

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

MINA RADJABI, *Applicant*

vs.

**CENTURY COMMUNITIES, INC./INSPIRE HOME LOAN; BERKSHIRE
HATHAWAY HOMESTATE INSURANCE COMPANY dba BERKSHIRE HATHAWAY
HOMESTATE COMPANIES, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ16007451
Riverside District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING PETITION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Reconsideration and the contents of the Report and the Opinion on Decision of the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) with respect thereto. Based on our review of the record, and for the reasons stated in the WCJ's Report and the Opinion on Decision, both of which we adopt and incorporate, we will deny reconsideration

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.

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 June 25, 2025 and 60 days from the date of transmission is Sunday, August 24, 2025. The next business day 60 days from the date of transmission, is Monday, August 25, 2025². (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600(b).) This decision is issued by or on Monday, August 25, 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.

Here, according to the proof of service for the Report and Recommendation by the workers’ compensation administrative law judge, the Report was served on June 25, 2025, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on June 25, 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 June 25, 2025.

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.

For the foregoing reasons,

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

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR

/s/ LISA SUSSMAN, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

August 25, 2025

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

**PUREMD GROUP
PEATMAN LAW GROUP**

DLM/oo

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

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
ON PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

I.

INTRODUCTION

<u>Date of injury:</u>	Cumulative trauma July 8, 2019 to February 28, 2022.
<u>Hearings set:</u>	None set.
<u>Age on date of injury:</u>	Age 62 on 02/28/2022.
<u>Identity of Petitioner:</u>	Lien claimant representative PureMD Group Lomita.
<u>Parts of body injured:</u>	Claimed head, nervous, psyche, anxiety, sleep disorder, depression, hypertension, jaw, TMJ, and teeth.
<u>Occupation:</u>	Loan Processer.
<u>Date of Decision:</u>	06/04/2025
<u>Petition for Reconsideration was filed:</u>	Filed 06/13/2025
<u>Timeliness:</u>	The petition was timely.
<u>Verification:</u>	The petition was verified by a representative for PureMD Group Lomita for Woodland Psyche Center Woodland Hills.
<u>Petitioner's Contentions:</u>	Petitioner contends that by the Board's Decision are in excess of powers, the evidence does not justify the Findings of Fact, and the petitioner the Findings of Fact, and the petitioner discovered new evidence material to him or her, which with reasonable diligence have been discovered and produced at the hearing.
<u>Date of Transmittal to Recon Unit:</u>	06/25/2025

Lien claimant, Woodland Psyche Center Woodland Hills, by and through its representative, PureMD Group Lomita (petitioner) has filed a timely Petition for Reconsideration (EAMS DOC ID 58420093).

The defense attorney has not filed an answer or response but is expected to file one. It is recommended that reconsideration be denied.

II.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Application for Adjudication was filed on April 6, 2022 by RP Law Group Riverside. The applicant alleged injury to head 07/08/2019-02/28/2022. Order Approving Compromise and Release issued 03/21/2023 for \$60,000.00.

Saam Ahmadinia Beverly Hills for The Dental Trauma Center filed a Declaration of Readiness on 09/05/2024. PureMD filed a Notice of Representation on 10/30/2024. Defense attorney filed a substitution on or about 11/01/2024 in which Peatman Law Group became the new representative for defendant. A Lien Conference with the undersigned was held on 11/18/2024. All parties present requested a Lien Trial.

The case originally proceeded to Lien Trial, in person, on January 15, 2025. A Notice of Intent to Submit issued due to there being no appearance by Woodland Psyche Center. At the Lien Trial The Dental Trauma Center settled. Biocare RX Pharmacy withdrew lien on 01/17/2025. PureMD Group objected to 10-day Notice of Intention to Submit on 01/17/2025, stating that the lien representative was in a traffic accident. The case proceeded to Lien Trial on 04/10/2025.

Findings, Orders, and Opinion on Decision issued on 06/04/2025 in which it was concluded that Woodland Psyche Center failed to prove injury AOE/COE and was to take nothing. Petitioner filed a Petition for Reconsideration dated 06/12/2025, which was received on June 13, 2025.

Defense attorney has not filed a response or answer, but this could be because the petitioner served defense attorney and insurance company using an e-mail address rather than all parties of record by U.S. mail. The Notice of Representation by Byron Lansford includes a statement of e-mail service only being accepted at mail@peatmanlawgroup.com. Further, it does not appear that the employer was served, which may be an adverse party pursuant to Labor Code 5905. The undersigned could not confirm that the e-mail address for Berkshire Hathaway is correct. Peatman Law Group and Berkshire Hathaway were not served at addresses according to Official Address Record. It is suspected that defendant's first Notice of Reconsideration will be service of the Report and Recommendation.

III.

DISCUSSION

The undersigned issued Findings, Orders, and Opinion on Decision 06/04/2025 (EAMS DOC ID 79236770; 79236778).

Petitioner filed a Petition for Reconsideration on June 12, 2025 (EAMS DOC ID 58420093, hereinafter "Reconsideration"). It is timely. The petitioner has alleged the following:

1. The Board acted without or in excess of its powers.
2. The evidence does not justify the findings of fact.
3. The petitioner has discovered new evidence material to case that could not with

reasonable diligence be discovered and produced at hearing.

Petitioner has discussed five (5) main arguments:

1. The lien claimant established causation;
2. The lien claimant was denied due process for not being served defense exhibits and the exhibits being admitted into evidence;
3. The lien claimant should be allowed medical-legal charges;
4. Treatment should be paid for due to Labor Code 5401 and presumption of compensability;
5. The 10-day letter from applicant attorney that was not listed or submitted into evidence indicates that treatment was not offered and the failure contributed to a worsening of applicant's condition.

CAUSATION

The petitioner produced nine (9) exhibits for Trial and had no witnesses. The petitioner argues that there was a discussion of causation in the consultation of 05/06/2022. The undersigned discussed and reviewed all exhibits of lien claimant. It appears that the petitioner focused on Exhibit 4.

Exhibit four (4) is an initial office consultation report by Judith Schwafel, Ph.D., dated 05/06/2022. The report discussed her problems at work and gave her diagnoses. The doctor stated the following: The events of injury arising from work were predominantly causative of injury to the psyche. The doctor also said the following: In order to provide a more definitive analysis of the percentages of causation of psyche injury, there should be a review of relevant personnel records, medical records, and any other investigative or discovery records. This could be provided in an initial comprehensive medical-legal evaluation upon the request by a party.

In the report there was no section entitled "causation." Applicant attorney reportedly elected Thomas Curtis to treat the applicant and did not request a medical legal report as indicated in Exhibit 9. The focus of the report was for treatment and not for proving a claim.

It should also be noted that applicant Mina Radjabi was contacted by defendant on March 25, 2022 with information regarding the Medical Provider Network (Exhibit A). A claim form was attached, as one was not previously completed. Further, the applicant attorney was provided with a letter dated April 18, 2022, indicating that Dr. Curtis is not in the Medical Provider Network. This was copied on applicant. The applicant could have chosen a doctor in the Medical Provider Network after notification on March 25, 2022 up until the case was denied on June 13,

2022 (Exhibit C). Although not specifically discussed in the Opinion on Decision, it appears that the first two dates of service would be the result of impermissible treatment outside the Medical Provider Network. The first two dates of services would not be compensable as defendant offered treatment in the Medical Provider Network and applicant attorney was made aware of the impermissible treatment outside the MPN.

The undersigned concluded that the medical reporting did not comply with CCR 9793(h).

