Class Action ReportsTM

A REVIEW OF CLASS ACTION DECISIONS IN ALL AREAS OF THE LAW

Editor, Beverly C. Moore, Jr., J.D. Harvard University, 1970 Associate Editor, Stuart J. Logan, J.D. American University Washington College of Law, 1985

Volume 24, Number 2

Washington, D.C.

March-April 2003

© 2003 Class Action Reports, Inc.

Commentary

On March 27, 2003 the Supreme Court approved and sent to Congress the latest round of amendments to Rule 23, which we previously published at 23 *Class Action Rep.* 502 (2002). Except for the unlikely event that Congress affirmatively vetoes these amendments, they will take effect on December 1, 2003.

Also moving through Congress is the "Class Action Fairness Act", which would remove most class actions from state to federal courts, which are now largely packed (especially the appeals courts) with Republican judges appointed by Reagan-Bush who generally take a jaundiced eye toward class actions in particular and plaintiffs in general. As we have noted before (see 23 Class Action Rep. 149 (2002)), the handful of so-called runaway" state court class action judges (who would certify any class action) have already been or soon will be reversed and controlled by appellate and state supreme court decisions in such states as Alabama. Texas. Louisiana, and Illinois, whose Supreme Courts are not exactly populated by radical pro-plaintiff populist judges.

If Congress really wanted to reform class action procedures, it would require a Final Report to be filed in each federal class action detailing (1) the total money paid out by defendants, including whether those costs are paid by the defendant on top of damages or are deducted from the class fund before distribution to class members, and (2) the amount of that total recovery consumed by attorney fees and expenses. These figures would include notice and later settlement administration costs incurred after the main fees are awarded. Also included would be the amount of the claims made if it is a claims made settlement and the redemption rate and thus the cost to defendant of any coupons issued. Also before the Final Report, settlement proceedings and settlement notices should require mandatory best estimates of the potential trial recovery vs. the settlement amount. The latter provision in the 1995 Securities Reform Act has become a

MAY 2 7 20 Contents

LAW LIBRARY

Beverly C. Moore, Jr.

page

Class Action Bibliography 157

Class Certification in the U.S. Circuit
Courts of Appeal (2002)161

I. Introduction/Methodology 167

IV. Citations to Cases Included 198

Cite as 24 Class Action Rep. _ (2003).

dead letter, because both sides disingenuously claim that they do not know the amount. If some range of estimates is required by the facts of a particular case, so be it. But it is important for society as well as class members to know whether their case recovers ten cents on the dollar or 100 cents. Δ

EXHIBIT A

ನಾತರ ಸರಕ್ಕ

ATTORNEY FEE AWARDS IN COMMON FUND CLASS ACTIONS¹

I. Introduction and Methodology

In 1990 we published an extensive survey of fee awards in securities and antitrust class actions.² That analysis included 404 cases, representing aggregate class recoveries of \$6.3 billion for more than 2.5 million hours for which the fees were awarded. Since then, we have reported fee award data for individual cases in § 50 of each issue. Now we have an updated Survey which, unlike the 1990 Survey, includes consumer, labor, mass tort, and other types of class actions as well as securities and antitrust cases.³ The new Survey is much larger—1.120 cases, representing aggregate class recoveries of about \$41 billion for more than 5.7 million hours—although we do not have hours data for cases actually accounting for 60% of the total recoveries and 65% of the fees awarded, due to the present dominance of the percentage of recovery method for awarding fees, where no hours are reported.⁴ The data for each case is itemized in Table 1 (pp. 169-193) and is summarized for each class recovery size range as follows:

Recovery Range (\$ millions)	No. of Cases	Aggregate Class Recovery (\$ millions)	Fees & Costs as %	Atty Hrs.	Multiplier	Current Hourly Rate (in 2/03 \$)
≥ \$100m	64	28.424.575	15.1	1.940.902	4.50	1,396.21
\$75 < \$100m	26	2.232.434	20.9	450,753	3.93	1.182.15
\$50 < \$75m	37	2.168,715	23.6	692,429	2.75	803.40
S30 < S50m	67	2,496,418	24.8	495,482	2.32	679.71
\$20 < \$30m	65	1.586,256	25.8	353,296	1.90	560.06
\$10 < \$20m	153	2.171.199	27.9	678.910	1.97	554.53
S5 < \$10m	217	1.478.543	30.4	568,985	1.89	513.39
\$3 < \$5m	142	542,235	31.6	274,591	1.89	498.28
\$2 < \$3m	98	232,727	30.5	103,495	1.63	489.90
\$1 < \$2m	123	172.466	31.9	105.740	1.25	356.27
<\$lm	128	69.272	31.4	95.427	1.10	300.22
All Cases	1,120	41,574,841	18.4	5,760,011	3.89	1,192.43

