

EXHIBIT 1

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

**IN RE ANNE ARUNDEL DATA BREACH
LITIGATION**

Case No. 1:25-cv-02274

**JOINT DECLARATION OF CLASS COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

We, Gary Klinger of Milberg PLLC, Tyler J. Bean of Siri & Glimstad LLP, James Pizzirusso of Hausfeld LLP, Gary Mason of Mason & Perry LLP, and James Ulwick of Kramon & Graham P.A., as Class Counsel¹ declare and state as follows:

1. We are Court-appointed Class Counsel for the Settlement Class in the above-captioned matter. We submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards filed contemporaneously herewith. Unless otherwise noted, we have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and could and would testify competently to them if called upon to do so.

2. Throughout the litigation, our law firms have been primarily responsible for the prosecution of Plaintiffs' claims on behalf of the Settlement Class. On February 26, 2026, Gary Klinger of Milberg PLLC, Tyler J. Bean of Siri & Glimstad LLP, James Pizzirusso of Hausfeld LLP, Gary Mason of Mason & Perry LLP, and James Ulwick of Kramon & Graham P.A were appointed as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class in the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. (*See* ECF No. 40, at pp. 3–4).

¹ All capitalized terms herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement Agreement" or "SA") (ECF No. 37-2), unless otherwise defined herein.

I. SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

3. The underlying litigation arises from a Data Security Incident involving Defendant Anne Arundel Dermatology, P.A.'s ("AAD" or "Defendant") systems.

4. AAD is a network of dermatological clinics that offers a wide variety of medical, surgical, and cosmetic dermatology treatments. (*See* Am. Consolidated Class Action Compl., ECF No. 32).

5. Between February 14, 2025, and May 13, 2025, AAD experienced a Data Security Incident which may have exposed certain personally identifiable information ("PII") and protected health information ("PHI") of Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members. While the exposed PII and PHI varied by individual, it may have included names, addresses, date(s) of birth, patient ID, medical record numbers, health history, and insurance information. After the Data Security Incident, Defendant mailed individual notice letters ("Notice Letters") to individuals potentially impacted by the Data Security Incident.

6. After receiving a Notice Letter, on July 14, 2025, Plaintiff Correa filed the first putative class action lawsuit against Defendant in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. Following the filing of Plaintiff Correa's complaint, Defendant was named as a defendant in twenty (20) other actions in the District of Maryland that arose from same Data Security Incident (including one (1) action transferred to the District of Maryland from the Northern District of Georgia). An action was also filed in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, Maryland captioned *Tyler v. Anne Arundel Dermatology, P.A.*, No. C-02-CV-25-002625, filed on September 5, 2025 (the "State Action") which was dismissed without prejudice on November 14, 2025.

7. Subsequently, Plaintiffs filed a motion to consolidate the related cases filed against Defendant and appoint interim class counsel. (*See* ECF Nos. 7, 15). After the Court granted consolidation, Plaintiffs filed their Consolidated Class Action Complaint on September 18, 2025, followed by an Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint on December 12, 2025, naming George Tyler as a Plaintiff from the State Action. (ECF Nos. 23, 32).

8. Following the appointment of interim co-lead class counsel, the Parties began discussing the potential for early resolution, which culminated in a full-day mediation session conducted on October 29, 2025, with the Honorable Diane M. Welsh (Ret.), of JAMS.

9. In preparation for the mediation, the Parties exchanged confidential information related to the issues in the litigation and mediation statements that permitted the Parties to assess the case and meaningfully engage in arm's length settlement discussions.

10. During the mediation, the Parties exchanged additional information pertaining to the Settlement Class and Defendant's financial condition, which further informed their settlement discussions. During the mediation, the Parties reached agreement regarding the material terms of a settlement, which if approved by the Court, will resolve all claims against Defendant that were or could have been asserted in the litigation.

11. Over the next several weeks, the Parties continued negotiations regarding the finer points of the Settlement. Specifically, the parties drafted and negotiated the remaining terms in the Settlement Agreement, crafted the notice documents and the claim form, and drafted Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (ECF No. 37).

12. The record demonstrates that our law firms skillfully performed many tasks and expended a great deal of time and effort to resolve the litigation and negotiate an excellent settlement for the Settlement Class.

II. SUMMARY OF WORK PERFORMED

13. This litigation required substantial time and effort. The work required in this litigation included:

- a. investigating the Data Security Incident and Defendant's collection of Plaintiffs' and Settlement Class Members' PII and PHI;
- b. interviewing victims of the Data Security Incident;
- c. evaluating potential class representatives and their respective claims;
- d. conducting thorough legal research regarding Plaintiffs' claims and the possible defenses Defendant could assert;
- e. drafting and filing multiple initial complaints on behalf of Plaintiffs;
- f. coordinating with the other Plaintiffs' counsel to self-organize the various actions filed and expeditiously address the merits of the case;
- g. drafting and filing the consolidation and leadership motions;
- h. exchanging informal discovery concerning the Data Security Incident, including the class size and types of PII and PHI potentially impacted;
- i. drafting a detailed mediation statement outlining the strengths and weaknesses of the case;
- j. engaging in hard-fought settlement negotiations overseen by a well-respected mediator;
- k. engaging in arms-length settlement negotiations with defense counsel over the course of several weeks following the mediation to negotiate the finer points of the Settlement;

- l. drafting the Settlement Agreement, the notice documents, the Claim Form, and the motion for preliminary approval of class action settlement;
- m. seeking competitive bids from multiple settlement administrators to ensure the Class would receive the best notice practicable at a cost-effective price;
- n. engaging in attorneys' fees and service awards negotiations with defense counsel after all material terms of the Settlement were agreed to;
- o. communicating with defense counsel throughout various points of the litigation;
- p. updating Plaintiffs regarding the status of the litigation; and
- q. overseeing the settlement and claims administration process.

III. FACTS SUPPORTING THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS

14. Despite the clear risks involved in pursuing this litigation, Class Counsel undertook this matter on a contingency basis with no guarantee of recovery.

15. Class Counsel committed substantial resources towards pursuing this matter, including significant attorney and staff time. This time spent is in addition to out-of-pocket costs, towards investigating, litigating, and settling the litigation.

