

1 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP
 DANIEL S. DROSMAN (200643)
 2 TOR GRONBORG (179109)
 ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART (144892)
 3 LUCAS F. OLTS (234843)
 J. MARCO JANOSKI GRAY (306547)
 4 CHRISTOPHER R. KINNON (316850)
 HEATHER G. GEIGER (322937)
 5 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
 San Diego, CA 92101-8498
 6 Telephone: 619/231-1058
 619/231-7423 (fax)

7
 8 MOTLEY RICE LLC
 GREGG S. LEVIN (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 LANCE V. OLIVER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 9 MEGHAN S.B. OLIVER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 MAX N. GRUETZMACHER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 10 CHRISTOPHER F. MORIARTY (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 MEREDITH B. WEATHERBY (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 11 28 Bridgeside Blvd.
 Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
 12 Telephone: 843/216-9000
 843/216-9450 (fax)

13 *Co-Class Counsel for the Class*

14 [Additional counsel appear on signature page.]

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17 OAKLAND DIVISION

18 In re TWITTER INC. SECURITIES)
 19 LITIGATION)

Case No. 4:16-cv-05314-JST (SK)

CLASS ACTION

20 _____)
 21 This Document Relates To:)

22 ALL ACTIONS.)
 23 _____)

CLASS COUNSEL’S NOTICE OF MOTION
 AND MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF
 ATTORNEYS’ FEES, EXPENSES, AND
 AWARDS TO CLASS REPRESENTATIVES
 PURSUANT TO 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(4) AND
 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
 AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF

JUDGE: Hon. Jon S. Tigar
 DATE: November 17, 2022
 TIME: 2:00 p.m. (via videoconference)

28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1	
2	
3	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION1
4	STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED2
5	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES1
6	I. INTRODUCTION1
7	II. HISTORY OF THE LITIGATION3
8	III. THE REQUESTED FEE IS FAIR AND REASONABLE.....4
9	A. The Court Should Award Attorneys’ Fees Using the
10	Percentage-of-the-Fund Method4
11	B. A Fee of 22.5% of the Settlement Fund Is Reasonable Under Either the
12	Percentage or Lodestar Method6
13	1. The Requested Attorneys’ Fees Are Reasonable Under the
14	Percentage Method.....6
15	2. The Requested Attorneys’ Fees Are Reasonable Under the
16	Lodestar Method8
17	C. The Factors Considered by Courts in the Ninth Circuit Support the
18	Requested Fee11
19	1. Class Counsel Achieved an Excellent Result for the Class11
20	2. The Litigation Was Uncertain and Highly Complex12
21	3. The Skill Required and Quality of Work15
22	4. The Contingent Nature of the Fee and the Financial Burden
23	Carried by Class Counsel.....15
24	5. Awards Made in Similar Cases Support the Fee Request.....17
25	6. The Class’s Reaction to Date Supports the Fee Request18
26	IV. COUNSEL’S EXPENSES ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE
27	APPROVED19
28	V. COUNSEL’S AWARDED FEES AND EXPENSES SHOULD BE PAID UPON
	THE COURT’S ORDER GRANTING THE AWARD20
	VI. CLASS REPRESENTATIVES’ REQUEST FOR AWARDS PURSUANT TO 15
	U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(4) IS REASONABLE22
	VII. CONCLUSION.....24
	MOTION AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ISO AN AWARD OF

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Page

CASES

Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Flowserve Corp.,
572 F.3d 221 (5th Cir. 2009)12

Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Tr. Funds,
568 U.S. 455 (2013).....4

Andrews v. Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P.,
2022 WL 4453864 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2022)6, 8, 17

Barbosa v. Cargill Meat Sols. Corp.,
297 F.R.D. 431 (E.D. Cal. 2013)19

Beckman v. KeyBank, N.A.,
293 F.R.D. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2013)10

Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.,
306 F.R.D. 245 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....8

Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert,
444 U.S. 472 (1980).....4

Brown v. Hain Celestial Grp. Inc.,
2016 WL 631880 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 17, 2016)21

