In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 02-206V
Filed: August 22, 2011
Not to be Published

TIMOTHY BEGLEY and KATHLEEN BEGLEY, parents of Liam Begley, Petitioners, v. SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, Respondent.	Petitioners' Motion for a Decision Dismissing the Petition; Insufficient Proof of Causation; Vaccine Act Entitlement; Denial Without Hearing

DECISION[1]

On March 15, 2002, petitioners filed a Petition for Vaccine Compensation in the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program ("the Program"),[2] alleging that various vaccinations injured Liam. 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[1] Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I intend to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in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), petitioners have 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.

On August 19, 2011, petitioners moved for a decision on the merits of the petition, acknowledging that insufficient evidence exists to demonstrate entitlement to compensation.

To receive compensation under the Program, petitioners must prove either 1) that Liam suffered a "Table Injury" – i.e., an injury falling within the Vaccine Injury Table – corresponding to one of Liam's vaccinations, or 2) that Liam 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 did not uncover any evidence that Liam suffered a "Table Injury." Further, the record does not contain a medical expert's opinion or any other persuasive evidence indicating that Liam's alleged injury was vaccine-caused.

Under the Act, petitioners may not be given a Program award based solely on the petitioners' claims alone. Rather, the petition must be supported by either medical records or by the opinion of a competent physician. § 300aa-13(a)(1). In this case, because there are insufficient medical records supporting petitioners' claim, a medical opinion must be offered in support. Petitioners, however, have offered no such opinion.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

_____
Denise K. Vowell
Special Master