

Karen I. Gold (State Bar No. 258360)
kgold@blackstonepc.com
Sara Pezeshkpour (State Bar No. 260240)
spezeshkpour@blackstonepc.com
Noam Y. Reiffman (State Bar No. 299446)
nreiffman@blackstonepc.com
Marissa A. Mayhood (State Bar No. 334376)
mmayhood@blackstonepc.com

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278/ Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Brittnei Aghedo, Ieasha Peters, and
Jimmy Quevedo and the Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

BRITTNEI AGHEDO and IEASHA PETERS,
individually and on behalf of others similarly
situated, and JIMMY QUEVEDO, individually,
on behalf of others similarly situated and
aggrieved employees pursuant to the California
Private Attorneys General Act

Plaintiff,

vs.

VILLA ESPERANZA SERVICES, a California
501(c)(3) non-profit organization; and DOES 1
through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23STCV27362

Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl
Department SS12

**DECLARATION OF PAUL K. HAINES IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
AND PAGA SETTLEMENT, ATTORNEYS'
FEES AND COSTS, ENHANCEMENT
PAYMENTS, AND SETTLEMENT
ADMINISTRATION COSTS**

Date: November 4, 2025
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Dept: 12

Complaint Filed: November 6, 2023
FAC Filed: March 13, 2025
Trial Date: Not Set

1 Paul K. Haines (State Bar No. 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
2 Sean M. Blakely (State Bar No. 264384)
sblakely@haineslawgroup.com
3 **HAINES LAW GROUP, APC**
4 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
5 Tel: (424) 292-2350 / Fax: (424) 292-2355

6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Brittnei Aghedo, Ieasha Peters, and
7 Jimmy Quevedo and the Class
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 I, PAUL K. HAINES, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a shareholder and principal of Haines Law Group, APC, and counsel for the named
3 Plaintiff Jimmy Quevedo ("Plaintiff") and the proposed Settlement Class in the above-captioned
4 matter. I am a member in good standing of the bar of the State of California and am admitted to
5 practice in this Court. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration and could testify
6 competently to them if called upon to do so.

7 2. I am a 2006 graduate of Pepperdine University School of Law, where I graduated cum
8 laude. During law school, I worked as a law clerk for the appellate firm of Horvitz & Levy, located in
9 Encino, California. I also spent a semester in law school working as an extern for the Honorable
10 Edward Rafeedie, District Judge for the United States District Court for the Central District of
11 California.

12 3. Since graduating from law school, my practice has focused almost exclusively on
13 employment litigation. In September 2007, I began working as an associate attorney at the
14 international law firm of Littler Mendelson P.C., at its Los Angeles office, which according to its
15 website is the "largest U.S.-based law firm exclusively devoted to representing management in every
16 aspect of labor and employment law." While at Littler Mendelson, I was primarily staffed on wage
17 and hour class actions venued in both state and federal courts, and I also worked on a number of single
18 and multi-plaintiff wage and hour matters as well.

19 4. During my employment at Littler Mendelson, I played a significant role in the class
20 actions that I was staffed on, as I was often the only associate staffed on such cases. In particular, I
21 received a wide-array of wage and hour class action experience performing the following types of
22 tasks: drafting demurrers, motions to strike and/or dismiss; removing actions from state court to
23 federal court; drafting and responding to written discovery; drafting and opposing discovery related
24 motions; arguing discovery related motions; drafting motions to consolidate related matters;
25 interviewing putative class members and obtaining declarations in connection with class certification;
26 drafting oppositions to motions for class certification; drafting motions for decertification following
27 class certification; conducting exposure analyses to assess the strengths and weaknesses of asserted
28 claims, the likelihood of prevailing at class certification and potential damages resulting from such

1 claims; drafting mediation briefs; serving as the primary contact to in-house counsel; deposing named
2 plaintiffs and putative class members; deposing retained expert witnesses; and defending the
3 depositions of corporate witnesses. In short, I played an integral role in all aspects of litigation from
4 the inception of a matter through and beyond class certification. I also supervised the work of several
5 junior attorneys who were staffed on the same wage and hour class actions.

