26

017558.0052\4514187.1

expense reimbursement sought is in conformity with the Guidelines for Compensation and
 Expense Reimbursement of Professionals for the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern

of my knowledge, information, and belief, formed after reasonable inquiry, the compensation and

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

28

017558.0052\4514187.1

District of California, except as set forth hereinbelow; (c) the compensation and expense reimbursement requested are billed at rates no less favorable than those customarily employed by Applicant and generally accepted by Applicant's clients; and (d) Applicant has not entered into any agreement or understanding with any other entity for the sharing of compensation received or to be received for services rendered in or in connection with this case, nor has the Applicant received from or shared with any other entity any compensation for services rendered in or in connection with this case.

The Application deviates from the Guidelines which provide that no category should exceed \$20,000.00. Applicant's categories were established so that the Court, the Office of the U.S. Trustee and creditors could understand the total fees related to categories that Applicant thought made logical sense and for that reason some categories exceeded the \$20,000.00 limitation. It would have been difficult for Applicant to reduce the categories below \$20,000 while still making it clear what the cost for the project was.

In addition, as noted in the application, there were a few meetings in which were multiple attorneys present. However, the only time that multiple attorneys billed for the same meeting was when it was critical that the multiple attorneys were present in the meeting and there was no way to avoid a meeting with the multiple attorneys. In reviewing the time records it is apparent that the attorneys consulted on various issues on an almost daily basis, and there are only a handful of meetings wherein all the attorneys working on this matter all billed. This case involved many complex issues, and without some meetings, work would have been duplicated, and it would have been significantly less efficient to perform the legal services.

## **REDUCTION IN FEES**

After further review, Applicant reduces the fees requested by the amounts set forth below:

1. The following time entries are hereby withdrawn as duplicates. The duplication was a clerical error:

Date	Category	Atty	Time	Amount	
3/18/16	CR1N	M. Bostick	1.0	\$495.00	
4/22/16	CR1M	T. Green	1.5	\$742.50	

Entered: 12/07/16 08:46:36 Page 2 of 3 16-40050 Doc# 480 Filed: 12/07/16

1	4/28/16 CR1M	Т.	Green	1.4		\$693.0 <u>0</u>				
2				Tot	tal	\$1,930.50				
3	2. The following entry is withdrawn and appears to have been inadvertently added to									
4	the wrong case.									
5	General Administrative #6/28/16		T. Gr	reen	.2	\$99.00				
6	Therefore, Applicant hereby reduces the fees requested by the sum of \$2,029.50, so that									
7	Applicants requested fees are in the reduced sum of \$960,353.50.									
8	DATED: December 6, 2016 WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN LLP									
9	Divide of 2010	" ENDED, ROODIN, DENOR & DEAN EEL								
10		D								
11	By: /s/ Mark Bostick Mark Bostick									
12	Attorneys for Michael G. Kasolas									
13			Chapter 7	Trustee						
14	DATED. Daniel C 2016	MEN	IDEL BO	CEN DI	A CW	6 DEANLID				
15	DATED: December 6, 2016 WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN LLP									
16										
17		By:	/s/ Tracy Tracy Gre							
18			Attorneys for Michael G. Kasolas							
19		Trustee	ree							
20 21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
-										

Filed: 12/07/16

Entered: 12/07/16 08:46:36 Page 3 of 3