

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-1227V

UNPUBLISHED

MAUREEN DEIGHAN,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: November 15, 2022

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

Scott D Frendel, Braunfotel & Frendel, LLC, Dresher, PA, for Petitioner.

Mary Eileen Holmes, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On September 18, 2020, Maureen Deighan 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 left shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (SIRVA) resulting from an influenza vaccine she received on October 10, 2017. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the vaccination was administered within the United States, her shoulder injury persisted for greater than six months, and neither Petitioner nor any other party has ever filed any action or received compensation in the form of award or settlement for her vaccine-related injury. Petition at 1, 4. 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¹ Because this unpublished Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in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 section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On November 14, 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. Respondent concluded that Petitioner's claim meets the Table criteria for SIRVA. *Id.* at 8. Specifically, Respondent determined that "[P]etitioner had no apparent 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; 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 intramuscular vaccine was administered; and there is no other condition or abnormality present that would explain [P]etitioner's symptoms." *Id.* Respondent further agrees that "the case was timely filed, that the vaccine was received in the United States, and that [P]etitioner satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of his injury for more than six months after vaccine administration." *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