



- (2) The nature and complexity of the appeal;<sup>5</sup>
- (3) The capacity in which the Representative has appeared;<sup>6</sup>
- (4) The actual time spent in connection with the Board appeal;<sup>7</sup> and
- (5) Customary local charges for similar services.<sup>8</sup>

By order dated February 23, 2015, the Board denied counsel's fee petition as it had failed to adequately explain in detail the hourly rate of billing for the persons identified in the statement, and otherwise failed to explain in detail how the claimed fee was justified under the five factors listed above. Counsel was permitted 60 days to resubmit the fee petition.

As required by the Board's regulations, appellant has been afforded written notice of the fee requested and provided an opportunity to comment on the fee petition.<sup>9</sup> No response was received.<sup>10</sup>

The requested fees pertain to services performed before the Board in the above-referenced appeal. The underlying issue was a January 13, 2007 claim for recurrence of disability and the requested expansion of accepted conditions to include complex regional pain syndrome. By decision dated November 23, 2012 OWCP denied appellant's claim for a merit review of the issues, finding that appellant had failed to raise substantive legal questions nor submitted new and relevant medical evidence. By decision dated December 24, 2013, the Board affirmed OWCP's denial of a merit review under 5 U.S.C. 8128(a). Counsel filed a petition for reconsideration of the decision with the Board on January 23, 2014 which the Board denied on June 4, 2014.

On appeal, counsel submitted a four-page brief arguing that the evidence and argument submitted to OWCP had been not only new but also relevant. Counsel cited Board precedent to support his argument on appeal.

On March 15, 2015 counsel provided a supplemental fee petition addressing the deficiencies previously noted by the Board. He clarified the two different amounts being charged for individuals in the itemized statements. Counsel addressed the usefulness of his

---

<sup>5</sup> The Board's evaluation of the "nature and complexity" of an appeal includes, but is not limited to, whether the issue appealed is novel or required extensive or unusual factual evidence or legal argument. The Board recognizes that not all complex issues are cases of first impression. However, the representative must establish the complex or unusual nature of the appeal.

<sup>6</sup> The Board's consideration of the "capacity" in which a representative appears includes, but is not limited to, whether the representative obtained a written retainer and fee agreement was obtained.

<sup>7</sup> The Board's evaluation of an itemized statement of work and charges includes, but is not limited to, whether the statement is clear, detailed, and describes those aspects of the appeal which merit the fee claimed and whether the representative has personally affirmed the correctness of the fee. No stipulated or contingent fee will be approved by the Board. 20 C.F.R. § 501.9(e).

<sup>8</sup> The Board's consideration of customary, local fees recognizes that representatives often have clients in several states and that local custom must be balanced against national practice in the FECA appeals.

<sup>9</sup> 20 C.F.R. § 501.9(e).

<sup>10</sup> The Board notes that included with the counsel's fee petition was a signed statement from appellant indicating that she found the requested fee to be reasonable and appropriate.

services noting that the case was complex and dated back to 1999. Counsel stated that although not successful before the Board, counsel was able to change its approach in the case and ultimately was successful in obtaining compensation benefits for appellant. Counsel discussed his communication with appellant during the representation before the Board and addressed the customary local charges for similar services. He specifically addressed the hourly rates charged by the staff of his law firm, noting that they had been found reasonable in other administrative tribunals.

OWCP's decision on appeal was dated November 23, 2012 and the appeal was filed with the Board on January 2, 2013. The fee petition requests approval of time from December 24, 2012 through June 9, 2014 and documents 15.20 hours spent in connection with this appeal before the Board at \$525.00 per hour for Steven E. Brown, Esq., \$350.00 for Daniel M. Goodkin, Esq., before February 1, 2013 and \$425.00 per hour after that date, and \$150.00 per hour for Paralegal Erika Bauer before February 1, 2013 and \$195.00 per hour after that date.

The Board has carefully reviewed the fee petition, and finds it satisfies the requirements of section 501.9(e) of the Board's implementing regulations. The Board concludes that the fee requested is reasonable.

The Board notes that under 20 C.F.R. §501.9(e) "[n]o claim for a fee for legal or other service performed on appeal before the Board is valid unless approved by the Board." Under 18 U.S.C. §292, collecting a fee without the approval of the Board may constitute a misdemeanor, subject to fine or imprisonment for up to a year or both."

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** the fee petition is granted in the amount of \$4,850.50.

Issued: April 28, 2016  
Washington, DC

Patricia H. Fitzgerald, Deputy Chief Judge  
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Colleen Duffy Kiko, Judge  
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

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