



## Prepared for Citizens Redistricting Commission

March 2011



## 37 Offices Around The World

### Americas

Los Angeles  
Mexico City  
Miami  
Monterrey  
New York  
São Paulo  
Silicon Valley  
Washington, DC

### Europe, Middle East and Africa

Abu Dhabi  
Almaty  
Ankara  
Berlin  
Bratislava  
Brussels  
Bucharest  
Budapest  
Doha  
Düsseldorf  
Frankfurt  
Geneva  
Hamburg  
Helsinki  
Istanbul  
Johannesburg  
London  
Moscow  
Munich  
Paris  
Prague  
Riyadh  
Stockholm  
Warsaw

### Asia

Beijing  
Hong Kong  
Shanghai  
Singapore  
Tokyo

---

Kirk E. Miller  
Chief Counsel  
Citizens Redistricting Commission  
1130 K Street, Suite 101  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Miller and the Citizens Redistricting Commission:

White & Case is pleased to have the opportunity to submit this Statement of Qualifications highlighting our unique and substantial experience with Redistricting Activities in California. John Sturgeon has been heavily involved in California redistricting litigation since 1982, when he represented the Republican Party in redistricting litigation before the California Supreme Court. In 2001, Mr. Sturgeon and Aalok Sharma were again retained by the California Assembly and Senate Republican Caucuses to provide legal advice regarding the formation of Congressional State Assembly, State Senate and Board of Equalization districts—including advising on the application of the California and US Constitutions and the Federal Voting Rights Act.

We are highly qualified to assist the Citizens Redistricting Commission (“CRC”) in fulfilling its duties pursuant to the Voters First Act based on our:

- Unique and specialized experience working on redistricting issues in California spanning more than 30 years.
- Sophisticated knowledge of California’s constitution and the United States political process, most notably John Sturgeon’s extensive legal and trial experience with matters involving issues surrounding the California governmental process.
- Extensive research involving the provisions of the California Constitution regarding redistricting and the Federal Voting Rights Act.
- Familiarity with requirements of Propositions 11 and 20.
- Advice regarding Voting Rights Act cases in California as a result of 2001 redistricting.

We believe the depth and breadth of our experience with voter rights, the California Constitution and the strength of our lawyers in the Los Angeles office make us the best choice of legal counsel for this engagement. Our experience permits us to deliver the high-quality, cost-efficient legal services necessary to meet the requirements of the CRC.

If you have any questions, please contact Aalok Sharma at + 1 213 620 7813 (asharma@whitecase.com) or John Sturgeon at + 1 213 620 7755 (jsturgeon@whitecase.com).

---

## Section 1—Personnel

The lawyers performing the work will be Aalok Sharma and John Sturgeon, Partner and Partner of Counsel at White & Case LLP, respectively. Each will be responsible for handling approximately 50 percent of the work responsibility.

Mr. Sturgeon has a general business trial and appellate practice. He has handled over fifty appellate proceedings before the California Court of Appeals, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the California Supreme Court. Active in public and political issues, in 1982, he represented the California Republican Party in redistricting litigation before the California Supreme Court. In 2001, he and Aalok Sharma were retained by the Assembly and Senate Republicans to advise on redistricting issues under both the California Constitution and the Federal Voting Rights Act. In connection with this engagement, Messrs. Sturgeon and Sharma assisted in the formation of legislative districts. Mr. Sturgeon also represented 70 California cities challenging the constitutionality of the Legislature's allocation of property tax revenue.

Mr. Sturgeon is recognized as a leading lawyer in California. In 1995, the *Los Angeles Business Journal* recognized Mr. Sturgeon as one of the 100 most prominent Los Angeles business lawyers. In 2008/9, he was recognized as a highly regarded and recommended litigator and appellate trial lawyer by several publications including *Chambers USA*, *PLC Which lawyer?* and *Global Counsel 3000*.

Aalok Sharma is the Hiring Partner of the Los Angeles office and has a general business trial practice. As highlighted above, his experience with redistricting in California includes the representation of the California Republican Party in the 2001 redistricting litigations. Mr. Sharma has extensive trial experience in federal and state courts and before arbitral tribunals. His work and courtroom success has earned him recognition as a leading lawyer in California. In 2011, Mr. Sharma was recognized as one of the "Top 20 Lawyers in California Under the Age of 40" by the *San Francisco Daily Journal* and the *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, leading California legal newspapers.

Full biographies for Mr. Sturgeon and Mr. Sharma are enclosed.

