

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 16-0764V

Filed: May 9, 2017

UNPUBLISHED

\*\*\*\*\*

MARIANA CREIGHTON-O'CONNOR, \*

\*

Petitioner, \*

v. \*

SECRETARY OF HEALTH \*

AND HUMAN SERVICES, \*

Respondent. \*

\*

\*\*\*\*\*

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

*Lara Ann Englund, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

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

**Dorsey**, Chief Special Master:

On June 29, 2016, Mariana Creighton-O'Connor ("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 she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration ("SIRVA"), including bursitis to her right shoulder, that was caused by an influenza ("flu") vaccine she received on October 9, 2014. On March 3, 2017, the undersigned issued a decision awarding compensation to petitioner based the parties' joint stipulation. (ECF No. 25).

On May 4, 2017, petitioner filed a motion for attorneys' fees and costs. (ECF No. 29). Petitioner requests attorneys' fees in the amount of \$13,765.50, and attorneys'

---

<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 Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned intends to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website,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).

costs in the amount of \$622.94, for a total amount of \$14,388.44. *Id.* at 2. In accordance with General Order #9, petitioner's counsel represents that petitioner incurred no out-of-pocket expenses.

On May 9, 2017, respondent filed a response to the motion for attorneys' fees and costs stating that respondent does not object to the overall amount sought, as it is not an unreasonable amount to have been incurred for the proceedings to date. (ECF No. 30). Respondent states that his lack of objection should not be construed as an admission, concession or waiver as to the hourly rates requested, the number of hours billed, or the other litigation related costs.

The undersigned has reviewed the billing records submitted with petitioner's request. In the undersigned's experience, the request appears reasonable, and the undersigned finds no cause to reduce the requested hours or rates.

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

**Accordingly, the undersigned awards the total of \$14,388.44,<sup>3</sup> as a lump sum in the form of a check jointly payable to petitioner and petitioner's counsel Muller Brazil, LLP.**

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.