

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 16-809V

Filed: December 15, 2016

UNPUBLISHED

\*\*\*\*\*

LUISA GOMES,

\*

\*

Petitioner,

\*

v.

\*

Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;  
Tetanus-Diphtheria-Acellular-Pertussis  
("Tdap"); Shoulder Injury Related to  
Vaccine Administration ("SIRVA");  
Special Processing Unit ("SPU")

\*

SECRETARY OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

\*

\*

Respondent.

\*

\*

\*\*\*\*\*

*Ronald Homer, Conway, Homber, P.C., Boston, MA, for petitioner.*

*Alice Tayman, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

### **RULING ON ENTITLEMENT**<sup>1</sup>

**Dorsey**, Chief Special Master:

On July 7, 2016, petitioner filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*,<sup>2</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration ("SIRVA") as a result of a tetanus-diphtheria-acellular-pertussis ("Tdap") vaccination in her right shoulder on July 16, 2013. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On December 15, 2016, respondent filed her Rule 4(c) report in which she concedes that petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, respondent concluded that a preponderance of evidence established that the injury to petitioner's right shoulder was caused by the July 16, 2013 Tdap vaccination. *Id.* at 3. Respondent further agrees that petitioner's right shoulder injury is compensable as a "caused-in-fact" injury under the Vaccine Act. *Id.* at 4.

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned intends to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website,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). 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, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within this definition, the undersigned will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> 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).

**In view of respondent's concession and the evidence before me, the undersigned finds that petitioner is entitled to compensation.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Nora Beth Dorsey**

Nora Beth Dorsey  
Chief Special Master