6 5. In June 2011, I voluntarily resigned from Littler Mendelson in order to accept an
7 associate attorney position with the international law firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, at its
8 Los Angeles office, where I began working in July 2011. During my employment at Morgan, Lewis
9 & Bockius LLP, I worked exclusively on the defense of wage and hour class and collective actions.
10 For the vast majority of these cases, I was the only associate staffed on the matter, and I performed
11 the same job duties as described in the immediately preceding paragraph. In addition to working on
12 wage and hour class actions, I also worked on a number of “hybrid” actions asserting nationwide wage
13 and hour claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), as well as California-specific claims
14 under Rule 23 of the Rules of Civil Procedure.

15 6. In July 2012, I transitioned into litigating wage and hour class actions from the
16 Plaintiff’s side, first as a Partner with the law firm of Boren, Osher & Luftman, LLP, and since
17 February 2016, as a Shareholder of the Haines Law Group, APC. Currently, over ninety percent (90%)
18 of my practice is dedicated exclusively to the prosecution of wage and hour class actions, and I am
19 currently responsible for prosecuting over fifty (50) wage and hour class actions filed in both State
20 and Federal courts throughout California. I have been appointed as Class Counsel in hundreds of wage
21 and hour class action settlements in state and federal courts within California. A few examples of the
22 matters in which I have been appointed as Class Counsel, all of which have been granted final
23 approval, include the following: *Sanchez v. Res-Care, Inc.*, Case No. BC526175, California Superior
24 Court, County of Los Angeles, Hon. John Shepard Wiley, Jr., presiding; *Prado v. Warehouse Demo*
25 *Services, Inc.*, Case No. CV14-3170 JFW (Ex), United States District Court, Central District of
26 California, Hon. John F. Walter presiding; *Tesla Motors Wage and Hour Litigation*, JCCP 4792,
27 California Superior Court, Santa Clara County, Hon. Peter H. Kirwan presiding; *Bower v. Cycle Gear,*
28 *Inc.*, Case No. CV14-2712 HSG, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Hon.

Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. presiding; *Longstreth v. PAQ, Inc., dba Food 4 Less*, Case No. 15CV-0206, California Superior Court, County of San Luis Obispo, Hon. Charles S. Crandall presiding; *Nunez v. CompuCom Systems, Inc.*, Case No. BC618385, California Superior Court, County of Los Angeles, Hon. John Shepard Wiley, Jr. presiding; *Mansilla v. Haeco Americas Line Services, LLC, et al*, Case No. BC615310, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Hon. Elihu M. Berle presiding; *Leverage, et al v. Traeger Pellet Grills, LLC, et al*, Case No. 4:16-cv-00784-KAW, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Hon. Kandis A. Westmore presiding.

7. I have also moved to certify and have received an order certifying a class action and/or conditionally certifying a collective action, in the following cases:

- *Medeiros v. Vortex Financial Management Inc.*, Case No. 30-2013-00644741-CU-OE-CXC, California Superior Court, County of Orange, Honorable Judge Gail A. Andler, presiding (certifying a class of employees who were misclassified as independent contractors);
- *Javine v. San Luis Ambulance Service, Inc.*, Case No. CV13-07480 BRO (SSx), United States District Court, Central District of California, Honorable Judge Beverly Reid O'Connell, presiding (conditionally certifying an unpaid FLSA overtime wage class);
- *Prado v. Warehouse Demo Services, Inc.*, Case No. CV14-3170 JFW (Ex), United States District Court, Central District of California, Honorable Judge John F. Walter, presiding (certifying a rest period violation class and conditionally certifying an FLSA unpaid overtime wage class);
- *Bower v. Cycle Gear, Inc.*, Case No. CV14-2712 HSG, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Honorable Judge Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr., presiding (conditionally certifying an unpaid FLSA overtime wage class);
- *Vega v. Weatherford U.S., Limited Partnership*, Case No. CV14-1790-JLT, United States District Court, Eastern District of California, Honorable Jennifer L. Thurston, presiding (conditionally certifying an unpaid FLSA overtime wage class);
- *Galvan v. AMVAC Chemical Corporation*, Case No. 30-2014-00716103-CU-OE-CXC, California Superior Court, County of Orange, Honorable Judge William Claster, presiding (certifying unpaid overtime wage class and waiting time penalty class);

