

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

JAE KOO CHANG; KEETEE HWANG, *Applicants*

vs.

**HOME PAINTING; SAM WON CONSTRUCTION;
STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ8112676, ADJ15375974
Los Angeles District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING PETITION APPEALING THE
ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR OF
THE DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION'S
MEDICAL PROVIDER NETWORK
DETERMINATION DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2025**

Lien claimant Ace Life Inc. dba Ace Translation Services filed a “global” petition for reconsideration in ADJ8112676 (*Chang v. Home Painting and State Compensation Insurance Fund*), addressing issues that purportedly affect the following matters:

Applicant Name	ADJ Number	Venue	Filing Type
Chang, Jae Koo	ADJ8112676	LAO	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination
Cho, Nam II	ADJ6610574	LAO	Needs to submit lien claimant name correction for filing. Interim Judge order on 2017 as lien allowed. See details as attached
Hong, Seong Min	ADJ10369244	LAO	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination
Hwang, Keetee	ADJ15375974	Oxnard (possible	Petition to Reopen (lost lien trial 10/23/2024)

		transfer to LAO)	
Lee, Kyung Geun	ADJ10101427	LAO	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination
Lee, Jae	ADJ4181659	AHM	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination
Lee, Soo Jong	ADJ8053378	LAO	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination
Shin, Seong	ADJ9815235	VNO	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination
Sun, Paul	ADJ9121045	LAO	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination
Sung, Myoung	ADJ7073484	LAO	Petition for Reconsideration of DWC MPN Determination

These matters have not been consolidated and, except for ADJ8112676 (*Chang*), the global petition has not been filed in any of the listed cases above. Lien claimant further filed a “supplemental” petition for reconsideration in ADJ15375974 (*Hwang v. Sam Won Construction and State Compensation Insurance Fund*). This supplemental petition supplements the global petition for reconsideration filed in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*). The supplemental petition for reconsideration is not filed in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*).

In its global petition, lien claimant seeks an appeal from the Division of Workers’ Compensation (DWC) Medical Provider Network (MPN) Unit’s September 16, 2025 Determination Letter (ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Exhibit E), which declared State Compensation Insurance Fund’s (SCIF’s) MPN for ancillary services in compliance with Labor Code,¹ sections 4600(g), 4616(a)(4)(A)(i) and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, sections 9767.3 and 9795.3.

Lien claimant contends that SCIF’s MPN ancillary rosters omit interpreter certification/license numbers, which violate statutory and regulatory mandates and that the 2025 Determination Letter failed to address service periods from 2011 to now. Lien claimant further

¹ All statutory references are to the Labor Code unless otherwise indicated.

contends that, independent of SCIF's defective MPN, interpreter services performed between April 2011 to January 2022 remain compensable under SCIF's fee schedule, as acknowledged by SCIF's April 6, 2011 Market Rate Acknowledgment Letter and November 19, 2021 Termination Letter (ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Exhibit L).

In its supplemental petition, lien claimant contends that ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*) is an illustrative example of the systemic defects with SCIF's ancillary MPN. In *Hwang*, the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) first issued Findings finding that lien claimant was entitled to payment for interpretation services and then vacated those Findings and issued second Findings reversing the previous decision and finding that SCIF had a valid MPN and lien claimant was not entitled to payment. (ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*) Findings of Fact dated August 20, 2024, Findings of Fact dated January 15, 2025.)

We received an answer from SCIF in both ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) and ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*). SCIF contends that lien claimant does not have the right to appeal the 2025 Determination Letter because the Administrative Director has not suspended or revoked SCIF's MPN. SCIF further contends that the supplemental petition should be dismissed as untimely, unverified, and for failure to obtain leave of court to file it.

We also received two reply briefs from lien claimant in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*). The WCJ in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) prepared a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Reconsideration (Report) and transmitted the matter to the Appeals Board on the ground that section 4616(b)(4) provides that the Administrative Director's determination of whether an MPN is valid may be reviewed by the Appeals Board as an original proceeding. The WCJ in ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*) prepared a report recommending that the supplemental petition be dismissed as untimely.

