

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 21-0494V

LOUIS BRANDT,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: February 9, 2024

Danielle Anne Strait, Maglio Christopher & Toale, PA, Seattle, WA, for Petitioner.

Lauren Kells, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS¹

On January 11, 2021, Louis Brandt 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 alleged that as a result of an influenza vaccine received on October 21, 2019, he suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccination (known as SIRVA) as defined on the Vaccine Injury Table. Petition (ECF No. 1) at Preamble. On June 14, 2023, I issued a decision awarding compensation to Petitioner, following briefing by the parties. ECF No. 42.

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 \$38,315.41 (representing \$37,625.80 in fees and \$689.61 in costs). Petitioner's Motion for Payment of Petitioner's Attorneys' Fees and Reimbursement of Case Costs, filed Oct. 19, 2023, ECF No. 46. In accordance with General Order No. 9, Petitioner filed a signed statement indicating that he incurred no out-of-pocket expenses. ECF No. 46-4.

Respondent reacted to the motion on November 2, 2023, 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. 47.

On November 8, 2023, Petitioner filed a reply, criticizing Respondent's lack of a specific response to his motion and reiterating that he is entitled to an award of attorney's fees and costs. Petitioner's Reply to Respondent's Response to Petitioner's Application for Fee and Costs. ECF No. 48. Petitioner insists that "Petitioner's counsel has accurately recorded the time spent on this case and has filed receipts for documenting the litigation expenses incurred." *Id.* at 1.

Having considered the motion along with the invoices and other proof filed in connection, I find several reductions in the amount of fees to be awarded appropriate, for the reasons 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 2023 are reasonable and consistent with our prior determinations, and will therefore be adopted. ECF No. 46-2 at 21-22. However, one task performed by Ms. Strait is 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 **\$60.00**.⁴

Regarding the number of hours billed, I deem the *total* amount of time devoted to briefing damages to be excessive. See Petitioner’s Motion for Damages, filed Aug. 10, 2022, ECF No. 34; Petitioner’s Reply to Respondent’s Response to Petitioner’s Motion for Damages, Nov. 1, 2022, ECF No. 38. Petitioner’s counsel expended approximately 20.70 hours drafting the brief and 18.7 hours drafting the reply brief, totaling 39.4.⁵ hours. ECF No. 46-2 at 16-18.

³ This entry, describing the revision of exhibits and an exhibit list, is dated 1/26/21. ECF No. 46-2 at 8.

⁴ This amount consists of $(\$395 - \$165) \times .3 \text{ hrs.} = \60.00 .

⁵ These totals are calculated as follows: 37.7 hours billed on 8/4/22 (three entries), 8/5/22 (two entries), 8/8/22, 8/9/22 (four entries), 8/10/22 (three entries), 10/17/22 (three entries), 10/26/22, 10/27/22 (two entries), 10/28/22, 11/1/22 by LeeAnne Pedrick at a rate of \$220; and 1.7 hours billed on 8/9/22, 8/10/22, and 10/31/22 by Jessica Olins at a rate of \$290.

My above calculation does not include time spent preparing the initial demand which would have informed this later work – 7.8 hours – and I am therefore awarding fees associated with that task in full.⁶ Nor am I counting time spent communicating with Petitioner and preparing additional supporting documentation such as affidavits or signed declarations, which is also being awarded in full. See, e.g., ECF No. 46-2 at 13 (1/6/22 entry).

It is unreasonable for counsel to spend so much time briefing the issue of damages in this case, once the sum in question is calculated, and where the issues presented are not complex. I have identified numerous cases (which may reasonably be compared to time spent in this matter),⁷ in which attorneys have accomplished this task in about half the time.⁸ See, e.g., *Mulloy v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 19-1396V (Nov. 6, 2023) (19.7 and 9.5 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Gao v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 21-1884V (Oct. 25, 2023) (16.5 and 9.4 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Knasel v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1366V (Oct. 25, 2023) (11.5 and 13.6 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Langdon v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1311V (Oct. 25, 2023) (12.5 and 12.8 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Mantagas v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1720V (Oct. 17, 2023) (6.7 and 4.2 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Majerus v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1346V (Oct. 17, 2023) (11.0 and 4.6 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Cosden v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1783 (Aug. 8, 2023) (6.3 hours billed for drafting a damages brief); *Balch v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-0872V (June 30, 2023) (18.7 hours billed for drafting a damages brief); *Kestner v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-0025V (June 22, 2023) (6.00 and 4.10 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Juno v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 18-0643V (June 14, 2023) (5.8 hours billed for drafting a damages brief); *Deutsch v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 18-0527V (June 12, 2023) (7.4 and 4.4 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief,

