

**Electronically Filed
by Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara,
on 3/14/2023 4:57 PM
Reviewed By: R. Walker
Case #18CV337830
Envelope: 11436750**

ZIMMERMAN REED LLP
Caleb Marker (SBN 269721)
caleb.marker@zimmreed.com
Flinn T. Milligan (SBN 323042)
flinn.milligan@zimmreed.com
6420 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1080
Los Angeles, CA 90048
Tel: (877) 500-8780
Fax: (877) 500-8781

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP
Susan E. Ellingstad (*Pro hac vice*)
Email: seellingstad@locklaw.com
Kristen G. Marttila (*Pro hac vice*)
Email: kgmarttila@locklaw.com
Kailey C. Mrosak (*Pro hac vice*)
Email: kcmrosak@locklaw.com
100 Washington Ave. S., Suite 2200
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Tel: (612) 339-6900
Fax: (612) 339-0981

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

R. ROSS and C. ROGUS, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HEWLETT PACKARD ENTERPRISE
COMPANY, a Delaware corporation, (formerly
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY),

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 18CV337830

*Assigned for All Purposes to the
Honorable Sunil R. Kulkarni*

**DECLARATION OF CALEB MARKER IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS'
FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES,
AND PAYMENT OF SERVICE AWARDS**

Date: April 27, 2023
Time: 1:30 PM
Dept: 1

Date Action Filed: November 8, 2018
Trial Date: TBD

(REPRESENTATIVE/CLASS ACTION)

1 I, Caleb Marker, declare and state as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice law in the state of California. I have been
3 a member in good standing of the State Bar of Michigan since 2007, the District of Columbia Bar since
4 2009, the State Bar of California since 2010, the State Bar of Texas since 2017, and the State Bar of
5 Washington since 2020.

6 2. I am a partner at the law firm of Zimmerman Reed LLP and am one of the attorneys
7 representing Plaintiffs and Class Representatives Rocio Ross and Claudia Rogus in this action. I am
8 submitting this declaration in support of the Motion Attorneys' Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and
9 Payment of Service Awards in this matter. I have personal knowledge of the statements contained in
10 this declaration and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to those facts and
11 opinions.

12 **FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

13 3. Zimmerman Reed began investigating claims on behalf of a potential class of female
14 employees at Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company ("HPE") (formerly Hewlett-Packard Company) in
15 March 2018, conducting extensive pre-filing, factual, and legal investigation. On November 8, 2018,
16 Plaintiffs filed this employment class action in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of
17 Santa Clara, against Defendant HPE alleging systemic discrimination in compensation and promotional
18 practices which adversely affected female employees.

19 4. Defendant filed a motion to strike and a demurrer on April 2, 2019. Plaintiffs filed their
20 opposition on May 6, 2019, and a hearing was held on June 28, 2019. On July 2, 2019, this Court granted
21 in part Defendant's Demurrer as to Plaintiffs' individual non-class claims and granted in part
22 Defendant's Motion to Strike as to Plaintiffs' UCL claims under the Fair Employment and Housing Act
23 ("FEHA") and Labor Code § 203. Defendant then answered the complaint on July 12, 2019.

24 5. On August 8, 2019, Defendant petitioned the California Court of Appeal for alternative
25 and peremptory writs of mandamus seeking to overturn the ruling as to the remainder of the demurrer
26 that was denied. The writ was fully briefed by both parties. Defendant's writ was denied on May 27,
27 2020.

28 6. Since August 2019, the Parties have exchanged multiple rounds of discovery, including

1 over 150 Requests for Production, nearly 150 Special Interrogatories, and over 30 Requests for
2 Admissions. Discovery included review of thousands of documents and over 4 GB of data, five 30(b)(6)
3 depositions of three Person Most Knowledgeable (PMK) witnesses covering 20 noticed deposition
4 topics, and continuous meet and confers until the Parties' mediation in 2022.

5 7. In addition, Plaintiffs' Counsel engaged two technical experts, labor economist Dr. David
6 Neumark and industrial and organizational psychologist Dr. Leaetta Hough, to analyze the documents
7 received from Defendant. Plaintiffs' experts conducted substantial data analysis and prepared reports to
8 be submitted in conjunction with Plaintiffs' motion for class certification. That motion was fully briefed
9 along with preparation of the expert reports but was never filed because the Parties agreed to go to
10 mediation prior to the filing deadline.

11 8. The Parties engaged in two full-day mediation sessions on January 28 and February 14,
12 2022 before experienced mediator Tripper Ortman. The Parties did not reach an agreement at the end of
13 the second day of mediation and Mr. Ortman made a mediator's proposal, which both parties accepted
14 the following week. Thereafter, the Parties negotiated a memorandum of understanding (MOU) and
15 subsequently negotiated the terms of this Settlement for several months.

16 9. On September 26, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class
17 Action Settlement and Certification of Settlement Class. The Motion for Preliminary Approval included
18 a notice plan and, as further explained in the memorandum and declarations filed in support of the
19 Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Parties accepted bids from two different settlement administrators
20 before jointly agreeing to retain Atticus Administration, LLC as Settlement Administrator.

21 10. This Court preliminarily approved the Settlement Agreement on November 3, 2022.

22 11. Class Counsel conducted extensive, yet efficient discovery in this matter prior to settling.
23 The proposed Settlement provides excellent value for Class Members, including a settlement fund of
24 \$8.5 million in consideration for the release of claims.

25 12. As a result of the extensive discovery and motion practice, Class Counsel had a thorough
26 understanding of the issues including: the composition of the Settlement Class; the nature of Defendant's
27 anticipated defenses on the merits; the costs that would be required for and the risks entailed with trial;
28 and the Class's potential recovery at trial. I believe the proposed Settlement to be fair, reasonable, and

1 adequate, and in the best interests of the proposed Settlement Class.

2 13. Attorneys' fees in this case are to be shared between the two firms who make up Class
3 Counsel, Zimmerman Reed LLP and Lockridge Grindal Nauen PLLP, based on comparative lodestars.

4 14. The Parties did not discuss or negotiate Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs or a
5 service award for the Class Representatives until agreement was reached on the Settlement's material
6 terms.

7 15. Ms. Ross and Ms. Rogus participated in written discovery, reviewed pleadings, and kept
8 themselves apprised of the progress of the case through frequent contact with Class Counsel.

9 16. After the Court preliminarily approved the Settlement, Class Counsel worked closely
10 with the Settlement Administrator to supervise dissemination of notice to Class Members. These efforts
11 included reviewing and drafting the language and format of the website, revising the Notice forms, and
12 monitoring Class Members' responses to the Notice Program. This work continues at the time of this
13 filing.

14 17. Atticus, the Court-approved Settlement Administrator in this case, reports that as of
15 March 1, 2023, the Administrator sent over 1,800 notices to Class Members, via email and U.S. mail.
16 Full claim statistics will be filed along with Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval, but at the time of this
17 filing, the Administrator reports that only one objection and six requests for exclusion have been
18 received. At the time of this filing, no Class Member has objected to Counsel's request for fees, costs,
19 or Class Representative service awards.

20 **ZIMMERMAN REED'S QUALIFICATIONS**

21 18. Founded in 1983, Zimmerman Reed is a nationally recognized leader in complex
22 litigation and has been appointed as lead counsel in some of the largest cases in courts across the country.
23 The firm brings a wealth of experience in representing plaintiffs in multi-district and class actions in the
24 areas of wage and hour, mass tort, antitrust, and consumer fraud as well as representing states' attorney
25 general and public entities. Currently, the firm is counsel for the State of Minnesota in litigation against
26 JUUL. ZR Counsel served on the Plaintiff's Steering Committee in *In re FedEx Ground Package*
27 *Systems, Inc., Employment Practices Litigation* (N.D. Ind.), a national employment class action
28 challenging the independent contractor classification of thousands of FedEx Ground pick-up and

1 delivery drivers. ZR also represents thousands of individuals in misclassification class actions against
2 Flowers Food, Inc. *See, e.g., Noll v. Flowers Foods Inc.*, No. 1:15-cv-00493 (D. Me. June 1, 2022). It
3 also represents the State of Indiana and the State of Vermont in litigation related to drug manufacturers,
4 distributors, and others for their roles in the opioid crisis. The firm maintains offices in Minneapolis,
5 Minnesota, Los Angeles, California, and Phoenix, Arizona.

6 19. Brief backgrounds of the partners at Zimmerman Reed who incurred time in this matter
7 are below.

8 **Caleb Marker**

9 20. I graduated from Michigan State University in 2004 and Michigan State University's
10 College of Law in 2007. I have been a partner at Zimmerman Reed since 2015.

11 21. I am active in a number of legal organizations, including the Los Angeles County Bar
12 Association where I have served on the Litigation Executive Committee and Access to Justice
13 Committee, the goal of which is to maximize the delivery of legal services to the poor and encourage
14 attorneys to provide free legal services to those in need of such services. In addition to LACBA, I am
15 also an active member of Duke Law School's Center for Judicial Studies and have worked as the lead
16 plaintiff-side contributor on a best practices guide for electronic notice of class action and mass tort
17 settlements, which included contributions from members of the state and federal judiciaries and was
18 published in the Center's *Judicature* publication.

19 22. I have been selected by Southern California Super Lawyers Magazine as a Rising Star
20 from 2015 to the present. A more detailed version of my professional background is available online at:
21 <https://www.zimmreed.com/attorneys/caleb-marker/>.

22 23. My practice has continuously focused on consumer protection, unfair business practices,
23 and wage and hour matters and I have always maintained a *pro bono* practice. My practice has
24 continuously focused on serving as class counsel in a variety of class actions including, but not limited
25 to, those involving wage and hour law violations, consumer fraud, deceptive trade practices, and
26 mortgage and banking law violations.

27 24. For more than a decade, I have been found to be qualified to serve as class counsel by
28 other courts on several occasions. No court has ever determined that I was inadequate to serve as class

1 counsel. Zimmerman Reed has represented countless employees in numerous cases challenging
2 misconduct by employers.

3 **Gordon Rudd**

4 25. Gordon Rudd is a Managing Partner of Zimmerman Reed and has been a partner at the
5 Firm since 1998. He has represented thousands of individuals challenging their independent contractor
6 status in various gig economy industries and has also recently served as class counsel on behalf of
7 financial institutions in multi-district litigation entitled *In re Target Corporation Customer Data*
8 *Security Breach Litigation* (D. Minn.) and served as a member of the six-person Plaintiff's Steering
9 Committee in *In re FedEx Ground Package Systems, Inc., Employment Practices Litigation* (N.D. Ind.),
10 a national employment class action which challenged the independent contractor classification of
11 thousands of FedEx Ground pick-up and delivery drivers. He also represents thousands of individuals
12 in misclassification class actions against Flowers Food, Inc. in federal courts in Pennsylvania, Maine,
13 Vermont and North Carolina. He is also representing former NFL players in the *In re National Football*
14 *League Players' Concussion Injury Litigation* (E.D. Pa.), among other matters. Mr. Rudd has been
15 named one of Minnesota's "Super Lawyers" since 2006 and recognized in The Best Lawyers in America
16 in the fields of Class Actions and Mass Tort Litigation since 2018.

17 **ATTORNEYS' FEES**

18 26. A fee award of one-third of the Settlement Fund is reasonable and justified considering
19 the risks Class Counsel undertook in prosecuting this case on a contingency basis and based on the result
20 achieved for the Class. It is consistent with standard fee arrangements in similar contingency class action
21 litigation. Class Counsel accepted significant financial risk in representing Plaintiffs knowing that it was
22 possible Class Counsel may not recover any compensation or would only recover compensation after
23 significant delay.

24 27. Class Counsel expended significant time and resources on this case, and, to date, have
25 received no compensation for their efforts to investigate, bring, and prosecute this action since its
26 inception.

27 28. The requested fee award does not include all of the continuing time that is and will be
28 incurred by Plaintiffs' Counsel in connection with the remaining settlement administration and the

1 motion for final approval of the Settlement Agreement. The time over the next several months to
 2 complete the claims administration and settlement process will likely be significant. We estimate that
 3 Class Counsel will expend more than 100 additional hours in finalizing this Settlement. The omission
 4 of this time from the fee application is a further effort to ensure the reasonableness of Plaintiffs'
 5 Counsel's fee request.

6 29. I have reviewed the concurrently filed Declaration of Susan Ellingstad in support of the
 7 Motion ("Ellingstad Declaration"), which describes Lockridge Grindal Nauen's fees and expenses. I am
 8 informed and believe that the facts stated therein are true and correct.

9 30. **ZR's Hours and Lodestar.** As of March 1, 2023, ZR has expended 4,735.36 hours in
 10 this litigation, totaling a lodestar of \$3,095,696.50.

11 31. All attorneys and legal staff who worked on this case maintained contemporaneous time
 12 records reflecting the time spent on billable matters. I audited the time records of Zimmerman Reed
 13 throughout the course of this litigation to eliminate time that could be considered duplicative, excessive,
 14 administrative, vague, or otherwise unnecessary. My firm's task-based, itemized statement of attorneys'
 15 fees is available for the Court's review upon request. I approved the time submitted in support of this
 16 attorney fee petition and believe the time was reasonable and necessary under the circumstances of this
 17 litigation.

18 32. A breakdown of my firm's lodestar is as follows:

PROFESSIONAL	POSITION	HOURS	RATE	LODESTAR
J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.	Partner	334.15	975	\$325,796.25
Caleb L. Marker	Partner	1,385.88	875	\$1,212,645.00
Hannah B. Fernandez	Associate	363.80	505	\$183,719.00
Bryce D. Riddle	Associate	79.90	505	\$40,349.50
Flinn T. Milligan	Associate	836.41	575	\$480,935.75
Arielle M. Canepa	Associate	862.22	575	\$495,776.50
Molly F. Billion	Associate	35.70	575	\$20,527.50
Danielle L. Manning	Associate	164.95	625	\$103,093.75

Amanda R. Klinger	Paralegal	34.45	315	\$10,851.75
Sabine A. King	Paralegal	34.10	315	\$10,741.50
Josephine Lu	Paralegal	603.80	350	\$211,260.00
Total		4,735.36		\$3,095,695.50

33. Zimmerman Reed is familiar with the prevailing market rates for leading attorneys in California for complex and class action litigation. Zimmerman Reed's hourly rates are commensurate with the hourly rates of other nationally prominent firms performing similar work for both plaintiffs and defendants.

34. Zimmerman Reed's rates have generally been accepted and approved in other contingent litigation and are comparable to rates charged by class action counsel in similar cases. *See, e.g.*, Order, *Becker v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, No. 0:20-cv-02016 (D. Minn. Aug. 31, 2022), ECF No. 284 (approving motion for attorneys' fees in which Zimmerman Reed's rates ranged from \$425 to \$900); Order, *Noll v. Flowers Foods Inc.*, No. 1:15-cv-00493 (D. Me. Apr. 26, 2022), ECF No. 331.

35. Based on my experience, the rates of attorneys in my firm listed here are consistent with, or lower than, rates charged by other class action litigators with similar experience.

36. We have also grouped the individual time entries into summaries corresponding to the various stages of litigation during which the work was performed, as further explained below. The vast majority of the time spent in this matter—approximately 74%—was spent on core litigation activities: pleadings, motions, written discovery, and depositions. Settlement-related activities, including mediation, negotiation, and the administration of this settlement, account for approximately 22% of time incurred in this matter.

Dates	Litigation Phase	Time Sought	% of Total Fees
Inception to 11/08/2018	Pre-Filing Investigation through Filing of Complaint	174.95	3.69%
11/08/2018 to 06/28/2019	Case Filing through Hearing on Demurrer	341.05	7.2%
06/29/2019 to 02/11/2020	Discovery and Writ Appeal through Informal Discovery Conference	854.32	18.04%

1	02/12/2020 to 01/11/2022	Intensive Discovery	2,327.03	49.14%
2	01/12/2022 to 02/14/2022	Mediation	163.80	3.46%
3	02/15/2022 to 06/10/2022	Negotiation of Memorandum of Understanding	290.94	6.14%
4	06/11/2022 to 11/03/2022	Negotiation of Settlement Agreement through Preliminary Approval	527.86	11.15%
5	11/04/2022 to present	Settlement Administration and Preparation for Final Approval	55.41	1.17%
6	Total		4,735.36	100.0%

8 37. Pre-Filing Investigation through Filing of Complaint (Inception to 11/08/2018): This
9 litigation phase involved the time spent researching and investigating the case theory and background
10 facts; developing general legal strategy; developing the claims to be presented; and drafting and filing
11 the operative complaint. A true and correct copy of hours for this phase broken down by timekeeper is
12 attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

13 38. Case Filing through Hearing on Demurrer (11/08/2018 to 06/28/2019): Following the
14 filing of the Complaint, Plaintiffs participated in Case Management Conferences, drafted an opposition
15 to Defendant's Demurrer and Motion to Strike, and prepared for and appeared at the hearing on the
16 Demurrer and Motion to Strike. A true and correct copy of hours for this phase broken down by
17 timekeeper is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

18 39. Writ Appeal and Discovery through Informal Discovery Conference (06/29/2019 to
19 02/11/2020): After the hearing on Defendant's Demurrer and Motion to Strike, Class Counsel expended
20 time opposing Defendant's Writ Petition. The Court's stay on discovery was also lifted, and the Parties
21 began work on tailored discovery. Plaintiffs served requests for production and special interrogatories,
22 responded to Defendant's requests for production and special interrogatories, and worked with
23 Defendant to finalize a proposed ESI protocol. Plaintiffs also reviewed the documents produced from
24 Defendant as a result of the discovery efforts and participated in an Informal Discovery Conference. A
25 true and correct copy of hours for this phase broken down by timekeeper is attached hereto as **Exhibit**
26 **D**.

27 40. Intensive Discovery (02/12/2020 to 01/11/2022): Following the Informal Discovery
28 Conference on February 11, 2020, the Parties continued to meet and confer and further participate in the

1 discovery process. During this litigation phase, Plaintiffs drafted and reviewed requests for admission,
2 special interrogatories, and requests for production of documents and responses thereto. Plaintiffs also
3 noticed, prepared for, and took six PMK depositions of Defendant's witnesses. Plaintiffs engaged two
4 technical experts, prepared expert reports, and reviewed voluminous damages data in preparation for a
5 class certification motion before opting to participate in mediation. A true and correct copy of hours for
6 this phase broken down by timekeeper is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

7 41. Mediation (01/12/2022 to 02/14/2022): After significant discovery, Plaintiffs prepared
8 for and participated in two full-day mediation sessions before Tripper Ortman. This included extensive
9 sessions with Plaintiffs' expert witnesses and circulating draft damages analyses with legal support
10 between both Parties. A true and correct copy of hours for this phase broken down by timekeeper is
11 attached hereto as **Exhibit F**.

12 42. Negotiation of Memorandum of Understanding (02/15/2022 to 06/10/2022): When the
13 parties did not reach an agreement following the two mediation sessions, Mr. Ortman provided the
14 Parties with a mediator's proposal. During this phase, Counsel reviewed and considered the mediator's
15 proposal, worked with Defendant's to tentatively agree on the proposal, and engaged in further
16 settlement discussions before memorializing the settlement terms in an MOU. A true and correct copy
17 of hours for this phase broken down by timekeeper is attached hereto as **Exhibit G**.

18 43. Negotiation of Settlement Agreement through Preliminary Approval (06/11/2022 to
19 11/03/2022): Following the execution of the MOU, Counsel continued to negotiate with Defendant over
20 language of the Settlement Agreement. Once the Agreement was finalized, Counsel prepared a Motion
21 for Preliminary Approval, along with a memorandum and declarations in support thereof. Counsel also
22 prepared for and participated in the hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Approval. A true and correct
23 copy of hours for this phase broken down by timekeeper is attached hereto as **Exhibit H**.

24 44. Settlement Administration and Preparation for Final Approval (11/04/2022 to present):
25 Since this Court's preliminary approval of the Class Settlement, Counsel has worked diligently to
26 oversee the dissemination of notice to Class Members. Counsel has expended time reviewing and
27 drafting the language and format of the website, revising the Notice forms, communicating with Class
28 Members, and monitoring Class Members' response to the Notice Program. This work continues at the

1 time of this filing. A true and correct copy of hours for this phase broken down by timekeeper is attached
2 hereto as **Exhibit I**.

3 **ZIMMERMAN REED'S REASONABLE EXPENSES**

4 45. To date, ZR also incurred a total of \$274,235.29 in expenses for the prosecution of this
5 litigation. These costs, including the expert work, were critical to the successful resolution of this case.
6 Plaintiffs' experts provided vital analyses which informed the mediation sessions between the Parties.
7 Had this matter progressed without a settlement, expert evidence would have been critical in obtaining
8 class certification and in prevailing at any trial that may have occurred. Significant mediation costs were
9 evenly split between Class Counsel and HPE.

10 46. The costs incurred by Zimmerman Reed in this case are broken down as follows:

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
Court Fees	\$4,547.15
Postage	\$61.08
Conference Calls	\$1,166.67
FedEx	\$73.23
Research Charges	\$8,224.26
Outside Copy Service	\$951.69
Mediation Expenses	\$15,000.00
Expert Fees	\$220,289.25
Outsource Service – Belaire-West Notice Fees	\$6,678.24
Photocopying/Printing Charges	\$25.60
Deposition/Transcript Costs	\$10,585.00
Airfare	\$3,472.36
Lodging	\$1,846.24
Business Meals	\$490.52
Ground Transportation	\$581.69
Parking Charges	\$80.00

Miscellaneous Travel Expenses	\$8.00
Office Supplies	\$154.31
TOTAL	\$274,235.29

47. As the table demonstrates, the majority of these costs are fees paid to experts and mediators. These, as well as the other costs incurred by Counsel, are common costs regularly billed to paying clients and recoverable in cases where statutory cost-shifting provisions are available.

48. Zimmerman Reed incurred all of these costs on behalf of Plaintiffs on a contingent basis. I approved the expenses incurred and believe they were necessary and reasonable under the circumstances. A true and correct copy of my firm's expense records are attached as **Exhibit J**, and backup documentation is available for the Court's review upon request.

49. Together with the expenses described in the Ellingstad Declaration, Class Counsel have incurred substantial unreimbursed expenses that were necessarily incurred in connection with the investigation, prosecution, and settlement of this litigation.

50. Class Counsel also anticipate incurring additional expenses throughout the remainder of this case, for which Class Counsel will not seek additional reimbursement.

COUNSEL'S DEDICATION TO PLAINTIFFS AND THE CLASS

51. As a result of the years of work in this matter, as well as the out-of-pocket expenses, Class Counsel has also had to decline other cases in order to ensure that there were adequate resources allocated to litigating this case. These time and cost investments were necessary in order to obtain the excellent value this Settlement provides to Plaintiffs and the Class. Class Counsel has received no payment or reimbursement for any work or expense in this matter and prosecuted the case despite the risk that the firm would never receive payment or reimbursement.

52. Even after Class Counsel has moved for these fees, the work for the Plaintiffs and the Class will continue. Class Counsel will continue to invest time and incur expenses in order to draft and file materials for final approval, assist Class Members, and monitor settlement administration efforts. As a result, Class Counsel's final lodestar and expense amounts will be higher than those reported in this declaration, but Class Counsel will seek no further payment for this additional work.

1 **CONTRIBUTIONS OF NAMED PLAINTIFFS**

2 53. Named Plaintiffs Rocio Ross and Claudia Rogus were active and engaged participants in
3 the investigation, strategy, and settlement of this case. Both are extremely deserving of the requested
4 services awards. Both Ms. Ross and Ms. Rogus provided information and evidence, participated in
5 conference calls, assisted in responding to discovery requests, reviewed draft documents, and
6 participated in mediation and settlement efforts.

7 54. To date, no Class Members have objected to the requested service fee awards.

8 55. In similar matters, named plaintiffs have received substantial service awards. *See*
9 Judgment, *Ellis v. Google, LLC*, No. CGC-17-561299 (S.F. Super. Ct. Oct. 25, 2022) (awarding \$50,000
10 to named plaintiffs and \$75,000 to the lead plaintiff).

11 **RELEVANT EXHIBITS**

12 56. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s
13 leadership resume reflecting its experience as lead or liaison counsel in MDLs, with membership in
14 steering committees and subcommittees in MDLs, and as lead counsel in class action lawsuits.

15 57. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s hours by time keeper for Pre-Filing
16 Investigation through Filing of Complaint (Inception to 11/08/2018) is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

17 58. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s hours by timekeeper for Case Filing
18 through Hearing on Demurrer (11/08/2018 to 06/28/2019) is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

19 59. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s hours by timekeeper for Writ Appeal
20 and Discovery through Informal Discovery Conference (06/29/2019 to 02/11/2020) is attached hereto
21 as **Exhibit D**.

22 60. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s hours by timekeeper for Intensive
23 Discovery (02/12/2020 to 01/11/2022) is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

24 61. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s hours by timekeeper for Mediation
25 (01/12/2022 to 02/14/2022) is attached hereto as **Exhibit F**.

26 62. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s hours by timekeeper for Negotiation
27 of Memorandum of Understanding (02/15/2022 to 06/10/2022) is attached hereto as **Exhibit G**.

28 63. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP’s hours by timekeeper for Negotiation

1 of Settlement Agreement through Preliminary Approval (06/11/2022 to 11/03/2022) is attached hereto
2 as **Exhibit H**.

3 64. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP's hours by timekeeper for Settlement
4 Administration and Preparation for Final Approval (11/04/2022 to present) is attached hereto as **Exhibit**
5 **I**.

6 65. A true and correct copy of Zimmerman Reed LLP's expenses report in this matter is
7 attached hereto as **Exhibit J**.

8 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my
9 knowledge.

10 Executed this March 14, 2023 at Los Angeles, California.

11 
12 _____
13 Caleb Marker

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

EXHIBIT A

ZIMMERMAN | REED
— FIRM RESUME

MINNEAPOLIS

Zimmerman Reed LLP
1100 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
t: 612.341.0400
zimmreed.com

LOS ANGELES

Zimmerman Reed LLP
6420 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1080
Los Angeles, CA 90048
t: 877.500.8780
zimmreed.com

SCOTTSDALE

Zimmerman Reed LLP
14646 North Kierland Blvd
Suite 145
Scottsdale, AZ 85254
t: 480.348.6400
zimmreed.com

FIRM PRACTICE AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Zimmerman Reed is a nationally recognized leader in complex and class action litigation and has been appointed as lead counsel in some of the largest and most complex cases in federal and state courts across the country. The firm was founded in 1983 and has successfully represented thousands of consumers and injured individuals nationwide in significant and demanding cases. The firm's practice includes a wide range of legal issues and complex cases involving consumer fraud, ERISA, shareholder actions, environmental torts, pharmaceutical drugs, dangerous or defective products, human rights violations, and privacy litigation. Since 2010, Zimmerman Reed has earned a "Best Law Firm" ranking released by U.S. News & World Report.

The following are just a few of the firm's notable achievements:

Co-Lead Counsel in the *Baycol Products Liability Litig.* (D. Minn.), seeking recovery for serious injuries from the use of Bayer's statin, Baycol. Achieved \$1.15 billion settlement.

Lead Counsel Committee member in the *Stryker Rejuvenate & ABG II Hip Implant Products Liability Litig.* (D. Minn.), seeking compensation for recalled Stryker hip replacements. Achieved in excess of \$1.4 billion settlement.

Co-Lead Counsel in the *Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litig.* (D. Minn.), arising out of malfunctions in cardiac defibrillators implanted in patients. Achieved \$230 million settlement.

Class and Derivative Counsel in the *Regions Morgan Keegan Securities, Derivative and ERISA Litig., Landers v. Morgan Asset Mgmt.* (W.D. Tenn.), alleging violations of federal securities laws and breach of fiduciary duty due to the collapse of Regions Morgan Keegan open-end funds. Achieved \$125 million settlement.

Class Counsel in *Soo Line R.R. Co. Derailment of Jan. 18, 2002 in Minot, N.D.* (Hennepin Cty. Dist. Ct.), representing hundreds of individuals injured by the release of anhydrous ammonia. Obtained a \$1.2 million jury verdict. Achieved a \$7 million class settlement and assisted congressional leaders in drafting and passing amendments to the Federal Railroad Safety Act, clarifying the scope of railroad preemption law.

Lead Counsel for the State of Mississippi in *Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics*, 571 U.S. 161 (2014), resulting in a unanimous U.S. Supreme Court decision reversing a Fifth Circuit decision, resolving a circuit split, and establishing binding law across the country that a State's enforcement action is not removable to federal court as a mass action.

Co-Lead Counsel in *Medtronic Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litig.* (D. Minn.), seeking recovery for more than 2,682 patients with recalled Medtronic heart defibrillators. Achieved a \$95.6 million settlement.

Class Counsel in *City of Farmington Hills Employees Retirement System v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.* (D. Minn.), to recover losses caused by the bank's mismanagement of its securities lending program. Achieved a \$62.5 million settlement, two days before trial.

Lead Counsel in *Dryer v. National Football League* (D. Minn.), arising out of the unauthorized use of retired NFL players' identities to generate revenue. Achieved a \$50 million settlement and created a ground-breaking program which allowed retired players the opportunity to benefit from the League's use of their images and allowed the League an opportunity to build its marketing using film clips of these former players.

Lead Counsel in *Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litig.* (D. Minn.), to recover financial institutions' losses from the company's massive 2013 data breach. Achieved a \$39 million settlement.

Class Counsel in *The Shane Group Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan* (E.D. Mich.), against insurance carrier for violations of antitrust laws from contractually requiring hospitals to charge higher prices to competitors. Achieved a \$30 million settlement (pending final approval).

