1 2 3	Daniel J. Mogin (95624, dmogin@moginlaw.co Jodie M. Williams (247848, jwilliams@moginla THE MOGIN LAW FIRM, P.C. 707 Broadway, Suite 1000 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 687-6611 Facsimile: (619) 687-6610	om) aw.com)				
4	Alexander Schack (99126, alexschack@amslawoffice.com)					
5	Natasha Naraghi (284711, natashanaraghi@ams	slawoffice.com)				
6	LAW OFFICES OF ALEXANDER M. SCH. 16870 West Bernardo Drive, Suite 400	ACK				
7 8	San Diego, California 92127 858-485-6535(phone) 858-485-0608(fax)					
9						
10	Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Certified Plaintiff Class					
11						
12	SUPERIOR COURT FOR	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
13	COUNTY OF	SAN FRANCISCO				
14	JOEL I. ROOS and TOM SANTOS, on	Case No. CGC-04-436205				
15	behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	DECLARATION OF ALEXANDER M.				
16	,	SCHACK IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'				
17	Plaintiffs,	MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS				
18	v.					
19	HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL, INC.	Date: May 2, 2014				
20	and DOES 1-100, inclusive,	Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept: 304				
21	Defendants.	Judge: Hon. Curtis E.A. Karnow				
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
		- 1 - CGC-04-436205 (RAK)				
	DECLARATION OF ALEXANDER M	SCHACK IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'				

MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS

I, Alexander M. Schack, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of San Francisco, and principal of The Law Offices of Alexander M. Schack, counsel of record for Plaintiffs and the Certified Class ("Plaintiffs" or "Class"). This declaration is submitted in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Reimbursement of Costs. I have personal knowledge of the facts herein, and if called to do so, could and would competently testify thereto.
- 2. My firm has substantial experience in antitrust cases, including other types of class action and complex litigation. We have litigated numerous indirect purchaser antitrust class actions similar to this case. A copy of the firm's resume is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
- 3. This firm has devoted extraordinary efforts and resources on behalf of the class members over the course of this litigation.
- 4. The following summarizes the work performed in connection with litigating this matter: performing factual research and investigation of legal theories; discovery, including, but not limited to, attending and defending depositions, responding to discovery requests, drafting and propounding discovery requests, preparing and serving subpoenas, reviewing tens of thousands of pages of documents produced during the litigation; drafting and/or assisting in the preparation of various pleadings including, but to limited to, the complaint, the opposition to the motion for summary judgment, the motion for class certification, as well as the motion for preliminary approval of the class settlement, and various other pleadings; participating in case management and settlement discussions, including, among other things, numerous conference calls with counsel, and attending a mediation in New York.
- 5. In addition to the work described above, this firm thoroughly evaluated the Settlement Agreement entered into with Defendant Honeywell International, Inc. We find it to be fair, adequate and reasonable.
- 6. This firm kept files contemporaneously documenting all time spent, including tasks performed and expense incurred, in this matter. All of the time and expenses reported were incurred for the benefit of the Class. This firm represented Plaintiffs and the Class on a wholly contingent

basis, dependent on the success of the litigation. To date, this firm has not received any compensation for its litigation efforts. Litigating this case over the course of nine years was time and resource intensive. This firm was precluded from accepting and pursuing other legal work, including hourly work for which it would have been compensated, while it devoted its time and resources to this matter.

- 7. The total number of hours spent on this litigation, from inception, by attorneys and paralegals at this firm is 4,193.27. Time spent preparing the fee motion and related documents is not included.
- 8. The total lodestar for this time, calculated at the firm's current hourly rates, is \$1,834,549.50. These rates are the same as those rates charged to the firm's hourly clients.
- 9. Additionally, based on my having over 21 years of experience litigating antitrust and class action lawsuits, the rates being charged by my firm reflect the market rate for litigating complex antitrust cases. Similar hourly rates have been approved for my firm by several courts in connection with prosecuting class action cases.
- 10. Attached as Exhibit 2 is a summary schedule showing the total time spent by each attorney and paralegal at this firm during the course of the litigation, along with their hourly rates and individual lodestar figures.
- 11. The total amount of expenses incurred by this firm in connection with the prosecution of this litigation is \$78,150.45. To date, this firm has not been reimbursed for any of these costs. Expense items are billed separately and are not duplicated in my firm's lodestar.
- 12. Attached as Exhibit 3 is a summary schedule showing the total expenses incurred by category.
- 13. The figures presented in Exhibits 2 and 3 attached hereto exclude time and expenses incurred litigating the New York, Maine and Massachusetts cases.
- 14. These expenses are reflected in the books and records of this firm that are maintained in the ordinary course of business. The books andrecords are prepared from invoices, check records, receipts, expense vouchers and similar items, and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

