

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

CARL AARON, *Applicant*

vs.

**HESPERIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, permissibly self-insured member
of CSRM JPA WITH PRISM, administered by SEDGWICK, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ10948627; ADJ11046485; ADJ11046682
San Bernardino District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DISMISSING PETITION
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Defendant seeks reconsideration of an Award, issued by the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) on May 30, 2023 wherein the WCJ approved a stipulated settlement agreement. Defendant contends that the Award should be rescinded because it is based on commutation calculations that were incorrect and both parties relied on the erroneous calculations. We have not received an answer from applicant.

The WCJ issued a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Reconsideration (Report) recommending that the Petition be denied or, in the alternative, treated as a Petition to set-aside the Award.

We have considered the allegations in the Petition and the contents of the Report with respect thereto. Based on our review of the record and for the reasons discussed below, we will dismiss the Petition as premature, and return this matter to the trial level for consideration of the Petition as one to set aside the Award.

“The appeals board has continuing jurisdiction over all its orders, decisions, and awards made and entered under the provisions of [Division 4] . . . At any time, upon notice and after the opportunity to be heard is given to the parties in interest, the appeals board may rescind, alter, or amend any order, decision, or award, good cause appearing therefor.” (Lab. Code, § 5803.)¹

¹ All further statutory references are to the Labor Code, unless otherwise noted.

We observe that contract principles apply to settlements of workers' compensation disputes. The legal principles governing compromise and release agreements, and by extension, stipulations with request for award, are the same as those governing other contracts. (*Burbank Studios v. Workers' Co. Appeals Bd. (Yount)* (1982) 134 Cal.App.3d 929, 935 [47 Cal.Comp.Cases 832].) Stipulations between the parties must be interpreted to give effect to the mutual intention of the parties it existed at the time of contracting, so far as the same is ascertainable and lawful. (*County of San Joaquin v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd. (Sepulveda)* (2004) 117 Cal.App.4th 1180, 1184 [69 Cal.Comp.Cases 193]; Civ. Code, § 1636.)

“A stipulation is ‘An agreement between opposing counsel ... ordinarily entered into for the purpose of avoiding delay, trouble, or expense in the conduct of the action,’ (Ballentine, Law Dict. (1930) p. 1235, col. 2) and serves ‘to obviate need for proof or to narrow range of litigable issues’ (Black’s Law Dict. (6th ed. 1990) p. 1415, col. 1) in a legal proceeding.” (*County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Weatherall)* (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 1114, 1118 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 1].) Stipulations are binding on the parties unless, on a showing of good cause, the parties are given permission to withdraw from their agreements. (*Weatherall, supra*, at 1121.)

“Good cause” to set aside an order or stipulations depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. “Good cause” includes mutual mistake of fact, duress, fraud, undue influence, and procedural irregularities. (*Johnson v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 964, 975 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 362]; *Santa Maria Bonita School District v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Recinos)* (2002) 67 Cal.Comp.Cases 848, 850 (writ den.); *City of Beverly Hills v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Dowdle)* (1997) 62 Cal.Comp.Cases 1691, 1692 (writ den.); *Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1985) 168 Cal.App.3d 1160, 1170 [50 Cal.Comp.Cases 311].) To determine whether there is good cause to rescind awards and stipulations, the circumstances surrounding their execution and approval must be assessed. (See Labor Code § 5702; *Weatherall, supra*, 1118-1121; *Robinson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1987) 194 Cal.App.3d 784, 790-792 [52 Cal.Comp.Cases 419]; *Huston v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1979) 95 Cal.App.3d 856, 864-867 [44 Cal.Comp.Cases 798].)

We note that while the parties may stipulate to the facts in controversy, the WCJ is not bound by the parties' stipulations and may make further inquiry into the matter “to enable it to determine the matter in controversy.” (Lab. Code, § 5702; see also *Weatherall, supra*, at 1119; *Turner Gas Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Kinney)* (1975) 47 Cal.App.3d 286 [40

Cal.Comp.Cases 253].) Moreover, “[t]he Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board shall inquire into the adequacy of all Compromise and Release agreements and Stipulations with Request for Award, and may set the matter for hearing to take evidence when necessary to determine whether the agreement should be approved or disapproved, or issue findings and awards.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10700(b).) The WCJ has the discretionary authority to develop the record when the medical record is not substantial evidence or when appropriate to provide due process or fully adjudicate the issues. (Lab. Code, §§ 5701, 5906; *McClune v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1117, 1121-1122 [63 Cal.Comp.Cases 261]; *Tyler v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 389, 394 [62 Cal.Comp.Cases 924].)

All parties in workers’ compensation proceedings retain their fundamental right to due process and a fair hearing under both the California and United States Constitutions. (*Rucker v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 151, 157-158 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 805].) A fair hearing includes, but is not limited to, the opportunity to call and cross-examine witnesses; introduce and inspect exhibits; and to offer evidence in rebuttal. (See *Gangwish v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 1284, 1295 [66 Cal.Comp.Cases 584]; *Rucker, supra*, at 157-158 citing *Kaiser Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (Baskin)* (1952) 109 Cal.App.2d 54, 58 [17 Cal.Comp.Cases 21]; *Katzin v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 703, 710 [57 Cal.Comp.Cases 230].)

Accordingly, we dismiss the Petition as premature and return the matter to the WCJ for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. Upon return of this matter to the trial level, we recommend that the WCJ treat the Petition as a petition to set aside, including setting a hearing to allow the parties to provide evidence and create a record upon which a decision can be made by the WCJ. After the WCJ issues a decision, any aggrieved person may then timely seek reconsideration of that decision.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration of the May 19, 2023 Award is **DISMISSED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

AUGUST 18, 2023

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

**CARL AARON
LERNER, MOORE, SILVA, CUNNINGHAM & RUBEL
O'CONNOR TELEZINSKI**

JB/cs

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