

Exhibit E

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

JOHN DOE ONE; JOHN DOE TWO;
JOHN DOE THREE; and JOHN DOE FOUR,
on behalf of themselves and all similarly
situated individuals,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CAREMARK, L.L.C.;
FISERV, INC.;
FISERV SOLUTIONS, LLC; and
DEFENDANTS DOES 1–10,

Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-00238-EAS-CMV

No. 2:18-cv-00488-EAS-CMV

(Consolidated for all purposes)

CLASS ACTION

**DECLARATION OF GERALD S. FLANAGAN IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS AND PLAINTIFFS' SERVICE AWARDS**

I, GERALD S. FLANAGAN, declare as follows:

I am Litigation Director for Consumer Watchdog, a charitable non-profit organization, and one of the counsel of record for Plaintiffs. I am a member in good standing of the State Bar of California and was admitted Pro Hac Vice by this Court on April 9, 2018. I respectfully submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Service Awards to the Named Plaintiffs, and in support of Final Approval of the Settlement. Except as otherwise noted, I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and could testify competently to them if called upon to do so.

Background and Experience

1. Consumer Watchdog is a nationally recognized non-profit, tax-exempt consumer research, education, litigation, and advocacy organization. Established in 1985, Consumer Watchdog utilizes a combination of litigation, advocacy, and public education to effectuate its

mission. Consumer Watchdog's legal staff advocates on behalf of consumers before regulatory agencies, legislatures, and the courts. The staff of Consumer Watchdog include some of the nation's foremost consumer advocates and experts on consumer matters. Over the course of nearly three decades, Consumer Watchdog's attorneys have represented consumers in numerous class actions, civil lawsuits, and administrative complaints challenging unfair business practices by insurers and large corporations. A particular focus of that litigation has been to challenge the illegal and unfair business practices of health insurance companies, pharmaceutical benefits managers (PBMs), health care providers, and property-casualty insurance companies. Consumer Watchdog attorneys have helped establish precedential decisions in numerous landmark cases. A copy of Consumer Watchdog's Legal Project resume is attached as **Exhibit A**.

2. I lead Consumer Watchdog's litigation efforts in the areas of health insurance coverage and access to treatment. I have 25 years of experience working in health care policy, legislation, and litigation. I graduated from the University of California at Berkeley, with honors, with a B.A. in Rhetoric and Anthropology in 1995, and earned my J.D. from Loyola Law School of Los Angeles in 2010, magna cum laude. I have led litigation efforts to address discrimination against those with HIV and other serious illnesses in the era of the Affordable Care Act (aka "Obamacare") and litigation to ameliorate the damaging effects of the "narrow" doctor network epidemic and loss of access to medical care providers. I am also an adjunct professor at Loyola Law School of Los Angeles and will be teaching the class "Health Insurance Regulation: Law, Policy & Politics" in the Spring of 2020. I have significant experience in litigating consumer class actions, including health privacy cases such as this one.

3. Particularly relevant here, I have litigated numerous actions across the United States with co-counsel Whatley Kallas, LLP to protect the privacy of patients with HIV and AIDS relating to unwanted disclosure of patients' medical status as a result of the mail delivery of their medications. All of these actions have been resolved through settlement providing significant protections for patients. For example,

- *DOE v. Anthem Blue Cross of California*, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00031442-CU-CR-CTL – a California action to address significant health and privacy concerns of patients with HIV and AIDS stemming from Blue Cross of California’s decision to require patients to obtain their life-sustaining medications solely by mail. In addition to privacy concerns relating to the potential inadvertent disclosure of the recipient’s health status as a result of the mail delivery of the medications, the practice caused significant health concerns among patients with HIV and AIDS as the program effectively barred access to community pharmacists that are best suited to provide needed advice and counseling. The case was settled on May 21, 2013. Under the settlement, patients may “opt-out” of the mail-order program and obtain their medications at a retail pharmacy of their choice.
- *DOE v. United HealthCare Ins. Co.*, No. SACV-13-cv-00864-DOC (JPRx), 2014 WL 3865847 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2014) – a national class action settlement approved on July 31, 2014 adopting a comprehensive procedure to permit current and future enrollees in United Health plans to opt-out of a mail-order program for HIV and AIDS medications, a compliance dispute protocol to resolve issues over implementation of the program, and setting up a \$240,000 fund to reimburse consumers for out-of-pocket expenses.
- *DOE v. Cigna Health Care*, Southern District of Florida Case No. 15-cv-60894-DPG – a national non-class settlement entered into on October 8, 2015 that removed HIV/AIDS specialty medications from the mandatory mail-order tier and set up an uncapped fund to reimburse consumers for out-of-pocket expenses.
- *DOE v. Aetna, Inc.* Southern District of California Case No. 14-cv-02986-LAB (DHB), *DOE v. Coventry Health Care*, Southern District of Florida Case No. 15-cv-62685-CMA.

