

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT TACOMA

9 CLARENCE BRUCE JOHNSON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 CAROLYN W COLVIN, Acting
13 Commissioner of the Social Security
14 Administration,

15 Defendant.

CASE NO. 13-cv-05742 JRC

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
ATTORNEY'S FEES PURSUANT
TO 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)

16 This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Fed. R. Civ. P. 73 and Local
17 Magistrate Judge Rule MJR 13 (*see also* Notice of Initial Assignment to a U.S. Magistrate Judge
and Consent Form, Dkt. 5; Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge, Dkt. 6).

18 This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §
19 406(b) (*see* Dkt. 23). Defendant has no objection to plaintiff's request (*see* Dkt. 24).

20 The Court may allow a reasonable fee for an attorney who represented a Social Security
21 Title II claimant before the Court and obtained a favorable judgment, as long as such fee is not in
22 excess of 25 percent of the total of past-due benefits. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1); *Grisbrecht v.*
23 *Barnhart*, 535 U.S. 789 (2002). When a contingency agreement applies, the Court will look first
24 to such agreement and will conduct an independent review to assure the reasonableness of the


1 fee requested, taking into consideration the character of the representation and results achieved.
2 *See Grisbrecht, supra*, 535 U.S. at 807, 808 (footnote omitted) (citations omitted). Although the
3 fee agreement is the primary means for determining the fee, the Court will adjust the fee
4 downward if substandard representation was provided, if the attorney caused excessive delay, or
5 if a windfall would result from the requested fee. *See Crawford v. Astrue*, 586 F.3d 1142, 1151
6 (9th Cir. 2009) (*citing Grisbrecht, supra*, 535 U.S. at 808).

7 Here, the representation was standard, at least, and the results achieved excellent (*see*
8 Dkt. 23, Attachments 4, 5). *See Grisbrecht, supra*, 535 U.S. at 808. Following a remand from
9 this Court (*see* Dkt. 18), a hearing was held and the Administration Law Judge issued a partially
10 favorable decision awarding benefits to plaintiff (*see* Dkt. 23, Attachment 5). There has not been
11 excessive delay and no windfall will result from the requested fee.

12 Plaintiff's total back payment was \$39,344.90 (*see id.*, Attachment 4). Plaintiff has
13 moved for an attorney's fee of \$3,836.22 (*see* Motion, Dkt. 23, p. 1), and the Court has
14 considered plaintiff's EAJA award previously received by plaintiff's attorney in the amount of
15 \$5,538 (*see id.* p. 2; *see also* Dkt. 23, Attachment 6). *See Parish v. Comm'r. Soc. Sec. Admin.*,
16 698 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 2012).

17 Based on plaintiff's motion and supporting documents (*see* Dkt. 23, Attachments 1, 2, 3,
18 4, 5, 6), and with no objection from defendant (Dkt. 24), it is hereby ORDERED that attorney's
19 fees in the amount of \$3,836.22 be awarded to plaintiff's attorney pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §
20 406(b).

21 Dated this 10th day of March, 2016.

22 

23 J. Richard Creatura
24 United States Magistrate Judge