16. By litigating this matter on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class, Class Counsel assumed a significant risk of non-payment.

17. The Settlement was largely achieved through the experience and skill of Class Counsel, who are highly respected in the data breach litigation sector. As demonstrated by the firm resumes (ECF No. 37-3, Ex. A-E), Class Counsel have significant experience in litigating class actions of similar size, scope, and complexity.

18. By the time the Settlement was achieved Class Counsel possessed the information necessary to critically evaluate the case, determine the contours of the proposed Settlement Class, and reach a fair and reasonable compromise.

19. If the litigation were to continue there is no doubt that Defendant would vigorously oppose the litigation. Defendant is represented by highly experienced lawyers from a well-respected law firm. Notwithstanding this formidable opposition, Class Counsel developed a strong case and negotiated settlement terms that are highly favorable to Settlement Class. Class Counsel worked hard and at great risk on behalf of the Settlement Class to obtain information from Defendant regarding the Data Security Incident and utilized their experience and the knowledge gained from other data breach class actions to negotiate a favorable Settlement.

20. Although Plaintiffs and Class Counsel strongly believe in the merit of the claims asserted, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize that the expense, duration, and complexity of protracted litigation would be substantial. Ultimately, the outcome of the litigation would be entirely uncertain, posing the risk of no recovery at all for the Settlement Class. As identified in Plaintiffs' accompanying Memorandum of Law, the uncertainties of data breach claims at the motion to dismiss stage, class certification stage, motion for summary judgment stage, trial, and appeal, posed real and immediate risks to this matter.

21. Absent this Settlement, Defendant would assert various defenses that could deprive Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members of any relief whatsoever.

22. The requested attorneys' fees represent one-third of the cash value of the Settlement Fund, which represents the quintessential fee award in class action litigation.

23. Class Counsel and additional Plaintiffs' counsel have expended substantial time, effort, and resources to settle this litigation. Collectively, based on their audited time records, Class

Counsel and additional Plaintiffs' counsel have devoted 1,005.17 hours, yielding a lodestar of \$813,116.85. Thus, the request of \$800,000.00 in attorneys' fees results in a *negative* lodestar multiplier of 0.98.

24. The following table summarizes Class Counsel's and additional Plaintiffs' counsel's reasonable lodestar:²

[CHART ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

² Each firm's detailed lodestar and expense chart is included in the attached **Exhibit A**.

FIRM LODESTAR AND EXPENSES SUMMARY

FIRM	HOURS SUMMARY	LODESTAR SUMMARY	COSTS & EXPENSES SUMMARY
MILBERG, PLLC	145.00	\$125,175.20	\$762.50
HAUSFELD LLP	119.80	\$106,557.50	\$5,247.23
SIRI & GLIMSTAD LLP	161.30	\$104,778.00	\$8,572.41
MASON & PERRY LLP	70.80	\$44,707.00	\$1,303.80
KRAMON & GRAHAM, P.A.	16.60	\$16,185.00	\$405.00
FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD	26.70	\$17,680.00	\$431.80
CYBERLAW, LLC	22.80	\$20,520.00	\$191.48
LEXERO LAW	21.50	\$26,380.50	\$15.56
STRANCH, JENNINGS & GARVEY, PLLC	10.70	\$9,080.50	\$655.00
POULIN WILLEY ANASTOPOULO, LLC	23.50	\$33,950.00	\$418.11
ELLZEY, KHERKHER, SANFORD & MONTGOMERY LLP	30.52	\$25,020.40	\$861.80
COHEN MALAD, LLP	1.50	\$1,125.00	\$250.05
EDELSON LECHTZIN LLP	19.40	\$20,415.00	\$421.35
ZIMMERMAN LAW OFFICES, P.C.	17.20	\$15,566.00	\$122.00
DANN LAW FIRM CO. LPA D/B/A DANNLAW	13.50	\$8,057.50	\$40.80
CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER & SPRENGEL LLP	15.10	\$20,730.00	\$958.67
COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP	48.50	\$35,345.00	\$576.12
BRYSON HARRIS SUCIU & DEMAY PLLC	21.00	\$14,430.00	\$505.00
KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.	54.90	\$50,335.00	\$0.00
MURPHY LAW FIRM	23.20	\$14,462.00	\$505.00
SILVERMAN THOMPSON	4.80	\$3,291.50	\$405.00
ZIMMERMAN REED LLP	31.65	\$21,113.75	\$167.80
SROURIAN LAW FIRM, P.C.	11.20	\$8,615.00	\$0.00
LYNCH CARPENTER, LLP	34.20	\$30,450.00	\$197.60
SCHUBERT JONCKHEER & KOLBE LLP	11.00	\$6,807.00	\$1,732.90
MARKOVITS, STOCK & DEMARCO, LLC	48.80	\$32,340.00	\$480.00
TOTAL	1,005.17	\$813,116.85	\$25,226.98

25. The lodestar chart above does not include the additional time that will be spent drafting the Motion for Final Approval, preparing for and attending the Motion for Final Approval hearing, overseeing the claims administration process through completion, and answering Settlement Class Members' questions after payments are distributed. These efforts will result in an even larger negative lodestar multiplier.

26. Over the course of the litigation, Class Counsel made reasonable efforts to minimize inefficiency and to prevent duplicative work. Tasks were assigned with clear instructions by lead counsel, to avoid duplication of efforts and to ensure that appropriately skilled personnel performed each task. Class Counsel also routinely communicated with each other to monitor progress and ensure that tasks were being performed in a timely and effective manner.

27. To date, *no* Settlement Class Member has objected to the Settlement or the requested fee, which was clearly noted in the Notice sent to Settlement Class Members.

IV. LITIGATION COSTS AND EXPENSES

28. Over the course of the Litigation, Class Counsel and additional Plaintiffs' counsel kept detailed records of all litigation expenses. The litigation expenses accrued across all firms amount to \$25,226.98. These unreimbursed expenses include costs associated with research, mediation, service fees, and filing fees. These costs also reflect typical expenses of the type ordinarily passed on to fee-paying clients in a general legal practice and are also typically recoverable in a specialized complex class action practice as they are necessary and reasonable to prosecuting a class action.

