

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

KYLE GREEN, *Applicant*

vs.

CORNERSTONE CAPITAL GROUP, INC.; UNITED WISCONSIN INSURANCE COMPANY administered by NEXT LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS; AVIATION PORT SERVICES LLC; LARS TONY HOGDAHL, an individual and a beneficial interest holder of AVIATION PORT SERVICES LLC; UNINSURED EMPLOYERS BENEFITS TRUST FUND, *Defendants*

**Adjudication Number: ADJ13930082
Sacramento District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING
PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND
NOTICE OF INTENTION TO
RESCIND ARBITRATOR'S DECISION**

Defendant, Cornerstone Capital Group, Inc., and United Wisconsin Insurance Company administered by Next Level Administrators (Cornerstone Capital), seeks reconsideration of the November 30, 2025 Findings and Order (F&O), wherein the workers' compensation arbitrator (WCA) found that (1) Exhibits A-J are admitted; (2) the Workers' Compensation policy No. WC509-00202-020-SZ was not properly cancelled at the time of applicant's injury; (3) the circumstances of applicant's injury were not excluded under the terms of the contract between Aviation Port Services and Cornerstone Capital Group; and (4) applicant's injury of November 7, 2020, sustained while employed by Aviation Port Services, was covered under Workers' Compensation policy No. WC509-00202-020-SZ, issued by United Wisconsin Insurance Company. The WCA then ordered that United Wisconsin Insurance Company shall provide workers' compensation benefits to applicant arising from his injury on November 7, 2020, while employed by Aviation Port Services.

Defendant contends that Aviation Port Services LLC applied to be a Cornerstone Capital client, but did not onboard any employees; applicant was never an employee of Cornerstone Capital per contract; a WCIRB database report is not evidence of coverage; and that workers'

compensation policy No. WC509-00202-020-SZ was flat cancelled on August 4, 2020, before applicant's date of injury.

We have not received an answer from any party. The WCA prepared a Report on Reconsideration (Report), recommending that the Petition be denied.

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Reconsideration and the Report of the WCA. Based on our review of the record, and for the reasons discussed below, we will grant the Petition and issue a Notice of Intention (NIT) to rescind the November 30, 2025 decision by the WCA unless all required documents per WCAB Rule 10995(c)(3) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10995(c)(3) are filed in the Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS) within thirty (30) days after service of this decision, plus an additional five (5) days for mailing per WCAB Rule 10605 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10605).

FACTS

We will briefly review the relevant facts.

Applicant filed an Application for Adjudication of Claim (Application) alleging he sustained injury AOE/COE while employed by Aviation Port Services LLC, insured by United Wisconsin Ins. New Berlin as a ramp agent on November 2, 2020, to his lower extremity when he was run over by a luggage cart. (Application, December 1, 2020.)

The matter proceeded to a Videoconference Arbitration between applicant, Cornerstone Capital and Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund on September 23, 2024. An Arbitration Transcript (Transcript) was submitted. Regarding the stipulations, issues and exhibits of the parties, the transcript stated:

JUDGE MASON: We have had extensive discussions considering the facts surrounding this issue of who the employer was at the time of applicant's injury. The parties will meet and attempt to agree upon a set of facts and also a list of issues that they want the undersigned to decide.

There is a question of a contract between Cornerstone Capital Group and Aviation Services. And once that contract is received, it will be served upon all parties and filed with the arbitrator.

At the conclusion of those 15 days, the parties will have an additional 15 days to submit post-arbitration briefs and the matter will then be submitted for decision.

All right. Anything additional?

ATTORNEY ROA: No. That's it.

...

Disposition: Hold this matter for 30 days for an agreed upon statement of facts and issues and post-arbitration briefs. And upon the expiration of those 30 days, unless there is a request for an extension, an order of submission shall issue.

ATTORNEY YANG: And I think all of us need a copy of this so we can follow the Judge's orders.

ATTORNEY WILLIAMS: Yep.

THE REPORTER: You too, Mr. Roa?

ATTORNEY ROA: Yes, please.

(Transcript, at pp. 4:4-18; 9:8-17.)

Next, on May 6, 2025, a "Minutes of Pre-Arbitration" issued. Stipulations regarding testimony were discussed, no issues were mentioned and exhibits were discussed as follows:

Exhibits shall be filed within 10 days of the trial. Cornerstone will use numbers 1 through 10. UEF will use numbers 15 through 30, and Applicant will use letters A to Z.

(Minutes of Pre-Arbitration, May 6, 2025.)

The matter was then continued to a half day arbitration at the first available date after July 15, 2025.

