

1 Robert Ahdoot, SBN 172098
rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com
2 Tina Wolfson, SBN 174806
twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com
3 Theodore Maya, SBN 223242
tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com
4 **AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC**
10728 Lindbrook Dr.
5 Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: 310-474-9111; Fax: 310-474-8585

6 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs,*
7 Julian Mena, Todd Schreiber, Nate Coolidge,
and Ernesto Mejia

8 Mike Arias, SBN 115385
9 mike@asstlawyers.com
Alfredo Torrijos, SBN 222458
10 alfredo@asstlawyers.com
11 **ARIAS, SANGUINETTI, STAHL &
TORRIJOS, LLP**
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1400
12 Los Angeles, California 90045-7504
Tel: 310-844-9696; Fax: 310-861-0168

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs,*
14 Byron McKnight

15 *(Additional counsel on signature page)*

16
17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

19 BYRON MCKNIGHT, JULIAN MENA, TODD
20 SCHREIBER, NATE COOLIDGE, and
21 ERNESTO MEJIA, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware
25 Corporation, and RASIER, LLC, a Delaware
Limited Liability Company,

26 Defendants.
27
28

Case No. 3:14-cv-05615-JST

The Honorable Jon S. Tigar

**DECLARATION OF ROBERT AHDOOT IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
EXPENSES**

Date: February 8, 2018

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Place: Courtroom 9 – 19th Floor

DECLARATION OF ROBERT AHDOOT

I, Robert Ahdoot, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner and founding member of Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC (“AW”), a member in good standing of the bar of the State of California, and designated by the Court as Class Counsel in this matter. I respectfully submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and could and will testify competently to them if called upon to do so.

CLASS COUNSEL’S LITIGATION AND SETTLEMENT EFFORTS

2. Even before initiating the Actions, AW conducted extensive research regarding Defendants’ representations, marketing, business practices, and promotional efforts. AW investigated facts and the applicable law and standards relating to background checks and commercial transportation service safety, and AW researched and analyzed the merits of any potential causes of action and defenses. AW continued these efforts after filing the Actions and before entering into the 2016 Stipulated Settlement and the 2017 Amended Settlement.

3. During the post-filing investigative phase, AW submitted comprehensive requests for information regarding their allegations and Defendants’ anticipated defenses, and Defendants provided thousands of pages of responsive documents and sworn responses. AW thoroughly analyzed and evaluated all information provided, including documents bearing on Defendants’ background checks, alleged safety expenditures, the Safe Rides Fee and resulting revenues, and Defendants’ representations, advertising, and marketing regarding safety.

4. AW’s investigation also included a detailed inspection and testing of Defendants’ ride share App across various operating system platforms; consultations with experts; interviews of witnesses, drivers, and putative class members; the evaluation of documents and information related to other litigation against Defendants; as well as extensive factual and legal research regarding arbitration, the sufficiency of the claims, and the appropriateness of class certification.

5. AW conducted ten extensive interviews of key witnesses over the course of three days at Uber’s offices and other locations in San Francisco. These witnesses included high-level Uber employees with direct knowledge of facts at issue in the Actions, including safety representations, safety

1 measures, alleged safety expenditures, details regarding the Safe Rides Fee, user databases, and other
2 relevant areas of Uber's operations.

3 6. AW also analyzed the pleadings and motion practice in many of the related cases before
4 this court, as well as additional cases involving Uber's safety messaging. These cases included
5 *California v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. CGC-14-543120 (S.F. Sup. Ct.), *Cordas v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No.
6 16-CV-04065-RS (N.D. Cal.), *Cullinane v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. CV 14-14750-DPW (D. Mass.),
7 *Curbia v. Uber Techs, Inc.*, No. A-16-CA-544-SS (W.D. Tex.), *Goldberg v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. 1:14-
8 cv-14264-RGS (D. Mass.), *Greater Houston Transportation Co. v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. 14-941 (S.D.
9 Tex.), *In re Uber FCRA Litig.*, No. C-14-5200 EMC (N.D. Cal.), *L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. v. Uber*
10 *Techs., Inc.*, No. 15-cv-01257-JST (N.D. Cal.), *Lavitman v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. 2012-04490 (Mass.),
11 *Metter v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. 16-CV-06652-RS (N.D. Cal.), *Meyer v. Kalanick*, 200 F. Supp. 3d 408,
12 420 (S.D.N.Y. 2016), *O'Connor v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 201 F. Supp. 3d 1110 (N.D. Cal. 2016), *Price v.*
13 *Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. BC554512 (L.A. Sup. Ct.), and *Sabatino v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, No. 15-cv-00363
14 (N.D. Cal.).

15 7. In December 2014, Counsel for plaintiffs Philliben and McKnight prepared and filed a
16 nationwide class action, No. 3:14-cv-05615 ("*McKnight*"), asserting causes of action for violations of
17 California's False Advertising Law ("FAL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17500 *et seq.*, and Unfair
18 Competition Law ("UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 *et seq.*, and alleging, *inter alia*,
19 misrepresentations and omissions regarding Defendants' "Safe Rides Fee," safety measures, alleged
20 expenditures, and driver background checks.

21 8. On or about January 6, 2015, AW filed a putative class action lawsuit on behalf of
22 Andrea Pappey and others similarly situated, against Uber Technologies, Inc., in the United States
23 District Court for the Northern District of California, Case No. 3:15-cv-00064 ("*Mena*"). On or about
24 April 13, 2015, (i) the Complaint filed in *Mena* was amended to, among other things, add Plaintiffs
25 Julian Mena, Todd Schreiber, Nate Coolidge, and Ernesto Mejia as representative Plaintiffs, and (ii)
26 Andrea Pappey withdrew from the *Mena* lawsuit as a plaintiff. The *Mena* lawsuit asserted causes of
27 action for Breach of Implied Contract (pursuant to California, Illinois, and Massachusetts law), alleged
28 violations of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 *et seq.*), California's

1 Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*), California’s False Advertising Law
2 (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 *et seq.*), and Illinois Consumer Fraud Act (815 ILCS 502/2, *et seq.*)
3 and which alleged, *inter alia*, that Defendants made misrepresentations and omissions regarding their
4 “Safe Rides Fee,” their safety measures, and the nature and character of their background checks, on
5 behalf of a putative nationwide class, or in the alternative, a California, Illinois, and Massachusetts class
6 of consumers. (*Mena* Dkt. No. 28).

7 9. On or about February 16, 2015, the parties filed a joint stipulation to relate *Mena* and
8 Northern District of California Case No. 4:14-cv-05615 (“*McKnight*”).¹ The Court granted this
9 stipulation on or about February 18, 2015 (*McKnight*, Dkt. No. 23; *Mena*, Dkt. No. 19), and ordered that
10 *Mena* and *McKnight* are related.

11 10. Co-Class Counsel and AW thereafter cooperated in organizing a leadership structure to
12 effectively and efficiently prosecute the claims on behalf of Plaintiffs and the proposed Class.

13 11. On or about May 4, 2015, Defendants filed an Administrative Motion To Determine
14 Whether Cases Should Be Related seeking to relate *Mena* and *Philliben* to a lawsuit entitled *L.A. Taxi*
15 *Cooperative, Inc. et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-01257, filed on or about
16 March 18, 2015 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (“*L.A. Taxi*”)
17 (*McKnight*, Dkt. Nos. 34 to 35). The Court granted this Motion on or about May 12, 2015 (*McKnight*,
18 Dkt. No. 36).

19 12. On or about May 4, 2015, in the response to the first amended complaint filed in *Mena*,
20 Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc. filed a Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Arbitration (*Mena*, Dkt.
21 Nos. 31 to 36). AW filed the *Mena* plaintiffs’ response in opposition to this Motion on or about May 13,
22 2015 (*Mena*, Dkt. Nos. 37 to 38) and Defendants filed their Reply on or about May 26, 2015 (*Mena*,
23 Dkt. Nos. 39 to 41).

24 13. On or about June 1, 2015, AW filed the *Mena* plaintiffs’ Objection to and Motion To
25 Strike Reply Evidence Re Defendant’s Motion To Stay Proceedings Pending Arbitration, or in the
26

27 ¹ In May 2017, Counsel for Byron McKnight filed a Stipulation of Partial Dismissal of Matthew
28 Philliben dismissing all claims related to Matthew Philliben without prejudice. This matter is referred to
as *McKnight, et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.* (*McKnight*, Dkt. 121).

1 Alternative, Request for a Surreply (*Mena*, Dkt. No. 42). On or about June 2, 2014, the Court granted
2 the *Mena* plaintiffs leave to file a Surreply and continued the hearing on Defendant's Motion to Stay
3 from June 11, 2015 to July 2, 2015. (*Mena*, Dkt. No. 43).

4 14. On or about June 9, 2015, AW filed the *Mena* plaintiffs' Surreply In Opposition To
5 Defendant's Motion To Stay Proceedings Pending Arbitration. (*Mena*, Dkt. No. 45.) On or about June
6 10, 2015, AW filed the *Mena* plaintiffs' Statement of Recent Decision In Support of Plaintiffs'
7 Opposition To Defendant's Motion To Stay Proceedings Pending Arbitration. (*Mena*, Dkt. 46.)

8 15. On or about June 29, 2015, the Parties filed a Stipulation and Proposed Order For A
9 Temporary Stay Pending Mediation (*Mena*, Dkt. 48; *McKnight*, Dkt. 48); and on or about July 29, 2015,
10 the Parties filed a Stipulation With Proposed Order For A Second Temporary Stay Pending Mediation.
11 (*Mena*, Dkt. 52; *McKnight*, Dkt. 51.)

12 16. On July 29, 2015, the Parties filed a Stipulation and Protective Order (*Mena* Dkt. 49;
13 *McKnight* Dkt. 50), which was entered by the Court on August 3, 2015. (*Mena* Dkt. 51; *McKnight* Dkt.
14 52.)

15 17. On or about January 7, 2016, Class Counsel filed a Consolidated Class Action Complaint,
16 which asserted causes of action for Breach of Implied Contract, alleged violations of California's
17 Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 *et seq.*), California's Unfair Competition Law
18 (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*), California's False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code
19 § 17500 *et seq.*), and Illinois Consumer Fraud Act (815 ILCS 502/2, *et seq.*) and which alleged, *inter*
20 *alia*, that Defendants made misrepresentations and omissions regarding their "Safe Rides Fee," their
21 safety measures, and the nature and character of their background checks, on behalf of a putative
22 nationwide class, or in the alternative, a California, Illinois, and Massachusetts class of consumers.
23 (*McKnight*, Dkt. 67.)

24 18. AW and co-Class Counsel submitted comprehensive requests for information relevant to
25 their allegations and Defendants' anticipated defenses and Defendants provided thousands of pages of
26 responsive documents and sworn responses (including responses and documents after the date of the
27 First Stipulation). Class Counsel thoroughly analyzed and evaluated all provided information, including
28

1 documents bearing on Defendants' background checks, alleged safety expenditures, the Safe Rides Fee
2 and resulting revenues, and Defendants' advertising and marketing regarding safety.

3 19. AW conducted an extensive investigation into the facts and law relating to the matters
4 alleged in Plaintiffs' respective Complaints, including (i) the extent, nature and quality of Defendants'
5 safety procedures during the Class Period; (ii) Defendants' representations and disclosures regarding the
6 safety of Defendants' ride share services; (iii) Defendants' representations and disclosures regarding the
7 Safe Rides Fee; (iv) financial data relating to Defendants' safety related expenditures and revenues; (v)
8 the size and composition of the Class; and (vi) data relating to the Class' use of Defendants' ride share
9 services.

10 20. As noted, these exchanges of information continued after the Denial Order, and
11 Defendants provided updated information to Class Counsel, plus thousands of pages of additional
12 documents.

13 21. Defendants also produced thousands of additional documents, including deposition
14 transcripts and expert reports from *LA Taxi* litigation, for Class Counsel's review.

15 22. In total, Defendants made eight (8) separate productions of documents over the course of
16 two years – productions containing, *inter alia*, deposition transcripts, written responses to discovery, and
17 documentary evidence, from the *LA Taxi* and other related litigations. Defendants produced documents
18 on August 12, 2015, August 18, 2015, August 21, 2015, September 30, 2015, October 30, 2015,
19 February 11, 2016, May 11, 2017, and May 18, 2017. All in all, Defendants produced nearly 50,000
20 pages of documents and data.

21 23. In addition to the sheer volume of discovery reviewed by Class Counsel, it is worth
22 noting that every step of the discovery process came with hard fought negotiations by the Parties'
23 Counsel.

24 24. The Parties began settlement discussions almost two years ago. After the arbitration
25 motions were fully briefed, the Parties began discussing possible settlement, which resulted in a long
26 series of arms'-length negotiations, including six separate days of mediation, a settlement conference
27 before the Chief Magistrate Judge Joseph C. Spero, and numerous face-to-face and telephonic meetings
28

1 between counsel and with the mediators, the Honorable Carl J. West (Ret.) of JAMS and Robert J.
2 Kaplan, Esq. of Judicate West.

3 25. The first round of mediation consisted of three full days with Judge West, and included
4 many additional face-to-face and telephonic meetings between counsel and with Judge West. On or
5 about August 24, 2015, AW attended an in-person mediation session with Judge West, which was
6 attended by all Class Counsel and defense counsel.

7 26. I am informed and believe that Judge West is a highly respected and experienced class
8 action mediator, who had joined JAMS following eighteen years on the bench, spending the most recent
9 ten years as a judge with the Los Angeles County Superior Court's complex litigation panel.

10 27. On or about September 17, 2015, the Parties filed a Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order
11 Updating the Court on Settlement Discussions and Requesting Extension of Temporary Stay Pending
12 Further Mediation. (*Mena*, Dkt. 56; *McKnight*, Dkt. 57.)

13 28. On or about October 2, 2015, AW attended, along with co-counsel, a second in-person
14 mediation session and, on or about October 30, 2015, a third in-person mediation session, all with Judge
15 West.

16 29. On or about November 16, 2015, the Parties filed a Stipulation and Proposed Order
17 Updating the Court on the Settlement Discussions and Requesting Extension of Temporary Stay.

18 30. After the third full day of mediation and another month of continued settlement
19 discussions directly and through Judge West, the Parties were able to report to the Court that they had
20 reached a settlement in principle in December 2015.

21 31. On or about December 14, 2015, the Parties filed a Stipulation and Proposed Order
22 Updating the Court on the Parties' Settlement in Principle and Requesting that Arbitration Hearing be
23 Vacated.

24 32. After reaching a settlement in principle, the Parties commenced memorializing the full
25 Settlement, which generated numerous additional rounds of comprehensive and often spirited
26 negotiations. Counsel for the Parties extensively and painstakingly negotiated each specific aspect of
27 the Stipulation, down to each sentence and word, including each of its nine (9) exhibits.
28

1 33. The Parties obtained bids from a number of professional class action administration
2 companies, who submitted detailed bids after I explained the terms and complex structure of the
3 settlement. Prior to the request for bids, the Parties met and conferred on the identity of the
4 administrators who would submit the bids. Thereafter, telephonic interviews were performed with each
5 potential administrator. The Plaintiffs then negotiated with the administrators and obtained a capped
6 price for settlement notice and administration. Further, the Parties conducted detailed negotiations
7 regarding class member data confidentiality and data security with the settlement administrator.

8 34. Class Counsel negotiated and meticulously refined the final notice program and each
9 document comprising the notice (the Long Form Notice, Summary Notice, and Banner Ads for certain
10 Internet advertising), with the assistance of a class action notice expert, to ensure that the information
11 disseminated to Class Members is clear and concise.

12 35. The Stipulation of Settlement was filed with the Court on February 11, 2016. (*McKnight*,
13 Dkt. 74) (“First Stipulation”). A motion for preliminary approval of the First Stipulation was filed the
14 same day (*McKnight*, Dkt. 75-3) (“2016 Settlement”), along with a corresponding Motion to File Under
15 Seal various information regarding the Defendants’ business (*McKnight*, Dkt. 75).

16 36. Soon thereafter, on February 24, 2016, the District Attorneys’ Offices for the City and
17 County of San Francisco, and the County of Los Angeles filed a Motion seeking to file an *amicus brief*
18 opposing the Motions to file certain settlement related materials under seal, which Defendants opposed
19 (*McKnight*, Dkts. 81, 82). The Court granted the District Attorneys’ request, and an *amicus brief* in
20 opposition to the Motion to Seal was filed on February 26, 2016, which Uber opposed. (*McKnight*, Dkts.
21 84, 85.) AW kept abreast and conducted in-depth review of all of these filings and the Court’s ruling.

22 37. On March 21, 2016, after meet and confer with Defendants, AW filed a Notice to Amend
23 the Settlement Class definition and an amended proposed Preliminary Approval Order. (*McKnight*, Dkt.
24 88, 89.)

25 38. On April 7, 2016, the District Attorneys’ withdrew their *amicus brief* in opposition to the
26 Motion to Seal. (*McKnight*, Dkt. 90.)

27 39. On April 15, 2017, the Court granted and denied in part the Defendants’ request to filed
28 certain materials under seal, and thereafter Defendants sought a modification of the Court’s Order.

1 (*McKnight*, Dkts. 91-93.) The Court granted Defendants request on July 7, 2016. (*McKnight*, Dkt. 94.)
2 Following the Court's ruling, Plaintiffs filed the Motion for Preliminary Approval and the supporting
3 Declaration of Robert Ahdoot again to reflect the Court's rulings on the Motion to seal. (*McKnight*,
4 Dkts. 95-96.)

5 40. On August 30, 2016, the Court issued an Order Denying Motion for Preliminary
6 Approval of Class Action Settlement (*McKnight*, Dkt. 98) ("Denial Order").

7 41. Following the Denial Order, Counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants began discussions and
8 negotiations regarding a new settlement. After an extensive meet and confer process, the Parties agreed
9 upon a new mediator, Robert J. Kaplan, Esq. of Judicate West, to assist in these negotiations. AW then
10 participated in three (3) in-person mediations on October 5, 2016, November 22, 2016, and January 5,
11 2017. In addition, I met in person on December 7, 2016, in San Francisco, with Defense Counsel and
12 two attorneys from Uber's in-house counsel team and conducted detailed negotiations. Throughout the
13 entire process, Plaintiffs conducted numerous telephonic discussions and negotiations both among
14 themselves and with the assistance of the new mediator.

15 42. Almost a year after the First Stipulation of Settlement was filed, and after further
16 telephonic conference between Defense Counsel and me, the Parties reached an amended settlement in
17 principle in February 2017. However, many crucial terms remained outstanding.

18 43. Thereafter, after further and extensive meet and confer and unsuccessful attempts to
19 resolve all of the remaining terms, Counsel for the Parties agreed that they would request the Court's
20 assistance with respect to finalizing the terms of the new settlement. Pursuant to the Parties' request,
21 this Court ordered the Parties to attend and participate in a settlement conference before Chief
22 Magistrate Judge Joseph C. Spero on March 7, 2017 to address the unresolved terms of the new
23 settlement.

24 44. After the settlement conference with Judge Spero, the Parties continued negotiating and
25 began drafting the terms of the amended stipulation of settlement. In depth negotiations continued
26 throughout March 2017, all of April 2017 and all of May 2017. Throughout this entire period the
27 negotiations were extensive and contentious, however, by May of 2017 the Parties were finally able to
28 agree on all terms.

1 45. Counsel for the Parties then worked to update the First Stipulation and its respective
2 exhibits and declarations, and agreed to an Amended Stipulation of Settlement (“Amended Stipulation”)
3 in May 2017. As with the First Stipulation, Class Counsel negotiated and refined the Amended
4 Stipulation to reflect the revised class definition and other changes to the First Stipulation.

5 46. On June 1, 2017, Plaintiffs filed an Amended Stipulation of Settlement, Motion for
6 Preliminary Approval, Motion to Seal, and a number of supporting declarations. (*McKnight*, Dkt. 125-
7 131). On August 7, 2017, the Court granted preliminary approval of the Amended Stipulation of
8 Settlement.

9 47. Before entering into the First Stipulation and the Amended Stipulation, Class Counsel
10 conducted an extensive and thorough examination, investigation, and evaluation of the relevant law,
11 facts, and allegations to assess the merits of the claims and potential claims to determine the strength of
12 liability, potential remedies, and all defenses thereto.

13 48. In my view, the Settlement provides substantial benefits to the Class, especially when one
14 considers the attendant expense, risks, delays, and uncertainties of litigation, trial and post-trial
15 proceedings.

16 49. While I believe that the claims asserted in this action have merit and that the evidence
17 developed to date supports those claims, I also recognize, based on my experience, the expense and
18 length of time necessary to prosecute this case to judgment. I also have taken into account the uncertain
19 outcome and the risk of any litigation, as well as the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation. I
20 am also mindful of the inherent problems of proof in establishing the claims asserted in this action, and
21 rebutting Defendants’ possible defenses to those claims.

22 **AW’S ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND EXPENSES**

23 50. Tina Wolfson and I were the primary attorneys handling this case on behalf of AW.
24 While Ms. Wolfson supervised most of the pre-settlement phase of the litigation, I supervised and
25 oversaw all settlement negotiations, confirmatory discovery, settlement related document creation and
26 drafting. Together we supervised a team of attorneys and staff from AW in performing the work
27 necessary to successfully litigate and negotiate the class settlement herein. We also coordinated
28 litigation and settlement strategy with attorneys from our Co-Class Counsel law firms, who also serve

1 as Lead and Class Counsel in this matter. AW expended a substantial amount of time and resource to
2 this matter to the exclusion of other work.

3 51. I oversaw and directed the work of all Counsel with respect to all aspects of the
4 settlement in this matter to ensure efficiency, lack of duplication, and to limit the lodestar to extent
5 possible. I performed this task by assigning discreet tasks to all attorneys involved and ensured that no
6 two attorneys were performing work on the same task, eliminating overlap and catch-up work as much
7 as possible. I also worked to divide discovery tasks among the firms as much as possible. For
8 example, with a very limited number of exceptions, rather than having one attorney from each firm on
9 a meet and confer call, I would have one person conduct the call and report back to all Class Counsel.
10 For maximum efficiency, the same attorney would generally handle any follow up. Moreover,
11 whenever possible, Class Counsel attempted to have associate level attorneys handle discreet tasks as
12 opposed to partner level attorneys. For example, the bulk of the discovery (UTBMS Code L300 (*see*
13 discussion below) in this matter was performed with the supervision of a mid-level partner by associate
14 level attorneys, who reported the results of their review to me or other senior partners as it related to
15 the work being performed by that partner. With respect to settlement negotiations and drafting, while
16 as much of the work performed was tasked to associate level attorneys, the nature of the work required
17 senior level partner oversight for most of the work performed.

18 52. Throughout this action, AW has sought to reach consensus with co-Class Counsel to
19 manage the administration and work division in this case in a systematic and efficient manner,
20 coordinating work assignments through conference calls, working to avoid duplication of efforts or
21 unnecessary work undertaken by any of the counsel for the Class in this case, and ensuring that the
22 skills and talents of counsel were put to use in an efficient and effective manner that maximized what
23 each firm and attorney could contribute in a non-redundant way.

24 53. Working with me on this matter, on behalf of Plaintiffs Mena, Schreiber, Coolidge, and
25 Mejia (the plaintiffs who originally appeared on the Complaint filed in *Mena*) were my partners Tina
26 Wolfson and Theodore Maya and AW associates Vanessa Shakib, Bradley K. Keith and Meredith
27 Lierz. Also working with AW on this matter were Of Counsel attorney, Keith Custis, and our co-
28 counsel Nick Suciu, III from the law firm of Barbat, Mansur & Suciu PLLC. For the purposes of

1 efficiency and ease, I include the hours they worked on this matter as part of AW's hours and
2 application, as these attorneys appeared with AW on the original complaint in *Mena*.

3 54. Tina Wolfson attended and graduated Harvard Law School *cum laude* in 1994. Ms.
4 Wolfson began her civil litigation career at the Los Angeles office of Morrison & Foerster, LLP, where
5 she defended major corporations in complex actions and represented indigent individuals in
6 immigration and deportation trials as part of the firm's *pro bono* practice. She then gained further
7 invaluable litigation and trial experience at a boutique firm, focusing on representing plaintiffs on a
8 contingency basis in civil rights and employee rights cases. Ms. Wolfson frequently lectures on
9 numerous topics related to class action litigation across the country.

10 55. I attended and graduated Pepperdine Law School *cum laude* in 1994, where I served as
11 Literary Editor of the Pepperdine Law Review. I also clerked for the Honorable Paul Flynn at the
12 California Court of Appeals, and began my career as a civil litigator at the Los Angeles office of
13 Mendes & Mount, LLP, where I defended large corporations and syndicates such as Lloyds of London
14 in complex environmental and construction-related litigation as well as a variety of other matters. I
15 have also lectured on numerous topics related to class action litigation across the country.

16 56. Founded in 1998, AW is a Los Angeles, California based law firm specializing in
17 complex and class action litigation and public interest litigation. For decades, the attorneys at AW
18 have vigorously litigated against large corporations and public entities vindicating the rights of
19 millions of consumers, employees, and taxpayers in protracted, complex litigation, to successful
20 results. AW has represented plaintiffs in employment, consumer rights, environmental and taxpayer
21 rights litigation. AW partners have been named "Super Lawyers" by their peers in recognition of the
22 results achieved by their work. Since its founding, AW has served as class counsel and in leadership
23 positions in a wide range of consumer protection class actions.

24 57. Theodore W. Maya is also a partner at AW and worked on this matter as detailed below.
25 Mr. Maya graduated from UCLA Law School in 2002 after serving as Editor-in-Chief of the *UCLA*
26 *Law Review*. From July 2003 to August 2004, Mr. Maya served as Law Clerk to the Honorable Gary
27 Allen Feess in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. Mr. Maya was
28 also a litigation associate in the Los Angeles offices of Kaye Scholer LLP for approximately eight

1 years where he worked on a large variety of complex commercial litigation from inception through
2 trial. Mr. Maya was named “Advocate of the Year” for 2007 by the Consumer Law Project of Public
3 Counsel for successful *pro bono* representation of a victim of a large-scale equity fraud ring.

4 58. Bradley K. King is an associate at AW who worked on this matter as detailed below.
5 Mr. King graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law in 2010, where he served as Associate
6 Editor of the Pepperdine Law Review. He worked as a law clerk for the California Office of the
7 Attorney General, Correctional Law Section in Los Angeles and was a certified law clerk for the
8 Ventura County District Attorney’s Office. Mr. King began his legal career at a boutique civil rights
9 law firm, gaining litigation experience in a wide variety of practice areas, including employment law,
10 police misconduct, municipal contract, criminal defense, and premises liability cases.

11 59. Vanessa T. Shakib is also an associate at AW who worked on this matter as detailed
12 below. Ms. Shakib graduated from George Mason University Law School in 2012, where she served
13 as Senior Notes Editor of the *Journal of International Commercial Law* and a member of the Moot
14 Court Board. Ms. Shakib began her legal career at Wasserman, Comden, Casselman & Esenstein, LLP,
15 where she practiced general business litigation and public entity liability. Ms. Shakib has also
16 extensive experience in the field of animal rights litigation and advocacy.

17 60. Meredith S. Lierz was an associate at AW who worked on this matter as detailed below.
18 Ms. Lierz graduated Southwestern University School of Law in 2013. Ms. Lierz also obtained a
19 Master’s in Business Administration from Claremont Graduate University. While at Southwestern
20 University School of Law, Ms. Lierz was a Lead Articles Editor at *Southwestern Law Review* and a
21 member of the Southwestern Law School Moot Court Honors Program. Ms. Lierz left her employment
22 at Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC in April 2017 when she moved from Los Angeles.

23 61. Diana Kiem is a paralegal at AW who worked on this matter as detailed below. Ms.
24 Kim graduated from Pasadena Community College in 2016 with a degree in Paralegal studies.

25 62. Keith Custis graduated from Boston College Law School in May 1997, *magna cum*
26 *laude*. He was admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on December 15,
27 2007. His Massachusetts Board of Bar Overseers number is 636511, although he has been on “retired”
28 status in Massachusetts for approximately 10 years. He was admitted to practice in the State of

1 California on or about February 15, 2002.

2 63. Nick Suci, III is a partner at the firm of Barbat, Mansour & Suci PLLC and member
3 in good standing of the bar of the state of Michigan. Mr. Suci has practiced law for nine years and
4 has been designated as Class Counsel in a number of class actions. Mr. Suci specializes in consumer
5 class actions.

6 64. Since 1999, Tina Wolfson and I have been appointed lead counsel in numerous complex
7 consumer class actions. The following are some examples of recent (2016-2017) class actions that
8 Tina Wolfson and I have litigated to conclusion or are currently litigating on behalf of its clients -
9 either as Class Counsel, proposed Class Counsel or members of a Court appointed Plaintiff Steering
10 Committee (AW's *curriculum vitae*, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**):

11 • *Eck, et al. v. City of Los Angeles*, No. BC577028 (Los Angeles Superior Court
12 ("LASC")): Robert Ahdoot & Tina Wolfson, along with co-Class Counsel, achieved a \$347 million
13 class settlement based on allegedly unlawful city tax regulations regarding electrical power; preliminary
14 approval granted and final approval pending.

15 • *Lavinsky vs. City of Los Angeles*, No. BC542245 (LASC): Class action settlement
16 in principal reached in large class action arising out of illegal utilities taxation practices regarding
17 natural gas. Prior to settlement, and through approximately four years of litigation, AW prevailed on
18 Summary Adjudication, certified a class, Robert Ahdoot and Tina Wolfson were appointed Class
19 Counsel, and prevailed on a Motion to Disseminate Class Notice. The settlement in principal is
20 confidential at this time and preliminary approval is pending.

21 • *Pantelyat vs. Bank of America*, No. 1:16-cv-8964 (S.D. N.Y.): Consumer class
22 action regarding allegedly illegal overdraft fees resulting from non-recurring charges. Confidential
23 settlement in principal reached by the Parties in November 2017; memorialization of the settlement and
24 preliminary approval pending. Robert Ahdoot and Tina Wolfson are proposed Class Counsel.

25 • *Kirby v. McAfee, Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02475-EJD (N.D. Cal.): \$80 million class
26 settlement based on defendant's auto renewal and alleged false discount practices; final approval
27 granted. Robert Ahdoot & Tina Wolfson designated Class Counsel.

28

1 • *Chimeno-Buzzi v. Hollister Co, et al.*, No. 1:14-cv-23120-MGC (S.D. Fla.): \$10
2 Million class settlement arising from violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991
3 (“TCPA”); final approval granted. Robert Ahdoot & Tina Wolfson designated Class Counsel.

4 • *Smith v. Floor and Décor Outlets of America, Inc.*, No. 1:15-cv-04316-ELR (N.D.
5 Ga.): \$14 million class settlement regarding flooring product defect allegations; final approval granted.
6 Robert Ahdoot & Tina Wolfson designated Class Counsel.

7 • *In re: Experian Data Breach Litig.*, No. 8:15-cv-01592-AG-DFM (C.D. Cal.):
8 Tina Wolfson is currently serving as appointed co-lead counsel managing a PSC of six firms, after
9 contested application and hearing in consolidated litigation consisting of thirty-eight (38) class actions
10 arising from a data breach disclosing the sensitive financial information of over 15 million T-Mobile
11 customers. Plaintiffs seek both monetary and injunctive relief.

12 • *Remijas v. Neiman Marcus Group, LLC*, No. 1:14-cv-01735 (N.D. Ill.): Tina
13 Wolfson and Theodore Maya were responsible for briefing and arguing the groundbreaking appeal from
14 the trial court’s order, which had granted the motion to dismiss on the pleadings based on lack of Article
15 III standing. The Seventh Circuit’s landmark opinion was its first to address the Supreme Court’s
16 decision in *Clapper v. Amnesty Intern. USA*, 133 S. Ct. 1138 (2013). This Neiman Marcus opinion was
17 the first appellate court to reject this view of *Clapper* and, adopting the plaintiffs’ reasoning, established,
18 among other things, that data breach victims have standing to pursue claims based on the increased risk
19 of identity theft and fraud, even before that theft or fraud materializes. *See Remijas v. Neiman Marcus*
20 *Group, LLC*, 794 F.3d 688 (7th Cir. 2015). This matter resulted in an \$1.6 million class settlement,
21 which that court preliminarily approved. Final approval is pending.

22 • *In re: Kind LLC “All Natural” Litig.*, No. 1:15-md-02645-WHP (S.D.N.Y.): Tina
23 Wolfson is currently serving as appointed interim co-lead counsel for the plaintiff class by MDL Court
24 after contested hearing.

25 • *In re: Premera Blue Cross Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 15-md-02633-
26 SI (D. Or.): Tina Wolfson is currently serving, by court appointment, on the Executive Leadership
27 Committee after contested leadership application and hearing.

28 • *In re: The Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 1:14-md-

1 02583-TWT (N.D. Ga.): Tina Wolfson served, by court appointment, on the MDL Consumer Plaintiffs'
2 Steering Committee. The finally approved settlement provided approximately \$29 million of monetary
3 relief to the consumer class, as well as robust injunctive relief requiring Home Depot to overhaul its data
4 security practices.

