

supervisor, Vickie Schnuerer, on January 21, 2010. After paraphrasing the two statements, the Office determined that appellant had not factually established an injury in the performance of duty. It cited to clear evidence of error language, relevant to untimely requests for reconsideration. The Office did not discuss the evidence submitted by appellant in support of her request for reconsideration or provide any explanation for its finding.

The Board finds that the Office did not make adequate findings of fact regarding the claimed employment factors and did not provide sufficient reasoning for concluding that she did not establish any compensable work factors. The Office is required to make findings of fact and a statement of reasons regarding the material facts of the case.² Its findings should be sufficiently detailed so that the claimant can understand the reasoning behind the decision.³ The Office's failure to analyze the evidence submitted on reconsideration and explain the basis for its conclusion that appellant did not establish any compensable work factors precludes the Board's review of this decision. The case is, therefore, remanded for the Office to make detailed findings regarding appellant's allegations, in conformance with its regulations and Board precedent. After such development as it deems necessary, it should issue an appropriate decision on the emotional condition claim.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the decisions of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs dated June 4 and February 25, 2010 are set aside and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion of the Board.

Issued: May 12, 2011
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

² 20 C.F.R. § 10.126; *Beverly Dukes*, 46 ECAB 1014 (1995).

³ See *Paul M. Colosi*, 56 ECAB 294 (2005).