

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-0747V

UNPUBLISHED

DOUGLAS MILLER,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: April 5, 2022

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

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

Wei Kit Tai, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On June 23, 2020, Douglas Miller 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”) as a result of a tetanus, diphtheria, and acellular pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccine administered to him on October 15, 2018. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On April 4, 2022, 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.

¹ Because this unpublished Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in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 section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

Specifically, Respondent has concluded that “[P]etitioner’s claim meets the Table criteria for SIRVA.” *Id.* at 6. Respondent further agrees that “[P]etitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Act.” *Id.* at 7.

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