

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GARY ZIEROTH, as representative of  
the estate of SHARON ZIEROTH,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALEX AZAR, in his capacity as  
Secretary of Health and  
Human Services,

Defendant.

Case No. [20-cv-00172-MMC](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES  
AND COSTS**

Re: Doc. No. 37

Before the Court is plaintiff Gary Zieroth's ("Zieroth") "Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs," filed October 10, 2020, pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act ("EAJA"). Defendant Alex Azar, Secretary of Health and Human Services ("Secretary"), has filed opposition, to which Zieroth has replied. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, the Court rules as follows.<sup>1</sup>

**BACKGROUND**

Zieroth's wife, Sharon Zieroth, was a type 1 diabetic with hypoglycemic unawareness. (See Certified Administrative Record ("CAR") at 8.) To manage her condition, she used a continuous glucose monitor ("CGM"), specifically, a Medtronic MiniMed 530G system ("MiniMed 530G"), which device consists of several components, one of which is a sensor. (See id. at 7-8.)

---

<sup>1</sup> By order filed November 17, 2020, the Court took the motion under submission.

1 Between July 2017 and May 2018, Sharon Zieroth submitted, under Part B of the  
 2 Medicare program, claims for reimbursement of the costs of three sensors, which claims  
 3 were denied on the ground that a CGM system of the type exemplified by the MiniMed  
 4 530G did not, according to the Medicare Appeals Council (“Appeals Council”), constitute  
 5 “durable medical equipment” as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 414.202, as interpreted by CMS-  
 6 1682-R, a ruling issued by the Secretary through the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid  
 7 Services. (See id. at 4, 11-13.)

8 On January 8, 2020, Sharon Zieroth filed the instant action seeking review of the  
 9 denial of her claims. Subsequently, on February 7, 2020, Sharon Zieroth passed away  
 10 from complications of diabetes (see Mot. to Substitute, filed Apr. 3, 2020), and Zieroth, as  
 11 the representative of her estate, continued the instant action on her behalf. In an order  
 12 filed September 22, 2020, the Court granted Zieroth’s motion for summary judgment,  
 13 denied the Secretary’s cross-motion for summary judgment, and remanded the action  
 14 with instructions to authorize coverage for the three sensors at issue.

## 15 DISCUSSION

16 By the instant motion, Zieroth seeks an award of attorneys’ fees in the amount of  
 17 \$53,835, as well as an award of costs in the amount of \$400.

### 18 A. Entitlement to Award

19 Pursuant to the EAJA, attorneys’ fees and costs shall be awarded to the  
 20 “prevailing party . . . unless the court finds that the position of the United States was  
 21 substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust.” See  
 22 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A).<sup>2</sup> Ordinarily, such fees are to be awarded at the statutory rate  
 23 of “\$125 per hour,” adjusted, if appropriate, for “an increase in the cost of living or a  
 24 special factor.” See id. § 2412(d)(2)(A). Where, however, the government has “acted in  
 25

---

26 <sup>2</sup> There is no dispute that Zieroth is the prevailing party, nor that the other  
 27 foundational requirements have been met, specifically, that the instant application was  
 28 timely filed, see 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(B), and that Sharon Zieroth’s net worth did not  
 exceed the cap set by the EAJA, see id. § 2412(d)(2)(B).

1 bad faith,” see Ibrahim v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec., 912 F.3d 1147, 1180 (9th Cir.  
2 2019) (internal quotation and citation omitted), such fees shall be awarded “to the same  
3 extent that any other party would be liable under the common law,” see id. § 2412(b).

4 Here, Zieroth argues he is entitled to an award of attorneys’ fees because the  
5 Secretary’s position was not, Zieroth contends, substantially justified, and, further, that he  
6 is entitled to an award at an enhanced rate because, according to Zieroth, the Secretary  
7 acted in bad faith.

### 8 1. Substantial Justification

9 The Secretary argues Zieroth is not entitled to an award of fees because, the  
10 Secretary asserts, the Secretary’s position was “substantially justified.” See 28 U.S.C.  
11 § 2412(d)(1)(A).<sup>3</sup> As set forth below, the Court disagrees.

12 “A substantially justified position must have a reasonable basis in both law and  
13 fact,” see United States v. Marolf, 277 F.3d 1156, 1161 (9th Cir. 2002), and fees  
14 generally should be awarded “where the government’s underlying action was  
15 unreasonable even if the government advanced a reasonable litigation position,” see id.  
16 at 1159.

17 Here, the Court, in its order granting Zieroth’s motion for summary judgment and  
18 denying the Secretary’s cross-motion for summary judgment, found the Secretary’s  
19 position, both as set forth in CMS-1682-R and reiterated in the course of the instant  
20 litigation, was not reasonable. (See Order at 7:4-5.) Moreover, to date, three other  
21 district courts have rejected the Secretary’s position, see Whitcomb v. Hargan, No. 17-  
22 CV-00014-DEJ (E.D. Wis. Oct. 26, 2017); Bloom v. Azar, 2018 WL 583111 (D. Vt. Jan.  
23 29, 2018), Lewis v. Azar, 308 F. Supp. 3d 574 (D. Mass. 2018), and, although not  
24 determinative, “a string of losses can be indicative” of whether a position was  
25 substantially justified, see Pierce v. Underwood, 487 U.S. 552, 569 (1988).

