

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

JUD FREITAS, *Applicant*

vs.

**PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY,
permissibly self-insured and administered, *Defendant***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ11323598; ADJ11323615
Eureka District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
GRANTING PETITION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

Petitioner 4600 Boehm on behalf of lien claimant Anthem Blue Cross (Anthem) seeks reconsideration of the Joint Findings of Fact and Award issued by the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) in this matter on August 29, 2023. In that decision, the WCJ found that lien claimant Anthem Blue cross was entitled to reimbursement of their lien in full for services relating to the applicant's industrial injuries, commencing from the period of February 21, 2017 and thereafter, along with a 15% increase and statutory interest.

Petitioner asserts that the WCJ erred by limiting Anthem's right to reimbursement to commence on February 21, 2017¹, and that as a health plan under Labor Code Section 4903.1, et seq., they are entitled, in cases involving a continuous trauma injury, to reimbursement for treatment paid prior to the filing of the application for adjudication. Insofar as the applicant's claim in case ADJ11323615 is a continuous trauma injury, petitioner asserts that case law supports their position and right to reimbursement for all of their services, not just services rendered after the application for adjudication for the specific injury was filed.

Petitioner cites as follows:

Indeed, prior decisions support Anthem should be reimbursed prior to applicant having knowledge of an industrial injury. Based on the Board's holding in

¹ Applicant sustained a specific industrial injury dated February 21, 2017 in case ADJ11323598, and a continuous trauma injury during the period August 29, 2005 through May 26, 2017 in case ADJ11323615.

Torok v. County of San Diego, 2018 Cal. Wrk. Comp. P.D. LEXIS 6, (at pg. 6-7):

“If neither the applicant nor lien claimant knew that applicant had sustained an industrial injury at the time of surgery, lien claimant would be entitled to recover against defendant pursuant to Labor Code §4903.1(a)(2) because the limitations in subsection (b) do not apply. In fact, treatment for a cumulative injury can predate an employee’s knowledge that an injury is industrial. The test for whether treatment is compensable is whether the treatment is related and not whether the employee had notice of an industrial injury claim” (emphasis added).

Petitioner requests that the Award be Amended to reflect that Anthem is entitled to recover for all treatment reasonably required over the course of the CT, and specifically that the Award not limit reimbursement for treatment after the specific injury only but include all treatment related and reasonably required for both claims along with any other relief deemed just and proper.

Defendant filed a response requesting denial of the petition.

The WCJ filed a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Reconsideration (Report) recommending denial of the Petition.

We have reviewed the allegations in the Petition for Reconsideration and the Answer, and the contents of the Report.

Based upon our preliminary review of the record, we will grant cost petitioner’s Petition for Reconsideration, and we will order that this matter be referred to a workers compensation administrative law judge or designated hearing officer of the Appeals Board for a status conference. Our order granting applicant’s Petition for Reconsideration is not a final order, and we will order that a final decision after reconsideration is deferred pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law. Once a final decision after reconsideration is issued by the Appeals Board, any aggrieved person may timely seek a writ of review pursuant to Labor Code section 5950 et seq.

I.

It is well established that decisions by 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].) “The term ‘substantial evidence’ means evidence which, if true, has probative force on the issues. It is more than a mere scintilla, and means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion...It must be reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value.” (*Braewood Convalescent Hospital v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd (Bolton)* (1983) 34 Cal.3d 159, 164 [48 Cal.Comp.Cases 566], emphasis removed and citations omitted.)

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. (Lab. Code, § 5313; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10787.) “It is the responsibility of the parties and the WCJ to ensure that the record is complete when a case is submitted for decision on the record. At a minimum, the record must contain, in properly organized form, the issues submitted for decision, the admissions and stipulations of the parties, and admitted evidence.” (*Hamilton, supra*, 66 Cal.Comp.Cases at p. 475.) 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.” (*Id.* at p. 476 (citing *Evans v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 753, 755 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 350]).)

The WCJ and the Appeals Board have a duty to further develop the record where there is insufficient evidence on an issue. (*McClune v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1117, 1121-1122 [63 Cal.Comp.Cases 261].) The Appeals Board has a constitutional mandate to “ensure substantial justice in all cases.” (*Kuykendall v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 396, 403 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 264].) The Board may not leave matters undeveloped where it is clear that additional discovery is needed. (*Id.* at p. 404.)

Labor Code section 5310 states in relevant part that: “The appeals board may appoint one or more workers’ compensation administrative law judges in any proceeding, as it may deem necessary or advisable, and may refer, remove to itself, or transfer to a workers’ compensation administrative law judge the proceedings on any claim. . . .” (See also Lab. Code, §§ 123.7, 5309.)

Here, it is unclear from our preliminary review whether the legal issues have been properly identified; whether the existing record is sufficient to support the decision, order, and legal conclusions of the WCJ; and/or whether further development of the record may be necessary. Thus, we will order the matter to a status conference before a workers' compensation administrative law judge or designated hearing officer of the Appeals Board.

II.

Finally, we observe that under our broad grant of authority, our jurisdiction over this matter is continuing.

A grant of reconsideration has the effect of causing “the whole subject matter [to be] reopened for further consideration and determination” (*Great Western Power Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Savercool)* (1923) 191 Cal. 724, 729 [10 I.A.C. 322]) and of “[throwing] the entire record open for review.” (*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Industrial Acc. Com. (George)* (1954) 125 Cal.App.2d 201, 203 [19 Cal.Comp.Cases 98].) Thus, once reconsideration has been granted, the Appeals Board has the full power to make new and different findings on issues presented for determination at the trial level, even with respect to issues not raised in the petition for reconsideration before it. (See Lab. Code, §§ 5907, 5908, 5908.5; see also *Gonzales v. Industrial Acci. Com.* (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 360, 364.) “[t]here is no provision in chapter 7, dealing with proceedings for reconsideration and judicial review, limiting the time within which the commission may make its decision on reconsideration, and in the absence of a statutory authority limitation none will be implied.”; see generally Lab. Code, § 5803 [“The WCAB has continuing jurisdiction over its orders, decisions, and awards. . . . At any time, upon notice and after an opportunity to be heard is given to the parties in interest, the appeals board may rescind, alter, or amend any order, decision, or award, good cause appearing therefor.”].)

“The WCAB . . . is a constitutional court; hence, its final decisions are given res judicata effect.” (*Azadigian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 372, 374 [57 Cal.Comp.Cases 391; see *Dow Chemical Co. v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.* (1967) 67 Cal.2d 483, 491 [62 Cal.Rptr. 757, 432 P.2d 365]; *Dakins v. Board of Pension Commissioners* (1982) 134 Cal.App.3d 374, 381 [184 Cal.Rptr. 576]; *Solari v. Atlas-Universal Service, Inc.* (1963) 215 Cal.App.2d 587, 593 [30 Cal.Rptr. 407].) 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. Interlocutory procedural or evidentiary decisions, entered in the midst of the workers’ compensation proceedings, are not considered “final” orders. (*Maranian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1068, 1070, 1075 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 650].) [“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 or discovery orders”]; *Kramer, supra*, at p. 45 [“[t]he term [‘final’] does not include intermediate procedural orders”].)

Labor Code section 5901 states in relevant part that:

“No cause of action arising out of any final order, decision or award made and filed by the appeals board or a workers’ compensation judge shall accrue in any court to any person until and unless the appeals board on its own motion sets aside the final order, decision, or award and removes the proceeding to itself or if the person files a petition for reconsideration, and the reconsideration is granted or denied. ...”

Thus, this is not a final decision on the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration, and we will order that issuance of the final decision after reconsideration is deferred. Once a final decision is issued by the Appeals Board, any aggrieved person may timely seek a writ of review pursuant to Labor Code sections 5950 et seq.

III.

Accordingly, we grant cost petitioner’s Petition for Reconsideration, order that this matter be set for a status conference, and order that a final decision after reconsideration is deferred pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that applicant's Petition for Reconsideration of the Joint Findings of Fact and Order issued on August 29, 2023 by a workers' compensation administrative law judge is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this matter will be set for a Status Conference with a workers' compensation administrative law judge or designated hearing officer of the Appeals Board. Notice of date, time, and format of the conference will be served separately, to be heard in the Lifesize electronic platform, in lieu of an in person appearance at the San Francisco office of the Appeals Board.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a final decision after reconsideration is **DEFERRED** pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

November 13, 2023

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

**4600BOEHM
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS
WELLS LAW
COLEMAN CHAVEZ & ASSOCIATES LLP**

AS/ara

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