

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MARK WILLITS, JUDY GRIFFIN,  
BRENT PILGREEN, and  
COMMUNITIES ACTIVELY LIVING  
INDEPENDENT & FREE (“CALIF”),  
on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a public  
entity,

Defendant.

Case No.: CV 10-5782 CBM (RZx)

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS**

The matter before the Court is Plaintiffs’ unopposed Motion For Attorneys’ Fees and Costs brought pursuant to Fed. Rule of Civ. Proc. 23(h) (the “Motion”). (Dkt. No. 380.)

**I. PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL OVERVIEW**

On August 4, 2010, Plaintiffs Mark Willits, Judy Griffin, Brent Pilgreen, and Communities Actively Living Independent and Free (“CALIF”) (collectively, “Named Plaintiffs”) filed a class action lawsuit on behalf of persons with mobility disabilities against the City of Los Angeles (the “City”) and various individual defendants based on the alleged inaccessibility of the City’s sidewalks and other

1 “pedestrian rights of way.” The Complaint asserted two federal claims under the  
2 American with Disabilities Act (the “ADA”) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation  
3 Act of 1973 (“Rehabilitation Act” or “Section 504”), and four state law claims.

4 **A. State Court Actions**

5 In December 2006, Saundra Carter and nine other individuals filed a class  
6 action complaint in state court against the City alleging disability discrimination in  
7 connection with the City’s sidewalks. (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No.  
8 BC363305.) In December 2007, Nicole Fahmie commenced a class action  
9 against the City in state court based on, among other things, lack of ramps or  
10 cutouts on the City’s curbs. (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC381773.)  
11 *Carter* and *Fahmie* (collectively, “*Carter/Fahmie*”) were consolidated on January  
12 27, 2011 under Case No. BC363305.<sup>1</sup>

13 Victor Pineda, Anatoli Ilyashov, and CALIF commenced a state court class  
14 action against the City and various individual defendants in December 2008 on  
15 behalf of persons with mobility disabilities who have been denied access to  
16 pedestrian rights of way in the City. (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No.  
17 BC403327, hereinafter “*Pineda*”.)

18 **B. Procedural History**

19 On December 10, 2010, the Court denied defendants’ motion to stay  
20 proceedings pending *Pineda*, but dismissed the state law claims without prejudice  
21 “to be pursued in state court.”<sup>2</sup> (Dkt. No. 57.) The Named Plaintiffs commenced  
22 a state court action against the City following this Court’s dismissal of their state  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> A settlement was reached in 2011 in *Carter/Fahmie*. Although the Named  
26 Plaintiffs objected to the *Carter/Fahmie* class action settlement, the settlement  
27 was approved by the Superior Court in 2012. The Named Plaintiffs appealed the  
28 Superior Court’s approval of the *Carter/Fahmie* settlement, and the California  
Court of Appeal reversed the Superior Court order certifying the settlement class  
and approving the settlement based on due process grounds. *Carter v. City of Los  
Angeles*, 224 Cal. App. 4th 808 (Cal. Ct. App. 2014).

<sup>2</sup> The Court also dismissed the individual defendants on that date. (Dkt. No. 57.)

1 law claims. (Case No. BC457403, hereinafter “*Griffin*”).<sup>3</sup>

2 The Court granted Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification for injunctive  
3 and declaratory relief only on January 3, 2011, and appointed Schneider Wallace  
4 Cottrell Konecky Wotkyns LLP (“SWCKW”), Disability Rights Legal Center  
5 (“DRLC”), Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarian & Ho (“GBDH”), and the Legal Aid  
6 Society – Employment Law Center (“LAS-ELC”) as Class Counsel. (Dkt. Nos.  
7 59, 177.)

8 Defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings based on the  
9 purported res judicata effect of the State Court Actions, which was denied as  
10 premature by this Court on August 10, 2012. (Dkt. No. 150.)

11 The Court granted preliminary and final approval of the parties’ class action  
12 settlement agreement in this case (the “Settlement Agreement”).

13 Plaintiffs’ instant Motion seeks \$13,300,000 in attorneys’ fees and  
14 \$1,700,000 in costs expended in connection with this litigation and the State Court  
15 Actions.<sup>4</sup>

## 16 II. STATEMENT OF THE LAW

17 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23(h) provides that “[i]n a certified  
18 class action, the court may award attorney’s fees and nontaxable costs that are  
19 authorized by law or by the parties’ agreement.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h).