Lead Counsel in *Zicam Remedy Marketing, Sales Practices & Products Liability Litig.* (D. Ariz.), seeking to recover for customers' loss of the sense of smell from using Zicam Cold Remedy Nasal Gel. Achieved \$27 million settlement.

Counsel for third-party payor in *In re Metoprolol Succinate End-Payor Antitrust Litig.* (D. Del.), alleging that the manufacturing and marketing of the heart drug, Toprol-XL, violated antitrust and deceptive trade practices laws. Achieved \$20 million settlement.

Class Counsel in *Weincke v. Metropolitan Airports Commission* (Hennepin Cty. Dist. Ct.), regarding excessive noise levels from the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. Achieved settlement to provide noise mitigation to more than 9,500 homeowners.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE FIRM'S WORK

Federal and state judges as well as legal scholars have consistently recognized the quality and impact of the firm's work on numerous occasions. Below are just a few examples.

"To summarize: class counsel recovered over ten times what is recovered in the typical case of this kind despite risks and complexities much more formidable than the typical case." Brian Fitzpatrick, Law Professor at Vanderbilt University and former clerk to Justice Scalia, expert in *In re Region Morgan Keegan Securities, Derivative and ERISA Litig., Landers v. Morgan Asset Mgmt.* (W.D. Tenn.)

"Fortunately for the absent class members, experienced counsel ... negotiated a settlement that is truly one-of-a-kind, and a remarkable victory for the class as a whole." Judge Paul Magnuson, *Dryer v. National Football League* (D. Minn.)

"I think no one can question your leadership in this matter. Again, thank you, and I say again it was the best decision I have ever made." Judge Michael Davis (former Chief Judge), *In re Baycol Products Liability Litig.* (D. Minn.)

"[S]uperior work the court observed from the firm throughout this litigation." Judge Donovan Frank, *In re Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litig.* (D. Minn.)

“The parties were represented by highly skilled and experienced counsel, who were extremely knowledgeable and clearly had spent a considerable amount of time developing the law and facts in this complex litigation.” Judge Layn Phillips (ret.), mediator in *In re Region Morgan Keegan Securities, Derivative and ERISA Litig., Landers v. Morgan Asset Mgmt.* (W.D. Tenn.)

It is “clear of the dedication, devotion, professionalism, and in the court’s view efficiency of these firms, so there is no question in the court’s mind of the quality of the representation.” Judge Deborah Batts, *In Re American Express Financial Advisors Securities Litig.* (S.D.N.Y.)

“Here, there is no doubt that the class has had competent counsel It’s been a pleasure ... to have counsel of this quality on both sides. I wish you would together go out and teach seminars about class action litigation. It would make my life a lot easier.” Judge Isabel Gomez, *Edwards v. Long Beach Mortgage Co.* (Hennepin Cty. Dist. Ct.)

“The reputation and experience of [Zimmerman Reed and co-counsel] to conduct class litigation of this nature is outstanding, and the record reflects that both law firms have successfully prosecuted numerous class actions in Minnesota courts and throughout the United States. The quality of representation in this case has been excellent, and the two firms are eminently qualified to serve as class counsel.” Judge Lloyd Zimmerman, *Holdhal v. BioErgonomics* (Hennepin Cty. Dist. Ct.)

REPRESENTATIVE LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

Zimmerman Reed has been appointed Lead or Liaison Counsel in the following MDLs:

CenturyLink Residential Customer Billing Disputes Litig., MDL 2795

National Hockey League Players’ Concussion Injury Litig., MDL 2551

Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litig., MDL No. 2522

Stryker Rejuvenate and ABG II Hip Implant Products Liability Litig., MDL 2441

National Arbitration Forum Trade Practices Litig., MDL 2122

Zicam Cold Remedy Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litig., MDL 2096

Northstar Education Finance, Inc. Contract Litig., MDL 1990

Zurn Pex Plumbing Products Liability Litig., MDL 1958

Levaquin Products Liability Litig., MDL 1943

Medtronic, Inc. Sprint Fidelis Leads Products Liability Litig., MDL 1905

Medtronic Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litig., MDL 1726

Viagra Products Liability Litig., MDL 1724

Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litig., MDL 1708

Pacquiao-Mayweather Boxing Match Pay-Per-View Litig., MDL 2639

Medco Health Solutions, Inc., Pharmacy Benefits Management Litig., MDL 1508

Baycol Products Liability Litig., MDL 1431

St. Jude Medical, Inc. Silzone Heart Valves Products Liability Litig., MDL 1396

Mortgage Escrow Deposit Litig., MDL 899

Zimmerman Reed has been appointed to the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee, Steering Committee, or Sub-Committees in the following MDLs:

Apple Inc. Device Performance Litig., MDL 2827
Dicamba Herbicides Litig., MDL 2820
Equifax, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig., MDL 2800
Fieldturf Artificial Turf Marketing Practices Litig., MDL 2779
Stryker Orthopaedics LFIT V40 Femoral Head Products Liability Litig., MDL 2768
Abilify Products Liability Litig., MDL 2734
Vizio, Inc. Consumer Privacy Litig., MDL 2693
Viagra and Cialis Products Liability Litig., MDL 2691
The Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litig., MDL 2583
LifeTime Fitness, Inc., Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Litig., MDL 2564
National Collegiate Athletic Association Student-Athlete Concussion Litig., MDL 2492
H&R Block IRS Form 8863 Litig., MDL 2474
Biomet M2A Magnum Hip Implant Products Liability Litig., MDL 2391
National Football League Players' Concussion Injury Litig., MDL 2323
Building Materials Corp. of America Asphalt Roofing Shingle Products Litig., MDL 2283
Zimmer NexGen Knee Implant Products Liability Litig., MDL 2272
Uponor, Inc., F1807 Plumbing Fittings Products Liability Litig., MDL 2247
DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., ASR Hip Implant Products Liability Litig., MDL 2197
Apple iPhone "MMS" Sales Practices Litig., MDL 2116
Digitek Products Liability Litig., MDL 1968
Fedex Ground Package System, Inc., Employment Practices Litig., MDL 1700
Bextra and Celebrex Marketing Sales Practices and Product Liability Litig., MDL 1699
Celebrex and Bextra Products Liability Litig., MDL 1694
Vioxx Products Liability Litig., MDL 1657
Neurontin "Off-Label" Marketing Litig., MDL 1629
Zyprexa Products Liability Litig., MDL 1596
Welding Rods Products Liability Litig., MDL 1535
Meridia Products Liability Litig., MDL 1481
Serzone Products Liability Litig., MDL 1477
Sulzer Inter-Op Orthopedic Hip Implant Litig., MDL 1401
Propulsid Products Liability Litig., MDL 1355
Rezulin Products Liability Litig., MDL 1348
Diet Drugs Products Liability Litig., MDL 1203
Telectronics Pacing Systems, Inc. Accufix Atrial "J" Lead Products Liability Litig., MDL 1057
Orthopedic Bone Screw Products Liability Litig., MDL 1014
Silicone Gel Breast Implant Products Liability Litig., MDL 926
T-Mobile Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig., MDL 3019

Representative cases in which Zimmerman Reed has served as Class or Lead Counsel:

Adams v. DPC Enterprises, LP (Jefferson Cty. Cir. Ct., Mo.)
Adedipe v. U.S. Bank, N.A. (D. Minn.)
AI Plus, Inc. and IOC Distrib., Inc. v. Petters Group Worldwide (D. Minn.)
Arby's Restaurant Group, Inc., Data Security Litig. (N.D. Ga.)
Castano Tobacco Litig. (E.D. La.)

City of Farmington Hills Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (D. Minn.)
City of Tallahassee Pension Plan v. Insight Enterprises, Inc. (Maricopa Cty. Super. Ct., Ariz.)
Cooksey v. Hawkins Chemical Co. (Henn. Cty. Dist. Ct., Minn.)
Coyle v. Flowers Food and Holsum Bakery (D. Ariz.)
Cuff v. Brenntag North America, Inc. (N.D. Ga.)
Daud v. Gold'n Plump Poultry, Inc. (D. Minn.)
DeKeyser v. ThyssenKrupp Waupaca, Inc. (E.D. Wis.)
Dockers Roundtrip Airfare Promotion Sales Practices Litig. (C.D. Cal.)
Doe v. Cin-Lan, Inc. (E.D. Mich.)
DeGrise v. Ensign Group, Inc. (Sonoma Cty. Super. Ct., Cal.)
Dryer v. National Football League (D. Minn.)
Ebert v. General Mills, Inc. (D. Minn.)
First Choice Fed. Credit Union v. The Wendy's Co. (W.D. Pa.)
Frank v. Gold'n Plump Poultry, Inc. (D. Minn.)
Garner v. Butterball, LLC (E.D. Ark.)
GLS Companies v. Minnesota Timberwolves Basketball LP (Henn. Cty. Dist. Ct., Minn.)
Haritos v. American Express Financial Advisors (D. Ariz.)
Helmert v. Butterball, LLC (E.D. Ark.)
Kurvers v. National Computer Systems, Inc. (Henn. Cty. Dist. Ct., Minn.)
Martin v. BioLab, Inc. (N.D. Ga.)
McGruder v. DPC Enterprises, LP (Maricopa Cty. Super. Ct., Ariz.)
Mehl v. Canadian Pacific Railway (D.N.D.)
Milner v. Farmers Insurance Exchange (D. Minn.)
Patlan, et al. v. BMW of North America, LLC (D.N.J.)
Ponce v. Pima County (Maricopa Cty. Super. Ct., Ariz.)
Regions Morgan Keegan [Landers v. Morgan Asset Mgmt.] (W.D. Tenn.)
Russo v. NCS Pearson, Inc. (D. Minn.)
Sanders v. Norfolk Southern Corporation (D.S.C.)
Scott v. American Tobacco Co. (Civ. Dist. Ct. Parish of New Orleans, La.)
Soo Line R.R. Co. Derailment of Jan. 18, 2002 in Minot, N.D. (Henn. Cty. Dist. Ct., Minn.)
Soular v. Northern Tier Energy, LP (D. Minn.)
State of Mississippi v. AU Optronics Corp. (Rankin Cty. Ch. Ct., Miss.)
State of New Mexico v. Visa, Inc. (Santa Fe Cty., N.M.)
Trauth v. Spearmint Rhino Companies Worldwide, Inc. (C.D. Cal.)
Weincke v. Metropolitan Airports Commission (Henn. Cty. Dist. Ct., Minn.)
Zicam Product Liability Cases (Maricopa Cty. Super. Ct., Ariz.)

ZIMMERMAN REED PARTNERS

Carolyn G. Anderson is a Managing Partner at Zimmerman Reed. She is co-chair of the Public Client & Attorney General practice and leads the firm's Securities & Financial Fraud practice group. Carolyn has successfully represented small investors, institutional clients, and states in individual and nationwide securities fraud, ERISA, and antitrust actions. She has served in a leadership role in obtaining significant recoveries in both individual actions and multi-state actions.

Carolyn currently represents two states in their investigation of and litigation related to the opioid crisis. Those cases involve pharmaceutical manufacturers, drug distributors, and pharmacies related to their roles in the ongoing opioid epidemic.

She is a member of the Lead Counsel Committee in nationwide litigation involving CenturyLink customers alleging they were overcharged and billed for services they didn't request or authorize. She also served as Lead Counsel in a case representing the State of New Mexico., where the State alleged antitrust and unfair practices against Visa and MasterCard. Carolyn also served as Lead Counsel in an action, asserting consumer fraud and antitrust violations, collaborating with a coalition of four Attorneys General, against manufacturers of LCD displays. The case was filed in state court but removed to federal court under the Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA). After opposing this removal at the district court and the Fifth Circuit, the State petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court ruled unanimously in favor of Mississippi, reversing the Fifth Circuit's decision and clarifying the standard for removal of state actions under CAFA. *Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics*, 571 U.S. 161 (2014).

Carolyn also represented the Office of Attorney General for the State of Mississippi, defending that Office in an action brought by Google, challenging the State's authority to issue a Civil Investigative Demand (CID). Google attempted to enjoin the Attorney General's CID authority and the district court granted that motion. In April, 2016, the State prevailed and the district court's decision was reversed by the Fifth Circuit.

Carolyn was also appointed Co-Lead Counsel on behalf of investors alleging losses due to Wells Fargo's securities lending program. The case settled for \$62 million, two days before trial was set to commence. She serves as Interim Co-Lead Counsel in an ERISA matter pending in the District of Minnesota against fiduciaries of U.S. Bancorp Pension Plan for violations of ERISA. Carolyn also served as Class Counsel on behalf of investors who had purchased bond funds from Morgan Keegan in a lawsuit that arose from the collapse of three mutual funds. The case also involved the auditor as a defendant. In 2016, the legal team achieved a \$125 million settlement with the assistance of mediator Layn Phillips, a former U.S. Attorney and former United States District Judge.

In prior representation, Carolyn represented large groups of investors with significant losses involving Merrill Lynch, AIG, Boston Scientific, and Lehman Brothers. Carolyn also led a legal team in a case brought by investors against American Express Financial Advisors, challenging that company's practices and breaches of fiduciary duty with its investing customers. The case, brought under the Investment Advisor Act, resulted in a \$100 million settlement. Carolyn also successfully represented Midwest farmers/shareholders who challenged an ethanol plant's merger with Archer Daniels Midland; she was appointed Class Counsel in that matter. The case was resolved weeks prior to trial. Carolyn was also appointed Lead Counsel in a securities fraud lawsuit involving Boston Scientific, representing a public pension fund and a certified class.

In addition to serving in positions of leadership in investor protection litigation, Carolyn currently represents *pro bono* one hundred not-for-profit organizations related to their losses from the \$3.6 billion Petters Ponzi scheme, centered in Minnesota. She was appointed by the federal judge to serve as Assistant Liquidating Trustee under the supervision of the Court and the Liquidating Trustee for assets being distributed to some of those investors. In *U.S. v. Petters*, No.

08-cv-05348 (D. Minn.), the Firm worked with the Department of Justice and the court-appointed receiver, to successfully recover and distribute millions of dollars to victims pursuant to a settlement with one of the Petters financiers.

Carolyn maintains strong ties with the National Association of Attorneys General, individual state Attorneys General, state pension fund officers, and other institutional investors. She is a lecturer at colleges and law schools, and has served as a legal education faculty member on the topics of complex litigation, legal ethics, the 2008 financial crisis, and securities law.

Carolyn currently serves as a board member with Bloomberg Law on its Litigation Innovation Board. She also serves as a board member and Chairperson for Children's Shelter of Cebu, an interdenominational organization for abandoned and neglected children.

