

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

**JULIA BERING, *Applicant***

**vs.**

**HEALTH LINK; MARKEL INSURANCE COMPANY,  
administered by MARKEL INSURANCE SERVICES, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ17258260  
San Francisco District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER  
DENYING PETITION  
FOR REMOVAL**

Defendant has filed a petition for removal from the order setting the matter for remote trial issued on October 21, 2025, by the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ).

Defendant contends that a remote trial is not appropriate because applicant's credibility is at issue on the topic of additional panel QMEs.

We have 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.)

Here, once the parties proceed to the remote trial, they will have an opportunity to create a record, raise all relevant issues, and submit evidence. Specifically, as part of that process, the WCJ may evaluate applicant’s credibility and determine whether a continuance is warranted for in-person testimony.

Defendant raises an additional point that it believes applicant’s true purpose in requesting a remote trial may be to avoid the cost and expense of travel. While we understand and defer defendant’s objection on the issue of credibility, to the extent that defendant objects to a remote trial as a means of requiring applicant’s attorney to incur unnecessary travel expenses, such objection is overruled. Requests for professional courtesy should be liberally granted, when possible.

Accordingly, we deny removal.

For the foregoing reasons,

**IT IS ORDERED** that defendant's Petition for Removal from the order setting the matter for trial issued on May 19, 2025, by the WCJ is **DENIED**.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD**

**/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR**

**I CONCUR,**

**/s/ ANNE SCHMITZ, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER**

**/s/ PAUL F. KELLY, COMMISSIONER**



**DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

**JANUARY 9, 2026**

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

**JULIA BERING  
LAW OFFICES OF SAAM AHMADINIA  
D'ANDRE LAW**

**EDL/mt**

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