

1 BARRETT S. LITT, SB# 45527
E-Mail: blitt@kmbllaw.com
2 **KAYE, McLANE, BEDNARSKI & LITT, LLP**
3 234 East Colorado Boulevard, Suite 230
Pasadena, CA 91101
4 Telephone: (626) 844-7660
Facsimile: (626) 844-7670
5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

6 ANNE RICHARDSON, SB#151541
E-mail: arichardson@publiccounsel.org
7 STEPHANIE CARROLL, SB# 263698
E-mail: scarroll@publiccounsel.org
8 **PUBLIC COUNSEL**
9 610 South Ardmore Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90005
10 Telephone: (213) 385-2977
11 Facsimile: (213) 385-9089
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

12
13
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

16 MICHAEL NOZZI et al.
17 Plaintiff,
18
19 vs.
20 HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE
CITY OF LOS ANGELES et al
21 Defendants.

CASE NO. CV 07-00380 PA (FFMx)
JUDGE: The Hon. Percy Anderson

**DECLARATION OF ANNE
RICHARDSON IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES**

22
23
24 I, Anne Richardson, declare as follows:

25 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the state of California. I
26 make this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees. It is
27 based upon my own personal knowledge and, if called as a witness, I could and
28

1 would testify to the following matters.

2 **PUBLIC COUNSEL ATTORNEY TIME AND EXPERIENCE**

3 2. I am Directing Attorney of the Consumer Law Project at Public
4 Counsel, counsel for Plaintiffs in this action. Before joining Public Counsel, from
5 1998 to 2014, I was a partner at Hadsell Stormer Richardson & Renick and its
6 predecessors, where I specialized in complex employment and civil rights cases.
7 From 1990 to 1998, I was an associate at Hadsell & Stormer, and a fellow at Litt &
8 Stormer. From 1989 to 1990, I clerked for the Honorable Mariana R. Pfaelzer, U.S.
9 District Judge for the Central District of California.

10 3. I graduated with Distinction from Stanford Law School in 1989, and
11 received my B.A. from Swarthmore College in 1984. In 2017, I was named a
12 California Lawyer Attorney of the Year for my work on the class action *Rodriguez*
13 *v. City of Los Angeles*, CV11-01335 DMG (JEMx), 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 43512
14 (C.D. Cal. 2017). In 2006, I was named a California Lawyer Attorney of the Year
15 for my work on the *Doe v. Unocal* case involving violations of international human
16 rights law. I received the ACLU of Southern California Pro Bono award in 2006. I
17 have been named to the “SuperLawyers” list for Southern California by Los Angeles
18 Magazine every year since 2004, and am regularly named to the Top 50 Women
19 Lawyers in Southern California list. I am rated AV Preeminent by Martindale
20 Hubbell. A true and correct copy of my curriculum vitae is attached hereto as
21 Exhibit A.

22 4. I have taught Section 1983 Litigation as an Adjunct Professor at Loyola
23 Law School and am regularly asked to give lectures regarding public interest and
24 class action litigation to lawyers, law students, and public interest organizations.
25 Most recently I was one of four trainers selected to provide training in the Impact
26 Fund's Class Action Institute for 2016 and 2017. I have also spoken to such
27 organizations and institutions as: UCLA Law School, Loyola Law School,
28

1 University of California, Irvine School of Law, USC Law School, Occidental
2 College, California Employment Lawyers Association, Los Angeles County Bar
3 Association; State Bar of California Labor and Employment Section; Litigation
4 Counsel of America, University of Colorado Law School, Rutgers Law School,
5 National Academy of Arbitrators, and others.

