

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 24-1462V

UNPUBLISHED

JULIA OBERMIER,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: March 12, 2025

Bijan Esfandiari, Wisner Baum LLP, Los Angeles, CA, for Petitioner.

Julia M. Collison, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION¹

On September 19, 2024, Julia Obermier filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. § 300aa—10 through 34² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleged that she suffered various injuries from human papillomavirus (“HPV”) vaccinations she received on September 20, 2018, March 21, 2019, and September 23, 2019. ECF No. 1 at 2.

Because the petition was untimely filed, and Petitioner has failed to establish a basis for equitable tolling, this case is **DISMISSED**.

Relevant Factual Background

As alleged in the petition³, Petitioner stated that she received the first HPV vaccination on September 20, 2018, when she was twenty-three years old, the second

¹ Because this Decision 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 Decision 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 “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

³ Petitioner has not filed any medical records to establish the vaccinations or her injuries. I will assume the accuracy of the facts in the petition to resolve the motion to dismiss.

vaccination on March 21, 2019, and the third vaccination on September 23, 2019. ECF No. 1. Within six months of the September 23, 2019 vaccination (i.e., by April 2020), Petitioner stated she developed onset of extreme allergies, rapid heart rate, fatigue, abnormal perspiration without exercise, joint stiffness, abnormal menstruation, muscle fatigue, and weight gain. ECF No. 1 ¶ 5. Petitioner was diagnosed with chronic fatigue later in 2020. *Id.* ¶ 6.

Petitioner alleged the preceding medical history in the petition and repeated the history in her response to the order to show cause. Facially, Petitioner's claim herein was filed almost five years after her last HPV dose, which was administered in 2019, and over four years after she began manifesting symptoms in April 2020. But Petitioner maintains her delay is excusable. Thus, in an affidavit dated September 15, 2024, Petitioner has attested that, at the time these vaccinations occurred, no Vaccine Information Statements (VIS) were provided and no information was relayed about the Vaccine Program. Exhibit 1 ¶ 4. Petitioner only learned that the HPV vaccine might be capable of causing adverse effects or that she had a legal remedy in July 2023. Exhibit 3 ¶ 6.

Relevant Procedural History

Given that the timeliness of the claim was legitimately called into question merely by the face of the actual Petition, while the case was still in the initial "pre-assignment review" (a process utilized by the Office of Special Masters to assess whether a claim's primary evidentiary documentation has been filed), I ordered Petitioner to show cause why the claim had not been filed outside the Act's 36-month statute of limitations. Sec. 16(a)(2); ECF No. 6.

On September 24, 2024, Respondent submitted a brief arguing for dismissal due to untimeliness.⁴ ECF No. 7. Respondent maintained that Petitioner in fact had not diligently pursued her rights before filing a vaccine claim in 2024. Respondent also disputed the veracity of contentions about the manufacturer's conduct, and whether it could in any event constitute an extraordinary circumstance that would serve as a basis for tolling of the statute.

On December 19, 2024, Petitioner filed a response. ECF No. 10. Petitioner did not dispute that the onset of symptoms occurred more than three years before the petition was filed in 2024, but instead argued that the limitations period should be equitably tolled. Petitioner asserted that she had diligently pursued her rights once she realized the connection between her injuries and the HPV vaccine and became aware of the Vaccine Program. Petitioner also made allegations not relevant to a Vaccine Act claim, about the

⁴ In a motion to strike, Petitioner opposed Respondent filing his brief before Petitioner had an opportunity to file her own. ECF No. 8. As detailed in the order denying the motion to strike, while procedurally atypical, Respondent's early filing of his brief did not harm Petitioner. ECF No. 9.

perfidious conduct of the vaccine manufacturer in fraudulently concealing the HPV vaccine's harmful character from the public. ECF No. 10 at 20. Relatedly, Petitioner argued that the failure of a healthcare professional to provide her with a VIS at the time of vaccination can be attributed to the Department of Health and Human Services' failure to systematically ensure that VIS are provided and explained to all vaccine recipients. *Id.* at 4.

Legal Standards

The Vaccine Act's statute of limitations is thirty-six months. Sec. 16(a)(2). The statute begins to run from the manifestation of the first objectively cognizable symptom, whether or not that symptom is sufficient for diagnosis (or even recognized by a claimant as significant). *Id.*; *Carson v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 727 F.3d 1365, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

The Federal Circuit has held that the doctrine of equitable tolling can apply to Vaccine Act's statute of limitations. See *Cloer v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 654 F.3d 1322, 1340-41 (Fed. Cir. 2011). However, in keeping with applicable U.S. Supreme Court precedent, equitable tolling of a limitations period is to be permitted "sparingly." *Irwin v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs*, 498 U.S. 89, 96, (1990). The appropriateness of equitable tolling is ultimately to be determined on a case-by-case basis, without rigid application of any relevant overarching guidelines. *Holland v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 631, 649-50 (2010); accord *Arctic Slope Native Ass'n v. Sebelius*, 699 F.3d 1289, 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

Petitioners must prove two elements to establish equitable tolling: (1) that petitioner diligently pursued her rights, and (2) an extraordinary circumstance prevented her from timely filing the claim. *K.G. v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 951 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (citing *Menominee Indian Tribe v. United States*, 577 U.S. 250, 255 (2016)). When first articulating this limited exception to equitable tolling, the Federal Circuit primarily enumerated fraud and duress—but not, for example, *lack of awareness* on a petitioner's part that she might have an actionable claim. *Cloer*, 654 F.3d at 1344-45 (noting that tolling of the Vaccine Act's statute of limitations period is not triggered "due to unawareness of a causal link between an injury and administration of a vaccine").

Analysis

The untimeliness of this filing is acknowledged by Petitioner, so the only question to be resolved is whether equitable tolling should save the claim. But Petitioner has failed to establish both elements of equitable tolling – diligent pursuit and extraordinary circumstances.

A) Diligent pursuit

Petitioner was twenty-three years old when she received the first HPV vaccination. Petitioner argues that she was impeded by the failure of the vaccine administrator to provide her with a VIS or any other information about the Vaccine Program. Petitioner only began to diligently pursue a vaccine claim after she learned that the HPV vaccine had potential adverse effects in July 2023 and that she had a legal remedy.

These arguments are wholly unpersuasive. It is beyond question that claims asserted in the Vaccine Program are not subject to a “discovery rule,” accruing only when a claimant *learns* he or she might possess a cause of action. Rather, the statute of limitations period is triggered by the onset of Petitioner’s symptoms – whether or not onset was understood to be the start of the claimed injurious illness or condition. *Cloer v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 654 F.3d 1322, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (en banc). And the failure to be advised of the Vaccine Program or the Act does not support equitable tolling of the statute of limitations period for an otherwise-untimely filed petition. *Speights v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 03-2619V, 2013 WL 5944084, at *13 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Oct. 17, 2013). Thus, a petitioner cannot generally shield an untimely claim from dismissal by asserting, even in good faith, that she literally was unaware of her Vaccine Act “rights.”

B) Extraordinary Circumstances

Petitioner’s arguments about the purported fraudulent conduct of the vaccine’s manufacturer, in hiding proof of the vaccine’s dangers, deserve even less consideration. ECF No. 10 at 20. As a threshold matter, these contentions are speculative and not evidentiarily-supported. And regardless of their actual truth, the fact remains that the Government *has approved* the HPV vaccine for administration to minors, rendering it “covered” under the Act. The only issue to be resolved in a Program case is whether (assuming, as here, the claim is not a Table claim) the claim meets the standards for causation – and those standards have nothing to do with a manufacturer’s alleged misconduct in preparation or promotion of the underlying vaccine.

These allegations also are not a basis for tolling under the circumstances. Petitioner simply has not shown that contentions of corporate misconduct not specific to, or directed at, her personally could rise to the level of the kind of “fraud” that might excuse failing to file a Program claim in a timely manner. Nor has she persuasively established that the vaccine administrator’s “failure to warn,” or provide a VIS in 2018 or 2019, is an extraordinary circumstance. Even assuming the factual accuracy of that allegation, it remains the case (as the Circuit recognized in *Cloer*) that vaccine claims accrue upon onset – and that the failure to be advised of the Vaccine Program does not support equitable tolling. *Cloer*, 654 F.3d at 1340; see also *Speights*, 2013 WL 5944084, at *13.

And arguments about governmental agency knowledge of a failure to warn reflect overheated, almost-conspiratorial allegations that do not come close to excusing the claim's untimely nature.

Conclusion

Thus, Petitioner has failed to establish equitable tolling. **This case is dismissed for being untimely filed. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.**⁵

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran
Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

⁵ If Petitioner wishes to bring a civil action, she must file a notice of election rejecting the judgment pursuant to § 21(a) "not later than 90 days after the date of the court's final judgment."