

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

SAUL TREJO, *Applicant*

vs.

**MERCHANTS BUILDING MAINTENANCE, Permissibly Self-Insured,
administered by CLAIMQUEST, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ14297877
Anaheim District Office**

**OPINION AND DECISION
AFTER RECONSIDERATION**

We previously granted reconsideration in order to further study the factual and legal issues in this case. ¹ This is our Opinion and Decision After Reconsideration.

Applicant seeks reconsideration of the Findings and Order (F&O) issued by a workers' compensation arbitrator (WCA) on September 30, 2021, wherein the WCA found that applicant did not sustain industrial injury arising out of and in the course of his employment (AOE/COE), defendant has no liability for self-procured medical treatment, and there are no funds from which to award attorney's fees.

We received an Answer from defendant.

The WCA filed a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Reconsideration (Report), recommending that we deny reconsideration.

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Reconsideration, the Answer, and the contents of the WCA's Report. Based on our review of the record, and for the reasons discussed below, we will rescind the F&O and return the matter to the arbitrator due to lack of a proper record. When the WCA issues a new decision, any aggrieved person may timely seek reconsideration.

¹ Commissioner Sweeney, who was a member of the panel that granted reconsideration, no longer serve on the Appeals Board. Another panel member has been appointed in her place.

I.

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.)² 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 Labor Code section 5950, but appellate review is limited to review of the record certified by the Appeals Board. (Lab. Code, §§ 5901, 5951.)

Former Labor Code section 5909 provided that a petition was denied by operation of law if the Appeals Board did not “act on” the petition within 60 days of the petition’s filing with the ‘appeals board’ and not within 60 days of its filing at a DWC district office. A petition for reconsideration of an arbitrator’s decision or award made pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement per the provisions of Labor Code sections 3201.5 and 3201.7 shall be subject to review by the appeals board in the same manner as provided for reconsideration of a final order, decision or award made and filed by a workers’ compensation administrative law judge. (Lab. Code §§ 3201.5(a)(1) and 3201.7(a)(3)(A).)

Once the Appeals Board receives the case file, it also receives the petition in the case file, and the Appeals Board can then “act” on the petition.

When the Appeals Board does not review the petition within 60 days due to irregularities outside the petitioner’s control, and the 60-day period lapses through no fault of the petitioner, the Appeals Board must then consider whether circumstances exist to allow an equitable remedy, such as equitable tolling.

It is well-settled that the Appeals Board has broad equitable powers. (*Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board* (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 413, 418 [43 Cal.Comp.Cases 785] citing *Bankers Indem. Ins. Co. v. Indus. Acc. Com.* (1935) 4 Cal.2d 89, 94-98 [47 P.2d 719]; see *Truck Ins. Exchange v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd. (Kwok)* (2016) 2 Cal.App.5th 394, 401 [81 Cal.Comp.Cases 685]; *State Farm General Ins. Co. v. Workers’ Comp.*

² The use of the term ‘appeals board’ throughout the Labor Code refers to the Appeals Board and not a DWC district office. (See e.g., Lab. Code, §§ 110, et seq. (Specifically, § 110 (a) provides: “‘Appeals board’ means the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. The title of a member of the board is ‘commissioner.’”).) Section 111 clearly spells out that the Appeals Board and DWC are two different entities.

Appeals Bd. (Lutz) (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 258, 268 [78 Cal.Comp.Cases 758]; *Dyer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 1376, 1382 [59 Cal.Comp.Cases 96].) It is an issue of fact whether an equitable doctrine such as laches applies. (*Kwok, supra* 2 Cal.App.5th at p. 402.) The doctrine of equitable tolling applies to workers' compensation cases, and the analysis turns on the factual determination of whether an opposing party received notice and will suffer prejudice if equitable tolling is permitted. (*Elkins v. Derby* (1974) 12 Cal.3d 410, 412 [39 Cal.Comp.Cases 624].) As explained above, only the Appeals Board is empowered to make this factual determination.³

In *Shiple v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1104, 1108 [57 Cal.Comp.Cases 493], the Appeals Board denied applicant's petition for reconsideration because it had not acted on the petition within the statutory time limits of Labor Code section 5909. This occurred because the Appeals Board had misplaced the file, through no fault of the parties. The Court of Appeal reversed the Appeals Board's decision holding that the time to act on applicant's petition was tolled during the period that the file was misplaced, especially in light of the fact that the Appeals Board had repeatedly assured the petitioner that it would rule on the merits of the petition. (*Id.*, at p. 1108.)

