WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KATRINA MURATALLA, *Applicant*

vs.

**TELECARE CORPORATION;
ARCH INDEMNITY INSURANCE COMPANY; Administered by GALLAGHER BASSETT SERVICES, *Defendants***

Adjudication Number: ADJ16305170
Santa Ana District Office

OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND DECISION AFTER RECONSIDERATION

Defendant filed a Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) of the Findings and Order (F&O) issued on March 27, 2025, wherein the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) found that while employed as a licensed vocational nurse for defendant up to May 8, 2022, applicant sustained cumulative injury arising out of and in the course of employment (AOE/COE) to the neck and back; that the date of injury per Labor Code section 5412[1] is June 2, 2022 based on the reporting of treating physician; and that the statute of limitations did not bar applicant's claim.

Defendant contends the WCJ erred in finding injury to the neck and back as the parties stipulated at trial to defer the issue of injury to individual body parts; that the reporting of the treating physician was not substantial evidence as to causation of injury; that the finding as to the section 5412 date of injury was incorrect as the date of the medical reporting was June 21, 2022, and not June 2, 2022 and that the section 5412 date of injury was not based on substantial evidence as applicant did not have disability even after June 21, 2022.

The WCJ's Report and Recommendation (Report) recommends the Petition be denied. We did not receive an answer from applicant.

---

[1] Unless otherwise stated, all further statutory references are to the Labor Code.

We have considered the allegations of the Petition and the contents of the Report of the WCJ with respect thereto. Based on our review of the record, for the reasons stated in the WCJ's Report and for the reasons discussed below, we will grant reconsideration, amend the F&O to correct the section 5412 date of injury (Finding of Fact 4), and otherwise affirm the F&O.

BACKGROUND

Applicant claims injury to the neck, back, hands, wrists, fingers, shoulders, knees, and feet resulting from cumulative injury ending May 8, 2022, while employed as licensed vocational nurse (LVN). (Minutes of Hearing and Summary of Evidence, January 2, 2025, page 2, lines 5 to 8, (MOH).) Defendant denied the claim on October 17, 2022. (Exhibit A.)

Initial evaluation and treatment occurred on June 21, 2022, by Dimitri Sirakoff, D.O., who noted his selection as primary treating physician. (Exhibit 1, Dr. Sirakoff, June 21, 2022, page 1.) For the mechanism of injury, Dr. Sirakoff referred to the history of work-related injury which states: "From 01/01/2015 through 05/08/2022, Ms. Muratalla conducted repetitive and continuous motions with both of her upper extremities, lower extremities, and back region in the performance of her duties as a[n] LVN. Progressively, she developed pain to her neck, mid back, lower back, bilateral shoulders, bilateral hands, right knee, right foot as well as developing stress-related symptoms and accelerated high blood pressure." (Exhibit 1, Dr. Sirakoff, June 21, 2022, pages 2 and 11.)

Dr. Sirakoff also completed primary treating physician's progress reports (PR-2) dated August 3, 2022, September 22, 2022, and November 3, 2022. (Exhibits 2, 3, and 4.) At the request of Dr. Sirakoff, applicant underwent MRIs of the left and right shoulders, right foot, cervical spine, lumbar spine, and right knee. (Exhibit 6, Accent Radiology, October 25, 2022, stamp pages 4 to 17.)

On December 14, 2022, Dr. Sirakoff completed an MMI/P&S report stating "I feel the factors of permanent impairment regarding the patient's lumbar spine, cervical spine, thoracic spine, bilateral shoulders, right knee, right ankle, anxiety, and hypertension are 100% caused by the direct result of the industrial injury on a continuous trauma basis from January 1, 2015[,] through May 8, 2022." (Exhibit 5, Dr. Sirakoff, December 14, 2022, page 22.)

On April 4, 2023, Panel Qualified Examiner (PQME) Jeffrey Benicker, M.D., evaluated the applicant and issued a report in which he found no cumulative injury. PQME Dr. Bernicker

stated “I concur with the decision by the Defendants to deny the claim” and further the “basis for the denial of the claim appears to have been based upon a Post-Termination defense.” PQME Dr. Bernicker notes “I am concerned regarding the absence of any independent medical evidence to corroborate the patient's testimony that she sustained an injury as a result of the performance of repetitive physical activities as part of her usual and customary position.” (Exhibit D, PQME Dr. Bernicker, April 5, 2023, pages 36 to 37.) PQME Dr. Bernicker concluded:

> In order for me to have affirmed AOE/COE in this matter, I would have needed to have seen some proof that the patient's work activities led to a worsening of the extensively documented history of non-industrial neck and back pain dating back almost a decade. Absent any such proof, I am left with the inescapable conclusion that Ms. Muratalla did not sustain an industrial injury. (Exhibit D, PQME Dr. Bernicker, April 5, 2023, page 38.)

