

Matthew S. Da Vega, SBN 195443
Matthew Fisher, SBN 229532
DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG, LLP
232 E. Anapamu St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Telephone: 805.232.4471
Facsimile: 877.535.9358
Mdavega@mdmflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE and
MICHELLE PONO, on behalf of herself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

AMN HEALTHCARE, INC.; AMN
SERVICES, LLC, and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL

CLASS and REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

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

Assigned For All Purposes to the Honorable
Gregory W. Pollack (Dept. C-71)

Date: October 5, 2023
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Location: Dept. C-71 (Hon. Gregory W. Pollack)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 and forth between the two on a regular basis. I currently have cases all over the state of
2 California including as far north as Sonoma County and as far South as San Diego County and as
3 far east as Stanislaus County. The majority of my practice and cases are in the San Francisco
4 South Bay area although I maintain my primary residence in Santa Barbara, California. DFM
5 LLP has always been a Plaintiff-side contingency based law firm representing clients
6 predominantly in employment and personal injury matters in both individual and class actions.
7 DFM LLP is experienced counsel in matters such as this and has worked on significant
8 employment cases such as *Salvatierra v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior
9 Court, Case No. 2014-1-CV-272069 (2016) (\$4.6M gross settlement for class of 208
10 misclassified class member employees); *Gibbins/Leal v. Hismeh Enterprises, Inc., Ventura*
11 *County Superior Court*, Case No. 56-2015-00468352 (2017) (\$1M gross settlement for class of
12 4000+ delivery driver members reimbursements); *Sena v. Facebook, Inc., San Mateo County*
13 *Superior Court*, Case No. 16CIV00496 (2018) (\$4.25M gross settlement for class of 900+ class
14 member employees for unpaid overtime wage); *Fregoso v. Eat Club, Inc.*, Santa Clara County
15 Superior Court, Case No. 18-CV-330433 (2021) (\$900K gross settlement for class of 1815 class
16 member employees for unpaid overtime wages); and *Magpiong v. CareLinx, Inc.*, San Mateo
17 County Superior Court, Case No. 21-CIV-03038 (2022)(\$1.9M gross settlement for a class of
18 2058 Nurses for under-paid overtime wages and misclassification as independent contractors).

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

20 8. **Common Fund Settlement:** In this matter DFM LLP negotiated a Class action
21 settlement providing a common settlement fund with a payout of **\$600,000 (Six Hundred**
22 **Thousand dollars)**. (Settlement Agreement §§ 6.A.- E). Class Counsel is seeking as a Fee
23 Award of **\$200,000 (Two Hundred Thousand dollars)** or one-third of this common settlement
24 fund. (Settlement Agreement §§ 6.C.(3)).

25 9. **Attorney Fees of 33.33% Percent of Common Fund is Reasonable:** Class
26 Counsel requests the Court grant its application for an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of
27 **\$200,000 (Two Hundred Thousand dollars)**. This is equal to 1/3 of the Maximum Settlement
28 Amount of \$600,000 created on behalf of the Class. (Settlement Agreement §6.C.(3), § 11). The

1 requested award is fair, reasonable, and well within the common range for attorney fees of 20%
2 to 50% in a common fund settlement. The requested award also compares favorably to the
3 overall lodestar incurred to date (see below). Therefore, the DFM LLP respectfully requests
4 approval of the agreed upon fee award.

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

19 11. **Contingency Fee Market:** I am familiar with the contingent fee market
20 throughout California and in particular as it pertains to complex employer, wage and hour, and
21 class action litigation. On behalf of my firm, I have negotiated hundreds of contingency fee
22 agreements with Plaintiffs, including both individual matters and as representatives in class
23 action suits. Many of those agreements provide that counsel will receive between 33% to 40%+
24 of any recovery that is obtained, and, in addition that counsel be reimbursed for the costs they
25 incurred out of the recovery amount. These are typical and standard percentages in
26 employment-related contingency fee agreements throughout California. The Class Members in
27 this complex wage and hour case would not be likely to obtain competent counsel in California,
28

1 for any amount less than these standard fee percentages. Class Counsel has also advanced all
2 costs in this matter and not been paid for any attorney's fees or costs to date.

3 12. **Class Counsel's Hours and Hourly Rates:** I will have worked on this matter
4 for 281 hours at the time of this motion and my current billable rate as of 2023 is \$775/hr. for
5 class action work ($\$775/\text{hr.} \times 281 \text{ hours} = \$217,775$ in lodestar). Matthew H. Fisher is an equity
6 partner of the DFM LLP and worked 33 hours on this case and his billing rate is \$675/hr. for
7 class action work ($\$675/\text{hr.} \times 33 \text{ hours} = \$22,275$ in lodestar). (See Declaration of Matthew H.
8 Fisher ISO of Motion). Ted D. Mechtenberg is an equity partner of the DFM LLP and worked
9 13 hours on this case and his billing rate is \$650/hr. for class action work ($\$650/\text{hr.} \times 13 \text{ hours}$
10 $= \$8,450$ in lodestar). (See Declaration of Ted D. Mechtenberg ISO of Motion). These rates are
11 comparable to, but are less than, those of counsel with the same education and experience in the
12 relevant legal communities in which I practice including the San Francisco Bay Area and
13 Southern California. Attached are various surveys of billing rates showing higher hourly rates
14 than DFM LLP currently charges for attorneys with less experience. (See Exhibits 4, 5, and 6).

15 13. **Class Counsel Lodestar Cross-Check:** I have reviewed my firm's lodestar in
16 this matter and believe the charges are reasonable and were reasonably necessary to the conduct
17 of the 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 \$200,000 in
19 attorneys' fees is further supported by a cross-check using attorney's lodestar in this matter.
20 Class Counsel has spent a significant amount of hours investigating, researching, and litigating
21 this matter, including but not limited to the following: interviewing Plaintiffs and flushing out
22 facts 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 clients who are the Class Representatives; drafting pleadings
26 (complaint, case management statements, mediation briefs); drafting and responding to informal
27 discovery; reviewing information produced in formal and informal discovery (payroll data,
28 etc.); researching employee classifications and various impact on class actions; participating in

1 Court-ordered hearings and conferences; taking and defending numerous depositions, attending
2 mediation; retention of expert witnesses; discussion with expert witnesses issues related to
3 damage model calculations; preparing and analyzing damage models; negotiating the terms of
4 the Settlement; reviewing and making changes to Settlement Agreement; and coordinating and
5 overseeing all the administration of the Settlement. The contemporaneous billing records
6 evidence that the attorneys' lodestar is \$248,500 (greater than the amount of fees requested)
7 with additional fees still to be incurred for preparation and attending the final approval hearing,
8 managing post approval settlement distribution with the claims administrator, responding to
9 class member inquiries, and handling any potential appeal of the matter. As a result, the current
10 lodestar amount understates the total attorneys' fees ultimately incurred in this action. Class
11 Counsel lodestar crosscheck of attorney fees is as follows:

Attorney Name	Hours	Hourly Rate	Totals
Matthew S. Da Vega	281	\$775	\$217,775
Matthew H. Fisher	33	\$675	\$22,275
Ted Mechtenberg	13	\$650	\$8,450
TOTAL	327		\$248,500

12
13
14
15
16 The requested fee award of \$200,000 represents a negative multiplier. Whereas
17 ““Multipliers of 1 to 4 are commonly found to be appropriate in complex class action cases.””
18 *Destefano v. Zynga, Inc.*, 2016 WL 537946, at *21 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2016) (quoting *Hopkins*
19 *v. Stryker Sales Corp.*, 2013 WL 496358, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013)); see *Vizcaino v.*
20 *Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d United States District Court Northern District 1043, 1051 n.6 (9th
21 Cir. 2002)(citing survey finding most multipliers range from 1.0 to 4.0). As a result, this Court
22 should have no trouble concluding that an award is supported by the lodestar cross-check is fair
23 and reasonable and is justified under California law. “[T]he lodestar method better accounts for
24 the amount of work done, while the percentage of the fund method more accurately reflects the
25 results achieved.” *Rawlings v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc.* (6th Cir. 1993) 9 F.3d
26 513, 516.

