



reversing and remanding this cause to the Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings. (Doc. 17; *see also* Doc. 16)

2. The application for attorney’s fees under the EAJA was filed on February 4, 2010 (Doc. 18), twenty-eight (28) days after entry of final judgment (*compare id. with* Doc. 17). In the application, plaintiff requests attorney’s fees in the amount of \$2,660.73 to compensate her attorney for the time (15.5 hours) spent representing her before this Court as of the date of the filing of the fee application and court costs of \$350.00. (*See* Doc. 18)

3. The Commissioner of Social Security filed his response to plaintiff’s motion on February 16, 2010 and therein notified the Court that he would not oppose plaintiff’s motion for attorney’s fees under the EAJA. (Doc. 20)

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Equal Access to Justice Act requires a district court to “award to a prevailing party . . . fees and other expenses . . . incurred by that party in any civil action . . ., including proceedings for judicial review of agency action, brought by or against the United States . . ., unless the court finds that the position of the United States was substantially justified or that

special circumstances make an award unjust.” 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A). It is imminently clear in this case that plaintiff is a prevailing party under the EAJA<sup>1</sup> and the Court further finds that the position of the United States in this case was not substantially justified.

2. The EAJA requires a prevailing party to file an application for attorney’s fees within thirty (30) days of final judgment in the action. 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(B). The thirty-day clock will not begin to run in this case until this Court’s reversal and remand order of January 7, 2010 becomes final, which will occur at the end of the sixty (60) days for appeal provided under Rule 4(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, *see Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 302, 113 S.Ct. 2625, 2632, 125 L.Ed.2d 239 (1993), that is, March 8, 2010. The application filed in this case, bearing a date of February 4, 2010, is extremely premature yet no less timely. *See, e.g., Myers v. Sullivan*, 916 F.2d 659, 678-679 n.20 (11th Cir. 1990) (“Even a premature motion is considered timely.”).

3. The EAJA, like 42 U.S.C. § 1988, is a fee-shifting statute. The Supreme Court has indicated that “the most useful starting point for determining the amount of a reasonable fee is the number of hours reasonably

---

<sup>1</sup> “[A] party who wins a sentence-four remand order is a prevailing party.” *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 302, 113 S.Ct.2625, 2632, 125 L.Ed.2d 239 (1993).

expended on the litigation multiplied by a reasonable hourly rate.’” *Watford v. Heckler*, 765 F.2d 1562, 1568 (11th Cir. 1985) (EAJA), quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433, 103 S.Ct. 1933, 1939, 76 L.Ed.2d 40 (1983)(§ 1988); see *Jean v. Nelson*, 863 F.2d 759, 772-773 (11th Cir. 1988) (discussing the reasonableness of the hours expended in the context of contentions by the government that the fee requests were not supported by sufficient documentation and often involved a duplication of effort), *aff’d sub nom. Commissioner, I.N.S. v. Jean*, 496 U.S. 154, 110 S.Ct. 2316, 110 L.Ed.2d 134 (1990).

This calculation provides an objective basis on which to make an initial estimate of the value of a lawyer’s services. The party seeking an award of fees should submit evidence supporting the hours worked and the rates claimed. Where the documentation of hours is inadequate, the district court may reduce the award accordingly. The district court also should exclude from this initial fee calculation hours that were not “reasonably expended.” . . . Cases may be overstaffed, and the skill and experience of lawyers vary widely. Counsel for the prevailing party should make a good-faith effort to exclude from a fee request hours that are excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary, just as a lawyer in private practice ethically is obligated to exclude such hours from his fee submission. “In the private sector, ‘billing judgment’ is an important component in fee setting. It is no less important here. Hours that are not properly billed to one’s *client* also are not

properly billed to one's *adversary* pursuant to statutory authority.”

*Hensley, supra*, 461 U.S. at 433-434, 103 S.Ct. at 1939-1940 (citations omitted); *see also id.*, at 437, 103 S.Ct. at 1941 (“[T]he fee applicant bears the burden of establishing entitlement to an award and documenting the appropriate hours expended and hourly rates.”); *ACLU of Georgia v. Barnes*, 168 F.3d 423, 428 (11th Cir.1999) (“If fee applicants do not exercise billing judgment, courts are obligated to do it for them, to cut the amount of hours for which payment is sought, pruning out those that are ‘excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary.’ Courts are not authorized to be generous with the money of others, and it is as much the duty of courts to see that excessive fees and expenses are not awarded as it is to see that an adequate amount is awarded.”); *Norman v. Housing Authority*, 836 F.2d 1292, 1301 (11th Cir. 1988) (“Excluding excessive or otherwise unnecessary hours under the rubric of ‘billing judgment’ means that a lawyer may not be compensated for hours spent on activities for which he would not bill a client of means who was seriously intent on vindicating similar rights, recognizing that in the private sector the economically rational person engages in some cost benefit analysis.”).

4. In *Norman, supra*, the Eleventh Circuit indicated that “the

measure of reasonable hours is determined by the profession's judgment of the time that may be conscionably billed and not the least time in which it might theoretically have been done." 836 F.2d at 1306.