These actions were settled jointly on February 23, 2017, as Coventry is a subsidiary of Aetna. Aetna and Coventry agreed not to implement a mandatory mail-order program for group plans and to notify consumers that it had ended such a requirement for individual plans. Aetna and Coventry also set up a \$295,000 fund to compensate consumers who were subjected to the mail-order program for reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses

4. In addition, on June 17, 2016, as a follow-on to that original settlement with Anthem Blue Cross of California, Whatley Kallas, LLP and Consumer Watchdog entered into a similar settlement with Anthem, Inc. on a nationwide basis on behalf of Anthem, Inc. and over 50 of its state-based affiliates (“Anthem National Settlement”). The Anthem National Settlement provided HIV and AIDS patients enrolled in a health plan provided by Anthem affiliates the right to elect to not participate in the mail-order requirement for HIV and AIDS related medications, provided for direct notice of that option to all affected enrollees, and permitted all impacted members previously subject to that program to obtain reimbursement of any out-of-pocket costs they may have incurred as a result of obtaining medications by mail-order.

5. In this matter I have been assisted by my colleague Benjamin Powell, a staff attorney at Consumer Watchdog. Mr. Powell received a B.A. in Political Science from UCLA and a J.D. from Loyola Law School of Los Angeles in 2016. Mr. Powell’s primary focus at Consumer Watchdog is in the area of health care related litigation. Mr. Powell is a member in good standing of the State Bar of California and was admitted Pro Hac Vice by this Court on April 9, 2018.

6. Consumer Watchdog’s Harvey Rosenfield also assisted in this matter. Mr. Rosenfield is the founder and former President of Consumer Watchdog, is presently its outside counsel, and has practiced law since 1979. Mr. Rosenfield is the author of Proposition 103, the landmark insurance reform law approved by California voters in 1988. Among other things, Proposition 103 applies civil rights, consumer, and antitrust laws to the insurance industry, and bars discriminatory practices by property-casualty insurers. As a result of his work, Harvey Rosenfield is one of the nation’s most recognized public interest lawyers. He has been selected as

one of the Top 50 Lawyers Under 50 by the National Law Journal (1989), one of the Top 100 California Lawyers by the Daily Journal (2008), and “California Lawyer of the Year – Public Interest” by California Lawyer Magazine (2007). Rosenfield has been profiled in the New York Times, Newsweek, Esquire, the Wall Street Journal, the Los Angeles Times, Good Morning America, CBS Sunday Morning, Money Magazine, and many other state and national publications. He is a frequent newspaper, television, and radio commentator.

Pre-Filing Investigation

5. Consumer Watchdog, along with its co-counsel, began actively investigating this matter in early 2018.

6. During this period Consumer Watchdog attorneys reviewed complaints submitted to Consumer Watchdog by consumers impacted by the mailing. Consumer Watchdog and its co-counsel also spent significant time gathering facts and evidence regarding the mailing, conducting legal research into potential claims implicated by Defendants’ conduct, and preparing the case for filing.

7. This work led to the filing of *John Doe One, John Doe Two, and John Doe Three v. Caremark, LLC et al.*, Case No. 2:18-cv-00238-EAS-CMV, on March 21, 2018.

The Litigation of the Case

8. In coordination with co-counsel, Consumer Watchdog attorneys assisted in drafting Plaintiffs’ Motion to Proceed Pseudonymously, preparing an amended complaint, and drafting an opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss the action.

9. Consumer Watchdog continued to review new complaints from impacted consumers following the filing of the action, collecting additional information about the privacy breach.

