WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID SCHUPP, *Applicant*

vs.

MAGIC MOUNTAIN LLC dba SIX FLAGS MAGIC MOUNTAIN; PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY OF HARTFORD, administered by BROADSPIRE, *Defendants*

Adjudication Numbers: ADJ10955805 (MF); ADJ10963100
Van Nuys District Office

OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND DECISION AFTER RECONSIDERATION

Defendant seeks removal in response to the July 8, 2025 Joint Findings and Order issued by a workers compensation administrative law judge (WCJ), which found, in pertinent part, that (1) applicant, while employed by defendant on June 17, 2017, sustained an injury arising out of and in the course of employment (AOE/COE) to his right ankle in case number ADJ10955805; (2) applicant sustained injury AOE/COE to his bilateral wrists and knees in ADJ1096310 [date of injury not identified]; (3) applicant properly obtained a qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) panel in pain management; (4) the reporting of Guodong Li, M.D., is admissible as the PQME in pain management; and (5) Dr. Li shall be allowed to finalize the evaluation of the applicant. The WCJ ordered that Dr. Li be allowed complete his evaluation of applicant, with all medical records to be forwarded to him in the next 15 days, and that his original reports shall remain in evidence. All other issues, including sanctions and costs were ordered off calendar, with the parties to meet and confer as to same within the next 15 days.

Petitioner contends that their right to due process was violated when the WCJ did not address specific issues raised by them at trial and did not provide a clear statement of the reasons and evidence relied upon in her decision, including, (1) whether applicant's objection to a medical

report was timely under Labor Code[1] section 4062.2(b); (2) whether section 4062.2 mandates a valid objection before a party can request a panel; (3) the validity of Panel #7693389 and Panel #3478373; (4) whether an amended Application alleging "chronic pain injury" must be filed prior to the securing of a panel in pain management; and (5) whether the issue of applicant's entitlement to a pain management panel should be addressed by the agreed medical evaluator (AME) in the case. Defendant asserts they will suffer substantial prejudice and irreparable harm if removal is not granted, and that a petition for reconsideration will not be an adequate remedy after the current QME has issued numerous reports that will be relied upon by other physicians.

Applicant filed an Answer and requested that sanctions and fees be ordered.

The WCJ issued a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Removal (Report), recommending that the Petition be denied.

We have considered the allegations of the Petition, the Answer, and the contents of the Report. Based on our review of the record, and for the reasons stated below, we will treat the Petition as one for reconsideration, grant reconsideration, and, as our Decision After Reconsideration, we will affirm the findings of fact as to injury, employment and parts of body, but we will amend the F&O to defer the remaining issues, and return the matter to the WCJ for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

FACTS

In case number ADJ10963100, applicant, while employed during the period March 26, 2015, through July 20, 2018, as a painter/maintenance worker by defendant, sustained injury to his bilateral wrists and knees, and claims to have sustained injury to various body parts. In case number ADJ10955805, applicant, while employed on June 17, 2017 as a painter/maintenance worker by defendant, sustained injury to his right ankle, and claims to have sustained injury to various body parts.

Applicant sought treatment with Universal Pain Management, where he was evaluated by both Rohit Choudhary, M.D., and Shahin A. Sadik, M.D. (Applicant's Exhibits 1 through 5).

On March 4, 2024, applicant objected, pursuant to section 4062.2, to the February 14, 2023 medical reporting of Dr. Sadik. (Ex. 11.) Notably, while Dr. Sadik signed reports dated April 11, 2021, May 2, 2021, October 17, 2024, and January 26, 2024, it was Dr. Choudhary who signed the medical report dated February 14, 2023 to which applicant objected on March 4, 2024. (Exs.

[1] All further references are to the Labor Code, unless otherwise stated.

3 and B, Report of Universal Pain Management, February 14, 2023, page 6.) Applicant's objection to the February 14, 2023 report did not specify whether the objection was made under sections 4061 or 4062, citing only section 4062.2. The stated basis for the objection was "the extent and scope of ongoing medical treatment." Applicant proposed either an AME, or advised that in the absence of a response within fifteen (15) days, they would request a PQME from the Administrative Director. (Ex. 11.)