Carolyn graduated cum laude from Trinity College, where she received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology. She received her law degree cum laude from Hamline University School of Law where she was a Dean's Scholar, received the Cali Award for Excellence in Constitutional Law, and served on Hamline Law Review, where her case note article was selected for publication. Carolyn also studied law at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Israel in course-work focusing on Law, Religion, & Ethics. Following law school, Carolyn served as a judicial extern to the Honorable Paul A. Magnuson, then Chief Judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota. Carolyn has been honored as Rising Star of Law, has been recognized as a Super Lawyer since 2014 by her peers in Minnesota, and named to The Best Lawyers in America in the fields of Class Actions and Mass Tort Litigation since 2019. She has also been recognized by Super Lawyers as one of the Top 50 Women Lawyers in Minnesota since 2020.

Carolyn is admitted to practice before, and is a member in good standing of, the U.S. Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, Fifth Circuit, and First Circuit, the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, and the Bar of the State of Minnesota. In addition to these courts, Carolyn works on cases with local counsel nationwide. She is a member of Public Justice, the Federal Bar Association, the American Association for Justice, the Minnesota Bar Association, and the Hennepin County Bar Association.

David M. Cialkowski is a partner with Zimmerman Reed and dedicates a substantial portion of his practice to the area of complex and mass tort litigation, with a primary focus on antitrust and consumer protection litigation.

Dave Cialkowski has two decades of experience in complex and class litigation. His leadership and litigation skills have been recognized by state and federal courts and have led to his appointment as class counsel and to several MDL leadership positions.

Dave was a member of the legal team representing the *Mississippi Attorney General's Office in Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics*, 571 U.S. 161 (2014), an antitrust case against manufacturers of LCD displays, which presented the issue of whether an attorney general's parens patriae case is a "mass action" under the meaning of the Class Action Fairness Act. The Supreme Court ruled unanimously in Mississippi's favor.

On behalf of the firm, Dave served on the Steering Committee for the Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs in *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation*, No. 18-cv-1776 (D. Minn.), on the Executive Committee for plaintiffs in *In re Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation*, No. 21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo.), and as discovery team leader coordinating complex discovery in *In re Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litigation*, 16-md-2724 (E.D. Pa.), *In re Domestic Airline Travel Antitrust Litigation*, 15-mc-1404 (D.D.C), and *In re Hard Disk Drive Suspension Assemblies Antitrust Litigation*, 19-md-291 (N.D. Cal.).

Dave was also appointed to leadership positions in consumer protection class actions including as class counsel on behalf of consumers in the consolidated action *Hudock et al. v. LG Electronics U.S.A. Inc.*, 0:16-cv-01220 (D. Minn.), on behalf of the firm as Executive Committee member in *In re Generali COVID-19 Travel Insurance Litigation*, No. 20-md-2968 (S.D.N.Y), as a member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re Apple iPhone 3G and 3GS "MMS" Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL 2116, and co-lead counsel in *In re Dockers Roundtrip Airfare Promotion Sales Practices Litigation*.

His extensive class action experience advanced the claims in *In re Fedex Ground Package Systems, Inc.*, MDL 1700, a multi-district consolidated proceeding involving 40 different state class actions challenging FedEx Grounds' independent contractor model. He also served as a lead counsel team member in *Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (D. Minn.), to recover financial institutions' losses from the company's massive 2013 data breach.

In addition to his consumer protection and antitrust work, Dave is experienced in complex mass torts. He was a member of the lead counsel trial team in *Levaquin Products Liability Litig.*, MDL 1943, and represented plaintiffs in *In re St. Jude Silzone Heart Valves Product Liability Litigation*, MDL 1396. Dave also represented a class of people injured following a train derailment and chemical release in *In re Soo Line Railroad Company Derailment of January 18, 2002 in Minot, N.D.* His work and leadership led to a clarification in federal law which limited the application of railroad preemption.

In addition to being recognized by the courts, Dave is recognized by his peers as one of Minnesota's top 100 lawyers since 2020, as a Super Lawyer in Minnesota since 2015, and as a Rising Star in Minnesota from 2006-2008 and 2010-2013.

Dave is licensed to practice and a member in good standing, for the Bars of the State of Minnesota and the State of Illinois. He is also admitted to practice before, and is a member in good standing of, the U.S. Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and the United States District Courts for the District of Minnesota, Northern District of Illinois, and District of North Dakota.

Brian C. Gudmundson is a partner and has led and litigated numerous MDL and consolidated actions in recent years. He currently serves as court-appointed lead counsel in the Sonic data breach litigation on behalf of financial institutions, *In Re: Sonic Corp. Customer Data Security Breach*, 17-md-02807 (N.D. Ohio), and in the consolidated consumer action *Patlan, et al. v. BMW of North America, LLC*, 18-cv-09546 (D.N.J.), which alleges damages arising from risk of fire caused by defective BMW vehicles. He is also appointed as interim class counsel in the consolidated action *In re Alexa Data Privacy Consumer Litigation*, No. 21-cv-00854 (W.D. Wash.), alleging privacy

violations related to the recording of communications obtained by Amazon's Alexa devices and co-lead counsel in *In re: Netgain Technology, LLC, Consumer Data Breach Litigation*, 21-cv-1210 (D. Minn.) (SRN/LIB), alleging damages arising from breach of sensitive consumer medical and personal information. Recently, Brian successfully led all plaintiff counsel on behalf of consumers in the settled MDL action *In Re: CenturyLink Sales Practices and Securities Litig.*, MDL 2795 (D. Minn.). Previously, Brian served as co-lead counsel in the consolidated Arby's data breach action on behalf of financial institutions, *In re: Arby's Restaurant Group, Inc., Data Security Litig.*, 17-cv-00514, (N.D. Ga.), and in the arbitration action *GLS Companies, et al. v. Minnesota Timberwolves Basketball LP*, which challenged implementation of the Timberwolves' paperless ticketing system and restrictions on transfer of game tickets.

In addition to serving as lead counsel, Brian has been appointed to and served on a number of steering committees, including in data breach actions on behalf of financial institutions such as *First Choice Fed. Credit Union v. The Wendy's Co.*, 16-cv-00506 (W.D. Pa.); the Home Depot data breach, MDL 2583 (N.D. Ga.); and Equifax data breach, MDL 2800 (N.D. Ga.), among others. Brian is a member of the lead counsel team that achieved a \$39 million settlement on behalf of banks and other financial institutions in recovering losses due to the 2013 Target data breach, MDL 2522. Brian has also served on executive committees in consumer actions, such as *FieldTurf Artificial Turf Marketing Practices Litigation*, MDL 2779 (representing schools, universities, municipalities, and private companies around the country that purchased allegedly defective artificial turf prone to rapid degradation); *Vikram Bhatia, D.D.S. v. 3M Company*, 16-cv-01304-DWF-TNL (settled action on behalf of dentists and dental practices for allegedly defective dental crown products); *Vizio, Inc. Consumer Privacy Litigation*, MDL 2693 (settled action asserting unlawful collection and sale of private consumer data);

Brian has also extensively litigated sports law cases, and represents hundreds of retired NFL players in claims arising from concussive head injuries on the field, MDL 2323 (E.D. Pa.). Brian also represented retired NHL players alleging the National Hockey League minimized concussion risks from its players for decades, MDL 2551 (D. Minn) and was a member of the lead counsel team that achieved a \$50 million settlement on behalf of retired National Football League players in a class action for the unauthorized use of former players' identities to generate revenue *In re: Dryer v. National Football League*, 09-cv-02182 (D. Minn.).

Brian also specializes in claims under the RICO Act and represented multiple non-profit and faith-based investors pro bono in RICO claims arising from the \$3.5 billion Petters Ponzi scheme.

Brian currently serves on the Steering Committee and Faculty of the Class Action Roundtable.

Brian received his BA from the University of Minnesota and his JD, *cum laude*, from the University of Minnesota Law School. Brian is admitted to the state courts of Minnesota, the U.S. District Courts for the District of Minnesota, the Northern District of Illinois, and the District of Colorado, and in the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit Court of Appeals, and 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. His professional associations include membership in the Federal Bar Association, Minnesota State Bar Association, Hennepin County Bar Association, American Bar Association, and the American Association for Justice. Brian has been recognized as a Rising Star of Law 2010-2016 and a Super Lawyer since 2017.

June P. Hoidal is a partner at Zimmerman Reed and co-chair of the Public Client & Attorney General practice group. She represents individuals and businesses who experience losses as a result of securities, consumer protection, and antitrust violations. June currently represents the State of Vermont and the State of Indiana in their investigation of and litigation related to the manufacturing, distribution, advertisement, dispensing, and marketing of opioid pain killers. She was a member of the legal team representing the State of Mississippi in a consumer fraud and antitrust action against manufacturers of LCD screens. Her work included assisting with briefing before the U.S. Supreme Court, which unanimously ruled in favor of Mississippi by finding the State's *parens patriae* action was not removable to federal court. *Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics*, 571 U.S. 161 (2014). June also represented investors alleging losses due to Wells Fargo's securities lending program, a case that settled two days before trial was set to commence for \$62 million. She represented the State of New Mexico in a matter against Visa and MasterCard, alleging antitrust and unfair practices and investors of Medtronic in a shareholder derivative case. June currently represents participants of the U.S. Bancorp Pension Plan alleging violations of ERISA.

Prior to joining the firm, June served as a judicial law clerk to the Honorable Arthur J. Boylan on the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. She gained substantial experience following law school at two law firms in Washington, D.C. and Minneapolis, practicing in diverse subject areas, including contract disputes, franchise, products liability, insurance, and employment law.

June currently serves as a board member and as the lead co-chair of the Associates Campaign for The Fund for Legal Aid. She also serves as a member of the Advisory Board for the Minnesota Urban Debate League and the Publications Committee for the Bench & Bar of Minnesota. Previously, she served as a Commissioner for the City of Saint Anthony Parks Commission, and a member of the Diversity Committee and the Women in the Legal Profession Committee of the Minnesota State Bar Association. In addition, June volunteered as an assistant debate coach for the Minnesota Urban Debate League and worked pro bono for Legal Assistance of Dakota County, Volunteer Lawyers Network, and The Advocates for Human Rights.

June graduated cum laude from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2003, where she was the Lead Managing Editor for the Minnesota Law Review and a member of the Dean's List. She is admitted to the state courts of Minnesota and the U.S. District Courts for the District of Minnesota. June has been recognized as a Rising Star of Law in 2007, 2015-2018 and a Super Lawyer since 2019. She has also been recognized by Best Lawyers in America for consumer protection law in 2023.

Jason P. Johnston is a partner at the firm's Minneapolis office, focusing primarily on complex cases involving individuals injured by defective drugs and faulty medical devices, advocating for clients both locally and nationally. Jason's personal engagement, resolute view of the law, and solid practice style make him a strong voice for his clients and an integral part of our firm.

Jason represents clients injured from defective orthopedic hip devices manufactured by DePuy, Biomet, Stryker, Smith & Nephew and other manufacturers of hip replacement systems. In the Stryker Rejuvenate and ABG II Multidistrict Litigation (MDL), Jason represents patients who experienced serious health complications as a result of a modular hip that was recalled from the

market. Jason also serves as a member of the Plaintiff Steering Committee in the Stryker LFIT V40 MDL. During the Biomet M2a hip litigation, Jason was a member of the Plaintiffs' Science Committee where he reviewed technical documents and participated in depositions involving the design and development of the hip implant systems. In the Zimmer NexGen knee litigation, Jason serves as a member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and has played an active role in the science and discovery phases of the litigation, as well as preparing cases for trial.

Jason's medical device litigation experience extends beyond orthopedic devices, including, representing clients injured by defibrillators and leads manufactured by St. Jude, Medtronic, and Guidant. In the Medtronic Sprint Fidelis litigation, Jason served as a member of the Claims Review Committee following a mass settlement involving Sprint Fidelis leads. He has also represented plaintiffs injured by various pharmaceutical drugs, including, Abilify, Invokana, Viagra, Avandia, Aredia/Zometa, testosterone replacement therapy drugs, and other medications.

Jason has participated in pro bono service during his career, including accepting cases in the District of Minnesota's Federal Pro Se Project which provides *pro se* plaintiffs with volunteer counsel to improve access to justice in the Federal Courts. Jason is also an active member of the American Association for Justice and the Minnesota Association for Justice. In 2016, the Minnesota Association for Justice recognized Jason as the "Member of the Year" for his contributions to the organization.

Since 2014, Jason has been selected as a Minnesota Rising Star of Law by Super Lawyers a distinction award given to only 2.5% of attorneys in the state. In addition, Jason has also been selected as a member of The National Trial Lawyers Top 100 Trial Lawyers and Top 40 Under 40. A graduate of the University of St. Thomas School of Law, he was recognized by the Minnesota Justice Foundation for his pro bono service while attending law school. Prior to law school, Jason attended Winona State University, earning his Bachelor of Science degree, magna cum laude, in Marketing.

Jason has been recognized as a Rising Star of Law by Super Lawyers since 2014. He is admitted to the state courts of Minnesota and U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota.

Caleb LH Marker is a partner at Zimmerman Reed, working at the firm's Los Angeles office. Caleb dedicates a significant portion of his practice to consumer protection and employment cases, including consumers, misclassified employees, mortgage borrowers, student loan borrowers, and senior citizens.

Caleb is a creative litigator who has been a leader in the consumer protection area and has been actively involved as class counsel in cases that have provided meaningful recoveries, through trial or settlement. He has first-chair trial experience in court and arbitration, having tried several cases to verdict and award. In 2016, he tried the first merits arbitration in the United States that alleged that a "gig economy" worker was an employee as opposed to an independent contractor and has continued to try and advance such cases in arbitration and courtrooms. He has briefed and argued appeals in California, Michigan, and the Ninth Circuit.

Caleb currently represents tobacco consumers as a member of the plaintiffs' steering committee for in the *Santa Fe Natural Tobacco Company Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (MDL 2695) currently pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico. The Santa Fe MDL was recently the subject of an in-depth article published by Bloomberg Businessweek in an article entitled "Nature's Cancer Sticks: American Spirits Long, Strange Trip to Court."

Caleb leads the firm's involvement in representing a sexual assault survivor of Larry Nassar, the former Michigan State University team physician and U.S. Women's Gymnastics Team coach. Nassar has been sentenced to up to 175 years in prison and dozens of high-ranking university and gymnastics officials have been ousted or face criminal investigations for their role in these heinous crimes. Among other issues, Caleb is defending Michigan P.A. 183 which provided a brief window for child sexual assault survivors to bring suit regardless of whether the statute of limitations had previously lapsed.

In recent years, Caleb's successes include leading a class action against the City of Los Angeles and Xerox that drew widespread media attention, winning a trial that now requires the City to end its decades-long outsourcing of the City's parking violations bureau in a case that will help over a hundred thousand motorists in Los Angeles in the next few years. Caleb later defended the trial court's verdict on appeal, resulting in a unanimous opinion fully affirming the trial court's verdict and award under the private attorney general doctrine. *Weiss v. City of Los Angeles*, 2 Cal. App. 5th 194 (August 8, 2016). Caleb has been a driving force in a number of class actions that have resulted in eight-figure settlements, including actions that involving misclassified employees, homeowners victimized by force-place insurance practices, patients at understaffed nursing homes, consumers of dangerous gas absorption refrigerators, and student loan borrowers who were overcharged for interest.

