

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

PHILLIP NEWELL, *Applicant*

vs.

**MIRACLE PLUMBING, INC.
SECURITY NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY,
administered by AMTRUST, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ14478546
San Francisco District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
GRANTING PETITION FOR
RECONSIDERATION
AND DECISION AFTER
RECONSIDERATION**

Defendant seeks reconsideration of Findings of Fact and Orders (F&O) issued on December 8, 2025. The workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) found, in relevant part, that there was good cause to reopen the prior Award and that applicant sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment to his left lower extremity, left leg, left ankle, low back, and right lower extremity. The WCJ further ordered the record to be developed regarding an issue pertaining to a prior stipulation to medical treatment outlined in the pre-trial conference statement.

Defendant alleges that the WCJ applied the incorrect legal standard to applicant's burden of proof to find industrial causation for the additional body parts and good cause to re-open the prior Award. Defendant argues that in considering causation for the low back, in particular, the WCJ was re-trying an issue already decided in the prior Findings and Award (F&A).

Applicant filed an answer. The WCJ issued a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Reconsideration (Report) recommending denial of the Petition.

Defendant also filed a January 15, 2026 Petition for Permission to File Reply to Answer to Petition For Reconsideration and Reply to Applicant's January 9, 2026 Answer to Petition for Reconsideration. We accept and have considered the Supplemental Pleading. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10964.)

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Reconsideration, the Answer, and the supplemental pleadings, and the contents of the Report. Based on our review of the record, and for the reasons stated below, we will grant reconsideration, rescind the WCJ's decision, and return this matter to the WCJ for further proceedings consistent with this decision. This is not a final decision on the merits of any issues raised in the petition and any aggrieved person may timely seek reconsideration of the WCJ's new decision.

FACTS

Applicant filed an Application for Adjudication (Application) on April 7, 2021, alleging injury to the left lower extremity, left leg, left ankle, and back.

The trial went forward on January 30, 2023. The parties stipulated in relevant part that applicant, while employed as a plumber by defendant, sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment to his left lower extremity, left leg, and left ankle, and claims to have sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment to his lumbar spine. (Minutes of Hearing (MOH) 01/30/2023, at 2:1-15.) As pertinent here, the first issue listed is framed as, "Is the lumbar spine an industrially injured body part with regard to this date of injury?" (MOH, 01/30/2023, at 4:19-20.)

On February 2, 2023, the WCJ issued an Findings and Award (F&A) finding, in relevant part, injury to the left lower extremity, left leg, and left ankle. The F&A is silent with respect to the lower back. She found that applicant's industrial injuries resulted in 49% permanent disability without apportionment and that future medical treatment is necessary. She awarded permanent disability of 49% less attorney's fees and future medical care but also deferred "all other issues."

In her Opinion on Decision, the WCJ reviewed five reports and the deposition of the Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Michael Fujinaka, M.D. She noted that she, "could not find any evidence where the PQME connects the dots between the low back injury and the industrial incident of September 25, 2019." She continued,

Admittedly, there appears to be some injury or impairment to the low back, but in the absence of a medical opinion of industrial causation of that "impairment" which constitutes substantial medical evidence, I'm not able to make such a finding. Therefore, applicant has not met his burden of proof on this issue of causation of industrial injury to the low back.

(F&A, at p. 5.)

Neither party challenged the decision by way of reconsideration.

On February 20, 2024, applicant filed a Petition to Reopen for New and Further Disability (Petition to Reopen). The Petition to Reopen alleges that applicant's left lower extremity, left leg, and left ankle have worsened and that applicant claims compensable consequence injuries to the right lower extremity, right leg, right ankle, and psyche.

Subsequently, on September 23, 2024, applicant filed an Amended Petition to Reopen (Amended Petition to Reopen) that includes discussion of the low back. The Amended Petition to Reopen alleges that applicant has had increase in compensable consequence low back pain. It states that "The WCJ did not make a finding of causation for the lumbar spine previously in the 2/2/2023 Findings and Award Opinion on Decision. New medical evidence in light of changing symptoms warrants re-evaluation with the QME to address this." (Amended Petition, at 2:3-4.) The Amended Petition alleges increasing lower extremity complaints as well as psychiatric complaints.