- 1 • *Camacho v. Residential Fire Systems, Inc.*, Case No. 30-2015-775372-CU-OE-CXC,
2 California Superior Court, County of Orange, Honorable Glenda Sanders, presiding (certifying
3 piece rate pay plan classes, expense reimbursement class, wage statement class, and waiting
4 time penalties class);
- 5 • *Ontiveros v. Safelite Fulfillment, Inc., et al*, Case No. CV 15-7118-DMG (RAOx), United
6 States District Court, Central District of California, Honorable Dolly M. Gee presiding
7 (certifying six classes of employees for rest period violations, wage statement violations, meal
8 period violations, and overtime and double-time violations);
- 9 • *Vazquez, et al v. Kraft Heinz Foods Company*, Case No. 16-cv-2749-WQH-BLM, United
10 States District Court, Southern District of California, Honorable William Q. Hayes presiding
11 (certifying six classes of employees for unpaid wages, meal period violations, wage statement
12 violations, and waiting time penalties);
- 13 • *Caudle, et al. v. Sprint/United Management Company, et al.* Case No. C 17-06874-WHA,
14 United States District Court, Northern District of California, Honorable William H. Alsup
15 presiding (certifying three classes of employees for unlawful wage deduction violations, wage
16 statement violations, and waiting time violations);
- 17 • *Staublein v. Wells Fargo Bank*, No. CIVDS1712267, San Bernardino County Superior Court,
18 Honorable David S. Cohn presiding (certifying wage statement class);
- 19 • *Perez v. Sunbelt Rentals, Inc.* Case No. 37-2018-00026405-CU-OE-CTL, California Superior
20 Court, County of San Diego, Honorable Eddie C. Sturgeon presiding (certifying class of
21 employees for wage statement violations);
- 22 • *Bowlin-Burdick, et al v. Life Care Centers of America, Inc.*, Case No. BC657139, Los Angeles
23 County Superior Court, Honorable Maren E. Nelson presiding (certifying four classes for meal
24 period violations, rest period violations, wage statement violations, and waiting time
25 penalties);
- 26 • *McDonald, et al. v. Sierra Pacific Industries*, Case No. 191133, Shasta County Superior Court,
27 Hon. Tamara L. Wood (certifying eight classes for meal period violations, rest period
28 violations, unpaid wages, unreimbursed business expenses, wage statement violations, and

1 waiting time penalties);

- 2 • *Danica N. Keich, et al. v. U.S. Healthworks, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 37-2017-00015343-CU-OE-
3 CTL, San Diego County Superior Court, Honorable Eddie C. Sturgeon, presiding (certifying
4 classes for rest period violations, meal period violations, on-call pay violations, wage
5 statement violations, and waiting time violations);
- 6 • *George Gomez v. The Bedrock Company*, Case No. CIVDS1824255, San Bernardino County
7 Superior Court, Honorable David Cohn, presiding (certifying claims for unpaid overtime and
8 minimum wage violations, meal period violations, rest period violations, wage statement
9 violations, and waiting time penalties); and
- 10 • *Aurora Gatica v. Valley Ag, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 19CECG03018, Fresno County Superior
11 Court, Honorable Tyler D. Tharpe, presiding (certifying claims for meal period violations, rest
12 period violations, wage statement violations, and waiting time penalties).

13 8. In 2015, 2016, and 2017, Thomson Reuters recognized me as a Top Young Attorney
14 in Southern California in the annual Rising Stars Edition of Super Lawyer. This is an honor awarded
15 to no more than two-and-a-half percent of attorneys under the age of forty in Southern California each
16 year. In 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021, Thomson Reuters recognized me as a “Super Lawyer” in the
17 annual Super Lawyer magazine, an honor awarded to no more than five percent of all attorneys in
18 Southern California each year.

19 9. As co-counsel for Plaintiffs and the proposed Settlement Class, I have been intimately
20 involved in every aspect of this case, and I believe that the proposed Settlement is a favorable result
21 for the Settlement Class.

22 10. On February 21, 2024, Plaintiff Jimmy Quevedo, through my office, filed a class action
23 lawsuit entitled *Jimmy Quevedo v. Villa Esperanza Services*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No.
24 24STCV04374 (the “*Quevedo Action*”). The *Quevedo Action* alleged causes of action for meal period
25 violations, rest period violations, wage statement violations, and unfair competition.

