

twelve separate states, though it accepts the number with hesitation. Plaintiffs' submissions meet the *Rode* standard, providing "fairly definite information as to the hours devoted to various general activities." *Rode*, 892 F.2d at 1190. As discussed, Plaintiffs provide a breakdown, by attorney and paralegal, of the hours spent engaging in eleven categories of legal work. See, e.g., ECF No. 86-2 Ex. 1. Plaintiffs also provide a chronological description of the work performed, collectively, by Class Counsel, including the investigation leading up to the drafting and filing of the first complaint, Plaintiffs' response to Defendants' motion to dismiss, the drafting of amended complaints, continued investigation and discovery, and the negotiations leading to this settlement. See ECF No. 86 at 7-10. However, Plaintiffs do not provide the specific dates of their services rendered, as required by L. Civ. R. 54.2(a)(c).

Defendants argue, generally, that [*73] Plaintiffs' application for fees is insufficient because some courts within the Third Circuit have approved attorneys' fees based on more detailed documentation than Plaintiffs submit here, including itemized, hourly billing records for each attorney. ECF No. 90 at 3-4 (citing cases). Defendants argue specifically that the Court should not accept Plaintiffs' aggregate submission of 1,225.5 hours of billable work for "Analysis/Strategy/Meetings" without further documentation of the precise number of meetings, dates, times, individuals present, and descriptions of "what was actually *done*" at the meetings. ECF No. 90 at 6. The Court does not deny that Plaintiffs *could* submit further documentation, and Plaintiffs have offered to submit detailed time records for the Court's *in camera* review if so required. ECF No. 105 at 6. But "it is not necessary" for the Court to "know the exact number of minutes spent nor the precise activity to which each hour was devoted nor the specific attainments of each attorney" in order to determine whether the number of hours billed was reasonable. *Rode*, 892 F.2d at 1190. In any event, as Plaintiffs suggest, "what was actually *done*" at these meetings likely includes protected attorney [*74] work product. ECF No. 105 at 9. The Court will not require Plaintiffs to submit further documentation of their meetings.

Defendants also suggest that the 679.1 total hours of "Research" reported by Plaintiffs is an unreasonable number because Class Counsel attorneys were already "presumably[] intimately familiar" with the relevant issues in this matter, reducing their need to conduct research. ECF No. 90 at 6-7. The Court agrees with Plaintiffs, however, that "[l]egal research is part of the job." ECF No. 105 at 9. Particularly in a multi-state class action involving federal and state law statutes, consolidated cases, a motion to dismiss, and an amended complaint, Class Counsel is expected to conduct a significant amount of legal research.

Given the lack of individual and task-based detail in Plaintiffs' billing summaries, the Court finds that Plaintiffs' submission of 5,100.75 billable hours is reasonable but accepts the number with some hesitation.

d. The billing rates submitted by Plaintiffs are high for the relevant community

To repeat, the average requested billing rate for Class Counsel attorneys is \$664.15 per hour, ECF No. 86-9 ¶ 28, with individual rates (including for paralegals) ranging [*75] from \$150 to \$1,100 per hour. See *id.* ¶ 30. Partners request a mean rate of \$745 per hour, while associates request a mean rate of \$423 per hour. ECF No. 90 at 9-10. The Court

For internal use only