20 In “civil rights and other injunctive relief class actions, courts often use a  
21 lodestar calculation because there is no way to gauge the net value of the  
22 settlement or any percentage thereof.” *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011,  
23 1029 (9th Cir. 1998). In determining the amount of a reasonable fee, the Court  
24 first determines “the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation  
25 multiplied by a reasonable hourly rate.” *Jankey*, 537 F.3d at 1132 (citing *Hensley*

26 <sup>3</sup> *Carter/Fahmie, Pineda, and Griffin* shall be collectively referred to herein as the  
27 “State Court Actions.”

28 <sup>4</sup> Currently pending before the Clerk is Plaintiffs’ application to tax costs. (Dkt.  
No. 377.)

1 v. *Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433-34 (1983)). “The hours expended and the rate  
2 should be supported by adequate documentation and other evidence.” *Hanlon*,  
3 150 F.3d at 1029. The Court then “exclude[s] from th[e] initial fee calculation  
4 hours that were not reasonably expended,” such as hours that are “excessive,  
5 redundant, or otherwise unnecessary.” *Jankey*, 537 F.3d at 1132 (citing *Hensley v.*  
6 *Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433-34 (1983)). The Court, however, must provide a  
7 “comprehensible” explanation for any fee reductions. *T.B. ex rel. Brenneise v.*  
8 *San Diego Unified Sch. Dist.*, 806 F.3d 451, 486 (9th Cir. 2015), *cert. denied sub*  
9 *nom. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. v. T.B.*, 136 S. Ct. 1679 (2016).

### 10 III. DISCUSSION

#### 11 A. Prevailing Party

12 The Court finds Plaintiffs are entitled to reasonable fees and costs as a  
13 prevailing party under the ADA and Section 504. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12205; 29  
14 U.S.C. § 794a(b); *Jankey v. Poop Deck*, 537 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2008); *La*  
15 *Asociacion de Trabajadores de Lake Forest v. City of Lake Forest*, 624 F.3d 1083,  
16 1089 (9th Cir. 2010).<sup>5</sup>

#### 17 B. Lodestar

##### 18 a. Hourly Rates

19 The Court finds, based on the evidence submitted, that the following hourly  
20 rates are reasonable:<sup>6</sup>

21  
22 <sup>5</sup> The Court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ state  
23 law claims and dismissed those claims without prejudice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs  
24 are not entitled to fees and costs as a prevailing party under state law, and are not  
25 entitled to a state-law multiplier of the lodestar. *See Chaudhry v. City of Los*  
26 *Angeles*, 751 F.3d 1096, 1112 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied sub nom. City of Los*  
*Angeles, Cal. v. Chaudhry*, 135 S. Ct. 295 (2014); *Mangold v. Cal. Pub. Utilities*  
*Comm’n*, 67 F.3d 1470, 1478 (9th Cir. 1995); *City of San Jose v. San Jose Police*  
*Officers’ Ass’n*, 2013 WL 4806453, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2013); *Yates v.*  
*Union Square*, 2008 WL 346418, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 7, 2008).

27 <sup>6</sup> *See Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 895 n.11 (1984); *United Steelworkers of Am.*  
28 *v. Phelps Dodge Corp.*, 896 F.2d 403, 407 (9th Cir. 1990); *Camacho v. Bridgeport*  
*Fin., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 973, 980 (9th Cir. 2008).

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>
Guy Wallace	Attorney	\$750
Mark Johnson	Attorney	\$700
Andrew Lee	Attorney	\$525
Jennifer Uhrowczik	Attorney	\$450
Kiran Prasad	Attorney	\$450
Michelle Nguyen	Attorney	\$300
Katharine White	Attorney	\$300
Amanda Riley	Attorney	\$300
Chris Springer	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$235
Charles Greenlee	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$200
Scott Gordon	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$200
Sam Marks	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$200
David A. Borgen	Attorney	\$795
Linda Dardarian	Attorney	\$775
Andrew Lee	Attorney	\$550
Jason Tarricone	Attorney	\$525
Katrina Eiland	Attorney	\$400
Nancy Hanna	Attorney	\$375
Raymond Wendell	Attorney	\$325
Scott G. Grimes	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$250
Elizabeth Kramer	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$250
Damon Valdez	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$225
Wendy E. Whitt	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$225
Charlotte Nguyen	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$195
Stuart Kirkpatrick	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$195
Jinny Kim	Attorney	\$644
Rachael Langston	Attorney	\$473
Alexis Alvarez	Attorney	\$385
Mary Broughton	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$165