26 11. After the filing of the *Quevedo Action*, I was informed that there was another pending
27 wage and hour class action pending against Defendant in the matter entitled *Brittini Aghedo, et al. v.*
28 *Villa Esperanza Services*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV27362 (“*Aghedo Action*”).

On July 18, 2024, the Court related the *Aghedo* Action and *Quevedo* Action and designated the *Aghedo* Action the lead case. Both cases are assigned to Department 12 at the Spring Street Courthouse for all purposes.

12. On August 13 2024, all Parties participated in an all-day global mediation with Marc Feder to resolve the *Quevedo* Action and the *Aghedo* Action. The Parties did not reach a settlement at mediation, however, through continued negotiations through Mr. Feder, the Parties ultimately reached a global class-wide settlement of the *Quevedo* Action and the *Aghedo* Action. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement reached in these matters, a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint was filed in the *Aghedo* Action which added Plaintiff Quevedo as a named plaintiff and class representative. On April 25, 2025, The *Quevedo* Action was dismissed without prejudice.

13. In my experience in wage and hour class actions matters similar to this one, fee awards generally average around one-third of the gross recovery.

14. Since undertaking representation of Plaintiff Quevedo, my office has borne all the costs of litigation without receiving any compensation to date. During this time, my office has expended \$1,975.48 in costs and have devoted substantial time to this litigation. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a report reflecting these costs, which include but are not limited to: filing fees, messenger fees, service fees, and postage.

15. In this case, my firm has a lodestar of approximately \$63,470.00. A general summary showing the number of hours of work performed by each attorney and paralegals is set forth below. The billing rates used are reasonable in view of the evidence submitted herewith.

Name	Rate	Hours	Pre-Multiplier Lodestar
Paul K. Haines (19th Year Attorney)	\$925	15.6	\$14,430.00
Sean M. Blakely (16th Year Attorney)	\$825	45.7	\$37,702.50
Aden M. Khachadoorian (3rd Year Attorney)	\$500	20.4	\$10,200.00
Firm Paralegals	\$175	6.5	\$1,137.50
Total Lodestar			\$63,470.00

16. My proposed hourly rate of \$925, Mr. Blakely's proposed hourly rate of \$825, Mr. Khachadoorian's proposed hourly rate of \$500, and the proposed \$175 hourly rate for paralegals, are

1 reasonable in light of our respective skills, wage and hour class action experience, reputation, and fee
2 awards to other attorneys of similar experience in California and are in line with rates at which I and
3 the other attorneys in my firm have been approved in other matters.

4 17. The respective hourly rates are also in line with the current *Laffey* Matrix, a true and
5 correct copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**. The *Laffey* Matrix has been recognized by
6 California courts as “a widely recognized compilation of attorney and paralegal rates based on various
7 levels of experience.” *Theme Promotions, Inc. v. News America Mktg. FSI, Inc.*, 731 F.Supp.2d 937,
8 948 (N.D. Cal. 2010); *see also Reed v. 1-800 Contacts, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-02359 JM (BGS), 2014 WL
9 29011 at **8-9 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 2, 2014) (cross-checking requested hourly rates against the *Laffey*
10 Matrix and finding that “the *Laffey* matrix lends further credibility” to counsel’s requested hourly
11 rates).

12 18. Plaintiffs also seek Enhancement Payments of \$7,500.00 each, and I believe this
13 amount is reasonable. Plaintiffs’ requested Enhancement Payments are in recognition of the time and
14 effort they expended on behalf of the Settlement Class. Throughout this case, Plaintiffs expended
15 substantial time and effort on behalf of the Settlement Class, including providing factual information
16 and documents to counsel, attending meetings with counsel to discuss the claims and theories at issue
17 in the litigation, and otherwise actively participating in the prosecution of their claims. Accordingly,
18 I believe Plaintiffs’ requested Enhancement Payments are reasonable and should be approved.

19 19. My firm, Haines Law Group, APC, has entered into a fee-sharing agreement in this
20 case with my co-counsel, Blackstone Law APC. Under the terms of the agreement, any attorneys’ fees
21 awarded by the Court will be allocated as follows: 80% to Blackstone Law APC; and 20% to Haines
22 Law Group, APC. This fee sharing agreement was expressly agreed to in writing by Plaintiffs pursuant
23 to California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.5.1 (formerly California Rule of Professional Conduct
24 2-200(A)).

