## In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

(Filed: December 19, 2002)

RECEIVED
DEC 1 9 2002
OFFICE OF THE CLERK U.S. COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

IN RE: CLAIMS FOR VACCINE INJURIES RESULTING IN AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER OR A SIMILAR NEURODEVELOPMENTAL DISORDER

VARIOUS PETITIONERS,

٧.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

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

.

AUTISM MASTER FILE 7

## ORDER

I have required respondent to produce documents or other information in response to petitioners' Interrogatories and Requests for Production propounded in this Omnibus Autism Proceeding ("discovery material").

Status conferences were held on December 5, December 10, and December 17, 2002. As a result of the discussions during those conferences, respondent will file in the case of Taylor v. Secretary of HHS, No. 02-699V, any discovery material.

I note that respondent has consented to use of the discovery material described above by any person with a petition within this Court's jurisdiction alleging vaccine injuries resulting in autistic spectrum disorder or a similar neurodevelopmental disorder, for the purposes of any proceeding under the Vaccine Act.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>I note that, in respondent's view, whether the filing of a "short form" petition under the Omnibus Autism Proceeding constitutes a valid, pending petition is an open question. I do not address that question at this time.

Respondent has represented that upon issuance of this Order, respondent will withdraw his motion for a protective order recently filed in this Omnibus Autism Proceeding, because, in respondent's view, adequate statutory protection exists in a proceeding on a petition under the Vaccine Act.2

IT IS SO ORDERED.

3. 3. 3

George L. Hastings, Jr. Special Master

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>I note that petitioners maintain that discovery materials are not, and should not, be "protected" as respondent contends.