In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 21-1069V

KATHERINE MURPHY

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: March 9, 2026

David Charles Richards, Christensen & Jensen, P.C., Salt Lake City, UT, for Petitioner.

Austin Joel Egan, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT[1]

On March 16, 2021, Katherine Murphy 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 alleged that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration ("SIRVA"), a defined Table injury, after receiving an influenza ("flu") vaccine on September 19, 2020. Petition at 1, ¶¶ 3, 18. Petitioner also alleged that she received the vaccine within the United States and that she suffered the residual effects of her SIRVA for more than six months. *Id.* at ¶¶ 3, 19. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

[1] Because this Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, and/or at https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (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 (2018).

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Although Respondent initially opposed compensation (ECF No. 77), after reviewing the additional medical records provided by Petitioner (Exs. 41-44, ECF No. 78), he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1, ECF No. 79. Specifically, Respondent "has concluded that [P]etitioner's alleged injury is consistent with SIRVA as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table." *Id.* at 5. Respondent further agrees that based on the record as it now stands, [P]etitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Act." *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