

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**

No. 04-1024V  
Filed: July 5, 2011

\*\*\*\*\*

JACQUELINE GILBERT and  
STEVENT GILBERT, parents of  
Taylor Gilbert, a minor,

Petitioners,

v.

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT  
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

Failure to Prosecute;  
Failure to Follow Court  
Orders; Dismissal

\*\*\*\*\*

**DECISION<sup>1</sup>**

On June 17, 2004, petitioners filed a Short-Form Autism Petition for Vaccine Compensation in the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program [“the Program”],<sup>2</sup> on behalf of Taylor Gilbert [“Taylor”]. In effect, the special “Short-Form” developed for use in the context of the Omnibus Autism Proceeding alleges that various vaccinations injured Taylor.

On July 17, 2008, I granted petitioners’ attorney’s motion to withdraw from this case because despite his good faith efforts, he was unable to continue representing petitioners. On May 15, 2009, I ordered petitioners to file medical records to support their claim. Petitioners failed to respond to the order, and on October 30, 2009, I granted an additional 30 days to file medical records. Petitioners again failed to

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I intend to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in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, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will delete such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2006).

respond. On both May 3, 2011 and May 16, 2011, I ordered petitioners again to file medical records or otherwise show cause why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute.<sup>3</sup> Petitioners failed to respond to those orders as well.

## 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.<sup>4</sup>

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).<sup>5</sup> 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

---

<sup>3</sup> The May 3, 2011 order was returned to the court as undeliverable on May 12, 2011. On May 16, 2011, the court resent the show cause order to both the address of record and to 38462 Duplessis Rd, Prairieville, LA 70769-4227. The order sent to the address of record was again returned as undeliverable. The clerk of court is instructed to send this decision to both addresses.

<sup>4</sup> 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).

<sup>5</sup> Petitioners in *Snyder* did not appeal the decision of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

exit the Program. The petitioners in this case have failed to inform the court how they intend to proceed.

## II. Failure to Prosecute

It is petitioners' duty to respond to court orders. As I reminded petitioners in my May 16, 2011 order, failure to follow court orders, as well as failure to file medical records or an expert medical opinion, shall result in dismissal of petitioners' claim. *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).

## III. Causation In Fact

To receive compensation under the Program, petitioners must prove either 1) that Taylor suffered a "Table Injury" – i.e., an injury falling within the Vaccine Injury Table – corresponding to one of his vaccinations, or 2) that Taylor suffered an injury that was actually caused by a vaccine. See §§ 300aa-13(a)(1)(A) and 300aa-11(c)(1). Under the Vaccine Act, a special master cannot find a petitioner has proven her case by a preponderance of the evidence based upon "the claims of a petitioner alone, unsubstantiated by medical records or by medical opinion." § 300aa-13(a). Petitioners have failed to file medical records and evidence in this case. Thus, the court is unable uncover any evidence that Taylor suffered a "Table Injury." Further, the record does not contain a medical opinion or any other persuasive evidence indicating that Taylor's autism spectrum disorder was vaccine-caused.

Accordingly, it is clear from the record in this case that petitioners have failed to demonstrate either that Taylor suffered a "Table Injury" or that his 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.**<sup>6</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

---

Denise K. Vowell  
Special Master

---

<sup>6</sup> This document constitutes my final "Decision" in this case, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-12(d)(3)(A). If petitioners wish to have this case reviewed by a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, a motion for review of this decision must be filed within 30 days. After 30 days the Clerk of this Court shall enter judgment in accord with this decision. If petitioners wish to preserve whatever right petitioners may have to file a civil suit (that is a law suit in another court) petitioners must file an "election to reject judgment in this case and file a civil action" within 90 days of the filing of the judgment. 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-21(a).