On March 24, 2024, defendant responded to applicant's objection, noting that the orthopedic AME, Dr. Woods, had not recommended any additional panels. (Ex. C, March 24, 2024, p. 1.)

Sometime thereafter, *although it is not in evidence*, it appears to be undisputed that the Medical Unit issued QME Panel #7693389 in the medical specialty of pain management.

On May 15, 2024, applicant requested a replacement panel because one of applicant's treating physicians, Dr. Sadik, was allegedly on the panel. (Ex. 15 and Ex. D, p. 1.)

On May 29, 2024, defendant objected to the replacement panel request, asserting that the original QME Panel was never served on them, and striking one of the three physicians on the panel. (Ex. E, p. 1.)

On June 10, 2024, the Medical Unit served replacement QME Panel #3478373. (Ex. G, June 10, 2024, p. 1.)

On June 18, 2024, defendant reasserted their objections and struck one of the three physicians from the replacement panel. (Ex. H, June 18, 2024, p. 1.)

On June 25, 2024, applicant served an appointment notice for August 29, 2024 with Dr. Li, the physician that neither party had struck from QME Panel #3478373. (Ex. 10, page 1.)

On July 15, 2024, defendant served a petition to strike the pain management panel and to obtain a protective order barring the examination until the dispute over defendant's objection to the panel was resolved.

On July 16, 2024, defendant filed a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DOR) to an expedited hearing.

On July 31, 2024, applicant amended the Application in case number in ADJ10963100 to allege chronic pain.

On August 19, 2024, defendant served a "Notice of Objection of Pain Management Evaluation on Guodong Li, M.D." (Ex. L, p. 1.) Defendant also filed a DOR.

On August 22, 2024, defendant wrote to applicant's attorney, requesting that the scheduled evaluation with Dr. Li be continued pending resolution of defendant's objections. (Ex. M, p. 1.)

On August 29, 2024, applicant was evaluated by pain management QME Dr. Li, and Dr. Li issued a medical report as to his findings. (Ex. 17, August 29, 2024, p.1.) On that same day, applicant amended the Application in case number ADJ10955805 to allege chronic pain.

On September 16, 2024, the parties proceeded to an expedited hearing, and despite defendant's objection, it was taken off calendar at applicant's request,

On October 29, 2024, defendant filed a DOR, requesting a mandatory settlement conference (MSC) on their petition to strike the QME Panel.

On January 15, 2025, the parties attended an MSC.

This matter proceeded to trial on March 10, 2025 and May 6, 2025.

At trial, the parties stipulated that in case number ADJ10963100, applicant, while employed during the period March 26, 2015, through July 20, 2018, as a painter/maintenance worker by defendant, sustained injury to his bilateral wrists and knees, and claims to have sustained injury to various body parts. (Minutes of Hearing and Summary of Evidence (MOH/SOE), March 10, 2025, p. 2: 5-11.) In case number ADJ10955805, the parties stipulated that on June 17, 2017, applicant sustained injury to his right ankle, and claims to have sustained injury to various body parts. (MOH/SOE, May 6, 2025, p. 4 :3-8.)

At trial on May 6, 2025, applicant testified that he began seeing a pain management doctor at Universal Pain Management in 2021. There were a number of doctors that he saw. He recalls Dr. Sadik, Dr. Choudhary, and a Dr. Pinter. These three doctors were at different locations; however, he did seek pain management treatment consistently from 2021 to present. When asked if any doctor told him that he was suffering chronic pain, he said yes. (MOH/SOE, May 6, 2026, p.9; 22-25.)

Applicant further testified that he currently takes approximately seven medications. He recalls seeing a Dr. Li who was a PQME in pain management. He remembers that he saw him sometime last year. He was asked about the complaints that he had at that time, and he stated that he has a number of physical complaints including difficulty taking a shower as his hand and wrist do not work well. He states that he has difficulty getting up from the toilet and cleaning himself. He indicates that he only showers approximately once a month due to the difficulties with his hand and wrist. He has problems cooking because he can only stand for 10 minutes and indicates that

he does not have any help in his home. He states that there's only so much that he can do to help himself and he is at the end of his rope. When asked if he felt that he needed a pain management doctor, he stated that he thinks that he does. He specifically believes that chiropractic and acupuncture treatment would be beneficial. He alleges that there has been a denial of treatment at Universal Pain Management; however, defense counsel objected and that testimony was stricken. (*Id.* page 10, numbered lines 1-11.)