Caleb serves on the Los Angeles County Bar's Litigation Executive Committee and Access to Justice Committee, the latter of which aims to maximize the delivery of legal services to the poor and encourage attorneys to provide free legal services to those in need. Several of his successes have been recognized as a "Top Settlement & Verdict" by the Los Angeles Daily Journal and Michigan Lawyers Weekly. He has been interviewed by numerous media outlets, including NBC, Fox Business, NPR, *The Wall Street Journal*, AP, the *Los Angeles Times*, *LA Weekly*, and Law360. He has also been recognized as a Rising Star of Law in Southern California by Super Lawyers since 2015, after a peer-nomination and review process awarded to less than 2.5% of attorneys under 40.

A native of Michigan, Caleb graduated from Michigan State University's James Madison College and College of Law. He is a member of the Los Angeles County Bar Association (LACBA), Duke Law's Bolch Judicial Institute and Electronic Discovery Reference Model (EDRM), the Federal Bar Association (FBA), the American Association for Justice (AAJ), Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles (CAALA), and Consumer Attorneys of California (CAOC).

Hart L. Robinovitch is a partner with Zimmerman Reed, leading the firm's Scottsdale, Arizona office. Hart focuses his practice in the areas of consumer and shareholder actions, and sports law.

For the past decade, Hart has represented clients in a series of class action lawsuits contesting mortgage lenders' excessive billing and deposits practices for mortgage escrow accounts. Hart is

now involved in numerous federal court lawsuits around the country alleging that mortgage banks and lenders have violated federal and state laws. These cases allege payment of kickbacks and/or illegal and unearned referral fees by the banks and lenders to mortgage brokers who refer mortgage clients who are then charged inflated interest rates on the mortgages. In addition, he represents consumers in other actions contesting the imposition of overcharges and improper fees or other contractual violations in various mortgage transactions. He has worked with co-counsel in state and federal courts across the country.

Hart currently represents corn farmers and DDGS exporters in the *Syngenta Viptera Litigation* who have experienced the effects of China's ban of U.S. corn and corn-derived products, suffering lower prices, decreased sales and other losses as the prices of U.S. corn has decreased. He is a member of the lead counsel team representing retired NHL players alleging the National Hockey League minimized the chronic cumulative effects of concussion risks from its players for decades. Hart also represents clients in a class action lawsuit on behalf of RV owners alleging that Norcold knew of a potentially dangerous RV refrigerator fire risk, but hid that information from the public.

Hart has been involved in numerous state and federal court lawsuits around the country challenging the misclassification of entertainers as independent contractors opposed to employees in the nightclub industry. He also represented consumers in other actions alleging deceptive and unlawful business conduct towards customers including, but not limited to, false advertising practices, "bait and switch" tactics, altering contractual terms without valid consideration, and retailers' requests and/or requirements that their customers provide personal identification information when they complete a transaction using their credit card, in violation of state and/or federal statutes. In addition, Hart represented residents of various skilled nursing facilities alleging pervasive and intentional failure to provide sufficient direct nursing care staffing resulting in harm to the residents.

A native of Canada, Hart earned his degree from the University of Toronto Law School in 1992 where he served as an Associate Editor on the University of Toronto Faculty of Law Review. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in 1989 from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Hart is admitted to practice before, and is a member in good standing of, the Bars of the States of Arizona and Minnesota and the United States District Court for the Districts of Arizona, Minnesota, and the Eastern District of Michigan. Hart is also licensed to practice law before the United States Courts of Appeals for the Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, and Eleventh Circuits, and the United States Supreme Court. Hart's memberships include the National Association of Consumer Advocates and Canadian American Bar Association.

J. Gordon Rudd, Jr. is a Managing Partner at Zimmerman Reed and represents clients in the areas of consumer protection, employment law, and mass torts. Gordon has been appointed class counsel in cases in state and federal courts across the country.

Gordon was recently part of the team that achieved a \$50 million settlement in the complicated court fight over publicity rights for retired NFL players. In a separate lawsuit, he represents hundreds of retired NFL players suffering from concussive head injuries that occurred while playing in the league. Gordon also represented thousands of individuals injured by the largest

release of anhydrous ammonia in U.S. history. Two of those individuals were awarded \$1.2 million by a jury. Eventually, these trials led to a settlement on behalf of other residents of Minot, North Dakota injured by the derailment.

In mass tort litigation, Gordon leads several cases, including representing clients who developed gambling addictions after taking top-selling prescription drug Abilify; representing nursing home residents sickened by a Hepatitis C outbreak (the second-largest outbreak of the disease in U.S. History); representing men who suffered cardiovascular injuries following their use of testosterone therapy supplements; and representing clients who experienced severe bleeding problems while taking Xarelto.

Gordon has also served on a number of multi-district litigation cases. He was a member of the lead counsel team representing banks and other financial institutions seeking recovery of losses from the 2013 Target data breach. He also holds leadership positions on several Plaintiffs' Steering Committees including *In re H&R Block IRS Form 8863 Litigation*, MDL 2474, *In re Life Time Fitness, Inc., Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Litigation*, MDL 2564, *In re FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*, MDL 1700, and *In re Building Materials Corp. of America Asphalt Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2283.

Gordon graduated from Connecticut College, where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in English Literature & Government. He received his law degree from the University of Cincinnati College of Law. Gordon is licensed to practice before, and is a member in good standing of, the Bar of the State of Minnesota and the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. Gordon is admitted to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. He has been admitted to appear pro hac vice in cases pending in the states of California, Oregon, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, North Dakota, Ohio, Florida, Georgia, Tennessee, and Michigan. Gordon has been selected as a Super Lawyer by his peers in Minnesota since 2006 and recognized in The Best Lawyers in America in the fields of Class Actions and Mass Tort Litigation since 2018.

Behdad C. Sadeghi is a partner at Zimmerman reed and a member of the firm's Attorney General practice. His practice focuses his practice on complex litigation involving consumer protection, securities and financial fraud, and antitrust law in state and federal courts.

Behdad currently is part of the Attorney General Practice, working with the team representing two states in the opioid litigation, conducting research, discovery, and motion practice. Behdad worked on the team representing investors who sustained losses as a result of alleged federal securities law violations by Morgan Keegan and its affiliates that achieved a \$125 million settlement. He also represented a class of financial institutions who suffered losses resulting from a major data breach in a class action against the Target Corporation that resulted in a \$39 million dollar settlement. In consumer litigation, he successfully achieved a multi-million dollar wrongful death settlement against a major automobile manufacturer, and a settlement on behalf of a group of elderly victims of one of the largest hepatitis C outbreaks in the nation's history. He also represents a putative class of consumers alleging violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act by Papa Murphy's and SuperAmerica.

Behdad graduated magna *cum laude* from William Mitchell College of Law, where he was a member of the William Mitchell Journal of Law and Practice and the Niagara International Moot

Court Team; he also participated in the school's Civil Advocacy Clinic. His academic honors include a CALI Excellence for the Future Award, four Dean's List honors, and a Burton Award Nomination for Excellence in Legal Writing. Behdad has been recognized as a Rising Star of Law since 2019. Behdad is licensed to practice law in Minnesota and the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota

ZIMMERMAN REED ATTORNEYS

Hrag Alexanian is an attorney at Zimmerman Reed working in the firm's Los Angeles office. He is a member of the consumer protection and employment law practice groups. He represents individuals in various employment wage disputes, gig-economy employment misclassification, consumer privacy, breach of contract, and financial fraud cases.

While in law school, Hrag gained valuable experience interning in the legal department for an international athletic apparel company and clerking at a software company working on a wide variety of issues with the General Counsel.

Prior to joining the firm, Hrag externed at a California law firm specializing in civil litigation.

Hrag is a graduate of the Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law. He also graduated with a Master of Business Administration from the Chapman Argyros School of Business & Economics. Hrag earned his B.S. from California State University, Northridge in Business Administration, Finance.

Hrag speaks conversational Spanish and is fluent in Armenian. He is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the California State Bar.

Molly F. Billion is an associate in the firm's Minneapolis office and a member of the consumer protection and employment law practice groups. She currently represents employees in employment wage disputes and gig-economy employment misclassification matters and represents consumers in consumer privacy, breach of contract, and financial fraud cases.

Before joining Zimmerman Reed, Molly litigated in immigration proceedings, representing asylum seekers and other noncitizens, appearing in immigration court on behalf of asylum and cancellation of removal applicants.

Molly is a graduate of the University of St. Thomas School of Law. While in law school, she clerked for the Hennepin County Attorney's Office, negotiating plea offers, and appearing in court for juvenile and misdemeanor matters as a Certified Student Attorney. She also served as the Managing Editor of the University of St. Thomas Law Journal and was President of the Women's Law Student Association. Prior to law school, she worked as a Guardian ad Litem in the Minnesota Fourth Judicial District Court where she advocated for the best interests of children in child protection cases.

Molly is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the Minnesota State Bar.

Killian Commers is an associate at Zimmerman Reed, working in the firm's Minneapolis office. As part of the consumer protection team, Killian handles all aspects of litigation and arbitration including dispositive motion practice, pleadings, oral arguments, trial preparation, and settlement negotiations.

Prior to joining the firm, Killian represented and advised businesses, including Fortune 500 companies in commercial, product, and professional liability litigation matters. He gained extensive experience in the discovery process, including expert discovery, dispositive motion practice, and settlement negotiations.

Killian is a graduate of Marquette University Law School. While in law school, Killian was a finalist in the Jenkins Honors Moot Court Competition and recognized with the Franz C. Eschweller award for best legal brief. As a law student, Killian participated in national moot court and negotiation competitions and served on the editorial of the *Marquette Sports Law Review*. Killian also worked as a judicial intern at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Killian is licensed to practice law in Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Zachary J. Freese is an associate in the firm's Minneapolis office and a member of the consumer protection and antitrust practice groups. In this practice, Zach focuses on protecting consumers and individuals from fraud, deceptive trade practices, and marketplace collusion.

Prior to joining the firm, Zach worked as a commercial litigator in the areas of business and construction litigation, litigating a broad range of disputes in state court. Prior to that, he clerked with Judge William H. Koch and Judge Kerry W. Meyer in the Fourth Judicial District Court.

Zach is a graduate of the University of St. Thomas School of Law, where he was the senior editor of the law journal. While in law school, he was a Certified Student Attorney in the Hennepin County Attorneys' Office where he assisted county attorneys in investigating and prosecuting complex white-collar crimes.

He is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the Minnesota State Bar.

Richard Hansen is an associate at Zimmerman Reed and a member of the firm's Public Client practice. His practice focuses on complex cases involving consumer fraud and environmental issues.

As part of the Public Client group, Richard represents states and municipalities in various matters. This includes currently representing the State of Minnesota in litigation against Juul for deceptively marketing its e-cigarettes. Richard has also represented states in litigation against entities responsible for the deceptive marketing, sale, and distribution of opioids.

Following law school, Richard work as a law clerk in the Minnesota Court of Appeals where he drafted bench memoranda and assisted with preparing judicial opinions. After his clerkship, he was an associate at a Minnesota firm that practices in a broad spectrum of areas, including antitrust, energy, and financial services law. In that position, Richard was responsible for preparing and drafting briefs for dispositive and non-dispositive motions, arguing motions in state court proceedings, and acted as lead associate in multiple cases which involved overseeing document collection and review.

Richard graduated cum laude from the University of Wisconsin Law School, where he served as the Managing Editor of the Wisconsin Law Review and was admitted to the Order of the Coif. He is admitted to the state courts of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota.

Richard is an associate at Zimmerman Reed and a member of the firm's Public Client practice. His practice focuses on complex cases involving consumer fraud and environmental issues.

Andre S. LaBerge brings over twenty years of professional experience – as an attorney and as a business executive – in his advocacy for the rights of investors and consumers, providing counsel to several of the firm's practice areas. He has represented participants in Wells Fargo's securities lending program, investors with losses in Morgan Keegan open end bond funds, and the Office of Attorney General in the LCD antitrust litigation.

Andre has practiced law in Chicago and Minneapolis, and has represented clients at all court levels and in various regulatory forums. He has also served as Vice President, Chief Compliance Officer, General Counsel, and FINRA Registered Principal and Designated Supervisor in the financial services industry with companies that supervised and supported large numbers of securities brokers, financial planners, and insurance agents.

Andre is a graduate of DePaul University College of Law, where he was a Senior Editor for the Journal of Health and Hospital Law, and worked as a Mansfield Foundation Fellowship intern at Southern Minnesota Regional Legal Services. He is a member of the Minnesota State Bar Association and the Hennepin County Bar Association.

Anna E. Jenks is a member of the firm's Public Client practice. Her practice focuses on representing state attorneys general and public entities in complex litigation involving consumer protection, securities and financial fraud, and antitrust law in state and federal courts.

Prior to joining Zimmerman Reed, Anna served as an Assistant Attorney General at the Minnesota Attorney General's Office. In that position, Anna worked on a wide variety of regulatory, administrative, and civil issues. She represented the State of Minnesota in tort and employment litigation at both the trial and appellate levels. She also advised the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission and represented the Commission on appeal. An accomplished advocate, Anna's impactful representations of clients throughout the stages of complex multi-party litigation and appeals has earned her the respect of the courts where she appears and the colleagues with whom she works.

Anna graduated magna cum laude from the University of Minnesota Law School and is licensed to practice law in Minnesota.

Michael J. Laird is an Associate at Zimmerman Reed and focuses his practice in the areas of sports law, data breach litigation, and consumer protection.

Michael currently represents hundreds of retired NFL players in the National Football League Concussion litigation. Former players sued the NFL alleging it downplayed the risk of progressive degenerative brain injuries caused by playing in the NFL. Michael has successfully obtained tens of millions of dollars on behalf of former players suffering degenerative brain injuries as part of the NFL Concussion Settlement. Michael also successfully represented former NHL players who alleged the National Hockey League was negligent in dealing with concussions and head injuries causing players to suffer serious brain injuries, including chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE).

In his data breach practice, Michael represents financial institutions and individuals affected by cyber-attacks that exposed their sensitive business and personal data. These cases seek to hold companies accountable for harm caused by their data breaches and allegedly inadequate data security. Michael has previously litigated against major companies responsible for some of the largest nationwide data breaches, including Equifax, Marriott, and Wendy's. He is currently litigating data breach cases against Sonic, Netgain, and is currently a court-appointed member of the leadership committee in the ParkMobile litigation.

In his consumer protection practice, Michael brings his broad experience to represent individuals and businesses who experienced consumer-related injuries. Currently, Michael represents pet owners and is currently a court-appointed member of the leadership committee in a class action where pets suffered harm and, in some cases, died allegedly due to Elanco's flea and tick collar, Seresto. Michael also represents consumers and electrical contractors who claim Siemens manufactured defective arc fault circuit interrupters.

