

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

In the Matter of BRUCE E. TIMMRECK and U.S. POSTAL SERVICE,
POST OFFICE, Williston, ND

Docket No. 01-1581; Submitted on the Record;
Issued January 25, 2002

DECISION and ORDER

Before MICHAEL J. WALSH, BRADLEY T. KNOTT,
PRISCILLA ANNE SCHWAB

The issue is whether the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs properly determined that appellant's request for reconsideration was untimely filed and did not demonstrate clear evidence of error.

On September 14, 1998 appellant, a 42-year-old letter carrier, filed a claim for benefits, alleging that his multiple sclerosis condition had been aggravated by factors of his federal employment.

Appellant submitted reports dated January 8, 1997, June 24 and December 11, 1998 from Dr. Bharat K. Patel, a Board-certified family practitioner. Dr. Patel stated findings on examination, indicated that appellant suffered from multiple sclerosis which was worsened by heightened physical activity and recommended adjustments in his work duties to ease the strain.

By decision dated September 24, 1999, the Office denied appellant's claim, finding the medical evidence insufficient to establish that his multiple sclerosis condition was causally related to factors of his employment.

By letter dated June 27, 2000, the Office sent appellant a copy of his claim file. By certified mail dated September 19, 2000, the Office received a handwritten note from appellant which stated, "I am requesting [an] extension for my case to be [reviewed]."

By letter dated February 9, 2001, appellant requested reconsideration of the September 24, 1999 Office decision. Appellant did not submit any additional medical evidence with his request.

By decision dated February 23, 2001, the Office denied reconsideration without a merit review, finding appellant had not timely requested reconsideration and that the evidence submitted did not present clear evidence of error. The Office stated that appellant was required to present evidence which showed that the Office made an error, and that there was no evidence

submitted that showed that its final merit decision was in error. The Office therefore denied appellant's request for reconsideration because it was not received within the one-year time limit pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 10.607(b).

In a letter received by the Office on April 19, 2001, appellant requested reconsideration of the September 24, 1999 Office decision. Appellant did not submit any additional medical evidence with his request.

By decision dated April 25, 2001, the Office denied reconsideration without a merit review, finding appellant had not timely requested reconsideration and that the evidence submitted did not present clear evidence of error. The Office stated that appellant was required to present evidence which showed that the Office made an error, and that there was no evidence submitted that showed that its final merit decision was in error. The Office therefore denied appellant's request for reconsideration because it was not received within the one-year time limit pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 10.607(b).

The Board finds that the Office properly determined that appellant's request for reconsideration was untimely filed and did not demonstrate clear evidence of error.

Section 8128(a) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act¹ does not entitle an employee to a review of an Office decision as a matter of right.² This section, vesting the Office with discretionary authority to determine whether it will review an award for or against compensation, provides:

“The Secretary of Labor may review an award for or against payment of compensation at any time on his own motion or on application. The Secretary, in accordance with the facts found on review may—

- (1) end, or increase the compensation awarded; or
- (2) award compensation previously refused or discontinued.”

The Office, through its regulations, has imposed limitations on the exercise of its discretionary authority under 5 U.S.C. § 8128(a).³ As one such limitation, the Office has stated that it will not review a decision denying or terminating a benefit unless the application for review is filed within one year of the date of that decision.⁴ The Board has found that the

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 8128(a).

² *Jesus D. Sanchez*, 41 ECAB 964 (1990); *Leon D. Faidley, Jr.*, 41 ECAB 104 (1989).

³ Thus, although it is a matter of discretion on the part of the Office whether to review an award for or against payment of compensation, the Office has stated that a claimant may obtain review of the merits of a claim by (1) showing that the Office erroneously applied or interpreted a point of law, or (2) advances a relevant legal argument not previously considered by the Office, or (3) submitting relevant and pertinent new evidence not previously considered by the Office. See 20 C.F.R. § 10.606(b).

⁴ 20 C.F.R. § 10.607(b).

imposition of this one-year time limitation does not constitute an abuse of the discretionary authority granted by the Office granted under 5 U.S.C. § 8128(a).⁵

The Office properly determined in this case that appellant failed to file a timely application for review. The Office issued its last merit decision in this case on September 24, 1999. Appellant requested reconsideration on February 9 and April 19, 2001. His requests were submitted outside the one-year time limit and are therefore untimely.

In those cases where a request for reconsideration is not timely filed, the Board has held, however, that the Office must nevertheless undertake a limited review of the case to determine whether there is clear evidence of error pursuant to the untimely request.⁶ Office procedures state that the Office will reopen an appellant's case for merit review, notwithstanding the one-year filing limitation set forth in 20 C.F.R. § 10.607(b), if appellant's application for review shows "clear evidence of error" on the part of the Office.⁷

To establish clear evidence of error, an appellant must submit evidence relevant to the issue which was decided by the Office.⁸ The evidence must be positive, precise and explicit and must be manifest on its face that the Office committed an error.⁹ Evidence which does not raise a substantial question concerning the correctness of the Office's decision is insufficient to establish clear evidence of error.¹⁰ It is not enough merely to show that the evidence could be construed so as to produce a contrary conclusion.¹¹ This entails a limited review by the Office of how the evidence submitted with the reconsideration request bears on the evidence previously of record and whether the new evidence demonstrates clear error on the part of the Office.¹²

To show clear evidence of error, the evidence submitted must not only be of sufficient probative value to create a conflict in medical opinion or establish a clear procedural error, but must be of sufficient probative value to *prima facie* shift the weight of the evidence in favor of the claimant and raise a substantial question as to the correctness of the Office's decision.¹³ The Board makes an independent determination of whether an appellant has submitted clear evidence

⁵ See cases cited *supra* note 2.

⁶ *Rex L. Weaver*, 44 ECAB 535 (1993).

⁷ Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *Reconsiderations*, Chapter 2.1602.3(b) (May 1991).

⁸ See *Dean D. Beets*, 43 ECAB 1153 (1992).

⁹ See *Leona N. Travis*, 43 ECAB 227 (1991).

¹⁰ See *Jesus D. Sanchez*, *supra* note 2.

¹¹ See *Leona N. Travis*, *supra* note 9.

¹² See *Nelson T. Thompson*, 43 ECAB 919 (1992).

¹³ *Leon D. Faidley* *supra* note 2.

of error on the part of the Office such that the Office abused its discretion in denying merit review in the face of such evidence.¹⁴

The Board finds that appellant's February 9 and April 19, 2001 requests for reconsideration fail to show clear evidence of error. Appellant did not submit any medical opinion evidence with his requests which presented any evidence of error on the part of the Office. In addition, appellant did not present any evidence of error in his request letter. The copy of the September 19, 2000 handwritten note which accompanied the April 19, 2001 request does not establish error on the part of the Office, as appellant did not clearly state in his note that he wished to have the Office reconsider its September 24, 1999 decision. Consequently, the evidence submitted by appellant on reconsideration is insufficient to establish clear evidence of error on the part of the Office such that the Office abused its discretion in denying merit review.

The April 25 and February 9, 2001 decisions of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs are hereby affirmed.

Dated, Washington, DC
January 25, 2002

Michael J. Walsh
Chairman

Bradley T. Knott
Alternate Member

Priscilla Anne Schwab
Alternate Member

¹⁴ *Gregory Griffin*, 41 ECAB 458 (1990).