

## Hart, Thomas

---

### COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT (RCW 51.08.013; RCW 51.08.180(1))

#### Deviation

A deputy sheriff, eating a meal in a restaurant while on a business trip to pick up a prisoner, did not remove himself from the course of employment when he left his table momentarily to "remonstrate with a group of rowdies" at a nearby table and was assaulted. ....*In re Thomas Hart*, BIIA Dec., 35,767 (1971)

Scroll down for order.

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS  
STATE OF WASHINGTON**

1     **IN RE: THOMAS G. HART**                     )     **DOCKET NO. 35,767**  
2   )  
3     **CLAIM NO. F-927241**                     )     **DECISION AND ORDER**  
4

5 APPEARANCES:

6             Claimant, Thomas G. Hart, by  
7             Jordan, Britt and Templeman, per  
8             Kenneth E. Phillipps  
9

10            Employer, Snohomish County,  
11            None  
12

13            Department of Labor and Industries, by  
14            The Attorney General, per  
15            Patrick McMullen, Assistant  
16

17  
18            This is an appeal filed by the claimant on May 5, 1970, from an order of the Department of  
19 Labor and Industries dated April 1, 1970, which rejected the claim for the reason "1. At the time the  
20 injury occurred the claimant was not furthering the interests of his employer and, therefore was not  
21 in the course of employment." **REVERSED AND REMANDED.**  
22

23   **DECISION**  
24

25            Pursuant to RCW 51.52.104 and RCW 51.52.106, this matter is before the Board for review  
26 and decision on a timely Statement of Exceptions filed by the Department of Labor and Industries to  
27 a Proposed Decision and Order issued by a hearing examiner for this Board on December 22,  
28 1970, in which the order of the Department dated April 1, 1970, was reversed and this claim  
29 remanded to the Department with direction to allow the claim.  
30

31            The claimant, a Snohomish County deputy sheriff, was injured on March 3, 1970, within the  
32 State of California, while traveling to pick up a prisoner to bring him back to the State of Washington  
33 for trial.  
34

35            The extraterritorial application of the Washington Workmen's Compensation Act is not an  
36 issue here. That has already been settled by decisions of the Supreme Court of this state. Hilding  
37 v. Department of Labor and Industries, 162 Wash. 168; Gustavson v. Department of Labor and  
38 Industries, 187 Wash. 296.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

1 The issue before the Board in this appeal is whether the claimant was in the course of his  
2 employment at the time that he was injured on March 3, 1970. The specific ground recited by the  
3 Department for the rejection of the claim, that at the time of the injury the claimant was not  
4 furthering the interests of his employer, is one of the elements to determine whether claimant was  
5 acting in the course of his employment. It is to be noted that in Section 51.08.013, RCW, defining  
6 the term "Acting in the Course of Employment," that the claimant must be in furtherance of his  
7 employer's business, but it is not necessary that at the time of his injury he be doing the work on  
8 which his compensation is based.  
9

10 This matter was presented to the Board based upon the contents of the Department file and  
11 some exhibits. The record establishes that the claimant and a fellow deputy sheriff were en route  
12 by automobile to San Francisco to pick up the prisoner. They stopped in Fairfield, California, to  
13 spend the night. They checked into their motel, then went to a restaurant for dinner. It is to be  
14 noted that at that time they were both in plain clothes. It was after they had seated themselves in  
15 the restaurant that the events occurred leading up to the actual injury. It must be acknowledged  
16 that at the time that the claimant seated himself in the restaurant to eat dinner, he was in the course  
17 of his employment. Larson's Workmen's Compensation Law, § 25.  
18

19 The injury occurred when the claimant left his table, momentarily, to remonstrate with a  
20 group of rowdies seated a short distance away from him, who were using obscene language. After  
21 requesting that they tone down their language, the claimant was returning to his table and at that  
22 time was attacked and injured by one or more of these rowdies.  
23

24 The specific issue, therefore, is whether the claimant removed himself from the course of his  
25 employment by leaving his table, momentarily, to endeavor to convince the other customers to tone  
26 down their language. The Board does not believe that the claimant did remove himself from the  
27 course of his employment by this momentary act. In this instance, the circumstances of his  
28 employment put him, in what turned out to be, a place of danger, and he was injured. Larson's,  
29 supra, § 10.  
30

31 After consideration of the Proposed Decision and Order and the Statement of Exceptions  
32 filed thereto, and a careful review of the entire record before us, we are persuaded that the  
33 Proposed Decision and Order is supported by the preponderance of the evidence and is correct as  
34 a matter of law.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

After a review of the entire record, including the exhibits herein, this Board finds as follows:

1. On March 30, 1970, the claimant, Thomas G. Hart, filed a report of accident with the Department of Labor and Industries alleging that he had sustained an industrial injury on March 3, 1970, while in the course of his employment with Snohomish County. On April 1, 1970, the Department entered an order rejecting the claim for the reason: "1. At the time the injury occurred the claimant was not furthering the interests of his employer and, therefore was not in the course of employment." On May 5, 1970, the claimant appeal to this Board, and on May 28, 1970, the Board granted the appeal and assigned it Docket No. 35,767.
2. Appellate proceedings were conducted before the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals and on December 22, 1970, a hearing examiner for this Board entered a Proposed Decision and Order in connection with this appeal. Thereafter, within the period of time provided by law, exceptions were filed and the case referred to the Board for review as provided by RCW 51.52.106.
3. That at all pertinent times herein, the claimant was employed by the County of Snohomish, State of Washington, as a deputy sheriff. That shortly prior to March 3, 1970, the claimant, in the company of a fellow deputy sheriff, left the State of Washington, by automobile, to travel to San Francisco, California, to pick up a prisoner to return him to the State of Washington for trial.
4. On the evening of March 3, 1970, the claimant and the fellow employee stopped in Fairfield, California, to spend the night. After checking into their motel, the claimant and the fellow employee went to a restaurant in that city to eat, and seated themselves. Some rowdies, who were seated at a table near to that of the claimant, were using obscene language, and the claimant, thereupon, got up from his table, went over to the table occupied by the rowdies, where he proceeded to mildly remonstrate with them concerning their language, reminded them that there were ladies present, and was in the process of returning to his table when he was attacked by one or more of the rowdies and suffered an injury that required medical treatment.

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Based on the foregoing findings of fact, the Board concludes as follows:

1. This Board has jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter of this appeal.
2. That when the claimant was injured on March 3, 1970, he was in the course of his employment, with Snohomish County.

1 3. That the order of the Department of Labor and Industries dated April 1,  
2 1970, is incorrect and this matter should be remanded to the  
3 Department with directions to allow the claim.  
4

5 It is so ORDERED.

6 Dated this 16th day of March, 1971.  
7  
8

9 BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS

10  
11 /s/  
12 ROBERT C. WETHERHOLT Chairman

13  
14 /s/  
15 R.H. POWELL Member

16  
17 /s/  
18 R.M. GILMORE Member  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47