As can be seen, for every doilar recovered in a common fund class action, 18.4 cents goes to the attorneys and for other costs (expert fees, out-of-pocket expenses, etc.)⁵ and 81.6 cents goes to the class members, which should seem to be a pretty good deal for class members relative to paying, say, 40% to an individual personal injury lawyer. A comparison with our 1990 study, limited to antitrust and securities class actions, shows the following:

¹ Case information compiled and analyzed by Stuart J. Logan, Associate Editor, and Beverly C. Moore, Jr., Editor-in-Chief. Database compiled by statistician Dr. Jack Moshman, Moshman Associates, Inc., Bethesda, Md.

² 13 Class Action Rep. 249 (1990).

 $^{^3}$ To the left of each case name in the main Table 1 is a symbol indicating the type of case. S = securities. A = antitrust, C = consumer. M = mass tort. T = taxpayer. L = labor/wage/pension, E = employment discrimination, EN = environmental pollution. CP = civil rights, W = social welfare/entitlements. U = utilities, D = derivative, and G = government regulation. The data for these particular types of cases are separately broken down later in Table 2 (see p. 1961).

⁴ This Survey does not cover any awards before approximately 1974, when fees were usually based on a percentage of the recovery, and data on attorney hours and hourly rates were typically unavailable. Some of these pre-Lindy awards are discussed at 5 Class Action Rep. 334-344, 472-480 (1978).

⁵ Total costs may be modestly understated to the extent that in some cases we do not have full information on post-settlement/judgment notice and claims administration costs later deducted from the common fund prior to its disbursement to class members. In some other cases for which this data is lacking, these expenses are paid by the defendants on top of the settlement fund.

	No. of Cases	Aggregate Class Recovery (8 millions)	Fees & Costs 28 %	Atty Hrs.	Muitiplier	Current Hourly Rate (in 2/03 8)
2003 Sample	1,120	41.574.841	18.4~	5.760,011	3.89	1.192.43
1990 Sample	404	6.322,658	14.8	2,515,642	1.83	494.26

In our 1990 Study, we noted that average hourly rates, multipliers, and fee percentages had changed little from that reported in our previous 1980 Study. In contrast, those numbers have changed significantly from 1990 to 2003. Notably (1) the average hourly rate has increased from \$494.26 in 1990 (inflated to 2003 dollars) to \$1,192.43 in 2003; and (2) the average multiplier has increased from 1.83 in 1990 to 3.89 in 2003. But these increases are mainly due to the addition of new "mega" cases with very high class recoveries. For example, in the 1990 Study there were only 12 cases with recoveries of \$75 million or greater (and containing hourly data). In the 2003 Study, there are 55 such cases. Because the data show that, on average, higher recoveries result in higher hourly rates and higher multipliers, these new large recovery cases explain the multiplier and hourly rate increases from 1990 to 2003.

Similarly, the average percentage of recovery consumed by fees and expenses has also increased. from 14.8 in 1990 to 18.4 in 2003. This increase is explained by the increasing ascendancy of the percentage-of-recovery method of awarding fees over the more stringent lodestar/multiplier method. For the 471 cases that used the percentage method, fees and costs consumed an average of 20.9% of recoveries. For the 649 non-percentage (or "mixed" percentage/multiplier) fee cases, fees and costs consumed an average of 14.5% of recoveries. Even in the larger recovery ranges (\$75 million or higher), courts have awarded fees of at least 25% in 25 of those 90 cases.

The 2003 Survey does confirm what the 1980 and 1990 Surveys found—that hourly rates and multipliers tend on average to increase with the size of the class recovery (though there is extreme variability in individual cases). The percentage of the class recovery consumed by attorney fees and costs is remarkably constant for recoveries under \$10 million (averaging from 30.4% to 31.9%) and then declines gradually from 27.9% to 23.6% for recoveries between \$10 million and \$75 million. Even at recoveries in the \$75 million to \$100 million Group (20.9%) and the over \$100 million Group (15.1%), the average percentages are significantly higher than those in the highest range in the 1990 study—10.1% for the over \$50 million Group.

That the overall fee percentage is 15.1% for recoveries in Group 1 (\$100 million and over), as compared with the 18.4% figure for the entire sample, illustrates how a relatively few "big cases" dominate the entire sample. Just 13 cases in which recoveries were over \$400 million account for nearly half of the total \$41.6 billion recovered in all 1,120 cases and 36% of the total fees awarded.

Care has been taken to include all fee awards we have been able to find and analyze thus far, those involving low as well as high percentages, hourly rates, and multipliers. This is not a "selective" Survey aimed at pleasing either plaintiffs or defendants. Table 1 follows and combines all of the cases into a single sample ordered by the size of the class recovery. A more detailed explanation of the data in Table 1 follows.

⁶ 6 Class Action Rep. 82 (1980).

TABLE 1 - Class Action Fee Awards for All Cases by Size of Recovery

II. Chart of Recoveries and Awards by Recovery Size
(Recoveries, Fee and Costs Recovery Percentages, Hours, Lodestars, Multipliers, and Hourly Rates)

			121	151	Ξ	191	=	[2]			1.19			1515	1000
	Name of Case		Recovery	-		F001 6		ree Date	Hours				, ollow	Hourly	Total
		The same and the same of the s		Awarded	(# 000 m)	Costs	9			10	Per hr.	Hourly		Aele	Hourly
	The second secon		19 000 61	75 200 21		Recovery	5				(2/03 \$)		(13/61)	(3/8)	Rate
	N 1120		41,574,841	7,024,295	637,028	1	4.6		6,740,011	120,647	30,183	240.75	3.68	70.08	1,192.43
			37,937,086	8,490,842	695,509	18.7	\$		4,722,505	11,237	25,343	20 000	2 2	, , , ,	2000
Overell	Overall - Proxy Date Only, N = 89		3,637,775	533,453	34,359	15.6	5,		9 301 903	93 180	35,199	236 80	3 03	79404	936 05
Overall -	Overall - No Percentage Fee, N - 649		16.083,376	20078	340,013	000			2.470.387	35.667	22,254	265.40	187	1,232.14	1,513.61
Overal	Overal - Percentage Fee Only, N = 471		60,140,62	0.040,000	200,										
Group	Group 1 - Recovery Is \$100 million of presiet	20000	10,100,500	1,775,125	0	17.6	4.8	5/03					1		
_	(C) Price (Alles) or tange months	opite	3.188.500	•	14,824	2.2	4.6	2/5/03	35,000		89,054	371 43	7	1,571 43	1,571.43
~	Carolina Shall Olice		1,131,803			14.8	2.2	11/17/95						1	
-	C COXY SHEET COX		1,027,000	143,780		7	4.5	11/1/98	129,629		7,511	279 19	3 87	1,109 17	1,228 87
	7	Drugs	696,667	175,000	1,673	25.4	0 0	2/10/00					1		
0	т.		887,000	50,228	50,310	14.6	12.5	10/24/95	136,518	16,639	2,005	201 45		307 000	7000
0	A Standard OilBP Ut		840,000	20,000	2,000	3.4	-	7/1/87	2,000		197,347		2 00	00000	0 200 0
