

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS :
ANTITRUST LITIGATION : Master File No. 12-md-02311

: Case No. 12-cv-00102
: Case No. 12-cv-00202

PRODUCT(S): : Case No. 12-cv-00302
: Case No. 12-cv-00602

: Case No. 13-cv-00702
AUTOMOTIVE WIRE HARNESSSES; : Case No. 13-cv-01002

INSTRUMENT PANEL CLUSTERS; : Case No. 13-cv-01102
FUEL SENDERS; OCCUPANT SAFETY : Case No. 13-cv-01302

RESTRAINT SYSTEMS; SWITCHES; : Case No. 13-cv-01402
STEERING ANGLE SENSORS; HID : Case No. 13-cv-01502

BALLASTS, ALTERNATORS, : Case No. 13-cv-01602
STARTERS, IGNITION COILS, MOTOR : Case No. 13-cv-01702

GENERATORS, INVERTERS, AIR : Case No. 13-cv-01802
FLOW METERS, FUEL INJECTION : Case No. 13-cv-02002

SYSTEMS, VALVE TIMING CONTROL : Case No. 13-cv-02202
DEVICES, ELECTRONIC THROTTLE : Case No. 13-cv-02402

BODIES, RADIATORS, and ATF : Case No. 13-cv-02502
WARMERS : Case No. 13-cv-02602

This Document Relates to: : Hon. Marianne O. Battani

ALL DEALERSHIP ACTIONS :
:

**ORDER REGARDING AUTO DEALERS' MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF
LITIGATION EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

The above matter came before the Court on the Auto Dealers' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, reimbursement of litigation expenses, and service awards.

The Court has reviewed the memorandum submitted by the Auto Dealers in support of their motion seeking an award of attorneys' fees, reimbursement of litigation expenses, and the issuance of service awards. The Court has also reviewed the various declarations and submissions relating to that motion and held a hearing on November 18, 2015.

Based on the record and proceedings before the Court, it is hereby **ORDERED**:

1. The Court has considered the relevant case law and authority and finds that awards of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses to the Auto Dealers and their counsel are appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 54(d)(2).

2. The Court engages in a two-part analysis when assessing the reasonableness of a petition seeking an award of attorneys' fees. *In re Cardinal Health Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 528 F.Supp.2d 752, 760 (S.D. Ohio 2007). The Court first determines the method of calculating the attorneys' fees: it applies either the percentage of the fund approach or the lodestar method. *Id.*; *Van Horn v. Nationwide Prop. and Cas. Inc. Co.*, 436 F. App'x 496, 498 (6th Cir. 2011).

3. The Court has the discretion to select the appropriate method for calculating attorneys' fees "in light of the unique characteristics of class actions in general, and of the unique circumstances of the actual cases before them." *Rawlings v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc.*, 9 F.3d 513, 516 (6th Cir. 1993). In common fund cases, the award of attorneys' fees need only "be reasonable under the circumstances." *Id.*, 9 F.3d at 516. The Court has also analyzed and weighed the six factors described in *Ramey v. Cincinnati Enquirer, Inc.*, 508 F.2d 1188 (6th Cir. 1974).

4. The Court will award fees to the Auto Dealers using the percentage-of-the-fund approach. This method of awarding attorneys' fees is preferred in this district because it eliminates disputes

about the reasonableness of rates and hours, conserves judicial resources, and aligns the interests of class counsel and the class members. *Rawlings*, 9 F.3d at 515; *Shane Group, Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan*, No. 10-cv-14360, 2015 WL 1498888 at * 15 (E.D. Mich. March 31, 2015); *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 08-MDL-01952, 2011 WL 6209188, at *16 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2011); *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 502; *Cardinal*, 528 F.Supp.2d at 762 (the Sixth Circuit has “explicitly approved the percentage approach in common fund cases.”); *In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig.*, 2014 WL 2946459, *1 (E.D. Tenn. Jun. 30, 2014).

