

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 25-0004V

LINDA MARANTO,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: October 28, 2025

Jimmy A. Zgheib, Zgheib Sayad, P.C., White Plains, NY, for Petitioner.

Naseem Kourosh, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On January 3, 2025, Linda Maranto 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 a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) resulting from a tetanus diphtheria acellular pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccine received on May 29, 2024. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the Tdap vaccine was administered in the United States, her symptoms have persisted for more than six months, and neither Petitioner, nor any other party, has ever filed any action for Petitioner’s vaccine-related injury, nor has Petitioner or any other party ever received or accepted compensation in the form of an award or settlement for her vaccine-related

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).

injury. Petition at ¶¶ 4, 28-30. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On June 17, 2025, I issued findings of fact determining that the evidence established that the Tdap vaccine was likely administered in Petitioner's right arm (ECF No. 14).

On October 27, 2025, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which, while reserving his right to appeal my June 17, 2025 ruling, he concedes that Petitioner has otherwise satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table and is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1-2. Specifically, Respondent agrees that, in light of my fact ruling and the record evidence, Petitioner's alleged injury is consistent with SIRVA as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table in that "petitioner had no history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of her right shoulder prior to vaccination; pain occurred within 48 hours after receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; pain and reduced ROM 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." *Id.* at 6-7. Respondent further agrees that the medical records indicate that Petitioner suffered the residual effects of her condition for more than six months, and 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