## Section 2—Attorney/Firm General Description

Founded in New York in 1901, White & Case has 37 offices in 25 countries around the world. Our clients include many of the world's most respected and well-established companies, visionary start-ups, governmental organizations and state-owned entities. In emerging and established markets, our lawyers use their knowledge of the laws, business practices and culture to advise our clients on their cross-border business. Our practices, systems and people are integrated across offices and jurisdictions, allowing us to leverage our global knowledge and resources to ensure our clients receive the same quality service, wherever they may be.

Staffed by more than 60 lawyers, our Los Angeles office provides clients a valuable combination of local and California-specific knowledge and ready access to global resources. Our team of lawyers routinely manages complex and cross-border matters that few other law firms are equipped to handle. Among our core areas of focus are litigation and arbitration, intellectual property, mergers and acquisitions, banking, financial transactions, asset finance, public finance and bankruptcy.

Active in the Los Angeles community, our lawyers serve on a number of local nonprofit boards and perform a wide range of pro bono services. The Los Angeles office has also received significant outside recognition, including independent third-party endorsements for our commercial litigation, banking and finance, bankruptcy and transportation finance practices. In the last twelve months, the lawyers in the Los Angeles office have been recognized and/or honored by the *Los Angeles/San Francisco Daily Journal*, *The Recorder*, *The Financial Times*, *California Lawyer* magazine, the American Bar Association, *Chambers USA*, *Law 360* and more.

With respect to the Firm's experience handling redistricting matters, and our overall approach regarding such matters, please see Section 3, immediately below.

---

## Section 3—Experience

Messrs. Sturgeon’s and Sharma’s experience with redistricting and voting issues in California includes:

### (a) Parties represented in Redistricting matters:

- 1982: Mr. Sturgeon’s representation of the California Republican Party in redistricting litigation before the California Supreme Court in a case titled: ***Assembly v. Deukmejian***, 30 Cal. 3d 638 (1982).
- 2001: Messrs. Sturgeon’s and Sharma’s representation of the California Assembly and Senate Republican Caucuses in connection with a case titled: ***Andal, et al. v. Davis, et al.***, Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 01CS01397.
- 2001: Messrs. Sturgeon’s and Sharma’s representation of the California Assembly and Senate Republican Caucuses in connection with a case titled: ***Kennedy, et al. v. Davis, et al.***, Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 02CS01045.
- 2001: Messrs. Sturgeon’s and Sharma’s representation of the California Assembly and Senate Republican Caucuses in connection with a case titled: ***Nadler, et al. v. Davis, et al.***, Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 02CS01046.
- 2001: Messrs. Sturgeon’s and Sharma’s representation of the California Assembly and Senate Republican Caucuses in connections with a case titled: ***Cano, et al. v. Davis, et al.***, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV-01-08477 MMM (RCx).

### (b) The principal legal issues presented in each of the above matters:

#### 1. ***Assembly v. Deukmejian***, 30 Cal. 3d 638 (1982).

These consolidated mandate proceedings before the California Supreme Court raised issues concerning referenda challenges to the 1981 Congressional, Senate and Assembly reapportionment statutes passed by a majority of the Legislature and signed by the Governor. The issues presented:

- (1) Were the referendum petitions defective because, in violation of Elections Code section 3516, subdivision (c), they required the signer to use his or her “address as registered to vote” rather than “residence address,” thereby making it impossible for election officials to determine if the signers were qualified registered voters?

- (2) Even if the petitions contain a substantial defect, should the court allow them to qualify so the referenda may be voted on by the people of this state?
- (3) Even if the petitions would otherwise technically qualify, may the referendum process be used to challenge reapportionment statutes? Does the stay provision of the referendum section of the state Constitution apply to the effective date of the reapportionment statutes?
- (4) If the referenda stay the effect of the 1981 reapportionment statutes, how should the 1982 elections be conducted? Should the old, unconstitutional districts be adopted by this court and used in the 1982 elections? Should the court defer to the Legislature and adopt the newly drawn, equally apportioned districts enacted by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor? If the court has no choice but to mandate the use of the 1981 congressional reapportionment plan, is there a legally compelling reason why the court should not also use the 1981 Assembly and Senate reapportionment plans?

