

I. The Omnibus Autism Proceeding

This case is one of more than 5,400 cases filed under the Program in which petitioners alleged that conditions known as “autism” or “autism spectrum disorders” [“ASD”] were caused by one or more vaccinations. A detailed history of the controversy regarding vaccines and autism, along with a history of the development of the OAP, was set forth in the six entitlement decisions issued by three special masters as “test cases” for two theories of causation litigated in the OAP and will not be repeated here.³

Ultimately, the Petitioners’ Steering Committee [“PSC”], an organization formed by attorneys representing petitioners in the OAP, litigated six test cases presenting two different theories on the causation of ASDs. The first theory alleged that the measles portion of the measles, mumps, rubella vaccine could cause ASDs. That theory was presented in three separate Program test cases during several weeks of trial in 2007. The second theory alleged that the mercury contained in thimerosal-containing vaccines could directly affect an infant’s brain, thereby substantially contributing to the causation of ASD. That theory was presented in three additional test cases during several weeks of trial in 2008.

Decisions in each of the three test cases pertaining to the PSC’s first theory rejected the petitioners’ causation theories. *Cedillo*, 2009 WL 331968, *aff’d*, 89 Fed. Cl. 158 (2009), *aff’d*, 617 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2010); *Hazlehurst*, 2009 WL 332306, *aff’d*, 88 Fed. Cl. 473 (2009), *aff’d*, 604 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010); *Snyder*, 2009 WL 332044, *aff’d*, 88 Fed. Cl. 706 (2009).⁴ Decisions in each of the three “test cases” pertaining to the PSC’s second theory also rejected the petitioners’ causation theories, and petitioners in each of the three cases chose not to appeal. *Dwyer*, 2010 WL 892250; *King*, 2010 WL 892296; *Mead*, 2010 WL 892248.

Thus, the proceedings in these six test cases are concluded. Petitioners remaining in the OAP must now decide whether to pursue their cases and submit new evidence on causation, or take other action to exit the Program.

I. Failure to Prosecute

It is petitioner’s duty to respond to court orders. As I reminded petitioner in my June 6, 2012 order, failure to follow court orders, as well as failure to file medical records or an expert medical opinion, shall result in dismissal of petitioner’s claim.

³ The Theory 1 cases are *Cedillo v. Sec’y, HHS*, No. 98-916V, 2009 WL 331968 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Feb. 12, 2009); *Hazlehurst v. Sec’y, HHS*, No. 03-654V, 2009 WL 332306 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Feb. 12, 2009); *Snyder v. Sec’y, HHS*, No. 01-162V, 2009 WL 332044 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Feb. 12, 2009). The Theory 2 cases are *Dwyer v. Sec’y, HHS*, No. 03-1202V, 2010 WL 892250 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Mar. 12, 2010); *King v. Sec’y, HHS*, No. 03-584V, 2010 WL 892296 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Mar. 12, 2010); *Mead v. Sec’y, HHS*, No. 03-215V, 2010 WL 892248 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Mar. 12, 2010).

⁴ Petitioners in *Snyder* did not appeal the decision of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

Tsekouras v. Sec’y, HHS, 26 Cl. Ct. 439 (1992), *aff’d per curiam*, 991 F.2d 810 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Sapharas v. Sec’y, HHS*, 35 Fed. Cl. 503 (1996); Vaccine Rule 21(b).

II. Causation In Fact

To receive compensation under the Program, petitioner must prove either 1) that Joshua suffered a “Table Injury” – i.e., an injury falling within the Vaccine Injury Table – corresponding to one of Joshua’s vaccinations, or 2) that Joshua suffered an injury that was actually caused by a vaccine. See §§13(a)(1)(A) and 11(c)(1). Under the Vaccine Act, a special master cannot find that petitioner has proven her case by a preponderance of the evidence based upon “the claims of petitioner alone, unsubstantiated by medical records or by medical opinion.” § 13(a).

Petitioner has failed to file sufficient medical records and evidence in this case. Thus, an examination of the record did not uncover any evidence that Joshua suffered a “Table Injury.” Further, the record does not contain a medical opinion or any other persuasive evidence indicating that Joshua’s autism spectrum disorder was vaccine-caused.

Accordingly, it is clear from the record in this case that petitioner has failed to demonstrate either that Joshua suffered a “Table Injury” or that Joshua’s injuries were “actually caused” by a vaccination. **This case is dismissed for insufficient proof and for failure to prosecute. The clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Denise K. Vowell
Special Master