

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

DAVID MOSS, *Applicant*

vs.

**UNITED CONTINENTAL HOLDINGS, INC.;
doing business as UNITED AIRLINES,
permissibly self-insured, administered by
SEDGWICK CLAIMS MANAGEMENT SERVICES,
*Defendants***

**Adjudication Number: ADJ14478876
San Francisco District Office**

**OPINION AND ORDER
GRANTING PETITION
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Defendant seeks reconsideration of the Findings of Fact, Award and Order (Findings), wherein the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) found that applicant, while employed by defendant during the period ending October 16, 2020, sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment (AOE/COE) to the back and hips, and that defendant timely conducted utilization review (UR) for the request for authorizations (RFAs) issued by Elaine Date, M.D., dated August 13, 2024, August 26, 2024, October 1, 2024, and October 28, 2024. The WCJ further found there is a need for further medical treatment to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury, specifically the continuing services of home healthcare for 8 – 10 hours a day, from March 14, 2024 through the present and continuing, consistent with the reasoning in the significant panel decision in *Patterson v. The Oaks Farm*, and that defendant has not met its burden to show that there is a change of circumstances such that the home healthcare services are no longer reasonably required. Accordingly, the WCJ awarded applicant further medical treatment in the form of such home healthcare to continue, until there is a change of circumstances showing that the services are no longer reasonably required to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury, despite finding that defendant conducted timely UR for each of the RFAs regarding home health care services. The WCJ ordered further development on the issue of reimbursement of home health

care services for the periods of March 14, 2024 through July 24, 2024, and August 9, 2024 through the present.

Defendant contends that the WCJ erred in reliance upon the *Patterson* case to find applicant's continued entitlement to home healthcare services, as applicant's case is distinguishable since that case specifically involved nurse care management services and was not intended to be applied broadly to other forms of medical treatment. Defendant further asserts that there is evidence of significant changes in the applicant's circumstances or condition since the original UR dated February 1, 2024, which certified caregiver services.

We have received an Answer from applicant. The WCJ prepared a Report and Recommendation on Petition for Reconsideration (Report), recommending that the Petition be denied.

We have considered the Petition for Reconsideration, the Answer, and the contents of the Report, and we have reviewed the record in this matter. Based upon our preliminary review of the record, we will grant defendant's Petition for Reconsideration. Our order granting the Petition for Reconsideration is not a final order, and we will order that a final decision after reconsideration is deferred pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law. Once a final decision after reconsideration is issued by the Appeals Board, any aggrieved person may timely seek a writ of review pursuant to Labor Code¹ section 5950 et seq.

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.

¹ Unless otherwise stated, all further statutory references are to the Labor Code.

(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 8, 2025, and 60 days from the date of transmission is Sunday, March 9, 2025. The next business day that is 60 days from the date of transmission is Monday, March 10, 2025. (See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10600(b).)² This decision is issued by or on Monday, March 10, 2025, 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 8, 2025, and the case was transmitted to the Appeals Board on January 8, 2025. 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 8, 2025.

² 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.

II.

We highlight the following legal principles that may be relevant to our review of this matter:

Section 4600(a) provides that an industrially injured worker is entitled, at their employer's expense, to medical treatment that is reasonably required to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury. (§ 4600(a).) The coverage of section 4600 extends to any medically related services that are reasonably required to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury, even if those services are not specifically enumerated in that section. (*Smyers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1984) 157 Cal.App.3d 36, 41 [49 Cal.Comp.Cases 454].)

In *Patterson v. The Oaks Farm* (2014) 79 Cal.Comp.Cases 910 [2014 Cal. Wrk. Comp. P.D. LEXIS 98] (*Patterson*) (significant panel decision),³ the Appeals Board held that an employer may not unilaterally cease to provide treatment authorized as reasonably required to cure or relieve the effects of industrial injury upon an employee without substantial medical evidence of a change in the employee's circumstances or condition. The panel reasoned:

Defendant acknowledged the reasonableness and necessity of [the medical treatment at issue] when it first authorized [that treatment], and applicant does not have the burden of proving [its] ongoing reasonableness and necessity. Rather, it is defendant's burden to show that the continued provision of the [treatment] is no longer reasonably required because of a change in applicant's condition or circumstances. Defendant cannot shift its burden onto applicant by requiring a new Request for Authorization and starting the process over again.

(*Patterson, supra*, at p. 918.)

In *National Cement Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Rivota)* (2021) 86 Cal.Comp.Cases 595, the Second District Court of Appeal upheld the Appeals Board's application of *Patterson* to award an applicant continued inpatient care, stating:

[T]he principles advanced in [*Patterson*] apply to other medical treatment modalities as well. Here ... Applicant had continued need for placement at Casa Colina. Further, [applicant's witness] stated that there was no change in Applicant's circumstance and no reasonable basis to discharge Applicant from care. The WCJ ... concluded that Applicant's continued care at Casa Colina was necessary, without

³ A significant panel decision is a decision of the Appeals Board that has been designated by all members of the Appeals Board as of significant interest and importance to the workers' compensation community. Although not binding precedent, significant panel decisions are intended to augment the body of binding appellate and en banc decisions by providing further guidance to the workers' compensation community. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 10305(r).)

ongoing RFAs, to ensure Applicant's safety and provide him with a stable living situation and uninterrupted medical treatment.

(*Rivota, supra*, at p. 597.)

