

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**

In re SONY PS3 “OTHER OS” LITIGATION

Case No. 4:10-CV-01811-YGR

**[PROPOSED] ORDER AWARDING  
ATTORNEYS’ FEES, COSTS, AND  
INCENTIVE AWARDS**

Date: January 24, 2017  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
Courtroom: 1 – 4th floor

1           1.       This matter came before the Court on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Award of Attorneys’  
2 Fees, Costs, and Incentive Awards. By separate order, the Court has determined that the proposed  
3 class action settlement reached by the Parties in the Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and  
4 Release is fair, reasonable and adequate and is finally approved.

5           2.       The Court exercises diversity jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
6 1332(d). *See Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Services, Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 571 (2005) (“CAFA  
7 confers federal diversity jurisdiction over class actions . . . [.]”). In diversity actions, “state law  
8 governs both the right to recover attorney’s fees and the computation of their amount.” *Collado v.*  
9 *Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.*, 550 Fed. Appx. 368, 369 (9th Cir. 2013); *Gezalyan v. BMW of*  
10 *North America, LLC*, 697 F. Supp. 2d 1168, 1169 (C.D. Cal. 2010) (citing *Mangold v. California*  
11 *Public Utilities Commission*, 67 F.3d 1470, 1478 (9th Cir. 1995)). As Plaintiffs’ claims in this  
12 lawsuit are for alleged violations of California’s consumer protection statutes, including the  
13 Consumers Legal Remedies Act, the False Advertising Law and the Unfair Competition Law,  
14 California state law has governed Plaintiffs’ claims in this action and thus applies to Plaintiffs’  
15 motion for an award of attorney fees. *See Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1047 (9th Cir.  
16 2002) (“Because Washington law governed the claim, it also governs the award of fees.”).

17           3.       The Court finds that Plaintiffs are “prevailing plaintiff[s]” entitled to a fee award  
18 under the CLRA because they obtained a net monetary recovery for the Proposed Class and  
19 succeeded in achieving a major goal of the litigation. *Kim v. Euromotors West/The Auto Gallery*, 149  
20 Cal. App. 4th 170, 179 (2007); *see also Graciano v. Robinson Ford Sales, Inc.*, 144 Cal. App. 4th  
21 140, 150-51 (2006). The Court also finds that Plaintiffs have benefited the public by vindicating  
22 consumer protection statutes and are a “successful party” under California Code of Civil Procedure §  
23 1021.5, and otherwise meet its requirements, for the same reasons they qualify as “prevailing  
24 plaintiff[s]” under the CLRA—they have achieved one of the primary benefits sought in bringing the  
25 lawsuit. *See Lyons v. Chinese Hosp. Ass’n*, 136 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1346 (2006) (“A ‘successful’  
26 party means a ‘prevailing’ party.”). Therefore, Interim Co-Lead Counsel are entitled to a fee award.

1           4.       The Court applies California’s lodestar method to calculate the appropriate attorneys’  
2 fees to be awarded to Class Counsel. *See Meister v. Regents of Univ. of California*, 67 Cal. App. 4th  
3 437, 448-49 (1998) (“the California Supreme Court intended its lodestar method to apply to a  
4 statutory attorney’s fee award unless the statutory authorization for the award provided for another  
5 method of calculation”); *Lealao v. Beneficial California, Inc.*, 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 26 (2000) (“the  
6 primary method for establishing the amount of ‘reasonable’ attorney fees [in fee-shifting cases] is  
7 the lodestar method”).

8           5.       I have reviewed the sworn testimony of Rosemary M. Rivas, James Pizzirusso, and  
9 Kathleen Fisher as to the work conducted by Class Counsel, the hourly rates, and the lodestar and  
10 find they are reasonable. Class Counsel’s lodestar of \$2,549,922.00, and the aggregate lodestar of  
11 all Plaintiffs’ firms (\$4,673,012) is a greater amount than the requested award of fees of  
12 \$2,186,105.41 and therefore the Court finds that the requested fee award is reasonable. The Court  
13 also finds that the request for reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$63,894.59 is reasonable  
14 as mandatory and discretionary costs pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1033.5 and should be  
15 awarded. Accordingly, as stipulated in Paragraph 109 of the Stipulation of Class Action Settlement  
16 and Release, Defendant shall pay Class Counsel a total of \$2.25 million for attorneys’ fees and costs.

17           6.       Furthermore, the Court finds that Plaintiffs’ request for incentive awards of \$3,500 to  
18 Plaintiffs Derrick Alba, Jason Baker, James Girardi, Jonathan Huber, and Anthony Ventura is  
19 appropriate. The Court has the discretion to award class representatives service payments for work  
20 they did on behalf of the class and the amount Plaintiffs request is within range of what has been  
21 approved. *See Rodriguez v. West Publ'g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 958-59 (9th Cir. 2009) (“Incentive  
22 awards are fairly typical in class action cases.”); *Morris v. Affinity Health Plan, Inc.*, 928 F. Supp. 2d  
23 805, 812 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) (service award of \$20,000 found reasonable); *Spicer v. Chi. Bd. Options*  
24 *Exchange, Inc.*, 844 F. Supp. 1226, 1266-68 (N.D. Ill.1993) (awarding \$10,000 to each named  
25 plaintiff and citing cases approving service awards ranging as high as \$100,000). Accordingly,  
26 having reviewed the Declaration of Rosemary M. Rivas as to the Plaintiffs’ efforts and other  
27

1 submissions, the Court finds that Plaintiffs Derrick Alba, Jason Baker, James Girardi, Jonathan  
2 Huber, and Anthony Ventura should each be awarded \$3,500 for their efforts.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 The Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
7 United States District Court Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26