

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

KIMBERLY WALTERS, *Applicant*

vs.

**MAGID ANWAR DVM, INC., a California Corporation doing business as VICTORIA
ANIMAL HOSPITAL; PREFERRED EMPLOYERS INSURANCE COMPANY,
*Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ13690308
Van Nuys District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING PETITION
FOR REMOVAL**

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Removal and the contents of the report of the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) with respect thereto. 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, former § 10843(a), now § 10955(a) (eff. Jan. 1, 2020); 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, former § 10843(a), now § 10955(a) (eff. Jan. 1, 2020).) 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.

Moreover, we note that the 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].) When presented with a compromise and release agreement, the WCJ “shall inquire into the adequacy of all compromise and release agreements . . . and may set the matter for hearing to take evidence when necessary to determine whether the agreement should be approved or disapproved.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, former § 10882, now § 10700(b) (eff. Jan. 1, 2020); see also Lab. Code, § 5001.)

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Removal is **DENIED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR

I CONCUR,

/s/ MARGUERITE SWEENEY, COMMISSIONER

/s/ DEIDRA E. LOWE, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

September 3, 2021

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

**KIMBERLY WALTERS
JONATHAN BRIAN
MISA STEFEN KOLLER WARD**

PAG/pc

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