

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104
KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672
JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626
JOSEPH M. SZILAGYI, State Bar No. 317450
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: (949) 379-6250
Facsimile: (949) 379-6251
Email: jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com
Email: jszilagyi@aegislawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Tracy Hoge, individually,
and on behalf of all others similarly situated.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN**

TRACY HOGE, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BETHANY HOME SOCIETY OF SAN
JOAQUIN COUNTY, INC.; and DOES 1
through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2020-0010956
(Lead Case)

[Consolidated with: Case No. STK-CV-UOE-
2021-0010793]

Assigned for All Purposes to:
Department 10C

**DECLARATION OF JOSEPH M.
SZILAGYI IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

BLANCA GALEAS, individually and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BETHANY HOME SOCIETY OF SAN
JOAQUIN COUNTY, INC.; and DOES 1
through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

1 I, Joseph M. Szilagyi, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice before all the courts of the State of
3 California. I am an associate at Aegis Law Firm, PC, counsel for Plaintiff Tracy Hoge
4 (“Plaintiff Hoge”) in this matter. I am thoroughly familiar with and have personal knowledge
5 of all the facts set forth herein.

6 2. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of
7 Class Action Settlement (“Final Approval Motion”). If called as a witness, I could and would
8 competently testify thereto.

9 3. On December 29, 2020, Plaintiff Hoge, through my office, provided written notice
10 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendant Bethany Home
11 Society of San Joaquin (“Defendant”) regarding Defendant’s alleged Labor Code violations, as
12 required by Lab. Code § 2699.3(a). The LWDA did not respond to this notice, indicating it did not
13 intend to investigate, thus allowing Plaintiff Hoge to bring a PAGA claim against Defendant.

14 4. On December 29, 2020, Plaintiff Hoge, through my office, filed this class action on
15 behalf of Defendant’s non-exempt employees and alleged the following claims: (1) failure to pay
16 minimum wages and straight time wages; (2) failure to pay overtime wages; (3) failure to provide
17 meal periods or premium pay in lieu thereof; (4) failure to permit rest breaks or premium pay in
18 lieu thereof; (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (6) failure to provide complete and
19 accurate itemized wage statements; (7) failure to pay all wages timely and upon separation of
20 employment; and (8) violation of Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., based on the
21 preceding claims (the “Hoge Action”). Plaintiff’s allegations present common legal and factual
22 questions of, inter alia, whether Defendant applied the same scheduling, timekeeping, minimum
23 and overtime pay, meal period, rest break, and compensation policies to all Class Members; whether
24 these policies and practices resulted in Labor Code violations; whether Defendant’s conduct was
25 intentional; and whether Class Members are entitled to penalties. These common questions could
26 be resolved using Class Members’ schedules, time punches, and payroll records, Defendant’s
27 corporate representative’s testimony, written communications between Defendant and Class
28 Members, and Class Member declarations.

1 5. On August 9, 2021, Plaintiff Hoge filed a First Amended Complaint alleging an
2 additional cause of action against Defendant for Enforcement of Labor Code § 2698 et seq.
3 (“PAGA”) following the Court’s order granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File a First
4 Amended Complaint on July 30, 2021.

5 6. Class Counsel thoroughly investigated Plaintiffs’ and the proposed Class Members’
6 claims, the applicable law, and Defendant’s potential defenses prior to the Parties’ settlement, and
7 assessed the value of the class claims using data and documents provided by Defendant to my office
8 through formal discovery and informally in preparation for mediation.

9 7. From all the documents and information obtained by my office, as well as data
10 provided before and at mediation by Defendant concerning the Class (including the estimated
11 number of Class Members, number of workweeks, and number of pay periods), my office
12 completed a thorough investigation to reasonably assess the damages before mediation. Proving the
13 extent of Plaintiff’s allegations on a class-wide basis presented unique challenges which Plaintiffs
14 and Class Counsel considered before reaching a settlement.

15 8. Plaintiffs’ claims were evaluated by my office in light of the risk that a jury might
16 find otherwise and considering the expense and resources required for trial. If Plaintiffs continued
17 to prosecute the claims rather than accept a settlement, Plaintiffs would have faced deadlines to file a
18 motion for class certification and prepare for trial, engaged in substantive written discovery, taken
19 depositions, expended a considerable amount of time and resources to resolve discovery disputes, and
20 prepared and filed potential dispositive motions and/or discovery motions. An adverse ruling at any
21 one of these stages could have prevented Plaintiffs and Class Members from obtaining recovery.

