

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION**

JED and ALISA BEHAR, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NORTHROP GRUMMAN CORPORATION
AND NORTHROP GRUMMAN SYSTEMS
CORPORATION,

Defendants

Case No. 21-cv-03946-HDV-SK

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF RYAN D. ELLIS IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, LITIGATION
EXPENSES, AND CLASS REPRESENTATIVE
AWARDS**

Hearing:

Date: November 12, 2026

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Place: Courtroom 5B, 5th Floor

350 W. 1st Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Judge: Hon. Hernán D. Vera

DECLARATION OF RYAN D. ELLIS

I, Ryan D. Ellis, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I am a Senior Attorney with The Lanier Law Firm, P.C. ("Lanier" or the "Firm"), counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class Members in this matter. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice before all courts of the State of Texas, and I was admitted *pro hac vice* in this action on December 10, 2021. Throughout this litigation I was one of the lead attorneys participating in this case on behalf of Lanier. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein and am competent to testify.

2. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for an Award of Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses and Class Representative Awards (the "Motion").

1 3. The Court has appointed four law firms to represent the Class in this case: Lanier, Nidel
2 & Nace, P.L.L.C., Environmental Energy & Natural Resources Advocates, P.L.L.C., and the Law Office
3 of Gideon Kracov (collectively, “Class Counsel”). Class Counsel have collectively led the Class’s
4 efforts in this case over more than five years, from inception through four days of jury trial to settlement
5 and now on to class settlement notice and administration.

6 4. This declaration focuses on facts bearing on the Motion, including the qualifications and
7 experience of Lanier and the Lanier attorneys who worked on this case, a summary of the Firm’s work
8 from inception through resolution, the Firm’s hours, rates and lodestar, the costs the Firm advanced and
9 has carried unreimbursed since 2021, and facts within my knowledge bearing on the requested Class
10 Representative Awards. Declarations of co-counsel and of Jed Behar and Alisa Behar are submitted
11 concurrently. The Behars’ declarations describe their service in their own words, and I do not repeat
12 that account here.

13 14 **II. THE LANIER LAW FIRM’S QUALIFICATIONS**

15 5. The Lanier Law Firm was founded in 1990 by W. Mark Lanier and maintains offices in
16 Houston, Los Angeles, New York, and Fort Worth. The Firm represents individuals and companies in
17 complex tort, environmental, product liability, pharmaceutical, commercial and class litigation. Unlike
18 many firms that resolve such matters short of trial, Lanier regularly tries complex scientific and technical
19 cases to verdict.

20 6. Over the course of its history the Firm has recovered more than \$20 billion for its clients.
21 Its verdicts include \$4.69 billion on behalf of twenty-two women and their families in litigation over
22 asbestos-contaminated talcum powder, named the *National Law Journal*’s Top Verdict of 2018; \$9
23 billion against Takeda Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd. and Eli Lilly & Co. concerning the diabetes medication
24 Actos; \$650.6 million against retail pharmacies operated by Walmart, CVS, and Walgreens for their
25 role in the distribution of opioid painkillers, followed by a \$1.85 billion settlement in Texas with opioid
26 manufacturers and distributors; verdicts of \$1.05 billion and \$528 million against DePuy Orthopaedics
27 Inc. and Johnson & Johnson in metal-on-metal hip implant litigation; and \$253 million in the first Vioxx
28 trial in the United States.

1 7. The Firm also served as counsel in the national Vioxx settlement with Merck & Co.,
2 which resolved for \$4.85 billion. The Firm has been recognized by Best Lawyers “Best Law Firms”
3 (*U.S. News & World Report*), The National Trial Lawyers, Super Lawyers, and *The National Law*
4 *Journal’s* Elite Trial Lawyers.

5 8. The Firm's experience is not limited to product liability and pharmaceutical litigation. It
6 has substantial experience prosecuting environmental contamination claims on behalf of residential
7 communities — litigation that requires marshaling expert evidence in hydrogeology, toxicology, and
8 economics, and the financial capacity to carry the resulting costs over many years without payment. In
9 addition to this action, the Firm currently represents a certified class of thousands of homeowners in
10 *Black v. Union Pacific Railroad Company* (D. Kan.), an environmental class action alleging that Union
11 Pacific’s mishandling and disposal of TCE and other chemicals at a Wichita, Kansas industrial site
12 caused those chemicals to migrate into the soil and groundwater beneath nearby residential properties.
13 The Firm has served as class action counsel for homeowners in heavy metals contamination litigation
14 in Carteret, New Jersey; has pursued natural resource damages claims on behalf of the State of New
15 Jersey; and serves as co-counsel for the State of Texas in litigation concerning the marketing and sale
16 of PFAS-containing products.

17 9. The Firm’s environmental and toxic tort practice includes litigation involving
18 mesothelioma and asbestos exposure, dangerous drugs, defective medical devices, and—as here—
19 contamination affecting residential communities. Lanier attorneys have been recognized as Board
20 Certified in Personal Injury Trial Law and Civil Appellate Law by the Texas Board of Legal
21 Specialization.

22 10. W. Mark Lanier is the Firm’s founder and is widely regarded as one of the leading civil
23 trial lawyers in the United States. He has tried numerous complex scientific and technical cases to
24 verdict, including some of the largest verdicts recorded in United States history, and his trial work is
25 frequently the subject of national coverage.

26 11. Alex J. Brown is the Managing Attorney of the Firm’s Business Litigation section. He
27 represents companies and individuals in federal and state courts across the country at both the trial and
28 appellate levels, and in domestic and international arbitration. He has serves as co-counsel for eight

1 states in antitrust litigation against Google, as counsel for the State of Texas consumer protection
2 litigation, as counsel for the State of Louisiana in national pharmacy benefit manager litigation, and
3 previously served as counsel to the United States Football League in trademark litigation against Fox
4 Sports. He was a member of trial teams securing multi-billion dollar jury verdicts in medical device and
5 pharmaceutical litigation. Before joining Lanier he was a partner at one of the oldest and largest law
6 firms in Texas.

7 12. My own practice centers on complex commercial litigation and environmental class
8 actions, with a particular emphasis on contamination cases affecting residential communities. In
9 addition to this case, I represent a certified class of homeowners in *Black v. Union Pacific Railroad*
10 *Company* (D. Kan.), an environmental class action alleging TCE contamination that is similar to this
11 case. I also represent a consortium of states in complex antitrust litigation against Google, as well as
12 clients in pharmaceutical qui tam litigation, state Medicaid fraud litigation, and contract and trade secret
13 matters.

14 13. The Lanier attorneys and professional staff principally responsible for this matter, in
15 addition to Mr. Lanier, Mr. Brown and me, were attorneys Alex Abston, Megan Waida, Joshua Upham,
16 Alfred Mackenzie, Caroline McLeod, Matt Przywara and Davis LaBarre, supported by paralegals Emily
17 Olson, Belinda Lower, Courtney Walton and Ariel Oxner. True and correct copies of the professional
18 biographies of these attorneys are attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

19 14. Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Przywara and Mr. LaBarre are no longer with the Firm. They are
20 identified as former attorneys in the schedules below and attached.

21 22 **III. OVERVIEW OF THE LITIGATION AND THE RISK ASSUMED**

23 15. This action concerns releases of volatile organic compounds, principally TCE and PCE,
24 from an industrial site at 8020 Deering Avenue in Canoga Park, California. Plaintiffs alleged
25 predecessors of Defendants manufactured printed circuit boards at the site from approximately 1968 to
26 1970 and discharged solvents into the subsurface, producing a groundwater plume roughly 2.4 miles
27 long beneath a residential neighborhood of 3,294 single-family homes and townhomes. Defendants
28 denied every element of those allegations.

1 16. The operative Second Amended Complaint pleaded negligence, nuisance and trespass.
2 It excluded all personal injury, wrongful death and medical monitoring claims, and the Class Settlement
3 releases none of them.

4 17. Lanier accepted this representation on a wholly contingent basis with full knowledge that
5 recovery was uncertain and remote in time. Liability depended on establishing corporate successorship
6 for conduct that began more than fifty years before suit; on proving, through expert modeling, the
7 geometry and provenance of a subsurface plume; on establishing a complete vapor-intrusion pathway
8 into homes; and on proving class-wide damages in the form of diminished property values and necessary
9 mitigation measures. Defendants asserted a statute of limitations defense that, if accepted, would have
10 barred the claims of the entire Class, and contended throughout that delayed discovery presented
11 individual issues defeating certification.

12 18. The Firm agreed to advance the costs of the litigation and to be compensated only from
13 a recovery. The Firm has received no fee of any kind for its work in this action and has been reimbursed
14 for none of the costs it advanced. Defendants are well-resourced corporations and were represented by
15 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP and Cermak & Inglin, LLP, who aggressively defended the case through
16 five years of litigation and four days of trial.

17
18 **IV. SUMMARY OF LANIER'S WORK**

19 19. Through August 31, 2026, Lanier timekeepers devoted 5,965.50 hours to this action.
20 Lanier attorneys and staff record their time contemporaneously, with narrative descriptions and task
21 designations. The figures below are drawn from those contemporaneous records, and have been
22 reviewed by me. Following review of those records I have sorted the entries by task category and
23 summarized them for the Court's convenience. The categories below correspond to the schedules
24 attached as Exhibits 2 and 3, which present summaries of the Firm's billing records in the formats
25 required by this Court's standing order.

26 **A. Pre-Litigation Investigation and Pleadings (67.45 hours)**

27 20. Before filing, Class Counsel investigated the Site's regulatory history, including files of
28 the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board and publicly available GeoTracker records, and

1 researched the ownership and operational history of the Site. Plaintiffs filed the initial Class Action
2 Complaint on May 10, 2021, ECF No. 1; a First Amended Complaint on September 1, 2021, ECF No.
3 41; and the operative Second Amended Complaint on March 21, 2023, ECF No. 91. Plaintiffs opposed
4 motions to dismiss and motions to strike, ECF Nos. 45, 46. Ultimately the case proceeded on the three
5 property-based claims.