5. Because the defendant does not oppose the fee petition, the Court finds that plaintiff's counsel reasonably spent 15.5 hours on legal tasks in this case.

6. With respect to a determination of the hourly rate to apply in a given EAJA case, for services performed by attorneys, the express language of the Act, as amended by the Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996, provides in pertinent part as follows:

The amount of fees awarded under this subsection shall be based upon prevailing market rates for the kind and quality of the services furnished, except that . . . attorney fees shall not be awarded in excess of \$125.00 per hour unless the court determines that an increase in the cost of living or a special factor, such as the limited availability of qualified attorneys for the proceedings involved, justifies a higher fee.

28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(2)(A) (Cum.Supp. 1997).

7. In *Meyer v. Sullivan*, 958 F.2d 1029 (1992), the Eleventh Circuit determined that the EAJA establishes a two-step analysis for determining the appropriate hourly rate to be applied in calculating attorney's fees under the

Act.

The first step in the analysis, . . . is to determine the market rate for “similar services [provided] by lawyers of reasonably comparable skills, experience, and reputation.” . . . The second step, which is needed only if the market rate is greater than \$[125] per hour, is to determine whether the court should adjust the hourly fee upward from \$[125] to take into account an increase in the cost of living, or a special factor.

*Id.* at 1033-1034 (citations and footnote omitted).

8. For years, the prevailing market rate in the Southern District of Alabama was \$125.00 per hour. *See, e.g., Willits v. Massanari*, CA 00-0530-RV-C; *Boggs v. Massanari*, 00-0408-P-C; *Boone v. Apfel*, CA 99-0965-CB-L. This Court adjusted that rate in 2007 to account for the increase in the cost of living. *Lucy v. Barnhart*, CA 06-0147-C, Doc. 32. More specifically, the Court has adopted the following formula to be used in calculating all future awards of attorney’s fees under the EAJA: ““(\$125/hour) x (CPI-U Annual Average “All Items Index”, South Urban, for month and year of temporal midpoint<sup>2</sup>)/152.4, where 152.4 equals the CPI-U of March 1996, the month and year in

---

<sup>2</sup> “The appropriate endpoint for computing the cost of living adjustment is the temporal midpoint of the period during which the compensable services were rendered[;] . . . [t]he temporal midpoint is calculated by computing the number of days from the date the claim was prepared until the date of the Magistrate or District Judge’s Order and Judgment.” *Lucy v. Barnhart*, CA 06-0147-C, Doc. 31, at 3.

which the \$125 cap was enacted.’” (*Id.* at 11, quoting Doc. 31, at 2)

9. The temporal midpoint in this case was October 15, 2009, the complaint having been prepared on or about July 22, 2009 (*compare* Doc. 18, ¶ 17 *with* Doc. 1) and the Court having entered its order and judgment on January 7, 2010 (Docs. 16-17). The CPI-U for October of 2009 was 209.292. Plugging the relevant numbers into the foregoing formula renders the following equation:  $\$125 \times 209.292 / 152.4$ . Completion of this equation renders an hourly rate of \$171.66.

10. In consideration of the foregoing, the plaintiff should be awarded an attorney’s fee in the amount of \$2,660.73 under the EAJA for the 15.5 hours her attorney spent performing work traditionally performed by attorneys in social security cases.

11. Plaintiff also seeks reimbursement for the \$350.00 filing fee paid on her behalf when the complaint was filed on July 22, 2009. (*See* Docket Sheet Entry for July 22, 2009) It is clear to the undersigned that court costs are compensable under the Equal Access to Justice Act, *Davis v. Apfel*, 2000 WL 1658575, \*4 (M.D. Fla. 2000) (“The EAJA also authorizes the award of ‘costs’ and ‘expenses.’ 28 U.S.C. § 2412(a)(1) & (d)(1)(A). It is undisputed that Davis incurred \$150.00 in costs in the form of the filing fee. She is entitled



to recover this amount.”); *see also Huitt v. Apfel*, 2000 WL 726914, \*3 (S.D. Ala. 2000) (“[P]laintiff is entitled to court costs of \$150.00[.]”), and, therefore, she is entitled to recover the \$350.00 filing fee paid in this case. The filing fee portion of the EAJA award is to be reimbursed from the Judgment Fund administered by the United States Department of Treasury. *See Reeves v. Barnhart*, 473 F.Supp.2d 1173, 1174 (M.D. Ala. 2007) (“The Commissioner proposed Plaintiff be compensated for the filing fee from the Judgment Fund administered by the United States Treasury Department. [] The court ordered that fees be paid to Plaintiff as recommended by the Commissioner.”).

### **CONCLUSION**

The Court **ORDERS** that plaintiff be awarded attorney’s fees in the amount of \$2,660.73 under the Equal Access to Justice Act, representing compensation for 15.5 hours of service by Gilbert B. Laden, Esquire, at the cost-of-living-adjusted rate of \$171.66 an hour, and court costs of \$350.00. The total EAJA award due in this case is \$3,010.73.

**DONE** and **ORDERED** this the 22nd day of February, 2010.

s/WILLIAM E. CASSADY  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**