

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

**EDETTE KING, *Applicant***

**vs.**

**WALMART, INC.;**  
**ACE AMERICAN, ADMINISTERED BY SEDGWICK, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ2339305; ADJ13239895; ADJ2966040**

**Santa Barbara 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, § 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, 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.

Once the parties proceed to trial, they will have an opportunity to raise all relevant issues, and to submit evidence and otherwise create a record. As part of that process, defendant will have

an opportunity to raise the preliminary issue of whether further discovery is appropriate. The trial 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 the Petition for Removal is **DENIED**.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD**

**/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER**

**I CONCUR,**

**/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER**

**/s/ LISA A. SUSSMAN, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER**



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

**March 13, 2024**

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

**EDETTE KING  
THE LAW OFFICES OF LUCY M. BISHOP  
DIETZ, GILMOR & CHAZEN, APC**

**AS/mc**

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