The defendant presented subpoenaed records from AIG (Exhibit J). Within those records was a report of an MRI report of brain dated 03/27/2015 (p. 1508 overall, pp 24-25 of 106) in which it was indicated that the applicant reported a work related traumatic brain injury on 03/05/2014. She was examined by a neurologist, Mark Emas, who noted she had a concussion secondary to cerebral trauma. Applicant had several evaluation with EMAS Spine and Brain Specialists. A patient questionnaire also noted she had history of anxiety, depression, and PTSD from war. She had complaints of decreases in memory, concentration, dizziness, blurriness, tinnitus, increased anxiety and fatigue. She was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder by Alan J. Harris PH. D. in his report dated 10/14/2015 (p. 1575, or p. 91 out of 106 pages).

The reporting of Dr. Curtis, Dr. Schwafel contained in Exhibits 4, 5, and 6 are incapable of proving industrial injury as they are not substantial evidence on causation, medical reporting due to insufficient discussion of causation and prior medical history as indicated in the excerpts and portions of subpoenaed records from AIG (Defense Exhibit J). The Medical Provider Network may be applied regardless of date of injury (*Babbitt v. Ow Jing dba National Market* (2007) 72 CCC 70, 80 (appeals board *en banc*)).

Additionally, it appears that the first two dates of service are not compensable as the defendant offered treatment and instructed the applicant to report to Kaiser for treatment (Exhibit D).

DUE PROCESS

Petitioner argues it was denied due process. The lien claimant was given every opportunity to participate, present evidence, and even admitted evidence offered (Exhibits 1-9). Lien claimant objected to evidence offered by defendant in what appeared to be a tactic in response to defense objections to some of lien claimant's evidence.

In the petition the lien claimant stated that the WCJ deprived the lien claimant of opportunity to review or object in a meaningful way to defense exhibits A and D-I. It should be

noted that some of the exhibits were offered by defendant in initial Trial in which Woodland Psyche failed to appear. There was no objection to 3 exhibits offered in objection to Notice of Intent to Submit.

Here it is evident that the lien claimant was served pursuant to Proof of Service dated December 9, 2024 (EAMS Doc ID 55314932). Pursuant to California Evidence Code 641: A letter correctly addressed and properly mailed is presumed to have been received in the ordinary course of mail. Further, it appears that the defendant complied with CCR 10625.

Service by defendant was valid and there was no violation of petitioner's due process rights.

MEDICAL-LEGAL CHARGES

Petitioner has argued that the reporting of the lien claimant is capable of proving an industrial injury and is a medical-legal report, and referred to CCR 9397(H). It appears that lien claimant is referring to 9793(h). It does not comply with this section as it was not obtained and requested by a party for the purpose of proving or disproving a contested claim. The request by applicant attorney was for treatment.

There was no contested claim until after denial on June 13, 2022, and after that date none of the reports from petitioner (5 & 6) are capable of proving or disproving a disputed fact or proving injury. The reporting by the lien claimant does not comply with California Code of Regulations 9793(h).

The exhibits from petitioner did not comply with Labor Code 4628 in that there was not a complete history, prior medical records were not summarized, and according to Labor Code 4628(e), failure to comply with requirements of this section make the report inadmissible.

The first report dated May 6, 2022 (Exhibit 4) is not compensable as it is outside the MPN, should not be admissible because it does not comply with Labor Code 4628, and is incapable of proving injury AOE/COE, and was procured when there was no medical-legal dispute.

LABOR CODE 5401 AND PRESUMPTION OF INJURY

It appears that lien claimant is claiming that the defendant failed to provide treatment pursuant to Labor Code 5401 and Labor Code 5402(c) that the defendant failed to provide treatment for which defendant was legally required to do. The lien claimant provided no evidence of the failure of defendant to provide treatment. In fact, the defendant provided notices to applicant and applicant attorney of treatment being required and offered in the Medical Provider network.

The defendant fulfilled the obligation pursuant to Labor Code 4600 by sending notices and how to access the MPN, letters regarding appointments with MPN providers until denial on June 13, 2022.

The lien claimant did not prove a denial of care, failure to timely offer care, or that the injury was presumed compensable or that treatment must be payable and allowed up to \$10,000.00.

These sections do not apply, as the petitioner never established date of notice or when a claim form was filed or served.

