

1 Guido Saveri (22349)  
*guido@saveri.com*  
2 R. Alexander Saveri (173102)  
*rick@saveri.com*  
3 Geoffrey C. Rushing (126910)  
*grushing@saveri.com*  
4 Cadio Zirpoli (179108)  
*cadio@saveri.com*  
5 Matthew D. Heaphy (227224)  
*mheaphy@saveri.com*  
6 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.  
7 706 Sansome Street  
8 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 217-6810  
Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

9 *Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs*

10  
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

14 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
15 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 07-CV-5944-JST

MDL No. 1917

16 This Document Relates to:

17 **DECLARATION OF MARY JANE FAIT IN**  
18 **SUPPORT OF DIRECT PURCHASER**  
**PLAINTIFFS' APPLICATION FOR**  
**ATTORNEYS' FEES AND INCENTIVE**  
**AWARDS**

19 *Crago, d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., et al. v.*  
20 *Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, et al.*, Case  
21 No. 14-CV-2058-JST.

Date: June 8, 2017  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Judge: Honorable Jon S. Tigar  
Courtroom: 9

1 I, Mary Jane Fait, declare:

2 1. I am the managing shareholder of Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait PLLC, Counsel  
3 for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs (“DPPs” or “Plaintiffs”) in this action. I submit this declaration in  
4 support of DPPs’ joint Application for Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses and Incentive Awards (“Fees  
5 and Expense Application”) in connection with the services rendered in this litigation. I make this  
6 declaration based on my personal knowledge and if called as a witness, I could and would  
7 competently testify to the matters stated herein.

8 2. I have served as counsel to class representative plaintiff Princeton Display  
9 Technologies, Inc. (“Princeton Display”) and as counsel for the Class throughout the course of this  
10 litigation. My background and experience is summarized in the curriculum vitae attached hereto as  
11 **Exhibit A**.

12 3. Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait PLLC has prosecuted this litigation solely on a  
13 contingent-fee basis, and has been at risk that it would not receive any compensation for  
14 prosecuting claims against the defendants. While Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait PLLC devoted its  
15 time and resources to this matter, it has foregone other legal work for which it would have been  
16 compensated.

17 4. During the pendency of the litigation, I have performed the following work, in  
18 coordination with lead and co-counsel:

19 (a) Based on my significant experience of over 30 years in antitrust class action litigation, I  
20 worked closely throughout the litigation with my client, Princeton Display. Princeton  
21 Display was one of the few class representatives who directly purchased cathode ray  
22 tubes, as opposed to products incorporating these price-fixed products. I worked closely  
23 with my client to provide important and relevant personal evidence regarding the price  
24 fixing conspiracy and information necessary for the experts. I also prepared my client  
25 for a second deposition and defended his deposition taken by counsel for the Mitsubishi  
26 defendants;

27 (b) I researched and provided data regarding defendants Thomson’s and Mitsubishi’s sales  
28 and pricing for the experts;

- 1 (c) I assisted in the preparation of the complaint against Thomson and Mitsubishi,  
2 evaluation of discovery issues, and preparation of discovery responses and a motion to  
3 compel;
- 4 (d) I analyzed and prepared evidence for the depositions of defendants;
- 5 (e) I analyzed and prepared evidence of conspiratorial contacts, meetings of competitors,  
6 and the interrelatedness and liability of all of the Mitsubishi entities; and
- 7 (f) I assisted in the preparation of evidence for trial.

8 5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B** is my firm's total hours and lodestar, computed at  
9 historical rates, from the inception of DPPs' case against the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants and  
10 the Thomson Defendants (Case No. 14-CV-2058-JST, filed May 5, 2014) through October 31,  
11 2016. The total number of hours spent by Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait PLLC during this period  
12 of time was 479.3, with a corresponding lodestar of \$400,153.50. This summary was prepared from  
13 contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by Law Offices of Mary  
14 Jane Fait PLLC. The lodestar amount reflected in Exhibit B is for work assigned by Lead Counsel,  
15 and was performed by me for the benefit of the DPP Class. None of these hours were included in  
16 connection with DPPs' first fee and expense application (ECF No. 4055).


17 6. The hourly rates included in Exhibit B are the usual and customary hourly rates  
18 charged by Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait PLLC.

19 7. Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait PLLC is not seeking reimbursement of any of its  
20 expenses incurred on a contingent basis in this action.

21 8. I have reviewed the time reported by Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait PLLC in this  
22 case which are included in this declaration, and I affirm that it is true and accurate.