22 9. Ultimately, the Parties settled due to the Parties’ counsels’ comprehensive
23 understanding of the disputed issues and their ability to convey the strengths and weaknesses of
24 the claims and defenses. The negotiations were adversarial, conducted at arm’s length and
25 tempered by the efforts of both sides to serve the interests of their clients.

26 10. Class Counsel’s skill in researching and presenting these issues at mediation
27 resulted in a fair settlement for the class, and weighs in favor of approving the fee request.
28

1 **Counsel's Qualifications**

2 11. Aegis Law Firm prosecutes wage and hour cases, including class actions on
3 behalf of employees and others who have had their rights violated. Aegis, either on its own or
4 with co-counsel is currently serving as plaintiffs' counsel of record in dozens of wage and hour
5 and employment class action cases pending in both state and federal court.

6 12. The attorneys working on this case have been appointed class counsel in many
7 cases, through both contested motions and settlement approval motions.

8 13. Aegis has litigated and successfully resolved many wage and hour class action
9 cases involving failure to pay wages and derivative Labor Code claims and penalties. *See, e.g.,*
10 *Calma v. Scooter Brew, Inc.*, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2021-00050379-CU-OE-
11 CTL (class certification granted on April 12, 2024 for non-exempt restaurant employees' on issues
12 of expense reimbursement, unpaid wages for off-the-clock work, meal violations, inaccurate
13 wage statements and waiting time penalties); *Vinalay v. Union City Hotel Management Corp. et*
14 *al.*, Case No. 37-2019-00021268-CU-OE-CTL (class certification granted on April 4, 2022 for
15 non-exempt employees on issues of unpaid overtime, automatic meal period deductions,
16 inaccurate wage statements, and waiting time penalties); *Bonello v. Laboratory Express, Inc.*, Case
17 No. CIVDS1714584 (class certification granted for misclassification of employees as independent
18 contractors); *Roman, et al. v. TRM Manufacturing, Inc.*, Riverside Superior Court, Case No.
19 RIC1706458 (class certification granted on December 17, 2020 for all current and former non-
20 exempt workers' on issues of rounding, meal period, and rest period claims); *Gamboa v. Kamran,*
21 *et al.*, San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1605273 (class certification granted on
22 September 16, 2019, for factory workers on issues of rounding, automatic deduction of first meal
23 period, and second meal period); *Romo, et. al, v. GMRI, Inc. d/b/a/ Olive Garden*, United States
24 District Court Central District of California, Case No. EDCV-12-0715-JLQ (class certification
25 granted for restaurant workers' rest period claims); *Sawyer v. Retail Data, LLC*, Orange County
26 Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00753767-CU-OE-CXC (unpaid wage and rest break claims
27 for piece rate workers); *Gonzalez v. SFFI Company, Inc., et. al*, San Bernardino County Superior
28 Court, Case No. CIV DS1504287 (unpaid wages, meal period and rest break claims for non-

