

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

DORSEY J. REIRDON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 6:16-cv-00445-SPS
)	
CIMAREX ENERGY COMPANY)	
and CIMAREX ENERGY CO. OF)	
COLORADO,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**CLASS COUNSEL’S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF 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 Litigation not to exceed \$225,000.00 (the “Expense Request”)—the amount set forth in the Notice.² This request is fair and reasonable, and, therefore, Class Counsel

¹ All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings given to them in the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement dated October 10, 2019 (the “Settlement Agreement”), a copy of which was attached as Exhibit 1 to Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion to Certify the Settlement Class for Settlement Purposes, Preliminarily Approve Class Action Settlement, Approve Form and Manner of Notice and Set Date for Final Approval Hearing [Doc. No. 107-1].

² To date, Class Counsel has incurred out-of-pocket expenses of \$199,471.92. 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 \$225,000.00. Likewise, Class Counsel likely will incur future expenses after the Final Approval Hearing, and may seek reimbursement for such future expenses, up to a total of \$225,000.00. 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 \$350,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Fund. That request is discussed in more detail below.

respectfully request that it be approved.

Class Counsel has obtained an excellent recovery for the benefit of Class Members, which consists of a cash payment of \$10 million (the “Gross Settlement Fund”) to compensate the Settlement Class for past damages. The \$10 million cash Gross Settlement Fund is an outstanding recovery for Class Members.³

In order to achieve this remarkable recovery for the Class, Class Counsel was required to expend a significant amount of out-of-pocket expenses that were necessary and reasonable for the prosecution of this action. Class Counsel now seeks reimbursement of those reasonable expenses, in an amount not to exceed \$225,000.00—the amount set forth in the Notice.⁴ To date, Class Counsel have advanced \$199,471.92 in prosecuting and resolving this case. *See* Joint Class Counsel Decl. at ¶87; NP Decl. at ¶33. 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 \$225,000.00. *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 \$225,000.00 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. *See* Declaration of Geoffrey Miller at ¶62.

³ *See* Declaration of Bradley E. Beckworth and Robert N. Barnes on Behalf of Class Counsel at ¶5 (“Joint Class Counsel Declaration”), attached as Exhibit 2 to Plaintiff’s Final Approval Memorandum; *see also* Affidavit of Barbara Ley at ¶3 (“Ley Aff.”), attached as Exhibit 3 to Plaintiff’s Final Approval Memorandum.

⁴ A copy of the Notice is attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Jennifer M. Keough on behalf of Settlement Administrator, JND Legal Administration LLC, Regarding Notice Mailing and Administration of Settlement (“JND Decl.”), which is attached as Exhibit 4 to Plaintiff’s Final Approval Memorandum.

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 refers the 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 respectfully 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 here 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 attorneys' fees and 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. 107-1) (emphasis added).

This Court previously approved and held this exact contractual language to be enforceable. *See Reirdon v. Cimarex Energy Co.*, No. 6:16-cv-113-KEW (E.D. Okla. Dec. 18, 2018) (Doc. No. 104 at 4-5); *Reirdon v. XTO Energy Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-87-KEW (E.D. Okla. Jan. 29, 2018) (Doc. No. 125 at 4-5). Thus, the Parties' decision to contractually agree that federal common law controls should be enforced. *See id.*; *see also* Miller Decl. at ¶¶24-26.

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)); *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 ¶¶89-90.⁵ Class Counsel set forth in the Notice that they would seek up to \$225,000.00 in reimbursement of expenses. *See* JND Decl. at Exhibit A, p. 2. To date, Class Counsel’s out-of-pocket expenses are \$199,471.92.⁶ All of these expenses were reasonably and necessarily incurred by Class Counsel and are directly related to their prosecution and resolution of this Litigation. *See* Joint Class Counsel Decl. at ¶¶89-90. The costs include routine expenses related to copying, court fees, postage and shipping, phone charges, legal research, and

⁵ In a similar action, this Court awarded Class Counsel \$174,191.50 in past expenses and additional 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) (Doc. No. 104). In another action, this Court awarded Class Counsel \$223,056.78 in past expenses and additional 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) (Doc. No. 125). In yet another action, this Court awarded Class Counsel litigation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$3,250,000.00. *See Chieftain Royalty Co. v. XTO Energy Inc.*, No. CIV-11-29-KEW (E.D. Okla. Mar. 27, 2018) (Order Awarding Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses) (Doc. No. 232).

⁶ Because additional expenses will continue to be incurred through and after the Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel specifically request reimbursement of \$199,471.92 *plus* the ability to recover additional expenses up to \$225,000.00—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.

travel and transportation, as well as expenses for experts, document production and review, and mediation, which are typical of large, complex class actions such as this. *See* NP Decl. at ¶33. As such, the Expense Request is fair, reasonable and should be granted. *See* Miller Decl. at ¶62.