In upholding this application of *Patterson*, the *Rivota* court rejected the employer's attempt to distinguish it on the grounds that it had never authorized inpatient care for an unlimited or ongoing period, had never relinquished its right to conduct UR, and had never been subject to a finding that inpatient treatment was reasonable and necessary for the applicant under section 4600. (*Id.*)

In *Los Angeles County MTA v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Burton)* 89 Cal.Comp.Cases 977 [2024 Cal. Wrk. Comp. LEXIS 55] (writ denied), applicant challenged defendant's UR non-certification of ongoing inpatient treatment, on the grounds that there had been no demonstrable change in applicant's condition such that a new UR determination was appropriate and necessary. The WCJ agreed and determined that applicant was entitled to continue her inpatient rehabilitation treatment until such time as defendant could establish a change in circumstance. The WCJ noted that "the whole point of *Patterson* is that a Form RFA is not required in certain circumstances involving care of an ongoing nature ... [t]he decision is about when an RFA is required, and if one is not required in the first place, then there can be no valid UR therefrom, timely or otherwise." (*Id.* at p. 980.) Thus, defendant's submission of the RFA to UR was invalid without a precipitating change in circumstance. The Appeals Board denied defendant's petition for reconsideration without further comment, and defendant's subsequent petition for writ of review was denied by the Second District Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court. (See *Los Angeles County MTA v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2024) 2024 Cal. LEXIS 6103.)

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).) 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])).)

Additionally, the WCJ and the Appeals Board have a duty to further develop the record where there is insufficient evidence on an issue. (*McClune v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1117, 1121-1122 [63 Cal.Comp.Cases 261].) The Appeals Board has a constitutional mandate to “ensure substantial justice in all cases.” (*Kuykendall v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 396, 403 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 264].) The Board may not leave matters undeveloped where it is clear that additional discovery is needed. (*Id.* at p. 404.)

Here, based on our preliminary review, it appears further review is necessary in order to determine whether the record may not be complete as to all relevant evidence, including, but not limited to, the initial RFA received by defendant on January 23, 2024, discussed by petitioner, as well as the WCJ in his Report, which was certified by UR on February 1, 2024.

III.

In addition, under our broad grant of authority, our jurisdiction over this matter is continuing.

A grant of reconsideration has the effect of causing “the whole subject matter [to be] reopened for further consideration and determination” (*Great Western Power Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (Savercool)* (1923) 191 Cal.724, 729 [10 I.A.C. 322]) and of “[throwing] the entire record open for review.” (*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Industrial Acc. Com. (George)* (1954) 125 Cal.App.2d 201, 203 [19 Cal.Comp.Cases 98].) Thus, once reconsideration has been granted, the Appeals Board has the full power to make new and different findings on issues presented for determination at the trial level, even with respect to issues not raised in the petition for reconsideration before it. (See Lab. Code, §§ 5907, 5908, 5908.5; see also *Gonzales v. Industrial Acci. Com.* (1958) 50 Cal.2d 360, 364.) “[t]here is no provision in chapter 7, dealing with proceedings for reconsideration and judicial review, limiting the time within which the commission may make its decision on reconsideration, and in the absence of a statutory authority limitation none will be implied.”; see generally Lab. Code, § 5803 [“The WCAB has continuing jurisdiction over its orders, decisions, and awards. . . . At any time, upon notice and after an

opportunity to be heard is given to the parties in interest, the appeals board may rescind, alter, or amend any order, decision, or award, good cause appearing therefor.].)

“The WCAB . . . is a constitutional court; hence, its final decisions are given res judicata effect.” (*Azadigian v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 372, 374 [57 Cal.Comp.Cases 391; see *Dow Chemical Co. v. Workmen’s Comp. App. Bd.* (1967) 67 Cal.2d 483, 491 [32 Cal.Comp.Cases 431]; *Dakins v. Board of Pension Commissioners* (1982) 134 Cal.App.3d 374, 381 [184 Cal.Rptr. 576]; *Solari v. Atlas-Universal Service, Inc.* (1963) 215 Cal.App.2d 587, 593 [30 Cal.Rptr. 407].) 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. Interlocutory procedural or evidentiary decisions, entered in the midst of the workers’ compensation proceedings, are not considered “final” orders. (*Maranian v. Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1068, 1070, 1075 [65 Cal.Comp.Cases 650].) [“interim orders, which do not decide a threshold issue, such as intermediate procedural or evidentiary decisions, are not ‘final’ “]; *Rymer, supra*, at p. 1180 [“[t]he term [‘final’] does not include intermediate procedural orders or discovery orders”]; *Kramer, supra*, at p. 45 [“[t]he term [‘final’] does not include intermediate procedural orders”].)

Section 5901 states in relevant part that:

No cause of action arising out of any final order, decision or award made and filed by the appeals board or a workers’ compensation judge shall accrue in any court to any person until and unless the appeals board on its own motion sets aside the final order, decision, or award and removes the proceeding to itself or if the person files a petition for reconsideration, and the reconsideration is granted or denied. . . .

Thus, this is not a final decision on the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration, and we will order that issuance of the final decision after reconsideration is deferred. Once a final decision is issued by the Appeals Board, any aggrieved person may timely seek a writ of review pursuant to sections 5950 et seq.

IV.

Accordingly, we grant defendant's Petition for Reconsideration, and order that a final decision after reconsideration is deferred pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that defendant's Petition for Reconsideration of the Findings Award and Order issued by a workers' compensation administrative law judge on December 12, 2024 is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a final decision after reconsideration is **DEFERRED** pending further review of the merits of the Petition for Reconsideration and further consideration of the entire record in light of the applicable statutory and decisional law.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

/s/ CRAIG SNELLINGS, COMMISSIONER

I CONCUR,

/s/ JOSÉ H. RAZO, COMMISSIONER

/s/ KATHERINE WILLIAMS DODD, COMMISSIONER



DATED AND FILED AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

March 10, 2025

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

**DAVID MOSS
GIMBEL LAW FIRM
CHAVEZ & BREault**

LAS/abs

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