

MARQUIS AURBACH  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1 **Marquis Aurbach**  
Craig R. Anderson, Esq.  
2 Nevada Bar No. 6882  
Nicholas M. Adams, Esq.  
3 Nevada Bar No. 15859  
10001 Park Run Drive  
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
Telephone: (702) 382-0711  
5 Facsimile: (702) 382-5816  
canderson@maclaw.com  
6 nadams@maclaw.com  
Attorneys for Defendants LVMPD, Sgt. Torrey, Ofc. Bourque, Ofc. Dingle, Ofc.  
7 Sorenson, Ofc. Sandoval and Ofc. Doolittle

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 JOSE DECASTRO,  
11 Plaintiff,

Case Number:  
2:23-cv-00580-APG-EJY

12 vs.

**LVMPD DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR**  
**ATTORNEY FEES**

13 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
DEPARTMENT; STATE OF NEVADA;  
14 BRANDEN BOURQUE; JASON TORREY;  
C. DINGLE; B. SORENSON; JESSE  
15 SANDOVAL; OFFICER DOOLITTLE and  
DOES 1 to 50, inclusive,  
16 Defendants.  
17

18 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2) and 42 U.S.C. § 1988, the  
19 LVMPD Defendants, by and through their counsel of record, Marquis Aurbach, hereby  
20 move for an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and related nontaxable expenses against  
21 Plaintiff Jose DeCastro. This motion is based on the following Memorandum of Points and  
22 Authorities, the papers and pleadings on file, and any oral argument heard by this Court.

23 Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

24 MARQUIS AURBACH

25 By s/Craig R. Anderson  
26 Craig R. Anderson, Esq.  
Nevada Bar No. 6882  
27 Attorney for LVMPD Defendants

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

On March 15, 2023, plaintiff Jose DeCastro (“DeCastro”) interrupted a police traffic stop while livestreaming on his YouTube channel with his sole goal to get arrested so he could sue the officer. After accomplishing his goal of getting arrested for obstructing and resisting, DeCastro posted several YouTube videos essentially admitting to both obstructing defendant Brandon Bourque (“Bourque”) and resisting him. Despite his admissions, he followed through on his goal of suing Bourque and other involved officers by filing this § 1983 lawsuit.

From February 9, 2026 through February 13, 2026, the parties conducted a jury trial on Plaintiff’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state law claims against LVMPD Defendants. On February 13, 2026, the jury reached a unanimous verdict in favor of the LVMPD Defendants on all of Plaintiff’s claims, awarding Plaintiff \$0 in damages. Judgment was entered on February 19, 2026. LVMPD Defendants are therefore prevailing parties in this matter.

Although defendants believe all of DeCastro’s claims were frivolous, two of his claims were particularly egregious. First, DeCastro alleged excessive force against defendant Sandoval for allegedly punching him in the groin. During discovery DeCastro posted numerous videos slandering Sandoval and even filed a Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) under the penalty of perjury identifying Sandoval as the abuser. However, at trial DeCastro admitted he lied in his SAC and his videos and now claimed Sandoval never punched him in the groin, but claimed Bourque did. The jury found no one punched DeCastro. Second, DeCastro alleged Bourque and defendant Torrey selectively enforced the law against him. Trial revealed DeCastro never had any supporting evidence. Because DeCastro knew these claims were false, yet he pursued them through the end, the defendants, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, LVMPD Defendants are therefore entitled to reasonable attorneys’ fees attributable to defending against these frivolous claims.

**MARQUIS AURBACH**  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

MARQUIS AURBACH  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1 **II. PROCEDURAL POSTURE AND PREVAILING PARTY STATUS**

2 On April 7, 2023, DeCastro filed his Complaint in this matter, which he  
3 subsequently amended on May 7, 2023, and again on November 27, 2023, when he filed his  
4 Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 61) (“SAC”). The SAC asserted fifteen causes of  
5 action against LVMPD and the individual officers, including claims for false arrest,  
6 unreasonable search and seizure, excessive force, First Amendment retaliation, selective  
7 enforcement, and various state law claims.

8 The LVMPD Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on June 14, 2024  
9 (ECF No. 86). On September 12, 2024, this Court issued its Order granting in part and  
10 denying in part LVMPD Defendants’ motion (ECF No. 100). The Court dismissed  
11 numerous claims on summary judgment but allowed certain claims to proceed to trial. The  
12 LVMPD Defendants filed a Second Motion for Summary Judgment on October 4, 2024  
13 (ECF No. 102), which was denied on April 24, 2025 (ECF No. 109).

14 The following claims and legal theories proceeded to trial: (1) state law false arrest  
15 under Nevada state law; (2) unlawful search and seizure under Nevada state law; (3)  
16 excessive force / battery under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Nevada state law against Officer  
17 Bourque (4) excessive force / battery under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Nevada state law against  
18 Officer Sandoval; (5) failure to intervene under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Officers Bourque,  
19 Dingle, Doolittle, and Sorenson; (6) First Amendment retaliation under 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
20 and Nevada state law against Officers Bourque and Torrey; and (7) selective enforcement  
21 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Nevada state law against Officers Bourque and Torrey.

22 The jury trial was conducted from February 9, 2026 through February 13, 2026. The  
23 jury returned a unanimous verdict in favor of the LVMPD Defendants on every claim.  
24 Plaintiff was awarded \$0 in damages. Judgment in favor of LVMPD Defendants was entered  
25 on February 19, 2026. (ECF No. 158). Because LVMPD Defendants prevailed on all claims  
26 against them, they are the prevailing parties entitled to seek their attorneys’ fees under 42  
27 U.S.C. § 1988.

28

MARQUIS AURBACH

10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

2 **A. LEGAL STANDARD FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS FEES TO A**  
3 **PREVAILING DEFENDANT IN A § 1983 ACTION.**

4 According to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, a prevailing party may recover their fees in a 42  
5 U.S.C. § 1983 case. Specifically, the statute reads:

6 In any action or proceeding to enforce a provision of . . . [42 U.S.C. § 1983] .  
7 . . . the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party . . . a reasonable  
8 attorney fee as part of the cost.

9 A prevailing defendant in a civil rights action may recover attorney fees “when the  
10 suit is vexatious, frivolous, or brought to harass or embarrass defendants,” *Hensley v.*  
11 *Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 429 n.2 (1983), or “unreasonable, or without foundation.”  
12 *Christiansburg Garment Co. v. EEOC*, 434 U.S. 412, 421 (1978). There are many instances  
13 in which the Ninth Circuit has upheld attorney fee awards to prevailing defendants under 42  
14 U.S.C. § 1988 where the plaintiffs’ actions were frivolous, meritless or groundless.

15 The following cases address issues where the plaintiff failed to produce evidence and  
16 knew their claims were not legally supported. *See Franceschi v. Schwartz*, 57 F.3d 828, 832  
17 (9th Cir. 1995) (fee award to defendants where plaintiff “utterly failed to meet his  
18 [evidentiary] burden”); *Price v. State of Hawaii*, 939 F.2d 702, 709 (9th Cir. 1991) (fee  
19 award to defendants where plaintiffs’ claims lacked factual basis); *Margolis v. Ryan*, 140  
20 F.3d 850, 854 (9th Cir. 1998) (fee award to defendants where “reasonable inquiry into  
21 applicable facts and law would have shown insufficiency in claim as a matter of law”);  
22 *Patton v. County of Kings*, 857 F.2d 1379, 1381-82 (9th Cir. 1998) (fee award to defendants  
23 where plaintiffs’ claims were frivolous and not legally supported). Courts are permitted to  
24 award attorney fees to prevailing defendants under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 only “in exceptional  
25 circumstances.” *See Harris*, 631 F.3d at 971; *Barry*, 902 F.2d at 773 (9th Cir. 1990).

26 A defendant is entitled to “the amount of attorney fees attributable exclusively to” a  
27 plaintiff’s frivolous claims. *Harris*, 631 F.3d at 971 (citations omitted). In *Tutor-Saliba*  
28 *Corp. v. City of Hailey*, 452 F.3d 1055 (9th Cir.2006), the Ninth Circuit held that fees are  
warranted where the plaintiff “knew or should have known that [a] claim was frivolous from

MARQUIS AURBACH

10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1 the outset of the litigation,” applying this standard on a claim-by-claim basis. In applying the  
2 *Tutor-Saliba* framework, district courts have awarded fees to defendants for defending  
3 against claims which were frivolous from the outset of the litigation, even if not all of the  
4 plaintiff’s claims were frivolous. *See Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. City of Turlock*, 483 F. Supp.  
5 2d 1023 (E.D. Cal. 2007).

6 Bad faith is not a prerequisite for the Court to award attorney’s fees to defendants in  
7 a 42 U.S.C. 1983 action; however, if a plaintiff is found to have brought or continued such a  
8 claim in bad faith, there will be an even stronger basis for charging him with the attorney’s  
9 fees incurred by the defense. *See Christiansburg*, 434 U.S. at 422.

10 **B. LEGAL STANDARD FOR AN AWARD OF REASONABLE**  
11 **ATTORNEY’S FEES.**

12 To determine what qualifies as reasonable attorney’s fees, the Ninth Circuit has  
13 adopted the twelve Lodestar Factors as “guidelines [and] as appropriate factors to be  
14 considered in the balancing process required in a determination of reasonable attorney’s  
15 fees:”

- 16 (1) the time and labor required,
- 17 (2) the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved,
- 18 (3) the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly,
- 19 (4) the preclusion of other employment by the attorney due to acceptance of the case,
- 20 (5) the customary fee,
- 21 (6) whether the fee is fixed or contingent,
- 22 (7) time limitations imposed by the client or the circumstances,
- 23 (8) the amount involved and the results obtained,
- 24 (9) the experience, reputation, and ability of the attorneys,
- 25 (10) the “undesirability” of the case,
- 26 (11) the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client, and
- 27 (12) awards in similar cases.

1 *Kerr v. Screen Extras Guild, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 67, 71 (9th Cir.1975), *abrogated on other*  
2 *grounds by City of Burlington v. Dague*, 505 U.S. 557 (1992).

3 The lodestar method is the required starting point for determining the reasonableness  
4 of a fee award and is calculated by “multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party  
5 reasonably expended on the litigation by a reasonable hourly rate.” *Camacho v. Bridgeport*  
6 *Fin., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 973, 978 (9th Cir. 2008) (*citing Ferland v. Conrad Credit Corp.*, 244  
7 F.3d 1145, 1149 n.4 (9th Cir. 2001)). “[T]here is a strong presumption that the lodestar  
8 figure is reasonable, but that presumption may be overcome in those rare circumstances in  
9 which the lodestar does not adequately take into account a factor that may properly be  
10 considered in determining a reasonable fee.” *Perdue v. Kenny A. ex rel. Winn*, 559 U.S. 542,  
11 554 (2010) (internal quotation omitted).

12 **IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT**

13 **A. PLAINTIFF KNEW HIS CLAIM FOR EXCESSIVE FORCE BASED**  
14 **UPON THE ALLEGED GROIN STRIKE AND CLAIM FOR**  
15 **SELECTIVE ENFORCEMENT CLAIM WERE FRIVOLOUS AND**  
16 **CONTINUED TO LITIGATE HIS MERITLESS CLAIMS DESPITE**  
17 **THIS KNOWLEDGE.**

18 **1. The Groin Strike Excessive Force Claim.**

19 DeCastro’s excessive force claim based upon an alleged groin strike was frivolous  
20 from the outset. In his Second Amended Complaint, DeCastro alleged Officer Sandoval  
21 struck him in the groin. Specifically, in paragraph 62 of the SAC, DeCastro alleged:

22 Sandoval said that Plaintiff needed to be patted down again. Plaintiff  
23 protested that he’d already been patted down by two officers. Sandoval then  
24 spread Plaintiff’s legs uncomfortably wide and purposely and maliciously,  
25 and with significant force, struck Plaintiff in the testicles with what felt like a  
26 closed fist. Plaintiff yelled in pain, “I can’t believe you just hit me in the  
27 nuts!”

28 (ECF No. 61 at ¶ 62). DeCastro signed the Second Amended Complaint under penalty of  
perjury. (ECF No. 61 at pgs. 33-34).

There is one critical problem with DeCastro’s allegation: the body worn camera  
footage in this case - which DeCastro had full access to at the time he filed the SAC - shows

MARQUIS AURBACH  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

MARQUIS AURBACH

10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1 this alleged groin strike by Sandoval simply did not happen. DeCastro had already been  
2 patted down by Officers Bourque and Dingle. While Bourque patted DeCastro down for  
3 weapons, DeCastro stated “now you just hit me in the dick,” and similar comments claiming  
4 that Bourque struck DeCastro in the genital area for “no reason.” (ECF No. 100 at 7).  
5 However, DeCastro did not flinch, and the video does not support the notion that he was  
6 gratuitously hit in the groin.

7 This Court’s summary judgment order allowed the excessive force claim based on  
8 the alleged groin strike to proceed - but against Bourque, not Sandoval, because the video  
9 shows Bourque conducting the pat-down. (ECF No. 100 at 29-31). The Court noted “the  
10 video does not clearly capture the alleged groin strike such that [the Court] could rule as a  
11 matter of law that the force Bourque used was reasonable.” (*Id.* at 30). Yet DeCastro had  
12 specifically alleged in his verified complaint Sandoval was the one who struck him - not  
13 Bourque.

14 After the Court allowed the claim to proceed against Bourque, DeCastro posted a  
15 YouTube video again stating it was Sandoval - not Bourque - who hit him in the genitals.  
16 (*See* ECF No. 152, Exhibit 521A). At trial, DeCastro testified he had “mistakenly” identified  
17 the wrong officer in his SAC, and he had actually meant to allege the groin strike against  
18 Bourque. When asked if he had signed the SAC under penalty of perjury, DeCastro invoked  
19 his Fifth Amendment right to remain silent.

20 DeCastro’s explanation he “mistakenly” named the wrong officer is not credible.  
21 The SAC’s own language refutes this excuse. Paragraph 62 of the SAC specifically  
22 describes a scenario where DeCastro “protested that he’d already been patted down by two  
23 officers” before Sandoval allegedly spread his legs and struck him. This description  
24 demonstrates DeCastro was not describing Bourque’s initial pat-down - he was fabricating a  
25 separate incident involving Sandoval. DeCastro knew he had already been patted down by  
26 Bourque and Dingle prior to interacting with Sandoval when he wrote this allegation, and he  
27

28

MARQUIS AURBACH

10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1 still specifically alleged Sandoval conducted another pat-down and struck him in the groin  
2 with a closed fist. That never happened.

3 Moreover, DeCastro had full access to the body worn camera footage at the time he  
4 filed the SAC and at the time he posted the YouTube video doubling down on his allegation  
5 that Sandoval gratuitously struck him in the genitals. The footage clearly shows who  
6 conducted the pat-down. A reasonable inquiry into the facts - or even a cursory review of the  
7 footage DeCastro himself was using to build his case - would have revealed Sandoval did  
8 not strike him in the groin during a pat-down.

9 In short, DeCastro fabricated an allegation against Officer Sandoval in his verified  
10 complaint, maintained that false allegation for years throughout this litigation, and then  
11 attempted to walk it back at trial by claiming he had “mistakenly” identified the wrong  
12 officer - an excuse that his own complaint refutes. This claim was frivolous from the outset,  
13 and DeCastro knew it. DeCastro either brought this claim in bad faith or failed to make a  
14 reasonable inquiry to the facts despite his having access to those facts. Accordingly, an  
15 award of attorney’s fees incurred as a result of this frivolous claim is warranted.

16 **2. The Selective Enforcement Claim.**

17 DeCastro’s selective enforcement claim was likewise frivolous. To prevail on his  
18 selective enforcement claim under the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause,  
19 DeCastro was required to prove that (1) enforcement had a discriminatory effect, and (2) the  
20 police were motivated by a discriminatory purpose. *Lacey v. Maricopa Cnty.*, 693 F.3d 896,  
21 920 (9th Cir. 2012). To prove a discriminatory effect, the plaintiff “must show that similarly  
22 situated individuals . . . were not” subject to the enforcement action. *Id.*

23 DeCastro alleged in his SAC that LVMPD Defendants “selectively enforced laws  
24 against people with white lips, against people with brown skin, against people that expressed  
25 criticism towards law enforcement, against those recording police interactions, and against  
26 those publicizing information on Police misconduct.” (ECF No. 61 at 26). He alleged  
27 “similarly situated individuals were not arrested.” (*Id.*).

28

MARQUIS AURBACH

10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada, 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1 This Court granted summary judgment in favor of all defendants on DeCastro’s  
2 selective enforcement claim based on the color of his skin or lips, finding “DeCastro has not  
3 pointed to evidence from which a reasonable jury could find the officers acted with a  
4 discriminatory purpose against people ‘with white lips’ or ‘with brown skin.’” (ECF No. 100  
5 at 43). However, the Court allowed the selective enforcement claim to proceed against  
6 Officers Bourque and Torrey based on the theory DeCastro was selectively arrested because  
7 he was exercising his First Amendment rights. (Id. at 43-44).

8 At trial, DeCastro was required to prove that “similarly situated individuals” who  
9 were not engaged in the same protected conduct (filming and criticizing police) were not  
10 arrested. DeCastro was unable to present any evidence to support this essential element of  
11 his claim. Instead, he relied on still images of other individuals in the parking lot during the  
12 subject incident and argued the police treated him selectively by not telling these individuals  
13 to back up or arresting them for obstruction.

14 However, none of these other individuals were “similarly situated” to DeCastro. To  
15 be similarly situated, DeCastro was required to show at least one other individual: (1)  
16 approached the detained driver or interacted with DeCastro while he was being detained; (2)  
17 ignored officer commands to step back; and (3) was not arrested. DeCastro could not  
18 identify a single individual who even arguably met these criteria.

19 DeCastro knew from the inception of this case he had no evidence of similarly  
20 situated individuals who were treated differently. During discovery, DeCastro did not  
21 identify any witnesses or evidence capable of showing a discriminatory effect. DeCastro did  
22 not identify a single cogent piece of evidence to support his claim similarly situated  
23 individuals were treated differently. (See ECF No. 130 at 14). Yet he continued to pursue  
24 this claim through trial. DeCastro’s selective enforcement claim was frivolous and without  
25 evidentiary support from the outset. The Ninth Circuit has held attorneys’ fees are  
26 appropriate to prevailing defendants when plaintiffs “utterly fail[] to meet [their evidentiary]  
27 burden.” *Franceschi*, 57 F.3d at 832. That is precisely what occurred here.

28

MARQUIS AURBACH  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**B. LVMPD DEFENDANTS ARE ENTITLED TO AN AWARD OF THEIR REASONABLE ATTORNEYS' FEES.**

**1. Itemization of and description of work performed.**

LVMPD Defendants seek \$18,385.45 in attorneys' fees as provided in the Declaration of Craig R. Anderson, Esq., attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. The attorneys' fees incurred by the LVMPD Defendants are reflected in monthly statements prepared by the law firm of Marquis Aurbach and are attached as **Exhibit B**.

As discussed in Mr. Anderson's declaration submitted in compliance with LR 54-16, defense counsel expended a significant amount of effort to defend against Plaintiff's claims. The defense of this matter required substantial work over an extended period, including before trial. Defense counsel's work included:

- Conducting legal research;
- Preparing and filing motions to dismiss;
- Preparing written discovery and responding to Plaintiff's discovery requests;
- Preparing and filing motions for summary judgment and related briefing;
- Preparing for and defending the Ninth Circuit appeal;
- Preparing and meeting with defendant officers throughout the litigation;
- Preparing and filing the joint pretrial order and pretrial report; and
- Trial preparation and attendance, including preparing direct and cross examinations, preparing and opposing motions in limine, preparing trial briefs and jury instructions, and post-trial briefing.

As reflected in the verdict form, Plaintiff brought seven distinct damages theories to trial: (1) false arrest; (2) illegal search/seizure; (3) excessive force (arm squeeze); (4) excessive force (groin strike); (5) failure to intervene; (6) First Amendment retaliation; and (7) selective enforcement. (ECF No. 155). Of those seven claims, two - excessive force based on the groin strike and selective enforcement - were frivolous and without evidentiary support from the outset.



**b. Time and labor required**

Attached as **Ex. B** are Marquis Aurbach’s billing statements regarding the work performed in this litigation. The billing statements establish that the legal services rendered were reasonable and necessary, as does the Declaration of Craig R. Anderson, Esq. *See Ex. A, ¶ 13.* LVMPD Defendants were required to prepare for and attend a jury trial, including but not limited to drafting relevant motions and preparing trial-related documents and witnesses.

**c. Novelty and difficulty of the questions involved**

This case involved 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims, which are specialized and require a specialized skill set to litigate. The case presented complex factual and legal issues, including claims for false arrest, excessive force, First Amendment retaliation, and selective enforcement. The factual analysis involved extensive body worn camera footage from multiple officers. Furthermore, DeCastro is a self-described “First Amendment auditor” with a substantial online presence and a history of filing lawsuits against police departments, requiring defense counsel to adapt their litigation strategy accordingly.

**d. Requisite skill to perform the legal services**

As mentioned above, civil rights cases under § 1983 are specialized and require a specific skill set to litigate effectively. Defense counsel has extensive experience litigating civil rights cases on behalf of law enforcement agencies and officers. The skill required to handle this matter was high, given the nature of the claims asserted by the Plaintiff, coupled with the number of defendants and the various legal theories involved.

**e. Preclusion of other employment due to acceptance of this case**

The litigation conduct exhibited by DeCastro in this case demanded a considerable amount of work by defense counsel. Because of the unique nature of this case, and the factual issues raised by DeCastro, this case demanded a significant portion of counsel’s time. The time defense counsel spent defending this case precluded them from performing work for other clients for whom they could have charged higher hourly rates.

