

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

**ELDONNA GILLESPIE, *Applicant***

**vs.**

**CONSTELLIS TRIPLE CANOPY; STARR INDEMNITY & LIABILITY COMPANY  
administered by GALLAGHER BASSETT, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ13376519; ADJ12800164; ADJ12800163  
Anaheim District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER DENYING PETITIONS  
FOR DISQUALIFICATION AND REMOVAL**

Defendant filed a Petition for Removal of the August 11, 2022 Order that claims adjuster, Lorrie Ragsdale appear at the October 4, 2022 trial. Separately, defendant filed a Petition for Disqualification of the workers' compensation administrative law judge. In the August 11, 2022 Order, the WCJ ordered that the August 11, 2022 hearing be converted into an MSC. The WCJ also ordered the parties to file trial briefs. Finally, the WCJ ordered defendant's claims adjuster to appear at trial.

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.

As mentioned above, at the August 11, 2022 hearing, the WCJ ordered that trial briefs be filed on the subject of whether there was valid notice of the MPN and whether invalidity of the notices gives a right to treat outside of the MPN. The WCJ ordered that the claims adjuster, Lorie Ragsdale, appear at the October 4, 2022 trial to testify regarding what information she is relying on to determine applicant does not meet any of the exceptions that would prevent transfer of care into the MPN and to explain why complete MPN notices were not sent to applicant. The WCJ also stated that the testimony of Ms. Ragsdale may be relevant to the issue of whether defendant should be sanctioned.

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.

With respect to defendant's petition for disqualification, Labor Code section 5311 provides that a party may seek to disqualify a WCJ upon any one or more of the grounds specified in Code of Civil Procedure section 641. (Lab. Code, § 5311; see also Code Civ. Proc., § 641.) Among the grounds for disqualification under section 641 are that the WCJ has "formed or expressed an unqualified opinion or belief as to the merits of the action" (Code Civ. Proc., § 641(f)) or that the WCJ has demonstrated "[t]he existence of a state of mind ... evincing enmity against or bias toward either party." (Code Civ. Proc., § 641(g).)

Under WCAB Rule 10960, proceedings to disqualify a WCJ "shall be initiated by the filing of a petition for disqualification supported by an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury stating in detail *facts* establishing one or more of the grounds for disqualification ... ." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10960, italics added.) It has long been recognized that "[t]he allegations in a statement charging bias and prejudice of a judge must set forth specifically the facts on which the charge is predicated," that "[a] statement *containing nothing but conclusions and setting forth no facts* constituting a ground for disqualification may be ignored," and that "[w]here no *facts* are set forth in the statement *there is no issue of fact to be determined.*" (*Mackie v. Dyer* (1957) 154 Cal.App.2d 395, 399, italics added.)

Furthermore, even if detailed and verified allegations of fact have been made, it is settled law that a WCJ is not subject to disqualification under section 641(f) if, prior to rendering a decision, the WCJ expresses an opinion regarding a legal or factual issue but the petitioner fails to

show that this opinion is a fixed one that could not be changed upon the production of evidence and the presentation of arguments at or after further hearing. (*Taylor v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Thomas)* (1940) 38 Cal.App.2d 75, 79-80 [5 Cal.Comp.Cases 61].)<sup>1</sup> Additionally, even if the WCJ expresses an unqualified opinion on the merits, the WCJ is not subject to disqualification under section 641(f) if that opinion is “based upon the evidence then before [the WCJ] and upon the [WCJ’s] conception of the law as applied to such evidence.” (*Id.*; cf. *Kreling v. Superior Court* (1944) 25 Cal.2d 305, 312 [“It is [a judge’s] duty to consider and pass upon the evidence produced before him, and when the evidence is in conflict, to resolve that conflict in favor of the party whose evidence outweighs that of the opposing party.”].)

Also, it is “well settled ... that the expressions of opinion uttered by a judge, in what he conceives to be a discharge of his official duties, are not evidence of bias or prejudice” under section 641(g) (*Kreling, supra*, 25 Cal.2d at pp. 310-311; accord: *Mackie, supra*, 154 Cal.App.2d at p. 400) and that “[e]rroneous rulings against a litigant, even when numerous and continuous, form no ground for a charge of bias or prejudice, especially when they are subject to review.” (*McEwen v. Occidental Life Ins. Co.* (1916) 172 Cal. 6, 11; accord: *Mackie, supra*, 154 Cal.App.2d at p. 400.) Similarly, “when the state of mind of the trial judge appears to be adverse to one of the parties but is based upon actual observance of the witnesses and the evidence given during the trial of an action, it does not amount to that prejudice against a litigant which disqualifies” the judge under section 641(g). (*Kreling, supra*, 25 Cal.2d at p. 312; see also *Moulton Niguel Water Dist. v. Colombo* (2003) 111 Cal.App.4th 1210, 1219 [“When making a ruling, a judge interprets the evidence, weighs credibility, and makes findings. In doing so, the judge necessarily makes and expresses determinations in favor of and against parties. How could it be otherwise? We will not hold that every statement a judge makes to explain his or her reasons for ruling against a party constitutes evidence of judicial bias.”].)

Under no circumstances may a party’s unilateral and subjective perception of bias afford a basis for disqualification. (*Haas v. County of San Bernardino* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1017, 1034; *Robbins v. Sharp Healthcare* (2006) 71 Cal.Comp.Cases 1291, 1310-1311 (Significant Panel Decision).)

---

<sup>1</sup> Overruled on other grounds in *Lumbermen’s Mut. Cas. Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Cacozza)* (1946) 29 Cal.2d 492, 499 [11 Cal.Comp.Cases 289].

Here, our review of the record does not cause us to doubt the impartiality of the WCJ or the fairness of the proceeding. Accordingly, we will deny defendant's petition for disqualification.

Finally, we observe that 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 and the WCJ shall ". . . make and file findings upon all facts involved in the controversy[.]" (Lab. Code, § 5313; *Hamilton, supra*, at p. 476; *Blackledge v. Bank of America, ACE American Insurance Company* (2010) 75 Cal.Comp.Cases 613, 621-622.) "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." (*Hamilton, supra*, at p. 476 (citing *Evans v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 753, 755 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 350]).) Here, the WCJ ordered that the parties submit trial briefs and that defendant's adjuster appear at the trial. Once the parties proceed to trial, they will have an opportunity to raise all relevant issues, and to submit relevant evidence and otherwise create a record. As part of that process, defendant will have an opportunity to raise the preliminary issues of whether the MPN notices were sufficient and whether there was a valid transfer of care. The WCJ can then consider the evidence and the legal arguments raised by the parties and determine how best to proceed.

For the foregoing reasons,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant's Petition for Removal is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's Petition for Disqualification is **DENIED**.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD**

**/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER**

**I CONCUR,**

**/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR**

**/s/ ANNE SCHMITZ, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER**



**DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

**October 4, 2022**

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

**ELDONNA GILLESPIE  
HUMPHREY & ASSOCIATES  
DIETZ GILMOR & CHAZEN APC**

**MWH/mc**

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