

JOSEPH W. LEWIS)	
)	
Claimant-Respondent)	
)	
v.)	
)	
INGALLS SHIPBUILDING,)	DATE ISSUED:
INCORPORATED)	
)	
Self-Insured)	
Employer-Petitioner)	DECISION and ORDER

Appeal of the Supplemental Decision and Order Awarding Attorney Fees of Richard D. Mills, Administrative Law Judge, United States Department of Labor.

Rebecca J. Ainsworth (Maples & Lomax, P.A.), Pascagoula, Mississippi, for claimant.

Traci M. Castille (Franke, Rainey & Salloum), Gulfport, Mississippi, for self-insured employer.

Before: HALL, Chief Administrative Appeals Judge, SMITH and DOLDER, Administrative Appeals Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Employer appeals the Supplemental Decision and Order Awarding Attorney Fees (89-LHC-2520) of Administrative Law Judge Richard D. Mills rendered on a claim filed pursuant to the provisions of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, 33 U.S.C. §901 *et seq.* (the Act). The amount of an attorney's fee award is discretionary and may be set aside only if the challenging party shows it to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not in accordance with law. *See, e.g., Muscella v. Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.*, 12 BRBS 272 (1980).

Claimant's counsel sought an attorney's fee of \$4,391.25, representing 34.75 hours at \$125 per hour plus expenses, for work performed before the administrative law judge in connection with claimant's hearing loss claim. The administrative law judge awarded counsel a fee of \$2,502.50, representing 22.75 hours at an hourly rate of \$110, plus expenses of \$47.50. Employer appeals the administrative law judge's fee award, incorporating by reference the arguments it made below into its appellate brief. Claimant responds, urging affirmance of the fee award.

Initially, we reject employer's argument that under Section 28(b) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. §928(b), the fee award should have been limited solely to the difference between the amount of benefits voluntarily paid by the employer and the amount ultimately awarded by the administrative law judge. The Board has consistently rejected the contention that the amount of the fee awarded under Section 28(b) must be limited in the manner urged by employer. See, e.g., *Hoda v. Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc.*, 28 BRBS 197 (1994) (McGranery, J., dissenting)(Decision on Recon.); *Watkins v. Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc.*, 26 BRBS 179 (1993), *aff'd mem.*, 12 F.3d 209 (5th Cir. 1993).

Employer's objections to the number of hours and hourly rate awarded are rejected, as it has not shown that the administrative law judge abused his discretion in this regard. See *Ross v. Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc.*, 29 BRBS 42 (1995); *Maddon v. Western Asbestos Co.*, 23 BRBS 55 (1989); *Cabral v. General Dynamics Corp.*, 13 BRBS 97 (1981). Employer's specific objection to counsel's method of billing in minimum increments of one-quarter hour also is rejected, as the administrative law judge considered this objection, and his award conforms to the criteria set forth in the decisions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc. v. Director, OWCP [Fairley]*, No. 89-4459 (5th Cir. July 25, 1990) (unpublished) and *Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc. v. Director, OWCP [Biggs]*, No. 94-40066 (5th Cir. Jan. 12, 1995) (unpublished).

Employer's contentions which were not raised below will not be addressed for the first time on appeal. *Bullock v. Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc.*, 27 BRBS 90 (1993)(*en banc*)(Brown and McGranery, JJ., concurring and dissenting), *modified on other grounds on recon. en banc*, 28 BRBS 102 (1994), *aff'd mem. sub. nom. Ingalls Shipbuilding Inc. v. Director, OWCP [Biggs]*, 46 F.3d 66 (5th Cir. 1995); *Clophus v. Amoco Production Co.*, 21 BRBS 261 (1988).

Accordingly, the Supplemental Decision and Order Awarding Fees of the administrative law judge is affirmed.

SO ORDERED.

BETTY JEAN HALL, Chief
Administrative Appeals Judge

ROY P. SMITH
Administrative Appeals Judge

NANCY S. DOLDER
Administrative Appeals Judge