United States Department of Labor
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

C.G., Appellant	)	
and	)	**Docket No. 26-0611**
	)	**Issued: September 29, 2026**
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE, SAN ANTONIO POST OFFICE, San Antonio, TX, Employer	)	

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

Case Submitted on the Record

ORDER REMANDING CASE

Before:
ALEC J. KOROMILAS, Chief Judge
PATRICIA H. FITZGERALD, Deputy Chief Judge
VALERIE D. EVANS-HARRELL, Alternate Judge

On June 19, 2026 appellant filed a timely appeal from a February 19, 2026 merit decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP).[1] The Clerk of the Appellate Boards docketed the appeal as No. 26-0611.[2]

On June 13, 2025 appellant, then a 37-year-old city carrier, filed a traumatic injury claim (Form CA-1) alleging that on June 10, 2025 she injured her right arm, head, and chest when her postal vehicle collided with a drunk driver while in the performance of duty. She stopped work on the date of injury. OWCP accepted the claim for joint derangement of the right shoulder, elbow, wrist, and hand; nondisplaced fracture of the hooked process of the hamate bone in the right wrist; strain of extensor muscle of the right forearm; lateral epicondylitis of the right elbow; multiple fractures of ribs right side; hemothorax; hemarthrosis of the right hand; and intervertebral disc

[1] In her June 19, 2026 appeal, appellant noted a decision date of February 14, 2026. The record as transmitted to the Board does not contain a decision by OWCP dated February 14, 2026. The February 19, 2026 decision is the only decision within the Board's jurisdiction. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 501.3.

[2] The Board notes that, following the February 19, 2026 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.*

displacement of the lumbar region. OWCP paid her wage-loss compensation on the supplemental rolls.

OWCP subsequently received medical evidence including progress reports dated October 8 and November 4, 2025 wherein Dr. Bhaskara Ganti, a Board-certified anesthesiologist and pain medicine specialist, noted that appellant underwent lumbar medial branch blocks.

In follow-up medical reports dated October 8 and December 3, 2025, Dr. Don M. Thompson, a Board-certified internist, noted appellant's complaints of pain in the lower back, right hand, and right wrist. He documented physical examination findings, and released her to return to work six hours per day with physical restrictions as tolerated.

On November 22, 2025 appellant filed a claim for compensation (Form CA-7) for disability from work during the period August 23 through November 7, 2025.[3]

By decision dated February 19, 2026, OWCP denied appellant's claim for disability from work for the period August 23 through November 7, 2025, finding that the medical evidence of record did not contain a narrative medical report by her treating physician stating that she was temporarily totally disabled during the claimed period and, therefore, was insufficient to establish her claim.

The Board, having duly considered this matter, finds that the case is not in posture for decision.

In the case of *William A. Couch*,[4] 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. In its February 19, 2026 decision, OWCP failed to consider evidence including the October 8 and November 4, 2025 reports of Dr. Ganti and the October 8 and December 3, 2025 reports of Dr. Thompson, which it received prior to February 19, 2026. While it is not required to list every piece of evidence submitted, OWCP failed to follow its procedures by not considering all relevant evidence of record.[5]

As the Board's decisions are final as to the subject matter appealed, it is crucial that OWCP consider and address all evidence received prior to the issuance of its final decision. The case shall therefore be remanded for further development. On remand, OWCP shall consider and address all evidence of record. Following this and other such further development as deemed necessary, it shall issue a *de novo* decision. Accordingly,

[3] Appellant previously filed a Form CA-7 for disability from work during the period August 9 through September 2, 2025, which OWCP denied by decision dated October 20, 2025.

[4] 41 ECAB 548 (1990); *see also Order Remanding Case*, *A.D.*, Docket No. 22-0519 (issued January 11, 2023); *Order Remanding Case, A.B.*, Docket No. 22-0179 (issued June 28, 2022); *Order Remanding Case, S.H.*, Docket No. 19-1582 issued May 26, 2020); *R.D.*, Docket No. 17-1818 (issued April 3, 2018).

[5] *See Order Remanding Case, R.M.*, Docket No. 26-0063 (issued August 5, 2026); *Order Remanding Case*, *S.T.*, Docket No. 23-0915 (issued January 8, 2024); *Order Remanding Case*, *G.A.*, Docket No. 21-0862 (issued June 8, 2022); *E.P.*, Docket No. 20-0655 (issued March 17, 2021). OWCP's procedures provide that all evidence submitted should be reviewed and discussed in the decision. Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *Initial Denials*, Chapter 2.1401.5b(2) (November 2012).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the February 19, 2026 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: September 29, 2026
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