On November 12, 2025, this matter proceeded to trial on the following issues:

1. Nature and extent, with applicant claiming additional body parts of low back and right lower extremity.
2. Enforcement of parties' stipulation that defendant has authorized and will provide medical treatment in the form of Ketamine injections per Thomas Klein, D.O.'s November 2024 request.
3. All other issues deferred.

(MOH, 11/12/2025, 2:19-27.)

We adopt the WCJ's outline of the medical evidence here:

1. Medical Evidence

a. QME Michael Fujinaka, M.D.

i. Report of February 3, 2025

Applicant's Exhibit 8 is a re-evaluation report of QME Dr. Fujinaka dated February 3, 2025. In his report, Dr. Fujinaka took a history and provided a summary of previous evaluations. He stated since the prior evaluation, "[t]he applicant reports that he has fallen down the stairs a couple of times because of his legs giving out." (p. 5.) Applicant stated he has pain in his back, bilateral legs, and bilateral ankles, which increases with certain activities. He has difficulty sleeping due to the pain. (pp. 5-6.) Dr. Fujinaka reviewed and summarized medical reports and conducted a physical evaluation of applicant. He diagnosed applicant with: lumbar spine radiculopathy and "fracture, left ankle with subsequent and ongoing Complex Regional Pain Syndrome". (p. 16.)

Regarding causation for the lumbar spine, Dr. Fujinaka stated:

The applicant sustained an industrial injury on September 25, 2019, while performing his usual job duties as a field technician for Miracle Plumbing Inc. The mechanism of injury involved a fall from the step of his work van while removing a ladder, causing his left foot to strike a curb and resulting in a forceful impact to his buttocks. This type of fall is biomechanically significant as it subjects the lumbar spine to sudden axial compression upon impact, combined with a hyperflexion moment as the applicant landed. The abrupt force transmitted through the spine can lead to structural injury, including acute discogenic trauma, facet joint irritation, and possible vertebral endplate stress. Additionally, the impact likely triggered paraspinal muscle strain and reactive spasms, contributing to ongoing discomfort.

Throughout the medical records, there is documentation of persistent lower back pain and symptoms that support the causal relationship between this injury and the applicant's lumbar spine condition. While the applicant initially focused on his ankle injury, it is common for lumbar pathology to become more apparent over time, particularly as compensatory mechanics develop due to an altered gait from the ankle injury. The combination of the direct impact to the lumbar spine during the fall and subsequent biomechanical strain from favoring the injured ankle provides a clear mechanism for ongoing lower back dysfunction. To a degree of reasonable medical probability, the applicant's lumbar spine condition is industrially related to the September 25, 2019, injury.

(pp. 17- 18.)

Regarding causation for the right lower extremity, Dr. Fujinaka stated:

The applicant's right lower extremity symptoms are consistent with a phenomenon known as "mirroring" in complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS), in which the neuropathic and autonomic dysfunction initially affecting one limb begins to manifest in the contralateral limb. Mirrored CRPS is well-documented in medical literature, particularly in cases where prolonged altered biomechanics and central nervous system sensitization contribute to the spread of neuropathic pain and dysautonomia.

Mirroring in CRPS is believed to occur due to maladaptive changes within the central nervous system, particularly within the spinal cord and brain. Chronic pain and inflammation in the initially affected limb can lead to central sensitization, a process where the nervous system becomes hyper-responsive to pain stimuli. This heightened sensitivity can cause pain signals to be amplified and spread to adjacent or even contralateral regions, a phenomenon sometimes referred to as "neuroplasticity gone awry." Additionally, alterations in the sympathetic nervous system can lead to vascular and trophic changes, resulting in temperature dysregulation, skin discoloration, hair loss, and abnormal nail growth in the contralateral limb.

In the applicant's case, his CRPS initially developed in the left lower extremity following his left ankle injury. Due to persistent pain, altered weight-bearing, and ongoing biomechanical strain on the right leg, the nervous system likely underwent progressive sensitization, leading to the development of similar symptoms in the right lower extremity. The presence of burning pain, electric shocks, temperature changes, skin discoloration, hair loss, and abnormal toenail growth all support a diagnosis of mirrored CRPS. The worsening of his symptoms, including allodynia (pain from non-painful stimuli such as water in the shower), suggests an advancing stage of central sensitization, reinforcing that the nervous system is now amplifying and spreading pain signals beyond the initially injured region.

