

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

(Filed: April 4, 2008)

DO NOT PUBLISH

_____)
SHELLY REVIS,)
as mother and natural guardian of her daughter,)
THAIRA REVIS,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
v.)
)
SECRETARY OF)
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,)
)
Respondent.)
_____)

No. 07-0487V
Attorneys' Fees; Attorneys' Costs

DECISION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND ATTORNEYS' COSTS¹

Petitioner, Shelly Revis (Ms. Revis), as mother and natural guardian of her daughter, Thaira Revis (Thaira), seeks an award of \$5,266.95 in attorneys' fees and attorneys' costs for an action that she pursued under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (Program).² See Petitioners' Application for Fees and Costs (Fee Petition), filed April 1, 2008, at 1. Ms. Revis did not incur any personal expenses as defined by General Order No. 9. See Fee Petition at 1. Respondent does not object. See Fee Petition at 1.

¹ As provided by Vaccine Rule 18(b), each party has 14 days within which to request redaction "of any information furnished by that party (1) that is trade secret or commercial or financial information and is privileged or confidential, or (2) that are medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy." Vaccine Rule 18(b). Otherwise, "the entire decision" will be available to the public. *Id.*

² The statutory provisions governing the Vaccine Program are found in 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-10 *et seq.* For convenience, further reference will be to the relevant section of 42 U.S.C.

Ms. Revis did not receive Program compensation. Nevertheless, the statute enacting the Program accords discretion to the special master to “award an amount of compensation to cover” Ms. Revis’s “reasonable attorneys’ fees and other costs” as long as “the special master or court determines that” Ms. Revis possessed “a reasonable basis for the claim” and that Ms. Revis filed the petition “in good faith.” § 300aa-15(e)(1); *see, e.g., Di Roma v. Secretary of HHS*, 1993 WL 496981 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Nov. 18, 1993). As the United States Supreme Court has cautioned in cases involving other fee-shifting schemes, the special master’s “discretion is not without limit.” *Blanchard v. Bergeron*, 489 U.S. 87, 89 n.1 (1989). Thus, absent “special circumstances,” the special master “should ordinarily” award attorneys’ fees and costs to an unsuccessful petitioner. *Id.*, *citing Newman v. Piggie Park Enterprises*, 390 U.S. 400, 402 (1968); *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 429 (1983).

The special master has considered carefully the record as a whole. Based upon his experience, the special master determines that an award of \$5,266.95 in attorneys’ fees and attorneys’ costs is appropriate. Therefore, in the absence of a motion for review filed under RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of court shall enter judgment in Ms. Revis’s favor for \$5,266.95 in attorneys’ fees and attorneys’ costs. The judgment shall reflect that Ms. Revis’s attorney of record, Lawrence R. Cohan, Esq. (Mr. Cohan), may collect \$5,266.95 from Ms. Revis. Under Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing the right to seek review.

The clerk of court shall send Ms. Revis’s copy of this decision to Ms. Revis by overnight express delivery.

John F. Edwards
Special Master