

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
O2 MICRO INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,  
Defendant.

No. C 08-4567 CW  
  
ORDER GRANTING  
MPS' MOTION FOR  
ATTORNEYS' FEES  
AND NON-TAXABLE  
COSTS

\_\_\_\_\_  
O2 MICRO INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,  
Counterclaimant,  
v.  
MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.;  
ASUSTEK COMPUTER INC.; ASUSTEK  
COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL AMERICA;  
BENQ CORPORATION; AND BENQ AMERICA  
CORP.,  
Counterclaim-Defendants

Plaintiffs and Counterclaim-Defendants Monolithic Power  
Systems, Inc., Asustek Computer and ASUS Computer International  
(together, MPS) have recalculated their attorneys' fees request in  
accordance with the Court's January 17, 2012 Order. Defendant and  
Counterclaimant O2 Micro International Limited (O2 Micro) has  
filed a response and MPS has filed a reply. The matter was taken

1 under submission on the papers. Having read all the papers filed  
2 by the parties, the Court approves MPS' recalculation of its  
3 attorneys' fees and awards attorneys' fees in the amount of  
4 \$8,419,429 and non-taxable costs in the amount of \$663,151.

5 BACKGROUND

6 In its January 17, 2012 Order Regarding Attorneys' Fees and  
7 Non-Taxable Costs, the Court granted MPS' request for non-taxable  
8 costs in the amount of \$663,151 and ordered MPS to recalculate its  
9 attorneys' fees request in accordance with the Court's  
10 determination. The Order (1) limited the recovery of fees for the  
11 legal services of the Finnegan firm to \$4,000,000 for work done  
12 after March 2009, in accordance with a fee cap agreement between  
13 Finnegan and MPS; (2) limited the recovery for fees corresponding  
14 to block-billed time entries to twenty-five percent of those fees;  
15 and (3) granted MPS leave to file an additional fee application  
16 for work done in preparation of the fee application.  
17  
18  
19

20 ///

21  
22 ///

23  
24 ///

25  
26  
27 ///

28

MPS recalculated its fee request as follows:

Fees generated by the Fish and Richardson (FR) firm	\$ 281,162
Fees generated by the Latham firm	\$3,455,333
Fees generated by the Finnegan firm prior to the March 2009 fee cap agreement	\$ 339,899
Fees generated by the Finnegan firm after the March 2009 fee cap agreement	\$4,000,000
Fees generated in preparing attorneys' fees application	\$ 343,035
Total Attorneys' Fees	\$8,419,429 <sup>1</sup>
Non-taxable costs	\$ 663,151
Total Fees and Non-taxable Costs Request	\$9,082,580

MPS clarifies that all fees requested have been discounted by ten percent, as was assumed by the Court in the January 17, 2012 Order. MPS documents the recalculated amounts with new spreadsheets of billing records for the Finnegan and Latham firms adhering to the Court's instructions in the January 17, 2012 Order. MPS has separated its billing records into work performed by the Finnegan firm and work performed by the Latham firm, including the work performed in preparing the fee application. The billing records show that Finnegan provided \$6,445,862 in legal services after March 2009, but, in keeping with the Court's directive, MPS is calculating reimbursement of \$4,000,000. MPS

---

<sup>1</sup> MPS indicates that the subtotal is \$8,423,129. This appears to be an error; the Court calculates the subtotal to be \$8,419,429.

1 has also provided a separate category for all the block-billed  
2 time entries it previously identified and, in keeping with the  
3 Court's directive, has calculated reimbursement of twenty-five  
4 percent of the total amount. MPS explains that the new reports  
5 "reflect the specific rates assigned to each time keeper at the  
6 time each entry was made. (The rates on the original spreadsheet,  
7 and therefore on the initial reports, reflected billing rates for  
8 each particular individual that were the result of averaging the  
9 individual's rates for 2009 and 2010)."

11 MPS also requests an award of interest at the legal rate on  
12 the amount of \$9,082,580 from March 3, 2011, the day the Court  
13 granted its motion for attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C.  
14 § 285. 02 Micro objects on several grounds to MPS' re-calculation  
15 of its fees.

