In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 14-467V Filed: January 6, 2015 Not for Publication

MILLMAN, Special Master

Heather L. Pearlman, Washington, DC, for respondent.

DECISION AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS¹

On January 5, 2015, the parties filed a stipulation of facts in which they agreed on an appropriate amount for attorneys' fees and costs in this case.

In accordance with the General Order #9 requirement, petitioner asserts that she did not incur any costs in pursuit of her petition. Petitioner submitted a draft application for attorneys' fees and costs to respondent, requesting \$6,377.18 in attorneys' fees and costs. Respondent has reviewed the draft fee application and does not object to this amount. The undersigned finds this

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the special master's action in this case, the special master intends to post this unpublished decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (Dec. 17, 2002). Vaccine Rule 18(b) states that all decisions of the special masters will be made available to the public unless they contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged and confidential, or medical or similar information whose disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. When such a decision is filed, petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact such information prior to the document's disclosure. If the special master, upon review, agrees that the identified material fits within the banned categories listed above, the special master shall redact such material from public access.

amount to be reasonable. Accordingly, the court awards \$6,377.18, representing reimbursement for attorneys' fees and costs. The award shall be in the form of a check payable jointly to petitioner and the Law Offices of Chicago-Kent College of Law in the amount of \$6,377.18.

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment herewith.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 6, 2015

<u>s/ Laura D. Millman</u>Laura D. MillmanSpecial Master

² Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by each party, either separately or jointly, filing a notice renouncing the right to seek review.