

§ 747.603

(an applicant who owns an unincorporated business will be considered as an “individual” rather than a “sole owner of an unincorporated business” if the issues on which the applicant prevails are related primarily to personal interests rather than to business interests);

(3) A charitable or other tax-exempt organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) with not more than 500 employees;

(4) A cooperative association as defined in section 15(a) of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U.S.C. 1141j(a)) with not more than 500 employees; or

(5) Any other partnership, corporation, association, or public or private organization with a net worth of not more than \$7 million and not more than 500 employees.

(b) For the purpose of determining eligibility, the net worth of an applicant and the number of employees of an applicant shall be determined as of the date the proceeding was initiated.

(c) The applicant’s net worth includes the value of any assets disposed of for the purpose of meeting an eligibility standard and excludes any obligations incurred for this purpose. Transfers of assets or obligations incurred for less than reasonably equivalent value will be presumed to have been made for this purpose.

(d) The employees of an applicant include all persons who regularly perform services for remuneration for the applicant, under the applicant’s direction and control; part-time employees shall be included on a proportional basis.

(e) The net worth and number of employees of the applicant and all of its affiliates shall be aggregated to determine eligibility. Any individual, corporation or other entity that directly or indirectly controls or owns a majority of the voting shares or other interest of the applicant, or any corporation or other entity of which the applicant directly or indirectly owns or controls a majority of the voting shares or other interest, will be considered an affiliate for purposes of this subpart, unless the NCUA Board determines that such treatment would be unjust and contrary to the purposes of the EAJA

12 CFR Ch. VII (1–1–08 Edition)

in light of the actual relationship between the affiliated entities. In addition, the NCUA board may determine that financial relationships of the applicant other than those described in this paragraph constitute special circumstances that would make an award unjust.

(f) An applicant that participates in a proceeding primarily on behalf of one or more other persons or entities that would be ineligible is not itself eligible for an award.

§ 747.603 Prevailing party.

An eligible applicant may be a “prevailing party” if the applicant wins an action after a full hearing or trial on the merits, if a settlement of the proceeding was effected on terms favorable to it, or if the proceeding against it has been dismissed. In appropriate situations an applicant may also have prevailed if the outcome of the proceeding has substantially vindicated the applicant’s position on the significant substantive matters at issue, even though the applicant has not totally avoided adverse final action.

§ 747.604 Standards for award.

(a) A prevailing party may receive an award for fees and expenses incurred in connection with a proceeding, or in a significant and discrete substantive portion of the proceeding, by or against NCUA unless the position of NCUA during the proceeding was substantially justified. The burden of proving that an award should not be made is on counsel for NCUA. To avoid an award, counsel for NCUA must show that its position was reasonable in law and in fact.

(b) An award will be reduced or denied if the applicant has unduly or unreasonably protracted the proceeding or if special circumstances make the award sought unjust.

(c) Where an applicant has prevailed on one or more discrete substantive issues in a proceeding, even though all the issues were not resolved in its favor, any award shall be based on the fees and expenses incurred in connection with the discrete significant substantive issue or issues on which the applicant’s position has been upheld. If such segregation of costs is not practicable, the award may be based on a