

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No.
UNPUBLISHED

Petitioner, v. SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, Respondent.
--

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed:

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Damages Decision Based on Proffer;
Tetanus Diphtheria acellular
Pertussis (Tdap) Vaccine; Shoulder
Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Elizabeth Martin Muldowney, Sands Anderson PC, Richmond, VA, for petitioner.

Voris Edward Johnson, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES¹

On _____ filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a left shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of a tetanus-diphtheria-acellular pertussis vaccination administered on _____. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the vaccine was administered within the United States, that she suffered the residual effects of her injury for more than six months, and that she has not received an award or settlement of any civil action for damages for her vaccine-related injury. Petition at 2, 7. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in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 note (2012) (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 “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On _____ a ruling on entitlement was issued, finding Petitioner entitled to compensation for a SIRVA. On _____, Respondent filed a proffer on award of compensation ("Proffer") indicating Petitioner should be awarded \$93,105.44 (consisting of \$90,000.00 for pain and suffering, and \$3,105.44 for past unreimbursed expenses). Proffer at 1. In the Proffer, Respondent represented that Petitioner agrees with the proffered award. *Id.* Based on the record as a whole, I find that Petitioner is entitled to an award as stated in the Proffer.

Pursuant to the terms stated in the attached Proffer, **I award Petitioner a lump sum payment of \$93,105.44 (consisting of \$90,000.00 for pain and suffering, and \$3,105.44 for past unreimbursed expenses in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.** This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under § 15(a).

The clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this decision.³

IT IS SO ORDERED.

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

³ 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.