

**United States Department of Labor
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board**

<hr/>)	
J.R., Appellant)	
)	
and)	Docket No. 22-0326
)	Issued: August 15, 2022
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FINANCIAL & BUSINESS OPERATIONS LOGISTICS DIVISION, Alexandria, VA, Employer)	
<hr/>)	

Appearances:
Appellant, pro se
Office of Solicitor, for the Director

Case Submitted on the Record

DECISION AND ORDER

Before:
ALEC J. KOROMILAS, Chief Judge
PATRICIA H. FITZGERALD, Deputy Chief Judge
JAMES D. McGINLEY, Alternate Judge

JURISDICTION

On December 29, 2021 appellant filed a timely appeal from a November 15, 2021 merit decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP). Pursuant to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act¹ (FECA) and 20 C.F.R. §§ 501.2(c) and 501.3, the Board has jurisdiction over the merits of this case.²

ISSUE

The issue is whether appellant has met his burden of proof to establish a diagnosed medical condition causally related to the accepted September 24, 2021 employment incident.

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 8101 *et seq.*

² The Board notes that, following the November 15, 2021 decision, OWCP received additional evidence. Appellant also submitted additional evidence on appeal to the Board. However, the Board's *Rules of Procedure* provides: "The Board's review of a case is limited to the evidence in the case record that was before OWCP at the time of its final decision. Evidence not before OWCP will not be considered by the Board for the first time on appeal." 20 C.F.R. § 501.2(c)(1). Thus, the Board is precluded from reviewing this additional evidence for the first time on appeal. *Id.*

FACTUAL HISTORY

On September 29, 2021 appellant, then a 56-year-old motor vehicle operator, filed a traumatic injury claim (Form CA-1) alleging that on September 24, 202 he sustained injuries to the head, arm, and lower back when he tripped over an engine cover during a school bus inspection while in the performance of duty.

Appellant submitted a position description dated October 4, 2021.

In a development letter dated October 12, 2021, OWCP informed appellant of the deficiencies of his claim. It advised him of the type of factual and medical evidence necessary and provided a questionnaire for his completion. OWCP afforded appellant 30 days to respond. No response was received.

By decision dated November 15, 2021, OWCP accepted that the September 24, 2021 employment incident occurred, as alleged. However, it denied the claim, finding that the medical evidence of record was insufficient to establish a diagnosed medical condition causally related to the accepted employment incident. Thus, appellant had not met the requirements to establish an injury as defined by FECA.

LEGAL PRECEDENT

An employee seeking benefits under FECA has the burden of proof to establish the essential elements of his or her claim, including the fact that the individual is an employee of the United States within the meaning of FECA, that the claim was timely filed within the applicable time limitation period of FECA,³ that an injury was sustained in the performance of duty as alleged, and that any disability or medical condition for which compensation is claimed is causally related to the employment injury.⁴ These are the essential elements of each and every compensation claim, regardless of whether the claim is predicated upon a traumatic injury or an occupational disease.⁵

To determine if an employee has sustained a traumatic injury in the performance of duty, OWCP begins with an analysis of whether fact of injury has been established. Fact of injury consists of two components that must be considered in conjunction with one another. The first component is whether the employee actually experienced the employment incident that allegedly occurred.⁶ The second component is whether the employment incident caused a personal injury.⁷

Rationalized medical opinion evidence is required to establish causal relationship. The opinion of the physician must be based on a complete factual and medical background, must be

³ *S.B.*, Docket No. 17-1779 (issued February 7, 2018); *J.P.*, 59 ECAB 178 (2007); *Joe D. Cameron*, 41 ECAB 153 (1989).

⁴ *J.M.*, Docket No. 17-0284 (issued February 7, 2018); *R.C.*, 59 ECAB 427 (2008); *James E. Chadden, Sr.*, 40 ECAB 312 (1988).

⁵ *K.M.*, Docket No. 15-1660 (issued September 16, 2016); *L.M.*, Docket No. 13-1402 (issued February 7, 2014); *Delores C. Ellyett*, 41 ECAB 992 (1990).

⁶ *B.P.*, Docket No. 16-1549 (issued January 18, 2017); *Elaine Pendleton*, 40 ECAB 1143 (1989).

⁷ *M.H.*, Docket No. 18-1737 (issued March 13, 2019); *John J. Carlone*, 41 ECAB 354 (1989).

one of reasonable medical certainty, and must be supported by medical rationale explaining the nature of the relationship between the diagnosed condition and the specific employment incident.⁸

ANALYSIS

The Board finds that appellant has not met his burden of proof to establish a diagnosed medical condition causally related to the accepted September 24, 2021 employment incident.

Appellant did not submit any medical evidence in support of his claim.

As appellant has not submitted rationalized medical evidence from a qualified physician establishing a diagnosed medical condition causally related to the accepted September 24, 2021 employment incident, the Board finds that he has not met his burden of proof.

Appellant may submit new evidence or argument with a written request for reconsideration to OWCP within one year of this merit decision, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 8128(a) and 20 C.F.R. §§ 10.605 through 10.607.

CONCLUSION

The Board finds that appellant has not met his burden of proof to establish a diagnosed medical condition causally related to the accepted September 24, 2021 employment incident.

⁸ *M.O.*, Docket No. 19-1398 (issued August 13, 2020); *J.L.*, Docket No. 18-1804 (issued April 12, 2019).

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the November 15, 2021 decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is affirmed.

Issued: August 15, 2022
Washington, DC

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

Patricia H. Fitzgerald, Deputy Chief Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board


James D. McGinley, Alternate Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board