

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 25-2037V

MARRIEA LAYTON,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: June 29, 2026

Matthew B Bernstein, Green & Schafle LLC, Philadelphia, PA, for Petitioner.

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

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On December 1, 2025, Marriea Layton 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 an influenza (“flu”) vaccine administered to her on September 13, 2024 caused her to suffer a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”), as defined in the Vaccine Injury Table (42 C.F.R. § 100.3). Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that she received the vaccine in the United States, that she suffered the residual effects of her injury for more than six months, and that there has been no prior award or settlement of a civil action on her behalf as a result of her injury. See Petition at ¶¶ 3, 20-21, 24. 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 June 18, 2026, 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 he

recommends that petitioner be found entitled to compensation for a Table SIRVA Petitioner had no history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of her left shoulder prior to vaccination that would explain petitioner's post-vaccination symptoms; shoulder pain occurred within 48 hours after receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; shoulder pain and reduced ROM were limited to the side 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)(XIV)(B), (c)(10). Additionally, petitioner suffered the residual effects of her condition for more than six months. See 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-11(c)(1)(D)(i). Therefore, based on the current record, petitioner has satisfied all requirements for compensation under the Act. See 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-13(a)(1)(A-B).

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