

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

SEAN WILSON, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUUUGE, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

No. 18-cv-5276-RSL

**ORDER GRANTING CLASS
COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, AND
CLASS REPRESENTATIVE
INCENTIVE AWARDS**

1 WHEREAS, Plaintiff has submitted authority and evidence supporting Class Counsel's
2 Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and Issuance of Incentive Awards; and

3 WHEREAS, the Court, having considered the Motion and being fully advised, finds that
4 good cause exists for entry of the Order below; therefore,

5 IT IS HEREBY FOUND, ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

6 1. Unless otherwise provided herein, all capitalized terms in this Order shall have
7 the same meaning as set forth in Class Counsel's Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees and
8 Expenses and Issuance of Incentive Awards.

9 2. The Court confirms its appointment of Jay Edelson, Rafey S. Balabanian, Todd
10 Logan, Alexander G. Tievsky, and Brandt Silver-Korn of Edelson PC as Class Counsel.

11 **A. Attorneys' Fees**

12 3. Class Counsel has requested the Court calculate their award using the percentage-
13 of-the-fund method. Class Counsel requests the Court award 25% of the \$6.5 million common
14 fund as attorneys' fees.

15 4. These requested attorneys' fees, which reflect the "benchmark" fee award in
16 common fund cases, are fair and reasonable. *See Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043,
17 1052 (9th Cir. 2002). The Court reaches this conclusion after analyzing: (1) the extent to which
18 class counsel achieved exceptional results for the class; (2) whether the case was risky for class
19 counsel; (3) whether counsel's performance generated benefits beyond the cash settlement fund;
20 (4) the market rate for the particular field of law; (5) the burdens class counsel experienced while
21 litigating the case; (6) and whether the case was handled on a contingency basis. In reaching this
22 conclusion, the Court has also taken into account the settlements reached, and fee awards
23 requested, in the *Kater v. Churchill Downs* and *Wilson v. Playtika* actions.

24 5. Class Counsel performed exceptional work and achieved an exceptional result for
25 the Class. Class Members stand to recover substantial portions of their Lifetime Spending
26 Amount on Defendant's Applications.
27

1 6. Class Counsel further achieved exceptional non-monetary benefits for the Class.
2 Among other things, Defendant has agreed to meaningful prospective relief for the Class,
3 including providing addiction-related resources on the Applications and creating a robust self-
4 exclusion policy within the Applications.

5 7. This litigation was extremely risky for Class Counsel. Class Counsel worked
6 entirely on contingency, prosecuted a line of several class actions against well-funded
7 corporations, and pursued an entirely novel legal theory: that Defendant’s internet-based “social
8 casinos” violated Washington’s “Return of Money Lost at Gambling” statute (RCW 4.24.070).
9 Class Counsel also defended the Class’s interests before the Washington State Gambling
10 Commission and the Washington State Legislature.

11 8. The market also supports Class Counsel’s fee request. Contingency arrangements
12 in high-stakes, high-value mass litigation typically fall in the range of 30-40%. *See* Declaration
13 of Charles M. Silver ¶¶ 47-53. Further, the mean percentage award of attorneys’ fees in class
14 actions in the Ninth Circuit is 24.5% of the common fund, and the mean percentage award in this
15 District is 26.98%. *See* Declaration of William B. Rubenstein ¶ 14.

16 9. The Court is not required to conduct a lodestar cross-check, *Farrell v. Bank of*
17 *Am. Corp.*, N.A., 827 F. App’x 628, 630 (9th Cir. 2020), and declines to do so here. Given the
18 unique circumstances presented by this litigation, in particular the significant amount of non-
19 legal work that had to be performed to turn back industry efforts to obtain protective legislation
20 and to prevent participation in this lawsuit, the Court concludes that a lodestar cross-check would
21 not be a valuable tool to help assess the reasonableness of Class Counsel’s fee request. *See*
22 Declaration of William B. Rubenstein ¶¶ 20-22; Declaration of Charles M. Silver ¶¶ 72-76.

23 10. The Court grants Class Counsel’s request for a fee award of 25% of the common
24 fund, or \$1,625,000.

25 **B. Costs and Expenses**

26 11. In addition to the fee request, Class Counsel requests reimbursement of
27 \$69,284.48 in costs and expenses.

1 12. The Court finds most of these costs and expenses to be reasonable and
2 appropriate. *See Dennings v. Clearwire Corp.*, No. C10-1859-JLR, 2013 WL 1858797, at *10
3 (W.D. Wash. May 3, 2013), *aff'd* (Sept. 9, 2013). The amount will be reduced, however, by the
4 \$41,797.44 attributed to “conducting a website-based ‘opt-out’ campaign.” Dkt. # 122 at ¶ 30.
5 There is no indication in the record that such a campaign was mounted as to these defendants or
6 the March 2020 Governing Law and Binding Arbitration pop-up. *Id.* at ¶¶ 10-20. The Court
7 consequently awards Class Counsel reimbursement of \$27,487.04 in costs and expenses.

8 **C. Incentive Awards**

9 13. Class Counsel requests an incentive award of \$10,000 Sean Wilson and an
10 incentive award of \$1,000 for Heidi Hammer.

11 14. The requested incentive awards are fair and reasonable. Wilson invested
12 substantial time in this case, risked reputational harm, and otherwise made significant
13 contributions to the Class. A \$10,000 incentive award is reasonable for his services. *See*
14 *McClintic v. Lithia Motors, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-859-RAJ, 2011 WL 13127844, at *6 (W.D. Wash.
15 Oct. 19, 2011). Hammer reviewed the terms of the settlement and stepped forward to share her
16 approval of the settlement with the public. A \$1,000 incentive award is reasonable for her
17 services. *See In re Portfolio Recovery Assocs., LLC, Tel. Consumer Prot. Act Litig.*, No. 11-md-
18 02295, 2017 WL 10777695, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2017) (incentive award appropriate where
19 class representatives “were required to review documents” and “they will earn little for their
20 efforts without [] incentive payments”).

21 **D. Conclusion**

22 15. Based on the foregoing findings and analysis, the Court awards Class Counsel
23 \$1,625,000 in attorneys’ fees; awards Class Counsel costs and expenses in the amount of
24 \$27,487.04; awards Sean Wilson an incentive award of \$10,000; and awards Heidi Hammer an
25 incentive award of \$1,000.

26
27 //

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 11th day of February, 2021.


ROBERT S. LASNIK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE