

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

:
: Master File No. 12-md-02311
: Hon. Marianne O. Battani

In re: Starters Cases
In re: Alternators Cases

:
: Case No. 2:15-cv-00707-MOB-MKM
: Case No. 2:15-cv-01107-MOB-MKM
: Case No. 2:15-cv-14096-MOB-MKM

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER
CASES

**COUNSEL FOR THE TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION
FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS’ FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF
LITIGATION EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs (“TED Plaintiffs”) hereby move the Court, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h) and 54(d)(2), for an award of attorneys’ fees of thirty percent of the \$1,300,000 in settlement funds (after deduction of class notice and claims administration expenses), reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, and service awards for the class representative Truck and Equipment dealerships.

In support of this Motion, TED Plaintiffs rely upon and incorporate by reference herein the facts and legal arguments set forth in the accompanying Memorandum of Law, the Declaration of Erica Fruiterman and its exhibits, and any oral argument that may be held.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 2, 2018

By: /s/ J. Manly Parks
Wayne A. Mack (PA Bar #46654)
J. Manly Parks (PA Bar #74647)
Sean P. McConnell (PA Bar #307740)
Andrew R. Sperl (PA Bar #311467)
Erica Lee Fruiterman (PA Bar #317289)
William Shotzbarger (PA Bar #320490)
DUANE MORRIS LLP
30 S. 17th Street Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 979-1000
Fax: (215) 979-1020
wamack@duanemorris.com
jmparks@duanemorris.com
spmccconnell@duanemorris.com
arsperl@duanemorris.com
efruiterman@duanemorris.com
wshotzbarger@duanemorris.com

*Counsel for Truck and Equipment Dealer
Plaintiffs*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS | : | Master File No. 12-md-02311 |
| ANTITRUST LITIGATION | : | Hon. Marianne O. Battani |
| | : | |
| | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-00707-MOB-MKM |
| | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-01107-MOB-MKM |
| In re: Starters Cases | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-14096-MOB-MKM |
| In re: Alternators Cases | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: | : | |
| | : | |
| TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER | : | |
| CASES | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |

**TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES,
REIMBURSEMENT OF LITIGATION EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Should counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs, who have obtained \$1.3 million in settlement in the *Starters* and *Alternators* cases, be awarded a portion of that settlement for attorneys' fees?

Suggested Answer: Yes.

2. Should counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs be reimbursed for the out-of-pocket costs and expenses they have incurred in pursuing the claims in this case in which a settlement has been presented?

Suggested Answer: Yes.

3. Should the Truck and Equipment Dealer class representatives receive service awards for their efforts involved in this litigation?

Suggested Answer: Yes.

CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITIES

- *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 12-cv-00103, ECF No. 498 (June 20, 2016)
- *In re Delphi Corp. Sec. Derivative & ERISA Litig.*, 248 F.R.D. 483 (E.D. Mich. 2008)
- *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 08-MDL-01952, 2011 WL 6209188 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2011)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| BACKGROUND | 6 |
| A. Counsel for Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs Have Committed Significant Resources in this Litigation..... | 7 |
| B. The Truck and Equipment Class Representatives Have Provided a Great Service to the Settlement Classes and Have Committed Significant Effort to Respond to Discovery and to Represent Settlement Class Members. | 10 |
| C. The Settlement Was Reached After Arms-Length Negotiation and Adversarial Proceedings. | 11 |
| ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND EXPENSES STANDARD OF REVIEW | 11 |
| ARGUMENT..... | 12 |
| I. The Court Should Reimburse Class Counsel for Past Expenses. | 12 |
| A. Reimbursement of Costs Already Incurred..... | 12 |
| II. The Court Should Award Attorneys’ Fees to Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs..... | 13 |
| A. The Court Should Again Use the Percentage-of-the-Fund Approach. | 14 |
| B. The Fee Requested by Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs is Appropriate..... | 15 |
| C. Consideration of the Factors Used by the Sixth Circuit Supports the Requested Fees..... | 17 |
| 1. Counsel Secured Valuable Benefits for Truck and Equipment Dealers. | 17 |
| 2. Society Has an Important Stake Rewarding Attorneys with Reasonable Fees in this Litigation. | 18 |
| 3. Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs Have Worked on a Contingent Basis. | 19 |
| 4. A Lodestar Crosscheck Confirms that the Requested Fee is Reasonable. | 19 |
| 5. The Complexity of the Litigation Supports the Requested Fee..... | 21 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 6. | Skill and Experience of Counsel..... | 22 |
| III. | The Court Should Award Service Payments to the Truck and Equipment Dealer Class Representatives..... | 22 |
| | CONCLUSION..... | 24 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | <u>Page(s)</u> |
|--|-----------------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>In re Air Cargo Shipping Serv. Litig.</i> , No. 06-md-1775 (JG) (VVP), 2011 WL 2909162 (E.D.N.Y., Jul. 15, 2011) | 8 |
| <i>Allapattah Servs., Inc. v. Exxon Corp.</i> , 454 F. Supp. 2d 1185 (S.D. Fla. 2006)..... | 17 |
| <i>In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.</i> , 526 F. Supp. 494 (D.D.C. 1981) | 12 |
| <i>In re Automotive Parks Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 2:12-cv-00102, ECF No. 401 (Dec. 7, 2015) | 6, 12, 14 |
| <i>In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2:12-cv-00101, ECF No. 232 (Mar. 20, 2015) | 8 |
| <i>In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2:12-cv-00102, ECF No. 401 (Dec. 7, 2015) | 8 |
| <i>In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig., Bearings</i> , No. 2:14-cv-00507, ECF No. 60 (April 13, 2017) (Exhibit 1-A to the Shotzbarger Decl.)..... | 2, 9 |
| <i>In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.</i> , Case No. 2:14-cv-14451, ECF No. 119 (Sept. 15, 2016)..... | 17 |
| <i>In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 12-cv-00103, ECF No. 498 (June 20, 2016) | 7-8 |
| <i>In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-14451, ECF No. 128 (Dec. 28, 2016) | 2, 9 |
| <i>B & H Med., L.L.C. v. ABP Admin., Inc.</i> , No. 02-73615, 2006 WL 123785 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 13, 2006) | 7 |
| <i>Bessey v. Packerland Plainwell, Inc.</i> , Case No. 4:06-CV- 95, 2007 WL 3173972 (W.D. Mich. 2007)..... | 11 |
| <i>Blum v. Stenson</i> , 465 U.S. 886 (1984) | 9 |
| <i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> , 444 U.S. 472 (1980)..... | 9 |
| <i>Brotherton v. Cleveland</i> , 141 F. Supp. 2d 907 (S.D. Ohio 2001)..... | 18 |
| <i>In re Cardinal Health Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 528 F. Supp. 2d 752 (S.D. Ohio 2007) | <i>Passim</i> |
| <i>In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.</i> , 218 F.R.D. 508 (E.D. Mich. 2003) | 11, 13, 16, 18 |

In re Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co. Sec. Litig., 643 F. Supp. 148 (S.D. Ohio 1986)11

