

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 16-159V

Filed: September 2, 2016

UNPUBLISHED

\*\*\*\*\*

RICHARD WATKINS, \*

\*

Petitioner, \*

v. \*

\*

Attorneys' Fees and Costs;  
Special Processing Unit ("SPU")

SECRETARY OF HEALTH \*

AND HUMAN SERVICES, \*

\*

Respondent. \*

\*

\*\*\*\*\*

*Paul R. Brazil, Muller Brazil LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.*

*Ryan Daniel Pyles, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

## **DECISION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>**

**Dorsey**, Chief Special Master:

On February 2, 2016, petitioner filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*,<sup>2</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleged that he suffered a left shoulder injury as a result of his October 14, 2014 influenza ("flu") vaccination. Petition at 1. On July 5, 2016, the undersigned issued a decision awarding compensation to petitioner based on respondent's Proffer. (ECF No. 20).

On August 3, 2016, petitioner filed an application for attorneys' fees and costs. (ECF No. 22). Petitioner requests attorneys' fees in the amount of \$12,213.50 and

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned intends to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within this definition, the undersigned will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all "§" references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

attorneys' costs in the amount of \$515.76 for a total amount of \$12,729.26. *Id.* at 1-2. In accordance with General Order #9, petitioner's counsel represents that petitioner incurred no out-of-pocket expenses. *Id.* at 2.

On August 16, 2016, respondent filed a response stating respondent "does not object to the overall amount of fees and costs request in [petitioner's] Application." (ECF No. 25).

On August 31, 2016, petitioner filed a supplemental application for attorneys' fees and costs (ECF 28) requesting the same amount of attorneys' fees and costs as sought in his initial application, but providing an accurate itemized accounting and documentation of his counsel's costs. *Id.* at 1. Respondent's counsel indicated by email communication to the court on September 1, 2016, that respondent maintains her position as stated in her August 16, 2016 response, and does not object to the overall amount of fees and costs requested by petitioner. (Informal Communication dated September 2, 2016.)

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. § 15(e). Based on the reasonableness of petitioner's request and the lack of opposition from respondent, the undersigned **GRANTS** petitioner's application for attorneys' fees and costs.

**Accordingly, the undersigned awards the total of \$12,729.26<sup>3</sup> as a lump sum in the form of a check jointly payable to petitioner and petitioner's counsel, Paul R. Brazil.**

The clerk of the court shall enter judgment in accordance herewith.<sup>4</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Nora Beth Dorsey**  
Nora Beth Dorsey  
Chief Special Master

---

<sup>3</sup> This amount is intended to cover all legal expenses incurred in this matter. This award encompasses all charges by the attorney against a client, "advanced costs" as well as fees for legal services rendered. Furthermore, § 15(e)(3) prevents an attorney from charging or collecting fees (including costs) that would be in addition to the amount awarded herein. See generally *Beck v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 924 F.2d 1029 (Fed. Cir.1991).

<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by the parties' joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.