27 14. **Class Counsel Attorney Costs:** The Settlement Agreement permits up to
28 **\$40,000 in reimbursement of costs.** (Settlement Agreement § 6.C.(3), §11). However,

1 Plaintiff's actual costs are only \$45,146 (Forty Five Thousand One Hundred and Forty Six
2 dollars). Therefore, Class Counsel requests the Court award it \$40,000 in costs related to filing
3 fees, service fees, mediation fees, travel costs, and expert fees which could not have been
4 recovered if this case had been lost. Class Counsel was required to advance all costs in this
5 litigation. In this type of litigation where the corporate defendant and their attorneys are well
6 funded, this can prove to be very expensive, risky, and therefore cost prohibitive to many
7 attorneys. The financial burdens undertaken by Plaintiff and Class Counsel in prosecuting this
8 action on behalf of the Class were substantial. Plaintiff undertook the risk of liability for
9 Defendant's costs and even fees had this case not succeeded, as well as other potential negative
10 financial ramifications from having come forward to sue Defendant on behalf of the Class.
11 Accordingly, the contingent nature of the fee and the financial burdens on Class Counsel and
12 Plaintiff also support the requested awards. The following list itemizes Class Counsel's costs
13 and expenses to date:

Filings/Service/Depos/Court Fees:	\$ 15,981
Travel (Flights, Lodging, Rentals, Meal):	\$ 7,744
Mediation Fees/Costs:	\$ 6,400
Experts Fees/Costs:	\$ 15,021
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>\$ 45,146</u>

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

18 16. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Court's May 19,
19 2023 Preliminary Approval of Class and Representative Action Settlement and Provisional Class
20 Certification Order ("Preliminary Approval Order").

21 17. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Yami
22 Burns (on behalf of Phoenix Settlement Administrators) with Respect to Notice and Settlement
23 Administration ("Phoenix Decl.").

24 18. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is the true and correct copies of the Declarations of
25 Class Representatives Catheryn-Lucy Price and Michelle Pono.

26 19. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** is a true and correct copy of the NALFA 2020
27 Litigation Hourly Rate Range Growth (demonstrating that average rates for lawyers who have
28

1 been practicing for 21-24 years [i.e. Plaintiff's counsel Matthew S. Da Vega] are between
2 \$751-\$1000/hour and from 17-20 years [i.e. Plaintiff's counsel Matthew H. Fisher and Ted
3 Mechtenberg] are between \$651-900/hour).

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

7 21. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** is a true and correct copy of National Law Journal
8 Billing Survey 2017 (demonstrating the average partner rates at various California defense firms
9 in 2017 were: Cooley LLP (\$1,100/hr.), Sheppard Mullin (\$760/hr.), Lobel Weiland Golden
10 Friedman LLP (\$750/hr.), Winthrop Couchot Golubow Hollander, LLP (\$595/hr.), Morris,
11 Polich & Purdy, LLP (\$575./hr.); Leslie Cohen Law PCS (\$575/hr.)(See 2017 - National Law
12 Journal Annual Survey on Billing Rates).

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

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

17
18 **DATED:** September 11, 2023

DA VEGA | FISHER | MECHTENBERG LLP

19
20 By: 

21 Matthew S. Da Vega
22 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Class
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1
(PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER)

MAY 19 2023

By: T. Abas

ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

03/02/2023 at 03:59:37 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Alma Rhodes, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE and MICHELLE
PONO, on behalf of herself and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

AMN HEALTHCARE, INC.; AMN
SERVICES, LLC, and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL

CLASS and REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

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

[Assigned To Hon. Gregory W. Pollack
Dept. C-71]

DATE: MARCH 24, 2023

TIME: 9:30 A.M.

LOCATION: DEPT. C-71 (HON. GREGORY W.
POLLACK)

On March 24, 2023 at 9:30 a.m., this Court heard Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and provisional class certification under California Rule of Court 3.769, as filed by Plaintiffs Cathryn-Lucy Price and Michelle Pono ("Plaintiffs"). This Court reviewed the motion, including the Stipulation of Settlement and Release (the "Agreement," "Settlement," or "Settlement Agreement"). Based on this review, the hearing, and the findings below, the Court finds good cause to GRANT the motion.

1 **FINDINGS:**

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

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

13 (a) The Settlement provides for a **Gross Settlement Amount of \$600,000**
14 that Defendants AMN Healthcare, Inc. and AMN Services, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”)
15 will pay into the settlement fund pursuant to the terms and timing specified in the Agreement.
16 The Settlement further provides that the Net Settlement Fund shall be calculated by subtracting
17 the following amounts from the total of the Gross Settlement Amount:

- 18 (1) the Class Counsel Award (estimated at **\$200,000 in attorneys’ fees** [1/3 of
19 **\$600,000 Gross Settlement Amount]** and **\$40,000 in attorney costs**);
20 (2) all Settlement Administration Costs (estimated not to exceed **\$9,750**);
21 (3) the Class Representative Enhancement Payment (estimated at **\$10,000 each** for a
22 total of **\$20,000**); and
23 (4) the amount allocated for PAGA Penalties (**\$60,000**) of which 75% (**\$45,000**) is
24 allocated to the California Labor Workforce and Development Agency
25 (“LWDA Payment”) and 25% (**\$15,000**) to the PAGA Group (“PAGA Group
26 Payment) under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”)

27 The **Net Settlement Fund**, to be disbursed to Settlement Class Members (estimated at
28 **525 individual class members**) who have not excluded themselves from the Settlement, is

1 presently anticipated to be **approximately \$ 270,250**. If the Settlement is approved, the full
2 amount of the Net Settlement Fund will be paid out to Settlement Class Members who do not
3 exclude themselves from the Settlement in accordance with the terms of the Agreement. The
4 PAGA Group Amount (\$15,000), if approved by the Court, will be disbursed to PAGA Group
5 Members whether or not the exclude themselves from the Class Settlement.

6 (b) The Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable as to all Class and PAGA
7 Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to liability
8 and damages issues.

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

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

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

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

19 3. The Court finds that distribution of the Notice of Class Action Settlement,
20 substantially in the form attached hereto as "**Exhibit A - Class Notice**" (also attached to
21 Declaration of Matthew S. Da Vega ISO of Motion as Exhibit A - Class Notice), via first class
22 U.S. postal mail to Class Members (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the
23 circumstances, (b) constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all members of the Class, and
24 (c) complies fully with the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382,
25 California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and
26 other applicable law.
27
28

1 4. For settlement purposes only, the Court finds the Class is so numerous that
2 joinder of all Class Members is impracticable, Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the Class's claims,
3 there are questions of law and fact common to the Class, which predominate over any questions
4 affecting only individual Class Members, the Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class,
5 and class certification is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
6 adjudication of the controversy. Should for whatever reason the Settlement not become final, the
7 fact that the parties were willing to stipulate to certification of the claims on behalf of Class
8 Members as part of the Settlement shall have no bearing on, nor be admissible in connection
9 with, the issue of whether a class should be certified in a non-settlement context in this action or
10 in any other lawsuit.

11 5. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (l)(2), the Court notes that
12 Plaintiff provided a copy of the Agreement to the LWDA at the same time that Plaintiff provided
13 it to the Court in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699(l), and the Court has
14 reviewed the Settlement's provisions relating to settlement of claims under PAGA. The Court
15 tentatively finds that the **payment of \$60,000 for settlement of any and all claims for which**
16 **civil penalties under PAGA** may be sought or are otherwise available (the "PAGA Penalties"),
17 is fair and adequate. Further, the Court tentatively finds that the PAGA Penalties satisfies the
18 requirements of California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (i), because **\$45,000 (75%) of**
19 **the PAGA Penalty Amount is allocated to the LWDA** for the enforcement of labor laws and
20 education of employers, and **\$15,000 (25%) is allocated for distribution to the PAGA Group,**
21 **i.e., the allegedly "aggrieved employees."**

22 **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

23 1. **Settlement Preliminary Approval.** The Settlement Agreement and the Notice of
24 Class Action Settlement are preliminarily approved. The Court further preliminarily approves
25 the formulas provided in the Settlement for calculating Individual Settlement Payments to the
26 Settlement Class Members and PAGA payments to the PAGA Group Members using a work
27 week calculation methodology.
28

1 **1.1 Provisional Certification.** The Settlement Class is provisionally certified for
2 settlement purposes only as a class of: "All current and former California based non-exempt
3 employees who worked for AMN as Credentialing Analysts from April 11, 2014 through the
4 date that the Court issues its order granting preliminary approval of the settlement. ("Approval
5 Date") and/or Customer Account Managers ("CAMs") from January 8, 2015 through the
6 Approval Date (the "Class"). Excluded from the Settlement Class are putative Class Members
7 who submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion (as defined by the Settlement
8 Agreement).