5. The Court **GRANTS** the Auto Dealers’ request for reimbursement of past litigation expenses in the amount of **\$1,661,945.95**. The past litigation expenses incurred in specific parts cases involved in these settlements, as set forth in the declarations submitted by counsel for the Auto Dealers, shall be deducted from the settlement funds available in those cases. The past litigation expenses incurred in the general prosecution of the cases with settlements currently before the Court shall be reimbursed on a pro rata basis from each of the settlements.

6. The Court **GRANTS** the Auto Dealers’ request to establish a fund for future litigation expenses in the amount of **\$2,947,395**. The money used to create the future litigation fund shall also be deducted from the settlements on a pro rata basis. As indicated in the memorandum submitted in support of this motion, the future litigation expenses will only be used in the cases at issue in the settlements currently before the Court. If the future litigation fund is not fully used, the money shall be returned to the members of those settlement classes that contributed to the future litigation fund.

7. The Court authorizes class counsel for the Auto Dealers to pay the costs of the settlement notice and claims administration (being handled by Gilardi & Co.) from the settlement funds on a pro rata basis.

8. Counsel for the Auto Dealers request a fee award of one-third of the settlement funds remaining after the future litigation fund and the cost of class notice and claim administration have been deducted. The award requested is within the range of fee awards made by courts in this Circuit. *In re Prandin Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litig.*, 2015 WL 1396473 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 20, 2015) (awarding one-third of the fund); *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, 2011 WL 6209188, at *19; *Skelaxin*, 2014 WL 2946459, at *1; *In re Southeastern Milk Antitrust Litig.*, 2013 WL 2155387, at *8 (E.D. Tenn. May 17, 2013); *Thacker v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C.*, 695 F. Supp. 2d, 521, 528 (E.D. Ky. 2010); *Bessey v. Packerland Plainwell, Inc.*, No. 4:06-CV-95, 2007 WL 3173972, at *4 (W.D. Mich. 2007); *Delphi*, 248 F.R.D. at 502-03; *In re National Century Financial Enterprises, Inc. Investment Litig.*, 2009 WL 1473975 (S.D. Ohio, May 27, 2009); *Kogan v. AIMCO Fox Chase, L.P.*, 193 F.R.D. 496, 503 (E.D. Mich. 2000).

9. The Court has considered the six *Ramey* factors in weighing a fee award to counsel for the Auto Dealers: (1) the value of the benefits rendered to the class; (2) society's stake in rewarding attorneys who produce such benefits in order to maintain an incentive to others; (3) whether the services were undertaken on a contingent fee basis; (4) the value of the services on an hourly basis [the lodestar cross-check]; (5) the complexity of the litigation; and (6) the professional skill and standing of counsel on both sides. *Ramey*, 508 F.2d at 1194-97.

10. The *Ramey* factors and a cross-check of the lodestar incurred by counsel for the Auto Dealers indicate that the fee requested constitutes fair and reasonable compensation for the work done and the benefits achieved for the members of the settlement classes. The lodestar currently exceeds the fee requested so any multiplier is currently a negative multiplier.

11. The Court **GRANTS** an award of attorneys' fees to counsel for the Auto Dealers in the amount of one-third of the net settlement funds available after the deduction of: (1) the cost of the settlement notice and claims administration, and (2) the future litigation expense fund

referenced above. These attorneys' fees, totaling **\$18,500,168**, shall be paid on a pro rata basis from the net settlement funds available for each settlement currently before the Court.

12. The Court hereby **AWARDS** each class representative named in the operative Complaints in the cases listed above a service award of \$50,000.00 for their effort and service to the members of the settlement classes in bringing these cases and helping move the cases to settlements that benefit the absent settlement class members. These awards shall be paid on a pro rata basis from the settlements currently before the Court.

Date: November 19, 2015

s/Marianne O. Battani
MARIANNE O. BATTANI
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing Order was served upon counsel of record via the Court's ECF System to their respective email addresses or First Class U.S. mail to the non-ECF participants on December 7, 2015.

s/ Kay Doaks
Case Manager