Michael Hsueh	Paralegal/Law Clerk	\$110
Shawna Parks	Attorney	\$695
Ronald Elsberry	Attorney	\$680
Surisa E. Rivers	Attorney	\$550
Trevor Finneman	Attorney	\$375
Law Clerk	Law Clerk	\$230
Shawna L Parks	Attorney	\$695
José R. Allen, Esq.	Attorney	\$1,115.60

**b. Hours Worked**

Based on the evidence submitted, the Court finds the following hours were reasonably expended:

<i>Willits</i>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Lodestar</b>
Guy Wallace	\$750	2,902.5	\$2,176,875.00
Mark Johnson	\$700	1,922.4	\$1,345,680
Andrew Lee	\$525	1,034.7	\$543,217.50
Jennifer Uhrowczik	\$450	331.4	\$149,130.00
Kiran Prasad	\$450	272.2	\$122,490.00
Michelle Nguyen	\$300	101.3	\$30,390.00
Katharine White	\$300	76.0	\$22,800.00
Amanda Riley	\$300	217.7	\$65,310.00
Chris Springer	\$235	277.5	\$65,212.50
Charles Greenlee	\$200	534.1	\$106,820.00

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

Scott Gordon	\$200	100.1	\$20,020.00
Sam Marks	\$200	1,026.7	\$205,340.00
David A. Borgen	\$795	113.8	\$90,471.00
Linda Dardarian	\$775	1,276.1	\$988,977.50
Andrew Lee	\$550	576.3	\$316,965.00
Jason Tarricone	\$525	278.0	\$145,950.00
Katrina Eiland	\$400	207.3	\$82,920.00
Nancy Hanna	\$375	44.4	\$16,650.00
Raymond Wendell	\$325	133.7	\$43,452.50
Scott G. Grimes	\$250	372.2	\$93,050.00
Elizabeth Kramer	\$250	63.3	\$15,825.00
Damon Valdez	\$225	946.4	\$212,940.00
Wendy E. Whitt	\$225	329.3	\$74,092.50
Charlotte Nguyen	\$195	100.3	\$19,588.50
Stuart Kirkpatrick	\$195	178.5	\$34,807.50
Jinny Kim	\$644	859.4	\$553,453.60
Rachael Langston	\$473	180.2	\$85,234.60
Alexis Alvarez	\$385	28.6	\$11,011.00

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

Mary Broughton	\$165	567.9	\$93,703.50
Michael Hsueh	\$110	77.4	\$8,514.00
Shawna Parks (DRLC) <sup>7</sup>	\$695	101.9	\$70,820.50
Ronald Elsberry	\$680	63.7	\$43,316.00
Surisa E. Rivers	\$550	810.6	\$445,830.00
Trevor Finneman	\$375	112.9	\$42,337.50
Unnamed Law Clerk	\$230	149.3	\$34,339.00
Shawna L Parks	\$695	15.2	\$10,564.00
José R. Allen, Esq.	\$1,115.60	560.2	\$624,962.12
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$9,013,060.32</b>

<i>Carter/Fahmie</i>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Lodestar</b>
Guy Wallace	\$750	499.7	\$374,775.00
Mark Johnson	\$700	141.2	\$98,840.00
Andrew Lee	\$525	1.7	\$892.50
Charles Greenlee	\$200	11.6	\$2,320.00

<sup>7</sup> Shawna Parks was the Legal Director / Director of Litigation at DRLC until her departure in 2012. The fees sought for Park’s time spent during her employment with DRLC is designated under “Shawna Parks (DRLC),” and the fees sought for Park’s time spent in connection with her own law practice is designated under “Shawna L Parks.”



