§ 13.1 Purpose of these rules.

These rules implement section 203 of the Equal Access to Justice Act, 5 U.S.C. 504 and 504 note, for the Department of Health and Human Services. They describe the circumstances under which the Department may award attorney fees and certain other expenses to eligible individuals and entities who prevail over the Department in certain administrative proceedings (called “adversary adjudications”). The Department may reimburse parties for expenses incurred in adversary adjudications if the party prevails in the proceeding and if the Department's position in the proceeding was not substantially justified or if the action is one to enforce compliance with a statutory or regulatory requirement and the Department's demand is substantially in excess of the ultimate decision and is unreasonable when compared with that decision. They also describe what proceedings constitute adversary adjudications covered by the Act, what types of persons and entities may be eligible for an award, and what procedures and standards the Department will use to make a determination as to whether a party may receive an award.


§ 13.2 When these rules apply.

These rules apply to adversary adjudications before the Department.
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§ 13.5 Standards for awards.

(a) An award of fees and expenses may be made either on the basis that the Department’s position in the proceeding was not substantially justified or on the basis that, in a proceeding to enforce compliance with a statutory or regulatory requirement, the Department’s demand substantially exceeded the ultimate decision and was unreasonable when compared with that decision. These two bases are explained in greater detail in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section.

(b) Awards where the Department’s position was not substantially justified. (1) Awards will be made on this basis only where the Department’s position in the proceeding was not substantially justified on the basis that, in a proceeding to enforce compliance with a statutory or regulatory requirement, the Department’s demand substantially exceeded the ultimate decision and was unreasonable when compared with that decision. The fact that a party has prevailed in a proceeding does not create a presumption that the Department’s position was not substantially justified. The burden of proof as to substantial justification is on the agency’s litigating party, which may avoid an award by showing that