

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR VETERANS CLAIMS**

BRUCE E. HOOPLE,

Appellant,

vs.

**ROBERT L. WILKIE,
Secretary of Veterans Affairs,**

Appellee.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Vet. App. No. 19-105

**MOTION FOR AWARD OF REASONABLE ATTORNEYS FEES UNDER 28
U.S.C. § 2412 AND DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION**

Comes now, Appellant BRUCE E. HOOPLE, through counsel, and files this motion for an award of reasonable attorneys fees and expenses under the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), 28 U.S.C. § 2412 (2012).

There has been a resolution in this action. On May 12, 2020, this Court issued a memorandum decision, vacating the part of the Board of Veterans' Appeals decision dated September 11, 2018, that denied entitlement to service connection to penile shortening. The Court determined that the Board provided an inadequate statement of reasons and bases for relying on the March 2016 medical examination.

An itemized statement of the services rendered and the reasonable fees and expenses for which Appellant seeks compensation is attached to this application as Exhibit A. Included in Exhibit A is a certification that lead counsel has "(1) reviewed the combined billing statement and is satisfied that it accurately

reflects the work performed by all counsel and (2) considered and eliminated all time that is excessive or redundant.” *Baldrige and Demel v. Nicholson*, 19 Vet. App. 227, 240 (2005). Appellant is seeking fees for 15.0 hours of attorney time at a rate of \$196.76 per hour, as outlined in Exhibit A. We are also seeking fees for 1.5 hours of law clerk time, performed under the supervision of lead counsel, billed at \$ 75.00 per hour, which is less than the rate set forth in the USAO Attorney’s Fees Matrix as set forth in Exhibit B, and should be considered reasonable. See *Sandoval v. Brown*, 9 Vet. App. 177 (1996). Appellant’s legal counsel is not seeking reimbursement for photocopying and other miscellaneous expenses incurred in this action. The total amount of fees requested is \$3,063.90.

The prerequisites for an award of attorneys and expenses pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2412 (2009) have been met, and are as follows:

- 1) Appellant is a prevailing party. *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 113 S.Ct.2625 (1993);
- 2) The underlying action was a civil action. The term “civil action” includes proceedings seeking judicial review of administrative agency decisions. It did not sound in tort, there is no statute which prohibits or provides for such awards;
- 3) This Court has jurisdiction. 38 U.S.C. § 7252(a) (2009);
- 4) The position of the United States was not substantially justified as set forth in the parties’ joint motion for remand;

- 5) No special circumstances exist to make the award unjust and this application is timely filed;
- 6) Appellant has submitted a declaration of net worth when the appeal was filed. Appellant did not have a net worth in excess of \$2,000,000 at such time;
- 7) The “United States” includes any agency and any official thereof acting in his official capacity, including the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;
- 8) The “position of the United States” for the purposes of deciding substantial justification means both the position taken by the United States in the civil action, and the action or the failure to act, by the agency against whom the civil action is based, and position was not justified;
- 9) No portion of time expended herein by appellant’s legal counsel has unreasonably protracted the proceedings; and
- 10) Appellant is qualified and eligible to receive attorneys fees and expenses pursuant to EAJA in this case. All of the provisions and prerequisites under the statute and governing case law have been met.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests the Court award attorneys fees in the amount of \$3,063.90.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE E. HOOPLE, Appellant

By: /s/ Jerusha L. Hancock
Jerusha L. Hancock, Esq.
BERRY LAW FIRM
6940 O Street, Suite 400
Lincoln, NE 68510
(402) 466-8444
(402) 466-1793 / Fax
jerusha@jsberrylaw.com
Attorney for Appellant

BILLING RECORDS & REPORT [Attorney Time – Hours]

Re: BRUCE E. HOOPLE, Appellant

USCAVC Case No. 19-105

Preface:

On May 12, 2020, this Court issued a memorandum decision, vacating the part of the Board of Veterans' Appeals decision dated September 11, 2018, that denied entitlement to service connection to penile shortening. The Court determined that the Board provided an inadequate statement of reasons and bases for relying on the March 2016 medical examination.

DATE	SERVICES PERFORMED (By Jerusha Hancock, unless otherwise indicated.)	HRS
9/14/18	Review Board decision, check docket, and review file docs for determination whether to appeal.	0.4
1/8/19	Notice of Docketing for BVA's decision w/in 30 days; RBA w/in 60 days.	0.1
2/6/19	Board Decision transmittal.	0.1
3/7/19	Entry of appearance for Timothy G. Joseph, for OGC.	0.1
3/7/19	RBA notice, calendar review.	0.1
3/27/19	Notice to file Appellant's brief.	0.1
4/11/19	Conference notice, schedule review.	0.1
5/1/19	Notice of withdrawal.	0.1
5/22/19	RBA review, draft SOI. (law clerk)	1.5
5/23/19	Reviewed SOI. Rule 33 notice.	0.1
6/12/19	Prepare for conference, conference held, finish memo.	0.4
7/11/19	Begin drafting brief. (Atty Bennett)	2.0
8/25/19	Continue drafting brief. (Atty Bennett)	4.5
8/26/19	Continue drafting brief. (Atty Bennett)	2.5
8/26/19	Finish drafting brief. (Atty Bennett)	3.0
10/24/19	Email w/ OGC re: appellee's extension.	0.1
12/9/19	Appellee's brief filed.	0.1
1/6/2020	ROP filed.	0.1
1/28/2020	Assigned case to judge.	0.1
5/12/2020	Memorandum decision issued.	0.1
6/3/2020	Judgment entered.	0.1
6/15/2020	Reviewed calendar, time, EAJA calculations.	0.8