**MARQUIS AURBACH**  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

**f. The customary fixed fee**

Pursuant to a contract with LVMPD, defense counsel’s hourly rates during the majority of this litigation were \$220.00-\$250.00. Defense counsel’s hourly rates rose to \$300.00-\$350.00 on or about August 2025. These hourly rates are actually low compared to the hourly rates charged to non-municipality clients. The hourly rate for other clients represented by Mr. Anderson ranges from \$500.00-\$550.00 per hour. Therefore, the rates charged to LVMPD are fair and reasonable rates for professional services from litigation attorneys at Marquis Aurbach, and in the legal community for attorneys with counsel’s level of experience and expertise in civil rights cases.

**g. Experience, reputation, and ability of the attorneys**

Craig R. Anderson, Esq. and Nicholas M. Adams, Esq. have extensive experience litigating civil rights cases on behalf of LVMPD and other law enforcement agencies. Mr. Anderson has been practicing civil rights law for 25 years, representing multiple government entities throughout the state of Nevada. This trial was a federal jury trial involving claims asserted under § 1983, requiring specialized knowledge and experience.

**h. Nature and length of the professional relationship with the client**

Marquis Aurbach has represented LVMPD and its officers for many years. Counsel has an intimate knowledge regarding LVMPD’s policies and procedures, and how the client desires its cases to be handled, which streamlines litigation and allows for more efficient representation.

**i. Similar awards**

It is not uncommon for the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to issue fee awards to police defendants in similar types of cases. This case particularly warrants fees because DeCastro maintained frivolous claims he knew or should have known were without factual support, including the groin strike excessive force claim against Officer Sandoval, which was based on a fabricated allegation, and the selective enforcement claim, which was unsupported by any evidence of similarly situated individuals. LVMPD

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Defendants' instant Motion accurately describes the proceedings in this case that warrant a  
2 fee award to the prevailing defendants.

3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 Based on the foregoing, LVMPD Defendants respectfully request the Court grant  
5 their Motion for Attorney's Fees in the amount of \$18,385.45.

6 Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

7 MARQUIS AURBACH

8 By s/Craig R. Anderson  
9 Craig R. Anderson, Esq.  
10 Nevada Bar No. 6882  
11 10001 Park Run Drive  
12 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
13 Attorney for LVMPD Defendants

14 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

15 I hereby certify that I electronically served the foregoing **LVMPD DEFENDANTS'**  
16 **MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES** on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026 on all participants in  
17 the case who are registered CM/ECF users.

18 s/Sherri Mong  
19 an employee of Marquis Aurbach  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

MARQUIS AURBACH  
10001 Park Run Drive  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

# Exhibit A – Declaration of Craig R. Anderson, Esq.

1 **Marquis Aurbach**  
2 Craig R. Anderson, Esq.  
3 Nevada Bar No. 6882  
4 Nicholas M. Adams, Esq.  
5 Nevada Bar No. 15859  
6 10001 Park Run Drive  
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
8 Telephone: (702) 382-0711  
9 Facsimile: (702) 382-5816  
10 canderson@maclaw.com  
11 nadams@maclaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants LVMPD, Sgt. Torrey, Ofc. Bourque, Ofc. Dingle, Ofc. Sorenson,  
Ofc. Sandoval and Ofc. Doolittle*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

11 JOSE DECASTRO,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
15 DEPARTMENT; STATE OF NEVADA;  
16 BRANDEN BOURQUE; JASON TORREY;  
17 C. DINGLE; B. SORENSON; JESSE  
18 SANDOVAL; OFFICER DOOLITTLE and  
DOES 1 to 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case Number:  
2:23-cv-00580-APG-EJY

**DECLARATION OF CRAIG R.  
ANDERSON, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF  
LVMPD DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
ATTORNEY FEES**

19 I, Craig R. Anderson, Esq., declare as follows:

20 1. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years of age and have personal knowledge  
21 of the facts stated herein, except for those stated upon information and belief, and as to those,  
22 I believe them to be true. I am competent to testify as to the facts stated herein in a Court of  
23 law and will so testify if called upon.

24 2. I am duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada and have personal  
25 knowledge of and am competent to testify concerning the facts herein.

1           3.       I make this declaration in support of LVMPD Defendants’ Motion for Attorney  
2 Fees in the case *Decastro v. LVMPD, et al.*, Case No. 2:23-cv-00580-APG-EJY.

3           4.       I am counsel for Defendants Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
4 (“LVMPD”), Sgt. Torrey, Ofc. Bourque, Ofc. Dingle, Ofc. Sorenson, Ofc. Sandoval and Ofc.  
5 Doolittle (collectively “LVMPD Defendants”) in the above-referenced matter.

6           5.       I have litigated 42 U.S.C. § 1983 lawsuits on behalf of LVMPD and other  
7 agencies for over 25-years.

8           6.       This particular matter was time and labor intensive. Plaintiff Jose DeCastro  
9 (“DeCastro”) brought fifteen claims against LVMPD Defendants premised upon state law and  
10 42 U.S.C. § 1983 theories. Throughout, LVMPD Defendants attempted to prove a negative as  
11 to many of the claims: that DeCastro had no evidence LVMPD Defendants had violated his  
12 rights. This matter was a constitutional, civil rights case involving related state law claims.  
13 The factual analysis in this case was complex and involved extensive body-worn camera  
14 footage from multiple officers as well as documentary evidence. Moreover, the procedural  
15 history of this case was exceedingly complex, as DeCastro filed his original complaint shortly  
16 after the incident, and thereafter was tried and convicted in state court for misdemeanor  
17 charges stemming from the subject incident, before prevailing on appeal from that conviction  
18 after discovery in this case had closed.

19           7.       The skill required to handle this matter was relatively high, given the nature of  
20 the claims asserted by DeCastro, coupled with the number of Defendants. This case was very  
21 time intensive and I was required to work several late evenings and weekends getting this  
22 matter prepared for trial.

23           8.       My normal customary fee for non-government clients is \$500.00 -  
24 \$550.00/hour. The firm of Marquis Aurbach has worked as outside counsel for LVMPD for a  
25 number of years and does so at a steeply discounted rate. For the majority of this matter, my  
26  
27

1 rate was \$250.00/hour and Mr. Adams' billing rate was \$220.00/hour.<sup>1</sup>

2 9. The time required in this matter was significant due to the volume of claims,  
3 the body worn camera footage, DeCastro's filing of numerous motions and appeals prior to  
4 his retention of counsel, the unique procedural posture of this litigation, and the need to review  
5 DeCastro's voluminous online and social media history.

6 10. At a minimum, the experience, reputation and ability of myself and my  
7 associate Mr. Adams is respectable. I am an experienced civil rights attorney and trial lawyer  
8 that has handled and litigated 42 U.S.C. § 1983 cases for more than 25 years. I have tried in  
9 excess of 15 jury trials in federal court and argued over thirty appeals in front of the Ninth  
10 Circuit Court of Appeals. I am a shareholder of and the president at Marquis Aurbach, which  
11 is one of the oldest law firms in the state of Nevada.

12 11. Mr. Adams was voted as one of the "Best Up and Coming" attorneys in Nevada  
13 Business Magazine in 2024 and was voted to the "Rising Stars" Mountain States Super  
14 Lawyers list in 2025. Mr. Adams was licensed to practice law in 2021 and has represented  
15 LVMPD in civil rights cases for over three years. Mr. Adams was vital in assisting me  
16 throughout this case, and particularly in preparing this case for trial.

17 12. I was, and am, the attorney responsible for reviewing the billing records in this  
18 case. In connection with this Declaration, I have reviewed all time entries issued in this matter.

19 13. Attached to the exhibits supporting the Motion for Attorney Fees, to which this  
20 Declaration is attached, are the billing records with itemizations, attached as **Exhibit B**.  
21 Redactions have been made to attorney-client privileged material and/or time entries for which  
22 the Defendants are not seeking fees, including time entries associated with work unrelated to  
23 DeCastro's frivolous claims as outlined in the Motion. Prior to issuing each bill to the  
24 defendants for payment, the bills were reviewed and edited to ensure that the fees and costs

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>1</sup> In or about August 2025, my billing rate for this matter increased to \$350.00/hour and Mr. Adams' billing rate increased to \$300.00/hour.

1 charged were reasonable. The fees and costs charged and billed were, and are, reasonable and  
2 necessary. LVMPD Defendants have paid all of the amounts and are current.

3 14. The total amount of fees and costs requested in the Motion is \$18,385.45. This  
4 sum, as explained in the Motion, reflects a conservative and reasonable assessment of the fees  
5 expended by LVMPD Defendants as a direct result of the need to defend against DeCastro's  
6 frivolous claims.

7 15. Because the litigation of these claims was intertwined, it is not practicable to  
8 segregate with precision the fees attributable solely to the frivolous claims from those  
9 attributable to the non-frivolous claims. However, LVMPD Defendants certainly have  
10 incurred fees solely by virtue of the need to defend against DeCastro's frivolous claims.

11 16. Having reviewed the billing records and itemizations attached as **Exhibit B**,  
12 and given that two of the seven claims that proceeded to trial were frivolous, I attest no less  
13 than ten percent (10%) of defense counsel's time in this case was spent at a direct result of the  
14 need to defend against DeCastro's frivolous claims.

15 17. Pursuant to NRS § 53.045, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of  
16 the State of Nevada that the foregoing is true and correct.

17 Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

18  
19 s/Craig R. Anderson

20 Craig R. Anderson  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

# Exhibit B - Invoice

**MARQUIS AURBACH**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

10001 PARK RUN DRIVE  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89145  
Telephone 702-382-0711  
Fax 702-382-5816

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Attn: Ruth Miller  
400 S. Martin Luther King Blvd., #B  
Las Vegas, NV 89106

Invoice 409818 - 454129  
March 2, 2026

ID: 14687-456 - CRA

Re:RM#: L23-K608963-01CR DeCastro, Jose adv.

