Trustees of the Ope	rating Engineers Pensic	n Trust et al v.	Western Explosives	Systems Company

1					
$\frac{1}{2}$					
3					
4					
5	UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT			
6	DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
7	***				
8	TRUSTEES OF THE OPERATING	Case No. 2:18-cv-00805-JCM-GWF			
	ENGINEERS PENSION TRUST, et al.,				
10	Plaintiffs, v.	ORDER			
11	WESTERN EXPLOSIVES SYSTEMS				
12	COMPANY,				
13	Defendant.				
14	This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Fees and Costs				
15	Request re: Motion to Compel (ECF No. 13), filed on September 13, 2018 and Plaintiffs'				
16	Memorandum in Support of Fees and Costs Request re: Motion for Order to Show Cause (ECF				
17	No. 16), filed on October 25, 2018. To date, no party has filed an opposition and the time for				
18	response has now expired.				
19	BACKGROUND				
20	On August 13, 2018, Plaintiffs filed their motion to compel (ECF No. 10) and on				
21	September 10, 2018, the Court granted their motion. See Order, (ECF No. 12). The Court				
22	ordered Defendant Western Explosives Systems Company ("WESCO") to serve its answers to				
23	Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories and responses to Request for Production no later than				
24	September 24, 2018. Defendant WESCO failed to serve its answers and responses as ordered.				
25	The Court also granted Plaintiffs' request for an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs				
26	incurred in filing its motion to compel and instructed Plaintiff to file a memorandum in support				
27	of fees and costs. Id. On September 13, 2018, Plaintiffs filed their memorandum in support of				
28	fees and costs, and on September 26, 2018, Plain				
	1				

(ECF No. 14). Defendant WESCO has not filed an opposition to either Plaintiffs' memorandum 1 2 in support of fees and costs or motion for order to show cause. On October 17, 2018 the Court granted Plaintiffs' Motion for Order to Show Cause (ECF No. 15) and order Defendants to show 3 cause, in writing why sanctions should not be imposed for failure to comply with this Court's 4 5 Order. The Court further instructed Plaintiff to file another memorandum in support of fees and costs associated with brining the motion for an order to show cause. See Order, (ECF No. 15). 6

7

DISCUSSION

The Supreme Court has held that reasonable attorney fees must "be calculated according 8 9 to the prevailing market rates in the relevant community," considering the fees charged by 10 "lawyers of reasonably comparable skill, experience, and reputation." *Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 895-96 n. 11, 104 S.Ct. 1541 (1984). Courts typically use a two-step process when 11 12 determining fee awards. Fischer v. SJB-P.D. Inc., 214 F.3d 1115, 1119 (9th Cir. 2000). First, the 13 Court must calculate the lodestar amount "by taking the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation and multiplying it by a reasonable hourly rate." Id. Furthermore, other factors should 14 15 be taken into consideration such as special skill, experience of counsel, and the results obtained. Morales v. City of San Rafael, 96 F.3d 359, 364 n. 9 (9th Cir. 1996). "The party seeking an award 16 of fees should submit evidence supporting the hours worked and rates claimed . . . [w]here the 17 18 documentation of hours is inadequate, the district court may reduce the award accordingly." 19 Hensley v. Eckerhart, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). Second, the Court "may adjust the lodestar, [only 20 on rare and exceptional occasions], upward or downward using a multiplier based on factors not 21 subsumed in the initial calculation of the lodestar." Van Gerwen v. Guarantee Mut. Life Co., 214 22

F.3d 1041, 1045 (9th Cir. 2000).

Plaintiffs' request attorney's fees in the amount of $$5,383.00^{1}$ for time expended in the 23 24 matter as well \$35.31 for costs related to the motion to compel, motion for order to show cause 25 and preparation of the memorandums in support of fees and costs against WESCO for a total of \$5,418.31. The amount is based on work performed by Michael A. Urban, Esq., Nathan R. Ring, 26

27

¹ This number represents the combined total of attorney's fees requested in both Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support 28 of Fees and Costs (ECF No. 13) and Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Fees and Costs (ECF No. 15).

1	Esq. and at an hourly rate of \$360.00 and work performed by April Denni paralegal employed by				
2	Plaintiffs' counsel's office, at an hourly rate of \$110.00. After reviewing Plaintiffs' counsel's				
3	affidavits and itemized billing entries, the Court finds that \$\$5,418.31 for fees and costs to				
4	prepare Plaintiffs motions and memorandums is excessive. The Court finds the hours involved				
5	in preparing Plaintiffs motions and memorandums and labor related to such motions should take				
6	no more than 13.5 hours of attorney labor. Therefore, the Court will reduce Plaintiffs' attorney's				
7	fees request by \$648.00 to a total of \$4,735.00. As a result, the Court will award reasonable				
8	attorney's fees in the amount of \$4,735.00 and costs in the amount of \$35.31 for a total of				
9	\$4,770.31. Accordingly,				
10	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant WESCO shall pay Plaintiff \$4,770.31 in				
11	attorney's fees and costs.				
12	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that WESCO is to make the payment to Plaintiffs no later				
13	than December 13, 2018 unless an objection is filed.				
14	Dated this 14th day of November, 2018.				
15	George Foley Jr.				
16	GEODGE FOLEV ID				
17	GEORGE FOLEY, JR. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	3				
	1				