

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8

9 TERESA FARRIS; WARDELL  
10 BRAXTON; GIOVANNI KINSEY;  
11 GUADALUPE MONTEJANO; THOMAS  
12 EDDINGTON; PAUL McVAY; FRANK  
13 MURILLO; RICHARD VINSON, and all  
14 other people who are similarly situated,  
15 Plaintiffs,  
16 v.  
17 FRANKLIN COUNTY, SHERIFF  
18 RICHARD LATHI and CAPTAIN RICK  
19 LONG,  
20 Defendants.

No. 4:14-cv-05083-SAB

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT  
MOTION TO AWARD  
PLAINTIFFS' ATTORNEYS'  
FEES AND COSTS**

21 Before the Court is the Parties' Joint Motion to Award Plaintiffs' Attorneys'  
22 Fees and Costs, ECF No. 120. The parties jointly ask that the Court enter an order  
23 awarding Plaintiffs their reasonable fees and costs in the total amount of  
24 \$399,942.66, in addition to the amount previously awarded for Plaintiffs' statutory  
25 costs of \$615.00. ECF No. 120. On November 1, 2016, the Court ordered the  
26 parties to file documentation in support of the reasonableness of their request to  
27 award Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees. ECF No. 126. The parties have since filed, and  
28

**ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO AWARD PLAINTIFF'S  
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS + 1**

1 the Court has reviewed, that supporting documentation. ECF Nos. 130, 131, 132,  
2 133, 134, 135.

3 The Court has an “independent obligation to ensure that the award, like the  
4 settlement itself, is reasonable, even if the parties have agreed to the amount.” In  
5 re *Bluetooth Headset Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 654 F.3d 935, 941 (9th Cir. 2011). In a  
6 class action, the Court utilizes the lodestar method in determining the fee amount.  
7 *Id.* This method involves “multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party  
8 reasonably expended on the litigation by the hourly rate.” *Staton v. Boeing Co.*,  
9 327 F.3d 938, 965 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d  
10 359, 363 (9th Cir. 1996)). “The resulting figure may be adjusted upward or  
11 downward to account for several factors including the quality of the  
12 representation, the benefit obtained for the class, the complexity and novelty of the  
13 issues presented, and the risk of nonpayment.” *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d  
14 1011, 1029 (9th Cir. 1998) (citing *Kerr v. Screen Extras Guild, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 67,  
15 70 (9th Cir. 1975)).

16 Having reviewed the documentation in support of the parties’ Motion to  
17 Award Plaintiffs’ Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, ECF No. 120, the Court finds that  
18 the proposed award of \$399,942.66 is fair and reasonable, and complies with the  
19 requirements of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(d). Thus, the  
20 Court finds good cause to grant the motion and award Plaintiffs their reasonable  
21 attorneys’ fees and costs.

22 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

23 1. The Parties’ Joint Motion to Award Plaintiffs’ Attorneys’ Fees and  
24 Costs, ECF No. 120, is **GRANTED**.

25 2. Plaintiffs are awarded \$399,942.66 to compensate them for reasonable  
26 attorneys’ fees and costs. This figure is in addition to the statutory costs of  
27 \$615.00 previously awarded by the Court.

28 **ORDER GRANTING JOINT MOTION TO AWARD PLAINTIFF’S  
ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS + 2**

1           3. The District Court Executive is directed to enter judgment in favor of  
2 Plaintiff and against Defendants in the amount of \$399,942.66.

3           **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk of Court is directed to enter this Order  
4 and forward copies to counsel.

5           **DATED** this 13th day of December, 2016.



10 

11           Stanley A. Bastian  
12           United States District Judge