

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

**EALISE CRUMB, *Applicant***

**vs.**

**APC TECHNOLOGY, INC.;  
STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ4500251  
Los Angeles District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER  
GRANTING PETITION FOR REMOVAL AND  
DECISION AFTER REMOVAL AND  
DENYING PETITION FOR DISQUALIFICATION**

We have considered the allegations of the applicant in the Petition for Removal and Disqualification as well as the contents of the report of the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) with respect thereto.<sup>1</sup> 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 grant applicant's Petition for Removal, rescind the March 14, 2023 minutes and the March 27, 2023 Order Compelling Attendance of the applicant for a Qualified Medical Examination (QME) with Joel Frank, M.D. on June 13, 2023, and deny the Petition for Disqualification.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Deputy Commissioner Garcia and Commissioner Dodd, who were on the panel that issued a prior decision in this matter are unavailable to participate in this decision. Other panelists have been substituted in their place.

ultimately issues. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10955(a).) Here, for the reasons stated in the WCJ's report, we are persuaded that good cause exists to grant removal and rescind the Order compelling applicant's attendance at a medical examination with Joel Frank, M.D., a non-panel QME physician chosen by defendant, and 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.) "It is the responsibility of the parties and the WCJ to ensure that the record is complete when a case is submitted for decision on the record. At a minimum, the record must contain, in properly organized form, the issues submitted for decision, the admissions and stipulations of the parties, and admitted evidence." (*Hamilton, supra*, 66 Cal.Comp.Cases at p. 475.) The WCJ's decision must "set[] forth clearly and concisely the reasons for the decision made on each issue, and the evidence relied on," so that "the parties, and the Board if reconsideration is sought, [can] ascertain the basis for the decision[.] . . . For the opinion on decision to be meaningful, the WCJ must refer with specificity to an adequate and completely developed record." (*Id.* at p. 476 (citing *Evans v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 753, 755 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 350]).)

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. (*Rucker v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 151, 157-158 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 805].) "Due process requires notice and a meaningful opportunity to present evidence in regards to the issues." (*Rea v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2005) 127 Cal.App.4th 625, 643 [70 Cal.Comp.Cases 312]; see also *Fortich v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1991) 233 Cal.App.3d 1449, 1452-1454 [56 Cal.Comp.Cases 537].) A fair hearing includes, but is not limited to, the opportunity to call and cross-examine witnesses; introduce and inspect exhibits; and to offer

evidence in rebuttal. (See *Gangwish v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 1284, 1295 [66 Cal.Comp.Cases 584]; *Rucker, supra*, at pp. 157-158 citing *Kaiser Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (Baskin)* (1952) 109 Cal.App.2d 54, 58 [17 Cal.Comp.Cases 21]; *Katzin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 703, 710 [57 Cal.Comp.Cases 230].)

Here, on March 14, 2023, the parties attended a hearing that had been scheduled as a trial, but the matter did not proceed to a full trial, and a record was not created. Thus, we are unable to properly review the merits of applicant's Petition for Removal. Thus, in the interest of due process, we must rescind the March 14, 2023 and rescind the March 27, 2023 Order Compelling.

Accordingly, we will grant the petition to the extent it seeks removal.

To the extent the petition contends that the WCJ should be disqualified, Labor Code section 5311 provides that a party may seek to disqualify a WCJ upon any one or more of the grounds specified in Code of Civil Procedure section 641. (Lab. Code, § 5311; see also Code Civ. Proc., § 641.) Among the grounds for disqualification under section 641 are that the WCJ has "formed or expressed an unqualified opinion or belief as to the merits of the action" (Code Civ. Proc., § 641(f)) or that the WCJ has demonstrated "[t]he existence of a state of mind ... evincing enmity against or bias toward either party" (Code Civ. Proc., § 641(g)).

Under WCAB Rule 10960, proceedings to disqualify a WCJ "shall be initiated by the filing of a petition for disqualification supported by an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury stating in detail *facts* establishing one or more of the grounds for disqualification ... ." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10960, italics added.) It has long been recognized that "[t]he allegations in a statement charging bias and prejudice of a judge must set forth specifically the facts on which the charge is predicated," that "[a] statement *containing nothing but conclusions and setting forth no facts* constituting a ground for disqualification may be ignored," and that "[w]here no *facts* are set forth in the statement *there is no issue of fact to be determined.*" (*Mackie v. Dyer* (1957) 154 Cal.App.2d 395, 399, italics added.)