6
7 **B. Discovery (1,141.40 hours) and Expert Discovery and Depositions (219.65 hours)**

8 21. Defendants produced, and Plaintiffs processed and reviewed, more than three million
9 pages of documents concerning Site history, hydrogeologic analysis and testing at the Site and in the
10 Class Area, and vapor-intrusion testing in Class Area homes. Plaintiffs took 10 fact depositions and 13
11 expert depositions and defended 15 depositions noticed by Defendants — nearly forty depositions in
12 all. Class Counsel also obtained and reviewed records from the class representatives and produced those
13 to Defendants in response to discovery.

14 22. Plaintiffs retained and worked with six testifying experts across five technical
15 disciplines: Dr. W. Richard Laton (hydrogeology and geology); Dr. Mark Kram (vapor intrusion); Dr.
16 Jill E. Ryer-Powder (toxicology); Dr. Matt Tonkin (hydrogeology and groundwater modeling); Dr.
17 Hugh Gorman (industrial history); and Dr. Kevin Boyle (real estate economics). Each submitted an
18 initial report and at least one supplemental report and sat for deposition. Defendants retained ten
19 testifying experts. Lanier attorneys analyzed each report, participated in the depositions and prepared
20 cross-examinations.

21 **C. Class Certification (131.90 hours), Motions to Exclude Experts (137.80 hours), and**
22 **the Rule 23(f) Petition (44.60 hours)**

23 23. Plaintiffs moved for class certification, ECF No. 116. Defendants opposed, ECF No. 132,
24 and simultaneously moved to exclude all six of Plaintiffs' experts, ECF Nos. 133, 134, 143–145, 147.
25 Class Counsel briefed the certification motion and six separate oppositions. ECF Nos. 150, 152, 154,
26 156, 159, 161. On July 1, 2024, the Court certified a Mitigation Class and a Property Damage Class and
27 denied the exclusion motions. ECF No. 175.

28 24. Defendants then petitioned the Ninth Circuit under Rule 23(f) for permission to appeal
the certification order. Class Counsel opposed the petition, and the Ninth Circuit denied it in September

2024. Case No. 24-4324, ECF No. 12.1. Had the petition been granted and the certification order reversed, the Class would have been dissolved before trial.

D. Summary Judgment (211.60 hours), Decertification (53.40 hours), and the Second Round of Exclusion Motions

25. Defendants mounted a second, coordinated attack on the case. They moved for summary judgment, ECF No. 238; moved to decertify both classes, ECF No. 246; filed a motion for clarification that sought to prevent Plaintiffs from mentioning the toxic characteristics of TCE at trial, ECF No. 247; and again moved to exclude all six of Plaintiffs' experts, ECF Nos. 240–245. Class Counsel opposed each motion. ECF Nos. 259–267. The Court denied summary judgment, ECF No. 296; denied decertification, ECF No. 302; and resolved the second round of exclusion motions in Plaintiffs' favor, ECF No. 323.

E. Trial Preparation and Motions in Limine (2,250.60 hours) and Trial (307.90 hours)

26. The parties submitted competing and joint trial briefs, trial plans, witness lists, exhibit lists, motions in limine, proposed jury instructions, proposed verdict forms, proposed voir dire questions, a statement of the case and a proposed Final Pretrial Conference Order. ECF Nos. 308–322, 332–348. Lanier prepared or contributed to each of these submissions and retained a jury consultant to assist with voir dire strategy and jury selection.

27. On March 9, 2026, Defendants applied *ex parte* to continue the trial date by ninety days. ECF No. 373. Class Counsel opposed the application and trial commenced as scheduled. Defendants also moved for sanctions under Rule 37(c)(1), ECF No. 364, which the Court denied. ECF No. 382.

28. Trial commenced on March 24, 2026. A jury was selected and sworn, the parties delivered opening statements, and four witnesses were sworn and testified. The Court had allotted each side forty-two hours for the liability and compensatory damages phase, with a separate punitive damages phase to follow any plaintiffs' verdict. On March 30, 2026, the Court held and continued trial due to the settlement.

F. Mediation (207.70 hours) and Settlement (319.90 hours)

29. The parties mediated three times before reaching agreement. The first mediation took place on January 28, 2022, before the Hon. Suzanne Segal (Ret.). The second was a full-day, in-person

1 session on October 1, 2025 before mediator Antonio Piazza. A third session was conducted remotely
2 with Mr. Piazza on November 21, 2025. None of the three resolved the case, but the parties continued
3 settlement discussions thereafter, both with and without the mediator's assistance.

4 30. The parties reached an agreement in principle during trial, after opening statements and
5 four witnesses. The material terms were memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding executed
6 on March 30, 2026. The fact of settlement was placed on the record on April 2, 2026, ECF No. 406, and
7 the parties executed the comprehensive Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release the same day.
8 The parties never agreed to an amount of fees to be paid to Class Counsel.

9 31. The Settlement contains no clear-sailing provision. The Settlement states that the parties
10 do not agree to one and that Defendants expressly reserve the right to oppose any application for
11 attorneys' fees and costs. The Settlement contains no reversion: it obligates Defendants to pay the entire
12 \$75,000,000, and no portion returns to them under any circumstance. The effectiveness of the Settlement
13 does not depend on the Court's approval of any fee award or Class Representative Award.

14 **G. Remaining Categories**

15 32. The balance of the Firm's time is reflected in the schedules and includes legal and factual
16 analysis of the claims and defenses (276.80 hours), non-dispositive motion practice (201.00 hours), case
17 management and court appearances (145.70 hours), communications with Class Members (124.60
18 hours), case strategy (84.70 hours), pleadings and non-motion filings (66.35 hours), *ex parte*
19 applications (36.60 hours), applications to seal (1.80 hours), pre-litigation investigation (1.10 hours) and
20 motions to dismiss (0.40 hours).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **V. THE RESULT OBTAINED FOR THE CLASS**

2 33. The Settlement establishes a non-reversionary common fund of \$75,000,000 for a class
3 consisting of current owners (as of the Settlement Notice Date) of 3,294 single-family homes and
4 townhomes, together with former owners who owned as of July 1, 2024, but have since sold.
5 Defendants' total financial commitment is exactly \$75,000,000, inclusive of administrative costs, Class
6 Representative service awards, and any fees and costs the Court awards.

7 34. The release is narrow. It covers only property damage and mitigation measures arising
8 from the facts alleged in the Second Amended Complaint and Section VII of the Proposed Final Pretrial
9 Conference Order. It expressly does not release personal injury, wrongful death or medical monitoring
10 claims.

11 35. After accounting for Court-approved attorneys' fees, costs, class representative service
12 awards, and class administration expenses, Net Settlement Proceeds are allocated by objective, plume-
13 derived geographic zones. \$100,000 is distributed equally among former owners who submit valid
14 claims. Of the remainder, 40% goes to the 789 homes within the Priority Study Area or Contingency
15 Study Area identified in the Geosyntec Revised Off-Property Vapor Intrusion Investigation Summary
16 Report dated July 16, 2020 (Trial Exhibit 396); 28% goes to the 727 homes west of Browns Canyon
17 Wash but outside those areas; and 32% goes to the 1,778 homes east of Browns Canyon Wash. That
18 gradient tracks the property-diminution model of Plaintiffs' real estate economist, Dr. Boyle, which
19 showed greater diminution nearer the release point.

20 36. On the conservative assumptions stated in the preliminary approval papers, Class
21 Counsel estimated per-home recoveries of approximately \$21,000 in Sub-Area A, \$16,000 in Sub-Area
22 B and \$7,500 in Sub-Area C, and \$445 for former owners. Those estimates were disclosed to the Class
23 in the Settlement Notice and assume full participation; actual per-home payments are likely to exceed
24 them.

25
26 **VI. LANIER'S HOURS, RATES AND LODESTAR**

27 37. The schedule below summarizes the time spent by Lanier attorneys and paralegals on
28 this case, the billing rate for each individual, and the Firm's lodestar calculation using current rates or

equivalent current rates for those who left the Firm before 2026. The schedule was prepared from contemporaneous time records through August 31, 2026, which were audited by me.

Table 1 — Lanier Timekeepers, Rates, Hours and Lodestar

Timekeeper	Role	Admitted	Rate	Hours	Lodestar
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	65.80	\$131,600.00
Alex J. Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	374.90	\$599,840.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	112.90	\$141,125.00
Megan Waida	Senior Attorney	2006 (TX)	\$1,250	304.80	\$381,000.00
Ryan D. Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	2,916.20	\$3,645,250.00
Caroline McLeod	Senior Attorney	2018 (TX)	\$900	39.00	\$35,100.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	949.25	\$854,325.00
Joshua Upham	Senior Attorney	2021 (TX)	\$900	233.10	\$209,790.00
Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	70.30	\$59,755.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	75.00	\$56,250.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	419.60	\$125,880.00
Belinda Lower	Paralegal	—	\$300	258.80	\$77,640.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	76.35	\$22,905.00
Ariel Oxner	Paralegal	—	\$300	69.50	\$20,850.00
TOTAL				5,965.50	\$6,361,310.00

38. Lanier's rates are the market rates for these timekeepers based on position and years of experience. Using current rates is appropriate to account for the delay in payment over more than five years. *See Lawson v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 2025 WL 3725697, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025); *Newton v. Equilon Enterprises, LLC*, 411 F. Supp. 3d 856, 882 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (citing *In re Wash. Pub. Power Supply Sys. Sec. Litig.*, 19 F.3d 1291, 1305 (9th Cir. 1994)). *See also Missouri v. Jenkins*, 491 U.S. 274, 283–84 (1989). Before submitting this Motion, I compared and confirmed the hourly rates of the

1 professionals in my Firm against rates charged by lawyers at other firms whose practices are focused
2 on complex class, environmental and toxic tort litigation, and against rates approved by courts in this
3 District.

4 39. These rates are consistent with rates approved in this Court and its sister courts for
5 comparable work during the pendency of this case. See *Hope Med. Enters., Inc. v. Fagron Compounding*
6 *Servs., LLC*, 2022 WL 826903, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2022) (approving \$895 to \$1,295 per hour for
7 partners and counsel and \$565 to \$985 for associates *in 2022*); *Marshall v. Northrop Grumman Corp.*,
8 2020 WL 5668935, at *7-8 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2020) (approving rates between \$490 and \$1,060 per
9 hour for attorneys, and \$330 per hour for paralegals, *in 2020*); *In re Volkswagen “Clean Diesel” Mktg.,*
10 *Sales Pracs., & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 2017 WL 1047834, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2017) (approving \$275
11 to \$1,600 for partners, \$150 to \$790 for associates and \$80 to \$490 for paralegals *in 2017*).