9 **2. Appointment of Class Representative and Class Counsel.** Plaintiffs' counsel is
10 conditionally appointed as the Class Representative to implement the Parties' Settlement in
11 accordance with the Agreement. Matthew S. Da Vega and Matthew Fisher of Da Vega Fisher
12 Mechtenberg LLP are conditionally appointed as Class Counsel. Class Counsel is conditionally
13 authorized to act on behalf of the Class with respect to all acts or consents required by, or which
14 may be given, pursuant to the Settlement, and such other acts necessary to finalize the Settlement
15 Agreement and its terms. Any Class Member may enter an appearance through his or her own
16 counsel at such Class Member's own expense. Any Class Member who does not enter an
17 appearance or appear on his or her own behalf will be represented by Class Counsel for
18 settlement purposes only. Plaintiff and Class Counsel must fairly and adequately protect the
19 Class's interests.

20 **3. Appointment of Settlement Administrator.** Phoenix Settlement Administrators
21 is hereby appointed as the Settlement Administrator for this case.

22 **4. Release of Class Claims.** The Court understands that the settlement includes a
23 release of class claims. The Settlement Agreement provides that Plaintiffs – on behalf of
24 themselves, the State of California and PAGA Group Members – and each of the Class Members
25 who do not file a valid request for exclusion ("Settlement Class Members") will fully and
26 irrevocably release the Released Parties from any and all of the Released Claims, as defined in
27 the Settlement Agreement. Settlement Class Members will release such Released Claims arising
28

1 during the period (1) for the Credentialing Analysts from April 11, 2014 through the date on
2 which the Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and (2) for the CAMs from
3 January 8, 2015 through the date on which the Court grants preliminary approval of the
4 Settlement (collectively, "Class Members' Released Period"). Per the Settlement Agreement,
5 Settlement Class Members may discover facts in addition to or different from those they now
6 know or believe to be true with respect to the subject matter of the Released Class Claims, but
7 upon the Effective Date, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Final Approval Order
8 shall have, fully, finally, and forever settled and released any and all of the Released Class
9 Claims. In light of consideration provided under the Settlement, the Court makes a preliminary
10 finding that the Settlement Class Members' Released Claims is fair, adequate and reasonable.

11 **5. Provision of Class Notice.** Within thirty (30) calendar days after entry of this
12 Preliminary Approval Order, Defendants shall provide the Class List/Class Data to the
13 Settlement Administrator. Within twenty-one (21) calendar days from receipt of the Class Data,
14 the Settlement Administrator shall mail the Notice of Class Action Settlement (which shall be
15 substantially similar to the form attached hereto as **Exhibit A - Class Notice** to all Class and
16 PAGA Members via regular First-Class U.S. Mail in the manner specified under the Settlement
17 Agreement.

18 **6. Response Deadline.** The Response Deadline shall be **forty-five (45) calendar**
19 **days** from the initial mailing of the Class Notice to Class Members pursuant to Settlement
20 Agreement. Class Members to whom a Class Notice is re-sent after having been returned as
21 undeliverable to the Settlement Administrator, shall have ten (10) business days from the date
22 of re-mailing, or until the Response Deadline has expired, whichever is later to submit a
23 Request for Exclusion, Objection, and/or Work Weeks Dispute to the Settlement
24 Administrator.

25 **7. Objection to Settlement.** Settlement Class Members who have not submitted a
26 timely and valid Request for Exclusion pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and who want to
27 object to the Agreement must sign and submit by U.S. Mail or other delivery service a valid
28

1 written Objection to the Settlement Administrator on or before the Response Deadline. The
2 Settlement Administrator will provide copies of all such Objections to Class Counsel and
3 Defendants' counsel weekly and will also provide a Final Report/Due Diligence Report within
4 five (5) business days of the Final Approval Hearing. For an Objection to be valid, it must:
5 (1) contain the case name and number of the Price Action; (2) contain the full name, address,
6 telephone number, and last four digits of the social security number of the Class Member; (3) be
7 signed by the Class Member; (4) contain an explanation of his or her objection(s) to the
8 Settlement; (5) indicate whether the Class Member is represented by counsel, and if represented
9 by counsel, provide the name and address of said counsel; (6) indicate whether Class Member
10 intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (7) be postmarked on or before the
11 Response Deadline and mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address specified in the
12 Class Notice. Objections postmarked after the Response Deadline will be untimely and therefore
13 not considered. A Class Member may appear at the final approval/fairness hearing to state
14 his/her Objection even if they fail to make valid and timely written objection to the Settlement
15 Agreement. If a Class Member intends to speak at the Final Approval Hearing, he or she
16 should (although they are not required to) file a "notice of intention to appear" with the Court
17 and provide a copy of this notice and their Objection to counsel for both Parties. Any
18 Settlement Class Member will be permitted to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing
19 in order to have an Objection heard by the Court.

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

24 **9. Requesting Exclusion (Opt Out).** Any Class Member wishing to be excluded
25 (aka "opt-out") from the Class Settlement must sign and submit by U.S. Mail or other delivery
26 service a valid written Request for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator on or before the
27 Response Deadline containing all the information required by the Agreement. To be valid, the
28

1 Request for Exclusion must: (1) contain the case name and number of the *Price* Action; (2)
2 contain the full name, address, telephone number, and last four digits of the social security
3 number of the Class Member; (3) be signed by the Class Member; (4) contain a statement
4 clearly indicating that the Class Member wishes to be excluded from the Settlement; and (5) be
5 postmarked on or before the Response Deadline and mailed to the Settlement Administrator at
6 the address specified in the Class Notice. If the Request for Exclusion does not satisfy the
7 requirements listed in items (1)-(5), it will not be deemed complete or valid. The date of the
8 postmark on the Request for Exclusion shall be the exclusive means used to determine whether
9 a Request for Exclusion has been timely submitted. Any Class Member who submits a valid
10 and timely Request for Exclusion will not be a member of the Settlement Class, will not be
11 entitled to any recovery under this Settlement Agreement, and will not be bound by the terms
12 of the Settlement or have any right to object, appeal, or comment thereon. However, they will
13 still receive payment for his or her portion of the PAGA penalty award and be bound by the
14 Released Claims as they pertain to PAGA. If a Class Member submits both a Request for
15 Exclusion and an Objection, then, the Request for Exclusion will be processed, and the
16 Objection will be considered void.

17 **10. Work Weeks Disputes.** If a Settlement Class Member wishes to dispute the
18 number of Work Weeks with which he or she has been credited, the Settlement Class Member
19 must submit to the Settlement Administrator, by U.S. Mail or other delivery service, a
20 Workweek Dispute on or before the Response Deadline. The Work Weeks Dispute must: (1)
21 contain the case name and number of the *Price* Action; (2) contain the full name, address,
22 telephone number, and last four digits of the social security number of the Class Member; (3)
23 be signed by the Class Member; (4) contain a clear statement indicating that the Class Member
24 disputes the Work Weeks credited to him or her and provide the number of Work Weeks that
25 the Class Member contends should be credited to him or her; (5) attach documentation and/or
26 an explanation to show that the Work Weeks credited to him or her are incorrect; and (6) be
27 mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address specified in the Class Notice and
28

1 postmarked by the Response Deadline. If there is a dispute, Defendants' records will be
2 presumed to be correct, unless that presumption is rebutted by the Class Member's showing.

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

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

16 **13. Stay of Dates and Deadlines.** All discovery and pretrial proceedings and
17 deadlines in the Action are stayed and suspended until further notice from the Court (including
18 the time to bring the case to trial pursuant to CCP § 583.330 is further extended to April 11,
19 2024), except for such actions as are necessary to implement the Agreement and this Preliminary
20 Approval Order.

