

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

**BITA BAKHTJOU, *Applicant***

**vs.**

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH;  
STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ11296437  
Oakland District Office**

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

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Reconsideration and the contents of the report of the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) with respect thereto.<sup>1</sup> Based on our review of the record, and for the reasons stated in the WCJ's report, we will dismiss the petition to the extent it seeks reconsideration, treat the petition as one for removal, and deny it to the extent it seeks removal. As an initial matter, we consider the Petition to be timely filed as it was filed within 20 days from the February 21, 2023 trial setting order. (Lab. Code, § 5903; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10955.)

**I.**

First, the petition is successive and must be dismissed. It is well settled that where a party fails to prevail on a petition for reconsideration, the Appeals Board will not entertain a successive petition by that party unless the party is newly aggrieved. (*Goodrich v. Industrial Acc. Com.* (1943) 22 Cal.2d 604, 611 [8 Cal.Comp.Cases 177]; *Ramsey v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1971) 18 Cal.App.3d 155, 159 [36 Cal.Comp.Cases 382]; *Crowe Glass Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Graham)* (1927) 84 Cal.App. 287, 293-295 [14 I.A.C. 221].) As stated in our en banc

---

<sup>1</sup> Commissioner Sweeney, who was previously a panelist in this matter, no longer serves on the Appeals Board. Another panel member has been assigned in her place.

opinion in *Navarro v. A & A Framing* (2002) 67 Cal.Comp.Cases 296, 299 (Appeals Board en banc):

The general rule is that where a party has filed a petition for reconsideration with the Board, but the party does not prevail on that petition for reconsideration, the petitioning party cannot attack the [Appeal's] Board's action by filing a second petition for reconsideration; rather, the petitioning party must either be bound by the [Appeals] Board's action or challenge it by filing a timely petition for writ of review.

The only exception to this general rule occurs when, although the petitioning party does not prevail on its original petition for reconsideration, the Appeals Board's decision is based on some new and additional evidence not presented at the time of trial. In this limited circumstance only, the original petitioner may properly file a second petition for reconsideration because the Appeals Board's decision is based on a new record. (*Pacific Employers Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Mazzanti)* (1956) 139 Cal.App.2d 22, 25-26 [21 Cal.Comp.Cases 46].)

Here, the petition for reconsideration raises the same issues and arguments that were raised in an earlier petition for removal filed on October 3, 2022, in which petitioner did not prevail. We denied that petition for removal on November 30, 2022, and the First District Court of Appeal denied petitioner's petition for a writ of review on January 11, 2023. Furthermore, no new evidence was accepted or considered at the time of the Appeals Board's decision on the original petition. Accordingly, the current petition for reconsideration must be dismissed as successive.

## II.

Further, 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 decision solely resolves an intermediate procedural or evidentiary issue or issues. The decision does not determine any substantive right or liability and does not determine a threshold issue. Accordingly, it is not a “final” decision and the petition will be dismissed to the extent it seeks reconsideration.

Instead, we will treat the petition as one for removal and we will also deny the petition to the extent it seeks removal. 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, § 10955(a); 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, § 10955(a).) Here, for the reasons stated in the WCJ’s report, we are not persuaded that substantial prejudice or irreparable harm will result if removal is denied and/or that reconsideration will not be an adequate remedy if the matter ultimately proceeds to a final decision adverse to petitioner.

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/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER**

I CONCUR,

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

**/s/ ANNE SCHMITZ, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER**



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

**May 1, 2023**

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

**BITA BAKHTJOU  
STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND**

**JMR/pc**

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