

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

ERNESTO MEDINA, *Applicant*

vs.

**CLOSET FACTORY SAN CARLOS;
PRAETORIAN INSURANCE COMPANY,
administered by QBE SPECIALTY INSURANCE *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ19358226
San Francisco District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING PETITION
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

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 the petitioner's arguments in the WCJ's report, we will deny the Petition as one seeking reconsideration.

Preliminarily, we note that former Labor Code¹ section 5909 provided that a petition for reconsideration was deemed denied unless the Appeals Board acted on the petition within 60 days from the date of filing. (Lab. Code, § 5909.) Effective July 2, 2024, section 5909 was amended to state in relevant part that:

(a) A petition for reconsideration is deemed to have been denied by the appeals board unless it is acted upon within 60 days from the date a trial judge transmits a case to the appeals board.

(b) (1) When a trial judge transmits a case to the appeals board, the trial judge shall provide notice to the parties of the case and the appeals board.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), service of the accompanying report, pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 5900, shall constitute providing notice.

(§ 5909.)

¹ All further statutory references are to the Labor Code, unless otherwise noted.

Under section 5909(a), the Appeals Board must act on a petition for reconsideration within 60 days of transmission of the case to the Appeals Board. Transmission is reflected in Events in the Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS). Specifically, in Case Events, under Event Description is the phrase “Sent to Recon” and under Additional Information is the phrase “The case is sent to the Recon board.”

Here, according to Events, the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on October 15, 2024, and 60 days from the date of transmission is Saturday, December 14, 2024, which by operation of law means that this decision is due by Monday, December 16, 2024. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600.) This decision is issued by or on December 16, 2024, so that we have timely acted on the Petition as required by section 5909(a).

Section 5909(b)(1) requires that the parties and the Appeals Board be provided with notice of transmission of the case. Transmission of the case to the Appeals Board in EAMS provides notice to the Appeals Board. Thus, the requirement in subdivision (1) ensures that the parties are notified of the accurate date for the commencement of the 60-day period for the Appeals Board to act on a petition. Section 5909(b)(2) provides that service of the Report and Recommendation shall be notice of transmission.

According to the proof of service for the Report and Recommendation by the WCJ, the Report was served on October 15, 2024, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on October 15, 2024. Service of the Report and transmission of the case to the Appeals Board occurred on the same day. Thus, we conclude that the parties were provided with the notice of transmission required by section 5909(b)(1) because service of the Report in compliance with section 5909(b)(2) provided them with actual notice as to the commencement of the 60-day period on October 15, 2024.

If a decision includes resolution of a “threshold” issue, then it is a “final” decision, whether or not all issues are resolved or there is an ultimate decision on the right to benefits. (*Aldi v. Carr, McClellan, Ingersoll, Thompson & Horn* (2006) 71 Cal.Comp.Cases 783, 784, fn. 2 (Appeals Board en banc).) Threshold issues include, but are not limited to, the following: injury arising out of and in the course of employment, jurisdiction, the existence of an employment relationship and statute of limitations issues. (See *Capital Builders Hardware, Inc. v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd. (Gaona)* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 658, 662 [81 Cal.Comp.Cases 1122].) Failure to timely petition for reconsideration of a final decision bars later challenge to the propriety of the decision before the

WCAB or court of appeal. (See Lab. Code, § 5904.) Alternatively, non-final decisions may later be challenged by a petition for reconsideration once a final decision issues.

Next, we turn to the type of relief appropriate in this matter. A decision issued by the Appeals Board may address a hybrid of both threshold and interlocutory issues. If a party challenges a hybrid decision, the petition seeking relief is treated as a petition for reconsideration because the decision resolves a threshold issue. However, if the petitioner challenging a hybrid decision only disputes the WCJ's determination regarding interlocutory issues, then the Appeals Board will evaluate the issues raised by the petition under the removal standard applicable to non-final decisions.

Here, the WCJ's decision includes a findings regarding the threshold issues of employment and injury arising out of and occurring in the course of employment (AOE/COE). Accordingly, the WCJ's decision is a final order subject to reconsideration rather than removal.

Although the decision contains a finding that is final, the petitioner is only challenging an interlocutory finding/order in the decision. Therefore, we will apply the removal standard to our review. (See *Gaona, supra.*)

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 significant 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 the petitioner's arguments, we are not persuaded that significant prejudice or irreparable harm will result if removal is denied and/or that reconsideration will not be an adequate remedy. Therefore, we will deny the Petition as one seeking reconsideration.

Finally, we find it necessary to admonish both attorneys in this matter. We admonish applicant's attorney Nadeem Makada for using offensive, inappropriate, and disrespectful language in the Conclusion section of his petition. (See Lab. Code, § 5813; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10421(b)(9)(B) [sanctionable conduct includes "using any language in any pleading or other document [...] [w]here the language or gesture impugns the integrity of the Workers'

Compensation Appeals Board or its commissioners, judges, or staff’].) We admonish defense attorney Aman Chattha, with Stockwell Harris, for citing to applicant’s deposition which was not admitted into evidence in violation of the WCAB's rules. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10945.) Future compliance with the Appeals Board's rules is expected.

For the foregoing reasons,

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

WORKERS’ COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

December 16, 2024

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

**ERNESTO MEDINA
LAW OFFICES OF NADEEM MAKADA
STOCKWELL HARRIS**

PAG/abs

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