

Cuendet, Frederic

DEPARTMENT

Authority to recoup overpayment of benefits

When the self-insured employer has previously paid time-loss compensation benefits for a period after the effective date of the pension, the Department's authority to use the second injury fund for pension payment includes the authority to reimburse the self-insured employer from the second injury fund for payment of the total disability benefits. Recoupment or offset of the overpayment of total disability benefits is the responsibility of the Department of Labor and Industries. ...*In re Frederic Cuendet, BIIA Dec., 99 21825 (2001)*

PERMANENT TOTAL DISABILITY (RCW 51.08.160)

Effective date of pension

The effective date of permanent total disability is the date the worker is both medically fixed and as a vocational matter, demonstrably permanently unable to be gainfully employed on a reasonably continuous basis. *Citing In re Roger Neuman, BIIA Dec., 97 7648 (1999).* The holding contained in the decision of *In re Mickey Chiu, BIIA Dec. 97 7432 (1999)* wherein it was determined the effective date of total disability to be the date of legal fixity is reversed. ...*In re Frederic Cuendet, BIIA Dec., 99 21825 (2001)*

SECOND INJURY FUND (RCW 51.16.120)

Authority to reimburse self-insured employer for overpayment of time-loss compensation benefits

When the self-insured employer has previously paid time-loss compensation benefits for a period after the effective date of the pension, the Department's authority to use the second injury fund for pension payment includes the authority to reimburse the self-insured employer from the second injury fund for payment of the total disability benefits. Recoupment or offset of the overpayment of total disability benefits is the responsibility of the Department of Labor and Industries. ...*In re Frederic Cuendet, BIIA Dec., 99 21825 (2001)*

Scroll down for order.

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

1 **IN RE: FREDERIC J. CUENDET**) **DOCKET NO. 99 21825**
2)
3 **CLAIM NO. T-040632**) **DECISION AND ORDER**
4 _____)

5 **APPEARANCES:**

6
7 Claimant, Frederic J. Cuendet, by
8 Davis, Roberts & Reid, L.L.P., per
9 David W. Ballew

10
11 Self-Insured Employer, Airborne Freight Corp., by
12 Craig, Jessup & Stratton, per
13 Janet L. Smith and Rebecca D. Craig

14
15 Department of Labor and Industries, by
16 The Office of the Attorney General, per
17 William A. Garling, Jr., Assistant

18
19 The self-insured employer, Airborne Freight Corp., filed an appeal with the Board of
20 Industrial Insurance Appeals on November 23, 1999, from an order of the Department of Labor and
21 Industries dated October 22, 1999. The order affirmed the provisions of prior Department orders
22 dated July 14, 1999 and July 15, 1999, which together placed the claimant on the pension rolls
23 effective December 1, 1998, ordered the claimant to reimburse the self-insured employer all time
24 loss compensation and medical benefits paid subsequent to the effective date of the pension, held
25 that the second injury fund is applicable to this claim, ordered the self-insured employer to pay
26 \$18,000 for the permanent partial disability caused by this injury, and required the pension reserve
27 to be charged against the second injury account. **REVERSED AND REMANDED.**

28
29
30
31
32 **DECISION**

33
34 Pursuant to RCW 51.52.104 and RCW 51.52.106, this matter is before the Board for review
35 and decision on a timely Petition for Review filed by the self-insured employer to a Proposed
36 Decision and Order issued on January 10, 2001, in which the order of the Department dated
37 October 22, 1999, was reversed and remanded to the Department with direction to consider the
38 claimant a totally and permanently disabled worker effective April 3, 1997, and to provide second
39 injury fund relief to the self-insured employer effective April 3, 1997.