For Services Rendered Through March 2, 2026

---

██████████  
Current Disbursements  
██████████

██████████  
7,876.80  
██████████



**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
 Invoice 409818  
 Page 3

Date	Atty	Description	Hours	Amount
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
05/19/23	CRA	Review Internal Affairs file provided by Marleen.	0.70	147.00
05/19/23	NMA	Review amended complaint in anticipation of preparing responsive pleading.	0.40	70.00
05/30/23	CRA	Review federal court docket and plaintiff's notice of service. Discuss with Nick Adams.	0.40	84.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
05/30/23	NMA	Prepare initial draft of partial motion to dismiss first amended complaint based upon failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.	3.10	542.50
05/31/23	CRA	Research and finalize motion for partial dismissal.	4.70	987.00
05/31/23	NMA	Review revisions of responsible partner; prepare notes and comments for final set of revisions.	0.50	87.50
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
06/01/23	NMA	Review, proofread, and revise final draft of partial motion to dismiss; file motion with court.	0.80	176.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
06/07/23	CRA	Draft Torrey's joinder to motion to dismiss.	0.20	50.00
06/08/23	NMA	Review correspondence between CRA and Mr. DeCastro; briefly conduct legal research on issues raised by Mr. DeCastro.	0.40	88.00





**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 6

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
07/21/23	CRA	Review order on motion to stay and update client.	0.30	75.00
07/24/23	CRA	Review plaintiff's motion to default the State of Nevada.	0.30	75.00
07/24/23	CRA	Review plaintiff's motion to strike portions of defendants' answer. Meet with Nicholas Adams on handling.	0.60	150.00
		[REDACTED]		
07/24/23	NMA	Confer with responsible partner regarding DeCastro's recently filed motions; begin conducting legal research in anticipation of preparing opposition to DeCastro's motion to strike.	0.50	110.00
07/25/23	CRA	Review Dangle and Sorensen's BWC to prepare for initial meeting. Contact Marleen on [REDACTED].	0.60	150.00
		[REDACTED]		
07/25/23	CRA	Meet with Officer Dingle and go over [REDACTED].	1.20	300.00
07/25/23	CRA	Prepare and meet with Officer Borque and go over [REDACTED].	2.00	500.00
		[REDACTED]		
07/25/23	NMA	Continue conducting legal research and outlining arguments in opposition to DeCastro's motion to strike.	1.40	308.00
07/25/23	NMA	Review other oppositions to motion to strike affirmative defenses and portions of the answer; begin preparing shell legal arguments within brief.	0.80	176.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
07/26/23	NMA	Continue conducting legal research and untangling DeCastro's numerous incorrect legal arguments.	0.60	132.00
		[REDACTED]		
07/28/23	NMA	Continue conducting legal research and begin preparing arguments in opposition to DeCastro's motion to strike affirmative defenses.	2.30	506.00
07/28/23	NMA	Begin legal research relating to deeming matters denied based on insufficient information as admitted; begin preparing legal argument opposing deeming denials within the answer as admitted.	1.60	352.00
07/31/23	NMA	Continue and complete initial draft of legal argument opposing DeCastro's request to strike LVMPD defendants' affirmative defenses.	2.40	528.00
07/31/23	NMA	Continue and complete initial draft of legal argument opposing	1.40	308.00







**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 10

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		and draft disclosure.		
11/14/23	CRA	Attend Rule 26 conference with Jose DeCastro.	0.50	125.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
11/15/23	CRA	Multiple conversations with Chille on joint discovery plan, settlement, and initial disclosures.	0.50	125.00
		[REDACTED]		
11/15/23	NMA	Review DeCastro's recent filings relating to an extension of time to file scheduling order and a motion to recuse Judge Gordon; confer [REDACTED]	0.60	132.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
11/16/23	CRA	Receipt and review of plaintiff's motion for clarification and motion to recuse judge.	0.40	100.00
11/17/23	CRA	Meet and confer with Chille on joint discovery plan. Make amendments. Finalize initial disclosures.	0.50	125.00
11/17/23	CRA	Review plaintiff's requests to produce documents. Identify help needed. Draft email to Marleen [REDACTED].	1.40	350.00
11/17/23	CRA	Review order on motion for clarification.	0.20	50.00
11/17/23	NMA	Review relevant authorities to determine proper procedure for opposing motion to recuse; begin preparation of motion to recuse.	1.30	286.00
11/18/23	NMA	Complete review of relevant authorities and initial draft of opposition to DeCastro's motion to recuse.	2.70	594.00
11/20/23	CRA	Review court order on discovery deadlines. Meet with Nicholas Adams and discuss written discovery.	0.40	100.00
		[REDACTED]		
11/20/23	CRA	Receipt review of plaintiff motion to extend time to file amended complaint. Discuss with Nicholas Adams.	0.30	75.00
11/20/23	NMA	Coordinate with responsible partner regarding status of case and assignment to prepare discovery requests to serve on DeCastro.	0.30	66.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
11/22/23	CRA	Review Nicholas Adams rule, 58 research. Discuss future strategy with Nicholas Adams regarding same.	0.30	75.00
11/22/23	NMA	Review recent filings by DeCastro; prepare list of potential concerns to discuss with responsible partner; review and revise initial draft of opposition to motion to recuse.	1.20	264.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 11

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
11/27/23	CRA	Review court order extending time to file amended complaint. Review and receipt of plaintiff's motion to extend time to file Rule 59 motion.	0.30	75.00
11/27/23	CRA	Review, revise and modify opposition to plaintiff's motion to recuse. Discuss with Nick Adams.	0.50	125.00
11/27/23	CRA	Review amended complaint and outline motion to dismiss with Nicholas. Instruct Nicholas on how to use BWC in light of complaint.	0.50	125.00
11/27/23	NMA	Review relevant legal authorities, revise, proofread, and finalize opposition brief to DeCastro's motion to recuse for apparent bias; send opposition to responsible partner for review.	0.70	154.00
11/27/23	NMA	Review DeCastro's second amended complaint and discuss amendments to prior complaint with responsible partner in anticipation of preparing written discovery and motion to dismiss.	1.60	352.00
11/27/23	NMA	Begin preparing LVMPD's first set of interrogatories to DeCastro.	2.20	484.00
11/28/23	NMA	Complete initial draft of LVMPD's first set of interrogatories to DeCastro.	2.10	462.00
11/28/23	NMA	Prepare and complete initial draft of LVMPD's first set of requests for production of documents to DeCastro.	2.80	616.00
11/28/23	NMA	Prepare and complete initial draft of LVMPD's first set of requests for admission to DeCastro.	2.90	638.00
11/28/23	NMA	Prepare and complete initial draft of Erland Torrey's first set of interrogatories to DeCastro.	1.70	374.00
11/28/23	NMA	Prepare and complete initial draft of Jesse Sandoval's first set of interrogatories to DeCastro.	1.90	418.00
11/29/23	NMA	Proofread and revise initial drafts of written discovery to DeCastro; remit initial drafts to responsible partner for review.	1.10	242.00
11/30/23	NMA	Incorporate revisions of responsible partner within LVMPD's first set of interrogatories and requests for production of documents; remit draft written discovery to responsible partner with additional comments.	0.70	154.00
11/30/23	CRA	Amend and finalize written discovery to serve on plaintiff.	1.30	325.00
12/01/23	CRA	Review file and draft discovery responses to plaintiff's written discovery. [REDACTED]	1.70	425.00
12/01/23	NMA	Incorporate additional interrogatories into draft interrogatories of defendant officers; finalize all written discovery and remit to legal assistant to be served.	1.80	396.00
12/04/23	CRA	Receipt and review of plaintiff's initial disclosures of witnesses and exhibits. Reach out to plaintiff on medical issues.	0.50	125.00
12/04/23	NMA	Review set of documents provided by Marleen including radio traffic, prior discipline, performance evaluations, and training history of subject officers.	1.20	264.00
12/04/23	NMA	Begin preparing initial draft of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; outline arguments and identify pertinent body worn camera footage.	2.30	506.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 12

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
12/05/23	CRA	Review plaintiff's motion for reconsideration and meet with Nick Adams on opposition.	0.40	100.00
12/05/23	CRA	Review documents provided by Marleen for admissible and relevant documents to written discovery requests. Update our responses.	2.20	550.00
12/05/23	NMA	Assess and analyze DeCastro's motion for reconsideration in anticipation of drafting opposition thereto.	0.50	110.00
12/05/23	NMA	Prepare introduction section to motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment.	0.80	176.00
12/05/23	NMA	Begin drafting statement of facts; draft subsection of statement of facts outlining the procedural history and causes of action stated in DeCastro's second amended complaint.	1.10	242.00
12/05/23	NMA	Continue drafting statement of facts; draft brief subsection identifying the attached exhibits.	0.40	88.00
12/05/23	NMA	Continue drafting statement of facts section; draft subsection detailing the facts of the subject incident and citing to the relevant body camera footage and to the relevant portions of DeCastro's YouTube video.	5.30	1,166.00
12/05/23	NMA	Continue drafting statement of facts; begin draft of subsection identifying the numerous ways in which the authentic video evidence directly contradicts DeCastro's allegations.	0.70	154.00
12/05/23	NMA	Begin drafting legal standard section within motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; draft subsection outlining legal standards for motion to dismiss and motion for summary judgment and arguing in favor of the incorporation by reference doctrine with respect to the video footage.	1.40	308.00
12/06/23	CRA	Watch hearing in DeCastro's criminal case and continuation of trial.	0.30	75.00
12/06/23	NMA	Assess and analyze DeCastro's reply to opposition to motion for recusal.	0.20	44.00
12/06/23	NMA	Continue drafting legal standard section of motion; draft subsection detailing relevant §1983 legal standards.	0.50	110.00
12/06/23	NMA	Begin drafting legal argument section of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; draft subsection identifying qualified immunity legal standards.	1.40	308.00
12/06/23	NMA	Draft subsection of motion arguing that DeCastro's excessive force claim fails.	2.80	616.00
12/06/23	NMA	Draft subsection of motion arguing that DeCastro's first amendment retaliation and selective enforcement claims fail.	2.50	550.00
12/06/23	NMA	Begin drafting subsection of legal argument within motion arguing that DeCastro's failure to intervene claim fails.	0.90	198.00
12/07/23	NMA	Draft subsection of motion arguing that DeCastro's failure to intervene claim should be dismissed.	1.90	418.00
12/07/23	NMA	Draft subsection of motion arguing that DeCastro's Monell claim should	1.70	374.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 13

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		be dismissed.		
12/07/23	NMA	Draft subsection of motion arguing that DeCastro's state law claims should be dismissed.	3.30	726.00
12/07/23	NMA	Proofread, revise, and finalize motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; remit draft to responsible partner for review.	0.80	176.00
12/08/23	NMA	Review video sent by responsible partner demonstrating DeCastro's admission to resisting arrest; send follow-up email to responsible partner identifying additional pertinent information within source video.	0.30	66.00
12/08/23	CRA	Substantial revisions and edits to motion to dismiss SAC. Legal research on same.	2.20	550.00
12/08/23	NMA	Begin review of responsible partner's revisions to motion and incorporation of said exhibits into motion.	1.10	242.00
12/11/23	NMA	Complete incorporation of responsible partner's revisions within motion and proofread of final draft; send final draft to paralegal for proofreading.	0.90	198.00
12/11/23	NMA	Coordinate with paralegal and legal assistant in gathering all body worn camera exhibits into single flash drive to be mailed to clerk and filing motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment.	0.50	110.00
		[REDACTED]		
12/12/23	CRA	Communicate with Marleen on [REDACTED]	0.20	50.00
12/12/23	NMA	Assess and analyze DeCastro's motion for reconsideration in anticipation of drafting opposition brief.	0.80	176.00
		[REDACTED]		
12/13/23	NMA	Begin review of relevant legal authorities and preparing initial draft of opposition to DeCastro's motion for reconsideration.	3.80	836.00
12/14/23	CRA	Review, revise and finalize opposition to motion for reconsideration.	0.40	100.00
12/14/23	NMA	Complete initial draft of opposition to DeCastro's motion for reconsideration and send draft to responsible partner for review and revision.	1.40	308.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 14

