

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

JACQUELYN RAMIREZ, *Applicant*

vs.

**ROSS STORES, INC.; ARCH INSURANCE COMPANY; SEDGWICK CLAIMS
MANAGEMENT SERVICES, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ10688600
Marina del Rey District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DISMISSING PETITION FOR
RECONSIDERATION
AND DENYING PETITION
FOR REMOVAL**

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Removal/Reconsideration 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 based upon the WCJ's analysis of the merits of the petitioner's arguments in the WCJ's report, we will dismiss the petition to the extent it seeks reconsideration, and deny it to the extent it seeks removal.

A petition for reconsideration may properly be taken only from a "final" order, decision, or award. (Lab. Code, §§ 5900(a), 5902, 5903.) A "final" order has been defined as one that either "determines any substantive right or liability of those involved in the case" (*Rymer v. Hagler* (1989) 211 Cal.App.3d 1171, 1180; *Safeway Stores, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Pointer)* (1980) 104 Cal.App.3d 528, 534-535 [45 Cal.Comp.Cases 410]; *Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Kramer)* (1978) 82 Cal.App.3d 39, 45 [43 Cal.Comp.Cases 661]) or determines a "threshold" issue that is fundamental to the claim for benefits. (*Maranian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1068, 1070, 1075 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 650].) Interlocutory procedural or evidentiary decisions, entered in the midst of the workers' compensation proceedings, are not considered "final" orders. (*Id.* at p. 1075 ["interim orders, which do not decide a threshold issue, such as intermediate procedural or evidentiary decisions,

are not ‘final’ ”]; *Rymer, supra*, at p. 1180 “[t]he term [‘final’] does not include intermediate procedural orders or discovery orders”]; *Kramer, supra*, at p. 45 “[t]he term [‘final’] does not include intermediate procedural orders”). Such interlocutory decisions include, but are not limited to, pre-trial orders regarding evidence, discovery, trial setting, venue, or similar issues.

Here, the WCJ’s June 30 2022 Minute Order setting this matter for trial is not a final order. Accordingly, the petition will be dismissed to the extent it seeks reconsideration.

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 substantial 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, based upon the WCJ’s analysis of the merits of the petitioner’s arguments, 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.

We admonish applicant’s attorney Dayna Berkowitz that it is improper to file a Petition for Reconsideration from a clearly non-final order. Counsel is expected to know the difference between a final and non-final order and seek only the appropriate remedy. Doing otherwise wastes the resources of the trial level, opposing parties, and the Appeals Board and may be found to be sanctionable under Labor Code section 5813. Future compliance with the WCAB’s rules is expected.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration is **DISMISSED** and the Petition for Removal is **DENIED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ MARGUERITE SWEENEY, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ PATRICIA A. GARCIA, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

September 6, 2022

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

**JACQUELYN RAMIREZ
BERKOWITZ COHEN
PRINDLE GOETZ**

PAG/pc

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