The following issues were submitted for decision in both cases on May 6, 2025:

(1) Attorney fees.

(2) Sanctions pursuant to petitions filed on October 31, 2024 and October 29, 2024.

(3) Applicant's objections to Defendant's DOR filed on November 6, 2024; August 27, 2024; and July 19, 2024.

(4) Whether the purported Labor Code § 4062 objection by applicant's attorney, dated March 4, 2024, to a nonexistent report more than one year earlier satisfies the mandate of Labor Code § 4062.2(b).

(5) Whether Labor Code § 4062.2 mandates a valid 4062 objection before a party can request a panel.

(6) Whether Panel No. 7693389 is invalid for failure to serve on defendants in violation of CCR 30(b)(1)(C).

(7) Whether replacement Panel No. 3478373 is likewise invalid where the initial panel was invalid.

(8) Whether a party must allege an injury in the application before they can secure a panel in that specialty.

(9) Whether applicant is entitled to sanctions pursuant to the Petitions filed on April 10, 2025; March 10, 2025; October 31, 2024; October 29, 2024; August 27, 2024; and 4 July 19, 2024.

(10) Applicant's counsel has requested that the Court review applicant's objection to Defendant's DOR filed on 6 November 6, 2024.

(MOH/SOE, March 10, 2025, p. 2; MOH/SOE, May 6, 2025, pp. 2-5.)

A Joint Findings and Award issued on July 8, 2025, which found, in pertinent part, that (1) applicant properly obtained a QME panel in pain management; (2) the reporting of the physician selected from that panel, Dr. Li is admissible; and (3) Dr. Li should be allowed to reevaluate applicant and review medical records.

While the decision included findings of injury, employment, and body parts in each case, defendant seeks removal only as to the WCJ's findings with respect to Dr. Li and the QME process involving his selection.

DISCUSSION

I.

Former 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.

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 August 19, 2025 following the petition, and 60 days from the date of transmission is Saturday, October 18, 2025. The next business day that is 60 days from the date of transmission is Monday, October 20, 2025. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600(b).)[2] This decision is issued by or on Monday, October 20, 2025, 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.

---

[2] WCAB Rule 10600(b) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600(b)) states that:

> Unless otherwise provided by law, if the last day for exercising or performing any right or duty to act or respond falls on a weekend, or on a holiday for which the offices of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board are closed, the act or response may be performed or exercised upon the next business day.

Here, according to the proof of service for the WCJ's report, the report was served on August 19, 2025, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on August 19, 2025. 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 August 19, 2025.

II.

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.

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 findings regarding the threshold issues of employment, injury AOE/COE and parts of body injured. Accordingly, the WCJ's decision is a final order subject to reconsideration rather than removal.

Although the decision contains findings that are final, the petitioner is only challenging an interlocutory finding/order in the decision regarding the propriety of a QME panel in the medical specialty of pain medicine. 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 our review, we conclude that it is necessary for the WCJ to address the additional issues raised at trial by the parties, due to the potential of further disputes if Dr. Li's reports are reviewed by other physicians. As such, we are persuaded that significant prejudice or irreparable harm will result if removal is denied and that reconsideration will not be an adequate remedy.

Accordingly, we will treat the Petition as one for reconsideration, grant reconsideration under the removal standard, and as our Decision After Reconsideration, affirm the joint findings of fact as to employment, injury AOE/COE, and parts of body, but otherwise defer the remaining issues and return this matter to the WCJ for further proceedings consistent with this decision.

III.