5 65. AW, Mr. Custis, and Mr. Suciú collectively expended 1,490.30 hours in this litigation
6 through November 30, 2017. I expect that AW will incur significant additional hours of time to see
7 this case through completion of the settlement, including: finalizing and filing these fee motion papers;
8 continuing to supervise class notice and claims with the settlement administrator and defense counsel;
9 responding to class member inquiries or challenges; responding to any requests for exclusion or
10 objections; preparing and filing final approval papers; attending the final approval hearing; working
11 with Defendants and the settlement administrator on the distribution of awards to the Class; monitoring
12 the award distributions to the Class; ensuring that any residual is paid to the Court-approved *cy pres*
13 beneficiaries; and reporting to the Court that the distribution of settlement funds has been completed;
14 and ensuring that Defendants comply with the injunction requirements of the Settlement. I expect to
15 maintain a high level of oversight and involvement in this process; therefore, I anticipate incurring
16 significant additional lodestar in the future.

17 66. AW's representation of the Plaintiff Class was on a wholly contingent basis. The firm
18 devoted substantial resources to this matter, and we have received no payment for any of the nearly
19 1,500 hours of services performed or the thousands of dollars in out of pocket costs and expenses that
20 my firm committed to the litigation of this case. We did this, with no guarantee of repayment, because
21 of the importance of this case. Moreover, given AW's resources, we can take on only a limited
22 number of cases. Thus, AW was required to forego other financial opportunities to litigate this case.
23 AW thus took this case with the expectation that the firm would receive a risk enhancement in the
24 event we prevailed.

25 67. All attorneys and legal staff at AW are instructed to maintain contemporaneous time
26 records reflecting the time spent on this and other matters. In all instances, the time keeper indicates
27 the date and amount of time spent on a task to one-tenth of an hour; describes the work that was
28 performed during the indicated time period; and identifies the case to which the time should be

1 charged.

2 68. AW made every effort to litigate this matter efficiently by coordinating the work of
3 AW's attorneys and paralegals, and the other law firms involved, minimizing duplication, and
4 assigning tasks in a time and cost-efficient manner, based on the time keepers' experience levels and
5 talents.

6 69. I reviewed the records of all time that all AW timekeepers and Mr. Suciu billed to this
7 matter. My review resulted in a reduction of approximately 52 total hours. I also exercised billing
8 judgment by deleting time entries that I deemed to be duplicative, inefficient, vague, administrative, or
9 otherwise non-compensable.

10 70. The remaining hours AW billed were properly and necessarily spent on the firm's
11 assigned tasks and projects. The detailed time records for the remaining hours spent by my firm and
12 billed to this case through November 30, 2017 are available to the Court for *in camera* review upon
13 request. I certify to the Court that AW's fee records accurately reflect work actually, reasonably, and
14 necessarily performed in connection with the litigation of this matter. I believe that the hours spent
15 reflect time spent reasonably litigating this case, in which Tina Wolfson and I have sought to manage
16 and staff efficiently as described above.

17 71. A summary of rates and hours expended by AW's professionals (including Messrs.
18 Custis and Suciu), as of November 30, 2017, is set forth as follows:

Professional	Title	Billable Rate	Billable Hours	Billable Fees
Tina Wolfson	Senior Partner	\$850	341.20	290,020.00
Robert Ahdoot	Senior Partner	\$850	510.40	\$433,840.00
Theodore Maya	Partner	\$675	188.40	\$127,170.00
Bradley King	Associate	\$475	8.80	\$4,180.00
Vanessa Shakib	Associate	\$475	62.70	\$29,782.50
Meredith Lierz	Associate	\$425	168.50	\$71,612.50
Keith Custis	Of Counsel	\$625	162.00	\$101,250.00
Nick Suciu, III	Co-Counsel	\$650	41.10	\$26,715.00
Diana Kiem	Paralegal	\$125	7.20	\$900.00
TOTALS:			1,449.30	\$1,085,470.00

26 72. All Plaintiffs' Counsel who billed on this matter, including Class Counsel, have applied
27 the American Bar Association's Uniform Task-Based Management System ("UTBMS") to categorize
28

1 their billable hours by litigation activity. *See* Description of UTBMS *available at*
 2 https://www.americanbar.org/groups/litigation/resources/uniform_task_based_management_system/litigation_code_definitions.html
 3 (last visited December 7, 2017).

4 73. All attorneys who worked on this matter billed a total of 2,835 hours for a total lodestar
 5 of \$1,896,480. The time expended by all attorneys who worked on this matter, as reported by our Co-
 6 Class Counsel Firms and including AW's time, categorized by UTBMS Code, is attached hereto as
 7 **Exhibit B.**

8 74. Below is a summary of all billable hours expended on this case through November 30,
 9 2017 by UTBMS Code:

UTBMS Code	UTBMS Description	Time Sought	% of Total Fees
L100	Case Assessment, Development and Administration	63.5	2.2%
L110	Fact Investigation/Development	176.9	6.2%
L120	Analysis/Strategy	113.0	4.0%
L160	Settlement/Non-Binding ADR	1,073.8	37.9%
L190	Other Case Assessment, Development and Administration	109.5	3.9%
L210	Pleadings	108.8	3.8%
L230	Court Mandated Conferences	21.7	0.8%
L250	Other Written Motions and Submissions	256.9	9.1%
L260	Class Action Certification and Notice	194.2	6.9%
L300	Discovery	420.1	14.8%
L310	Written Discovery	104.5	3.7%
L320	Document Production	149.9	5.3%
L460	Post-Trial Motions and Submissions	37.9	1.3%
L500	Appeal	4.3	0.2%
Total		2835	100%

25 75. L100 Case Assessment, Development and Administration: The ABA defines this
 26 general category as “[f]ocus[ing] on the case as a whole, the ‘forest’ rather than the ‘trees’”. In the
 27 context of this litigation, Plaintiffs’ Counsel included in this category time spent communicating with
 28

1 the Plaintiffs and the media about general case status. Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 63.5
2 hours under this subcategory.

3 76. L110 Fact Investigation / Development: The ABA defines this subcategory as "[a]ll
4 actions to investigate and understand the facts of a matter. Covers interviews of client personnel and
5 potential witnesses, review of documents to learn the facts of the case (but not for document
6 production, L320), work with an investigator, and all related communications and correspondence."
7 Plaintiffs' Counsel included in this category time spent communicating with the Plaintiffs, other riders
8 who used the Uber App across all various platforms, drivers, experts, and other witnesses, in
9 connection with Counsel's factual investigation of this matter. This category does not include hours
10 expended on discovery which are included in the L300, L310, and L320 categories described below.
11 Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 176.9 hours under this subcategory.

12 77. L120 Analysis / Strategy: The ABA defines this subcategory as "[t]he thinking,
13 strategizing, and planning for a case, including discussions, writing, and meetings on case strategy.
14 Also includes initial legal research for case assessment purposes and legal research for developing a
15 basic case strategy." Plaintiffs' Counsel included in this category time spent performing general and
16 early case research, and conferencing regarding strategy among Plaintiffs' Counsel. Also in this
17 category Plaintiffs' Counsel included time setting up the working structure between the groups of
18 attorneys who filed the *Mena* and *McKnight* matters. Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 113
19 hours under this subcategory.

20 78. L160 Settlement/Non-Binding ADR: The ABA defines this subcategory as "[a]ll
21 activities directed specifically to settlement. Encompasses planning for and participating in settlement
22 discussions, conferences, and hearings and implementing a settlement. Covers pursuing and
23 participating in mediation and other non-binding Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) procedures."
24 Plaintiffs' Counsel included in this subcategory time spent attending and preparing for six mediations
25 and a settlement conference before Judge Spero, participating in numerous direct settlement
26 discussions, researching and drafting mediation statements, conducting time regarding settlement
27 administrator and administration and negotiating and drafting the parties' Stipulation of Settlement and
28 the exhibits thereto. All time related to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action

1 settlement is categorized under code L260, as discussed below. Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably
2 expended 1,073.8 hours under this subcategory.

3 79. L190 Other Case Assessment, Development and Administration: The subcategory is
4 considered a catchall, and includes "[t]ime not attributable to any other overall task." In the context of
5 this litigation, Plaintiffs' Counsel included in this category time spent preparing retainer agreements,
6 and performing general case calendaring. This subcategory also includes time spent on tasks related to
7 the monitoring of, and coordinating with, overlapping, related cases listed in the Motion for Attorneys'
8 Fees and Expenses concurrently filed herewith. Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 109.5 hours
9 under this subcategory.

10 80. L210 Pleadings: The ABA defines this subcategory as "[d]eveloping (researching,
11 drafting, editing, filing) and reviewing complaints, answers, counter-claims and third-party complaints.
12 It also embraces motions directed at pleadings such as motions to dismiss, motions to strike, and
13 jurisdictional motions." This subcategory includes time spent preparing and serving the initial
14 complaint in the *McKnight* matter and the initial and amended complaints in the *Mena* matter. It also
15 includes time spent preparing and serving the Consolidated Complaint. This subcategory further
16 includes time spent on reviewing or preparing or responding to other motions and notices such as Motions
17 to Seal, Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related, Notice of Related
18 Cases, *etc.* Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 108.8 hours under this subcategory.

19 81. L230 Court Mandated Conferences: This subcategory includes time spent drafting and
20 filing case management statements. It also includes time spent preparing for, traveling to, and
21 attending regularly scheduled case management conferences. Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended
22 21.7 hours under this subcategory.

23 82. L250 Other Written Motions and Submissions: The ABA defines this subcategory as
24 "[d]eveloping, responding to, and arguing all motions other than dispositive (L240), pleadings (L210),
25 and discovery (L350), such as motions to consolidate, to bifurcate, to remand, to stay, to compel
26 arbitration, for MDL treatment and for change of venue." This subcategory includes time spent
27 opposing Defendants' Motions to Compel Arbitration and Motions to Stay before the District Court. It
28 also includes time spent related to miscellaneous stipulations regarding case deadlines. Plaintiffs'

1 Counsel reasonably expended 256.9 hours under this subcategory.

2 83. L260 Class Certification and Notice: This subcategory includes all time related to
3 proceedings that are unique to class action litigation. In the context of this litigation, Plaintiffs'
4 Counsel included in this category time spent conducting legal research regarding class certification as
5 it relates to this matter and other false pricing and misrepresentation class settlements, and preparing
6 Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. Plaintiffs' Counsel
7 reasonably expended 194.2 hours under this subcategory.

8 84. L300 Discovery: This category includes time spent on general discovery matters and
9 billing entries that could be categorized under one or more discovery subcategories. It primarily relates
10 to Plaintiffs' efforts to review documents produced by Defendants, review documents from other
11 related cases (such as the Motions to Compel in the District Attorneys' case and pleadings, and
12 discovery from other relevant cases). Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 420.1 hours under this
13 subcategory.

14 85. L310 Written Discovery: This subcategory includes time spent drafting, responding and
15 objecting to, and meeting and conferring about interrogatories. Plaintiffs propounded interrogatories
16 germane to Uber's policies and practices and extensive meet and confer efforts related thereto.
17 Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 104.5 hours under this subcategory.

18 86. L320 Document Production: This subcategory includes time spent drafting, responding
19 and objecting to, and meeting and conferring about document requests during confirmatory discovery
20 including meeting and conferring with Defendants. Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 149.9
21 hours under this subcategory.

22 87. L460 Post-Trial Motions and Submissions: This subcategory includes time spent
23 researching and drafting Plaintiffs' Motions for an Award of Reasonable Attorneys' Fees, Expenses,
24 and Costs and Plaintiffs' Motion for Service Awards. Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 37.9
25 hours under this subcategory. AW notes that their billing records cover the time period from the
26 beginning of the case until November 30, 2017. Thus, a large portion of their time spent on the above-
27 referenced motions is not included in the total hours figure for this subcategory. Plaintiffs also expect
28 to incur additional time in this category drafting the Motion for Final Approval and related declarations

1 and to respond to any objections.

2 88. L500 Appeal: The category includes all time related to the any appeal of the Court's
3 ruling on the Motion to Compel Arbitration and the process after an appeal, including the likelihood of
4 a Court imposed stay at the trial level. In the context of this litigation, Plaintiffs' Counsel included in
5 this category time spent researching the appellate process and an analysis of possible appellate issues,
6 and the factors related to a Court's decision to stay a case pending any appeal of an Arbitration ruling.
7 Plaintiffs' Counsel reasonably expended 4.3 hours under this category.

8 **AW'S REASONABLE HOURLY RATES**

9 89. I believe that my firm's rates are fully commensurate with the hourly rates of other
10 nationally prominent firms performing similar work for both plaintiffs and defendants. After
11 considering all of these data points, I have determined that the rates are reasonable for each of the AW
12 professionals who worked on this matter.

13 90. Because of the importance of recovery of attorney fee awards in contingency cases to a
14 plaintiffs' class action practice firm such as AW, we keep current on federal and California state law
15 developments on the subject of attorneys' fees. Accordingly, AW is familiar with the prevailing
16 market rates for leading attorneys in California for trial court, complex and class action litigation of
17 important issues

18 91. AW periodically establishes hourly rates for the firm's billing personnel. AW
19 establishes the rates based on prevailing market rates for attorneys and law firms in the Los Angeles
20 area that have attorneys and staff of comparable skill, experience, and qualifications. AW obtains
21 information concerning market rates from other attorneys in the area that have similar experience doing
22 similar work, from information that occasionally appears in the local press and national bar
23 publications, and in orders awarding attorneys' fees in similar cases.

24 92. The bulk of AW's practice is contingent, and many of my firm's cases have been large
25 and substantial in settlements or verdicts. In contingent risk cases, my firm and other firms doing this
26 type of work frequently advance tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars in expenses and costs and
27 defer all payment of our fees for several years, with no guarantee that any of the fees we incurred or
28 costs we advanced would ever be recovered.

1 93. AW primarily represents clients on a contingent fee basis, both in class and individual
 2 cases. However, and although it is a small portion of its practice, AW also represents clients on an
 3 hourly basis and is paid according to its then-current hourly rates. AW is currently retained at the
 4 hourly rates used to calculate its lodestar in this matter.

5 94. Courts have awarded AW attorneys' fees at rates that are comparable to the rates
 6 applicable to this matter. *See, e.g. Williamson, et al. vs. McAfee, Inc.*, Case No. 5:14-cv-00158-EJD
 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2017) (Dkt. 118; \$85 Million settlement in deceptive auto renewal case); *Smith v.*
 8 *Floor & Decor Outlets of Am., Inc.*, Case No. 1:15-cv-04316-ELR, (N.D. Ga. Jan. 10, 2017) (Dkt. No.
 9 69; \$14.5 Million product liability settlement re: laminate flooring); *Chimeno-Buzzi v. Hollister Co.*,
 10 Case No. 1:14-cv-23120-MGC (S.D. Fla. April 11, 2016) (Dkt. No. 155; \$10 Million TCPA
 11 Settlement); *West v. ExamSoft Worldwide Inc.*, Case No. 1:14-cv-22950-UU (S.D. Fla. October 9,
 12 2015) (Dkt. No. 62; \$2.1 Million Settlement in Bar Exam Testing case).