This mirrored CRPS is not simply a result of local tissue damage in the right leg but rather an indication of widespread nervous system dysfunction driven by prolonged pain signaling from the left side. The fact that the applicant initially experienced symptoms of fatigue and neuropathic pain in the right leg due to overcompensation supports the hypothesis that prolonged biomechanical strain contributed to the right-sided involvement. Over time, as the nervous system remained in a persistent state of hyper-reactivity, the pain and autonomic dysfunction spread, leading to the full development of CRPS-like symptoms in the right lower extremity.

To a degree of reasonable medical probability, the applicant's right lower extremity CRPS is industrially related to the September 25, 2019, injury.

(p. 18.)

Dr. Fujinaka also provided impairment ratings. Dr. Fujinaka stated applicant is in need of further medical treatment for CRPS and the lumbar spine. He also provided work restrictions. (pp. 21-22).

ii. Report of August 7, 2025

Applicant's Exhibit 7 is a supplemental report of QME Dr. Fujinaka dated August 7, 2025. In his report, Dr. Fujinaka reviewed vocational testing and reporting, and commented on work restrictions.

iii. Deposition transcript of QME Dr. Fujinaka

Joint Exhibit 1 is a deposition transcript of QME Dr. Fujinaka dated November 6, 2025. Dr. Fujinaka testified, "I believe...in my report on February 3, 2025, I re-issued my opinion on the lumbar spine." (p. 12.) He further testified: applicant was experiencing burning and aching pain in his lower back as of December 8, 2021, he was having pain symptoms arising from sitting at that time, he had 10/10 pain, and he had interference with activities of daily living (ADLs).

(pp. 14-16.) Dr. Fujinaka testified in looking at his May 31, 2022, report, applicant has well-documented lumbar spine pain. (pp. 17-18.) Most of applicant's lumbar spine impairment pre-existed the award. (p. 35.) He went on to testify that the "...rating should not have been given back in 2022 without the full physical evaluation of the spine"; there is essentially no rating from him that predates his February 2025 lumbar spine rating. He found that the right lower extremity is an injury that is a compensable consequence of that to the left. (p. 55.) Additionally, part of the lumbar spine complaints are compensable consequences of the altered gait of the right lower extremity. It is common that these types of compensable consequence injuries arise when someone has a left lower extremity injury that is resulting in an altered gait, especially when it is a long period of time affected. (p. 56.)

b. Reports of Thomas Klein, D.O.

Joint Exhibit 2 is comprised of several reports of Thomas Klein, D.O. The reports contain in relevant part the diagnosis of complex regional pain syndrome. Reports dated December 2, 2024, and February 3, 2025, state applicant was "still in a trial with the ketamine treatment facility." (pp. 6, 9.)

The WCJ found that there was good cause to reopen the prior Award and that, in addition to the previously accepted body parts, the low back and the right lower extremity are also industrially related and compensable. The matter was continued to a status conference to address the secondary issue relating to a stipulation regarding medical treatment.

DISCUSSION

I

Former 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 6, 2026 and 60 days from the date of transmission is Saturday, March 7, 2026. The next business day, that is 60 days from the date of transmission, is Monday, March 9, 2026. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600(b).)¹ This decision is issued by or on Monday, March 9, 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.

Here, according to the proof of service for the Report and Recommendation by the workers’ compensation administrative law judge, the Report was served on January 6, 2026, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on January 6, 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 6, 2026.

II

Taken together, sections 5313 and 5815 require the WCJ to “make and file findings upon all facts involved in the controversy” and to issue a corresponding award, order or decision that states the “reasons or grounds upon which the [court’s] determination was made.” (Lab. Code, §§ 5313, 5815; see also *Blackledge v. Bank of America* (2010) 75 Cal.Comp.Cases 613, 621 (Appeals

¹ 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.

10 Bd. en banc) [“It is the duty of the WCAB to make ‘findings upon all facts involved in the controversy’”].) The WCJ’s decision “must be based on admitted evidence in the record” (*Hamilton v. Lockheed Corporation (Hamilton)* (2001) 66 Cal.Comp.Cases 473, 476 (Appeals Bd. en banc)), and the decision must be supported by substantial evidence. (Lab. Code, §§ 5903, 5952(d); *Lamb v. Workmen’s Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 274, 281 [39 Cal.Comp.Cases 310]; *Garza v. Workmen’s Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1970) 3 Cal.3d 312 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 500]; *LeVesque v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1970) 1 Cal.3d 627 [35 Cal.Comp.Cases 16].)