21 **14. Final Approval Hearing.** On October 6, 2023, at 9:30 am/pm,
22 this Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing to determine whether the Agreement should be
23 finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of the
24 Settlement and ~~all papers supporting the Class Counsel Award and Class Representative~~
shall be timely filed in per Code.
25 ~~Enhancement Payment must be filed by~~ X 17
26 ~~Any additional papers supporting final approval, including the Settlement Administrator~~
27
28

1 declaration and any response to Objections to the Agreement must be filed by no later than
2

3 **15.** The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the Final Approval
4 Hearing and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to the Class, and
5 retains jurisdiction to consider further applications concerning the Settlement.
6

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 DATED: _____

 5/19/23

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
GREGORY W. POLLACK

EXHIBIT 2
(Settlement Administrator Declaration)

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

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE and MICHELLE
PONO, on behalf of herself and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMN HEALTHCARE, INC.; AMN
SERVICES, LLC, and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL

**DECLARATION OF YAMI BURNS
WITH RESPECT TO NOTICE AND
SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Assigned For All Purposes to the Honorable
Gregory W. Pollack (Dept. C-71)

Complaint Filed:
FAC Filed:
Trial Date: None Set

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 YAMI BURNS

I, Yami Burns, declare as follows:

1. I am a Case Manager at Phoenix Settlement Administrators (“Phoenix”), the Court-appointed Class Action Settlement Administrator for *Price v. AMN Healthcare*. (the “Action”). I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and, if called upon to testify, I could and would testify competently to such facts.

2. Phoenix was selected by the Parties to provide notice of the Settlement and perform class administration duties in this Action. Pursuant to the Stipulation of Settlement and Release (“Settlement Agreement” or “Settlement”) for this matter, Phoenix was responsible for: (i) preparing, translating, printing, and mailing the *Notice of Class Action Settlement* (“Notice”); (ii) responding to inquiries from Class Members; (iii) calculating the number of weeks each Class Member worked during the period from April 11, 2014 to May 19, 2023 (“Class Period”) and the number of weeks that each Aggrieved Employee worked during the time period from April 11, 2014 to May 19, 2023 (“PAGA Period”); (iv) determining the validity of letters indicating a request to be excluded from the Class Settlement (“Requests for Exclusion”), written objections to the Class Settlement (“Objections”), and/or dispute regarding the number of Workweeks submitted by Class Members; (v) calculating the Net Settlement Amount and the Individual Settlement Shares to Class Members; (vi) calculating and issuing the Individual Settlement Payments and distributing them to Settlement Class Members and Individual PAGA Payments to Aggrieved Employees; (vii) issuing the payment to Class Counsel for attorneys’ fees and costs, the Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs, and the employer/employee payroll taxes to the appropriate taxing authorities; and (viii) such other tasks as set forth in the Settlement Agreement or as the Parties mutually agree or as the Court orders.

3. On June 20, 2023, Phoenix received a data file from Defense Counsel that contained names, last known mailing addresses, Social Security numbers, and dates of employment of each Class Member (“Class List”) during the Class Period. The final mailing list contained five hundred twenty-six (526) individuals identified as Class Members.

1 4. On June 21, 2023, Phoenix conducted a National Change of Address (“NCOA”)
2 search in an attempt to update the class list of addresses as accurately as possible. A search of this
3 database provides updated addresses for any individual who has moved in the previous four (4)
4 years and notified the U.S. Postal Service of their change of address.

5 5. On July 10, 2023, Phoenix mailed the Notice via U.S. first class mail, in English, to
6 all five hundred twenty-six (526) Class Members on the Class List. A true and correct copy of the
7 mailed Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

8 6. As of the date of this declaration, fifty-three (53) Notices have been returned to
9 Phoenix. None were returned with a forwarding address. For the fifty-three (53) Notices returned
10 from the Post Office without a forwarding address, Phoenix attempted to locate a current mailing
11 address using TransUnion TLOxp, one of the most comprehensive address databases available for
12 skip tracing. Of the fifty-three (53) Notices that were skip traced, forty-six (46) updated addresses
13 were obtained and the Notice was promptly re-mailed to those Class Members via first class mail.

14 7. As of the date of this declaration, seven (7) Notices remain undeliverable since an
15 updated address could not be obtained via skip trace.

16 8. As of the date of this declaration, Phoenix has received one (1) Requests for
17 Exclusion from Class Member Brianna Calvert. The deadline to request exclusion from the Class
18 Settlement was August 14, 2023.

19 9. As of the date of this declaration, Phoenix has received zero (0) Notices of Objection
20 from Class Members. The deadline for objecting to the Class Settlement was August 14, 2023.

21 10. As of the date of this declaration, Phoenix has received zero (0) Workweek disputes
22 from Class Members. The deadline for submitting a dispute was August 14, 2023.

23 11. There are five hundred twenty-five (525) Class Members who did not submit timely
24 and valid Requests for Exclusion and are therefore deemed Settlement Class Members, representing
25 99.81% of the Class. Settlement Class Members have worked a collective total of forty-two
26 thousand eight hundred sixty (42,860) Workweeks during the Class Period. Each Workweek is
27 valued at approximately \$6.31.

1 12. The Net Settlement Amount of \$270,250.00 available to pay Settlement Class
2 Members was determined by subtracting the requested Class Counsel attorneys' fees (\$200,000.00),
3 and Class Counsel costs (\$40,000.00), requested Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs to PRICE and
4 PONO (\$10,000.00 for a total of \$20,000.00), the PAGA Amount (\$60,000.00), and the requested
5 Settlement Administration Costs (\$9,750.00) from the Gross Settlement Amount (\$600,000.00).

6 13. Based upon the calculations stipulated in the Settlement, the highest Individual
7 Settlement Share to be paid is approximately \$2,698.72, the lowest Individual Settlement Share to
8 be paid is approximately \$6.31, while the average Individual Settlement Share to be paid is
9 approximately \$514.76. Settlement Class Members will be issued payment of their Individual
10 Settlement Shares subject to reduction for the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with
11 respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Share (the net payment is their "Individual
12 Settlement Payment").

13 14. Additionally, \$60,000.00 of the Gross Settlement Amount has been allocated toward
14 penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA Amount"), of which 75%, or
15 \$45,000.00, shall be paid to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), and 25%,
16 or \$15,000.00, of which shall be paid to all current and former hourly non-exempt individuals who
17 are or were employed by Defendant during the PAGA Period. There are five hundred twenty-six
18 (526) Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of forty-two thousand eight hundred eighty-two
19 (42,882) weeks during the PAGA Period. The highest Individual PAGA Payment to be paid is
20 approximately \$149.71, and the average Individual PAGA Payment to be paid is approximately
21 \$28.52.

22 15. Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendant has agreed to fund the employer-side taxes
23 due separately and apart from the Gross Settlement Amount.

24 16. Phoenix's costs associated with the administration of this matter are \$9,750.00. This
25 includes all costs incurred to date, as well as estimated costs involved in completing the settlement
26 distribution. A true and correct copy of the invoice from Phoenix is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

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

3 Executed this 31th day of August 2023, at Orange, California.
4

5
6 
YAMI BURNS

Exhibit A

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

**CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE and MICHELLE PONO, on
behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**AMN HEALTHCARE, INC.; AMN SERVICES, LLC,
and DOES 1-100, inclusive,**

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL

NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION AND PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

TO: All current and former California based non-exempt employees who worked for AMN as Credentialing Analysts from April 11, 2014 through the date that the Court issues its order granting preliminary approval of the settlement. (“Approval Date”) and/or Customer Account Managers (“CAMs”) from January 8, 2015 through the Approval Date (the “Class”)

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

A settlement (“Settlement”) has been proposed in a class action lawsuit pending in San Diego County Superior Court (“Court”) titled *Price v. AMN Healthcare, Inc.*, Case No. 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL (the “Action”). If the Court gives final approval to the Settlement, AMN Healthcare, Inc. and AMN Services, LLC, (collectively “Defendants” or “AMN”), will provide each Settlement Class Member a payment as set forth in this notice. Here is a summary of your rights and options; they are described in more detail later in this document. If you have any questions, please contact *Price v. AMN*, c/o Phoenix Settlement Administrators, P.O. Box 7208, Orange, CA 92863, Telephone: (800) 523-5773.