12 40. The Firm’s rates are also below the rates charged by defense counsel in this District. In
13 a recent filing, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher reported a “standard” partner rate of \$2,245, a senior associate
14 rate of \$1,555, a junior associate rate of \$1,220 and a paralegal rate of \$820. See *LA Alliance for Human*
15 *Rights v. City of Los Angeles*, No. 2:20-cv-02291, ECF No. 1073, at 47 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2025). Mr.
16 Lanier’s rate of \$2,000 is below the standard partner rate reported by Defendants’ own counsel, and the
17 Firm’s paralegal rate of \$300 is well below the \$820 reported for Gibson Dunn paralegals.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Table 2 — Lanier Hours and Lodestar by Task

Task	Hours	Lodestar
Pre-Litigation Investigation	1.10	\$1,760.00
Pleadings & Non-Motion Filings	66.35	\$51,035.00
Legal and Factual Analysis of Claims and Defenses	276.80	\$343,535.00
Case Strategy	84.70	\$102,525.00
Motions to Dismiss	0.40	\$640.00
Motions to Strike / Motions to Exclude Experts	137.80	\$144,100.00
Discovery	1,141.40	\$1,336,585.00
Expert Discovery and Depositions	219.65	\$245,870.00
Class Certification	131.90	\$170,450.00
Appeal (Rule 23(f) Petition)	44.60	\$56,415.00
Motion for Summary Judgment	211.60	\$251,955.00
Opposition to Motion to Decertify	53.40	\$67,450.00
Non-Dispositive Motions	201.00	\$254,650.00
Ex Parte Applications	36.60	\$45,740.00
Applications to Seal	1.80	\$2,285.00
Case Management & Case Management Hearings	145.70	\$207,355.00
Communications with Class Members	124.60	\$162,675.00
Mediation	207.70	\$282,765.00
Settlement	319.90	\$349,265.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine	2,250.60	\$1,987,020.00
Trial	307.90	\$297,235.00
TOTAL	5,965.50	\$6,361,310.00

41. Based on the concurrently filed declarations of co-counsel, the combined lodestar of all Class Counsel is \$19,803,041.76, reflecting 15,356.5 hours. The requested fee of 40% of the Settlement Fund represents a multiplier of approximately 1.51 on that combined lodestar.

42. The foregoing figures do not include work remaining to be performed: responding to Class Member inquiries, preparing the motion for final approval, responding to any objections, appearing at the Final Approval Hearing, overseeing claims administration and distribution, and defending any appeal. At this time, Class Counsel is seeking no separate or supplemental fee for that work.

VII. LANIER'S COSTS AND EXPENSES

43. Lanier advanced the vast majority of the costs of this litigation out of its own funds, and was also responsible for reimbursing co-counsel for case expenses that were submitted to it by co-counsel. Lanier has carried these expenses, unreimbursed, since 2021. Through September 3, 2026, the Firm incurred \$2,720,692.41 in unreimbursed out-of-pocket costs and expenses in connection with this action. The Firm does not seek reimbursement of all of that amount. In an exercise of billing judgment, the Firm has excluded \$478,274.69 — approximately 17.6% of the total — consisting of interest and other financing charges, certain travel costs, and other items the Firm has elected not to charge to the Class. Lanier therefore seeks \$2,242,417.72.

Table 3 — Lanier Costs and Expenses by Category

Category	Amount
Expert & Consultant Fees	\$1,318,374.13
Copying, Printing & Delivery	\$280,837.55
Depositions, Transcripts & Court Reporters	\$182,747.92
E-Discovery Hosting & Processing	\$175,973.82
Travel — Airfare & Booking Fees	\$50,979.31
Travel — Lodging	\$19,184.17
Travel — Meals & Incidentals	\$11,343.82
Travel — Ground Transportation & Parking	\$9,906.26
Co-Counsel Travel Reimbursements	\$32,307.03
Mediation Fees and Expenses	\$45,833.56
Class Notice & Administration (incl. 2025 post-certification notice)	\$43,909.44
Legal Research, Public Records & Publications	\$38,023.07
Trial Technology, Facilities & Support	\$27,982.50
Jury Consulting	\$16,674.39
Filing, Service & Court Fees	\$8,275.87
Refunds & Credits	\$-19,935.12
TOTAL	\$2,242,417.72

1 44. Expert and consultant fees are by a wide margin the largest category, at \$1,318,374.13,
2 or approximately 59% of the costs sought. That reflects the technical character of this case. Six testifying
3 experts prepared initial and supplemental reports, defended their opinions against two rounds of
4 exclusion motions, sat for at least one deposition (with most experts giving two), and prepared for trial.
5 The Firm also retained additional consulting experts in real estate economics, medicine, environmental
6 health science and environmental consulting whose work informed the case but who did not testify.

7 45. The second largest category is copying, printing and delivery, at \$280,837.55. The great
8 majority of that amount was incurred in March 2026 to print and assemble trial exhibit binders. Exhibit
9 binders for the Court, the court reporter, the witness stand and both parties must be printed and
10 assembled before trial begins. The Court had allotted each side forty-two hours for the liability and
11 compensatory damages phase alone, and the parties' exhibit lists ran to thousands of items. That the
12 case settled on the fourth day of trial does not make the expenditure unreasonable; it was necessary
13 when incurred, and it was incurred because Class Counsel prepared to try this case to verdict rather than
14 settle before trial.

15 46. Each cost was reasonably and necessarily incurred in the prosecution of this action, and
16 is of a type customarily billed to fee-paying clients in complex litigation. These costs are recorded in
17 the Firm's books in the ordinary course of business, which were used by me to compile these summaries.

18 47. The cost of class notice and settlement administration performed (and to be performed)
19 by the class administrator for the Settlement (A.B. Data, Ltd.) are separate from the litigation costs
20 described above. Under § 4.3(a) of the Settlement Agreement, Administrative Costs are deducted from
21 the Settlement Fund, and A.B. Data will provide the Court and the parties with a declaration detailing
22 those costs no fewer than ten court days before the Final Approval Hearing. Administration was
23 estimated at \$200,000 at preliminary approval, and any portion of that estimate not expended remains
24 in the Settlement Fund for distribution to the Class.

25 48. Defendants have no obligation to fund the Settlement Fund until thirty days after the
26 Effective Date. Because notice to the Class began in August 2026 and administration is underway, there
27 is at present no Settlement Fund from which A.B. Data can be paid. Lanier is advancing those costs as
28 they come due. The Firm does not include those payments in the litigation costs it seeks in this Motion.

1 It requests instead that the amounts it has advanced be reimbursed from the Administrative Costs
2 deducted from the Settlement Fund under § 4.3(a), as reflected in A.B. Data's forthcoming declaration,
3 so that the amounts are neither omitted nor counted twice.
4

5 **VIII. CONTINGENT RISK, DELAY IN PAYMENT, AND THE COST OF FUNDS**

6 49. The Firm has received no fee and no reimbursement of any cost in this matter. It has
7 carried more than \$2.2 million in advanced costs for as long as five years, and continues to carry them
8 today. If the Court does not approve the Settlement, or if final approval is reversed on appeal, the Firm
9 will recover nothing.

10 50. Carrying those costs was not free. The Firm borrowed against lines of credit to fund the
11 litigation and, between 2021 and August 2026, paid \$435,285.62 in interest on the amounts advanced
12 in this case. The Firm is not asking the Class to reimburse any part of that \$435,285.62. However, it is
13 a real, quantified cost of prosecuting this case on a contingent basis that the Firm has absorbed entirely.

14 51. The 5,965.50 hours the Firm devoted to this case were hours its attorneys could not
15 devote to other matters. The risk of no recovery was real and persisted into the final week of the case.
16 Defendants moved twice to exclude every one of Plaintiffs' experts; had any of those motions succeeded
17 (especially as to Dr. Laton, Dr. Kram or Dr. Boyle), the case would have been seriously compromised
18 or ended. Defendants moved for summary judgment, moved to decertify, and petitioned the Ninth
19 Circuit for interlocutory review of the certification order. They preserved affirmative defenses which
20 they contended barred the claims of the entire Class, contended that Plaintiffs' damages are unavailable
21 as a matter of law, and contended that Plaintiffs had no diminished value and no need for mitigation
22 measures.

23 52. Even a plaintiffs' verdict would not have ended the risk. Defendants preserved every
24 certification objection for post-trial motions and appeal, reserved their position that all issues of liability,
25 damages and defenses as to every class member must be tried to a single jury, and proposed a post-
26 verdict individual-issues process requiring class-member-by-class-member proof on delayed discovery
27 and class membership. Any judgment would have been subject to post-trial motions and a Ninth Circuit
28 appeal, deferring payment to the Class by years and risking it entirely.

1 **IX. CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE AWARDS**

2 53. Plaintiffs request Class Representative service awards of \$30,000 each for Jed Behar and
3 Alisa Behar, to be paid from the Settlement Fund. Combined, the requested awards total \$60,000 —
4 eight one-hundredths of one percent (0.08%) of the Settlement Fund. The maximum amount of the
5 request was disclosed in the Settlement Agreement, § 4.1, in the preliminary approval papers, and in the
6 Settlement Notice.

7 54. The Behars' own declarations describe their service. I set out below the facts within my
8 own knowledge as counsel.

9 55. Jed and Alisa Behar were the only named plaintiffs in this action from its filing on May
10 10, 2021 through settlement—a period of nearly five years. They responded to written discovery, sat
11 for depositions, consented to and accommodated multiple days of an invasive and burdensome
12 inspection and testing of their home by Defendants and their consultants, remained in regular contact
13 with counsel throughout, attended trial and prepared to testify.

14 56. Serving as a class representative also exposed private aspects of the Behars' lives to
15 public filing in a way that ordinary class members did not experience. On the eve of trial, Defendants
16 obtained and filed divorce records concerning the Behars and argued from those materials that they
17 lacked standing and were inadequate representatives and that trial should be continued. ECF No. 373.
18 The Behars nevertheless continued to serve.

