### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

### **INDICATE FULL CAPTION:**

ASSOCIATED RISK MANAGEMENT, INC.
Appellant,
vs.
MANUEL IBANEZ
Respondent

No. 80480 Electronically Filed
Feb 06 2020 01:03 p.m.

DOCKETING ElizabethEATBrown

CIVIL ARPENALS Supreme Court

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Appellants must complete this docketing statement in compliance with NRAP 14(a). The purpose of the docketing statement is to assist the Supreme Court in screening jurisdiction, identifying issues on appeal, assessing presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, scheduling cases for oral argument and settlement conferences, classifying cases for expedited treatment and assignment to the Court of Appeals, and compiling statistical information.

### WARNING

This statement must be completed fully, accurately and on time. NRAP 14(c). The Supreme Court may impose sanctions on counsel or appellant if it appears that the information provided is incomplete or inaccurate. *Id.* Failure to fill out the statement completely or to file it in a timely manner constitutes grounds for the imposition of sanctions, including a fine and/or dismissal of the appeal.

A complete list of the documents that must be attached appears as Question 27 on this docketing statement. Failure to attach all required documents will result in the delay of your appeal and may result in the imposition of sanctions.

This court has noted that when attorneys do not take seriously their obligations under NRAP 14 to complete the docketing statement properly and conscientiously, they waste the valuable judicial resources of this court, making the imposition of sanctions appropriate. See <u>KDI Sylvan Pools v. Workman</u>, 107 Nev. 340, 344, 810 P.2d 1217, 1220 (1991). Please use tab dividers to separate any attached documents.

1. Judicial District Eight Judicial District Cou	Department X
County Clark	Judge Tierra Jones
District Ct. Case No. A-19-792902-J	
2. Attorney filing this docketing statemen	t:
Attorney David H. Benavidez	Telephone 702-565-9730
Firm Law Office of David H. Benavidez	
Address 850 S. Boulder Hwy. #375 Henderson, Nv 89015	
Client(s) Associated Risk Management, Inc	
If this is a joint statement by multiple appellants, add the names of their clients on an additional sheet accompfiling of this statement.	
3. Attorney(s) representing respondents(s)	<b>):</b>
Attorney Javier Arguello, Esq.	Telephone (702) 649-2600
Firm Bertolo, Baker, Carter & Smith	
Address 7408 W. Sahara Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89117	
Client(s) Manuel Ibanez	
Attorney	Telephone
Firm	
Address	
Client(s)	

(List additional counsel on separate sheet if necessary)

4. Nature of disposition below (check	all that apply):	
☐ Judgment after bench trial	☐ Dismissal:	
☐ Judgment after jury verdict	☐ Lack of jurisdict	ion
☐ Summary judgment	☐ Failure to state	a claim
☐ Default judgment	Failure to prose	cute
☐ Grant/Denial of NRCP 60(b) relief	☐ Other (specify):	
☐ Grant/Denial of injunction	☐ Divorce Decree:	
☐ Grant/Denial of declaratory relief	C Original	☐ Modification
⊠ Review of agency determination	Cother disposition (	specify):
5. Does this appeal raise issues conce	erning any of the follo	owing?
☐ Child Custody		
□ Venue		
Termination of parental rights		
6. Pending and prior proceedings in of all appeals or original proceedings presare related to this appeal:		
None.		

7. Pending and prior proceedings in other courts. List the case name, number and court of all pending and prior proceedings in other courts which are related to this appeal (e.g., bankruptcy, consolidated or bifurcated proceedings) and their dates of disposition:

8. Nature of the action. Briefly describe the nature of the action and the result below:

This appeal involves a District Court order denying the Petition for Judicial Review of an April 11, 2019 Appeals Officer decision which reversed the Hearing Officer 's August 28, 2018 decision affirming the Administrator 's determination denying the claimant 's request for permanent total disability (PTD).

**9. Issues on appeal.** State concisely the principal issue(s) in this appeal (attach separate sheets as necessary):

The claimant is not medically stable. To date, the claim remains open for medical care. No physician has found the claimant medically stable. The claimant has not been rated for permanent impairment. Nor has the authorized treatment physician recommended permanent restrictions. The claimant has therefore not met with a vocational counselor. During the administration of the claim, it was determined the claimant is not lawfully in the United States. The Administrator denied temporary total disability (TTD) benefits as the claimant is not entitled to the monetary wage replacement benefits based on his inability to work as a result of being an undocumented alien. Tarango v. SIIS, 117 Nev. 444, 25 P.3d 175 (2001).

