

- 1 (3) the work performed, including the skill, time, and attention given to the  
work; and  
2 (4) the result—whether the attorney was successful and what benefits were  
derived.

3 *Barney*, 192 P.3d at 736 (citing *Brunzell*, 85 Nev. at 349, 455 P.2d at 33). According to  
4 *Shuette*, the district court is required to “provide[ ] sufficient reasoning and findings in support  
5 of its ultimate determination.” *Id.* (citing *Shuette*, 121 Nev. at 865, 124 P.3d at 549).  
6

7 Margolin concedes that he is not currently entitled to attorney’s fees that are incurred  
8 on appeal. See *Bd. of Gallery of History, Inc. v. Datecs Corp.*, 116 Nev. 286, 288, 994 P.2d  
9 1149, 1150 (2000). However, as stated above, Margolin is entitled to his postjudgment  
10 attorney’s fees, including those incurred in executing on the judgment. Therefore, Margolin is  
11 hereby awarded only those fees that have been incurred, postjudgment, with regards to  
12 execution of the judgment, for a total of \$31,247.50 in fees, which reflects the lodestar amount  
13 of postjudgment attorney’s fees.  
14

15 The amount of attorney’s fees awarded only includes reasonable attorney’s fees from  
16 October 18, 2013 to April 18, 2014, as follows: 11.4 hours of work performed by attorney  
17 Matthew D. Francis at \$300 per-hour (\$3,420.00); 75.3 hours of work performed by attorney  
18 Adam P. McMillen at \$300 per-hour (\$22,590.00); and 41.9 hours of work performed by  
19 paralegal Nancy Lindsley at \$125 per-hour (\$5,237.50). This lodestar amount is reasonable  
20 under the *Brunzell* factors as follows.  
21

- 22 (1) **Factors 1 and 2 - The Advocate’s Qualities, Including Ability, Training,  
Education, Experience, Professional Standing, and Skill and The Novelty  
23 and Difficulty of The Questions Involved, and The Time and Skill Involved**

24 The issues related to this case included: (a) whether Plaintiff’s patents were entitled to  
25 protection; (b) whether Defendants fraudulently assigned Plaintiff’s patents; and (c), whether  
26 Plaintiff was damaged by Defendants’ conduct. The patent and deceptive trade practices  
27 issues, and the unique facts surrounding them, involved careful consideration and research. In  
28 general, patent and deceptive trade practices litigation is a niche practice that requires a high