

EXHIBIT F

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Harvey v. Mohammed</i> , 951 F. Supp. 2d 47, 54 (D.D.C. 2013) (Lamberth, J.) (accepting pltf's reliance on Laffey)	RCL	x		x		1983	6/26/2013	
<i>Berke v. Bureau of Prisons</i> , 942 F. Supp. 2d 71, 77 (D.D.C. 2013)	ESH		x	x		1983	4/29/2013	
<i>Medina v. District of Columbia</i> , 864 F. Supp. 2d 13 (D.D.C. 2012)	JMF	x		x		1983	4/23/2012	
<i>Petties v. District of Columbia</i> , 95-0148-PLF, 2009 WL 8663462 *3 (D.D.C. Oct. 20, 2009) (parties agreed to USAO Laffey rates)	PLF	x		x		1983	10/20/2009	
<i>Heller v. District of Columbia</i> , 832 F. Supp. 2d 32, 41-42 (D.D.C. 2011)	EGS		x	x		const.	12/29/2011	
<i>Beck v. Test Masters Educ. Services, Inc.</i> , 289 F.R.D. 374, 383-84 (D.D.C. 2013) (in fees as sanction, most requested rates were below USAO Laffey, one was above, court awarded lesser for each); <i>see also Beck</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2014 WL 5822911 (Nov. 10, 2014) (same for fees for the whole case)	JDB	< *		< *		consumer	3/1/2013	* only one rate was above (\$15), so aggregate was clearly below USAO Laffey
<i>Bode & Greiner, LLP v. Knight</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 1199361 *8 (D.D.C. 2014)	DAR	x		x		contract	3/25/2014	
<i>Embassy of Fed. Republic of Nigeria v. Ugwuonye</i> , 297 F.R.D. 4, 15 (D.D.C. 2013) (Rothstein, J.)	BJR		x	x		contract	7/24/2013	
<i>Affinity Financial Corp. v. AARP Financial, Inc.</i> , No. 10-2055-RMU, 2011 WL 4738546 *2 & n.3 (D.D.C. Oct. 7, 2011)	RMU	x		x		contract	10/7/2011	
<i>Ellipso, Inc. v. Mann</i> , 594 F. Supp. 2d 40, 46 (D.D.C. 2009) (noting attorney had 30 years' experience and sought only \$300/hour)	RCL	<		<		contract	1/29/2009	
<i>Friends of Animals v. Salazar</i> , 696 F. Supp. 2d 16, 20 & n.1 (D.D.C. 2010) (parties agreed on USAO Laffey rates)	RMC	x		x		envtl	3/16/2010	
<i>Fanning v. Wegco, Inc.</i> , 5 F. Supp. 3d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2013) (requester cited <i>Salazar</i> but attorney had over 20 years experience and sought only \$250/hour, well below USAO Laffey rates; court granted \$250/hour)	BJR	<		<		ERISA	11/21/2013	

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Fanning v. Angus Corp.</i> , 939 F. Supp. 2d 23, 26 (D.D.C. 2013) ("The hourly rate sought by the Plaintiff, just \$240 per hour, is well below the Laffey matrix rate for attorney with over twenty years of experience.")	CKK	<		<		ERISA	4/16/2013	
<i>Dorsey v. Jacobson Holma PLLC</i> , 851 F. Supp. 2d 13, 18-19 (D.D.C. 2012) (awarding requested \$395/hour, which was under USAO Laffey of \$445-455/hour)	RMC	<		<		ERISA	3/30/2012	
<i>Flynn v. Dick Corp.</i> , 624 F. Supp. 2d 125, 131 (D.D.C. 2009) (awarding "Updated Laffey" rates)	AK		x		x	ERISA	6/12/2009	
<i>United States v. Dynamic Visions, Inc.</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2015 WL 294378 (D.D.C. Jan. 23, 2015)	CKK	x		x		FCA	1/23/2015	
<i>Baylor v. Mitchell Rubenstein & Assoc., P.C.</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2015 WL 65289 (D.D.C. Jan. 6, 2015)	ABJ	x		x		FDCPA	1/6/2015	
<i>Driscoll v. George Washington Univ.</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 4197556 *9 (D.D.C. July 17, 2014)	ESH	x		x		FLSA	7/17/2014	Court modified rate somewhat, using USAO as baseline
<i>Alvarez v. Keystone Plus Construction Corp.</i> , --- F.R.D. ---, 2014 WL 1400846 *10 (D.D.C. 2014) (citing <i>Pleitez v. Carney</i> , 594 F.Supp.2d 47, 53 (D.D.C. 2009))	KBJ	x		x		FLSA	4/11/2014	<i>Pleitez</i> cited <i>Covington</i> which used USAO Laffey Matrix.