10. Consumer Watchdog counsel also participated in the Rule 26 conference and assisted in discovery efforts as well as the preparation of a mediation statement and settlement proposal.

11. After the two cases were consolidated, all Plaintiffs' counsel coordinated their efforts and worked together to reduce or eliminate any possible duplicative efforts.

12. In the interest of efficiency, Consumer Watchdog attorneys did not attend the mediation but monitored progress in real-time in phone conferences with co-counsel who were in attendance.

13. Once a settlement was reached, Consumer Watchdog attorneys worked closely with co-counsel and counsel for Defendants to ensure that the provisions of the Settlement Agreement protected the interests of consumers. In the interest of efficiency and to maximize impact, Consumer Watchdog, in coordination with co-counsel, focused on specific provisions of the Settlement Agreement. Consumer Watchdog attorneys reviewed multiple drafts of the settlement agreement and participated in numerous telephone conferences with co-counsel and counsel for Defendants to work through complex issues.

Consumer Watchdog's Lodestar and Billing Rates

14. This Lawsuit was pursued on a fully contingent basis. Through November 22, 2019, Consumer Watchdog counsel devoted 163.2 hours of professional time to the investigation, development, prosecution, and resolution of this lawsuit. Based upon the current hourly rates ordinarily charged by Consumer Watchdog counsel in conjunction with civil class action litigation, the lodestar value of that time is \$77,095.00. All of the services performed by Consumer Watchdog counsel were reasonably necessary in the prosecution of this lawsuit. The lodestar was compiled from contemporaneous time records regularly maintained by Consumer Watchdog's legal counsel in the ordinary course of business providing descriptions of hours spent on each task divided into tenths of an hour. I have reviewed Consumer Watchdog's time billing records and believe that the hours and fees were necessary and reasonable.

15. Below is a chart that indicates the Consumer Watchdog attorneys who worked on the lawsuit, their hourly rates, hours worked, and their respective lodestars. Consumer Watchdog arrived at these hourly rates based on the experience and qualifications of its attorneys; our review of the hourly rates charged by plaintiff firms for attorneys of comparable skill in consultation with

Mr. Richard Pearl, a recognized expert on attorneys' fees; the historical rates awarded or paid for Consumer Watchdog attorneys' professional services in other civil class action proceedings; and the historical rates awarded in a litigated fee motion in federal court in the matter *John Doe One, et al. v. United Healthcare Insurance Company, et al.*, U.S. Dist. Ct., Cent. Dist. of Cal., S. Div., Case No. SACV-13-00864-DOC (JPRx) (Hon. David O. Carter presiding). No adjustment was made to these usual and customary hourly rates, notwithstanding the complexity of the matters involved, the opposition encountered, the preclusion of other employment, the expected delay in payment, or the other factors present in this case that might justify a higher rate of compensation.

16. As a non-profit, public interest organization, Consumer Watchdog conducts its advocacy efforts as a public interest service. Therefore, consistent with the decisions of the California Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court, Consumer Watchdog's policy is to seek prevailing market rates in all fee award applications. Consumer Watchdog has consistently been awarded prevailing market hourly rates in judicial and administrative proceedings.

17. Consumer Watchdog counsel closely coordinated the prosecution of this lawsuit with co-counsel in order to minimize duplication of efforts while maintaining the high quality of legal work for which Consumer Watchdog is nationally recognized. The putative Class in this lawsuit has received the full benefit of the professional time expended.

18. Although I was the main attorney at Consumer Watchdog to work on this case, I assigned certain tasks to Mr. Powell and Mr. Rosenfield. The work I delegated was work that required sufficient knowledge of legal concepts that I would have had to perform, absent such assistance.