The WCJ is required to "make and file findings upon all facts involved in the controversy[.]" (Lab. Code, § 5313; *see also*, *Hamilton v. Lockheed Corporation* (*Hamilton*) (2001) 66 Cal.Comp.Cases 473, 476 (Appeals Board en banc).) Section 5313 also requires a WCJ to state the "reasons or grounds upon which the determination was made." This is required so that the WCJ's opinion on decision "enables the parties, and the Board if reconsideration is sought, to ascertain the basis for the decision, and makes the right of seeking reconsideration more meaningful." (*Hamilton*, *supra*, at p. 476, citing *Evans v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal.2d 753, 755 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 350].) Each decision "must be based on admitted evidence in the record" (*Hamilton*, *supra*, at page 478), and it 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].) As required by section 5313 and explained in *Hamilton*, "the WCJ is

charged with the responsibility of referring to the evidence in the opinion on decision, and of clearly designating the evidence that forms the basis of the decision." (*Hamilton*, *supra*, at p. 475.)

While the submitted issues of attorney fees and sanctions have been deferred, other issues were not deferred, and those issues must be fully addressed. For example, while ten issues were raised as to each case by the parties, the F&O did not address the submitted issues of applicant's objections to defendant's DORs of November 6, 2024, August 27, 2024, and July 19, 2024.

The issue of whether the objection by applicant, dated March 4, 2024, satisfies the mandate of section 4062.2(b) was also not addressed in the July 8, 2025 decision, which only found that a panel was "properly obtained" under that section. The matter should be returned to address this, along with the submitted issue of whether applicant's objection was a valid section 4062 objection. We note that section 4062.2 expressly provides a path to a QME panel or AME in represented cases based not only on objections under section 4062, but also under sections 4060 and 4061. (Lab. Code, § 4062.2(b).)

Further, Panel #7693389 is not in evidence, and the issue of whether it is invalid for failure to serve on defendant in violation of AD Rule 30(b)(1)(C) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 30(b)(1)(C) must be addressed. The WCJ should also consider whether this failure caused any prejudice to defendant, as well as whether replacement Panel #3478373 is invalid if Panel #7693389 was for any reason invalid.

AD Rule 30(b)(1)C) requires the service of a QME Panel obtained by a party within one working day. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the invalidation of the QME panel, and issuance of a replacement panel, but this is a matter exclusively within the discretion of the Appeals Board. (*Vazquez v. Inocensio Renteria* (2025) 90 Cal. Comp. Cases 514 (Appeals Board en banc.)

Here, defendant asserts defective service of the initial QME panel. The record is devoid of any evidence to support their claim that the original QME panel was not served on them, and that they were not aware of it until they received applicant's request for a replacement panel QME. However, even if defendant's assertion of defective service is supported by evidence, it is not clear whether there was any prejudice incurred as a result of the alleged delay in learning about the QME panel. Defendant was able to exercise their right to strike one of the members of both the original and the replacement panel without any assertion by applicant's counsel that either strike was untimely. The WCJ should, however, also address the validity of the subsequent Panel #3478373.

We now turn to the issue of applicant's objection to Universal Pain Management's February 14, 2023 report. The objection did not specify whether the objection was made pursuant to section 4061 or 4062. Objections under section 4061 pertain to permanent disability or further medical treatment. Subsection (b) explains this:

> (b) If either the employee or employer objects to a medical determination made by the treating physician concerning the existence or extent of permanent impairment and limitations or the need for future medical care, and the employee is represented by an attorney, a medical evaluation to determine permanent disability shall be obtained as provided in Section 4062.2.

(Lab. Code, § 4061(b).)

In this case, the dispute stated in applicant's objection letter does appear to pertain to the need for future medical care.

Section 4062 only applies to objections to a medical report made on grounds other than permanent disability or further medical treatment, and it includes the requirement that the objection be made within 20 days in a represented case, as explained in subsection (a):

> (a) If either the employee or employer objects to a medical determination made by the treating physician concerning any medical issues not covered by Section 4060 or 4061 and not subject to Section 4610, the objecting party shall notify the other party in writing of the objection within 20 days of receipt of the report if the employee is represented by an attorney or within 30 days of receipt of the report if the employee is not represented by an attorney. These time limits may be extended for good cause or by mutual agreement. If the employee is represented by an attorney, a medical evaluation to determine the disputed medical issue shall be obtained as provided in Section 4062.2, and no other medical evaluation shall be obtained…

(Lab. Code, § 4062(a).)