1 exempt employees); *Antoine v. Riverstone Residential California, Inc., et. al*, Sacramento County
2 Superior Court, Case No. 34-2013-00155974 (rate of pay, on-call time, unpaid wage, meal period,
3 rest break, and expense reimbursement claims for non-exempt employees); *Nguyen v.*
4 *Pharmerica*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00716072-CU-OE-CXC (unpaid
5 wages and unreimbursed expenses for pharmacists); *Orellana v. Westlake*, Los Angeles County
6 Superior Court, Case No. BC539614 (unpaid overtime, meal period and rest break claims for call
7 center employees); *Kent v. Mountain View Child Care, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court,
8 Case No. BC539633 (minimum wage, overtime, meal period, and rest break claims for hospital
9 workers); *Durroh v. East West Bank*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC528860
10 (overtime claims for failure to include bonuses in regular rate of pay for bank workers); *O'Brien*
11 *et al. v. Pizza Hut of Southeast Kansas, Inc. et al.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No
12 MCC 1301030 (meal period and expense reimbursement claims for delivery drivers); *Bell v.*
13 *Prime Healthcare*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00475240-CU-OE-CXC
14 (overtime claims for failure to include shift premiums in regular rate of pay and failure to provide
15 meal and rest periods to hospital workers), *Grana v. Toys R US-Delaware, Inc.*, Central District
16 of California, Case No. 2:13-cv-01302-DSF-JCG (bag check claims for unpaid wages and failure
17 to provide meal periods and rest breaks to retail employees); *Mendez v. H.J. Heinz Company,*
18 *L.P., et. al*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00644915-CU-OE-CXC (failure
19 to pay all wages to factory workers due to rounding practice); *Fresh & Easy Wage and Hour*
20 *Cases*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Cas No. JCCP 4705 (failure to provide meal and rest periods
21 to supermarket workers); *Lunsford v Stater Bros.*, Riverside Superior Court, Case No. RIC
22 1104475 (failure to provide meal and rest periods to supermarket workers); *Gregg v. Belo*,
23 Riverside Superior Court, Case No. RIC 523697 (unpaid wages and missed meal and rest periods
24 due to misclassification of newspaper delivery employees); *Brown v. Experian Information*
25 *Solutions, Inc., et. al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00375163
26 (misclassification of engineers and similar positions); *Tereth v. Shakey's USA, Inc.*, Los Angeles
27 Superior Court, Case No. BC441359 (failure to provide meal and rest periods to restaurant
28 employees); *Azurin v. Harbor Distributing LLC, et. al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No.

1 BC421392 (failure to pay overtime wages, provide meal and rest periods, reimburse business
2 expenses to Account Managers); *Caffero v. ABC* (failure to provide meal periods and reimburse
3 expenses of therapists).

4 14. Samuel A. Wong is a graduate of University of Pennsylvania Law School, where
5 he received his J.D. in 2001. Mr. Wong received a Bachelors of Arts in Sociology from the
6 University of California at Berkeley in 1997.

7 15. After graduation from law school in 2001, the same year in which Mr. Wong took
8 and successfully passed the California Bar Exam, Mr. Wong moved to back to Los Angeles,
9 California where he was employed at Paul Hastings, Janofsky & Walker, LLP. While working in
10 the employment department at Paul Hastings, he was involved in numerous wage and hour class
11 action lawsuits and other employment related matters.

12 16. Mr. Wong became a founding partner of Aegis Law Firm, PC in 2003, and focused
13 his practice on plaintiff's side employment work. Throughout his years of practice, Mr. Wong
14 represented and obtained successful outcomes for his clients, including awards through
15 arbitration and trial.

16 17. Mr. Wong is a member of the Orange County Bar Association, Orange County
17 Trial Lawyers Association, and California Employment Lawyers Association.

18 18. Mr. Wong was chosen by Law and Politics Magazine as a Super Lawyer Rising
19 Star, representing one of the top 2.5% of lawyers under 40 in Southern California in 2011, 2012,
20 2013, and 2014. He was chosen by Law and Politics Magazine as a Super Lawyer in 2015, 2016,
21 2017, and 2018. Mr. Wong was also chosen as a Top Attorney in the field of employment law by
22 OC Metro in 2014, 2015, and 2018. Mr. Wong currently bills at a rate of \$950 per hour.

23 19. Kashif Haque received his J.D. in 2001 from Washington University School of
24 Law. While in law school, Mr. Haque was a member of the Law Review Editorial Board, author
25 of an article published in the Law Review, Executive Board Member of Moot Court, and a
26 member of the Dean's List. He received a Bachelor's of Science in Business Administration from
27 the University of Central Missouri in 1998, where he was a member of the Beta Alpha Psi honors
28 fraternity.

1 20. Since 2004, Mr. Haque has exclusively focused his practice on plaintiff's
2 employment litigation with a specific focus on wage and hour claims. Since then, he has
3 represented over 500,000 employees with their employment claims, many of which included
4 wage and hour claims. He has been appointed class counsel in over 100 cases and is currently
5 litigating over 150 employment wage and hour class action cases.

