

1 ALLAN STEYER (Bar No. 100318)
 JILL M. MANNING (Bar No. 178849)
 2 D. SCOTT MACRAE (Bar No. 104663)
 SUNEEL JAIN (Bar No. 314558)
 3 **STEYER LOWENTHAL BOODROOKAS**
 4 **ALVAREZ & SMITH LLP**
 235 Pine Street, 15th Floor
 5 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 424-3400
 6 Facsimile: (415) 421-2234
 asteyer@steyerlaw.com
 7 jmanning@steyerlaw.com
 8 smacrae@steyerlaw.com
 sjain@steyerlaw.com

9
 CLIFFORD H. PEARSON (Bar. No. 108523)
 10 DANIEL L. WARSHAW (Bar No. 185365)
 THOMAS J. NOLAN (Bar No. 66992)
 11 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**
 12 15165 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 400
 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
 13 Telephone: (818) 788-8300
 Facsimile: (818) 788-8104
 14 cpearson@pswlaw.com
 15 dwarshaw@pswlaw.com
 tnolan@pswlaw.com

16 *Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class*

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 19 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

20 CHRISTINA GRACE and KEN POTTER
 21 Individually and on Behalf of All Others
 Similarly Situated,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 APPLE INC.,

25 Defendant.

CASE NO. 5:17-cv-00551-LHK-NC

CLASS ACTION

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

Date: February 8, 2021
 Time: 1:30 p.m.
 Courtroom: 8, 4th Floor
 Judge: The Honorable Lucy H. Koh

28

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 8, 2021, at 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in the Courtroom of the Honorable Lucy H. Koh, United States District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, 280 South 1st Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Plaintiffs Christina Grace and Ken Potter (“Plaintiffs”) will and hereby do move the Court, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(h)(1) and 54(d)(2), for the entry of an Order awarding the following in this action (the “Action”):

1. Attorneys’ fees to class counsel in this Action (“Class Counsel”) in the amount of \$5,400,000, which is 30% of the total settlement fund of \$18 million;

2. Unreimbursed expenses Class Counsel necessarily incurred in connection with the prosecution of this Action in the amount of \$1,092,459.47; and

3. Service awards of \$7,500 for each of the two Class Representatives, for a total of \$15,000.

This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion and accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities; the Declaration of Jill M. Manning filed herewith; the Declaration of Daniel L. Warshaw filed herewith; the Declaration of David F.E. Tejtel filed herewith; the Declaration of John Austin Curry filed herewith; all exhibits thereto; argument by counsel at the hearing before this Court; any papers filed in reply; the pleading and papers on file in this Action, and such oral argument and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.

Date: November 24, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

STEYER LOWENTHAL BOODROOKAS
ALVAREZ & SMITH LLP

By: /s/ Jill M. Manning
Jill M. Manning

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

Page

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. BACKGROUND.....2

 A. The Action and the Claims Asserted Therein2

 B. Class Counsel Prosecuted this Action Tenaciously and with Great Skill and Effectiveness3

 C. Mediation and Settlement.....6

III. ARGUMENT6

 A. The Requested Fee Is Reasonable and Appropriate.....7

 1. The Court Should Calculate Class Counsel’s Fees as a Percentage of the Common Fund.....8

 2. The Court Should Award A Fee of Thirty Percent of the Common Fund.....9

 (a) Class Counsel Achieved a Significant Benefit for the Class11

 (b) Class Counsel Faced Significant Risk in Litigating the Action11

 (c) Substantial Effort and Skill Was Required to Prosecute this Action13

 (d) Class Counsel Litigated this Action on a Purely Contingent Basis16

 (e) Awards in Similar Cases Support an Upward Adjustment16

 3. A Lodestar-Multiplier “Cross-Check” Further Confirms the Reasonableness of the Requested Fee.....17

 B. Class Counsel’s Expenses Are Reasonable and Should Be Reimbursed.....20

 C. The Service Award Request Is Reasonable.....20

IV. CONCLUSION22

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(s)

Cases

Acosta v. Frito-Lay, Inc.,
No. 15-CV- 02128-JSC, 2018 WL 646691 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2018) 20