Here, the WCJ’s February 2, 2023 findings did not comply with the requirement in section 5313 that the WCJ “make and file findings upon all facts involved in the controversy.” (Lab. Code, § 5313; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10787(c)(5); *Blackledge, supra*, 75 Cal.Comp.Cases at p. 621.) In the 2023 proceeding, there were multiple body parts framed as issues for trial, including the left lower extremity, left leg, left ankle, and lumbar spine. The 2023 FA&O, however, only addressed injury to applicant’s left lower extremity, left leg, and left ankle, and was silent as to injury to the lumbar spine. That is, the 2023 F&A included no finding regarding the additional body part of lumbar spine at issue here. Moreover, under Award in the F&A, it stated that “All other issues are deferred at this time.” Thus, although the body part was listed as an issue in the minutes of hearing, and discussed in the Opinion on Decision, the issue was not actually “decided on the merits,” as required. (*Pacific Lumber, Co., supra*, 37 Cal.4th 921, 943.)

A petition for reconsideration may properly be taken only from a “final” order, decision, or award. (Lab. Code, §§ 5900(a), 5902, 5903.) A “final” order has been defined as one that either “determines any substantive right or liability of those involved in the case” (*Rymer v. Hagler* (1989) 211 Cal.App.3d 1171, 1180; *Safeway Stores, Inc. v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd. (Pointer)* (1980) 104 Cal.App.3d 528, 534-535 [45 Cal.Comp.Cases 410]; *Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd. (Kramer)* (1978) 82 Cal.App.3d 39, 45 [43 Cal.Comp.Cases 661]) or determines a “threshold” issue that is fundamental to the claim for benefits. (*Maranian v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1068, 1070, 1075 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 650].)

Here, the lack of a “final order” regarding injury to the lumbar spine precluded any party from filing a petition for reconsideration regarding that body part at that time, since there was no finding that could be challenged. As noted above, no party sought reconsideration.

Section 5410, in conjunction with section 5803, defines the Appeals Board’s continuing jurisdiction and authority, “to award compensation for a new disability resulting from the original

injury or for an increase of the disability for which compensation has been awarded or paid voluntarily.” (*Broadway-Locust Co. v. Industrial Accident Comm.* (1949) 92 Cal.App.2d 287, 290 [14 Cal.Comp.Cases 111]; see also *Nickelsberg v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 288, 297 [56 Cal.Comp.Cases 476].) An injured worker who previously received workers’ compensation benefits, whether voluntarily paid by the employer or pursuant to an award, is entitled to claim benefits for “new and further disability” within five years of the date of injury. (Lab. Code, § 5410; *Sarabi v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 920, 925 [72 Cal.Comp.Cases 778].)

Section 5410 states:

Nothing in this chapter shall bar the right of any injured worker to institute proceedings for the collection of compensation within five years after the date of the injury upon the ground that the original injury has caused new and further disability. The jurisdiction of the appeals board in these cases shall be a continuing jurisdiction within this period. This section does not extend the limitation provided in Section 5407.

(Lab. Code, § 5410.)

For an applicant to recover additional temporary or permanent disability benefits, the petition must be filed within five years from the date of injury, and applicant must have suffered a “new and further disability” within that five-year period, unless there is otherwise good cause to reopen the prior award. The Court of Appeal in *Applied Materials v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd. (Chadburn)* (2021) 64 Cal.App.5th 1042 [86 Cal.Comp.Cases 331] defined new and further disability as “disability resulting from some demonstrable change in the employee’s condition, including a gradual increase in disability, a recurrence of TD, a new need for medical treatment, or the change of a temporary disability into a permanent disability.” (*Id.* at p. 1080.) California case law has applied section 5410 to cases involving new and further disability to the original body part (*Sarabi, supra*, 151 Cal.App.4th at pp. 922–923, 926–927) or injury to a new body part which is alleged as a compensable consequence of the original injury. (*Southern California Rapid Transit Dist., Inc. v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd. (Weitzman)* (1979) 23 Cal.3d 158, 165-166 [44 Cal.Comp.Cases 107]; *Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Industrial Accident Com. (Walden)* (1964) 231 Cal.App.2d 501, 504-505 [29 Cal.Comp.Cases 293].) However, irrespective of whether the Appeals Board’s continuing jurisdiction is invoked because of new and further injury to an original body part or injury to a new body part as a compensable consequence of the original injury, the

