



Pursuant to its regulation, the Board considered the fee petition under the following criteria:

- (1) The usefulness of the Representative's services;<sup>4</sup>
- (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>

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.

The Board, having considered the fee petition and supporting documentation, denies the fee petition. The Board finds that the petition provides insufficient information to allow approval of any portion of the amount claimed. The Board notes the following defects:<sup>10</sup>

- (1) The fee agreement is not attached.
- (2) The fee petition fails to explain in detail how the claimed fee is justified under the five factors listed in this order.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Board's consideration of "usefulness" includes, but is not limited to, the frequency and quality of communication by the representative with the client, the factual evidence and legal argument offered and written pleadings filed in the case. The Board will also consider the usefulness of a representative's work as it aided the Board in its consideration and decision of the issue appealed.

<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> This list is intended to assist counsel but does not limit the Board's discretion to evaluate any future fee petition on its own merits.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** the fee petition is denied and may be resubmitted to the Board within 60 days of the date of this order.<sup>11</sup>

Issued: December 15, 2017  
Washington, DC

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

Valerie D. Evans-Harrell, Alternate Judge  
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board-

---

<sup>11</sup> Colleen Duffy Kiko, Judge, participated in the preparation of this order, but was no longer a member of the Board effective December 11, 2017.