40
41 The Board has reviewed the evidentiary rulings in the record of proceedings and finds that
42 no prejudicial error was committed and the rulings are affirmed. We have granted review in order to
43 resolve an inconsistency within some of our past significant decisions regarding the proper analysis
44
45
46
47

1 for determining the effective date of permanent total disability benefits (also referred to as pension
2 benefits), and to direct that the Department reimburse the self-insurer for the time loss
3 compensation it paid to the claimant for periods of time **after** the effective date of the permanent
4 total disability benefits.
5

6
7 Mr. Cuendet's entitlement to a pension and the self-insurer's entitlement to second injury
8 fund relief were not contested by any party to this appeal. The self-insurer contended that the
9 claimant's entitlement to permanent total disability benefits should become effective on April 3,
10 1997, instead of the December 1, 1998 date determined by the Department order. The Proposed
11 Decision and Order granted this relief to the self-insured employer. Although the self-insured
12 employer's Petition for Review did not assign error to the Proposed Decision and Order's
13 determination that the effective date of the pension benefits set by the Department was erroneous,
14 this issue is still within the scope of our review. *In re Richard Sims*, BIIA Dec., 85 1748 (1986).
15
16

17
18 The parties stipulated that Mr. Cuendet's physical conditions proximately caused by the
19 September 1, 1989 industrial injury were medically fixed and stable in 1993 and his psychiatric
20 conditions caused by the industrial injury as of April 3, 1997, notwithstanding the provision of further
21 psychological counseling thereafter. The parties stipulated that Dr. Andy Sands continued to
22 provide reasonably necessary psychiatric treatment between April 3, 1997 and December 1, 1998.
23 The testimony of Ann Larson, a vocational counselor, established that after she wrote her
24 November 27, 1996 report no further efforts were directed to returning the claimant to the work
25 force. The only additional work performed under this claim by Ms. Larson between November 1996
26 and September 1998 was addressed to the question of whether second injury fund relief was
27 available to the self-insured employer. The Department first attempted to close the claim by an
28 order dated July 14, 1999, which placed the claimant on the pension rolls effective December 1,
29 1998.
30
31

32 Under these facts, the Proposed Decision and Order was incorrect to determine that the
33 effective date of the pension should be April 3, 1997. *In re Harold McCormack*, BIIA Dec., 90 3178
34 (1992); *In re Roger Neuman*, BIIA Dec., 97 7648 (1999). In *Neuman*, an injured worker was found
35 to be medically fixed and stable on September 9, 1996, and vocational evidence showed that he
36 was unable to work since the spring of 1996 due to the industrial injury and the effects of
37 pre-existing medical conditions. The date of "legal fixity" (in that case the date of the Department
38 order determining the claimant to be permanently and totally disabled) was September 16, 1997.
39 The Department order set November 1, 1997, as the effective date of the worker's pension. The
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 Department chose this date for administrative reasons. We held that the effective date of
2 permanent total disability to be "the date the worker is both medically fixed and, as a vocational
3 matter, is demonstrably permanently unable to be gainfully employed on a reasonably continuous
4 basis as a result of the conditions proximately caused by the worker's industrial injury." *Neuman*, at
5 2. Consistent with our holding, we determined September 9, 1996, to be the effective date of the
6 worker's permanent total disability benefits and also as the date his employer was entitled to
7 second injury fund relief.
8

9
10
11 Unfortunately, the legal analysis within *McCormack* and *Neuman* is irreparably inconsistent
12 with the analysis of the same issue contained within *In re Mickey Chiu*, BIIA Dec., 97 7432 (1999),
13 another of our significant decisions. In *Chiu*, medical evidence supported a finding that the worker
14 was medically fixed and stable in 1996. The Department first attempted to close the claim on
15 June 12, 1997. We determined the effective date of permanent total disability benefits to be
16 June 12, 1997, which would have been the date of "legal fixity" had entitlement to loss of earning
17 power benefits been at issue.
18

19 Application of the "legal fixity" doctrine to determine the effective date of permanent total
20 disability benefits is not appropriate for the reasons we stated in *Neuman*:
21