On November 30, 2025, the F&O and a Statement of Reasons for Determination (Statement) issued. Regarding stipulations of the parties, the F&O is silent but the WCA's Statement reports: "The parties did not agree to a joint statement of facts." (Statement, at p. 1:17.) Similarly, the WCA's Statement lists Issues 1-3 followed by his determinations on each issue. (Statement, at pp. 2:19-4:17.) The F&O admits Exhibits A-J into evidence. (F&O, at pp. 1:19-2:12.)

It is from this F&O that Cornerstone Capital seeks reconsideration.

DISCUSSION

I.

Preliminarily, we note that 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.

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 January 5, 2026 and 60 days from the date of transmission is March 6, 2026. This decision was issued by or on March 6, 2026, 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.

¹ All further references are to the Labor Code unless otherwise stated.

Here, according to the proof of service for the Report and Recommendation by the WCA, the Report was served on January 5, 2026, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on January 5, 2026. 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 January 5, 2026.

II.

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, 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.)

A petition for reconsideration of an arbitrator's decision or award made pursuant to the mandatory or voluntary arbitration provisions of sections 5270 through 5275 shall be filed in EAMS or with the district office having venue in accordance with section 5501.5. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10995.)

WCAB Rule 10995 further provides that if the arbitrator does not rescind the order, decision or award within 15 days of receiving the petition for reconsideration, the arbitrator is required to forward an electronic copy of their report and the complete arbitration file within 15 days after receiving the petition for reconsideration pursuant to WCAB Rule 10995(c)(3). (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10995(c)(1)-(3).)

WCAB Rule 10914 requires the arbitrator to make and maintain the record of the arbitration proceeding, which must include the following:

- (1) Order Appointing Arbitrator;
- (2) Notices of appearance of the parties involved in the arbitration;
- (3) Minutes of the arbitration proceedings, identifying those present, the date of the proceeding, the disposition and those served with the minutes or the identification of the party designated to serve the minutes;

- (4) Pleadings, petitions, objections, briefs and responses filed by the parties with the arbitrator;
- (5) Exhibits filed by the parties;
- (6) Stipulations and issues entered into by the parties;
- (7) Arbitrator's Summary of Evidence containing evidentiary rulings, a description of exhibits admitted into evidence, the identification of witnesses who testified and summary of witness testimony;
- (8) Verbatim transcripts of witness testimony if witness testimony was taken under oath;
- (9) Findings, orders, awards, decisions and opinions on decision made by the arbitrator; and
- (10) Arbitrator's report on petition for reconsideration, removal or disqualification.

(Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10914(c).)

WCAB Rule 10803(a)(2) states in relevant part that:

(a) The Workers' Compensation Appeals Board's adjudication file shall consist of:

(2) The record of proceedings, which consists of: the pleadings, minutes of hearing, summaries of evidence, certified transcripts, proofs of service, admitted evidence, exhibits identified but not admitted as evidence, notices, petitions, briefs, findings, orders, decisions and awards, opinions on decision, reports and recommendations on petitions for reconsideration and/or removal, and the arbitrator's file, if any. Each of these documents is part of the record of proceedings, whether maintained in paper or electronic form. Documents that are in the adjudication file but have not been received or offered as evidence are not part of the record of proceedings.

(Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10803(a)(2).)

WCAB Rule 10615 states in relevant part that:

All documents required or permitted to be filed under the rules of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board shall be filed in EAMS² or with the district office

² Pursuant to WCAB Rule 10305(j) (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10305(j)):

“Electronic Adjudication Management System” or “EAMS” means the computerized case management system used by the Division of Workers' Compensation to electronically store and maintain adjudication files and to perform other case management functions.

having venue, except as otherwise provided by these rules or ordered or allowed by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.

(Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10615.)

The record does not contain the minutes of the arbitration proceedings seemingly scheduled after July 15, 2025, identifying those present, the date of the proceeding, the disposition and those served with the minutes or the identification of the party designated to serve the minutes. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10914(c)(3).) Nor does the record reflect the pleadings, petitions, objections, briefs and responses filed by the parties with the arbitrator, if any. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10914(c)(4).) The record does not clearly reflect exhibits offered by each party or objection thereto, if any. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10914(c)(5).) Additionally, the record does not include stipulations and issues entered into by the parties. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10914(c)(6).) Finally, the record does not contain the arbitrator's summary of evidence containing evidentiary rulings, a description of exhibits admitted into evidence. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10914(c)(7).)