19. The following chart details the time each Consumer Watchdog attorney worked on this case.

Name	Years as an Attorney	Billable Rate	Hours	Lodestar
Gerald Flanagan	9	\$450	89.5	\$40,275.00
Benjamin Powell	3	\$350	49.2	\$17,220.00
Harvey Rosenfield	40	\$800	24.5	\$19,600.00
Total			163.2	\$77,095.00

Plaintiff Does' Request for Service Awards

22. The Plaintiffs in this case came forward to help putative Class members at great risk to their personal privacy. An improper disclosure of a person's HIV or AIDS status can often result in the denial of proper health care, poor treatment in educational and work settings, and many other collateral consequences. *See Activities Combating HIV Stigma and Discrimination*, HIV.gov, <https://www.hiv.gov/federal-response/federal-activities-agencies/activities-combating-hiv-stigma-and-discrimination> (last visited November 27, 2019). The reasonable service awards requested here are easily warranted based on these facts.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed at Los Angeles, California on November 27, 2019.



Gerald S. Flanagan (PHV)

Exhibit A



Consumer Watchdog Legal Project

Consumer Watchdog is a non-profit, non-partisan, consumer research and advocacy organization founded in 1985 by consumer attorney and advocate Harvey Rosenfield. Its mission is to provide an effective voice for taxpayers and consumers in an era when special interests dominate public discourse, government, and politics. The organization deploys public interest attorneys, policy experts, strategists, and grassroots activists to expose, confront, and change unjust practices in the private and public sectors.

Consumer Watchdog's Legal Project attorneys advocate for consumers' rights and hold corporations and government officials accountable in federal and state courts and before regulatory agencies.

The Legal Project specializes in highly complex litigation, including class actions in federal and state courts, to address abuses in the marketplace such as illegal overcharges, false advertising, and violation of consumer protection laws. Some of our most notable accomplishments include:

- Settled a class action lawsuit against Anthem Blue Cross over the "narrow network" issue in which plaintiffs alleged Anthem Blue Cross misrepresented which doctors were participating in its EPO and PPO provider networks. Under the settlement, Anthem Blue Cross provided \$15 million in direct payments, an uncapped claims process, and significant programmatic relief.
- Settled a class action lawsuit against Blue Shield over a similar "narrow network" issue in which plaintiffs alleged Blue Shield misrepresented that specific providers were "in network" under their ACA-compliant health service plans, and concealed and failed to disclose the differences between the provider networks available under new ACA-compliant health service plans the pre-ACA Blue Shield Provider network. The settlement provided more than \$18 million in direct payments to consumers and a claims process with an uncapped fund.
- Settled six class action lawsuits against Anthem Blue Cross, United Healthcare, Cigna, Anthem, Inc., Coventry Health Care, Inc., and Aetna, Inc. for illegally requiring HIV/AIDS patients to purchase their medications from a mail-order pharmacy, threatening their health and privacy. As a result of the settlements, members prescribed HIV/AIDS medications may purchase their medications at any network pharmacy. Members were also allowed to seek reimbursement for out-of-pocket losses resulting from the mail order requirement.
- Settled a class action against Anthem Blue Cross for illegally making mid-year changes to annual deductibles, co-pays, and other out-of-pocket costs. As a result of the settlement, Anthem reimbursed consumers for out-of-pocket losses resulting from the mid-year changes totaling \$8.5 million. The company also agreed not to make mid-year cost increases in the future.
- Settled a class action against Anthem Blue Cross for illegally closing insurance policies and using large rate hikes to force patients into lower-benefit and higher-deductible health coverage – a practice known as the "death spiral." Relief obtained included a cap on future rate increases and the opportunity for plan members to switch coverage, without medical underwriting, to any open policy regulated by the California Department of Managed Health Care.

- Settled a class action against the Auto Club requiring the insurer to pay \$22.5 million in refunds to policyholders who were overcharged for not having prior insurance, a practice that is prohibited by insurance reform Proposition 103.
- Secured a consumer's right to enforce the Insurance Code in court under the state's Unfair Competition Law in a case against Mercury for illegally surcharging drivers without prior insurance.
- Secured a historic \$27.5 million fine against Mercury Insurance Company in an administrative enforcement action for charging excessive and unfairly discriminatory rates by allowing its agents to charge illegal broker fees at the point of sale. (*In the Matter of Mercury Ins. Co., et al.* (Cal. Dept. Ins.), No. NC03027545.)
- Obtained an order from the Insurance Commissioner approving a settlement agreement requiring Farmers Insurance to refund \$1.2 million in premium overcharges and pay a \$2 million fine to the State of California for utilizing improper homeowners insurance underwriting practices.
- Successfully blocked insurance rate hike requests by dozens of insurance companies, saving Californians \$227.4 million in 2017 and over \$3 billion since 2003 on their auto, homeowners, earthquake, and medical malpractice insurance.

