

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

10 BARBARA S. LINTHICUM,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting  
Commissioner of the Social Security  
Administration,

14  
15 Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:16-cv-05048 JRC

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

16  
17 This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Fed. R. Civ. P. 73 and Local  
18 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).

19 This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §  
20 406(b) (*see* Dkt. 22). Defendant has no objection to plaintiff's motion. *See* Dkt. 24.

21  
22 The Court may allow a reasonable fee for an attorney who represented a Social Security  
23 Title II claimant before the Court and obtained a favorable judgment, as long as such fee is not in  
24 excess of 25 percent of the total of past-due benefits. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1); *Grisbrecht v.*

1 | *Barnhart*, 535 U.S. 789 (2002). When a contingency agreement applies, the Court will look first  
2 | to such agreement and will conduct an independent review to assure the reasonableness of the  
3 | fee requested, taking into consideration the character of the representation and results achieved.  
4 | *See Grisbrecht, supra*, 535 U.S. at 807, 808 (footnote omitted) (citations omitted). Although the  
5 | fee agreement is the primary means for determining the fee, the Court will adjust the fee  
6 | downward if substandard representation was provided, if the attorney caused excessive delay, or  
7 | if a windfall would result from the requested fee. *See Crawford v. Astrue*, 586 F.3d 1142, 1151  
8 | (9th Cir. 2009) (*citing Grisbrecht, supra*, 535 U.S. at 808).


9 | Here, the representation was standard, at least, and the results achieved excellent (*see*  
10 | Dkt. 23, Attachment 3). *See Grisbrecht, supra*, 535 U.S. at 808. Following remand from this  
11 | Court for further consideration (*see* Dkt. 16), plaintiff was awarded benefits. There has not been  
12 | excessive delay and no windfall will result from the requested fee.

13 | Plaintiff's total back payment was \$78,767.00 (*see* Dkt. 23, Attachment 3, p. 3). The  
14 | Social Security Administration has withheld \$19,691.75 for payment of attorney fees. Plaintiff  
15 | has moved for a net attorney's fee of \$11,477.60 (*see* Motion, Dkt. 22, p. 1), and the Court has  
16 | considered plaintiff's requested gross attorney's fee of \$16,500.00 (*see id.*) and the EAJA award  
17 | received by plaintiff's attorney in the amount of \$5,022.40. *Parish v. Comm'r. Soc. Sec. Admin.*,  
18 | 698 F.3d 1215, 1221 (9th Cir. 2012).

19 | Based on plaintiff's unopposed motion and supporting documents (*see* Dkts. 22, 23  
20 | Attachments 1, 2, 3, 4), it is hereby ORDERED that attorney's fees in the amount of \$16,500.00  
21 | be awarded to plaintiff's attorney pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406(b). The Social Security  
22 | Administration is to release the remaining backpay (the previously awarded EAJA fees in the  
23 | amount of \$5,022.40, and the remaining attorney fees withheld by the Administration) to  
24 |

1 plaintiff. The net fee of \$11,477.60, minus any processing fees allowed by statute should be  
2 mailed to Francisco Rodriguez, Attorney at Law, P.O. Box 31844, Seattle, WA 98103.

3 Dated this 31st day of January, 2018.

4 

5 J. Richard Creatura  
6 United States Magistrate Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24