

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-291V

UNPUBLISHED

DIANE DESISTO,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: July 15, 2021

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

Leah V. Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for petitioner.

Catherine E. Stolar, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On March 16, 2020, Diane Desisto 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 injuries, including shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (SIRVA), resulting from the adverse effects of an influenza (flu) vaccination she received on October 4, 2018. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On July 8, 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. Respondent determined that Petitioner’s claim meets the Vaccine Injury Table requirements for SIRVA. *Id.* at 6. Specifically, Respondent found that “[P]etitioner had no

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website in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

history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of the affected shoulder prior to her vaccination that would explain the alleged symptoms and examination findings occurring after vaccine injection; she more likely than not suffered the onset of pain within forty-eight hours of vaccine administration; her pain and reduced range of motion were limited to the shoulder in which the vaccine was administered; and there is no other condition or abnormality present that would explain [P]etitioner's symptoms." *Id.* Respondent concluded that Petitioner is 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