13 95. The rates charged by Plaintiffs' Counsel are reasonable and well within the range of
 14 rates charged by comparably qualifying attorneys for comparably complex work. Comparable hourly
 15 rates have been found reasonable in numerous cases, including the following:

16 a. *Huynh v. Hous. Auth. of Santa Clara*, 2017 WL 105039 (N.D. Cal. March 17,
 17 2017), a tenant class action challenging the Housing Authority's policy regarding the accommodation
 18 of households with disabled family members, in which the court found the following hourly rates
 19 reasonable:

<u>Graduation Year</u>	<u>Rate</u>
<u>Law Foundation of Silicon Valley</u> 1990	\$800
2001	660
2004	635
2007	545
2008	545
2010	415
2014	325

2015	325
<u>Fish & Richardson PC</u>	
1996	\$862.07
2002	700
2005	676.75
2011	530
2007	475
2014	362.54
2015	329.09
2016	330.11
Paralegals	236-275

b. *Cotter et al. v. Lyft, Inc.*, N.D. Cal. No. 13-cv-04065-VC, Order Granting Final Approval of Settlement Agreement, filed March 16, 2017 (Dkt. No. 310), a class action against Lyft alleging Lyft underpaid its drivers by classifying them as independent contractors, in which the court approved the percentage-based fee award requested by plaintiffs based on the following hourly rates, plus a 3.18 multiplier:

<u>Class</u>	<u>Rate</u>
1996	\$800
2010	500
2014	325
Paralegal	200

c. *National Federation of the Blind of California v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, N.D. Cal. No. 14-cv-04086 NC, Order Granting Final Approval and Attorneys' Fees, filed December 6, 2016 (Dkt. No. 139), a class action against Uber alleging that it violated federal antidiscrimination laws by allowing its drivers to refuse to accept service dogs, in which the court found the following 2016 hourly rates reasonable (before applying a 1.5 lodestar multiplier under California law):

<u>Class</u>	<u>Rate</u>
1980	\$900
1985	895
1997	740
2005	645

2010	475
2011	460
2014	355
Paralegals	275
Summer Associates	275-280

d. *Wynn v. Chanos*, 2015 WL 3832561(N.D. Cal. 2015), filed June 19, 2015, an anti-SLAPP fee award, in which the court found the following hourly rates reasonable:

<u>Years of Experience</u>	<u>2015/2014 Rates</u>
40	\$1085/1035
35	750
20	920/875
6	710/645
4	640/570

e. *Gutierrez v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 2015 WL 2438274 (N.D. Cal. 2015), filed May 21, 2015, an unfair business practices class action, in which the court found the following hourly rates reasonable (before applying a 5.5 multiplier):

<u>Years of Bar Admission</u>	<u>Rate</u>
1972	\$975
1989	850
2001	625
2006	435
2009	435
2013	370
Paralegals	300-320
Law Clerks	325

f. *Banas v. Volcano Corp.*, N.D. Cal. No. 3:12-cv-01535-WHO, Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Volcano's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, filed December 12, 2014, a dispute over a merger agreement decided on summary judgment, in which the court found the following hourly rates reasonable:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Rate</u>
Partners and associates	\$355-1,095
E-discovery attorneys	260-325
Paralegals	245-290

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

96. Moreover, the rates requested by AW are in line with the non-contingent market rates charged by attorneys of reasonably comparable experience, skill, and reputation for reasonably comparable services and supported by surveys of legal rates, including the following:

a. In December 2015, Thomson Reuters published its “Legal Billing Report,” which surveys the rates approved for various law firms by the bankruptcy courts. (Under bankruptcy law, the rates sought must be the firm’s ordinary commercial rates.) A true and correct copy of an excerpt for the data listed for the California and West Regions is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**. It shows that Class Counsel’s rates are within the range of the rates found reasonable for other law firms.

b. On January 5, 2015, the National Law Journal published an article about its then current rate survey entitled “Billing Rates Rise, Discounts Abound.” A true and correct copy of that article is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**. It contains the rates charged by numerous Bay Area law firms handling comparably complex litigation. Class Counsel’s rates are well in line with those rates.

c. In addition, the rates charged by counsel in *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.*, N.D. Cal. No. 11-cv—01846-LKK (PSG), support the rates requested here. In that case, according to the declaration filed by Diane C. Hutnyan on July 22, 2012 (Dkt. No. 1275), Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan LLP, counsel for defendant Samsung, charged median partner rates of \$821 per hour and median associate rates of \$448 per hour.

REASONABLE EXPENSES

97. AW is seeking reimbursement of its reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred in this matter. It is my firm’s practice to ensure that all costs and expenses are accurately assigned to the appropriate case. Below are the true and correct expenses my firm incurred in litigating this matter from inception through November 30, 2017, for which we are claiming reimbursement. My firm’s total expenses in this matter through November 10, 2017 come to \$15,524.54. AW paid these expenses on a regular and timely basis as they were incurred, over the course of this litigation, without any guarantee

1 of being reimbursed. I certify to the Court that the foregoing expenses are correct, and have been
 2 necessarily incurred in this case.

Description	Amount
Attorney Service Fees & Messenger	\$535.73
Filing Fees	\$400.00
Mediation Fees	\$6,216.67
Pacer Fees	\$41.80
Postage & Fedex	\$105.95
Travel (Airfare, Ground Transport, Hotel)	\$8,224.39
Total	\$15,524.54

3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10 98. The foregoing expenses were incurred solely in connection with this litigation. These
 11 expenses are reflected in the books and records of my firm, which are kept in the ordinary course and
 12 prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other documents.

13 99. AW has not listed its expenses incurred for in-house electronic research fees
 14 (Westlaw/LexisNexis), copies, facsimile, mileage, telephone, *etc.* and, in an exercise of discretion,
 15 does not seek reimbursement for such expenses. AW's travel expenses do not include meals or
 16 entertainment, and are limited to airfare, hotels, and ground transportation. All airfare was economy
 17 class and all hotels did not exceed \$435 per night. Travel expenses were incurred as a result of travel
 18 to attend court hearings, in person settlement conferences, mediation, and three days of confirmatory
 19 discovery work in San Francisco.

20 100. AW's costs and expenses are fully documented and reasonable.

RESPONSE OF THE CLASS AND ADMINISTRATION COSTS

21
 22 101. As part of our work overseeing the administration of the Settlement, my firm is in
 23 regular contact with the Settlement Administrator: Epiq Sysytems. Epiq reports that as of December 1,
 24 2017, it has received 29 requests for exclusion, and 1 objection (McKnight, Dkt. 137). These numbers
 25 stand in stark contrast to the Class Size and the 80,060 Payment Election Forms (as of December 1,
 26 2017) that have already been submitted. The objection and opt out deadlines are January 8, 2018.
 27
 28

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California and of the United States that the
2 foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 7th day of December 2017 in Los Angeles, California.
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



ROBERT R. AHDOOT

EXHIBIT A



AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC

ATTORNEYS

Ahdoot & Wolfson (“AW”) is a top tier law firm specializing in complex and class action litigation. The attorneys at AW vigorously litigate against large corporations to vindicate the rights of millions of consumers in protracted, complex litigation, to successful results.

AW has been appointed class counsel in numerous class actions, and, as a founding members, Robert Ahdoot and Tina Wolfson have extensive experience in prosecuting complex class action and representative lawsuits. They have served as plaintiffs’ counsel/co-counsel or class counsel and litigated numerous class actions or representative actions.

Tina Wolfson attended and graduated Harvard Law School *cum laude* in 1994. Ms. Wolfson began her civil litigation career at the Los Angeles office of Morrison & Foerster, LLP, where she defended major corporations in complex actions and represented indigent individuals in immigration and deportation trials as part of the firm’s *pro bono* practice. She then gained further invaluable litigation and trial experience at a boutique firm, focusing on representing plaintiffs on a contingency basis in civil rights and employee rights cases.

Robert Ahdoot graduated from Pepperdine Law School *cum laude* in 1994, where he served as Literary Editor of the Pepperdine Law Review. Mr. Ahdoot clerked for the Honorable Paul Flynn at the California Court of Appeals, and then began his career as a civil litigator at the Los Angeles office of Mendes & Mount, LLP, where he defended large corporations and syndicates such as Lloyds of London in complex environmental and construction-related litigation as well as a variety of other matters.

In March 1998, Mr. Ahdoot and Ms. Wolfson founded AW. Partner Theodore Maya and associates Bradley King, Vanessa Shakib, Meredith Lierz, and Emily Rader have also participated in this litigation.

Theodore Maya is a partner at AW working on this matter. He graduated from UCLA Law School in 2002 after serving as Editor-in-Chief of the UCLA Law Review. From July 2003 to August 2004, Mr. Maya served as Law Clerk to the Honorable Gary

Allen Feess in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. Mr. Maya was also a litigation associate in the Los Angeles offices of Kaye Scholer LLP for approximately eight years where he worked on a large variety of complex commercial litigation from inception through trial. Mr. Maya was named “Advocate of the Year” for 2007 by the Consumer Law Project of Public Counsel for successful *pro bono* representation of a victim of a large-scale equity fraud ring.

Bradley King is an associate at AW working on this matter. Mr. King graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law, where he served as Associate Editor of the Pepperdine Law Review. He worked as a law clerk for the California Office of the Attorney General, Correctional Law Section in Los Angeles and was a certified law clerk for the Ventura County District Attorney’s Office. Mr. King began his legal career at a boutique civil rights law firm, gaining litigation experience in a wide variety of practice areas, including employment law, police misconduct, municipal contract, criminal defense, and premises liability cases.

Vanessa Shakib is another associate at AW working on this matter. Ms. Shakib graduated from George Mason University Law School, where she served as Senior Notes Editor of the Journal of International Commercial Law and a member of the Moot Court Board. Ms. Shakib began her legal career at Wasserman, Comden, Casselman & Esenstein, LLP, where she practiced general business litigation and public entity liability.

Meredith Lierz and Emily Rader were associates at AW who worked on miscellaneous tasks on this matter. Ms. Lierz graduated from Southwestern University School of Law and Ms. Rader graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law.

AW has been appointed lead counsel in numerous complex consumer class actions, sometimes in contested leadership applications. The following actions are some examples of recently resolved or pending class actions which AW has litigated or is currently litigating on behalf of its clients:

- *Eck, et al. v. City of Los Angeles*, No. BC577028 (LASC): \$347 million class settlement based on allegedly unlawful city tax regulations regarding electrical power; preliminary approval granted and final approval pending.
- *McKnight v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, No. 3:14-cv-05615-JST (N.D. Cal.): amended class settlement for non-reversionary fund of \$32.5 million based on “safe ride” fee charged to Uber customers; preliminary approval granted and final approval pending.
- *Kirby v. McAfee, Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02475-EJD (N.D. Cal.): appointed as co-lead class

- counsel. Plaintiffs challenged defendant's auto renewal and false discount practices. The finally approved class action settlement made \$80 Million available to the class and included injunctive relief requiring McAfee to notify customers at the point of every sale that the service will be auto-renewed at an undiscounted subscription price. Further, the settlement required McAfee to change its policy regarding the past product price it lists as a reference to any discount it's currently offering. McAfee will now only list a past price it has actually charged customers within the past 45 days.
- *Chimeno-Buzzi v. Hollister Co, et al.*, No. 1:14-cv-23120-MGC (S.D. Fla.): AW served as class counsel in \$10 Million nationwide finally approved settlement arising from violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 ("TCPA").
 - *Smith v. Floor and Décor Outlets of America, Inc.*, No. 1:15-cv-04316-ELR (N.D. Ga.): class action challenging product defect based on toxic emissions. \$14 Million class settlement finally approved by the court.
 - *In re: Experian Data Breach Litig.*, No. 8:15-cv-01592-AG-DFM (C.D. Cal.): currently serving as appointed co-lead counsel managing a PSC of six firms, after contested application and hearing in consolidated litigation consisting of thirty-eight class actions arising from a data breach disclosing the sensitive financial information of over 15 million T-Mobile customers. Plaintiffs seek both monetary and injunctive relief.
 - *Remijas v. Neiman Marcus Group, LLC*, No. 1:14-cv-01735 (N.D. Ill.): AW was responsible for briefing and arguing the groundbreaking appeal from the trial court's order, which had granted the motion to dismiss on the pleadings based on lack of Article III standing. The Seventh Circuit's landmark opinion was its first to address the Supreme Court's decision in *Clapper v. Amnesty Intern. USA*, 133 S. Ct. 1138 (2013). This Neiman Marcus opinion was the first appellate court to reject this view of *Clapper* and, adopting the plaintiffs' reasoning, established, among other things, that data breach victims have standing to pursue claims based on the increased risk of identity theft and fraud, even before that theft or fraud materializes. See generally 794 N.E.3d 688 (7th Cir. 2015) (reversed and remanded).
 - *In re: Kind LLC "All Natural" Litig.*, No. 1:15-md-02645-WHP (S.D.N.Y.): currently serving as appointed interim co-lead counsel for the plaintiff class by MDL Court after contested hearing.
 - *In re: Premera Blue Cross Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 15-md-02633-SI (D.

- Or.): currently serving, by court appointment, on the Executive Leadership Committee after contested leadership application and hearing.
- *Adlouni v. UCLA Health Systems Auxiliary*, No. BC589243 (Cal. Super. Ct. Los Angeles Cty.): currently serving by court appointment on PSC for plaintiff class allegedly impacted by university medical data breach, tentative settlement agreement in principle pending.
 - *In re: The Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 1:14-md-02583-TWT (N.D. Ga.): served, by court appointment, on the MDL Consumer Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee. The finally approved settlement provided approximately \$29 million of monetary relief to the consumer class, as well as robust injunctive relief requiring Home Depot to overhaul its data security practices.
 - *In re: Target Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 0:14-md-02522-PAM (D. Minn.): AW contributed considerable effort to vetting hundreds of potential class representatives, legal research involving the different state laws in play, the consolidated complaint, and significant discovery efforts.
 - *In re: YapStone Data Breach*, No. 4:15-cv-04429-JSW (N.D. Cal.): preliminarily approved class settlement provides credit monitoring and identity theft services to claimants (valued at approximately \$4.5 million annually in perpetuity), a non-reversionary fund to non-profit organizations, and injunctive relief in the form of YapStone implementing substantial data security measures.
 - *Pappas v. Naked Juice Co. of Glendora, Inc.*, No. 2:11-cv-8276-JAK-PLA (C.D. Cal.): appointed co-lead counsel after contested applications; resulted in nationwide settlement for \$9 million non-reversionary fund and injunctive relief in the form of product labeling changes, and periodic audits to assure compliance with labeling representations.
 - *In Re: Hain Celestial Seasonings Products Consumer Litigation*, No. 13-cv-01757-AG-AN (C.D. Cal.): appointed co-lead counsel after contested application.
 - *Lavinsky vs. City of Los Angeles*, No. BC542245 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles Cty. (“LASC”)): appointed Class Counsel at class certification on behalf of LA residents challenging allegedly illegal utilities taxation practices.
 - *Trammell v. Barbara’s Bakery, Inc.*, No. 3:12-cv-02664-CRB (N.D. Cal.): lead plaintiffs’ counsel in \$4 Million non-revertible fund nationwide settlement of food false advertising case. The case alleged false advertising of food products as “all natural” and “non-GMO.” In addition to the monetary relief, defendant agreed to correct the labeling, re-formulate its product to include only truly non-

GMO ingredients, and obtain certification from the non-GMO Project, including periodic audits. When preliminarily approving the settlement, the Hon. Charles R. Breyer commented that the settlement was an “excellent settlement” and that both sides did “an excellent job of resolving the case,” doing a “superb job” and presenting “a model of good lawyering on both sides”; when granting final approval to the settlement, Judge Breyer reiterated that the settlement was “very good” and that the case was “quite a successful class action.”

- *In re: Equifax, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, MDL No. 2800 (J.P.M.L.): class actions arising from alleged data breach of personal information of approximately 145 million Americans.
- *Cassidy v. Reebok International Ltd.*, No. 2:10-cv-09966-AHM (C.D. Cal.): \$25 Million nationwide settlement of apparel false advertising case.
- *Carey v. New Balance Athletic Shoe, Inc.*, Nos. 1:11-cv-10632-LTS & 1:11-cv-10001-LTS (D. Mass.): \$3.7 Million nationwide settlement of apparel false advertising case.
- *West v. ExamSoft Worldwide Inc.*, No. 14-cv-22950-UU (S.D. Fla.): \$2 Million nationwide settlement arising from software error on bar exam.
- *Melito v. American Eagle Outfitters, Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-02440-VEC (S.D.N.Y.): \$14.5 million nationwide settlement arising from TCPA violations pending preliminary approval.
- *Rivera v. Google, Inc.*, No. 1:16-cv-02714 (N.D. Ill.): prosecuting a class action for alleged violations of Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act (“BIPA”).
- *Monroy v. Shutterfly, Inc.*, No. 1:16-cv-10984 (N.D. Ill.): prosecuting a class action for alleged violations of Illinois BIPA.
- *Mirto v. AIG/Granite State Insurance Co. et al.*, No. HG 04180408 (Cal. Super. Ct., Alameda Cty.): \$3 Million California settlement re insurance discriminatory pricing.
- *Lewand v. Mazda Motor of America, Inc.*, No. 8:17-cv-620-JVS-JCG (C.D. Cal.): class action arising from alleged misrepresentations regarding live traffic feature on vehicle navigation software.
- *Axen v. Genco International, et al.*, No. 427033 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco Cty. (“SFSC”)): injunctive relief settlement for class action alleging pesticides in Ginseng products.
- *Citizens for Responsible Business v. Rite Aid Corporation, et al.*, No. 414831 (SFSC): prosecuted claims of false and illegal labeling in the herbal supplement industry

against 107 retailers and manufacturers, who were gleaning millions of dollars from this nationwide practice; AW was successful in completely eradicating the alleged illegal practice in the United States.