Michael graduated magna cum laude from the University of Minnesota Law School. During law school, he served as a member of the Journal of Law, Science & Technology and argued on the American Bar Association Moot Court team. He externed for the Honorable Jeffrey J. Keyes of the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

Michael has been recognized as a Rising Star by Super Lawyers since 2021. He is licensed to practice law in Minnesota.

Ian F. McFarland is an associate at Zimmerman Reed and a member of the firm's Antitrust and Consumer Protection Practice Groups. Ian's current antitrust work includes representation of a putative classes of restaurants and catering businesses in multidistrict litigation against the nation's largest pork and turkey processors. In addition, he is also representing reseller class plaintiffs in multidistrict litigation against the manufacturers of a critical component of hard disk drives. Previously, as a member of the firm's Public Client Practice Group, Ian represented the States of Indiana and Vermont in litigation against the entities responsible for the unfair and deceptive marketing, sale, and distribution of opioids.

Following law school, Ian served as a law clerk to the Honorable Regina M. Chu, Minnesota District Court, Fourth Judicial District. He then moved to a litigation firm where he worked on a variety of complex litigation matters, including National Hockey League Players' Concussion Injury Litigation, Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation, Aggrenox Antitrust Litigation, and the Target Customer Data Security Breach Litigation.

Ian graduated magna cum laude from the University of Wisconsin Law School, where he served as a Note and Comment Editor of the Wisconsin Law Review and was admitted to the Order of the Coif. While attending law school, he worked as a judicial intern to the Honorable Margaret J. Vergeront, Wisconsin Court of Appeals, District IV.

Ian was recognized as a Rising Star by Super Lawyers in 2022.

He is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of Minnesota.

Kimberly McNulty is an associate at Zimmerman Reed and is a member of the Public Client practice group. She represents states and municipalities in a variety of matters. She currently represents the State of Minnesota in its litigation against e-cigarette manufacturer, JUUL, for its deceptive marketing practices and targeting of Minnesota's youth. She also represents individual state Attorneys General in litigation against entities responsible for deceptive marketing, sale, and distribution of opioids.

Prior to joining the firm, Kimberly was an associate attorney for another Minneapolis law firm representing businesses and individuals in all stages of complex commercial litigation. Prior to that, she worked as a Judicial Law Clerk to the Honorable Matthew E. Johnson. Kimberly is a graduate of the University of South Dakota School of Law with high honors. While in law school, she was the Lead Articles Editor for the South Dakota Law Review, member of the Trial Team, and intern with the United States Attorney's Office (District of South Dakota). Kimberly earned her B.A. from Creighton University in English.

Kimberly has been recognized as a Rising Star by Super Lawyers since 2021. She is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of Minnesota.

Flinn T. Milligan is an associate at Zimmerman Reed, working in the firm's Los Angeles office. He dedicates his practice to protecting consumers and workers in complex litigation, including cases involving consumer fraud and misclassified employees. Flinn has demonstrated his commitment to ensuring access to justice, especially for the most vulnerable members of our communities.

Prior to joining the firm, he worked at a non-profit, as a UC President's Public Interest Fellow. He assisted victims of PACE (property assessed clean energy) financing scams, ensuring that his clients stayed in their homes. He also worked on matters at the intersection of poverty and elder law, including debt collection, real estate, elder abuse, and access to estate funds. During law school, Flinn served as a law clerk for the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, working in the domestic violence clinic and the eviction defense center.

Flinn is a graduate of the UCLA School of Law. He also earned his B.A. from the University of Exeter (South West England, UK), during which he studied abroad at Iowa State University. Flinn is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California.

Flinn is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California.

Christopher Nagakawa is an attorney at Zimmerman Reed working in the firm's Los Angeles office. He is a member of the consumer protection and employment law practice groups, representing individuals in various consumer privacy, breach of contract, and financial fraud cases.

Prior to joining the firm, Chris was a Deputy Attorney General of the California Department of Justice and Deputy City Attorney of the Santa Monica City Attorney's Office. He defended the State of California, City of Santa Monica, and city and state officials and employees. During his career, Chris also specialized in investigating and prosecuting fraud claims. He was solo or first-chair in numerous trials at both agencies and is an experienced litigator in state and federal courts, at the district and appellate levels.

Chris served as a proud member of the Glendale California and Los Angeles County Fire Departments. He remains a member of the International Association of Fire Fighters and the California Professional Firefighters Association.

He is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the California State Bar.

Rachel K. Tack is an associate at Zimmerman Reed and a member of the firm's Consumer Protection practice and the Securities and Financial Fraud practice.

Rachel is currently litigating against multiple insurance companies for denying certain coverages and overcharging for others, including Meta Platforms, Inc. for failing to control or remove copyright infringement on its sites, BMW of North America for damages related to unresolved safety defects, and several healthcare companies for data breaches. Rachel has also worked on many other data breach cases, including the T-Mobile data breach, in which a federal district court appointed Rachel to the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee to oversee the litigation and advocate on behalf of more than 53 million breach victims.

Following law school, Rachel worked at a general practice firm where she concentrated on complex civil litigation and corporate disputes. Her litigation experience includes working directly with clients and developing skills in all areas of legal advocacy including drafting pleadings, conducting discovery, motion practice, oral arguments, and representing clients in mediations and arbitration. Representing clients in this diverse practice honed her litigation expertise in state, tribal, and federal courts.

Rachel graduated from University of North Dakota Law School, where she served as a member of the North Dakota Law Review and the American Inns of the Court. While attending law school, Rachel served as a Chambers Legal External Clerk in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court where she gained

hands-on experience in the courtroom, conducted extensive legal research, and assisted in preparing judicial opinions.

Rachel is admitted to the state courts of Minnesota and North Dakota and the U.S. District Courts for the District of Minnesota.

Charles R. Toomajian, III is an associate at Zimmerman Reed and a member of the firm's Public Client, Consumer Protection, and Whistleblower/False Claims Act practice groups.

In the Public Client context, Chuck represents states and municipalities in various matters, including representing the State of Minnesota in its litigation against JUUL for deceptively marketing its e-cigarettes and targeting Minnesota's youth. Chuck also represents the State of Indiana and the State of Vermont in the opioid litigation, against entities responsible for the deceptive marketing, sale, and distribution of opioids.

In the False Claims Act practice, Chuck represents whistleblowers who come forward to report fraud against state and federal governments. In the Consumer Protection area, Chuck has successfully represented individuals with claims under the TCPA and other consumer-facing statutes and regulations.

Prior to joining Zimmerman Reed, Chuck practiced at a nationally recognized trial and litigation firm where he handled broad aspects of cases including drafting pleadings, conducting discovery, motion practice, oral arguments, and representing clients in mediation, arbitration, and through all phases of litigation and settlement.

A magna cum laude graduate from the University of Minnesota Law School, Chuck was a symposium editor for *Law and Inequality: A Journal of Theory and Practice*. He was a three-year consecutive Dean's List recipient and received the First Amendment Law Book Award for achieving the highest score in the class.

During law school, he externed for the Honorable Mark Wernick of the Hennepin County District Court. Chuck holds a Bachelor of Arts in English from Williams College. He is licensed to practice law in Minnesota and California and is admitted to the U.S. District Courts for Minnesota and the Central District of California.

Chuck has been recognized as a Rising Star by Super Lawyers since 2021. He is licensed to practice before and is a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of Minnesota.

EXHIBIT B

Summary Fee Transaction File List
Zimmerman Reed LLP

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	9.75	9,506.25	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 150	Billable	49.90	25,199.50	Hannah B. Fernandez
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	107.80	94,325.00	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	7.50	2,625.00	Josephine Lu
GRAND TOTALS				
	Billable	174.95	131,655.75	

EXHIBIT C

Summary Fee Transaction File List
Zimmerman Reed LLP

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	13.25	12,918.75	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 150	Billable	155.60	78,578.00	Hannah B. Fernandez
Total for Timekeeper 161	Billable	17.40	10,005.00	Flinn T. Milligan
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	112.60	98,525.00	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	42.20	14,770.00	Josephine Lu
GRAND TOTALS				
	Billable	341.05	214,796.75	

EXHIBIT D

Summary Fee Transaction File List
Zimmerman Reed LLP

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	38.40	37,440.00	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 150	Billable	158.30	79,941.50	Hannah B. Fernandez
Total for Timekeeper 161	Billable	326.12	187,519.00	Flinn T. Milligan
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	193.20	169,050.00	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 235	Billable	21.40	6,741.00	Sabine A. King
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	116.90	40,915.00	Josephine Lu
GRAND TOTALS				
	Billable	854.32	521,606.50	

EXHIBIT E

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	126.85	123,678.75	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 153	Billable	79.90	40,349.50	Bryce D. Riddle
Total for Timekeeper 161	Billable	458.90	263,867.50	Flinn T. Milligan
Total for Timekeeper 166	Billable	683.83	393,202.25	Arielle M. Canepa
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	670.30	586,512.50	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 235	Billable	12.70	4,000.50	Sabine A. King
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	260.10	91,035.00	Josephine Lu
Total for Timekeeper 500	Billable	34.45	10,851.75	Amanda R. Klinger

GRAND TOTALS

Billable	<u>2,327.03</u>	<u>1,513,497.75</u>
----------	-----------------	---------------------

EXHIBIT F

Summary Fee Transaction File List
Zimmerman Reed LLP

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	42.05	40,998.75	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 161	Billable	15.10	8,682.50	Flinn T. Milligan
Total for Timekeeper 166	Billable	23.64	13,593.00	Arielle M. Canepa
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	70.01	61,258.75	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	13.00	4,550.00	Josephine Lu

GRAND TOTALS

Billable 163.80 129,083.00

EXHIBIT G

Summary Fee Transaction File List
Zimmerman Reed LLP

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	29.90	29,152.50	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 161	Billable	9.70	5,577.50	Flinn T. Milligan
Total for Timekeeper 166	Billable	49.85	28,663.75	Arielle M. Canepa
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	111.08	97,195.00	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 228	Billable	51.51	32,193.75	Danielle L. Manning
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	38.90	13,615.00	Josephine Lu
GRAND TOTALS				
	Billable	290.94	206,397.50	

EXHIBIT H

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	69.85	68,103.75	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 161	Billable	8.78	5,048.50	Flinn T. Milligan
Total for Timekeeper 166	Billable	104.90	60,317.50	Arielle M. Canepa
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	110.64	96,810.00	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 228	Billable	113.44	70,900.00	Danielle L. Manning
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	120.00	41,930.00	Josephine Lu
Total for Timekeeper 268	Billable	0.25	143.75	Molly F. Billion
GRAND TOTALS				
	Billable	527.86	343,253.50	

EXHIBIT I

Summary Fee Transaction File List
Zimmerman Reed LLP

		<u>Hours to Bill</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Total for Timekeeper 7	Billable	4.10	3,997.50	J. Gordon Rudd, Jr.
Total for Timekeeper 161	Billable	0.41	235.75	Flinn T. Milligan
Total for Timekeeper 169	Billable	10.25	8,968.75	Caleb L. Marker
Total for Timekeeper 237	Billable	5.20	1,820.00	Josephine Lu
Total for Timekeeper 268	Billable	35.45	20,383.75	Molly F. Billion
GRAND TOTALS				
	Billable	55.41	35,405.75	

EXHIBIT J

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 94 Court Fee -								
1495.002	11/15/2018	169	P	94		75.00	Court Fee - Labor and Workforce Dev Agency LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-635317-18 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	2
1495.002	12/01/2018	168	P	94		465.02	11/21/2018 94JANNEY & JANNEY ATTORNE 43684555651982 - LOS ANGELES, CA (CPR Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	433
1495.002	01/01/2019	168	P	94		14.72	12/12/2018 JANNEY & JANNEY ATTORNE 43684555651982 - LOS ANGELES, CA (CPR Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	7
1495.002	01/01/2019	168	P	94		141.00	12/06/2018 JANNEY & JANNEY ATTORNE 43684555651982 - LOS ANGELES, CA (CPR Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	434
1495.002	04/01/2019	168	P	94		17.67	03/09/2019 ONE LEGAL LLC - NOVATO, CA (CPR Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	15
1495.002	06/17/2019	598	P	94		19.67	05/08/2019 One Legal Llc BMO Mastercard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	25
1495.002	06/17/2019	598	P	94		40.75	05/08/2019 One Legal Llc BMO Mastercard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	26
1495.002	07/17/2019	598	P	94		19.67	06/27/2019 One Legal Llc (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	45
1495.002	07/17/2019	598	P	94		18.75	06/29/2019 One Legal Llc (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	46
1495.002	08/16/2019	598	P	94		19.67	06/27/2019 One Legal Llc (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	72
1495.002	08/16/2019	598	P	94		18.75	06/29/2019 One Legal Llc (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	73
1495.002	09/16/2019	598	P	94		25.67	08/03/2019 One Legal Llc (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	81
1495.002	09/16/2019	598	P	94		25.67	08/07/2019 One Legal Llc (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	82
1495.002	09/16/2019	598	P	94		21.00	08/16/2019 Truefiling Court Fees (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	83
1495.002	09/16/2019	598	P	94		144.50	08/26/2019 Janney & Janney Attorn (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	84
1495.002	10/17/2019	598	P	94		144.50	08/28/19 Janney & Janney Attorn BMO Mastercard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	104
1495.002	10/17/2019	598	P	94		46.41	09/10/19 One Legal Llc BMO Mastercard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	105
1495.002	10/17/2019	598	P	94		31.00	09/12/19 Courts/Usdc-Wa-W-S BMO Mastercard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	106
1495.002	10/17/2019	598	P	94		540.25	09/20/19 One Legal Llc BMO Mastercard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	107
1495.002	11/16/2019	169	P	94		22.67	Court Fee - 10/12/19 One Legal LLC (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	127

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 94 Court Fee -								
1495.002	11/16/2019	169	P	94		502.05	Court Fee - 10/23/19 Casefile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	128
1495.002	11/16/2019	169	P	94		18.67	Court Fee - 10/23/19 Casefile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	129
1495.002	03/01/2020	169	P	94		173.60	Court Fee - 01/29/20 US Legal (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	158
1495.002	03/18/2020	169	P	94		3.67	Court Fee - 02/07/20 Casefile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	159
1495.002	03/18/2020	169	P	94		2.05	Court Fee - 02/07/20 Casefile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	160
1495.002	03/18/2020	169	P	94		96.50	Court Fee - 02/11/20 One Legal LLC (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	161
1495.002	04/16/2020	169	P	94		2.05	Court Fee - 02/28/20 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	172
1495.002	04/16/2020	169	P	94		3.67	Court Fee - 02/28/20 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	173
1495.002	07/17/2020	169	P	94		2.05	Court Fee - 05/30/20 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	179
1495.002	10/19/2020	169	P	94		3.67	Court Fee - 09/18/20 CA efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	189
1495.002	10/19/2020	169	P	94		2.05	Court Fee - 09/18/20 CA efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	190
1495.002	02/16/2021	169	P	94		3.67	Court Fee - 01/08/21 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	402
1495.002	02/16/2021	169	P	94		2.05	Court Fee - 01/08/21 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	403
1495.002	03/19/2021	169	P	94		33.67	Court Fee - 02/18/21 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	411
1495.002	03/19/2021	169	P	94		2.05	Court Fee - 02/18/21 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	412
1495.002	03/19/2021	169	P	94		1,002.05	Court Fee - 02/18/21 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	413
1495.002	03/19/2021	169	P	94		3.67	Court Fee - 02/18/21 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	414
1495.002	04/01/2021	169	P	94		51.25	Court Fee - 03/12/21 CA Bar WEB (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	418
1495.002	04/01/2021	169	P	94		51.25	Court Fee - 03/12/21 CA Bar WEB (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	419
1495.002	05/17/2021	169	P	94		4.27	Court Fee - 04/23/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	423
1495.002	05/17/2021	169	P	94		22.05	Court Fee - 04/23/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	424
1495.002	06/16/2021	169	P	94		220.53	Court Fee - 05/11/21 Janney & Janney (BMO Mastercard)	431