In re Combustion, Inc., 968 F. Supp. 1116 (W.D. La. 1997)11

Connectivity Systems Inc. v. National City Bank, 2011 WL 292008 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 26, 2011).....18

Cook v. Niedert, 142 F.3d 1004 (7th Cir. 2008)17

In re Delphi Corp. Sec. Derivative & ERISA Litig., 248 F.R.D. 483 (E.D. Mich. 2008)*Passim*

Denney v. Jenkins & Gilchrist, 230 F.R.D. 317, 2005 WL 388562 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 18, 2005)17

In re Diet Drugs Prod. Liab. Litig., 2002 WL 32154197 (E.D. Pa., Oct. 3, 2002)9

Enter. Energy Corp. v. Columbia Gas Transmission Corp., 137 F.R.D. 240 (S.D. Ohio 1991)18

In re Folding Carton Antitrust Litig., 84 F.R.D. 245 (N.D. Ill. 1979)13

Hadix v. Johnson, 322 F.3d 895 (6th Cir. 2003).....18

Hainey v. Parrott, No. 1:02–cv–733, 2007 WL 3308027 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 6, 2007).....18

In re Sterling Foster & Company, Inc. Sec. Litig., 238 F. Supp. 2d 480, 484-85, 489-90 (E.D.N.Y. 2002)8

Isabel v. City of Memphis, 404 F.3d 404 (6th Cir. 2005)15

Kogan v. AIMCO Fox Chase, L.P., 193 F.R.D. 496 (E.D. Mich. 2000)11

Kritzer v. Safelite Solutions, LLC, 2012 WL 1945144 (S.D. Ohio May 30, 2012).....14

Liberte Capital Group v. Capwill, No. 5:99 cv 818, 2007 WL 2492461 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 29, 2007)18

In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig., 292 F. Supp. 2d 631 (E.D. Pa. 2003).....16

Missouri v. Jenkins, 491 U.S. 274 (1989).....15

Moulton v. U.S. Steel Corp., 581 F.3d 344 (6th Cir. 2009)18

In re National Century Financial Enterprises, Inc. Investment Litig., 2009 WL 1473975 (S.D. Ohio, May 27, 2009)11

In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig., 08-MDL-01952, 2011 WL 6209188 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2011)*Passim*

In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig., 2011 WL 621918817

Pennsylvania v. Delaware Valley Citizens’ Council for Clean Air, 483 U.S. 711 (1987).....15

In Re Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litig., Case No. 1:10 MD 2196, 2015 WL 1639269.....17

Ramey v. Cincinnati Enquirer, Inc., 508 F.2d 1188 (6th Cir. 1974)7, 12, 17

Rawlings v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc., 9 F.3d 513 (6th Cir. 1993) 2, 6, 9-10

In re Revco Sec. Litig., 1992 WL 118800 (N.D. Ohio May 6, 1992).....18

In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig., 2014 WL 2946459 (E.D. Tenn. Jun. 30, 2014)9, 18

In re Teletronics Pacing Sys., Inc., Accufix Atrial “J” Leads Prods. Liab. Litig., 137 F. Supp. 2d 1029 (S.D. Ohio 2001)11

Thacker v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C., 695 F. Supp. 2d (E.D. Ky. 2010)11

In re Trans Union Corp. Privacy Litig., 629 F. 3d 741 (7th Cir. 2011).....14

In re U.S. Bancorp Litig., 291 F.3d 1035 (8th Cir. 2002).....11

Van Horn v. Nationwide Prop. and Cas. Inc. Co., 436 F. App’x 496 (6th Cir. 2011)..... 6-7

In re Vitamin C Antitrust Litig., No. 06–MD–1738, 2012 WL 5289514 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 23, 2012)18

In re Vitamins Antitrust Litig., 2001 WL 34312839 (D.D.C. 2001).....11

Waters v. Intern. Precious Metals Corp., 190 F.3d 1291 (11th Cir. 1999)11

Other Authorities

ALBA CONTE & HERBERT NEWBERG, *NEWBERG ON CLASS ACTIONS* (4th ed. 2002), §14:6 at 55111

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h)6

Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2).....6

MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION (Third) § 24.12 at 189 (WEST 1995).....10

Rule 30(b)(6).....18

BACKGROUND

After three years of hard-fought litigation, counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs (“TED Plaintiffs”) have negotiated a settlement with a Defendant in the *Starters* and *Alternators* cases for approximately \$1.3 million. This settlement provides significant cash and non-cash benefits, including fulsome cooperation from the settling Defendant. All of the net proceeds from this settlement will be paid to eligible new Truck and Equipment dealerships—there is no *cy pres* reversion to Defendant or third-party charities.

Truck and Equipment Dealer class representatives and their counsel have zealously pursued this complex antitrust litigation. While there were undoubtedly antitrust violations, Defendant has argued, among other things, that the illegal conduct as it related to Trucks and Equipment was primarily related to overseas markets, that none of the Plaintiffs suffered an antitrust injury, and that no litigation class could be certified.

The settlement currently before the Court provides substantial benefits to Truck and Equipment Dealers and is notable in light of the formidable opposition from MDL Defendants. The Court and Special Master have seen first-hand much of the work done by the attorneys representing the Truck and Equipment Dealers. MDL Defendants directed significant discovery efforts at the Truck and Equipment Dealer class representatives, and responding to this discovery—and the discovery that remains ongoing in other parts cases—has consumed a significant amount of time and resources for Truck and Equipment Dealer class representatives and their counsel.

TED Plaintiffs submit this motion in support of their request for: (1) an award of attorneys’ fees; (2) reimbursement of litigation expenses already incurred in this case; and (3) service awards for the Class Representatives. As discussed in this brief, the case law from the

Sixth Circuit and other federal courts, as well as this Court's prior rulings in this MDL proceeding, supports these requests.

Like the percentage-of-the-fund award this Court previously approved for TED Plaintiffs, Direct Purchasers and Automobile Dealers in this MDL, counsel for Truck and Equipment Dealers seek a fee award based on a percentage of the approximately \$1.3 million in settlement funds currently available to eligible members of the Truck and Equipment Dealer settlement classes. This Court has previously supported this approach in this MDL. *See, e.g., In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig., Bearings*, No. 2:14-cv-00507, ECF No. 60, at 2 (April 13, 2017) (Exhibit 1-A to the Shotzberger Decl.) (applying percentage-of-the-fund approach from *Rawlings v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc.*, 9 F.3d 513, 515 (6th Cir. 1993)); *In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, No. 2:14-cv-14451, ECF No. 128 at 2 (Dec. 28, 2016) (same). The award requested—thirty percent of the settlement fund after certain costs have been deducted—is within the range of fee awards made by this Court. *See, e.g., id.* (awarding one-third of the fund).

Through the efforts of counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers and the dealerships who serve as named plaintiffs, a substantial cash settlement has been obtained. Counsel have pursued the litigation vigorously; engaged in motion practice; reviewed documents; and engaged in lengthy settlement negotiations during the three years since this case was filed. Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have substantially advanced the claims of the Truck and Equipment Dealers on a contingent fee basis.

