1 Kevin Mahoney (SBN: 235367) kmahoney@mahoney-law.net 2 Sean M. Blakely (SBN: 264384) sblakely@mahoney-law.net MAHÔNEY LAW GROUP, APC 249 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 814 4 Long Beach, CA 90802 Tel.: (562) 590-5550 5 Fax: (562) 590-8400 6 7 [Additional Counsel Listed on the Following Page.] 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff KURT CASADINE and ALFRED GUERRERO on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated 9 10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 13 KURT CASADINE on behalf of Case No.: CV 12-10078-DMG (CWx) himself and all others similarly situated, 14 Honorable Dolly M. Gee 15 Plaintiff, DECLARATION OF KEVIN 16 MAHONEY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S UNOPPOSED 17 MOTION FOR CLASS VS. REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE 18 ENHANCEMENTS, ATTORNEYS' FEES AND 19 MAXIM HEALTHCARE SERVICES, LITIGATION COSTS 20 INC., a Maryland Corporation and Hearing Date: September 18, 2015 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 21 Hearing Time: 11:00 a.m. 22 Courtroom: Defendants. 23 24 Complaint Filed: October 24, 2012 25 26 27 28

ADDITIONAL COUNSEL: Jose R. Garay, Esq., SBN 200494 **JOSE GARAY, APLC** 9861 Irvine Center Drive Irvine, CA 92618 Bus. (949) 208- 3400 Fax. (949) 713-0432

DECLARATION OF KEVIN MAHONEY

- I, KEVIN MAHONEY, declare the following:
- 1. I am an attorney and principal of the law firm Mahoney Law Group, APC, counsel of record for Plaintiff KURT CASADINE and ALFRED GUERRERO in the above referenced matter *Kurt Casadine v. Maxim Healthcare Services, Inc.*, Case No. CV 12-10078-DMG (CWx), and am admitted to practice before the United States District Court, Central District of California. All of the facts stated herein are true and to the best of my knowledge, and if called as a witness, I am competent to testify thereto.
- 2. This declaration is made in support of Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Unopposed Class Representative Service Enhancements, Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Costs.
- 3. This Settlement, which was negotiated between Plaintiff Kurt Casadine ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Maxim Healthcare Services, Inc. ("Defendant"), is fair and reasonable because it provides substantial and immediate benefits to the class members. Plaintiffs' counsel provided great benefit to the class, through actively litigating this class action lawsuit for nearly three years. Indeed, Plaintiffs' counsel conducted substantial discovery in this matter, drafted extensive law and motion, including Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification and Supplemental Class Certification Briefing (Docket No. 55, 72) Plaintiffs' counsel, Mahoney Law Group, APC, committed substantial costs and time in the successful prosecution of this case.
- 4. The total hours worked by Plaintiffs' counsel, MAHONEY LAW GROUP, APC is not less than 855.22, for a total lodestar of \$403,428.50. Attached to this Declaration as Exhibit "A" is a detailed billing report for the hours worked by Kevin Mahoney in this matter.

27 | ///

28 | ///

	<u>Hours</u>	Rate	<u>Lodestar</u>
Kevin Mahoney, Esq.	177.60	\$ 650.00	\$ 115,440.00
Sean Blakely, Esq.	677.62	\$ 425.00	\$ 287,988.50
Total	855.22		\$ 403,428.50

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY OF THE CASE

- 5. Below is a brief recitation of the factual history of this matter and the substantial work performed by Class Counsel.
- 6. On or about October 24, 2012, Plaintiff Kurt Casadine and Ronald Kroenig filed a wage and hour class action lawsuit against Defendant Maxim Healthcare Services, Inc. ("Defendant") in the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles, based upon violations of the California Labor Code and the California Business and Professions Code, alleging the following causes of action: (1) Failure to Pay Wages; (2) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (3) Failure to Provide Rest Periods; (4) Failure to Pay Wages Due at Termination; (5) Knowing and Intentional Failure to Comply With Itemized Wage Statement Provisions; and (6) Unfair Competition (Business And Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* Prior to the filing of this lawsuit, I had several in-person meetings with Plaintiffs Kurt Casadine and Ronald Korenig regarding their potential claims and Defendant's employment practices and policies. The representation of Plaintiffs throughout this case has been strictly on a contingency fee.
- 7. On or about November 26, 2012, Defendant removed this action from the Los Angeles County Superior Court to the instant Court. Plaintiff's counsel analyzed Defendant's Notice of Removal and accompanying documents to ensure that subject matter jurisdiction was proper in this Court.
- 8. On or about January 25, 2013, the Parties filed a Joint Case Management Statement in anticipation for the Scheduling Conference in this

