office in the San
8 Francisco Bay Area then later opening additional offices in Santa Barbara, Ventura, and the
9 Sacramento area. I am one of the firm’s two founding partners and the current managing partner.
10 I personally manage the firm’s Mt. View office and Santa Barbara office and travel back and
11 forth between the two on a regular basis. I currently have cases all over the state of California
12 including as far north as Sonoma County and as far South as San Diego County and as far east as
13 Stanislaus County. The majority of my practice and cases are in the San Francisco South Bay
14 area although I maintain my primary residence in Santa Barbara, California. DFM LLP has
15 always been a Plaintiff-side contingency based law firm representing clients predominantly in
16 employment and personal injury matters in both individual and class actions. DFM LLP is
17 experienced counsel in class action matters and has worked on significant cases such as *Gruber v.*
18 *Yelp Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC 16-554784 (2024) (\$15M gross
19 settlement for 400,000+ call recording class); *Sena v. Facebook, Inc.*, San Mateo County Superior
20 Court, Case No. 16CIV00496 (2018) (\$4.25M gross settlement for class of 900+ class member
21 employees for unpaid overtime wage); *Salvatierra v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, Santa Clara County
22 Superior Court, Case No. 2014-1-CV-272069 (2016) (\$4.6M gross settlement for class of 208
23 misclassified class member employees); *Magpiong v. CareLinx*, San Mateo County Superior
24 Court, Case No. 21-CIV-03038 (2022) (\$1.8 M gross settlement for class of 2000+ class member
25 employees for IC misclassification /unpaid overtime wage), and *Gibbins/Leal v. Hismeh*
26 *Enterprises, Inc.*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2015-00468352 (2017) (\$1M
27 gross settlement for class of 4000+ delivery driver members reimbursements) to name but a few.
28

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

2 7. **Common Fund Settlement:** In this matter DFM LLP negotiated a Class action
3 settlement providing a common settlement fund with a payout of **\$250,000 (Two Hundred and**
4 **Fifty Thousand dollars)**. (Settlement Agreement, 3:11-22). Class Counsel is seeking as a Fee
5 Award of **\$83,333 (Eighty-Three Thousand, three hundred and thirty dollars)** or one-third of
6 this common settlement fund. (Settlement Agreement, 10:23-24)

7 8. **Attorney Fees of 33.33% Percent of Common Fund is Reasonable:** Class
8 Counsel requests the Court grant its application for an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of
9 **\$83,333 (Eighty-Three Thousand, three hundred and thirty dollars)**. This is equal to 1/3 of
10 the Maximum Settlement Amount of \$250,000 created on behalf of the Class. (Settlement
11 Agreement, 10:23-24.). The requested award is fair, reasonable, and well within the common
12 range for attorney fees of 20% to 50% in a common fund settlement. The requested award also
13 compares favorably to the overall lodestar incurred to date (see below). Therefore, DFM LLP
14 respectfully requests approval of the agreed upon fee award.

15 9. **Contingency Fee Matter:** As this is a contingency matter, Class Counsel litigated
16 this action without receiving any payment for their services or reimbursement of their costs
17 incurred for the benefit of the Class. To represent the Class on a contingent fee basis, Class
18 Counsel had to forego compensable hourly work or other contingency fee cases to devote the
19 necessary time and resources to this contingent case. In so doing, Class Counsel gave up work
20 that a firm receives more immediate payment for in exchange for risky class action contingency
21 fee work which could have paid the Class and its Counsel nothing. A number of difficult issues,
22 the adverse resolution of any one of which could have barred the successful prosecution of the
23 action, were present here. Attorneys' fees in this case were not only contingent but risky, with a
24 very real chance that Class Counsel would receive nothing at all for their efforts, having devoted
25 time and advancing costs. Class Counsel has previously invested in similar cases which resulted
26 in little or no recovery due to various issues, including but not limited to bankruptcy, failed
27 certification/decertification, other overlapping class cases, and/or lengthy appeals.
28

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

12 11. **Class Counsel's Hours and Hourly Rates:** I will have worked on this matter for
13 24 hours at the time of this motion and my current billable rate as of 2024 is \$775/hr. for class
14 action work (\$775/hr. x 24 hours = \$18,600 in lodestar).

15 12. **Class Counsel Lodestar Cross-Check:** I have reviewed my firm's lodestar in this
16 matter and believe the charges are reasonable and were reasonably necessary to the conduct of the
17 case. These rates are in line with the prevailing rates of attorneys in the California legal
18 community for similar work. In this case, the reasonableness of the requested for \$83,333 in
19 attorneys' fees is further supported by a cross-check using attorney's lodestar in this matter. Class
20 Counsel has spent a significant amount of hours investigating, researching, and litigating this
21 matter, including but not limited to the following: interviewing Plaintiffs and flushing out facts
22 and issues; researching employer and causes of action; developing facts and investigating
23 Defendant's ownership structure (Secretary of State, etc.); investigating and discussing job
24 functions, duties, compensation, policies and procedures, etc.; regularly meeting and/or
25 communicating with our the Class Representative client; drafting pleadings (complaint, case
26 management statements, opposition to removal, mediation briefs); drafting and responding to
27 informal discovery; reviewing information produced in formal and informal discovery (payroll
28