**ADMISSABILITY OF LETTER FROM APPLICANT ATTORNEY DATED 04/14/2022
THAT WAS NOT PRESENTED AT TRIAL**

Petitioner apparently seeks to enter into evidence a letter from applicant attorney dated April 14, 2022 that requests treatment with a mental health specialist. The letter was not offered by lien claimant at Trial. Pursuant to Labor Code 5502 (d) (3) the evidence is not admissible. Further, the petitioner did not offer any evidence why the evidence was not available or could not have been discovered with the exercise of reasonable diligence. This document is not admissible and petitioner did not provide any evidence, information, or an explanation regarding why the document could not have been discovered prior to listing exhibits at Trial.

Even assuming that the evidence was admissible, the applicant had been offered treatment in the Medical Provider Network and the defendant even objected to treatment with Dr. Thomas Curtis on April 18, 2022 (Exhibit E). This document is inadmissible and even if it was admissible, it is not capable of proving that the lien claimant is entitled to reimbursement for medical treatment or medical- legal charges.

IV.

RECOMMENDATION

It is respectfully recommended that the lien claimant's Petition for Reconsideration be denied.

DATE: 06/25/2025

Eric Thompson
WORKERS' COMPENSATION
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

OPINION ON DECISION

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Application for Adjudication alleging injury to head, circulatory system, nervous system, multiple, and nervous system was filed 04/06/2022. The case settled by Compromise and Release on 03/21/2023. The Compromise and Release noted that the defendant maintained the denial AOE/COE. The applicant also agreed to waive supplemental job displacement benefits pursuant to the Beltran case as there was a bona fide dispute regarding AOE/COE.

The lien of Woodland Psyche Center Woodland Hills was filed April 10, 2023. The initial filing indicated that the lien was \$5,238.53. The billing indicated that there were 23 dates of service from 05/06/2022-03/23/2023.

Biocare withdrew their lien and The Dental Trauma Center resolved their lien at Lien Trial on January 15, 2025.

The law firm of Rosenberg Yudin LLP substituted in place of Siegel Moreno on May 31, 2023. The case proceeded to Lien Trial first on 01/15/2025. Since lien claimant failed to appear a 10-day Notice of Intent to Submit issued and lien claimant filed an objection to Notice of Intent due to the representative reportedly being in a motor vehicle accident. The case was again set for Trial on April 10, 2025 and proceeded forward on that day and was considered submitted on April 10, 2025.

STIPULATIONS

Mina Radjabi, born xx/xx/xxxx, while employed during the period 07/08/2019 to 02/28/2022, as a loan processor, at Newport Beach, California by Century Communities, Inc. / Inspire Home Loan claims to have sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment to head (headaches), nervous (stress), psyche, anxiety, sleep disorder, depression, hypertension, jaw, TMJ, and teeth.

At the time of the injury, the employer's workers' compensation carrier was Berkshire Hathaway Homestate Insurance Company dba Berkshire Hathaway Homestate Companies.

The employer has furnished some medical treatment.

ISSUES

The issues are:

1. Injury arising out of and in the course of employment to head (headaches), nervous (stress), psyche, anxiety, sleeping disorder, depression, hypertension, jaw, TMJ and

teeth.

2. Lien of Woodland Psyche Center Woodland Hills for treatment in the amount of \$5,238.53 in which zero has been paid.
3. Whether defendant is liable for non-MPN medical treatment up to the date of denial.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES OF ADMISSABILITY OF EXHIBITS

At Trial, the defendant objected to admissibility of lien claimant's exhibits 1-9. The lien claimant also objected to defense exhibits A & D-I.

The Proof of Service from defendant dated 12/09/2024 provides evidence that the defense exhibits were served on lien claimant. Defense exhibits A & D-I are admitted into evidence as they were properly listed and served.

Woodland Psyche Center Woodland Hills did list exhibits in Pre-Trial Conference Statement on 11/20/2024. Therefore, exhibits 1-9 are admitted into evidence.

