

On November 7, 2014, respondent filed her Rule 4(c) Report [Respondent's Report"], in which she concedes that petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Report at 2. Specifically, respondent concluded, based on the Qualifications and Aids to Interpretation of the Vaccine Injury Table, that BN is an injury on the Vaccine Injury Table for tetanus-containing vaccines and that contemporaneous medical records support that the onset of petitioner's pain fell within the Table's timeframe for a presumed vaccine injury. Id. at 3-4. Respondent agrees that petitioner's symptoms and the EMG study results are consistent with a diagnosis of BN, and that several of petitioner's treating neurologists believed that her BN was most likely caused by the Tdap vaccination. Id. at 4. Accordingly, respondent concedes that petitioner "meets the criteria for a Table injury of BN following a tetanus vaccine." Id.

In light of respondent's concession and the evidence before me, I find that petitioner is entitled to compensation.

s/ Thomas L. Gowen
Thomas L. Gowen
Special Master