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 94 Court Fee -							
						Gender Wage Gap	
1495.002	08/16/2021	169	P	94		Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
					3.67	Court Fee - 06/26/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	452
						Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	08/16/2021	169	P	94		Court Fee - 06/26/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	453
					2.05	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	08/16/2021	169	P	94		Court Fee - 07/15/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	454
					2.05	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	08/16/2021	169	P	94		Court Fee - 07/15/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	455
					3.67	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	09/16/2021	169	P	94		Court Fee - 08/05/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	458
					22.05	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	09/16/2021	169	P	94		Court Fee - 08/05/21 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	459
					4.27	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	02/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 12/28/21 LA Superior Court (BMO Mastercard)	474
					1.00	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	02/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 12/28/21 LA Superior Court (BMO Mastercard)	475
					12.20	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	02/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 12/28/21 LA Superior Court (BMO Mastercard)	476
					1.00	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	02/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 12/29/21 LA Superior Court (BMO Mastercard)	477
					104.20	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	03/21/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 02/01/22 LA Superior Court (BMO Mastercard)	483
					34.00	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	03/21/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 02/01/22 LA Superior Court (BMO Mastercard)	484
					34.00	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	03/21/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 02/03/22 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	485
					3.67	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	03/21/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 02/03/22 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	486
					2.05	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	04/18/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 03/04/22 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	489
					4.27	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	04/18/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 03/04/22 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	490
					22.05	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	06/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 05/13/22 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	496
					3.67	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	06/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 05/13/22 CA eFile (BMO Mastercard)	497
					2.05	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	09/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 07/28/2022 CA efile (BMO Mastercard)	510
					26.32	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	09/16/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - 08/15/2022 CA efile (BMO Mastercard)	511
					26.32	Gender Wage Gap	
						Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
1495.002	09/23/2022	169	P	94		Court Fee - First Legal Network LLC Invoice No 10550494	514
					94.75	Gender Wage Gap	

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 94 Court Fee -								
1495.002	11/16/2022	598	P	94		3.67	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) 10/13/2022 1495.002 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap	526
1495.002	11/16/2022	598	P	94		2.05	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) 10/13/2022 1495.002 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap	527
1495.002	11/16/2022	598	P	94		62.05	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) 09/26/2022 1495.002 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap	528
1495.002	11/16/2022	598	P	94		5.47	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) 09/26/2022 1495.002 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap	529
1495.002	11/16/2022	598	P	94		2.05	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) 09/26/2022 1495.002 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap	530
1495.002	11/16/2022	598	P	94		3.67	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) 09/26/2022 1495.002 CA Efile (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap	531
Total for Tcode 94					Billable	4,547.15	Court Fee -	
Tcode 98 Postage								
1495.002	11/08/2018	169	P	98	0.460	6.58	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	4
1495.002	11/08/2018	169	P	98	0.460	6.58	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	5
1495.002	11/15/2018	169	P	98	0.460	0.47	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	3
1495.002	05/08/2019	169	P	98	0.460	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	19
1495.002	05/30/2019	169	P	98	0.460	6.55	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	20
1495.002	05/30/2019	169	P	98	0.460	6.55	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	21
1495.002	05/30/2019	169	P	98	0.460	6.55	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	22
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	49
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	50
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	51
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	52
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	53
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	54
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	0.50	Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	55

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 98 Postage							
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	56
1495.002	08/01/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	75
1495.002	08/20/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	76
1495.002	08/20/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	77
1495.002	09/05/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	92
1495.002	09/13/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	93
1495.002	10/24/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	110
1495.002	10/24/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	111
1495.002	10/24/2019	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	112
1495.002	02/14/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	153
1495.002	02/14/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	154
1495.002	02/14/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	155
1495.002	03/05/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	165
1495.002	03/05/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	166
1495.002	03/05/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	167
1495.002	03/09/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	168
1495.002	03/09/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	169
1495.002	03/09/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	170
1495.002	03/20/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	162
1495.002	03/20/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) PostageCA Office Gender Wage Gap	163
1495.002	03/20/2020	169	P	98	0.500	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Postage CA Office Gender Wage Gap	164

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 98 Postage								
Total for Tcode 98					Billable	61.08	Postage	
Tcode 103 Conference Calls -								
1495.002	03/20/2019	169	P	103	9.58	Conference Calls - Premiere Global Services Invoice No 27567909 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		11
1495.002	03/27/2019	169	P	103	10.93	Conference Calls - Premiere Global Services Invoice No 27567909 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		12
1495.002	04/01/2019	169	P	103	94.00	03/14/2019 CCALL ID#9668876 - LOS ANGELES, CA (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		16
1495.002	04/03/2019	169	P	103	7.34	Conference Calls - GlobalMeet Invoice No 041219 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		13
1495.002	06/17/2019	598	P	103	94.00	05/22/2019 CourtCall #9812963 3103420888 CA BMO Mastercard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		27
1495.002	09/16/2019	598	P	103	94.00	08/01/2019 Courtcall #9959905 (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		79
1495.002	09/16/2019	598	P	103	94.00	08/01/2019 Courtcall #9959927 (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		80
1495.002	10/14/2019	169	P	103	10.82	Conference Calls - GlobalMeet Invoice No 6123410400-111219 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		132
1495.002	11/16/2019	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 10/04/19 Courtcall (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		126
1495.002	07/01/2020	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 06/03/20 CourtCall (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		175
1495.002	07/01/2020	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 06/03/20 CourtCall (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		176
1495.002	07/01/2020	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 06/03/20 CourtCall (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		177
1495.002	10/19/2020	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 09/23/20 Court Call (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		191
1495.002	02/16/2021	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 01/13/21 Courtcall (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		404
1495.002	08/01/2021	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 07/01/21 CCall ID (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		449
1495.002	08/01/2021	169	P	103	94.00	Conference Calls - 07/01/21 CCall ID (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		450
Total for Tcode 103					Billable	1,166.67	Conference Calls -	
Tcode 127 Federal Express Invoice No.								
1495.002	08/30/2019	169	P	127	21.90	Federal Express Invoice No. FedEx Invoice No 6-730-02975 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		78
1495.002	06/23/2021	169	P	127	51.33	Federal Express Invoice No. FedEx Invoice No 7-421-06813 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)		441

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 127 Federal Express Invoice No.								
Total for Tcode 127					Billable	73.23	Federal Express Invoice No.	
Tcode 129 Research -								
1495.002	12/31/2018	169	P	129		1.20	Research - Pacer Invoice No 4658651-Q42018 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	6
1495.002	03/31/2019	169	P	129		26.60	Research - PACER Invoice No 4658651-Q12019 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	10
1495.002	05/31/2019	169	P	129		14.86	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	18
1495.002	06/30/2019	169	P	129		1.10	Research - PACER Invoice No 4658651-Q22019 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	43
1495.002	07/31/2019	169	P	129		601.10	Research - Westlaw Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	48
1495.002	08/31/2019	169	P	129		31.74	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	74
1495.002	09/30/2019	169	P	129		41.00	Research - Westlaw charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	94
1495.002	09/30/2019	169	P	129		3.42	Research - Westlaw charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	95
1495.002	09/30/2019	169	P	129		2.10	Research - Pacer Invoice No 4658651-Q32019 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	96
1495.002	10/31/2019	169	P	129		136.30	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	108
1495.002	10/31/2019	169	P	129		97.44	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	109
1495.002	11/30/2019	169	P	129		4.21	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	130
1495.002	11/30/2019	169	P	129		243.92	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	131
1495.002	12/31/2019	169	P	129		43.47	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	134
1495.002	01/31/2020	169	P	129		19.64	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	135
1495.002	01/31/2020	169	P	129		127.69	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	136
1495.002	02/29/2020	169	P	129		78.24	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	156
1495.002	02/29/2020	169	P	129		77.32	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	157
1495.002	03/31/2020	169	P	129		138.28	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	171
1495.002	08/31/2020	169	P	129		3.45	Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	182

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 129 Research -							
1495.002	08/31/2020	169	P	129		112.85 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	183
1495.002	09/30/2020	169	P	129		274.94 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	187
1495.002	10/31/2020	169	P	129		48.26 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	193
1495.002	10/31/2020	169	P	129		104.87 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	194
1495.002	10/31/2020	169	P	129		109.46 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	195
1495.002	11/30/2020	169	P	129		119.79 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	197
1495.002	01/31/2021	169	P	129		3.93 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	199
1495.002	02/28/2021	169	P	129		19.91 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	410
1495.002	03/31/2021	169	P	129		7.45 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	416
1495.002	03/31/2021	169	P	129		29.23 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	417
1495.002	04/30/2021	169	P	129		3.79 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	421
1495.002	04/30/2021	169	P	129		134.46 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	422
1495.002	05/31/2021	169	P	129		3.17 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	428
1495.002	05/31/2021	169	P	129		791.50 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	429
1495.002	06/30/2021	169	P	129		240.90 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	440
1495.002	07/31/2021	169	P	129		25.32 Research - Westlaw Research Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	446
1495.002	08/31/2021	169	P	129		22.64 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	456
1495.002	10/31/2021	169	P	129		39.17 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	461
1495.002	11/30/2021	169	P	129		2.70 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	463
1495.002	11/30/2021	169	P	129		252.45 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	464
1495.002	12/31/2021	169	P	129		61.50 Research - Westlaw Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	467
1495.002	01/31/2022	169	P	129		49.03 Research - Westlaw Charges	473

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 129 Research -							
1495.002	02/28/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	479
1495.002	04/30/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	491
1495.002	05/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	494
1495.002	05/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	495
1495.002	06/30/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	499
1495.002	06/30/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	500
1495.002	07/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	503
1495.002	07/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	504
1495.002	07/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Westlaw Charges	505
1495.002	08/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - August 2022 Westlaw Charges	507
1495.002	08/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - August 2022 Westlaw Charges	508
1495.002	09/30/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - September 2022 Westlaw charges	515
1495.002	09/30/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - September 2022 Westlaw Charges	516
1495.002	10/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - October 2022 Westlaw Charges	520
1495.002	10/31/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - October 2022 Westlaw Charges	521
1495.002	11/30/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - November 2022 Westlaw Charges	525
1495.002	12/22/2022	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Pacer Statement 4658651-Q32022 (BMO Mastercard)	532
1495.002	02/28/2023	169	P	129		Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Research - Thomson Reuters - February 2023 Westlaw Charges	536
Total for Tcode 129					Billable	8,224.26	Research -
Tcode 133 Outside Copy Service -							
1495.002	07/11/2019	169	P	133		Outside Copy Service - Flinn Milligan CA Secretary of State Archives Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	47

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 133 Outside Copy Service -								
1495.002	11/27/2019	169	P	133		18.79	Outside Copy Service - Hannah Fernandez FedEx Office Gender Wage Gap	133
1495.002	05/17/2021	7	P	133		758.40	Outside Copy Service - 04/13/21 Nat'l Archives SeaFRC (BMO Mastercard) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	436
Total for Tcode 133					Billable	951.69	Outside Copy Service -	
Tcode 137 Mediation Expenses -								
1495.002	06/11/2021	169	P	137		10,000.00	Mediation Expenses - Ortman Mediation, Inc. Invoice No 2516 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	432
1495.002	08/11/2021	169	P	137		5,000.00	Mediation Expenses - Ortman Mediations, Inc. Invoice No 2546 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	451
Total for Tcode 137					Billable	15,000.00	Mediation Expenses -	
Tcode 138 Experts -								
1495.002	07/23/2020	169	P	138		1,955.00	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. Doc Review and Data Request Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	178
1495.002	10/01/2020	169	P	138		507.92	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	186
1495.002	01/20/2021	169	P	138		4,400.00	Experts - The Dunnette Group, Ltd. Invoice No 608 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	198
1495.002	02/24/2021	169	P	138		2,500.00	Experts - EmployStats Partners LLC Retainer Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	406
1495.002	03/01/2021	169	P	138		1,677.08	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	408
1495.002	03/01/2021	169	P	138		4,687.50	Experts - EmployStats Consulting Partners Invoice No 1195 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	409
1495.002	03/31/2021	169	P	138		2,223.33	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D Consulting 3/5/21-3/29/21 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	415
1495.002	04/13/2021	169	P	138		9,300.00	Experts - EmployStats Consulting Partners Invoice No 1215 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	420
1495.002	05/26/2021	169	P	138		20,896.25	Experts - EmployStats Consulting Partners Invoice No 1238 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	425
1495.002	06/01/2021	169	P	138		3,181.67	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. 4/2/21-4/30/21 Consulting Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	426
1495.002	06/01/2021	169	P	138		9,382.08	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. 5/3/21-5/31/21 Consulting Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	427
1495.002	06/09/2021	169	P	138		23,237.50	Experts - The Dunnette Group, Ltd. Invoice No 615 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	430
1495.002	06/30/2021	169	P	138		6,142.92	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. June 2021 Data analysis; report draft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	439
1495.002	07/19/2021	169	P	138		12,183.75	Experts - EmployStats Consulting Partners Invoice No 1289 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	447