29. Class Counsel's and additional Plaintiffs' counsel's litigation expenses were calculated from receipts, expense vouchers, check records and other documents maintained by their respective firms. Thus, reimbursement of the requested costs and expenses is warranted.

V. CLASS COUNSEL'S FEES AND EXPENSES

SIRI & GLIMSTAD LLP

30. Siri & Glimstad LLP undertook significant risk in litigating this matter under a contingency fee arrangement with no guarantee of any recovery. There was a substantial risk of no recovery at all given the threshold issues raised by Defendant and the uncertain nature of data breach class action litigation.

31. Siri & Glimstad LLP's rates are reasonable and have been approved by courts across the country. *See, e.g., Tuteur v. Metropolitan Opera Association*, No. 23-cv-3997, ECF No. 72 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2025); *Wilkins, et al. v. Mulkey Cardiology Consultants at Holy Name Medical Center, P.C.*, No. BER-L-006203-23 (N.J. Super. Ct. Mar. 21, 2025); *In re Onix Group, LLC Data Breach Litig.*, No. 23-2288-KSM, ECF No. 47-6 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 13, 2024); *Holden v. Guardian Analytics, Inc.*, No. 2:23-cv-2115, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 100349, at *36 (D.N.J. June 5, 2024); *Boudreaux v. Systems East, Inc.*, No. 5:23-cv-1498, ECF No. 32 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 2024); *Medina v. Albertsons Companies, Inc.*, No. 1:23-cv-00480-MN, ECF No. 34 (D. Del. April 6, 2024); *In re Sovos Compliance Data Security Incident Litigation*, No. 1:23-cv-12100, ECF No. 51 (D. Mass. July 23, 2024); *Carter et al. v. Vivendi Ticketing US LLC b/b/a See Tickets*, No. 22-01981-CJC (DFMx), ECF No. 53 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2023).

32. Siri & Glimstad LLP's rates reflect what would be charged to a fee-paying client in the private legal marketplace for complex litigation. The rates are also in line with the rates charged by other firms that handle complex cases and class actions.

33. Siri & Glimstad LLP is familiar with the range of hourly rates typically charged by plaintiffs' class action counsel in data breach and complex consumer class actions throughout the United States, both on a current and historical basis. The rates charged by Siri & Glimstad LLP in this litigation are within the range of market rates charged by attorneys of equivalent experience,

skill, and expertise for legal services furnished in complex contingency class action litigation such as this.

34. Siri & Glimstad LLP kept detailed records regarding the amount of time its attorneys and staff spent on the litigation.

35. Siri & Glimstad LLP's lodestar calculation is based on current billing rates.

36. The lodestar calculation was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Siri & Glimstad LLP.

37. As of the date of this Declaration, Siri & Glimstad LLP has spent 161.3 hours pursuing this matter on behalf of the Settlement Class.

38. As of the date of this Declaration, Siri & Glimstad LLP's total lodestar is \$104,778.00.

39. The time spent was reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this litigation and Siri & Glimstad took meaningful steps to ensure efficiency.

40. Siri & Glimstad LLP expects to spend a significant amount of additional time to see this matter through completion.

41. Siri & Glimstad LLP also advanced costs and expenses for this matter. As of the date of this Declaration, Siri & Glimstad LLP has advanced \$8,572.41 in costs and expenses in connection with this litigation.

42. The costs and expenses incurred in this action are reflected in the books and records of Siri & Glimstad LLP. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials and are an accurate record of the costs and expenses incurred. It is anticipated that additional costs and expenses will accrue to see this matter through completion.

43. The amount of expenses stated above does not include costs that Siri & Glimstad LLP incurred in this litigation but, in an exercise of discretion, do not seek to recover.

44. Siri & Glimstad LLP's expenses were necessary and reasonable to resolve the litigation.

MILBERG, PLLC

45. Milberg, PLLC undertook significant risk in litigating this matter under a contingency fee arrangement with no guarantee of any recovery. There was a substantial risk of no recovery at all given the threshold issues raised by Defendant and the uncertain nature of data breach class action litigation.

46. Milberg, PLLC's rates are reasonable and recently have been approved by multiple judges in this judicial district in connection with lodestar cross-checks. *See In re AACOM Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:25-cv-01239-DLB, ECF No. 41 (D. Md. Mar. 27, 2026) (Boardman, J., granting attorneys' fee motion after examining hourly rates for purposes of lodestar crosscheck); *In re Center for Vein Restoration Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:24-CV-03593, ECF No. 57 (D. Md. Nov. 6, 2025) (Boardman, J.); *In re Retina Group of Washington Data Security Incident Litigation*, No. 8:24-cv-00004-LWW, ECF No. 53 (D. Md. July 21, 2025) (Chasanow, J., granting the attorneys' fee motion). Milberg's hourly rates have also been approved by courts across the country. *See, e.g., In re Onix Group Data Breach Litigation*, No. 23-2288-KSM, ECF No. 57 (ED Pa. Dec. 13, 2024) (Judge Marston approving Milberg hourly rates); *In re: GE/CBPS Data Breach Litigation*, No. 1:20-cv-02903 (KPF), ECF No. 123 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 28, 2023) (Judge Failla approving Milberg hourly rates); *Pagan v. Faneuil, Inc.*, No. 3:22-cv-297, ECF No. 53 (E.D. Va. Feb. 17, 2023) (Judge Payne approving Milberg hourly rates); *Lamie et al. v. LendingTree, LLC*, No. 3:22-cv-00307, ECF No. 60 (W.D.N.C. Feb. 27, 2024) (final approval order approving

Milberg hourly rates as reasonable as part of a lodestar cross-check, and highlighting “the quality, skill, and experience of counsel” and “the excellent results”).

47. Milberg, PLLC’s rates reflect what would be charged to a fee-paying client in the private legal marketplace for complex litigation. The rates are also in line with the rates charged by other firms that handle complex cases and class actions.

