

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-1414V

UNPUBLISHED

WADE ALLEN MARTIN,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: June 6, 2023

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Attorney's Fees and Costs;  
Reasonable Basis; Influenza (Flu)  
Vaccine; Guillain-Barre Syndrome  
(GBS)

*Ronald Craig Homer, Conway, Homer, P.C., Boston, MA, for Petitioner.*

*Meghan Murphy, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

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

On October 19, 2020, the eve of the expiration of the Vaccine Act's statute of limitations,<sup>2</sup> Wade Allen Martin filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>3</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleged that he suffered Guillain-Barré syndrome ("GBS") after receiving an influenza ("flu") vaccine on October 20, 2017. Petition at 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> In cases involving a vaccine administered after October 1, 2018, which did not result in death, to be timely filed, a petition must be filed within "36 months after the date of the occurrence of the first symptom or manifestation of onset or significant aggravation of such injury." 42 U.S.C. §300aa-16(a)(2) (2018).

<sup>3</sup> 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).

After determining that Petitioner had failed to provide sufficient evidence to support his claim, I allowed him the opportunity to correct the noted deficiencies or to otherwise show cause why his claim should not be dismissed. ECF No. 30. Specifically, I determined that the evidence as it currently stood supported a potential onset several months prior to vaccination and failed to establish that Petitioner suffered from GBS under the Table definition. *Id.* at 2.

On May 31, 2022, Petitioner filed a motion requesting that I dismiss his claim. ECF No. 37. Petitioner added that he “ha[d] been advised by counsel that a decision by the Special Master dismissing the petition will result in a judgment . . . [and] will end all of petitioner’s rights in the Vaccine Program.” *Id.* at 1. The same day, I issued a Decision dismissing Petitioner’s claim. ECF No. 38. Judgment entered on July 1, 2022. ECF No. 40.

On October 19, 2022, Petitioner filed a motion seeking a total of \$28,055.53 in attorney’s fees and costs. Petitioner’s Application for Attorneys’ Fees, ECF No. 42. In accordance with General Order No. 9, Petitioner filed a signed statement indicating that Petitioner incurred no out-of-pocket expenses. ECF No. 43.

On November 2, 2022, Respondent reacted to the motion, opposing an award of attorney’s fees and costs. Respondent’s Response and Objection to Motion, ECF No. 44. Maintaining “that [P]etitioner has failed to establish a reasonable basis for his claim” (*id.* at 1), Respondent emphasized the intermittent bilateral fingertip numbness he reported when receiving the flu vaccine alleged as causal, fluctuation of Petitioner’s symptoms, and potential alternative cause – alcoholism, for his illness sometimes characterized as alcoholic polyneuropathy (*id.* at 2-2-3).

Petitioner countered Respondent’s arguments in his reply. Petitioner’s Reply to Respondent’s Response and Objection, ECF No. 47. Noting that he alleged only a causation-in-fact claim, Petitioner detailed the evidence supporting a GBS diagnosis. *Id.* at 6-10. He also raised the possibility of a significant aggravation claim if the fingertip numbness Petitioner reported when receiving his vaccination was determined to be GBS-related. *Id.* at 5-6.

For the reasons discussed below, I find there was a reasonable basis for Petitioner’s claim, and he is otherwise entitled to a fees award despite the dismissal of his claim. And I have reviewed the submitted billing records and find no reduction in the amount of fees to be awarded is needed.

## I. Reasonable Basis

### A. Legal Standard

Motivated by a desire to ensure that petitioners have adequate assistance from counsel when pursuing their claims, Congress determined that attorneys' fees and costs may be awarded even in unsuccessful claims. H.R. REP. NO. 99-908, at 22 *reprinted in* 1986 U.S.C.C.A.N. 6344, 6363; *see also Sebelius v. Cloer*, 133 S.Ct. 1886, 1895 (2013) (discussing this goal when determining that attorneys' fees and costs may be awarded even when the petition was untimely filed). As Judge Lettow noted in *Davis*, "the Vaccine Program employs a liberal fee-shifting scheme." *Davis v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 105 Fed. Cl. 627, 634 (2012). It may be the only federal fee-shifting statute that permits unsuccessful litigants to recover fees and costs.

