

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

WHITE FAMILY MINERALS, LLC,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 6:19-CV-409-KEW
	)	
EOG RESOURCES, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**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 Settlement<sup>1</sup> 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 \$100,000.00 (the “Expense Request”)—the amount set forth in the Notice.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, Class Counsel also respectfully move the Court for

---

<sup>1</sup> All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings given to them in the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement dated June 29, 2021 (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. 36].

<sup>2</sup> To date, Class Counsel have incurred out-of-pocket expenses of \$75,418.38. 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 \$100,000.00. 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 \$150,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Fund. That request is discussed in more detail below.

approval of reimbursement of Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs associated with effectuating the Settlement in an amount not to exceed \$150,000.00. 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 a cash payment of \$4,000,000.00 (the “Gross Settlement Fund”) to compensate the Settlement Class for past damages. The \$4,000,000.00 cash Gross Settlement Fund is an outstanding recovery for Class Members.<sup>3</sup>

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 \$100,000.00—the amount set forth in the Notices.<sup>4</sup> To date, Class Counsel have advanced \$75,418.38 in prosecuting and resolving this case. *See* NP Decl. at ¶11; RW Decl. at ¶15; 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 \$100,000.00 *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

---

<sup>3</sup> *See* Declaration of Patrick M. Ryan, Andrew G. Pate, and Robert N. Barnes on Behalf of Class Counsel at ¶¶7 & 12 (“Joint Class Counsel Declaration”), attached as Exhibit 2 to Plaintiff’s Final Approval Memorandum; *see also* Affidavit of Barbara A. Ley, CPA, CITP, CFF at ¶8 (“Ley Aff.”), attached as Exhibit 3 to Plaintiff’s Final Approval Memorandum.

<sup>4</sup> 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 Administration of Settlement (“JND Decl.”), which is attached as Exhibit 4 to Plaintiff’s Final Approval Memorandum.

the \$100,000.00 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 \$150,000.00 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 \$150,000.00.

## **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 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 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. 36-1) (emphasis added).

This Court previously approved and held this contractual language to be enforceable. *See, e.g., McClintock v. Enterprise Crude Oil, LLC*, No. CIV-16-136-KEW (E.D. Okla. March 26, 2021) (Dkt. No. 121); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. Marathon Oil Co.*, No. CIV-17-334-SPS (E.D. Okla. Mar. 8, 2019) (Dkt. No. 119); *Reirdon v. Cimarex Energy Co.*, No. 16-cv-00113-KEW (E.D. Okla. Dec. 18, 2018) (Dkt. No. 103); *Reirdon v. XTO Energy Inc.*, No. 16-cv-00087-KEW (E.D. Okla. Jan. 29, 2018) (Dkt. No. 126); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. XTO Energy, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-00029-KEW (E.D. Okla. Mar. 27, 2018) (Dkt. No. 230); *Cecil v. BP America Production Co.*, No. 16-cv-00410-KEW (E.D. Okla. Nov. 19, 2018) (Dkt. No. 260). 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 ¶74.<sup>5</sup> Class Counsel set forth in the Short Form and Long Form

---

<sup>5</sup> In a similar action, this 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

Notices that they would seek up to \$100,000.00 in reimbursement of expenses. *See* JND Decl. at Exhibits A & C. To date, Class Counsel's out-of-pocket expenses are \$75,418.38.<sup>6</sup> *See* Joint Class Counsel Decl. at ¶74. 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, absent Class Members have executed affidavits in support of Class Counsel's Expense Request. *See* Affidavits of Absent Class Members, attached as Exhibits 6-8 to Class Representative's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Final Approval.

**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 \$150,000.00 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

---

Expenses) (Dkt. No. 104). In another action, this 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).

<sup>6</sup> Because additional expenses will continue to be incurred through and after the Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel specifically request reimbursement of \$75,418.38 *plus* the ability to recover additional expenses up to \$100,000.00—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.

approval of payment of Administration, Notice and Distribution Costs actually incurred, and in no event will their request exceed the noticed amount of \$150,000.00.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Class Counsel respectfully request the Court (1) award the Expense Request of \$75,418.38, *plus* any additional amount Class Counsel actually incurs after the filing of this Memorandum, not to exceed the noticed amount of \$100,000.00, and (2) approve payment of Administration, Notice and Distribution Costs in an amount not to exceed the noticed amount of \$150,000.00.

DATED: October 13, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Patrick M. Ryan

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 Avenue

Oklahoma City, OK 73140

(405) 239-6040 telephone

(405) 239-6766 facsimile

*pryan@ryanwhaley.com*

*jryan@ryanwhaley.com*

*pjantzen@ryanwhaley.com*

Bradley E. Beckworth, OBA No. 19982

Andrew G. Pate, TX Bar No. 24079111

**NIX PATTERSON, LLP**

3600 N. Capital of Texas Hwy.

Building B, Suite 350

Austin, TX 78746

(512) 328-5333 telephone

(512) 328-5335 facsimile

*bbeckworth@nixlaw.com*

*dpate@nixlaw.com*

Susan Whatley, OBA No. 30960  
**NIX PATTERSON, LLP**  
P.O. Box 178  
Linden, Texas 75563  
(903) 215-8310 telephone  
*swhatley@nixlaw.com*

Michael Burrage, OBA No. 1350  
**WHITTEN BURRAGE**  
512 N. Broadway Ave., Suite 300  
Oklahoma City, OK 73103  
(405) 516-7800 telephone  
(405) 516-7859 facsimile  
*mburrage@whittenburragelaw.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  
(405) 843-0363 telephone  
(405) 832-1007 facsimile  
*rbarnes@barneslewis.com*  
*plewis@barneslewis.com*  
*ekitch@barneslewis.com*

**CLASS COUNSEL**



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 13, 2021, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the clerk of this Court using the ECF system for filing. Based on the records currently on file, the Clerk of Court will transmit a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

J. Todd Woolery – [todd.woolery@mcafeetaft.com](mailto:todd.woolery@mcafeetaft.com)

Patrick L. Stein – [patrick.stein@mcafeetaft.com](mailto:patrick.stein@mcafeetaft.com)

Daniel M. McClure – [dan.mcclure@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:dan.mcclure@nortonrosefulbright.com)

*/s/ Patrick M. Ryan*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick M. Ryan