

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 22-1611V

██████████,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: June 11, 2024

Leah V. Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for Petitioner.

Sarah C. Duncan, U.S. Dep’t of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES¹

On October 27, 2022, ██████████ filed a petition on behalf of her then-minor daughter seeking compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (“Vaccine Program”).² Petition, dated October 27, 2022 (ECF No. 1) (“Pet.”). The minor, ██████████, replaced her mother as Petitioner after reaching the age of majority. (ECF No. 19). Petitioner alleges that she suffered from brachial neuritis as a result of her November 27, 2019, receipt of the influenza (“flu”) vaccine. Pet. at 1. Moreover, Petitioner alleges that she experienced residual effects of this injury for more than six months.

¹ Because this decision contains a reasoned explanation for my actions in this case, I will post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. § 3501 (2012). As provided by 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-12(d)(4)(B), however, the parties may object to the decision’s inclusion of certain kinds of confidential information. Specifically, under Vaccine Rule 18(b), each party has fourteen days within which to request redaction “of any information furnished by that party: (1) that is a trade secret or commercial or financial in substance and is privileged or confidential; or (2) that includes medical files or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy.” Vaccine Rule 18(b). Otherwise, the whole decision will be available to the public. *Id.*

² The Vaccine Program comprises Part 2 of the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3758, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-10 through 34 (2012) (“Vaccine Act” or “the Act”). Individual section references hereafter will be to § 300aa of the Act (but will omit that statutory prefix).

Respondent denies that the flu vaccine caused Petitioner to suffer brachial neuritis, or any other injury or condition. Respondent also denies that the flu vaccine caused Petitioner to suffer a significant aggravation of any pre-existing condition. Nonetheless both parties, while maintaining their above-stated positions, agreed in a stipulation (filed on June 11, 2024) that the issues before them could be settled, and that a decision should be entered awarding Petitioner compensation.

I have reviewed the file, and based upon that review, I conclude that the parties' stipulation (as attached hereto) is reasonable. I therefore adopt it as my decision in awarding damages on the terms set forth therein.

The stipulation awards:

- A lump sum of \$50,000.00 in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.

Stipulation ¶ 8. This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under Section 15(a) of the Act.

I approve a Vaccine Program award in the requested amount set forth above to be made to Petitioner. In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment herewith.³

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Brian H. Corcoran
Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

³ Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by each filing (either jointly or separately) a notice renouncing their right to seek review.