6 5. In addition to this case, I have been co-lead counsel on numerous class
7 actions in both state and federal court, including: *Rodriguez v. City of Los Angeles*,
8 CV11-01335 DMG (JEMx), 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 43512 (C.D. Cal. 2017) (class
9 action certified in landmark case curbing widespread unconstitutional practices
10 related to the use of gang injunctions); *United Steel, et al. v. ConocoPhillips*, CV 08-
11 02068-PSG (FFMx), 593 F.3d 802 (9th Cir. 2010) (lead appellate counsel in wage
12 and hour class action regarding “on duty” meal periods); *Trujillo v. City of Ontario*,
13 EDCV 04-1015-VAP (SGLx), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79309 (C.D. Cal. 2009)
14 (class action involving violations of right to privacy where police officers were
15 videotaped in their locker room); *Avery v. Orange County Transportation Authority*,
16 Case No. 07CC00004 (class action certified regarding excessive penalties in fines
17 on toll roads and violation of due process); *Fitzgerald v. City of Los Angeles*, CV
18 03-01876-DDP (RZx), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS (C.D. Cal. 2009) (class action
19 challenging search and seizure policy of LAPD in Skid Row), and *Paige v. State of*
20 *California*, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 12050 (9th Circuit 2007) (appeal from a two-
21 month trial alleging disparate impact in a failure to promote case). I have also
22 worked on other class action cases in which my former firm was lead counsel,
23 including *Wang v. Chinese Daily News*, CV 04-1498-CBM (AJWx) (class action
24 alleging multiple wage and hour violations); *Soto v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts*
25 *Worldwide, Inc.*, BC 352849 (class action alleging meal and rest break violations),
26 and *Flores v. Albertsons*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26857 (C.D. Cal. 2003) (P.
27 Anderson, J.) (overtime violations against janitorial staff). I have also been co-lead
28

1 counsel on numerous other complex non-class cases.

2 6. Public Counsel is the largest pro bono law firm in the United States.
 3 Founded in 1970, as of the date of this declaration, it has 121 total staff, with 64
 4 attorneys. Lawyers at the firm handle direct services as well as impact litigation,
 5 including class actions and complex civil rights matters. Public Counsel is a
 6 nonprofit legal services firm that generally does not charge its clients for legal
 7 representation, and thus depends on donations, private and government grants, and
 8 attorney fee awards to sustain its services. Public Counsel bills my time at the rate of
 9 \$850 an hour.

10 7. Since I began as Directing Attorney of the Consumer Law Project in
 11 October 2015, I have been closely involved in this case and was named as one of the
 12 Class Counsel in the case by this Court. Among other things, I have been involved
 13 in: supervising and managing the work of all Public Counsel staff working on the
 14 case; litigation strategy; researching, drafting and editing sections of motions related
 15 to class certification, summary judgment, opposing HACLA's petition for a writ of
 16 certiorari, and HACLA's motion to amend their answer.

17 8. I was involved in every stage of the mediation and settlement
 18 discussions in this case. I also provided input on and edited the motion for
 19 preliminary approval and the exhibits, and I edited the motion for attorney's fees. I
 20 have spent 146.7 hours on this matter.

21 9. In addition to my own time, Public Counsel is seeking compensation
 22 for the work of five other attorneys who have worked on the case since 2006. The
 23 rates we are seeking (without including time spent going forward) are:

Name	Title/Year Graduation	Rate	Hours	Lodestar
NAME	TITLE [GRAD YR]	RATE	HOURS	LODESTAR
Anne Richardson	Attorney, 1989	\$850	146.7	\$ 124,695.00
Patrick Dunlevy	Attorney, 1992	\$750	195	\$ 146,250.00
Lisa Jaskol	Attorney, 1988	\$850	75.6	\$ 64,260.00
Hernán Vera	Attorney, 1994	\$750	160.6	\$ 120,450.00

NAME	TITLE [GRAD YR]	RATE	HOURS	LODESTAR
Stephanie Carroll	Attorney, 2004	\$640	945.8	\$ 605,312.00
Adelaide Anderson	Attorney, 2010	\$540	19.90	\$ 10,746.00
TOTAL			1543.6	\$1,071,713.00

