In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 16-1189V
Filed: September 10, 2018
UNPUBLISHED

IPUNA BLACK, as Mother and Natural Guardian, and KLINE BLACK, as Father and Natural Guardian of J.B.,,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

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

Jeffrey S. Pop, Jeffrey S. Pop & Associates, Beverly Hills, CA, for petitioner.
Alexis B. Babcock, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

DECISION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS[1]

Dorsey, Chief Special Master:

On September 22, 2016, petitioners filed a petition for compensation, on behalf of their minor child, J.B., under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, et seq., (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioners allege that J.B. suffered Guillain-Barre Syndrome ("GBS") as a result of his October 14, 2015 influenza ("flu") vaccine. Petition at 1. On July 4, 2018, the undersigned issued a decision awarding compensation to petitioner based on the respondent's proffer. (ECF No. 50).

On August 30, 2018, petitioner filed a motion for attorneys' fees and costs. (ECF No. 54). Petitioner requests attorneys' fees in the amount of $42,229.00 and attorneys' costs in the amount of $7,257.88. *Id.* at 54. In compliance with General Order #9, petitioner filed a signed statement indicating that petitioner incurred no out-of-pocket expenses. *Id.* at 4. Thus, the total amount requested is $55,655.00.

[1] Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned intends to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims'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

On September 7, 2018, respondent filed a response to petitioner's motion. (ECF No. 56.) Respondent argues that "[n]either the Vaccine Act nor Vaccine Rule 13 contemplates any role for respondent in the resolution of a request by a petitioner for an award of attorneys' fees and costs." *Id.* at 1. Respondent adds, however, that he "is satisfied the statutory requirements for an award of attorneys' fees and costs are met in this case." *Id.* at 2. Respondent "respectfully recommends that the Chief Special Master exercise her discretion and determine a reasonable award for attorneys' fees and costs." *Id.* at 3.

Through email communication on September 7, 2018, petitioner's counsel informed the undersigned that petitioner did not intend to file a reply.

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, the undersigned **GRANTS** petitioner's motion for attorneys' fees and costs.

Accordingly, the undersigned awards the total of $55,655.00[2] as a lump sum in the form of a check jointly payable to petitioner and petitioner's counsel Jeffrey S. Pop.

The clerk of the court shall enter judgment in accordance herewith.[3]

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Nora Beth Dorsey
Nora Beth Dorsey
Chief Special Master

[2] 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).

[3] 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.