The time limit of 20 days "may be extended for good cause" or by agreement. In this case, the decision assumes that applicant's objection was made under section 4062, notwithstanding that there is no express reference to section 4062 in the objection and concludes that the lack of expected further reporting from Universal Pain Management constitutes good cause for an extension of more than one year. However, the decision does not account for subsequent reports dated January 26, 2024 and October 18, 2024 that were admitted into evidence as Applicant's Exhibits 1 and 2, respectively.

The potential applicability of section 4061 does not appear to have been expressly identified as a submitted issue. However, the failure to raise a legal requirement does not necessarily render it inoperable. If section 4061 applies to applicant's objection, then there is no time limit.

Further, there appears to be no evidence regarding the scope of the agreement to use Dr. Woods, which would be necessary to apply the requirements of section 4062.2(f), which provides as follows:

> (f) The parties may agree to an agreed medical evaluator at any time, except as to issues subject to the independent medical review process established pursuant to Section 4610.5. A panel shall not be requested pursuant to subdivision (b) on any issue that has been agreed to be submitted to or has been submitted to an agreed medical evaluator unless the agreement has been canceled by mutual written consent.

(Lab. Code, § 4062.2(f).)

More broadly, AD Rule 31.7(a) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 31.7(a)) suggests that any "new medical dispute" should be submitted to an existing AME. Thus, the WCJ should consider whether AME Dr. Woods should have been asked to comment on the disputed medical issue of whether he would recommend or defer to a pain management specialist.

As noted above, findings should be made to address the nature and scope of applicant's March 4, 2024 objection to the medical report dated February 14, 2023, including whether it was made under section 4061 or 4062, because the objection itself does not specify. If the objection is more like a section 4061 objection than a section 4062 objection, then it has no time limits. If it is strictly under section 4062, then more evidence and analysis by the WCJ is required to justify whether a lengthy delay of 13 months between the date of the report and the date of the objection constitutes "good cause" under section 4062.

In either event, the July 8, 2025 decision does not discuss whether any legal significance should be accorded to the fact that the March 4, 2024 objection incorrectly referred to the February 14, 2023 report as Dr. Sadik's when the report was in fact signed by Dr. Choudhary. This requires evidence and analysis of whether there was any genuine and prejudicial confusion on the part of defendant as a result of the error. If the subject of the objection letter was properly understood by defendant notwithstanding the error, then the error should not invalidate the objection. This was not addressed in the July 8, 2025 decision.

For the reasons set forth above, we will treat the Petition as one for Reconsideration, grant reconsideration, affirm the F&O as to the findings of the WCJ on the threshold issues of employment, injury and parts of body, amend the F&O to defer the remaining issues, and return the matter to the WCJ for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration of the Joint Findings of Fact issued on July 8, 2025 is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as the Decision After Reconsideration, that the Joint Findings of Fact and Order issued on July 8, 2025 is **AFFIRMED**, and that it is **AMENDED** as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. In case number ADJ10955805, David Schupp, while employed on June 17, 2017, as a painter/maintenance worker Occupational Group 380, at Valencia, California, by Magic Mountain LLC, doing business as Six Flags Magic Mountain, sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment to his right ankle, and claims injury to his foot, wrist, knee, lower extremities, Achilles tendon, right distal tibia, high blood pressure, diabetes, and chronic pain syndrome.

2. In case number ADJ10963100, David Schupp, while employed during the period from March 26, 2015 to July 20, 2018, as a painter/maintenance worker, Occupational Group 380, at Valencia, California by Magic Mountain LLC, doing business as Six Flags Magic Mountain sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment to his bilateral wrists and knees, and claims injury to carpal tunnel on both sides, blood pressure increase, ankle, foot, Achilles tendon, distal tibia, lower extremities, diabetes, psyche due to repetitive stress and strain, and chronic pain syndrome.

3. At the time of the injuries, the employer's worker's compensation insurance carrier was Property and Casualty Insurance Company of Hartford, administered by Broadspire.

4. All other issues are deferred.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the matter is **RETURNED** to the WCJ for further proceedings consistent with this decision.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ PAUL F. KELLY, COMMISSIONER

DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

OCTOBER 20, 2025

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

DAVID SCHUPP
LAW FIRM OF ROWEN, GURVEY & WIN
FLOYD, SKEREN, MANUKIAN & LANGEVIN

CWF/*cs*

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