

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

MARIA A LEYVA TORRES, *Applicant*

vs.

**ESPARZA ENTERPRISES, INC., permissibly self-insured,
administered by PACIFIC CLAIMS MANAGEMENT, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ19549540; ADJ16500248
Van Nuys District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING PETITION
FOR REMOVAL**

Defendant has filed a petition for removal from the order taking the matter off calendar issued on June 16, 2025, by the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ).

Defendant contends that it should proceed upon its affirmative post-termination defense prior to obtaining an evaluation of applicant's injury.

We have not received an Answer from applicant. The WCJ filed a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Removal (Report) recommending that we deny removal.

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Removal and the contents of the WCJ's Report. 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.

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).) Furthermore, decisions of 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].) 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, § 10761.)

In workers’ compensation, the general rule is that all matters are submitted at a single trial. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10787(a).) However, it is within the discretion of a WCJ to bifurcate any issue if good cause is presented. Here, and for the reasons discussed by the WCJ in the Report, we agree that the WCJ properly exercised discretion in declining to bifurcate the issue of Labor Code section 3600(a)(10).

Accordingly, we deny removal.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that defendant's Petition for Removal from the order taking the matter off calendar issued on June 16, 2025, by the WCJ is **DENIED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ CRAIG L. SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

OCTOBER 22, 2025

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

**MARIA A. LEYVA TORRES
SAG LAW GROUP
MICHAEL SULLIVAN & ASSOCIATES**

EDL/mt

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