

The Board has duly considered the matter and finds that the case is not in posture for decision. The Board finds that OWCP did not adequately explain why it adjudicated appellant's notice of recurrence of disability as a new injury given that she alleged that she experienced pain immediately upon returning to work rather than relating any condition or disability to new work factors. Further, OWCP procedures provide that cases should be doubled when a new injury is reported for an employee who previously filed an injury claim for a similar condition and further indicates that the cases should be doubled as soon as the need to do so becomes apparent.¹ In its June 5, 2011 and August 2, 2012 decisions, OWCP referenced a decision dated September 2, 2010 in File No. xxxxxx265. The factual and medical evidence pertaining to appellant's accepted claim in File No. xxxxxx265, however, is not contained in the case record. The Board will consequently remand the case for OWCP to combine the current case record with File No. xxxxxx265 and determine whether she sustained either a recurrence of disability due to her August 4, 2009 employment injury or a new work injury.² Following this and any further development deemed necessary, it shall issue a *de novo* decision on the merits.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the August 2, 2012 decision is set aside and the case remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order of the Board.

Issued: June 26, 2013
Washington, DC

Colleen Duffy Kiko, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Patricia Howard Fitzgerald, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

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

¹ Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *Doubling Case Files*, Chapter 2.400.8(c)(1) (February 2000).

² See *L.Z.*, Docket No. 11-1415 (issued December 12, 2011).