

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-0295V

UNPUBLISHED

CHRIS HEMPEL,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: June 11, 2021

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

*Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for
Petitioner.*

*Mallori Browne Openchowski, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for
Respondent.*

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On March 16, 2020, Chris Hempel 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 a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”), which meets the definition of a Table SIRVA, after receiving the influenza vaccine on October 15, 2018. Petition at 1, ¶¶ 1, 9. Petitioner further alleges that he received the vaccine in the United States, that he suffered the residual effects of his SIRVA for more than six months, and that neither he nor any other party has filed a civil action or received compensation for his injury. 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¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in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 June 11, 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 "believes that {P}etitioner alleged injury is consistent with a SIRVA, as defined on the Vaccine Injury Table." *Id.* at 3. Respondent further agrees that "based on the records as it now stands, [P]etitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the 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