The Appeals Board may not ignore due process for the sake of expediency. (*Barri v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2018) 28 Cal.App.5th 428, 469 [83 Cal.Comp.Cases 1643] [claimants in workers' compensation proceedings are not denied due process when proceedings are delayed in order to ensure compliance with the mandate to accomplish substantial justice]; *Rucker v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 151, 157-158 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 805][all parties to a workers' compensation proceeding retain the fundamental right to due process and a fair hearing under both the California and United States Constitutions].) "Even though workers' compensation matters are to be handled expeditiously by the Board and its trial judges, administrative efficiency at the expense of due process is not permissible." (*Fremont Indem. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 965, 971 [49 Cal.Comp.Cases 288]; see *Ogden Entertainment Services v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Von Ritzhoff)* (2014) 233 Cal.App.4th 970, 985 [80 Cal.Comp.Cases 1].)

The Appeals Board's constitutional requirement to accomplish substantial justice means that the Appeals Board must protect the due process rights of every person seeking reconsideration. (See *San Bernardino Cmty. Hosp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1999) 74 Cal.App.4th 928, 936 [64 Cal.Comp.Cases 986] ["essence of due process is...notice and the opportunity to be heard"]; *Katzin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 703, 710 [57 Cal.Comp.Cases 230].) In fact, "a denial of due process renders the appeals board's decision unreasonable..." and therefore vulnerable to a writ of review. (*Von Ritzhoff, supra*, 233 Cal.App.4th at p. 985 citing Lab. Code,

§ 5952(a), (c).) Thus, due process requires a meaningful consideration of the merits of every case de novo with a well-reasoned decision based on the evidentiary record and the relevant law.

As with a workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ), an arbitrator's decision must be based on admitted evidence and must be supported by substantial evidence. (*Hamilton v. Lockheed Corporation (Hamilton)* (2001) 66 Cal.Comp.Cases 473, 476 (Appeals Board en banc).) Meaningful review of an arbitrator's decision requires that the "decision be based on an ascertainable and adequate record," including "an *orderly identification* in the record of the evidence submitted by a party; and *what evidence is admitted or denied admission.*" (*Lewis v. Arlie Rogers & Sons* (2003) 69 Cal.Comp.Cases 490, 494, emphasis in original.) "An organized evidentiary record assists an arbitrator in rendering a decision, informs the parties what evidence will be utilized by the arbitrator in making a determination, preserves the rights of parties to object to proffered evidence, and affords meaningful review by the Board, or reviewing tribunal." (*Id.*; see also *Evans v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal.2d 753 [a full and complete record allows for a meaningful right of reconsideration].)

Further, with limited exceptions, arbitrators shall have all of the statutory and regulatory duties and responsibilities of a workers' compensation judge. (Cal. Lab. Code § 5272.) This may include delegation to the petitioner and/or the parties, the responsibility of ensuring that an electronic copy of a complete arbitration file is forwarded directly to the presiding workers' compensation judge of the district office having venue over the matter. (Cal. Code. Regs., tit. 8 § 10995(c)(3).)

Here, we are unable to conduct meaningful review of the petition or render a decision until we have received a complete record including stipulations, issues and exhibits appropriately identified including the offering party. Thus, this is not a final decision on the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration, and once a final decision is issued by the Appeals Board, any aggrieved person may timely seek a writ of review pursuant to sections 5950 et seq.

Accordingly, we grant the Petition for Reconsideration, and issue Notice of our Intention to rescind the arbitrator's decision and return the matter to the arbitrator if a complete record of the proceedings as stated in WCAB Rule 10995(c)(3) is not filed in EAMS within thirty (30) days after service of this Notice (plus additional time for mailing) in accordance with AD Rule 10205.12(b).

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration filed by Cornerstone Capital of the decision issued by the WCA on November 30, 2025 is **GRANTED**.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that within thirty (30) days after service of this decision plus additional time for mailing per WCAB Rule 10605(a) the required documents per WCAB Rule 10995(c)(3) must be filed in the Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS). If all documents are not properly filed in EAMS by that date, the November 30, 2025 decision by the workers' compensation arbitrator will be **RESCINDED** and the matter will be **RETURNED** to the arbitrator for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ ANNE SCHMITZ, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

/s/ PAUL F. KELLY, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

March 6, 2026

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

**KYLE GREEN
LAW OFFICE OF ROY YANG
DJG LAW GROUP
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR-LEGAL UNIT (SACRAMENTO)
LARS TONY HOGDAHL
AVIATION PORT SERVICES LLC
GEORGE W. MASON, ARBITRATOR**

SL/abs

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