On July 18, 2024, applicant took PQME Dr. Bernicker’s deposition which resulted in the following exchange:

> Q. And, Doctor, you say it's based on the history given to you at that time, but you had both the doctor noting that there was increased symptoms due to work, as well as the applicant coming to your office and telling you she had increased symptoms due to work, but you're not accepting that, correct?
>
> A. No, I'm not questioning that. In 2019 the record that we discussed at that moment, that single moment, the doctor indicated that the patient told her that life and work stress was contributing to her pain; I don't dispute that record.
>
> But for me to completely revise my opinion regarding AOE/COE based upon a single chart note three years prior to the end point of her employment, would be not substantial medical evidence. The weight of the evidence here argues against AOE/COE. (Exhibit 101, Deposition PQME Dr. Bernicker, July 18, 2024, page 39 line 14, to page 40, line 4.)

On September 19, 2024, Dr. Sirakoff issued a rebuttal report addressing PQME Dr. Bernicker’s opinions. Dr. Sirakoff found “[t]here is clear evidence that Ms. Muratalla suffered a cumulative trauma injury over the course of her employment at Telecare Corporation as an LVN.” (Exhibit 6, Dr. Bernicker, September 19, 2024, page 7.)

The parties proceeded to trial on January 22, 2025. At trial applicant testified under cross examination that “[b]efore she saw Dr. Sirakoff, she believed her pain in her neck, back, hands, wrists, fingers, shoulders, knees, and feet had been caused by work at Telecare.” (MOH, page 8, lines 3 to 5.) On re-direct applicant testified:

> Between 2018 and 2022 when Applicant worked part time, her symptoms that she complained about today got worse in comparison to how they had been years before.
>
> After 2018 and through 2019, she started to slow down. In 2021 and 2022, she had difficulty performing her job duties. Those physical difficulties were greater than those problems she had in 2018. (MOH, page 9, lines 5 to 9.)

At trial issues were listed as 1) injury AOE/COE, 4) section 5412 date of injury, 5) statute of limitations, and 6) "PTP versus PQME." Additional "issues" listed were 2) "Parts of body injured: Deferred," and 3) "Liens: Deferred."

After trial, the WCJ found a cumulative injury up to May 8, 2022, to the neck and back and that the section 5412 date of injury was the date of Dr. Sirakoff's initial report.[2]

DISCUSSION
I.
A.

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. (Former 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.

(Lab. Code, § 5909.)

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

[2] Finding number 4 is "[t]he date of injury per Labor Code Section 5412 is 06/02/2022, the date of Dr. Sirakoff's initial report." This date of June 2, 2022, is clearly a clerical error as Dr. Sirakoff's initial report is dated June 21, 2022. (Exhibit 1, Dr. Sirakoff, June 21, 2022.)

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 May 1, 2025, and 60 days from the date of transmission is Monday, June 30, 2025. This decision issued by or on June 30, 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 shall be notice of transmission.

According to the proof of service, the Report was served on May 1, 2025, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on May 1, 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 May 1, 2025.

B.

As found by the WCJ, while employed during the cumulative injury period through May 8, 2022, by defendant as an LVN, applicant sustained injury to the neck and back.

Defendant, in the timely filed Petition, argues 1) it was improper for the WCJ to find injury to specific body parts, 2) the wrong date of injury was found, and 3) the finding of injury is not supported by substantial evidence.

We note the Petition does not contest the finding that "[t]he statute of limitations does not bar the instant claim" and therefore appears to have conceded this finding. We see no facts of record giving rise to a statute of limitation defense. Therefore, we do not address this issue.

1.

Body Parts Injured

In the Petition defendant acknowledges the parties tried the issue of injury AOE/COE but asserts the issue of body parts was deferred and, therefore, any finding regarding body parts exceeded the WCJ's authority. (Petition page 3, lines 13 to 25.)

