

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

ARTHUR L. LEWIS, JR., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO,

Defendant.

Case No. 98 C 5596

Judge Joan B. Gottschall

**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion to Award Plaintiffs' Attorney's Fees ("Motion").

The Court, having considered the Motion and being aware of the extensive history and record in this case, finds as follows pursuant to Rules 23(h)(1) and 52(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:

1. After protracted legal proceedings in this class action, including a full trial on both liability and extensive remedial proceedings before this Court, two appeals and one remand to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and an appeal to the United States Supreme Court, this Court has found that plaintiffs are prevailing parties within the meaning of Section 706(K) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. 42 USC § 2000e-5(K).

2. On March 21, 2012 this Court entered an order awarding Plaintiffs' Counsel's fees and costs expended through mid-September 2011, [Dkt. # 522], reserving consideration of costs and fees subsequently incurred for future

proceedings. On December 12, 2013, the Court entered an order awarding Plaintiffs' Counsel's costs since mid-September 2011. [Dkt. # 698].

3. Since mid-September 2011, Plaintiffs' counsel have invested over 2,010 hours of attorney time and 2,950 hours of paralegal time in representation of the Plaintiffs. All the proceedings in this case have now been concluded, with the exception of the determination of Plaintiffs' final claims for attorneys' fees for that work.

4. The parties have engaged in disclosures of information which have resulted in unopposed claims for plaintiffs' attorneys' fees in the amounts indicated below. Plaintiffs' counsel have provided the City with information relating to all of the time and expenses incurred from September 2011 to the present. The Court finds that the amounts of legal fees are justified.

5. The Court finds that there is neither any evidence of collusion nor other impropriety in the parties' discussions regarding attorney's fees, nor any adverse impact on the plaintiff class from the proposed awards of attorney's fees, which are payable wholly in addition to and do not reduce, delay or otherwise affect monetary amounts or other remedies and relief available to class members in any manner. Indeed, in this case, all relief has already been awarded to the Plaintiffs, as there has been a fully implemented hiring remedy and distribution of back pay and interest.

6. Accordingly, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedures 23(h) and 54(d)(2), this Court finds that the proposed awards of attorney's fees are fair and

reasonable, and orders that the City of Chicago make the following payments of attorney's fees to each of the indicated plaintiffs' counsel on or before thirty days after the entry of this order, on or before April 21, 2014:

- a. To the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Inc., \$71,600 in fees for work done since mid-September 2011;
- b. To Robinson, Curley & Clayton, \$16,000 in fees for work done since mid-September 2011;
- c. To the Chicago Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, \$2,400 in fees for work done since mid-September 2011;
- d. To Hughes Socol Piers Resnick & Dym, Ltd., \$1,175,000 in fees for work done since mid-September 2011;
- e. To Bridget Arimond, \$11,000 in fees for work done since mid-September 2011;
- f. To Miner Barnhill & Galland, P.C., \$114,000 in fees for work done since mid-September 2011;

The above-stated amounts represent a compromise of all of Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees incurred through the date of the entry of this Order. Plaintiffs' counsel release the City from any and all claims for fees and expenses related to this case through the date of the entry of this Order.

7. Plaintiffs' counsel have posted notice of this Motion and a copy of this order (as proposed) on the website maintained for this case, [www.cfd1995testlitigation.com](http://www.cfd1995testlitigation.com), and on the Class Action Administrator's website,

www.chicagofirefighterclassaction.com. The Court finds that this manner of notice was reasonable, the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(h).

APPROVED and ORDERED this 21st day of March, 2014.



---

JOAN B. GOTTSCHALL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE