

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 99-610 V

Filed: June 21, 2011

Not for Publication

LOREEN ARTZ,

*

*

Petitioner,

*

*

v.

*

Final Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs

*

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

*

*

Respondent.

*

*

Ronald C. Homer, Boston, MA, for petitioner.

Lisa A. Watts, Washington, DC, for respondent.

MILLMAN, Special Master

DECISION AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS¹

On June 17, 2011, petitioner filed a final application for attorneys' fees and costs. Petitioner asked for final attorneys' fees of \$23,044.40 and final attorneys' costs of \$23,623.02. Petitioner's final costs are \$0. Total final fees and costs are **\$46,667.42**.

On June 21, 2011, respondent's counsel communicated with the undersigned's law clerk that respondent had no objection to petitioner's final fees and costs.

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the special master's action in this case, the special master intends to post this unpublished decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub.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). Vaccine Rule 18(b) states that all decisions of the special masters will be made available to the public unless they contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged and confidential, or medical or similar information whose disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. When such a decision is filed, petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to delete such information prior to the document's disclosure. If the special master, upon review, agrees that the identified material fits within the banned categories listed above, the special master shall delete such material from public access.

The court awards the sum of **\$46,667.42** in the form of a check made payable jointly to petitioner and the law firm of Conway, Homer & Chin-Caplan, PC.

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment herewith.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 21, 2011

s/ Laura D. Millman
Laura D. Millman
Special Master

² Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by each party's filing a notice renouncing the right to seek review.