

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

MICHAEL KERNEN, on behalf of)
himself and all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

Case No. CIV-18-00107-JD

CASILLAS OPERATING, LLC,)

Defendant.)

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF CLASS COUNSEL’S MOTION
FOR APPROVAL OF REIMBURSEMENT OF LITIGATION EXPENSES**

I. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

In connection with approval of the Settlement¹ in the above-captioned Litigation, Class Counsel respectfully move the Court for reimbursement of expenses incurred in successfully prosecuting and resolving this Litigation² not to exceed \$200,000.00 (the

¹ All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning given to them in the August 12, 2021 Amended Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement (“Settlement Agreement”), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1 to Plaintiff’s Supplement in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion to Certify Class for Settlement Purposes, Preliminarily Approve Class Action Settlement, Approve Form and Manner of Notice, and Set Date for Final Approval Hearing (the “Supplement”) (Dkt. No. 100).

² To date, Class Counsel have incurred out-of-pocket expenses of \$169,462.46. Class Counsel may incur additional expenses between now and the Final Approval Hearing. As such, at the Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel may seek reimbursement for expenses incurred after the date of this filing, not to exceed \$200,000.00. Class Counsel’s Expense Request does not include the Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs associated with effectuating the Settlement. In the Notice, Class Counsel stated they would request approval of Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs associated with effectuating the Settlement in an amount not to exceed \$175,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Fund. That request is discussed in more detail below.

“Expense Request”)—the amount set forth in the Notice. Moreover, Class Counsel also respectfully move the Court for approval of reimbursement of Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs associated with effectuating the Settlement in an amount not to exceed \$175,000.00. These requests are fair and reasonable, and, therefore, Class Counsel respectfully requests that they be approved.

Class Counsel have obtained an excellent recovery for the benefit of Class Members, which consists of (1) a cash payment of \$2,700,000.00 (the “Gross Settlement Fund”) to compensate the Settlement Class for past damages, and (2) Future Benefits to the Settlement Class consisting of binding changes to Defendant’s statutory interest payment practices and policies in Oklahoma which are estimated to have a present value of at least \$5,000,000.00, bringing the total value of the Settlement to at least \$7,700,000.00 – an outstanding recovery for Class Members.³

In order to achieve this remarkable recovery for the Class, Class Counsel were required to expend out-of-pocket expenses that were necessary and reasonable for the prosecution of this action. Class Counsel now seek reimbursement of those reasonable expenses, in an amount not to exceed \$200,000.00—the amount set forth in the Notices.⁴

³ See Declaration of Robert N. Barnes, Andrew G. Pate and Patrick M. Ryan on Behalf of Class Counsel (“Joint Class Counsel Decl.”) at ¶5, attached as Exhibit 2 to Final Approval Memorandum; *see also* Affidavit of Barbara A. Ley, CPA, CITP, CFF (“Ley Aff.”) at ¶8, attached as Exhibit 3 to the Final Approval Memorandum.

⁴ A copy of the Short Form and Long Form Notices (the “Notices”) are attached as Exhibits A & C to the Declaration of Jennifer M. Keough on behalf of Settlement Administrator, JND Legal Administration LLC, Regarding Notice Mailing and

To date, Class Counsel have advanced \$169,462.46 in prosecuting and resolving this case. *See* NP Decl. at ¶11; RW Decl. at ¶16; BL Decl. at ¶18. In addition to these expenses, Class Counsel may incur additional expenses between now and the Final Approval Hearing. *See id.* As such, at the hearing, Class Counsel may seek reimbursement for expenses incurred after the date of this filing, not to exceed \$200,000.00. *Id.* In addition, Class Counsel reserve their right to make additional expense requests following the Final Approval Hearing; however, in no event will Class Counsel’s cumulative expense requests exceed the \$200,000.00 stated in the Notice. Because the Expense Request is fair and reasonable, and for the reasons set forth below, the Expense Request should be granted.

In order to facilitate the settlement, provide notice, and distribute funds, the Short Form Notice stated Class Counsel would request approval of Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs associated with effectuating the Settlement in an amount not to exceed \$175,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Fund. *See* JND Decl. at Exhibit A. These costs will include those of the Settlement Administrator JND, accounting expert Barbara Ley, and land experts. As with the Litigation Expenses, Class Counsel only seek approval of payment of Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs actually incurred and not to exceed \$175,000.00.

II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL SUMMARY

In the interest of brevity, Class Counsel will not recite the factual and procedural background of this Litigation again herein. Instead, Class Counsel respectfully refer the

Administration of Settlement (“JND Decl.”), which is attached as Exhibit 4 to the Final Approval Memorandum.