In addition, several absent Class Members executed affidavits in support of Class Counsel's Expense Request. *See* Affidavits of Absent Class Members Clear Energy, Ltd.; Castlerock Resources, Inc.; Michael J. Weeks as Manager of Legacy Royalty, LLC; Robert Abernathy on behalf of Acorn Royalty Company and Chieftain Royalty Company; and Dan Little on behalf of Sagacity, Inc.

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

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 \$350,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Fund. *See* JND Decl. at Exhibit A, p. 2. These costs will include those of the Settlement Administrator JND, accounting expert Barbara Ley, and land experts Matlin Petroleum. 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 \$350,000.00.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Class Counsel respectfully request the Court (1) award the Expense Request of \$199,471.92, *plus* any additional amount Class Counsel actually incurs after the filing of this Memorandum, not to exceed the noticed amount of \$225,000.00, and (2) approve payment of Administration, Notice and Distribution Costs in an amount not to exceed the noticed amount of \$350,000.00.

DATED: December 23, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Bradley E. Beckworth

Bradley E. Beckworth, OBA No. 19982

Jeffrey J. Angelovich, OBA No. 19981

Lisa P. Baldwin, OBA No. 32947

Andrew G. Pate, TX Bar No. 24079111

Trey Duck, OBA No. 33347

Cody L. Hill, TX Bar No. 24095836

NIX PATTERSON, LLP

3600 N. Capital of Texas 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

Susan Whatley, OBA No. 30960

NIX PATTERSON, LLP

P.O. Box 178

Linden, Texas 75563

Telephone: (903) 215-8310

swhatley@nixlaw.com

Robert N. Barnes, OBA No. 537

Patranell Lewis, OBA No. 12279

Emily Nash Kitch, OBA No. 22244

BARNES & LEWIS, LLP

208 N.W. 60th Street

Oklahoma City, OK 73118

Telephone: (405) 843-0363

Facsimile: (405) 832-1007

rbarnes@barneslewis.com

plewis@barneslewis.com

ekitch@barneslewis.com

Michael Burrage, OBA No. 1350

WHITTEN BURRAGE

512 N. Broadway, Suite 300

Oklahoma City, OK73102

Telephone: (405) 516-7800

Facsimile: (405) 516-7859
mburrage@whittenburragelaw.com

Lawrence R. Murphy, Jr.
OBA No. 17681
SMOLEN LAW
611 S. Detroit Ave.
Tulsa, OK 74120
Telephone: (918) 777-4529
Facsimile: (918) 890-4529
larry@smolen.law

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that 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.

DATED: December 23, 2019.

/s/ Bradley E. Beckworth
Bradley E. Beckworth

Subject: Activity in Case 6:16-cv-00445-SPS Reirdon v. Cimarex Energy Company et al Brief in Support of Motion

Date: Monday, December 23, 2019 at 4:49:51 PM Central Standard Time

From: CM-ECFRetMail_OKED@oked.uscourts.gov

To: CM-ECFLive_OKED@oked.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

Eastern District of Oklahoma

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered by Beckworth, Bradley on 12/23/2019 at 4:49 PM CST and filed on 12/23/2019

Case Name: Reirdon v. Cimarex Energy Company et al

Case Number: [6:16-cv-00445-SPS](#)

Filer: Dorsey J. Reirdon

Document Number: [121](#)

Docket Text:

[BRIEF in Support of Motion \(Re: \[120\] MOTION Class Counsel's Motion for Approval of Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses \) by Dorsey J. Reirdon ;\(Beckworth, Bradley\)](#)

6:16-cv-00445-SPS Notice has been electronically mailed to:

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

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

Bradley W. Welsh bwelsh@gablelaw.com, kspeed@gablelaw.com

Cody L. Hill codyhill@nixlaw.com, mgomez@nixlaw.com, sprince@nixlaw.com

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

Lawrence R. Murphy, Jr larry@smolen.law

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

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

Nathan K. Davis ndavis@swlaw.com, docket_den@swlaw.com, hnilson@swlaw.com

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

Robert N. Barnes rbarnes@barneslewis.com, aoldenburg@barneslewis.com, ekitch@barneslewis.com,
lbeebe@barneslewis.com

Susan R. Whatley swhatley@nixlaw.com

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

6:16-cv-00445-SPS 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=1108664770 [Date=12/23/2019] [FileNumber=1082897-
0] [12336e11f830dc243f8a7583402518b447d71909861e5027b9f4a89db4e99abdce
2c358bc008359a461f6062a864ce6016db84fcc5d3da4c579bb065670595df]]