- 9. On or about February 13, 2013, Plaintiff Casadine served Request for Production, Set One; Special Interrogatories, Set One; and Request for Admission, Set One on Defendant. This written discovery sought information and documents pertaining to Defendant's policies and procedures for the payment of wages, and the identity of "Caregivers" during the liability period.
- 10. After significant meet and confer efforts, the Parties agreed to stipulate to the filing of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint. On or about April 23, 2013, this Court granted the Parties Stipulation, and ordered that Plaintiffs may file an amended complaint. Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint alleged causes of action for (1) Recovery of Unpaid Minimum Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Wages Due at Termination; (3) Knowing and Intentional Failure to Comply with Itemized Wage Statement Provisions; and (4) Violation of Unfair Competition law, and omitted causes of action for failure to pay overtime and failure to provide meal and rest periods.
- 11. On or about April 12, 2013, Defendant served responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents, Set One. On or about April 19, 2013, Defendant served responses to Plaintiff's Special Interrogatories, Set One and Plaintiff's Request for Admissions, Set One. Defendant additionally produced over three hundred (300) pages of responsive documents, including Plaintiff's personnel file, wage statements and time records, as well as various policies, procedures and Defendant's employee handbook. The Parties met and conferred regarding Defendant's responses to Plaintiff's initial set of written discovery for several weeks, and on or about July 10, 2013, Defendant served supplemental discovery responses and served further responsive documents including communications between Plaintiff and Defendant and various policies and procedures specific to Home Health Aides. The Parties could not come to an

 agreement regarding Defendant's responses to Plaintiff's first set of written discovery, and Plaintiff initiated the meet and confer process pursuant to Local Rule 37-1 to move the Court for an order compelling Defendant to provide the requested information and documents.

- 12. On September 5, 2013, the Parties filed a Joint Motion to Compel Further Discovery Responses. (See Docket No. 23) On November 4, 2013, the Court granted Plaintiff Casadine's Motion in part, and ordered Defendant to supplement its previous response to Plaintiffs' Special Interrogatory No. 1 and provide the name, address and telephone number of putative class members, defined as Home Health Aides who worked 24-hour Live-In shifts and were paid a flat or per-shift rate, who were employed by Defendant in Southern California offices. The Court further ordered Defendant to supplement some of its response to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents. (See Docket No. 31)
- 13. Defendant noticed Plaintiff Casadine's deposition in this matter. Plaintiff Casadine was produced for two full days of deposition on August 28, 2013 and September 30, 2013.
- 14. Defendant served Request for Production of Documents on Plaintiff Casadine. On or about August 8, 2013, Plaintiff Casadine served responses to Defendant's document requests and served responsive documents.
- 15. On or about September 13, 2013, Plaintiff Casadine served further written discovery, including Special Interrogatories, Set Two; Request for Production of Documents, Set Two; and Request for Admission, Set Two, seeking information and documents specific to Caregivers, Certified Home Health Aides, and Patient Care Assistants who worked twenty-four (24) hour Live-In shifts and were paid a flat or daily rate of pay.
- 16. On or about October 26, 2013, Plaintiff Casadine noticed the deposition of Defendant pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6) and requested Defendant to produce various documents. Plaintiff Casadine sought

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

testimony on a wide variety of topics including Defendant's policies and practices as to timekeeping, payment of minimum wages, wage rates, payment of wages to employees who worked twenty-four (24) hour Live-In shifts, wage statements, and the scheduling of twenty-four (24) hour Live-In shifts.

- 17. On or about November 18, 2013, Defendant served further supplemental discovery responses as to Plaintiff's first set of written discovery, and provided class contact information for Home Health Aides who worked twenty-four (24) hour Live-In shifts and were paid a flat or per-shift rate as ordered by the Court. Plaintiff's counsel prepared and delivered a class contact letter, and began to speak directly with putative class members regarding the alleged wage and hour violations and Defendant's policies and practices. Beginning in November 2013, and for a period of time covering approximately one year, Plaintiff's counsel spent countless hours contacting and speaking to dozens of putative class members to investigate Plaintiff's allegations and obtained a significant amount of information pertaining to Defendant's policies and Based on the information provided by putative class members, Plaintiff's counsel drafted declarations which were reviewed, edited and executed by putative class members.
- On November 22, 2013, the Parties attended a private mediation 18. session with experienced class action wage and hour mediator Jeffrey Krivis. Ultimately, the Parties were unable to reach a resolution at this mediation. Plaintiff's counsel spent considerable time reviewing documents and evidence in drafting Plaintiff's confidential mediation brief.
- On or about January 15, 2014, pursuant to Plaintiff's FRCP 30(b)(6) 19. deposition notice, Plaintiff Casadine took the deposition of Defendant by and through Amy Gargiulo in Sacramento, California. Both myself and Sean M. Blakely attended this deposition in Sacramento, California. Prior to the Deposition on January 15, 2014, Defendant produced further responsive documents. Prior to

this deposition, Plaintiff's counsel reviewed hundreds of pages of documents to prepare and spent numerous hours in preparation of this FRCP 30(b)(6) deposition.

- 20. On January 17, 2014 and February 20, 2014, Plaintiff Casadine took the depositions of Bryan Chacon and Frederick Cichy respectively, and received further testimony on the scheduling of twenty-four (24) hour Live-In shifts among other topics. Prior to these depositions, Plaintiff's counsel reviewed hundreds of pages of documents and reviewed previous deposition testimony in preparation for these depositions.
- 21. Plaintiff Casadine noticed and took a further FRCP 30(b)(6) deposition on February 27, 2014 in Sacramento, California, regarding Defendant's corporate structure and its relationship with individual filed offices in California.
- 22. Additionally, on February 27, 2014, Plaintiff Casadine also obtained testimony from Michael Beams, in his individual capacity as Regional Accounts Manager for Defendant.
- Amended Complaint, which amended the proposed class definition in this matter to include certified home health aide / home health aide, companion care homemaker / companion care provider, companion caregiver, and caregiver personal care assistant. Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint amended the proposed classes Plaintiff sought to certify. (See Docket No. 49) Following the filing of the Second Amended Complaint, Plaintiff Casadine sought further testimony on the newly added job positions. The Parties could not reach an agreement as to a further FRCP 30(b)(6) deposition, and Plaintiff Casadine filed a Motion to Compel the Further Deposition of Defendant. (See Docket No. 52)
- 24. On April 8, 2014, this Court granted Plaintiff Casadine a limited further FRCP 30(b)(6) deposition with respect to the additional job titles and descriptions included in the proposed class definition in the Second Amended Complaint. (See Docket No. 54) On April 17, 2014, Plaintiff Casadine took a

- 25. On or about April 14, 2014, pursuant to Plaintiff Casadine's discovery requests, Defendant agreed to produce a sampling of time records and corresponding payroll records for putative class members who worked twenty-four (24) hour Live-In shifts and were paid a flat or daily rate of pay. Upon receipt of the pay and time records, Plaintiff's counsel spent considerable time analyzing Defendant's records in preparation for Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification. Plaintiff's counsel additionally conducted a thorough damage analysis based on Defendant's sampling.
- 26. Throughout this litigation, and in response to Plaintiff's discovery requests, Defendant produced over three thousand (3,000) documents pertaining to Defendant's policies regarding minimum wage policies, timekeeping procedures, and a sampling of time and pay records. Defendant also produced various Employee Handbooks utilized throughout the liability period.
- 27. After significant formal and informal discovery, Plaintiff Casadine began preparing its Motion for Class Certification. Plaintiff's counsel obtained numerous declarations from putative class members in support of its anticipated Motion for Class Certification. Plaintiff's counsel then undertook significant efforts in drafting Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification, which included extensive legal research and review of documents and testimony in this case.
- 28. On May 5, 2014, Plaintiff Casadine filed his Motion for Class Certification seeking certification on all causes of action pled in Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint. (See Docket No. 55) Plaintiff's counsel spent many hours reviewing Defendant's Opposition (Docket No. 60, 61, 62), and prepared and filed a Reply Brief in support of its Motion for Certification. (Docket No. 63)