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

Sam Marks	\$200	4.4	\$880.00
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$477,707.50</b>

<i>Pineda</i>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Lodestar</b>
Guy Wallace	\$750	188.2	\$141,150.00
Mark Johnson	\$700	142.9	\$100,030.00
Andrew Lee	\$525	67.4	\$35,385.00
Kiran Prasad	\$450	13.5	\$6,075.00
Shawna Parks (DRLC)	\$695	121.6	\$84,512.00
Sage Reeves	\$625	236.9	\$148,062.50
Surisa E. Rivers	\$550	67.2	\$36,960.00
Debra J. Patkin	\$450	410.2	\$184,587.75
Unnamed Law Clerk	\$230	108.5	\$24,955.00
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$761,717.25</b>

<i>Griffin</i>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Lodestar</b>
Guy Wallace	\$750	0.8	\$600.00
Mark Johnson	\$700	6.5	\$4,550.00
Shawna Parks (DRLC)	\$695	2.0	\$1,390.00
Surisa E.	\$550	18.6	\$10,230.00

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

Rivers			
Trevor Finneman	\$375	1.4	\$490.00
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$17,260.00</b>

The Court also finds, based on the evidence submitted, that the above-listed hours expended by non-appointed class counsel Shawna Parks and Jose Allen, and hours expended in connection with the State Court Actions, benefitted the class in this case. *See* F.R.C.P. 23(h) 2003 Advisory Committee Notes; *Winger v. SI Mgmt. L.P.*, 301 F.3d 1115, 1121 (9th Cir. 2002).

Accordingly, the Court awards \$10,269,745.07 in reasonable attorneys’ fees to Plaintiffs’ counsel.

**C. Costs**

Plaintiffs seek \$1,631,511.98 in costs as follows: (1) SWCKW: \$1,079,353.37; (2) GBDH: \$231,937.31; (3) LAS-ELC: \$276,257.48; (4) DRLC: \$43,918.94; and (5) Parks: \$44.88.

**(1) SWCKW**

Plaintiffs seek a total of \$1,079,353.37 in costs expended by SWCKW as follows:<sup>8</sup>

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>AMOUNT REQUESTED</b>
Copying/Scanning (external)	\$94,122.20
Copying (internal)	\$86,565.00
Document Management	\$393,837.20
Experts	\$324,429.95
Filing/Service Fees	\$23,702.74
Legal Research	\$34,395.54

<sup>8</sup> The amount of costs sought on behalf of SWCKW is based on the amounts set forth in the declarations of Eugenia Gueorguieva.

1	Mediation	\$58,929.50
2	Messenger	\$1,853.90
3	Overnight Mail	\$2,169.79
4	Telephonic Court Appearance	\$473.00
5	Travel and Transportation	\$52,953.09
6	Depositions (video services)	\$4,472.50
7	Postage	\$509.96
8	System Access Fees	\$939.00
9	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,079,353.37</b>

10  
11 Copying (internal). SWCKW seeks \$86,565.00 in internal copying costs.  
12 The evidence demonstrates SWCKW made 290,629 internal copies for this action  
13 and 11,222 in connection with the State Court Actions, at a cost of \$0.20 per page,  
14 totaling \$60,370.20. Accordingly, the Court awards \$60,370.20 in costs expended  
15 by SWCKW for internal copying.

16 Travel and Transportation. SWCKW seeks \$52,953.09 in travel and  
17 transportation costs. SWCKW submits evidence verifying \$51,791.49 in travel  
18 and transportation costs were expended by SWCKW. SWCKW declares that it  
19 cannot locate receipts confirming \$9 and \$409.80 in travel expenses purportedly  
20 expended on December 15, 2012 and January 11, 2013, respectively, and therefore  
21 do not seek reimbursement for those costs. SWCKW fails to submit evidence that  
22 \$742.80 was actually expended for airfare on March 16, 2012.<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, the  
23 Court decreases travel and transportation costs by \$1,161.60, and awards  
24

25 <sup>9</sup> SWCKW submits evidence that the \$742.80 travel cost sought “is consistent  
26 with airfares charged by Southwest Airlines for other events that took place in Los  
27 Angeles during the above-captioned litigation,” but fails to submit evidence of the  
28 actual cost for the March 16, 2012 airfare requested. *See Vectren Commc’ns  
Servs. v. City of Alameda*, 2014 WL 3612754, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. July 22, 2014);  
*Butler v. Homeservices Lending LLC*, 2014 WL 5460447, at \*9 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 27,  
2014).

1 \$51,791.49 for travel and transportation costs expended by SWCKW.

2 Other Categories. The evidence submitted demonstrates that the amount of  
3 the costs sought for the remaining categories were reasonably expended by  
4 SWCKW. Accordingly, the Court awards the following amounts for costs  
5 reasonably expended by SWCKW: (1) Copying/Scanning (external): \$94,122.20;  
6 (2) Document Management: \$393,837.20; (3) Experts: \$324,429.95; (4)  
7 Filing/Service Fees: \$23,702.74; (5) Legal Research: \$34,395.54; (6) Mediation:  
8 \$58,929.50; (7) Messenger: \$1,853.90; (8) Overnight Mail: \$2,169.79; (9)  
9 Telephonic Court Appearance: \$473.00; (10) Depositions (video services):  
10 \$4,472.50; (11) Postage: \$509.96; and (12) System Access Fees: \$939.00.