INJURY ARISING OUT OF AND IN THE COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT

Pursuant to Labor Code 5705, "The burden of proof rests upon the party or lien claimant holding the affirmative of the issue." The lien claimant has the affirmative of proving it was entitled to more money. Evidence can be offered in multiple forms. It could be in the form of testimony or documents.

Labor Code 3202.5 requires all parties and lien claimants to meet the evidentiary burden of proof on all issues by a "preponderance of the evidence." This means "evidence that, when weighed with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and the greater probability of truth."

A lien claimant has the affirmative burden of proving all elements necessary to the establishment of its lien by a preponderance of the evidence. Before it may recover anything pursuant to that lien it must prove AOE/COE and reasonableness of charges and treatment (reference LC 3202.5 & 5705; *Torres v. AJC Sandblasting* (2012) 77 CCC 1113, 1120 (en banc); *Tapia v. Skill Master Staffing* (2008) 73 CCC 1338, 1342-43 (en banc); *Kunz v. Patterson Floor Coverings, Inc.* (2002) 67 CCC 1588, 1592 (en banc)).

This case was settled by Compromise and Release on 03/21/2023 while the case was in a denied state.

Lien exhibits 1&2 included billing from 05/06/2022-03/18/2023 (itemized and CMS 1500 billing forms).

Lien claimant exhibit three (3) totals three pages and is dated 05/06/2022. It is labeled

Woodland Psyche Center Progress Note. There were multiple boxes checked regarding presenting complaints. There was a box checked for TTD. Attached was also a request for authorization. There was no discussion of causation.

Exhibit four (4) is an initial office consultation report by Judith Schwafel, Ph.D. The report discussed her problems at work and gave her diagnoses. The doctor stated the following: The events of injury arising from work were predominantly causative of injury to the psyche. The doctor also said the following: In order to provide a more definitive analysis of the percentages of causation of psyche injury, there should be a review of relevant personnel records, medical records, and any other investigative or discovery records. This could be provided in an initial comprehensive medical-legal evaluation upon the request by a party.

Exhibit five (5) was labeled “Special Report on Temporary Total Disability.” The report discussed a flare-up and finding that applicant was TTD on a psychological basis.

Exhibit six (6) is labeled “Special Report on Request for Further Cognitive behavioral Therapy.” It discusses necessity of applicant receiving cognitive behavioral therapy.

Lien claimant’s exhibit seven (7) was the original Application for Adjudication. Exhibit eight (8) is the Notice and Request for Allowance of Lien dated 04/10/2023.

Exhibit nine (9) is a designation of Dr. Thomas Curtis as treating physician pursuant to Labor Code 4600.

The lien claimant steps in the shoes of the applicant to establish all necessary elements by a preponderance of evidence. This includes AOE/COE.

There were no witnesses for either party. The medical reports included lien claimants exhibits 3, 4, 5, and 6 are incapable of proving industrial injury. The report was requested by applicant attorney for treatment and not regarding AOE/COE. It does not comply with CCR 9793(h). The focus was on treatment and justifying treatment. Consequently, it is found that the lien claimant did not carry burden of proving injury AOE/COE to head (headaches), nervous (stress), psyche, anxiety, sleep disorder, depression, hypertension, jaw, TMJ, and teeth.

LIEN OF WOODLAND PSYCHE CENTER FOR TREATMENT

In this case, it appears that the applicant did obtain treatment that was not authorized by the employer. The treatment may be self-procured. In this case, there was no medical emergency. There has been no consent to the treatment. It does not appear that the employer neglected or refused to provide treatment due to the notices to the applicant.

A lien claimant has the affirmative burden of proving all elements necessary to the establishment of its lien by a preponderance of the evidence. Before it may recover anything pursuant to that lien (reference LC 3202.5 & 5705; *Torres v. AJC Sandblasting* (2012) 77 CCC 1113, 1120 (en banc); *Tapia v. Skill Master Staffing* (2008) 73 CCC 1338, 1342-43 (en banc); *Kunz v. Patterson Floor Coverings, Inc.* (2002) 67 CCC 1588, 1592 (en banc)).

