File Number: HR14-D-H

RECEIVED APR 0 3 2020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMP PROGRAMS PO BOX 8300 DISTRICT 50 LONDON, KY 40742-8300 Phone: (202) 693-0045

Date of Injury: Employee:

Dear

This is in reference to your workers' compensation claim. Pursuant to your request for a hearing, the case file was transferred to the Branch of Hearings and Review.

Your case file has been returned to the District Office at:

US DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMP PROGRAMS
PO BOX 8300 DISTRICT 6 JAC
LONDON, KY 40742-8300

If you disagree with the decision attached to this letter, you have the right to submit new evidence to the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs and request reconsideration of the case or, if you have no additional evidence to present to the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, you may appeal the decision to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board.

**Electronically Signed** 

Division of Federal Employees' Compensation

PAUL H FELSER FELSER LAW FIRM QUEENSBOROUGH BANK BLDG 7393 HODGSON MEMORIAL DR SUITE 102 SAVANNAH, GA 31406

If you have a disability and are in need of communication assistance (such as alternate formats or sign language interpretation), accommodation(s) and/or modification(s), please contact OWCP.

## File Number: ( HR14-D-H

RECONSIDERATION: If you have additional evidence, not previously considered, which you believe is pertinent, you may request, in writing, the OWCP reconsider this decision. Such a request must be received within one year of the date of the attached decision, clearly state the grounds upon which reconsideration is being requested, and be accompanied by relevant evidence not previously submitted, such as medical reports or affidavits, or a legal argument not previously made. Your request for reconsideration and the new evidence you are submitting should be sent to the

US DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMP PROGRAMS
PO BOX 8300 DISTRICT 6 JAC
LONDON, KY 40742-8300

In order to ensure that you receive an independent evaluation of the evidence, your case will be reconsidered by persons other than those who made this determination.

APPEALS: If you believe that all available evidence has been submitted, you have the right to appeal to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board (ECAB) (20 C.F.R. 10.625). The ECAB will review only the evidence received prior to the date of this decision (20 C.F.R. Part 501). Effective November 19, 2008, ECAB has changed its Rules of Procedure on the time limit to appeal and has eliminated its practice of allowing one year to file an appeal. Request for review by the ECAB must be made within 180 calendar days from the date of this decision. More information on the new Rules is available at www.dol.gov/ecab.

To expedite the processing of your ECAB appeal, you may include a completed copy of the AB 1 form used by ECAB to docket appeals available on the Department of Labor Web Site at www.dol.gov/ecab. You must mail your request to:

Employees' Compensation Appeals Board 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room S-5220 Washington, DC 20210

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Office of Workers' Compensation Programs

## DECISION OF THE HEARING REPRESENTATIVE

In the matter of the claim for compensation under Title 5, U.S. Code 8101 et. seq. of Claimant; Employed by the  Case number Hearing was held by telephone
Case number Hearing was held by telephone conference on
The issue for determination is whether the claimant has a continuing, injury-related disability.
The claimant, a , was employed as a
On claimant filed a timely Notice of Traumatic Injury and Claim for Compensation, claiming that on she slipped and fell on a stairway landing. The Office accepted the claim for right arm abrasion and right upper extremity complex regional pain syndrome, or CRPS (formerly called reflex sympathetic dystrophy, or RSD). The claimant stopped work
Effective the present claim was merged with file number , date of injury ;, accepted for right upper extremity RSD/CRPS, right wrist sprain, right ulnar nerve lesion, right forearm derangement, right hip contusion, left upper extremity phlebitis, left upper extremity benign necroplasm, left carpal bone fracture, and left wrist sprain. The present claim is the master file.
Following the injury the claimant stopped work and was paid appropriate compensation. She returned to work in in a limited duty capacity. The claimant stopped work to undergo authorized surgery to the upper extremities (three left and two on the right). The claimant was paid compensation and placed on the periodic (28-day cyclic) compensation roll.
MD, conducted a second opinion medical examination and submitted a report dated Dr opined the claimant could work 8 hours per day with restrictions of no lifting, pushing, pulling or repetitive hand/wrist movement of the right upper extremity.
In a letter the USDA notified the Office that the employing agency could not provide modified work to the claimant consistent with the restrictions prescribed by Dr.

A USDA report dated stated that a surveillance of the claimant disclosed that she participated in running events including a triathlon and the Boston Marathon. Video footage of the claimant was included.

In a supplemental report of Dr. noted review of the surveillance video. Dr. concluded that there were no residuals of the injury and that the claimant could resume full duty.

By a decision of the Office terminated entitlement to compensation and medical benefits effective based on Dr. opinion. By a decision of an Office hearing representative affirmed the decision.

In a report MD, the claimant's attending physician, opined that the accepted injuries limited the claimant's use of her right hand/arm such that she could not perform the full duties of a veterinary medical officer. Dr. opined that the accepted injuries did not limit the claimant's ability to participate in recreational activities such as running.

In a statement the claimant stated she had been approved for disability retirement.

The claimant requested reconsideration of the decision. On reconsideration the Office determined that a conflict existed between the opinions of Drs. and as to injury-related disability and work capacity. In order to resolve such conflict the Office referred the claimant to , MD, for a referee medical examination.

conducted a physical examination, reviewed the claim file and Statement of Dr. stated an Accepted Facts (SOAF) and submitted a report dated a Dr. accurate history and provided findings of severe pain on palpation of the right elbow, diminished right hand/wrist motion, and normal sensation. Dr. opined that CRPS injury had resolved, but such condition remained active with associated with the noted that on examination the claimant injury. Dr. regard to the told him she felt she was "pretty much where she was on Dr concluded based on examination findings and the claimant's statement that there were no injury remained active. Dr. injury, while the residuals of the the claimant could not performed full duty as a veterinary medical officer due to continuing right upper extremity RSD/CRPS. The doctor noted that limitations on right hand pronation restricted the claimant's capacity to use mouse or computer keyboard. On a form OWCP-5 stated restrictions of lift/push/pull up to 10 pounds for 1/2 hour, and repetitive Dr. wrist/hand movement for up to ½ hour. In a supplement report of stated that the surveillance video did surveillance video. Dr. noted review of the not change any of the conclusions stated in his report.

On the Office denied modification of the decision. The Office accorded weight to Dr. opinion. The claimant requested review by the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board (ECAB).

By a decision of the ECAB set aside the decision and remanded the case to the Office. The ECAB instructed the Office to merge the two claim files, conduct any additional development deemed necessary, and issue a *de novo* decision.

On remand the Office on merged the files. By a decision of the Office terminated entitlement to compensation and medical benefits effective based on Dr. 's opinion. The claimant disagreed and requested an oral hearing.

Accordingly, said hearing was scheduled and held by telephone conference on Paul Felser, Esq., represented the claimant. Based upon the hearing testimony, together with the written evidence of record, I find that the Office's decision of should be modified and affirmed.

The claimant did not attend the hearing. Counsel argued that inasmuch as Dr. opined the claimant could not work full duty, the claimant was entitled to compensation pending any offer by employing agency of suitable modified duty work.

Post hearing the record was held open for 30 days to allow for the submission of additional written evidence. A copy of the hearing transcript was provided to the employing agency and 20 days allowed for the submission of written comments. No comments or additional written evidence were received.

Once the Office accepts a claim, it has the burden of justifying termination or modification of compensation.<sup>1</sup> To terminate entitlement to medical benefits the Office must establish a claimant no longer has residuals of an employment-related condition that require further medical treatment.<sup>2</sup>

The Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) provides for the appointment of a referee (also called impartial) physician to examine the claimant and resolve a conflict of medical opinion in a case.<sup>3</sup> A referee examination is needed when the Office determines that a conflict exists between medical opinions of approximately equal value. A conflict exists when there is a disagreement between the opinions of an attending physician and a physician designated by the United States (e.g. a second opinion specialist).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> T.F., 58 ECAB 128 (2006)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> C.C., Dkt. No. 19-1062, issued February 6, 2020

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 5 U.S.C. §8123(a)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 3—Medical, *Directed Medical Examinations*, Ch. 3-500-4(a) (July 2011)

When a referee medical specialist is asked to resolve a conflict in medical evidence, his opinion, if sufficiently well rationalized and based on a proper factual background, must be given special weight.<sup>5</sup>

The Office properly accorded special weight to Dr. opinion. Dr. provided an accurate history, physical examination findings, and rationale in support of his opinion. Dr. eviewed the case file and SOAF and considered both accepted injuries. Dr. report encompassed the complete factual and medical background to the subject claim, as well as the claimant's history of workplace injuries and medical history, including reports by Drs. and Consequently Dr. opinion was properly accorded special weight. As a result the Office properly terminated entitlement to compensation and medical benefits with regard to the injury.

However, the record does not support complete termination of entitlement to wage loss compensation and medical benefits. The claim files are merged Dr. opined that right upper extremity CRPS remains active with regard to the injury and disables the claimant from full duty as a veterinary medical officer. The employing agency has not provided a suitable modified duty assignment. Consequently the claimant is entitled to wage loss compensation and medical benefits with regard to the injury.

For the reasons set forth above, the Office's decision of is hereby MODIFIED and AFFIRMED, and the case file is returned to the district office for actions consistent with this decision.

The claimant is entitled to restoration of compensation and medical benefits for the injury covered by claim number retroactive to However, as the claimant is receiving benefits for disability retirement she will have to make an election for FECA benefits instead of disability retirement.

Issued: Washington, D.C.

Electronically Signed
Hearing Representative
for
Director, Office of Workers'
Compensation Programs

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> James R. Driscoll, 50 ECAB 146 (1998)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> An offer of modified employment must be consistent with medically prescribed restrictions. See Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2—Claims, *Job Offers and Return to Work*, Ch. 2-814 (June 2013)