

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 24-1777V

[REDACTED]

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: December 18, 2025

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

*Benjamin Rex Eisenberg, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for
Respondent.*

DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES¹

On October 30, 2024, [REDACTED] filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”) as personal representative of the Estate of her deceased spouse, [REDACTED]. Petitioner alleges that [REDACTED] suffered the Vaccine Injury Table injury of Guillain-Barre Syndrome (“GBS”) as the result of an influenza (“flu”) vaccine administered to him on November 6, 2021. Petition at ¶ 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc>, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2018).

On August 6, 2025, a ruling on entitlement was issued, finding Petitioner entitled to compensation for GBS. On December 16, 2025, Respondent filed the attached joint stipulation,³ requesting that I issued a decision awarding \$470,000.00 to Petitioner. Stipulation at ¶ 8. I find the stipulation reasonable and adopt it as my decision awarding damages, on the terms set forth therein.

Pursuant to the terms stated in the attached Stipulation, **I award Petitioner a lump sum payment of \$470,000.00, to be paid through an ACH deposit to Petitioner's counsel's IOLTA account for prompt disbursement to Petitioner.** This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under Section 15(a).

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this decision.⁴

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

³ Usually, a proffer is filed by Respondent if the parties have reached an informal agreement regarding the appropriate amount of compensation to be awarded after an entitlement determination. However, in a minority of cases, the parties may choose to file a joint stipulation instead, representing more of a compromise regarding the compensation to be awarded.

⁴ Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by the parties' joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.