<i>Bradshaw v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-1558-ABJ, 2012 WL 2803401 *2 (D.D.C. July 10, 2012)	ABJ	x		x		FLSA	7/10/2012	
<i>Mafa v. Clean House, Inc.</i> , No. 12-0040-ESH, 2012 WL 1450181 (D.D.C. Apr. 26, 2012) (awarding amount requested, using USAO Laffey rates)	ESH	x		x		FLSA	4/26/2012	
<i>Ventura v. Bebo Foods, Inc.</i> , 738 F. Supp. 2d 8, 34 (D.D.C. 2010) (awarding requested rates for 3 attorneys, where 2 rates were well under USAO Laffey and 3rd was \$5 over)	RCL	<		<		FLSA	12/3/2010	
<i>Pleitez v. Carney</i> , 594 F. Supp. 2d 47, 53 (D.D.C. 2009) (relying on "Laffey matrix")	JDB	x		x		FLSA	1/30/2009	Varella Decl. par. 11 (ECF No. 10-42) and Ex. 36 (ECF No. 10-43) confirm USAO Laffey Matrix
<i>Roseboro v. Billington</i> , 618 F. Supp. 2d 85, 87 (D.D.C. 2009)	TFH	x		x		FMLA	5/28/2009	
<i>EPIC v. FBI</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2015 WL 737101 (D.D.C. Feb. 20, 2015)	CKK	x		x		FOIA	2/20/2015	
<i>CREW v. DOJ</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2015 WL 545991 (D.D.C. Feb. 11, 2015)	CRC		x		x	FOIA	2/20/2015	

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>EPIC v. FBI</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2014 WL 5713859 *7 n.10 (D.D.C. Nov. 5, 2014)	TSC	x		x		FOIA	11/5/2014	
<i>CREW v. FEC</i> , No. 11-0951-CKK, 2014 WL 4380292 at *8, *13 (D.D.C. Sep. 5, 2014) (CREW sought USAO rates generally, but Salazar rates for fees on fees)	CKK	x	x	x		FOIA	9/5/2014	Court noted that CREW could have asked for Salazar rates all along, since Salazar came down in 2000.
<i>EPIC v. DHS</i> , 999 F. Supp 2d 61, 70, 72 (D.D.C. 2013) (Bates, J.)	JDB	x		x		FOIA	11/15/2013	During time when attorney was unlicensed, paralegal rates applied. Court cited USAO Laffey Matrix.
<i>EPIC v. DHS</i> , 982 F. Supp. 2d 56, 61, 64 (D.D.C. 2013) (Lamberth, J.)	RCL	x		x		FOIA	10/15/2013	During time when attorney was unlicensed, paralegal rates applied. Court cited USAO Laffey Matrix. Note: different case than 982 F. Supp. 2d 53.
<i>EPIC v. DOT</i> , 982 F. Supp 2d 53, 55 (D.D.C. 2013) (Lamberth, J.)	RCL	x		x		FOIA	10/15/2013	During time when attorney was unlicensed, paralegal rates applied. Court cited USAO Laffey Matrix.
<i>Judicial Watch v. DOJ</i> , 878 F. Supp. 2d 225, 239 (D.D.C. 2012) (Walton, J.) (citing “ <i>Hansson v. Norton</i> , 411 F.3d 231, 236 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (“[T]he ‘reasonable hourly rate’ is guided by the Laffey matrix prepared by the U.S. Attorney’s Office.”)).”)	RBW	x		x		FOIA	7/23/2012	
<i>CREW v. DOJ</i> , 825 F. Supp. 2d 226, 229 & n.2 (D.D.C. 2011)	JEB	x		x		FOIA	11/21/2011	
<i>Negley v. FBI</i> , 818 F. Supp. 2d 69, 78 (D.D.C. 2011) (Kessler, J.) (DCT called motion papers “opaque” and so ordered parties to explain their positions better)	GK	x		x		FOIA	10/11/2011	No apparent dispute that USAO rate was appropriate. Subsequent filings showed pltf requesting USAO rates. No. 03-2126 ECF No. 133 at 3 of 7 (rates same as USAO rates)
<i>ACLU v. DHS</i> , 810 F. Supp. 2d 267, 277 (D.D.C. 2011) (Walton, J.)	RBW	x		x		FOIA	9/15/2011	“Laffey Matrix,” without reference to USAO or enhanced rates. No. 08-1100 ECF No. 43-4 ¶ 6 confirms that plaintiff sought USAO rates.