Allapattah Servs., Inc. v. Exxon Corp.,
454 F. Supp. 2d 1185 (S.D. Fla. 2006)..... 17

Alvarez v. Farmers Ins. Exch.,
No. 3:14-CV-00574-WHO, 2017 WL 2214585 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 18, 2017) 22

In re Animation Workers Antitrust Litig.,
No. 14-CV-4062-LHK, 2016 WL 6663005 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 11, 2016) 18

In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.,
No. 15-MD-02617-LHK, 2018 WL 3960068 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2018)*passim*

Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.,
306 F.R.D. 245 (N.D. Cal. 2015) 22

In re Bluetooth Headset Products Liab. Litig.,
654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011)..... 7, 11

Blum v. Stenson,
465 U.S. 886 (1984) 9, 18

Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert,
444 U.S. 472 (1980) 7

Castaneda v. Burger King Corp.,
No. C 08-04262 WHA, 2010 WL 2735091 (N.D. Cal. July 12, 2010)..... 10

In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.,
No. 3:07-cv-5944 JST, 2016 WL 721680 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2016)..... 10

de Mira v. Heartland Employment Serv.,
LLC, No. 12-CV-04092 LHK, 2014 WL 1026282 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2014) 15

Garner v. State Farm,
No. CV 08 1365 CW, 2010 WL 1687829 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2010)..... 10

Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs., Inc.,
No. C-06-4068 MMC, 2007 WL 221862 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2007), *aff'd*, 331 F.
App'x 452 (9th Cir. 2009)..... 13

1	<i>In re Google LLC St. View Elec. Commc'ns Litig.</i> , No. 10-MD-02184-CRB, 2020 WL 1288377 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2020).....	8
2		
3	<i>Hendricks v. Starkist Co.</i> , No. 13- 00729-HSG, 2016 WL 5462423 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2016), <i>aff'd</i> , 2018 WL 5115482 (9th Cir. Oct. 19, 2018).....	6
4		
5	<i>Hickcox-Huffman v. US Airways, Inc.</i> , No. 10-CV-05193-VKD, 2019 WL 1571877 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2019)	22
6		
7	<i>In re High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2015 WL 5158730 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2015).....	17, 18, 20, 22
8		
9	<i>Hopkins v. Stryker Sales Corp.</i> , No. 11-CV-02786-LHK, 2013 WL 496358 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013).....	10, 15
10		
11	<i>Johnson v. Quantum Learning Network, Inc.</i> , No. 15-CV-05013-LHK, 2017 WL 747462 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2017).....	8, 10, 15
12		
13	<i>Knight v. Red Door Salons, Inc.</i> , No. 08–01520 SC, 2009 WL 248367 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 2, 2009).....	10, 12
14		
15	<i>Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Cos.</i> , No. 94 CIV. 2373 (MBM), 1999 WL 1076105 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 30, 1999).....	17
16		
17	<i>In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. CIV.A. 98-5055, 2004 WL 1221350 (E.D. Pa. Jun. 2, 2004)	17
18		
19	<i>In re Media Vision Tech. Sec. Litig.</i> , 913 F. Supp. 1362 (N.D. Cal. 1995)	20
20		
21	<i>In re National Collegiate Athletic Association Athletic Grant-in-Aid Cap Antitrust Litigation</i> , Case No. 4:14-md-2541-CW (N.D. Cal.), Dkt No. 1246 (Oct. 16, 2019)	18
22		
23	<i>In re National Collegiate Athletic Association Athletic Grant-in-Aid Cap Antitrust Litigation</i> , Case No. 4:14-md-2541-CW (N.D. Cal.), Dkt. No. 1259 (Dec. 6, 2019)	18
24		
25	<i>In re Nexus 6P Prod. Liab. Litig.</i> , No. 17-CV-02185-BLF, 2019 WL 6622842 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2019).....	8, 10
26		
27	<i>In re Omnivision Techs., Inc.</i> , 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	10, 13, 14
28		
	<i>In re Online DVD-Rental Antitrust Litig.</i> , 779 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2015).....	21
	<i>Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Grauly</i> , 886 F.2d 268 (9th Cir. 1989).....	15

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.