Consumer Watchdog's attorneys have taken the lead role – authored comprehensive appellate briefs and participated in oral argument – in numerous landmark cases resulting in published appellate and California Supreme Court opinions upholding consumer protection statutes:

- *Consumer Watchdog et al. v. Department of Managed Health Care et al.* (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 862 (counsel for petitioner Consumer Watchdog) – holding that the Department of Managed Health Care can no longer uphold a health plan's denial of coverage for autism treatment provided or supervised by a nationally board-certified individual on the basis that the provider is not licensed.
- *Association of California Insurance Companies v. Poizner* (2009) 180 Cal.App.4th 1029 (counsel for intervenor Consumer Watchdog) – upholding Department of Insurance regulations consistent with the language and purpose of Proposition 103 to promote consumer participation in rate proceedings.
- *In re Tobacco II* (2009) 207 P.3d 20 (counsel for amicus curiae Consumer Watchdog) – holding that Prop 64 standing requirements apply only to named plaintiffs and not unnamed putative class members.
- *Karnan v. Safeco Ins. Co. of America* (2009) 173 Cal.App.4th 814 (counsel for plaintiff) – allowing plaintiff in a UCL action to proceed with pre-certification discovery to locate class members.
- *Fogel v. Farmers Group, Inc.* (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 1403 (counsel for amicus curiae Consumer Watchdog) – allowing a UCL action to proceed against an insurer challenging as excessive fees paid by policyholders to the insurer's management company.
- *Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights v. Garamendi* (2005) 132 Cal.App.4th 1354 (counsel for plaintiff) – overturning an illegal legislative amendment to Proposition 103 that would have allowed illegal surcharges to drivers who lacked prior insurance coverage.
- *State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. v. Garamendi* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1029 (counsel for amicus curiae FTCT) – upholding against industry challenge Department of Insurance regulations requiring the public disclosure of insurance redlining data submitted to the Insurance Commissioner as required by Proposition 103.

- *Donabedian v. Mercury Ins. Co.* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 968 (counsel for amicus curiae Consumer Watchdog) – upholding consumers’ right to bring a UCL action to enforce Proposition 103.
- *Proposition 103 Enforcement Project v. Quackenbush* (1998) 64 Cal.App.4th 1473 (counsel for plaintiff) – invalidating an illegal legislative amendment to Proposition 103 that would have decreased the amount of refunds owed to policyholders under the initiative’s rate rollback provision.
- *Amwest Surety Ins. Co. v. Wilson* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 1243 (counsel for intervenor) – Cal. Supreme Court decision invalidating an illegal legislative amendment to Proposition 103 that would have exempted surety insurance from regulation.
- *20th Century Ins. Co. v. Garamendi* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 216 (counsel for intervenor) – Cal. Supreme Court decision upholding insurance rate regulations enforcing Proposition 103’s prohibition against excessive or inadequate rates.
- *Calfarm Ins. Co. v. Deukmejian* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 805 (counsel for intervenor) – Cal. Supreme Court decision upholding Proposition 103 against constitutional challenge by the insurance industry.

Consumer Watchdog’s Legal Project is currently litigating high impact consumer protection lawsuits and administrative actions, including:

- A class action against Anthem Blue Cross for violating state and federal law by canceling consumers’ health insurance plans and automatically enrolling them in plans that eliminate coverage for out-of-network doctors without proper notice. (*Simon, et al. v. Blue Cross of California, dba Anthem Blue Cross, et al.* (L.A. County Super. Ct.), No. BC639205.)

Brief Biographies of Consumer Watchdog Attorneys

Harvey Rosenfield (Of Counsel) is one of the nation's foremost consumer lawyers and the founder of Consumer Watchdog (1985). Rosenfield has organized and led countless consumer protection lawsuits and administrative proceedings.

Rosenfield authored insurance reform Proposition 103 and organized the campaign that led to its passage by California voters in 1988. He has also authored or co-authored legislative proposals on patient safety, insurance and utility rate regulation. Rosenfield is the author of the book, *Silent Violence, Silent Death: The Hidden Epidemic of Medical Malpractice*. (Essential Books, 1994).