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
12/15/23	CRA	Review training and all additional records provided by Marleen. Finalize answers to written discovery. Emails with Chille on address change.	1.30	325.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
12/18/23	NMA	Revise, proofread, and finalize opposition to motion for reconsideration; file opposition brief.	0.60	132.00
12/21/23	CRA	Meet and confer with Jose DeCastro on written discovery.	0.50	125.00
12/22/23	CRA	Review and respond to plaintiff's second set of requests for production. Email Marleen regarding [REDACTED].	0.80	200.00
12/27/23	CRA	Review DeCastro's motion to strike motion to dismiss and separate motion to compel discovery. Meet with Nick Adams and discuss.	1.20	300.00
12/27/23	CRA	Research and draft opposition to motion to compel.	1.80	450.00
12/27/23	NMA	Assess and analyze motion to compel and motion to strike filed by DeCastro; confer with responsible partner and begin preparation of opposition to motion to strike.	1.50	330.00
12/28/23	CRA	Finalize opposition to motion to compel and prepare exhibits.	0.40	100.00
12/28/23	CRA	Review order denying plaintiff's motion to compel.	0.30	75.00
12/28/23	NMA	Assess and analyze order denying motion to compel discovery responses.	0.20	44.00
12/28/23	NMA	Continue preparing opposition to motion to strike LVMPD defendants' motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment.	2.10	462.00
12/29/23	CRA	Review court order denying motion to strike.	0.20	50.00
12/29/23	NMA	Assess and analyze order granting motion for extension of time and denying motion to strike.	0.20	44.00
01/02/24	CRA	Review Marleen's email and finalize responses to second set of requests to produce served by plaintiff.	0.40	100.00
01/05/24	CRA	Conference with Officer Borque on [REDACTED].	0.30	75.00
01/10/24	CRA	Review notice of appearance by plaintiff's counsel.	0.20	50.00
01/10/24	NMA	Assess and analyze notice of appearance of counsel for plaintiff; conduct brief research on legal counsel for plaintiff.	0.30	66.00
01/11/24	NMA	Review notice of appearance filed by counsel for DeCastro, emails sent by DeCastro after filing of notice of appearance.	0.30	66.00
01/19/24	CRA	Review and respond to plaintiff's interrogatories to the named defendants.	0.40	100.00
01/23/24	CRA	Check in criminal trial and Chile's no show.	0.30	75.00
01/24/24	NMA	Attempt to call Officer Jesse Sandoval [REDACTED].	0.10	22.00
01/24/24	NMA	Review footage of DeCastro's latest continuance of bench trial relating to obstruction charge stemming from the incident that is the subject of	0.40	88.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 15

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		this case; confer with responsible partner regarding new firm trial date set for February.		
01/28/24	CRA	Review medical records of DeCastro received from an anonymous source.	0.40	100.00
01/29/24	NMA	Correspond via phone with Officer Sandoval regarding [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED].	0.30	66.00
02/04/24	CRA	Review plaintiff's opposition to dispositive motion and discuss same with Nick Adams.	0.80	200.00
02/06/24	NMA	Review video of plaintiff sent by concerned citizen wherein plaintiff admits to standing too close to police to bait a police response and discusses his demands for a substantial settlement.	0.70	154.00
02/06/24	NMA	Assess and analyze plaintiff's opposition to motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment in anticipation of preparing reply brief in support of motion.	1.40	308.00
02/07/24	NMA	Begin preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; draft introduction and statement of facts.	1.60	352.00
02/07/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; review relevant legal authority and prepare legal standards section of brief.	1.30	286.00
02/07/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; review relevant legal authority and prepare subsection of legal argument establishing that the body worn camera evidence has been sufficiently authenticated.	0.80	176.00
02/07/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; review relevant legal authority and prepare subsection of legal argument establishing that DeCastro converted the motion to a motion for summary judgment by challenging the authenticity of the body worn camera evidence.	1.20	264.00
02/07/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; review relevant legal authority and prepare subsection of legal argument contending that DeCastro failed to meet his burden of establishing that Rule 56(d) relief is warranted.	1.90	418.00
02/07/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; review relevant legal authority and begin drafting subsection of legal argument contending that summary judgment is warranted on DeCastro's excessive force claim.	0.70	154.00
02/08/24	CRA	Get extension to serve written discovery responses.	0.20	50.00
02/08/24	CRA	Review, revise, and finalize reply to opposition to motion to dismiss or in the alternative motion for summary judgment.	0.60	150.00
02/08/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in	1.50	330.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
 Invoice 409818  
 Page 16

Date	Atty	Description	Hours	Amount
		the alternative, motion for summary judgment; complete draft of subsection of legal argument contending that summary judgment is warranted on DeCastro's excessive force claim.		
02/08/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; review relevant legal authority and draft subsection of legal argument arguing that summary judgment is warranted on DeCastro's first amendment retaliation and selective enforcement claims.	1.20	264.00
02/08/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; review relevant legal authority and draft subsection of legal argument contending that summary judgment is warranted on DeCastro's failure to intervene claim.	0.40	88.00
02/08/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; analyze relevant legal authority and draft section of legal argument contending that summary judgment is warranted on DeCastro's Monell claims.	0.90	198.00
02/08/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; analyze relevant legal authority and draft section of legal argument contending that summary judgment is warranted on DeCastro's various state law claims.	2.30	506.00
02/09/24	NMA	Incorporate revisions of responsible partner within reply brief; proofread and revise reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment.	1.20	264.00
02/09/24	NMA	Gather exhibits in support of reply brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment; finalize and file reply brief.	0.50	110.00
		[REDACTED]		
02/15/24	NMA	Assess and analyze new court of appeals decision sent by client interpreting Nevada's obstruction statute.	0.80	176.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
02/26/24	CRA	Review and watch criminal case hearing.	0.30	75.00
03/12/24	NMA	Confer with responsible partner regarding DeCastro's failure to provide responses to our written discovery and need for deposition availability for DeCastro; correspond with opposing counsel regarding need to finalize and serve discovery responses and provide deposition availability for his client.	0.40	88.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 17

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
03/14/24	NMA	Review correspondence from concerned citizen claiming that DeCastro was threatening on YouTube to kill police officers if they arrived on his property; review video provided by concerned citizen.	0.70	154.00
03/18/24	NMA	Confer with responsible partner regarding plaintiff's failure to provide answers to discovery responses and provide deposition availability, significance of plaintiff's upcoming criminal trial.	0.20	44.00
03/19/24	NMA	Review email from Ofc. Bourque [REDACTED]; research and review available information relating to conviction and sentencing in anticipation of filing motion for leave to supplement summary judgment motion and informing the court of the conviction.	2.10	462.00
03/20/24	CRA	Watch criminal trial online. Discuss with Officer Borque. Meet with Nick Adams on supplementing motion to dismiss.	1.70	425.00
03/21/24	NMA	Coordinate with responsible partner and opposing counsel in scheduling meet and confer conference regarding plaintiff's failure to serve responses to written discovery.	0.20	44.00
03/22/24	NMA	Prepare for and attend meet and confer conference with opposing counsel regarding plaintiff's failure to serve discovery responses; send confirming email to opposing counsel regarding deadline to provide answers to written discovery.	0.80	176.00
03/25/24	NMA	Review public records relating to DeCastro's conviction in anticipation of filing motion for leave to provide supplemental evidence of the conviction.	0.20	44.00
03/29/24	NMA	Assess and analyze judge's order denying DeCastro's motion to recuse.	0.20	44.00
03/31/24	CRA	Review order on motion to recuse.	0.20	50.00
04/01/24	CRA	Watch bail hearing and respond to emails.	0.40	100.00
04/03/24	NMA	Prepare initial draft of motion for leave to file supplemental brief in support of motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment, based upon plaintiff's criminal conviction stemming from the same incident which forms the basis for his claims.	2.20	484.00
04/04/24	NMA	Review and revise motion for leave to file supplemental evidence, incorporate additional legal authority and argument.	0.60	132.00
04/04/24	NMA	Confer with responsible partner regarding filing of motion for leave, reaching out to counsel for DeCastro regarding failure to provide responses to written discovery.	0.20	44.00
04/05/24	NMA	Finalize and file motion for leave to file supplemental brief and evidence in support of summary judgment.	0.30	66.00
04/08/24	NMA	Confer with responsible partner regarding preparing motion to compel in light of plaintiff's failure to respond to written discovery requests.	0.20	44.00
04/24/24	CRA	Discuss court order with Ruth Miller.	0.30	75.00
05/08/24	CRA	Meet with Nick Adams regarding summary judgment motion and filing same.	0.50	125.00
05/08/24	NMA	Review case file and relevant deadlines in anticipation of preparing	0.40	88.00

## MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 18

Date	Atty	Description	Hours	Amount
		motion for summary judgment. [REDACTED]		
05/30/24	CRA	Review recent development and criminal filings. Discuss summary judgment motion with Nick Adams.	0.70	175.00
05/30/24	NMA	Review documents and videos propounded by third-parties observers in anticipation of drafting motion for summary judgment.	0.30	66.00
05/30/24	NMA	Review previously drafted motions and begin outlining motion for summary judgment.	0.40	88.00
06/07/24	NMA	Begin preparing initial draft of motion for summary judgment.	1.80	396.00
06/10/24	NMA	Identify additional exhibits to attach to motion for summary judgment beyond exhibits attached in prior motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, motion for summary judgment.	0.40	88.00
06/10/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft motion for summary judgment.	3.10	682.00
06/11/24	CRA	Amend, revise, and finalize motion for summary judgment. Meet with Nick Adams on same.	3.80	950.00
06/11/24	NMA	Complete initial draft of motion for summary judgment; remit to responsible partner for review and revision.	2.80	616.00
06/11/24	NMA	Incorporate revisions of responsible partner within motion for summary judgment; begin final proofread and revisions, draft of additional facts section relating to DeCastro's criminal conviction.	2.30	506.00
06/12/24	NMA	Begin preparing initial draft of declaration in support of motion for summary judgment; identify exhibits requiring authentication declarations and coordinate with assistant regarding reaching out to officer for declaration. [REDACTED]	2.20	484.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
06/13/24	NMA	Continue coordinating with legal assistant and paralegal in acquiring declaration authenticating exhibits and preparing manual filing of video exhibits.	0.60	132.00
06/14/24	CRA	Finalize summary judgments and declarations and prepare for filing. [REDACTED]	1.00	250.00
06/14/24	NMA	Proofread, make final revisions, and finalize motion for summary judgment, finalize exhibits and declaration in support thereof, and file motion for summary judgment. [REDACTED]	1.40	308.00
		[REDACTED]		
06/30/24	CRA	Check on status of case.	0.20	50.00
07/05/24	CRA	Discuss summary judgment with plaintiff's counsel and agree to extension.	0.20	50.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 19