See page 12 (attached)

10. Pending proceedings in this court raising the same or similar issues. If you are aware of any proceedings presently pending before this court which raises the same or similar issues raised in this appeal, list the case name and docket numbers and identify the same or similar issue raised:

None known.

the state, any state age	sues. If this appeal challenges the constitutionality of a statute, and ency, or any officer or employee thereof is not a party to this appeal, lerk of this court and the attorney general in accordance with NRAP 44
П N/A	
☐ Yes	• •
No No	
If not, explain:	
ii not, explant.	
•	
12. Other issues. Doe	es this appeal involve any of the following issues?
Reversal of well-se	ettled Nevada precedent (identify the case(s))
An issue arising u	nder the United States and/or Nevada Constitutions
🗵 A substantial issue	e of first impression
An issue of public	policy
An issue where en court's decisions	banc consideration is necessary to maintain uniformity of this
A ballot question	
(198 impr pern whe light	Nevada Indus. Comm 'n v. Hildebrand, 100 Nev.47, 675 P.2d 401 (4), where the treating physician found her at maximum medical rovement, medically stable and Hildebrand had been rated for manent impairment receiving a 5% award unlike the present claim re the claimant continues to treat, is not stable and continues with the duty restrictions. Hildebrand was offered vocational services where cational counselor assessed the job market, unlike this claim.

13. Assignment to the Court of Appeals or retention in the Supreme Court. Briefly set forth whether the matter is presumptively retained by the Supreme Court or assigned to the Court of Appeals under NRAP 17, and cite the subparagraph(s) of the Rule under which the matter falls. If appellant believes that the Supreme Court should retain the case despite its presumptive assignment to the Court of Appeals, identify the specific issue(s) or circumstance(s) that warrant retaining the case, and include an explanation of their importance or significance:

This case is presumptively assigned to the Court of Appeals under NRAP17(b)(10) as it is a Petition for Judicial Review of a final decision of an administrative agency. However, the Supreme Court should retain jurisdiction given that his case presents an issue of first impression which would affect the statewide administration of workers 'compensation insurance.

14. Trial.	If this action proceeded to trial, how many days did the trial last?	•
Was i	t a bench or jury trial?	

**15. Judicial Disqualification.** Do you intend to file a motion to disqualify or have a justice recuse him/herself from participation in this appeal? If so, which Justice? N/A

### TIMELINESS OF NOTICE OF APPEAL

16. Date of entry of	written judgment or order appealed from
If no written judg seeking appellate	ment or order was filed in the district court, explain the basis for review:
January 21, 2020	
17. Date written no	tice of entry of judgment or order was served January 29,2020
Was service by:	
☐ Delivery	
🗵 Mail/electronic	z/fax
18. If the time for fi (NRCP 50(b), 52(b),	iling the notice of appeal was tolled by a post-judgment motion or 59)
(a) Specify the the date of f	type of motion, the date and method of service of the motion, and illing.
□ NRCP 50(b)	Date of filing
☐ NRCP 52(b)	Date of filing
□ NRCP 59	Date of filing
	pursuant to NRCP 60 or motions for rehearing or reconsideration may toll the a notice of appeal. See AA Primo Builders v. Washington, 126 Nev, 245 )).
(b) Date of entr	ry of written order resolving tolling motion
(c) Date writter	n notice of entry of order resolving tolling motion was served
Was service	by:
☐ Delivery	
┌ Mail	

19	Date notice of appea	al filed January 22, 2020	
	<del>-</del>	ty has appealed from the judgment or order, list the date each filed and identify by name the party filing the notice of appea	
	. Specify statute or rug., NRAP 4(a) or other	ale governing the time limit for filing the notice of appe	eal,
NJ	RAP 4(a)SUBSTANTIV	E APPEALABILITY	
		SUBSTANTIVE APPEALABILITY	
	e judgment or order a	or other authority granting this court jurisdiction to reappealed from:	view
\ <del></del> /	☐ NRAP 3A(b)(1)	□ NRS 38.205	
	□ NRAP 3A(b)(2)	IX NRS 233B 150	

