# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

### **OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**

No. 09-768 V Filed: June 28, 2011 Not for Publication

<u>Diana L. Stadelnikas</u>, Sarasota, FL, for petitioner. <u>Chrysovalantis P. Kefalas</u>, Washington, DC, for respondent.

## MILLMAN, Special Master

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

On June 28, 2011, the parties filed the attached stipulation in which they agreed to settle this case and described the settlement terms. Petitioner alleged that she suffered from Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS) following an influenza vaccination. Respondent denies that petitioner's GBS was caused in fact by her influenza vaccination. Nonetheless, the parties agreed to resolve this matter informally.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the special master's action in this case, the special master intends to post this unpublished decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (Dec. 17, 2002). Vaccine Rule 18(b) states that all decisions of the special masters will be made available to the public unless they contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged and confidential, or medical or similar information whose disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. When such a decision is filed, petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact such information prior to the document's disclosure. If the special master, upon review, agrees that the identified material fits within the banned categories listed above, the special master shall redact such material from public access.

The court hereby adopts the parties' said stipulation, attached hereto, and awards compensation in the amount of and on the terms set forth therein. Pursuant to the stipulation, the court awards a lump sum of \$100,000.00 in the form of a check made payable to petitioner.

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>2</sup>

### IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 28, 2011 /s/ Laura D. Millman
Laura D. Millman
Special Master

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by each party's filing a notice renouncing the right to seek review.