

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

Musa Daramy et al.,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
Arctic Storm Management Group LLC,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 21-1431 MJP  
  
ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S  
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES  
AND COSTS

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs’ Motion for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs. (Dkt. No. 93.) Having reviewed the Motion, Defendants’ Opposition (Dkt. No. 94), the Reply (Dkt. No. 97) and Defendants’ Surreply and Motion to Strike (Dkt. No. 99), and all relevant portions of the record, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs’ Motion.

**BACKGROUND**

This is an employment discrimination case filed by twenty-one former crewmembers of a fishing vessel. Plaintiffs brought claims under Title VII, Washington’s Law Against Discrimination, and 42 U.S.C. § 1981 on theories of intentional discrimination, hostile work

1 environment, retaliation, and wrongful termination. Plaintiffs later accepted Defendants' Offers  
2 of Judgment, exclusive of all costs and attorneys' fees up to March 31, 2022. Plaintiffs then  
3 brought a Motion for Attorneys' Fees and to Enter Judgment Pursuant to the Offers of Judgment.  
4 This Court entered judgment for sixteen plaintiffs and denied one offer due to ambiguity, but  
5 reserved ruling as to the issue of attorneys' fees. (Dkt. Nos. 100-117.) The Court now addresses  
6 the issue of attorneys' fees. Plaintiffs request \$115,720.00 in fees for 289.3 hours spent  
7 representing the 21 Plaintiffs in this case. Plaintiffs also ask for reimbursement of \$3,880.19 for  
8 costs spent during the duration of the case.

## 9 ANALYSIS

### 10 A. Prevailing Party

11 Plaintiffs seek an award of attorneys' fees based on their acceptance of Defendants' Offer  
12 of Judgments and their status as the prevailing party. See Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450  
13 U.S. 346, 363 (1981) (Powell, J., concurring) (stating that a Rule 68 offer of judgment "by  
14 definition, stipulates that the plaintiff shall be treated as the prevailing party.") "A typical  
15 formulation is that plaintiffs may be considered 'prevailing parties' for attorney's fees purposes if  
16 they succeed on any significant issue in litigation which achieves some of the benefit the parties  
17 sought in bringing suit." Hensley v. Eckerhart, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983) (quoting Nadeau v.  
18 Helgemoe, 581 F.2d 275, 278-279 (1st Cir. 1978)). "This is a generous formulation that brings  
19 the plaintiff only across the statutory threshold. It remains for the district court to determine what  
20 fee is "reasonable.'" Id.

21 Defendants advance several arguments as to the prevailing nature of Plaintiffs' claims.  
22 None of which have merit. First, Defendants argue that because Plaintiffs did not prevail in their  
23 EEOC charge filed prior to the filing of the complaint in this action they cannot be deemed  
24

1 prevailing for the purposes of attorneys’ fees and costs associated with those hours. (Def. Mot. in  
2 Opp. at 7.) Defendants cite to no rule or case law in support of this argument, and they seem to  
3 overlook the fact that filing a charge with the EEOC is a mandatory prerequisite to filing a Title  
4 VII claim. Plaintiffs need not prevail on the EEOC charge to be the ‘prevailing party.’ Rather,  
5 this argument speaks to the reasonable number of hours Plaintiffs’ attorneys expended.  
6 Nonetheless, because the EEOC charge is a mandatory step before filing a complaint, the Court  
7 finds that those hours were “hours reasonably expended on the litigation.” Hensley, 461 U.S. at  
8 435.

9 Defendants then argue that five Plaintiffs may not be considered prevailing. Four of the  
10 five did not accept offers of judgment, and the remaining Plaintiff, Sekou Soukouna, Defendants  
11 argue, cannot be considered prevailing because her Offer of Judgment was for zero dollars.  
12 However, the Court finds this too is unpersuasive. The Court has already addressed the issue of  
13 Soukouna’s Offer of Judgment and found it to be invalid. (Dkt. No. 100.) And while it is true  
14 that four Plaintiffs did not accept the Offers of Judgment, Plaintiffs as a whole are still  
15 considered ‘prevailing parties.’ See Hensley, 461 U.S. at 435 (finding that in cases involving  
16 multiple claims, it is difficult to divide the hours expended on a claim-by-claim basis, “[i]nstead  
17 the district court should focus on the significance of the overall relief obtained by the plaintiff in  
18 relation to the hours reasonably expended on the litigation.”)