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is \$75.63 based on the 12 Workweeks you worked during the Class Period, as shown in Defendants’ records.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT

GET PAYMENT	A	If you do nothing, you will automatically receive a payment if the Settlement is finally approved by the Court.	N/A
SUBMIT WORKWEEK DISPUTE	A	If you believe that the number of Workweeks with which you have been credited is incorrect, you must submit a Work Weeks Dispute to the Settlement Administrator. Detailed instructions for this option are set forth in Section 10 below.	Deadline: August 24, 2023
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 24, 2023
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 24, 2023
APPEAR AT THE “FINAL APPROVAL HEARING”		The Court will hold a “Final Approval Hearing” to consider the Settlement, the request for attorneys’ fees and costs by counsel representing the Class in the Action, and the Representative Plaintiffs’ requests for service/enhancement awards for bringing the Action. You may, but are not required to, speak at the Final Approval Hearing about any objection to the Settlement that you submitted. If you intend to speak at the Final Approval Hearing, we ask that you also provide to the Settlement Administrator a “Notice of Intention to Appear” indicating your intent to do so. Instructions for this option are set forth in Section 18 below.	Hearing Date: October 6, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

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

WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS

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

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Why did I get this notice?

You received this Notice because a Settlement has been reached in this Action. According to Defendants' 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?

Plaintiffs Cathryn-Lucy Price and Michelle Pono (the "Plaintiffs" or "Representative Plaintiffs") filed a lawsuit against Defendants AMN Healthcare, Inc. and AMN Services, LLC (collectively, "AMN" or "Defendants") on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated. The lawsuit alleges that Defendants violated California law by, among other things, failing to pay all overtime wages, failing to pay minimum wage, failing to provide duty-free meal/rest periods, failing to provide timely/accurate wage statements, failing to pay all wages due at separation, failing to reimburse necessary business expenses, and unfair business practices. 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. 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 Plaintiffs' 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 "Plaintiffs" (in this case Cathryn-Lucy Price and Michelle Pono) sues on behalf of other people who allegedly have similar claims. For purposes of this proposed Settlement, one court will resolve the issues for all Class Members. The company sued (in this case AMN) is called the Defendant.

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 Plaintiffs 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 sooner 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 worked for AMN as Credentialing Analysts from April 11, 2014 through the date that the Court issues its order granting preliminary approval of the settlement. (“Approval Date”) and/or Customer Account Managers (“CAMs”) from January 8, 2015 through the Approval Date (the “Class”).”

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: *Price v. AMN*, c/o Phoenix Settlement Administrators, P.O. Box 7208, Orange, CA 92863, Telephone: (800) 523-5773.

THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

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

Defendants have agreed to fund a Settlement with a maximum value of **\$600,000 (Six Hundred Thousand Dollars)**. The Settlement amount will be used to pay the claims of Settlement Class Members, the cost of providing notice to the Class and administering the Settlement (i.e., \$9,750); to pay any awards of the Court for attorneys’ fees (i.e., \$200,000) and costs (i.e., \$40,000) to Plaintiff’s counsel; any service/enhancement award the Court awards to the Representative Plaintiffs (i.e., \$10,000 each for a total of \$20,000); and the amount allocated under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698 et seq. (“PAGA”) (i.e., \$60,000, the “PAGA Penalties”), which includes the 75% payment to the California Labor Workforce and Development Agency (“LWDA Payment”) (i.e., \$45,000) and the 25% “PAGA Group Amount” distributed to the PAGA Group (i.e., \$15,000).

Your Estimated Settlement Payment is \$75.63 based on the 12 Workweeks you worked during the Class Period, as shown in Defendants’ records. Your estimated payment was calculated using Defendants’ records. Individual Settlement Payments will be calculated and apportioned as follows:

(a) The “Net Settlement Fund” shall be calculated by subtracting, from the Gross Settlement Amount total of \$600,000 the payments to Class Counsel, the Representative Plaintiffs, and the Settlement Administrator, and the PAGA Penalties.

(b) For each Class Member, the Settlement Administrator shall determine the number of Workweeks worked by them during the Class Period based on Defendants’ records (i.e. the fractional numerator). The sum of the Workweeks for all Settlement Class Members shall be the “Total Workweeks.” (i.e. the fractional denominator).

(c) The Net Settlement Amount will be apportioned to each Settlement Class Member (i.e., Class Members who do not request to be excluded from the Settlement), based on their proportionate number of Weeks Worked, by multiplying the Net Settlement Amount by a fraction, the numerator of which is the Settlement Class Member’s individual total Weeks Worked, and the denominator of which is the total number of Weeks Worked of all Settlement Class Members. The resulting figure shall be the “Individual Settlement Payment” for each such Settlement Class Member.

(d) The Settlement Administrator shall determine the PAGA Group Members portion of the PAGA Group Amount (\$15,000) by the same formula be determine each PAGA Group Member’s pro rata share of the PAGA Group Amount.

PAYMENT TO THE CLASS

8. How can I get a payment?

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

9. When will I get a payment?

As described in Sections 20 and 21, the Court will hold a hearing on October 6, 2023 at 9:30 a.m., to decide whether to approve the Settlement. Even if the Court approves the Settlement, there may be appeals filed. 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 Defendants' calculation 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 24, 2023 showing that such information is inaccurate. The Settlement Administrator shall decide the dispute. Defendants' 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 Work Weeks Dispute by mail to the Settlement Administrator at: *Price v. AMN*, c/o Phoenix Settlement Administrators, P.O. Box 7208, Orange, CA 92863. A Work Weeks Dispute must: (1) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Price v. AMN*, Case No. 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL); (2) contain the full name, address, telephone number, and last four digits of the social security number of the Class Member; (3) be signed by the Class Member; (4) contain a clear statement indicating that the Class Member disputes the Work Weeks credited to him or her and provide the number of Work Weeks that the Class Member contends should be credited to him or her; (5) attach documentation and/or an explanation to show that the Work Weeks credited to him or her are incorrect; and (6) be mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address specified in the Class Notice and postmarked by the Response Deadline.

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

Thirty-three percent (33%) of each Individual Settlement Payment shall be considered wages ("Wages Portion") and subject to reduction for all applicable employee's and employer's share of payroll contributions and withholdings, which shall be reported by the Settlement Administrator on an IRS Form W-2. Thirty-three percent (33%) of each Individual Settlement Payment shall be allocated as penalties and other non-wage damages and thirty-four percent (34%) of each Individual Settlement Payment shall be allocated as interest (collectively, "Non-Wages Portion"), which shall be reported by the Settlement Administrator on an IRS Form 1099. The PAGA Group Payments shall be reported by the Settlement Administrator on an 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 (mdavega@mdmflaw.com) or (mfisher@mdmflaw.com), or calling them at (805) 232-4471. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

14. How will the lawyers be paid?

Defendants have agreed to pay Class Counsel's attorneys' fees up to **\$200,000** and costs and expenses of up to **\$40,000** for their services in litigating the Action, subject to approval by the Court. You will not be required to pay any attorneys' fees or costs yourself.

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

The Representative Plaintiffs will request a service award (also known as an "incentive" or "enhancement" award) of up to **\$10,000** each (\$20,000 collectively) for their services as class representatives and their efforts in bringing the Action. The Court will make the final decision as to the amount to be paid to the class representatives.

RELEASE OF ALL CLAIMS

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

If the Court approves the proposed Settlement, unless you exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will be releasing your claims against Defendant. This generally means that you will not be able to file a lawsuit, continue prosecuting a lawsuit, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendants regarding the allegations in the Action. The lawsuit concerns a bona fide dispute regarding wages, meal period and rest period violations, and other alleged labor law violations. The Release reads as follows:

Plaintiffs and every member of the Settlement Class, will release and discharge Defendants, and all of its former and present parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates, and their current and former officers, directors, employees, partners, shareholders and agents, and the predecessors and successors, assigns, and legal representatives of all such entities and individuals (collectively, the "Class Members' Released Parties") as follows:

Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members will release the Released Parties from any and all wage-and-hour claims, rights, demands, liabilities and causes of action of every nature and description, whether known or unknown, that arise out of or are reasonably related to the allegations in the operative complaint including unpaid wages, overtime premium pay, meal and rest period penalty pay, failure to reimburse business expenses, and statutory or civil penalties arising during the period (1) for the Credentialing Analysts from April 11, 2014 through the date on which the Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and (2) for the CAMs from January 8, 2015 through the date on which the Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement (collectively, "Class Members' Released Period"). The claims released by the Class Members include, but are not limited to, statutory, constitutional, contractual or common law claims for wages, damages, unpaid costs, penalties, liquidated damages, punitive damages, interest, attorneys' fees, litigation costs, restitution, or equitable relief, for the following categories of allegations: (a) all claims for failure to pay wages for hours worked, including overtime premium pay; (b) all claims for failure to pay the minimum wage in accordance with applicable law; (c) all claims for the failure to

provide meal and/or rest periods in accordance with applicable law, including payments of premiums for missed meal and/or rest periods and alleged non-payment of wages for meal periods worked and not taken; and (d) any and all claims for recordkeeping or pay stub violations, waiting time penalties and all other civil and statutory penalties, including those recoverable under PAGA, assuming the Court’s approval of the PAGA Group Settlement (“Class Members’ Released Claims”). The Class Members’ Released Claims include all those recited in the operative complaint as well as all claims that reasonably relate to the allegations in the operative complaint that could have been brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act that arose during the Class Members’ Released Period. The Class Members’ Released Claims include without limitation claims meeting the above definition(s) under any and all applicable statutes, including without limitation the California Payment of Wages Law, and in particular, California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 216, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, California Working Hours Law, including California Labor Code §§ 510, 512, 558; California Labor Code §§ 1174, 1174.5, 1182.11, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1194.3, 1194.5, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199; the California Unfair Competition Act, and in particular, California Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq.; the PAGA, California Labor Code §§ 2698 et. seq.; California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; California Civil Code § 3287; California Industrial Wage Order Nos. 4, 5, and 15, and any other provision of the California Labor Code or any applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, in all of their iterations, and the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et. seq. (the “Released Claims”).

