

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

ANDRES CATALAN, *Applicant*

vs.

**TRADEMARK CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.;
ADMINSURE, INC., *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ13762395
Van Nuys District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DISMISSING PETITION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

The Petition for Reconsideration of the decision issued on November 15, 2023 by a workers' compensation arbitrator (WCA) has been withdrawn by petitioner.

The proceedings herein arise out of an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) program authorized under Labor Code section 3201.5¹. The statute provides that “the decision of the arbiter or board of arbitration is subject to review by the appeals board in the same manner as provided for reconsideration of a final order, decision, or award made and filed by a workers' compensation administrative law judge pursuant to the procedures set forth in Article 1 (commencing with Section 5900) of Chapter 7 of Part 4 of Division 4, and the court of appeals pursuant to the procedures set forth in Article 2 (commencing with Section 5950) of Chapter 7 of Part 4 of Division 4, governing orders, decisions, or awards of the appeals board.” (Lab. Code, § 3201.5(a).)

Only the Appeals Board is statutorily authorized to issue a decision on a petition for reconsideration. (Lab. Code, §§ 112, 115, 5301, 5901, 5908.5, 5950; see Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, §§ 10320, 10330.) The Appeals Board must conduct de novo review as to the merits of the petition and review the entire proceedings in the case. (Lab. Code, §§ 5906, 5908; see Lab. Code, §§ 5301, 5315, 5701, 5911.) Once a final decision by the Appeals Board on the merits of the petition issues,

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

the parties may seek review under section 5950, but appellate review is limited to review of the record certified by the Appeals Board. (Lab. Code, §§ 5901, 5951.)

Former section 5909 provided that a petition was denied by operation of law if the Appeals Board did not “act on” the petition within 60 days of the petition’s filing. However, the Appeals Board cannot “act on” the petition if it has not received it, and if it has not received the case file. Transmission of the case to the Appeals Board 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, the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on March 10, 2026.

In *Shiple v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1104, 1108 [57 Cal.Comp.Cases 493], the Appeals Board denied applicant’s petition for reconsideration because it had not acted on the petition within the statutory time limits of section 5909. This occurred because the Appeals Board had misplaced the file, through no fault of the parties. The Court of Appeal reversed the Appeals Board’s decision holding that the time to act on applicant’s petition was tolled during the period that the file was misplaced. (*Id.* at p. 1108.) Pursuant to the holding in *Shiple* allowing equitable tolling of the 60-day time period in section 5909, the Appeals Board acts to grant, dismiss, or deny such petitions for reconsideration within 60 days of receipt of the petition, and thereafter issues a decision on the merits.

If a timely filed petition is never acted upon and considered by the Appeals Board because it is “deemed denied” due to an administrative irregularity and not through the fault of the parties, the petitioning party is deprived of their right to a decision on the merits of the petition. (Lab. Code, §5908.5; see *Evans v. Workmen’s Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal.2d 753, 754-755 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 350]; *LeVesque v. Workmen’s Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1970) 1 Cal.3d 627, 635 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 16].) Just as significantly, the parties’ ability to seek meaningful appellate review is compromised, raising issues of due process. (Lab. Code, §§ 5901, 5950, 5952; see *Evans, supra*, 68 Cal.2d 753.) Like the Court in *Shiple*, “we are not convinced that the burden of the system’s inadequacies should fall on [a party].” (*Shiple, supra*, 7 Cal.App.4th at p. 1108.) The touchstone of the workers’ compensation system is our constitutional mandate to “accomplish substantial justice in all cases expeditiously, inexpensively, and without incumbrance of any character.” (Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4.) “Substantial justice” is not a euphemism for inadequate justice. Instead, it is an exhortation that the workers’ compensation system must focus on the *substance* of justice,

rather than on the arcana or minutiae of its administration. (See Lab. Code, § 4709.) When a litigant is deprived of their due process rights based upon the administrative errors of a third party, for which they bear no blame and over whom they have no control, substantial justice cannot be compatible with such a draconian result.

The Appeals Board has relied on the *Shiple*y precedent for over thirty years,² by continuing to consider all timely filed petitions for reconsideration on the merits, consistent with due process. Treating all petitions for reconsideration in the same or similar way procedurally promotes judicial stability, consistency, and predictability and safeguards due process for all litigants. We also observe that a decision on the merits of the petition protects every litigant's right to seek meaningful appellate review after receiving a final decision from the Appeals Board.

Consequently, as discussed below, we apply the doctrine of equitable tolling pursuant to *Shiple*y to this case. Here, the WCA issued the F&A on November 15, 2023. Defendant timely served its Petition on the WCAB on December 14, 2023. However, for reasons that are not entirely clear from the record, the Appeals Board did not receive the complete case file for review. Accordingly, the Appeals Board failed to act on the petition within 60 days, through no fault of the parties. We note that neither party sought judicial review despite our failure to act. The case came to the attention of the Appeals Board on March 10, 2026, and was transmitted to the Appeals Board on March 10, 2026. Under the circumstances, the requirements for equitable tolling have been satisfied in this case.

Previously, on October 13, 2025, defendant filed a request for withdrawal of the Petition.

Accordingly, we dismiss the Petition for Reconsideration.

² On December 11, 2024, the California Supreme Court granted review in *Mayor v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd.* (2024) 104 Cal.App.5th 713 [2024 Cal.App. LEXIS 531] ("*Mayor*"). One issue granted for review is the same issue present in this case, i.e., whether section 5909 is subject to equitable tolling. The Supreme Court noted the conflict present in the published decisions of the Courts of Appeal, and in its order granting review of *Mayor*, allowed the exercise of discretion to continue to apply *Shiple*y. (Order Granting Petition for Review, S287261, December 11, 2024.)

For the foregoing reasons,

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

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

MARCH 20, 2026

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

**REYES ASSOCIATES
ADMINSURE
HANNA BROPHY**

TD/bp

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