6 21. Mr. Haque authored a book on employment litigation strategies with West
7 Publishing and has been invited to speak on class action and wage and hour issues on numerous
8 occasions. He has spoken at seminars by the State Bar of California, California Employment
9 Lawyer's Association (CELA), Orange County Bar Association, and various other CLE
10 providers. Mr. Haque is the former Chair for the Labor and Employment Section of the Orange
11 County Bar Association. He was selected as one of the Top 50 Attorneys in Orange County by
12 Super Lawyers for 2017 and 2019. He has been a Super Lawyer for every year from 2009 to the
13 present. OC Register/Metro has selected him as one of the Top 5 Employment Lawyers in Orange
14 County for every year the list was published, from 2012 to 2021. Mr. Haque currently bills at a
15 rate of \$950 an hour.

16 22. Jessica L. Campbell is a partner at Aegis Law Firm. Ms. Campbell was admitted
17 to the California Bar in December of 2011, and received her J.D. from Santa Clara University
18 School of Law and her B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley. Ms. Campbell has
19 dedicated her career to plaintiffs' side class actions. Ms. Campbell's experience includes
20 successful work on class action appeals, class certification motions, and class settlements. She
21 was chosen by Law and Politics Magazine as a Super Lawyer Rising Star, representing one of
22 the top 2.5% of lawyers under 40 in Southern California in 2018-2021. Ms. Campbell currently
23 bills at \$800 an hour.

24 23. I am an associate at Aegis Law Firm. I was admitted to the California Bar in
25 December of 2017. I received my J.D. from Loyola Law School, and B.A. from California State
26 University, Fullerton. I have worked exclusively on wage and hour class and representative action
27 litigation since joining Aegis Law Firm in 2019, including on successful class certification motions,
28 approval of class action and PAGA settlements, management of cases through the course of

1 litigation, and with success in the Court of Appeals. Prior to joining Aegis Law Firm, my experience
2 includes defense-side employment law litigation. I currently bill at \$625.00 an hour.

3 **Class Counsel's Fees and Costs**

4 24. Aegis' hourly rates are comparable to those charged by other class action
5 plaintiff's counsel and the firms defending class actions. *See*
6 <http://www.laffeymatrix.com/see.html> (Laffey Matrix); *see also* *see e.g., Ellis v. Harder Mech.*
7 *Contractors, Inc.*, No. 21-CV-00844-JSW, 2023 WL 2620145, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2023)
8 (finding "hourly rates of \$950 for partners and \$675 for senior associates" to be "reasonable and
9 consistent with the rates charged by other attorneys with similar experience"). Our attorneys have
10 specifically been approved at these rates. *See Victor Rangel v. President and Board of Trustees*
11 *of Santa Clara College*, Santa Clara Superior Court, Case No. 23CV413920, Order dated August
12 15, 2024 (approving Jessica Campbell at \$800 per hour, stating "counsel's hourly rates are
13 reasonable"); *Denise Hands v. Central California Faculty Medical Group, Inc.*, Fresno County
14 Superior Court, Case No. 22CECG00474 Order dated March 11, 2025, (approving rates for
15 Samuel Wong, Jessica Campbell, Joseph Szilagyi [\$625], stating "The hourly rates...appear to be
16 in line with what other Southern California attorneys of similar background and experience
17 charge."); *Karen Hecker v. Mathew Enterprise, Inc.*, Santa Clara County, Case No. 22CV405334,
18 Order dated August 21, 2024, (finding \$600 per hour reasonable for an Aegis class action
19 associate attorney barred in 2018).

20 25. Aegis' current lodestar reflects 380.60 hours of work resulting in \$293,582.50 in
21 fees, excluding the time Class Counsel will spend at the final approval hearing and helping with
22 Settlement Administration after final approval.

23 26. Aegis dedicated significant resources to this case by dividing the tasks required
24 according to skill level, and the professional hours generated by each attorney are neither
25 unreasonable nor duplicative. This time could have been spent on other potentially lucrative
26 cases. Aegis' lodestar reflects the efficiencies achieved by a law firm experienced in this field.
27 The chart below shows the calculation of hours spent by each of Aegis' attorneys on this case.
28

Attorney	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Samuel Wong	46.3	\$950.00	\$43,985.00
Kashif Haque	77.4	\$950.00	\$73,530.00
Jessica L. Campbell	88.6	\$800.00	\$70,880.00
Joseph M. Szilagyi	168.3	\$625.00	\$105,187.50
Totals	380.60		\$293,582.50

27. Aegis bore the entire risk of recovery. Aegis took this case on a pure contingency basis, with no guarantee of any payment. Before mediation, Aegis spent significant time in formal discovery and preparing for multiple mediations despite the risk of recovering nothing. Had the litigation continued, Defendant would undoubtedly have mounted an aggressive defense at the certification stage and at the merits stage. A defeat at one of these stages could have foreclosed the possibility of Aegis recovering any remuneration for their time and effort. Given the extensive exchange of evidence and exhaustive negotiations in this case, Aegis has achieved a large settlement through efficient and diligent work.

