

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 19-1670V

ASHLEY WIRGES,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: December 27, 2024

Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, for Petitioner.

Alexis B. Babcock, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS¹

On October 29, 2019, Ashley Wirges filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of an influenza vaccine she received to her left shoulder on October 19, 2018. Petition at 1. On March 6, 2024, I issued a decision awarding damages following briefing and expedited Motions Day argument by the parties. ECF No. 56.

¹ Because this Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc>, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** 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, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2018).

Petitioner has now filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, requesting an award of \$58,105.38 (representing \$56,312.50 for attorney's fees, \$1,392.88 for attorney's costs, and \$400.00 for Petitioner's out-of-pocket litigation costs). Petitioner Application for Attorneys' Fees, filed Aug. 28, 2024, ECF No. 64. In accordance with General Order No. 9, counsel for Petitioner represents that Petitioner incurred \$400.00 in out-of-pocket expenses. *Id.* at 2.

Respondent reacted to the motion on August 29, 2024, indicating that he is satisfied that the statutory requirements for an award of attorney's fees and costs are met in this case, but deferring resolution of the amount to be awarded to my discretion. Respondent's Response to Motion at 2-3, 3 n.2, ECF No. 65. On August 30, 2024, Petitioner filed a reply, reiterating her previous request. ECF No. 66.

Having considered the motion along with the invoices and other proof filed in connection, I find a reduction in the amount of fees to be awarded appropriate, for the reason set forth below.

ANALYSIS

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Section 15(e). Counsel must submit fee requests that include contemporaneous and specific billing records indicating the service performed, the number of hours expended on the service, and the name of the person performing the service. *See Savin v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 85 Fed. Cl. 313, 316-18 (2008). Counsel should not include in their fee requests hours that are "excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary." *Saxton v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 3 F.3d 1517, 1521 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983)). It is "well within the special master's discretion to reduce the hours to a number that, in [her] experience and judgment, [is] reasonable for the work done." *Id.* at 1522. Furthermore, the special master may reduce a fee request *sua sponte*, apart from objections raised by respondent and without providing a petitioner notice and opportunity to respond. *See Sabella v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 86 Fed. Cl. 201, 209 (2009). A special master need not engage in a line-by-line analysis of petitioner's fee application when reducing fees. *Broekelschen v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 102 Fed. Cl. 719, 729 (2011).

The petitioner "bears the burden of establishing the hours expended, the rates charged, and the expenses incurred." *Wasson v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 24 Cl. Ct. 482, 484 (1991). The Petitioner "should present adequate proof [of the attorney's fees

and costs sought] at the time of the submission.” *Wasson*, 24 Cl. Ct. at 484 n.1. Petitioner’s counsel “should make a good faith effort to exclude from a fee request hours that are excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary, just as a lawyer in private practice ethically is obligated to exclude such hours from his fee submission.” *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 434.

ATTORNEY FEES

The rates requested for work performed through the end of 2024 are reasonable and consistent with our prior determinations, and will therefore be adopted.

However, a few of the tasks performed by Ms. Durant are more properly billed using a paralegal rate.³ “Tasks that can be completed by a paralegal or a legal assistant should not be billed at an attorney’s rate.” *Riggins v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 99-382V, 2009 WL 3319818, at *21 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. June 15, 2009). “[T]he rate at which such work is compensated turns not on who ultimately performed the task but instead turns on the nature of the task performed.” *Doe/11 v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. XX-XXXXV, 2010 WL 529425, at *9 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Jan. 29, 2010). **This reduces the amount of fees to be awarded by \$226.40.**⁴

Regarding the time billed, I note this case required additional briefing regarding entitlement and damages. See Petitioner’s Brief on Damages, filed Mar. 7, 2023, ECF No. 46; Petitioner’s Reply Brief on Damages, filed July 24, 2022, ECF No. 50; Minute Entry, dated Feb. 27, 2024 (for February 26, 2024 expedited hearing). Petitioner’s counsel expended approximately 16.8 hours drafting the damages brief and 7.5 hours drafting the reply brief, for a combined total of 24.3 hours. ECF No. 64-1 at 12-13. I find this time to have been reasonably incurred. (And all time billed to the matter was also reasonably incurred.)

ATTORNEY AND PETITIONER COSTS

Petitioner requests \$1,792.88 in overall costs (\$1,392.88 in attorney costs and \$400.00 in Petitioner’s out-of-pocket litigation costs) and has provided receipts for all expenses. ECF No. 64-2. And Respondent offered no specific objection to the rates or

³ These entries, drafting basic documents such as an exhibit list, cover sheet, and statement of completion, are dated as follows: 11/8/19 (two entries) and 7/22/22. ECF No. 64-1 at 3, 9.

⁴ This amount consists of $(\$380 - \$156) \times 0.7 \text{ hrs.} + (\$525 - \$177) \times 0.2 \text{ hrs.} = \226.40 .

amounts sought. ECF No. 65.

CONCLUSION

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs for successful claimants. Section 15(e). Accordingly, I hereby GRANT Petitioner's Motion for attorney's fees and costs. **Petitioner is awarded the total amount of \$57,878.98⁵ as follows:**

- **A lump sum of \$57,478.98, representing reimbursement in the amount of \$56,086.10 for attorney's fees and \$1,392.88 for attorney's costs, in the form of a check payable jointly to Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel, Leah VaSahnja Durant; and**
- **A lump sum of \$400.00, representing reimbursement for Petitioner's costs, in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.**

In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in accordance with this decision.⁶

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran

Chief Special Master

⁵ 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, Section 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 & Hum. Servs.*, 924 F.2d 1029 (Fed. Cir.1991).

⁶ Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.