11

14

13

16 17

15

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

- Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification came up for a hearing on 29. August 29, 2014. Prior to the hearing, Plaintiff's counsel reviewed all relevant filings, documents and evidence in support of Plaintiff's motion. At the hearing, the Court ordered the Parties to meet and confer regarding Plaintiff' supplemental class certification briefing. (See Docket No. 67)
- 30. On or about November 17, 2014, Plaintiff Casadine filed a Supplemental Brief Regarding Certification as to Plaintiff's Third Cause of Action for Knowing and Intentional Failure to Comply with Itemized Wage Statement Provision. (See Docket No. 72) Following Defendant's filing of its Opposition to Plaintiff's Supplemental Briefing, the Parties entered into settlement discussions and requested that the Court stay any ruling as to Plaintiff's Supplemental Class Certification Briefing. (See Docket No. 76, 77) During this time, Defendant provided Plaintiff with further information under the mediation privilege and Plaintiff's counsel thoroughly reviewed further information and documents.
- The Parties engaged in settlement discussions for several weeks. The 31. Parties reached a tentative settlement in this matter in or about April 2015. In the weeks that followed, Plaintiffs' counsel worked diligently with Defendant's counsel in drafting a long form settlement agreement. The Parties spent many hours negotiating the details of the settlement agreement, including the preparation of the proposed Class Notice and Claim Form. On or about May 7, 2015, Plaintiffs filed its Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. (Docket No. 90)
- 32. The Settlement creates a \$630,000.00 settlement fund to pay Class members' claims, attorneys' fees, costs, any service enhancement awards, and administration expenses. Assuming that the full amount of the requested attorneys fees and costs are ordered as set forth in the Settlement agreement, the total Net Settlement Amount is approximately \$373,500.00. As there are 371 class members, the approximate distribution to class members is \$1,006.74.

- 33. On or about May 22, 2015, Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement came up for a hearing. After hearing arguments from counsel, the Court granted preliminary approval to the proposed settlement. (Docket No. 94, 95)
- 34. Thereafter, Plaintiffs' counsel worked with Defendant's counsel and the Class Action Administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, to disseminate notice to the class.
- 35. On or about July 7, 2015, Phoenix Settlement Administrators completed the initial mailing in this matter.
- 36. As of July 31, 2015, 54 class members have submitted valid claims in this matter. Significantly, there have been zero opt-outs and Plaintiffs' counsel is unaware of any objections to this proposed settlement.
- 37. Plaintiffs' counsel will continue to be involved in the administration of this settlement, including fielding any questions from class members. Plaintiff will also be preparing a Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement in anticipation of the Final Fairness hearing currently set for September 18, 2015 at 11:00 a.m.

EXPERIENCE OF COUNSEL

- 38. Class counsel is qualified because of our collective experience in handling class action matters. Class counsel is comprised of two law firms, both of which specialize in, and have experience handling wage and hour class actions.
- 39. I received my Juris Doctorate from Howard University School of Law in 2002. I worked as an associate at Rose, Klein & Marias from 2005 until my resignation in August of 2009.
- 40. Since 2007, I have been involved in class action litigation involving various wage and hour violations, including the claims in the instant matter. The

45

7

6

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

2728

class size of these cases ranged anywhere between approximately 1,200 to over 15,000 putative class members with approved settlements in the millions.