25 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
26 is true and correct. Executed on October 7, 2025, at El Segundo, California.

27 

28
Paul K. Haines

EXHIBIT A

October 07, 2025

Jimmy Quevedo

Additional Charges :

			<u>Qty/Price</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2/21/2024	ALL	First legal's filing fee for: Complaint;Civil Case Cover Sheet;Summons Order #: 5625674 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges + Adv/wit ck + Check charge	1 1,508.55	1,508.55
	ALL	Filing fee for: LWDA. Order #: ORD-000272000	1 75.00	75.00
2/22/2024	ALL	First legal's filing fee for: Notice of Posting of Jury Fees Order #: 5627517 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges + Adv/wit ck + Check charge	1 172.15	172.15
2/29/2024	ALL	Postage for February, 2024.	1 14.72	14.72
	ALL	Copying cost for February, 2024.	8 0.25	2.00
3/8/2024	ALL	First legal's filing fee for: Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint) Order #: 5645834 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges	1 16.15	16.15
3/21/2024	ALL	First legal's filing fee for: Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt Order #: 5662316 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges	1 16.15	16.15
3/31/2024	ALL	Postage for March, 2024.	1 3.71	3.71
	ALL	Copying cost for March, 2024.	45 0.25	11.25

10/7/2025

		<u>Qty/Price</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4/29/2024	IDLC First legal's filing fee for: Amended Complaint Order #: 5712095 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges	1 16.15	16.15
6/6/2024	ALL First legal's filing fee for: Joint Stipulation to Continue Initial Status Conference; [Proposed] Order; Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint); Joint Stipulation to Continue Initial Status Conference; [Proposed] Order. Order #: 5761079 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges + Adv/wit ck + Check charge	1 36.95	36.95
6/7/2024	ALL First legal's filing fee for: Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint) Order #: 5762081 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges	1 16.15	16.15
	IDLC LA County document purchase fee for: Initial status conference report: Joint initial status conference statement. Receipt #: PA-2024-274597702	1 5.40	5.40
6/14/2024	ALL First legal's filing fee for: Notice of Ruling Order #: 5772162 Direct E-filing Base charge + Additional charges	1 16.15	16.15
8/31/2024	ML Copying cost for August, 2024.	4 0.25	1.00
9/17/2024	IDLC First legal's filing fee for: Joint Stipulation to Continue September 24, 2024, Further Status Conference; [Proposed] Order; Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint); Joint Stipulation to Continue September 24, 2024, Further Status Conference; [Proposed] Order. Order #: 5888675 Direct E-filing Base charge	1 11.95	11.95
4/24/2025	ML First Legal's filing fee for Request for Dismissal; Declaration of Sean M. Blakely in Support of Plaintiff's Request for Dismissal of Entire Action Without Prejudice; [Proposed] Order Granting Plaintiff's Request for Dismissal of Entire Action Without Prejudice; Proof of Service (not Summons and Complaint); Declaration of Sean M. Blakely in Support of Plaintiff's Request for Dismissal of Entire Action Without Prejudice Order #: 17214438	1 18.70	18.70

10/7/2025

		<u>Qty/Price</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4/28/2025	IO First Legal service fee for Notice of Entry of Dismissal and Proof of Service Invoice #: 17218674	1 5.55	5.55
	IO First Legal filing fee for Notice of Entry of Dismissal and Proof of Service Invoice #: 17218665	1 18.70	18.70
7/7/2025	IO LA Superior Court Document Purchase: Order Granting Prelim Approval. Receipt Number: PA-2025-318762102	1 8.60	8.60
9/30/2025	ML Copying cost for September, 2025.	1 0.25	0.25
	ML Copying cost for September, 2025.	1 0.25	0.25
Total additional charges			<u>\$1,975.48</u>
Balance due			<u><u>\$1,975.48</u></u>

EXHIBIT B

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 +
6/01/24- 5/31/25	1.080182	\$258	\$473	\$581	\$839	\$948	\$1141
6/01/23- 5/31/24	1.059295	\$239	\$437	\$538	\$777	\$878	\$1057
6/01/22- 5/31/23	1.085091	\$225	\$413	\$508	\$733	\$829	\$997
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)

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