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 written Request for Exclusion via U.S. Mail or other delivery service that must: (1) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Price v. AMN*, Case No. 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL); (2) contain the full name, address, telephone number, and last four digits of the social security number of the Class Member; (3) be signed by the Class Member; (4) contain a statement clearly indicating that the Class Member wishes to be excluded from the Settlement; and (5) be postmarked on or before the Response Deadline and mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address specified in the Class Notice. The Request for Exclusion must be sent (i.e., postmarked or delivery date stamped) by no later than August 24, 2023 and sent to the Settlement Administrator at: *Price v. AMN*, c/o Phoenix Settlement Administrators, P.O. Box 7208, Orange, CA 92863.

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

HOW TO OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT

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

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

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 (i.e via the included “Objection Form”) the to the Settlement Administrator at the address set forth below by no later than (i.e., postmarked or delivery date stamped by August 24, 2023.

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR
<i>Price v. AMN</i> , c/o Phoenix Settlement Administrators P.O. Box 7208 Orange, CA 92863 https://www.phoenixclassaction.com/price-v-amn-healthcare/

To be valid, any objection/Objection Form must: (1) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Price v. AMN*, Case No. 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL); (2) contain the full name, address, telephone number, and last four digits of the social security number of the Class Member; (3) be signed by the Class Member; (4) contain an explanation of his or her objection(s) to the Settlement; (5) indicate whether the Class Member is represented by counsel, and if represented by counsel, provide the name and address of said counsel; (6) indicate whether Class Member intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (7) be postmarked on or before the Response Deadline August 24, 2023 and mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address specified in the Class Notice. 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 and again you are not required to do so in order 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 only that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the Agreement falls within the range of possible approval as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and that the final determination of these issues will be made at the Final Approval Hearing. The purpose of the Final Approval Hearing will be for the Court to determine whether the Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class; to consider the award of attorneys' fees and expenses to Class Counsel; and to consider the request for service award to the Representative Plaintiffs.

21. When and where is the Final Approval Hearing?

On October 6, 2023 at 9:30 a.m., a hearing will be held on the fairness of the proposed Settlement (i.e. "Final Approval Hearing"). 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 Gregory W. Pollack in Department C-71 of the California Superior Court for the County of San Diego, located at the Central Branch, Central Branch - 330 West Broadway, San Diego CA 92101. The hearing may be postponed to a different date or time or location without notice.

22. May I speak at the hearing?

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

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

23. How do I get more information?

To see a copy of the Settlement Agreement, the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and the operative Complaint filed in the Action, please contact Class Counsel by writing them at 232 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, California 93101, or emailing them at (mdavega@mdmflaw.com) or (mfisher@mdmflaw.com), or calling them at (805) 232-4471. The Settlement Agreement is attached as an Exhibit A to the Declaration of Class Counsel Matthew S. Da Vega that was filed in support of the Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval.

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 Central Branch - 330 West Broadway, San Diego CA 92101, to obtain the file for inspection and copying at your own expense. Some documents and/or information may also be available online at: <https://roa.sdcourt.ca.gov/roa/>

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: *Price v. AMN*, c/o Phoenix Settlement Administrators, P.O. Box 7208, Orange, CA 92863.

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

Exhibit B



PHOENIX

CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION SOLUTIONS

CASE ASSUMPTIONS

Class Members	525
Opt Out Rate	0%
Opt Outs Received	0
Total Class Claimants	525
Subtotal Admin Only	\$10,015.60

TOTAL COSTS	\$9,750.00
--------------------	-------------------

August 31, 2023

Case: Price/Pono v. AMN Healthcare, Inc.

Case & Database Setup / Toll Free Setup & Call Center / NCOA (USPS)

Administrative Tasks:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Manager	\$100.00	4	\$400.00
Programming Database & Setup	\$100.00	4	\$400.00
Toll Free Setup*	\$140.00	1	\$140.00
Call Center & Long Distance	\$2.00	53	\$105.00
NCOA (USPS)	\$0.15	525	\$78.75
Total			\$1,123.75

Data Merger & Scrub / Notice Packet, Opt-Out Form & Postage / Translation

Project Action	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Notice Packet Formatting	\$105.00	4	\$420.00
Data Merge & Duplication Scrub	\$0.15	525	\$78.75
Notice Packet & Opt-Out Form	\$0.95	525	\$498.75
Estimated Postage (up to 1 oz.)	\$0.60	525	\$315.00
Language Translation	\$0.30	3,261	\$978.30
Total			\$2,290.80

Skip Tracing & Remailing Notice Packets / Tracking & Programming Undeliverables

Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Case Associate	\$55.00	4	\$220.00
Skip Tracing Undeliverables	\$1.00	40	\$40.00
Remail Notice Packets	\$0.95	41	\$38.95
Estimated Postage	\$0.60	41	\$24.60
Programing Undeliverables	\$50.00	1	\$50.00
Total			\$373.55

Database Programming / Processing Opt-Outs, Deficiencies or Disputes

Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Claims Database	\$100.00	4	\$400.00
Non Opt-Out Processing	\$200.00	1	\$200.00
Case Associate	\$55.00	4	\$220.00
Opt-Outs/Deficiency/Dispute Letters	\$5.00	0	\$0.00
Case Manager	\$85.00	3	\$255.00
Total			\$1,075.00

Calculation & Disbursement Programming/ Create & Manage QSF/ Mail Checks			
Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Programming Calculations	\$100.00	4	\$400.00
Disbursement Review	\$100.00	3	\$300.00
Programming Manager	\$95.00	2	\$190.00
QSF Fees, Bank Account & EIN	\$75.00	3	\$225.00
Check Run Setup & Printing	\$100.00	3	\$300.00
Mail Class Checks, W2 and 1099 *	\$1.00	525	\$525.00
Estimated Postage Checks, W2 and 1099	\$0.50	525	\$262.50
Total			\$2,202.50

* Checks are printed on 8.5 x 11 in. sheets with W2/1099 Tax Filing

Tax Reporting & Reconciliation / Re-Issuance of Checks / Conclusion Reports and Declarations			
Project Action:	Rate	Hours/Units	Line Item Estimate
Case Supervisor	\$100.00	3	\$300.00
Remail Undeliverable Checks (Postage Included)	\$1.50	40	\$60.00
Case Associate	\$55.00	2	\$110.00
Reconcile Uncashed Checks	\$85.00	3	\$255.00
Conclusion Reports	\$115.00	2	\$230.00
Case Manager Conclusion	\$85.00	2	\$170.00
Final Reporting & Declarations	\$115.00	1	\$115.00
Uncashed Check Notice Postcard (Postage Included)	\$1.50	40	\$60.00
Uncashed Check QSF Tax Filing	\$150.00	3	\$450.00
IRS & QSF Annual Tax Reporting * (State Tax Reporting Included)	\$1,200.00	1	\$1,200.00
Total			\$2,950.00

* All applicable California State & Federal taxes, which include SUI, ETT, and SDI, and FUTA filings. Additional taxes are Defendant's responsibility.