1 data, etc.); researching employee classifications, jurisdictional issues, and various impact on class
2 actions; participating in Court-ordered hearings and conferences; attending mediation; retention of
3 expert witnesses; discussion with expert witnesses issues related to damage model calculations;
4 preparing and analyzing damage models; negotiating the terms of the Settlement; reviewing and
5 making changes to Settlement Agreement; and coordinating and overseeing all the administration
6 of the Settlement. The contemporaneous billing records evidence that the attorneys' lodestar is
7 \$101,450.00 (greater than the amount of fees requested) with additional fees still to be incurred for
8 preparation and attending the final approval hearing, managing post approval settlement
9 distribution with the claims administrator, responding to class member inquiries, and handling any
10 potential appeal of the matter. As a result, the current lodestar amount understates the total
11 attorneys' fees ultimately incurred in this action. Class Counsel lodestar crosscheck of attorney
12 fees is as follows:

Attorney Name	Hours	Hourly Rate	Totals
Matthew H. Fisher	110	\$700	\$77,000
Matthew S. Da Vega	24	\$775	\$18,600
Ted Mechtenberg	9	\$650	\$5,850
TOTAL	143		\$101,450

13
14
15
16
17 13. The requested fee award of \$83,333 represents a negative multiplier. Whereas
18 “Multipliers of 1 to 4 are commonly found to be appropriate in complex class action cases.”
19 *Destefano v. Zynga, Inc.*, 2016 WL 537946, at *21 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2016) (quoting *Hopkins v.*
20 *Stryker Sales Corp.*, 2013 WL 496358, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013)); see *Vizcaino v. Microsoft*
21 *Corp.*, 290 F.3d United States District Court Northern District 1043, 1051 n.6 (9th Cir.
22 2002)(citing survey finding most multipliers range from 1.0 to 4.0). As a result, this Court should
23 have no trouble concluding that an award is supported by the lodestar cross-check is fair and
24 reasonable and is justified under California law. “[T]he lodestar method better accounts for the
25 amount of work done, while the percentage of the fund method more accurately reflects the
26 results achieved.” *Rawlings v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc.* (6th Cir. 1993) 9 F.3d 513,
27 516.
28

14. **Class Counsel Attorney Costs:** The Settlement Agreement permits up to **\$20,000 in reimbursement of costs.** (Settlement Agreement, 10:25). However, Plaintiff's actual costs are \$22,514 (Twenty-Two Thousand Five-Hundred Fourteen Dollars). Therefore, Class Counsel requests the Court award it \$20,000 in costs related to filing fees, service fees, mediation fees, travel costs, 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:	\$ 1,988.44
Travel (Flights, Lodging, Rentals, Meal):	\$ 1,038.17
Mediation Fees/Costs:	\$ 6,375.00
Experts Fees/Costs:	\$ 13,112.50
<u>TOTAL</u>	\$ 22,514.11

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

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

Date: August 20, 2024

Math S.D.

Matthew S. Da Vega

EXHIBIT 8

Matthew Fisher, SBN 229532
Matthew S. Da Vega, SBN 195443
DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP
850 Iron Point Road, Suite 211
Folsom, CA 95630
Telephone: 408.758.8974
Facsimile: 877.535.9358
Mfisher@mdmflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF VENTURA

GENARO CAMPOS, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RL ON-TIME DELIVERY SERVICE,
INC.; FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE
SYSTEM, INC.; and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 56-2023-00575742-CU-OE-VTA

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF TED D.
MECHTENBERG IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
SETTLEMENT and ATTORNEY FEES and
COSTS**

Date: September 20, 2024

Time: 8:20 AM

Dept: 40

Honorable Mark S. Borrell

Action Filed: February 17, 2023

Trial Date: TBD

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

DECLARATION OF TED D. MECHTENBERG

I, Ted D. Mechtenberg, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney admitted to practice law in the State of California.
2. I am a named Partner at Da Vega Fisher Mechtenberg, LLP (“DFM LLP”).
3. DFM LLP is lead and only counsel for the Plaintiffs in this Lawsuit. (“Class Counsel.”)
4. I have been intimately involved in all aspects of this case. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval of Class Settlement and Attorney Fees and Costs.