Section 4616(b)(4) provides that, "[a] determination of the administrative director may be reviewed only by an appeal of the determination of the administrative director filed as an original proceeding before the reconsideration unit of the workers' compensation appeals board on the same grounds and within the same time limits after issuance of the determination as would be applicable to a petition for reconsideration of a decision of a workers' compensation administrative law judge." (§ 4616(b)(4).) WCAB Rule 10560 provides that, "[w]here the Labor Code provides that the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board has jurisdiction over appeals from or enforcement of an order, any aggrieved party may appeal or seek to enforce an order issued by the Division of Workers' Compensation Administrative Director or the Director of Industrial Relations by filing

a petition, and an Application for Adjudication of Claim if one has not already been filed.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10560(a).)

Lien claimant’s global and supplemental petitions concern the same issues—the validity of SCIF’s MPN ancillary roster and payments for lien claimant’s services. Based on section 4616(b)(4) and Rule 10560, we deem lien claimant’s global petition for reconsideration as an appeal of the Administrative Director’s MPN Determination dated September 16, 2025. WCAB Rule 10964 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10964) states that supplemental petitions, pleadings, or responses shall be considered only when specifically requested or approved by the Appeals Board. Although lien claimant has not requested permission to file a supplemental petition or reply briefs, we nevertheless accept and review lien claimant’s supplemental and reply briefs.

We have considered both the global and supplemental petitions, the answer in both matters, the replies, the contents of both Reports, and we have reviewed the record in both matters. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the global and supplemental petitions.

I. SECTION 5909 AND TIMELINESS OF THIS OPINION AND DECISION

Section 4616(b)(4) provides that the Administrative Director’s MPN determination may be appealed on the same grounds and within the same time limits applicable to a petition for reconsideration. Former section 5909 provided that a petition for reconsideration was deemed denied unless the Appeals Board acted on the petition within 60 days from the date of filing. (§ 5909.) Effective July 2, 2024, section 5909 was amended to state in relevant part that:

- (a) A petition for reconsideration is deemed to have been denied by the appeals board unless it is acted upon within 60 days from the date a trial judge transmits a case to the appeals board.
- (b)
 - (1) When a trial judge transmits a case to the appeals board, the trial judge shall provide notice to the parties of the case and the appeals board.
 - (2) For purposes of paragraph (1), service of the accompanying report, pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 5900, shall constitute providing notice.

Under section 5909(a), the Appeals Board must act on a petition for reconsideration within 60 days of transmission of the case to the Appeals Board. Transmission is reflected in Events in the Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS). Specifically, in Case Events, under

Event Description is the phrase “Sent to Recon” and under Additional Information is the phrase “The case is sent to the Recon board.”

Here, according to Events, the global petition in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) was transmitted to the Appeals Board on October 28, 2025 and 60 days from the date of transmission is Saturday, December 27, 2025. The next business day that is 60 days from the date of transmission is Monday, December 29, 2025. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600(b).)² The supplemental petition in ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*) was transmitted to the Appeals Board on October 17, 2025, and 60 days from the date of transmission is December 16, 2025. This decision is issued by or on December 16, 2025, so that we have timely acted on both the global and supplemental petitions as required by section 5909(a).

Section 5909(b)(1) requires that the parties and the Appeals Board be provided with notice of transmission of the case. Transmission of the case to the Appeals Board in EAMS provides notice to the Appeals Board. Thus, the requirement in subdivision (1) ensures that the parties are notified of the accurate date for the commencement of the 60-day period for the Appeals Board to act on a petition. Section 5909(b)(2) provides that service of the Report and Recommendation shall be notice of transmission.

Here, according to the proof of service for the Report and Recommendation by the workers’ compensation administrative law judge, the Report in the global petition, ADJ8112676 (*Chang*), was served on October 28, 2025, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on October 28, 2025. The Report in the supplemental petition, ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*), was served on October 17, 2025, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on October 17, 2025. The date for the service of the Report and transmission of the case to the Appeals Board occurred on the same day in both matters. Thus, we conclude that the parties were provided with the notice of transmission required by section 5909(b)(1) because service of the Report in compliance with section 5909(b)(2) provided them with actual notice as to the commencement of the 60-day period on October 17, 2025 in the supplemental petition in ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*) and on October 28, 2025 in the global petition in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*).

