

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 03-1753V

Filed: October 27, 2011

Not to be Published

\*\*\*\*\*

TIM HOKKANEN and NANCY \*
HOKKANEN, as parents and natural \*
guardians, on behalf of their minor son, \*
ANDREW HOKKANEN, \*

Petitioners, \*

v. \*

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND \*
HUMAN SERVICES, \*

Respondent. \*

\*\*\*\*\*

Autism; Petitioner’s Motion for a
Decision Dismissing the Insufficient
Petition; Proof of Causation; Vaccine
Act Entitlement; Denial Without Hearing

DECISION 1

On July 22, 2003, petitioners filed a Petition for Vaccine Compensation in the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (“the Program”),2 alleging that various vaccinations injured Andrew. The information in the record, however, does not show entitlement to an award under the Program.

On October 10, 2011, petitioners moved for a decision on the merits of the petition, acknowledging that insufficient evidence exists to demonstrate entitlement to compensation.

1 In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioners have 14 days to file a proper motion seeking redaction of medical or other information that satisfies the criteria in 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-12(d)(4)(B). Redactions ordered by the special master, if any, will appear in the document as posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website.

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.

To receive compensation under the Program, petitioners must prove either 1) that Andrew suffered a “Table Injury” – i.e., an injury falling within the Vaccine Injury Table – corresponding to one of Andrew’s vaccinations, or 2) that Andrew 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 Andrew suffered a “Table Injury.” Further, the record does not contain a medical expert’s opinion or any other persuasive evidence indicating that Andrew’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 Andrew suffered a “Table Injury” or that Andrew’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.**

s/Dee Lord  
Dee Lord  
Special Master