Like the Court in *Shiple*, "we are not convinced that the burden of the system's inadequacies should fall on [a party]." (*Ibid.*) The touchstone of the workers' compensation system is our constitutional mandate to "accomplish substantial justice in all cases expeditiously, inexpensively, and without incumbrance of any character." (Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4.) "Substantial justice" is not a euphemism for inadequate justice. Instead, it is an exhortation that the workers' compensation system must focus on the *substance* of justice, rather than on the arcana or minutiae of its administration. (See Lab. Code, § 4709 ["No informality in any proceeding . . . shall invalidate any order, decision, award, or rule made and filed as specified in this division."].)

With that goal in mind, 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].) If a timely filed petition is never considered by the Appeals Board because

³ Labor Code section 5952 sets forth the scope of appellate review, and states that: "Nothing in this section shall permit the court to hold a trial de novo, to take evidence, or to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence." (Lab. Code, § 5952; see Lab. Code, § 5953.)

it is “deemed denied” due to an administrative irregularity not within the control of the parties, the petitioning party is deprived of their right to a decision on the merits of the petition. (Lab. Code, § 5908.5; see *Evans v. Workmen’s Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1968) 68 Cal.2d 753, 754-755 [33 Cal.Comp.Cases 350]; *LeVesque, supra* 1 Cal.3d 627, 635.) Just as significantly, the parties’ ability to seek meaningful appellate review is compromised, raising issues of due process. (Lab. Code, §§ 5901, 5950, 5952; see *Evans, supra*, 68 Cal.2d 753.)

Substantial justice is not compatible with such a result. A litigant should not be deprived of their due process rights based upon the administrative errors of a third party, for which they bear no blame and over whom they have no control. This is doubly true when the Appeals Board’s action in granting a petition for reconsideration has indicated to the parties that we will exercise jurisdiction and issue a final decision on the merits of the petition, and when, as a result of that representation, the petitioner has forgone any attempt to seek judicial review of the “deemed denial.” Having induced a petitioner not to seek review by granting the petition, it would be the height of injustice to then leave the petitioner with no remedy.

In this case, the WCJ issued the Findings and Order on September 30, 2021, and according to EAMS, applicant filed a petition on October 25, 2021 and an amended petition on October 29, 2021. However, for reasons that are not entirely clear from the record, the Appeals Board did not receive and process the petition until May 18, 2022. Accordingly, the Appeals Board failed to act on the petition within 60 days, through no fault of the parties. The Appeals Board granted the petition on July 18, 2022, within 60 days of the day it became aware of it. In so doing so, we sent a clear signal to the parties of our intention to exercise jurisdiction and issue a final decision after reconsideration. Neither party expressed any opposition to this course of action, and it appears clear from the fact that neither party sought judicial review of our grant of reconsideration that both parties have acted in reliance on our grant.

Under the circumstances, the requirements for equitable tolling have been satisfied in this case. Accordingly, our time to act on defendant’s petition was equitably tolled until 60 days after May 18, 2022. Because we granted the petition on July 18, 2022, our grant of reconsideration was timely, and we may issue a decision after reconsideration addressing the merits of the petition.

II.

WCAB Rule 10990 provides that if the arbitrator does not rescind the entire order, decision or award within 15 days of receiving the petition for reconsideration per WCAB Rule 10990(f)(1) or 10990(f)(2), WCAB Rule 10990(f)(3) requires the arbitrator to submit to the Appeals Board an electric copy of the complete record of proceedings including:

- (A) The transcript of proceedings, if any;
- (B) A summary of testimony if the proceedings were not transcribed;
- (C) The documentary evidence submitted by each of the parties;
- (D) An opinion that sets forth the rationale for the decision; and
- (E) A report on the petition for reconsideration, consistent with the provisions of rule 10962. The original arbitration record shall not be filed.

(Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10990(f)(3)(A)-(E); see also Lab. Code, §§ 3201.5(a)(1), 3201.7(a)(3)(A).)

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).)

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].)

Here, the WCA issued the Report on November 13, 2021; however, while we received the arbitration transcript, the *record still does not include* any of the documentary evidence submitted by each of the parties.

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.

We are unable to conduct meaningful review of the Petition or render a decision based on an incomplete record. Accordingly, as our decision after reconsideration, we will rescind the arbitrator's decision and return the matter to the trial level. When the WCA issues a new decision, any aggrieved person may timely seek reconsideration.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED as the Decision After Reconsideration of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board that the Findings and Order issued by the WCA on September 30, 2021 is **RESCINDED** and the matter is **RETURNED** to the arbitrator for further proceedings consistent with this decision.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ LISA A. SUSSMAN, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

October 14, 2024

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

**SAUL TREJO
THE DOMINGUEZ FIRM
COLANTONI, COLLINS, MARREN, PHILLIPS & TULK
LINDA DAVIDSON-GUERRA, ARBITRATOR**

LAS/abs

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