However, Congress did not intend that every losing petition be automatically entitled to attorney's fees. *Perreira v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 33 F.3d 1375, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 1994). And there is also a prerequisite to even obtaining fees in an unsuccessful case. The special master or court may award attorney's fees and costs in a case in which compensation was not awarded only if "that the petition was brought in good faith and there was a reasonable basis for the claim for which the petition was brought." Section 15(e)(1). Reasonable basis is a prerequisite to a fee award for unsuccessful cases – but establishing it does not automatically *require* an award, as special masters are still empowered by the Act to deny or limit fees. *James-Cornelius on behalf of E. J. v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 984 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2021) ("even when these two requirements are satisfied, a special master retains discretion to grant or deny attorneys' fees").

As the Federal Circuit explained, whether a discretionary fees award is appropriate involves two distinct inquiries – a subjective one when assessing whether the petition was brought in good faith and an objective one when ascertaining whether reasonable basis existed. *Simmons v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 875 F.3d 632, 635 (quoting *Chuisano v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 116 Fed. Cl. 276, 289 (2014)). "Good faith is a subjective test, satisfied through subjective evidence." *Cottingham v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 971 F.3d 1337, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2020) ("*Cottingham I*"). "[T]he 'good faith' requirement . . . focuses upon whether petitioner honestly believed he had a legitimate claim for compensation." *Turner v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 99-0544V, 2007 WL 4410030, at \*5 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Nov. 30, 2007).

Cases in which good faith has been found to be lacking often involve petitioners who failed to produce or actively concealed evidence undermining their claims. *Purnell-Reid v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 18-1101V, 2020 WL 2203712 (Fed. Cl. Spec.

Mstr. Apr. 6, 2020); *Crowding v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 16-0876V, 2019 WL 1332797 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Feb. 26, 2019); *Heath v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 08-0086V, 2011 WL 4433646 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Aug. 25, 2011); *Carter v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 90-3659V, 1996 WL 402033 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. July 3, 1996).

“Additionally, a petitioner’s attorney’s conduct may also be relevant when evaluating good faith.” *Purnell-Reid*, 2020 WL 2203712, at \*6. “Counsel still have a duty to investigate a Program claim even if they reasonably find their client to be a credible individual.” *Cortez v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 09-0176V, 2014 WL 1604002, at \*8 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Mar. 26, 2014). Factors, such as a looming statute of limitations and the conduct of counsel, are properly considered when determining whether good faith exists – but *do not bear* on the claim’s objective basis. *Simmons*, 875 F.3d at 636; *Amankwaa v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 138 Fed. Cl. 282, 289 (2018) (“the effort that an attorney makes to investigate a claim or to ensure that a claim is asserted before the expiration of the statutory limitations period . . . are properly evaluated in determining whether a petition was brought in good faith”).

“Reasonable basis, on the other hand, is an objective test, satisfied through objective evidence.” *Cottingham I*, 971 F.3d at 1344. The reasonable basis requirement examines “not at the likelihood of success [of a claim] but more to the feasibility of the claim.” *Turner*, 2007 WL 4410030, at \*6 (quoting *Di Roma v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 90-3277V, 1993 WL 496981, at \*1 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Nov. 18, 1993)). The Federal Circuit recently explained “that a reasonable basis analysis is limited to objective evidence, and that subjective considerations, such as counsel’s subjective views on the adequacy of a complaint, do not factor into a reasonable basis determination.” *James-Cornelius*, 984 F.3d at 1379.