A. Counsel for Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs Have Committed Significant Resources in this Litigation.

The Court has noted several times that this litigation is unique in its size and complexity. Antitrust litigation is inherently risky, with high stakes, and the outcome of this litigation has

been far from certain. From the outset, counsel for the TED Plaintiffs worked on a contingent basis to advance the claims of Truck and Equipment dealerships authorized by OEMs to sell new vehicles.

The Department of Justice has described its investigation of the bid-rigging and price-fixing conspiracies at issue here as the largest criminal investigation it has ever undertaken. The conduct involves a staggering number of parts, affected models, and conspiring participants. Most of the Defendant groups have had one or more of their corporate affiliates convicted of serious crimes in the United States, Europe, and/or Asia. The list of settling and non-settling Defendants includes well-known companies that are dominant players in their industries.

There are 21 TED Plaintiffs who pursued money damage claims. And there are dozens of different cases pending in this MDL proceeding surrounding different parts (or types of parts) in a bid-rigging and price-fixing conspiracy involving numerous Defendants; my firm has advanced claims on behalf of classes of Truck and Equipment Dealers in five different parts cases.

Since 2014, my firm has represented the TED Plaintiffs. Many of the Duane Morris attorneys working on this matter have worked nearly full-time on this MDL proceeding in various aspects of the following activities (and expect to be involved in similar future activities in connection with other aspects of this MDL proceeding):

- Collecting and synthesizing information from a variety of sources and evidence produced by Defendants;
- Collecting and analyzing information and discovery;
- Researching various aspects of the laws of the states under which laws the Complaints assert claims, and drafting and editing the Complaints and amendments thereto;
- Reviewing, selecting, hiring, and consulting with economic and other liability and damages experts;

- Drafting and negotiating key case management documents, protocols, and stipulations;
- Reviewing, in conjunction with the other plaintiff groups, English and foreign language documents produced by the Defendants;
- Receiving and reviewing cooperation materials from amnesty applicants, and traveling to and attending in-person attorney and witness proffers from amnesty applicants;
- Drafting, preparing for, and arguing oppositions to multiple motions to dismiss;
- Drafting, preparing for, and arguing discovery motions and oppositions to discovery motions;
- Negotiating discovery issues with defense counsel including innumerable meet and confer sessions;
- Preparing correspondence with respect to timing, stipulations, and case planning issues;
- Obtaining and analyzing documents and data from the class representatives, including multiple telephone conferences;
- Locating, reviewing, and producing of over 870,000 pages of documents from the class representatives;
- Participating in telephone conferences and meetings to help formulate OEM subpoenas and discovery from third-parties;
- Preparing/coordinating service of in excess of 50 OEM subpoenas throughout the United States;
- Traveling to and attending many MDL status conferences;
- Performing all the tasks necessary to reach these settlements, including assessing the potential value of claims and risks associated with continued pursuit of those claims, formulating demands, negotiating, preparing, reviewing, and revising various drafts of settlement agreements, preparing, reviewing, and revising various drafts of escrow agreements;
- Communicating and negotiating with an escrow agent;
- Communicating and negotiating with a settlement administrator;
- Drafting preliminary approval motions;

- Receiving cooperation materials from settling Defendants disclosing the details of the conspiracies, and reviewing and analyzing cooperation materials from settling Defendants; and
- Drafting settlement notices, developing claim forms, and preparing other settlement-related documents and consulting with the claims administrator regarding those materials.

(See generally, Exhibit 1 (Fruiterman Decl.))

B. The Truck and Equipment Class Representatives Have Provided a Great Service to the Settlement Classes and Have Committed Significant Effort to Respond to Discovery and to Represent Settlement Class Members.

The Truck and Equipment Dealer class representatives have shouldered a substantial burden representing the absent class members to assist in gaining the settlements before the Court. Defendants have made a coordinated and concerted effort in this MDL to put an extreme strain on the dealerships who have acted as representatives of the Truck and Equipment dealer community to protect the rights of the class members injured by the Defendants' criminal conduct.

Defendants in the MDL have asked the class representative Truck and Equipment dealers to produce documents for an over 14-year period that include: (1) all documents or data referring, or relating to any actual or potential term of every new vehicle-related transaction, including thousands of hard copy "deal files"; (2) information regarding any and all costs incurred in connection with their businesses; (3) financing and insurance details; (4) what and how they paid their sales employees; (5) every negotiation for every one of the tens of thousands of vehicles sold by the class representatives during the period in question; (6) sales and margin targets; (7) inventory management documents including but not limited to, business guidelines, handbooks, strategy presentations, and planning presentations; and (8) salesperson training materials. MDL Defendants have sought documents and data located at all locations where the class representatives did business during the period in question, as well as hard copy documents

located at every such location (including in storage at off-site locations). Counsel for the TED Plaintiffs have had to negotiate these demands with MDL Defendants and have brought and opposed multiple discovery motions and objections. (*Id.*)

C. The Settlement Was Reached After Arms-Length Negotiation and Adversarial Proceedings.

The settlement before the Court was reached after litigation was well underway and was negotiated by experienced counsel on both sides. The settlement was reached through lengthy negotiations of the parties. (*Id.*) In each instance, counsel was armed with transactional data produced by the settling Defendant, witness proffers, and a strong understanding of the claims and defenses.

ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES STANDARD OF REVIEW

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h) provides that “[i]n a certified class action, the court may award reasonable attorney’s fees and non-taxable costs that are authorized . . . by law.” District courts may award reasonable attorneys’ fees and expenses from the settlement of a class action upon motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2) and 23(h). This Court has adopted a two-part analysis when assessing the reasonableness of a petition seeking an award of attorneys’ fees. *See, e.g., In re Automotive Parks Antitrust Litig.*, No. 2:12-cv-00102, ECF No. 401, at 2 (Dec. 7, 2015) (citing *In re Cardinal Health Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 528 F. Supp. 2d 752, 760 (S.D. Ohio 2007)). The court first determines the method of calculating the attorneys’ fees: it applies either the percentage of the fund approach or the lodestar method. *Id.*; *Van Horn v. Nationwide Prop. and Cas. Inc. Co.*, 436 F. App’x 496, 498 (6th Cir. 2011). The court has the discretion to select the appropriate method for calculating attorneys’ fees “in light of the unique characteristics of class actions in general, and of the unique circumstances of the actual cases before them.” *Id.* (citing *Rawlings*, 9 F.3d at 513, 516). In common fund cases, the award of attorneys’ fees need only “be

reasonable under the circumstances.” *Id.* The court will then analyze and weigh the six factors described in *Ramey v. Cincinnati Enquirer, Inc.*, 508 F.2d 1188 (6th Cir. 1974). *Id.*

ARGUMENT

I. The Court Should Reimburse Class Counsel for Past Expenses.

For three years, counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers funded the substantial expenses required to advance the litigation and continue to do so without any guarantee of being reimbursed. Having achieved the settlement currently before the Court counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers should be reimbursed for the litigation expenses incurred in connection with the settled claims.

