

the medical reasons for her condition, and an opinion as to whether her claimed condition was causally related to her federal employment. The Office requested that appellant submit the additional evidence within 30 days.

By decision dated December 23, 2008, the Office denied appellant's claim, finding that she failed to submit medical evidence in support of her claim.

LEGAL PRECEDENT

An employee seeking benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act¹ has the burden of establishing that the essential elements of his or her claim including the fact that the individual is an "employee of the United States" within the meaning of the Act, that the claim was timely filed within the applicable time limitation period of the Act, that an injury was sustained in the performance of duty, as alleged, and that any disability and/or specific condition for which compensation is claimed are causally related to the employment injury.² These are the essential elements of each and every compensation claim regardless of whether the claim is predicated upon a traumatic injury or an occupational disease.³

To determine whether a federal employee has sustained a traumatic injury in the performance of duty, it must first be determined whether a "fact of injury" has been established. First, the employee must submit sufficient evidence to establish that he or she actually experienced the employment incident at the time, place and in the manner alleged.⁴ Second, the employee must submit sufficient evidence, generally only in the form of medical evidence, to establish that the employment incident caused a personal injury.⁵ The medical evidence required to establish causal relationship is usually rationalized medical evidence. Rationalized medical opinion evidence is medical evidence which includes a physician's rationalized opinion on the issue of whether there is a causal relationship between the claimant's diagnosed condition and the implicated employment factors. The opinion of the physician must be based on a complete factual and medical background of the claimant, must be one of reasonable medical certainty and must be supported by medical rationale explaining the nature of the relationship between the diagnosed condition and the specific employment factors identified by the claimant.⁶

The Board has held that the mere fact that a condition manifests itself during a period of employment does not raise an inference that there is a causal relationship between the two.⁷

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 8101-8193.

² *Joe D. Cameron*, 41 ECAB 153 (1989); *Elaine Pendleton*, 40 ECAB 1143 (1989).

³ *Victor J. Woodhams*, 41 ECAB 345 (1989).

⁴ *John J. Carlone*, 41 ECAB 354 (1989).

⁵ *Id.* For a definition of the term "injury," see 20 C.F.R. § 10.5(a)(14).

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *See Joe T. Williams*, 44 ECAB 518, 521 (1993).

An award of compensation may not be based on surmise, conjecture or speculation. Neither the fact that appellant's condition became apparent during a period of employment nor the belief that her condition was caused, precipitated or aggravated by her employment is sufficient to establish causal relationship.⁸ Causal relationship must be established by rationalized medical opinion evidence and appellant failed to submit such evidence.

ANALYSIS

The Office accepted that appellant experienced the incident in question; *i.e.*, a vehicular accident, on November 4, 2008. The question of whether an employment incident caused a personal injury can only be established by probative medical evidence.⁹ Appellant has not submitted rationalized, probative medical evidence to establish that the November 4, 2008 employment incident caused a personal injury.

While appellant stated on her Form CA-1 that she bruised her left knee, neck and lower back while riding in a van on November 4, 2008, she did not submit evidence from a physician, which presented a diagnosis of her condition or addressed how this condition was causally related to the November 4, 2008 work incident. There is no rationalized evidence in the record to support that appellant's left knee, neck and lower back injuries were work related. Therefore, she failed to provide a medical report from a physician that explains how the work incident of November 4, 2008 caused or contributed to the claimed left knee, neck and lower back injuries.

The Office advised appellant of the evidence required to establish her claim; however, appellant failed to submit such evidence. Appellant did not provide a medical opinion which describes or explains the medical process through which the November 4, 2008 work accident would have caused the claimed injury. Accordingly, she did not establish that she sustained a left shoulder injury in the performance of duty. The Office properly denied appellant's claim for compensation.

CONCLUSION

The Board finds that appellant has failed to establish that she sustained left knee, neck and lower back injuries in the performance of duty.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Carlone, supra* note 4.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the December 23, 2008 decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs be affirmed.

Issued: September 30, 2009
Washington, DC

Alec J. Koromilas, Chief Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

David S. Gerson, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

James A. Haynes, Alternate Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board