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
07/09/24	CRA	Review opposition to MSJ. Meet with Nicholas Adams on reply.	0.80	200.00
07/09/24	NMA	Assess and analyze plaintiff's opposition to motion for summary judgment in anticipation of drafting reply brief; begin outlining arguments for reply brief.	1.90	418.00
07/10/24	NMA	Assess and analyze plaintiff's appeal hearing, review legal authority regarding effect of overturned conviction in relation to pending summary judgment motion and preparation of reply brief in support of summary judgment motion.	1.60	352.00
07/15/24	NMA	Begin preparing initial draft of reply brief in support of motion for summary judgment.	1.50	330.00
07/16/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of motion for summary judgment.	3.20	704.00
07/17/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply in support of motion for summary judgment, complete statement of facts and argument section regarding plaintiffs' federal claims.	4.50	990.00
07/18/24	NMA	Complete preparing draft reply in support of motion for summary judgment; draft argument sections regarding plaintiffs' state law claims and opposing DeCastro's request for leave to supplement; clean up draft reply and remit to responsible partner for review.	4.20	924.00
07/19/24	CRA	Review, revise, and edit reply to opposition to motion for summary judgment.	0.60	150.00
07/19/24	NMA	Proofread and revise reply brief in support of motion for summary judgment; finalize reply brief in preparation of filing and serving.	0.90	198.00
07/22/24	NMA	Finalize and file reply brief in support of motion for summary judgment.	0.20	44.00
08/12/24	CRA	Review DeCastro's filing to reopen MSJ briefing and discuss with Nick Adams.	0.50	125.00
08/12/24	NMA	Assess and analyze motion for leave to file supplemental briefing filed by plaintiff; begin outlining arguments in opposition to motion for leave.	0.50	110.00
08/13/24	NMA	Assess and analyze minute order setting supplemental briefing schedule; confer with responsible partner regarding arguments to advance through supplemental briefing.	0.50	110.00
08/15/24	NMA	Conduct cursory research regarding lawfulness of police order when telling citizen recording police interaction to stand back in anticipation of preparing supplemental brief arguing in part as to that issue.	0.30	66.00
08/19/24	CRA	Answer Ruth's questions [REDACTED]. Discuss with Nicholas Adams.	0.30	75.00
08/20/24	NMA	Assess and analyze appellate briefing in DeCastro's criminal proceedings in anticipation of drafting supplemental brief regarding impact of DeCastro's conviction being overturned on appeal to instant case.	1.70	374.00
08/20/24	NMA	Begin preparing initial draft of supplemental brief regarding DeCastro's criminal conviction being overturned, impact of recent court of appeals decision relating to obstruction statute.	3.70	814.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 20

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
08/21/24	NMA	Assess and analyze minute order dismissing Citco defendant from case based upon lack of service.	0.20	44.00
08/21/24	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of supplemental brief regarding DeCastro's criminal conviction being overturned, impact of recent court of appeals decision relating to obstruction statute; draft statement of facts and procedural history.	1.90	418.00
08/21/24	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of supplemental brief regarding DeCastro's criminal conviction being overturned, impact of recent court of appeals decision relating to obstruction statute; draft section arguing that the overturning of DeCastro's criminal conviction has no impact on the civil case.	2.60	572.00
08/21/24	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of supplemental brief regarding DeCastro's criminal conviction being overturned, impact of recent court of appeals decision relating to obstruction statute; draft section contending that Willson case supports position that probable cause existed to arrest DeCastro.	3.10	682.00
08/21/24	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of supplemental brief regarding DeCastro's criminal conviction being overturned, impact of recent court of appeals decision relating to obstruction statute; proofread and revise initial draft and remit to responsible partner for review.	0.40	88.00
08/22/24	CRA	Review, revise, edit, and finalize supplemental brief. Legal research on minor issues.	1.30	325.00
08/22/24	NMA	Incorporate revisions of responsible partner; proofread and finalize supplemental brief.	0.70	154.00
08/23/24	NMA	Review, finalize, and file supplemental brief in support of summary judgment.	0.20	44.00
08/23/24	NMA	Begin review of plaintiff's supplemental brief in support of opposition to summary judgment.	0.40	88.00
08/25/24	CRA	Review and evaluate plaintiff's supplemental brief. Read cited cases.	0.70	175.00
08/26/24	NMA	Complete initial review of plaintiff's supplemental brief, initial outline of arguments for response brief.	0.70	154.00
08/26/24	NMA	Review and analyze court minute order denying motion to dismiss as moot in light of pending summary judgment motion.	0.10	22.00
08/26/24	NMA	Begin preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; begin drafting legal argument that plaintiff has not cogently argued that the court should defer to the state court's criminal appeal ruling.	0.70	154.00
08/26/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; complete initial draft of legal argument subsection that collateral estoppel requires an independent review separate from the state court's criminal appellate ruling.	1.40	308.00
08/26/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; complete initial draft of legal argument subsection that the state court's first amendment analysis incorrectly applied the	2.80	616.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 21

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		federal law regarding the First Amendment as applies to filming of police officers.		
08/26/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; begin drafting legal argument subsection that the state court's miscellaneous factual findings and legal conclusions unrelated to the First Amendment are dicta and have no persuasive value.	0.80	176.00
08/27/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; complete draft of legal argument subsection that the state court's miscellaneous factual findings and legal conclusions unrelated to the First Amendment are dicta and have no persuasive value.	1.40	308.00
08/27/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; drafting legal argument section regarding plaintiff's insufficient analysis of the Willson decision.	0.70	154.00
08/27/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; draft legal argument section contending that even given the opportunity for supplemental briefing, plaintiff has failed to meet his burden of overcoming summary judgment.	2.90	638.00
08/27/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; draft introduction and conclusion.	0.60	132.00
08/27/24	NMA	Proofread, review, and revise initial draft of LVMPD defendants' response to plaintiff's supplemental brief; remit to responsible partner for review and revision.	1.40	308.00
08/28/24	CRA	Review, edit, and revise response to plaintiff's supplemental brief. Discuss with Nick Adams.	0.60	150.00
08/28/24	NMA	Review feedback from responsible partner regarding response brief to plaintiff's supplemental brief; finalize draft and prepare for filing.	0.40	88.00
08/30/24	NMA	Facilitate manual filing of video of appellate hearing exhibit; finalize and serve response to plaintiff's supplemental brief.	0.50	110.00
09/13/24	CRA	Read and evaluate court's order on MJS with leave to file new MSJ motion. Discuss with Nick Adams.	1.60	400.00
09/13/24	NMA	Assess and analyze court order granting in part and denying in part summary judgment.	2.20	484.00
09/13/24	NMA	Begin outlining supplemental summary judgment briefing as to set of issues identified by court for additional briefing.	1.10	242.00
09/13/24	NMA	Discuss summary judgment order and next steps in case with responsible partner.	0.20	44.00
09/16/24	NMA	Begin preparing chart analyzing status of each claim in light of court order granting in part and denying in part summary judgment, identify	1.40	308.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 22

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		claims subject to second round of summary judgment briefing.		
09/17/24	CRA	Meeting with Nick Adams on Judge Gordon's order, strategy, motion for reconsideration, and vicarious liability.	0.60	150.00
09/17/24	NMA	Confer and strategize with responsible partner regarding next steps in case in light of court's summary judgment order.	0.20	44.00
09/17/24	NMA	Complete chart analyzing status of each claim in light of court order granting in part and denying in part summary judgment, incorporate chart within draft second motion for summary judgment.	0.70	154.00
09/17/24	NMA	Assess and analyze pertinent legal authority, begin preparing initial draft of second motion for summary judgment.	2.70	594.00
		[REDACTED]		
09/19/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft second motion for summary judgment.	1.30	286.00
09/20/24	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of second motion for summary judgment; research issues relevant to state law constitutional claims.	1.10	242.00
		[REDACTED]		
09/25/24	NMA	Confer with responsible partner and paralegal, begin compiling redacted copies of video exhibits filed in support of motion for summary judgment.	0.50	110.00
		[REDACTED]		
09/27/24	NMA	Complete compiling of redacted exhibits, finalize and file notice of manual filing.	0.40	88.00
09/27/24	NMA	Continue drafting second motion for summary judgment.	1.70	374.00
10/01/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft second motion for summary judgment.	0.80	176.00
10/02/24	NMA	Review relevant legal authority, complete legal argument within second motion for summary judgment.	2.70	594.00
10/02/24	NMA	Draft introduction and conclusion, proofread, and remit draft second motion for summary judgment to responsible partner for review and revision.	0.70	154.00
10/03/24	CRA	Review, revise, and finalize second motion for summary judgment.	1.20	300.00
10/04/24	NMA	Revise, proofread, finalize, and file second motion for summary judgment.	0.50	110.00
10/25/24	CRA	Discuss extension to respond to second motion for summary judgment with plaintiff's counsel and grant extension.	0.20	50.00
11/01/24	NMA	Review plaintiff's opposition to second motion for summary judgment;	1.70	374.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 23

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		begin outlining arguments for reply brief.		
11/02/24	CRA	Review plaintiff's opposition to motion for summary judgment.	1.10	275.00
11/05/24	NMA	Prepare draft stipulation and order extending reply deadline; remit to responsible partner for review and revision.	0.40	88.00
11/13/24	NMA	Assess and analyze court order granting extension of time to reply; review case file and current deadlines.	0.30	66.00
11/19/24	NMA	Assess and analyze all prior summary judgment briefing, continue preparing draft reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment.	1.80	396.00
11/20/24	NMA	Conduct legal research regarding discretionary immunity application in comparable contexts, continue preparing draft reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment.	2.60	572.00
11/21/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment.	1.50	330.00
11/25/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment; conduct legal research and incorporate legal argument relating to discretionary function immunity as applied to arrests and searches incident to arrest.	3.80	836.00
11/25/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment; incorporate legal argument distinguishing cases cited by plaintiff and identifying incorrect and inapposite arguments advanced by plaintiff.	2.30	506.00
12/11/24	NMA	Continue preparing draft reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment; assess and analyze legal authority as relates to discretionary immunity in making arrest when probable cause is a genuine dispute of material fact.	1.90	418.00
12/13/24	CRA	Finalize reply to second motion for summary judgment.	0.50	125.00
12/13/24	NMA	Complete draft reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment; revise and proofread reply brief and remit to responsible partner for review.	2.10	462.00
12/16/24	NMA	Finalize and file reply brief in support of second motion for summary judgment.	0.40	88.00
01/02/25	NMA	Review case file, assess and analyze status of case and remaining work to be done in advance of trial.	0.60	132.00
01/23/25	NMA	Review case file and pending motion, revise outline of trial preparation and necessary actions prior to trial.	0.40	88.00
02/11/25	CRA	Review file and update Ruth Miller.	0.20	50.00
04/25/25	CRA	Review court order. Outline remaining claims for trial. Check on discovery production.	1.50	375.00
04/25/25	NMA	Assess and analyze order denying second motion for summary judgment; review case file and next steps in case prior to trial.	0.80	176.00
04/28/25	NMA	Assess and analyze court's order denying second motion for summary judgment; prepare summary of remaining claims for trial and remit to	1.40	308.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 24