A. Reimbursement of Costs Already Incurred.

The Court should follow the approach it has previously adopted in this MDL and award reimbursement for the litigation expenses already incurred in these cases. *See, e.g., In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, 2:12-cv-00102, at 3-5 (Dec. 7, 2015) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h); *In re Delphi Corp. Sec. Derivative & ERISA Litig.*, 248 F.R.D. 483, 504 (E.D. Mich. 2008) (“Under the common fund doctrine, class counsel are entitled to reimbursement of all reasonable out-of-pocket litigation expenses and costs in the prosecution of claims and in obtaining settlement, including expenses incurred in connection with document production, consulting with experts and consultants, travel and other litigation-related expenses.” (Citation and internal quotation marks omitted.)); *Cardizem*, 218 F.R.D. at 535; *B & H Med., L.L.C. v. ABP Admin., Inc.*, No. 02–73615, 2006 WL 123785, at *3 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 13, 2006).)

Duane Morris, as counsel for the TED Plaintiffs, has invested approximately \$38,347.78 of its own money to pay for reasonable litigation expenses in these cases from inception to January 26, 2018. (Fruiterman Decl.) These out-of-pocket case-related costs included experts, document review, travel to court hearings, conferences, proffers, and other meetings, and other

reasonable litigation expenses. (*Id.*) Counsel for TED Plaintiffs are not requesting that any percentage of the settlement funds be set aside to pay for future expenses, as this Court has permitted the Auto Dealer, End Payors, and Direct Purchasers to do. *See, e.g., In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, No. 12-cv-00103, ECF No. 498 at 2 (June 20, 2016) (End Payors); *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, 2:12-cv-00102, ECF No. 401, at 3-5 (Dec. 7, 2015) (Auto Dealers); *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, 2:12-cv-00101, ECF No. 232, at 1 (Mar. 20, 2015) (Direct Purchasers).

Duane Morris incurred these expenses in this case without any guarantee of recovery and should be reimbursed from the settlement fund. (*Id.*) Having achieved the settlement currently before the Court, Duane Morris should be awarded the amount of \$38,347.78, representing the litigation expenses it has incurred in this case from inception through January 26, 2018.

II. The Court Should Award Attorneys' Fees to Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs.

The Court has a settlement before it totaling approximately \$1.3 million for the benefit of the Truck and Equipment Dealers. Counsel for TED Plaintiffs have been litigating these cases on a contingent basis for three years and have already invested hundreds of hours in the cases. Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers request an award of attorneys' fees based on the work done to achieve this settlement and deliver these substantial benefits to the Settlement Class.

Fee awards are appropriate in large-scale litigation in which settlements are reached periodically. *See In re Air Cargo Shipping Serv. Litig.*, No. 06-md-1775 (JG) (VVP), 2011 WL 2909162, at *5-7 (E.D.N.Y., Jul. 15, 2011) (interim fee award granted); *In re Sterling Foster & Company, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 238 F. Supp. 2d 480, 484-85, 489-90 (E.D.N.Y. 2002) (interim attorneys' fees awarded). Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have already litigated

these cases for three years and will continue to vigorously represent the interests of truck and equipment dealerships in other parts cases. *See In re Diet Drugs Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 2002 WL 32154197, at *12 (E.D. Pa., Oct. 3, 2002) (awarding an interim fee after years of litigation and noting “to make them wait any longer for at least some award would be grossly unfair”).

A. The Court Should Again Use the Percentage-of-the-Fund Approach.

The Supreme Court recognizes that “a litigant or a lawyer who recovers a common fund for the benefit of persons other than himself or his client is entitled to a reasonable attorney’s fee from the fund as a whole.” *Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert*, 444 U.S. 472, 478 (1980); *see also Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 502. When calculating attorneys’ fees under the common fund doctrine, “a reasonable fee is based on a percentage of the fund bestowed on the class.” *Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 900 n.16 (1984).

The Court has previously awarded fees in this MDL using the percentage-of-the-fund approach. *See, e.g., Bearings*, Case No. 2:14-cv-00507, ECF No. 60, at 2 (April 13, 2017) (applying percentage-of-the-fund approach); *In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 2:14-cv-14451, ECF No. 128, at 2 (Dec. 28, 2016) (same). Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers seek the same approach here. Courts in this Circuit prefer this method of awarding attorneys’ fees because it eliminates disputes about the reasonableness of rates and hours, conserves judicial resources, and aligns the interests of class counsel and the class members. *See, e.g., Rawlings*, 9 F.3d at 515; *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 08-MDL-01952, 2011 WL 6209188, at *16 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2011); *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 502; *Cardinal*, 528 F. Supp. 2d at 762 (the Sixth Circuit has “explicitly approved the percentage approach in common fund cases”); *In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig.*, 2014 WL 2946459, *1 (E.D. Tenn. Jun. 30, 2014) (“the lodestar method is cumbersome; the percentage-of-the-fund approach more accurately reflects the result achieved; and the percentage-of-the-fund approach has the

virtue of reducing the incentive for plaintiffs' attorneys to over-litigate or 'churn' cases.") (citations omitted).

The lodestar method, on the other hand, "has been criticized for being too time-consuming of scarce judicial resources," as it requires that courts "pore over time sheets, arrive at a reasonable hourly rate, and consider numerous factors in deciding whether to award a multiplier." *Rawlings*, 9 F.3d at 516-17. Moreover, "[w]ith the emphasis it places on the number of hours expended by counsel rather than the results obtained, it also provides incentives for overbilling and the avoidance of early settlement." *Id.* at 517; *see also* MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION (Third) § 24.12 at 189 (West 1995). There is a "trend towards adoption of a percentage-of-the-fund method in [common fund] cases." *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 502 (quoting *Rawlings*, 9 F.3d at 516-517).

B. The Fee Requested by Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs is Appropriate.

The Court is well-versed with the complexity of this litigation. For the cases at issue here, counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have worked for over three years and dedicated roughly 630 hours total in the cases to date. (*See* Fruiterman Decl.) Interim Lead Counsel was solely responsible for prosecuting these cases and had no assistance from other counsel, except to the extent the parties coordinated, as ordered by the Court, with respect to issues such as briefing, depositions and third-party discovery. (*Id.*)

Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers request that the Court award fees totaling thirty percent of the settlement funds remaining after the deduction of: (1) the notice and administration costs; and (2) the costs of escrow anticipated in this case. Precedent supports applying the selected percentage to the settlement fund before deducting the litigation costs and expenses from the funds. *See, e.g., In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 2011 WL 6209188, at

*17; *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 505 (attorneys' fees awarded on gross settlement fund); *In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.*, 218 F.R.D. 508, 531-535 (E.D. Mich. 2003) (awarding costs in addition to percentage of the fund fee). Reasonable fee awards range from 20 to 50 percent of the common fund. *In re Telectronics Pacing Sys., Inc., Accufix Atrial "J" Leads Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 137 F. Supp. 2d 1029, 1046 (S.D. Ohio 2001); *In re Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co. Sec. Litig.*, 643 F. Supp. 148, 150 (S.D. Ohio 1986); Alba Conte & Herbert Newberg, *NEWBERG ON CLASS ACTIONS* (4th ed. 2002), §14:6 at 551 ("Empirical studies show that, regardless whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery."). Courts in this District routinely approve attorneys' fees in antitrust class actions of one-third of the common fund created for the settlement class. *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 2011 WL 6209188, at *19; *Thacker v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C.*, 695 F. Supp. 2d, 521, 528 (E.D. Ky. 2010); *Bessey v. Packerland Plainwell, Inc.*, Case No. 4:06-CV-95, 2007 WL 3173972, at *4 (W.D. Mich. 2007); *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 502-03; *In re National Century Financial Enterprises, Inc. Investment Litig.*, 2009 WL 1473975 (S.D. Ohio, May 27, 2009); *Kogan v. AIMCO Fox Chase, L.P.*, 193 F.R.D. 496, 503 (E.D. Mich. 2000).