11 The Court therefore awards \$1,051,996.97 in costs reasonably expended by  
12 SWCKW.<sup>10</sup>

13 (2) **GBDH**

14 Plaintiffs seek \$231,937.31 in costs expended by GBDH in this action as  
15 follows:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT REQUESTED
Court Reporters/Transcripts	\$10,267.05
Special masters/Mediators/Arbitrators	\$7,816.12
Copying Costs - In-house	\$10,664.80
Depositions	\$3,100.00
Experts	\$157,804.65
Overnight Mail	\$180.06
Copying and Scanning - outside agency	\$1,023.12

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
<sup>10</sup> Plaintiffs seek costs expended by SWCKW in this action and in connection with the State Court Actions. The Court finds, based on the evidence submitted, that costs which were reasonably expended by SWCKW in connection with the State Court Actions benefitted the class in this litigation.

Filing/Service Fees	\$7,360.90
Class Notice:	\$990.00
Postage/USPS	\$64.04
Legal Research	\$19,812.27
Telephone/Conference Calls	\$45.33
Travel and Transportation	\$10,362.35
Travel – Lodging	\$2,446.62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$231,937.31</b>

Taxable Costs. Plaintiffs seek \$18,083.17 in taxable costs expended by GBDH (i.e., \$10,267.05 (court reporters/transcripts), and \$7,816.12 (Special masters/Mediators/Arbitrators). Accordingly, the Court decreases GBDH’s costs by \$18,083.17.<sup>11</sup> See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54; Local Rule 54.

Other Categories. The evidence submitted demonstrates that the amount of costs sought for the remaining categories were reasonably expended by GBDH in this action. Accordingly, the Court awards the following amounts for costs reasonably expended by GBDH in this action: (1) Copying Costs - In-house: \$10,664.80; (2) Depositions: \$3,100.00; (3) Expert Fees: \$157,804.65; (4) Overnight Mail: \$180.06; (5) Copying and Scanning - outside agency: \$1,023.12; (6) Filing Service Fees: \$7,360.90; (7) Class Notice: \$990.00; (8) Postage USPS: \$64.04; (9) Legal Research: \$19,812.27; (10) Telephone/Conference Calls: \$45.33; (11) Travel and Transportation: \$10,362.35; and (12) Travel – Lodging: \$2,446.62.

The Court therefore awards \$213,854.14 in costs reasonably expended by GBDH.

---

<sup>11</sup> To the extent not already including in Plaintiff’s pending application to the Clerk to tax costs (Dkt. No. 377), Plaintiffs are directed to apply for all taxable costs with the Clerk pursuant to Rule 54.

1           (3)    **LAS-ELC**

2           Plaintiffs seek \$276,257.48 in costs expended by LAS-ELC in this action as  
3 follows:

<b>CATEGORY</b>	<b>AMOUNT REQUESTED</b>
clerk's fees	\$230.00
depositions	\$539.70
reproducing exhibits to deposition	\$9.99
Special Master	\$27,697.87
copying (in house)	\$6,721.40
copying/scanning (outside)	\$28,189.65
document management and hosting	\$16,290.04
Experts	\$167,325.98
legal research	\$245.10
mediation	\$21,462.98
messenger	\$134.29
overnight mail	\$69.37
travel and transportation	\$5,418.33
long distance phone charges	\$119.78
photo reproduction	\$20.92
temporary staffing	\$872.08
investigator fees	\$910.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$276,257.48</b>

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25           Taxable Costs. Plaintiffs seek \$28,477.56 in taxable costs expended by  
26 LAS-ELC (i.e., \$230 (clerk's fees), \$539.70 (depositions), \$9.99 (reproducing  
27 exhibits to deposition), and \$27,697.87 (Special Master fees)). Accordingly, the  
28 Court decreases LAS-ELC's costs by \$28,477.56. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h); Fed.