It is axiomatic that in determining injury it is necessary to identify the body part or parts injured. The California Supreme Court long ago confirmed the "Constitution, in our opinion, authorizes compensation for injury to the body of the workman, including every part thereof, natural or artificial, which is essential to its proper functioning." (*Pacific Indem. Co. v. IAC*. (1932) 215 Cal. 461, 465, emphasis added.)

A finding of orthopedic injury without finding a single body part that has caused the need for medical treatment or disability is unhelpful and creates confusion for defendant as to its obligation to provide benefits. "Awards of the board 'are subject to those general legal principles which circumscribe and regulate the judgments of all judicial tribunals.' [Citations.] Accordingly, they must be sufficiently certain to permit enforcement…." (*Toccalino v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1982) 128 Cal.App.3d 543, 557 [47 Cal.Comp.Cases 145].)

"[W]hile stipulations are permissible in workers' compensation cases and are treated as evidence in the nature of an admission, they are not binding on the WCJ or the WCAB. (*Turner Gas Co. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1975) 47 Cal.App.3d 286, 290-291 [40 Cal.Comp.Cases 253]; see also *Draper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 502, 508, fn. 4 [48 Cal.Comp.Cases 748], (Workers' Compensation Appeals Board does not exceed its authority in making a finding contrary to a stipulation), and *Robinson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.*, (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 784, 790 [52 Cal.Comp.Cases 419] (stipulations which arise in workers' compensation cases are not necessarily binding on the WCAB).)

Determining the body part(s) injured is integral to finding of injury AOE/COE. Defendant was clearly aware of the need to make a finding on body part(s) once the issue of injury AOE/COE was identified. To argue otherwise is disingenuous.

"Petitioner's argument is untenable for another reason. In its petition for reconsideration, petitioner did not demonstrate what evidence it could have developed and emphasized by way of cross-examination. Neither did petitioner attempt to show what new evidence it was prepared to present on the specific injury issue if the petition for reconsideration were granted. If petitioner

had information" . . . "or if it had other relevant medical evidence to present on the issue, petitioner should have so stated or made an appropriate offer of proof in its petition for reconsideration. (See *Montez v. Superior Court*, 10 Cal.App.3d 343, 351 [88 Cal.Rptr. 736]; cf. Cal. Admin. Code, tit. 8, § 10856.)" (*Turner*, *supra*, 293.)

We further observe that 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.

Here while the parties stipulated to deferring the issue of body parts, the parties also stipulated to submitting the issue of injury AOE/COE. The parties provided evidence on the issue of injury AOE/COE, which of course includes the question of body part injured. There is no surprise that the finding of injury AOE/COE required a finding of the body part injured. Defendant has not demonstrated what new evidence it would have produced on the issue of body parts injured had that issue been explicitly set for trial. Based on the above, we discern no merit in defendant's position.

2.

Date of Injury

The Petition asserts as error the finding of the section 5412 date of injury as June 2, 2022. Error is asserted in part because the applicant had knowledge of injury before June 2, 2022, and in part because defendant contends there is no substantial evidence as to the date of disability. (Petition pages 2 to 7.)

We note that a cumulative injury is defined as one "occurring as repetitive mentally or physically traumatic activities extending over a period of time, the combined effect of which causes any disability or need for medical treatment." The date of a cumulative injury shall be the date determined under section 5412. (Lab. Code, § 3208.1.)

Section 5412 states: "The date of injury in cases of occupational diseases or cumulative injuries is the date upon which the employee first suffered disability therefrom and either knew, or

in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, that such disability was caused by his present or prior employment." (Lab. Code, § 5412.) Thus, the date of injury per section 5412 is a specific day and is distinguishable from the period of industrial exposure, or the period of liability per section 5500.5 (See Lab. Code, §5500(a) (liability period is one year immediately preceding the last date on which the employee was employed in an occupation exposing him or her to the hazards of cumulative injury).)

Either compensable temporary disability or permanent disability is required to satisfy section 5412, and medical treatment alone is not disability, but it may be evidence of compensable permanent disability. (*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 998, 1005-1006 [69 Cal. Comp. Cases 579].)

We note the F&O includes as finding number four that "[t]he date of injury per Labor Code Section 5412 is 06/02/2022, the date of Dr. Sirakoff's initial report." (Emphasis added.) This date is clearly a clerical error. Dr. Sirakoff's initial report and evaluation occurred on June 21, 2022. (Exhibit 1, Dr. Sirakoff, June 21, 2022.) In addition, the WCJ clarified the date of injury in the Report:

> [T]he applicant gained knowledge of an industrial, cumulative trauma injury when the applicant first saw Dr. Sirakoff. The applicant had no medical evidence that she had suffered a cumulative trauma injury until she saw the primary treating physician. It was not until the report on 06/21/2022 that there was a combination of knowledge of injury of a cumulative trauma injury claim and disability to establish injury under Labor Code Section 5412. (Report, pages 7 to 8, emphasis added.)

Thus, we grant reconsideration to amend the findings to correct this clerical error.

As noted by the WCJ in the Report, "applicant gained knowledge of an industrial, cumulative trauma injury when the applicant first saw Dr. Sirakoff. The applicant had no medical evidence that she had suffered a cumulative trauma injury until she saw the primary treating physician. It was not until the report on 06/21/2022 that there was a combination of knowledge of injury of a cumulative trauma injury claim and disability to establish injury under Labor Code Section 5412." (Report, pages 6 to 7.) In the June 21, 2022 report, Dr. Sirakoff found applicant disabled, stating under work status, "she may not perform modified work and is to be temporarily totally disabled through 08/03/2022." (Exhibit 1, Dr. Sirakoff, June 21, 2022, page 12.)

Although the Petition places great emphasis on applicant's knowledge of injury prior to the date as found by the WCJ, it is knowledge combined with disability that establishes the date

of injury. (Lab. Code, § 5412.) Applicant's knowledge of injury alone is insufficient to establish injury. Even if such knowledge is sufficient to establish the date of injury, we would not charge applicant with knowledge in this case as such knowledge is nuanced and even an evaluating physician, PQME Dr. Bernicker, was of the medical opinion there was no injury.

Defendant contends that applicant has not yet shown disability, so that a finding as to the section 5412 date of injury is premature. It is unclear how this argument furthers defendant's other argument that the section 5412 date of injury should be based on applicant's earlier date of knowledge. We agree with the WCJ that the confluence of applicant's knowledge with disability in the form of temporary total disability found by Dr. Sirakoff establishes June 21, 2022, as the section 5412 date of injury.

3.

Substantial Evidence

The Petition asserts that there is no substantial evidence as to date of injury or injury, and further that PQME Dr. Bernicker's opinions are substantial evidence while those of Dr. Sirakoff are not substantial. (Petition page 5, line 18, to page 13, line 22.)

To be compensable, an injury must arise out of and occur in the course of employment. (Lab. Code, § 3600.) All that is required is that employment be one of the contributing causes without which the injury would not have occurred. The employee bears the burden of proving injury AOE/COE by a preponderance of the evidence. (*South Coast Framing v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (*Clark*) (2015) 61 Cal.4th 291, 297-298, 302 [80 Cal.Comp.Cases 489]; Lab. Code, §§ 3600(a); 3202.5.) Medical evidence that industrial causation was reasonably probable, although not certain, constitutes substantial evidence for a finding of injury AOE/COE. (*McAllister v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 69 Cal.2d 408, 416-417 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 660].) "That burden manifestly does not require the applicant to prove causation by scientific certainty." (*Rosas v. Worker's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 1692, 1701 [58 Cal.Comp.Cases 313].)

We note the WCJ found the applicant credible:

> Her testimony was coherent, internally consistent, and corroborated by her job description as an LVN and the other evidence in the record from the medical reports. Her answers about her job duties and injury appeared credible, providing consistent, detailed testimony that aligned with the facts about her injury. No other witnesses rebutted her testimony, and the applicant established a clear connection between the injury and the performance of her job duties over the years of working as an LVN. (Report, page 4.)

We have given the WCJ's credibility determination great weight because the WCJ had the opportunity to observe the demeanor of the witness. (*Garza v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd*. (1970) 3 Cal.3d 312, 318-319 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 500].) Furthermore, we conclude there is no evidence of considerable substantiality that would warrant rejecting the WCJ's credibility determination. (*Id*.)