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		responsible partner.		
04/28/25	NMA	Confer with responsible partner regarding next steps in case; review DeCastro's recent online conduct in anticipation of utilizing DeCastro's online presence and videos as impeachment evidence at trial.	1.20	264.00
04/30/25	CRA	Review file and update officers on case status and recent rulings.	0.70	175.00
05/22/25	NMA	Assess and analyze DeCastro's recently filed civil rights complaint, review DeCastro's online presence and identify social media uploads relating to incident.	0.50	110.00
06/04/25	CRA	Discuss status with Brandon Borgque.	0.20	50.00
06/05/25	CRA	Begin reviewing file and drafting joint pretrial order.	3.30	825.00
06/08/25	CRA	Work on joint pretrial order.	1.30	325.00
06/11/25	NMA	Review and revise draft pretrial order; review DeCastro's online presence since prison relief in search of additional impeachment evidence.	1.90	570.00
06/12/25	NMA	Review and revise joint pre-trial order, incorporate video names and dates within proposed exhibit list.	0.50	150.00
06/16/25	CRA	Finish JPTO and have multiple calls with plaintiff's counsel on plaintiff's information/input. Review local rules regarding sanctions for plaintiff failing to file a JPTO.	0.60	210.00
06/16/25	NMA	Correspondence with responsible partner, opposing counsel relating to joint pretrial order.	0.20	60.00
06/18/25	NMA	Continue correspondence with responsible partner, legal assistant regarding plan to file joint pretrial order unless opposing counsel submits a timely draft.	0.20	60.00
06/19/25	CRA	Change joint pretrial memorandum into defendants' pretrial memorandum due to lack of response from plaintiff's counsel.	0.70	245.00
06/20/25	CRA	Final attempts to reach plaintiff's counsel on joint pretrial order. Finalize defendant's pretrial order.	0.30	105.00
06/23/25	CRA	Emails with Officer Bourque regarding [REDACTED].	0.20	70.00
06/23/25	NMA	Assess and analyze plaintiff's proposed pre trial order and proposed exhibits in anticipation of preparing objections to plaintiff's exhibits.	0.30	90.00
06/25/25	CRA	Review plaintiff's proposed pretrial order and court's rejection of same. Meet with Nick Adams regarding the court's order.	0.60	210.00
06/25/25	NMA	Review court order rejecting joint pretrial orders and ordering plaintiff to meet and confer with defendants; confer with responsible partner regarding next steps.	0.30	90.00
06/27/25	NMA	Begin preparing list of objections to plaintiff's proposed exhibits which have not been disclosed in discovery or are otherwise objectionable.	0.30	90.00
06/30/25	CRA	Emails with Brandon Borque on [REDACTED].	0.20	70.00
07/01/25	CRA	Review file and meet with Ruth and Marleen [REDACTED].	0.20	70.00
07/10/25	CRA	Review plaintiff's proposed joint pretrial order. Multiple phone calls and discussions. Meet with Nick Adams on handling.	0.70	245.00

## MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 25

Date	Atty	Description	Hours	Amount
07/10/25	NMA	Correspondence with client and opposing counsel regarding [REDACTED]; begin making reline revisions to plaintiff's draft joint pretrial order.	2.70	810.00
07/10/25	NMA	Confer with responsible partner and opposing counsel regarding joint pretrial order and best method of organizing contested facts as compared to uncontested facts, other revisions to joint pretrial order.	0.70	210.00
07/11/25	CRA	Work with Nick Adams and plaintiff's counsel on joint pretrial report.	1.20	420.00
07/11/25	NMA	Continue and complete preparing draft joint pretrial order including objections to plaintiff's proposed exhibits; remit to responsible partner for review.	2.90	870.00
07/14/25	NMA	Correspond with opposing counsel regarding joint pretrial order and revisions; review and approve final version of joint pretrial order.	0.70	210.00
07/15/25	CRA	Review court's pretrial order and trial date. Update all officers of trial date. Take call from Officer Borque.	0.50	175.00
08/11/25	CRA	Review court order setting settlement conference.	0.20	70.00
08/11/25	NMA	Assess and analyze court order setting mandatory settlement conference in anticipation of preparing confidential settlement brief.	0.30	90.00
08/12/25	CRA	Email officers regarding settlement conference. Phone calls with Doolittle and Torrey [REDACTED].	0.60	210.00
		[REDACTED]		
08/21/25	NMA	Begin preparing draft mediation brief.	1.10	330.00
08/22/25	NMA	Continue preparing draft mediation brief.	1.70	510.00
08/26/25	NMA	Continue preparing draft confidential settlement brief.	1.30	390.00
08/29/25	NMA	Continue preparing draft confidential settlement brief.	1.20	360.00
09/03/25	NMA	Continue preparing draft confidential settlement brief.	1.70	510.00
09/05/25	CRA	Discuss settlement conference with Ruth Miller.	0.30	105.00
09/07/25	NMA	Complete initial draft of confidential settlement brief; remit draft to responsible partner.	2.60	780.00
09/09/25	CRA	Meet with and update Matt on case.	0.20	70.00
09/10/25	CRA	Amend and revise settlement brief. Update Ruth and team on [REDACTED]. Meet with Nick Adams.	0.80	280.00
09/10/25	NMA	Review and analyze revised draft confidential settlement statement; confer with responsible partner regarding same.	0.30	90.00
09/11/25	CRA	Discuss case with Chadly Dingle.	0.20	70.00
09/16/25	NMA	Gather exhibits in support of confidential settlement brief; revise, finalize, and submit confidential settlement brief to settlement judge.	0.90	270.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
09/18/25	CRA	Take calls from defendant officers [REDACTED].	0.40	140.00
		[REDACTED]		



**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 27

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
12/22/25	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of LVMPD defendants' proposed jury instructions.	2.90	870.00
12/23/25	CRA	Discuss upcoming trial with Officer Bourque.	0.30	105.00
12/23/25	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of LVMPD defendants' proposed jury instructions.	1.20	360.00
12/23/25	NMA	Begin outlining core issues and arguments for trial to be incorporated within examination outlines and trial brief.	2.40	720.00
12/29/25	NMA	Continue preparing draft defendants' proposed jury instructions.	2.70	810.00
12/30/25	NMA	Continue preparing draft defendants' proposed jury instructions.	2.10	630.00
12/31/25	CRA	Meet with Nick Adams on jury instructions and trial brief.	0.60	210.00
12/31/25	NMA	Confer with responsible partner regarding case; draft and send email correspondence to opposing counsel requesting time to meet and confer.	0.40	120.00
12/31/25	NMA	Review and analyze responsible partner's revisions to draft omnibus motion in limine.	0.30	90.00
01/05/26	NMA	Correspondence with opposing counsel relating to meet and confer regarding trial readiness, motions in limine.	0.30	90.00
01/06/26	NMA	Follow-up correspondence with counsel for DeCastro relating to scheduling meet and confer conference.	0.20	60.00
01/07/26	NMA	Follow up with counsel for DeCastro regarding meet and confer on timing of trial, motions in limine; confer with responsible partner regarding same.	0.40	120.00
01/09/26	CRA	Draft email to all defendants regarding trial date. Review court emails on same. Phone call with Ofc. Borque.	0.40	140.00
01/09/26	NMA	Confer with counsel for DeCastro's refusal to agree to issues raised in motions in limine; email to court regarding trial readiness and expected duration of trial.	0.30	90.00
01/11/26	CRA	Review email from Ruth Miller on [REDACTED]. Respond to same.	0.20	70.00
01/12/26	NMA	Organize exhibits, proofread, finalize, and file omnibus motion in limine.	0.80	240.00
01/14/26	CRA	Review court order moving pretrial conference. Update Mike Dickerson on same.	0.20	70.00
01/14/26	NMA	Assess and analyze federal rules, local rules, and Judge Gordon's rules regarding trial deadlines; prepare list of pre-trial deadlines and remit same to responsible partner.	0.80	240.00
01/15/26	NMA	Continue preparation of trial brief and review of legal authority regarding same.	1.00	300.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
01/20/26	NMA	Coordinate with paralegal and responsible partner in gathering all Bates stamped documents and relevant videos onto flash drive for in-house counsel.	1.30	390.00
01/20/26	NMA	Continue preparing initial draft of trial brief.	1.40	420.00
01/21/26	CRA	Prepare and attend pretrial conference with Judge Gordon. Meet with	2.00	700.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 28

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		Mike Dickerson about trial.		
01/21/26	CRA	Legal research and draft jury instructions. Multiple calls with Michael Mee on trial issues.	6.20	2,170.00
01/21/26	NMA	Prepare for and attend trial scheduling conference; confer with responsible partner and co-counsel regarding trial expectations and strategy.	1.90	570.00
01/22/26	CRA	Finalize jury instructions.	3.30	1,155.00
01/22/26	CRA	Review all prior dispositive motion orders. Begin outlining trial strategy and key points to go over with each defendant. Delineate which claims remain against which officers.	2.20	770.00
01/22/26	CRA	Settlement talks with plaintiff's counsel. Draft email to client summarizing status and all claims.	0.70	245.00
01/23/26	CRA	Watch plaintiff's criminal trial and sentencing including testimony of Bourque and DeCastro.	1.50	525.00
01/23/26	NMA	Begin reviewing DeCastro YouTube video impeachment evidence and identifying timestamps for clips to use during cross-examination of DeCastro.	2.10	630.00
01/26/26	CRA	Draft offer of judgment and discuss with Michael Mee.	0.30	105.00
01/26/26	CRA	Multiple calls with Michael Mee on subpoenas, motions in limine, and exhibits. Set up meet and confer.	0.60	210.00
01/26/26	NMA	Continue review of DeCastro impeachment material videos; notate relevant timestamps for potential impeachment video clips.	2.60	780.00
01/27/26	CRA	Go over exhibit lists with Nicholas Adams.	0.60	210.00
01/27/26	NMA	Continue and complete review of DeCastro impeachment material videos; remit notes to responsible partner identifying possible impeachment video clips for trial.	3.40	1,020.00
01/27/26	NMA	Complete initial draft of trial brief; remit same to responsible partner for review.	1.60	480.00
01/28/26	CRA	Telephone call with Chadly Dingle.	0.40	140.00
01/28/26	CRA	Review plaintiff's opposition to omnibus motion in limine and check plaintiff's cites.	0.70	245.00
01/28/26	CRA	Call with plaintiff's counsel on trial exhibits.	0.40	140.00
01/28/26	CRA	Work on trial brief.	2.20	770.00
01/28/26	NMA	Begin preparing draft jury verdict form.	1.60	480.00
01/28/26	NMA	Assess and analyze plaintiff's opposition to omnibus motion in limine.	0.40	120.00
01/28/26	NMA	Prepare draft joint trial exhibit list; remit draft to responsible partner in anticipation of meet and confer conference.	1.80	540.00
01/28/26	NMA	Attend meet and confer conference with responsible partner and opposing counsel regarding trial exhibits and jury instructions.	0.30	90.00
01/29/26	CRA	Finalize trial brief and include new section.	1.20	420.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
Invoice 409818  
Page 29