Court to the Final Approval Memorandum, the Joint Class Counsel Declaration, the pleadings on file, and any other matters of which the Court may take judicial notice, all of which are incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein.

III. ARGUMENT

A. The Parties Have Agreed Federal Common Law Controls the Reasonableness of Any Requests for Expenses

The Parties contractually agreed that the Settlement Agreement shall be governed *solely* by federal common law with respect to certain issues, including the reasonableness of attorneys' requests for reimbursement of expenses:

To promote certainty, predictability, the full enforceability of this Settlement Agreement as written, and its nationwide application, this Settlement Agreement shall be governed *solely by federal law*, both substantive and procedural, as to due process, class certification, judgment, collateral estoppel, res judicata, release, settlement approval, allocation, Case Contribution Award, *the right to and reasonableness of Plaintiff's Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses*, and all other matters for which there is federal procedural or common law, including federal law regarding federal equitable common fund class actions.

Settlement Agreement at ¶11.8 (Doc. No. 100-1) (emphasis added).

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma has previously approved and held this contractual language to be enforceable. *See, e.g., Miller v. DCP Operating Co., L.P.*, No. CIV-18-0199-JH (E.D. Okla. June 29, 2021) (Heaton, J.) (Dkt. No. 98 at 3); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. SM Energy Co.*, No. CIV-18-1225-J (W.D. Okla. Apr. 27, 2021)(Jones, J.) (Dkt. No. 115 at 5-6); *Hay Creek Royalties, LLC v. Roan Resources, LLC*, No. 19-CV-177-CVE-JFJ (N.D. Okla. April 28, 2021) (Dkt. No. 74 at 3-4); *McClintock v. Enterprise Crude Oil, LLC*, No. CIV-16-136-KEW (E.D. Okla. March

26, 2021) (Dkt. No. 120 at 4-5); *McClintock v. Continuum Producer Services, L.L.C.*, No. 17-cv-00259-JAG (E.D. Okla. June 4, 2020) (Dkt. No. 61 at 4-5); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. Marathon Oil Co.*, No. CIV-17-334-SPS (E.D. Okla. Mar. 8, 2019) (Dkt. No. 120 at 4-5); *Reirdon v. Cimarex Energy Co.*, No. 16-cv-113-KEW (E.D. Okla. Dec. 18, 2018) (Dkt. No. 105 at 4-5); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. XTO Energy Inc.*, No. CIV-11-29-KEW (E.D. Okla. Mar. 27, 2018) (Dkt. No. 231 at 5); *Reirdon v. XTO Energy Inc.*, No. 16-cv-00087-KEW (E.D. Okla. Jan. 29, 2018) (Dkt. No. 124 at 4-5). Thus, the Parties' decision to contractually agree that federal common law controls should be enforced.

Moreover, the Tenth Circuit has recognized parties' freedom to contract regarding choice of law issues and also the fact that courts typically honor the parties' choice of law. Indeed, the Tenth Circuit has explained, "[a]bsent special circumstances, courts usually honor the parties' choice of law because two 'prime objectives' of contract law are 'to protect the justified expectations of the parties and to make it possible for them to foretell with accuracy what will be their rights and liabilities under the contract.'" *See Boyd Rosene & Assocs., Inc. v. Kansas Mun. Gas Agency*, 174 F.3d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1999) (citing *Restatement 2d of Conflict of Laws* § 187, cmt. e (Am. Law Inst. 1988) (the *Restatement*)); *Yavuz v. 61 MM, Ltd.*, 465 F.3d 418, 428 (10th Cir. 2006). Further expanding on this freedom to contract, the *Restatement* states:

These objectives may best be attained in multistate transactions by letting the parties choose the law to govern the validity of the contract and the rights created thereby. In this way, certainty and predictability of result are most likely to be secured. Giving parties this power of choice is also consistent with the fact that, in contrast to other areas of the law, persons are free within broad limits to determine the nature of their contractual obligations.

Restatement 2d of Conflict of Laws § 187, cmt. e (Am. Law Inst. 1988); *see also Williams v. Shearson Lehman Bros.*, 1995 OK CIV APP 154, ¶17, 917 P.2d 998, 1002 (concluding that parties’ contractual choice of law should be given effect because it does not violate Oklahoma’s constitution or public policy); *Barnes Group, Inc. v. C & C Prods., Inc.*, 716 F.2d 1023, 1029 n. 10 (4th Cir. 1983) (“Parties enjoy full autonomy to choose controlling law with regard to matters within their contractual capacity.”).