19 **B. Lodestar Calculation**

20 Having determined that Plaintiffs are the prevailing party, the Court must determine the  
21 reasonable fees to which Plaintiffs are entitled. To set the fee award, the Court begins by  
22 calculating a lodestar “by taking the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation and  
23 multiplying it by a reasonable hourly rate.” Fischer v. SJB-P.D. Inc., 214 F.3d 1115, 1119 (9th  
24

1 Cir. 2000) (citing Hensley, 461 U.S. at 429); see Ewing v. Glogowski, 198 Wn. App. 515, 521  
2 (2017) (accord under Washington law).

3 Under federal law, the Court determines the hourly rate by considering the “evidence  
4 produced by the parties, including fee rates of other attorneys in similar practices, awards in  
5 comparable cases, counsel’s experience and reputation level, and the market rates, as well as two  
6 additional Kerr factors: the novelty/difficulty of the issues and the preclusion of other work.”  
7 Dang v. Cross, 422 F.3d 800, 814 (9th Cir. 2005). And under Washington law, if the “attorneys  
8 in question have an established rate for billing clients, that rate will likely be a reasonable rate.”  
9 Bowers v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co., 100 Wn.2d 581, 597 (1983). But “[t]he attorney’s usual  
10 fee is not, however, conclusively a reasonable fee and other factors may necessitate an  
11 adjustment,” such as “the level of skill required by the litigation, time limitations imposed on the  
12 litigation, the amount of the potential recovery, the attorney’s reputation, and the undesirability  
13 of the case.” Id. And “[t]he reasonable hourly rate should be computed for each attorney, and  
14 each attorney’s hourly rate may well vary with each type of work involved in the litigation.” Id.

15 In deciding the number of hours “reasonably expended,” the Court considers whether the  
16 time spent on the matter was “excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary.” Hensley, 461  
17 U.S. at 434. The requesting attorney “must provide reasonable documentation of the work  
18 performed” to enable this determination. Bowers, 100 Wn.2d at 597 (1983); Hensley, 461 U.S. at  
19 433 (accord). “This documentation need not be exhaustive or in minute detail, but must inform  
20 the court, in addition to the number of hours worked, of the type of work performed and the  
21 category of attorney who performed the work (i.e., senior partner, associate, etc.)” Bowers, 100  
22 Wn.2d at 597. “Illegible, abbreviated time records, submitted in a form not reasonably capable of  
23  
24

1 evaluation, do not satisfy the burden of submitting detailed time records justifying the hours  
2 claimed.” Stewart v. Gates, 987 F.2d 1450, 1453 (9th Cir. 1993) (citation and quotation omitted).

### 3 **1. Hourly Rates**

4 The Court here reviews the evidence supporting the rates requested for each attorney and  
5 determines each person’s reasonable rate for the work in this case.

6 Plaintiffs ask for approval of an hourly rate of \$400 for all three attorneys involved in the  
7 case. Anthony Ginster has 32 years of experience practicing law, with a focus on admiralty law.  
8 (Ginster Decl. ¶ 4 (Dkt. No. 93-1).) Gordon Webb has been practicing since 1993 and similarly  
9 focuses on admiralty law. (Webb Decl. ¶ 2 (Dkt. No. 93-2).) Lastly, Reba Weiss has been  
10 practicing since 1982, focusing on employment law since 1992. (Weiss Decl. ¶ 3 (Dkt. No. 93-  
11 3).)

#### 12 **a. Defendants’ Motion to Strike**

13 In their initial motion, Plaintiffs’ attorneys provide no evidence of fee rates of other  
14 attorneys in similar practices, awards in comparable cases, or market rates. Instead, Plaintiffs  
15 provide such evidence for the first time in their reply brief. (See Pltffs. Reply at 2-3.) In  
16 response, Defendants asked the Court to strike Plaintiffs’ argument and supporting declarations  
17 regarding the hourly rate. (See Surreply and Mot. to Strike at 1-3.) Indeed, Plaintiffs have not  
18 provided any basis to justify their late inclusion, and it does not appear to respond to a novel  
19 argument presented by Defendants. The Court GRANTS Defendants’ motion to strike as it  
20 pertains to the hourly fee.

21 However, the Court in its discretion, still finds that a \$400 hourly rate is appropriate  
22 given each attorney’s years of practice and the preclusive effect of accepting a case in which  
23 Plaintiffs’ attorneys represented 21 individuals, many of whom spoke little or no English. (See  
24 Pltffs. Mot. for Attnys Fees at 4).