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>EPIC v. DHS</i> , 811 F. Supp. 2d 216, 236 (D.D.C. 2011) (Urbina, J.) (“The plaintiff grounds its base fee calculation in the Laffey Matrix, id. at 10, a schedule of hourly rates based predominantly on an attorney's years of experience that is used frequently in this jurisdiction to calculate ‘reasonable’ attorney’s fees[.]”)	RMU	x		x		FOIA	9/12/2011	Court made no explicit reference to USAO as source of Laffey Matrix, but the rates are the same as the USAO rates, and plaintiff’s motion (ECF No. 30-2) at 10, No. 09-2084, cites USAO Matrix explicitly.
<i>Queen Anne’s Conservation Ass’n v. Dep’t of State</i> , 800 F. Supp. 2d 195, 200-01 (D.D.C. 2011) (Robinson, M.J.)	DAR		x	x		FOIA	8/3/2011	Court rejected enhanced rates and awarded USAO Laffey Matrix rates.
<i>Judicial Watch, Inc. v. DOJ</i> , 774 F. Supp. 2d 225, 232 (D.D.C. 2011) (Kennedy, J.) (“Judicial Watch used the Laffey Matrix to calculate the proper hourly rate for each of the attorneys and paralegals who worked on this case. See Pl.’s Mot. Ex. 1 at 7.”)	HHK	x		x		FOIA	3/31/2011	No. 06-0406, plaintiff’s motion papers, ECF No. 30-2, use USAO Laffey Matrix.
<i>CREW v. DHS</i> , No. 08-1046-JDB, 2010 WL 8971920 *1 n.1 (D.D.C. Apr. 21, 2010) (“CREW has used the prevailing market rates set by the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia to calculate its hourly rate, see Pl.’s Mot., Ex. A (United States Attorney's Office matrix)”).	JDB	x		x		FOIA	4/21/2010	Barnard sought \$205/hour. Court made no explicit reference to any matrix, but the work was done in 2006-07, and \$205 is the USAO rate for 1-3 years of experience.
<i>Barnard v. DHS</i> , 656 F. Supp. 2d 91, 94 (D.D.C. 2009) (Robinson, M.J.) (“an hourly rate of \$205.00—the prevailing market rate for an attorney with one to three years of experience”)	DAR	x		x		FOIA	9/18/2009	
<i>Judicial Watch, Inc. v. DHS</i> , No. 08-2133-EGS/DAR, 2009 WL 1743757 *9 n.10 (D.D.C. June 15, 2009) (“Defendant does not challenge Plaintiff's usage of the Laffey matrix”).	EGS	x		x		FOIA	6/15/2009	Plf. Mot. ECF No. 8 at 8 uses USAO Laffey Matrix.
<i>Brown v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2015 WL 690928 (D.D.C. Feb. 19, 2015)	RC	x		x		IDEA	2/19/2015	Court awarded 3/4 Laffey rates
<i>Coates v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2015 WL 428118 (D.D.C. Feb. 3, 2015)	RMC	x		x		IDEA	2/3/2015	Court ordered 3/4 Laffey rates
<i>Salmeron v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2015 WL 129079 (D.D.C. Jan. 9, 2015)	RBW		x	x		IDEA	1/9/2015	
<i>Jay v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2014 WL 6808295 (D.D.C. Dec. 3, 2014)	RBW	x		x		IDEA	12/3/2014	Court awarded 4/5 Laffey rates

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Briggs v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2014 WL 5860358 (D.D.C. Nov. 12, 2014) (awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	RC	x		<		IDEA	11/12/2014	
<i>Wood v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2014 WL 5438409 *8 (D.D.C. Oct. 27, 2014)	DAR	x		<		IDEA	10/27/2014	Court awarded 3/4 Laffey rates
<i>Davis v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2014 WL 5293594 *8, 9 (D.D.C. Oct. 16, 2014) (awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates for Tamika Davis, for KJ, for \$10,457.50 in fees)	AK	x		<		IDEA	10/16/2014	Court awarded 3/4 Laffey rates. *9.