I. LEAD COUNSEL BACKGROUND

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

6. **Plaintiff’s Counsel Ted D. Mechtenberg:** I am an equity partner at the firm. I am a graduate of the University of Notre Dame, B.A. Anthropology, Cum Laude (1996) and Washington University School of Law, J.D. (2001). I became a member of the California State Bar in 2002. I have worked with firms both in Washington State and California. From 2011 to 2013 I worked with the Ventura, California firm of Anderson Kill. In 2013, I was designated as a Rising Star by Southern California Super Lawyers. I joined DFM LLP in 2014 as a partner. DFM

1 LLP has always been a Plaintiff-side contingency based law firm representing clients
2 predominantly in employment and personal injury matters in both individual and class actions.
3 DFM LLP is experienced counsel in class action matters and has worked on significant cases such
4 as *Gruber v. Yelp Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC 16-554784 (2024)
5 (\$15M gross settlement for 400,000+ call recording class); *Sena v. Facebook, Inc.*, San Mateo
6 County Superior Court, Case No. 16CIV00496 (2018) (\$4.25M gross settlement for class of 900+
7 class member employees for unpaid overtime wage); *Salvatierra v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, Santa
8 Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 2014-1-CV-272069 (2016) (\$4.6M gross settlement for
9 class of 208 misclassified class member employees); *Magpiong v. CareLinx*, San Mateo County
10 Superior Court, Case No. 21-CIV-03038 (2022) (\$1.8 M gross settlement for class of 2000+ class
11 member employees for IC misclassification /unpaid overtime wage), and *Gibbins/Leal v. Hismeh*
12 *Enterprises, Inc.*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 56-2015-00468352 (2017) (\$1M
13 gross settlement for class of 4000+ delivery driver members reimbursements) to name but a few.

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

15 7. **Common Fund Settlement:** In this matter DFM LLP negotiated a Class action
16 settlement providing a common settlement fund with a payout of **\$250,000 (Two Hundred and**
17 **Fifty Thousand dollars)**. (Settlement Agreement, 3:11-22). Class Counsel is seeking as a Fee
18 Award of **\$83,333 (Eighty-Three Thousand, three hundred and thirty dollars)** or one-third of
19 this common settlement fund. (Settlement Agreement, 10:23-24)

20 8. **Attorney Fees of 33.33% Percent of Common Fund is Reasonable:** Class
21 Counsel requests the Court grant its application for an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of
22 **\$83,333 (Eighty-Three Thousand, three hundred and thirty dollars)**. This is equal to 1/3 of
23 the Maximum Settlement Amount of \$250,000 created on behalf of the Class. (Settlement
24 Agreement, 10:23-24.). The requested award is fair, reasonable, and well within the common
25 range for attorney fees of 20% to 50% in a common fund settlement. The requested award also
26 compares favorably to the overall lodestar incurred to date (see below). Therefore, DFM LLP
27 respectfully requests approval of the agreed upon fee award.
28

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

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

25 11. **Class Counsel's Hours and Hourly Rates:** I will have worked on this matter for
26 9 hours at the time of this motion and my current billable rate as of 2024 is \$650/hr. for class
27 action work (\$650/hr. x 9 hours = \$5,850 in lodestar).
28

12. **Class Counsel Lodestar Cross-Check:** I have reviewed my firm's lodestar in this matter and believe the charges are reasonable and were reasonably necessary to the conduct of the case. These rates are in line with the prevailing rates of attorneys in the California legal community for similar work. In this case, the reasonableness of the requested for \$83,333 in attorneys' fees is further supported by a cross-check using attorney's lodestar in this matter. Class Counsel has spent a significant amount of hours investigating, researching, and litigating this matter, including but not limited to the following: interviewing Plaintiffs and flushing out facts and issues; researching employer and causes of action; developing facts and investigating Defendant's ownership structure (Secretary of State, etc.); investigating and discussing job functions, duties, compensation, policies and procedures, etc.; regularly meeting and/or communicating with our the Class Representative client; drafting pleadings (complaint, case management statements, opposition to removal, mediation briefs); drafting and responding to informal discovery; reviewing information produced in formal and informal discovery (payroll data, etc.); researching employee classifications, jurisdictional issues, and various impact on class actions; participating in Court-ordered hearings and conferences; attending mediation; retention of expert witnesses; discussion with expert witnesses issues related to damage model calculations; preparing and analyzing damage models; negotiating the terms of the Settlement; reviewing and 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 \$101,450.00 (greater than the amount of fees requested) 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 H. Fisher	110	\$700	\$77,000
Matthew S. Da Vega	24	\$775	\$18,600

Ted Mechtenberg	9	\$650	\$5,850
TOTAL	143		\$101.450

13. The requested fee award of \$83,333 represents a negative multiplier. Whereas “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 Attorney Costs:** The Settlement Agreement permits up to **\$20,000 in reimbursement of costs.** (Settlement Agreement, 10:25). However, Plaintiff’s actual costs are \$22,514 (Twenty-Two Thousand Five-Hundred Fourteen Dollars). Therefore, Class Counsel requests the Court award it \$20,000 in costs related to filing fees, service fees, mediation fees, travel costs, 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: \$ 1,988.44
Travel (Flights, Lodging, Rentals, Meal): \$ 1,038.17
Mediation Fees/Costs: \$ 6,375.00
Experts Fees/Costs: \$ 13,112.50
TOTAL \$ **22,514.11**

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

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

Date: August 20, 2024



Ted D. Mechtenberg