Fee awards of *more than* thirty percent are also common. *See, e.g., In re Combustion, Inc.*, 968 F. Supp. 1116, 1133, 1142 (W.D. La. 1997) (awarding fee of 36 percent and noting that "50 percent of the fund is the upper limit on a reasonable fee award from a common fund [D]istrict courts in the Fifth Circuit have awarded percentages of approximately one-third contingency fee"); *In re U.S. Bancorp Litig.*, 291 F.3d 1035, 1038 (8th Cir. 2002) (fee of 36 percent); *Waters v. Intern. Precious Metals Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1291, 1292-94 (11th Cir. 1999); *In re Vitamins Antitrust Litig.*, 2001 WL 34312839, at *10 (D.D.C. 2001) (awarding one third of \$359 million antitrust recovery, which is "within the fifteen to forty-five percent range

established in other cases.”); *In re Ampicillin Antitrust Litig.*, 526 F. Supp. 494, 498 (D.D.C. 1981) (awarding fee of 45 percent).

C. Consideration of the Factors Used by the Sixth Circuit Supports the Requested Fees.

Once the Court has selected a method for awarding attorneys’ fees, it will consider the six *Ramey* factors in weighing a fee award in a common fund case: (1) the value of the benefits rendered to the class; (2) society’s stake in rewarding attorneys who produce such benefits in order to maintain an incentive to others; (3) whether the services were undertaken on a contingent fee basis; (4) the value of the services on an hourly basis [the lodestar cross-check]; (5) the complexity of the litigation; and (6) the professional skill and standing of counsel on both sides. *See, e.g., In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-00102, ECF No. 401 at 3-5 (Dec. 7, 2015) (Auto Dealers) (citing *Ramey*, 508 F.2d at 1194-97). When applied here, these factors indicate that the fee requested is fair.

1. Counsel Secured Valuable Benefits for Truck and Equipment Dealers.

The result achieved for the class members is a principal consideration. *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 503. As discussed in the memoranda filed in support of the preliminary approval of the settlement, counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have achieved an excellent recovery. This is a cash settlement coupled with meaningful cooperation that will assist TED Plaintiffs in the prosecution of these cases. The settlement fund totaling \$1.3 million represents a significant recovery for class member dealerships that sell new Trucks and Equipment.

After the deduction of fees, notice and claims administration costs, and expenses, all of the net settlement fund will be paid to eligible dealerships that file claims. None of the money will revert to the settling Defendant or to a *cy pres* designee. All eligible Truck and Equipment dealerships that file a claim for new vehicles and parts purchased in the indirect purchaser states

will be entitled to a share of the settlement fund. In addition to the money benefits, the cooperation terms of these settlements provide significant value to TED Plaintiffs in their prosecution of the claims against the non-settling Defendants.

2. Society Has an Important Stake Rewarding Attorneys with Reasonable Fees in this Litigation.

There is a “need in making fee awards to encourage attorneys to bring class actions to vindicate public policy (e.g., the antitrust laws) as well as the specific rights of private individuals.” *In re Folding Carton Antitrust Litig.*, 84 F.R.D. 245, 260 (N.D. Ill. 1979). Courts in the Sixth Circuit weigh “society’s stake in rewarding attorneys who [win favorable outcomes in antitrust class actions] in order to maintain an incentive to others Society’s stake in rewarding attorneys who can produce such benefits in complex litigation such as in the case at bar counsels in favor of a generous fee Society also benefits from the prosecution and settlement of private antitrust litigation.” *In re Cardizem*, 218 F.R.D. at 534 (internal quotation marks omitted); *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 504.

The Department of Justice did not seek restitution from the settling Defendant, and the criminal actions were largely focused on conduct involving passenger cars, not commercial trucks or equipment. As such, the work of movants, working on a contingent basis, was essential to securing a recovery for Truck and Equipment Dealers. The substantial recovery counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have achieved has helped serve the public policy of holding accountable those who violate antitrust laws in the United States. Society benefits when those who have violated laws fostering fair competition and honest pricing are required to reimburse affected consumers in civil proceedings such as this one.

3. Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs Have Worked on a Contingent Basis.

Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have pursued, and will continue to pursue, litigation in this MDL proceeding on a contingent basis. The risk relating to doing so supports a reasonable fee award from a common fund. *See In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 2011 WL 6209188, at *19 (risk of non-payment a factor supporting the requested fee). The contingency factor “stands as a proxy for the risk that attorneys will not recover compensation for the work they put into a case.” *Cardinal*, 528 F. Supp. 2d at 766. Indeed, “some courts consider the risk of non-recovery as the most important factor in fee determination.” *Kritzer v. Safelite Solutions, LLC*, 2012 WL 1945144, at *9 (S.D. Ohio May 30, 2012) (quoting *Cardinal*, 528 F. Supp. 2d at 766). “[W]ithin the set of colorable legal claims, a higher risk of loss does argue for a higher fee.” *In re Trans Union Corp. Privacy Litig.*, 629 F. 3d 741, 746 (7th Cir. 2011).

Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers work on a contingent fee basis and advance funds and time associated with the litigation, risking not receiving payment for their work or reimbursement of the out-of-pocket expenses they paid. Being rewarded only for success in litigation this complex creates a high degree of risk, which was enhanced by the fact that the claims being pursued on behalf of the Truck and Equipment Dealers were not the main focus of the guilty pleas secured during the criminal enforcement proceedings against some of the MDL Defendants. The substantial risk undertaken by counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers further supports the requested attorneys’ fees. *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 503-54.

