

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**IN RE NORTEL NETWORKS CORP.
SECURITIES LITIGATION**

**THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
ALL ACTIONS**

01-CV-1855 (RMB)

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL'S
APPLICATION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES**

**MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD
& SCHULMAN LLP**

Sanford P. Dumain (SD-8712)
George A. Bauer III (GB-2919)
Ross Brooks (RB-9431)
January L. Kerr (JK-9073)
One Pennsylvania Plaza
New York, NY 10119
Telephone: (212) 594-5300
Facsimile: (212) 868-1229

KOSKIE MINSKY LLP

Murray Gold
20 Queen Street West
Suite 900, Box 52
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5H 3R3
Telephone: (416) 977-8353
Facsimile: (416) 204-2873

Lead Plaintiff's Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. The Common Fund Recovery	1
B. The Fee Application	3
C. The Settlement Notice.....	5
II. LEAD COUNSEL’S SERVICES	6
III. ARGUMENT	8
A. Lead Counsel Is Entitled to an Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses from the Common Fund	8
B. The Requested Attorneys’ Fees Are Reasonable Under the Percentage of the Fund Method	12
1. The Time, Labor, and Lodestar are Reasonable.....	14
a. Plaintiffs’ Counsel’s Hours are Reasonable.....	15
b. Plaintiffs’ Counsel’s Hourly Rates Are Reasonable	16
c. The Multiplier is Reasonable as a Cross-Check.....	17
2. The Magnitude, Complexity, and Risks of the Litigation Support the Requested Fee.....	18
3. The Quality of Plaintiffs’ Counsel’s Representation of the Class Supports the Requested Fee	22
4. The Fee Request is Fair In Relation to the Settlement Amount.....	22
5. Public Policy Considerations Support the Requested Fee	23
C. The Class’ Reaction to the Fee Request.....	24
D. Plaintiffs’ Counsel’s Expenses Were Reasonably Incurred and Necessary to the Prosecution of This Action.....	24
CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>In re 3Com Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> No. C-97-21083, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22685 (N.D. Cal. July 7, 1999).....	13
<i>In re Am. Bank Note Holographics, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 127 F. Supp. 2d 418, 422 (S.D.N.Y. 2001).....	12, 18
<i>Amchem Prods. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	18
<i>In re Ashanti Goldfields Sec. Litig.</i> , No. CV-00-717 (DGT), 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28431 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 15, 2005).....	25
<i>In re Austrian and German Bank Holocaust Litig.</i> , 80 F. Supp. 2d 164 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).....	18
<i>In re BancAmerica Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 228 F. Supp. 2d 1061 (E.D. Mo. 2002).....	13, 17
<i>Basic Inc. v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	23
<i>In re Blech Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 94 Civ. 7696, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6920 (S.D.N.Y. May 19, 2000).....	10
<i>In re Blech Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 94 Civ. 7696 (RWS), 2002 WL 31720381 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 2002).....	12
<i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> , 444 U.S. 472 (1980).....	8, 9
<i>In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 94 C 897, 2000 WL 204112 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 10, 2000).....	13
<i>In re Bristol-Myers Squibb Sec. Litig.</i> , 361 F. Supp. 2d 229 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).....	18, 23
<i>In re Broadcom Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 01-CV-00275, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41993 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2005).....	12
<i>In re Buspirone Antitrust Litig.</i> , MDL 1413 (JGK), 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26538 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 11, 2003).....	13

<i>Camden I Condo. Ass'n v. Dunkle</i> , 946 F.2d 768 (11th Cir. 1991).....	11
<i>In re Cardizem Antitrust Litig.</i> , MDL No. 1278 (E.D. Mich., Nov. 10, 2002).....	12
<i>In re Cendant Corp. Deriv. Action Litig.</i> , 232 F. Supp. 2d 327 (D.N.J. 2002)	9
<i>In re Cendant Corp. Litig.</i> , 243 F. Supp. 2d 166 (D.N.J. 2003)	12
<i>City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.</i> , 495 F.2d 448 (2d Cir. 1974).....	19
<i>City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.</i> , 560 F.2d 1093 (2d Cir. 1977).....	16
<i>In re Computer Assocs. Sec. Litig.</i> , 98-CV-4839 (TCP) (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 16, 2003)	13
<i>In re Cont'l Ill. Sec. Litig.</i> , 962 F.2d 566 (7th Cir. 1992).....	10, 19
<i>Cosgrove v. Sullivan</i> , 759 F. Supp. 166 (S.D.N.Y. 1991).....	18
<i>Cruz v. Local Union No. 3 Of IBEW</i> , 34 F.3d 1148 (2nd Cir. 1994).....	16
<i>Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo</i> , 125 S. Ct. 1627 (2005).....	20
<i>In re Elan Sec. Litig.</i> , 385 F. Supp. 2d 363 (S.D.N.Y. April 19, 2005)	14, 18
<i>Emergent Capital Inv. Mgmt., LLC v. Stonepath Group, Inc.</i> , 343 F.3d 189 (2d Cir. 2003).....	20
<i>FTR Consulting v. Advantage Fund II, Ltd.</i> , 02 Civ. 8608, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20013 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 13, 2006)	14, 16, 18
<i>In re GMC Pick-Up Truck Fuel Tank Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 55 F.3d 768 (3d Cir. 1995), <i>cert. denied</i> , 516 U.S. 824 (1995)	10
<i>Gierlinger v. Gleason</i> , 160 F.3d 858 (2d Cir. 1998).....	17

