1	NELSON E. ROTH, SBN 67350 ner3@cornell.edu					
2	CORNELL UNIVERSITY 300 CCC Building					
3	Garden Avenue Ithaca, New York 14853-2601					
4	Telephone: (607)255-5124					
5	Facsimile: (607)255-2794					
6	BERT H. DEIXLER, SBN 70614 bdeixler@proskauer.com					
7	CLIFFORD S. DAVIDSON, SBN 246119 cdavidson@proskauer.com					
8	PROSKAUER ROSE LLP 2049 Century Park East, 32nd Floor					
9	Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206 Telephone: (310) 557-2900					
10	Facsimile: (310) 557-2193					
11	Attorneys for Defendant, CORNELL UNIVERSITY					
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
13						
14	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
15	KEVIN VANGINDEREN,	) Case No. 07-CV-2045 BTM(JMA)				
16	Plaintiff,	) ) ) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND ) AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF				
17	v.					
18	CORNELL UNIVERSITY,	) CORNELL'S MOTION FOR ) ATTORNEYS' FEES				
19	Defendant.	)				
20		) [Per chambers, no oral argument unless ) requested by the Court]				
21		) [Notice of Motion and Motion, Declarations				
22		) of Bert H. Deixler and Clifford S. Davidson, ) and [Proposed] Order filed concurrently				
23		) herewith]				
24		) Hearing Date: August 22, 2008 ) Time: 11:00 a.m.				
25		) Place: Courtroom 15				
26		) Action Filed: October 1, 2007				
27						
28						

1	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES					
2	In its June 3, 2008 Order Granting Special Motion to Strike (the "Order"), the Court note					
3	In conclusion, Cornell's special motion to strike is granted in its entirety As the prevailing party on the motion to strike, Cornell					
4 5	is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.26(c). The amount of the attorney's fees shall be determined upon motion by Cornell Any motion for attorney's					
6	fees must be brought within 30 days of this order.					
7	Order at 9-10. As documented in Exhibit A to the concurrently filed Declaration of Clifford S.					
	Davidson ("Davidson Declaration"), <sup>1</sup> Cornell incurred 150.50 hours in attorneys' fees in bringing					
8	and winning its anti-SLAPP motion, and 15.75 hours preparing its Bill of Costs and Motion for					
9	Attorneys' Fees. A chart summarizing these fees is attached hereto as Exhibit B. A chart					
10	summarizing the time Cornell spent drafting its Bill of Costs and Motion for Attorneys' Fees					
11	Based upon the hours reflected in the Davidson Declaration, and the \$350/hour flat rate charged to					
12						
13						
14	Declaration"), Cornell respectfully requests that the Court award to Cornell attorneys' fees in the					
15	amount of \$65,561.25.					
16	The \$65,561.25 figure is based on the number of hours worked by Cornell's attorneys on					
17	the anti-SLAPP motion multiplied by the rates of those attorneys. "District courts must calculate					
18	awards for attorneys' fees using the 'lodestar method The 'lodestar' is calculated by					
19						
20						
21	<sup>1</sup> Exhibit A is a collection of all bills sent to Cornell, prepared with the assistance of Proskauer's					
22	Accounting Department. Davidson Decl. ¶ 3. Exhibit A is sufficient to support this motion. See					
23	Frank Music Corp. v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc., 886 F.2d 1545, 1557 (9th Cir. 1989) (holding					
24	timesheets not per se required if other documentation presented).					
25	$^{2}$ Cornell is antitled to both its feas in pressource the anti-SLAPD motion and the feas it incurred					
26	<sup>2</sup> Cornell is entitled to both its fees in prosecuting the anti-SLAPP motion and the fees it incurred					
27	in applying for costs and fees. See Ketchum v. Moses, 24 Cal. 4th 1122, 1131 (2001) (holding the					
28	fee award in anti-SLAPP cases "should ordinarily include compensation for <i>all</i> the hours					
	reasonably spent, including those relating solely to the fee.").					
/ /59v	1 07-cv-2045 BTM(JMA)					

1 multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party reasonably expended on the litigation by a 2 reasonable hourly rate." Camacho v. Bridgeport Fin. Inc., 523 F.3d 973, 978 (9th Cir. 2008); see 3 also Espinoza v. City of Imperial, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45611, \*16-17 (S.D. Cal. June 6, 2008) 4 ("The lodestar method applies to the determination of a proper attorneys' fees award for an Anti-5 SLAPP prevailing party."). "The amount awarded must be reasonable, and it must also adequately 6 compensate the [prevailing party] for the expense of responding to a baseless suit." Silverstein v. 7 E360insight, LLC, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36858, \*22 (C.D. Cal. May 5, 2008) (internal 8 quotations and citations omitted) (awarding attorneys' fees on anti-SLAPP motion). "A 9 reasonable hourly rate is that prevailing in the community for similar work." Kearney v. Foley & 10 Lardner, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21115, \*12 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2008) (awarding fees to 11 defendant prevailing in anti-SLAPP motion). The reasonableness of a fees award is "to be 12 determined from a consideration of such factors as the nature of the litigation, the complexity of 13 the issues, the experience and expertise of counsel and the amount of time involved." Id. 14 As described in the Deixler Declaration, the rates charged by Proskauer attorneys to 15 Cornell are consistent with (and in fact lower than) prevailing rates among attorneys of similar 16 caliber, education and experience in the community. Deixler Decl. ¶ 12, 13. Further, Cornell's 17 \$65,561.25 request is reasonable and consistent with awards for successful defendants in other 18 anti-SLAPP cases. For example, in Premier Medical, the California Court of Appeal affirmed an 19 award of \$165,000 in attorneys' fees to a defendant in that case after successful prosecution of an 20 anti-SLAPP motion. 163 Cal. App. 4th at 556. Cornell also does not seek fees for the time 21 expended by Nelson E. Roth, Esq. and other lawyers and legal assistants in Cornell's Office of

22 General Counsel.

23

The work of Cornell's attorneys was not duplicative and was necessary to advance several 24 complex legal arguments, such as the application of the single publication rule to the digitization 25 of the Cornell library's newspaper archive and the effect of the discovery rule in tolling statutes of 26 limitations in defamation cases. While Cornell does not seek an enhancement of fees based on the 27 complexity of its anti-SLAPP motion, such complexity more than justifies the time that 28 Proskauer's attorneys spent advocating on behalf of their client and indicates that Cornell's fee

2

07-cv-2045 BTM(JMA)

1	1 request is reasonable. <i>See Premier Medical</i> , 163 Cal. App. at 558 (noting, in anti-SLAPP of					
2	uding (1) the					
3	3 novelty and difficulty of the questions involved ").					
4	For the foregoing reasons, Cornell respe	For the foregoing reasons, Cornell respectfully requests that the Court award to Cornell				
5						
6						
7						
8	DATED: July 2, 2008	NELSON E. ROTH CORNELL UNIVERSIT	Y			
9		BERT H. DEIXLER				
10		CLIFFORD S. DAVIDSO PROSKAUER ROSE LL				
11						
12		/s/ Clifford S. Davidson Clifford S.	n Davidson			
13		Attorneys for Defendant,				
14		CORNELL UNIVERSIT	Y			
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
8085/21177-001		3	07-cv-2045 BTM(JMA)			
Current/11484759v						