

# Court Opinions Concerning Our Audits

The following is a sample of what some courts have said about our audits. As you can see, after reading our audits, some courts have reduced the fee request by as much as **75 percent**. These clients obtained these results and took no risk by hiring Jim Schratz and Associates. Why not join them at **no risk**.

**In Florida Asset Financing Corp. v. Borton, Petrini & Conron**, United States District Court, Central District of California, Southern Division (Santa Ana), Case No. 8:96cv01144 AHS-MLG, Jim Schratz and Associates was retained to audit a fee request of \$600,000. Based on the audit report, the court awarded \$80,000.

**In Adam v. Norton, Northern District of California, Case No. C-98-2094 CW**, plaintiff sought total fees in the sum of \$1,726,312.92. The Special Master cited Mr. Schratz's audit report and recommended a total award of only \$434,581.95 in attorney's fees, less than 25 percent of the amount originally sought. The Special Master stated:

"I believe Mr. Schratz' expert testimony meets the standard. Schratz's testimony is relevant, in that Schratz has provided a useful breakdown of the time spent by Plaintiff's attorneys, and reliable, in that Schratz has accurately summarized the time and expenses claimed by Plaintiffs' attorneys."

**In North Pacifica, LLC v. City of Pacifica, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-01-4823 EMC**, Jim Schratz and Associates was retained to audit plaintiff's request for \$2,046,759.16 in fees and costs. In awarding plaintiffs only \$453,810.75 in fees, or approximately 22 percent, Magistrate Judge Edward M. Chen cited Mr. Schratz's audit with approval with respect to various billing issues. The Order, dated December 16, 2005, states, in pertinent part:

Based on the information provided in the declaration, Mr. Schratz has demonstrated that he is qualified to opine about fee awards and that his methodology in evaluating the billing records of NP's attorneys in this case is reasonable and sufficiently reliable. For example, Mr. Schratz's approach to categorizing the nature of the work of the attorneys is reasonable and sufficiently reliable as is, overall, his approach to unblocking the block-billed time entries.

**In Frieders v. City of Glendale, No. BC263271**, the Los Angeles County Superior Court adopted audit findings of Jim Schratz and Associates, and plaintiffs' request of \$4.1 million in fees was reduced to \$1.1 million.

**In McMurray v. City of Burbank, No. BC 247304**, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, plaintiff sought legal fees of approximately \$1.1 million and following a

full-scale audit by Jim Schratz and Associates, the court reduced the fees by 58 percent.

**In Conrad v. Perry, (2004) U.S.D.C. Cal.N.D., No. C-00-2236 PHJ, C-00 2142 PJH** (not for citation), the United States Department of Justice retained Jim Schratz and Associates to audit a fee request totaling \$719,135. Based on our audit the fees were reduced to \$227,772.50, for a reduction of 68 percent.

**In Florida Asset Financing Corp. v. Borton, Petrini & Conron, United States District Court, Central District of California, Southern Division (Santa Ana), Case No. 8:96cv01144 AHS-MLG**, Jim Schratz and Associates was retained to audit a fee request of \$600,000. Based on the audit report, the court awarded \$80,000.

**In Rios v. Rowland, No. 330211, Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento**, Jim Schratz and Associates was retained to audit a fee request of \$1.5 million. The court upheld the audit results, and reduced the fee request to approximately \$227,000.

**In CVB Corporation v. John Cavallucci, No. 156505**, Superior Court of California, County of Marin, Jim Schratz and Associates was retained to audit a fee request of approximately \$2 million. The audit uncovered a number of billing abuses, and the court disallowed approximately 50 percent of the fee request.

**In Aquilar v. Avis Rent-A-Car System, No. 948597**, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco, Jim Schratz and Associates was retained to audit a fee request of approximately \$1.3 million. The court followed the audit findings and reduced the request by approximately 50 percent, to \$650,000.

**In McCauley v. BFC Direct Mailing, No. 5711562**, Superior Court of California, County of Orange, the plaintiff sought attorneys' fees of \$1.1 million. The defendant, Howard Jarvis Tax Reform Movement, hired Jim Schratz and Associates to conduct a legal fee audit. The court followed the audit findings and awarded approximately \$525,000 of the \$1 million requested.

**In Rose v. Lancaster School District, No. BC 303843**, Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Jim Schratz and Associates was retained to conduct an audit. The court adopted the methodology, analysis and recommendations contained in the audit, and reduced plaintiff's request for fees by 58 percent from \$498,000 to \$209,000.