1	+		550,000		3,405	0 0	6.5	12/16/83	117,001	3,666	7724	6) col	3	240	0 0 0 0
0	* (C) Nael v Masonia Corp **		528,000		2,500	12.9		1/88					+		
1	+	Pacific ***	526,800	26,600	0	- 9		4/86		1	1	04.030	000	1000	1 043 42
2 =	4 (S) Bankamerica Securities		490,000	66,416	8	19.7	0	10/15/02	01,442		20.00	38170	100	1 916 35	1 835 59
2	_	unties	457,000		1	-	2	4/29/02	00.00	1000	55,133			151 82	427 15
45	1	Group	415,000		١	0.2	13.5	12/16/94	04.580	007	7'88/				
2 3	% (A) Vilamins Antitust Litigation	llon	365,188		į	34.6	3	1/16/01			20.00	260.00	1,24	1832 81	1 547 94
- "	+-		298,229		2.367	5.5	2	6/11/02	007		940	323.25	28	2 153 25	2 220 46
-	1		259,000		120	18 5	-	3/1/01	10017		250,51				
-	_	Sav	250,000		0	26.6		26/1/8							
-	_		240,000			200	2 -	00/11/0							
8	% (S) Waste Management Securities	urilles	220,000		2			10/5/79	A1 419	5 460	7,980	105 90	2 03	215.10	517 96
20	(A) Folding Carlon		218,000		200		-	4/19/85							
21	(S) Joseph v. Shell Oil		000'002	000'61	,		-	4/21/87	41 180		7,200	147.76	1 31	193 05	311 24
2.2	(M) Agent Orange		000 681			25.8	0.5	10/8/9	16,000		9,139	266.84	10 73	3,078 13	3,142 11
23	% (S) Rite Aid Corp Sec 111		000,581		100	31.6	9 +	12/1/95	20,000		3,076	247.83	4.05	1,201 50	1,419 45
7.7	_	au ins	190 000	L	19,858	35.1	3.8	5/1/89	132,000		1,022	262 37	135	353.42	386 30
52	K I(A) Lease OII	917007	188 000		7.4	3.5	8	10/1/95	8,731		31,868	182.47	3	804 33	1000
2	(1) Kunwan V ris Sept.		163,664	7,482	397	4.3	2.6	6/27/86	26,802		10,897	36.38		1 2/3	70,
2 5	K ALL NAIT Treas. Emp Union v. U.S.	US	178,018		0008	103		12/20/02	2 2 2		79 759	207 39	2 82	542 68	819 66
100	_		176,950	1,796	202		0	4/1/83	2,55						
30	(A) In se Plywood		171,427	24,600	27861	98.0	7	10/1/93	43,540		3,560	225.00	3.25	731.44	912.16
31	(M) Shell Oll Relinery		100,000		1	14.0	7.5	3/21/90					1	1	
32	(C) Sampson v. Kodak		142 000	33.624	1	21.5	=	5(24/02					-		
33	_	7,7	153 521	27.634	2.560	187	9	10/56/01	37,007		3,408	289.84	2 58	746 72	763 53
34	*	-	150,000			- 4-	3.8	4/1/98	48,784	1	2,953	200 00	2 00	398 64	448 80
35		nation	141,730			17.8	5.1	5/8/02				36	1	407 84	672 55
20	R		141,730	16,506	1,724	143	20	9/27/91	36.440		0100	101.73	-	187.64	529 41
	1	nen.	141,168	21,178	9	15.0	2	7/18/97	48,287		2000	20.00	15	378.69	392 97
38	4	retion	140,750		4,652	20 3	22	12/1/01	92,816	ĺ					
38	4 7		140,000		0	210	200	18/11/8					1		
	* *		136,500		4.287	32.2	2 6	2/1/98	94 379		1,110	251 50	1.42	357 48	419 33
7 27	4		132,500		2,005	280		1/1/00	58 015		1,757	271.10	2 2 2	602 43	648 47
1		llon	132,095	34,950	2.48/1	7.53	7					Ĺ			