Total: \$10,015.60

EXHIBIT 3
(Declarations of Class Representatives)

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE and MICHELLE
PONO, on behalf of herself and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

AMN HEALTHCARE, INC.; AMN
SERVICES, LLC, and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL

CLASS and REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**DECLARATION OF CATHRYN-LUCY
PRICE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT and ENHANCEMENT
PAYMENT**

Assigned For All Purposes to the Honorable
Gregory W. Pollack (Dept. C-71)

Date: October 5, 2023

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Location: Dept. C-71 (Hon. Gregory W. Pollack)

DECLARATION OF CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE

I, CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE, 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 AMN Healthcare, Inc. and/or AMN Services, LLC (“Defendants” or “AMN”). 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 single 28-year-old adult female and current resident of Fremont in Alameda County. During the Class Period, from

1 approximately August 2016 to February 8, 2018, I worked for Defendant at AMN's headquarters
2 located in San Diego, CA as a Credentialing Analyst, one of the job positions at issue in this case
3 and which is included within the Settlement Class.

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

17 5. I have been involved with this case since its beginning and I am one of the
18 proposed Class Representatives for the Settlement Class. I first contacted my attorney and
19 worked with them directly to gather information and evidence in support of the class action
20 lawsuit. I have never asked to be relieved from my role as a proposed Class Representative. I
21 understand that its my job to be "the stand-in" for other Class Members and must put their interest
22 before my own in pursuing this lawsuit and proposed settlement. I accept these duties and
23 responsibilities and request, when appropriate, that I be approved as the Class Representative for
24 the purposes of the proposed Settlement.

25 6. I have had long discussions with my attorneys about the proposed Settlement both
26 before, during, and after the successful mediation in this case. I am not an attorney but I
27 understand the risk factors that were considered when evaluating the Settlement including the
28

1 enormous effort, time, and costs to litigate such class action cases, the risk of losing the case and
2 getting nothing, and the ability of Defendants to pay the settlement versus prolonged litigation.

3 7. **Community of Interest (Typicality, Adequacy, and Lack of Conflicts):** I was a
4 non-exempt employee of Defendant and was subject to the same pay structure, policies, practices,
5 and rules as all the other Credentialing Analyst employees of Defendant.

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

9 9. I am not aware of any conflicts of interest I have with other Class Members and/or
10 PAGA group members included in this proposed Settlement. I do not have any personal
11 relationship or family ties to my legal counsel or any officers of this court. I am not involved
12 with any litigation involving other Class Members or PAGA group members. I have no other
13 business or legal arrangements/dealings with my legal counsel other than this lawsuit. I have
14 never been promised money to serve as the proposed Class Representative. I have never been a
15 Class Representative in another other class action lawsuit. I do not have any intention to take any
16 action that would place me in a position that is hostile to other Class Members or PAGA group
17 members.

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

23 11. I have actively assisted my attorney in all the phases of this litigation to advance
24 the interests of the Class and PAGA group to the best of my abilities. I have kept in constant
25 contact with them throughout this process. My participation began with contacting my attorneys
26 through a referral to confirm that I might have a case in that Defendants' policies and practices
27 might be illegal. I also reviewed hundreds of pages of documents (employment files, data,
28 policies, etc.) which I already had or were produced in this litigation by Defendants. I provided

1 relevant documents to my counsel, and I explained those documents and related facts to my
2 counsel to assist them in their review and filing of this case. I also discussed the responsibilities
3 that I would have as a Class Representative with my attorney, including my responsibility to act
4 on behalf of the interests of all proposed Class Members and PAGA group.

5 12. I have devoted a substantial amount of my own time during this litigation to ensure
6 a fair result for the Class Members and PAGA group. This involved ongoing communications and
7 participation with my counsel, reviewing documents, being deposed by Defendant,
8 attending/reviewing other depositions, attending the mediation in-person, and numerous phone
9 calls, meetings, and emails with my counsel pre and post mediation through settlement.

10 13. **Class and PAGA Settlement:** After a mediation and years of discovery the
11 parties negotiated an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and then a long-form settlement
12 agreement (Stipulation of Settlement and Release [“Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement”]). I
13 have been informed of, reviewed, approved of the terms of, and executed the proposed settlement,
14 which is before the Court. After reviewing and discussing the terms of the proposed settlement
15 with my attorneys and considering the issues in the case and the value of the claims, I have
16 concluded that the proposed settlement obtained on behalf of the Class is fair, adequate, and
17 reasonable to the Class members and PAGA group.

18 14. In sum, I believe that I have diligently, adequately, and fairly represented the Class
19 Members and PAGA group. I have not placed my own interests above those of any member of the
20 Class but have always and will continue to keep the Class Members’ and PAGA groups’ best
21 interests in this litigation until its conclusion. I have provided approximately 50+ hours of my
22 time to date and during the course of this lawsuit to ensure a good outcome and Settlement for the
23 best interest of the Class Members and PAGA group. I believe that I have fairly represented the
24 absent Class members and herein request that the Court finally approve this settlement.

25 15. **Requested Enhancement Payment:** I request that the Court award me a
26 reasonable Enhancement Payment to compensate me for the work performed in my role as Class
27 Representative. I believe taking on the role and my service as a Class Representative had
28 inherent risks which I took on behalf of others and has caused me a small, but not insignificant,

1 disruption to my work and personal life. I was aware that being a Class Representative in a class
2 action lawsuit could impact my career and future employment because I might be “blackballed”
3 or viewed differently for suing a former employer. I was also aware that by filing the lawsuit, I
4 might be responsible for some or all of Defendant’s legal costs if the case was not successfully
5 litigated. As a Class Representative, I actively participated in the litigation and have always
6 maintained the best interests of the Class and PAGA group while performing my representative
7 duties. Therefore based on the effort, risk, delay in payment, and time spent on the matter I
8 believe that the requested Enhancement Payment of **\$10,000 (ten thousand dollars)** is fair,
9 reasonable and compensates me for such a positive result for so many people who would have
10 otherwise likely never received any compensation at all.

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

13
14 **DATED:** 9/8/2023 _____

By: _____

DocuSigned by:

63E2D86F8CEF489

Cathryn-Lucy Price
Plaintiff / Proposed Class Representative

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Proposed Plaintiffs Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

CATHRYN-LUCY PRICE and MICHELLE
PONO, on behalf of herself and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

AMN HEALTHCARE, INC.; AMN
SERVICES, LLC, and DOES 1-100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 37-2018-00017996-CU-OE-CTL

CLASS and REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**DECLARATION OF MICHELLE PONO IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT and ENHANCEMENT
PAYMENT**

Assigned For All Purposes to the Honorable
Gregory W. Pollack (Dept. C-71)

Date: October 5, 2023

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Location: Dept. C-71 (Hon. Gregory W. Pollack)

DECLARATION OF MICHELLE PONO

I, MICHELLE PONO, 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 AMN Healthcare, Inc. and/or AMN Services, LLC (“Defendants” or “AMN”). 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 40-year old adult female and current resident of La Mesa, CA in San Diego County. During the Class Period, from

1 approximately June 6, 2012 until April 8, 2017, I worked for Defendant at AMN's headquarters in
2 San Diego, CA as a Customer Account Manager (CAM), one of the job positions at issue in this
3 case and which is included within the Settlement Class.

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

17 5. I have been involved with this case since shortly after its original filing and I am
18 one of the proposed Class Representatives for the Settlement Class. I first contacted my attorney
19 and worked with them directly to gather information and evidence in support of the class action
20 lawsuit. I have never asked to be relieved from my role as a proposed Class Representative. I
21 understand that its my job to be "the stand-in" for other Class Members and must put their interest
22 before my own in pursuing this lawsuit and proposed settlement. I accept these duties and
23 responsibilities and request, when appropriate, that I be approved as the Class Representative for
24 the purposes of the proposed Settlement.

25 6. I have had long discussions with my attorneys about the proposed Settlement both
26 before, during, and after the successful mediation in this case. I am not an attorney but I
27 understand the risk factors that were considered when evaluating the Settlement including the
28

1 enormous effort, time, and costs to litigate such class action cases, the risk of losing the case and
2 getting nothing, and the ability of Defendants to pay the settlement versus prolonged litigation.

3 7. **Community of Interest (Typicality, Adequacy, and Lack of Conflicts):** I was a
4 non-exempt employee of Defendant and was subject to the same pay structure, policies, practices,
5 and rules as all the other Customer Account Manager employees of Defendant.