Originally PQME Dr. Bernicker stated "I concur with the decision by the Defendants to deny the claim" . . . "based upon a Post-Termination defense." (Defendant Exhibit D, PQME Dr. Bernicker, April 5, 2023, pages 36 to 37.) The post termination defense generally refers to barring a claim when it is filed after notice of termination or layoff. (Lab. Code, § 3600(a)(10).) Here the post termination defense was not raised at trial (only the statute of limitations defense was raised), and the claim denial makes no reference of a post termination basis. (Exhibit A). Application of the post termination defense is a legal question for the trier of fact and not the province of medical opinion. The record is silent as to how PQME Dr. Bernicker applied the post termination defense in finding there was no industrial injury, although it is clear he considered the defense important in this case.[3]

In the Report the WCJ explains "Dr. Bernicker states that the applicant could not prove injury AOE/COE unless she provided "some proof that the patient's work activities led to a worsening of the extensively documented history of non-industrial neck and back pain dating back almost a decade." (Dr. Jeffrey Bernicker, 04/25/2023, pg. 38)" (Report, page 7.) The WCJ documented treatment records digested in PQME Dr. Bernecker's own reporting as:

> The medical records from St. Joseph Heritage Medical Group show occasions when the applicant stated her physical complaints were worse due to work activities up to 2022. For example, the records show from 2019 the applicant was experiencing "neck and RU pain increased, increased work and life/family stress are causing more pain" (Dr. Jeffrey Bernicker, 04/25/2023, pg. 21). In January 2020 the applicant's neck pain was reportedly "worse with work and cold." (Dr. Jeffrey Bernicker, 04/25/2023, pg. 22). In April 2020 the applicant was "having to work more, which is causing a slight increase in pain." (Dr. Jeffrey Bernicker, 04/25/2023. 23) Thus, the treatment records refer to the applicant's employment and neck and back pain complaints. (Report pages 6 to 7.)

[3] We also observe that PQME Dr. Bernicker devoted a large portion of his report to summarizing applicant's previous treatment to her claimed body parts, so even if defendant had asserted the post-termination defense, it would not have met its burden under section 3600(a)(10)(b).

This is more evidence of injury than the "single chart note three years prior to the end point of her employment" considered by PQME Dr. Bernicker in deposition. (Exhibit 101, Deposition PQME Dr. Bernicker, July 18, 2024, page 40, line 1 to 3.) PQME Dr. Bernicker relied on an inadequate medical history in reaching his conclusions.

"Medical reports and opinions are not substantial evidence if they are known to be erroneous, or if they are based on facts no longer germane, on inadequate medical histories and examinations, or on incorrect legal theories. Medical opinion also fails to support the Board's findings if it is based on surmise, speculation, conjecture or guess." (*Hegglin v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 162, 169 [36 Cal.Comp.Cases 93].

Here PQME Dr. Bernicker's opinions clearly suffer from being based on an incorrect legal theory, post termination defense, and he fails to explain how the post termination defense effected his reasoning and opinions. Further, PQME Dr. Bernicker relied on an inadequate medical history in providing opinions. Thus, we agree with the WCJ that PQME Dr. Bernicker's medical reports and opinions are not substantial evidence.

In conjunction with applicant's credible testimony, the WCJ relied on the substantial opinions of Dr. Sirakoff to make findings. "According to the primary treating physician and the applicant's credible testimony, the applicant sustained a cumulative trauma injury while performing the above job duties. There is substantial evidence to support a finding of injury arising out of and in the course of employment to the neck and back due to a cumulative trauma injury while working at Telecare Corporation as an LVN." (Report, page 5.)

It is clear "the relevant and considered opinion of one physician, though inconsistent with other medical opinions, may constitute substantial evidence. [citation]." (*Place v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.* (1970) 3 Cal.3d 372, 378 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 525].)

Here Dr. Sirakoff's opinions are consistent with applicant's credible testimony and the medical history. Dr. Sirakoff's opinions and reporting are substantial evidence of applicant's cumulative injury to the neck and back.

Accordingly, we grant the Petition for Reconsideration, amend the F&O to correct the section 5412 date of injury to June 21, 2022, and otherwise affirm the F&O.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration of the March 27, 2025, Findings and Order is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as the Decision After Reconsideration of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board that the F&O of March 27, 2025, is **AFFIRMED**, except that it is **AMENDED** as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

4. The date of injury per Labor Code section 5412 is June 21, 2022, the date of Dr. Sirakoff's initial report.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ ANNE SCHMITZ, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER

DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

June 30, 2025

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

KATRINA MURATALLA
LAW OFFICE OF JESSE MELENDREZ
ALBERT & MACKENZIE

PS/oo

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