4. A Lodestar Crosscheck Confirms that the Requested Fee is Reasonable.

Some courts, including this one, apply a lodestar “cross-check” on the reasonableness of the fee calculated as a percentage of the fund. *See, e.g., In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-00102, ECF No. 401 at 3-5 (Dec. 7, 2015) (Auto Dealers); *see also Cardinal*,

528 F. Supp. 2d at 764; *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 2011 WL 6209188, at *18. A lodestar cross-check is optional, however, and the Court is not required to engage in a detailed scrutiny of time records. *Cardinal*, 528 F. Supp. 2d at 767. The time counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers had to expend confirms that the fee requested is well “aligned with the amount of work the attorneys contributed” to the recovery, and does not constitute a “windfall.” *Id.*

To calculate a reasonable fee under the lodestar method, the court determines the base amount of the fee by multiplying the number of hours counsel reasonably expended by their hourly rate. *Isabel v. City of Memphis*, 404 F.3d 404, 415 (6th Cir. 2005). Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have responded to motion practice and engaged in lengthy settlement negotiations. All the while, counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have been working to certify classes and prepare to bring this case to trial.

Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers have vigorously prosecuted this case while being efficient and avoiding duplication and unproductive work. As shown in the declaration of Erica Fruiterman submitted with this motion, counsel representing the Truck and Equipment Dealers and their professional staff have worked approximately 630 total hours in the *Starters* and *Alternators* cases. Applying the rates charged by counsel to the total hours expended from inception through January 26, 2018 yields a “lodestar” of approximately \$357,106.50.¹ (*See* Fruiterman Decl.) The requested fee is \$367,200.00, which represents thirty percent of the funds remaining after deducting the fund for the escrow agent costs (\$6,000) and notice and claims administration (\$70,000). *Id.*

¹ The use of current rates is appropriate to compensate counsel for inflation and the delay in receipt of the funds. *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 491 U.S. 274, 282-84 (1989); *see also Pennsylvania v. Delaware Valley Citizens’ Council for Clean Air*, 483 U.S. 711, 716 (1987).

Whether analyzed as a “cross-check” on the percentage-of-the-fund method—or under the lodestar method—the requested fee is reasonable. The requested fee represents approximately 100% of the total lodestar for time spent from inception through January 26, 2018. A fee representing a multiplier of almost exactly 1.0 like this one is entirely reasonable and is lower than the multipliers approved in other cases. *See, e.g., Cardinal*, 528 F. Supp. 2d at 767-68 (*approving multiplier of 6*, and observing that “[m]ost courts agree that the typical lodestar multiplier” on a large class action “*ranges from 1.3 to 4.5*”) (emphasis added); *Prandin*, 2015 WL 1396473, at *4 (approving a 3.01 multiplier).

While the hours worked are substantial, they are reasonable and reflect the challenging nature of the litigation. Defendant is represented by able counsel who have asserted vigorous defenses. Defendant’s efforts have required the Truck and Equipment Dealers to expend considerable effort and skill in prosecuting these cases. Given the excellent results achieved, the complexity of the claims and defenses, the real risk of non-recovery, the formidable defense teams, the delay in receipt of payment, and the substantial experience and skill of counsel, the requested multiplier on the lodestar and the resulting fee is reasonable compensation for the work done by counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers.

5. The Complexity of the Litigation Supports the Requested Fee.

As the Court is well-aware, “[a]ntitrust class actions are inherently complex” *In re Cardizem*, 218 F.R.D. at 533; *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 2011 WL 6209188, at *19; *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.*, 292 F. Supp. 2d 631, 639 (E.D. Pa. 2003) (“An antitrust class action is arguably the most complex action to prosecute. The legal and factual issues involved are always numerous and uncertain in outcome.”) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). This litigation is decidedly complex given the numerous conspiracies and parts

involved, the international Defendants, and the sheer magnitude of the conduct and regulatory investigations.

6. Skill and Experience of Counsel.

The skill and experience of counsel on both sides of the litigation is a factor courts consider in determining a reasonable fee award. *In Re Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 1:10 MD 2196, 2015 WL 1639269 at * 7; *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 2011 WL 6219188, at *19. The Court has already found Interim Lead Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers to have the requisite skill and experience in class action and antitrust litigation to serve effectively as class counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers. *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 2:14-cv-14451, ECF No. 119 at 6 (Sept. 15, 2016); *id.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-12050, ECF No. 18 at 8 (Oct. 7, 2016). In assessing this *Ramey* factor, courts also look to the qualifications of the defense counsel opposing the certification of the class. Here, defense counsel are extraordinarily well-qualified and experienced antitrust and class action firms.

III. The Court Should Award Service Payments to the Truck and Equipment Dealer Class Representatives.

Class representatives are “an essential ingredient of any class action” and incentive awards are appropriate to induce a business or consumer to participate in worthy class action lawsuits. *Cook v. Niedert*, 142 F.3d 1004, 1016 (7th Cir. 2008). “Such [i]ncentive awards serve an important function, particularly where the named plaintiffs participated actively in the litigation.” *Allapattah Servs., Inc. v. Exxon Corp.*, 454 F. Supp. 2d 1185, 1218 (S.D. Fla. 2006) (citing *Denney v. Jenkins & Gilchrist*, 230 F.R.D. 317, 2005 WL 388562, at *31 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 18, 2005)).

The Sixth Circuit has noted that incentive awards are typically awarded to class representatives for their extensive involvement with a lawsuit. *Hadix v. Johnson*, 322 F.3d 895, 897 (6th Cir. 2003). Awards encourage members of a class to become class representatives and reward their efforts taken on behalf of the class. *Id.* Payment of incentive awards to class representatives is a reasonable use of settlement funds. *Moulton v. U.S. Steel Corp.*, 581 F.3d 344, 351 (6th Cir. 2009). Larger incentive awards than those to individual plaintiffs have been approved for organizational class representatives because of the greater burden in the course of litigation by producing greater numbers of documents and participating in Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. *See In re Vitamin C Antitrust Litig.*, No. 06–MD–1738, 2012 WL 5289514, at *11 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 23, 2012).

Interim Lead Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers request a service award of \$5,000 for each class representative in this case. Such an award is well within the Court's discretion. *See Prandin*, 2015 WL 1396473, at *5 (in a \$19 million settlement, award of \$50,000 to each class representative); *Skelaxin*, 2014 WL 2946459 (settlement of direct antitrust action, awarding \$50,000 to each class representative); *Connectivity Systems Inc. v. National City Bank*, 2011 WL 292008, at *20 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 26, 2011) (in \$10 million settlement, awarding \$50,000 each to three named plaintiffs); *Liberte Capital Group v. Capwill*, No. 5:99 cv 818, 2007 WL 2492461, at *3 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 29, 2007) (awarding \$97,133.83 and \$95,172.47 to two named plaintiffs representing subclasses that received \$11 million and \$7 million); *Hainey v. Parrott*, No. 1:02–cv–733, 2007 WL 3308027 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 6, 2007) (approving award of \$50,000 for each class representative); *Cardizem*, 218 F.R.D. at 535-36 (awarding \$75,000 to each class representative); *Brotherton v. Cleveland*, 141 F. Supp. 2d 907, 913–14 (S.D. Ohio 2001) (granting a \$50,000 service award out of a \$5.25 million fund); *In re Revco Sec. Litig.*, 1992 WL 118800, *7 (N.D. Ohio May 6, 1992) (\$200,000 incentive award to named plaintiff); *Enter. Energy Corp. v. Columbia Gas Transmission*

Corp., 137 F.R.D. 240, 251 (S.D. Ohio 1991) (approving service awards of \$50,000 to six class representatives out of a settlement fund of \$56.6 million).