ŀ	
1	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
2	foregoing is true and correct.
3	Executed this <u>23</u> day of April, 2014, at San Diego, California.
4	M. M. no
5	ALEXANDER M. SCHACK
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	- 4 - CGC-04-436205 (RAK)

RESUME OF LAW OFFICES OF ALEXANDER M. SCHACK

Mr. Schack received a degree in Economics from Rutgers College in 1978. In December of 1981, he received his Juris Doctorate from the University of San Diego School of Law (State Bar No. 99126). In 1985 he passed the California CPA exam (although he is not a C.P.A.) and received an LL.M in Taxation from the University of San Diego School of Law. He was employed by the former "big six" accounting firms of Arthur Andersen and Company (Los Angeles) and KPMG Peat Marwick (San Diego) for approximately four years. His client list included MGM, Wickes Furniture, Circus Circus, S.E. Rykoff, Ernest Borgnine, Santa Catalina Island Co., San Diego Hall of Champions, National Pen, etc.

Since 1988, Mr. Schack has represented both consumers and businesses in numerous complex litigation lawsuits. He has orally argued before the Fourth Appellate District and Second Appellate District on at least five separate occasions. In one case in particular, the Fourth Appellate District - Division One, set aside approximately two hours for appellate discussion to analyze the antitrust jurisdiction of a Superior Court to hear an action under the Cartwright Act for price fixing against the cellular telephone carriers in light of the jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission to approve cellular telephone rates. That appellate discussion resulted in the published opinion of Cellular Plus v. Superior Court, 14 Cal.App.4th 1224 (cert.denied July 1, 1993). This opinion has twice been the subject of articles in Competition - the Journal of the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Section of the State Bar of California. He also is a former adjunct professor at the University of San Diego.

Mr. Schack is married with two children, ages 23 and 20, and lives in Poway, California. He has offices both in Poway and San Diego, and litigates throughout the nation. Highlights of some other cases are as follows:

San Diego Coordinated Wildfire Cases of October 2007

Robert Waldon, et al. v. San Diego Gas & Electric Co., Sempra, Cox San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2007-00079891-CU-PO-CTL Lead counsel against Sempra - pending Member of Plaintiff Control Group and Discovery Coordinator for over 2,000 claims filed after SDG&E and Cox equipment allegedly started three wildfires in October 2007, burning over 1,000 homes.

James Lastra, et al. v. Micron Technology, Inc., et al.
San Francisco County Superior Court
Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding Case No. 4265
Counsel for consumer class of indirect purchasers of DRAM alleging
price fixing and tampering with prices. Settlement of approximately \$190,000,000
pending.

Jeff Lohman, et al. v. General Motors Corporation, et al.

San Francisco Superior Court Case No. 03-419802

Counsel for consumer class of new car purchasers alleging antitrust violations in policies implemented to deter importation of less expensive Canadian automobiles to the U.S. Settlement of \$30,000,000 finalized in 2012.

Bruce Saucier, et al. v. United States Smokeless Tobacco Company Orange County Superior Court Case No. 02CC00181 Co-Counsel for consumer class of indirect purchasers of smokeless tobacco alleging monopolization and antitrust violations by producer of 90% of the moist snuff sold in the U.S. Class certified in 2004. \$96,000,000 settlement approved in 2008.

Helen Polonitza, et al. v. Medallion Products, Inc., et al. Orange County Superior Court Case No. 05CC00030 Counsel for nationwide consumer class of purchasers of Liquid Lense, alleging false advertising of the efficacy of the product. Defendant agreed to disgorge and refund up to \$5,779,410 to the class in 2006.

Alan Hemphill, et al. v. San Diego Association of Realtors, et al. United States District Court Case No. 04-CV-1495 BEN (JMA) Counsel for consumer class of 28,000 local real estate Multiple Listing Service (MLS) users alleging price fixing of MLS support services against MLS providers and five associations of realtors. Permanent injunction and \$6,000,000 settlement approved in 2005.

John Bahl, et al. v. Metabolife International, Inc. San Diego Superior Court Case No. GIN006263 Counsel for consumer class of Metabolife users alleging illegal advertising policies and price fixing. Permanent injunction and coupon settlement in excess of \$10,000,000 for class finalized in 2005.

Telet Martin v. First International Bank, et al. San Diego Superior Court Case No. GIN035066 Counsel for customer who alleged bank manager borrowed \$20,000 in exchange for preferential treatment on loan application, and failed to repay same. Settlement \$20,000 in September, 2004.

Steve Johnson, et al. v. Cox Communications, Inc. San Diego Superior Court Case No. GIN031197 Counsel for class of digital cable subscribers alleging false advertising of "on demand" movies. Case settled in 2004 for \$826,000 in free movies to class.

Thomas Sprague, et al. v. Qualcomm San Diego Superior Court Case No. 730565 Counsel for class of employees who were deprived the benefit of their stock options when a division of Qualcomm was sold to Ericsson. Settlement \$11,000,000.

Arthur Garabedian, et al. v. Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Company, et al. Orange County Superior Court Case No. 721144
Counsel for class of 2,000,000 cellular telephone users in Los Angeles and Orange Counties in antitrust case. Settlement \$175,000,000.

7-Eleven OFFF, et al. v. The Southland Corp., et al.

Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 722272-6

Counsel for a class of approximately 1,200 California 7-Eleven franchise owners in a breach of contract/franchise dispute action against The Southland Corp., McLane and others. Settlement \$32,000,000.

Lawndale Medical Clinic, et al. v. Bay Area Cellular Telephone Co., et al. Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 767832-9 Counsel for class of 900,000 cellular telephone users in San

Francisco Bay Area in antitrust case. \$35,000,000 Settlement.

Joseph Quattrini, et al. v. Pana-Pacific, et al.

Orange County Superior Court Case No. 766649

Counsel for eight businesses in complex antitrust litigation against numerous large corporations including Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Company and AirTouch Communications. Confidential settlement.

Harry Betts, et al. v. Raymond James & Associates, et al.

San Diego Superior Court Case No. N71973

Counsel for a group of elderly investors in breach of fiduciary duty/elder abuse case. Class certified in the interests of justice despite only approximately 10-20 members. Case settled for \$185,000.

Harvey Dunn v. Kirtland & Packard

Santa Monica Superior Court Case No. SC 024498

Counsel for plaintiff in legal malpractice case relating to the failure to reasonably settle an accounting malpractice case which resulted in a substantial adverse judgment against the accountant. Girardi & Keese represented plaintiff in related insurance bad faith cases. Settled for \$1,250,000.

Meilin Hua v. Southland Corporation

Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No.LC031658

Franchise dispute between parent company of 7-Eleven and franchisee relating to failure to follow procedures during the Northridge earthquake. Despite summary judgment, counsel was able to obtain a rare stay of execution of the commercial unlawful detainer ruling during the almost two year pendency of the appeal, allowing the franchisee time to transition her occupation while still supporting her family.