(b) Explain how each authority provides a basis for appeal from the judgment or order:

☐ NRS 703.376

☐ NRAP 3A(b)(3)

Other (specify)

NRS 233B.150 Appeal from final judgment of district court. An aggrieved party may obtain a review of any final judgment of the district court by appeal to the appellate court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to the rules fixed by the Supreme Court pursuant to Section 4 of Article 6 of the Nevada Constitution. The appeal shall be taken as in other civil cases

22. List all parties involved in the action or consolidated actions in the district court: (a) Parties:
Associated Risk Management, Inc.
Manuel Ibanez
(b) If all parties in the district court are not parties to this appeal, explain in detail why those parties are not involved in this appeal, <i>e.g.</i> , formally dismissed, not served, or other:
•
23. Give a brief description (3 to 5 words) of each party's separate claims, counterclaims, cross-claims, or third-party claims and the date of formal disposition of each claim.
24. Did the judgment or order appealed from adjudicate ALL the claims alleged below and the rights and liabilities of ALL the parties to the action or consolidated actions below?
⊠ Yes
$\Gamma$ No
25. If you answered "No" to question 24, complete the following:  (a) Specify the claims remaining pending below:

(b) Specify the	e parties remaining below:
(c) Did the dis pursuant to N	trict court certify the judgment or order appealed from as a final judgment RCP 54(b)?
☐ Yes	
□ No	
	trict court make an express determination, pursuant to NRCP 54(b), that treason for delay and an express direction for the entry of judgment?
□ Yes	
□ No	
	ered "No" to any part of question 25, explain the basis for seeking w (e.g., order is independently appealable under NRAP 3A(b)):
	tamped copies of the following documents:
	est-filed complaint, counterclaims, cross-claims, and third-party claims ing motion(s) and order(s) resolving tolling motion(s)
• Orders claims	of NRCP 41(a) dismissals formally resolving each claim, counterclaims, cross and/or third-party claims asserted in the action or consolidated action below,
	not at issue on appeal er order challenged on appeal
<del>-</del>	of entry for each attached order

### **VERIFICATION**

I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read this docketing statement, that the information provided in this docketing statement is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I have attached all required documents to this docketing statement.

Associated Risk Manageme	ent, Inc	David H. Benavidez, Esq.
Name of appellant		Name of counsel of record
February 6, 2020 Date		Signature of counsel of record
Nevada, Clark State and county where sign	ed	
	CERTIFICATE OI	FSERVICE
I certify that on the 6th	day of February	, $2020$ , I served a copy of this
completed docketing stateme	ent upon all counsel of	record:
⊠ By personally serving	g it upon him/her; or	
address(es): (NOTE:		ent postage prepaid to the following sses cannot fit below, please list names addresses.)
Javier A Arguello, Esq. Benson Bertoldo Baker 7408 W Sahara Ave Las Vegas, NV 89122		
Dated this 6th	day of February	, 2020 gnature

### 9. Continued

Instead of allowing the claim to play out, the claimant hired a rating physician who found the claimant permanent and totally disabled. The rating physician does not mention the claimant is illegal. , nor does he mention the claim remains open and no physician has found him medically stable

*	Electronically Filed 1/29/2020 10:37 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT
1	NOTC BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH
2	JAVIER A. ARGUELLO, ESQ.
3	Nevada Bar No. 4908 7408 W. Sahara Ave.
. 4	Las Vegas, NV 89117 Phone (702) 649-2600
5	Fax (702) 657-1107 Attorneys for Respondent
6	Attorneys for Respondent MANUEL IBANEZ
7	DISTRICT COURT
8 9	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
10	ASSOCIATED RISK MANAGEMENT, INC., ) CASE NO. A-19-792902-J
11	) DEPT NO. 10 vs. Petitioner,
12	) )
13	MANUEL IBANEZ, DEPARTMENT OF ) ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS )
14	DIVISION, APPEALS OFFICE
15	Respondents.
16	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER
17	YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, please take notice that an ORDER DENYING
18	PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW was entered in the above-captioned
19	matter on the January 21, 2020 a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.
20	DATED this day of January 2020,
21	Respectfully submitted by:
22	BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH, CHTD.
23	
24	JAVIER Á. ARGUELLO, ESQ Nevada Bar No. 4908
25	7408 W. Sahara Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89117
26	Attorney's for Respondent