<i>Douglas v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 4359192 *4 (D.D.C. Sep. 4, 2014)	PLF	x		<		IDEA	9/4/2014	Court found IDEA litigation not complex
<i>Blackman v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 4257769 *4 (D.D.C. Aug. 29, 2014) (LaShawn Smith, seeking \$504,492.61 in fees)	PLF	x		x		IDEA	8/29/2014	Class action, so full Laffey appropriate
<i>Brown v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 13-1560-KBJ/DAR, 2014 WL 4212619 *2 n.2 (D.D.C. Aug. 7, 2014)	DAR	x		0		IDEA	8/7/2014	no fees awarded
<i>Robinson v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 3702853 *4, 6 (D.D.C. 2014)	BAH	x		x		IDEA	7/28/2014	
<i>Blackman v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 351174 *5 (D.D.C. July 17, 2014) (Denyce Hubbard, seeking \$27,251.25 in fees)	PLF	x		<		IDEA	7/17/2014	fees here were for one plaintiff, and only for her PI motion.
<i>Blackman v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 97-1629-PLF, 2014 WL 2927571 (D.D.C. June 27, 2014) (Anne & Brantley Davis, seeking \$8,780.20 in fees)	PLF	x		<		IDEA	6/27/2014	3/4 USAO rate awarded
<i>McAllister v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 2921020 *3 (D.D.C. June 27, 2014) (denying reconsideration motion based on <i>Eley</i>); 2014 WL 901512 (D.D.C. Mar. 6, 2014) (denying motion for fees)	RC		x	x		IDEA	6/27/2014	Two decisions treated as one because they involve the same motion for fees. Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Staton v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 13-0773-ABJ/DAR, 2014 WL 2700894 (D.D.C. June 11, 2014) (DAR) (recommended decision), <i>adopted</i> , 2014 WL 2959017 (D.D.C. July 2, 2014) (ABJ)	ABJ	x		<		IDEA	6/11/2014	3/4 USAO rate awarded
<i>Brighthaupt v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 1365506 *2-3 (D.D.C. 2014)	JMF	<		<		IDEA	4/2/2014	Requested \$10/hour under USAO Laffey, and court awarded 3/4 Laffey

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Capital City Public Charter School v. Gambale</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 1100366*15-16 (D.D.C. 2014)	RMC	<		<		IDEA	3/20/2014	Requested 3/4 USAO Laffey and court awarded it
<i>Hawkins v. Potomac Lighthouse Public School Charter</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 715121 *3 n.4 (D.D.C.), <i>aff'g in pertinent part</i> , 2014 WL 185948 *5-6 (D.D.C. Jan. 17, 2014) (DAR) (awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey)	GK	x		<		IDEA	2/25/2014	Requested full USAO Laffey before DAR, who awarded 3/4. Then parties agreed on rate before GK, i.e., 3/4.
<i>A.B. by Holmes-Ramsey v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 346058 *8 (D.D.C. 2014)	ABJ	x		x		IDEA	1/31/2014	Court rejected reduction below Laffey, calling case complex, both at admin level and in district court
<i>Clay v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 09-1612, 2014 WL 322017 (D.D.C. Jan. 28, 2014)	DAR	x		x		IDEA	1/28/2014	Requested USAO Laffey for DCT work and 3/4 for admin work and DCT granted both
<i>Eley v. District of Columbia</i> , 999 F. Supp. 2d 137, 150 (D.D.C. 2013)	BAH		x		x	IDEA	11/20/2013	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Haywood v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 12-1722-BJR, 2014 WL 5211437 *6-7 (D.D.C. Aug. 23, 2013)	BJR	<		<		IDEA	8/3/2013	Requested just under USAO Laffey, and court awarded 3/4 Laffey
<i>Smith v. Imagine Hope Community Public Charter School</i> , 934 F. Supp. 2d 132, 134-35 (D.D.C. 2013)	DAR	x		0		IDEA	3/29/2013	Court found requester ineligible
<i>Gardill v. District of Columbia</i> , 930 F. Supp. 2d 35, 44-45 (D.D.C. 2013)	RWR	x		< x		IDEA	3/13/2013	All sought USAO Laffey, most got 3/4 but 2 got full Laffey.