19 57. One further fact bears directly on their adequacy and service. The Behars' home is
20 located in Sub-Area C — the zone with the lowest per-home allocation under the Settlement, estimated
21 at approximately \$7,500, as against approximately \$21,000 for Sub-Area A and \$16,000 for Sub-Area
22 B (assuming 100% participation in the claims filing process). The Behars reviewed and approved an
23 allocation formula, derived from the plume geometry and Dr. Boyle's diminution model, that directs
24 the largest share of the remaining Net Settlement Proceeds to the 789 homes nearest the source and
25 assigns their own property the smallest recovery available to any current owner in the Class. They
26 accepted a structure that pays them less in order to pay the most affected homeowners more.
27
28

1 **X. CONCLUSION**

2 58. Based on my experience, the requested fee, the requested reimbursement of litigation
3 expenses, and the requested Class Representative Awards are fair and reasonable, and I respectfully ask
4 that the Court approve them.
5

6 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
7 foregoing is true and correct.

8 Executed on September 4, 2026, at Houston, Texas.
9

10 /s/ Ryan D. Ellis
11 Ryan D. Ellis, Declarant
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

W. Mark Lanier

Founder — The Lanier Law Firm

Mark Lanier is recognized as one of the top civil trial lawyers in America. He has earned that standing one jury at a time, representing people harmed by the most powerful companies in the world and turning complex scientific evidence and corporate record-keeping into a clear, relatable story that jurors understand and believe.

Over more than 35 years, Mark has taken on some of the most difficult legal challenges and won some of the largest verdicts in U.S. history. His cases have confronted the harm caused by mesothelioma and asbestos exposure, dangerous drugs, defective medical devices, addictive social media, and other dangerous consumer products and services. His work has helped to protect the public and has led to changes in how companies conduct themselves. He's also prevailed in significant and important business disputes involving fraud, breach of contract, and other commercial matters. Cumulatively, his trial work now exceeds \$20 billion in verdicts.

What sets Mark apart is not only the size of the verdicts and settlements but also how he reaches them. He takes his clients' story and makes a jury feel its weight, then uses that verdict to achieve appropriate justice. He prepares exhaustively and adopts new tools when they help, including artificial intelligence, yet he still tries every case the way he always has, by telling the truth plainly and trusting a jury to do what is right.

Mark is also widely regarded as one of the most persuasive courtroom advocates of his generation, known for distilling complex scientific and technical cases into clear, compelling narratives that resonate with juries. Speaking in plain language and without notes, he builds each case around a simple theme and reinforces it with vivid demonstratives, examples and props taken from everyday life, and carefully designed visual presentations that make difficult evidence easy for jurors to follow and understand. He shares this unique talent widely. Mark headlines his own Lanier Trial Academy each summer for more than 1,000 plaintiffs' lawyers, and in 2025 he delivered the inaugural lecture in Case Western Reserve University School of Law's Anatomy of a Trial series on trial strategy, persuasion, and storytelling.

Most recently, Mark led a trial team that secured a jury verdict totaling \$6 million in compensatory and punitive damages for an individual plaintiff against Meta and Google's YouTube in a landmark trial on the role of addictive social media platform features in harming mental health.

Mark has also become a prominent voice on the use of artificial intelligence in trial practice. In the social media addiction trial, he drew on a collaborative AI platform that integrates multiple large language models to help build and pressure-test his case strategy, an approach that drew wide attention in the legal and technology press. He also teaches the practical and ethical use of AI in litigation, from case development through trial, as part of the Lanier Trial Academy curriculum.

Mark's success in the courtroom and perspectives on litigation have been featured in The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, The Boston Globe, Bloomberg News, and the Houston Chronicle, among many other publications. He is also a frequent guest on news and business programs for a wide range of broadcast and cable networks, including CNBC, Fox News, CNN and Fox Business.

Personal Background

A devout Christian, Mark is also the founder of the Lanier Theological Library, one of the nation's largest private theological collections. He teaches a weekly, 750-plus-member Sunday school class

focusing on Biblical literacy at Champion Forest Baptist Church in Houston. He is a prolific author as well. His works examining faith include Christianity on Trial (IVP, 2014), Atheism on Trial (IVP, 2022), and Religions on Trial (IVP, 2023), along with a series of daily devotionals from Baylor University Press: Psalms for Living (2016), which received the 2018 Illumination Book Award in the Devotional category, Torah for Living (2018), Minor Prophets for Living (2024), and New Testament Letters for Living (2024). He has also authored the legal practice text Lanier's Texas Personal Injury Forms.

Mark considers his greatest achievement to be his family. He is the father of five wonderful children and lives in Houston with his wife, Becky.

Representative Cases

- **2026** – A \$6 million verdict against Meta and Google's YouTube in the first social media addiction lawsuit trial in the nation, holding the platforms liable for addictive design features that harmed a young user's mental health.
- **2024** – \$8 million verdict from a jury that unanimously determined that exposure to asbestos from the BNSF Railyard in Libby, Montana was a contributing factor in the deaths of clients who tragically succumbed to mesothelioma — the first successful community exposure case against BNSF Railway related to asbestos illnesses.
- **2021–2022** – Led the national trial team that secured a historic \$650.6 million jury verdict against retail pharmacies operated by Walmart, CVS, and Walgreens for their role in the opioid crisis, followed by a \$1.85 billion settlement in Texas with opioid manufacturers and distributors, and a \$260 million settlement with distributors AmeriSource Bergen, Cardinal Health, McKesson, and Teva.
- **2018** – A record-setting \$4.69 billion verdict on behalf of 22 women and their families who alleged decades of use of Johnson & Johnson's asbestos-laden talcum powder products caused their ovarian cancer — named National Law Journal's Top Verdict of 2018 and upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2021.
- **2017** – \$247 million verdict against DePuy Orthopaedics Inc. and Johnson & Johnson.
- **2016** – \$528 million verdict against DePuy Orthopaedics Inc. and Johnson & Johnson, recognized as the National Law Journal's Outstanding Medical Device Award for 2016.
- **2016** – \$1.05 billion verdict against DePuy Orthopaedics Inc. and Johnson & Johnson, the fourth largest verdict in America in 2016.
- **2014** – Class-action settlement on behalf of Missouri gun owners against Remington Arms Co. and DuPont over a trigger defect in Remington Model 700 rifles.
- **2014** – \$9 billion Actos verdict against Takeda Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd. and Eli Lilly & Co.
- **2013** – Wrongful-death settlement for the family of a former University of Mississippi student-athlete against the university and the NCAA.
- **2010** – \$54.2 million verdict in San Antonio against Caterpillar Inc. and Holt Texas Ltd. after a jury found defects and lax maintenance left a worker paralyzed.
- **2007** – \$6.5 million verdict for an oilfield worker injured by a falling pipe, after a jury found two West Texas drilling companies negligent.
- **2005** – \$253 million in the first Vioxx® verdict in the U.S. (Ernst v. Merck).
- **2000** – Reversal of \$1.6 billion judgment (Owens-Illinois v. T&N, Ltd., and Federal Mogul).

- **1998** – \$115.6 million in an asbestos-related legal matter (Aaron v. Carborundum).
- **1993** – \$417 million in a business fraud case against Amoco (Rubicon v. Amoco).

Notable Mentions

“One of the top civil trial lawyers in America.” — The New York Times

“Jurors often vote for who they like. It’s why so many corporations hate to step in a courtroom and it’s why Lanier is turning so many heads.” — The American Lawyer

“He (Mark Lanier) has established himself as one of the best trial lawyers in the nation.” — Texas Lawyer

“He is the gold-standard plaintiff lawyer.” — Chambers USA

“Mark Lanier is an exceptional trial lawyer and an exceptional human.” — Chambers USA

Community and Professional Activities

In addition to those he represents, Mark has committed himself to helping others in the law profession. He regularly appears at seminars and legal education events and serves as a featured lecturer at many of the nation’s top law schools, including Harvard Law School, Stanford Law School, Pepperdine University School of Law, University of Chicago Law School, and Texas Tech University School of Law.

Executives and administrators from major American corporations and institutions often call on Mark for his respected views on national and international issues. In 2011, Mark received the distinguished Ambassador of Peace Award from the Guatemalan government for his work with Guatemala SANA, a nonprofit organization he founded in 2009 to help bring health care, education, and infrastructure development to rural areas of Guatemala. Mark also serves on the boards of the American Schools of Oriental Research and The Albright Institute, as well as on the Lipscomb University Board of Trustees. He also serves on the Texas Tech University School of Law Foundation Board and as a director on the Board of the Harris County Sports & Convention Corporation, appointed by the Harris County Commissioners Court.

Education

- Texas Tech University School of Law, Juris Doctor, 1984
- David Lipscomb University, Bachelor of Arts in Biblical Languages, minor in Economics, 1981
- Texas Tech University, undergraduate studies, 1978–1980
- Honorary doctorates: St. John’s University School of Law; Pepperdine University; Trinity International University

Admissions and Certification

- State Bar of Texas
- State Bar of New York
- United States Supreme Court
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Circuits
- United States Court of Federal Claims
- U.S. District Courts: Southern, Eastern, Northern, and Western Districts of Texas; Southern District of Texas (Bankruptcy); Eastern and Southern Districts of New York; Eastern District of

Arkansas; District of Colorado; Western District of Michigan; and Northern District of Oklahoma

- Board Certified in Personal Injury Trial Law, Texas Board of Legal Specialization
- Member, National Board of Trial Advocacy

Awards

- Chambers USA: The only attorney in the nation to reach “Star Individual” status in both Product Liability: Plaintiffs and Litigation: Trial Lawyers, 2025–2026
- Benchmark Litigation: Litigation Star and Top 100 Trial Lawyers, 2013–2026; Impact Case Award, 2023
- Best Lawyers in America (U.S. News), 2006–2026, including multiple Houston “Lawyer of the Year” honors across mass tort, product liability, commercial, and personal injury litigation
- Texas Super Lawyers (Thomson Reuters), 2003–2026, including selection among the Top 10 attorneys in Texas in multiple years
- Lawdragon: inducted into the Leading Lawyers Hall of Fame, Class of 2026; named to the Lawdragon 500 for multiple consecutive years, including the 2026 editions of the 500 Global Plaintiff Lawyers and the 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers
- The Legal 500: Leading Lawyer and Hall of Fame
- The National Law Journal: Elite Trial Lawyers, Keith Givens Visionary Award and Lifetime Achievement Award (2022); Winning Litigator (2019); Litigation Trailblazer (2015); Most Influential Attorneys of the Decade (2010)
- The National Trial Lawyers: Trial Lawyer of the Year (2015, 2017, 2018); Trial Lawyer Hall of Fame; Association President (2018)
- Inner Circle of Advocates, member
- Texas Bar Foundation, Ronald D. Secrest Outstanding Trial Lawyer Award (2015)
- Clarence Darrow Award (2012)
- Texas Tech University School of Law Distinguished Alumnus (2005, 2015); Texas Tech University Distinguished Alumni Award (2016)
- Ambassador of Peace, Government of Guatemala (2011)

ALEX J. BROWN

Personal Background

Alex J. Brown is the Managing Attorney of the Lanier Law Firm's Business Litigation section. Alex represents companies and individuals in federal and state courts across the country at both the trial and appellate level, and in domestic and international arbitration forums. Before he became a plaintiff's lawyer, Alex was a partner in the Houston office of one of the oldest and largest law firms in Texas. There, he represented multi-national corporations in complex business disputes involving international project development, partnerships, oil and gas ventures, corporate governance and shareholder's rights, real estate development, and mass tort litigation.