new and further disability must be a result or an effect of the prior compensable injury. (*Chadburn, supra*, 64 Cal.App.5th at p. 1080; *Sarabi, supra*, 151 Cal.App.4th at p. 926; *Weitzman, supra*, 23 Cal.3d at pp. 164-166.)

Irrespective of whether or not there has been “new and further disability,” good cause to reopen may also exist pursuant to section 5803. (*Aliano v. Workers’ Comp. App. Appeals Bd.* (1979) 100 Cal.App.3d at p. 366 [45 Cal.Comp.Cases 876].) To reopen for good cause pursuant to section 5803 there must exist some ground, not within the knowledge of the appeals board at the time of making the former award or order which renders the original award inequitable; this cannot be premised on a mere change of opinion by the appeals board. (*Walters v. Ind. Acci. Com.* (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 387, 394). “Good cause” is discussed in great detail in *Nicky Blair’s Restaurant v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd. (Macias)* (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 941, 45 Cal.Comp.Cases 876] in which the court states:

The principle of reopening for "good cause" does not permit an attempt to simply relitigate the original award. A petition to reopen may not be used to litigate issues which should have been raised by a timely petition for reconsideration. "Good cause" to reopen does not consist of medical evidence obtained subsequent to the original decision which merely disagrees with the medical opinion relied upon by the Board at the time of the original decision. ...¶ ... Through many court decisions it has become well settled that, in order to constitute 'good cause' for reopening, new evidence (a) must present some good ground, not previously known to the Appeals Board, which renders the original award inequitable, (b) must be more than merely cumulative or a restatement of the original evidence or contentions, and (c) must be accompanied by a showing that such evidence could not with reasonable diligence have been discovered and produced at the original hearing.

(*Id.* at p. 956, citations omitted.)

All parties to a workers’ compensation proceeding retain the fundamental right to due process and fair hearing under both the California and United States Constitutions. All parties must be fully apprised of the evidence submitted or to be considered, and must be given opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, to inspect documents and to offer evidence in explanation or rebuttal.’ ” (*Rucker v. Workers’ Comp Appeals Bd.* (2000) Cal.App.4th 151, 157-158 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 805], citing *Kaiser Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com.* (1952) 109 Cal.App.2d 54, 58.) Determining an issue without giving the parties notice and an opportunity to be heard violates the parties’ rights to due process. (*Gangwish v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 1284, 1295 [66 Cal.Comp.Cases 584], citing *Rucker, supra*, at pp. 157-158.)

Here, it appears that both statutes must be considered in determining whether there is jurisdiction to amend the existing award to add a body part previously raised but not adjudicated and to consider whether there is new and further disability stemming from the prior award. In addition, or alternatively, the WCJ may consider whether there is a new compensable consequence injury to the low back.

Though the opinion and the F&O find good cause, neither the petition to reopen for new and further nor good cause itself were listed as issues for trial. Instead, only nature and extent was listed as an issue, with applicant claiming injury to additional body parts. The issues of the petition for new and further and good cause should be raised and considered before addressing the issue of whether there is jurisdiction to add body parts.

Accordingly, we rescind the Findings of Fact and Orders and return the matter to the trial level for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. When the WCJ issues a new decision, any aggrieved person may timely seek reconsideration.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that defendant's Petition for Reconsideration of the Findings of Fact and Order issued on December 8, 2025 is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as the Decision After Reconsideration of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board that the Findings of Fact and Order issued on December 8, 2025 is **RESCINDED** and that the matter is **RETURNED** to the trial level for further proceedings consistent with this decision.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ LISA A. SUSSMAN, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

MARCH 9, 2026

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

**PHILLIP NEWELL
GIMBEL LAW FIRM, P.C.
HANNA, BROPHY, MACLEAN, MCALEER & JENSEN, LLP**

TF/kl

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