

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 05-905V
Filed: September 12, 2007

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

TYRAN DUNCAN,

*

*

*

Petitioner,

*

Attorney's fees; costs

*

v.

*

*

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

*

*

*

Respondent.

*

*

DECISION¹

A status conference was conducted in the above-captioned matter on September 12, 2007, to discuss petitioner's request for fees and costs in this compensated case. The parties represented that after reviewing and discussing counsel's request, adjustments to the request were made and the parties agree that \$156,035.31 for fees and cost are reasonable. The undersigned concurs.

Thus, petitioner is awarded \$156,035.31 for fees and cost. Fees and cost are to be paid jointly and paid solely to petitioner.

The undersigned thanks the parties for their diligent and cooperative efforts in resolving this matter.

¹The undersigned intends to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, 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 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.

The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Gary J. Golkiewicz
Chief Special Master

² 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 HHS, 924 F.2d 1029 (Fed. Cir. 1991).