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 138 Experts -								
1495.002	08/02/2021	169	P	138		1,245.83	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. 7/9/21-7/26/21 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	445
1495.002	09/09/2021	169	P	138		5,225.00	Experts - The Dunnette Group, Ltd. Invoice No 622 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	457
1495.002	11/01/2021	169	P	138		2,041.25	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. 8/6/21-10/29/21 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	460
1495.002	11/30/2021	169	P	138		4,274.00	Experts - Econ One Research Invoice No 21004 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	466
1495.002	12/01/2021	169	P	138		1,322.50	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D November Consulting Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	462
1495.002	12/31/2021	169	P	138		825.00	Experts - The Dunnette Group, Ltd. Expert Witness Work December 2021 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	465
1495.002	12/31/2021	169	P	138		15,915.00	Experts - Econ One Research Invoice No 21152 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	469
1495.002	12/31/2021	169	P	138		2,817.50	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. December 2021 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	470
1495.002	02/28/2022	169	P	138		1,878.33	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D February 2022 Consulting Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	478
1495.002	03/07/2022	169	P	138		2,836.50	Experts - Econ One Research Invoice No 21376 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	480
1495.002	03/21/2022	169	P	138		18,153.50	Experts - Econ One Research Invoice No 21258 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	481
1495.002	03/21/2022	169	P	138		11,361.00	Experts - Econ One Research Invoice No 20886 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	482
1495.002	03/28/2022	169	P	138		2,475.00	Experts - The Dunnette Group, Ltd. Invoice No 632 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	487
1495.002	03/30/2022	169	P	138		3,152.92	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. 12/27/21-1/13/22 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	488
1495.002	06/30/2022	169	P	138		2,520.42	Experts - David Neumark May/June Consulting Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	498
1495.002	06/30/2022	169	P	138		10,348.00	Experts - Econ One Invoice No 22041 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	501
1495.002	07/31/2022	169	P	138		920.00	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. July 2022 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	502
1495.002	07/31/2022	169	P	138		4,107.00	Experts - Econ One Invoice No 22157 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	506
1495.002	09/13/2022	169	P	138		3,951.00	Experts - Econ One Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	509
1495.002	09/30/2022	169	P	138		412.08	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. September 2022 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	512
1495.002	09/30/2022	169	P	138		2,338.33	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. August 2022 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	513

Client	Trans Date	Tkpr	H P	Tcode/ Task Code	Stmt # Rate	Amount		Ref #
Tcode 138 Experts -								
1495.002	10/31/2022	169	P	138		105.42	Experts - David Neumark, Ph.D. October 2022 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	519
1495.002	12/01/2022	169	P	138		1,812.50	Experts - David Neumark Ph.D. October/November 2022 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	523
1495.002	01/03/2023	169	P	138		1,625.00	Experts - David Neumark Ph.D. December 2022 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	533
1495.002	02/07/2023	169	P	138		604.17	Experts - David Neumark Ph.D. January 2023 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	535
Total for Tcode 138					Billable	204,542.25	Experts -	
Tcode 139 Experts -								
1495.002	10/11/2022	169	P	139		2,057.50	Experts - Econ One Invoice No. 22533 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	518
1495.002	11/08/2022	169	P	139		457.50	Experts - Econ One Invoice No. 22721 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	522
1495.002	12/10/2022	169	P	139		8,579.00	Experts - Econ One Invoice # 22940 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	524
1495.002	01/09/2023	169	P	139		4,653.00	Experts - Econ One Invoice # 23017 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	534
Total for Tcode 139					Billable	15,747.00	Experts -	
Tcode 140 Outsource Service								
1495.002	07/14/2021	169	P	140		5,397.61	Outsource Service Class Action Administration LLC Invoice No 151758 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	444
1495.002	01/12/2022	169	P	140		1,280.63	Outsource Service U.S. Legal Support Invoice No 20220080583-11 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	468
Total for Tcode 140					Billable	6,678.24	Outsource Service	
Tcode 142 Photocopying/Printing Charges								
1495.002	02/24/2020	598	P	142	0.100	2.20	Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	139
1495.002	02/24/2020	598	P	142	0.100	1.70	Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	140
1495.002	02/24/2020	598	P	142	0.100	2.00	Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	141
1495.002	02/24/2020	598	P	142	0.100	1.70	Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	142
1495.002	02/24/2020	598	P	142	0.100	1.70	Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	143
1495.002	02/24/2020	598	P	142	0.100	0.50	Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	144
1495.002	02/24/2020	598	P	142	0.100	1.60	Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	145

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 142 Photocopying/Printing Charges								
1495.002	02/26/2020	598	P	142	0.100	1.90	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	146
1495.002	02/26/2020	598	P	142	0.100	1.30	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	147
1495.002	02/28/2020	598	P	142	0.100	2.20	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	148
1495.002	02/28/2020	598	P	142	0.100	1.40	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	149
1495.002	02/28/2020	598	P	142	0.100	3.00	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	150
1495.002	02/28/2020	598	P	142	0.100	3.50	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	151
1495.002	02/28/2020	598	P	142	0.100	0.70	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	152
1495.002	06/23/2021	598	P	142	0.100	0.10	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap	437
1495.002	06/23/2021	598	P	142	0.100	0.10	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Photocopying/Printing Charges Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	438
Total for Tcode 142					Billable	25.60	Photocopying/Printing Charges	
Tcode 143 Deposition/Transcript Costs -								
1495.002	05/08/2019	169	P	143		14.40	Deposition/Transcript Costs - Raynee Mercado, CSR Gender Wage Gap	14
1495.002	06/28/2019	169	P	143		575.00	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs - TSG Reporting, Inc. Invoice No 693982 Gender Wage Gap	44
1495.002	07/16/2019	169	P	143		124.02	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs - Esquire Deposition Solutions, LLC Invoice No INV1519290 Gender Wage Gap	71
1495.002	09/09/2019	7	P	143		747.60	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs - TSG Reporting, Inc. Invoice No 671709 Gender Wage Gap	435
1495.002	09/10/2020	169	P	143		1,024.50	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs - TSG Reporting, Inc. Invoice No 2027415 Gender Wage Gap	184
1495.002	09/11/2020	169	P	143		1,527.00	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs - TSG Reporting, Inc. Invoice No 2027508.1 Gender Wage Gap	185
1495.002	10/22/2020	169	P	143		1,541.80	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs - TSG Reporting, Inc. Invoice No 2030395.1 Gender Wage Gap	192
1495.002	01/17/2022	169	P	143		2,535.00	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs - U.S. Legal Support Invoice No 20220082699-11 Gender Wage Gap	471
1495.002	01/19/2022	169	P	143		2,495.68	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Deposition/Transcript Costs -	472

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 143 Deposition/Transcript Costs -								
							Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
Total for Tcode 143					Billable	10,585.00	Deposition/Transcript Costs -	
Tcode 150 Airfare for								
1495.002	03/07/2019	169	P	150		218.98	Airfare for Caleb Marker 03/15/19 Southwest Airlines (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	8
1495.002	05/30/2019	169	P	150		171.96	Airfare for Flinn Milligan 05/22/19 LA to San Jose CA to LA Southwest Airlines Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	17
1495.002	06/05/2019	169	P	150		339.96	Airfare for Caleb Marker 06/28/19 Southwest Airlines Los Angeles CA to San Jose CA Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	23
1495.002	06/11/2019	169	P	150		217.96	Airfare for Hannah Fernandez 06/27/19 Jet Blue Round Trip Long Beach CA to San Jose CA Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	24
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	150		32.00	Airfare for Caleb Marker 06/27/19 Southwest Los Angeles CA to San Jose CA Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	32
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	150		20.00	Airfare for Caleb Marker 06/28/19 Hyatt Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	42
1495.002	08/08/2019	169	P	150		391.96	Airfare for Caleb Marker 08/08/19 Southwest Airlines Los Angeles CA to San Jose CA Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	57
1495.002	08/08/2019	169	P	150		5.60	Airfare for Caleb Marker Southwest Airlines Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	68
1495.002	08/08/2019	169	P	150		45.75	Airfare for Caleb Marker Southwest Airlines Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	69
1495.002	08/13/2019	169	P	150		119.98	Airfare for Caleb Marker Delta Airlines Los Angeles CA to Minneapolis MN Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	59
1495.002	09/27/2019	169	P	150		432.36	Airfare for Caleb Marker Southwest Airlines Roundtrip Los Angeles CA to San Jose CA Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	91
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	150		123.98	Airfare for Flinn Milligan Southwest Airlines Los Angeles CA to San Jose CA Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	97
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	150		124.98	Airfare for Flinn Milligan Southwest Airlines San Francisco CA to Los Angeles CA Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	98
1495.002	02/11/2020	169	P	150		229.96	Airfare for Caleb Marker Southwest Airlines Roundtrip LAX to SJC Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	137
1495.002	02/14/2020	169	P	150		465.96	Airfare for Caleb Marker Southwest Airlines Roundtrip LAX to SJC Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	138
1495.002	10/11/2022	169	P	150		530.97	Airfare for Caleb Marker to and from San Jose 10/20/2022 Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	517

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 150 Airfare for								
Total for Tcode 150					Billable	3,472.36	Airfare for	
Tcode 151 Lodging for								
1495.002	03/07/2019	169	P	151		769.07	Lodging for Caleb Marker 03/14/19 Westin (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	9
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	151		289.39	Lodging for Caleb Marker 06/27/19 Hyatt Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	33
1495.002	08/08/2019	169	P	151		273.78	Lodging for Caleb Marker Hyatt House Santa Clara Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	64
1495.002	08/13/2019	169	P	151		514.00	Lodging for Caleb Marker Hyatt Grand Hotel Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	58
Total for Tcode 151					Billable	1,846.24	Lodging for	
Tcode 152 Business meals for								
1495.002	07/01/2019	169	P	152		27.16	Business meals for Flinn Milligan 06/28/19 LAX Coffee Bean Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	31
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	152		16.67	Business meals for Caleb Marker 06/27/19 Uber Eats Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	34
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	152		30.18	Business meals for Caleb Marker 06/30/19 Hudson Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	40
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	152		116.05	Business meals for Caleb Marker 06/27/19 Paper Plane Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	41
1495.002	08/09/2019	169	P	152		7.10	Business meals for Caleb Marker Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	65
1495.002	08/09/2019	169	P	152		23.00	Tres Gringos Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	66
1495.002	08/11/2019	169	P	152		31.82	Business meals for Caleb Marker LAX Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	88
1495.002	08/11/2019	169	P	152		13.78	Business meals for Caleb Marker Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	89
1495.002	08/16/2019	169	P	152		27.53	Business meals for Caleb Marker Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	90
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	152		3.70	Business meals for Flinn Milligan Starbucks Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	114
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	152		14.15	Business meals for Flinn Milligan Back A Yard Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	115
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	152		2.90	Business meals for Flinn Milligan Coffee Bean & Tea Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	116
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	152		4.65	Business meals for Flinn Milligan Starbucks Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	117
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	152		1.29	Business meals for Flinn Milligan Delmas Market Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	118
1495.002	10/19/2019	169	P	152		3.90	Business meals for Flinn Milligan Bun Mee SFO Gender Wage Gap	113

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 152 Business meals for								
1495.002	08/25/2020	169	P	152		66.76	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Business meals for Flinn Milligan Gender Wage Gap	180
1495.002	08/27/2020	169	P	152		19.27	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Business meals for Flinn Milligan Chipotle Gender Wage Gap	181
1495.002	10/01/2020	169	P	152		48.18	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Business meals for 09/01/20 DoorDash (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	188
Total for Tcode 152					Billable	458.09	Business meals for	
Tcode 154 Ground transportation for								
1495.002	07/01/2019	169	P	154		36.86	Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan 06/28/19 Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	28
1495.002	07/01/2019	169	P	154		30.49	Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan 06/28/19 Uber Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	29
1495.002	07/01/2019	169	P	154		18.01	Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan 06/28/19 Uber Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	30
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	154		28.38	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker 06/27/19 Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	35
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	154		50.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker 06/28/19 Taxi Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	37
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	154		40.55	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker 06/28/19 Uber Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	38
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	154		21.48	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker 06/28/19 Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	39
1495.002	08/08/2019	169	P	154		16.85	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	60
1495.002	08/08/2019	169	P	154		5.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	61
1495.002	08/09/2019	169	P	154		19.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	62
1495.002	08/09/2019	169	P	154		5.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	63
1495.002	08/09/2019	169	P	154		15.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	67
1495.002	08/09/2019	169	P	154		5.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	85
1495.002	08/11/2019	169	P	154		15.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	86
1495.002	08/11/2019	169	P	154		13.00	Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Lyft Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	87
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	154		10.50	Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan San Jose Diridon Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	120
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	154		31.30	Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan Lyft Gender Wage Gap	121

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>		<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 154 Ground transportation for								
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	154		22.34	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan Lyft Gender Wage Gap	123
1495.002	10/18/2019	169	P	154		28.10	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan Uber Gender Wage Gap	125
1495.002	10/19/2019	169	P	154		36.22	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan Lyft Gender Wage Gap	122
1495.002	10/19/2019	169	P	154		14.78	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Ground transportation for Flinn Milligan Lyft Gender Wage Gap	124
1495.002	10/24/2019	169	P	154		118.83	Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Ground transportation for Caleb Marker Uber Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	103
Total for Tcode 154					Billable	581.69	Ground transportation for	
Tcode 155 Parking charges for								
1495.002	10/19/2019	169	P	155		80.00	Parking charges for Flinn Milligan LAX Parking Lot Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	119
Total for Tcode 155					Billable	80.00	Parking charges for	
Tcode 156 Miscellaneous travel expenses for								
1495.002	07/10/2019	169	P	156		8.00	Miscellaneous travel expenses for Caleb Marker 06/28/19 Southwest Airlines WiFi Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	36
Total for Tcode 156					Billable	8.00	Miscellaneous travel expenses for	
Tcode 162 Business meals for								
1495.002	11/01/2020	169	P	162		32.43	Business meals for 10/05/20 Whole Foods Depo Lunch (CLM Amex) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	196
Total for Tcode 162					Billable	32.43	Business meals for	
Tcode 182 Office Supplies -								
1495.002	08/20/2019	169	P	182		6.00	Office Supplies - Caleb Marker Amazon Wage Book Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	99
1495.002	09/25/2019	169	P	182		6.56	Office Supplies - Caleb Marker Amazon Wage Book Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	100
1495.002	09/26/2019	169	P	182		129.75	Office Supplies - Caleb Marker Amazon Wage Book Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	101
1495.002	10/01/2019	169	P	182		12.00	Office Supplies - Caleb Marker Amazon Wage Book Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	102
Total for Tcode 182					Billable	154.31	Office Supplies -	
Tcode 199 Payment - Thank You								
1495.002	10/28/2019		P	199		2,500.00	Payment - Thank You Lockridge Ck#599584 (expert Henry Farber) Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	1
1495.002	02/16/2021		P	199		40,000.00	Payment - Thank You Lockridge Grindal Nauen PLLP Ck#601381 Assessment	2

<u>Client</u>	<u>Trans Date</u>	<u>Tkpr</u>	<u>H P</u>	<u>Tcode/ Task Code</u>	<u>Stmt # Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Ref #</u>
Tcode 199 Payment - Thank You							
1495.002	08/03/2021		P	199		50,000.00	3
						Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Payment - Thank You Lockridge Grindal Nauen PLLP Ck#601966	
1495.002	10/07/2021		P	199		5,000.00	4
						Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Payment - Thank You Ortman Mediation, Inc. Ck#1517 Refund for Lockridge duplicate payment	
1495.002	12/22/2021		P	199		15,000.00	5
						Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE) Payment - Thank You Lockridge Grindal Nauen PLLP Ck#602437	
						Gender Wage Gap Hewlett Packard Enterprise (HPE)	
Total for Tcode 199					Billable	0.00	Payment - Thank You
					Payments	112,500.00	
GRAND TOTALS							
					Billable	274,235.29	
					Payments	112,500.00	