

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

B.W., Appellant)	
)	
and)	Docket No. 25-0794
)	Issued: September 22, 2025
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,)	
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT)	
AGENCY, MOUNT WEATHER EMERGENCY)	
OPERATIONS CENTER, Bluemont, VA,)	
Employer)	
)	

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
VALERIE D. EVANS-HARRELL, Alternate Judge

JURISDICTION

On August 22, 2025 appellant filed a timely appeal from a March 31, 2025 merit decision of the Office of Workers’ Compensation Programs (OWCP).¹ Pursuant to the Federal Employees’

¹ Appellant timely requested oral argument before the Board. 20 C.F.R. § 501.2(b). Pursuant to the Board’s *Rules of Procedure*, oral argument may be held in the discretion of the Board. 20 C.F.R. § 501.5(a). The Board in exercising its discretion, denies appellant’s request for oral argument because the arguments on appeal can adequately be addressed in a decision based on a review of the case record. Oral argument in this appeal would further delay issuance of a Board decision and not serve a useful purpose. As such, the oral argument request is denied, and this decision is based on the case record as submitted to the Board.

Compensation Act² (FECA) and 20 C.F.R. §§ 501.2(c) and 501.3, the Board has jurisdiction over the merits of this case.³

ISSUE

The issue is whether appellant has met his burden of proof to establish a diagnosed medical condition in connection with the accepted employment exposure.

FACTUAL HISTORY

On December 22, 2024 appellant, then a 33-year-old fire protection and prevention agent, filed an occupational disease claim (Form CA-2) alleging that he experienced a bloodborne pathogen exposure due to factors of his federal employment. He noted that a patient inside an ambulance forcefully coughed blood and sputum onto his face and into his mouth. Appellant noted that he first became aware of his condition and realized its relationship to his federal employment on December 22, 2024. He did not stop work.

In a December 31, 2024 development letter, OWCP informed appellant of the deficiencies of his claim. It advised him of the type of factual and medical evidence needed to establish his claim and afforded him 60 days to submit the necessary evidence. No additional evidence was received.

In a follow-up letter dated January 30, 2025, OWCP advised appellant that it had conducted an interim review, and the evidence remained insufficient to establish his claim. It noted that he had 60 days from the December 31, 2024 letter to submit the necessary evidence. OWCP further advised that if the evidence was not received during this time, it would issue a decision based on the evidence contained in the record. No additional evidence was received.

By decision dated March 31, 2025, OWCP denied the claim, finding that the medical evidence of record was insufficient to establish a medical condition in connection with the accepted employment exposure. It concluded, therefore, that the requirements had not been met to establish an injury as defined by FECA.

LEGAL PRECEDENT

An employee seeking benefits under FECA⁴ has the burden of proof to establish the essential elements of his or her claim, including 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

² 5 U.S.C. § 8101 *et seq.*

³ The Board notes that, following the March 31, 2025 decision, OWCP received additional evidence. 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.*

⁴ *Supra* note 2.

limitation of FECA,⁵ 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.⁶ 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.⁷

To establish that an injury was sustained in the performance of duty in an occupational disease claim, a claimant must submit: (1) a factual statement identifying employment factors alleged to have caused or contributed to the presence or occurrence of the disease or condition; (2) medical evidence establishing the presence or existence of the disease or condition for which compensation is claimed; and (3) medical evidence establishing that the diagnosed condition is causally related to the identified employment factors.⁸

The medical evidence required to establish causal relationship between a diagnosed condition and the accepted employment factors is rationalized medical opinion evidence.⁹ The opinion of the physician must be based on a complete factual and medical background of the employee, must be one of reasonable medical certainty, and must be supported by medical rationale explaining the nature of the relationship between the diagnosed condition and specific employment factors identified by the employee.¹⁰

ANALYSIS

The Board finds that appellant has not met his burden of proof to establish a diagnosed medical condition in connection with the accepted employment exposure.

OWCP, in its December 31, 2024 development letter, notified appellant of the type of medical evidence needed to establish his claim and afforded him 60 days to submit the necessary evidence. Appellant did not respond. In a follow-up letter dated January 30, 2025, it advised him that the evidence remained insufficient to establish his claim, reminded him that he had 60 days from the December 31, 2024 letter to submit the necessary evidence, and advised him that if the evidence was not received during the specified time frame, it would issue a decision based on the

⁵ *F.H.*, Docket No. 18-0869 (issued January 29, 2020); *J.P.*, Docket No. 19-0129 (issued April 26, 2019); *Joe D. Cameron*, 41 ECAB 153 (1989).

⁶ *L.C.*, Docket No. 19-1301 (issued January 29, 2020); *J.H.*, Docket No. 18-1637 (issued January 29, 2020); *James E. Chadden, Sr.*, 40 ECAB 312 (1988).

⁷ *P.A.*, Docket No. 18-0559 (issued January 29, 2020); *K.M.*, Docket No. 15-1660 (issued September 16, 2016); *Delores C. Ellyett*, 41 ECAB 992 (1990).

⁸ *S.R.*, Docket No. 24-0839 (issued October 30, 2024); *T.W.*, Docket No. 20-0767 (issued January 13, 2021); *L.D.*, Docket No. 19-1301 (issued January 29, 2020); *S.C.*, Docket No. 18-1242 (issued March 13, 2019).

⁹ *S.S.*, Docket No. 19-0688 (issued January 24, 2020); *A.M.*, Docket No. 18-1748 (issued April 24, 2019); *Robert G. Morris*, 48 ECAB 238 (1996).

¹⁰ *T.L.*, Docket No. 18-0778 (issued January 22, 2020); *Y.S.*, Docket No. 18-0366 (issued January 22, 2020); *Victor J. Woodhams*, 41 ECAB 345, 352 (1989).

evidence contained in the record. However, no additional evidence was received prior to OWCP's March 31, 2025 decision.

As there is no medical evidence of record establishing a diagnosed medical condition in connection with the accepted employment factors, the Board finds that appellant 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 in connection with the accepted employment exposure.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the March 31, 2025 decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is affirmed.

Issued: September 22, 2025
Washington, DC

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

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

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