#### 2. ***Andal, et al. v. Davis, et al., consolidated with Kennedy, et al. v. Davis, et al., and Nadler, et al. v. Davis, et al.***

These consolidated cases involved a constitutional and Federal Voting Rights Act challenge to the 2001 Assembly, Senate and Congressional redistricting plans. The issues presented:

- (1) What is the appropriate standard of review when assessing whether a redistricting plan is proper and constitutional?
- (2) Whether the Legislature acted arbitrarily or capriciously in enacting the plan?
- (3) Whether the redistricting plans, as drawn, demonstrate a manifest abuse of discretion and are palpably arbitrary?
- (4) Whether the redistricting plans fail to reflect reasonable efforts to comply with the criteria set forth in Article XXI of the constitution?
- (5) Whether the redistricting plans clearly and unmistakably conflict with a clear, express provision in Article XXI of the constitution?

- 
- (6) Whether the redistricting plans comply with Article 1, Section 2 of the US Constitution (which requires population equality among congressional districts)?
  - (7) Whether the redistricting plans comply with the 14th Amendment to the US Constitution (which has been interpreted to require population equality among state legislative districts)?
  - (8) Whether the redistricting plans comply with Sections 2 and 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act?

### 3. *Cano, et al. v. Davis*

A number of Latino voters filed this action challenging the legality of the 2001 redistricting plan. The plaintiffs asserted that three of the plan's provisions had the unlawful effect of diluting Latino voters' ability to elect representatives of choice. The issues presented:

- (1) Do Congressional districts 27 and 28 unlawfully divide the Latino community in a portion of Los Angeles County's San Fernando Valley into two districts instead of preserving the integrity of that community and establishing one majority-Latino district in which Latinos could elect a representative of choice?
- (2) Does Congressional district 51, which encompasses parts of San Diego and Imperial Counties, unlawfully exclude certain Latino neighborhoods that, if included, would preserve the integrity of that Latino community and allow Latinos in that district to elect a representative of choice?
- (3) Does Senate district 27 violate the integrity of the Latino community of Southeast Los Angeles County and fail to place its residents in a majority-Latino district in which Latinos could elect a representative of choice?

### (c) Experience with Section 2 and Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act (and *Shaw v. Reno*)

The primary purpose of the Voting Rights Act is to protect the right to vote as guaranteed by the 14th and 15th Amendments. The Act prohibits states and their political subdivisions from denying or abridging citizens' rights to vote "on account of race or color" or membership in a "language minority group." The Act can be violated by both intentional discrimination in the drawing of district lines and facially neutral apportionment schemes that have the effect of diluting minority votes. Sections 2 and 5 are the relevant sections with regard to redistricting legislation.

In each of the above cases in 2001, we were appointed advisors to the Assembly and Senate Republican caucuses to provide legal advice regarding the formation of the Congressional State Assembly, State Senate and Board of Equalization districts.

In particular, the *Cano, et al. v. Davis* case specifically dealt with claims based on Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. There, Plaintiffs' legal theories were threefold. First, they alleged that each of the challenged redistricting decisions had the effect of diluting Latino voting power in contravention of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Second, they asserted that the challenged congressional districts were intentionally drawn to dilute Latino votes, and therefore violated Section 2 for that reason as well; similarly, they contended that the intentional dilution violated the Constitution. Finally, they contended that the congressional districts constituted an improper "racial gerrymander" under the cause of action established by the Supreme Court in *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 US 630, 648 (1993).

In providing our advice, we monitored each of the above redistricting cases, attended the important hearings and performed a comprehensive legal analysis, including a detailed analysis of the Section 2 and Section 5 claims presented in those cases. We researched and prepared comprehensive memoranda and legal opinions analyzing the California and US constitutional issues and Section 2 and Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act.

---

Specifically as to a Section 2 claim, we analyzed the three preconditions that must be met:

- Whether the minority group demonstrated that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district.
- Whether the minority group demonstrated that it is politically cohesive.
- Whether the minority group demonstrated that, in the absence of special circumstances, bloc voting by the White majority usually defeats the minority's preferred candidate.

We then analyzed and applied the different factors that should be considered:

- The extent of any history of official discrimination in the state or political subdivision that touched the right of the members of the minority group to register, to vote or otherwise participate in the democratic process.
- The extent to which voting in the elections of the state or political subdivision is racially polarized.
- The extent to which the state or political subdivision has used unusually large election districts, majority vote requirements, anti-single shot provisions, or other voting practices or procedures that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination against the minority group.
- If there is a candidate slating process, whether the members of the minority group have been denied access to that process.

The extent to which members of the minority group in the state or political subdivision bear the effects of discrimination in areas such as education, employment and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process.

- Whether political campaigns have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals.
- The extent to which members of the minority group have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction.
- Whether there is a significant lack of responsiveness by elected officials to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group.
- Whether the policy underlying the use of the voting qualification, standard, practice or procedure is tenuous.

The above factors were created in response to historical acts of discrimination and racial polarization. The list is not meant to be comprehensive or exclusive.

Specifically as to a Section 5 claim, in 2001, we analyzed the four counties in California that were subject to a Section 5 claim: Kings County, Merced County, Monterey County and Yuba County. Section 5 requires those counties to submit all proposed election law changes, including changes in Senate, Assembly and Congressional districts, to the US Attorney General for clearance prior to the effective date of the changes.

A Section 5 challenge, therefore, can be made on the basis that (1) the proposed changes were never submitted to the Attorney General for review; or (2) if they were, the proposed changes will have the effect of worsening the current voting positions of racial or language minorities.

---

#### (d) Outcome of prior redistricting representations

The 1982 *Assembly v. Deukmejian* case resulted in a 4-3 decision by the California Supreme Court in favor of respondents. Chief Justice Bird authored the opinion.

The 2001 consolidated cases—*Andal v. Davis*, *Kennedy v. Davis*, and *Nadler. v. Davis*—were decided in favor of the respondents.

#### (e) Additional experience handling voting and election law issues in the United States

In addition to White & Case's work specific to California redistricting and voting issues discussed above, the Firm has significant additional experience handling voting and election law issues throughout the United States. Some examples follow:

- Our lawyers played a significant role in one of the most high-profile litigation matters in recent years, the hotly disputed US Presidential election in 2000. A team from our Washington, DC office advised the campaign of then-Governor George W. Bush on the complex web of litigation surrounding the election.
- Representation of the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, Inc. (ACORN), a not-for-profit corporation, in two federal court cases in the Southern District of Florida. The cases, based on allegations of voter registration fraud in ACORN's 2004 general election voter outreach program, were both successfully dismissed with prejudice. A favorable judgment was granted on a defamation counterclaim filed by ACORN.
- Served as counsel to the United States Senate Committee in connection with an election fraud investigation.
- Representation of Pierce O'Donnell, a prominent Los Angeles trial lawyer, against felony charges involving campaign finance. In a precedent-setting ruling on June 8, 2009, in applying the Federal Election Campaign Act, a US district judge dismissed two of three campaign-finance charges against our client.

#### Section 4—Conflicts of Interest

We see no conflict in our past representation of the Assembly Republican Caucus in 1982 and 2001.

#### Section 5—Fee Arrangements

White & Case's billing policies include cost-effective measures designed to create a fee model that will benefit our clients.

White & Case generally charges for our services at predetermined hourly rates, based on the skills and experience of a particular team member. We are acutely conscious of client cost concerns and the competitive pressures in today's legal environment. Accordingly, we would be pleased and are prepared to propose a reduced hourly rate of US\$500 per hour (less for associates) with a cap of US\$285,000, or such other arrangement as is desired by the CRC and is fair and equitable to all parties.

White & Case's costs and disbursements (such as photocopying documents, facsimile and overseas telephone calls, travel expenses, hotel accommodations, other necessary travel expenses, secretarial overtime and the like) will be charged for this project in accordance with CRC guidelines.

We customarily submit detailed monthly invoices for services performed and expenses incurred. We will not charge for travel time other than for time spent during such travel actually working on the matter.

# Biographies

---



## Aalok Sharma Partner, Los Angeles

+ 1 213 620 7813  
asharma@whitecase.com

### Bars and Courts

California State Bar

US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

US District Courts for the Central,  
Eastern, Northern and Southern Districts  
of California

### Education

JD, Loyola Law School Los Angeles,  
Editor, *Loyola Law Review*, 1999

BA, University of Washington, Economics,  
with Honors, 1995

### Languages

English

### Citizenship

United States

### Practice Experience

Aalok Sharma is the Hiring Partner of the Los Angeles office and a partner in the Firm's US Disputes Group. He is also in charge of the Los Angeles office Associates' Committee.

Aalok has a national and international practice handling complex business disputes. He has extensive trial experience in federal and state courts and before arbitral tribunals. He represents clients in high-stakes litigations in a variety of industries including social media, real estate, hospital, advertising, accounting, manufacturing, banking and energy. His practice includes cases involving contract disputes, privacy and defamation, trade secrets and unfair competition, real property disputes and corporate governance disputes.

Aalok's work and courtroom success has earned him recognition as a leading lawyer in the legal community. In 2011, Aalok was recognized as one of the "Top 20 Lawyers in California Under the Age of 40" by the *San Francisco Daily Journal* and the *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, leading California legal newspapers.

Aalok's notable clients include Facebook, Inc., Children's Hospital Los Angeles, SunCal Companies, Valero Energy Company and McKinley Children's Center.

Some of Aalok's current and recent engagements and cases are described below:

- Facebook, Inc.: Aalok is Facebook's international outside counsel, responsible for handling all of Facebook's international litigation.
- Co-chaired 5-day federal court trial: *Venture Corporation Limited* ("Venture") v. *Wherify Wireless, Inc.* ("Wherify")(CV04-8583RGKI). Filed suit on behalf of Venture to recover millions of dollars for the product it manufactured for Wherify. Wherify filed a counterclaim seeking more than US\$95 million in lost profits and compensatory damages. A final judgment was entered in favor of the Firm's client and Wherify was denied any of its US\$95 million lost profits and compensatory damages claim.
- Co-chaired 10-day state court trial: *Aharoni v. Malibou Lake Mountain Club, Ltd.* (BC 302066). Defended Malibou Lake Mountain Club in a real property dispute involving thirteen causes of action, including breach of contract claims, breach of fiduciary duty claims and claims alleging violations of the Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act ("Davis-Stirling Act"). A final judgment was entered in favor of the Firm's client as to every cause of action, and included an attorneys' fee award in our client's favor in excess of US\$1 million.
- Representation of the California Republican Party regarding reapportionment and redistricting litigation.

---

**Aalok Sharma**  
Partner, Los Angeles

- First chaired arbitration trial before a three-judge arbitral panel representing the plaintiff in a multimillion-dollar breach of contract action concerning the performance of professional legal services. Obtained favorable verdict for the Firm's client.
- Representation of a cable service provider in defense of class and unfair competition claims on behalf of cable television, telephone and Internet subscribers alleging the late fee assessed by the provider violated state unfair competition laws. The Court granted summary judgment in favor of the Firm's client. The court of appeal affirmed. *Utility Consumers' Action Network, Inc., v. AT&T Broadband of Southern Cal., Inc., et al.*, 135 Cal App. 4th 1023 (2006).
- Representation of a cable service provider in defense of class and unfair competition claims alleging improper billing for service outages.
- Representation of an advertising agency against the former agency president and officers, their new company and their financial backer for unfair competition, breach of fiduciary duty, trade secret violations and breach of contract. This case resulted in a favorable settlement for the client.
- Representation of an energy company concerning federal preemption issues before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.
- Representation of a national accounting company in defense of claims concerning accounting malpractice, negligence and fraud.

**Publications**

Co-author "Late Fees Protected From Class Action Attack by White & Case Victory," *California Litigation Report*, September 22, 2006

Co-author, "Satisfaction Not Guaranteed: California's Conflicting Law on the Use of Accord and Satisfaction Checks," 33 *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review* 1, 1999

**Professional Associations**

Association of Business Trial Lawyers

Los Angeles County Bar Association

Member of the Board of Directors of McKinley Children's Center

# Biographies

---



**John A. Sturgeon**  
Partner of Counsel, Los Angeles

+ 1 213 620 7755  
jsturgeon@whitecase.com

## Bars and Courts

US Supreme Court, 1987

US District Courts for the Central, Eastern, Northern and Southern Districts of California, 1983

US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, 1978

California State Bar, 1963

## Education

JD, Stanford Law School, 1962

AB, Stanford University, *cum laude*, 1957

## Awards and Recognition

*Chambers 2008/9* listed as  
"Highly regarded litigator"

*PLC Which lawyer?* 2008/9 selected as  
"Highly Recommended"

*Global Counsel 3000 2008/9*—Highly Recommended ranking in Dispute Resolutions section for business and appellate trial lawyers

*Los Angeles Business Journal*, 1995 selected as one of the 100 most prominent Los Angeles business lawyers

## Practice Experience

Mr. Sturgeon has a general business trial and appellate practice. He has represented several banks, including Bank of America, Northern Trust Bank, Deutsche Bank, Federal Reserve Bank and Wells Fargo Bank, in major lender liability cases and in cases involving trust and general banking issues. His practice also includes trade secret and unfair competition cases, defense of securities and other class actions, real property disputes, trust and probate litigation, business torts, and disputes among partners and shareholders. Active in public issues, Mr. Sturgeon represented 70 California cities challenging the constitutionality of the Legislature's allocation of property tax revenue. He also represented the California Republican Party in reapportionment litigation before the California Supreme Court. He has handled more than fifty appellate proceedings before the California Court of Appeals, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the California Supreme Court.