22 The fundamental rationale for requiring the Department to issue
23 an order that terminates time loss compensation or loss of earning
24 power benefits is to ensure that aggrieved parties have an opportunity to
25 timely challenge the Department's action. The date of the Department's
26 order has been referred to as the date of "legal fixity." Establishing a
27 date of legal fixity is not critical in claims in which a worker is determined
28 to be permanently totally disabled. If the worker is receiving ongoing
29 temporary total disability benefits on the date he or she is declared
30 permanently totally disabled, no interruption of wage replacement
31 benefits will occur. If time loss compensation or loss of earning power
32 benefits have been terminated prior to the date the Department declares
33 the worker permanently totally disabled, the Department will presumably
34 have previously issued an order from which the worker could appeal.
35 Requiring that a date of legal fixity be established before the effective
36 date of commencement of permanent total disability benefits would
37 serve no purpose.
38

39
40
41
42 *Neuman*, at 7-8.

43 Furthermore, if the holding in *Chiu* was to apply to this case the effective date of
44 Mr. Cuendet's pension would be July 14, 1999, a date that does not agree with the contentions and
45 analysis of any of the parties and which would be prejudicial to the self-insurer while providing little
46 or no monetary benefit to the worker. Choosing the date of "legal fixity" as the effective date for a
47

1 pension prevents provision of second injury fund relief to an employer for part of the period that the
2 worker was **in fact** permanently and totally disabled. On the other hand, the worker will always be
3 in total disability status, whether temporary or permanent, so there should be no gap between time
4 loss compensation and pension benefits regardless of when the characterization of the wage
5 replacement benefits changes. In light of these factors we overrule *In re Mickey Chiu*, BIIA Dec.,
6 97 7432 (1999) and remove it from our significant decisions.
7
8
9

10 We determine that Mr. Cuendet is entitled to a pension (and the employer entitled to second
11 injury fund relief) as of the date VRC Larson submitted her employability assessment report on
12 September 10, 1998. At that time, and not before that time, Ms. Larson, based on medical and
13 vocational evidence **then in existence**, determined that Mr. Cuendet was not eligible for vocational
14 services because he was permanently totally disabled due to the effects of his industrial injury
15 superimposed on pre-existing limitations. Ms. Larson's opinion that Mr. Cuendet was permanently
16 incapable of working as of April 3, 1997, is based upon hindsight and certainly not based upon
17 information or data that was known to her in April 1997. *Neuman*. See also, *In re James M. Eddy*,
18 Dckt. No. 99 18062 (December 5, 2000).
19
20
21
22

23 Since the effective date of Mr. Cuendet's entitlement to permanent total disability benefits
24 has been moved back in time to September 10, 1998, he may receive a double recovery (time loss
25 compensation paid earlier by the self-insurer and pension benefits paid by the Department through
26 the second injury fund) for the period of September 10, 1998 through December 1, 1998. The
27 self-insured employer contends that it should be reimbursed from the second injury fund for time
28 loss compensation it already paid to Mr. Cuendet during that time period. The effect of granting this
29 request would be to make the Department, rather than the self-insured employer, the party that
30 bears the burden of collecting from Mr. Cuendet any time loss compensation that was erroneously
31 paid to him for that period of time. We believe that the self-insured employer's request is logical,
32 consistent with the legislative policy behind the creation of the second injury fund, and more
33 administratively efficient than the alternative.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The Proposed Decision and Order denied the self-insurer this additional relief, concluding
41 that the Board does not have jurisdiction to direct the Department to reimburse the self-insurer from
42 the second injury fund for time loss compensation it paid the claimant during the period stated
43 above. We disagree. We believe that we have the jurisdiction to provide this relief to the
44 self-insured employer. The July 14, 1999 order, which was affirmed by the Department order under
45 appeal, contained the following provision: "It is therefore ordered that all time loss and/or medical
46
47

