

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

SOCORRO HUERTA, *Applicant*

vs.

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION, legally
uninsured, administered by STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ10077068, ADJ15371676
Fresno District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING PETITION
FOR REMOVAL**

Defendant has filed a petition for removal from the order taking the matter off calendar issued on April 30, 2026, by the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ).

Defendant contends that the matter is ready to proceed to trial.

We have not received an Answer from applicant. The WCJ filed a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Removal (Report) recommending that we deny removal.

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Removal and the contents of the WCJ's Report. Based on our review of the record and based upon the WCJ's analysis of the merits of petitioner's arguments in the WCJ's Report, we will deny 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).)

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).) Furthermore, decisions of 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].) 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, § 10761.)

The Labor Code is quite clear that the WCJ and the Appeals Board have *discretion* when setting a matter for trial: "The hearing on the application may be adjourned from time to time and from place to place in the discretion of the appeals board or the workers' compensation judge holding the hearing." (Lab. Code, § 5700.)

Here, based upon the WCJ's analysis of the merits of petitioner's arguments, 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. Nor are we persuaded that the WCJ abused his discretion in ordering the matter off calendar for further discovery.

Accordingly, we deny removal.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that defendant's Petition for Removal from the order taking the matter off calendar issued on April 30, 2026, by the WCJ is **DENIED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ CRAIG L. SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

JULY 14, 2026

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

**SOCORRO HUERTA
LAW OFFICES OF GOLDBERG & IBARRA
MAXIMUM MEDICAL
STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND**

EDL/mt

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