

§ 2610.107

5 CFR Ch. XVI (1-1-02 Edition)

substantially justified is on the Office. No presumption arises that the Office's position was not substantially justified simply because the Office did not prevail.

(b) If, in a proceeding arising from an Office action to enforce an applicant's compliance with a statutory or regulatory requirement, the demand of the Office is substantially in excess of the decision in the proceeding and is unreasonable when compared with that decision under the facts and circumstances of the case, the applicant shall be awarded the fees and other expenses related to defending against the excessive demand, unless the applicant has committed a willful violation of law or otherwise acted in bad faith or special circumstances make an award unjust. The burden of proof that the demand of the Office is substantially in excess of the decision and is unreasonable when compared with such decision is on the applicant. As used in this paragraph, "demand" means the express demand of the Office which led to the adversary adjudication, but it does not include a recitation by the Office of the maximum statutory penalty in the administrative complaint, or elsewhere when accompanied by an express demand for a lesser amount. Fees and expenses awarded under this paragraph shall be paid only as a consequence of appropriations provided in advance.

(c) Awards for fees and expenses incurred before the date on which a proceeding was initiated will be made only if the applicant can demonstrate that they were reasonably incurred in preparation for the proceeding.

(d) An award under this part will be reduced or denied if the Office's position was substantially justified in law and fact, if the applicant has unduly or unreasonably protracted the proceeding, if the applicant has falsified the application (including documentation) or net worth exhibit, or if special circumstances make the award unjust.

[57 FR 33268, July 28, 1992, as amended at 60 FR 38666, July 28, 1995; 63 FR 13116, Mar. 18, 1998]

§ 2610.107 Allowable fees and expenses.

(a) Awards will be based on rates customarily charged by persons engaged

in the business of acting as attorneys, agents and expert witnesses, even if the services were made available without charge or at reduced rate to the applicant.

(b) Except as provided in § 2610.108, no award for the fee of an attorney or agent under these rules may exceed \$125.00 per hour. No award to compensate an expert witness may exceed the highest rate at which the Office pays expert witnesses. However, an award may also include the reasonable expenses of the attorney, agency, or witness as a separate item, if the attorney, agent or witness ordinarily charges clients separately for such expenses.

(c) In determining the reasonableness of the fee sought for an attorney, agent or expert witness, the adjudicative officer shall consider the following:

(1) If the attorney, agent or witness is in private practice, his or her customary fees for similar services, or, if an employee of the applicant, the fully allocated costs of the services;

(2) The prevailing rate for similar services in the community in which the attorney, agent or witness ordinarily performs services;

(3) The time actually spent in the representation of the applicant;

(4) The time reasonably spent in light of the difficulty or complexity of the issues in the proceeding; and

(5) Such other factors as may bear on the value of the services provided.

(d) The reasonable cost of any study, analysis, engineering report, test, project or similar matter prepared on behalf of a party may be awarded, to the extent that the charge for the services does not exceed the prevailing rate for similar services, and the study or other matter was necessary for preparation of applicant's case.

[57 FR 33268, July 28, 1992, as amended at 63 FR 13116, Mar. 18, 1998]

§ 2610.108 Rulemaking on maximum rate for attorney and agent fees.

(a) If warranted by an increase in the cost of living or by special circumstances (such as limited availability of attorneys or agents qualified to handle certain types of proceedings), the Office may adopt regulations providing that attorney or agent fees may

be awarded at a rate higher than \$125.00 per hour in some or all of the types of proceedings covered by this part. The Office will conduct any rulemaking proceedings for this purpose under the informal rulemaking procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553.

(b) Any person may file with the Office a petition for rulemaking to increase the maximum rate for attorney or agent fees as provided in 5 U.S.C. 504(b)(1)(A)(ii). The petition should identify the rate the petitioner believes the Office should establish and the types of proceedings in which the rate should be used. It should also explain fully the reasons why the higher rate is warranted. The Office will respond to the petition within 60 days after it is filed, by initiating a rulemaking proceeding, denying the petition, or taking other appropriate action.

[57 FR 33268, July 28, 1992, as amended at 63 FR 13116, Mar. 18, 1998]

§ 2610.109 Awards against other agencies.

If an applicant is entitled to an award because it prevails over another agency of the United States that participates in a proceeding before the Office of Government Ethics and takes a position that is not substantially justified, the award or an appropriate portion of the award shall be made against that agency.

Subpart B—Information Required From Applicants

§ 2610.201 Contents of application.

(a) An application for an award of fees and expenses under the Act shall identify the applicant and the proceeding for which an award is sought. Unless the applicant is an individual, the application shall further state the number of employees of the applicant and describe briefly the type and purpose of its organization or business. The application shall also:

(1) Show that the applicant has prevailed and identify the position of the Office in the proceeding that the applicant alleges was not substantially justified; or

(2) Show that the demand by the Office in the proceeding was substantially in excess of, and was unreasonable when compared with, the decision in the proceeding.

(b) The application shall also include, for purposes of § 2610.106 (a) or (b), a statement that the applicant's net worth does not exceed \$2,000,000 (for individuals) or \$7,000,000 (for all other applicants, including their affiliates) or alternatively, for purposes of § 2610.106(b) only, a declaration that the applicant is a small entity as defined in 5 U.S.C. 601. However, an applicant may omit the statement concerning its net worth if:

(1) It attaches a copy of a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service that it qualifies as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) or, in the case of a tax-exempt organization not required to obtain a ruling from the Internal Revenue Service on its exempt status, a statement that describes the basis for the applicant's belief that it qualifies under such section; or

(2) It states that it is a cooperative association as defined in section 15(a) of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141j(a)).

(c) The application shall state the amount of fees and expenses for which an award is sought.

(d) The application may also include any other matters that the applicant wishes the Office to consider in determining whether and in what amount an award should be made.

(e) The application shall be signed by the applicant or an authorized officer or attorney of the applicant. It shall also contain or be accompanied by a written verification made by the applicant or authorized officer or attorney of the applicant under oath or under penalty of perjury that the information provided in the application is true and correct.

(f) These collections of information are not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) because they are expected to involve nine or fewer persons each year.

[57 FR 33268, July 28, 1992, as amended at 59 FR 34755, July 7, 1994; 63 FR 13116, Mar. 18, 1998]