

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

7 MICHAEL ANDERSON,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY  
11 ADMINISTRATION,

12 Defendant.

CASE NO. 4:15-CV-5091-EFS

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
TO ALTER JUDGMENT**

13 Before the Court, without oral argument, is Plaintiff Michael  
14 Anderson's "Rule 59E Motion on This Court's Order Granting In Part  
15 Plaintiff's Motion for EAJA Fees." ECF No. 32. On January 13, 2017,  
16 the Court granted in part Plaintiff's Motion for EAJA Fees. ECF No.  
17 31. Plaintiff now moves the Court to alter or amend that judgment. He  
18 argues that the Court committed clear error by reducing the requested  
19 attorney fee award. The Commissioner objects and argues that the Court  
20 did not commit any legal or factual error that would justify altering  
21 or amending the previous order. ECF No. 33

22 Three grounds justify altering or amending a judgment under  
23 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e): "(1) the district court is  
24 presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) the district court  
25 committed clear error or made an initial decision that was manifestly  
26 unjust, or (3) there is an intervening change in the controlling law."

1 *United Nat. Ins. Co. v. Spectrum Worldwide, Inc.*, 555 F.3d 772, 780  
2 (9th Cir. 2009). Plaintiff argues that the Court committed clear error  
3 because it reduced the fee award despite the presence of a common core  
4 of facts, and cites to *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424 (1983), for  
5 support.

6 In its previous order, the Court expressly referenced *Hensley*,  
7 explaining: "Where a 'plaintiff has failed to prevail on a claim that  
8 is distinct in all respects from his successful claims, the hours  
9 spent on the unsuccessful claim should be excluded in considering the  
10 amount of a reasonable fee.' *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 440  
11 (1983)." ECF No. 31 at 2. The Court concluded that Claim Two, the  
12 claim on which Plaintiff lost, was "largely independent" of the claims  
13 on which Plaintiff prevailed. ECF No. 31 at 3. Accordingly, the Court  
14 found that it was appropriate under *Hensley* to reduce the requested  
15 fees to account for the fact that Plaintiff did not prevail on all of  
16 the issues.

17 In reducing the fees, the Court reduced only the reported time  
18 spent writing the briefs, and not time spent reviewing the record,  
19 doing legal research, writing the fact section, or reading Defendant's  
20 filings or Court orders, as the Court recognized that these activities  
21 could not be clearly attributed to any of the four claims presented by  
22 Plaintiff. The Court finds that this analysis accounted for time spent  
23 on research or review that may have been common to the four claims  
24 presented. See *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 435 ("Much of counsel's time will  
25 be devoted generally to the litigation as a whole, making it difficult  
26 to divide the hours expended on a claim-by-claim basis."); *id.* at 436-

1 37 ("There is no precise rule or formula for making these  
2 determinations. The district court may attempt to identify specific  
3 hours that should be eliminated, or it may simply reduce the award to  
4 account for the limited success. The court necessarily has discretion  
5 in making this equitable judgment.").

6 Plaintiff cites to language from *Hensley* indicating that an  
7 attorney fee award should be tied to the result, and that a successful  
8 result may justify a "fully compensatory fee" even if the plaintiff  
9 did not prevail on all alternative grounds for relief. ECF No. 32 at 4  
10 (citing *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 343-35). While this contention is  
11 correct, the Court notes that Plaintiff did not obtain a fully  
12 successful result in this case. The Court upheld the ALJ's finding on  
13 Claim Two and advised that the ALJ did not need to reconsider or  
14 reweigh related evidence on remand. ECF No. 25 at 11-12, 21.  
15 Accordingly, this claim was not simply an alternative argument for the  
16 relief granted by the Court, but was instead a separate argument upon  
17 which relief was denied. The time spent on Claim Two was thus not  
18 "expended in pursuit of the ultimate result achieved." *Hensley*, 461  
19 U.S. at 431.

20 The Court finds that it correctly analyzed the law regarding  
21 EAJA fee awards and thus denies Plaintiff's motion to alter or amend  
22 the judgment.

23 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 24 1. Plaintiff Michael Anderson's "Rule 59E Motion on This  
25 Court's Order Granting In Part Plaintiff's Motion for EAJA  
26 Fees," **ECF No. 32**, is **DENIED**.

1           2.     This file shall remain **CLOSED**.

2           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**    The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this  
3 Order and provide copies to all counsel.

4           **DATED** this   1<sup>st</sup>   day of March 2017.

5  
6                                      s/Edward F. Shea  
7                                      \_\_\_\_\_

---

8                                      EDWARD F. SHEA  
9                                      Senior United States District Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26