

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-0203V

UNPUBLISHED

SANDEEP BAINS,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: July 19, 2021

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

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

Christine Mary Becer, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On February 25, 2020, Sandeep Bains 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 he suffered from a left shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of receiving the tetanus-diphtheria-acellular pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccine on April 23, 2018. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On July 16, 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 states that he has reviewed the facts of this case and concludes

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in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

that Petitioner's claim meets the Table criteria for SIRVA. *Id.* at 3. Respondent further agrees that "[P]etitioner had no history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of the affected shoulder prior to intramuscular vaccine administration that would explain the alleged signs, symptoms, examination findings, and/or diagnostic studies occurring after vaccine injection; he suffered the onset of pain within forty-eight hours of vaccine administration; his pain and reduced range of motion were limited to the shoulder in which the intramuscular vaccine was administered; and there is no other condition or abnormality present that would explain petitioner's symptoms" and states that Petitioner is therefore entitled to a presumption of vaccine causation. *Id.*

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