When he isn't traveling around the country for firm clients, Alex enjoys spending time with his wife and three children and being outdoors.

Representative Cases

Co-Counsel for eight states (Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, Louisiana, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota) in an anti-trust case against Google

Trial counsel for the State of Maryland for damages arising from a ship collision with the Baltimore Key Bridge resulting in its collapse

Co-counsel for the State of Louisiana in an action case against a national Pharmacy Benefits Manager

Co-Counsel for the State of Texas in litigation concerning the marketing and sale of PFAS containing products

Counsel for The United States Football League in trademark litigation against Fox Sports

Trial team member securing \$1 billion jury verdict in medical device litigation (2016)

Trial team member securing \$502 million jury verdict in medical device litigation (2016)

Trial team member securing \$9 billion jury verdict in pharmaceutical litigation (2014)

Counsel for various whistleblowers in federal and state qui tam actions against pharmaceutical companies, defense contractors, and pharmacy benefit managers

Defense counsel for a pharmaceutical company in litigation brought by a consortium of insurance companies

Counsel for Texas energy company in ICC and ICSID arbitration proceedings against Federal Government of Nigeria

Trial team member representing a coalition of sugar farmers and producers against agribusiness conglomerates for false advertising claims

First chair trial counsel for national real estate investment trust

Class action counsel for Carteret, New Jersey homeowners in heavy metals contamination litigation

Trial committee chair for a joint venture pursuing natural resource damages cases on behalf of the State of New Jersey

Defense counsel for oil and gas interest owner in joint operating agreement dispute

Defense counsel for national packaging company in a non-compete dispute

Counsel for U.S. retailer in litigation against a Chinese manufacturer

Defense counsel for CEO in minority shareholder litigation

Litigation counsel for a creditor's committee in bankruptcy court related to a plan of reorganization dispute

Counsel for land investor against Circuit of The Americas race organizers

Defense counsel for developer in partnership dispute involving a Lake Travis development project

Counsel for landowners in property damage litigation against multinational oil company

Defense counsel in FINRA arbitration for a stockbroker accused of mishandling client trading accounts

Counsel for royalty owner in litigation against an oil and gas well operator

Counsel for securities traders against a securities trading company for breach of a tag-along agreement

Wrongful death counsel for family of oil rig worker killed in drilling-rig accident

Personal injury counsel for a rifle misfire victim and class action counsel for a national class of firearm owners who purchased the same model rifle

Community and Professional Activities

Member, National Trial Lawyers Top 100

Member, College of the State Bar of Texas

Member, American Association of Justice

Member, American Bar Association

Member, International Dispute Resolution Centre

Member, Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo Calf Scramble Committee

Education

J.D. – University of Houston Law Center, Articles Editor UHLC Journal of International Law

Bachelor from Texas Tech University, magna cum laude

Awards

2026 Lawdragon’s 500 Leading Plaintiff Consumer Lawyers

Best Lawyers – Commercial Litigation (2024-2025)

500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers, Lawdragon, (2025-2026)

Named a “Texas Rising Star” by Texas Monthly Magazine and Thomson Reuters

Recognized as a “Texas Super Lawyer” by Thomson Reuters

Named to the Lawdragon 500 Leading Lawyers in America

Recognized by The Legal 500 – the world’s largest legal referral guide

Honored to be selected for American Lawyer’s list of Top Rated Lawyers for International Law
& International Trade.

Rated AV Preeminent® by Martindale-Hubbell

RYAN D. ELLIS

Personal Background

Ryan D. Ellis is a Senior Attorney at The Lanier Law Firm, where he represents individuals, businesses, and communities in high-stakes disputes across state and federal courts and in private arbitration. His practice centers on complex commercial litigation and environmental class actions, including business fraud, trade secret misappropriation, breach of contract, product liability, qui tam and whistleblower matters, and toxic tort cases, with a particular emphasis on contamination cases affecting residential communities. Ryan is known for taking on well-resourced adversaries and securing meaningful results for the people and companies he represents.

Featured Matters

Behar v. Northrop Grumman Corporation (U.S. District Court, Central District of California). Ryan was a key member of the trial team in this certified environmental class action on behalf of more than 3,200 homeowners in the Canoga Park and Winnetka neighborhoods of Los Angeles, whose properties sit above groundwater and soil contaminated with volatile organic compounds—including the known carcinogen trichloroethylene (TCE)—from industrial operations at a nearby facility. After obtaining contested class certification and trying the case to a federal jury, the team reached a \$75 million non-reversionary class settlement in the middle of trial. The settlement is pending court approval.

State of Texas, et al. v. Google, LLC (U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas). Ryan is part of the team representing the States of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota in antitrust litigation against Google concerning its conduct in the digital advertising technology industry.

Black v. Union Pacific Railroad Company (U.S. District Court, District of Kansas). Ryan represents a putative class of thousands of homeowners in an ongoing environmental class action alleging that Union Pacific contaminated surrounding neighborhoods through its mishandling of toxic chemicals at a Wichita, Kansas industrial site. Plaintiffs allege that the improper handling and disposal of hazardous waste caused toxic chemicals to leak and migrate into the soil and groundwater of nearby residential properties.

Representative Cases

Pharmaceutical Qui Tam Litigation. Represents a relator whistleblower in federal and state qui tam actions against pharmaceutical companies alleging fraud against state Medicaid programs.

State Medicaid Fraud Qui Tam. Represented a relator whistleblower in a state Medicaid fraud action that resulted in a multi-million-dollar settlement.

Renewable Energy Contract Dispute. Served as sole trial counsel for a renewable energy company in a contract dispute, trying the case to a successful verdict in Bexar County, Texas district court.

Energy Arbitration. Represented a small Houston-based exploration and production company in arbitration against a large, publicly traded energy producer on claims of business fraud, negligent misrepresentation, and breach of contract. Ryan coordinated electronic and expert discovery involving an extensive volume of data and prepared the matter for the final arbitration hearing. The matter settled shortly before the final arbitration hearing, resulting in a significant recovery for the smaller company.

Trade Secret Dispute. Obtained a favorable settlement for a Texas medical education company on claims that a prospective business partner misappropriated the company's trade secrets and competed against it in violation of a non-disclosure agreement.

Trade Secret & Unfair Competition Defense. Represented a multi-state transmission line construction company and its principal against claims of trade secret misappropriation, conspiracy, and unfair competition. Ryan drafted a jurisdictional challenge, conducted jurisdictional discovery, and, following a hearing, obtained dismissal of all claims against his clients.

Harlandale Independent School District. Represented the San Antonio-area school district in litigation alleging that defective HVAC equipment installed in school buildings created a hazardous mold condition. The case settled favorably for the district before trial.

Construction Defect Litigation. Represented a Texas statewide elected official in a construction defect dispute. Ryan drove case strategy and coordinated discovery and expert work, obtaining a favorable settlement before trial.

General Motors Ignition Switch Litigation. Worked closely with victims and their families, coordinating fact and expert discovery and ultimately recovering millions of dollars for clients through the GM Victim Compensation Fund.

Professional Athlete Injury. Member of the litigation team representing former Houston Texans punter Brett Hartmann, who suffered a career-ending knee injury when his foot caught in a turf seam created by the stadium's "pallet system." The case resolved with a settlement for Mr. Hartmann and prompted changes to the playing surface to better protect professional athletes from preventable injury.

Business Dispute — Defense & Affirmative Recovery. Defended a family-owned manufacturing business against a former broker's claim for hundreds of thousands of dollars in alleged commissions, and pursued counterclaims on the business's behalf. The matter resolved with Ryan's client paying nothing to the broker and instead recovering a payment on its counterclaims.

Professional Activities & Publications

Fellow, Texas Bar Foundation

Co-author, Rigged Game: The Florida Supreme Court's Decision in Plancher and the Abuse of Sovereign Immunity in Sports Law, Sports Litigation Alert (June 26, 2015)

Contributor, Does the Tort System Make America Safer? Reuters (Nov. 21, 2014)

Author, Note, Mandating Injustice: The Preponderance of the Evidence Mandate Creates a New Threat to Due Process on Campus, 32 Rev. Litig. 65 (2013)

Education

The University of Texas School of Law, J.D., 2013.

- Executive Editor, Texas Review of Law & Politics
- Articles Editor, The Review of Litigation
- Member, UT Interscholastic Mock Trial Team
- Intramural mock trial champion
- Served as judicial intern to Justice Eva Guzman of the Supreme Court of Texas.

The University of Texas at Austin, B.A., Highest Honors, B.S., Highest Honors, 2010.

