



establish the medical component of fact of injury.<sup>1</sup> By decision dated June 13, 2011, OWCP denied modification of the April 29, 2010 decision on the basis that the medical evidence failed to establish causal relationship between appellant's condition and factors of his federal employment. By decision dated June 25, 2012, OWCP denied modification of the June 13, 2011 decision on the grounds that the medical evidence submitted was not sufficient to establish causal relationship.

Decisions of OWCP shall contain findings of fact and a statement of reasons.<sup>2</sup> The Board finds that the basis on which OWCP denied appellant's claim is unclear and thus the Board is unable to render an informed decision in this case. The record contains evidence of appellant's attempt to file a claim for a recurrence of a May 5, 2008 employment injury which was accepted by OWCP under File No. xxxxxx613. However, OWCP continued to adjudicate the claim as new occupational disease claims. Consequently, the case will be remanded for OWCP to combine the current case record with File No. xxxxxx613 and properly adjudicate the issue of whether appellant has established a recurrence of disability on October 10, 2008 causally related to the May 5, 2008 employment injury.<sup>3</sup> Following this and such other development as deemed necessary, OWCP shall issue a *de novo* decision.

---

<sup>1</sup> On May 25, 2010 appellant, through his attorney, requested an oral hearing before an OWCP hearing representative. In an August 16, 2010 letter, appellant's attorney requested withdrawal of the oral hearing scheduled for August 18, 2010 at 12:00 p.m. By decision dated August 25, 2010, OWCP granted appellant's request for withdrawal of the hearing.

<sup>2</sup> See 20 C.F.R. § 10.126.

<sup>3</sup> See Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *File Maintenance and Management*, Chapter 2.400.8 (February 2000). Under 2.400.8(c), cases should be doubled when correct adjudication of the issues depends on frequent cross-reference between files, including: (1) a new injury case is reported for an employee who previously filed an injury claim for a similar condition or the same part of the body. For instance, a claimant with an existing case for a back strain submits a new claim for a herniated lumbar disc; (2) two or more separate injuries (not recurrences) have occurred on the same date; and (3) adjudication or other processing will require frequent reference to a case which does not involve a similar condition or the same part of the body. For instance, an employee with an existing claim for carpal tunnel syndrome files a new claim for a mental condition which has overlapping periods of disability.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** the June 25, 2012 Office of Workers' Compensation Programs decision is set aside and the case remanded for further development consistent with this order of the Board.

Issued: May 13, 2013  
Washington, DC

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

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

Michael E. Groom, Alternate Judge  
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board