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

9 9. I am not aware of any conflicts of interest I have with other Class Members and/or
10 PAGA group members included in this proposed Settlement. I do not have any personal
11 relationship or family ties to my legal counsel or any officers of this court. I am not involved
12 with any litigation involving other Class Members or PAGA group members. I have no other
13 business or legal arrangements/dealings with my legal counsel other than this lawsuit. I have
14 never been promised money to serve as the proposed Class Representative. I have never been a
15 Class Representative in another other class action lawsuit. I do not have any intention to take any
16 action that would place me in a position that is hostile to other Class Members or PAGA group
17 members.

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

23 11. I have actively assisted my attorney in all the phases of this litigation to advance
24 the interests of the Class and PAGA group to the best of my abilities. I have kept in constant
25 contact with them throughout this process. My participation began with contacting my attorneys
26 through a referral to confirm that I might have a case in that Defendants' policies and practices
27 might be illegal. I also reviewed hundreds of pages of documents (employment files, data,
28 policies, etc.) which I already had or were produced in this litigation by Defendants. I provided

1 relevant documents to my counsel, and I explained those documents and related facts to my
2 counsel to assist them in their review and filing of this case. I also discussed the responsibilities
3 that I would have as a Class Representative with my attorney, including my responsibility to act
4 on behalf of the interests of all proposed Class Members and PAGA group.

5 12. I have devoted a substantial amount of my own time during this litigation to ensure
6 a fair result for the Class Members and PAGA group. This involved ongoing communications and
7 participation with my counsel, reviewing documents, being deposed by Defendant,
8 attending/reviewing other depositions, attending the mediation in-person, and numerous phone
9 calls, meetings, and emails with my counsel pre and post mediation through settlement.

10 13. **Class and PAGA Settlement:** After a mediation and years of discovery the
11 parties negotiated an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and then a long-form settlement
12 agreement (Stipulation of Settlement and Release [“Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement”]). I
13 have been informed of, reviewed, approved of the terms of, and executed the proposed settlement,
14 which is before the Court. After reviewing and discussing the terms of the proposed settlement
15 with my attorneys and considering the issues in the case and the value of the claims, I have
16 concluded that the proposed settlement obtained on behalf of the Class is fair, adequate, and
17 reasonable to the Class members and PAGA group.

18 14. In sum, I believe that I have diligently, adequately, and fairly represented the Class
19 Members and PAGA group. I have not placed my own interests above those of any member of the
20 Class but have always and will continue to keep the Class Members’ and PAGA groups’ best
21 interests in this litigation until its conclusion. I have provided approximately 40+ hours of my
22 time to date and during the course of this lawsuit to ensure a good outcome and Settlement for the
23 best interest of the Class Members and PAGA group. I believe that I have fairly represented the
24 absent Class members and herein request that the Court finally approve this settlement.

25 15. **Requested Enhancement Payment:** I request that the Court award me a
26 reasonable Enhancement Payment to compensate me for the work performed in my role as Class
27 Representative. I believe taking on the role and my service as a Class Representative had
28 inherent risks which I took on behalf of others and has caused me a small, but not insignificant,

1 disruption to my work and personal life. I was aware that being a Class Representative in a class
2 action lawsuit could impact my career and future employment because I might be “blackballed”
3 or viewed differently for suing a former employer. I was also aware that by filing the lawsuit, I
4 might be responsible for some or all of Defendant’s legal costs if the case was not successfully
5 litigated. As a Class Representative, I actively participated in the litigation and have always
6 maintained the best interests of the Class and PAGA group while performing my representative
7 duties. Therefore based on the effort, risk, delay in payment, and time spent on the matter I
8 believe that the requested Enhancement Payment of **\$10,000 (ten thousand dollars)** is fair,
9 reasonable and compensates me for such a positive result for so many people who would have
10 otherwise likely never received any compensation at all.

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

13
14 9/8/2023
15 **DATED:** _____

16 By:  _____
17 Michelle Pono
18 Plaintiff / Proposed Class Representative
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 4
(NALFA 2020 Litigation Hourly Rate
Range Growth)

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

News Blog

NALFA Releases 3 Models of Growth for Litigation Hourly Rates

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

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

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

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

From these growth curves, we learn 2 key concepts:

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

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

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

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

EXHIBIT 5
(Laffey Matrix)

LAFFEY MATRIX

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

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

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

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

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

EXHIBIT 6
(National Law Journal)



2017 NLJ Billing Report

Source: National Law Journal

Category: National Law Journal

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Year	Firm Name	Largest U.S. Office - City	State	NLJ 500 Rank 2017	Partner Billing Rate Low	Partner Billing Rate High	Partner Billing Rate Avg	Associate Billing Rate Low	Associate Billing Rate High	Associate Billing Rate Avg	Counsel Billing Rate Low	Counsel Billing Rate Average
2017	Steinberg & Associates Esqs	Kew Gardens	NY				\$450*					
2017	Steinberg Nutter & Brent	Calabasas	CA				\$450*			\$250*		
2017	Stephen C. Hinze, Counselor At Law	Vista	CA				\$275*					
2017	Steven L. Yarmy, Esq.	Las Vegas	NV							\$450*		
2017	Steven M. Fishman P.A.	Clearwater	FL							\$300*		
2017	Steven R Fox Law Offices	Encino	CA				\$450*					
2017	Steven T. Mulligan	Denver	CO					\$236	\$325	\$293		
2017	Stevenson & Bullock, P.L.C	Southfield	MI		\$275	\$375	\$325	\$275	\$300	\$300		
2017	Stewart McArdle & Sorice, LLC	Greensburg	PA				\$225*					
2017	Stewart Robbins & Brown, LLC	Baton Rouge	LA		\$285	\$370	\$360					
2017	Stichter, Riedel, Blain & Postler, P.A.	Tampa	FL				\$350*			\$225*		
2017	Stillman & Associates, P.C.	Miami Beach	FL							\$500*		
2017	Stone and Baxter, LLP	Macon	GA							\$135*		
2017	Strawn & Edwards, PLLC	Dyersburg	TN							\$285*		
2017	SulmeyerKupetz	Los Angeles	CA		\$550	\$800	\$595	\$175	\$550	\$475	\$525	\$560
2017	Suzy Tate, P.A.	Tampa	FL		\$300	\$325	\$313			\$260*		
2017	Tang & Associates, P.C.	Los Angeles	CA				\$325*	\$250	\$400	\$325		
2017	Tarbox Law, P.C.	Lubbock	TX							\$300*		
2017	Tarpy, Cox, 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 \$525
2017	Wauson Probus	Sugar Land	TX				\$450*	\$250	\$450	\$400		
2017	Wayne Greenwald, P.C.	New York	NY				\$600*			\$550*		
2017	Weinberg Zareh & Geyerhahn, LLP	New York	NY				\$575			\$325*		
2017	Weinman & Associates, PC	Denver	CO				\$475*			\$475*		
2017	Weintraub & Selth APC	Los Angeles	CA		\$495	\$550	\$523	\$395	\$550	\$430		\$435*
2017	Weiss & Spees, LLP	Los Angeles	CA		\$350	\$500	\$500					
2017	Weissberg & Associates, Ltd	Chicago	IL				\$450*					
2017	Wells And Jarvis, P.S	Seattle	WA							\$360*		
2017	Weyer, Kaplan, Pulaski & Zuber, P.C.	Arlington	TX				\$385*			\$195*		
2017	White & Wolnerman, PLLC	New York	NY					\$250	\$400	\$400		
2017	Whiteford, Taylor & Preston	Baltimore	MD	265	\$530	\$570	\$550			\$340*		
2017	Whitelaw & Fango	Syracuse	NY				\$225*					
2017	Wilcox Law Firm	Ponte Vedra Beach	FL				\$325*					
2017	William E. Jamison Jr., Attorney at Law	Chicago	IL							\$350*		
2017	William E. Maddox Jr., L.L.C.	Knoxville	TN							\$200*		
2017	William F. Davis & Associates, PC	Albuquerque	NM				\$475*	\$225	\$250	\$238		
2017	William H. Brownstein & Associates, Professional Corpo	Santa Monica	CA				\$525*					
2017	Willis & Wilkins, LLP	San Antonio	TX				\$375*					
2017	Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP	New York	NY	74	\$1,150	\$1,425	\$1,350	\$625	\$965	\$800		
2017	Wilson, Harrell, Farrington	Pensacola	FL							\$150*		

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

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

EXHIBIT 7
(LWDA POS of Submission)