

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE APPLE iPhone 4 PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 5:10-md-02188-RMW

**[PROPOSED] SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER GRANTING ATTORNEYS' FEES
AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES**

1 On July 13, 2012, the Court held a hearing on plaintiffs’ motion for approval of the
2 Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement”) and on class counsel’s motion for an award
3 of attorneys’ fees, reimbursement of expenses, and service awards for the class
4 representatives. The Court heard from counsel for the parties, and considered all objections to
5 the Settlement and the application for fees, expenses, and service awards.

6 On August 10, 2012, the Court issued an Order granting in part and denying in part
7 Plaintiffs’ request for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs (the “Order”). The Order granted fees and
8 expenses to Co-Lead Counsel and JCCP Liaison Counsel equal to the loadstar and expenses
9 provided to the Court and denied fees and expenses to all other plaintiffs counsel. However,
10 the Order stated in footnote 3 that any counsel for plaintiffs that had not previously submitted
11 as declaration in support of an application for fees could do so at a later time and the Court
12 would consider all such submissions.

13 On September 13, 2012 the Court issued an Order granting in part and denying in part
14 the request for fees and expenses submitted by non-lead counsel. As part of that Order, the
15 Court considered the supplemental declarations submitted, but declined to award fees and
16 expenses that the Court could not determine were incurred prior to appointment of lead
17 counsel or were reasonably incurred subsequent to the appointment of lead counsel.

18 On September 24, 2012, lead counsel submitted supplemental declarations on behalf
19 of non-lead counsel detailing the fees and expenses of non-lead counsel.

20 Having now obtained supplemental detailed fee and expense declarations the Court
21 makes the following ruling on the payment of attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of expenses.
22 This Order supplants the September 13, 2012 Order as to those firms listed in this Order.

23 The Court GRANTS plaintiffs’ counsel Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses, and orders as
24 follows:

- 25 1. The Court awards Complex Litigation Group _____ in fees
26 and _____ in expenses;

1 2. The Court awards McCallum Hoaglund Cook & Irby, LLP _____
2 in fees and _____ in expenses;

3 3. The Court awards Ram, Olson, Cereghino & Kopczynski _____
4 in fees and _____ in expenses;

5 4. The Court awards Farmer, Jaffe, Weissing, Edwards, Fistos & Lehrman
6 _____ in fees and _____ in expenses;

7 5. The Court awards Felahy Law Group _____ in fees and
8 _____ in expenses;

9 6. The Court awards King & Ferlauto _____ in fees and
10 _____ in expenses;

11 7. The Court awards Klafter Olsen & Lesser LLP _____ in fees and
12 _____ in expenses;

13 8. The Court awards Whitfield Bryson & Mason LLP _____ in fees
14 and _____ in expenses;

15 9. The Court awards Wilentz, Goldman & Spitzer, P.A. _____ in
16 fees and _____ in expenses;

17 10. The Court awards Seeger Weiss LLP _____ in fees and
18 _____ in expenses;

19 11. The Court awards Kershaw, Cutter & Ratinoff LLP _____
20 in fees and _____ in expenses;

21 12. The Court awards Hiden, Rott & Oertle, LLP _____ in fees
22 and _____ in expenses;

23 13. The Court awards Wexler Wallace LLP _____ in fees and
24 _____ in expenses.

25 The aforementioned fees, and expenses shall be paid pursuant to the terms of the
26 parties' Settlement.

1 IT IS SO ORDERED.

2 Dated: _____, 2012

3 By: Order of the United States
4 District Court for the Northern District
5 of California

6 _____
7 The Honorable Ronald Whyte
8 DISTRICT JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28