

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 7-102V

Filed: August 15, 2011

Not to be Published

Jacob Moursi, a minor by his parents and
natural guardians, HOUSAM MOURSI and
DAWN MOURSI,

Petitioners,

v.

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Failure to Prosecute;
Failure to Follow Court
Orders; Dismissal

DECISION¹

On February 12, 2007, petitioners filed a Petition for Vaccine Compensation in the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program [“the Program”],² alleging that Jacob Moursi [“Jacob”] was injured by a vaccine or vaccines listed on the Vaccine Injury Table. See § 14.

On May 11, 2011, petitioners were ordered to inform the court whether petitioners intended to proceed with this case.³ Petitioners did not respond to that

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I intend to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in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, 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.

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 of the Act.

³ On April 29, 2011, petitioners were ordered to inform the court how they intend to proceed. The order was mailed to the address of record. However, this order was returned as

order. On July 5, 2011, petitioners were again ordered to inform the court whether petitioners intended to proceed with this case or otherwise show cause within thirty days, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Efforts have been made to reach petitioners at three different addresses. Petitioners have failed to respond to all of these orders.⁴

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.⁵

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,

undeliverable on May 9, 2011. The May 11, 2011 order was resent to the address of record and to: Housam Moursi at 18421 Lithia Ranch Rd., Lithia, FL 33547-1938 and Dawn Moursi at 1926 Dierker Drive, Valrico, FL 33596-5010.

⁴ The order was sent to petitioners’ address of record as well as to: Housam Moursi, 18421 Lithia Ranch Rd., Lithia, FL 33547-1938 and Dawn Moursi at 1926 Dierker Drive, Valrico, FL 33596-5010. The July 5, 2011 order sent to the address of record was returned as undeliverable.

⁵ 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).

aff'd, 88 Fed. Cl. 706 (2009).⁶ 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 exit the Program. The petitioners in this case has failed to inform the court how petitioners intend to proceed.

II. Failure to Prosecute

It is petitioners’ duty to respond to court orders. As I reminded petitioners in my July 5, 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 Jacob suffered a “Table Injury” – i.e., an injury falling within the Vaccine Injury Table – corresponding to one of Jacob’s vaccinations, or 2) that Jacob suffered an injury that was actually caused by a vaccine. See §§ 13(a)(1)(A) and 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.” § 13(a). Petitioners have failed to file sufficient medical records and evidence in this case. Thus, an examination of the record did not uncover any evidence that Jacob suffered a “Table Injury.” Further, the record does not contain a medical opinion or any other persuasive evidence indicating that Jacob’s autism spectrum disorder was vaccine-caused.

⁶ Petitioners in *Snyder* did not appeal the decision of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

Accordingly, it is clear from the record in this case that petitioners have failed to demonstrate either that Jacob suffered a “Table Injury” or that Jacob’s injuries were “actually caused” by a vaccination. **This case is dismissed for insufficient proof and for failure to prosecute.⁷ The clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.⁸**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Denise K. Vowell
Special Master

⁷ If petitioners elect to file a Petition for Fees and Costs pursuant to § 15(e), based on current case law petitioners will need to first establish proof of vaccination and the timely filing of their Petition for Vaccine Compensation, see §§ 16(a)(2) and 16(b), prior to any award for attorneys’ fees and costs being granted. See *Brice v. Sec’y, HHS*, 358 F.3d 865, 869 (2004) citing *Martin v. Sec’y, HHS*, 62 F.3d 1403, 1406 (1995).

⁸ This document constitutes my final “Decision” in this case, pursuant to § 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. § 21(a).