<i>McNeil v. Options Public Charter School</i> , No. 12-0529-EGS/DAR, 2013 WL 791199 (Mar. 1, 2013)	DAR	x		<		IDEA	3/1/2013	Court awarded 3/4 USAO Laffey
<i>Thomas v. District of Columbia</i> , 908 F. Supp. 2d 233, 243 (D.D.C. 2012)	BAH		x	x		IDEA	12/17/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Johnson v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0494-JMF, 2012 WL 5900792 *4 (D.D.C. Nov. 21, 2012) (requester sought \$400/hr, USAO Laffey was \$475/hr, and court awarded \$410/hr)	JMF	<		<		IDEA	11/21/2012	same case as 850 F. Supp. 2d 74, but later fees
<i>Carter v. District of Columbia</i> , 894 F. Supp. 2d 46, 52, 54 (D.D.C. 2012) (where requesting attorney sought \$350/hour, which is less than USAO Laffey, court awarded \$348.75/hour, equal to 3/4 USAO Laffey)	RLW	<		<		IDEA	9/30/2012	RLW adopted, without objection, recommended decision of JMF

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Parks v. District of Columbia</i> , 895 F. Supp. 2d 124, 130-31 (D.D.C. 2012) (awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey, \$350/hour, where request was for \$400/hour, which was below USAO Laffey of \$465/hour)	RWR	<		<		IDEA	9/28/2012	
<i>Young v. District of Columbia</i> , 893 F. Supp. 2d 125, 131 (D.D.C. 2012) ("this Court will ... apply the rates that plaintiffs requested, which are equal to the Laffey Matrix rates"; Maude Young)	ABJ	x		x		IDEA	9/28/2012	
<i>Fisher v. District of Columbia</i> , 880 F. Supp. 2d 149, 154-55 & n.4 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding USAO Laffey rates)	RCL		x	x		IDEA	7/31/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Moss v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0994-JEB, 2012 WL 4510682 (D.D.C. July 12, 2012) (rejecting request for USAO Laffey rates and awarding 3/4)	JEB	x		<		IDEA	7/12/2012	
<i>Santamaria v. District of Columbia</i> , 875 F. Supp. 2d 12, 20-21 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for USAO Laffey rates and awarding less)	RC	x		<		IDEA	7/12/2012	
<i>Sykes v. District of Columbia</i> , 870 F. Supp. 2d 86, 94-96 (D.D.C. 2012) (awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey)	AK		x	<		IDEA	6/18/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Davis v. District of Columbia</i> , 864 F. Supp. 2d 110, 116-17, 119 (D.D.C. 2012) (Julette Davis)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/23/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Wood v. District of Columbia</i> , 864 F. Supp. 2d 82, 90, 92 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/22/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Huntley v. District of Columbia</i> , 860 F. Supp. 2d 53, 60-61 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates); <i>see also Huntley v. District of Columbia</i> , 859 F. Supp. 2d 25, 26 n.1 (D.D.C. 2012) (same fee petition), <i>Huntley v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0164-AK, 2012 WL 1596724 *1 n.1 (D.D.C. May 7, 2012) (same fee petition);	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/17/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Wallace v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2012 WL 1744692 *3-6 (D.D.C. May 16, 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/16/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Jones v. District of Columbia</i> , 859 F. Supp. 2d 149, 153, 156 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates; Tamika Jones)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/14/2012	Douglas Tyrka counsel for requester
<i>Jones v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0168-AK, 2012 WL 1664231 *3, 5 (D.D.C. May 11, 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates; Krystal Jones)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/11/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Young v. District of Columbia</i> , 869 F. Supp. 2d 1, 5, 7 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates; Cherie Young)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/11/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Scott v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0165-AK, 2012 WL 1633207 *3, 5 (D.D.C. May 9, 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/9/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Flores v. District of Columbia</i> , 858 F. Supp. 2d 95, 100, 102 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates); see also <i>Flores</i> 857 F. Supp. 2d 15 n.1 (D.D.C. 2012) (same requester)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/4/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Huntley v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0157-AK, 2012 WL 1569553 *4, 6 (D.D.C. May 3, 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/3/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Petway v. District of Columbia</i> , 858 F. Supp. 2d 70, 75, 78 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	5/2/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Cousins v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0172-AK, 2012 WL 1439033 (D.D.C. Apr. 26, 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	4/26/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Crawford v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0174-AK, 2012 WL 1438985 (D.D.C. Apr. 26, 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	4/26/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Gorman v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0150-AK, 2012 WL 1438977 (D.D.C. Apr. 26, 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates)	AK		x	<		IDEA	4/26/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Young v. District of Columbia</i> , 870 F. Supp. 2d 1, n.1, 4-5, 8 (D.D.C. 2012) (rejecting request for Salazar rates and awarding 3/4 USAO Laffey rates; Carolyn Young)	AK		x	<		IDEA	4/26/2012	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Garvin v. District of Columbia</i> , 851 F. Supp. 2d 101, 107 (D.D.C. 2012) (awarding requested rates of \$400/hour and \$450/hour, where USAO Laffey provided \$465 and \$475)	RBW	<		<		IDEA	3/30/2012	note same case as Garvin, 901 F. Supp. 2d 135, but that dealt with separate motion for fees on fees.
