

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 18-1713V

UNPUBLISHED

LISA K. MATHIS,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: March 11, 2020

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;
Anaphylaxis

Nancy Routh Meyers, Ward Black Law, Greensboro, NC, for petitioner.

Jennifer Leigh Reynaud, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On November 5, 2018, Lisa K. Mathis 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 anaphylaxis as a result of an influenza (“flu”) vaccine administered on November 13, 2017. Petition at *Preamble*. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On February 12, 2020, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent’s Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, Respondent concedes that Petitioner experienced anaphylaxis within an hour of receiving the vaccine at issue. *Id.* at 3. Respondent

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website in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 ruling 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).

further agrees that “there is not preponderate evidence of an alternate cause for [P]etitioner’s anaphylaxis” and the medical records demonstrate that Petitioner has suffered the residual effects of her condition for more than six months. *Id.* at 3-4.

In view of Respondent’s position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master