1 benefits paid subsequent to the effective date are due and refundable to the self-insured employer
2 by the claimant." Clearly, the Department has adjudicated the issues of how the self-insurer is to
3 be reimbursed for time loss compensation paid after the effective date of the pension and which
4 party is supposed to seek reimbursement from Mr. Cuendet. The self-insurer's Notice of Appeal
5 specifically asked for action inconsistent with that provision of the Department order when it asked
6 for a Board order "to declare that the Employer shall recoup from the second injury fund any
7 benefits paid by the Employer to the Claimant between April 3, 1997 and December 1, 1998."
8 Clearly, the Notice of Appeal preserved those issues. Therefore, we have jurisdiction to hear and
9 decide those issues. *Lenk v. Department of Labor & Indus.*, 3 Wn. App. 977 (1970).

14 RCW 51.44.040(1), which gives the Director of the Department authority to administer the
15 second injury fund, does not give him sole discretion over payments made from that fund. Pursuant
16 to RCW 51.16.120(1), the "total cost of the pension reserve" less the claim cost assessed against
17 the employer should be assessed against the second injury fund. In this case, the self-insurer's
18 claim cost is limited to the \$18,000 assessed by the Department in its July 15, 1999 order. The
19 balance of the pension reserve is to come from the second injury fund. By law, the self-insurer is
20 relieved from paying further time loss compensation as of the effective date of the pension. The
21 payment of the pension benefits is the responsibility of the Department. The Department's authority
22 to use monies from the second injury fund for pension payments logically includes the power to
23 reimburse the self-insured employer for payment of total disability benefits for which the
24 Department is responsible, such as those paid by the employer to Mr. Cuendet between
25 September 9, 1998 and December 1, 1998.

32 Our Supreme Court in *Jussila v. Department of Labor & Indus.*, 59 Wn.2d 772 (1962) noted
33 that the second injury fund was created to finance incentives that encourage the hiring of previously
34 disabled workers. Any rule or procedure that makes it easier for an employer to benefit from the
35 fund tends to support this purpose. To place the burden of obtaining recoupment on the
36 self-insured employer in this situation creates a disincentive for employers to hire previously
37 disabled workers due to the time and expense of collecting overpayments from workers to whom no
38 future benefits are owed. Thus, placing the responsibility of obtaining recoupment under these
39 circumstances on the Department is consistent with the legislative purpose that resulted in the
40 creation of the second injury fund.

46 Recoupment of overpayments is the subject of RCW 51.32.240. In this situation, either
47 subsection (1) or (4) of that statute would place the burden of seeking recoupment on the

1 Department. Each of these subsections provides that the recipient of the erroneous payment "shall
2 repay it and recoupment may be made from any future payments due to the recipient on any claim
3 with the state fund or self-insurer, as the case may be." The self-insurer is no longer responsible
4 for making any future payments, therefore, it cannot withhold portions of future payments to obtain
5 reimbursement. The Department, on the other hand, has the responsibility to pay pension benefits
6 from the second injury fund and, therefore, the ability to recoup any overpayment efficiently. In the
7 event that some or all of the pension benefits payable to Mr. Cuendet for the period of April 3, 1997
8 to December 1, 1998, have not yet been paid to him, the Department (and not the self-insured
9 employer) is in the position of using those benefits to offset the time loss compensation he
10 erroneously received during that period. Thus, for the sake of administrative efficiency, placing the
11 burden of recoupment on the Department is the logical choice.

12 We note that the employer stipulated that in the event the effective date of Mr. Cuendet's
13 pension is changed as a result of this appeal, the employer will waive reimbursement of any bills for
14 psychiatric treatment through December 1, 1998. At the same time, the parties stipulated that this
15 treatment was reasonably necessary. Based on the parties' stipulation we enter a finding that this
16 treatment was proper and necessary. However, based on our significant decision of *In re Anthony*
17 *Lajcin*, BIIA Dec., 99 12440 (2000), medical benefits subsequent to the effective date of a
18 retroactive pension would not be subject to reimbursement by the injured worker in any event.

