

OWCP subsequently received information from the employing establishment. In a November 7, 2024 statement, the employing establishment noted that appellant cased, pulled down, and loaded mail, opened mailboxes, and dismounted her vehicle to deliver parcels. Physical requirements included sorting, lifting and pushing moderate to heavy loads of mail and packages.

The employing establishment also provided appellant's official position description. The listed duties included casing, delivering, and collecting mail along a prescribed rural route using a vehicle, loading mail into the vehicle, and collecting mail from customers' roadside mailboxes.

By decision dated December 27, 2024, OWCP denied appellant's occupational disease claim, finding that the evidence of record was insufficient to establish the implicated employment factors, as no corroborative evidence had been provided to establish that the events occurred in the manner alleged. It concluded, therefore, that the requirements had not been met to establish an injury as defined by FECA.

The Board finds that this case is not in posture for decision.

In the case of *William A. Couch*,¹ the Board held that, when adjudicating a claim, OWCP is obligated to consider and address all evidence properly submitted by a claimant and received by OWCP before the final decision is issued. While OWCP is not required to list every piece of evidence submitted, the Board notes that the employing establishment's November 7, 2024 statement describing appellant's job duties, and the attached official position description, were not considered and addressed by OWCP in the December 27, 2024 decision.²

It is crucial that OWCP consider and address all evidence received prior to the issuance of its final decision, as Board decisions are final with regard to the subject matter appealed.³ The Board finds that this case is not in posture for decision as OWCP did not consider and address the above-noted evidence in the December 27, 2024 decision.⁴ On remand, OWCP shall review all of the evidence submitted. Following this, and other such further developments as deemed necessary, it shall issue an appropriate decision. Accordingly,

¹ 41 ECAB 548 (1990); *see J.R.*, Docket No. 21-1421 (issued April 20, 2022); *see also R.D.*, Docket No. 17-1818 (issued April 3, 2018).

² *Order Remanding Case, A.H.*, Docket No. 25-0169 (issued January 2, 2025); *see C.D.*, Docket No. 20-0168 (issued March 5, 2020).

³ *See C.S.*, Docket No. 18-1760 (issued November 25, 2019); *Yvette N. Davis*, 55 ECAB 475 (2004); *see also William A. Couch*, *supra* note 1.

⁴ *Order Remanding Case, A.H.*, *supra* note 2; *see Order Remanding Case, L.G.*, Docket No. 23-0637 (issued September 15, 2023).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the December 27, 2024 decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is set aside, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this order of the Board.

Issued: May 7, 2025
Washington, DC

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

Janice B. Askin, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Valerie D. Evans-Harrell, Alternate Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board