The lien claimant provided 23 dates of service and separate charges from 05/06/2022-03/18/2023. The total charges were \$5,238.53.

The applicant was sent an initial Notification of Rights packet on March 25, 2022. It did include medical provider network information and how to access treatment (Exhibit A). It was served on the applicant. Thereafter the applicant was sent a Notice of Delay dated 04/07/2022 (Exhibit B). The applicant was sent a Notice of Denial on 06/13/2022.

The applicant was sent a notice of an authorization of appointment with Dr. Gregory Bouyer on April 29, 2022 (Exhibit D). The defendant objected to applicant treating with Dr. Thomas Curtis (who must have been at Woodland Psyche Center) based on the provider being outside the medical provider network (Exhibit E). Another letter was sent to applicant attorney on 05/24/2022 (Exhibit F).

There has been no prior determination of a threshold issue: AOE/COE. There are multiple dates of service for treatment. The lien claimant did not prove injury AOE/COE.

Pursuant to Labor Code 4600, an employer is required to furnish medical treatment that is reasonably required to cure or relieve an injured worker from the effects of an industrial injury. The defendant initially served the applicant a packet on March 25, 2022. The packet had sufficient information and references to put the applicant on notice that there was a medical provider network for the applicant to make an inquiry regarding the medical provider network.

The employer's liability was not determined until this decision. Liability was contested up until the Compromise and Release was filed and approved on 03/21/2023. It is found herein that the Woodland Psyche Center did not carry the burden of proving injury AOE/COE. Therefore, since the lien claimant failed to prove injury AOE/COE it is unnecessary to prove the elements of reasonableness of treatment.

WHETHER DEFENDANT IS LIABLE FOR NON-MEDICAL PROVIDER NETWORK TREATMENT

It was determined that the Woodland Psyche Center did not carry the burden of proving

injury AOE/COE and therefore any treatment charges would not be compensable. Since this is the case, it is unnecessary to discuss whether non-MPN treatment prior to denial notice if compensable. If it was necessary, the treatment from for the first two dates of treatment on 05/06/2022 and 06/09/2022 would not be compensable as the defendant satisfied Labor Code 4600 through its MPN in offering treatment.

CONCLUSION

Woodland Psyche Center did not carry burden of proving injury AOE/COE and therefore the lien of Woodland Psyche Center not compensable. Woodland Psyche Center takes nothing by virtue of this decision.

DATE: June 4, 2025

Eric Thompson
WORKERS'COMPENSATION
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

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

MINA RADJABI, *Applicant*

vs.

**CENTURY COMMUNITIES, INC./INSPIRE HOME LOAN; BERKSHIRE
HATHAWAY HOMESTATE INSURANCE COMPANY dba BERKSHIRE HATHAWAY
HOMESTATE COMPANIES, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ16007451
Riverside District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
CORRECTING
CLERICAL ERROR**

It has come to the Appeals Board's attention that its Opinion and Order Denying Petition for Reconsideration served on August 25, 2025 contains a clerical error consisting of an incorrect title on the third signature line. The correct title for panelist Lisa Sussman is "Deputy Commissioner" rather than "Commissioner."

We correct this clerical error by virtue of this decision without granting reconsideration, as such errors may be corrected without further proceedings at any time. (See 2 *Cal. Workers' Comp. Practice* (Cont. Ed. Bar, March 2019 Update) Supplemental Proceedings, § 23.74, p. 23-76.)

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the title in the third signature line of the Opinion and Order Denying Petition for Reconsideration served on August 25, 2025 is **CORRECTED** to “Deputy Commissioner” as reflected below.

WORKERS’ COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR

/s/ LISA A. SUSSMAN, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

August 29, 2025

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

**PUREMD GROUP
PEATMAN LAW GROUP**

PAG/oo

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