## BERTOLDO BAKER CARTER & SMITH

### Las Vegas, Nevada 89117 702-228-2600• Fax 702-228-2333 7408 West Sahara Avenue

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH and that, on the 29day of January 2020, I deposited a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER in the U.S. Mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, enclosed in a sealed envelope upon which first-class postage was fully prepaid, addressed to the following:

DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ, Esq. 850 S. Boulder Hwy. #375 Henderson, NV 89015

Richard Staub, Esq. PO Box 392 Carson City, NV 89701

ASSOCIATED RISK MANAGEMENT, INC. PO Box 4930 Carson City, NV 89702-4930

An Employee of BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH

1 ORDR BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH 2 JAVIER A. ARGUELLO, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4908 3 7408 W. Sahara Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89117 4 Phone (702) 649-2600 5 Fax (702) 657-1107 Attorneys for Respondent 6 MANUÉL IBANEZ 7 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 9 ASSOCIATED RISK MANAGEMENT, INC., 10 A-19-792902-J Case No: Petitloner, 11 Dept. No.: 10 ٧. 12 MANUEL IBANEZ; and the STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF 13 ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS DIVISION, 14 APPEALS OFFICER, An Agency of the State of Nevada, 15 Respondents. 16 17 ORDER 18 Petitioner's Petition for Judicial review having come on for hearing on October 19 22, 2019; the Petitioners were represented by their attorney of record, David H 20 Benavidez, Esq., of the law firm of DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ, and Respondent, MANUEL 21 22 IBANEZ was represented by Javier A. Arguello, Esq., of the Law Offices of 23 BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH; The Court having been fully apprised of the 24 matter and having heard arguments of counsel. 25 26 []] 27 28

Electronically Filed 1/21/2020 4:36 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

Case Number: A-19-792902-J

27

28

111

2

3

4

5

6

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's Petition for Judicial Review is hereby

DENIED.

DATED this 15 day of January 2020.

Respectfully submitted by:

BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH

JAVIÉR A. ARGUELLO, ESQ Nevada Bar No. 4908 7408,W. Sahara Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89117 (702) 649-2600 Attorneys for Respondent YEVGEN MALIMON

DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ

Nevada Bar No. 4919 850 S. Boulder Hwy. #375 Henderson, NV 89015 (702) 565-9730 Attorneys for Petitioner

## BERTOLDO BAKER CARTER & SMITH

## 7408 West Sahara Avenue

Las Vegas, Nevada \$9117 702-228-2600• Fax 702-228-2333

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH and that, on the \_\_\_\_ day of January 2020, I deposited a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing ORDER in the U.S. Mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, enclosed in a sealed envelope upon which first-class postage was fully prepaid, addressed to the following:

DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ, Esq. 850 S. Boulder Hwy. #375 Henderson, NV 89015

Richard Staub, Esq. PO Box 392 Carson City, NV 89701

Associated Risk Mgmt., Inc. PO Box 4930 Carson City, NV 89702-4930

23

24

25

26

28

Steven D. Grierson PTJŔ 1 DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ, ESQUIRE 2 Nevada Bar No. 004919 LAW OFFICE OF DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ 3 850 South Boulder Highway, #375 CASE NO: A-19-792902-J Henderson, Nevada 89015 4 Department 10 Davidbenavidez@gmail.com 5 (702) 565-9730Attorney for Petitioner 6 7 DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 8 9 ASSOCIATED RISK MANAGEMENT, INC., 10 Petitioners, 11 ) Case No.: vs. 12 ) Dept No .: MANUEL IBANEZ, THE DEPARTMENT OF 13 ADMINISTRATION, HEARINGS DIVISION, 14 APPEALS OFFICE, an agency of the State of Nevada 15 16 Respondents. 17 PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW 18 19 COMES NOW, the Petitioner Associated Risk Management, Inc. 20 (Administrator), by and through its legal counsel David H. 21

Electronically Filed 4/12/2019 3:51 PM

COMES NOW, the Petitioner Associated Risk Management, Inc (Administrator), by and through its legal counsel David H. Benavidez, and petitions this Court for judicial review of the decision of the Appeals Officer decision dated April 11, 2019 attached hereto.

The Petition for Judicial Review is filed pursuant to the provisions of NRS 233B.130 and is based upon the grounds in NRS 233B.135(3). Substantial rights of the Petitioner have been

prejudiced because the decision of the Appeals Officer is:

- 1. In violation of constitutional or statutory provisions;
- 2. In excess of the statutory authority of the Appeals Officer;
- Made upon unlawful procedures;
- 4. Affected by other error of law;
- 5. Clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence on the whole record, and
- 6. Arbitrary or capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion.

It is specifically requested that this Court review written briefs and hear oral arguments.

DATED this 12th day of April, 2019.

David H. Benavidez, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 004919
850 S Boulder Hwy #375
Henderson, NV 89015
Attorney for Petitioner

### THE LAW OFFICE OF DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ 850 S. BOULDER HIGHWAY, #375 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89015

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury, that I am an employee of The Law Office of David H. Benavidez and on the 12th day of April, 2019, I deposited the foregoing PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW in the United States Mail, with first class postage fully prepaid thereon, sent via electronic delivery, or had hand-delivered, copies of the attached document addressed as follows:

Javier Arguello, Esq.
Bertoldo, Baker, Carter & Smith
7408 W. Sahara Ave.
Las Vegas NV 89117

High Point Construction 5870 Construction Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89122

Associated Risk Mgmt, Inc. Po Box 4930 Carson City NV 89702-4930

Richard Staub, Esq P O Box 392 Carson City, NV 89702 Patrick Cates Director, Dept of Admin Nv Dept of Admin 515 E. Musser St, 3rd Floor Carson City, NV 89701-4298

Aaron D. Ford, Esq.
Nevada Attorney General
Office of Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701

Department of Administration Hearing Division-Appeals Off 2200 S. Rancho Dr Ste 220 Las Vegas Nv 89102

Jennifer Bingham, Assistant

27

702-228-2600 Fax 702-228-2333 7408 West Sahara Avenue

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

LAW OFFICES OF BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH JAVIER A. ARGUELLO, ESQ., BAR # 4908 7408 W SAHARA AVENUE LAS VEGAS, NV 89117

APPEALS OFFICE

### **NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION** BEFORE THE APPEALS OFFICER

In the Matter of the Contested Industrial Insurance Claim of APPEAL NO.: 1903730-CJY MANUEL IBANEZ, CLAIM NO.: 5012-1271-2015-0195 Claimant

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The above captioned matter originally came on for hearing before Appeals Officer CHARLES J. YORK, ESQ, on March 18, 2019. The Petitioner Claimant, MANUEL IBANEZ, was not present and represented by JAVIER A. ARGUELLO, ESQ., of BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH. The Respondent Employer, HIGH POINT CONSTRUCTION, (hereinafter referred to as "Employer"), was not present and the Administrator, ASSOCIATED RISK MANAGEMENT, INC., (hereinafter "Administrator") was represented by DAVID H. BENAVIDEZ, ESQ.

The issue before the Appeals Officer involves the Hearing Officer's August 28, 2018 Decision, affirming the Administrator's July 9, 2018 determination denying the claimant's request for Permanent Total Disability ("PTD") benefits.

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

After consideration of all the evidence, including the testimony of the parties, the Appeals Officer finds and decides as follows:

### FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. On October 16, 2014, the claimant, Manuel Ibana sustained multiple severe industrial injuries, while working within the course and scope of his employment as a Carpenter, for High Point Construction.
- 2. According to the C-4, claim for compensation form, filled out on the date of injury, the claimant was putting block on the stairs, when a 2x4 fell from the second floor hitting him in the head, right shoulder and low back. The physician diagnosed him with contusion to the right shoulder, cervical strain and lumbar strain, which he directly connected to the claimant's injury. Additional medical treatment was recommended and the claimant was placed on light duty restrictions of no lifting over 10 pounds, no reaching above shoulders.
- The Employer completed its C-3 form on October 24, 2014. Validity of the claim was not doubted. The Employer indicated that the claimant was building stairs on a second floor home when a 2x4 piece of lumbar fell from the roof trusses and dropped down hitting him on the shoulder.
- The claimant would undergo various modalities of treatment at Concentra Medical Center and was prescribed medications and physical therapy. The claimant remained on light duty restrictions consisting of no lifting over 10 pounds and no reaching above shoulders.
- 5. In a determination dated October 30, 2014, the Administrator advised the claimant that his claim had been accepted for a cervical and lumbar strain, and right shoulder contusion.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- On January 6, 2015, the claimant's care was transferred to Dr. G.M. Elkanich for his low back and cervical conditions. Dr. Elkanich recommended injections for the low back and referral to pain management, as well as an orthopedic referral for the right shoulder. The claimant remained on light duty restrictions consisting of no lifting over 10 pounds and no bending at the waist.
- The claimant would would undergo various modalities of treatment including injections at the L4-5 and L5-S1 levels with Dr. Fischer and ultimately underwent diskectomy and lumbar interbody fusion by Dr. Elkanich on November 11, 2015. The claimant would be taken off work.
- 8. On February 2, 2015, the claimant's care for his right shoulder was transferred to Dr. Steven Sanders, and he would ultimately conservative treatment. The claimant would ultimately undergo a right shoulder surgery on February 4, 2016. The operative report noted the postoperative diagnosis of right shoulder acromioclavicular joint posttraumatic arthoplasty, right biceps tendinopathy, and right shoulder posttraumatic impingement syndrome, which Dr. Sanders opined was all industrially related. A distal clavicle resection was performed.
- 9. On May 17, 2016, the claimant returned to Dr. Elkanich and he opined the claimant had reached maximum medical improvement and was stable and rateable for his lumbar and cervical spine.
- 10. The claimant was examined by Dr. Avi Weiss on July 21, 2016 with a complaint of hematuria. He noted the claimant presented with a finding of persistent microscopic hematuria and indicated it was common for orchalgia to be present in such circumstances after reviewing the Op report from Dr. Elkanich with an L5 discogenic.
- As a result of continued symptomology in the lumbar and cervical spine, the 11. claimant began treating with Dr. Ryan Workman, a pain management physician, on December 22, 2016. He would undergo various modalities of treatment.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 12. On April 24, 2017, the claimant would begin treating with Dr. Archie Perry. Following additional injection therapy in the lumbar and cervical spine by Dr. Schifini, the claimant underwent a second lumbar surgery on September 12, 2017. performed a removal of segmental pedicle screw instrumentation at L4, L5, and S1, and exploration of posterior final fusion at L4-5 and L5-S1.
- 13. The claimant underwent surgical intervention to the cervical spine by Dr. Perry on September 26, 2017, consisting of a C5-6 fusion. The claimant was seen postoperatively by Dr. Stacy Oliver on October 16, 2017. She noted he was now having signficant right shoulder pain and recommended medication management.
- On November 13, 2017, the claimant returned to Dr. Perry for a follow up He noted despite the surgerical interventions, the claimant was continuing evaluation. to have significant low back, neck and right shoulder pain. His impression was status post C5-6 fusion and post removal of lumbar instrumentation. Dr. Perry recommended additional treatment, including a dorsal column stimulator, and took the claimant off work.
- The claimant continued to undergo various modalities of treatment for his 15. low back, neck and right shoulder with various physicians from December 7, 2017 through January 11, 2018. In his reporting dated January 11, 2018, Dr. Perry released the claimant with light duty restrictions consisting of no lifting over 10 pounds and no bending/twisting at the waist.
- On January 28, 2018, the claimant was evaluated by Dr. Elizabeth Munoz for a psychological clearance for the dorsal column stimulator. Dr. Munoz noted the claimant was suffering from severe depression, anxiety, and post traumatic stress and several medical issues as a result of his job accident in 2014. She recommended treatment for these conditions,