- *Feliciano v. General Motors LLC*, No. 14-cv-06374-AT (S.D.N.Y.): product defect regarding Chevy Cruze vehicles.
- *Skeen v. BMW of North America, LLC*, No. 2:13-cv-01531-WHW-CLW (D.N.J.): served as one of six plaintiffs' counsel on behalf of purchasers of MINI Coopers with allegedly defective timing chain and timing chain tensioners, secured an uncapped settlement fund granted final approval for claims for warranty extension, reimbursement for repairs, and compensation for sale at a loss.
- *Weiss v. Los Angeles*, No. BC141354 (LASC): currently serving as class counsel in this action challenging the defendant's review of parking violations, won *writ of mandate* trial to stop the allegedly illegal practice.
- *In re: Lumber Liquidators Chinese-Manufactured Flooring Durability Marketing and Sales Practices Litig.*, No. 1:16-md-02743-AJT-TRJ (E.D. Va.): settlement in principle reached in MDL class action arising from alleged misrepresentations of laminate flooring durability.
- *Whalen v. Michael Stores Inc.*, No. 2:14-cv-07006-JS-ARL (E.D.N.Y.): data breach class action.
- *Zadeh v. Chase Manhattan Bank, et al.*, No. 323715 (SFSC): privacy class action resulting in \$47 Million settlement.
- *Steinhaus v. American Express Travel Related Services Co. et al.*, No. 416248 (SFSC): privacy class action resulting in \$6 Million settlement.
- *Bernard v. MBNA America Bank, et al.*, No. 408700 (SFSC): privacy class action resulting in \$45.8 Million settlement.
- *Shakib v. Discover Bank, et al.*, No. 416194 (SFSC): privacy class action resulting in \$20.6 Million settlement.
- *Baumsteiger v. FleetBoston, et al.*, No. 408698 (SFSC): privacy class action resulting in \$10.1 Million settlement.
- *Lanchester v. Washington Mutual Bank, et al.*, No. 429754 (SFSC): privacy class action resulting in \$6 Million settlement.
- *Whitaker v. Health Net*, No. 2:11-cv-00910-KJM (E.D. Cal.): appointed to the Executive Committee in the consolidated action claiming violations of the California Confidentiality of Medical Information Act ("CMIA").
- *Sutter Medical Information Cases*, No. JCCP 4698 (Cal. Super. Ct., Sacramento Cty.): appointed to the Executive Committee in the consolidated action

claiming violations of California CMIA.

Additionally, Ms. Wolfson frequently lectures on numerous topics related to class action litigation across the country. An incomplete list of her speaking engagements is as follows:

- HarrisMartin: Equifax Data Breach Litigation Conference, November 2017, Atlanta (Co-Chair).
- Association of Business Trial Lawyers: “Navigating Class Action Settlement Negotiations and Court Approval: A Discussion with the Experts,” May 2017, Los Angeles; featuring the Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez and the Hon. Jay C. Gandhi.
- American Conference Institute: “2nd Cross-Industry and Interdisciplinary Summit on Defending and Managing Complex Class Actions,” April 2017, New York: Class Action Mock Settlement Exercise featuring the Hon. Anthony J. Mohr.
- CalBar Privacy Panel: “Privacy Law Symposium: Insider Views on Emerging Trends in Privacy Law Litigation and Enforcement Actions in California,” March 2017, Los Angeles (Moderator), featuring the Hon. Kim Dunning.
- Federal Bar Association: Northern District of California Chapter “2016 Class Action Symposium,” December, 2016, San Francisco (Co-Chair); featuring the Hon. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., and the Hon. Susan Y. Illston.
- Federal Bar Association: The Future of Class Actions, featuring the Hon. Jon Tigar and the Hon. Laurel Beeler, “Cutting Edge Topics in Class Action Litigation,” November 2015, San Francisco (Co-Chair and Faculty), featuring the Hon. Jon S. Tigar and the Hon. Laurel Beeler.
- American Association for Justice: AAJ 2015 Annual Convention - “The Mechanics of Class Action Certification,” July 2015, Montreal.
- HarrisMartin: Data Breach Litigation Conference: The Coming of Age - “The First Hurdles: Standing and Other Motion to Dismiss Arguments,” March 2015, San Diego.
- Bridgeport: 2015 Annual Consumer Class Action Conference, February 2015, Miami (Co-Chair).
- Venable, LLP: Invited by former opposing counsel to present mock oral argument on a motion to certify the class in a food labeling case, Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel (Ret.) presiding, October 2014, San Francisco.
- Bridgeport: 15th Annual Class Action Litigation Conference - “Food Labeling and Nutritional Claim Specific Class Actions,” September 2014, San Francisco

(Co-Chair and Panelist).

- Bridgeport: 2014 Consumer Class Action Conference - "Hot Topics in Food Class Action Litigation," June 2014, Chicago.
- Perrin Conferences: Challenges Facing the Food and Beverage Industries in Complex Consumer Litigations, invited to discuss cutting edge developments in settlement negotiations, notice, and other topics, April 2014, Chicago.
- Bridgeport: Class Action Litigation & Management Conference - "Getting Your Settlement Approved," April 2014, Los Angeles.
- HarrisMartin: Target Data Security Breach Litigation Conference - "Neiman Marcus and Michael's Data Breach Cases and the Future of Data Breach Cases," March 2014, San Diego.
- Bridgeport: Advertising, Marketing & Media Law: Litigation and Best Management Practices - "Class Waivers and Arbitration Provisions Post-*Concepcion / Oxford Health Care*," March 2014, Los Angeles.

Moreover, Mr. Ahdoot also frequently lectures on numerous topics related to class action litigation across the country. An incomplete list of his speaking engagements is as follows:

- HarrisMartin: Lumber Liquidators Flooring Litigation Conference, May 2015, Minneapolis: "Best Legal Claims and Defenses."
- Bridgeport: 15th Annual Class Action Litigation Conference, September 2014, San Francisco: "The Scourge of the System: Serial Objectors."
- Strafford Webinars: Crafting Class Settlement Notice Programs: Due Process, Reach, Claims Rates and More, February 2014: "Minimizing Court Scrutiny and Overcoming Objector Challenges."
- Pincus: Wage & Hour and Consumer Class Actions for Newer Attorneys: The Do's and Don'ts, January 2014, Los Angeles: "Current Uses for the 17200, the CLRA an PAGA."
- Bridgeport: 2013 Class Action Litigation & Management Conference, August 2013, San Francisco: "Settlement Mechanics and Strategy."

EXHIBIT B

Class Counsel Lodestar and Time Report by Category

McKnight, et al. v. Uber Technologies, et al.

(Case No. 3:14-cv-05615-JST)

Category Codes: L100 (case assessment, development & admin); L110 (fact investigation / development); L120 (analysis / strategy); L160 (settlement / non-binding ADR); L190 (other case assessment, development & admin); L210 (pleadings); L230 (court mandated conferences); L250 (other motions and submissions); L260 (class action certification and notice); L300 (discovery); L310 (written discovery); L320 (document production); L460 (post-trial motions and submissions); L500 (appeal).

Hours by Category Code

Timekeeper	Title	Hourly Rate	Lodestar	Total Hours	Hours by Category Code													
					L100	L110	L120	L160	L190	L210	L230	L250	L260	L300	L310	L320	L460	L500
AHDOOT & WOLFSON																		
Robert Ahdoot	Partner	\$850	\$433,840	510.4	2.0	1.6	1.8	381.9	7.6	5.4	0.8	4.3	41.5	3.2	14.1	37.6	8.6	-
Tina Wolfson	Partner	\$850	\$290,020	341.2	9.7	12.4	21.3	137.4	28.4	12.4	18.2	38.5	28.4	1.1	1.5	21.5	9.5	0.9
Ted Maya	Partner	\$675	\$127,170	188.4	1.1	-	2.1	5.8	3.4	4.6	0.0	74.2	35.0	0.8	26.3	16.4	18.7	-
Meredith Lierz	Associate	\$425	\$71,613	168.5	2.8	-	1.2	-	3.6	3.1	-	-	-	116.3	0.0	41.5	-	-
Vanessa Shakib	Associate	\$475	\$29,783	62.7	-	-	0.0	1.6	12.8	-	-	-	10.0	-	32.5	2.4	-	3.4
Brad King	Associate	\$475	\$4,180	8.8	-	-	0.0	2.2	0.0	-	-	-	6.6	-	-	-	-	-
Diana Kiem	Paralegal	\$125	\$900	7.2	-	-	0.0	2.3	2.1	-	-	-	1.0	-	0.7	-	1.1	-
Keith Custis	Of Counsel	\$625	\$101,250	162.0	-	15.1	5.6	20.2	5.9	26.1	0.9	82.9	1.0	1.0	-	3.3	-	-
Nick Suci	Co-Counsel	\$650	\$26,715	41.1	12.4	7.8	2.9	14.5	-	-	-	-	3.5	-	-	-	-	-
Totals for AW:			\$1,085,470	1,490.3	28.0	36.9	34.9	565.9	63.8	51.6	19.9	199.9	127.0	122.4	75.1	122.7	37.9	4.3
ARIAS, SANGUINETTI, WANG & TORRIJOS, LLP																		
Mike Arias	Partner	\$850	\$109,905	129.3	15.2	14.8	17.8	54.7	19.0	3.2	-	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alfredo Torrijos	Partner	\$675	\$382,118	566.1	14.6	77.9	18.4	174.8	14.6	22.6	1.1	48.6	57.1	79.8	29.4	27.2	-	-
L. McDuffie	Paralegal	\$125	\$2,163	17.3	-	5.8	-	-	5.3	1.7	0.7	-	3.0	0.8	-	-	-	-
Totals for ASWT:			\$494,185	712.7	29.8	98.5	36.2	229.5	38.9	27.5	1.8	53.2	60.1	80.6	29.4	27.2	-	-
LIDDLE & DUBIN, PC																		
Steven Liddle	Partner	\$850	\$80,325	94.5	4.4	0.0	18.7	67.2	-	3.5	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nicholas Coulson	Associate	\$440	\$236,500	537.5	1.3	41.5	23.2	211.2	6.8	26.2	-	3.1	7.1	217.1	-	-	-	-
Totals for LD:			\$316,825	632.0	5.7	41.5	41.9	278.4	6.8	29.7	-	3.8	7.1	217.1	-	-	-	-
Grand Totals:			\$1,896,480	2,835.0	63.5	176.9	113.0	1,073.8	109.5	108.8	21.7	256.9	194.2	420.1	104.5	149.9	37.9	4.3
Percent of Total Hours:			-	-	2.2%	6.2%	4.0%	37.9%	3.9%	3.8%	0.8%	9.1%	6.9%	14.8%	3.7%	5.3%	1.3%	0.2%

EXHIBIT C

LEGAL RESEARCH REPORT
by Benjamin P. H. H. H.

Volume 17, Number 3
December 2015



THOMSON REUTERS

California Region

Firm: **Snell & Wilmer**

Firm Size: 419 Firm Rank 104

Court Name: Arizona
 Case Name: Xhibit Corp., et al.
 Case Number: 2:15-bk-00679-BKM

For fee applications
 1/22/2015 through 9/11/2015

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Eric S. Pezold	Partner	CA	2004	2004	\$520	0.10	\$52.00
					Total:	0.10	\$52.00

Firm: **Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP**

Firm Size: 19 Firm Rank 0

Court Name: California Central
 Case Name: State Fish Co., Inc
 Case Number: 2:15-bk-11084-SK

For fee applications
 6/1/2015 through 9/30/2015

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Kenneth Klee	Partner	CA	1974	1975	\$1,300	0.20	\$260.00
David Stern	Partner	CA	1975	1975	\$1,080	189.50	\$204,660.00
Micheel Tuchin	Partner	CA	1990	1990	\$1,080	137.10	\$148,068.00
Maria Sountas Argiropoulos	Partner	CA	2006	2006	\$675	25.20	\$17,910.00
Colleen M. Keating	Counsel	CA	2008	2008	\$650	111.20	\$72,280.00
Jonathan M. Weiss	Associate	CA	2012	2012	\$475	525.00	\$249,375.00
Kathryn T. Zwicker	Associate	CA	1986	1986	\$440	9.50	\$4,180.00
Sasha M. Gurwitz	Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$395	40.80	\$16,116.00
					Total:	1038.50	\$711,949.00

Firm: **Bracewell & Giuliani LLP**

Firm Size: 422 Firm Rank 103

Court Name: Delaware
 Case Name: Optim Energy, LLC, et al.
 Case Number: 14-10262 (BLS)

For fee applications
 2/12/2014 through 10/15/2015

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Joe R. Huil	Partner	CA	1969	1969	\$790	0.60	\$474.00
					Total:	0.60	\$474.00

Firm: **Brown Rudnick LLP**

Firm Size: 184 Firm Rank 211

Court Name: Delaware
 Case Name: Corinthian Colleges Inc.
 Case Number: 15-10952 (KIC)

For fee applications
 5/4/2015 through 9/21/2015

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Ronald Rus	Partner	CA	1975	1975	\$880	1.50	\$1,320.00
Lauren E. Curry	Partner	CA	2010	2010	\$730	78.90	\$57,597.00
					Total:	80.40	\$58,917.00

California Region

Firm Codley LLP

Firm Size: 613 Firm Rank: 63

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 10/7/2015

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: RS Legacy Corporation
Case Number: 15-10197 (BLS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Seth A. Raffkin	Partner	CA	1998	1998	\$810	0.50	\$405.00
Janet D. Gertz	Associate	CA	2004	2004	\$755	14.60	\$11,023.00
Shannon L. Sorrells	Associate	CA	2011	2011	\$595	2.80	\$1,666.00
Total:						17.90	\$13,094.00

Firm Gibson Dunn & Crutcher, LLP

Firm Size: 1099 Firm Rank: 21

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS CORP
Case Number: 14-10979 (CSS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Matthew Bouslog	Associate	CA	2011	2011	\$625	5.10	\$3,187.50
Total:						5.10	\$3,187.50

Firm Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Firm Size: 1442 Firm Rank: 13

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS CORP
Case Number: 14-10979 (CSS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Mike Behrus	Partner	CA	1999	1999	\$1,220	3.10	\$3,782.00
Mark E. McKane	Partner	CA	1997	1997	\$1,025	198.50	\$203,462.50
Christopher Keegan	Partner	CA	2002	2002	\$855	75.50	\$64,552.50
Michael Esser	Associate	CA	2009	2009	\$825	213.40	\$176,055.00
Alexander Davis	Associate	CA	2012	2012	\$710	192.60	\$136,746.00
Justin Sowa	Associate	CA	2013	2013	\$710	199.70	\$141,787.00
Austin Klar	Associate	CA	2013	2013	\$635	35.00	\$22,225.00
Sarah Stock	Associate	CA	2013	2013	\$635	121.60	\$77,216.00
Anna Tertnyan	Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$555	241.80	\$134,199.00
James Barolo	Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$555	108.60	\$60,273.00
Kevin Chang	Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$555	170.80	\$94,794.00
Total:						1560.50	\$1,115,092.00

California Region

Firm: Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP

Firm Size: 19 Firm Rank: 0

Court Name: Delaware
 Case Name: SEAL123, INC., et al
 Case Number: 15-10081 (CSS)

For fee applications
 7/1/2015 through 11/30/2015

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Lee Bogdanoff	Partner	CA	1985	1985	\$1,080	7.30	\$7,884.00
Michael Tuchin	Partner	CA	1990	1990	\$1,080	37.10	\$40,068.00
David Fidler	Partner	CA	1997	1998	\$850	12.70	\$10,795.00
Robert J. Pfister	Partner	CA	2001	2001	\$795	0.20	\$159.00
David M. Gress	Partner	CA	2005	2005	\$695	67.30	\$46,773.50
Marfa Sountas Argiropoulos	Partner	CA	2006	2006	\$675	1.70	\$1,147.50
Justin D. Yi	Partner	CA	2009	2009	\$625	0.80	\$500.00
Jonathan M. Weiss	Associate	CA	2012	2012	\$475	34.70	\$16,482.50
Kathryn T. Zwicker	Associate	CA	1986	1986	\$440	12.40	\$5,456.00
Total:						174.20	\$129,265.50

Firm: Morrison & Foerster LLP

Firm Size: 1025 Firm Rank: 22

Court Name: Delaware
 Case Name: ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS CORP
 Case Number: 14-10979 (CSS)

For fee applications
 8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Clara Lim	Associate	CA	2012	2012	\$635	39.80	\$25,273.00
Chika Arakawa	Associate	CA	2013	2013	\$495	8.30	\$4,108.50
Total:						48.10	\$29,381.50

California Region

Firm **Munger Toiles & Olson LLC**

Firm Size: 181 Firm Rank: 216

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Court Name Delaware
Case Name ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS CORP
Case Number 14-10979 (SS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
John W. Spiegel	Partner	CA	1977	1977	\$1,065	36.30	\$38,659.50
Thomas B. Walper	Partner	CA	1980	1980	\$1,065	184.05	\$196,013.25
Stephen D. Rose	Partner	CA	1991	1991	\$960	29.20	\$28,032.00
Todd J. Rosen	Partner	CA	1999	1999	\$875	53.20	\$46,550.00
Jay M. Fujitani	Partner	CA	1984	1984	\$830	92.50	\$76,775.00
Kevin S. Allred	Partner	CA	1986	1986	\$830	94.50	\$78,435.00
Seth Goldman	Partner	CA	2002	2002	\$750	154.70	\$116,025.00
Bradley R. Schneider	Of Counsel	CA	2004	2004	\$680	115.10	\$78,288.00
Emily A. Bussigel	Associate	CA	2010	2010	\$635	184.80	\$117,348.00
Sam Greenberg	Associate	CA	2010	2010	\$615	61.70	\$37,945.50
Alex D. Terapka	Associate	CA	2012	2012	\$510	89.40	\$45,594.00
Andrea M. Weirtraub	Associate	CA	2013	2013	\$510	68.30	\$34,833.00
Sara N. Taylor	Associate	CA	2012	2012	\$510	70.40	\$35,904.00
Peter E. Boos	Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$395	11.40	\$4,503.00
Total:						1245.55	\$934,885.25