- In August of 2009, I voluntarily resigned from Rose, Klein & Marias 41. and co-cofounded Mahoney, Perry & Burrows, in Long Beach, California. The firm (now the Mahoney Law Group, APC) currently serves as lead counsel and/or co-counsel in numerous wage and hour class action litigation in the Los Angeles Superior Court, Orange County Superior Court, and United States District Court for the Central District of California. Some examples of cases where I served as lead and/or co-counsel include: Albiar, et al. v. Spectrum Athletics-Canoga Park, et al., Case No. BC413860; Berry v. Brierwood Terrace Convalescent Hospital, et al., Case No. BC437781; Calvo v. Providence Health Systems-Southern California, et al., Case No. BC419843; Davis v Pacific Hospital of Long Beach, et al., Case No. BC488542; De Lar Torre v Cri-Help, Inc. Case No. BC508430; Daniel Branch v. Indiana Plumbing Supply, Co. Inc. et al., Case No. BC425627; Doe v. C.B & D.M. Entertainment, Inc., Case No. 37-2009-00097992-CU-OE-CTL; Gerardo Ortega, et al. v. CR & R Incorporated, Case No. BC414434;; Holt, et al. v. Parsec, Inc., Case No. CV-9540-VBF; Oliver, et al. v. College Health Enterprise, et al., Case No. BC406481; Teyuca v Pacific Alliance Medical Center, Inc. Case No. BC459422; Velazquez v. New Vista Health Services, Inc., Case No. BC 424797; Wilcox, et al. v. Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital, et al., Case No. BC 424796; Zavala v. Ware Disposal, Inc., Case No. 30-2010-00392816-CU-OE-CXC; Zimmerman v Quality Children's Services, Case No. BC472001; and Arteaga v. Command Center Security, Inc. Case No. BC480496.
- 42. My current hourly rate is \$650.00 per hour, which has been approved by courts in the State of California.
- 43. Attached to this declaration as Exhibit "B" is a true and correct copy of Mahoney Law Group's litigation costs in this matter. Mahoney Law Group, APC has incurred \$15,830.28 in costs. I have reviewed these records

and invoices and believe that all costs were appropriate and necessary for the prosecution of this action. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on August 6, 2015 at Long Beach, California. /s/ Kevin Mahoney_ Kevin Mahoney

Case 2:12-cv-10078-DMG-CW Document 97-3 Filed 08/07/15 Page 13 of 19 Page ID #:3573

EXHIBIT A

CASADINE v. MAXIM HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC.

LODESTAR FOR ATTORNEY KEVIN MAHONEY

TASK	TASK DETAIL	LABOR HOURS
Initial Consultation		
Apr. 18, 2012	Initial Meeting with client	3.50
Complaint		
Oct. 23, 2012	Review and Edit Complaint	1.80
Scheduling Conference		
Feb. 8, 2013	Attend Scheduling Conference	4.00
First Amended Complaint		
Apr. 24, 2013	Review and Edit FAC	0.30
Plaintiff's Motion to Compel	Further Responses	
Aug. 21, 2013	Review and Edit Motion to Compel Further Responses re First Set of Discovery	3.50
Sept. 3, 2013	Review and Edit Joint Motion to Compel	2.00
Sept. 5, 2013	Draft Declaration in Support of Motion to Compel	3.00
Oct. 8, 2013	Review and Edit Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion to Compel	2.80
Oct. 9, 2013	Review Defendant's Supplemental Brief in Opposition	4.00
Nov. 4, 2013	Attend Hearing on Motion to Compel	4.00
Mediation		
Nov. 7, 2013	Review Documents / evidence in preperation for mediation	2.50
Nov. 8, 2013	Draft / Edit Mediation Brief	5.50
Nov. 11, 2013	Review and Edit Mediation Brief	6.50
Nov. 12, 2013	Review Mediation Brief	5.00
Nov. 22, 2013	Attend Mediation	8.50
	and to Modify Scheduling Order	
Jan. 6, 2014	Review and Edit Motion	2.50
Jan. 7, 2014	Review and Edit Motion	2.00
Jan. 17, 2014	Review Opposing Papers	1.50
Deposition of Maxim 30(b)(6		
Jan. 14, 2014	Review Documents and Prepare for Deposition	6.50
Jan. 15, 2014	Take Deposition - Sacramento, California	11.00
Deposition of Maxim 30(a)(1		11.00
Jan. 14, 2014	Review Documents and Prepare for Deposition	4.20
Jan. 16, 2014	Review Documents and Prepare for Deposition	3.50
Jan. 17, 2014	·	4.00
Second Amended Complain	Take Deposition - Long Beach, California	4.00
•		0.50
Jan. 29, 2014	Review and Edit SAC	0.50
Ex Parte Application to Conf		0.50
Feb. 19, 2014	Review and Edit Ex Parte	2.50
Plaintiff's Motion to Compel		0.50
Mar. 27, 2014	Review and Edit Motion	2.50
April 1, 2014	Review Joint Document	0.50
April 8, 2014	Attend Hearing on Motion to Compel	4.00
Deposition of Maxim 30(b)(6		
Apr. 15, 2014	Review Documents and Prepare for Deposition	2.50
Apr. 16, 2014	Review Documents and Prepare for Deposition	3.80
Apr. 17, 2014	Take Deposition - Mountain View, California	10.00
Plaintiff's Motion for Class C		
April 28, 2014	Draft Portions of Motion	3.50
May 1, 2014	Review Class Declarations	4.00
May 3, 2014	Review and Edit Motion	5.80
May 4, 2014	Further Review and Edit Motion	6.00
May 4, 2014	Review and Edit Declaration of KM	2.50
May 5, 2014	Review Final Draft of Motion	0.80

Case 2:12-cv-10078-DMG-CW Document 97-3 Filed 08/07/15 Page 16 of 19 Page ID #:3576

Notice of Errata re: Plaintiff's Motion for Class Cert						
1	May 9, 2014	Review Notice of Errata	0.40			
Opposition to Defendant's Ex Parte Application						
1	May 20, 2014	Review Defendant's Ex Parte	2.00			
1	May 20, 2014	Review and Edit Opposition	2.50			
1	May 20, 2014	Review Finalized Opposition	0.20			
1	May 21, 2014	Review Court's Order on Ex Parte	0.20			
Plaintiff's Re	eply to Opposition t	to Motion for Class Certification				
	July 22, 2014	Review Opposing Papers	3.80			
	July 23, 2014	Draft Portions of Reply to Opposition	6.50			
	July 27, 2014	Review and Edit Reply	2.50			
	July 28, 2014	Further Review and Edit Reply	0.50			
,	Aug. 28, 2014	Prepare for Hearing on Motion for Certification	3.50			
,	Aug. 29, 2014	Prepare for Hearing / Attend Hearing on Motion to Certify	5.00			
Stipulation t	to Extend Time to fi	le Supplemental Briefing				
5	Sept. 8, 2014	Review and Edit Stipulation	0.30			
Plaintiff's Su	upplemental Class (Certification Briefing				
1	Nov. 16, 2014	Review and Edit Supplemental Brief	1.00			
1	Nov. 17, 2014	Review and Edit Declaration of SMB	1.50			
1	Nov. 17, 2014	Review final Supplemental Brief in Support	0.30			
]	Dec. 10, 2014	Review Opposing Papers	1.00			
Third Amended Complaint						
/	April 23, 2015	Review and Edit 3AC	0.30			
1	May 5, 2015	Review Defendant's Concerns re: 3AC	0.80			
1	May 7, 2015	Review Finalized 3AC	0.50			
Plaintiff's Mo	otion for Preliminar	y Approval				
/	April 29, 2015	Review and Edit Motion	1.00			
1	May 6, 2015	Review Defendant's Edits	0.50			
1	May 7, 2015	Review Finalized Memorandum	0.80			
	May 7, 2015	Review Finalized Declaration of SMB	1.50			
Subtotal			177.60			