10. Patrick Dunlevy was my predecessor as the Directing Attorney of the Consumer Law Project at Public Counsel. I have worked with Mr. Dunlevy for more than a decade in two different firms. Based on my personal knowledge of Mr. Dunlevy I can attest to his background. Mr. Dunlevy began his legal career in 1992 as a Staff Attorney at the Inner City Law Center (ICLC) in Los Angeles. While there, he worked primarily on lawsuits affecting the homeless or tenants living in slum apartment buildings. In 1998, he became Director of Litigation at ICLC and continued in that capacity until 2003, when he left to join the Hadsell & Stormer law firm in Pasadena. At Hadsell & Stormer, he worked on numerous high profile and/or impact cases. These included a class action lawsuit against the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for discrimination in promotions, a case against Chevron for human rights abuses in Nigeria, a class action lawsuit against the three major supermarket chains in California for wage and hour violations, and the South Central Farmers case, which involved destruction of the largest community garden in the United States. In 2007, Mr. Dunlevy left Hadsell & Stormer to become a Staff Attorney at the Western Center on Law and Poverty (WCLP). Later that year, he became Deputy Director of Litigation at WCLP. While there, he worked on a lawsuit involving discrimination against the elderly and disabled at the Alexandria Hotel in downtown Los Angeles and on a major slum housing lawsuit that he began working on in 2006 when he was at Hadsell & Stormer. That lawsuit settled in 2009 and was among the largest per person settlements ever in a habitability lawsuit in Southern California. Mr. Dunlevy joined Public Counsel as a Staff Attorney in Public Counsel's Consumer Law Project in September 2009 and became Directing

1 Attorney for the Project in 2010. Mr. Dunlevy retired from his position in August
2 2015, after which he was employed by our co-counsel Kaye, McLane, Bednarski &
3 Litt LLP to continue working on the case. He graduated from Carleton College in
4 1972 and from the UCLA School of Law in 1992.

5 11. Based on my review of Patrick Dunlevy's time records and discussions
6 with him, during Mr. Dunlevy's time working on the case while at Public Counsel
7 he was responsible for reviewing, coordinating, assigning and supervising the work
8 of everyone in the project who worked on the case. He participated in strategy and
9 planning sessions by conference calls, in-person meetings and email with co-counsel
10 and met regularly with Public Counsel staff who were working on the case. Mr.
11 Dunlevy worked on briefs and other documents that were submitted in the trial court
12 and to the Ninth Circuit and attended court hearings in the case. More specifically,
13 work that he did on the case included: monitoring the status of one of the plaintiffs
14 and contacting a potential new plaintiff; corresponding with Plaintiffs and opposing
15 counsel; arranging for a data consultant and participating in calls with the
16 consultant; assisting in drafting a motion to compel, a motion for class certification,
17 responses to questions by Judge Wu regarding a Motion for Summary Judgment by
18 defendants, responses to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, responses to
19 Defendants' objections to Plaintiffs' summary judgment evidence, Plaintiffs'
20 supplemental briefing for the Motion for Summary Judgment, and Plaintiffs' appeal
21 to the Ninth Circuit. During his time at Public Counsel, Mr. Dunlevy spent 195
22 hours working on this case. Public Counsel seeks to recover for Mr. Dunlevy's
23 work on this case at the rate of \$750 an hour.

24 12. As evidenced by the Declaration of Hernán Vera filed concurrently
25 herewith, during the period from 2008 until 2014, he was President and CEO of
26 Public Counsel and, prior to that, he was the Directing Attorney of the Consumer
27 Law Project at Public Counsel. For a full description of Mr. Vera's credentials,
28

1 please refer to his resume attached as Exhibit A to his declaration. (“Vera Decl.”).

2 13. Based on my review of his time records and as evidenced by his
3 declaration, Hernán Vera was heavily involved in the case from its inception up to,
4 and including, the first appeal to the Ninth Circuit. Mr. Vera’s work included:
5 working out our litigation strategy; meeting with clients; meeting with Defendants
6 to seek an early resolution to the case; co-authoring and reviewing the complaint;
7 preparing for, and attending, depositions, including taking the deposition of Shirley
8 Fields; drafting sections of our oppositions to Defendants’ anti-SLAPP motion,
9 motion to dismiss, and motion for summary judgment, and attendance at associated
10 hearings; and preparation for, and attendance at, argument in Plaintiffs’ first appeal
11 to the Ninth Circuit. In his declaration filed concurrently herewith, Mr. Vera
12 presents an itemized breakdown for 80.6 hours and estimates that he spent at least
13 an additional 80 hours working on the case, totaling 160.6 hours. Public Counsel
14 seeks to recover for Mr. Vera’s work on this case at the rate of \$750 an hour.

15 14. As evidenced by the Declaration of Lisa Jaskol filed concurrently
16 herewith, Ms. Jaskol was the Directing Attorney of the Appellate Law Program at
17 Public Counsel from January 2007 to June 2016. For a full description of Ms.
18 Jaskol’s credentials, please refer to her resume attached as Exhibit A to her
19 declaration. (“Jaskol Decl.”).

20 15. Based on my review of her time records and as evidenced by her
21 declaration, Ms. Jaskol worked on the briefing for both of Plaintiffs’ appeals to the
22 Ninth Circuit in this case. In the first appeal she researched and drafted arguments
23 relating to Plaintiffs’ Section 1983 claim for a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1437f(o)(2)
24 and, in the second appeal, she researched and drafted arguments relating to the law
25 of the case doctrine. At the time she worked on both appeals, she kept
26 contemporaneous time records on paper. However, after a diligent search by my
27 staff, those time records have not been located. Nevertheless, Ms. Jaskol presents
28

1 an itemized breakdown for 15.6 hours and estimates that she spent at least an
2 additional 30 hours working on each of the two appeals, totaling 75.6 hours. Public
3 Counsel seeks to recover for Ms. Jaskol's work on this case at the rate of \$850 an
4 hour.

5 16. Stephanie Carroll is a Senior Staff Attorney in the Consumer Law
6 Project at Public Counsel. She is licensed to practice in the state of California and
7 in the Central District of California. Ms. Carroll began her legal career as a barrister
8 in England in 2004, practicing criminal and immigration law. From 2006 until
9 2008, Ms. Carroll was an independent contractor working with teams of attorneys
10 litigating cases before the International Criminal Tribunals in The Hague and Sierra
11 Leone. Ms. Carroll became a member of the California Bar in 2009 and worked for
12 Paul Hoffman at Schonbrun DeSimone Seplow Harris and Hoffman from April until
13 September 2009. While working for Mr. Hoffman, she focused on civil litigation
14 and appellate work, and drafted a prevailing appellate brief. Ms. Carroll joined
15 Public Counsel in October 2009 and worked as a Staff Attorney assisting low-
16 income clients with housing, public benefits and consumer finance issues. She
17 moved to the Consumer Law Project in May 2011 and since then has been litigating
18 individual and class action cases that deal with foreclosure, mortgage fraud, patient
19 dumping and elder abuse.

20 17. Based on my own personal knowledge and my review of her time
21 records in this case, Ms. Carroll has been deeply involved in this case since it came
22 back down from the Ninth Circuit after the first appeal in 2011, and was named as
23 one of the Class Counsel by the Court in this case. Among other things, Ms. Carroll
24 has been involved in: drafting and responding to discovery; outreach, meetings,
25 telephone calls and communications with the named plaintiffs and other class
26 members; assisting with the search for readability and statistical experts; reviewing
27 discovery produced by the defendants; preparing for, and attending, the PMK
28

1 deposition; analyzing various large and complex data sets from the defendants, and
2 working closely with expert statisticians and co-counsel to work out the parameters
3 of class membership and the calculation of damages; drafting various sections of
4 motions and briefing including, for example, Plaintiffs' motion for summary
5 judgment, oppositions to Defendants' motions for summary judgment, and
6 Plaintiffs' motion for class certification; attending various hearings, including status
7 conferences, hearings related to summary judgment motions, and oral argument at
8 the Ninth Circuit; and drafting sections and preparing excerpts of transcripts for the
9 second appeal to the Ninth Circuit.

10 18. Ms. Carroll was involved in every stage of the mediation and
11 settlement discussions. She provided input on the motion for preliminary approval
12 and the exhibits, and motion for attorney's fees and spent time drafting and
13 collecting declarations in support thereof, as well as compiling the hours and the
14 costs.

15 19. In addition, Ms. Carroll spent a good deal of time organizing and
16 supervising law clerk and volunteer attorney teams to complete various tasks
17 including compiling research memoranda, conducting outreach to class members,
18 and mining data from Section 8 participants notes files (over 1 million lines of text)
19 to identify class members to contact. Ms. Carroll has spent 945.8 working on this
20 case and Public Counsel seeks to recover her work on this case at the rate of \$640 an
21 hour.

22 20. Adelaide Anderson is a Staff Attorney in the Consumer Law Project at
23 Public Counsel. She is licensed to practice in the state of California and in the
24 Central District of California. Ms. Anderson graduated law school in 2009, and has
25 been at Public Counsel since 2011. In her time at Public Counsel, Ms. Anderson has
26 focused on financial elder abuse and foreclosure-related issues, as well as patient
27 dumping, predatory lending and civil rights claims. Ms. Anderson worked on this
28

1 case in 2011 and 2012. She conducted fact investigation related to HACLA's
2 database systems and researched and drafted a letter to opposing counsel regarding
3 the preservation of evidence. Ms. Anderson worked 19.9 hours on the case and
4 Public Counsel seeks to recover her work on this case at the rate of \$540 an hour.

5 21. Attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of Barrett Litt (Litt Decl.)
6 filed concurrently herewith is a true and correct copy of the itemized time records
7 which were kept contemporaneously by current Public Counsel staff members and
8 Patrick Dunlevy during the pendency of this case. In addition, it includes
9 reconstructed time records for Hernán Vera and Lisa Jaskol based on documented
10 time records of co-counsel and transcripts and papers in the case: these
11 reconstructed records have been checked and verified by Mr. Vera and Ms. Jaskol,
12 both of whom have also included conservative estimates of the additional time they
13 have spent on the case. See Vera Decl. and Jaskol Decl., filed concurrently herewith.

14 **BILLING JUDGMENT**

15 22. With regard to the attorneys for whom Public Counsel is claiming time
16 for the purposes of the lodestar cross check, I have exercised the following billing
17 judgment in the matter by deducting certain time that was either duplicative,
18 excessive, not supported by the records of other co-counsel (for example, meetings
19 recorded by one attorney, but not by another), or otherwise non-compensable (such
20 as time spent on media that was unrelated to class member outreach, and time spent
21 by attorneys that was largely clerical in nature): specifically, I deducted 83.9 hours
22 of Stephanie Carroll's time; 9.70 hours of my time; 1 hour of Patrick Dunlevy's
23 time; and .2 hours of Adelaide Anderson's time. For Ms. Carroll, a significant
24 proportion of the deducted time relates to extracting and analyzing data from
25 HACLA, the need for some of which was obviated once our data expert, Dr. Brian
26 Kriegler, was appointed. The total amount of Public Counsel time I excluded for
27 attorneys in the lodestar cross-check amounts to 94.8 hours.

28

1 23. In addition, I exercised billing judgement in excluding time for other
2 members of Public Counsel staff who did not keep contemporaneous time records or
3 for whom time records could not be otherwise adequately reconstructed. This
4 include Louis Rafti, a staff attorney who worked on the case from its inception until
5 May 2007. Mr. Rafti did a great deal of initial fact investigation prior to filing the
6 lawsuit and we estimate the time he spent on the case was in excess of 50 hours, but
7 none of his time is included. Also excluded is any work undertaken by David
8 Daniels. Mr. Daniels was the Directing Attorney of the Homelessness Prevention
9 Law Project and worked on the case from October 2006 through the filing of the
10 case. During this time, he conducted interviews with potential plaintiffs for purposes
11 of representing the class of individuals affected; participated in strategy conferences
12 with counsel regarding the scope and direction of the litigation; and reviewed and
13 edited pleadings filed in the case. We estimate that Mr. Daniels spent at least 30
14 hours working on the case, none of which is included. The total amount of excluded
15 Public Counsel time related to attorneys not included in the lodestar cross-check is
16 in excess of 80 hours.

17 24. In addition to the staff attorney time spent on the case at Public Counsel
18 as outlined above, several other volunteer attorney and law clerks have worked on
19 this case. These include the following individuals, for whom we have
20 contemporaneous time records but who we are not including for the purposes of the
21 lodestar cross-check: Chelsea Samuels (26.9 hours); Corbin Barthold (5 hours); Eric
22 Mendelson (29.5 hours); Nancy Mayne (50.8 hours); Nathaniel Goldfinger (12
23 hours); Sam Brown (6.2 hours); Shelley Krall (24.7 hours); Sonia Vucetic (13.7
24 hours) and Valerie Marek (6 hours). The total number of law clerk and attorney
25 volunteer time we are excluding from the lodestar cross-check is 174.8 hours.

26 25. The current Public Counsel records being submitted to the Court (and
27 thus used to calculate the current lodestar) do not include the time spent by
28

1 paralegals in outreach to class members and other paralegal tasks on this case. That
2 number will be provided along with the updated time for other time keepers at the
3 time the final accounting is submitted in this case in connection with the Final
4 Approval hearing.

5 **OTHER PUBLIC COUNSEL EXPERIENCE**

6 26. In addition to the above-noted class action matters, Public Counsel has
7 also been counsel of record to the following class actions, among others: *Gary B. v.*
8 *Snyder*, CV 16-13292-SJM-APP (E.D. Mich.); *Peter P. v. Compton Unified Sch.*
9 *Dist.*, CV 15-3726-MWF (PLAx) (C.D. Cal.); *Stephen C. v. Bureau of Indian*
10 *Education*, CV 17-08004-SPL (D. Ariz.); *Page v. Parisotto*, Case No. BC 525922;
11 *Cruz v. State of California*, Case No. RG 14727139; *Franco v. Holder*, CV 10-
12 2211-DMG (C.D. Cal.); *Reed v. State of California*, Case No. BC432420; *F.L.B*
13 *(formerly J.E.F.M.) et al v. Lynch et al*, 14-CV091926-TSZ (W.D. Wash.); *G.F. v.*
14 *Contra Costa County*, 13-cv-03667-MEJ (N.D. Cal.); *Casey A. v. Gundry*, CV-10-
15 00192 (C.D. Cal.); *D.J. v. California*, Case No. BS142775; *Benito R. v. East Los*
16 *Angeles Regional Center*, Case No. BC429819; *Bautista v. State of California*, Case
17 No. BC418871; and *Community Action League v. Lancaster, et al.*, CV 11-4817
18 ODW (VBKx) (C.D. Cal.).

19 **CONCLUSION**

20 27. In pursuing this case for over a decade, including two successful
21 appeals to the Ninth Circuit, defending against three motions for summary judgment
22 by HACLA, making two motions for summary judgment on behalf of Plaintiff,
23 defending against a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court by
24 HACLA, extensive discovery, detailed analysis of complex and voluminous data to
25 identify class members, and months of settlement discussions, I believe that I and
26 the other Class Counsel have demonstrated a high degree of skill in the litigation of
27 the issues and that we have achieved an outstanding result for the Class.

28

1 **PUBLIC COUNSEL COSTS**

2 23. Public Counsel is seeking a total of \$1,441.37 in expenses it incurred
3 while litigating this case. A summary and a detailed itemization of these expenses
4 is attached as Exhibit D to the Litt Declaration filed concurrently herewith, and
5 may be summarized as follows:

6

Expense Description	Amount
7 Photocopies	\$ 202.10
8 Deposition costs	\$ 602.30
9 Mileage/Parking	\$ 392.29
10 Phone	\$ 1.15
11 Postage	\$ 243.53
12 TOTAL	\$1,441.37

13

14 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the
15 foregoing is true and correct.

16 Executed at Los Angeles, California on September 15, 2017.

17 

18 Anne Richardson

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

ANNE K. RICHARDSON

Public Counsel
610 S. Ardmore Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90005
(213) 385-2977 x 146
arichardson@publiccounsel.org

- HONORS**
- California Lawyer Attorney of the Year (CLAY) Award, 2017, for work as Co-Lead Counsel on case of *Rodriguez v. City of Los Angeles* involving unconstitutional curfew provisions in gang injunctions
 - Named in Top 100 Lawyers in Southern California in 2014-15 by Los Angeles Magazine
 - Named in Top 50 Women Lawyers in Southern California, 2004-2005, 2007-2009, 2012-2017 by Los Angeles Magazine
 - Honored by National Lawyers Guild for work in Guantánamo case, Los Angeles, 2012
 - California Lawyer Attorney of the Year (CLAY) Award, 2006, for work on *Doe v. Unocal* case involving international human rights law
 - ACLU Pro Bono Award, 2006
 - AV Preeminent Rating, Martindale Hubbell
 - Named in Best Lawyers in America, 2003 - present
 - Named to SuperLawyers List by Los Angeles Magazine, 2003 - present

LEGAL EXPERIENCE

- 9/14 to date PUBLIC COUNSEL
Director, Consumer Law Project. Direct and develop complex litigation in variety of areas affecting low-income persons and income inequality.
- 1/08 - 9/14 HADSELL STORMER RICHARDSON & RENICK, LLP
Partner. Handled all aspects of litigation and appeals on behalf of plaintiffs in the areas of civil rights, employment discrimination, class actions, and international human rights.
- 1/93 - 12/07 HADSELL & STORMER, INC.
Partner 1/98 - 12/07. Associate 1/93 - 12/97.
- 10/90 - 10/92 LITT & STORMER/LITT, MARQUEZ & FAJARDO
Public Interest Fellowship Attorney. Worked on all aspects of a wide range of public interest litigation.
- 8/89 - 8/90 THE HONORABLE MARIANA R. PFAELZER
Law Clerk, United States District Court for the Central District of California. Drafted research memoranda and opinions.

- 6/88 - 8/88 CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
Summer Intern, New York. Worked on cases involving international human rights law, poverty and environmental problems, attorneys' fees in public interest litigation.
- 6/87 - 8/87 ACLU OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, Los Angeles
Summer Intern. Worked on cases involving the Freedom of Information Act, homelessness, and the Palestinian deportation case.

EDUCATION

STANFORD LAW SCHOOL, Stanford, CA
J.D. with Distinction, 1989
Associate Editor, Stanford Law Review
Board Member, Stanford Public Interest Law Foundation

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, Swarthmore, PA
B.A. in Philosophy, 1984

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- Fall 2017 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Irvine
Adjunct Professor, Appellate Law Clinic
- 2004, 96-99 LOYOLA LAW SCHOOL, Los Angeles
Adjunct Professor, Civil Rights Litigation under Section 1983
- Fall 1994 Adjunct Professor, Introduction to Appellate Advocacy

BAR AND PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Admitted to all California courts, 1990
Admitted to U.S. District Court, Central District of California, 1990
Admitted to U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, 1999
Admitted to U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, 2010
Admitted to U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 2009
Admitted to U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, 1992
Admitted to U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, 2009
Admitted to United States Supreme Court, 2008
Board Member, ACLU of Southern California, 2000 to present
Advisory Board Member, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
Member, California Employment Lawyers' Association
Member, Consumer Attorneys Organization of California
Member, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Labor & Employment
Charter Member, Litigation Counsel of America
Fellow, American Bar Foundation