Firm **O'Melveny & Myers LLP**

Firm Size: 1198 Firm Rank: 16

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 9/30/2015

Court Name Delaware
Case Name Colt Holding Company
Case Number 15-11296 (LSS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
John-Paul Mctiey	Partner	CA	1999	1999	\$930	6.70	\$6,231.00
Sarah Hoffner	Counsel	CA	2004	2004	\$755	11.20	\$8,456.00
Jeeho Lee	Counsel	CA	2007	2007	\$745	5.00	\$3,725.00
Joannah Caneda	Associate	CA	2015	2015	\$460	4.90	\$2,254.00
Christopher Marcin	Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$415	1.20	\$498.00
Joseph Zujkowski	Counsel	CA	2008	2008	\$390	183.60	\$71,604.00
Total:						212.60	\$92,768.00

California Region

Firm: Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Wei

Firm Size: 55 Firm Rank: 0

Name

Debra I. Grassgreen
William Ramseyer

Title
Partner
Of Counsel

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: DDMG Estate
Case Number: 12-12568(BLS)

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
CA	1991	1994	\$925
CA	1980	1980	\$650
Total:			

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Hours	Fees
1.30	\$1,202.50
1.10	\$715.00
<u>2.40</u>	<u>\$1,917.50</u>

Firm: Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Wei

Firm Size: 55 Firm Rank: 0

Name

William L. Ramseyer

Title
Of Counsel

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: ICL Holdings Company, INC
Case Number: 12-18319

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
CA	1980	1980	\$650
Total:			

For fee applications
6/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Hours	Fees
7.60	\$4,940.00
<u>7.60</u>	<u>\$4,940.00</u>

Firm: Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Wei

Firm Size: 55 Firm Rank: 0

Name

Andrew W. Caine
William L. Ramseyer
William Ramseyer

Title
Partner
Of Counsel
Of Counsel

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: NE OPCO Int
Case Number: 1:13-BK-11483

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
CA	1983	1983	\$925
CA	1980	1980	\$650
CA	1980	1980	\$650
Total:			

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 9/30/2015

Hours	Fees
0.20	\$185.00
1.30	\$845.00
2.10	\$1,365.00
<u>3.60</u>	<u>\$2,395.00</u>

Firm: Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Wei

Firm Size: 55 Firm Rank: 0

Name

Andrew W. Caine
Jeffrey Pomerantz
Shirley S. Cho

Title
Of Counsel
Partner
Of Counsel

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: SEAL123, INC., et al
Case Number: 15-10081 (CS)

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
CA	1983	1983	\$925
CA	1989	1989	\$895
CA	1997	1997	\$750
Total:			

For fee applications
7/1/2015 through 11/30/2015

Hours	Fees
0.40	\$370.00
0.90	\$805.50
13.10	\$9,825.00
<u>14.40</u>	<u>\$11,000.50</u>

California Region

Firm: Packulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weil		Court Name: Delaware		For fee applications:			
Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Alan J. Kornfeld	Partner	CA	1987	1987	\$925	8.90	\$8,232.50
Andrew Caine	Of Counsel	CA	1983	1983	\$895	0.20	\$179.00
David J. Barton	Partner	CA	1981	1981	\$850	0.30	\$255.00
David M. Bertenthal	Partner	CA	1989	1993	\$850	10.00	\$8,500.00
Maxim B. Litvak	Partner	CA	2001	2001	\$775	1.70	\$1,317.50
Joshua M. Fried	Partner	CA	2006	2006	\$725	2.80	\$2,030.00
Jonathan Kim	Of Counsel	CA	1995	1995	\$665	0.80	\$532.00
Elissa Wagner	Of Counsel	CA	2000	2001	\$625	46.60	\$29,125.00
William Ramseyer	Of Counsel	CA	1980	1980	\$625	2.40	\$1,500.00
Total:						73.70	\$51,671.00

Case Name: SS Body Armor, Inc.
 Case Number: 10-11255-(PW)
 For fee applications: 9/1/2014 through 9/30/2015

Firm: Paul Hastings LLP		Court Name: Delaware		For fee applications:			
Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Leslie A. Plaskon	Partner	CA	1988	1988	\$1,150	111.10	\$127,765.00
Peter Burke	Partner	CA	1996	1996	\$975	3.90	\$3,802.50
Daniel C. Tola	Associate	CA	2013	2013	\$550	20.50	\$11,275.00
Kevin Kraft	Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$495	4.80	\$2,376.00
Total:						140.30	\$145,218.50

Case Name: Mphcorp, Inc.
 Case Number: 15-11357 (CSS)
 For fee applications: 8/1/2015 through 9/30/2015

Firm: Paul Hastings LLP		Court Name: Delaware		For fee applications:			
Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Nancy L. Abell	Partner	CA	1979	1979	\$995	0.30	\$895.50
Stephen D. Cooke	Partner	CA	1985	1985	\$973	0.30	\$292.13
Total:						1.20	\$1,187.63

Case Name: SEAL 123, INC., et al.
 Case Number: 15-10081 (CSS)
 For fee applications: 7/1/2015 through 11/30/2015

California Region

Firm: Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

Firm Size: 647 Firm Rank: 58

Court Name: Delaware
 Case Name: RS Legacy Corporation
 Case Number: 15-10197 (BLS)

For fee applications
 6/1/2015 through 10/7/2015

Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Partner	CA	2004	2005	\$840	11.20	\$9,408.00
Associate	CA	2008	2010	\$735	211.50	\$155,452.50
Partner	CA	1990	1990	\$695	47.20	\$32,804.00
Total:					269.90	\$197,664.50

Firm: Robins Kaplan LLP

Firm Size: 250 Firm Rank: 0

Court Name: Delaware
 Case Name: Corinthian Colleges Inc
 Case Number: 15-10952 (KIG)

For fee applications
 5/4/2015 through 9/21/2015

Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Partner	CA	1995	1995	\$810	5.70	\$4,617.00
Partner	CA	2014	2014	\$795	60.30	\$47,938.50
Partner	CA	2014	2014	\$675	17.00	\$11,475.00
Partner	CA	2014	2014	\$675	452.00	\$305,100.00
Partner	CA	2014	2014	\$650	17.40	\$11,310.00
Associate	CA	2009	2009	\$470	397.90	\$187,013.00
Associate	CA	2014	2014	\$450	568.10	\$255,645.00
Partner	CA	2001	2001	\$420	18.10	\$7,602.00
Total:					1536.50	\$830,700.50

Firm: Torgys LLP

Firm Size: 236 Firm Rank: 0

Court Name: Delaware
 Case Name: Nortel Networks Inc.
 Case Number: 09-10138

For fee applications
 8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Partner	CA	1974	1974	\$1,090	9.10	\$9,919.00
Associate	CA	2007	2007	\$775	163.00	\$126,325.00
Total:					172.10	\$136,244.00

California Region

Firm: **Cooley LLP**

Firm Size: 613 Firm Rank: 63

Name

Aarti G. Reddy
Amanda B. Pacheco

Court Name: Virginia Eastern
Case Name: Health Diagnostic Laboratory, Inc.
Case Number: 15-32919-KRH

For fee applications

6/7/2015 through 8/31/2015

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
CA	2010	2010	\$655	11.20	\$7,336.00
CA	2013	2013	\$470	3.30	\$1,551.00
				Total:	\$8,887.00

Title
Associate
Associate

West Region

Firm Faegre Baker Daniels LLP

Firm Size: 750 Firm Rank: 0

Name

Michael K. Bolton
 Brandon K. Oliver

Title
 Partner
 Associate

Court Name Colorado
 Case Name ROBERT D. MORDINI, JR.,
 Case Number 11-15491-ABC

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
CO	2001	2001	\$540
CO	2010	2010	\$295
Total:			

For fee applications
 9/1/2013 through 11/18/2015

Hours	Fees
0.50	\$270.00
3.50	\$1,082.50
<u>4.00</u>	<u>\$1,302.50</u>

Firm Greenberg Traurig LLP

Firm Size: 1699 Firm Rank: 9

Name

Matthew L. Hinker

Title
 Associate

Court Name Delaware
 Case Name ATLS Acquisition LLC
 Case Number 13-10262 (PJM)

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
CO	2010	2010	\$635
Total:			

For fee applications
 8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Hours	Fees
2.30	\$1,460.50
<u>2.30</u>	<u>\$1,460.50</u>

Firm O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Firm Size: 2193 Firm Rank: 16

Name

Robert Alashek
 Peter Friedman

Title
 Partner
 Partner

Court Name Delaware
 Case Name Colt Holding Company
 Case Number 15-11296 (LS)

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
CO	1977	1977	\$1,075
CO	1998	1998	\$935
Total:			

For fee applications
 8/1/2015 through 9/30/2015

Hours	Fees
1.50	\$1,612.50
107.00	\$100,045.00
<u>108.50</u>	<u>\$101,657.50</u>

Firm Jenner & Block LLP

Firm Size: 433 Firm Rank: 98

Name

Jarrell A. Cook

Title
 Associate

Court Name Alabama Northern
 Case Name Walter Energy Inc
 Case Number 15-02741-TOM11

State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate
WA	2014	2014	\$460
Total:			

For fee applications
 7/15/2015 through 10/31/2015

Hours	Fees
10.00	\$4,600.00
<u>10.00</u>	<u>\$4,600.00</u>

West Region

Firm: **Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP**

Firm Size: 790 Firm Rank 40

For fee applications
7/1/2015 through 10/31/2015

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: Chicksilver Resources Inc
Case Number: 15-10585(LSS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Matthew W. Kinskey	Associate	WA	2014	2014	\$430	115.10	\$49,493.00
						Total:	\$49,493.00

Firm: **Bracewell & Giuliani LLP**

Firm Size: 422 Firm Rank 105

For fee applications
2/12/2004 through 10/15/2015

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: Optim Energy, LLC, et al,
Case Number: 14-10262 (BLS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Nancy Jo Nelson	Partner	WA	1984	1984	\$975	28.60	\$27,885.00
Jacqueline Java	Counsel	WA	2000	2000	\$670	0.90	\$603.00
Jacqueline Java	Counsel	WA	2000	2000	\$650	54.50	\$35,432.63
Sandra Snyder	Associate	WA	2006	2006	\$529	106.80	\$56,583.71
Sandra Snyder	Associate	WA	2006	2006	\$520	2.30	\$1,196.00
Blake Urban	Associate	WA	2009	2009	\$481	5.10	\$2,455.50
Serena Rwejuna	Associate	WA	2013	2013	\$363	37.00	\$13,449.87
						Total:	\$137,605.71

Firm: **Foley & Lardner LLP**

Firm Size: 874 Firm Rank 31

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 8/31/2015

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: Universal Cooperatives Inc
Case Number: 14-11187 (MPW)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Jack G. Haake	Associate	WA	2011	2011	\$315	12.40	\$3,906.00
						Total:	\$3,906.00

Firm: **Jones Day**

Firm Size: 2407 Firm Rank 3

For fee applications
8/1/2015 through 9/30/2015

Court Name: Delaware
Case Name: Molycorp, Inc
Case Number: 15-11357 (CSS)

Name	Title	State	Graduated	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Fees
Kent L. Killelea	Of Counsel	WA	1984	1984	\$750	5.30	\$3,975.00
						Total:	\$3,975.00

California Region

Title	Professional	Firm	Graduated	Admitted	State	Rate	Hours	Total
Partner	Kenneth Klee	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	1975	1974	CA	\$1,300	0.2	\$260.00
Partner	Mike Bethus	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	1999	1999	CA	\$1,220	3.1	\$3,782.00
Partner	Leslie A. Plaskon	Paul Hastings LLP	1988	1988	CA	\$1,150	111.1	\$127,765.00
Partner	Sheila Block	Torys LLP	1974	1974	CA	\$1,090	9.1	\$9,919.00
Partner	David Stern	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	1975	1975	CA	\$1,080	189.5	\$204,660.00
Partner	Lee Bogdanoff	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	1975	1975	CA	\$1,080	7.3	\$7,884.00
Partner	Michael Tuchin	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	1975	1975	CA	\$1,065	36.3	\$38,135.00
Partner	John W. Spiegel	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	1985	1985	CA	\$1,065	184.05	\$196,013.25
Partner	Thomas B. Walper	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	1990	1990	CA	\$1,025	198.5	\$203,452.50
Partner	Mark E. Mickand	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	1977	1977	CA	\$995	0.9	\$895.50
Partner	Nancy I. Abeil	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	1980	1980	CA	\$975	3.9	\$3,802.50
Partner	Peter Burke	Paul Hastings LLP	1997	1997	CA	\$973	0.3	\$292.13
Partner	Stephen D. Cooke	Paul Hastings LLP	1986	1986	CA	\$960	29.2	\$28,032.00
Partner	Stephert D. Rose	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	1985	1985	CA	\$930	6.7	\$6,231.00
Partner	John-Paul Motley	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	1991	1991	CA	\$925	8.9	\$8,232.50
Partner	Alan J. Kornfeld	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1999	1999	CA	\$925	0.6	\$555.00
Partner	Andrew W. Cairne	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1987	1987	CA	\$925	1.3	\$1,202.50
Partner	Debra I. Grassgreen	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1983	1983	CA	\$895	0.2	\$179.00
Partner	Andrew Cairne	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1994	1994	CA	\$895	0.9	\$805.50
Partner	Jeffrey Pomerantz	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1983	1983	CA	\$880	1.5	\$1,320.00
Partner	Ronald Rus	Brown Rudnick LLP	1989	1989	CA	\$875	53.2	\$46,550.00
Partner	Todd J. Rosen	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	1975	1975	CA	\$855	75.5	\$64,552.50
Partner	Christopher Keegan	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	1999	1999	CA	\$850	12.7	\$10,785.00
Partner	David Felder	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	2002	2002	CA	\$850	0.3	\$255.00
Partner	David J. Barton	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1998	1997	CA	\$840	10	\$8,500.00
Partner	David M. Benthall	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1981	1981	CA	\$830	11.2	\$9,408.00
Partner	Benjamin Finestone	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1993	1989	CA	\$830	92.5	\$76,775.00
Partner	Jay M. Fujitani	Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP	2005	2004	CA	\$830	94.5	\$78,435.00
Partner	Kevin S. Allred	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	1984	1984	CA	\$825	213.4	\$176,055.00
Associate	Michael Esser	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	1986	1986	CA	\$810	5.7	\$4,617.00
Partner	Romen M. Silberfeld	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2009	2009	CA	\$810	0.5	\$405.00
Partner	Seth A. Rafkin	Robins Kaplan LLP	1995	1995	CA	\$795	60.3	\$47,938.50
Partner	Howard Weg	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	1998	1998	CA	\$795	0.2	\$159.00
Partner	Robert J. Pfister	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$790	0.6	\$474.00
Associate	Joe R. Hull	Torys LLP	2001	2001	CA	\$775	163	\$126,325.00
Partner	Adam Stevens	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1969	1969	CA	\$775	1.7	\$1,317.50
Partner	Maxim B. Litvak	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	2007	2007	CA	\$755	14.6	\$11,023.00
Associate	Janet D. Gertz	Cooley LLP	2001	2001	CA	\$755	11.2	\$8,456.00
Partner	Sarah Hoffman	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	2004	2004	CA	\$750	154.7	\$116,025.00
Partner	Seth Goldman	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	2004	2004	CA	\$750	13.1	\$9,825.00
Of Counsel	Shirley S. Cho	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	2002	2002	CA	\$750		
Of Counsel			1997	1997	CA			

