

**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.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF CLASS REPRESENTATIVE’S  
MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF CASE CONTRIBUTION AWARD**

Class Representative White Family Minerals, LLC (hereinafter “White Family Minerals” or “Class Representative”), by and through its counsel of record, submits the following Memorandum of Law in Support of his Motion for Approval of Case Contribution Award.

**I. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

In connection with Class Representative’s request for approval of the Settlement in the above-captioned Litigation,<sup>1</sup> Class Representative respectfully moves the Court for a Case Contribution Award not to exceed \$35,000.00 from the Gross Settlement Fund, as compensation for its valuable time, effort, and assistance throughout this Litigation, which culminated in a Settlement with a total value of \$4,000,000.00. This award is proportionate to the contribution of Class Representative and is supported by the declaration of Jerry M. White, which demonstrates

---

<sup>1</sup> All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning given to them in the June 29, 2021 Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement (“Settlement Agreement”), a copy of which is 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 (the “Preliminary Approval Memorandum”) (Dkt. No. 36).

the time, effort, and the risk and burden Class Representative incurred. *See* Declaration of Jerry M. White (“White Decl.”), attached to the Final Approval Memorandum as Exhibit 1.

## II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL SUMMARY

In the interests of time and judicial economy, Class Representative will not recite the factual and procedural background of this Litigation. Instead, Class Representative respectfully refers the Court to the Memorandum of Law in Support of Class Representative’s Motion for Final Approval, the Declaration of Patrick M. Ryan, Andrew G. Pate, and Robert N. Barnes on Behalf of Class Counsel, 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. *See New Mexico ex rel. Richardson v. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 565 F.3d 683, 702 n. 21 (10th Cir. 2009) (court may take judicial notice of its own files and records).

## III. ARGUMENT

In recognition of the time, effort, risk and burden Class Representative incurred to produce such a significant result for the Settlement Class, it seeks a case contribution award not to exceed \$35,000.00 from the Gross Settlement Fund for the time and attention on behalf of the Class. *See* White Decl., attached to the Final Approval Memorandum as Exhibit 1. As demonstrated below, this request is fair, reasonable, and adequate and therefore, should be granted.

### *A. The Parties Have Agreed That Federal Common Law Controls the Case Contribution Award*

The Parties here contractually agreed that the Settlement Agreement shall be governed solely by federal common law with respect to certain issues, including the case contribution award:

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.

See Settlement Agreement at ¶11.8 (Dkt. No. 36-1) (emphasis added). The Parties' decision to contractually agree that federal common law controls the case contribution award should be enforced, as it has been in recent analogous cases. See, e.g., *McClintock v. Enterprise Crude Oil, LLC*, No. CIV-16-136-KEW (E.D. Okla. Mar. 26, 2021) (Dkt. No. 122); *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). Further, 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:

Absent 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.'

*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.”). Put simply, litigants are free to select the choice of law that will govern decisions regarding interpretation and enforcement of a settlement agreement and all matters relating to thereto. Here, in light of the fact that this is a multi-state class action, governed by Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and a case over which this Court has jurisdiction because of the application of the Class Action Fairness Act, the parties contractually chose to apply federal common law to all matters regarding the reasonableness and fairness of the Settlement, including but not limited to, the issue of any class representative award.

***B. The Case Contribution Award Is Reasonable Under Federal Common Law***

Federal courts routinely grant incentive awards to compensate named plaintiffs for the work they performed—their time and effort invested in the case. In fact, this Court and other Oklahoma federal courts have awarded case contribution awards to class representatives in similar oil and gas class actions. *See, e.g., McClintock v. Enterprise Crude Oil, LLC*, No. CIV-16-136-KEW (E.D. Okla. Mar. 26, 2021) (Dkt. No. 122); *Hay Creek Royalties, LLC v. Roan Resources LLC*, No. CIV-19-177-CVE-JFJ (N.D. Okla. April 28, 2021) (Dkt. No. 74); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. Marathon Oil Co.*, No. 17-cv-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); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. XTO Energy, Inc.*, Case No. CIV-11-29-KEW (E.D. Okla. Mar. 27, 2018) (Dkt. No. 230); *Reirdon v. XTO Energy Inc.*, No. 16-cv-00087-KEW (E.D. Okla. Jan. 29, 2018) (Dkt. No.

126); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. Laredo Petroleum, Inc.*, Case No. CIV-12-1319-D (W.D. Okla. May 13, 2015) (Dkt. No. 52); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. QEP Energy Co.*, Case No. CIV-11-212-R (W.D. Okla. May 31, 2013) (Dkt. No. 182); *see also, e.g., UFCW Local 880-Retail Food v. Newmont Mining Corp.*, 352 F. App'x 232, 235 (10th Cir. 2009) (unpublished) (“Incentive awards [to class representatives] are justified when necessary to induce individuals to become named representatives...Moreover, a class representative may be entitled to an award for personal risk incurred or additional effort and expertise provided for the benefit of the class.”);<sup>2</sup> *Cobell v. Salazar*, 679 F.3d 909, 922-23, (D.C. Cir. 2012) (holding district court did not err in finding that lead plaintiff’s “singular, selfless, and tireless investment of time, energy, and personal funds to ensure survival of the litigation [merited] an incentive award”); *Rodriguez v. West Publ’g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 958 (9th Cir. 2009) (“Incentive awards . . . are intended to compensate class representatives for work done on behalf of the class . . . .”); *Fankhouser v. XTO Energy, Inc.*, No. CIV-07-798-L, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 147197, at \*9-10 (W.D. Okla. Oct. 12, 2012) (incentive awards totaling \$100,000 from \$37 million fund); *In re Marsh ERISA Litig.*, 265 F.R.D. 128, 150 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) (awarding case contribution award of \$15,000 to three named representatives, holding “[c]ase law in this and other circuits fully supports compensating class representatives for their work on behalf of the class, which has benefited from their representation.”) (citing *Dornberger v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, 203 F.R.D. 118, 124-25 (S.D.N.Y. 2001)); *Allapattah Servs., Inc. v. Exxon Corp.*, 454 F. Supp. 2d 1185, 1218 (S.D. Fla. 2006) (1.5% of \$1.06 billion fund, equaling \$15,900,000 to be split amongst nine class representatives and stating “[t]here is ample

---

<sup>2</sup> In *Newmont*, the Tenth Circuit held the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying an incentive award to a *pro se* objector because: (1) his objections did not confer a benefit on the class, (2) he did not incur any risk, “nor could he, since his participation as an objector began after a settlement was reached and a common fund was created” (*id.* at 236), and (3) his objections to class counsel’s attorneys’ fees were “general and lacking in meaningful analysis” (*id.* at 237).

precedent for awarding incentive compensation to class representatives at the conclusion of a successful class action.”); *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1261, 2004 WL 1221350, at \*18-19 (E.D. Pa. June 2, 2004) (finding “ample authority in this district and in other circuits” for total incentive awards of \$125,000); *In re Lorazepam & Clorazepate Antitrust Litig.*, 205 F.R.D. 369, 400 (D.D.C. 2002) (“Incentive awards are not uncommon in class action litigation and particularly where . . . a common fund has been created for the benefit of the entire class.”); *Enter Energy Corp. v. Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.*, 137 F.R.D. 240 (S.D. Ohio 1991) (awarding \$300,000 to class representatives, equaling .93% of current cash portions of settlement and approximately .53% of estimated present value); *In re Dun & Bradstreet Credit Servs. Customer Litig.*, 130 F.R.D. 366, 373-74 (S.D. Ohio 1990) (\$215,000 in incentive awards from \$18 million fund).

In *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. EnerVest Energy Institutional Fund XIII-A, L.P.*, 888 F.3d 455 (10th Cir. 2017), a two-judge panel of the Tenth Circuit reversed and remanded a district court order that granted an incentive award to the class representative to be paid out of the common fund, finding that the record did not contain sufficient evidence to support the percentage incentive award in that case of 0.5%. Regardless of the decision in *EnerVest*, the opinion is wholly inapplicable here because that case dealt with the application of state law choice of law principles while the parties here—unlike in *EnerVest*—contractually agreed that federal common law controls the case contribution award. Moreover, although incentive awards can be percentage-based or dollar-based, Class Representative seeks a flat dollar award based on the hours spent times a reasonable rate, and not a percentage-based award, as was requested and awarded by the district court in *EnerVest*. Indeed, this Court noted such distinction in awarding case contribution awards in similar oil and gas class action settlements. *See, e.g., Chieftain Royalty Co. v. Marathon*

*Oil Co.*, No. 17-cv-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).

The services for which incentive awards are given typically include “monitoring class counsel, being deposed by opposing counsel, keeping informed of the progress of the litigation, and serving as a client for purposes of approving any proposed settlement with the defendant.” *See 5 Newberg on Class Actions* § 17:3 (5th ed) (“*Newberg*”). The award should be proportional to the contribution of the plaintiff. *Phillips v. Asset Acceptance, LLC*, 736 F.3d 1076, 1081 (7th Cir. 2013) (noting that if the lead plaintiff’s services are greater, her incentive award likely will be greater); *Rodriguez*, 563 F.3d at 960 (incentive award should not be “untethered to any service or value [the lead plaintiff] will provide to the class”); *see also Newberg* at § 17:18.