⁶ This time was billed by LeeAnne Pedrick, using an hourly rates of \$195 and \$220, and results in \$1,573.50 in attorney’s fees. ECF No. 46-2 at 13-14.

⁷ Special masters may use comparisons to attorneys performing similar tasks to determine if hours are excessive. See *Saxton v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 3 F.3d 1517, 1518-1521 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

⁸ These decisions can be found on the United States Court of Federal Claims website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc> (last visited July 21, 2023).

respectively); *Edminister v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 19-0184V (May 30, 2023) (15.3 and 3.5 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Aponte v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1031V (May 18, 2023) (6.9 hours billed for drafting a damages brief); *Gray v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1708V (May 18, 2023) (5 hours billed for drafting a damages brief); *Horky v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-0239V (May 18, 2023) (5.8 hours billed for drafting a damages brief); *Thomson v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 22-0234V (May 18, 2023) (9.5 and 2.5 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively); *Rice-Hansen v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1338V (May 17, 2023) (12.9 and 6.1 hours billed for drafting a damages brief and responsive damages brief, respectively).

The circumstances of this case did not warrant devoting so much time to damages briefing. The parties agreed upon the amount of past expenses, and the only area of dispute was the appropriate amount of compensation for Petitioner’s past pain and suffering. ECF No. 42 at 9-10. Furthermore, the parties’ views differed by only \$10,000.00 - Petitioner sought \$100,000.00, and Respondent countered with \$60,000.00 to \$67,000.00. I ultimately awarded \$65,000.00, an amount for pain and suffering within the range proposed by Respondent – further underscoring the extent to which Petitioner’s efforts in this behalf had a futile quality (since I ultimately found the higher figure was not adequately defended). *Id.* at 10. Nevertheless, due to the reasonable amount of overall attorney’s fees and costs sought, I will reduce the hours billed by a lower amount than I otherwise would apply. See, e.g., *Peterson v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-1649V, 2023 WL 6444426 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Aug. 31, 2023).

Of course, having prevailed in this case, a fees award is generally appropriate. See ECF No. 42. But the Act permits only an award of a *reasonable amount of attorney’s fees*. Accordingly, I will reduce the sum to be awarded for damages briefing (**a total of 39.4 hours, or \$8,787.00**) by *twenty percent*. Such an across-the-board reduction (which I am empowered to adopt)⁹ fairly captures the overbilling evidenced by this work, without requiring me to act as a “green eye-shaded accountant” in identifying with specificity each objectionable task relevant to this one sub-area of work performed on the case. **This results in a reduction of \$1,757.40.**¹⁰

⁹ Special masters are permitted to employ percentage reductions to hours billed, provided the reduction is sufficiently explained. See, e.g., *Abbott v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 135 Fed. Cl. 107, 111 (2017); *Raymo v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 129 Fed. Cl. 691, 702-704 (2016); *Sabella v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 86 Fed. Cl. 201, 214 (2009).

¹⁰ This amount is calculated as follows: $(37.7 \times \$220 \times .20) + (1.7 \times \$290 \times .20) = \$1,757.40$.

ATTORNEY COSTS

Petitioner requests \$689.61 for attorney's costs, and has provided supporting documentation for all claimed attorney costs. ECF No. 46-3. Additionally, Respondent offered no specific objection to the rates or amounts sought. Thus, I will award the amount of attorney's costs sought in full.

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. I award a total of **\$36,498.01 (representing \$35,808.40 in fees and \$689.61 in costs)** as a lump sum in the form of a check jointly payable to **Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel, Danielle Anne Strait. Per Petitioner's request, the checks are to be forwarded to Maglio Christopher & Toale Law, 1605 Main Street, Suite 710, Sarasota Florida 34236.**

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.¹¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

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