

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

**PATTI SHANNON, *Applicant***

**vs.**

**WEST CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT;  
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SCHOOLS INSURANCE GROUP, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ9830518; ADJ12598559; ADJ12598558; ADJ20069001**  
**Santa Rosa District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER  
DENYING PETITION  
FOR REMOVAL**

Defendant has filed a petition for removal from the Order Denying Change in Venue and Order Denying Consolidation issued on November 18, 2025, by the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ).

Defendant contends that consolidation of cases is warranted because the facts of applicant's multiple cases overlap. Defendant contends that venue change is warranted because witnesses live closer to Oakland.

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.

Here, and for the reasons discussed in the WCJ's Report, we agree with the WCJ that petitioner fails to establish good cause for consolidation of proceedings and change of venue at this time.

Accordingly, we deny removal.

For the foregoing reasons,

**IT IS ORDERED** that defendant's Petition for Removal from the Order Denying Change in Venue and Order Denying Consolidation issued on November 18, 2025, by the WCJ is **DENIED**.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD**

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ CRAIG L. SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER



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

**January 28, 2026**

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

**PATTI SHANNON  
JOHN HILL  
MEECHAN ROSENTHAL  
COHEN ASSOCIATES**

**EDL/mt**

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