As described above, the class representative dealerships have already sustained a significant discovery burden in this MDL, *see supra* at § B. The Truck and Equipment Dealers have been the target of extensive discovery efforts from MDL Defendants and have been deluged with requests for burdensome and commercially sensitive information. In response, the class representative dealerships have located and produced hundreds of thousands of documents during discovery, have shared their knowledge of the industry, and have spent a great deal of time and resources. Among other things, Plaintiffs have produced extremely sensitive, complete downloads of their inventory and sales databases. Without the class representatives' willingness to bring these claims and undertake these efforts, there would be no settlements for Truck and Equipment dealers. In addition, the class representatives will continue to incur significant burden as litigation and discovery proceeds in *Starters* and *Alternators* and the other parts cases.

A significant amount of effort from the dealerships has been required to advance this litigation. Such effort requires the class representative dealers to devote employee time away from the day-to-day demands of running their businesses. Service awards are intended to relieve some of this burden and are well-justified in litigation as lengthy and complex as the case before the Court. Therefore, the Court should award to each named plaintiff a \$5,000 service award.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Interim Lead Counsel for the Truck and Equipment Dealers respectfully request that the Court grant their Motion and award attorneys' fees, reimburse litigation expenses, and issue class representative service awards.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 2, 2018

By: /s/ J. Manly Parks
Wayne A. Mack (PA Bar #46654)
J. Manly Parks (PA Bar #74647)
Sean P. McConnell (PA Bar #307740)
Andrew R. Sperl (PA Bar #311467)
Erica Lee Fruiterman (PA Bar #317289)
William Shotzbarger (PA Bar #320490)
DUANE MORRIS LLP
30 S. 17th Street Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 979-1000
Fax: (215) 979-1020
wamack@duanemorris.com
jmparks@duanemorris.com
spmccconnell@duanemorris.com
arsperl@duanemorris.com
efruiterman@duanemorris.com
wshotzbarger@duanemorris.com

*Counsel for Truck and Equipment Dealer
Plaintiffs*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I served the foregoing Motion for an Award of Attorneys' Fees, Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses, and Service Awards on all counsel of record by the Court's ECF system.

Dated: February 2, 2018

By: /s/ J. Manly Parks
J. Manly Parks

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS | : | Master File No. 12-md-02311 |
| ANTITRUST LITIGATION | : | Hon. Marianne O. Battani |
| | : | |
| | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-00707-MOB-MKM |
| | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-01107-MOB-MKM |
| In re: Starters Cases | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-14096-MOB-MKM |
| In re: Alternators Cases | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: | : | |
| | : | |
| TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER | : | |
| CASES | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |
| | : | |

**INDEX OF EXHIBITS TO
TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AN
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF LITIGATION
EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

| <u>Exhibit</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|----------------|---|
| 1 | Declaration of Erica Fruiterman, Esquire |
| 1-A | Summary of Time Spent from inception to January 26, 2018 |
| 1-B | Summary of Litigation Expenses from inception to January 26, 2018 |

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| _____ | : | |
| IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS | : | Master File No. 12-md-02311 |
| ANTITRUST LITIGATION | : | Hon. Marianne O. Battani |
| | : | |
| _____ | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-00707-MOB-MKM |
| In re: Starters Cases | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-01107-MOB-MKM |
| In re: Alternators Cases | : | Case No. 2:15-cv-14096-MOB-MKM |
| | : | |
| _____ | : | |
| THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: | : | |
| | : | |
| TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER | : | |
| CASES | : | |
| | : | |
| _____ | : | |

**DECLARATION OF ERICA FRUITERMAN IN SUPPORT OF TRUCK AND
EQUIPMENT DEALER PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS’
FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF LITIGATION EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Erica Fruiterman, submit this declaration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 and declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at Duane Morris LLP and submit this declaration in support of the Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs’ Motion for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses, and Service Awards. We are Class Counsel appointed by the Court to represent the putative litigation and provisionally-certified settlement classes of Truck and Equipment Dealers in this multi-district litigation (“TED Plaintiffs”).
2. Our firm has worked on this case on a contingent basis and without any guarantee of being paid for its time or being reimbursed for the millions of dollars of time and expenses invested in the pursuit of these cases.

3. This is a decidedly complex litigation, a point the Court itself has acknowledged. There are 21 TED Plaintiff class representatives who pursued money damage claims and dozens of different cases pending in this MDL proceeding surrounding different parts (or types of parts) in a bid-rigging and price-fixing conspiracy involving MDL Defendants; my firm has advanced claims on behalf of classes of Truck and Equipment Dealers in five different parts cases.

4. Since 2014, my firm has represented the TED Plaintiffs. Many of the Duane Morris attorneys working on this matter have worked nearly full-time on this MDL proceeding in various aspects of the following activities (and expect to be involved in similar future activities in connection with other aspects of this MDL proceeding):

- Collecting and synthesizing information from a variety of sources and evidence produced by Defendants;
- Collecting and analyzing information and discovery in the cases with settlements;
- Researching various aspects of the laws of the states under which laws the Complaints assert claims, and drafting and editing the Complaints and amendments thereto;
- Reviewing, selecting, hiring, and consulting with economic and other liability and damages experts;
- Drafting and negotiating key case management documents, protocols, and stipulations;
- Reviewing, analyzing, and translating English and foreign language documents produced by the Defendants;
- Receiving and reviewing cooperation materials from amnesty applicants, and traveling to and attending in-person attorney and witness proffers from amnesty applicants;
- Drafting, preparing for, and arguing discovery motions and oppositions to discovery motions;
- Negotiating discovery issues with defense counsel including numerous meet and confer sessions;
- Preparing correspondence with respect to timing, stipulations, and case planning issues;
- Obtaining and analyzing documents and data from the class representatives, including multiple telephone conferences;
- Locating, reviewing, and producing of over 870,000 pages of documents from the class representatives;
- Participating in telephone conferences and meetings to help formulate OEM subpoenas and discovery from third-parties;

- Preparing/coordinating service of in excess of 50 OEM subpoenas throughout the United States;
- Traveling to and attending many MDL status conferences;
- Performing all the tasks necessary to reach these settlements, including assessing the potential value of claims and risks associated with continued pursuit of those claims, formulating demands, negotiating, preparing, reviewing, and revising various drafts of settlement agreements, preparing, reviewing, and revising various drafts of escrow agreements;
- Communicating and negotiating with an escrow agent;
- Communicating and negotiating with a settlement administrator;
- Drafting preliminary approval motions;
- Receiving cooperation materials from settling Defendants disclosing the details of the conspiracies, and reviewing and analyzing cooperation materials from settling Defendants; and
- Drafting settlement notices, developing claim forms, and preparing other settlement-related documents and consulting with the claims administrator regarding those materials.