48. Milberg, PLLC is familiar with the range of hourly rates typically charged by plaintiffs’ class action counsel in data breach and complex consumer class actions throughout the United States, both on a current and historical basis. The rates charged by Milberg, PLLC in this litigation are within the range of market rates charged by attorneys of equivalent experience, skill, and expertise for legal services furnished in complex contingency class action litigation such as this.

49. Milberg, PLLC kept detailed records regarding the amount of time its attorneys and staff spent on the litigation.

50. Milberg, PLLC’s lodestar calculation is based on current billing rates.

51. The lodestar calculation was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Milberg, PLLC.

52. As of the date of this Declaration, Milberg, PLLC has spent 145 hours pursuing this matter on behalf of the Settlement Class.

53. As of the date of this Declaration, Milberg, PLLC’s total lodestar is \$125,175.20.

54. The time spent was reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this litigation and Siri & Glimstad took meaningful steps to ensure efficiency.

55. Milberg, PLLC expects to spend a significant amount of additional time to see this matter through completion.

56. Milberg, PLLC also advanced costs and expenses for this matter. As of the date of this Declaration, Milberg, PLLC has advanced \$762.50 in costs and expenses in connection with this litigation. The costs and expenses incurred in this action are reflected in the books and records of Milberg, PLLC.

57. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials and are an accurate record of the costs and expenses incurred. It is anticipated that additional costs and expenses will accrue to see this matter through completion.

58. The amount of expenses stated above does not include costs that Milberg, PLLC incurred in this litigation but, in an exercise of discretion, do not seek to recover.

59. Milberg, PLLC's expenses were necessary and reasonable to resolve the litigation

HAUSFELD LLP

60. Hausfeld LLP undertook significant risk in litigating this matter under a contingency fee arrangement with no guarantee of any recovery. There was a substantial risk of no recovery at all given the threshold issues raised by Defendant and the uncertain nature of data breach class action litigation.

61. Hausfeld LLP's rates are reasonable and have been approved by courts across the country. *See, e.g., In re LoanDepot Data Breach Litig.*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167123, at *20 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2025); *Reed v. PostMeds, Inc.*, No. 4:23-cv-05710-HSG (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2025); *Kay v. Frodl*, No. 1:22-cv-10977-NMG (D. Mass. Aug. 14, 2024); *In re Enzo Biochem Data Security Litig.*, No. 2:23-cv-04282-AYS (E.D.N.Y. June 10, 2025); *In re T-Mobile Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, No. 4:21-md-03019-BCW (W.D. Mo. Jan. 16, 2025); *In re Prudential Financial Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, No. 1:24-cv-06818-SRC-AME (D.N.J. Dec. 3, 2025); and *Anaya v. Cencora, Inc.*, 24-cv-02961-CMR (E.D. Pa. Feb. 22, 2026).

62. Hausfeld LLP's rates reflect what would be charged to a fee-paying client in the private legal marketplace for complex litigation. The rates are also in line with the rates charged by other firms that handle complex cases and class actions.

63. Hausfeld LLP is familiar with the range of hourly rates typically charged by plaintiffs' class action counsel in data breach and complex consumer class actions throughout the United States, both on a current and historical basis. The rates charged by Hausfeld LLP in this litigation are within the range of market rates charged by attorneys of equivalent experience, skill, and expertise for legal services furnished in complex contingency class action litigation such as this.

64. Hausfeld LLP kept detailed records regarding the amount of time its attorneys and staff spent on the litigation.

65. Hausfeld LLP's lodestar calculation is based on current billing rates.

66. The lodestar calculation was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Hausfeld, LLP.

67. As of the date of this Declaration, Hausfeld LLP has spent 119.80 hours pursuing this matter on behalf of the Settlement Class.

68. As of the date of this Declaration, Hausfeld LLP's total lodestar is \$106,557.50.

69. The time spent was reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this litigation and Siri & Glimstad took meaningful steps to ensure efficiency.

70. Hausfeld LLP expects to spend a significant amount of additional time to see this matter through completion.

71. Hausfeld LLP also advanced costs and expenses for this matter. As of the date of this Declaration, Hausfeld LLP has advanced \$5,247.23 in costs and expenses in connection with this litigation.

72. The costs and expenses incurred in this action are reflected in the books and records of Hausfeld, LLP. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials and are an accurate record of the costs and expenses incurred. It is anticipated that additional costs and expenses will accrue to see this matter through completion.

73. The amount of expenses stated above does not include costs that Hausfeld LLP incurred in this litigation but, in an exercise of discretion, do not seek to recover.

74. Hausfeld LLP's expenses were necessary and reasonable to resolve the litigation.

MASON & PERRY LLP

75. Mason & Perry LLP undertook significant risk in litigating this matter under a contingency fee arrangement with no guarantee of any recovery. There was a substantial risk of no recovery at all given the threshold issues raised by Defendant and the uncertain nature of data breach class action litigation.

76. Mason & Perry LLP's rates are reasonable and have been approved by courts across the country. *See, e.g., Pannozi et al. v. Deloitte Consulting LLP*, No. 1:24-cv-00524-MRD-AEM, ECF No. 37 (D.R.I. Jan. 29, 2026); *Brim et al. v. Prestige Care Inc.*, No. 3:2024-cv-05133, ECF No. 37 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 21, 2025); *Jolla et al. v. Acadia Health, LLC d/b/a Just Kids Dental*, No. 3:23-cv-01370-SDD-EWD, ECF No. 81 (M.D. La. June 23, 2025); *Toussaint et al. v. HanesBrands, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00879, ECF No. 57 (M.D.N.C. June 23, 2025); *In re Onix Group Data Breach Litigation*, No. 23-2288-KSM, ECF No. 57 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 13, 2024); *In re: Deva*

Concepts Products Liability Action, No. 1:20-cv-01234-GHW, ECF No. 129 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 3, 2022).

77. Mason & Perry LLP's rates reflect what would be charged to a fee-paying client in the private legal marketplace for complex litigation. The rates are also in line with the rates charged by other firms that handle complex cases and class actions.