28. In litigation costs, Aegis has spent \$42,385.71 on items such as filing fees, copies, postage, a discovery referee, mediation fees, and other fees related to the litigation. A true and correct copy of Aegis' Cost Report is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. All of the costs were reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this case.

Exhibits

1. A true and correct copy of the correspondence received by my office upon my office's submission of the Parties' CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND CLASS NOTICE to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

2. A true and correct copy of the correspondence received by my office upon my office's submission of the Parties' AMENDMENT TO CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

3. A true and correct copy of Class Counsel's cost report for costs incurred in this action is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

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

3
4 Executed on July 7, 2025 at Irvine, California.


5 
6 _____
Joseph M. Szilagyi

EXHIBIT 1

Joseph Szilagyi

From: DIR PAGA Unit <no-reply@formassembly.com> on behalf of DIR PAGA Unit
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2024 2:36 PM
To: jszilagyi@aegislawfirm.com
Subject: Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

10/29/2024 02:35:49 PM

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm

EXHIBIT 2

Joseph Szilagyi

From: DIR PAGA Unit <no-reply@formassembly.com> on behalf of DIR PAGA Unit
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2025 2:29 PM
To: jszilagyi@aegislawfirm.com
Subject: Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

01/13/2025 02:28:57 PM

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm

EXHIBIT 3

Matter Billing Detail

Report Date: 7/1/2025
 Report Time: 4:33PM
 Page: 1 of 3
 User ID: Carlsen

Aegis Law Firm, PC

Date Range: 01/01/1900 to 07/01/2025
 Client: 547433 - Tracy Hoge
 Matter: 585 - Hoge v. Bethany Home Society of San Joaquin County

Date	Expense Code	Description	Debit	Credit	Billing Status	On Hold	Invoice Number	Check Number	Payee
		Balance Forward:	\$0.00						
12/28/2020	FF	Filing Fee- LWDA Claim	\$75.00		Unbilled				
12/28/2020	FF	Filing Fee- S & C	\$1,435.00		Unbilled				
12/28/2020	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee- S & C	\$142.99		Unbilled				
02/10/2021	SOP	Service of Process - S&C	\$180.50		Unbilled				
05/05/2021	FF	Filing Fee - MTC Further Responses to RPDs	\$60.00		Unbilled				
05/05/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - MTC Further Responses to RPDs	\$117.74		Unbilled				
05/05/2021	FF	Filing Fee - MTC Further Responses to SPROGs	\$60.00		Unbilled				
05/05/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - MTC Further Responses to SPROGs	\$107.54		Unbilled				
05/17/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - Further Ntc of MTCs	\$77.94		Unbilled				
06/03/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - Consolidated Reply ISO MTCS	\$77.94		Unbilled				
06/07/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - Opp. to Mtn for Protective Order	\$115.34		Unbilled				
06/07/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - Opp to MTC Written Discovery	\$250.49		Unbilled				
06/10/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - CMS	\$77.94		Unbilled				
06/11/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - Mtn for Leave to File FAC	\$122.99		Unbilled				
06/28/2021	FF	Filing Fee - Mtn for Leave to File FAC	\$60.00		Unbilled				
06/28/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - Mtn for Leave to File FAC	\$125.39		Unbilled				
08/09/2021	AFF	Administrative Filing Fee - FAC	\$84.74		Unbilled				
10/01/2021	FF	Filing Fee - CMC stmt	\$77.94		Unbilled				
10/06/2021	FF	Vendor: JOHN ANTHONY ABBOTT; Date: 10/6/2021 - Referee costs for discovery motions	\$4,940.00		Unbilled			995800	JOHN ANTHONY ABBOTT
10/06/2021	FF	Vendor: ERICKSEN ARBUTHNOT KILDUFF DAY & LINDSTROM, INC; Date: 10/6/2021 - Discovery Motions - Referee	\$2,070.00		Unbilled			995801	ERICKSEN ARBUTHNOT KIL

