

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
ARKANSAS, HOT SPRINGS DIVISION

James D. Womble v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner, Social Security
Administration

Civil No. 6:25-cv-06116-MEF · No. 6:25-cv-06116-MEF · Decided June 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas grants Plaintiff James D. Womble’s unopposed motion for attorney’s fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act. The court awards \$6,620.00 in fees and no costs, payable to the plaintiff subject to the conditions described in *Astrue v. Ratliff*, and notes that the award will be considered when any fee is later determined under 42 U.S.C. § 406.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Hot Springs Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mark E. Ford
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Hot Springs Division
DECIDED	June 23, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-06116-MEF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved unopposed for attorney fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act after prevailing in the underlying Social Security benefits litigation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court determined entitlement to EAJA fees by applying the prevailing-party and substantial-justification requirements and reviewed the stipulated fee amount for statutory and reasonable-fee compliance.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	James D. Womble v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner, Social Security Administration

TOPICS

attorney fees administrative law judicial review of agency action remedies civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

administrative law Social Security law attorney fees

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to attorney fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act.
2. Whether the stipulated EAJA fee award of \$6,620.00 was permissible and should be awarded to Plaintiff or, under specified conditions, directly to Plaintiff's attorney.

HOLDINGS

1. A prevailing plaintiff is entitled to an EAJA fee award when the government's position was not substantially justified and the requested award satisfies the statute's requirements; Plaintiff was entitled to fees in this case.
2. The court approved the stipulated EAJA attorney-fee award of \$6,620.00 and awarded no costs.
3. The EAJA award is payable to Plaintiff, but may be paid directly to Plaintiff's attorney if Plaintiff validly assigned the fee rights to counsel and owes no outstanding federal debt.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff prevailed in litigation challenging the government's denial of Social Security benefits. The government did not establish that its position was substantially justified. The parties stipulated to an EAJA attorney-fee award of \$6,620.00 and requested no costs.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Commissioner denied Plaintiff's Social Security benefits. Plaintiff prevailed in the underlying action, and the parties agreed that Plaintiff was entitled to \$6,620.00 in EAJA attorney fees and no costs. The court granted the unopposed motion and entered the stipulated fee award.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Jackson v. Bowen, 807 F.2d 127, 128 (8th Cir. 1986)
- Johnson v. Sullivan, 919 F.2d 503, 505 (8th Cir. 1990)
- Hensley v. Eckerhart, 461 U.S. 424, 430 (1983)
- Astrue v. Ratliff, 560 U.S. 586, 596 (2010)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-arkansas-hot-springs-division-united-states/2026/james-d-womble-v-frank-bisignano-commissioner-social-sl5w6ejx>