

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**  
**OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**

No. 10-373V  
Filed: June 12, 2012  
Unpublished

\*\*\*\*\*

JILLIAN KAMKIM, in her own right, and as a	*	
Parent and natural guardian of JAYDON	*	
CAESAR, a minor,	*	
	*	
Petitioner,	*	Attorneys' fees and costs
	*	
v.	*	
	*	
SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT	*	
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,	*	
	*	
Respondent.	*	

\*\*\*\*\*

Lawrence R. Cohan, Anapol, Schwartz, et al., Philadelphia, PA, for Petitioner.  
Ann Donohue Martin, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

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

**GOLKIEWICZ**, Special Master.

On June 11, 2012, the parties filed a Stipulation of Facts Concerning Attorneys' Fees and Costs [hereinafter "Fee Stipulation"]. The Fee Stipulation states that petitioner filed an Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs on April 25, 2012, requesting a total of \$22,686.28. Fee Stipulation at ¶ 2. Respondent raised certain objections during informal discussions and, based upon those discussions, petitioner amends her fees and costs request. Id. at ¶ 3. Petitioner now requests \$20,600.00 in attorney fees and costs. Id. Respondent does not object to the revised amount. Id. (noting the amended request is not unreasonable to have been incurred in this case, without waiving any objections); see also R Status Report, filed June 11, 2012 (noting respondent will not expend "additional resources asserting defenses based on lack of jurisdiction or lack of reasonable basis in response to petitioner's motion for attorneys' fees" upon a case alleging an *in utero* injury claim). In compliance with General Order #9, the Fee Stipulation

---

<sup>1</sup> The undersigned intends to post this decision on the website for the United States Court of Federal Claims, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (Dec. 17, 2002). **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 a trade secret or commercial or financial in substance and is privileged or confidential; or (2) that includes medical files or 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. Any motion for redaction must be filed by no later than fourteen (14) days after filing date of this filing. Further, consistent with the statutory requirement, a motion for redaction must include a proposed redacted decision, order, ruling, etc.**

states that petitioner did not incur reimbursable costs paid solely by petitioner. Fee Stipulation at ¶ 4; Petitioner and Counsel Statement, filed June 8, 2012.

“The parties now agree that a decision should be entered awarding attorneys’ fees and costs payable jointly to petitioner and petitioner’s attorney . . . for a total award of \$20,600.00.” Fee Stipulation at ¶ 5.

The court hereby awards petitioner attorney fees and costs in the total amount of \$20,600.00. **Specifically, petitioner is awarded a lump sum of \$20,600.00 in the form of a check payable jointly to petitioner and petitioner’s attorney of record.**

The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly.<sup>2</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Gary J. Golkiewicz  
Gary J. Golkiewicz  
Special Master

---

<sup>2</sup>Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties can expedite entry of judgment by each party filing a notice renouncing the right to seek review by a United States Court of Federal Claims judge. Furthermore, this amount is intended to cover all legal expenses. This award encompasses all charges by the attorney against a client, “advanced costs” as well as fees for legal services rendered. Furthermore, 42 U.S.C.A. §300aa-15(e)(3) prevents an attorney from charging or collecting fees (including costs) which would be in addition to the amount awarded herein. See generally, Beck v. Secretary of the Dept. of Health & Human Servs., 924 F.2d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 1991).