#### 17 DISCUSSION

##### 18 I. Finnegan's Fees for Preparation of Fee Application

19 02 Micro objects to the \$249,834 for services performed by  
20 Finnegan in preparing the fee application. 02 Micro argues that  
21 this Court has held that recovery of work performed by Finnegan is  
22 limited to the \$4,000,000 fee cap negotiated between the parties  
23 on the ground that it would be inequitable to require 02 Micro to  
24 pay MPS more in fees than MPS paid to Finnegan. MPS responds that  
25 Finnegan's fees for preparing the fee application were incurred  
26 after dismissal of the 02 Micro infringement claims and, thus,  
27 were not covered by the fee cap. See Supplemental Declaration of  
28

1 Finnegan partner, Scott Mosko, at ¶ 3. MPS also asserts that it  
2 has paid the \$249,834 to Finnegan for its work on the fee  
3 application. Id. In its January 17, 2012 Order, the Court  
4 allowed MPS to submit an additional request for fees incurred in  
5 the preparation of its attorneys' fees application and did not  
6 limit the fee request to work performed by Latham. Thus, an award  
7 of these fees will not require 02 Micro to pay MPS more than MPS  
8 has paid to Finnegan. Therefore, 02 Micro's objection to the  
9 \$249,834 for Finnegan's work in preparing the fee application is  
10 overruled.  
11

## 12 II. Different Billing Rates

13 02 Micro objects to the fact that MPS has altered its  
14 attorneys' billing rates to "reflect the specific rate assigned to  
15 each time keeper at the time each entry was made." 02 Micro  
16 points out that the Court did not require MPS to revisit the issue  
17 of reasonable attorney billing rates and only instructed MPS to  
18 recalculate its fee request based on the hours allowed or  
19 disallowed. 02 Micro suggests that, to remedy this, all billing  
20 entries associated with MPS' recalculation be reduced by two  
21 percent, which amounts to \$69,107, or that MPS be required to  
22 resubmit its billing entries using the previous rates.  
23

24 MPS indicates that it used the actual rates in this fee  
25 application "to provide the Court with an even more exact  
26 accounting." MPS explains that the net effect of using the actual  
27 billing rates for the years 2009 and 2010, rather than the blended  
28

1 rates that it used in its original fee application, was to reduce  
2 the fees requested by \$6,207.

3 The Court did not require MPS to change the rates billed by  
4 each attorney. However, because the change in the billing rates  
5 is minor, it represents a more accurate picture of the attorneys'  
6 rates and it results in a reduction of total fees requested, the  
7 Court concludes that any further reduction is not warranted.  
8 Therefore, 02 Micro's objection to the change in billing rates is  
9 overruled.  
10

11 III. Unreasonable Hours in Preparing Fee Application

12 02 Micro objects to the "unreasonably high number of hours"  
13 expended in preparing the fee application and requests a twenty-  
14 five percent reduction of fees requested for work performed by  
15 Latham.<sup>2</sup> This argument is without merit. As acknowledged by 02  
16 Micro, the Court denied its previous request for a reduction in  
17 fees for preparing the fee application. The fees incurred in  
18 preparing the fee application were reasonable and necessary in  
19 light of the fact that Latham and Finnegan were required to  
20 review, analyze and summarize two years of extensive billing  
21 records. Therefore, 02 Micro's objection to the number of hours  
22 expended in preparing the fee application is overruled.  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>2</sup> As noted above, 02 Micro objects to all the fees requested  
28 for the work performed by Finnegan.

