WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ALFREDO LEDEZMA, Applicant

vs.

KAREEM CART COMMISSARY AND MFG. CO.; STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND, *Defendants*

Adjudication Numbers: ADJ15382349; ADJ15382351 Los Angeles District Office

OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND DISMISSING PETITION FOR REMOVAL

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Reconsideration or in the alternative 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, we will dismiss the petition as untimely.

On May 25, 2023, the WCJ held a pre-trial settlement conference where applicant, his attorney, and defendant's attorney were present and the WCJ set the matter for trial on June 29, 2023. (Pre-Trial Settlement Conference Statement, 5/25/23, p. 1.) The Pre-Trial Settlement Conference Statement was served on May 30, 2023. Applicant's Petition for Reconsideration or in the alternative Removal was filed on June 29, 2023.

There are 25 days allowed within which to file a petition for reconsideration from a "final" decision that has been served by mail upon an address in California. (Lab. Code, §§ 5900(a), 5903; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10605(a)(1).) This time limit is extended to the next business day if the last day for filing falls on a weekend or holiday. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600.) To be timely, however, a petition for reconsideration must be filed with (i.e., received by) the WCAB within the time allowed; proof that the petition was mailed (posted) within that period is insufficient. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, §§ 10940(a), 10615(b).)

This time limit is jurisdictional and, therefore, the Appeals Board has no authority to consider or act upon an untimely petition for reconsideration. (*Maranian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1068, 1076 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 650]; *Rymer v. Hagler* (1989) 211 Cal.App.3d 1171, 1182; *Scott v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1981) 122 Cal.App.3d 979, 984 [46 Cal.Comp.Cases 1008]; *U.S. Pipe & Foundry Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Hinojoza)* (1962) 201 Cal.App.2d 545, 549 [27 Cal.Comp.Cases 73].)

The petition in this matter was filed on June 29, 2023. This was more than 25 days after service of the WCJ's Pre-Trial Conference Statement and beyond whatever extension of time, if any, the petitioner might have been entitled to under WCAB Rule 10600. Thus, the petition was not timely filed and must be dismissed.

A petition for reconsideration may properly be taken only from a "final" order, decision, or award. (Lab. Code, §§ 5900(a), 5902, 5903.) 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. (*Maranian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1068, 1070, 1075 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 650].) Interlocutory procedural or evidentiary decisions, entered in the midst of the workers' compensation proceedings, are not considered "final" orders. (*Id.* at p. 1075 ["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"].) Such interlocutory decisions include, but are not limited to, pre-trial orders regarding evidence, discovery, trial setting, venue, or similar issues.

Here, the WCJ's decision solely resolves an intermediate procedural or evidentiary issue or issues. The decision does not determine any substantive right or liability and does not determine a threshold issue. Accordingly, it is not a "final" decision, and if we had not dismissed it as untimely, the petition for reconsideration would have been dismissed. Moreover, if we would have not dismissed the petition for untimeliness then we would have denied the petition to the extent it seeks 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).) Here, 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 a final decision adverse to petitioner.

Accordingly, we dismiss the Petition.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration or in the alternative Removal is **DISMISSED.**

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

August 28, 2023

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

ALFREDO LEDEZMA GARRETT LAW GROUP STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND

DM/oo

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