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
01/29/26	NMA	Assess and analyze lesson plans of defendant officers disclosed in discovery; identify potentially relevant portions for trial examination and remit same to responsible partner.	1.40	420.00
01/30/26	CRA	Draft voir dire for the jury. Research potential voir dire questions in First Amendment cases.	0.70	245.00
01/30/26	CRA	Review and outline Bourque's BWC and compare with Dingle and DeCastro videos.	2.20	770.00
01/30/26	NMA	Begin preparing updated breakdown of BWC footage.	0.70	210.00
01/30/26	NMA	Complete initial draft of verdict form; remit same to responsible partner for review.	1.30	390.00
01/31/26	NMA	Assess and analyze responsible partner's revisions to draft verdict form; incorporate revisions and prepare second draft verdict form.	0.50	150.00
01/31/26	NMA	Continue preparing updated breakdown of officer body worn camera footage; notate relevant events within Sandoval footage.	1.30	390.00
02/02/26	CRA	Final review and edits to all pretrial filings including: jury instructions, trial brief, exhibit list, witness lists, and case statement. Numerous calls with Michael Mee on house cleaning and trial issues.	2.70	945.00
02/02/26	CRA	Review case file in its entirety and all relevant material. Draft detailed direct examination questions for Officer Bourque and include cites to exhibits. Call Bourque [REDACTED].	6.80	2,380.00
02/02/26	NMA	Draft, revise, and finalize joint trial exhibit list, LVMPD Defendants' exhibit list.	0.40	120.00
02/02/26	NMA	Prepare initial draft of LVMPD Defendants' statement of the case, remit to responsible partner for review.	0.60	180.00
02/02/26	NMA	Continue and complete preparation of body worn camera video summary for defendant officers Dingle, Sandoval, Sorenson, and Doolittle.	3.40	1,020.00
02/02/26	NMA	Prepare for oral argument regarding LVMPD Defendants' omnibus motion in limine; confer with responsible partner regarding same.	1.80	540.00
02/03/26	CRA	Prepare and attend calendar call. Conference with Mee on jury instructions and settlement.	2.30	805.00
02/03/26	CRA	Draft update email to Ruth and Matt after calendar call.	0.30	105.00
02/03/26	CRA	Review plaintiff's proposed jury instructions and provide objections to same. Conference with attorney Mee on objections.	1.20	420.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
02/03/26	CRA	Prepare and meet with Officer Sorensen for trial preparation.	1.40	490.00
02/03/26	CRA	Prepare and meet with Officer Sandoval, Officer Dingle, Officer Doolittle, and Officer Bourque for trial preparation. Discuss with Mike Dickerson.	3.20	1,120.00
02/03/26	NMA	Prepare for and attend calendar call.	2.30	690.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
 Invoice 409818  
 Page 30

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
02/03/26	NMA	Begin preparing direct examination outline for examination of Jesse Sandoval.	1.40	420.00
02/03/26	CRA	Review plaintiff's trial brief and voir dire.	0.60	210.00
02/03/26	NMA	Attend trial preparation meeting with Craig Anderson, Michael Dickerson, and Brandon Sorenson.	1.50	450.00
02/03/26	NMA	Attend meeting with Craig Anderson, Michael Dickerson, Branden Bourque, Erland Torrey, Jesse Sandoval, Chadly Dingle, and Clinton Doolittle.	1.80	540.00
02/03/26	NMA	Begin review and analysis of most recent DeCastro YouTube videos regarding case.	1.40	420.00
		[REDACTED]		
		[REDACTED]		
02/04/26	CRA	Review entire file and all BWC and draft direct examination questions for Sgt. Torrey. Call Sgt. Torrey [REDACTED].	4.20	1,470.00
02/04/26	CRA	Work with Taylor on formatting exhibits and organizing same.	1.00	350.00
02/04/26	CRA	Begin preparing cross-examination of DeCastro.	3.30	1,155.00
		[REDACTED]		
02/04/26	NMA	Continue preparing direct examination outline for examination of Jesse Sandoval.	1.20	360.00
02/04/26	NMA	Begin preparing direct examination outline for examination of Chadly Dingle.	1.30	390.00
02/05/26	CRA	Review file and draft direct examination of DeCastro.	6.80	2,380.00
02/05/26	CRA	Review Judge Gordon's summary judgment order and outline relevant cases to potential evidentiary arguments.	1.60	560.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026  
 Invoice 409818  
 Page 31

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
02/05/26	NMA	Draft direct examination outline for examination of Brandon Sorenson.	1.40	420.00
02/05/26	NMA	Draft direct examination outline for examination of Clinton Doolittle.	1.40	420.00
02/05/26	NMA	Identify YouTube video dates and prepare screenshots of dates of relevant impeachment videos for purposes of refreshing DeCastro's recollection at trial.	0.30	90.00
02/05/26	NMA	Prepare clips of relevant YouTube videos for purposes of impeachment of DeCastro at trial.	1.80	540.00
02/05/26	NMA	Attend meeting at courthouse to test audiovisual equipment in advance of trial.	2.50	750.00
02/06/26	CRA	Trial preparation. Draft opening. Multiple calls with plaintiff's counsel. Review Chillie's pretrial videos. Receipt and review of court's proposed jury instructions and verdict form. Continue reviewing evidence. Research and prepare for obscure issues. Meet with Nicholas Adams on trial issues.	9.30	3,255.00
02/06/26	CRA	Research qualified immunity and duty to intervene in non excessive force cases in light of Judge Gordon's instructions.	1.30	455.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
02/06/26	NMA	Continue preparation of clips of relevant video footage for use in trial.	1.70	510.00
02/06/26	NMA	Cursory review of recent YouTube videos regarding trial uploaded by plaintiff in search of additional impeachment video.	1.20	360.00
02/06/26	NMA	Coordinate with opposing counsel and provide Dropbox containing documents contained on joint exhibit list.	0.40	120.00
02/06/26	NMA	Prepare LVMPD Defendants' revised exhibit list containing video clips as additional exhibits.	0.60	180.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
02/07/26	CRA	Meet with Sgt. Torrey and [REDACTED]. Prepare Sorensen's direct examination. Continue working on opening statement. Work with Nicholas Adams on jury instructions, evidentiary issues, and	5.20	1,820.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 32

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
		overall trial preparation.		
02/07/26	NMA	Trial preparation with responsible partner.	3.70	1,110.00
		[REDACTED]		
02/09/26	CRA	Attend first day of trial.	8.00	2,800.00
02/09/26	CRA	Prepare for day 2 of trial.	1.40	490.00
02/09/26	NMA	Prepare for and attend first day of trial.	8.70	2,610.00
02/09/26	NMA	Correspondence with officers Sandoval and Sorenson [REDACTED]	0.30	90.00
02/10/26	CRA	Attend day two of trial.	7.40	2,590.00
02/10/26	CRA	Prepare for day 3 of trial including redoing DeCastro's cross with new exhibits. Go back over jury instructions in light of testimony.	3.80	1,330.00
02/10/26	NMA	Prepare for and attend second day of trial.	7.80	2,340.00
02/10/26	NMA	Prepare draft proposed changes to court's jury instructions, remit same to responsible partner.	0.40	120.00
02/10/26	NMA	Prepare revised video clip for use within DeCastro's cross examination.	0.30	90.00
02/11/26	CRA	Prepare and attend day three of trial. Argue jury instructions.	9.30	3,255.00
02/11/26	CRA	Prepare for day 4 including draft closing, work on further cross of Jose DeCastro, and go over Judge's emails and final instructions. Draft rule 50 motion.	5.30	1,855.00
02/11/26	NMA	Prepare for and attend third day of trial.	9.30	2,790.00
02/11/26	NMA	Prepare draft fifth amendment jury instruction, coordinate with counsel and judge regarding same.	0.30	90.00
02/11/26	NMA	Coordinate with court regarding uploading of video exhibits admitted into evidence for submission to jury.	0.20	60.00
02/12/26	CRA	Final closing argument preparation. Attend fourth day of trial.	10.00	3,500.00
02/12/26	NMA	Prepare for and attend fourth day of trial.	8.60	2,580.00
02/13/26	CRA	Attend trial and take jury verdict. Handle post-trial issues.	5.00	1,750.00
02/13/26	CRA	Meet with Nicholas and address post trial issues and discuss handling. Research on fees under state offer of judgment.	1.40	490.00
02/13/26	NMA	Attend fifth day of trial, receive verdict; begin outlining next steps relating to recovery of fees and costs.	5.40	1,620.00
02/16/26	CRA	Legal research on all avenues to obtain attorney fees and costs. Research whether fees are appropriate under section 1988 if only certain claims were frivolous. Update client on strategy. Meet with Nick Adams on same.	2.20	770.00
02/19/26	NMA	Assess and analyze entry of judgment; begin preparing draft memorandum of costs.	0.80	240.00
02/20/26	NMA	Assess and analyze legal authority relating to recovery of fees by defendant in section 1983 civil case.	0.80	240.00
02/24/26	NMA	Prepare initial draft of motion for attorneys' fees.	0.80	240.00

**MARQUIS AURBACH CHTD.**

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

March 2, 2026

Invoice 409818

Page 33

<b>Date</b>	<b>Atty</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Amount</b>
02/26/26	NMA	Continue preparing draft motion for attorneys' fees.	4.80	1,440.00
02/27/26	NMA	Finalize memorandum of costs.	0.40	120.00
02/27/26	NMA	Continue preparing draft motion for attorneys' fees.	1.20	360.00

██████████
██████████
██████████

**Disbursements**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>
	Westlaw Research	6,268.36
	Messenger Service	180.00
02/27/24	Pacer; Online Records Review	1.10
10/30/24	Check Issued; Video Technician; Holo Discovery - Seneca Holdings, LLC	750.00
02/25/26	Parking Fee; Trial Parking - Clinton Doolittle	84.48
02/13/26	Miscellaneous Expenses; Lunch During Trial for All Defendants - 02/09/26	160.84
02/13/26	Miscellaneous Expenses; Lunch During Trial for All Defendants - 02/10/26	86.99
02/13/26	Miscellaneous Expenses; Lunch During Trial for All Defendants - 02/11/26	144.83
02/13/26	Miscellaneous Expenses; Lunch During Trial for All Defendants - 02/12/26	115.41
02/13/26	Parking Fee; Trial - 02/09/2026	19.22
02/13/26	Parking Fee; Trial - 02/10/2026	17.57
02/13/26	Parking Fee; Trial - 02/11/2026	16.00
02/13/26	Parking Fee; Trial - 02/12/2026	16.00
02/13/26	Parking Fee; Trial - 02/13/2026	16.00
<b>Total Disbursements</b>		<b>7,876.80</b>