### HILL IN THE UNOFFICIAL COPY

### United States District Court

Northern District of Illinois

**Eastern Division** 

I. H. Stuart Cunningham, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, do hereby attest and certify that the annexed document is a full, true, and correct copy of the original(s) on file in my office and in my legal custody.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereuntone subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the aforesaid Court at Chicago, Illinois on 4-4-56

H. STUART CUNNENC"AM

CLERK

By: Kuth Dillies

Deputy Clerk

Return to Box 408

## UNOFFICIAL COPY UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF HUSINGIS, EASTER'S DIVISION

Vame of Number of Transport (	TATEON 1.	Shadur	Sitting Judge if Other Than Assigned Judge			
Case	Number 81	C 1279	Date	Dec. 19	,1985	
	JOHN TEOMSON V	/ LIEUTENANT EARL	JONES et al			
Case						
Title						
MOTION:		a) indicate the party filing briefly the nature of the m	notion being preser	nted.)	. ,	
memorandum opinion and order			Sent for the stilling.			
				101 1.	); };	
			<u>5e".</u>		<u>)</u>	
	100			0£6	•	
			. 20			
			Elimed on			
OCKET EN	TRY: (Th	e habove of this form is re	served for notatio	ns by court staf	f.)	
				·	·	
a:	Judament is entered as folio	m1:	₹ Since (Other)	docker entry		
	tum opinion and	order entered. A	Accordingly.	plaintiff'	s petition	
		expenses is appro				
		in are jointly &				
		to the compensation		tive damage	s previously	
awarded	by this Court,	the sum of \$92,09	7.51.			
			<i>y</i>			
(3)	Filed motion of fuse listing in	"MOTION" box abovej			<b>3</b> ~	
14)	Brief in support of motion du			74,	Ŏ.	
15)	Answer buef to motion due		Reply to answer brief d	lue O	7.	
16)	lifearing		rt for	) i	छ	
	Status hearing held	continued to Set for			., <b>.</b>	
.8,	Fretrul conference he		t for restor.			
(9)	Trial set for	w.ki (oi	<u> ( 10 20 20 </u>	••		
` <b>├</b> ─┥			nd continued to	~		
(i0)						
(II) [	This case is dismissed		lice and without costs	by agreemen	FRCP 41(a)(2)	
	FRCP 4() (failure to se		ant of prosecutions	FRCP floanti	<del></del>	
(12)	[For further detail see	outrenth reaked - 2	order attached to th	<del></del>	ri totm.]	
<del></del>	otices required.		İ	number of notices		
	res mailed by judge's staff.	17.0		date typed	Document *	
<del></del>	ied counsel by relephone.	10 25 11 4	DEC 2 3		10/6	
	eting to mail notices.	<u> </u>	DEC 2 3 13	<del></del>	1'4	
Mail	CIV-31 form.		DEC 6 0 13	<b>-</b>	- (	
. •	deputy's		CEC 2	date mid.		
بالأنوزر	efeitun	Date/time received in		Tradung den	<u>.                                    </u>	
,3	j	central Clerk's Office	NVX	initials		

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN THOMSON,	)		
	)		
Plaintiff,	)		
	)		
٧.	)	No.	81 C 1279
	)		
LIEUTENANT EARL JONES, et a	11.,)		
	)		
Defendants.	)		

#### MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

John Thomson ("Thomson"), through appointed counsel, has moved under 42 U.S.C. \$1988 ("Section 1988") for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses after having obtained judgment by default against Earl Jones "Jones") and Marvin Baskin ("Baskin"), two of the defendants in this 42 U.S.C. \$1983 case. 1/Neither Jones nor Baskin has responded to the motion despite a personal notification from this Court (see Appendix 1), and the Assistant Attorney General who handled the case before and at trial has filed a short statement explaining why he has not responded either on behalf of defendant Warden Richard DeRobertis (who stood trial and won his case) or on behalf of Jones and Baskin, whom the Attorney General's office had not represented since 1982 (see Appendix 2). This Court has

As this Court's findings and conclusions reflect (619 F.Supp. 745 (N.D. Ill. 1985)), Thomson claimed and proved deprivations of his constitutional rights--both of his liberty interest under the Due Process Clause itself and of his right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment under the Pourteenth Amendment's incorporation of the Eighth Amendment.

, 30134754

perforce evaluated the current petition without the assistance normally provided by opposing parties' presentations, but it has nonetheless given the request the same hard look that is always accorded to such fee applications.

Members of the Schiff, Hardin & Waite law firm ("Schiff Hardin") were appointed by this Court to represent Thomson, who had originally filed a pro se complaint. Counsel conducted themselves throughout this extended case in accordance with the best standards of the profession, according Thomson the same high-quality representation the firm provides to its clients that can afford to pay today's tariffs for legal services.

Though the total damages (Nis Court awarded against Jones and Baskin (including punitive damages) aggregated \$40,000, Thomson seeks an award of \$92,091.51. There is now pending before the United States Supreme Court the question whether Section 1988 awards to successful plaintiffs are automatically to be tempered by a comparatively low underlying judgment, even though the requested fee is otherwise entirely reasonable.

City of Riverside va Rivera, No. 85-224, cert. granted, 37

U.S.L.W. 3270 (Oct. 21, 1985). But unless and until the Supreme Court rules otherwise, this Court will adhere to the standards set by the courts for determining the reasonableness of fees to be awarded. See Lynch v. City of Milwaukee, 747

F.2d 423, 428-29 (7th Cir. 1984) (rejecting district court's application of a negative multiplier "in view of the nominal award here," while at the same time recognizing such a nominal

award may be factor to be considered in determining fee award).