Although clearly easier to meet than the preponderant standard required for compensation, “courts have struggled with the nature and quantum of evidence necessary to establish a reasonable basis.” *Wirtshafter v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 155 Fed. Cl. 665, 671 (Fed. Cl. 2021). “[I]t is generally accepted that ‘a petitioner must furnish *some evidence* in support of the claim.’” *Id.* (quoting *Chuisano*, 116 Fed. Cl. at 288, emphasis added in *Wirtshafter*). Citing the *prima facie* elements of a successful claim described in Section 11(c)(1), the Federal Circuit recently instructed that the level of the objective evidence sufficient for a special master to find reasonable basis should be “more than a mere scintilla but less than a preponderance of proof.” *Cottingham I*, 971 F.3d at 1345-46. “This formulation does not appear to define reasonable basis so much as set its outer bounds.” *Cottingham v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 159 Fed. Cl. 328, 333, (Fed. Cl. 2022) (“*Cottingham II*”). “[T]he Federal Circuit’s statement that a special master ‘could’

find reasonable basis based upon more than a mere scintilla does not mandate such a finding.” *Cottingham II*, 159 Fed. Cl. at 333 (citing *Cottingham I*, 971 F.3d at 1346).

Furthermore, the issue of reasonable basis is not a static inquiry. The reasonable basis which existed when a claim was filed may cease to exist as further evidence is presented. *Perreira*, 33 F.3d at 1377. In *Perreira*, the Federal Circuit affirmed a special master’s determination that reasonable basis was lost after Petitioner’s “expert opinion, which formed the basis of the claim, was found to be unsupported by either medical literature or studies.” *Id.* at 1376.

## **B. Existence of Reasonable Basis**

Despite the numerous observed deficiencies related to Petitioner’s claim, the record contains objective evidence supporting his assertions. Although unlikely to establish a Table GBS injury - due to the lack of appropriate onset, fluctuations in symptoms well beyond the nine-week time frame for allowable for a Table GBS, and viable alternative cause,<sup>4</sup> Petitioner could have provided sufficient evidence to support a causation-in-fact or significant aggravation claim. The record contained *some* evidence supporting a GBS diagnosis. *E.g.*, Exhibit 3 at 65, 73, 101 (results of lumbar puncture). And Petitioner’s symptoms clearly worsened post-vaccination. *Compare* Exhibit 5 at 5 (describing prior bilateral fingertip numbness on the date of vaccination - October 20, 2017) *with* Exhibit 3 at 65 (describing numbness and tingling in both feet and lower legs two weeks post-vaccination when admitted to the hospital - on November 10, 2017).

Although not sufficient for entitlement, I find the minimal evidence Petitioner provided prior to dismissal constitutes the level of proof required to establish reasonable basis – a standard far lower than the preponderance of evidence standard needed to meet the Vaccine Act’s requirements for compensation. I thus find that Petitioner had a reasonable basis to file his petition in this case which continued until I dismissed his claim. And there is no other basis for a denial of fees, despite the claim’s lack of success. Therefore, the only remaining question is the appropriate amount of the attorney’s fees and costs to be awarded.

## **II. Appropriate Amount to be Awarded**

### **A. Legal Standard**

Counsel must submit fee requests that include contemporaneous and specific billing records indicating the service performed, the number of hours expended on the

---

<sup>4</sup> See 42 C.F.R. § 100.3(c)(15) (Qualifications and Aids to Interpretation criteria for GBS).

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).

### **B. Attorney’s Fees and Costs**

I have reviewed the billing records submitted with Petitioner’s request. In my experience, the request appears reasonable, and I find no cause to reduce the requested hours or rates. Petitioner billed a reasonable amount of time using hourly rates previously approved for all attorneys and paralegals performing this work. ECF No. 42 at 1, 4-24, 35-39. She provided supporting documentation for all claimed costs, except for \$14.83 claimed for postage and \$20.00 for 200 pages of in-house copying costs which I nevertheless will allow. *Id.* at 23, 26-33. And Respondent offered no specific objection to the rates or amounts sought.

### **Conclusion**

I have determined that an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs is appropriate in this case even though compensation was not awarded. Section 15(e)(1). Additionally, no reduction in the amount of attorney’s fees and costs is warranted. Accordingly, I hereby GRANT Petitioner’s Motion for attorney’s fees and costs and award a total of **\$28,055.53 (representing \$27,452.20 in fees and \$603.33 in costs) as a lump sum in the form of a check jointly payable to Petitioner and Petitioner’s counsel.**

In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk shall enter judgment in accordance with this Decision.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**

Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master