1 IV. Accrual of Post-Judgment Interest

2 02 Micro argues that MPS is not entitled to an award of  
3 interest from March 3, 2011, the day the Court granted MPS' motion  
4 for attorneys' fees, because the fees had not been quantified at  
5 that time. Citing 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a), which provides that post-  
6 judgment interest accrues from the date of entry of judgment, 02  
7 Micro argues that interest cannot accrue until the Court enters  
8 judgment as to the fee amount. 02 Micro also cites Special  
9 Devices, Inc. v. OEA, Inc., 269 F.3d 1340, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001),  
10 for the proposition that there is no final judgment regarding a  
11 fee award until the district court enters judgment as to the  
12 amount of fees.  
13

14 Special Devices is inapplicable here. It addressed the  
15 question of whether an unquantified award of attorneys' fees  
16 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 is final for purposes of conferring  
17 jurisdiction on the Federal Circuit. Id. at 1343. It did not  
18 address when interest begins to accrue on an award of attorneys'  
19 fees.  
20

21 Under 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a), interest is allowed on money  
22 judgments in civil cases recovered in a district court accruing  
23 "from the date of the entry of the judgment." Courts have  
24 interpreted this to mean that post-judgment interest is calculated  
25 "from the date of the judgment establishing the right to the  
26 award." Takeda Chem. Indus. Ltd. v. Mylab Labs., Inc., 2007 WL  
27 840368, \*14 (S.D.N.Y.) (attorneys' fees award under § 285); Mathis  
28

1 v. Spears, 857 F.2d 749, 769 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (same); Friend v.  
2 Kolodzieczak, 72 F.3d 1386, 1391-92 (9th Cir. 1995) (on attorneys'  
3 fee award under 42 U.S.C. § 1988, post-judgment interest accrues  
4 from date entitlement to fees is secured, rather than from date  
5 exact quantity of fees is set).

6 Thus, MPS is entitled to post-judgment interest on its award  
7 of attorneys' fees and non-taxable costs accruing from March 3,  
8 2011, the date the Court issued its order determining MPS'  
9 entitlement to such an award. This amount does not include the  
10 \$343,035 in attorneys' fees subsequently incurred in the  
11 preparation of the fee application, which shall accrue interest  
12 commencing on the date of this Order. Interest is to be  
13 calculated at the legal rate as set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a).

14 V. 02 Micro's Objection to Non-taxable Costs  
15

16 In its January 17, 2012 Order, the Court stated that 02 Micro  
17 had not objected to MPS' request for non-taxable costs. 02 Micro  
18 clarifies that it objected to non-taxable costs and cites to page  
19 eleven in its opposition to MPS' May 5, 2011 submission  
20 documenting fees and costs, in which 02 Micro stated, "The court  
21 has previously ruled that discovery costs not solely related to  
22 the ITC investigation are recoverable. 02 disagrees and preserves  
23 its objection for appeal, but even without challenging that  
24 decision, it is clear that fees related to work on issues that  
25 were in no way part of this case should not be awarded." 02 Micro  
26 also points to a footnote on the same page in which it stated, "02  
27  
28



1 also separately objects to any ITC Discovery costs incurred before  
2 this Court entered the order allowing parties to use ITC discovery  
3 in this case. Until that order issued, the parties' discovery  
4 efforts could not have been considered to be related to this case.  
5 Those costs total \$341,100.05."

6 The Court acknowledges that 02 Micro objects to MPS' request  
7 for non-taxable costs, but overrules the objection.

8  
9 VI. Payment of Taxable Costs

10 MPS indicates that 02 Micro has not paid the \$339,315 that  
11 was taxed as costs by the Court and requests that the Court order  
12 02 Micro to pay this amount with interest accruing from March 3,  
13 2011, the day the Court ordered 02 Micro to remit \$339,315 in  
14 taxable costs forthwith. 02 Micro does not respond to this  
15 request. Therefore, the Court orders 02 Micro immediately to pay  
16 the \$339,315 in costs previously taxed by the Court, with interest  
17 at the legal rate accruing from March 3, 2011.

18  
19 CONCLUSION

20 For the foregoing reasons, the Court awards attorneys' fees  
21 in the amount of \$8,419,429 and non-taxable costs in the amount of

22  
23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

\$663,151, with interest accruing as set forth in this Order. A separate judgment shall be entered by the Clerk of the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 5/3/2012

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge