

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 24-1709V

CHRISTOPHER BUDGE,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: August 26, 2025

*Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for  
Petitioner.*

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

### **RULING ON ENTITLEMENT**<sup>1</sup>

On October 21, 2024, Christopher Budge filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that he suffered a Table injury - shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of the administration of his September 22, 2023 influenza (“flu”) vaccination. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges 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 ¶¶ 11-12. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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 August 25, 2025, 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 states that the 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 had no history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of his left shoulder prior to vaccination; pain occurred within forty-eight hours after receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; pain and reduced range of motion were 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). 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 4-5. Respondent further agrees that

[w]ith respect to other statutory and jurisdictional issues, the records show that the case was timely filed, that the vaccine was received in the United States, and that petitioner satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of his injury for more than six months after vaccine administration. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-11(c)(1)(D)(i). Petitioner also avers that neither he "nor any other party, has ever filed any civil action for [his] vaccine-related injury" and that he "nor any other party, has ever received compensation in the form of an award or settlement for [his] vaccine-related injury." Ex. 9 at 2, ¶ 11. Thus, in light of the information contained in petitioner's medical records and affidavit, respondent concedes that entitlement to compensation is appropriate under the terms of the Vaccine Act.

*Id.* at 5.

**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