

noted that appellant did not contest the reasonableness of the fee.³ Regarding the usefulness of the representative's services, counsel stated that the issue was whether the medical evidence at least supported causal relationship enough to require further development of the claim. The Board notes that counsel's initial six-page pleading in the appeal cited pertinent case law in support of his arguments.

Counsel noted that the time spent on the appeal was documented and addressed the customary local charges for similar services. He specifically addressed the 3.1 hours of service and charges by the staff of his law firm in this appeal from July 22, 2011 through August 22, 2012. The legal work outlined and accompanying billing entries for the pleading preparation, client contact appear to be reasonable in the context of the subject matter of the appeal.

The Board has reviewed the fee petition and additional information submitted by counsel and finds that it satisfies the requirements of section 501.9(e) of the Board's implementing federal regulations.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the fee petition is granted in the amount of one thousand, one hundred and nineteen dollars and fifty cents (\$1,119.50).⁴

Issued: August 26, 2014
Washington, DC

Alec J. Koromilas, Alternate Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

James A. Haynes, Alternate Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

³ Counsel cited to the provisions of the Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *Representatives' Services*, Chapter 2.1200.6 (June 2012) and inquired as to whether they pertain to uncontested fees for work performed before the Board. The procedures implemented by the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP) with regard to the consideration of fees are separate from the Board's review of such applications under section 501.9(e). OWCP and the Board are two separate and distinct bodies and separate application to the Board is required for approval of a fee for legal or other services performed in connection with an appeal. *Evelyn R. Adams*, 10 ECAB 585 (1959).

⁴ Richard J. Daschbach, Chief Judge, who participated in the preparation of the opinion, was no longer a member of the Board after May 16, 2014.