2

3

5

6

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 17. The claimant returned to Dr. Perry for follow up on February 12, 2018 and he continued to recommend approval of the dorsal column stimulator trial. He continued to recommend work restrictions consisting of no lifting over 10 pounds and no bending/twisting at the waist.
- The claimant continued to undergo various modalites of treatment for his 18. multiple industrial injuries. According to Dr. Oliver's April 5, 2018 reporting, the claimant was continuing to have significant issues with his industrial injuries. She continued to prescribe various medications including Hydrocodone, celebrex and tizandine to support the claimant's pain, additional injections, as well the SCS trial lumbar stimulator recommended by Dr. Perry. Dr. Oliver recommended the claimant maintain the same work restrictions given by Dr. Perry. Similar reporting was issue through July 26, 2018.
- 19. Due to the claimant's severe industrial injuries, ongoing need for medical treatment, including opiate medication, his lack of education and work experience, the claimant requested acceptance for permanent total disability (PTD) status on June 25, 2018.
- On July 9, 2018, the Administrator issued a determination denying the 20. claimant's request for Permanent Total Disability ("PTD") benefits based on the fact he was not documented to work in the United States. The claimant would appeal this determination to the Hearing Officer.
- In a Decision dated August 28, 2018, the Hearing Officer affirmed the Administrator's July 9, 2018 determination denying the claimant's request for Permanent Total Disability ("PTD") benefits. The claimant would appeal this Decision to this Court.
- On August 1, 2018, the claimant, via counsel, scheduled an appointment with Dr. Richard Cestkowski for a permanent total disability assessment and sent him all of the claimant's records.

13.

Fax 702-228-2333

- 24. Regarding the claimant's current employability, Dr. Cestkowkski opined it would be very difficult for the claimant to sell his employment services, in a competitive market. He considered the patients pain and limitations in multiple activities of daily life, along with his requirement for opiate medication would make it clearly impracticable to find employment on a sedentary basis.
- 25. The claimant continued to treat at MONOS Health with Dr. Oliver in December of 2018, and she noted the SCS trial occurred on 9/15/18, but the claimant did not get adequate pain relief to justify implant. She continued to prescribe opiate medication and continued to release the claimant with the sedentary 10 pounds of Dr. Perry. The claimant would continue to undergo various modalities of treatment with Dr. Patek at the same facility beginning in March of 2019.
- 26. The Appeals Officer finds that as a result of his severe industrial injury, which included multiple surgeries by various physicians for the claimant's low back, cervical spine, and right shoulder, the significant physical impairment as documented by Dr. Cestkowski in his IME report, and his sedentary 10 pound lifting restrictions imposed by Dr. Perry and Dr. Oliver, the claimant qualifies for PTD status.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- The Appeals Officer finds that based on the credible reporting from the 27. claimant's treating physicians, as well as the credible IME reporting from Dr. Cestkowsi, the Claimant has established that the Insurer's determination to deny his request for permanent total disability benefits was improper.
- The Appeals Officer finds the claimant qualifies for permanent total disability NRS 616C.435 is the applicable statute and the Appeals Officer finds the benefits. claimant would fall under the "odd lot doctrine" as explained in the Nevada Supreme Court case of Nevada Indus. Comm'n v. Hildebrand, 100 Nev. 47 (1984).
- 29. The Court stated as follows: "On the other hand, a worker may qualify for permanent total disability benefits under the odd-lot doctrine even if the worker's injury is not found in the statutory schedule. The doctrine is generally recognized by use of a residuary catch-all clause following the list of scheduled injuries. In Nevada, odd-lot situations are recognized by NRS 616.575 (2)[3] which provides that \*404 the list of scheduled injuries is not exclusive, and that in all other cases permanent total disability must be determined by the insurer in accordance with the facts presented."
- In determining whether a worker with a nonscheduled injury qualifies for 30. permanent total disability benefits under the odd-lot doctrine factors in addition to the physical impairment of the worker must be taken into account. This is because, as Professor Larson has stated, the odd-lot doctrine permits: [T]otal disability [to] be found in the case of workers who, while not altogether incapacitated for work, are so handicapped that they will not be employable regularly in any way well-known branch of the labor market. The essence of the test is the probable dependability with which claimant can sell his services in a competative labor market.... 2 A. Larson, the Law of Workmen's Compensation, section 57.51 (1981).

31. Larson has also stated that the worker need not be in a state of utter and abject helplessness to be considered permanently and totally disabled under the odd-lot doctrine. Id.

