DY FAX

Superior Court Of California, Sacramento C.D. Michel – S.B.N. 144258 10/12/2021 Sean A. Brady - S.B.N. 262007 torowither MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 180 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 200 Case Number: Long Beach, CA 90802 Telephone: (562) 216-4444 34-2013-80001667 Facsimile: (562) 216-4445 Email: sbrady@michellawyers.com 5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO 9 DAVID GENTRY, JAMES PARKER, Case No. 34-2013-80001667 10 MARK MIDLAM, JAMES BASS, and CALGUNS SHOOTING SPORTS DECLARATION OF SCOTT M. FRANKLIN 11 ASSOCIATION. IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES Plaintiffs and Petitioners. 12 (Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion & Motion, Memorandum of Points & Authorities in 13 V. Support, Request for Judicial Notice, Proposed Order, Declaration of Anna M. Barvir, Declaration 14 XAVIER BECERRA, in His Official Capacity as Attorney General For the State of Sean A. Brady, Declaration of Alexander A. 15 of California; STEPHEN LINDLEY, in Frank, Declaration of C.D. Michel, Declaration of His Official Capacity as Acting Chief for Albert E. Peacock, III, and Haydee Villegas, the California Department of Justice, 16 Exhibits A-I) BETTY T. YEE, in Her Official Capacity 17 as State Controller, and DOES 1 - 10, Hearing Date: January 14, 2022 Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m. 18 Defendants and Respondents. Department: 21 Judge: Hon. Shelleyanne W.L. Chang 19 Trial Date: August 24, 2018 20 Action Filed: October 16, 2013 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

FILED

DECLARATION OF SCOTT M. FRANKLIN

I, Scott M. Franklin, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the state of California. I am an attorney at the law firm Michel & Associates, P.C. ("MAPC"), attorneys of record for Plaintiffs in this action. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and, if called and sworn as a witness, could and would testify competently thereto.

Plaintiffs' Counsel's Background and Experience

- 2. In 2005, I graduated from Loyola Law School, earning my Juris Doctor. During law school, I served on the Loyola Los Angeles Entertainment Law Review, and my student-written article, What Is So B-A-D About D.A.B.? How High Definition Radio Affects the Producers of Sound Recordings, 25 Loy. L.A. Ent. L. Rev. 203 (2005) was selected for publication.
- 3. I have been admitted to practice law before the courts of California since December 2005. I am also currently licensed to practice before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, as well as the United States District Courts for the Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Central Districts of California.
- 4. I began my career at MAPC as a post-graduate law clerk in July 2006. I would then begin practicing law full time as an associate at MAPC in September 2006. In February 2012, I became a "Responsible Attorney," taking on more case management responsibilities, and in September 2016, I was named Of Counsel for the firm.
- 5. My practice areas currently include business disputes, environmental law, toxic tort, land use, employment, and public record access. Specific aspects of Mr. Franklin's practice include discovery, mediation, Public Records Act compliance and litigation, insurance coverage disputes, condemnation, and environmental liability under CERCLA, RCRA, HSAA, and common law claims.
- 6. I was recognized by Southern California Super Lawyers magazine as a "Rising Star" nine times—from 2009 through 2011, and again from 2013 through 2018.
- 7. During this matter, I was categorized by Michel & Associates, P.C., as an "Associate 6+," and later "Of Counsel." See Ex. B (attached to declaration of Anna M. Barvir filed

simultaneously herewith). My \$375 hourly rate is well within the hourly rates charged by highly specialized firms for attorneys of similar skill, experience, and expertise in Southern California.

Authentication of Billing

- 8. Plaintiffs' billing records, attached to the Declaration of Haydee Villegas filed simultaneously herewith, include true and accurate copies of my billing records for which fee recovery is sought in this matter. *See* Ex. A (attached to the Declaration of Haydee Villegas filed simultaneously herewith). The records include detailed descriptions of the work I performed on this matter and the time spent on each task between May 2013 and October 2021. *Id*.
- 9. In the regular course and scope of my daily business activities, I prepared the descriptions contained in each billing record that shows my name as the "Timekeeper," and I did so at or near the time of the occurrence of the work that I performed on this matter.
- 10. The descriptions contained within my billing records are a fair and accurate description of the work I performed on this matter and time spent on each task. In my professional judgment, the amount of time indicated for each task described in my billing records is a reasonable amount of time for me to have spent on the type of work described therein.

Role in the Litigation

11. I spent approximately **47.6** hours engaged in case management work. That time breaks down as follows: (1) about 10.2 hours were spent engaged in case-management meetings with the attorneys and other billing professionals (e.g., law clerks) assigned to litigate this case; (2) about 2.3 hours were spent communicating with the litigation team and opposing counsel via telephone; (3) about 13.3 hours were spent communicating with the litigation team and opposing counsel via email and other written correspondence; (4) about 16.1 hours were spent conducting research, reviewing, and analyzing, inter alia, potentially related lawsuits and investigations to determine whether filings or holdings would be helpful here, relevant case law to develop arguments and theories, and proposed regulations and legislation to determine what, if any, impact they would have on the case; and (5) about 5.7 hours were spent drafting stipulations re: bifurcation and extending case deadlines, and legal research memoranda re: case strategies and theories. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.

- 12. I spent approximately **19.6** hours during the complaint phase of litigation. That time breaks down as follows: (1) about 3.0 hours were spent in meetings with the litigation team about the status of and strategies related to building this case through legal research to determine viable claims, gathering relevant evidence, and preparing the complaint; (2) about 0.3 hour was spent communicating with the litigation team and clients via telephone and email; (3) about 12.3 hours were spent drafting and revising verifications, errata, and the amended complaint; and (4) another 4.0 hours were spent researching and analyzing legal issues arising in the preparation of the complaint. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.
- 13. I spent approximately 189.5 hours during the motions phase of litigation. That time breaks down as follows: (1) about 9.3 hours were spent in meetings and telephone conferences with the litigation team about the status of and strategies related to moving this case forward through motions practice; (2) about 5.9 hours were spent communicating with the litigation team and opposing counsel via email and other written correspondence; (3) about 151.0 hours were spent drafting, reviewing, revising, and preparing to serve/file Plaintiffs' motion for leave to file an amended complaint, Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings, as well as the supporting documents for those motions; (4) about 18.7 hours were researching, reviewing, and analyzing, inter alia, Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings, hearing transcripts, tentative rulings, Defendants' answer, and case precedent relied on in the parties' motions briefing; and (5) about 4.6 hours were spent preparing for and making appearances related to law and motion practice. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.
- 14. I spent approximately **106.3** hours during the summary adjudication phase of litigation. That time breaks down as follows: (1) about 1.7 hours were spent discussing the strategies for, status of, and arguments to make during the first phase of this bifurcated litigation (i.e., the parties' cross-motions for summary adjudication re: Causes of Action 5 and 9) with the litigation team through meetings and emails; (2) about 103.3 hours were spent researching, drafting, reviewing, revising, and preparing to file Plaintiffs' motion for summary adjudication and supporting documents, Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' motion for summary adjudication, and Plaintiffs' reply to Defendants' opposition; and (3) about 1.3 hours were spent preparing for and

making an appearance related to the summary adjudication motion. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.

- 15. I spent approximately 131.4 hours during the bench trial phase of litigation. That time breaks down as follows: (1) about 4.3 hours were spent in meetings and telephone conferences with the litigation team about the status of and strategies related to the bench trial; (2) about 3.0 hours were spent drafting and responding to emails and other written correspondence with the litigation team and opposing counsel; (3) about 112.2 hours were spent drafting, reviewing, and revising Plaintiffs' opening merits brief and reply briefing—this also includes time I spent before bifurcation of the case drafting a "motion for summary judgment" that would largely serve as the foundation for Plaintiffs' motion for summary adjudication and trial briefing; (4) about 3.2 hours were spent research and analysis of Defendants' briefing and relevant caselaw to prepare for trial; and (5) about 8.7 hours were spent preparing for and appearing at the trial hearing, including drafting my trial hearing outline and opening statement, analyzing the Court's tentative ruling, and participating in a mock hearing. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.
- 16. I spent approximately **5.4** hours during the post-judgment phase of litigation. All of that time was spent drafting a proposed order and judgment, analyzing the judgment in this matter and preparing a memorandum for the client re: same, and negotiating and preparing a stipulation to extend time to file motion for attorneys' fees and memorandum of costs until after appeal. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.

My Role in Discovery

- 17. I spent approximately **587.2** hours during the discovery phase of litigation, constituting over half of the hours I seek recovery for in this matter. This is because discovery in this matter was quite extensive and dealt with, among other things, rather technical and detailed accounting information from the State related to the DROS Fee.
- 18. I was responsible for Plaintiffs propounding at least 5 sets of document requests, 4 sets of requests for admission, 4 sets of form interrogatories, and 6 sets of special interrogatories—for a total of about 465 separate requests.
 - 19. I also took the depositions of David Harper (about 3 hours and 40 minutes), Jessica

26

27

28

- R. Devencenzi Holmes (about 2 hours and 30 minutes total), and Stephen J. Lindley (about 3 hours and 15 minutes) on behalf of Plaintiffs.
- 20. Discovery was fraught with disputes that required Plaintiffs to prosecute an extraordinary number of motions to compel. Indeed, I drafted and filed about a half dozen such motions on Plaintiffs' behalf, and then renewed two of them. These discovery motions, as well as the parties' meet-and-confer efforts, resulted in Defendants providing amended discovery responses on no less than 18 occasions. To be certain, the discovery challenges Plaintiffs faced in this case were unusually severe, causing Plaintiffs' counsel—myself especially—to expend extraordinary efforts.
- 21. The time I spent during this phase of litigation breaks down as follows: (1) about 19.5 hours were spent in meetings with the litigation team about the status of and strategies for discovery; (2) about 18.8 hours were spent engaging in e-mail communications with the litigation team about the status of and strategies for discovery, as well as with opposing counsel re: discovery status and disputes; (3) about 49.4 hours were spent on other written correspondence, including drafting and revising meet-and-confer letters to opposing counsel about discovery disputes; (4) about 12.4 hours were spent engaged in telephone conferences with the litigation team about the status of and strategies for discovery, as well as participating in telephonic meetand-confers and other telephone conferences with opposing counsel; (5) about 12.9 hours were spent conducting research and drafting a research memorandum re: discovery options and strategy; (6) about 46.8 hours were spent determining who to depose, drafting deposition notices, preparing to take and taking the depositions of Devencenzi Holmes, Harper, and Lindley; (7) about 9.9 hours were spent preparing to meet and confer with opposing counsel, as well as preparing for discovery motion hearings and discovery conferences; (8) about 16.1 hours were spent conducting legal research regarding various discovery-related issues, including scope and validity of privileges claimed by DOJ and various arguments for use in motions to compel; and (9) about 2.5 hours were spent making appearances on discovery motions. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.
- 22. I spent about 85.9 hours reviewing, evaluating, and analyzing discovery-related documents, including discovery responses and documents produced in response to Plaintiffs'

discovery requests and public records requests. This included an intensive review of thousands of pages of documents, responses, and objections, including a detailed and technical review of the State's accounting information related to the DROS Fee. It also included creating attorney notes and impressions, reports, tables, and charts of the responses received, and other discovery summaries. And it includes times spent reviewing, analyzing, and summarizing deposition transcripts of David Harper, Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.

23. The bulk of the time I spent during this phase (i.e., 313.0 hours) was, naturally, spent drafting, reviewing, and/or revising the Public Records Act Requests and 18 sets of discovery Plaintiffs served on Defendants, including 4 sets of document requests, four sets of requests for admission, 4 sets of form interrogatories, and 6 sets of special interrogatories. This time also includes the many hours I devoted to researching, drafting, reviewing, revising, and preparing to file Plaintiffs' motions to compel that were both necessary and largely successful. Villegas Decl., Ex. A; Brady Decl., Ex. C.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 11th day of October, at Glendale, California.

Scott M. Franklin Declarant

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO 3 I, Laura Palmerin, am employed in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and am not a party to the within action. My 4 business address is 180 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 200, Long Beach, CA 90802. 5 On October 12, 2021, the foregoing document described as 6 DECLARATION OF SCOTT M. FRANKLIN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION 7 FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES 8 on the interested parties in this action by placing ☐the original 9 ⊠a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s) addressed as follows: 10 Ryan A. Hanley Deputy Attorney General 11 California Department of Justice 1300 I Street, Suite 125 12 P.O. Box 944255 13 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Ryan.Hanley@doj.ca.gov 14 Attorney for Defendants 15 16 ⊠ (BY OVERNIGHT MAIL) As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for overnight delivery by UPS/FED-EX. Under the 17 practice it would be deposited with a facility regularly maintained by UPS/FED-EX for receipt on the same day in the ordinary course of business. Such envelope was sealed and placed for collection and delivery by UPS/FED-EX with delivery fees paid or provided for in 18 accordance with ordinary business practices. 19 ☐ (BY MAIL) As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and 20 processing correspondence for mailing. Under the practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Long Beach, 21 California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date is more than one day after date of 22 deposit for mailing an affidavit. 23 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the 24 foregoing is true and correct. 25 Executed on October 12, 2021, at Long Beach, California. mfaleur 26 27 28 8

PROOF OF SERVICE