

forwarded the record with a statement of accepted facts to Dr. Ronald Blum, an OWCP medical adviser, who is Board-certified in orthopedic surgery. The statement of accepted facts indicated that under file number xxxxxx132 appellant had been granted a schedule award for 20 percent left leg impairment on October 24, 2006. In his November 14, 2013 report, Dr. Blum noted appellant's receipt of the prior schedule award and referred to his report dated October 5, 2006, found in that record. He indicated that, under Table 16-15, appellant was entitled to seven percent left leg impairment, rather than the whole person impairment found by Dr. Huynh, and advised that the seven percent impairment should be combined with the 20 percent previously awarded under file number xxxxxx132, which would yield an additional five percent impairment.

In its November 22, 2013 schedule award decision, granting appellant an additional five percent impairment, OWCP referenced the prior schedule award, issued under file number xxxxxx132. In the August 5, 2014 decision, an OWCP hearing representative described the events that caused an April 11, 2006 injury, adjudicated under file number xxxxxx132, and further referenced elements of that claim. The hearing representative indicated that OWCP "may wish to possibly consider doubling the instant case with file number xxxxxx132."

It is thus apparent that both Dr. Blum, OWCP medical adviser, and OWCP hearing representative had access to both the files for claim numbers xxxxxx132 and xxxxxx940. The Board does not have access to the former. For the Board to conduct a full and fair adjudication of an appeal, the case record must be complete and contain all evidence relied upon by OWCP in reaching its decision.³

Hence, the Board finds that this case is not in posture for a decision as the record before the Board is incomplete and would not permit an informed adjudication of the case by the Board. The case must therefore be remanded to OWCP to obtain OWCP file number xxxxxx132 and combine it with the instant case, OWCP file number xxxxxx940, and for further reconstruction and development deemed necessary, to be followed by an appropriate *de novo* decision on appellant's schedule award claim.⁴

³ *Lon E. Grinage*, 57 ECAB 177 (2005). See Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *File Maintenance and Management*, Chapter 2.400.8(c) (February 2000) (cases should be doubled when correct adjudication of the issues depends on frequent cross-reference between files).

⁴ The Board also notes that section 16.5 of the A.M.A., *Guides* indicates that CRPS impairment is a "stand alone" approach and if impairment is assigned for CRPS, the CRPS impairment cannot be combined with any other approach for the same extremity under Chapter 16, The Lower Extremities. A.M.A., *Guides*, *supra* note 2 at 540.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the August 5, 2014 decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is set aside and the case remanded to OWCP for further proceedings consistent with this order of the Board.

Issued: March 2, 2015
Washington, DC

Christopher J. Godfrey, Chief Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Colleen Duffy Kiko, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Patricia Howard Fitzgerald, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board