- Phi Beta Kappa

Admissions and Certification

United States District Courts for the Western, Eastern, and Southern Districts of Texas

United States District Court for the District of Colorado

Awards

Texas Rising Stars — Business Litigation (Thomson Reuters, 2020–2026)

Lawdragon 500 Leading Plaintiff Consumer Lawyers — Toxic Tort (2026)

Lawdragon 500 X — The Next Generation, Commercial Litigation (2024, 2025, 2026)

Best Lawyers: Ones to Watch in America — Commercial Litigation (2024–2025)

Texas Lawyer, “Lawyers on the Rise” (2017)

ALEX ABSTON

Personal Background

Alex Abston is a Senior Attorney who focuses on complex litigation disputes within the Firm's Business Litigation practice group.

Alex's trial advocacy foundation shapes her strategic approach to dispute resolution. Most recently, Alex spent years as a member of the Firm's trial team assisting with high-stakes mass tort cases. Her work has been instrumental in securing many notable Lanier jury trial verdicts, including one of the nation's first federal jury verdicts in MDL 2804, *In re: National Prescription Opiate Litigation*.

Alex considers it an honor and a privilege to amplify her clients' voices in their pursuit of justice. She approaches all disputes first from a "human" perspective, then a legal one. As she puts it, "If you forget the humanity of our practice, you lose the purpose of what we're doing."

Her tenure with the Firm spans over 15 years, beginning with a high school internship and evolving to include time within all the Firm's various practice groups. Her diverse practice has bridged practice groups to include litigation relating to products liability, commercial litigation disputes, deceptive trade practices, asbestos exposure, antitrust violations, and pharmaceutical and medical device industry disputes. Previously, she clerked at a prominent complex litigation firm where she concentrated on products liability and civil sexual abuse litigation.

Alex is a native Texan who loves Houston sports and spending time with her family and their golden retrievers.

Representative Cases

Member of the trial team that obtained one of the nation's first federal jury verdicts within MDL 2804, *In re: National Prescription Opiate Litigation*.

Represented multiple counties within federal and state litigations addressing the improper promotion, distribution, and dispensing of opioid medications and the resulting devastation of the opioid epidemic.

Member of the trial team who obtained a federal jury verdict against a prominent national railroad on behalf of plaintiffs impacted by the Libby, Montana asbestos disaster.

Assisted in representing hundreds of former coal miners in consolidated actions against disposable mask manufacturers.

Represented both companies and individuals in complex matters within federal and state courts.

Member of the trial team who represented thousands of EpiPen class action purchasers in a federal antitrust class action alleging manufacturers' anticompetitive conduct and practices.

Assisted in representing plaintiffs and their families in asbestos-related suits stemming from the use of talcum powder products.

Member of the trial team representing 17 states and territories in a multistate lawsuit alleging deceptive trade practices and antitrust violations in the advertising technology industry.

Member of an environmental class action trial team who represented a certified class of approximately 3,200 California homeowners alleging that contaminated water, soil, and air migrated into their residential neighborhood.

Member of the trial team representing the State of Arkansas in an antitrust and deceptive trade practices action regarding two pesticide manufacturers' rebate programs.

Assists with the representation of the State of Texas in suits against various pharmaceutical companies regarding alleged violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act and the Texas Health Care Program Fraud Prevention Act. **Community and Professional Activities**

American Association for Justice

The National Trial Lawyers

The Lanier Trial Academy

Awards

Lawdragon 500 X – The Next Generation, Lawdragon, 2024 – 2026

Best Lawyers: Ones To Watch, Product Liability Litigation – Plaintiffs, Best Lawyers, 2024 – 2027

Texas' Top 40 Under 40, Civil Plaintiff Trial Lawyers, The National Trial Lawyers, 2021 – 2026

“Editor of the Year,” The Houston Business & Tax Law Journal, 2019

“Honor Woman of the Year,” selected by Abilene Christian University's faculty and administration, 2015

MEGAN WAIDA

Personal Background

Megan Waida joined the Asbestos Litigation Issues and Appeals section of The Lanier Law Firm in 2012 as a well-seasoned mesothelioma attorney in Houston, advocating on behalf of the victims of asbestos exposure with experience in other well-recognized plaintiffs' firms. Megan currently works in the Issues and Appeals section on a variety of issues, including but not limited to asbestos litigation.

Megan prides herself on being a fast, efficient worker with a broad command of different states' laws. Her experience with cases across multiple jurisdictions gives her a sharp instinct for identifying what truly needs to be addressed in each motion. Megan can often pick up a motion with little guidance and immediately recognize where it needs to go.

Megan is a native Texan, born and raised in Victoria. She graduated from Texas Tech University in Lubbock in 2002, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Biology and minors in Chemistry and Marketing. While at Tech, Megan was a member of Beta, Beta, Beta National Biological Honor Society; Rho Lambda, a national leadership recognition society for sorority women; and Order of Omega, a national Greek leadership honor society. She earned her Doctor of Jurisprudence from South Texas College of Law, graduating in the top fifteen percent of her class and earning numerous honors including the Highest Grade Award for Legal Research and Writing II and multiple appointments to the Dean's Honor List. At South Texas, Megan was also a member of Phi Delta Phi, an international legal honors fraternity and the Texas Tech Law Society.

Megan calls Tomball, Texas home where she lives with her two children Magdalene and Davyn. Megan enjoys spending time with her family and friends, and, when time and life permits, a leisurely read of a good book.

Representative Cases

Canoga Park Contamination

During the Canoga Park litigation, Megan took primary responsibility for handling pre-trial motions and drafting proposed jury instructions and charges, helping lay the groundwork for the trial team's strategy. She also attended the trial, staying closely engaged to address any legal issues that arose as the case unfolded.

Ingham v. Johnson & Johnson

In 2018, while serving on the firm's asbestos litigation issues and appeals team, Megan was brought onto the *Ingham v. Johnson & Johnson* trial team, where she handled all briefings related to two of the case's asbestos experts.

Community & Professional Activities

- American Association for Justice

Admissions

- State Bar of Texas, 2006
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
- United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

JOSHUA UPHAM

Personal Background

Joshua is a senior attorney in the Houston office, whose practice areas include issues & appeals and product liability. Joshua is a native Texan who grew up in the Austin hill country and now enjoys spending time with his fiancée, being outdoors, and playing the guitar.

Before joining the Lanier Law Firm, Joshua worked as an associate at a highly respected Houston firm where he specialized in construction law representing commercial contractors and homeowners. He also clerked at the Lanier Law Firm as a law student in the summer of 2020.

As an attorney, Joshua is a creative problem solver, a quality his peers often use to describe him as well. He has a unique ability to view challenges through a bigger-picture lens, often spotting alternative approaches that others might overlook. A strong advocate and writer, Joshua has channeled these strengths into considerable success within the Issues & Appeals section. Joshua has also had the opportunity to lead internal firm trainings on best practices for using artificial intelligence.

Representative Cases

Canoga Park Contamination

Joshua worked on the Canoga Park contamination litigation from its early stages, including drafting a key motion to amend the complaint in federal court. As the case moved toward trial, he contributed to several evidentiary motions and helped negotiate the final settlement agreement.

Wrongful Death – Inadequate Hotel Security

Joshua provides research and briefing support for the family of a man murdered at a hotel property in New Orleans after the assailant pulled the fire alarm to draw guests from their rooms before attacking them. His work primarily focuses on motions and appellate briefing on the legal issues surrounding the property owner's and security contractor's failure to provide adequate security to protect guests from an attack

Community and Professional Activities

Houston Young Lawyer's Association

Houston Bar Association (Appellate Section)

Education

J.D. – Pepperdine Law School, 2021

- Order of the Barristers: Excellence in national trial and appellate advocacy competitions

- Interscholastic Moot Court & Trial Team: Executive board member
- Champion: Vincent S. Dalsimer moot court competition: Most Outstanding Advocate
- Terry Giles Honor Scholar

B.A. – Baylor University (University Scholars program with concentrations in Political Science and Economics), 2018

- Honors Scholar with Distinction
- Baylor Undergraduate Mock Trial Team: Executive board member and team captain

Awards

Best Lawyers “Ones To Watch” – 2025-2026 – Appellate Practice and Product Liability Litigation – Plaintiffs

National Trial Lawyers – 2025 Texas Top 40 under 40 – Civil Plaintiff

Champion, Most Outstanding Advocate – Dalsimer Moot Court Competition

All American Attorney – America Mock Trial Association Houston Young Lawyers Association (HYLA) President’s Award 2023 & 2024

ALFRED MACKENZIE (former LLF attorney)

Personal Background

Alfred Mackenzie is a Senior Attorney in the Houston office. As a member of The Lanier Law Firm's Issues and Appeals team, his focus is on enhancing and protecting client outcomes by presenting and preserving legal arguments before and during trial and on appeal.

Alfred joined The Lanier Law Firm in 2023. Previously, Alfred clerked for a state appellate court and subsequently practiced at two different law firms and for a decade as a solo attorney. Alfred is a board-certified appellate lawyer and has represented clients in appellate matters in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, the Texas Supreme Court, and the Texas Courts of Appeals. Alfred also has extensive experience briefing, arguing, and trying cases in federal and state trial courts throughout Texas, including civil litigation ranging from employment law, business disputes, fiduciary duty claims, property conflicts, medical malpractice, and personal injury.

Alfred is a fourth-generation Houstonian. He and his wife, Gretchen, have two adult children and two Gordon setters.

Admissions and Certification

Texas Board of Legal Specialization – Civil Appellate Law

Awards

Super Lawyers by Thomson Reuters, 2024

Rated AV Preeminent by Martindale-Hubbell

CAROLINE MCLEOD

Personal Background

A member of the firm's Issues and Appeals group, Ms. McLeod serves on the law and briefing team supporting the firm's most complex litigation, where she handles dispositive motions, trial and post-trial briefing, and appellate matters. She is known for her conscientiousness and meticulous attention to detail and is the colleague others rely on for the final review that catches what might otherwise be missed.

Ms. McLeod, a West Texas native from Abilene, resides in Houston with her family. In her spare time, she enjoys riding horses and traveling.

