

Since the entitlement decisions of the vaccinee's siblings were not redacted, granting the relief requested at this time would not protect Petitioner's privacy, as she and all of her children have been named in the two published entitlement decisions. See Sabella v. Sec'y of Dep't of Health & Human Servs., No. 02-1627V, 2008 WL 4531828, *3 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Sept. 23, 2008)) (denying redaction where petitioner's name had been disclosed in a previous order adopting the parties' stipulation).

Further, the fees decision addresses not only the facts of this case, but the facts of two additional cases brought by Petitioner on behalf of her other children. Those cases were consolidated with this one, and present many common facts and issues. The fees decision in this case can best be understood with reference to the names of Petitioner and the vaccinees in the other cases.

I am sympathetic to Petitioner's request for privacy, and I certainly would have granted redaction of the entitlement decisions had I received timely requests. Regrettably, I cannot in this instance undo what has been done.¹ Since redaction of the fees decision would not protect Petitioner's privacy interest in any meaningful way, the motion to redact is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Dee Lord
Dee Lord
Chief Special Master

¹ In the electronic era, when third parties disseminate decisions almost immediately upon publication, it is impossible effectively to "un-publish" them.