

³ 20 C.F.R. § 10.126. *See also O.R.*, 59 ECAB 432 (2008).

enough for the reader to understand the precise defect of the claim and the kind of evidence which would overcome it.”⁴ These requirements are supported by Board precedent.⁵

The Board concludes that in its August 3, 2011 decision, OWCP did not discharge its responsibility to provide appellant a statement explaining the disposition so that she could understand the basis for the decision. In the August 3, 2011 decision, OWCP denied appellant’s claim on the basis that medical causal relationship was not established and also that no compensable work factors were established. In finding that no compensable work factors were established, OWCP found that “no factual or corroborating evidence was provided that established that any work factors caused any condition.” Under these circumstances, appellant would not adequately understand the precise defect of her claim and the kind of evidence which would tend to overcome it.

For these reasons, OWCP did not adequately explain the denial of appellant’s emotional condition claim and the case shall be remanded to OWCP to make appropriate findings. Following this and such further development as it deems necessary, it shall issue a *de novo* decision.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the August 3, 2011 Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs’ decision be set aside and the case remanded for further action consistent with this order of the Board.

Issued: May 23, 2012
Washington, DC

Richard J. Daschbach, Chief Judge
Employees’ Compensation Appeals Board

Alec J. Koromilas, Judge
Employees’ Compensation Appeals Board

Colleen Duffy Kiko, Judge
Employees’ Compensation Appeals Board

⁴ Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *Disallowances*, Chapter 2.1400.4(e) (March 1997).

⁵ See *James D. Boller, Jr.*, 12 ECAB 45, 46 (1960).