Representative Cases

Part of the law and briefing team in the firm's landmark social media addiction lawsuit trial, contributing extensive pretrial and bench-motion briefing, and handling the post-trial briefing that preserved a favorable verdict for the plaintiffs

Key member of the firm's trial team combatting the opioid epidemic that secured a verdict for two counties in Ohio against CVS, Walgreens, and Walmart

Helped secure a milestone opinion from the Supreme Court of Texas denying the sovereign immunity protection claims of GTECH, a contractor that produced and printed scratch-off tickets for the Texas Lottery Commission

Part of the team that protected a \$2.11 billion judgment from a Missouri Court of Appeals against Johnson & Johnson in regard to 22 plaintiffs who allegedly contracted ovarian cancer from talcum powder use

Community and Professional Activities

Order of the Coif at Texas Tech University School of Law

Executive board of the Texas Tech Law Review

Member of the Board of Directors of the Better Business Bureau of Metropolitan Houston and South Texas

Publications

Co-Author, Making Many Cases One: Big Pharma Litigation and MDLs, Texas Bar Journal (Oct. 2022).

Author, Down to the Wire: The Desperate Need for the Texas Racing Industry to Catch Up to Other States, Texas Tech Law Review

Education

J.D. – Texas Tech University School of Law, summa cum laude

Bachelor of Science in Psychology – Texas A&M University

Admissions and Certification

Licensed in:

State Bar of Texas

The United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

The United States District Courts for the Eastern District of Texas

Awards

Lawdragon 500 X The Next Generation, 2023-2026

Texas Super Lawyers Rising Stars, 2022-2026

Best Lawyers “Ones To Watch” – Appellate Practice, 2024-2026

National Trial Lawyers – Top 40 Under 40 Civil Plaintiff Trial Lawyer in Texas, 2024-2026

Earned individual recognition for her law review comment, which was published as the Outstanding Student Comment for Book 2, Volume 50 of the Texas Tech Law Review

Sprouse Shrader Smith Top Grade Award in Property Law

Top-Grade Award in Legal Practice II and Employment Discrimination Law

Distinction Award in Criminal Procedure, Environmental Law, Torts, Contracts, Water Law, Professional Responsibility, Employment Law, Nonprofit Organizations, and Legal Practice

MATTHEW PRZYWARA (former LLF attorney)

Matthew represents clients in complex litigation matters, including multidistrict litigation, class actions, and government representation across various industries. His practice focuses on representing companies and individuals in commercial and business litigation in both state and federal court. Matthew has represented clients in a broad range of matters, including contract disputes, antitrust claims, construction disputes, environmental matters, insurance coverage, and *qui tam* actions under federal and state False Claims Acts.

Concentrations

- Litigation
- Business Litigation
- Commercial Litigation
- Breach of Contract

Experience

Representative Matters

- Member of team representing the state of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Mississippi, Louisiana, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota as outside trial counsel in a multidistrict litigation antitrust case against a Fortune 10 technology company.
- Appointed to a plaintiffs steering committee in the FTX cryptocurrency exchange collapse multidistrict litigation.
- Member of team representing various clients, from local businesses to professional sports teams, in federal multidistrict, federal and state litigations across the country involving COVID-19 business interruption insurance claims.
- Member of outside counsel team for the State of New Jersey in various lawsuits to recover natural resource damages incurred by the state.
- Member of litigation team representing relator whistleblowers in federal and state *qui tam* actions against pharmaceutical companies for fraud against state Medicaid programs.
- Assisted in the representation of various class representatives in groundwater contamination class action litigations.
- Assisted in the representation of a privately-owned mortgage bank against a large global investment manager.
- Representation of a Fortune 200 company in multiple lawsuits arising from a general contractor's breach of a multi- million-dollar construction contract.

- Representation of a national EPC contractor in multi-state federal litigation involving a subcontractor's breach of contract on a multi-million-dollar construction project.
- Managed the defense of a regional insurance provider against a property damage claim, resulting in a favorable settlement.
- Defense of a publicly traded oil and natural gas drilling and completion services company from a personal injury claim.

Recognition & Leadership

Awards & Accolades

- Listed, *The Best Lawyers in America*, "Ones to Watch"
 - Commercial Litigation, 2025 and 2027
 - Litigation - Construction, 2027
- Listed, *Lawdragon*, "500 X – The Next Generation," 2023-2025
- Listed, *The National Trial Lawyers*, "40 Under 40," 2022-2023

Professional & Community Involvement

- Member, Houston Bar Association, Present
 - Member, Annual Golf Tournament Committee, 2023-2024
- Committee Member, Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo, 2020-2024

Credentials

Education

- J.D., *cum laude*, Suffolk University Law School, 2019
- B.S., University of Connecticut, 2009

Admissions

- Texas
- U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas
- U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas

J. DAVIS LABARRE (former LLF attorney)

Davis LaBarre is an attorney in the Trial & Appellate Litigation practice group in Jackson Walker's Houston office. His practice focuses on commercial litigation, with an emphasis on energy, oil & gas, and environmental disputes. He has represented both defendants and plaintiffs in a wide range of matters, including complex judgment enforcement, wire-fraud litigation, contract disputes, antitrust, federal securities, energy-related disputes, qui tam actions under the federal and state False Claims Acts, environmental matters (including CERCLA and state Superfund cleanups and related litigation), and products liability cases.

Davis has extensive experience appearing in federal and state courts, including securing a successful jury verdict and co-leading all pretrial activities in a multimillion-dollar dispute. He also regularly guides clients through arbitrations and mediations. As part of his practice, he prioritizes early, efficient resolutions and has recovered millions of dollars for clients pre-litigation.

While in law school, Davis served as a judicial extern to Chief Administrative Law Judge Carmen A. Cintron in the Office of Administrative Law Judges at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. He also served on the editorial staff of the *Wake Forest Law Review* and was an active member of the Energy Bar Association and the Institute for Energy Law.

Practice Areas

Trial & Appellate Litigation

Education

B.B.A., The University of Oklahoma

- JCPenney Leadership Program
- CAC Speaker's Bureau, Executive Voting Member

J.D., Wake Forest University School of Law

- *Wake Forest Law Review*, Editorial Staff Member
- Wake Forest Pro Bono
- Energy Bar Association
- Institute for Energy Law
- Chief Justice Branch Inn of Court

Bar Admissions

Texas

Court Admissions

State of Texas

United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals

United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas

Recognition & Accolades

- *Best Lawyers: Ones to Watch* (Woodward/White Inc.), Commercial Litigation, 2027

EXHIBIT 2

Behar v. Northrop Grumman Corp., No. 2:21-cv-03946-HDV-SK (C.D. Cal.)

THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C. — SUMMARY OF TIMEKEEPERS, RATES, HOURS, AND LODESTAR

Inception (October 23, 2020) through August 31, 2026

Timekeeper	Title	Bar Year (State)	Hourly Rate	Hours	Lodestar
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	65.80	\$131,600.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	374.90	\$599,840.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	112.90	\$141,125.00
Megan Waida	Senior Attorney	2006 (TX)	\$1,250	304.80	\$381,000.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	2,916.20	\$3,645,250.00
Caroline McLeod	Senior Attorney	2018 (TX)	\$900	39.00	\$35,100.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	949.25	\$854,325.00
Joshua Upham	Senior Attorney	2021 (TX)	\$900	233.10	\$209,790.00
Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	70.30	\$59,755.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	75.00	\$56,250.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	419.60	\$125,880.00
Belinda Lower	Paralegal	—	\$300	258.80	\$77,640.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	76.35	\$22,905.00
Ariel Oxner	Paralegal	—	\$300	69.50	\$20,850.00
TOTAL				5,965.50	\$6,361,310.00

Behar v. Northrop Grumman Corp., No. 2:21-cv-03946-HDV-SK (C.D. Cal.)

THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C. — TABLE 1: HOURS BY ATTORNEY, ORGANIZED BY TASK

Inception (October 23, 2020) through August 31, 2026

Task / Timekeeper	Title	Bar Year	Hourly Rate	Hours	Lodestar
Pre-Litigation Investigation				1.10	\$1,760.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	1.10	\$1,760.00
Pleadings & Non-Motion Filings				66.35	\$51,035.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	3.50	\$5,600.00
Joshua Upham	Senior Attorney	2021 (TX)	\$900	44.30	\$39,870.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	7.30	\$2,190.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	11.25	\$3,375.00
Legal and Factual Analysis of Claims and Defenses				276.80	\$343,535.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	6.30	\$10,080.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	259.00	\$323,750.00
Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	10.80	\$9,180.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	0.70	\$525.00
Case Strategy				84.70	\$102,525.00
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	10.20	\$20,400.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	4.90	\$7,840.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	35.10	\$43,875.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	33.10	\$29,790.00
Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	0.20	\$170.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	0.20	\$150.00
Ariel Oxner	Paralegal	—	\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Motions to Dismiss				0.40	\$640.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	0.40	\$640.00
Discovery				1,141.40	\$1,336,585.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	14.90	\$23,840.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	0.10	\$125.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	951.50	\$1,189,375.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	9.80	\$8,820.00
Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	58.10	\$49,385.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	73.20	\$54,900.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	16.30	\$4,890.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	17.50	\$5,250.00
Expert Discovery and Depositions				219.65	\$245,870.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	30.80	\$49,280.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	147.30	\$184,125.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	4.00	\$1,200.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	4.75	\$1,425.00
Ariel Oxner	Paralegal	—	\$300	32.80	\$9,840.00
Class Certification				131.90	\$170,450.00
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	3.00	\$6,000.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	9.50	\$15,200.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	18.20	\$22,750.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	101.20	\$126,500.00
Motions to Strike / Motions to Exclude Experts				137.80	\$144,100.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	6.00	\$9,600.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	84.80	\$106,000.00
Caroline McLeod	Senior Attorney	2018 (TX)	\$900	24.00	\$21,600.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	15.00	\$4,500.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	8.00	\$2,400.00
Appeal (Rule 23(f) Petition)				44.60	\$56,415.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	1.90	\$3,040.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	24.30	\$30,375.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	18.40	\$23,000.00
Motion for Summary Judgment				211.60	\$251,955.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	6.30	\$10,080.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	69.20	\$86,500.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	111.10	\$138,875.00
Caroline McLeod	Senior Attorney	2018 (TX)	\$900	15.00	\$13,500.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	10.00	\$3,000.00
Opposition to Motion to Decertify				53.40	\$67,450.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	2.00	\$3,200.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	51.40	\$64,250.00
Non-Dispositive Motions				201.00	\$254,650.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	11.60	\$18,560.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	187.90	\$234,875.00
Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	0.90	\$765.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	0.60	\$450.00