26  
27  
28 <sup>3</sup> The Secretary does not contend there exist any “special circumstances mak[ing]  
an award unjust.” See 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A).



1 “therapeutic” and “non-therapeutic” systems. See CMS-1682-R at 6-7, 13.

2 Second, the Court finds the Secretary’s position has not changed. In particular,  
 3 the Court disagrees with Zieroth’s contention that the Secretary, in the course of the  
 4 instant litigation, asserted, for the first time, that the MiniMed 530G is not as “accurate” as  
 5 other systems. (See Pl.’s Reply in Support of Mot. for Summ. J. at 10:2.) In support  
 6 thereof, Zieroth cites to the Secretary’s cross-motion for summary judgment, in which the  
 7 Secretary states that, “[u]nder the terms of [CMS-1682-R], CGMs are only covered if they  
 8 are accurate enough to be ‘used for making diabetes treatment decisions, such as  
 9 changing one’s diet or insulin dosage based solely on the readings of the CGM.’” (See  
 10 Def.’s Cross-Mot. for Summ. J. at 5:22-6:1 (citing CMS-1682-R at 7).) In making that  
 11 statement however, the Secretary cites to a specific page of CMS-1682-R, in which the  
 12 Secretary, in denying coverage for systems such as the MiniMed 530G, compared  
 13 “therapeutic” and “non-therapeutic” CGM systems and explained that the former is, in  
 14 essence, more accurate than the latter. (See CMS-1682-R at 7.)

15 In sum, the Court finds the Secretary has not acted in bad faith.

16 **B. Amount of Award**

17 Where, as here, a party establishes he is entitled to an award of fees, such fees  
 18 are, as noted, awarded at the statutory rate of “\$125 per hour unless the court  
 19 determines that an increase in the cost of living or a special factor, such as the limited  
 20 availability of qualified attorneys for the proceedings involved, justifies a higher fee.” See  
 21 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(2)(A).<sup>5</sup> There is no disagreement here as to the calculation of the  
 22 statutory hourly rate. As set forth by the Ninth Circuit, the statutory hourly rates, adjusted  
 23 for increases in the cost of living, are \$205.25 and \$206.77 for work performed,  
 24 respectively, in 2019 and 2020. See Statutory Maximum Rates Under the EAJA,  
 25 [https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/content/view.php?pk\\_id=0000000039](https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/content/view.php?pk_id=0000000039) (setting forth

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 using fingertip blood samples.” See id. at 6.

28 <sup>5</sup> Zieroth does not contend any “special factor” exists here. See id.

1 adjusted rates for 2010 through first half of 2020).<sup>6</sup>

2 Next, with one exception, there is no dispute as to the number of hours claimed,  
 3 namely, 98.45 hours for work performed by Zieroth's counsel, the one exception being  
 4 2.4 hours of work described as "delivering chambers copy of pleadings" (see Reply, Ex.  
 5 A-1 at 3), which, the Secretary argues, were not reasonably expended. In response,  
 6 Zieroth contends the challenged expenditure was reasonable because his counsel has  
 7 "no administrative support in the Bay Area" (see Reply at 6:1), and, consequently, in  
 8 endeavoring to comply with the Court's directive to "submit forthwith a chambers copy of  
 9 [the] Complaint" (see Order, filed Jan. 16, 2020, at 1:14-15), personally "hand-deliver[ed]"  
 10 the copy to the Clerk of Court (see Reply at 6:4). As the Ninth Circuit has noted,  
 11 however, "purely clerical or secretarial tasks should not be billed at a paralegal [or  
 12 lawyer's] rate, regardless of who performs them." See Davis v. City & Cty. of San  
 13 Francisco, 976 F.2d 1536, 1543 (9th Cir. 1992) (alteration in original; internal quotation  
 14 and citation omitted), opinion vacated in part on other grounds, 984 F.2d 345 (9th Cir.  
 15 1993) (finding time spent by counsel in "serving and filing of papers" should "not have  
 16 been included in the attorneys' fee award").

17 Accordingly, the Court will reduce by 2.4 hours the total hours claimed by Zieroth,  
 18 resulting in an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of \$19,838.60.<sup>7</sup>

19 Lastly, as noted, Zieroth seeks costs in the amount of \$400, specifically, the filing  
 20 fee for the instant action. There is no dispute Zieroth is entitled to an award of that  
 21 amount as a taxable item of cost under 28 U.S.C. § 2412(a)(1).

## 22 CONCLUSION

23 For the reasons stated above, Zieroth's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs is  
 24

---


25 <sup>6</sup> The hours Zieroth claims for 2020 were expended in both the first half and  
 26 second half of the year. "If no rate is posted for the period in which [the] work was  
 performed," the court "use[s] the rate that is posted for the previous period." See id.

27 <sup>7</sup> This sum is calculated as follows: (14.25 hours x hourly rate of \$205.25) +  
 28 (81.8 hours x hourly rate of \$206.77).

1 hereby GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, and Zieroth is awarded attorneys' fees in  
2 the amount of \$19,838.60, together with costs in the amount of \$400.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4  
5 Dated: December 3, 2020

  
MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
United States District Court  
Northern District of California