78. Mason & Perry LLP is familiar with the range of hourly rates typically charged by plaintiffs' class action counsel in data breach and complex consumer class actions throughout the United States, both on a current and historical basis. The rates charged by Mason & Perry LLP in this litigation are within the range of market rates charged by attorneys of equivalent experience, skill, and expertise for legal services furnished in complex contingency class action litigation such as this.

79. Mason & Perry LLP kept detailed records regarding the amount of time its attorneys and staff spent on the litigation.

80. Mason & Perry LLP's lodestar calculation is based on current billing rates.

81. The lodestar calculation was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Mason & Perry LLP.

82. As of the date of this Declaration, Mason & Perry LLP has spent 70.80 hours pursuing this matter on behalf of the Settlement Class.

83. As of the date of this Declaration, Mason & Perry LLP's total lodestar is \$44,707.00.

84. The time spent was reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this litigation and Siri & Glimstad took meaningful steps to ensure efficiency.

85. Mason & Perry LLP expects to spend a significant amount of additional time to see this matter through completion.

86. Mason & Perry LLP also advanced costs and expenses for this matter. As of the date of this Declaration, Mason & Perry LLP has advanced \$1,303.80 in costs and expenses in connection with this litigation.

87. The costs and expenses incurred in this action are reflected in the books and records of Mason & Perry LLP. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials and are an accurate record of the costs and expenses incurred. It is anticipated that additional costs and expenses will accrue to see this matter through completion.

88. The amount of expenses stated above does not include costs that Mason & Perry LLP incurred in this litigation but, in an exercise of discretion, do not seek to recover.

89. Mason & Perry LLP's expenses were necessary and reasonable to resolve the litigation.

KRAMON & GRAHAM, P.A.

90. Kramon & Graham, P.A. undertook significant risk in litigating this matter under a contingency fee arrangement with no guarantee of any recovery. There was a substantial risk of no recovery at all given the threshold issues raised by Defendant and the uncertain nature of data breach class action litigation.

91. Kramon & Graham, P.A.'s rates are reasonable and have been approved by this court on multiple occasions. *See, e.g., In re Retina Group of Washington Data Security Incident Litigation*, No. 24-cv-00004-DKC, ECF No. 53; *Rentschler v. Atlantic General Hospital Corporation*, No. 23-cv-01005-JRR, ECF No. 29; *Fadness et al v. US Fertility, LLC*, No. 21-cv-

00299-PJM, ECF No. 133; *Jien et al v. Perdue Farms, Inc. et al.*, 19-cv-02521-SAG, ECF No. 1012; and *Jackson et al v. Viking Group, Inc. et al.*, No. 18-cv-02356-PJM, ECF No. 46.

92. Kramon & Graham, P.A.'s rates reflect what would be charged to a fee-paying client in the private legal marketplace for complex litigation. The rates are also in line with the rates charged by other firms that handle complex cases and class actions.

93. Kramon & Graham, P.A. is familiar with the range of hourly rates typically charged by plaintiffs' class action counsel in data breach and complex consumer class actions throughout the United States, both on a current and historical basis. The rates charged by Kramon & Graham, P.A. in this litigation are within the range of market rates charged by attorneys of equivalent experience, skill, and expertise for legal services furnished in complex contingency class action litigation such as this.

94. Kramon & Graham, P.A. kept detailed records regarding the amount of time its attorneys and staff spent on the litigation.

95. Kramon & Graham, P.A.'s lodestar calculation is based on current billing rates.

96. The lodestar calculation was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Kramon & Graham, P.A.

97. As of the date of this Declaration, Kramon & Graham, P.A. has spent 16.60 hours pursuing this matter on behalf of the Settlement Class.

98. As of the date of this Declaration, Kramon & Graham, P.A.'s total lodestar is \$16,185.00.

99. The time spent was reasonable and necessary for the prosecution of this litigation and Siri & Glimstad took meaningful steps to ensure efficiency.

100. Kramon & Graham, P.A. expects to spend a significant amount of additional time to see this matter through completion.

101. Kramon & Graham, P.A. also advanced costs and expenses for this matter. As of the date of this Declaration, Kramon & Graham, P.A. has advanced \$405.00 in costs and expenses in connection with this litigation

102. The costs and expenses incurred in this action are reflected in the books and records of Kramon & Graham, P.A. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, check records, and other source materials and are an accurate record of the costs and expenses incurred. It is anticipated that additional costs and expenses will accrue to see this matter through completion.

103. The amount of expenses stated above does not include costs that Kramon & Graham, P.A. incurred in this litigation but, in an exercise of discretion, do not seek to recover.

104. Kramon & Graham, P.A.'s expenses were necessary and reasonable to resolve the litigation

VI. CLASS REPRESENTATIVES' EFFORTS AND SERVICE AWARDS

105. The Class Representatives devoted substantial effort on behalf of the Class, including: (i) completing detailed questionnaires; (ii) providing counsel with critical information to support their claims; (iii) gathering documents and other evidence relevant to the litigation; (iv) agreeing to participate in potentially invasive and time-consuming discovery, including depositions, if required; (v) reviewing pleadings and coordinating with counsel on case strategy and status; (vi) conferring with counsel regarding settlement negotiations; and (vii) carefully considering and approving the Settlement terms on behalf of the Class.

106. The Class Representatives were instrumental to the success of the case and deserve to be compensated for their efforts. As such, a service award of \$1,500.00 per plaintiff (\$33,000 in total) is justified.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 19, 2026, in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

/s/ Tyler J. Bean
Tyler J. Bean

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 19, 2026, in Chicago, Illinois.

/s/ Gary M. Klinger
Gary M. Klinger

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 19, 2026, in Washington, D.C.

/s/ James Pizzirusso
James Pizzirusso

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 19, 2026, in Washington, D.C.

/s/ Gary E. Mason
Gary E. Mason

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 19, 2026, in Baltimore, Maryland.

/s/ James P. Ulwick
James P. Ulwick

EXHIBIT A

FIRM LODESTAR AND EXPENSES SUMMARY

FIRM	HOURS SUMMARY	LODESTAR SUMMARY	COSTS & EXPENSES SUMMARY
MILBERG, PLLC	145.00	\$125,175.20	\$762.50
HAUSFELD LLP	119.80	\$106,557.50	\$5,247.23
SIRI & GLIMSTAD LLP	161.30	\$104,778.00	\$8,572.41
MASON & PERRY LLP	70.80	\$44,707.00	\$1,303.80
KRAMON & GRAHAM, P.A.	16.60	\$16,185.00	\$405.00
FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD	26.70	\$17,680.00	\$431.80
CYBERLAW, LLC	22.80	\$20,520.00	\$191.48
LEXERO LAW	21.50	\$26,380.50	\$15.56
STRANCH, JENNINGS & GARVEY, PLLC	10.70	\$9,080.50	\$655.00
POULIN WILLEY ANASTOPOULO, LLC	23.50	\$33,950.00	\$418.11
ELLZEY, KHERKHER, SANFORD & MONTGOMERY LLP	30.52	\$25,020.40	\$861.80
COHEN MALAD, LLP	1.50	\$1,125.00	\$250.05
EDELSON LECHTZIN LLP	19.40	\$20,415.00	\$421.35
ZIMMERMAN LAW OFFICES, P.C.	17.20	\$15,566.00	\$122.00
DANN LAW FIRM CO. LPA D/B/A DANNLAW	13.50	\$8,057.50	\$40.80
CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER & SPRENGEL LLP	15.10	\$20,730.00	\$958.67
COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP	48.50	\$35,345.00	\$576.12
BRYSON HARRIS SUCIU & DEMAY PLLC	21.00	\$14,430.00	\$505.00
KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.	54.90	\$50,335.00	\$0.00
MURPHY LAW FIRM	23.20	\$14,462.00	\$505.00
SILVERMAN THOMPSON	4.80	\$3,291.50	\$405.00
ZIMMERMAN REED LLP	31.65	\$21,113.75	\$167.80
SROURIAN LAW FIRM, P.C.	11.20	\$8,615.00	\$0.00
LYNCH CARPENTER, LLP	34.20	\$30,450.00	\$197.60
SCHUBERT JONCKHEER & KOLBE LLP	11.00	\$6,807.00	\$1,732.90
MARKOVITS, STOCK & DEMARCO, LLC	48.80	\$32,340.00	\$480.00
TOTAL	1,005.17	\$813,116.85	\$25,226.98

MILBERG, PLLC					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Gary Klinger	Senior Partner	16 years	69.80	\$1,019.00	\$71,126.20
David Lietz	Senior Partner	35 years	20.60	\$1,227.00	\$25,276.20
Casondra Turner	Senior Counsel	13 years	8.50	\$1,019.00	\$8,661.50
Carolyn Cuneo	Senior Associate	15 years	3.00	\$1,019.00	\$3,057.00
Mark Svensson	Associate	5 years	14.70	\$625.00	\$9,187.50
Kendal McLaughlin	Paralegal	-	10.20	\$277.00	\$2,825.40
Michelle Benvenuto	Paralegal	-	6.90	\$277.00	\$1,911.30
Heather Schefflin	Paralegal	-	6.70	\$277.00	\$1,855.90
Ashley Tyrell	Paralegal	-	4.30	\$277.00	\$1,191.10
Sandra Passanisi	Paralegal	-	0.30	\$277.00	\$83.10
TOTAL			145.00		\$125,175.20

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Pro Hac Vice Admission Fees	\$200.00
Service of Process Fees	\$162.50
TOTAL	\$762.50

HAUSFELD LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Jadé James	Paralegal	-	0.50	\$400.00	\$200.00
James Mitchell	Paralegal	-	0.40	\$425.00	\$170.00
Steven Nathan	Of Counsel	38 years	28.80	\$1,050.00	\$30,240.00
James Pizzirusso	Partner	25 years	48.80	\$1,150.00	\$56,120.00
Ramon Rodriguez	Paralegal	-	22.60	\$425.00	\$9,605.00
Gisela Rosa	Associate	2 years	18.10	\$525.00	\$9,502.50
Steven Rotman	Of Counsel	46 years	0.60	\$1,200.00	\$720.00
TOTAL			119.80		\$106,557.50

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$910.00
Westlaw Usage	\$234.99
Pacer Usage	\$18.90
Mediation	\$4,083.34
TOTAL	\$5,247.23

SIRI & GLIMSTAD LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Tyler Bean	Partner	8 years	56.00	\$905.00	\$50,680.00
Sonjay Singh	Sr. Associate	5 years	8.90	\$625.00	\$5,562.50
Kennedy Brian	Associate	5 years	10.10	\$625.00	\$6,312.50
Gabrielle Williams	Associate	4 years	51.70	\$625.00	\$32,312.50
Tanner Hilton	Associate	3 years	0.10	\$625.00	\$62.50
Jennifer Malainy	CMO	-	3.70	\$375.00	\$1,387.50
Alcira Pena	Paralegal	-	0.40	\$325.00	\$130.00
Cherie Cornfield	Paralegal	-	27.10	\$325.00	\$7,588.00
Mike Malainy	Paralegal	-	3.30	\$225.00	\$742.50
TOTAL			161.30		\$104,778.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Research Fees	\$54.93
Service of Process Fees	\$85.00
Mediation	\$8,027.48
TOTAL	\$8,572.41

MASON & PERRY LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Gary E. Mason	Partner	38 years	8.50	\$1,300.00	\$11,050.00
Danielle L. Perry	Partner	12 years	2.40	\$900.00	\$2,160.00
Ra O. Amen	Staff Attorney	9 years	20.90	\$750.00	\$15,675.00
Salena J. Chowdhury	Associate Attorney	3 years	9.00	\$500.00	\$4,500.00
Jenni Suhr	Paralegal	-	17.60	\$365.00	\$6,424.00
Taylor Heath	Paralegal	-	12.40	\$395.00	\$4,898.00
TOTAL			70.80		\$44,707.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$810.00
Pro Hac Vice Admission Fees	\$100.00
Service Of Process Fees	\$331.50
Pacer	\$62.30
TOTAL	\$1,303.80

KRAMON & GRAHAM, P.A.					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
James P. Ulwick	Principal	45+ years	16.60	\$975.00	\$16,185.00
TOTAL			16.60		\$16,185.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
TOTAL	\$405.00

FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
William Federman	Managing Partner	43+ years	6.30	\$1,250.00	\$7,875.00
Jessica Wilkes	Attorney	5 years	8.20	\$675.00	\$5,535.00
Tiffany Peintner	Paralegal	-	2.10	\$350.00	\$735.00
Tashia Poore	Paralegal	-	2.80	\$350.00	\$980.00
Frandelind Traylor	Legal Assistant	-	7.30	\$350.00	\$2,555.00
TOTAL			26.70		\$17,680.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Postage	\$26.80
TOTAL	\$431.80

CYBERLAW, LLC					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Arnold Abraham	Partner	9* years	22.80	\$900.00	\$20,520.00
TOTAL			22.80		\$20,520.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$191.48
TOTAL	\$191.48

**9 years in legal practice, 39 years total experience related to cybersecurity.*

LEXERO LAW					
Name	Position	Years of Experience*	Total Hours	Rate^	Total Lodestar
Eric J. Menhart	Partner	21 years	21.50	\$1,227.00	\$26,380.50
TOTAL			21.50		\$26,380.50

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$15.56
TOTAL	\$15.56

* Calculated based on “years after law school graduation.” *Salazar v. District of Columbia*, 420 U.S. App. D.C. 403, 407, 809 F.3d 58, 62 (2015).

^ Rate exactly as defined by the LSI Laffey Matrix, because the “litigation at issue qualifies as complex federal litigation.” *Salazar*, 420 U.S. App. D.C. at 64.

STRANCH, JENNINGS & GARVEY, PLLC					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Grayson Wells	Partner	6 years	1.10	\$1,000.00	\$1,100.00
J. Gerard Stranch	Partner	23 years	3.70	\$1,525.00	\$5,642.50
Miles McDowell	Associate Attorney	5 years	0.40	\$725.00	\$290.00
Jennifer Roy	Sr. Paralegal	-	2.40	\$395.00	\$948.00
Misty Johnston	Legal Assistant	-	0.40	\$375.00	\$150.00
Ryan Hall	Paralegal	-	0.60	\$375.00	\$225.00
Ryan Rayburn	Paralegal	-	2.20	\$375.00	\$825.00
TOTAL			10.70		\$9,080.50

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Pro Hac Vice Admission Fees	\$200.00
Other (Pacer Fees)	\$50.00
TOTAL	\$655.00

POULIN WILLEY ANASTOPOULO, LLC					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Alina Rizvi	Attorney	1-3 years	0.30	\$1,500.00	\$450.00
Andre Belanger	Attorney	20+ years	9.80	\$1,500.00	\$14,700.00
Antonio Cifuentes	Attorney	1-3 years	0.30	\$1,500.00	\$450.00
Ashley Belanger	Attorney	11-20 years	2.80	\$1,500.00	\$4200.00
Christine Philipose	Paralegal	-	0.30	\$500.00	\$150.00
Deborah Arroyo Diaz	Attorney	1-3 years	0.30	\$1,500.00	\$450.00
Marina Wellman	Paralegal	-	2.40	\$500.00	\$1200.00
Marnacia Williams	Paralegal	-	0.30	\$500.00	\$150.00
Olivia Collins	Law Clerk	-	0.30	\$500.00	\$150.00
Paul Doolittle	Attorney	20+ years	3.20	\$1,500.00	\$4,800.00
Roy Willey, IV	Partner/Attorney	8-10 years	2.60	\$2,500.00	\$6,500.00
Ryan Wilson	Attorney	11-20 years	0.30	\$1,500.00	\$450.00
Valeria Crespo Rosado	Paralegal	-	0.30	\$500.00	\$150.00
William Collins	Law Clerk	-	0.30	\$500.00	\$150.00
TOTAL			23.50		\$33,950.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Service of Process Fees	\$13.11
TOTAL	\$418.11

ELLZEY, KHERKHER, SANFORD & MONTGOMERY LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Leigh Montgomery	Partner	18 years	13.10	\$1,000.00	\$13,100.00
Josh Sanford	Partner	25 years	5.80	\$1,000.00	\$5,800.00
Sean Short	Associate	11 years	8.50	\$650.00	\$5,525.00
Alice Newlin	Senior Paralegal	-	1.40	\$250.00	\$251.40
Raya Jacob	Paralegal	-	1.72	\$200.00	\$344.00
TOTAL			30.52		\$25,020.40

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Service of Process Fees	\$456.80
TOTAL	\$861.80

COHEN MALAD, LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Amina Thomas	Partner	10 years	1.50	750.00	\$1,125.00
TOTAL			1.50		\$1,125.00

Expense	Amount
Service of Process Fees	\$212.25
Other (Pacer Fees)	\$37.80
TOTAL	\$250.05

EDELSON LECHTZIN LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Marc H. Edelson	Partner	39 years	7.30	\$1,200.00	\$8,760.00
Marc H. Edelson	Partner	39 years	0.40	\$1,300.00	\$520.00
Liberato Verderame	Sr. Counsel	29 years	11.50	\$950.00	\$10,925.00
Liberato Verderame	Sr. Counsel	29 years	0.20	\$1,050.00	\$210.00
TOTAL			19.40		\$20,415.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Service of Process Fees	\$16.35
TOTAL	\$421.35

ZIMMERMAN LAW OFFICES, P.C.					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Tom Zimmerman	Shareholder	30 years	17.20	\$905.00	\$15,566.00
TOTAL			17.20		\$15,566.00

Expense	Amount
Service of Process Fees	\$122.00
TOTAL	\$122.00

DANN LAW FIRM CO. LPA D/B/A DANNLAW					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Marc E. Dann	Partner	35 years	1.70	\$1,000.00	\$1,700.00
Brian D. Flick	Partner	19 years	5.10	\$625.00	\$3,187.50
Brent S. Snyder	Associate	20 years	5.70	\$550.00	\$2,970.00
Kimberly S. White	Paralegal	-	1.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
TOTALS			13.50		\$8,057.50

