

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

ARYANNA HENRY, *Applicant*

vs.

**NORTHSTAR SENIOR LIVING; ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY,
administered by ESIS, *Defendants***

**Adjudication Numbers: ADJ20022599, ADJ20023122
Santa Ana District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING PETITION
FOR REMOVAL**

Applicant has filed a petition for removal from the order taking the matter off calendar issued on August 20, 2025, by the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ).

Applicant contends that the matter should proceed upon the bifurcated issue of the presumption of compensability.

We have not received an Answer from defendant. 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.

In workers' compensation, the general rule is that all matters are submitted at a single trial. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10787(a).) However, it is within the discretion of a WCJ to bifurcate any issue if good cause is presented. Here, and for the reasons discussed by the WCJ in the Report, we agree that good cause was not presented to bifurcate the issue of the presumption of compensability.

Accordingly, we deny removal.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that applicant's Petition for Removal from the order taking the matter off calendar issued on August 20, 2025, by the WCJ is **DENIED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ CRAIG L. SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ ANNE SCHMITZ, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

/s/ JOSEPH V. CAPURRO, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

OCTOBER 10, 2025

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

**ARYANNA HENRY
ESIS CHATSWORTH
MULLEN & FILIPPI LLP
MVP TRIAL LAWYERS**

EDL/mt

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