

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 24-934V

MATTHEW DEAN,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: April 18, 2025

Jonathan Joseph Svitak, Shannon Law Group, P.C., Woodridge, IL, for Petitioner.

Parisa Tabassian, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On June 18, 2024, Matthew Dean 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 Table injury – shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) - as the result of a tetanus, diphtheria, acellular pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccine received on September 5, 2023. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that he received his vaccination in the United States, that he suffered the residual effects of his injury for more than six months, and that there has been no prior award or settlement of a civil action on his behalf as a result of his injury. See Petition at ¶¶ 2, 24, 27-28. 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 April 18, 2025, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer of Damages in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer of Damages at 1. Specifically, Respondent states that Division of Injury Compensation Programs, Department of Health and Human Services ("DICP") has

reviewed the petition and medical records filed in this case and has concluded that compensation is appropriate. DICP has concluded that petitioner's alleged injury is consistent with SIRVA as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table. Specifically, petitioner's history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of his shoulder prior to vaccination was determined to be separate from the left shoulder pain, inflammation, or dysfunction post-vaccination; pain occurred within forty-eight hours after receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; pain was limited to the shoulder in which the vaccine was administered; and no other condition or abnormality has been identified to explain petitioner's shoulder pain. 42 C.F.R. §§ 100.3(a), (c)(10). Additionally, based on the medical records outlined above, petitioner suffered the residual effects of his condition for more than six months. Therefore, based on the record as it now stands, petitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Act. See 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-13(a)(1)(B); 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-11(c)(1)(D)(i).

Id. at 5-6.

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