Here, Class Representative seeks a modest, dollar-based award not to exceed \$35,000.00. This request is supported by the abundant evidence submitted by Class Representative, including Mr. White’s Declaration, representations by Class Counsel, and other evidence in the record. *See Newberg* at § 17:12 (evidence might be provided through “affidavits submitted by class counsel and/or the class representatives, through which these persons testify to the particular services performed, the risks encountered, and any other facts pertinent to the award.”). Mr. White’s education and work history background more than justify this award. *See White Decl.* at ¶¶4-5. Mr. White attended Oklahoma State University, where he obtained a Bachelor’s degree in Animal Science. *Id.* at ¶4. After college, he worked in the banking industry for several years, until purchasing the Farm Service Company in 1977. *Id.* As the owner of the Farm Service Company, Mr. White continued its long history of managing farms, ranches, and mineral interests in central and southwest Oklahoma. *Id.* As part of his business operations, Mr. White also performs farm

appraisals, including the sale of farms and mineral interests. As an individual, or as part of his duties at White Family Minerals, LLC, Mr. White has owned and/or managed mineral interests for approximately fifty (50) years. *Id.* These mineral interests include wells located in many counties, including current interests located in Grady, Caddo, Carter, Payne, and Seminole Counties. *Id.*

As demonstrated by his Declaration, both the rate and efforts of Class Representative are reasonable. Specifically, Mr. White, on behalf of Class Representative, has dedicated approximately 120 hours to this Litigation. White Decl. at ¶20. These hours were spent collecting documents for discovery, reviewing emails, draft pleadings, briefs and other court documents from Class Counsel, consulting and/or meeting with Class Counsel, and reviewing and discussing settlement documents, preliminary approval documents, and final approval documents. *Id.*

Class Representative was heavily involved in all aspects of the Litigation, even prior to the filing of the Petition on October 22, 2019. *Id.* at ¶8. Class Representative actively and effectively fulfilled its obligations as a representative of the Settlement Class, complying with all reasonable demands placed upon it during the prosecution and settlement of this Litigation, and provided valuable assistance to Class Counsel. *Id.* at ¶20. Class Representative has worked with Class Counsel since before the inception of this Litigation, and its active participation has contributed significantly to the prosecution and resolution of this case. *Id.* In addition, Class Representative produced documents, reviewed pleadings, motions, and other court filings, communicated regularly with Class Counsel, reviewed expert analysis on damages, and actively participated in the negotiations that led to the settlement of this Action. *Id.* All of these efforts were necessary and beneficial to the Litigation and the ultimate Settlement.

Furthermore, Class Representative will continue to work on behalf of the Settlement Class in the coming weeks and months, including through the Final Fairness Hearing and, if approved,



assisting with administration of the Settlement. *Id.* This will add at least an additional 25-30 hours that Class Representative will dedicate to this Litigation. It will also incur additional time in the event of an appeal, conferring with Class Counsel and reviewing additional pleadings. *Id.* In total, Class Representative will devote approximately 150 hours to this Litigation. Class Representative's time and effort in this Litigation more than justify an award of \$35,000.00, and also comports with awards granted in similar oil and gas class actions. *See, e.g., McClintock v. Enterprise Crude Oil, LLC*, No. CIV-16-136-KEW (E.D. Okla. Mar. 26, 2021) (Dkt. No. 122); *Hay Creek Royalties, LLC v. Roan Resources LLC*, No. CIV-19-177-CVE-JFJ (N.D. Okla. April 28, 2021) (Dkt. No. 74); *Chieftain Royalty Co. v. Marathon Oil Co.*, No. 17-cv-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).

Moreover, Class Representative was never promised any recovery or made any guarantees prior to filing this Litigation, nor at any time during the Litigation. *See* White Decl. at ¶21. In fact, if the Court determines that no award is appropriate, Class Representative understands and agrees that such an award, or rejection thereof, has no bearing on the fairness of the Settlement and that it will be approved and go forward no matter how the Court rules on its request. *Id.* In other words, Class Representative fully supports the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, even if it is awarded no case contribution award at all. *Id.* Class Representative has no conflicts of interest with Class Counsel or any absent class member. *Id.* Finally, absent Class Members have executed affidavits to support Class Representative's request for a Case Contribution Award. *See* Exhibits 6-8 to Final Approval Memorandum.

Because Class Representative has dedicated significant time and attention to this Litigation, it respectfully requests the Court award a Case Contribution Award not to exceed \$35,000.00 to reflect the important role that it played in representing the interests of the Settlement Class and in achieving the substantial result reflected in the Settlement.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Class Representative respectfully requests the Court enter an order granting approval of a Case Contribution Award not to exceed \$35,000.00.

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