

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 19-1432V

UNPUBLISHED

AMY NORTON,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: February 26, 2021

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Paul R. Brazil, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.

Debra A. Filteau Begley, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On September 18, 2019, Amy Norton 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 shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”), which meets the Table definition for SIRVA, after receiving an influenza vaccine on December 11, 2017. Petition at 1 ¶ 2. Petitioner further alleges that she received the vaccination in the United States, suffered the residual effects of her SIRVA for more than six months, and that neither she nor any other party has filed a civil action or received an award or settlement for her SIRVA. *Id.* at ¶¶ 2, 10-12. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in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

On February 26, 2021, 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 "has concluded that compensation is appropriate because [P]etitioner meets the criteria for a presumed SIRVA, as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table." *Id.* at 3. Respondent further agrees that "based on the record as it now stands, [P]etitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Vaccine Act." *Id.* at 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