

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

NATIONAL PRODUCTS, INC.,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
GAMBER-JOHNSON LLC,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO. C08-0049JLR  
  
ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR *IN CAMERA* REVIEW

Before the court is National Products, Inc.’s (“NPI”) motion for *in camera* review of records in support of its motion for attorneys’ fees (Dkt. # 249). NPI represents to the court that the *in camera* records consist entirely of detailed billing statements for NPI’s legal fees related to this litigation. NPI concedes, however, that the billing statements are not necessary to support its requested amount of attorneys’ fees. (*See Reply* (Dkt. # 281) at 2) (“NPI’s obligation in making its fees request was to identify the general subject matter of its fees expenditures; it was ‘not required to record in great detail how each minute of [ ]time was expended.’”) (citing *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 437 n.12

1 (1983); and Mot. at 3 (citing *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 437 n.12) (“[C]ounsel, of course, is not  
2 required to record in detail how each minute of his time was expended. But at least  
3 counsel should identify the general subject matter of his time expenditures.”); and *City of*  
4 *Oakland v. McCullough*, 53 Cal. Rptr.2d 531, 535 (Cal. Ct. App. 1996) (holding  
5 attorneys’ declarations “documented their time in sufficiently descriptive categories” to  
6 uphold fee award.) NPI then takes the position that by providing its unredacted billing  
7 statements to the court, *but not to opposing counsel*, it has “exceeded” its obligations.  
8 The court disagrees.

9 By providing heavily redacted copies of its billing statements to Gamber-  
10 Johnson’s counsel and unredacted statements to the court, *in camera*, NPI garners an  
11 unfair advantage that hinders Gamber-Johnson’s ability to object to certain fees and costs  
12 set forth in the billing statements. Accordingly, the court DENIES the motion for *in*  
13 *camera* review (Dkt. # 249) and returns the billing statements, unopened, to NPI.

14 Dated this 2nd day of November, 2010.

15  
16 

17 JAMES L. ROBART  
18 United States District Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22