Expense	Amount
Other (Pacer Fees)	\$40.80
TOTAL	\$40.80

CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER & SPRENGEL LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Daniel Herrera	Partner	18 years	1.60	\$1,300.00	\$2,080.00
Nickolas Hagman	Partner	13 years	3.50	\$1,100.00	\$3,850.00
Alex Lee	Associate	6 years	16.00	\$800.00	\$12,800.00
Sharon Nyland	Paralegal	-	0.40	\$500.00	\$200.00
Kelly McDonald	Paralegal	-	3.60	\$500.00	\$1,800.00
TOTAL			15.10		\$20,730.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Other (Research)	\$553.67
TOTAL	\$958.67

COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Thomas E. Loeser	Partner	27 years	19.20	\$1,100.00	\$21,120.00
Ellen J. Wen	Associate Attorney	3 years	14.00	\$600.00	\$8,400.00
Jacob M. Alhadeff	Associate Attorney	3 years	1.50	\$600.00	\$900.00
Tara Faulds	Senior Paralegal	-	5.90	\$400.00	\$2,360.00
Lucy Gould	Paralegal/Case Asst	-	5.90	\$350.00	\$2,065.00
Oliver Loeser	Clerk	-	2.00	\$250.00	\$500.00
TOTAL			48.50		\$35,345.00

Expense	Amount
Other (Lexis Nexis)	\$576.12
TOTAL	\$576.12

BRYSON HARRIS SUCIU & DEMAY PLLC					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Robert Jimenez	Partner	17 years	17.30	\$750.00	\$12,975.00
Scott Falgoust	Partner	15 years	2.00	\$600.00	\$1,200.00
Alvin Jaramillo	Paralegal	-	1.00	\$150.00	\$150.00
Lisette Blanco	Paralegal	-	0.60	\$150.00	\$90.00
Amanda Mkamanga	Paralegal	-	0.10	\$150.00	\$15.00
TOTAL			21.00		\$14,430.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Pro Hac Vice Admission Fees	\$100.00
TOTAL	\$505.00

KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Jeff Ostrow	Managing Partner	29 years	14.00	\$1,100.00	\$15,400
Courtney E. Maccarone	Partner	14 years	38.40	\$900.00	\$34,560
Macey A. Geller	Law Clerk	-	2.50	\$150.00	\$375.00
TOTALS			54.90		\$50,335.00

Expense	Amount
TOTAL	\$0.00

MURPHY LAW FIRM					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
A. Brooke Murphy	Partner	16 years	13.30	\$785.00	\$10,440.50
Hunter D. Antonisse	Associate	4 years	4.80	\$535.00	\$2,568.00
Allicia D. Bolton	Paralegal	-	5.10	\$285.00	\$1,453.50
TOTAL			23.20		\$14,462.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Pro Hac Vice Admission Fees	\$100.00
TOTAL	\$505.00

SILVERMAN THOMPSON					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
William Sinclair	Partner	24 years	4.70	\$695.00	\$3,266.50
Emily Neiman	Paralegal	-	0.10	\$250.00	\$25.00
TOTAL			4.80		\$3,291.50

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
TOTAL	\$405.00

ZIMMERMAN REED LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Brian C. Gudmundson	Partner	22 years	7.40	\$1,050.00	\$7,770.00
Madison M. DeMaris	Associate	4 years	17.00	\$625.00	\$10,625.00
Leslie Harms	Paralegal	-	6.95	\$375.00	\$2,606.25
Amanda Klinger	Legal Assistant	-	0.30	\$375.00	\$112.50
TOTAL			31.65		\$21,113.75

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$150.00
Other (Legal Research)	\$17.80
TOTAL	\$167.80

SROURIAN LAW FIRM, P.C.					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Daniel Srourian	Partner	14 years	7.30	\$950.00	\$6,935.00
Yervand Boyajyan	Associate	1 year	2.10	\$500.00	\$1,050.00
Mayra Borboa	Paralegal	-	1.80	\$350.00	\$630.00
TOTALS			11.20		\$8,615.00

Expense	Amount
TOTAL	\$0.00

LYNCH CARPENTER, LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Gary Lynch	Partner	37 years	10.20	\$1,350.00	\$13,770.00
Nick Colella	Partner	9 years	4.90	\$950.00	\$4,655.00
Anasuya Shekhar	Associate	7 years	1.80	\$850.00	\$1,530.00
Patrick Donathen	Associate	5 years	11.10	\$750.00	\$8,325.00
Daniel Hart	Paralegal	-	6.20	\$350.00	\$2,170.00
TOTAL			34.20		\$30,450.00

Expense	Amount
Service of Process Fees	\$197.60
TOTAL	\$197.60

SCHUBERT JONCKHEER & KOLBE LLP					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Amber L. Schubert	Partner	14 years	1.80	\$1,075.00	\$1,935.00
Dustin L. Schubert	Partner	18 years	0.10	\$1,075.00	\$107.00
Sonum Dixit	Associate	2 years	7.90	\$550.00	\$4,345.00
Nelida Almeida	Paralegal	-	1.20	\$350.00	\$420.00
TOTAL			11.00		\$6,807.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Pro Hac Vice Admission Fees	\$100.00
Service of Process Fees	\$140.00
Pacer – Legal Research	\$17.90
Cision – Notice Cost	\$1,070.00
TOTAL	\$1,732.90

MARKOVITS, STOCK & DEMARCO, LLC					
Name	Position	Years of Experience	Total Hours	Rate	Total Lodestar
Terence R. Coates	Partner	16 years	15.30	\$950.00	\$14,535.00
Dylan J. Gould	Partner	8 years	7.40	\$695.00	\$5,143.00
Jonathan T. Deters	Attorney	11 years	10.30	\$675.00	\$6,952.50
Spencer D. Campbell	Attorney	3 years	6.40	\$485.00	\$3,104.00
Ashley Paver	Paralegal	-	5.10	\$300.00	\$1,530.00
Brandy Mathews	Paralegal	-	4.30	\$250.00	\$1,075.00
TOTAL			48.80		\$32,340.00

Expense	Amount
Filing Fees	\$405.00
Service of Process Fees	\$75.00
TOTAL	\$480.00