19 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- 20 1. On December 5, 1989, the Department of Labor and Industries received
21 an application for benefits filed on behalf of the claimant,
22 Frederic J. Cuendet, alleging an industrial injury on September 1, 1989,
23 during the course of his employment with Airborne Freight Corp. The
24 claim was allowed and benefits were paid to the claimant. On
25 October 22, 1999, the Department issued an order affirming the
26 provisions of prior Department orders dated July 14, 1999 and July 15,
27 1999, placing the claimant on the pension rolls effective December 1,
28 1998, and ordering the claimant to reimburse the self-insured employer
29 all time loss compensation and holding that the second injury fund relief
30 is applicable to this claim and ordering the self-insured employer to pay
31 \$18,000 for the permanent partial disability caused by this injury and
32 requiring the pension reserve to be charged against the second injury
33 account, respectively. On November 23, 1999, the Board of Industrial
34 Insurance Appeals received a Notice of Appeal filed on behalf of the
35 self-insured employer.
- 36 2. On September 1, 1989, Mr. Cuendet sustained an industrial while lifting
37 freight during the course of his employment with Airborne Freight Corp.

- 1 3. In spring 1993, Mr. Cuendet's upper digestive tract condition,
2 exacerbated by the September 1, 1989 industrial injury, had reached
3 maximum medical improvement.
- 4
5 4. Between April 3, 1997 and December 1, 1998, Mr. Cuendet received
6 proper and necessary psychiatric treatment for conditions proximately
7 caused by or aggravated by his industrial injury of September 1, 1989.
- 8
9 5. As of April 3, 1997, Mr. Cuendet's psychiatric condition, exacerbated by
10 the September 1, 1989 industrial injury, had reached maximum medical
11 improvement.
- 12
13 6. As of September 10, 1998, Mr. Cuendet was permanently unable to be
14 gainfully employed on a reasonably continuous basis when considering
15 the combined effects of his pre-existing conditions and the September 1,
16 1989 industrial injury, work history, education, and physical restrictions.
- 17
18 7. Between September 10, 1998 and December 1, 1998, the self-insured
19 employer paid time loss compensation to Mr. Cuendet under this claim.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 22 1. The Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals has jurisdiction over the
23 parties and the subject matter to this appeal.
- 24
25 2. As of September 10, 1998, Mr. Cuendet was a totally and permanently
26 disabled worker within the meaning of RCW 51.32.060.
- 27
28 3. Effective September 10, 1998, Airborne Freight Corp. was entitled to
29 distribution of further accident costs with regard to this claim under the
30 provisions of RCW 51.16.120.
- 31
32 4. The self-insured employer is entitled to be reimbursed from the second
33 injury fund for the time loss compensation it paid the claimant for the
34 period of September 10, 1998 through December 1, 1998. Recoupment
35 or offset of any overpayment of total disability benefits to the claimant for
36 that time period is the responsibility of the Department.
- 37
38 5. The order of the Department of Labor and Industries dated October 22,
39 1999, is incorrect and is reversed. This claim is remanded to the
40 Department with direction to consider Mr. Cuendet a totally and
41 permanently disabled worker effective September 10, 1998, and to
42 provide second injury fund relief to the self-insured employer effective
43 September 10, 1998, including reimbursement of any time loss
44
45
46
47

1 compensation it paid to Mr. Cuendet for the period of September 10,
2 1998 through December 1, 1998.

3
4 It is so ORDERED.

5
6 Dated this 14th day of August, 2001.

7
8 BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS

9
10
11 /s/ _____
12 THOMAS E. EGAN Chairperson

13
14
15 /s/ _____
16 FRANK E. FENNERTY, JR. Member

17
18
19 /s/ _____
20 JUDITH E. SCHURKE 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