
EXHIBIT D

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

LORI BILEWICZ, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
and all others similarly situated,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	Civil Action No. 13-10636-DJC
vs.)	
)	
FMR LLC; FMR LLC INVESTMENT)	
COMMITTEE;)	
and John and Jane Does 1-25,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		
AIDEN YEAW, ALEX C. BROWN,)	
and all others similarly situated,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	Civil Action No. 14-10035-DJC
vs.)	
)	
FMR LLC; FMR LLC RETIREMENT)	
COMMITTEE;)	
and John and Jane Does 1-25,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		

DECLARATION OF JOSEPH C. PEIFFER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF REASONABLE ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS

I, Joseph C. Peiffer, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the state of Louisiana and am admitted *pro hac vice* to the District of Massachusetts for the above consolidated Actions (the “Actions”). I am an attorney with the law firm of Peiffer Rosca Abdullah Carr & Kane, LLC (“PRACK”). I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ request for attorneys’ fees, as set forth in Plaintiffs’ motion for an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees.

2. My firm is counsel of record and one of four firms representing the Plaintiffs in the Actions. A firm profile, including a description of the background, experience and qualifications of the firm’s attorneys having primary responsibility for working on this case, was previously submitted to the Court as Exhibit C to the Declaration of Gregory Y. Porter in support of Plaintiffs’ motion for an order preliminarily approving the Settlement and related relief. (Dkt. No. 54-3). By order dated July 10, 2014 (Dkt. No. 59), this Court appointed Plaintiffs’ counsel, including PRACK and its attorneys of record, Class Counsel for the Settlement Class.

3. In the prosecution of the Actions, PRACK and the other firms representing Plaintiffs maintained a “co-lead” relationship and shared responsibility for the various activities and projects that were undertaken before bringing the case to proposed resolution through the Class Settlement. During the course of the litigation, PRACK took care to avoid duplication of efforts and unnecessary work on the case. PRACK has not included time spent on the fee petition in its summary.

4. The total number of hours expended on this litigation by my firm through August 20, 2014 is 443.8 hours. The total lodestar for my firm, based on the hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed, is \$178,530.

5. The summary billing report for PRACK in this case, which includes the name and position of each person who worked on the case, his hourly billing rate, the number of hours he worked on the case, and his lodestar, is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Should the Court desire to review

PRACK's detailed individual time entries in considering Plaintiffs' motion for an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, those records can be made available.

6. Although PRACK maintains offices in several cities, the billing rate for each PRACK attorney is set each year in a manner designed to be commensurate with the rates charged by attorneys with similar levels of education and expertise who provide similar services in the market in which the PRACK attorney is located. The attorneys who performed work on the Actions, myself and Daniel J. Carr, are located in New Orleans and their hourly rates are designed to be commensurate with similarly-situated professionals in that area. I believe that the hourly rates reflected in Exhibit A are consistent with the rates that would be charged in the marketplace for the same work by attorneys with the same level of education and expertise and that would be or have been approved by local federal and state courts.

7. In planning for the funding of this case, each of the three firms serving as Class Counsel agreed to utilize and contribute to a litigation fund from which expenses would be paid, to be managed by the firm of Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell, Rafferty & Proctor. The litigation-related expenditures from this fund for which Plaintiffs seek reimbursement from the Settlement Fund are described in the Declaration of Peter J. Mougey. Although PRACK contributed to that fund, it also incurred additional litigation costs of \$8,182.78 for which it has not yet been reimbursed. The litigation expenses paid directly by PRACK in the Actions are summarized, by category in Exhibit B to this declaration.

8. A detailed itemization of all of the above-described costs as well as invoices and other supporting documentation, are available for each of the individual costs and expenses on which the above-summary is based, should the Court wish to review them.

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

Executed on August 20, 2014 in New Orleans, Louisiana.

/s/ Joseph C. Peiffer

EXHIBIT A

Bilewicz, et al. v. FMR, LLC, et al.
Yeaw, et al. v. FMR, LLC, et al.
Peiffer Rosca Abdullah Carr Kane, LLC Fee Summary

Professional Attorneys	Hours	Rate	Lodestar
Joseph C. Peiffer	105.9	\$ 575.00	\$ 60,892.50
Daniel J. Carr	179.8	\$ 325.00	\$ 58,435.00
Daniel J. Carr	139.3	\$ 425.00	\$ 59,202.50
TOTAL	443.8	\$	\$ 178,530.00

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT B

Bilewicz, et al. v. FMR, LLC, et al.
Yeaw, et al. v. FMR, LLC, et al.
Peiffer Rosca Abdullah Carr Kane, LLC Fee Summary

Expense	Amount
Commercial Copies	\$27.90
Computer Research (Legal)	\$474.30
Court Fees	
Court Reporters/Transcripts	
Database Services	
Document Management	
Experts/Consultants	\$3,333.50
Filing Fees	
Internal Copies	
License Fees	
Mediation Services	
Messenger	
Miscellaneous	
Postage/Express Delivery	
Process Service	
Telephone/Facsimile	\$66.72
Travel (Air fare, ground travel, meals, lodging)	\$4,280.36
TOTAL	\$8,182.78

EXHIBIT B