

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 07-490V

Filed: January 26, 2011

Not for Publication

JAMES WOODY THOMPSON, *

*

Petitioner, *

*

v. *

Attorneys' Fees and Costs Decision based
on Stipulation

*

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT *
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, *

*

Respondent. *

*

Carl B. Duke, Jr., Baton Rouge, Louisiana, for petitioners.

Michael P. Milmo, Washington, D.C., for respondent.

MILLMAN, Special Master

DECISION AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS¹

On December 27, 2010, Petitioner filed an application for attorney's fees and costs. In his Application, Petitioner requested fees and costs in the amount of \$46,534.35. In her status report filed January 21, 2011, Respondent states that she does not object to this amount. The court finds this amount to be reasonable.

In accordance with General Order #9, Petitioner states that he incurred no costs to pursue

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the special master's action in this case, the special master intends to post this unpublished decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub.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.

his petition.

The court hereby awards compensation in the amount of \$46,534.35. The award shall be in the form of one check made jointly payable to Petitioner and the law firm Duke Law of La-Tex, A Professional Law Corporation.

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: _____

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.