

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 17-715V

Filed: April 12, 2018

UNPUBLISHED

CATHERINE W. VIEGA,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Damages Decision Based on Proffer;  
Tetanus Diphtheria acellular  
Pertussis (Tdap) Vaccine; Shoulder  
Injury Related to Vaccine  
Administration (SIRVA)

*Matthew F. Belanger, Faraci Lange, LLP, Rochester, NY, for petitioner.*

*Ilene Clair Albala, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

### **DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES<sup>1</sup>**

**Dorsey**, Chief Special Master:

On May 31, 2017, petitioner 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 she suffered a left shoulder injury as a result of a tetanus vaccination administered on September 26, 2016. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On January 17, 2018, a ruling on entitlement was issued, finding petitioner entitled to compensation for SIRVA. On April 12, 2018, respondent filed a proffer on award of compensation (“Proffer”) indicating petitioner should be awarded \$81,877.64. Proffer at 1. In the Proffer, respondent represented that petitioner agrees with the proffered award. Based on the record as a whole, the undersigned finds that petitioner is entitled to an award as stated in the Proffer.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned intends to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). 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, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within this definition, the undersigned 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 “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

Pursuant to the terms stated in the attached Proffer, **the undersigned awards petitioner a lump sum payment of \$81,877.64 in the form of a check payable to petitioner, Catherine W. Viega.** This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under § 300aa-15(a).

The clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this decision.<sup>3</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Nora Beth Dorsey**  
Nora Beth Dorsey  
Chief Special Master

---

<sup>3</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by the parties' joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.

	)	
CATHERINE W. VIEGA,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	No. 17-715
v.	)	Chief Special Master Dorsey
	)	ECF
SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND	)	
HUMAN SERVICES,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

## **I. Items of Compensation**

## II. Form of the Award

Petitioner is a competent adult. Evidence of guardianship is not required in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD A. READLER  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

C. SALVATORE D'ALESSIO  
Acting Director  
Torts Branch, Civil Division

CATHARINE E. REEVES  
Deputy Director  
Torts Branch, Civil Division

ALEXIS B. BABCOCK  
Assistant Director  
Torts Branch, Civil Division

s/ Ilene Albala  
ILENE ALBALA  
Trial Attorney  
Torts Branch, Civil Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 146  
Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, D.C. 20044-0146  
Direct dial: (202) 616-3655

Dated: April 12, 2018

---

<sup>1</sup> Should petitioner die prior to the entry of judgment, the parties reserve the right to move the Court for appropriate relief. In particular, respondent would oppose any award for future medical expenses, future lost earnings, and future pain and suffering.