In litigation involving the energy industry, Mr. Sturgeon has represented Sierra Pacific Power Company in federal preemption issues and Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP and Mirant Corporation in class actions involving the California energy problems.

Mr. Sturgeon was a co-founder of the 4,000-member Association of Business Trial Lawyers.

He is a Fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

## Publications

Co-author of the 2nd vol. of "California Business Litigation,"  
California Continuing Education of the Bar, 2002

"*Checking Off on Class Certification*," October 2009

"A California Screen Play?" June 2008

"The Rescission Remedy," *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, December 4, 2007

"Appealing Standards," *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, April 19, 2007

"Where Fences Fall, Injunctions Can Corral Neighbor's Nuisance," *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, February 3, 2006

"Sum of Contract's Parts Can Add Up to Attorney-Fee Win" *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, November 2005

"Fee Simple—Streamlining Recovery of Attorneys' Fees" *Los Angeles Daily Journal*, September 1995

---

**John A. Sturgeon**  
Partner of Counsel, Los Angeles

**Languages**

English

**Citizenship**

United States

**Professional Associations**

The State Bar of California

Fellow, American College of Trial Lawyers

Association of Business Trial Lawyers, Member, Board of Governors, 1974 – 1976, 1992 – 1994

Member, Los Angeles County Superior Court Arbitration Panel

Fellow, American Bar Foundation

**Community Services**

Member, Board of Overseers, The Huntington Library,  
Art Collections and Botanical Gardens

Chairman, The Huntington Library, Art Collections and Botanical Gardens, Art Committee

Chairman, The Getty Museum Museum Conservation Council

President, The Valley Hunt Club, 1991

# Our Global Network



## Supporting Clients Across the Globe

White & Case is a leading global law firm with lawyers in 37 offices across 25 countries.

We advise on virtually every area of law that affects cross-border business and our knowledge, like our clients' interests, transcends geographic boundaries.

Whether in established or emerging markets, our commitment is substantial, with dedicated on-the-ground knowledge and presence.

Our lawyers are an integral, often long-established part of the business community, giving clients access to local, English and US law capabilities, plus a unique appreciation of the political, economic and geographic environments in which they operate.

At the same time, working between offices and cross-jurisdiction is second nature and we have the experience, infrastructure and processes in place to make that happen effortlessly.

We work with some of the world's most respected and well-established companies—including two-thirds of the *Global Fortune 100* and half of the *Fortune 500*—as well as start-up visionaries, governments and state-owned entities.

"White & Case can handle any issue with experienced lawyers and a great global network—great depth and high quality around the world."

*Chambers Global 2010*

Top 10 US Firm

*American Lawyer 2010*

Top 10 Global Firm

*American Lawyer 2010*

Top 10 US Firm for Legal Innovation

*RSG Consulting 2011*

Global Elite Firm

*Legal Business 2010*

Leading Innovative US Firm in M&A, Restructuring, Litigation, Financial Services and Pro Bono and Leading Innovative UK Firm in Financial Services

*Financial Times 2010*

Law Firm of the Year in Central and Eastern Europe

*Chambers Europe 2010*

No. 1 Global Bankruptcy Law Firm

*The Deal 2010*

Top International Arbitration Firm

*Global Arbitration Review 2010*

Global Elite in Antitrust/Competition

*Global Competition Review 2011*

Top 5 M&A Firm in Latin America

*Latin Business Chronicle 2010*

Top 5 Energy M&A Firm

*SNL Financial 2011*

A Class Action Law Firm of the Year

*Law360 2011*

## Americas

Los Angeles

Mexico City

Miami

Monterrey

New York

São Paulo

Silicon Valley

Washington, DC

## Europe, Middle East and Africa

Abu Dhabi

Almaty

Ankara

Berlin

Bratislava

Brussels

Bucharest

Budapest

Doha

Düsseldorf

Frankfurt

Geneva

Hamburg

Helsinki

Istanbul

Johannesburg

London

Moscow

Munich

Paris

Prague

Riyadh

Stockholm

Warsaw

## Asia

Beijing

Hong Kong

Shanghai

Singapore

Tokyo

Worldwide. For Our Clients.

[www.whitecase.com](http://www.whitecase.com)

---

White & Case LLP  
633 West Fifth Street Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071-2007  
United States  
Tel: + 1 213 620 7700  
Fax: + 1 213 452 2329