23 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the  
24 foregoing is true and correct.

25 Executed on March 15, 2017 at Chicago, IL.

26   
27 Mary Jane Fait

ATTESTATION

I, R. Alexander Saveri, hereby attest, pursuant to United States District Court, Northern District of California Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), that concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from the signatory hereto.

By: /s/ R. Alexander Saveri  
R. Alexander Saveri

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

# EXHIBIT A

**MARY JANE FAIT**  
1510 Alfred Drive  
Boynton Beach, FL 33426  
(847) 922-6729  
mjf@faitlaw.com

## **EDUCATION**

**Cornell Law School**, Ithaca, NY, J.D.

**University of Illinois**, Urbana-Champaign, IL, B.A., Economics

## **EXPERIENCE**

**Law Offices of Mary Jane Fait, PLLC**

**August, 2013-Present**

- Complex and business litigation
- Federal district court and appellate practice
- Skilled in briefing and motion practice, e-discovery, expert issues, all current legal tools and technology such as Westlaw, Lexis/Nexis, Relativity, Summation, Microsoft Word, Microsoft Excel, E-filing, Pacer

### *Representative Matters Handled*

- *Co-Lead Counsel: Messner v NorthShore Hospital (In re Evanston Northwestern Healthcare Corp., No. 07-4446 (N.D. IL)*
- *Co-Counsel: Dairy Farmers of America Inc. Cheese Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 2031 (N.D. IL) Settlement \$46M*
- *Co-Counsel: In Re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation No. 07-C-5944 (N.D. CA) Settlements over \$50M*

**Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP, Partner**, Chicago, IL

**September, 2000-August, 2013**

- Opened and managed Chicago office comprising 9 attorneys, 2 paralegals, and 2 secretaries.
- Obtained over 30 large corporate clients
- Generated over \$70M in fees and expenses from cases with own clients
- Practiced in antitrust, securities fraud, consumer fraud, patent litigation, class action, and complex litigation

### *Representative Matters Handled*

- Co-Lead Counsel: *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litigation*, No. M 02-1486 (N.D. CA)- \$325M in settlements
- Co-Lead Counsel: *McDonough v Babies R Us*, No. 06 cv 0242 (E.D. Pa.)- settled for \$32.5 M.
- Co-Lead Counsel: *Dairy Farmers of America Inc. Cheese Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 2031 (N.D. IL) \$46 M settlement
- Co-Lead of Consumer Class: *In re Vytarin/Zetia Marketing, Sales Practices Product Liability Litigation* 08 cv 285 (D.N.J.)
- Co-Lead Counsel: *The Shane Group, Inc., et al v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan*, 2:10-cv-14360, \$29.9 M settlement (E.D. MI)
- Co-Lead Counsel: *In re Text Messaging Antitrust Litigation* MDL 1997 (N.D.IL )
- Co-Lead Counsel: *Messner v NorthShore Hospital* (No. 07-4446 (N.D. IL)
- Co-Counsel: *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1952 (E.D. MI.)
- Co-Counsel: *In re Rail Freight Fuel Surcharge Antitrust Litigation*, M.D.L. 1536 (D.D.C.)
- Co-Counsel: *In re Air Cargo Shipping Antitrust Litigation*, No. 06-MD-1775 (E.D.N.Y.)
- Co-Counsel : *In re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation*, No. 07-C-5944 (N.D. CA)
- Co-Counsel: *In Re Relafen Antitrust Litigation*, No. 01-12239 (D. Mass.). 07-C-5944 (N.D. IL), \$175 M settlement
- Co-Lead Counsel: *In Re Microstrategy Securities Litigation*, (E.D. Va.) \$160M settlement.

**Much Shelist, Chicago, IL**

**1981-2000**

- Practiced in antitrust, securities fraud, and complex litigation

*Representative Matters Handled*

- Co-Lead Counsel: *In re Brand Name Prescription Drug Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 940 (N.D. Ill.) \$715 M in settlements
- Co-Lead Counsel: *In Re Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 878, \$126M in settlements
- Co-Counsel: *In Re Flat Glass Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1200 (W.D. Pa.) \$61.7M in settlements

**ADMITTED**

**WA, NY and IL Bars**

**U.S. Supreme Court; Second, Third, Seventh, Ninth Circuits; N.D. IL, S.D. N.Y., E.D.N.Y., W.D.TX, E.D.**

**MI**

**Member, Federal Trial Bar**

# EXHIBIT B