TABLE 1 - Class Action Fee Awards for All Cases by Size of Recovery

						[5]	3	3	1101	Ξ	[11]	[13]	11-11
	(2)			(6)	=		1 1 1 1	Moure	142	t ode	3	Total	2/03
Name of Case	Recovery	-	Costs	4				à	Bernand	1414	- Yellah		Total
The state of the s		Awarded	1	Coate	21 5		200		7	Houriv	-	Rate	Hourly
	(9,000 5)	(8.000.9)	(i,000 s)	10 % S	91 6				(2/03 8)	Rate	(13/11)	(3/6)	Rete
		ŀ		1		1/25/93							
4.4 (E) Haynes v. Shoney's	130,500	45.867	16.788	7 87	0 =	6/4/97							
_	125 780	L	1,612	26 3	3.0	9/7/93							
4.6 % (A) Intent Formula	125,000		3,686	23.7	3.3	3/1/98	70,000		1,526	264 80	9	370 /2	410 68
	123.820		1,687	31.3	5.6	11/1/89							
× i	120.000		2,450	16.7	2 3	8/7/02				_1	:	10.010	118.61
×	116 100	L	168	17.4	3 3	7/29/87	15,000		7,242	1		1.270 34	
	114 500		261	3.1	4.0	2/25/87	006,8		16,315	1		407	20.4
	113 500		386		60	1/1/85	7,592		24,953	159 43	2 28	410 02	10, 33
	111 841		3,843	l''	1.6	5/1/00	47,814	1	1,675	1		05//0	27 007
×	111 000		475	6.7	1.5	3/1/95	16,670	3,800	7,456	ļ		0 9 9 9	1000
×	110,000	29	1,895	28.7	3.0	1/1/96	01,280		1,138	01 007	•	2	2
55 (5) In (8 Tibusina)	107,100			12.0	5.7	4/50/84			1,067	300 42	1 85	571 43	572 69
1	107,000		977	23 3	6	10/3/02	42,000				4 65	1,346 84	1,362.89
	104,000		1	14.2		12/6/02			3 715	1	3 70	840 81	960 47
_	103,500		2.7	22 6	2.5	0///0	200			L			
4	102,500			12.2		1/3/80	30 106		3,521	163 62	2 07	338 56	393 88
	102,500			90	000	06/4/2/0	300 03		1.483		1.17	425 13	518 43
*	100,000		1	0 07	2	10/1/04	61 532		1,076	204.49	0 72	147 18	153 69
	100,000		3,991	0 0	-	3/1/0	747		224 307		111	1,663 50	2,265 67
1	100,000	-				3/1/2	1 040 002	32 016	42.085	272.63	4.50	1,187.46	1,306.21
3	28,424,576	3,007,350	+	15.1			999 059	L	34,923	200.05	3.41	1.019 19	1.092.37
Gran I Without Proxy Date, N = 55	26,241,079	-	۶Į				200 236	250	75.045	237.93	9.54	2,017.85	2,794.39
Service Date Doly. N = 9	2,162,598	238,403	9,737	•	2		071 480	28.215	48.788	269.31	3 30	959.55	1,048 86
Comp. No Paraolane Fee. N = 29	9,940,790	-	207,948	8	,		087 422	3 800	32.618	277.09	6.20	1,533.49	1,886.80
Grant Percentage Fee Only, N = 35	18,483,786	3,266,924	105,264	18.2									
M. Bacovery is \$75 million but less than \$100 milli	lion		1			10,1,1	34 622		2,700	204.01	3 17	647 41	853 66
A S (S) VAS	96,500		-	2	2	211/06	6.264		15,892	244.06	9 63	2,398 46	2,678 47
*	000'98			2 2		201717	17 787		3,963	_	3 81	1,490 63	1,506 58
A 7 % (1) Vizaino V. Microsoft Corp	96,885			280	2	20/0/1	3 384		34,856		6 62	1,473 19	1,936 29
1	95,000			100	2 2	10/1/4	25.824		3,389	246.47	3 22	793 83	843 35
*	04,983			(4,5)	3	3/10/81	6.418		29,693	77.12	2 48	191 25	391 77
	94,352		124			10/1/00							
*	92,420		2,031	200	2	8/11/5	115,150	1,000	1,889	1	١	187 80	632.92
72 (A) Antiblolice	887 06	21,025	1	25.0	-	\$11194	31,578		2,633	251.03	2 68	676 16	CA 250
73 % (S) Prudential Bache	30,000		L	6.0	5.5	1/1/86							
	000		0	29 0	2 0	4/1/01							
7.5 % (C) MCI Non Subscriber Tel Reles	2 500			25.7	3.1	1/1/90							
-	86.692	L			2.0	1/28/87							
_	95,000	16,763		21.1	5 5	7/31/02	100		2 848	310 00	3 53	1,094 15	1,135 39
×	92,500		1,500		2 0	1/1/01	20777						
	81,978		-	-	6	11/1/00							
×	81,500		1,300	22	0 2	20,000							
1	80,908			2	9	7871070	22 191		5,404			436 97	756 17
4	90,578			2		7011101	42 647	9 063	1,917	10,01	9	138 48	232 7
T	90,000	-	-	-]	7	10,1,0			5 411	195 94	4.83	045 45	1,374.31
T	78,000		975	-	7	6/1/8	000			L			
1	77,215		1	33 3	33	12/1/94							i
66 X (A) Contracting Contracting													