1 2 3 4	ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP MICHAEL W. BIEN, Bar No. 96891 ERNEST GALVAN, Bar No. 196065 JANE E. KAHN, Bar No. 112239 LISA ELLS, Bar No. 243657 315 Montgomery Street, 10th Floor	PRISON LAW OFFICE DONALD SPECTER, Bar No. 83925 STEVEN FAMA, Bar No. 99641 1917 Fifth Street Berkeley, California 94710-1916 Telephone: (510) 280-2621
5	San Francisco, California 94104-1823 Telephone: (415) 433-6830	
6	K&L GATES LLP	BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN, LLP
7	JEFFREY L. BORNSTEIN, Bar No. 99358 EDWARD P. SANGSTER, Bar No. 121041	WARREN E. GEORGE, Bar No. 53588 Three Embarcadero Center
8	4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1200 San Francisco, California 94111-5994	San Francisco, California 94111-4067 Telephone: (415) 393-2000
9	Telephone: (415) 882-8200	
10	THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY – EMPLOYMENT LAW CENTER	
11	CLAUDIA CENTER, Bar No. 158255 600 Harrison Street, Suite 120	
12	San Francisco, California 94107-1389 Telephone: (415) 864-8848	
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
14		
15	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	FOR THE EASTERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17	FOR THE EASTERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17 18	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRIBUTION FOR THE EASTERN FOR T	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM
17 18 19		Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING
17 18 19 20	RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM  STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING PARALEGAL AND LITIGATION ASSISTANT RATES DISPUTE FOR 2008
17 18 19 20 21	RALPH COLEMAN, et al., Plaintiffs,	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM  STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING PARALEGAL AND LITIGATION
17 18 19 20	RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,  Plaintiffs,  v.	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM  STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING PARALEGAL AND LITIGATION ASSISTANT RATES DISPUTE FOR 2008
17 18 19 20 21 22	RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,  Plaintiffs,  v.  EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM  STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING PARALEGAL AND LITIGATION ASSISTANT RATES DISPUTE FOR 2008
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,  Plaintiffs,  v.  EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM  STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING PARALEGAL AND LITIGATION ASSISTANT RATES DISPUTE FOR 2008
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,  Plaintiffs,  v.  EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM  STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING PARALEGAL AND LITIGATION ASSISTANT RATES DISPUTE FOR 2008
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,  Plaintiffs,  v.  EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,  Defendants.  1	Case No. CIV S 90-520 LKK-JFM  STIPULATION RE: OUTSTANDING PARALEGAL AND LITIGATION ASSISTANT RATES DISPUTE FOR 2008

On August 30, 2010, the parties stipulated that they would meet and confer regarding the hourly rate for paralegals and certain other litigation assistants within 10 days after the mandate issued in the *Perez v. Cate* appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. (Docket No. 3906). That mandate issued on February 4, 2011, and the parties thereafter agreed to extend the deadline to meet and confer on this issue through February 22, 2011. The parties thereafter met and conferred and hereby stipulate to the following:

- 1. This stipulation applies to past due amounts for work performed by paralegals and litigation assistants during the years 2008 and 2009. During this period, defendants compensated plaintiffs at an interim hourly rate of \$135 for all work performed by paralegals and litigation assistants during 2008 and the first and second quarters of 2009. For the third quarter, defendants compensated plaintiffs at a rate of \$82.50 for work performed by paralegals and litigation assistants. For the fourth quarter of 2009, defendants compensated plaintiffs at a rate of \$82.50 for work performed by paralegals, and did not compensate plaintiffs at all for work performed by litigation assistants.
- 2. The parties have reached an agreement that, in light of the Ninth Circuit decision, defendants will pay the following hourly rates for work performed by paralegals: \$169.50 for 2008, and \$170 for 2009. The parties further agree that defendants will pay the difference between these stipulated hourly rates and the interim hourly rate of either \$135 or \$82.50 already paid during the pendency of this dispute.
- 3. The parties have further agreed that defendants will pay the following hourly rates for work performed by litigation assistants: \$135 for 2008 and \$140 for 2009. The parties further agree that defendants will pay the difference between these stipulated hourly rates and the interim hourly rate of either \$135 or \$82.50 already paid during the pendency of this dispute, and will pay plaintiffs at an hourly rate of \$140 for the fourth quarter of 2009, when they did not compensate plaintiffs at all for litigation assistant time.
- 4. The parties have further agreed that defendants will pay \$2,175.82 in accrued interest related to the above-discussed outstanding fees.

- 5. Based upon the terms set forth above, for 2008 and 2009, defendants agree to pay plaintiffs' counsel \$258,224.22. This amount shall be paid within 30 days of the signing of this Order. On the 31st day following the entry of this Order, interest on any unpaid amount will begin to accrue at the rate provided by 28 U.S.C. § 1961 (i.e., the weekly average 1 year constant maturity Treasury yield for the calendar week preceding the date of the Order).
- The parties have reached this agreement solely for the purpose of settling the 6. paralegal and litigation assistant rate dispute for 2008 and 2009 in this action. The parties agree that the rates outlined in the stipulation are for settlement purposes only and cannot be introduced by either party in any other litigation regarding the reasonableness of any particular rate for any particular year.

WHEREFORE, defendants agree to pay plaintiffs' counsel \$258,224.22 within 30 days of the signing of this Order. On the 31st day following the entry of this Order, interest on any unpaid amount will begin to accrue at the rate provided by 28 U.S.C. § 1961 (i.e., the weekly average 1 year constant maturity Treasury yield for the calendar week preceding the date of the Order).

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: March 30, 2011 Respectfully submitted,

ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP

By: /s/ Lisa Ells

Lisa Ells

Attorneys for *Coleman* Plaintiffs

Dated: March 30, 2011

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: /s/ David Brice

David Brice, Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Coleman Defendants

## IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 31, 2011 SENIOR JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT