

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 12-807V

(E-Filed: October 22, 2013)

\* \* \* \* \*

FRANCIS RAPA,

\* UNPUBLISHED

\*

Petitioner,

\* Special Master

\* Hamilton-Fieldman

\*

v.

\* Influenza Vaccination;

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND

\* Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating

HUMAN SERVICES,

\* Polyneuropathy; Decision; Stipulation.

\*

Respondent.

\*

\* \* \* \* \*

Lawrence R. Cohan, Philadelphia, PA, for Petitioner.

Glenn MacLeod, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

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

On November 26, 2012, Petitioner, Francis Rapa, filed a petition seeking compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (“the Vaccine Program”). Petitioner alleged that he suffered chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy, as a result of receiving an influenza vaccination.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this decision contains a reasoned explanation for the undersigned’s action in this case, the undersigned intends 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)). As provided by Vaccine Rule 18(b), each party has 14 days within which to request redaction “of any information furnished by that party: (1) that is a trade secret or commercial or financial in substance and is privileged or confidential; or (2) that includes medical files or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy.” Vaccine Rule 18(b). Otherwise, “the entire” decision will be available to the public. *Id.*

<sup>2</sup> The National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program is set forth in Part 2 of the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755,

Respondent denies that Petitioner's influenza vaccination caused Petitioner's chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy, and/or any other injury. Nonetheless, both parties, while maintaining their above stated positions, agreed in a Stipulation, filed October 22, 2013, ("Stipulation") that the issues before them can be settled and that a decision should be entered awarding Petitioner compensation.

The undersigned finds said stipulation reasonable and adopts it as the decision of the Court in awarding damages, on the terms set forth therein.

The stipulation awards:

A lump sum of \$200,000.00 in the form of a check payable to Petitioner. This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under 42 U.S.C. §300aa-15(a) to which Petitioner would be entitled.

Stipulation ¶ 8.

The undersigned approves the requested amounts for Petitioner's compensation. In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment herewith.<sup>3</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Lisa Hamilton-Fieldman  
Lisa Hamilton-Fieldman  
Special Master

---

codified as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. § 300aa-10-§ 300aa-34 (West 1991 & Supp. 2002) (Vaccine Act or the Act). All citations in this decision to individual sections of the Vaccine Act are to 42 U.S.C.A. § 300aa.

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