California Region

Title	Professional	Firm	Graduated	Admitted	State	Rate	Hours	Total
Counsel	Jeeho Lee	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	2007	2007	CA	\$745	5	\$3,725.00
Associate	Katharine Scharfing	Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP	2010	2008	CA	\$735	211.5	\$155,452.50
Partner	Lauren E. Curry	Brown Rudnick LLP	2010	2010	CA	\$730	78.9	\$57,597.00
Partner	Joshua M. Fried	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	2006	2006	CA	\$725	2.8	\$2,030.00
Associate	Alexander Davis	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2012	2012	CA	\$710	192.6	\$136,746.00
Associate	Justin Sowa	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2013	2013	CA	\$710	199.7	\$141,787.00
Partner	David M. Gress	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	2005	2005	CA	\$695	67.3	\$46,773.50
Partner	Randa Osman	Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP	1990	1990	CA	\$695	47.2	\$32,804.00
Of Counsel	Bradley R. Schneider	Munger Toles & Olson LLC	2004	2004	CA	\$680	115.1	\$78,268.00
Partner	David B. Sherman	Robins Kaplan LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$675	17	\$11,475.00
Partner	Maria Sountas Argiropoulos	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	2006	2006	CA	\$675	26.9	\$18,157.50
Partner	Scott F. Gauthier	Robins Kaplan LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$675	452	\$305,100.00
Of Counsel	Jonathan Kim	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1995	1995	CA	\$665	0.8	\$532.00
Associate	Aarti G. Reddy	Cooley LLP	2010	2010	CA	\$655	11.2	\$7,336.00
Counsel	Colleen M. Kending	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	2008	2008	CA	\$650	111.2	\$72,280.00
Partner	James P. Meinton, Jr.	Robins Kaplan LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$650	17.4	\$11,510.00
Of Counsel	William L. Ramseyer	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1980	1980	CA	\$650	8.9	\$5,785.00
Of Counsel	William Ramseyer	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1980	1980	CA	\$650	3.2	\$2,080.00
Associate	Austin Klar	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2013	2013	CA	\$635	35	\$22,225.00
Associate	Clara Lim	Morrison & Foerster LLP	2012	2012	CA	\$635	39.8	\$25,273.00
Associate	Emily A. Bussigal	Munger Toles & Olson LLC	2010	2010	CA	\$635	184.8	\$117,348.00
Associate	Sarah Stock	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2013	2013	CA	\$635	121.6	\$77,216.00
Of Counsel	Elissa Wagner	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	2001	2000	CA	\$625	46.6	\$29,125.00
Partner	Justin D. Yi	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	2009	2009	CA	\$625	0.8	\$600.00
Associate	Matthew Bouslog	Gibson Dunn & Crutcher, LLP	2011	2011	CA	\$625	5.1	\$3,187.50
Of Counsel	William Ramseyer	Pachulski Stang Ziehl Young Jones & Weintraub	1980	1980	CA	\$625	2.4	\$1,500.00
Associate	Sam Greenberg	Munger Toles & Olson LLC	2010	2010	CA	\$615	61.7	\$37,945.50
Associate	Shannon L. Sorrells	Cooley LLP	2011	2011	CA	\$595	2.8	\$1,666.00
Associate	Anna Terteryan	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$555	241.8	\$134,199.00
Associate	James Berolo	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$555	108.6	\$60,273.00
Associate	Kevin Chang	Kirkland & Ellis LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$555	170.8	\$94,794.00
Associate	Daniel C. Tola	Paul Hastings LLP	2013	2013	CA	\$550	20.5	\$11,275.00
Partner	Eric S. Perzold	Snell & Wilmer	2004	2004	CA	\$520	0.1	\$52.00
Associate	Alex D. Terpka	Munger Toles & Olson LLC	2012	2012	CA	\$510	89.4	\$45,594.00
Associate	Andrea M. Weintraub	Munger Toles & Olson LLC	2013	2013	CA	\$510	68.3	\$34,833.00
Associate	Sara N. Taylor	Munger Toles & Olson LLC	2012	2012	CA	\$510	70.4	\$35,904.00
Associate	Chika Arakawa	Morrison & Foerster LLP	2013	2013	CA	\$495	8.3	\$4,108.50
Associate	Kevin Kraft	Paul Hastings LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$495	4.8	\$2,376.00
Associate	Jonathan M. Mielts	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	2012	2012	CA	\$475	559.7	\$265,857.50
Associate	Amanda B. Pacheco	Cooley LLP	2013	2013	CA	\$470	3.3	\$1,551.00
Associate	Cynthia C. Hernandez	Robins Kaplan LLP	2009	2009	CA	\$470	397.9	\$187,013.00

California Region

Title	Professional	Firm	Graduated	Admitted	State	Rate	Hours	Total
Associate	Joannah Camedia	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	2015	2015	CA	\$450	4.9	\$2,254.00
Associate	Lorfe A. Ball	Robbins Kaplan LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$450	568.1	\$255,645.00
Associate	Kathryn T. Zwicker	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	1986	1986	CA	\$440	21.9	\$9,635.00
Partner	Amy Churein	Robbins Kaplan LLP	2001	2001	CA	\$420	18.1	\$7,602.00
Associate	Christopher Martini	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$415	1.2	\$498.00
Associate	Peter E. Boos	Munger Tolles & Olson LLC	2014	2014	CA	\$395	11.4	\$4,503.00
Associate	Sasha M. Gurvitz	Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern, LLP	2014	2014	CA	\$395	40.8	\$16,116.00
Counsel	Joseph Zujkowski	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	2008	2008	CA	\$390	183.6	\$71,604.00


West Region

Title	Professional	Firm	Graduated	Admitted	State	Rate	Hours	Total
Partner	Robert Blashek	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	1977	1977	CO	\$1,075	1.5	\$1,612.50
Partner	Peter Friedman	O'Melveny & Myers LLP	1998	1998	CO	\$935	107	\$100,045.00
Associate	Matthew L. Hinker	Greenberg Traurig LLP	2010	2010	CO	\$635	2.3	\$1,460.50
Partner	Michael K. Bolton	Faegre Baker Daniels LLP	2001	2001	CO	\$540	0.5	\$270.00
Associate	Brandon K. Oliver	Faegre Baker Daniels LLP	2010	2010	CO	\$295	3.5	\$1,032.50
Partner	Nancy Jo Nelson	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	1984	1984	WA	\$375	28.6	\$27,885.00
Of Counsel	Kent L. Killelea	Jones Day	1984	1984	WA	\$750	5.3	\$3,975.00
Counsel	Jacqueline Java	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	2000	2000	WA	\$670	0.9	\$603.00
Counsel	Jacqueline Java	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	2000	2000	WA	\$650	54.5	\$35,432.63
Associate	Sandra Snyder	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	2006	2006	WA	\$529	106.8	\$56,583.71
Associate	Sandra Snyder	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	2006	2006	WA	\$520	2.3	\$1,196.00
Associate	Blake Urban	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	2009	2009	WA	\$481	5.1	\$2,455.50
Associate	Jarrell A. Cook	Jenner & Block LLP	2014	2014	WA	\$460	10	\$4,600.00
Associate	Matthew W. Kinskey	Akin Gump Strauss Hauser & Feld LLP	2014	2014	WA	\$430	115.1	\$49,493.00
Associate	Serena Rvejuana	Bracewell & Giuliani LLP	2013	2013	WA	\$363	37	\$13,449.87
Associate	Jack G. Haake	Foley & Lardner LLP	2011	2011	WA	\$315	12.4	\$3,906.00

EXHIBIT D

THE NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL

NOT FOR REPRINT

 [Click to Print](#) or Select 'Print' in your browser menu to print this document.

Page printed from: [National Law Journal](#)

Billing Rates Rise, Discounts Abound

A 10 percent increase is offset by price cuts.

Katelyn Polantz, The National Law Journal

January 5, 2015

The price of a billable hour has risen by more than 10 percent in four years, as large corporate law firms focused on their most expensive work and saved clients' money elsewhere.

"The question is: Is anybody paying that?" Maurice Watson, chairman at Husch Blackwell, said, looking back at hourly rates charged last year for lawyers. Husch's average rate for partners is about \$449 per hour, the firm told The National Law Journal in response to our 2014 billing survey. But \$407 is closer to what the firm collects for its work.

The former number represents the "rack rate," Watson said, while the lower price factors in discounts given to clients on the billable hour and in alternative billing arrangements.

Husch's fees are indicative of the pricier billable hour and complementary cost cuts that law firms find for clients. The Kansas City, Mo.-founded firm was among the firms that have reported their rates to The National Law Journal since 2010. Almost all of the highest- and lowest-charging partners among the firms increased rates since 2010.

Partners' hourly prices at the 40 firms that reported their numbers in 2014 now hover around \$500 an hour on average. The highest-billing partner among the survey came from Kaye Scholer, with a \$1,250 rate. The lowest-billing partner, from Frost Brown Todd, made \$220, the firms told the NLJ.

See chart: [Billing Rates at the Nation's Priciest Law Firms](#)

The NLJ billing data also includes rates collected from public records — mostly bankruptcy filings — for 128 additional firms during the past three years.

Although the rates charged have gone up in recent years, the amounts that clients pay have not kept pace with inflation, legal industry leaders say.

"I think the story of billing rates is no longer as full or clear as it once was," Watson said.

Lawyers often give discounts on their stated rates, or firms arrange alternative fee plans with clients, including caps on fees, retainers or other flat rates for legal work. Still, firms lean on hourly pricing more than any other model. Generally, 15 percent to 20 percent of work comes from alternative fee structures, according to Steve Nelson of the McCormick Group Inc., a legal consulting firm in Northern Virginia.

Dinsmore & Shohl, a Cincinnati-based firm, has changed the way it sets rates instead of ditching the billable model.

"The billable hour is still very important. There's probably 100 reasons for that," firm chairman George Vincent said.

Dinsmore opened an office in Washington in 2011, so billing rates for lawyers in the nation's capital notched higher than at the rest of the firm. At the same time, associates faced a shift away from rates that rise in lockstep to individualized pricing, Vincent said. Dinsmore also has added nonpartner-track associates to cut some fees. The firm's lawyers charged between \$590 and \$175 in 2010, but they ranged between \$850 and \$160 in 2014.

The spread shows a rate expansion that mimics the decisions made by other firms — increases for top earners while squeezing value where they can.

Associates, on average, charged \$306 an hour at 28 firms in the NLJ study in 2014, an increase of 12 percent from those firms' average rate four years previously. The most expensive associates' rates pushed up at about the same pace, while a number of firms increased their lowest-paid associates' rates by only \$15 or less an hour.

The deleveraging of lawyers in the industry may account for this. Many clients now refuse to pay for legal work performed by first-year associates, Nelson said. Associates instead train during their first year, or work on pro bono or the equivalent of clerk and paralegal tasks. Outsourcing some work to cheaper consultants and firms plays into the pricing models more every year.

Many large firms are shedding lower-end practices, which fueled partners' lateral moves in 2014, Nelson added. Large firms now often mandate that partners meet or exceed certain rates. Some practices become priced out, so the lawyers move to less strict or lower-tiered firms to keep their clients. Practices that work on large corporate mergers or high-stakes litigation saw less lateral movement because of rate pressure. Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, with an \$1,800 hourly rate for Theodore Olson, an outlier, had the highest rate the NLJ could find in public records.

The billing rate story was different in bankruptcy matters. Those numbers showed that the practice area, which runs countercyclical to the U.S. economy, suffered as companies recovered from the economic recession. Partners and associates working with clients in bankruptcy often must report their hourly rates in court.

Those partners averaged \$452 per hour in 2014, compared with an average rate of \$480 in 2012. The NLJ found fewer partners mentioned in new bankruptcy filings in 2014 compared with the previous years. On average over three years, bankruptcy partners charged about \$475 an hour, according to records from more than 2,300 firm shareholders.

In 2012, when rates were higher, elite New York firms told courts their partners earned \$1,000 an hour or more on the work. This \$1,000-an-hour club included three partners from Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison and two partners from Weil, Gotshal & Manges.

It also included a team of nine Sullivan & Cromwell partners who charged \$1,150 an hour each to represent Eastman Kodak Co. in its bankruptcy.

In 2014, the rates for bankruptcy work topped out at about \$900 an hour, according to the data. Two partners from Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones, a Los Angeles corporate restructuring boutique, charged \$875 and \$895 each for their work on the bankruptcy of staffing company Ablest Inc.

Copyright 2015. ALM Media Properties, LLC. All rights reserved.