Furthermore, even if detailed and verified allegations of fact have been made, it is settled law that a WCJ is not subject to disqualification under section 641(f) if, prior to rendering a decision, the WCJ expresses an opinion regarding a legal or factual issue but the petitioner fails to show that this opinion is a fixed one that could not be changed upon the production of evidence and the presentation of arguments at or after further hearing. (*Taylor v. Industrial Acc. Com.*

(*Thomas*) (1940) 38 Cal.App.2d 75, 79-80 [5 Cal.Comp.Cases 61].)<sup>2</sup> Additionally, even if the WCJ expresses an unqualified opinion on the merits, the WCJ is not subject to disqualification under section 641(f) if that opinion is “based upon the evidence then before [the WCJ] and upon the [WCJ’s] conception of the law as applied to such evidence.” (*Id.*; cf. *Kreling v. Superior Court* (1944) 25 Cal.2d 305, 312 [“It is [a judge’s] duty to consider and pass upon the evidence produced before him, and when the evidence is in conflict, to resolve that conflict in favor of the party whose evidence outweighs that of the opposing party.”].)

Also, it is “well settled ... that the expressions of opinion uttered by a judge, in what he conceives to be a discharge of his official duties, are not evidence of bias or prejudice” under section 641(g) (*Kreling, supra*, 25 Cal.2d at pp. 310-311; accord: *Mackie, supra*, 154 Cal.App.2d at p. 400) and that “[e]rroneous rulings against a litigant, even when numerous and continuous, form no ground for a charge of bias or prejudice, especially when they are subject to review” (*McEwen v. Occidental Life Ins. Co.* (1916) 172 Cal. 6, 11; accord: *Mackie, supra*, 154 Cal.App.2d at p. 400.) Similarly, “when the state of mind of the trial judge appears to be adverse to one of the parties but is based upon actual observance of the witnesses and the evidence given during the trial of an action, it does not amount to that prejudice against a litigant which disqualifies” the judge under section 641(g). (*Kreling, supra*, 25 Cal.2d at p. 312; see also *Moulton Niguel Water Dist. v. Colombo* (2003) 111 Cal.App.4th 1210, 1219 [“When making a ruling, a judge interprets the evidence, weighs credibility, and makes findings. In doing so, the judge necessarily makes and expresses determinations in favor of and against parties. How could it be otherwise? We will not hold that every statement a judge makes to explain his or her reasons for ruling against a party constitutes evidence of judicial bias.”].)

Under no circumstances may a party’s unilateral and subjective perception of bias afford a basis for disqualification. (*Haas v. County of San Bernardino* (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1017, 1034; *Robbins v. Sharp Healthcare* (2006) 71 Cal.Comp.Cases 1291, 1310-1311 (Significant Panel Decision).)

---

<sup>2</sup> Overruled on other grounds in *Lumbermen’s Mut. Cas. Co. v. Industrial. Acc. Com.* (*Cacozza*) (1946) 29 Cal.2d 492, 499 [11 Cal.Comp.Cases 289].

Finally, WCAB Rule 10960 provides that when the WCJ and “the grounds for disqualification” are known, a petition for disqualification “shall be filed not more than 10 days after service of notice of hearing or after grounds for disqualification are known.”

Here, as discussed in the WCJ’s report, the petition for disqualification does not set forth facts, declared under penalty of perjury, that are sufficient to establish disqualification pursuant to Labor Code section 5311, WCAB Rule 10960, and Code of Civil Procedure section 641(f) and/or (g). Accordingly, we will deny the petition to the extent it seeks to disqualify the WCJ.

Finally, we advise applicant that repetitive, meritless, and ineffectual filings may lead to proceedings for the purpose of declaring applicant as a vexatious litigant pursuant to WCAB rule 10430 (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10430). Here, as outlined by the WCJ in his Report, applicant has continued to file numerous pleadings that are duplicative and address the same issues as other pleadings and do not further the proceedings, and burden the court and its resources. The pattern and practice of filing multiple filings on the same issues may be considered a violation under WCAB Rule 10430. Applicant is cautioned that based on her conduct to date, she risks designation as a vexatious litigant. We also note that WCAB Rule 10430(b) allows the presiding judge of any district having venue to declare a party to be a vexatious litigant upon the petition of a party or **upon the motion of any workers’ compensation judge.**

Thus, we grant the Petition for Removal and rescind the minutes of March 14, 2023 and the Order Compelling of March 27, 2023, and return the matter to the WCJ for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. We also deny the Petition for Disqualification.

For the foregoing reasons,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Petition for Removal of the Minutes of March 14, 2023 and the Order issued on March 27, 2023 by the WCJ is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Petition for Disqualification is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** as the Decision After Removal that the Minutes of March 14, 2023 and the Order of March 27, 2023 are **RESCINDED** and the matter is **RETURNED** to the trial level for further proceedings by the WCJ consistent with this decision.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD**

/s/ LISA A. SUSSMAN, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ KATHERINE A. ZALEWSKI, CHAIR



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

**June 5, 2024**

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

**EALISE CRUMB  
STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND**

**LAS/abs**

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