

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 05-433V

Filed: February 25, 2011

**JOHNNIELLE BARREN, Parent of
JONATHAN CHANDLER BARREN, a
Minor,**

Petitioner,

v.

**SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICES**

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED DECISION

Petitioner's Motion for a Decision
Dismissing her Petition; Insufficient Proof
of Causation; Vaccine Act Entitlement;
Denial Without a Hearing

DECISION¹

On April 01, 2005, petitioner filed a Short-Form Autism Petition for Vaccine Compensation in the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program ("the Program").² In effect, by use of the special "Short-Form" developed for use in the context of the Omnibus Autism Proceeding, the petition alleges that various vaccinations injured Jonathan. The information in the record, however, does not show entitlement to an award under the Program.

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I intend to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, § 205, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (codified as amended at 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2006)). In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to delete medical or other information, that satisfies the criteria in § 300aa-12(d)(4)(B). Further, consistent with the rule requirement, a motion for redaction must include a proposed redacted decision. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within the requirements of that provision, I will delete such material from public access.

² The Program comprises Part 2 of the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755, codified as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-10 *et seq.* (hereinafter "Vaccine Act" or "the Act"). Hereafter, individual section references will be to 42 U.S.C. § 300aa of the Act.

On February 24, 2011, petitioner filed a Motion for a Decision dismissing her Petition. Petitioner asserts in the Motion that under the current applicable law she will be unable to demonstrate entitlement to compensation in the Program. Petitioner's Motion at 1. Accordingly, petitioner requests that the undersigned dismiss the above-captioned petition. Id.

To receive compensation under the Program, petitioner must prove either 1) that Jonathan suffered a "Table Injury" – i.e., an injury falling within the Vaccine Injury Table – corresponding to one of Jonathan's vaccinations, or 2) that Jonathan suffered an injury that was actually caused by a vaccine. See §§ 300aa-13(a)(1)(A) and 300aa-11(c)(1). An examination of the record does not uncover any evidence that Jonathan suffered a "Table Injury." Further, the record does not contain a medical expert's opinion or any other persuasive evidence indicating that Jonathan's alleged injury was vaccine-caused.

Under the Act, petitioner may not be given a Program award based solely on the petitioner's claims alone. Rather, the petition must be supported by either medical records or by the opinion of a competent physician. § 300aa-13(a)(1). Because the offered medical records cannot alone support petitioner's claim, a medical opinion must also be offered in support. Petitioner, however, have offered no such opinion.

Accordingly, it is clear from the record in this case that petitioner has failed to demonstrate either that Jonathan suffered a "Table Injury" or that Jonathan's injuries were "actually caused" by a vaccination. **Thus, this case is dismissed for insufficient proof. The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.**³

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Patricia E. Campbell-Smith
Special Master

³ The undersigned notes that if petitioner elects to file a Petition for Fees and Costs pursuant to § 300aa-15(e), based on current case law petitioner will need to first establish proof of vaccination and the timely filing of their Petition for Vaccine Compensation, see § 300aa-16(a)(2) and 16(b), prior to any award for attorneys' fees and costs being granted. See Brice v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 358 F.3d 865, 869 (2004), citing Martin v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 62 F.3d 1403, 1406 (1995).