2014 Adams and Reese	New Orleans, LA	318	\$700.00	\$305.00	\$420.00	\$915.00	\$220.00	\$270.00	\$500.00	\$425.00	\$875.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Akerman	Miami, FL	523	\$880.00	\$380.00	\$535.00	\$465.00	\$205.00	\$305.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld	Washington, DC	609	\$1220.00	\$615.00	\$785.00	\$660.00	\$365.00	\$525.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natisis	Los Angeles, CA	181	\$680.00	\$525.00	\$615.00							National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Alston & Bird	Atlanta, GA	789	\$875.00	\$485.00	\$675.00	\$575.00	\$280.00	\$425.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Andrews Kurth	Houston, TX	337	\$1090.00	\$745.00	\$890.00	\$1090.00	\$265.00	\$670.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Archer & Greiner	Haddonfield, NJ	194	\$460.00	\$330.00	\$400.00	\$295.00	\$200.00	\$245.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Arent Fox	Washington, DC	330	\$950.00	\$500.00	\$680.00	\$595.00	\$275.00	\$395.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Arnall Golden Gregory	Atlanta, GA	140	\$520.00	\$430.00	\$480.00							National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Arnold & Porter	Washington, DC	720	\$650.00	\$570.00	\$815.00	\$610.00	\$345.00	\$500.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Arnstein & Lehr	Chicago, IL	144	\$595.00	\$350.00	\$465.00	\$350.00	\$175.00	\$250.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Baker & Hostetler	Cleveland, OH	756	\$670.00	\$275.00	\$449.00	\$350.00	\$210.00	\$272.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Baker & McKenzie	Chicago, IL	4057	\$1130.00	\$260.00	\$755.00	\$625.00	\$100.00	\$385.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz	Memphis, TN	588	\$495.00	\$340.00	\$400.00	\$465.00	\$245.00	\$295.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Ballard Spahr	Philadelphia, PA	483	\$550.00	\$385.00	\$475.00	\$495.00	\$235.00	\$315.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Barnes & Thornburg	Indianapolis, IN	522	\$660.00	\$330.00	\$480.00	\$370.00	\$280.00	\$320.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Bonesch, Friedlander, Caplan & Aronoff	Cleveland, OH	150	\$635.00	\$350.00	\$465.00	\$475.00	\$155.00	\$280.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Best Best & Krieger	Riverside, CA	176	\$655.00	\$340.00	\$455.00	\$385.00	\$235.00	\$280.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Bingham McCutchan	Boston, MA	795	\$1080.00	\$220.00	\$795.00	\$605.00	\$165.00	\$450.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Blank Rome	Philadelphia, PA	447	\$940.00	\$445.00	\$540.00	\$595.00	\$175.00	\$350.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Bond, Schoenack & King	Syracuse, NY	196	\$520.00	\$240.00	\$355.00	\$310.00	\$160.00	\$225.00	\$485.00 National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Bowles Rice	Charleston, WV	140	\$285.00	\$165.00	\$230.00	\$180.00	\$115.00	\$135.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Bracewell & Giuliani	Houston, TX	441	\$1125.00	\$575.00	\$180.00	\$700.00	\$275.00	\$440.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Bradley Arant Boult Cummings	Birmingham, AL	413	\$605.00	\$325.00	\$480.00	\$340.00	\$200.00	\$280.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Broad and Cassel	Olando, FL	150	\$465.00	\$235.00	\$360.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Brown Rudnick	Boston, MA	167	\$1045.00	\$550.00	\$666.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck	Denver, CO	214	\$700.00	\$370.00	\$520.00	\$345.00	\$265.00	\$305.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Bryan Cave	St. Louis, MO	965	\$900.00	\$470.00	\$520.00	\$595.00	\$220.00	\$405.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Buchalter Nimmer	Los Angeles, CA	139	\$695.00	\$475.00	\$605.00	\$375.00	\$350.00	\$385.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Burr & Forman	Birmingham, AL	261	\$525.00	\$300.00	\$371.00	\$275.00	\$200.00	\$241.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Butler Snow	Ridgeland, MS	280	\$335.00	\$235.00	\$302.00				Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft	New York, NY	437	\$1050.00	\$900.00	\$950.00	\$750.00	\$395.00	\$605.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Carlton Fields	Tampa, FL	272	\$840.00	\$455.00	\$600.00				Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Cohn, Scholtz, Meisel, Forman & Leonard	Hackensack, NJ	116	\$730.00	\$590.00	\$653.00	\$940.00	\$275.00	\$302.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Connell Foley	Roseland, NJ	129	\$575.00	\$275.00	\$425.00	\$325.00	\$200.00	\$265.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Cooley	Palo Alto, CA	673	\$990.00	\$950.00	\$870.00	\$540.00	\$335.00	\$515.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Covington & Burling	Washington, DC	760	\$890.00	\$605.00	\$780.00	\$665.00	\$320.00	\$415.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Cozen O'Connor	Philadelphia, PA	495	\$1195.00	\$275.00	\$570.00	\$640.00	\$180.00	\$355.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Curtis, Mallett-Prevost, Colt & Mosie	New York, NY	323	\$850.00	\$730.00	\$600.00	\$785.00	\$345.00	\$460.00	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Davis Graham & Stubbs	Denver, CO	145	\$635.00	\$315.00	\$435.00	\$350.00	\$200.00	\$256.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Davis Polk & Wardwell	New York, NY	810	\$865.00	\$860.00	\$975.00	\$975.00	\$130.00	\$615.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Debevoise & Plimpton	New York, NY	586	\$1075.00	\$555.00	\$1055.00	\$750.00	\$120.00	\$490.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Dechert	New York, NY	845	\$1085.00	\$670.00	\$900.00	\$735.00	\$395.00	\$530.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Dentons	New York, NY	2503	\$1050.00	\$345.00	\$700.00	\$665.00	\$210.00	\$425.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Dickstein Shapiro	Washington, DC	254	\$1250.00	\$590.00	\$750.00	\$595.00	\$310.00	\$475.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Dinsmore & Shohl	Cincinnati, OH	415	\$850.00	\$250.00	\$411.00	\$365.00	\$160.00	\$238.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 DLA Piper	New York, NY	3962	\$1025.00	\$450.00	\$765.00	\$750.00	\$250.00	\$610.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Dorsey & Whitney	Minneapolis, MN	501	\$585.00	\$340.00	\$435.00	\$510.00	\$215.00	\$315.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Duane Morris	Philadelphia, PA	613	\$950.00	\$415.00	\$589.00	\$585.00	\$260.00	\$373.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Edwards Wildman Palmer	Boston, MA	540	\$765.00	\$210.00	\$535.00	\$415.00	\$245.00	\$325.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Fasgre Baker Daniels	Minneapolis, MN	673	\$580.00	\$355.00	\$260.00	\$315.00	\$110.00	\$260.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Foley & Lardner	Milwaukee, WI	844	\$860.00	\$405.00	\$535.00	\$470.00	\$270.00	\$535.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Foley Hoag	Boston, MA	221	\$775.00	\$590.00	\$325.00	\$385.00	\$290.00	\$325.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Fox Rothschild	Philadelphia, PA	531	\$750.00	\$335.00	\$530.00	\$500.00	\$245.00	\$530.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson	New York, NY	450	\$1100.00	\$930.00	\$1000.00	\$750.00	\$375.00	\$595.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Frost Brown Todd	Cincinnati, OH	414	\$630.00	\$220.00	\$330.00	\$315.00	\$150.00	\$234.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Gardner Wynne Sewell	Dallas, TX	218	\$775.00	\$430.00	\$635.00	\$330.00	\$290.00	\$303.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Gibbons	Newark, NJ	201	\$695.00	\$440.00	\$560.00	\$475.00	\$295.00	\$380.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher	New York, NY	1154	\$1800.00	\$765.00	\$980.00	\$930.00	\$175.00	\$590.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani	San Diego, CA	478	\$475.00	\$375.00	\$420.00	\$325.00	\$265.00	\$300.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Greenberg Traurig	New York, NY	1690	\$355.00	\$535.00	\$763.00	\$570.00	\$325.00	\$470.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Harris Beach	Rochester, NY	198	\$400.00	\$298.00	\$346.00	\$265.00	\$175.00	\$230.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Hunter Street & Emery	Rochester, NY	132	\$465.00	\$300.00	\$365.00	\$280.00	\$195.00	\$250.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Haynes and Boone	Dallas, TX	493	\$1020.00	\$450.00	\$570.00	\$580.00	\$310.00	\$405.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Hogan Lovells	Washington, DC	2313	\$1000.00	\$705.00	\$835.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Holland & Hart	Denver, CO	423	\$725.00	\$305.00	\$442.00	\$425.00	\$175.00	\$277.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Holland & Knight	Washington, DC	955	\$1085.00	\$355.00	\$525.00	\$595.00	\$210.00	\$340.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn	Detroit, MI	231	\$560.00	\$280.00	\$390.00	\$225.00	\$205.00	\$220.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Hughes Hubbard & Reed	New York, NY	351	\$995.00	\$725.00	\$890.00	\$675.00	\$365.00	\$555.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Husch Blackwell	St. Louis, MO	539	\$785.00	\$250.00	\$449.00	\$440.00	\$190.00	\$275.00	\$418.00	\$240.00	\$825.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Ice Miller	Indianapolis, IN	291	\$530.00	\$335.00	\$450.00	\$506.00	\$245.00	\$270.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Irell & Manella	Los Angeles, CA	165	\$975.00	\$900.00	\$850.00	\$750.00	\$395.00	\$535.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Jackson Kelly	Charleston, WV	179	\$595.00	\$270.00	\$345.00	\$315.00	\$200.00	\$243.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Jackson Lewis	Los Angeles, CA	724	\$440.00	\$310.00	\$380.00	\$815.00	\$275.00	\$290.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Jackson Walker	Dallas, TX	333	\$675.00	\$575.00	\$622.00	\$385.00	\$255.00	\$335.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Jenner, Mangels, Butler & Mitchell	Los Angeles, CA	125	\$875.00	\$560.00	\$690.00							National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Jenner & Block	Chicago, IL	434	\$925.00	\$585.00	\$745.00	\$650.00	\$380.00	\$465.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Jones Day	New York, NY	2464	\$975.00	\$445.00	\$745.00	\$775.00	\$205.00	\$435.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Jones Walker	New Orleans, LA	363	\$625.00	\$275.00	\$385.00	\$240.00	\$200.00	\$225.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman	New York, NY	372	\$1195.00	\$600.00	\$835.00	\$625.00	\$200.00	\$340.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Katten Muchin Rosenman	Chicago, IL	612	\$745.00	\$500.00	\$615.00	\$595.00	\$340.00	\$485.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Kaye Scholer	New York, NY	392	\$1250.00	\$725.00	\$860.00	\$795.00	\$370.00	\$597.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Kelley Drye & Warren	New York, NY	283	\$815.00	\$435.00	\$640.00	\$600.00	\$305.00	\$430.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton	Atlanta, GA	561	\$775.00	\$400.00	\$550.00	\$475.00	\$315.00	\$385.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 King & Spalding	Atlanta, GA	874	\$995.00	\$545.00	\$775.00	\$735.00	\$125.00	\$460.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Kirkland & Ellis	Chicago, IL	1554	\$995.00	\$580.00	\$825.00	\$715.00	\$235.00	\$540.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear	Irvine, CA	290	\$810.00	\$450.00	\$575.00	\$455.00	\$305.00	\$380.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel	New York, NY	313	\$1100.00	\$745.00	\$921.00	\$815.00	\$515.00	\$675.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Lane Powell	Seattle, WA	170	\$675.00	\$375.00	\$516.00	\$425.00	\$260.00	\$331.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Latham & Watkins	New York, NY	2060	\$1,110.00	\$695.00	\$960.00	\$725.00	\$465.00	\$605.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Lathrop & Gage	Kansas City, MO	283	\$700.00	\$285.00	\$420.00	\$375.00	\$195.00	\$250.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Lewis Roca Rothgerber	Phoenix, AZ	229	\$695.00	\$390.00	\$505.00	\$525.00	\$205.00	\$400.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Lindquist & Vennum	Minneapolis, MN	178	\$600.00	\$460.00	\$520.00	\$470.00	\$275.00	\$385.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Litter Mendelson	San Francisco, CA	1002	\$615.00	\$395.00	\$550.00	\$420.00	\$245.00	\$280.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Lowenstein Sandler	Roseland, NJ	261	\$690.00	\$600.00	\$785.00	\$650.00	\$300.00	\$450.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Mannatt, Phelps & Phillips	Los Angeles, CA	329	\$795.00	\$540.00	\$740.00	\$650.00	\$300.00	\$450.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 McCarter & English	Newark, NJ	371	\$625.00	\$450.00	\$530.00	\$370.00	\$220.00	\$300.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 McDermott Will & Emery	Chicago, IL	1021	\$635.00	\$525.00	\$710.00				National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 McElroy, Deutsch, Mulvaney & Carpenter	Monkstown, NJ	274	\$660.00	\$225.00	\$445.00	\$335.00	\$200.00	\$285.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 McGuireWoods	Richmond, VA	931	\$725.00	\$450.00	\$595.00	\$525.00	\$265.00	\$360.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 McKenna Long & Aldridge	Atlanta, GA	518	\$650.00	\$480.00	\$530.00	\$425.00	\$375.00	\$395.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Michael, Best & Friedrich	Milwaukee, WI	189	\$650.00	\$235.00	\$445.00	\$425.00	\$200.00	\$293.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Miles & Stockbridge	Baltimore, MD	226	\$740.00	\$340.00	\$478.00	\$425.00	\$230.00	\$290.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Moore & Van Allen	Charlotte, NC	274	\$870.00	\$315.00	\$460.00	\$430.00	\$190.00	\$280.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius	Philadelphia, PA	1363	\$765.00	\$430.00	\$620.00	\$595.00	\$270.00	\$350.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Morris, Manning & Martin	Atlanta, GA	148	\$575.00	\$400.00	\$480.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Morrison & Foerster	San Francisco, CA	1020	\$1195.00	\$395.00	\$695.00	\$725.00	\$230.00	\$525.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Nelson Mullins	Columbia, SC	466	\$600.00	\$250.00	\$444.00	\$395.00	\$215.00	\$271.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Nixon Peabody	Boston, MA	564	\$650.00	\$295.00	\$520.00	\$550.00	\$180.00	\$300.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Norris McLaughlin & Marcus	Bridgewater, NJ	128	\$505.00	\$485.00	\$495.00	\$365.00	\$185.00	\$275.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Norton Rose Fulbright	Houston, TX	3537	\$500.00	\$525.00	\$775.00	\$515.00	\$300.00	\$400.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Nossaman	Los Angeles, CA	148	\$600.00	\$370.00	\$579.00	\$490.00	\$255.00	\$340.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Rutter, McClellan & Fish	Boston, MA	146	\$715.00	\$470.00	\$575.00	\$460.00	\$285.00	\$375.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Ogletree Deakins	Atlanta, GA	666	\$650.00	\$250.00	\$380.00	\$365.00	\$200.00	\$260.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 O'Melveny & Myers	Los Angeles, CA	721	\$950.00	\$615.00	\$715.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe	New York, NY	954	\$1095.00	\$715.00	\$845.00	\$375.00	\$710.00	\$560.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein	Charlotte, NC	185	\$500.00	\$425.00	\$450.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Paul Hastings	New York, NY	889	\$900.00	\$750.00	\$815.00	\$735.00	\$335.00	\$540.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Paul, Weiss, Rinkoff, Wharton & Garrison	New York, NY	854	\$1120.00	\$760.00	\$1040.00	\$735.00	\$595.00	\$578.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Pepper-Hamilton	Philadelphia, PA	510	\$950.00	\$465.00	\$645.00	\$525.00	\$280.00	\$390.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Perkins Coie	Seattle, WA	881	\$1000.00	\$330.00	\$615.00	\$510.00	\$215.00	\$425.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Pittsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman	Washington, DC	591	\$1070.00	\$515.00	\$865.00	\$680.00	\$375.00	\$520.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Polsinelli	Kansas City, MO	616	\$775.00	\$325.00	\$435.00	\$350.00	\$235.00	\$279.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Proskauer Rose	New York, NY	712	\$950.00	\$725.00	\$880.00	\$675.00	\$295.00	\$465.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Quarles & Brady	Milwaukee, WI	422	\$625.00	\$425.00	\$519.00	\$500.00	\$210.00	\$335.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan	New York, NY	673	\$1075.00	\$810.00	\$915.00	\$675.00	\$320.00	\$410.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Reed Smith	Pittsburgh, PA	1555	\$850.00	\$605.00	\$737.00	\$550.00	\$295.00	\$420.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Richards, Layton & Finger	Wilmington, DE	124	\$800.00	\$500.00	\$578.00	\$465.00	\$350.00	\$414.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Riker Danzig Scherer Hyland & Perretti	Morristown, NJ	148	\$485.00	\$430.00	\$455.00	\$285.00	\$210.00	\$250.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Robinson & Cole	Hartford, CT	201	\$700.00	\$285.00	\$500.00	\$445.00	\$215.00	\$300.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Rutan & Tucker	Costa Mesa, CA	147	\$675.00	\$345.00	\$490.00	\$500.00	\$230.00	\$320.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Saul Ewing	Philadelphia, PA	240	\$875.00	\$375.00	\$546.00	\$590.00	\$225.00	\$344.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Schiff Hardin	Chicago, IL	317				\$415.00	\$250.00	\$538.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Sedgwick	San Francisco, CA	342	\$615.00	\$305.00	\$425.00	\$475.00	\$250.00	\$325.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Seward & Kissel	New York, NY	143	\$850.00	\$625.00	\$735.00	\$600.00	\$280.00	\$400.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Seyfarth Shaw	Chicago, IL	779	\$650.00	\$375.00	\$610.00	\$505.00	\$225.00	\$355.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton	Los Angeles, CA	545	\$875.00	\$480.00	\$665.00	\$535.00	\$275.00	\$415.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Shumaker Loop & Kendrick	Toledo, OH	224	\$595.00	\$305.00	\$418.00	\$330.00	\$160.00	\$256.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Shuttles & Bowen	Miami, FL	239	\$680.00	\$250.00	\$460.00	\$345.00	\$195.00	\$280.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom	New York, NY	1664	\$1150.00	\$845.00	\$1035.00	\$845.00	\$340.00	\$620.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Snell & Wilmer	Phoenix, AZ	411	\$845.00	\$325.00	\$525.00	\$470.00	\$180.00	\$280.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Spilman Thomas & Battle	Charleston, WV	131	\$850.00	\$350.00	\$655.00	\$530.00	\$230.00	\$355.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Squire Patton Boggs									National Law Journal, December 2014	Location data not available due to merger in 2014. Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox	Washington, DC	122	\$795.00	\$450.00	\$577.00	\$470.00	\$255.00	\$463.57	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Stevens & Lee	Reading, PA	154	\$800.00	\$525.00	\$625.00			\$450.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Steel Rivas	Portland, OR	385	\$600.00	\$300.00	\$492.00	\$465.00	\$205.00	\$287.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Strasburger & Price	Dallas, TX	217	\$680.00	\$290.00	\$435.00	\$365.00	\$210.00	\$300.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Stroock & Stroock & Lavan	New York, NY	285	\$1125.00	\$675.00	\$850.00	\$640.00	\$350.00	\$675.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 Taft Stebbins & Hallister	Cincinnati, OH	357	\$536.00	\$285.00	\$415.00	\$475.00	\$200.00	\$285.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Thompson & Knight	Dallas, TX	290	\$740.00	\$425.00	\$535.00	\$610.00	\$240.00	\$370.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Thompson Coburn	St. Louis, MO	317	\$510.00	\$330.00	\$440.00	\$350.00	\$220.00	\$270.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Troutman Sanders	Atlanta, GA	597	\$975.00	\$400.00	\$620.00	\$570.00	\$245.00	\$340.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Ulmer & Berne	Cleveland, OH	178	\$415.00	\$315.00	\$380.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Varnum	Grand Rapids, MI	133	\$465.00	\$230.00	\$390.00				National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Venable	Washington, DC	533	\$1075.00	\$470.00	\$660.00	\$575.00	\$295.00	\$430.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Vinson & Elkins	Houston, TX	650	\$770.00	\$475.00	\$600.00	\$565.00	\$275.00	\$390.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis	Nashville, TN	178	\$600.00	\$350.00	\$460.00	\$335.00	\$190.00	\$245.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Weil, Gotshal & Manges	New York, NY	1157	\$1075.00	\$525.00	\$630.00	\$780.00	\$300.00	\$600.00	National Law Journal, December 2014	Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report

2014 White & Case	New York, NY	1885	\$1050.00	\$700.00	\$875.00	\$1050.00	\$220.00	\$525.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Wiley Rein	Washington, DC	277	\$850.00	\$550.00	\$665.00	\$535.00	\$320.00	\$445.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Williams Mullan	Richmond, VA	233	\$410.00	\$360.00	\$385.00	\$350.00	\$260.00	\$285.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Wilkie Farr & Gallagher	New York, NY	526	\$1090.00	\$780.00	\$650.00	\$790.00	\$350.00	\$580.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr	Washington, DC	966	\$1250.00	\$735.00	\$905.00	\$695.00	\$75.00	\$290.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Winston & Strawn	Chicago, IL	822	\$895.00	\$650.00	\$800.00	\$590.00	\$425.00	\$520.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Wolff & Samson	West Orange, NJ	125	\$450.00	\$325.00	\$400.00	\$450.00	\$225.00	\$340.00	National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Wombie Carlye Sandridge & Rice	Winston-Salem, NC	492	\$640.00	\$470.00	\$554.00				National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report
2014 Wyatt Tarrant & Combs	Louisville, KY	202	\$500.00	\$280.00	\$416.00				National Law Journal, December 2014 Full-time equivalent (FTE) attorneys at the firm and the city of the firm's largest U.S. office as listed in the 2014 NLJ 350 report