1           **2.       Hours Expended**

2           The Court next assesses the reasonable number of hours spent litigating this matter.  
3 Plaintiffs’ attorneys allege they spent a total amount of 289.3 hours representing 21 Plaintiffs,  
4 which averages out to 14 hours per Plaintiff. (See Id. at 3; Reply at 3.) However, the Court notes  
5 a slight mathematical error. It added up each attorney hours – 136.5 for Weiss, 77.5 for Webb,  
6 and 75.2 for Ginster and found a total of 289.2 hours. (See Weiss Dec. at 2; Webb Dec. Ex. 1;  
7 and Ginster Dec Ex. 1.) Defendants put forth a number of arguments as to why the number of  
8 hours Plaintiffs’ attorneys expended are not reasonable. The Court finds two persuasive.

9                   **a.       Costs and Fees After March 31, 2022 Are Not Recoverable**

10           The terms of the offer of judgment govern the award of fees and costs. Herrington v.  
11 County of Sonoma, 12 F.3d 901, 907 (9th Cir. 1993). The terms of Defendants’ second Offers of  
12 Judgment explicitly offer a total amount to each Plaintiff “exclusive of all awardable costs and  
13 attorneys’ fees accrued up to the date of this Offer (March 31, 2022) . . .” (See Defendants’ Offer  
14 of Judgment (Dkt. No. 57).) These terms control the cut-off of attorney’s fees and costs.  
15 Guerrero v. Cummings, 70 F.3d 1111, 1114 (9th Cir. 1995).)

16           Weiss seeks fees for 31.3 hours and \$85 in costs spent after March 31, 2022; Webb seeks  
17 4.4 hours of fees accrued after that date; and Ginster seeks 3.8 hours. (Weiss Decl. Ex. 1; Webb  
18 Decl. Ex. 1; Ginster Decl. Ex. 1.) Because these fees and costs occurred after the cut off set by  
19 Defendants’ Offer of Judgment, the Court will reduce the additional hours and costs spent after  
20 March 31, 2022. This leads to a total reduction of 39.5 hours, which yields \$15,800 plus the  
21 additional \$85 reduction for costs, for a total reduction of \$15,885.00.

22                   **b.       Block Billing**

23           Defendants also take issue with Plaintiffs’ block billing and claim that due to these types  
24 of time entries Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden to demonstrate the reasonableness of

1 their time. Though the Court agrees with Defendants' objection the the block billing, it  
2 ultimately finds the total number of hours expended reasonable.

3 Block billing generally deprives the Court of the ability to determine whether time spent  
4 on more than one divergent task is reasonably spent. Inadequate segregation of time falls below  
5 the standards required of counsel to support a request for fees under federal or Washington law.  
6 See Stewart, 987 F.2d at 1453; Bowers, 100 Wn.2d at 597.

7 The Court's review of Wiess, Ginster and Webb's billing records show that there is  
8 frequent block billing, with Ginster and Webb being the worst offenders. This impedes the  
9 Court's ability to ensure that the time was not excessive. However, despite the block billing and  
10 the Court's disfavor of it, the Court finds that the time entries submitted by each attorney are  
11 reasonable. This is underscored by the fact that each attorney spent roughly 96 hours over the  
12 course of a year representing 21 Plaintiffs, which amounts to only 14 hours per Plaintiff. (Reply  
13 brief at 3.) The Court finds that the number of hours expended by each attorney is reasonable.

14 **3. Total Lodestar**

15 Based on the records provided by counsel and the reductions noted above, the Court  
16 makes the following lodestar calculation:

<b>Biller</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Weiss	105.2	\$400/hour	\$42,080
Webb	73.1	\$400/hour	\$29,240
Ginster	71.4	\$400/hour	\$28,560

1 **C. Expenses**

2 The parties do not dispute the costs associated with Plaintiffs' expenses in furtherance of  
3 the litigation, with the exception of the \$85 Plaintiffs incurred after Defendant's Offer of  
4 Judgment. The Court has reviewed the other requested expenses and finds them to be reasonable.  
5 In applying the reduction for the \$85, the Court finds it reasonable to award expenses in the  
6 amount of \$3,795.19 ( $\$6.60 + (\$983.33 \times 3) + \$402.00 + \$277.00 + \$138.50 + \$1.10 + \$20.00$ ).

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 The Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees. The Court has determined  
9 that the lodestar amount of \$99,880.00 yields an appropriate and reasonable award of fees to  
10 counsel for their successful efforts in bringing this case. And the Court also awards an additional  
11 \$3,795.19 for expenses for a grand total of \$103,675.19 in fees. Defendants must pay these fees  
12 within 30 days of this order.

13 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

14 Dated July 25, 2022.

15 

16 Marsha J. Pechman  
17 United States Senior District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24