Matter Billing Detail

Report Date: 7/1/2025
 Report Time: 4:33PM
 Page: 2 of 3
 User ID: Carlsen

Aegis Law Firm, PC

Date	Expense Code	Description	Debit	Credit	Billing Status	On Hold	Invoice Number	Check Number	Payee
05/09/2022	FF	Filing Fee - Opp to Mtn to Consolidate	\$81.21		Unbilled				
06/21/2022	FF	Filing Fee - Opp to Mtn for PO	\$154.31		Unbilled				
06/21/2022	FF	Filing Fee - Opp to Mtn for Waiver	\$181.51		Unbilled				
09/14/2022	MED	Vendor: Signature Resolution; Date: 9/14/2022 - Mediation Services-	\$5,950.00		Unbilled			996084	Signature Resolution
10/03/2022	EXP	Vendor: Berger Consulting Group, LLC; Date: 10/3/2022 - Expert Witness Fee-	\$4,150.00		Unbilled			996097	Berger Consulting Group, LLC
12/27/2022	FF	Filing Fee	\$99.96		Unbilled				
01/18/2023	EX	Vendor: John A. Abbott; Date: 1/18/2023 - Discovery Referee charges - motion waivers	\$1,780.00		Unbilled			996221	John A. Abbott
02/27/2023	CTC	Conference Call	\$1.27		Unbilled				
03/01/2023	CTC	Conference Call	\$17.78		Unbilled				
03/24/2023	EX	Vendor: Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith; Date: 3/24/2023 - Expert Fees-	\$1,994.00		Unbilled			996310	Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith
03/24/2023	EX	Vendor: John A. Abbott; Date: 3/24/2023 - Expert Fees-	\$1,960.00		Unbilled			996311	John A. Abbott
06/20/2023	FF	Filing Fee	\$194.26		Unbilled				
06/22/2023	FF	Filing Fee	\$102.11		Unbilled				
07/12/2023	FF	Filing Fee	\$103.76		Unbilled				
07/13/2023	FF	Filing Fee	\$1,412.81		Unbilled				
10/19/2023	FF	Filing Fee	\$105.31		Unbilled				
10/25/2023	FF	Filing Fee	\$125.31		Unbilled				
02/13/2024	MED	Vendor: Signature Resolution; Date: 2/13/2024 - Mediation Services-	\$4,650.00		Unbilled			996711	Signature Resolution
03/29/2024	EXP	Vendor: Berger Consulting Group, LLC; Date: 3/29/2024 - Expert Witness Fee-	\$6,165.00		Unbilled			996768	Berger Consulting Group, LLC
07/05/2024	FF	Filing Fee	\$112.09		Unbilled				
10/07/2024	FF	Filing Fee	\$142.69		Unbilled				
10/16/2024	FF	Filing Fee	\$132.94		Unbilled				
10/17/2024	FF	Filing Fee	\$121.89		Unbilled				
01/21/2025	FF	Filing Fee	\$270.19		Unbilled				
01/29/2025	FF	Filing Fee	\$131.79		Unbilled				
02/05/2025	FF	Filing Fee	\$113.79		Unbilled				
07/01/2025	CC	Cumulative Copies, Faxes, Scans, Postage	\$1,872.25		Unbilled				

Matter Billing Detail

Aegis Law Firm, PC

Date	Expense Code	Description	Debit	Credit	Billing Status	On Hold	Invoice Number	Check Number	Payee
		Total:	<u>\$42,385.71</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>					
		Balance:	<u>\$42,385.71</u>						
Total Fees Billed-		-----	\$0.00						
Total Fees Unbilled :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Fees Received :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Soft Cost Billed :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Soft Cost Unbilled :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Soft Cost Received :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Hard Cost Billed :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Hard Cost Unbilled :		-----	\$42,385.71						
Total Hard Cost Received :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Taxes Billed :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Taxes Unbilled :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Taxes Received :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Late Charges Billed :		-----	\$0.00						
Total Late Charges Unbilled:		-----	\$0.00						
Total Late Charges Received :		-----	\$0.00						
Trust Balance:		-----	\$0.00						