

1 Steve W. Berman (*pro hac vice*)  
Robert F. Lopez (*pro hac vice*)  
2 Ted Wojcik (*pro hac vice*)  
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
3 1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98101  
4 Telephone: (206) 623-7292  
5 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
steve@hbsslaw.com  
6 robl@hbsslaw.com  
tedw@hbsslaw.com

7  
8 Shana E. Scarlett (SBN 217895)  
Benjamin J. Siegel (SBN 256260)  
Ben M. Harrington (SBN 313877)  
9 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP  
715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202  
10 Berkeley, CA 94710  
Telephone: (510) 725-3000  
11 Facsimile: (510) 725-3001  
shanas@hbsslaw.com  
12 bens@hbsslaw.com  
13 benh@hbsslaw.com

14 *Interim Lead Class Counsel*

15 [Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

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

19 DONALD R. CAMERON, *et al.*,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 APPLE INC.,

23 Defendant.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. 4:19-cv-03074-YGR

**DEVELOPER PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE  
OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR  
ATTORNEYS' FEES,  
REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES,  
AND SERVICE AWARDS**

Date: June 7, 2022  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
Location: Courtroom 1- 4th Floor

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on June 7, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard by the Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, located in Courtroom 1, at 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612, Developer Plaintiffs will and hereby do move the Court for an award of attorneys' fees, reimbursement of expenses, and service awards. This motion is based on this notice of motion and motion, the accompanying memorandum of points and authorities, the declarations in support of the motion, argument by counsel at the hearing before this Court, any papers filed in reply, such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of this motion, and all papers and records on file in this matter.

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT .....	1
II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY .....	2
III. THE WORK UNDERTAKEN BY THE DEVELOPER PLAINTIFFS .....	3
A. Class Counsel completed a substantial pre-litigation investigation that led to a comprehensive, well-pleaded complaint. ....	3
B. Class Counsel engaged in substantial discovery efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class. ....	3
1. Class Counsel coordinated with counsel for Consumer Plaintiffs and Epic to obtain critical discovery.....	3
2. Class Counsel completed substantial written and document discovery.....	4
3. Class Counsel took and defended more than twenty fact and 30(b)(6) depositions.....	6
C. Class Counsel and their experts undertook a large amount of expert discovery and analysis critical to class certification.....	6
D. Class Counsel conducted extensive work on an amicus brief and a comprehensive motion for class certification and settled strategically with Apple to maximize recovery for the Settlement Class. ....	7
IV. THE SETTLEMENT OBTAINED VALUABLE MONETARY AND STRUCTURAL RELIEF. ....	8
V. ARGUMENT .....	9
A. Class Counsel’s fee request is reasonable. ....	10
1. The requested fee award is reasonable under a percentage-of-the-fund analysis. ....	11
a. Class Counsel achieved exceptional results for the Settlement Class, including generating benefits beyond the cash settlement fund.....	12
b. This case posed enormous risks and challenges.....	15

1 c. The market rate for antitrust class action lawyers  
 2 supports the fee request. .... 17  
 3 d. Counsel’s litigation on a contingency basis supports  
 4 the fee request. .... 18  
 5 e. The burdens faced by Class Counsel support the fee  
 6 request..... 19  
 7 2. A lodestar cross-check confirms the reasonableness of  
 8 the requested fees. .... 19  
 9 B. Lead Class Counsel requests authorization to distribute fees  
 10 among Class Counsel. .... 23  
 11 C. The litigation expenses advanced were reasonable and necessary  
 12 to secure the benefits obtained for the Class. .... 23  
 13 D. Plaintiffs request that the two class representatives be awarded  
 14 reasonable service awards to compensate them for their  
 15 dedication to this case..... 24  
 16 E. The Class received appropriate notice of Class Counsel’s fee  
 17 application. .... 25  
 18 VI. CONCLUSION ..... 25  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Pages(s)**

**CASES**

1		
2		
3		
4	<i>In re Animation Workers Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
5	2016 WL 6663005 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 11, 2016).....	20
6	<i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i> ,	
7	2018 WL 3960068 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2018).....	10
8	<i>In re Apple Inc. Device Performance Litig.</i> ,	
9	2021 WL 1022866 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2021).....	10, 11
10	<i>In re Aremissoft Corp. Secs. Litig.</i> ,	
11	210 F.R.D. 109 (D.N.J. 2002).....	22
12	<i>In re Auto. Refinishing Paint Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
13	617 F. Supp. 2d 336 (E.D. Pa. 2007).....	15
14	<i>Beckman v. KeyBank, N.A.</i> ,	
15	293 F.R.D. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	22
16	<i>In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> ,	
17	654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011).....	10, 19, 20, 21
18	<i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> ,	
19	444 U.S. 472 (1980).....	10
20	<i>In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
21	2016 WL 3648478 (N.D. Cal. July 7, 2016).....	13
22	<i>In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
23	2016 WL 4126533 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2016).....	17
24	<i>Ching v. Siemens Indus., Inc.</i> ,	
25	2014 WL 2926210 (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2014).....	18
26	<i>In re Corel Corp., Inc. Secs. Litig.</i> ,	
27	293 F. Supp. 2d 484 (E.D. Pa. 2003).....	13
28	<i>de Mira v. Heartland Emp't Serv., LLC</i> ,	
	2014 WL 1026282 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2014).....	11
	<i>Dyer v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> ,	
	303 F.R.D. 326 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....	21
	<i>Hartless v. Clorox Co.</i> ,	
	273 F.R.D. 630 (S.D. Cal. 2011).....	23

# 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.