

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 23-384V

CHARLENE BENEDICK,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: August 6, 2024

Richard Gage, Richard Gage, P.C. (WY), Cheyenne, WY, for Petitioner.

Mark Kim Hellie, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On March 20, 2023, Charlene Benedick (“Petitioner”) 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 from a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of receiving a tetanus-diphtheria-acellular pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccination on August 24, 2020. Pet., ECF No. 1. Petitioner further alleges that she suffered the residual effects of her injury for more than six months. *Id.* The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On August 5, 2024, 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 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).

1, ECF No. 27. Specifically, Respondent indicated that “[P]etitioner’s alleged injury is consistent with SIRVA as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table.” *Id.* at 5. Respondent does not dispute that Petitioner “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