B. The Request for Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses Is Reasonable Under Federal Common Law

Applying the Parties’ chosen law—federal common law—Rule 23(h) allows courts to reimburse counsel for “non-taxable costs that are authorized by law or by the parties’ agreement.” *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 23(h). “As with attorney fees, an attorney who creates or preserves a common fund for the benefit of a class is entitled to receive reimbursement of all reasonable costs incurred...in addition to the attorney fee percentage.” *Vaszlavik v. Storage Tech. Corp.*, No. 95-B-2525, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21140, at *11 (D. Colo. Mar. 9, 2000) (citations omitted). Similarly, should the Court choose to disregard the Parties’ choice of law and instead apply Oklahoma state law, the Oklahoma class action statute provides “the court may award . . . nontaxable costs that are authorized by law or by the parties’ agreement.” 12 O.S. § 2023(G)(1).

Class Counsel respectfully request reimbursement of Litigation Expenses that have been and may be advanced or incurred by Class Counsel in prosecuting and resolving this

Litigation. *See* Joint Class Counsel Decl. at ¶72.⁵ Class Counsel set forth in the Short Form and Long Form Notices that they would seek up to \$200,000.00 in reimbursement of expenses. *See* JND Decl. at Exhibits A & C. To date, Class Counsel’s out-of-pocket expenses are \$169,462.46.⁶ *See* Joint Class Counsel Decl. at ¶72. All of these expenses were reasonably and necessarily incurred by Class Counsel and are directly related to their prosecution and resolution of this Litigation. *Id.* at ¶73. The costs include routine expenses related to copying, court fees, postage and shipping, phone charges, legal research, and travel and transportation, as well as expenses for experts, document production and review, which are typical of large, complex class actions such as this. As such, the Expense Request is fair, reasonable and should be granted.

In addition, several absent Class Members have executed affidavits in support of Class Counsel’s Expense Request. *See* Affidavits of Absent Class Members, attached as Exhibits 6-10 to Class Representative’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Final Approval.

⁵ In a similar action, Oklahoma’s Eastern District Court awarded Class Counsel \$174,191.50 in past litigation expenses and future expenses up to \$250,000.00. *See Reirdon v. Cimarex Energy Co.*, No. 6:16-cv-113-KEW (E.D. Okla. Dec. 18, 2018) (Order Awarding Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses) (Dkt. No. 104). In another action, the court awarded Class Counsel \$223,056.78 in past litigation expenses and future expenses up to \$300,000.00. *See Reirdon v. XTO Energy Inc.*, No. 6:16-00087-KEW (E.D. Okla. Jan. 29, 2018) (Order Awarding Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses) (Dkt. No. 125).

⁶ Because additional expenses will continue to be incurred through and after the Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel specifically request reimbursement of \$169,426.46 *plus* the ability to recover additional expenses up to \$200,000.00—the noticed amount—to the extent such expenses are actually incurred. At the Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel will provide the Court with updated charts of Class Counsel’s actual expenses incurred.

C. The Request for Approval of Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs Is Reasonable and Should be Approved

In the Short Form Notice, Class Counsel stated they would request approval of Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs associated with effectuating the Settlement in an amount not to exceed \$175,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Fund. *See* JND Decl. at Exhibit A. These costs will include those of the Settlement Administrator JND, accounting expert Barbara Ley, and land experts. As with the Litigation Expenses, Class Counsel will only seek approval of payment of Administration, Notice and Distribution Costs actually incurred, and in no event will their request exceed the noticed amount of \$175,000.00.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Class Counsel respectfully request the Court (1) award the Expense Request of \$169,462.46, *plus* any additional amount Class Counsel actually incurs after the filing of this Memorandum, not to exceed the noticed amount of \$200,000.00, and (2) approve payment of Administration, Notice and Distribution Costs in an amount not to exceed the noticed amount of \$175,000.00.

