

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Reece v. Commissioner of Social Security

Reece · No. 2:23-cv-2499-SCR · Decided August 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted the parties’ stipulation for attorneys’ fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act. The court awarded Plaintiff Tamara Reece \$5,995.15 after finding that she was a prevailing party based on the prior remand for further proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sean C. Riordan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 26, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-2499-SCR
DISPOSITION	approved
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After granting Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment in part and remanding the Social Security matter for further proceedings, the court considered the parties' stipulation for attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court determined whether Plaintiff qualified as a prevailing party under the EAJA, whether the government's position was substantially justified, and whether the stipulated fee was reasonable.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated.
PARTIES	Tamara Reece v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- attorney fees
- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- summary judgment
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security
- administrative law
- attorneys' fees

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was a prevailing party entitled to attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act after obtaining a remand for further proceedings.
2. Whether the stipulated EAJA fee award of \$5,995.15 was reasonable.
3. Whether the EAJA award should be made to Plaintiff rather than directly to Plaintiff's counsel.

HOLDINGS

1. A claimant who obtains a remand for further proceedings without the court retaining jurisdiction is a prevailing party for purposes of the EAJA.
2. The stipulated award of \$5,995.15 was a reasonable EAJA fee.
3. The EAJA award must be made to Plaintiff, although payment may be made in the name of Plaintiff's attorney if the government determines that Plaintiff owes no qualifying federal debt.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The EAJA award must be made by this Court to Plaintiff, and not to counsel.” (at 3)

“Therefore, the Court will award Plaintiff EAJA attorneys’ fees in the full amount of \$5,995.15.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought judicial review of a Social Security matter and obtained a remand for further proceedings after partially prevailing on summary judgment. The case involved an administrative record exceeding 500 pages, and Plaintiff's counsel prepared a motion for summary judgment and a reply brief. The parties stipulated to an EAJA fee award of \$5,995.15.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced the Social Security action on October 30, 2023. On July 28, 2025, the court granted Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment in part and remanded for further proceedings without retaining jurisdiction. The parties then filed a stipulation for EAJA fees, which the court granted.

DISPOSITION

approved

CASES CITED

- *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 300-02 (1993)
- *Flores v. Shalala*, 49 F.3d 562, 569 (9th Cir. 1995)
- *Commissioner, INS v. Jean*, 496 U.S. 154, 163 (1990)
- *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 437 (1983)
- *Atkins v. Apfel*, 154 F.3d 986, 988 (9th Cir. 1998)

- *Astrue v. Ratliff*, 560 U.S. 586, 589 (2010)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/reece-v-commissioner-of-social-security-gs6ktgk0>