

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

SARAH MCILROY, *Applicant*

vs.

**CHARTWELL STAFFING SERVICES, INC.;
OLD REPUBLIC INSURANCE COMPANY, administered by
GALLAGHER BASSETT, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ16767852
Pomona District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
GRANTING PETITION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

Applicant seeks reconsideration of the Order Dismissing Case for Failure to Appear (Order Dismissing) following a Notice of Intention to Dismiss (NOI) the case dated November 16, 2023, wherein the workers' compensation judge (WCJ) notified the parties that it would dismiss the case for applicant's failure to appear at the trial on November 16, 2023, if there was no objection within 10 days showing good cause. Applicant contends that she could not participate in her case initially as she was homeless but that she recently reached out to her attorney and was ready, willing, and able to participate now as she has found housing.

We have not received an Answer from defendant. The WCJ prepared a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Reconsideration (Report), recommending that the Petition be granted and the Order Dismissing be rescinded or, alternatively, that the Petition be dismissed and the case referred back to the trial level to consider whether the Order Dismissing be set aside.

We have considered the Petition for Reconsideration and the contents of the Report, and we have reviewed the record in this matter. Based on our preliminary review of the record, we will grant the Petition for Reconsideration. Our order granting the Petition for Reconsideration is not a final order, and we will order that a final decision after reconsideration is deferred pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the

entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law. Once a final decision after reconsideration is issued by the Appeals Board, any aggrieved person may timely seek a writ of review pursuant to Labor Code section 5950 et seq.

I.

We highlight the following facts that may be relevant to our review of the matter. Applicant claimed industrial injury to her chest, arms, shoulder, and multiple body parts when she tripped and fell while working as a laborer for defendant on January 31, 2022. The case proceeded to trial on November 16, 2023. Applicant did not appear at the trial but her attorney was present. (11/16/23 Minutes of Hearing (MOH), p. 1.) On that same date, the WCJ issued a NOI that the Order Dismissing Case for Failure to Appear, without prejudice, shall become final, absent timely objection showing good cause received within ten days from date of service of the NOI plus the additional calendar days allowed under the applicable mailing time as provided for in WCAB rule 10605. The NOI also stated that no additional order shall follow. The defendant served copies of the NOI on November 21, 2023. Applicant did not file an objection to the NOI. Applicant filed the Petition on February 21, 2024.

II.

We highlight the following legal principles that may be relevant to our review of the matter.

Each applicant and defendant shall appear or have an attorney or non-attorney representative appear at all hearings pertaining to the case in chief. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10752(a).) A WCJ may issue a notice of intention pursuant to rule 10832 for failure to comply with this rule. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10752(e).)

Labor Code section 5803 provides

The appeals board has continuing jurisdiction over all its orders, decisions, and awards made and entered under the provisions of this division, and the decisions and orders of the rehabilitation unit established under Section 139.5. At any time, upon notice and after an 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.)

III.

It is well established that decisions by the Appeals Board must be supported by substantial evidence. (Lab. Code, §§ 5903, 5952(d); *Lamb v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1974) 11 Cal.3d

274 [39 Cal.Comp.Cases 310]; *Garza v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1970) 3 Cal.3d 312 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 500]; *LeVesque v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1970) 1 Cal.3d 627 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 16].) “The term ‘substantial evidence’ means evidence which, if true, has probative force on the issues. It is more than a mere scintilla, and means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion...It must be reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value.” (*Braewood Convalescent Hospital v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Bolton)* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 159, 164 [48 Cal.Comp.Cases 566], emphasis removed and citations omitted.)

Decisions of the Appeals Board “must be based on admitted evidence in the record.” (*Hamilton v. Lockheed Corporation (Hamilton)* (2001) 66 Cal.Comp.Cases 473, 476 (Appeals Board en banc).) An adequate and complete record is necessary to understand the basis for the WCJ’s decision. (Lab. Code, § 5313; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10787.) “It is the responsibility of the parties and the WCJ to ensure that the record is complete when a case is submitted for decision on the record. At a minimum, the record must contain, in properly organized form, the issues submitted for decision, the admissions and stipulations of the parties, and admitted evidence.” (*Hamilton, supra*, 66 Cal.Comp.Cases at p. 475.) The WCJ’s decision must “set[] forth clearly and concisely the reasons for the decision made on each issue, and the evidence relied on,” so that “the parties, and the Board if reconsideration is sought, [can] ascertain the basis for the decision[.] . . . For the opinion on decision to be meaningful, the WCJ must refer with specificity to an adequate and completely developed record.” (*Id.* at p. 476 (citing *Evans v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 753, 755 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 350]).)