Ex Parte Applications				36.60	\$45,740.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	5.40	\$8,640.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	29.20	\$36,500.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Applications to Seal				1.80	\$2,285.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	0.10	\$160.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	1.70	\$2,125.00
Case Management & Case Management Hearings				145.70	\$207,355.00
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	13.00	\$26,000.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	45.00	\$72,000.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	87.10	\$108,875.00
Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	0.30	\$255.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	0.30	\$225.00
Communications with Class Members				124.60	\$162,675.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	22.50	\$36,000.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	101.10	\$126,375.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Mediation				207.70	\$282,765.00
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	31.60	\$63,200.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	25.70	\$41,120.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	0.10	\$125.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	123.00	\$153,750.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	27.30	\$24,570.00
Settlement				319.90	\$349,265.00
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	4.00	\$8,000.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	38.10	\$60,960.00
Megan Waida	Senior Attorney	2006 (TX)	\$1,250	39.50	\$49,375.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	78.40	\$98,000.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	1.60	\$1,440.00
Joshua Upham	Senior Attorney	2021 (TX)	\$900	140.00	\$126,000.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	18.30	\$5,490.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine				2,250.60	\$1,987,020.00
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	4.00	\$8,000.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	102.90	\$164,640.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	1.00	\$1,250.00
Megan Waida	Senior Attorney	2006 (TX)	\$1,250	234.40	\$293,000.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	451.80	\$564,750.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	815.25	\$733,725.00
Joshua Upham	Senior Attorney	2021 (TX)	\$900	48.80	\$43,920.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	271.20	\$81,360.00
Belinda Lower	Paralegal	—	\$300	253.20	\$75,960.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	32.35	\$9,705.00
Ariel Oxner	Paralegal	—	\$300	35.70	\$10,710.00
Trial				307.90	\$297,235.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	36.00	\$57,600.00
Megan Waida	Senior Attorney	2006 (TX)	\$1,250	30.90	\$38,625.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	96.20	\$120,250.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	62.20	\$55,980.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	76.50	\$22,950.00
Belinda Lower	Paralegal	—	\$300	5.60	\$1,680.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	0.50	\$150.00
GRAND TOTAL				5,965.50	\$6,361,310.00

EXHIBIT 3

Behar v. Northrop Grumman Corp., No. 2:21-cv-03946-HDV-SK (C.D. Cal.)

THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C. — TABLE 2: HOURS BY ATTORNEY, ORGANIZED BY ATTORNEY

Inception (October 23, 2020) through August 31, 2026

Timekeeper / Task	Title	Bar Year	Hourly Rate	Hours	Lodestar
Mark Lanier	Founder	1985 (TX)	\$2,000	65.80	\$131,600.00
Case Strategy			\$2,000	10.20	\$20,400.00
Class Certification			\$2,000	3.00	\$6,000.00
Case Management & Case Management Hearings			\$2,000	13.00	\$26,000.00
Mediation			\$2,000	31.60	\$63,200.00
Settlement			\$2,000	4.00	\$8,000.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$2,000	4.00	\$8,000.00
Alex Brown	Managing Attorney	2000 (TX)	\$1,600	374.90	\$599,840.00
Pre-Litigation Investigation			\$1,600	1.10	\$1,760.00
Pleadings & Non-Motion Filings			\$1,600	3.50	\$5,600.00
Legal and Factual Analysis of Claims and Defenses			\$1,600	6.30	\$10,080.00
Case Strategy			\$1,600	4.90	\$7,840.00
Motions to Dismiss			\$1,600	0.40	\$640.00
Discovery			\$1,600	14.90	\$23,840.00
Expert Discovery and Depositions			\$1,600	30.80	\$49,280.00
Class Certification			\$1,600	9.50	\$15,200.00
Motions to Strike / Motions to Exclude Experts			\$1,600	6.00	\$9,600.00
Appeal (Rule 23(f) Petition)			\$1,600	1.90	\$3,040.00
Motion for Summary Judgment			\$1,600	6.30	\$10,080.00
Opposition to Motion to Decertify			\$1,600	2.00	\$3,200.00
Non-Dispositive Motions			\$1,600	11.60	\$18,560.00
Ex Parte Applications			\$1,600	5.40	\$8,640.00
Applications to Seal			\$1,600	0.10	\$160.00
Case Management & Case Management Hearings			\$1,600	45.00	\$72,000.00
Communications with Class Members			\$1,600	22.50	\$36,000.00
Mediation			\$1,600	25.70	\$41,120.00
Settlement			\$1,600	38.10	\$60,960.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$1,600	102.90	\$164,640.00
Trial			\$1,600	36.00	\$57,600.00
Alfred Mackenzie	Senior Attorney (Former)	1991 (TX)	\$1,250	112.90	\$141,125.00
Discovery			\$1,250	0.10	\$125.00
Class Certification			\$1,250	18.20	\$22,750.00
Appeal (Rule 23(f) Petition)			\$1,250	24.30	\$30,375.00
Motion for Summary Judgment			\$1,250	69.20	\$86,500.00
Mediation			\$1,250	0.10	\$125.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$1,250	1.00	\$1,250.00
Megan Waida	Senior Attorney	2006 (TX)	\$1,250	304.80	\$381,000.00
Settlement			\$1,250	39.50	\$49,375.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$1,250	234.40	\$293,000.00
Trial			\$1,250	30.90	\$38,625.00
Ryan Ellis	Senior Attorney	2013 (TX)	\$1,250	2,916.20	\$3,645,250.00
Legal and Factual Analysis of Claims and Defenses			\$1,250	259.00	\$323,750.00
Case Strategy			\$1,250	35.10	\$43,875.00
Discovery			\$1,250	951.50	\$1,189,375.00
Expert Discovery and Depositions			\$1,250	147.30	\$184,125.00
Class Certification			\$1,250	101.20	\$126,500.00
Motions to Strike / Motions to Exclude Experts			\$1,250	84.80	\$106,000.00
Appeal (Rule 23(f) Petition)			\$1,250	18.40	\$23,000.00
Motion for Summary Judgment			\$1,250	111.10	\$138,875.00
Opposition to Motion to Decertify			\$1,250	51.40	\$64,250.00
Non-Dispositive Motions			\$1,250	187.90	\$234,875.00
Ex Parte Applications			\$1,250	29.20	\$36,500.00
Applications to Seal			\$1,250	1.70	\$2,125.00
Case Management & Case Management Hearings			\$1,250	87.10	\$108,875.00
Communications with Class Members			\$1,250	101.10	\$126,375.00
Mediation			\$1,250	123.00	\$153,750.00
Settlement			\$1,250	78.40	\$98,000.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$1,250	451.80	\$564,750.00
Trial			\$1,250	96.20	\$120,250.00
Caroline McLeod	Senior Attorney	2018 (TX)	\$900	39.00	\$35,100.00
Motions to Strike / Motions to Exclude Experts			\$900	24.00	\$21,600.00
Motion for Summary Judgment			\$900	15.00	\$13,500.00
Alex Abston	Senior Attorney	2020 (TX)	\$900	949.25	\$854,325.00
Case Strategy			\$900	33.10	\$29,790.00
Discovery			\$900	9.80	\$8,820.00
Mediation			\$900	27.30	\$24,570.00
Settlement			\$900	1.60	\$1,440.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$900	815.25	\$733,725.00
Trial			\$900	62.20	\$55,980.00
Joshua Upham	Senior Attorney	2021 (TX)	\$900	233.10	\$209,790.00
Pleadings & Non-Motion Filings			\$900	44.30	\$39,870.00
Settlement			\$900	140.00	\$126,000.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$900	48.80	\$43,920.00

Matt Przywara	Attorney (Former)	2019 (TX)	\$850	70.30	\$59,755.00
Legal and Factual Analysis of Claims and Defenses			\$850	10.80	\$9,180.00
Case Strategy			\$850	0.20	\$170.00
Discovery			\$850	58.10	\$49,385.00
Non-Dispositive Motions			\$850	0.90	\$765.00
Case Management & Case Management Hearings			\$850	0.30	\$255.00
Davis LaBarre	Attorney (Former)	2022 (TX)	\$750	75.00	\$56,250.00
Legal and Factual Analysis of Claims and Defenses			\$750	0.70	\$525.00
Case Strategy			\$750	0.20	\$150.00
Discovery			\$750	73.20	\$54,900.00
Non-Dispositive Motions			\$750	0.60	\$450.00
Case Management & Case Management Hearings			\$750	0.30	\$225.00
Emily Olson	Paralegal	—	\$300	419.60	\$125,880.00
Pleadings & Non-Motion Filings			\$300	7.30	\$2,190.00
Discovery			\$300	16.30	\$4,890.00
Expert Discovery and Depositions			\$300	4.00	\$1,200.00
Motions to Strike / Motions to Exclude Experts			\$300	15.00	\$4,500.00
Motion for Summary Judgment			\$300	10.00	\$3,000.00
Ex Parte Applications			\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Settlement			\$300	18.30	\$5,490.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$300	271.20	\$81,360.00
Trial			\$300	76.50	\$22,950.00
Belinda Lower	Paralegal	—	\$300	258.80	\$77,640.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$300	253.20	\$75,960.00
Trial			\$300	5.60	\$1,680.00
Courtney Walton	Paralegal	—	\$300	76.35	\$22,905.00
Pleadings & Non-Motion Filings			\$300	11.25	\$3,375.00
Discovery			\$300	17.50	\$5,250.00
Expert Discovery and Depositions			\$300	4.75	\$1,425.00
Motions to Strike / Motions to Exclude Experts			\$300	8.00	\$2,400.00
Ex Parte Applications			\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Communications with Class Members			\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$300	32.35	\$9,705.00
Trial			\$300	0.50	\$150.00
Ariel Oxner	Paralegal	—	\$300	69.50	\$20,850.00
Case Strategy			\$300	1.00	\$300.00
Expert Discovery and Depositions			\$300	32.80	\$9,840.00
Trial Preparation & Motions in Limine			\$300	35.70	\$10,710.00
GRAND TOTAL				5,965.50	\$6,361,310.00