IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	§	
COMMISSION,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 3:09-CV-298-N
	§	
STANFORD INTERNATIONAL BANK,	§	
LTD., et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

ORDER

This Order addresses the Receiver's motion for approval of sixth interim fee application [1084]. The Court grants the Receiver's motion.

When considering whether a fee award is reasonable, a district court must consider: (1) the time and labor involved; (2) the novelty and difficulty of the questions; (3) the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly; (4) the preclusion of other employment by the attorney due to the acceptance of the case; (5) the customary fee; (6) whether the fee is fixed or contingent; (7) time limitations imposed by the client or the circumstances; (8) the amount involved and the results obtained; (9) the experience, reputation, and ability of the attorneys; (10) the political "undesirability" of the case; (11) the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client; and (12) awards in similar cases. *Johnson v. Ga. Highway Express, Inc.*, 488 F.2d 714, 717-19 (5th Cir. 1974). However, "[i]n light of the voluminous nature of fee applications, 'courts have recognized that it is unrealistic to expect a trial judge

to evaluate and rule on every entry in an application. These courts have endorsed percentage cuts as a practical means of trimming fat from a fee application." *S.E.C. v. Byers*, 590 F. Supp. 2d 637, 648 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (quoting *N.Y. State Ass'n for Retarded Children, Inc. v. Carey*, 711 F.2d 1136, 1146 (2d Cir. 1983)).

For reasons discussed the Court's February 3, 2010 Order,¹ the Court grants the Receiver's motion. The Receiver incurred \$3,951,301.58 in fees from the period of January 1, 2010 to February 28, 2010. He requests a reduced amount at this time: \$3,161,041.28. This amount represents the 20% holdback previously imposed by the Court.² The Court approves payment of \$3,161,041.28. The Receiver may apply later for the remaining amount, and the Court reserves any ruling on objections to that amount until a later date.

Signed June 22, 2010.

United States District Judge

¹There, the Court considered the Receiver's requested fees in light of the *Johnson* factors and reiterated the 20% holdback it had previously imposed on the Receiver's fees. *See* Order of Feb. 3, 2010 [994]; *see also* Tr. of Hr'g of September 10, 2009 at 39–41 [777] (imposing 20% holdback on the Receiver's fees going forward).

²See Tr. of Hr'g at 39.