<i>Johnson v. District of Columbia</i> , 850 F. Supp. 2d 74, 77 (D.D.C. 2012)	JMF	<		<		IDEA	3/20/2012	same case as No. 11-0494-JMF, but earlier fees request
<i>A.S. v. District of Columbia</i> , 842 F. Supp. 2d 40, 48 (D.D.C. 2012) (awarding requested rates that were "consistent with (and, in some cases, below) the rates in the Laffey Matrix, as updated and maintained by the Civil Division of the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia")	BJR	x		x		IDEA	2/1/2012	
<i>Wright v. District of Columbia</i> , No. 11-0384-AK, 2012 WL 79015 (D.D.C. Jan. 11, 2012) (where request was just under USAO Laffey, court awarded less, i.e., 3/4 USAO Laffey)	AK	<		<		IDEA	1/11/2012	same case as 883 F. Supp. 2d 132, but that was fees on fees, and this is for underlying case
<i>Baker v. D.C. Public Schools</i> , 815 F. Supp. 2d 102, 112-13 (D.D.C. 2011) (Yodie Baker, seeking \$11,448.25 in disputed fees)	RMU		x		x	IDEA	9/30/2011	Samuel Gbenga Adewusi requesting attorney
<i>Baker v. D.C. Public Schools</i> , 823 F. Supp. 2d 1, 8-9 (D.D.C. 2011) (Yodie Baker, \$2,751.50 disputed fees)	RMU		x		x	IDEA	9/30/2011	Samuel Gbenga Adewusi requesting attorney
<i>Hayes v. D.C. Public Schools</i> , 815 F. Supp. 2d 134, 142-43 (D.D.C. 2011)	RMU		x		x	IDEA	9/30/2011	Samuel Gbenga Adewusi requesting attorney
<i>Irving v. D.C. Public Schools</i> , 815 F. Supp. 2d 119, 128-29 (D.D.C. 2011)	RMU		x		x	IDEA	9/30/2011	Samuel Gbenga Adewusi requesting attorney
<i>McClam v. District of Columbia</i> , 808 F. Supp. 2d 184, 188 (D.D.C. 2011) (awarding \$300/hour, where request was \$400, which was itself < USAO Laffey)	RMC	<		<		IDEA	9/6/2011	
<i>B.R. ex rel. Rempson v. District of Columbia</i> , 802 F. Supp. 2d 153, 164 (D.D.C. 2011)	RMU	<		<		IDEA	8/12/2011	Samuel Gbenga Adewusi one of two requesting attorneys

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Roots v. District of Columbia</i> , 802 F. Supp. 2d 56, 61 (D.D.C. 2011)	PLF		x	x		IDEA	8/9/2011	Douglas Tyrka requesting attorney.
<i>Bridges Public Charter School v. Barrie</i> , 796 F. Supp. 2d 39, 50 (D.D.C. 2011)	ABJ	<		<		IDEA	7/11/2011	
<i>Gray v. District of Columbia</i> , 779 F. Supp. 2d 68, 73 (D.D.C. 2011) (requester sought more than USAO Laffey rates, but did not point to Salazar matrix)	GK	>		<		IDEA	4/26/2011	court awarded DCPS Guidelines (3/4 USAO rates?)
<i>Wilson v. District of Columbia</i> , 777 F. Supp. 2d 123, 127 (D.D.C. 2011) (request sought \$250/hour, well below \$405 from USAO Laffey); <i>see also Wilson</i> , 269 F.R.D. 8 (D.D.C. 2010) (denying motion to dismiss)	JEB	<		0		IDEA	4/14/2011	court denied SJ, finding disputes of fact, and so did not award fees in this decision
<i>Bucher v. District of Columbia</i> , 777 F. Supp. 69, 75 (D.D.C. 2011) (awarding requested rates, which were below USAO Laffey rates)	GK	<		<		IDEA	4/11/2011	
<i>Cox v. District of Columbia</i> , 754 F. Supp. 2d 66, 76-77 (D.D.C. 2010) (awarding requested rates, which were under USAO Laffey rates)	GK	<		<		IDEA	12/9/2010	
<i>Friendship Edison Public Charter School Collegiate Campus v. Nesbit</i> , 752 F. Supp. 2d 1, 7 (D.D.C. 2010) (awarded requested rates, which where DCPS Guidelines)	JMF	<		<		IDEA	10/28/2010	
<i>Dickens v. Friendship-Edison PCS</i> , 724 F. Supp. 113, 119 (D.D.C. 2010) (parties agreed on USAO Laffey rates)	AK	x		x		IDEA	7/21/2010	
<i>Jackson v. District of Columbia</i> , 696 F. Supp. 2d 97, 101 (D.D.C. 2010) (on reconsideration, granting requested USAO Laffey rates); <i>see also Jackson</i> , 603 F. Supp. 2d 92 (D.D.C. 2009) (awarding USAO Laffey rates in decision later reconsidered)	RMU	x		x		IDEA	3/19/2010	
<i>District of Columbia v. Jeppsen</i> , 686 F. Supp. 2d 37, 38-39 (D.D.C. 2010) (awarding requested rates which were "within the [USAO] Laffey Matrix")	RJL	x		x		IDEA	2/24/2010	
<i>Blackman v. District of Columbia</i> , 677 F. Supp. 169, 173-75 (D.D.C. 2010) (awarding USAO Laffey rates, where requested rates were customary rates for the firm, and were close to Salazar rates, class pltf's sought fees from July 2006 to end of 2008)	PLF		x	x		IDEA	1/4/2010	

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>A.C. ex rel Clark v. District of Columbia</i> , 674 F. Supp. 2d 149, 155 (D.D.C. 2009) (request based on USAO Laffey rates, court awarded less)	HHK	x		<		IDEA	12/15/2009	
<i>Friendship Edison Public Charter School Chamberlain Campus v. Suggs</i> , No. 06-1284-PLF, 2009 WL 8750121 *3 (D.D.C. Mar. 30, 2009)	PLF	x		x		IDEA	3/30/2009	
<i>D.L. v. District of Columbia</i> , 256 F.R.D. 239, 242 (D.D.C. 2009)	RCL		x	x		IDEA	3/11/2009	
<i>F.S. v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2014 WL 4923025 *2 (D.D.C. Oct. 2, 2014) (50% Laffey for fees on fees, despite earlier awarding 100% for underlying case)	EGS	x		<		IDEA	10/2/2014	Court distinguished "fees on fees" litigation from underlying litigation
<i>Means v. District of Columbia</i> , 999 F. Supp. 2d 128, 136 (D.D.C. 2013)	RC	<		<		IDEA	11/20/2013	Unclear what requester sought before AK, but parties agreed to 50% USAO Laffey for fees on fees.
<i>Garvin v. District of Columbia</i> , 910 F. Supp. 2d 135, 139 (D.D.C. 2012) (reducing requested hourly rate to 1/2 USAO Laffey, noting that fees on fees is not complex)	RBW	<		<		IDEA	12/19/2012	Note same case as Garvin, 851 F. Supp. 2d 101, but that request dealt with fees for rest of case.
<i>Wright v. District of Columbia</i> , 883 F. Supp. 2d 132, 135 (D.D.C. 2012) (awarding 1/2 USAO Laffey for fees on fees, where request was for full Laffey)	AK	x		<		IDEA	8/10/2012	cf. 2012 WL 79015 for fees for underlying case
<i>Laborers' Internat'l Union of N. America v. Brand Energy Servs.</i> , 746 F. Supp. 2d 121, 125-26 (D.D.C. 2010) (awarding requested rates, which were mostly below USAO Laffey rates)	RMC	<		<		labor	10/25/2010	
<i>Fraternal Order of Police, DC Lodge 1 v. Barry</i> , No. 08-0462-ESH-JMF, 2009 WL 430393 *3 (D.D.C. Feb. 23, 2009)	JMF		x	x		labor	2/23/2009	
<i>Salazar v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 1118352 (D.D.C. 2014).	GK		x		x	medicaid class action	3/21/2014	apparently separate request from 1/30/14 decision
<i>Salazar v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 342084 (D.D.C. 2014) (amended mem. op.)	GK		x		x	medicaid class action	1/30/2013	

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Salazar v. District of Columbia</i> , 750 F. Supp. 2d 70 (D.D.C. 2011) (awarding fees for part of 2007 and 2008)	GK		x		x	medicaid class action	1/4/2011	
<i>Salazar v. District of Columbia</i> , 666 F. Supp. 2d 53 (D.D.C. 2009) (fees for January to June 2007)	GK		x		x	medicaid class action	10/28/2009	
<i>McKesson Corp. v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 935 F. Supp. 2d 34, 40-42 (D.D.C. 2013)	RJL	>		>		property	3/27/2013	Court awarded firm's regular rates, which it billed here, rejecting lower USAO Laffey, tho not mentioning Salazar rates.
<i>In re InPhonic, Inc.</i> , 674 F. Supp. 2d 273, 283 n.10 (D.D.C. 2009) (finding aggregate rate of \$379.22/hour comparable to USAO Laffey rate of \$375/hour)	ESH	x		x		RICO	12/18/2009	
<i>Davis v. District of Columbia Child & Family Services Agency</i> , --- F.R.D. ---, 2014 WL 2507921 *10 (D.D.C. 2013) (awarding fees to DC agency)	RC	x		x		sanction discovery	6/4/2014	no explicit reference to USAO, but rate is consistent with years' experience and work done in 2013-14
<i>Fonville v. District of Columbia</i> , --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2014 WL 1427780 *11 (D.D.C. 2014)	EGS	x		x		sanction discovery	4/14/2014	
<i>Hajjar-Nejad v. GW Univ.</i> , No. 10-0626-CKK/JMF, 2013 WL 2635190 *2 (D.D.C. 2013)	JMF	<		<		sanction discovery	6/12/2013	No reference to Laffey. Court accepted discounted rates paid by client, most of which were lower than USAO Laffey, based on years exper.
<i>Azamar v. Stern</i> , 278 F.R.D. 23, 25 (D.D.C. 2011)	JDB	x		x		sanction discovery	12/19/2011	
<i>Covad Communications Co. v. Revonet, Inc.</i> , 267 F.R.D. 14, 32 (D.D.C. 2010) (request sought "Updated Laffey" rates, which court rejected, awarding USAO Laffey rates)	JMF		x	x		sanction discovery	3/31/2010	
<i>Guantanamera Cigar Co. v. Corporacion Habanos, S.A.</i> , 263 F.R.D. 1, 12 (D.D.C. 2009)	RCL	x		x		sanction discovery	8/18/2009	
<i>Act Now to Stop War and End Racism Coalition v. District of Columbia</i> , 286 F.R.D. 145, 153 (D.D.C. 2012) ("The parties agree that the USAO Laffey Matrix governs[.]"); accord 286 F.R.D. 117 (not addressing reasonable hourly rate)	RCL	x		x		sanction litigation	11/19/2012	

Case cite	Judge	Req USAO	Req Sal	Crt USAO	Crt Sal	Kind of Case	Date	Notes
<i>Robertson v. Cartinhour</i> , 883 F. Supp. 2d 121, 131 n.32 (D.D.C. 2012) (awarding requested rates and noting that the "rates are below those on the Laffey Matrix[.]")	ESH	<		<		sanction litigation	8/10/2012	
<i>SEC v. Bilzerian</i> , 641 F. Supp. 2d 16, 20 (D.D.C. 2009)	RCL	x		x		sanction litigation	8/12/2009	
<i>Winston & Strawn LLP v. FDIC</i> , 894 F. Supp. 2d 115, 129-30 (D.D.C. 2012) (noting that requesting attorney sought enhancement of twice his hourly rate, altho he "ha[d] already been compensated at his own rates which are comparable to the Laffey matrix.")	RCL		>	x		taxes in FDIC rcvrship	10/2/2012	no reference to Salazar rates, but twice attorney's actual rate is probably over Salazar rates. same case but different request as 841 F. Supp. 2d 225
<i>Winston & Strawn LLP v. FDIC</i> , 841 F. Supp. 2d 225, 227-28 (D.D.C. 2012) (parties agreed to use USAO Laffey rates)	RCL	x		x		taxes in FDIC rcvrship	1/27/2012	same case but different request as 894 F. Supp. 2d 115
<i>Electronic Transaction Systems Corp. v. Prodigy Partners Ltd., Inc.</i> , No. 08-1610-RWR, 2009 WL 3273920 *2 (D.D.C. Oct. 9, 2009) (awarding rates charged to clients, which were "higher than the Laffey Matrix's recommended rates," where the other side failed to contest the rates)	RWR	>		>		trademark	10/9/2009	no reference to Salazar rates, and unclear how requested rates compare to Salazar Matrix.