IN RE: HONEYWELL

\$1,834,549.50		4,193.27	\$1,834,549.50	4,193.27	77.2	0	2 867.8	0		856.25	1834.5	555.5	S:	TOTALS:
\$110,812.50		678.45	\$110,812.50	678.45	46.4	0	0 90	0		37.05	425.9	79.1	TOTAL PARALEGALS	TOTAL
\$3,300.00	\$250.00	13.20	\$3,300.00	13.20	1.2				1	11.3		0.7	ennett	Joan Bennett
\$2,000.00	\$250.00	8.00	\$2,000.00	8.00						T	8		King	Marilyn King
	\$325.00	11.50	\$3,737.50	11.50	11.5								Patrick Spreter	Patrick
	\$250.00	8.00	\$2,000.00	8.00)eLoa	Betsy (
	\$425.00	42.50	\$18,062.50	42.50					5,	7.5		6	Kathy Schack	Kathy
\$67,100.00	\$125.00	536.80	\$67,100.00	536.80	00.7		90			10.63	375.4	71.4	Christina Evola	Christin
	\$350.00	50 AF	\$14.613.50	л 0 4л	22 7					TT	5		PARALEGALS	P
\$1,240,789.50		2810.02	\$ 1,240,789.50	2,810.02	30.8	0	0 589.5	0		676.7	1119.5	393.5	TOTAL ASSOCIATES	TOTAL
\$35,738.00	\$295,00	192.40	\$56,758.00	192.40	1.		25.8	1	Ť	98.3		5/.2	a Naragni	Natash
\$7,095,00	\$275.00	25.80	\$7,095.00	25.80	13./					T	6.3	7.8	Sara Rasmussen	Sara R
	\$375.00	69.20	\$25,950.00	69.20					T .	13.8	1,5	1.7	tajo	Lee Patajo
	\$475.00	39.80	\$18,905.00	39.80						Γ	39.8		Jonathan Kurniadi	Jonatha
	\$275.00	74.82	\$20,575.50	74.82							74.82		Jonathan Kurniadi	Jonatha
\$160,650.00	\$425.00	378.00	\$160,650.00	378.00									Steve Deubler	Steve [
	\$475.00	1,689.80	\$802,655.00	1,689.80			527.3	1		480.6	ဒ္ဌ	293.8	John Nowakowski	아 아 아
	\$375.00	0.30	\$112.50	0.30							0.3	-	Amanda Moreno	Amand
\$8,316.00	\$495.00	16.80	\$8,316.00	16.80	8		1.5	1	1	1		1.2	preter	Geoff Spreter
	\$475.00	49.10	\$23,322.50	49.10			6.5			1	23.4		preter	Geoff Spreter
\$116,450.00	\$425.00	274.00	\$116,450.00	274.00			28.4		1	58.7	155.1	31.8	preter	Geoff Spreter
													ASSOCIATES	A
\$482,947.50		704.8	\$ 482,947.50	704.8	0	0	2 188.3	0		142.5	289.1	82.9	TOTAL PARTNERS	TOTAL
\$1,650.00	\$825.00	2.00	\$1,650.00	2.00			2						Alexander Schack	Alexano
	\$750.00	92.10	\$69,075.00	92.10			46.8			11.1	31	3.2	Alexander Schack	Alexano
\$412,222.50	\$675.00	610.70	\$412,222.50	610.70			2 139.5		7-	131.4	258.1	79.7	Alexander Schack	Alexano
	1000		40000	1000									PARTNERS	
CUMULATIVE	Hourly Rate	Total Hours	Current	Current	8	3	6	[5]	4	<u> </u>	2	IJ	Status*	Name
-			ation	[8] Case Management and Administration	ement and	Manage	[8] Case						[4] Court Apperances	[4] Co
					ation	[7] Class Certification	[7] Class	<u> </u>	ıding leg	ns (inclu	ial Motio	nd Pretr	[3] Pleadings, Briefs and Pretrial Motions (including legal	[3] Ple
				Analysis	[6] Litigation Strategy and Analysis	ition Stra	[6] Litiga						[2] Discovery	[2] Dis
						ements	[5] Settlements				earch	tual Res	Categories [1] Investigations, Factual Research	Categories [1] Investig
									4	10/1/06 - 4/21/14	10/1/06		REPORTING PERIOD:	REPO
						ACK I	LAW OFFICES OF ALEXANDER M. SCHACK	XANDEF	OF ALE	FFICES	LAW O		FIRM NAME:	FR
				F	TIME REPORT									

IN RE: HONEYWELL

FIRM NAME: LAW OFFICES OF ALEXANDER M.

SCHACK

REPORTING PERIOD: 10/1/06 - 4/21/14

	MONTHLY	CUMULATIVE
DESCRIPTION	EXPENSES	EXPENSES
Assessment	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00
Travel/Meals/Lodging	\$6,346.87	\$6,346.87
Telephone/Facsimile	\$5.01	\$5.01
Postage/Express Delivery/Messenger	\$172.96	\$172.96
Commercial Copies	\$25.51	\$25.51
Internal Reproduction/Copies/Printing	\$7,708.34	\$7,708.34
Expert Consultants		
Court Fees	\$48.95	\$48.95
Court Reporters/Transcripts		
Witness/Services Fees	\$685.45	\$685.45
Computer Research	\$159.30	\$159.30
Clerical Overtime		
Deposition	\$2,163.76	\$2,163.76
Miscellaneous	\$603.82	\$603.82
Parking/Mileage	\$230.48	\$230.48
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$78,150.45	\$78,150.45