Cheng Jiangchen v. Rentech, Inc.,
2019 WL 5173771 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2019).....8, 14

Comcast Corp. v. Behrend,
569 U.S. 27 (2013).....12, 13

Craft v. Cnty. of San Bernardino,
624 F. Supp. 2d 1113 (C.D. Cal. 2008)10

Farrell v. Bank of Am. Corp., N.A.,
827 F. App'x 628 (9th Cir. 2020)8

Fischel v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc'y of U.S.,
307 F.3d 997 (9th Cir. 2002)8

Fleisher v. Phoenix Life Ins. Co.,
2015 WL 10847814 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 2015).....17

MOTION AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ISO AN AWARD OF

1		
2		Page
3		
4	<i>Fleming v. Impax Labs. Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 2789496 (N.D. Cal. July 15, 2022).....	9
5	<i>Franco v. Ruiz Food Prods., Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 5941801 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2012).....	19
6		
7	<i>Gutierrez v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> , 2015 WL 2438274 (N.D. Cal. May 21, 2015).....	10, 17
8		
9	<i>Harris v. Marhoefer</i> , 24 F.3d 16 (9th Cir. 1994)	19
10	<i>Hatamian v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 8950656 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2018).....	18, 23
11		
12	<i>Hefler v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i> , 2018 WL 6619983 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2018), <i>aff'd sub nom. Heffler v. Pekoc</i> , 802 F. App'x 285 (9th Cir. 2020)	<i>passim</i>
13		
14	<i>Hensley v. Eckerhart</i> , 461 U.S. 424 (1983).....	11
15		
16	<i>In re 3Com Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. C-97-1083-EAI, slip op. (N.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2001).....	18
17		
18	<i>In re Amgen Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2016 WL 10571773 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2016).....	8
19		
20	<i>In re Amkor Tech., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2009 WL 10708030 (D. Ariz. Nov. 19, 2009).....	4, 14
21		
22	<i>In re Apollo Grp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61995 (D. Ariz. Aug. 4, 2008).....	14
23		
24	<i>In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011)	4
25		
26	<i>In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 184031 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 7, 2022).....	7
27		
28	<i>In re Cardinal Health Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 528 F. Supp. 2d 752 (S.D. Ohio 2007)	18
	MOTION AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ISO AN AWARD OF	

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

Page

In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.,
2016 WL 4126533 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2016)6

In re Cendant Corp. Litig.,
264 F.3d 201 (3d Cir. 2001).....19

In re CenturyLink Sales Pracs. & Sec. Litig.,
2020 WL 7133805 (D. Minn. Dec. 4, 2020).....23

In re Charles Schwab Corp. Sec. Litig.,
2011 WL 1481424 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 19, 2011)11

In re Charter Comm'ns, Inc. Sec. Litig.,
2005 WL 4045741 (E.D. Mo. June 30, 2005)17

In re DaimlerChrysler Sec. Litig.,
2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31757 (D. Del. Feb. 5, 2004)17

In re Facebook Biometric Info. Priv. Litig.,
522 F. Supp. 3d 617 (N.D. Cal. 2021),
aff'd, 2022 WL 822923 (9th Cir. Mar. 17, 2022)10

In re Gilat Satellite Networks, Ltd.,
2007 WL 2743675 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2007)23

In re HP Inkjet Printer Litig.,
716 F.3d 1173 (9th Cir. 2013)5

In re Immune Response Sec. Litig.,
497 F. Supp. 2d 1166 (S.D. Cal. 2007).....14

In re Initial Pub. Offering Sec. Litig.,
671 F. Supp. 2d 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2009).....6

In re JDS Uniphase Corp. Sec. Litig.,
2007 WL 4788556 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2007)16

In re Korean Air Lines Co., Antitrust Litig.,
2013 WL 7985367 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2013)4

In re Luckin Coffee Inc. Sec. Litig.,
No. 1:20-cv-01293-JPC, slip op. (S.D.N.Y. July 22, 2022)17

MOTION AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ISO AN AWARD OF



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.