EXHIBIT B

COST SUMMARY

Class Action

CASADINE v. MAXIM FILE NO. 5138.001

	Name	CHECK #	INVOICE #	Date	Amount
1	Initial Case Cost			11/2/2012	\$38.55
2	Court hearing parking/mileage			2/8/2013	\$30.95
3	Filing Fee			2/25/2013	\$8.55
4	Copies Form			7/3/2013	\$19.22
5	Copies Form			7/9/2013	\$8.12
6	Copies Form			7/15/2013	\$87.39
7	Copies Form			7/25/2013	\$37.57
8	Copies Form			8/8/2013	\$67.14
9	Copies Form			8/16/2013	\$3.17
10	Copies Form			8/19/2013	\$2.71
11	US Legal Support	10415	394990/Ck#10415	10/4/2013	\$1,442.61
12	US Legal Support	10413	396681/Ck#10413	10/15/2013	\$993.00
13	William Shane Invoice	10428	126/Ck#10428	10/29/2013	\$40.00
14	William Shane Invoice	10434	139/Ck#10434	11/3/2013	\$25.00
15	Expense Report (Sean - MTC Hearing)			11/4/2013	\$8.00
16	Expense Report (Kevin - Mediation)			11/22/2013	\$110.51
17	William Shane Invoice	10474	142	11/26/2013	\$80.00
18	Flights to Sacramento for Depo		ZXILRR	1/15/2014	\$624.00
19	LAX Fee for Sacramento Depo		3445	1/15/2014	\$30.00
20	Cab Fee for Sacramento Depo		374	1/15/2014	\$45.90
21	Lunch for Sacramento Depo			1/15/2014	\$14.17
22	Dinner for Sacramento Depo			1/15/2014	\$31.00
23	Cab Fee for Sacramento Depo			1/15/2014	\$39.60
24	William Shane Invoice	10582	164/Ck#10582	2/11/2014	\$40.00
25	Red Lion Hotel - Depo in Sacramento		26103172	2/26/2014	\$79.01
26	Southwest Flight - Depo in Sacramento		ZNXOUA	2/27/2014	\$220.00
27	Jet Blue Flight - Depo in Sacramento		RYZFLX	2/27/2014	\$174.00
28	Expense Report (Sean - Depo Maxim)			2/27/2014	\$86.00
29	William Shane Invoice	10659	169/ck#10659	2/19/2014	\$40.00
30	William Shane Invoice	10683	171/ck#10683	4/13/2014	\$80.00
31	Flight for 30 b 6		conf#MQ9HS2	4/17/2014	\$430.00
32	Parking fee/Mileage/Fast Track			4/8/2014	\$47.95
33	Depo re: Corp Struct/Cab Fee& Food/mi.	cc visa		4/17/2014	\$91.00
34	Copies From Docket			5/1/2014	\$0.50
35	Copies From Docket			5/1/2014	\$2.60
36	Copies From Docket			5/1/2014	\$3.00
37	Copies From Docket			5/1/2014	\$2.70

Case 2:12-cv-10078-DMG-CW Document 97-3 Filed 08/07/15 Page 19 of 19 Page ID #:3579

	-	_			
38	Copies From Docket			5/1/2014	\$0.50
39	Copies From Docket			5/1/2014	\$3.00
40	Copies From Docket			5/1/2014	\$3.00
41	Copies Fom Docket			5/6/2014	\$17.50
42	Copies From Docket			5/9/2014	\$3.30
43	Copies From Docket			5/22/2014	\$2.60
44	William Shane Invoice	10781	175	6/3/2014	\$40.00
45	Atkinson-Baker	10764	A80033A AA	6/1/2014	\$463.00
46	Atkinson-Baker	10767	A800DF7 AA	6/1/2014	\$831.75
47	Atkinson-Baker	10765	A80479B AA	6/1/2014	\$923.56
48	Atkinson-Baker	10763	A70D988 AA	6/1/2014	\$967.95
49	William Shane Invoice	10852	181 (5/6,5/12,5/21	5/21/2014	\$80.00
50	Atkinson-Baker	cc visa	A801EC4AA	3/14/2014	\$1,800.17
51	Copies			8/27/2014	\$80.00
52	Hearing Class Cert. Miles/Parking			8/29/2014	\$25.54
53	William Shane Invoice	11030	205	11/30/2014	\$65.00
54	Certified Paga LTL			4/10/2015	\$12.96
55	Expense Report (SB) Mtn for Prelim Apprl	cash	16434	5/22/2015	\$50.86
56	Merchant Atkinson	сс	A801EC4 AA	9/9/2014	\$1,800.17
57	Trascript	11297		6/3/2015	\$145.50
	Printing/Scanning Cost as of 8/6/15				\$3,430.00

TOTAL \$15,830.28