² WCAB Rule 10600(b) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600(b)) states that:

Unless otherwise provided by law, if the last day for exercising or performing any right or duty to act or respond falls on a weekend, or on a holiday for which the offices of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board are closed, the act or response may be performed or exercised upon the next business day.

II. FACTS

As the WCJ in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) stated in her Report:

On September 3, 2025, Lien Claimant, Ace Translation Services, (“Ace Translation”) filed a DWC Medical Provider Network Complaint Form 9767.16.6 with the Division of Workers’ Compensation – MPN Complaints Unit. *See correspondence – other pdf dated 9.29.2025 pages 23-26, EAMS Doc Id: 60277484*. The Division of Workers’ Compensation Medical Unit issued a DWC MPN Determination Letter dated September 16, 2025 determining there was no violation of *Labor Code* section 4616(a)(4)(A)(i) raised by Ace Translation. *See exhibit E etc.pdf pgs. 3-5 dated October 8, 2025, EAMS Doc Id.: 60450127*.

Ace Translation timely filed and verified a petition for reconsideration on September 29, 2025 appealing DWC MPN Unit’s determination finding [] SCIF’s ancillary MPN compliant and [finding that] there was no violation of *Labor Code* section 4616(a)(4)(A)(i). Ace Translation contends DWC’s determination was incomplete because it did not address service periods from 2012 through 2023. *petition for reconsideration dated 9.29.2025 p. 3 EAMS Doc Id. 60277483*. The petition for reconsideration contains a list of other cases related to this petition for reconsideration but these cases are not consolidated and a petition for reconsideration is not filed in those cases. *See Appendix A p. 6 in the petition for reconsideration*. (Report, pp. 1-2; italics in original.)

III. DISCUSSION

Lien claimant filed a global petition in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) without consolidating the other cases the global petition purportedly affects. Lien claimant also filed a supplemental petition in ADJ15375974 (*Hwang*) but not in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*). There has not been any evidence admitted or any findings made. As such, we now take judicial notice of Exhibits A to M filed on September 29, 2025, October 3, 2025, and October 8, 2025 in ADJ8112676 (*Chang*). (Evid. Code, §§ 451, 452.)

Lien claimant contends that (1) SCIF’s MPN ancillary rosters are not valid; and (2) even if SCIF’s MPN ancillary rosters are valid, lien claimant is entitled to payment for services from 2011 to 2022 under SCIF’s fee schedule. (Legal Authority Supporting Petition for Reconsideration filed on September 29, 2025, p. 12 of 65.)

A. Validity of SCIF’s MPN Rosters

Section 4616(a)(4)(A)(i) provides:

(4)(A)(i) Commencing July 1, 2021, every medical provider network shall post on its internet website a roster of all participating providers, which includes all

physicians and ancillary service providers in the medical provider network, and shall update the roster at least quarterly. Every network shall provide to the administrative director the internet website address of the network and of its roster of participating providers. The roster of participating providers shall include, at a minimum, the name of each individual provider and their office address and office telephone number. If the ancillary service is provided by an entity rather than an individual, then that entity's name, address, and telephone number shall be listed. (§ 4616(a)(4)(A)(i).)

AD Rule 9767.3(c)(3) provides:

(3) If an MPN chooses to provide ancillary services, the ancillary service provider file shall have only the following six columns. The columns shall be in the following order: (1) the name of each ancillary service provider (2) specialty or type of service (3) physical address (4) city (5) state (6) zip code of each ancillary service provider. If the ancillary service or ancillary service provider is mobile, list the covered service area within California. By submission of an ancillary provider listing, the applicant is affirming that the providers listed can provide the requested medical services or goods and have a current valid license number or certification to practice, if they are required to have a license or certification by the State of California. If interpreter services are included as an MPN ancillary service, the interpreters listed must be certified pursuant to section 9795.1.6(a)(2)(A) and (B). (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 9767.3(c)(3).)