DATED: October 20, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Robert N. Barnes

Robert N. Barnes, OBA No. 537
Patranell B. Lewis, OBA No. 12279
Emily Nash Kitch, OBA No. 22244
BARNES & LEWIS LLP
208 NW 60th Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73118

Telephone: (405) 843-0363
Facsimile: (405) 832-1007
rbarnes@barneslewis.com
plewis@barneslewis.com
ekitch@barneslewis.com

Bradley E. Beckworth, OBA No. 19982
Jeffrey J. Angelovich, OBA No. 19981
Lisa P. Baldwin, OBA No. 32947

Drew G. Pate
Trey N. Duck, III
Cody L. Hill
Susan Whatley

NIX PATTERSON, LLP
3600 N. Capital of TX Hwy.
Bldg. B, Suite 350
Austin, TX 78746
Telephone: (512) 328-5333
Facsimile: (512) 328-5335
bbeckworth@nixlaw.com
jangelovich@nixlaw.com
lbaldwin@nixlaw.com
dpate@nixlaw.com
tduck@nixlaw.com
codyhill@nixlaw.com
swhatley@nixlaw.com

Patrick M. Ryan, OBA No. 7864
Jason A. Ryan, OBA No. 18824
Paula M. Jantzen, OBA No. 20464
**RYAN WHALEY COLDIRON JANTZEN
PETERS & WEBBER PLLC**
400 North Walnut Ave.
Oklahoma City, OK 73104
Telephone: (405) 239-6040
Facsimile:(405) 239-6766
pryan@ryanwhaley.com
jryan@ryanwhaley.com
pjantzen@ryanwhaley.com

CLASS COUNSEL

Michael Burrage, OBA No. 1350
WHITTEN BURRAGE
512 N. Broadway, Suite 300
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 516-7800
Facsimile: (405) 516-7859
mburrage@whittenburrage.com

LIASON LOCAL CLASS COUNSEL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of October 2021, I authorized the electronic filing of the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send email notification of such filing to all registered parties.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ Robert N. Barnes
Robert N. Barnes

Subject: Activity in Case 5:18-cv-00107-JD Kernen v. Casillas Operating LLC et al Brief
Date: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 at 7:11:32 PM Central Daylight Time
From: okwd_ecf_notice@okwd.uscourts.gov
To: okwdecf@okwd.uscourts.gov

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

Western District of Oklahoma[LIVE]

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered by Barnes, Robert on 10/20/2021 at 7:11 PM CDT and filed on 10/20/2021

Case Name: Kernen v. Casillas Operating LLC et al
Case Number: [5:18-cv-00107-JD](#)
Filer: Michael Kernen
Document Number: [111](#)

Docket Text:

[BRIEF IN SUPPORT re \[110\] MOTION for Order Class Counsel's Motion for Approval of Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses by Michael Kernen. \(Barnes, Robert\)](#)

5:18-cv-00107-JD Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Andrew G Pate dpate@nixlaw.com, ncameron@nixlaw.com

Bradley E Beckworth bbeckworth@nixlaw.com, sprince@nixlaw.com, swhatley@nixlaw.com, tduck@nixlaw.com

Cody L Hill codyhill@nixlaw.com

Dawson A Brotemarkle dbrotemarkle@hallestill.com, lwest@hallestill.com, sbaccus@hallestill.com

Emily N Kitch ekitch@barneslewis.com

J Kevin Hayes khayes@hallestill.com, ghambrick@hallestill.com, lwest@hallestill.com

Jason A Ryan jryan@ryanwhaley.com, jmickle@ryanwhaley.com, rharrison@ryanwhaley.com

Jeffrey J Angelovich jangelovich@nixlaw.com, codyhill@nixlaw.com, ncameron@nixlaw.com, sprince@nixlaw.com

Lisa P Baldwin lbaldwin@nixlaw.com, ncameron@nixlaw.com, sprince@nixlaw.com

Michael Burrage mburrage@whittenburrage.com, cnorman@whittenburrage.com, docketing@whittenburrage.com

Pamela S Anderson panderson@hallestill.com, lwest@hallestill.com, ssmock@hallestill.com

Patranell Britten Lewis plewis@barneslewis.com, abarnes@barneslewis.com, lbeebe@barneslewis.com, lrosales@barneslewis.com

Patrick M Ryan pryan@ryanwhaley.com, jmickle@ryanwhaley.com

Paula M Jantzen pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com, jmickle@ryanwhaley.com, mkeplinger@ryanwhaley.com

Robert N Barnes rbarnes@barneslewis.com, abarnes@barneslewis.com, lbeebe@barneslewis.com

Susan R Whatley swhatley@nixlaw.com, sprince@nixlaw.com

Trey N Duck, III tduck@nixlaw.com, sprince@nixlaw.com

5:18-cv-00107-JD Notice has been delivered by other means to:

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description:Main Document

Original filename:n/a

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP dcecfStamp_ID=1041971380 [Date=10/20/2021] [FileNumber=4623487-0] [759466ff689fa0d05541b1ee32594636eca1cc68380cb7d7eb7a47dc75e8614d10a8d60702968df334950570a7f391e99d8b669568f611a09a5f52ae961d2df8]]