

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**TAMARA PELLOW, *Applicant***

**vs.**

**VICTOR TREATMENT CENTERS, permissibly self-insured,  
administered by ATHENS ADMINISTRATORS, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ11764259  
Redding District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER  
DENYING PETITION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

We have considered the allegations of applicant's Petition for Reconsideration, defendant's answer and the contents of the report of the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) with respect thereto. Based on our review of the record and for the reasons discussed below, we will deny the Petition.

If a decision includes resolution of a "threshold" issue, then it is a "final" decision, whether or not all issues are resolved or there is an ultimate decision on the right to benefits. (*Aldi v. Carr, McClellan, Ingersoll, Thompson & Horn* (2006) 71 Cal.Comp.Cases 783, 784, fn. 2 (Appeals Board en banc).) Threshold issues include, but are not limited to, the following: injury arising out of and in the course of employment (AOE/COE), jurisdiction, the existence of an employment relationship and statute of limitations issues. (See *Capital Builders Hardware, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Gaona)* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 658, 662 [81 Cal.Comp.Cases 1122].) Failure to timely petition for reconsideration of a final decision bars later challenge to the propriety of the decision before the WCAB or court of appeal. (See Lab. Code, § 5904.) Alternatively, non-final decisions may later be challenged by a petition for reconsideration once a final decision issues.

A decision issued by the Appeals Board may address a hybrid of both threshold and interlocutory issues. If a party challenges a hybrid decision, the petition seeking relief is treated as a petition for reconsideration because the decision resolves a threshold issue. However, if the petitioner challenging a hybrid decision only disputes the WCJ's determination regarding

interlocutory issues, then the Appeals Board will evaluate the issues raised by the petition under the removal standard applicable to non-final decisions.

Here, the WCJ's decision includes a finding of injury AOE/COE to the left knee. Injury AOE/COE is a threshold issue fundamental to the claim for benefits. Accordingly, the WCJ's decision is a final order subject to reconsideration rather than removal.

Although the decision contains a finding that is final, applicant is only challenging the WCJ's decision regarding the admissibility of certain exhibits and witness testimony. This is an interlocutory decision regarding evidence. Therefore, we will apply the removal standard to our review. (See *Gaona, supra.*)

Removal is an extraordinary remedy rarely exercised by the Appeals Board. (*Cortez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2006) 136 Cal.App.4th 596, 599, fn. 5 [71 Cal.Comp.Cases 155]; *Kleemann v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2005) 127 Cal.App.4th 274, 280, fn. 2 [70 Cal.Comp.Cases 133].) The Appeals Board will grant removal only if the petitioner shows that significant prejudice or irreparable harm will result if removal is not granted. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, former § 10843(a), now § 10955(a) (eff. Jan. 1, 2020); see also *Cortez, supra*; *Kleemann, supra.*) Also, the petitioner must demonstrate that reconsideration will not be an adequate remedy if a final decision adverse to the petitioner ultimately issues. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, former § 10843(a), now § 10955(a) (eff. Jan. 1, 2020).) Here, we are not persuaded that significant prejudice or irreparable harm will result if removal is denied and/or that reconsideration will not be an adequate remedy.

Therefore, we will deny the Petition.

For the foregoing reasons,

**IT IS ORDERED** that applicant's Petition for Reconsideration of the Findings and Order, Opinion on Decision issued by the WCJ on April 7, 2021 is **DENIED**.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD**

**/s/ MARGUERITE SWEENEY, COMMISSIONER**

I CONCUR,

**/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER**

**/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR**



**DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

**June 18, 2021**

**SERVICE MADE ON THE ABOVE DATE ON THE PERSONS LISTED BELOW AT THEIR ADDRESSES SHOWN ON THE CURRENT OFFICIAL ADDRESS RECORD.**

**RILEY LAW  
SIEGEL MORENO  
TAMARA PELLOW**

***AI/pc***

I certify that I affixed the official seal of the  
Workers' Compensation Appeals Board to this  
original decision on this date. *o.o*