Lien claimant claims that SCIF's MPN roster violates section 4616(a)(4)(A)(i) and AD Rule 9767.3(c)(3) because SCIF's public provider finder lists entities such as One Call, Language Line, Stratus, and not individual interpreter names, certification numbers, and certification agencies—qualifications needed to verify compliance with AD Rule 9795.1.6, which addresses the qualifications of interpreters for medical treatment or medical legal exams. (ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Lien claimant's reply dated December 1, 2025, p. 3.) Lien claimant further contends that SCIF's MPN did not meet the six-column requirement of AD Rule 9767.3(c)(3) and that the Administrative Director erred in determining that SCIF met this rule when SCIF provided this information in an internal Excel spreadsheet submitted to the Division of Workers' Compensation. (*Id.* at p. 2; see ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Exhibit E, MPN Determination Letter dated September 16, 2025, filed September 29, 2025 and October 8, 2025.) Lien claimant argues that the functional purpose of MPN directories is to allow injured workers, physicians, and the public to verify provider qualifications and that an internal Excel spreadsheet does not satisfy this legal obligation. (ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Lien claimant's reply dated December 1, 2025, p. 2.)

We note that the 2025 Determination Letter concludes that “DWC’s independent review of the MPN Provider Directory search results and Roster of Participating Providers confirmed compliance with the Labor Code. The MPN listed interpreters with their individual or entity name, physical address, and telephone number.” (ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Exhibit E, MPN Determination Letter dated September 16, 2025, filed September 29, 2025 and October 8, 2025.) However, even if this was not true, and the MPN roster only provided, as lien claimant alleges, interpreting entities as opposed to individual interpreters, we note that section 4616(a)(4)(A)(i) states that if “the ancillary service is provided by an entity rather than an individual, then that entity’s name, address, and telephone number shall be listed.” Hence, we see no violation of the statute.

Furthermore, we agree that the six-column requirement provided in AD Rule 9767.3(c)(3) applies to the application for the approval of an MPN and is not a requirement for what information must be published on the internet. (ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Exhibit E, MPN Determination Letter dated September 16, 2025, filed September 29, 2025 and October 8, 2025.) Section 4616(a)(4)(A)(i) delineates what must be published on the MPN’s internet website. AD Rule 9767.3(c)(3) is in the context of an application for MPN approval.

Lastly, while section 5811 and AD Rule 9795.1.6 set forth the requirements for a certified interpreter, we have found no legal authority requiring information regarding an interpreter’s certification be made public. AD Rule 9767.3(c)(3) requires a service provider to affirm that the providers in its MPN are properly certified; it does not require information regarding certification be public.

As such, we agree that SCIF’s MPN with respect to interpretation services is valid.

B. Payment from 2011 to 2022

With respect to lien claimant’s contention that, irrespective of the validity of SCIF’s MPN, lien claimant should be paid for interpretation services from 2011 to 2022 under SCIF’s fee schedule, this issue should be adjudicated at the trial level in the first instance in each of the matters involved in this global petition.

While we conclude that SCIF’s MPN with respect to interpretation services is valid, we note that section 4616(a)(4)(A)(i) is applicable starting July 1, 2021, and that there was no requirement before then to publish an MPN roster on the internet. (§ 4616(a)(4)(A)(i).) We also note that lien claimant received a letter dated October 1, 2015 reminding it that effective November 1, 2015, SCIF required that all interpretation services be provided by Cypress Care or One Call

and invited lien claimant to verify that it is a provider under these entities and if it is not, to become a provider under these entities. (ADJ8112676 (*Chang*) Exhibit F, Advisory Reminder Notice to Ancillary Providers letter dated October 1, 2015, filed September 29, 2025 and October 3, 2025.) We further note that section 4603.6 and AD Rules 9792.5.4 et seq. are applicable procedures in challenging payment disputes. It is not until there is a determination of the independent bill reviewer that lien claimant can then file an appeal with Appeals Board. (§ 4603.6(f).)

Accordingly, we deny the global and supplemental petitions appealing the Administrative Director's MPN determination dated September 16, 2025. We defer the issue of payments to lien claimant from 2011 to 2022.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that Ace Life Inc. dba Ace Translation Services' global and supplemental petitions appealing the administrative director's Medical Provider Network Determination Letter dated September 16, 2025 for interpretation services is **DENIED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ CRAIG L. SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DECEMBER 16, 2025

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

JAE KOO CHANG

KEETEE HWANG

ACE LIFE INC. DBA ACE TRANSLATION SERVICES

JANET M. HILL – STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND

JOHN D. IRELAND – STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND

LSM/ara

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