Total Hours:

Attorney time, 15.0 hours

Law clerk, 1.5 hours (1.5 hours with 0 hours eliminated for redundancy)

Issues / Claims Being Remanded:

On May 12, 2020, this Court issued a memorandum decision, vacating the part of the Board of Veterans' Appeals decision dated September 11, 2018, that denied entitlement to service connection to penile shortening. The Court determined that the Board provided an inadequate statement of reasons and bases for relying on the March 2016 medical examination.

Billing General Case Management:

In this appeal, a portion of the hours spent in prosecuting the appeal are "general case management" hours. That is, time spent on tasks inherent to prosecuting an appeal regardless of the number of claims remanded compared to the number of claims appealed. These hours include review of records, preparation of documents and pleadings, *inter alia*. Although not directly related to a claim which was remanded, such time is billable time. See, *Elcyszyn v. Brown*, 7 Vet. App. 170 (1994) (The time spent for general case management is inextricably linked to the preparation of an entire case. There is no basis or fair mechanism for equitably apportioning the time spent for general case management into billable and non-billable hours.)

Time Spent on the Issue Remanded:

The time spent in prosecuting this appeal was related to the issues

remanded.

The Billing Formula Employed Herein:

A. The Hourly Rate:

The law provides effective for appeals filed after March 29, 1996, the hourly rate for EAJA purposes is \$125. This base amount is adjusted annually to reflect cost of living changes relative to 1996. The statutory formula provides the base hourly rate (\$125) is multiplied by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the appropriate mid-point date. The sum is then divided by \$151.70, which is the Midwest CPI for March 1996.

Under *Elczyn v. Brown*, 7 Vet. App. 170 (1994), the appropriate hourly rate for paralegals, law clerks, and law students is (1) the rate in the prevailing market in which the services were performed, or (2) the \$75 rate set forth in § 2412(d)(2)(a) plus a cost of living adjustment calculated under the Consumer Price Index. We are asking for \$75.00 per hour for law clerk time, which is less than that listed for law clerks under the USAO's Attorney's Fees Matrix.

B. The Mid-Point Date:

The mid-point date is one of three dates:

- (1). The date the appeal was filed;
- (2). The date the summary of issues was filed, or;
- (3). The date the brief was filed.

See *Elczyn v. Brown*, 7 Vet. App. 170 (1994) (The mid-point date should be the date of the appellant's principle brief, motion, or petition filed with the

Court, which provides, “the capstone of the litigation process.”); *Apodackis v. Nicholson*, 19 Vet. App. 91 (2005) (The midpoint of the litigation is the middle of the month where a majority of the work was performed.).

In this case, the appropriate mid-point date is in August 2019 – the date the Appellant’s brief was filed.

C. Consumer Price Index (CPI):

This Court has held the cost of living adjustment is determined by reference to the **CPI-All Index** in the region where the work is performed. *Elcyzn v. Brown*, 7 Vet. App. 170 (1994). In this appeal, the work was performed in Nebraska.

Accordingly, the midwest urban region – in which Nebraska is grouped – is the appropriate region of the **CPI-All Index**.

The CPI Rate for the mid-point is 238.786. See, Bureau of Labor Statistics, CPI Tables for the midwest urban. See, *Elcyzyn v. Brown*, the rate is for the All-Items Index. See, <https://www.bls.gov/regions/midwest/data/xg-tables/ro5xq01.htm>

D. Hourly Rate For This Appeal:

The statutory formula results in the following calculations.

\$125.00	(Base Amount)
	(multiplied by)
\$238.786	(Midwest CPI in August 2019 midpoint date)
	(divided by)
\$151.70	(Midwest CPI in March 1996)
<hr/>	
\$196.76	(Adjusted Rate for attorney time)

CONCLUSION

Applying the statutory rate of \$196.76 to the 15.0 hours of attorney time equals \$2,951.40, and the rate of \$75.00 to the 1.5 hours spent by the law clerk equals \$112.50, for a total of \$3,063.90– the amount sought herein.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE E. HOOPLE, Appellant

By: /s/ Jerusha L. Hancock
Jerusha L. Hancock, Esq.
BERRY LAW FIRM
6940 O Street, Suite 400
Lincoln, NE 68510
(402) 466-8444
(402) 466-1793 / Fax
jerusha@jsberrylaw.com
Attorney for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify, to the best of my knowledge and ability, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, that copy of the foregoing was electronically served with the following:

Timothy G. Joseph, Esq.
Office of the General Counsel
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington DC 20420

On July 28, 2020.

/s/ Jerusha L. Hancock
Jerusha L. Hancock, Esq.