**CASES RESULTING
IN PUBLISHED
OPINIONS**

Rodriguez v. City of Los Angeles, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43512 (C.D. Cal. 2017)
Nozzi v. Housing Authority for the City of Los Angeles, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 62996 (C.D. Cal. 2016)
United States of America v. County of Los Angeles, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167716 (C.D. Cal. 2015)
Obaydullah v. Obama, 688 F.3d 784 (D.C. Cir. 2012)
Richards v. County of Los Angeles, 775 F. Supp. 2d 1176 (C.D. Cal. 2011)
Carter v. County of Los Angeles, 770 F. Supp. 2d 1042 (C.D. Cal. 2011)
Obaydullah v. Obama, 609 F.3d 444 (D.C. Cir. 2010)
Obaydullah v. Obama, 744 F. Supp. 2d 344 (D.D.C. 2010)
United Steel v. ConocoPhillips Co., 593 F.3d 802 (9th Cir. 2010)
Trujillo v. City of Ontario, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79309 (C.D. Cal. 2009)
Rosenstock v. LAUSD, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108187 (C.D. Cal. 2009)
Doe v. Wal-Mart Stores, 572 F.3d 677 (9th Cir. 2009)
Metoyer v. Chassman, 504 F.3d 909 (9th Cir. 2008)
Fitzgerald v. City of Los Angeles, 485 F. Supp. 2d 1137 (C.D. Cal. 2007)
Blair v. City of Los Angeles, 223 F.3d 1074 (9th Cir. 2000)
Doe v. Unocal Corp., 110 F. Supp. 2d 1294 (C.D. Cal. 2000)
Doe v. Unocal Corp., 27 F. Supp. 2d 1174 (C.D. Cal. 1998)
Beyda v. City of Los Angeles, 65 Cal. App. 4th 511 (1998)
Doe v. Unocal Corp., 963 F. Supp. 880 (C.D. Cal. 1997)
Rosenthal v. Great Western Financial Sec. Corp., 14 Cal. 4th 394 (1996)
Macias v. State of California, 10 Cal. 4th 844 (1995)
Martin v. Fisher, 11 Cal. App. 4th 118 (1992)
Angelheart v. City of Burbank, 232 Cal. App. 3d 460 (1991)

PUBLICATIONS

Contributor, Los Angeles Review of Books

Contributor, California *Advocate* Magazine

Contributor, CELA Voice, www.celavoice.org

Chapter 28 on Evidence in Age Discrimination in Employment edited by Lindemann, Grossman and Kadue

"Opposing Employment Discrimination," Chapter 15 of the NLG Employee and Union Member Guide to Labor Law (Clark Boardman Callaghan) (original chapter and yearly supplements)

Co-author with Nancy Bornn, Chapter 21 of Sexual Harassment in Employment Law (1997 Supplement), edited by Lindemann & Kadue

"Absolutely Exhausted," an article on exhaustion of administrative remedies for employment discrimination claims; Los Angeles Lawyer, 9/95

Stormer and Richardson, "The Graying of America: Age Discrimination in the Nineties," 26 West Los Angeles Law Review 189 (1995)

PARTIAL LIST OF PRESENTATIONS

Impact Fund Class Action Institute, 2016, 2017
UC Berkeley Law School, 2016
Loyola Law School, 2014, 2017
First Tuesday Speaker, Occidental College, March 2012
University of Colorado Law School, March 2012
Litigation Counsel of America, Santa Fe, NM, May 2009
UCLA Pro Bono Conference, 2009
Stanford Law School, 2008
Los Angeles County Bar Association, 2001, 2002, 2006
Los Angeles County Bar Association Annual Labor & Employment Law Symposium, March 1996, 2002
California Employment Lawyers Association, 2001, 2006, 2014
Institute for Corporate Counsel, December 2006
Los Angeles County Bar Association, Labor & Employment Retreat, 2000, 2006
Western Trial Lawyers' Association, March 2001
National Lawyers Guild Convention, Detroit, 1998
National Academy of Arbitrators, 1998 Annual Meeting, San Diego

MISCELLANEOUS

- Merit Selection Panel for the Selection of Magistrate Judges, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, January 2017 to the present
- Represented an Afghan detainee in Guantánamo Bay pro bono, from 2008 until his release in 2016
- Board Member, Slingshot Fund, Myanmar, 2013-2015
- Misión Observadora de Elecciones Ciudadanos Estadounidenses, El Salvador, March 1994
- Conversational Spanish
- Private Pilot's License, 1981
- Profiled by Los Angeles Daily Journal, July 13, 1998