(\$4,000.00) under the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d). This amount represents compensation for all legal services rendered on behalf of Plaintiff by counsel in connection with this civil action, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §§ 1920; 2412(d).

24

25

26

After the Court issues an order for EAJA fees to John F. Ross, the government will consider the matter of John F. Ross's assignment of EAJA fees to Young Cho. Pursuant to Astrue v. Ratliff, 130 S.Ct. 2521, 2529 (2010), the ability to honor the assignment will depend on whether the fees are subject to any offset allowed under the United States Department of the Treasury's Offset Program. After the order for EAJA fees is entered, the government will determine whether they are subject to any offset.

Fees shall be made payable to John F. Ross, but if the Department of the Treasury determines that John F. Ross does not owe a federal debt, then the government shall cause the payment of fees, expenses and costs to be made directly to Law Offices of Lawrence D. Rohlfing, pursuant to the assignment executed by John F. Ross. United States v. \$186,416.00, 722 F.3d 1173, 1176 (9th Cir. 2013) (\$186,416.00 II) (ordering fees paid to counsel because of an assignment that did not interfere with a raised superior lien). Any payments made shall be delivered to Young Cho.

¹ The Commissioner does not stipulate to the citation of \$186,416.00 II, and will not participate in representing to this Court that it carries legal import in these proceedings. \$186,416 II involved a different statute and very different factual circumstances than those presented here, or in other Social Security cases. Because the parties have agreed to the payment of EAJA fees, and the amount, and to avoid motion practice solely related to Plaintiff's citation, the Commissioner agrees to this stipulation. The Commissioner reserves the right to challenge the applicability of \$186,416 II to any Social Security case, and this Stipulation should not be construed as a waiver of such reservation.

John Ross contends that U.S. v. \$186,416.00 in U.S. Currency, 642 F.3d 753, 757 (9th Cir. 2011) (\$186,416.00 I) held that there is no functional difference between the CAFRA and EAJA in terms of "ownership" of the fee.

1	This stipulation constitutes a compromise settlement of John F. Ross's
2	request for EAJA attorney fees, and does not constitute an admission of liability on
3	the part of Defendant under the EAJA or otherwise. Payment of the agreed amount
4	shall constitute a complete release from, and bar to, any and all claims that John F.
5	Ross and/or Young Cho including Law Offices of Lawrence D. Rohlfing may have
6	relating to EAJA attorney fees in connection with this action.
7	This award is without prejudice to the rights of Young Cho and/or the Law
8	Offices of Lawrence D. Rohlfing to seek Social Security Act attorney fees under
9	42 U.S.C. § 406(b), subject to the savings clause provisions of the EAJA. DATE: December 2, 2014 Respectfully submitted,
10	LAW OFFICES OF LAWRENCE D. ROHLFING
11	
12	/s/Young Cho BY:
13	Young Cho Attorney for plaintiff John F. Ross
14	
15	DATE: December 2, 2014 BENJAMIN B. WAGNER United States Attorney
16	/S/ Tova Wolking
17	Tova Wolking
18	Special Assistant United States Attorney Attorneys for Defendant Carolyn W. Colvin,
19	Acting Commissioner of Social Security (Per e-mail authorization)
20	(1 ci c-man authorization)
21	ORDER
22	Approved and so ordered.
23	Datade Dagambar & 2014 Carolle U. Delany
24	Dated: December 8, 2014 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
25	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26	
I	