

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 23-1346V

MARK E. HANSON,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: May 20, 2024

Heidi Marie Torvik, Lommen Abdo P.A., Minneapolis, MN, for Petitioner.

Felicia Langel, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On August 17, 2023, Mark E. Hanson 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 an influenza (“flu”) vaccine administered on September 4, 2022. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the vaccine was administered within the United States, that he experienced the residual effects of his condition for more than six months, and that there has been no prior award or settlement of a civil action for damages on his behalf as a result of his alleged injury. Petition at 1, 4-5. 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).

On May 16, 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. Specifically, Respondent has concluded that Petitioner's injury is consistent with a SIRVA as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table. *Id.* at 5. Respondent further agrees that Petitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Vaccine 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