Rosenfield has worked for the Federal Trade Commission, the U.S. Congress, as a staff attorney for Public Citizen Congress Watch and as the Program Director for the California Public Interest Research Group (CALPIRG).

Rosenfield graduated magna cum laude from Amherst College (1974) and obtained a joint Law and Masters degree in Foreign Service from Georgetown University (1979). He received an honorary doctorate from Amherst in 2010. He is admitted to practice in D.C. (1979) and California (1986).

Jerry Flanagan is Consumer Watchdog’s Litigation Director. Flanagan leads Consumer Watchdog’s litigation efforts in the areas of health insurance coverage and access to treatments. He is one of the nation’s leading public interest health law analysts and has over 20 years’ experience working in public interest and health care policy, legislation and litigation. Flanagan was admitted to the California Bar in 2010.

Flanagan has spearheaded efforts to address discrimination against those with HIV and other serious illnesses in the era of the Affordable Care Act (aka "Obamacare"). Flanagan leads Consumer Watchdog's efforts to ameliorate the damaging effects of the "narrow" doctor network epidemic in four class action lawsuits against Blue Shield, Health Net, Cigna, and Anthem Blue Cross.

Flanagan is an adjunct professor at Loyola Law School of Los Angeles and currently teaches the class "Health Insurance Regulation: Law, Policy & Politics."

Flanagan exposed the illegal practice of health insurers retroactively canceling coverage and authored a law journal article underscoring the need for reform in health insurance rescission law, *Healthy State of Mind: The Role of Intent in Health Plan Rescissions*, 43 *Loy. L.A. L. Rev.* 291 (2009). An "intentional misrepresentation" standard for coverage rescissions, advocated by the article, was adopted in the ACA.

Prior to joining Consumer Watchdog, Flanagan drafted and won passage of one of the nation's strongest HMO accountability measures, which was signed into law in New Jersey in 2001.

Flanagan received a B.A. in Social/Cultural Anthropology and Rhetoric from the University of California, Berkeley and his law degree from Loyola Law School of Los Angeles. At Loyola, Flanagan was a Note and Comment Editor on the *Loyola Law Review*. He graduated Magna Cum Laude and is a member of the Order of the Coif, Sayre Macneil Scholars Program, St. Thomas More Law Honor Society, and Alpha Sigma Nu Honor Society.

Pamela Pressley is a senior staff attorney and has headed up Consumer Watchdog's regulatory efforts since 1999. Pressley has served as lead counsel in challenges to insurance industry rate hike proposals resulting in savings to California policyholders of over \$3 billion since 2003.

Additionally, Pressley has led Consumer Watchdog's efforts to enforce Proposition 103's mandates to protect California insurance policyholders against discriminatory practices and premium overcharges, including through rulemaking proceedings before the California Department of Insurance and court actions. Pressley has also authored numerous appellate briefs and presented oral argument in cases seeking to enforce Proposition 103 and California's consumer protection laws.

Pressley received her B.A. in Sociology from UCLA and her J.D. from Pepperdine University School of Law. She was admitted to the California Bar in 1995. Before joining Consumer Watchdog, Pressley worked for CALPIRG as its Consumer Attorney and as a staff attorney for the Center for Law in the Public Interest, a non-profit, public interest law firm specializing in consumer, environmental, and civil rights advocacy and litigation.

Benjamin Powell is a staff attorney on Consumer Watchdog's Litigation Team. While his primary focus is in the area of health insurance litigation, he also provides litigation support in other areas.

Powell received a B.A. in Political Science from UCLA and a J.D. from Loyola Law School in Los Angeles. During law school, Powell was a member of the *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review*, writing articles for the journal's specialized "Developments in the Law" issue.

His scholarship included an analysis of the shifting employment status of California Uber drivers and a discussion of the fate of class action waivers under California contract law. He also served as a Coordinator for Loyola's Young Lawyers Program, providing students from local high schools with mentorship as well as training for a mock trial experience in front of actual Los Angeles Superior Court judges.

Mr. Powell was admitted to the California Bar in 2016.