

Rodriguez, Rafael

APPEALABLE ORDERS

Department agreed exam

Where a worker agreed to be bound by the results of a Department medical examination, the worker is not foreclosed from appealing the Department's determination since there is no statutory authority to bind parties to a final disposition of the claim. Only the Board has such authority pursuant to RCW 51.52.095, WAC 263-12-093.*In re Rafael Rodriguez, BIIA Dec., 90 3308 (1991)*

Scroll down for order.

1 because we do not agree with the conclusions and the discussion of the industrial appeals judge with
2 respect to this issue.
3

4 We do not question the Department's wisdom in attempting to utilize "binding examinations"
5 during the administration of claims. In most cases, such an agreement is to the advantage of all,
6 including the Department. However, in those instances where a claimant may be dissatisfied with the
7 results, the Department does not have the statutory authority to assert that the claimant is legally
8 bound by the results of an examination and that the claimant cannot appeal the final order to the
9 Board. During the administration of individual cases, the statute does not provide the Department any
10 authority to settle cases as is provided to the Board in RCW 51.52.095. The Board, on the other hand,
11 has statutory authority to enter final orders based upon the parties' agreement. This is the Board's
12 basis for binding the parties to the results of a medical or vocational examination. Without such a
13 statutory authority as is granted to the Board, the Department cannot legally bind claimants at the
14 administrative level to the results of any one medical or vocational examination.
15

16 We recognize that when administering claims, the Department may hesitate to continue the use
17 of "agreed exams" without the authority to legally bind claimants. However, our decision is not meant
18 to imply that the Department may not use this tool in hopes of securing final results in a claim. But in
19 using "binding exams", the Department must assume the risk that such a medical examination may
20 not prove to be the final adjudicative result in a claim. We would hope that the Department realizes
21 that although there is the risk that such an examination may not conclusively decide the claim, the
22 Department does achieve one additional opinion in those rare instances where a claimant appeals
23 from the Department order after a "binding examination".
24

25 This decision should have no effect whatsoever upon the Department's willingness to enter into
26 agreements to be bound by the results of medical/vocational examinations during proceedings before
27 the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals, since the Board does have the statutory authority to bind
28 the parties to final disposition of an appeal. See RCW 51.52.095 and WAC 263-12-093.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 We also note that in Mr. Rodriguez's case, the "agreement" reached at the Department level
2 was set forth by a statement signed only by the claimant, both in Spanish and English, stating he
3 would be bound by the results, but not indicating whether the Department representative was also
4 bound. Contrast this "binding" agreement with an agreement reached before the Board where all
5 participating parties must stipulate to be bound by the results of an examination to resolve an appeal.
6 At the Board, both claimant and the Department representative must clearly state the agreement to be
7 bound by the results of an examination. In fact, in the present case, the results of Dr. Burrell's
8 examination included a rating for permanent partial disability for the low back, as well as for cervical
9 impairment. When the claims consultant explained thereafter to Dr. Burrell that the low back had
10 previously been segregated and asked Dr. Burrell if there was any thoracic permanent disability, Dr.
11 Burrell gave an opinion that there was no thoracic permanent disability. Thus, the Department did not
12 feel so bound by the "agreement" with Mr. Rodriguez that Mr. Rodriguez was given a low back
13 disability in accordance with Dr. Burrell's original examination. While there were correct legal reasons
14 for the Department's failure to award a Category 2 low back disability based upon Dr. Burrell's
15 examination, we could no more hold the Department to such a "binding" agreement than we would a
16 claimant.
17

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 We are troubled in this case by the summary judgment proceedings with a pro se claimant who
26 obviously had no inkling of what was occurring in the proceedings. Despite the industrial appeals
27 judge having sent a legally exhaustive explanation as to what might occur during the summary
28 judgment proceedings and an explanation as to the legal authorities involved, and went to the extra
29 step of translating this explanation into Spanish, upon review of the transcript we do not believe that
30 Mr. Rodriguez had any understanding of what occurred or what was required of him during the
31 telephone proceedings.
32

33
34
35 We hereby remand this matter to the hearing judge for further proceedings, specifically to take
36 evidence regarding the timeliness of the claimant's appeal, as well as any and all evidence concerning
37 whether Mr. Rodriguez is in need of any further treatment due to the industrial injury, and if not, then a
38 consideration of the extent of Mr. Rodriguez's permanent disability causally related to the industrial
39 injury.
40

41
42
43 This matter is remanded to the hearings process pursuant to WAC 263-12-145(3), for further
44 proceedings as indicated in this order. The parties are advised that this order is not a final Decision
45 and Order of the Board within the meaning of RCW 51.52.110. At the conclusion of the proceedings,
46
47

1 the industrial appeals judge shall, unless the matter is dismissed or resolved by an Order on
2 Agreement of parties, enter a Proposed Decision and Order containing findings and conclusions as to
3 each contested issue of fact and law, based upon the entire record, and consistent with this order.
4 Any party aggrieved by such Proposed Decision and Order may petition the Board for review of such
5 further Proposed Decision and Order, pursuant to RCW 51.52.104.
6
7

8 It is so ORDERED.
9

10 Dated this 22nd day of July, 1991.
11

12 BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS
13

14 /s/
15 _____
16 S. FREDERICK FELLER Chairperson
17

18 /s/
19 _____
20 FRANK E. FENNERTY, JR. Member
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