1 R. Civ. P. 54; Local Rule 54.

2 Long Distance Phone Charges. Plaintiffs originally requested \$119.78 in  
3 long distance phone charges purportedly expended by LAS-ELC. LAS-ELC,  
4 however, declares that it was unable to locate evidence supporting any of the long  
5 distance phone charges, and therefore will not be seeking reimbursement of those  
6 costs. Accordingly, the Court does not award LAS-ELC any amount for long  
7 distance phone charges.

8 Other Categories. The evidence submitted demonstrates that the amount of  
9 costs sought for the remaining categories were reasonably expended by LAS-ELC  
10 in this action. Accordingly, the Court awards the following amounts for costs  
11 reasonably expended by LAS-ELC: (1) copying (in house): \$6,721.40; (2)  
12 copying/scanning (outside): \$28,189.65; (3) document management and hosting:  
13 \$16,290.04; (4) expert fees: \$167,325.98; (5) legal research: \$245.10; (6)  
14 mediation fees: \$21,462.98; (7) messenger: \$134.29; (8) overnight mail: \$69.37;  
15 (9) travel and transportation: \$5,418.33; (10) photo reproduction charges: \$20.92;  
16 (11) temporary staffing: \$872.08; and (12) investigator fees: \$910.00.

17 The Court therefore awards \$247,660.14 in costs reasonably expended by  
18 LAS-ELC.

19 (4) **DRLC**

20 Plaintiffs seek \$40,908.94 in costs expended by DRLC as follows:

21

CATEGORY	AMOUNT REQUESTED
Clerks' fees	\$1,891.45
Depositions	\$10,135.95
Interpreter's and Translator Fees	\$2,067.50
Fees for Service of Process	\$1,028.00
Reporter's Transcripts	\$789.00

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

Reproduction of Documents - Chambers Copies	\$1,736.40
Other Costs - Photographs	\$6,075.00
Copying and Scanning - outside agency	\$4,050.09
Copying Costs - In-house	\$833.98
Filing/Service Fees	\$87.40
Experts	\$10,821.12
Messenger	\$99.00
Overnight Mail	\$261.13
Travel and Transportation	\$2,891.86
Postage	\$45.76
System Access Fees	\$580.30
Translation of Documents	\$145.00
Official Court Reporter	\$380.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$43,918.94</b>

Taxable Costs. Plaintiffs seek \$23,723.30 in taxable costs expended by DRLC (i.e., \$1,891.45 (clerks fees), \$10,135.95 (Depositions), \$2,067.50 (Interpreter’s and Translator Fees), \$1,028.00 (Fees for Service of Process), \$789.00 (Reporter’s Transcripts), \$1,736.40 (Reproduction of Documents - Chambers Copies), and \$6,075.00 (Other Costs - Photographs)). Accordingly, the Court decreases DRLC’s costs by \$23,723.30. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54; Local Rule 54.

Other Categories. The evidence submitted demonstrates that the entire amount of costs sought for the remaining categories were reasonably expended by DRLC in this action. Accordingly, the Court awards the following amounts for costs reasonably expended by DRLC: (1) Copying and Scanning - outside agency: \$4,050.09; (2) Copying Costs - In-house: \$833.98; (3) Filing/Service Fees: \$87.40; (4) Expert Fees: \$10,821.12; (5) Messenger: \$99.00; (6) Overnight



1 Mail: \$261.13; (7) Travel and Transportation: \$2,891.86; (8) Postage: \$45.76; (9)  
2 System Access Fee: \$580.30; (10) Translation of Documents: \$145.00; and (11)  
3 Official Court Reporter: \$380.00.<sup>12</sup>

4 The Court therefore awards \$20,195.64 in costs reasonably expended by  
5 DRLC.

6 **(5) Parks**

7 Plaintiffs seek \$44.88 in costs expended by Parks. The evidence submitted  
8 demonstrates the \$44.88 in costs were reasonably expended and benefitted the  
9 class. The Court therefore awards \$44.88 in costs reasonably expended Parks.

10 **IV. CONCLUSION**

11 Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion, and awards \$10,269,745.07  
12 in attorneys' fees and \$1,533,751.77 in costs to Plaintiffs.

13  
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15  
16 DATED: August 25, 2016.



17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 Honorable Consuelo B. Marshall  
19 United States District Judge

20 CC:FISCAL

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>12</sup> Plaintiffs seek costs expended by DRLC in this action and in connection with  
28 the State Court Actions. The Court finds, based on the evidence submitted, that costs which were reasonably expended by DRLC in connection with the State Court Actions benefitted the class in this litigation.