

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

---

In the Matter of PEARLINE PIERRE and U.S. POSTAL SERVICE,  
POST OFFICE, Los Angeles, CA

*Docket No. 02-508; Submitted on the Record;  
Issued January 10, 2003*

---

DECISION and ORDER

Before COLLEEN DUFFY KIKO, DAVID S. GERSON,  
WILLIE T.C. THOMAS

The issue is whether appellant sustained an injury in the performance of her federal duties.

On May 10, 2001 appellant, then a 57-year-old window clerk filed a notice of recurrence of disability (Form CA-2a), alleging that while working the window section she experienced pain in her shoulders, neck, arms and hand.

Appellant indicated on the CA-2a form that she was being treated by a Dr. Arnold M. Sanlow, a chiropractor, but she did not submit any medical evidence.

In a June 25, 2001 letter, the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs notified appellant of the deficiencies in her claim, including the fact that she appeared to have sustained a new injury, not a recurrence.

Appellant responded with a July 6, 2001 personal letter, in which, she only recounted her work history and the events leading up to the alleged incident.

In a September 5, 2001 decision, the Office denied the claim.

The Board finds that appellant has not established that she sustained an injury in the performance of her federal duties.

An employee seeking benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act has the burden of establishing the essential elements of his or her claim, including the fact that an injury was sustained in the performance of duty as alleged and that any disability for which compensation is claimed is causally related to the employment injury.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Duane B. Harris, 49 ECAB 170 (1997).

The evidence required to establish causal relationship is rationalized medical evidence, based on a complete factual and medical background, showing a causal relationship between the claimed medical condition and the identified factors.<sup>2</sup>

As appellant did not submit any medical evidence, she has not met her burden of proof to establish entitlement to benefits under the Act.

The September 5, 2001 decision by the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is affirmed.

Dated, Washington, DC  
January 10, 2003

Colleen Duffy Kiko  
Member

David S. Gerson  
Alternate Member

Willie T.C. Thomas  
Alternate Member

---

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*; *Dennis Mascarenas*, 49 ECAB 215 (1997).