Counsel's memorandum in support of the present petition reflects the same level of meticulousness and first-rate lawyering as the services counsel rendered to Thomson in preparing for trial and trying the case. It reflects:

- l. the properly careful calculation, and elimination, of time allocable to the defendants who prevailed at trial;
- in that same respect, the exclusion of one-half the actual trial time;
- 3. the exclusion of the time of senior Schiff Hardin attorneys who provided occasional assistance to the active litigators, and the exclusion of the time of paralegals having minimal contacts with the case; and
- 4. the elimination of duplicative or "insufficiently explained" time.

All those things cut away over 220 hours of actually-recorded time--some 17% of the total lawyers' hours. In summary, and from this Court's own knowledge of the work involved in the case, the remaining time is reasonable.

One of the petition's exhibits is an affidavit from the Director of the Institutionalized Persons Project of the American Civil Liberties Union, stating his opinion that the hourly rate sought for each of the lawyers in the case is reasonable and well within the range of normal market rates. This Court has also independently reviewed all those rates and

86134454

found them reasonable in market terms. See Henry v. Wetermeier, 738 F.2d 188, 193-94 (7th Cir. 1984). Finally this Court has determined that the calculation resulting from multiplying the reasonable time by the reasonable hourly rates is itself reasonable, taking into account all the relevant factors (see Lynch, 747 F.2d at 426).

Accordingly the petition for fees and expenses is approved as tendered. Jones and Baskin are jointly and severally ordered to pay to Thomson, in addition to the compensatory and punitive damages previously awarded by this Court, the sur of \$92,091.51.

Milton I. Shadur United States District Judge ate.

December 19, 1985 Date:

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

CHARLES OF MILTON I. SHADUR JUGGE

November 29, 1985

C=< +00 ILL-104 60604

Ms. Sara L. Johnson Schiff Hardin & Waite 7200 Sears Tower Chicago, Illinois 60606

Mr. Earl Jones 9920 South Oglesby Chicago, Illinois 60628

Thomas A. Toppolo, Esq. Assistant Attorney General 100 West Randolph Street 13th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60601

Mr. Marvin Baskin 913 Lois Place Apt. A-112 Joliet, Illinois 60435

Mr. William Sheldon 98 East Lakeshore Drive Cherokee Village Hardy, Arkansas 72542

> Re: Thomson v. Jones, et al. No. 81 C 1279

Dear Ms. Johnson and Gentlemen:

On November 22 I received the petition filed by appointed counsel for plaintiff John Thomson, seeking an award of attorneys' fees in the civil rights case tried before me earlier this year. Because defendants Jones and Baskin were not separately represented at trial, and because judgments were entered against thom based on the proof at trial, I wanted to alert them particularly to the need to respond to the current petition.

Needless to say, I will evaluate the petition to see whether the amount requested is reasonable, whether or not any responses are filed. However, the task of a court in deciding issues is necessarily simplified when parties present their own positions to the court—that is the very reason we have the adversary process. Accordingly I shall await any responses to the petition until December 16, 1985. Anyone who has not filed a response on or before that date will be considered to have waived the right to respond, and I will then decide the issues based on the papers before me and my own independent review of the matter.

Sing rely,

Milton I. Shadur
APPENDIX 1

MIS:wb

÷¢

Bolsy John

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION विधिक्र

JOHN THOMSON,

Plaintiff.

v.

No. 81 C 1279

LT. EARL JONES, et al.,

Judge Shadur

Defendants.

PLAINTIFF'S PETITION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES

In a letter dited November 29, 1985, the Court set

December 16, 1985 as a deadline for filing responses to plaintiff's

petition for attorneys fees.

The Illinois Attorney General's office had withdrawn representation from defendants Jones and Baskin in 1982. Because the office did not represent those individuals on the merits and will not indemnify them, it would be inappropriate at this stage to respond on their behalf to the fee petition filed against them.

Warden DeRobertis was a prevailing party at the trial and therefore neither he, the Department of Corrections, nor the State of Illinois is liable for attorneys' fees in this situation.

Accordingly, he will not address the merits of the fee petition.

Respectfully submitted,

NEIL F. HARTIGAN Attorney General of Illinois

BY:

THOMAS A. IOPPOLO

Assistant Attorney General

General Law Division 100 W. Randolph, Floor 13

Chicago, Illinois 60601

312/917-5165

APPENDIX 2

86139959

#### **UNOFFICIAL CC** 8 6 1 3 7 9 3

#### LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THE NORTH 9 FEET OF LOT 7 AND ALL OF LOT 6 IN BLOCK 9 IN CALUMET TRUST'S SUBDIVISION IN SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 37 NORTH, RANGE 14, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, BOTH NORTH AND SOUTH OF THE INDIAN BOUNDARY LINE, AND FRACTIONAL SECTION ?, TOWNSHIP 37 NORTH, RANGE 15, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NORTH OF THE INDIAN EGUNDARY LIKES PER PLAT RECORDED DECEMBER 30, 1925 AS DOCUMENT NO 9137462 IN COOK COUNTY. ILLINOIS.

Commonly Known As: 9920 S. Oglesby Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60617

Property Tax Identification Number: 25-12-406-039, Vol. 287 M D.

THIS DOCUMENT PREPARED BY AND WHEN RECORDED SHOULD BE LETURNED TO:

Sara L. Johnson Schiff Hardin & Waite 7200 Sears Tower Chicago, Illinois 60606

OR

BOX 408

#3323 TRAN #3592 \* pa