- 32. As noted above, consideration of factors other than physical impairment is necessary to determine wheather a nonscheduled injury qualifies the worker for permanent total disability benefits under the odd-lot doctrine. Such factors may include, among others, the worker's age, experince, training and education. See E.R. Moore Co. v. Industrial Com'n, 71 I11. 2d 353, 17 I11.Dec. 207, 211, 376 N.E.2d 206, 210 (I11. 1978); Lyons v. Industrial Special Indem. Fund, 98 Idaho 403, 565 P.2d 1360 (1977); see generally 2 A. Larson, supra, at sec. 57.51. The focus of the analysis, in considering the various factors, is on the degree to which the worker's physical disability impairs the worker's earning capacity or ability to work. See E.R. Moore Co., 17 I11.Dec. at 211,376 N.E.2d at 210.
- 33. As a result and based on the totality of the evidence, including the credible reporting of Dr. Perry, Dr. Oliver, and Dr. Cestkowski, the Appeals Officer finds that the claimant has demonstrated an entitlement to permanent total disability status.
- 34. The Appeals Officer finds the Administrator's argument that because the claimant did not possess a valid work visa he was not entitled to PTD status not credible or persuasive and not relevant to the inquiry of Permanent and Total Disability eligibility. Furthermore, there is no requirment in the statute that the claimant be at maximum, medical improvement to qualify for Permanent Total Disability status.
- 35. The Appeals Officer finds that the totality of the evidence, including the credible reporting of Dr. Cestkowski makes it clear, that the claimant fall under the "odd lot doctrine" as explained in the Nevada Supreme Court case of Nevada Indus. Comm'n V. Hildebrand, 100 Nev. 47 (1984).

36. Any finding of fact more appropriately considered to be a conclusion of law, and vice versa, shall be so deemed.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Appeals Officer concludes that the claimant has established by a preponderance of the evidence, including the credible reporting of Dr. Cestkowski, as well as the record before this Court, that he is entitled to Permanent and Total disability benefits. NRS 616C.150; NRS 616C.435. <u>Nevada Indus. Comm'n v. Hildebrand</u>, 100 Nev. 47 (1984). See also <u>Fancher v. Overhead Doors, Inc.</u>, 425 So. 2d 965, 966 (La. App 1983.

### **ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED Hearing Officer's August 28, 2018 Decision, **affirming** the Administrator's July 9, 2018 determination denying the claimant's request for Permanent Total Disability ("PTD") benefits, is hereby **reversed**.

g

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The matter shall be remanded to the Administrator to declare the claimant Permanent and Totally Disabled and to pay benefits under his Permanent and Total disability status retroactive to his request on June 25, 2018, and ongoing, with interest, pursuant to NRS 616C.335.

> Dated this // day of April, 2019.

> > APPEALS OFFICER CHARLES J. YORK, ESQ.

Respectfully submitted,

BERTOLDO, BAKER, CARTER & SMITH

JAVIER A ARGUELLO, ESO. Wevada Bar No. 004908

7408 W Sahara Avenue

Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

Attorneys for the Claimant

NOTICE: Pursuant to NRS 616C.370, should any party desire to appeal this final decision of the Appeals Officer, a Petition for Judicial Review must be filed with the District Court within thirty (30) days after service of this Order.

# BERTOLDO BAKER CARTER & SMITH

### 702-228-2600 Fax 702-228-2333 7408 West Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned, an employee of the State of Nevada, Department of Administration, Appeals Division, does hereby certify that on the date shown below, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **DECISION AND ORDER** was duly mailed, postage prepaid OR placed in the appropriate addressee runner file maintained by the Division, 2200 S Rancho Dr., Suite 200, Las Vegas, Nevada, to the following:

David H. Benavidez, Esq. 850 S Boulder Highway, #375 Henderson, NV 89015

**High Point Construction** 5870 Construction Ave Las Vegas, NV 89122-7332

Associated Risk Mgmt P O Box 4930 Carson City, NV 89702-4930

Richard Staub, Esq. P O Box 392 Carson City, NV 89702

Javier A. Arquello, Esq. Bertoldo, Baker, Carter & Smith 7408 W Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89117

Manuel Ibanez 5620 Eugene Ave Las Vegas, NV 8108

DATED THIS DAY OF April, 2019.

An Employee of THE STATE OF NEVADA