5. The class representative TED Plaintiffs have met with and communicated through their in-house counsel with their lawyers countless times over the course of MDL proceeding and have actively participated in the litigation. They have opened their business records and files, provided access to documents and data, have provided over 870,000 pages of documents that have been produced in the MDL proceeding to date, have turned over highly sensitive business information, and have offered up a senior sales employee of their corporate parent for deposition in the MDL proceeding. In addition, the class representatives will continue to incur significant burden as litigation and discovery proceeds in the other parts cases, including producing significant numbers of additional documents and submitting to depositions.

6. The Court has before it a settlement totaling \$1.3 million for the benefit of eligible TED Plaintiffs. This settlement was negotiated by experienced counsel on both sides. The settlement was reached through lengthy negotiations of the parties involving many months and involving many communications and numerous rounds of negotiation. Counsel on both sides received and reviewed transactional data, information exchanged during Settlement discussions,

and developed a robust understanding of the claims and defenses. TED Plaintiffs' counsel also received and reviewed information provided by the ACPERA applicant.

7. The Court is well-versed with the complexity of this litigation. For the *Starters/Alternators* case at issue in this settlement, counsel for the TED Plaintiffs have dedicated roughly 630 hours total in the case to date. (My firm maintained its time and expense records, when possible, on a per-case basis for tasks that related specifically to a particular case. Work done to specifically analyze the damage caused in a specific case was charged to that case.)

8. Duane Morris has served as sole counsel for the TED Plaintiffs throughout this proceeding and has invested substantial time on this litigation that could have been spent working on other lucrative matters. Duane Morris has invested this time for approximately three years.

9. Attached to this Declaration as Exhibit 1A is a summary of the time spent by Duane Morris attorneys and professional staff who have been involved in the *Starters/Alternators* case from inception through January 26, 2018. The summary was prepared at my request from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Duane Morris. The hourly rates for the attorneys and professional staff reflected in Exhibit 1A are the usual customary hourly rates charged by Duane Morris in similar complex class action matters from inception through January 26, 2018 and are in line with rates approved by other courts for work by Duane Morris attorneys in similar matters.

10. Duane Morris, as Counsel for the TED Plaintiffs, has also invested approximately \$38,347.78 of its own money to pay for reasonable litigation expenses in this case from inception to January 26, 2018. (*See* attached to this declaration as Exhibit 1B a summary of \$38,347.78

spent by Duane Morris toward litigation expenses from inception to January 26, 2018.) These out-of-pocket case-related costs included experts, document review, travel to court hearings, conferences, proffers, and other meetings, and other reasonable and typical litigation expenses. Duane Morris incurred these expenses in this case without any guarantee of recovery and should be reimbursed from the settlement funds.

11. Duane Morris, as counsel for the TED Plaintiffs, also requests that the Court grant service awards of \$5,000 to each of the class representative dealerships with a settlement currently before the Court. The Truck and Equipment Dealers have been the target of extensive discovery efforts from MDL Defendants and have been deluged with requests for burdensome and commercially sensitive information. In response, the class representative dealerships have located and produced hundreds of thousands of documents during discovery, have shared their knowledge of the industry, and have spent a great deal of time and resources during the MDL. Among other things, Plaintiffs have produced extremely sensitive, complete downloads of their inventory and sales databases. Without the class representatives' willingness to bring these claims and undertake these efforts, there would be no settlements for Truck and Equipment dealers. In addition, the class representatives will continue to incur significant burden as litigation and discovery proceeds in *Starters* and *Alternators* and the other parts cases.


12. The expenses for the development, implementation, and delivery of the notice plan for the settlement before the Court and the administration of claims (if the settlements are granted final approval) are limited by the settlement agreements to approximately \$70,000. To the extent that the costs of notice and administration of claims do not reach \$70,000, all remaining funds will be returned to the settlement fund for allocation to the class members.

13. The expenses paid or to be paid to the escrow agent for accepting, holding, and distributing the settlement funds pursuant to the settlement agreement before the Court are projected to be \$6,000.

14. Duane Morris, as counsel for TED Plaintiffs, respectfully requests that it receive a fee award equal to thirty percent of the settlements presently before the court for final approval, after backing out the cost of the escrow agent and class notice and claims administration. That calculation is: $(\$1,300,000 - \$70,000 - \$6,000) \times 30\% = \$367,200$. The requested fee represents approximately 100% of the total lodestar for time spent from inception through January 26, 2018. A fee representing a multiplier of almost exactly 1.0 like this one is entirely reasonable.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on the 2nd day of February, 2018 at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.



Erica Fruiterman
Duane Morris LLP

EXHIBIT 1A**IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION TIME REPORT****Firm Name: Duane Morris LLP****Reporting Period: Inception – January 26, 2018**

| PROFESSIONAL | STATUS | TOTAL HOURS | CURRENT HOURLY RATE | TOTAL LODESTAR |
|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Wayne A. Mack | P | 85.5 | 974.33 | \$83,305.50 |
| J. Manly Parks | P | 153.4 | 733.82 | \$112,567.50 |
| Sean McConnell | A | 77.6 | 555.12 | \$43,077.00 |
| Robyn Stoter | A | 6.8 | 545.07 | \$3,706.50 |
| Andrew Sperl | A | 63.7 | \$425.56 | \$27,108.00 |
| Erica Fruiterman | A | 21.9 | \$391.51 | \$8,574.00 |
| Sarah Kulik | A | 7.7 | \$320.00 | \$2,464.00 |
| Richard M. Heaslip | A | 4.4 | \$350.00 | \$1,540.00 |
| William Shotzbarger | A | 181.4 | \$353.69 | \$64,160.00 |
| Barbara Ruth | TA | .2 | \$390.00 | \$78.00 |
| Brian Pennock | TA | 1.9 | \$295.00 | \$560.50 |
| Andrea Stein | PL | 25 | \$390.36 | \$9,759.00 |
| Joanne Helmich | PL | .5 | \$245.00 | \$122.50 |
| Cate Nash | LS | .3 | \$280.00 | 84.00 |
| TOTALS | | 630.3 | | \$357,106.50 |

P= Partner

A=Associate

LC=Law Clerk

PL=Paralegal

LS=Library Staff

LA =Legal Assistant

EXHIBIT 1B**IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION TIME REPORT****Firm Name: Duane Morris LLP****Reporting Period: Inception – January 26, 2018**

| EXPENSE | AMOUNT |
|--|--------------------|
| Arbitrators/Mediators | \$19,560.85 |
| Court Fees (Filings, etc) | \$400.00 |
| Deposition/Court Transcripts | \$100.60 |
| Experts | \$1,880.60 |
| In-House Postage Expense | \$42.70 |
| Travel/Meals/Meetings | \$4,431.56 |
| Telephone/Fax Expenses | \$224.73 |
| Overnight Mail Service (Federal Express. UPS, etc. | \$94.98 |
| Translation Services | \$8,321.50 |
| In-House Photocopying | \$808.62 |
| On-line Research (West Law/Lexis/Pacer/Industry Data) | \$1,901.64 |
| Subpoena Services/Third Party Documents | \$580.00 |
| | |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | \$38,347.78 |
| | |