The Appeals Board has the discretionary authority to develop the record when the record does not contain substantial evidence or when appropriate to provide due process or fully adjudicate the issues. (Lab. Code §§ 5701, 5906; *Tyler v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 389, 394 [62 Cal.Comp.Cases 924] [“The principle of allowing full development of the evidentiary record to enable a complete adjudication of the issues is consistent with due process in connection with workers’ compensation claims.”]; see *McClune v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1117 [63 Cal.Comp.Cases 261]; *Rucker v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 151, 157-158 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 805]; *Gangwish v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 1284, 1295 [66 Cal.Comp.Cases 584].)

The Appeals Board also has a constitutional mandate to “ensure substantial justice in all cases.” (*Kuykendall v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 396, 403 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 264].) The Board may not leave matters undeveloped where it is clear that additional discovery is needed. (*Id.* at p. 404.)

Labor Code section 5310 states in relevant part that: “The appeals board may appoint one or more workers’ compensation administrative law judges in any proceeding, as it may deem necessary or advisable, and may refer, remove to itself, or transfer to a workers’ compensation administrative law judge the proceedings on any claim. . . .” (See also Lab. Code, §§ 123.7, 5309.)

Here, it is unclear from our preliminary review whether the existing record is sufficient to support the decision, order, and legal conclusions of the WCJ; and/or whether further development of the record may be necessary.

IV.

Finally, we observe that under our broad grant of authority, our jurisdiction over this matter is continuing.

A grant of reconsideration has the effect of causing “the whole subject matter [to be] reopened for further consideration and determination” (*Great Western Power Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Savercool)* (1923) 191 Cal. 724, 729 [10 I.A.C. 322]) and of “[throwing] the entire record open for review.” (*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Industrial Acc. Com. (George)* (1954) 125 Cal.App.2d 201, 203 [19 Cal.Comp.Cases 98].) Thus, once reconsideration has been granted, the Appeals Board has the full power to make new and different findings on issues presented for determination at the trial level, even with respect to issues not raised in the petition for reconsideration before it. (See Lab. Code, §§ 5907, 5908, 5908.5; see also *Gonzales v. Industrial Acci. Com.* (1958) 50 Cal.2d 360, 364) “[t]here is no provision in chapter 7, dealing with proceedings for reconsideration and judicial review, limiting the time within which the commission may make its decision on reconsideration, and in the absence of a statutory authority limitation none will be implied.”; see generally Lab. Code, § 5803 [“The WCAB has continuing jurisdiction over its orders, decisions, and awards. . . . At any time, upon notice and after an 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.”].)

“The WCAB . . . is a constitutional court; hence, its final decisions are given res judicata effect.” (*Azadigian v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 372, 374 [57

Cal.Comp.Cases 391; see *Dow Chemical Co. v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.* (1967) 67 Cal.2d 483, 491 [32 Cal.Comp.Cases 431]; *Solari v. Atlas-Universal Service, Inc.* (1963) 215 Cal.App.2d 587, 593.) 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. Interlocutory procedural or evidentiary decisions, entered in the midst of the workers' compensation proceedings, are not considered "final" orders. (*Maranian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1068, 1070, 1075 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 650]) ["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"].)

Labor Code section 5901 states in relevant part that:

No cause of action arising out of any final order, decision or award made and filed by the appeals board or a workers' compensation judge shall accrue in any court to any person until and unless the appeals board on its own motion sets aside the final order, decision, or award and removes the proceeding to itself or if the person files a petition for reconsideration, and the reconsideration is granted or denied. ...

Thus, this is not a final decision on the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration, and we will order that issuance of the final decision after reconsideration is deferred. Once a final decision is issued by the Appeals Board, any aggrieved person may timely seek a writ of review pursuant to Labor Code sections 5950 et seq.

Accordingly, we grant applicant's Petition for Reconsideration and order that a final decision after reconsideration is deferred pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that applicant's Petition for Reconsideration of the Order Dismissing Case for Failure to Appear is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, as the Decision After Reconsideration of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, the Order Dismissing Case for Failure to Appear is **DEFERRED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR

I CONCUR,

/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

April 22, 2024

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

**SARAH MCILROY
SOLIMON RODGERS, P.C.
EMPLOYER DEFENSE GROUP**

JMR/ara

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