

State of California
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

VICTOR SANCHEZ PENALOZA,

Applicant,

vs.

MRS GROUP, INC.; INSURANCE
COMPANY OF THE WEST,

Defendant(s).

Case No. ADJ12018865
Los Angeles District Office

FINDINGS AND ORDER

TELLERIA, TELLERIA & LEVY

By: Neil Ratnasoma, Esq.

Attorneys for Applicant

GREENUP, HARTSTON & ROSENFELD, LLP

By: C. Duke Marsh, Esq.

Attorneys for Defendant

* * * * *

The above-entitled matter having been regularly heard and submitted, the Honorable Douglas A. Watkins, Workers' Compensation Judge, now makes his decision as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Applicant, while employed by MRS Group, Inc. on February 19, 2019, did not sustain injury arising out of and in the course of employment.

(Continued Next Page)

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that Applicant take nothing by the filing of his Application for Adjudication of Claim.

DATED: March 19, 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Watkins", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

DOUGLAS A. WATKINS
Workers' Compensation Judge

WCAB CASE NO.: ADJ12018865

VICTOR SANCHEZ PENALOZA

-vs-

MRS GROUP, INC.;
INSURANCE COMPANY
OF THE WEST

JUDGE:

DOUGLAS A. WATKINS

DATE OF INJURY:

FEBRUARY 19, 2019

OPINION ON DECISION

Victor Sanchez Penaloza claims that while employed on February 19, 2019, as a truck driver, by MRS Group, Inc., he sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment to the neck, back, knee, foot, leg, and head. Defendant denies injury AOE/COE.

Background:

Applicant claims he was injured twice on February 19, 2019. He testified at trial that the first injury occurred when he was at a rest stop and he slipped while getting out of his truck. He said he was coming from San Francisco and going to San Bernardino. He first said he fell onto his hands and feet, but then said he fell onto his feet and knees, and then fell onto his hands. He also said he hurt his face and arms in that accident. He said it was not a strong blow to the face; it was more like a scrape. He then confirmed that in his deposition he had said it was a strong injury to his face. He testified at trial that it was not a strong "blow" to the face but it was a strong "injury". He said he had scratches or bruises on his face from that fall, and he showed them to someone named "Chico" or "Chino" at work. He then confirmed that he had said in his deposition that he did not have scratches on his face.

Applicant testified that the second incident occurred at the warehouse in San Bernardino where he was leaving his container. He said he fell while getting out of his truck, injuring his back and face. He said he hit his face on the door and hit his back on a diesel can. He also said he fell onto his back. He then said it wasn't so much of a fall, but more of a slide type injury. He also changed his testimony to say he injured his back when he hit it on some aluminum steps.

Applicant testified that he only reported the first injury, not the second injury. He said he reported that first injury to Maria, who is in charge of the office. He then said he called the dispatcher, Steve Wilkinson, after the first injury but wasn't able to reach him, and spoke to Maria after the second injury.

Applicant testified that he discussed his injury with "Chico" or "Chino", who was the owner of the company.

Applicant testified that Maria did not give him medical treatment, but then said she told him he could go to Kaiser. He said the first doctor he saw was the doctor the company sent him to about 2 months after the accidents. He said the statement in the report of Gerald Ferencz, D.C. that the company did not make an appointment for him is incorrect.

Applicant testified that he had a prior workers' compensation case against California Cartage involving his feet. He said he had another prior injury while working for Tri State Staffing on October 1, 2012, involving his neck, back, trunk, knees and legs. He said he had ongoing pain from that injury prior to the current February 19, 2019 alleged injury. He does not know why Dr. Ferencz's report says that he denied having any prior injuries to the subject body parts.

Maria Troncoso testified for the employer. She said that when Applicant was hired he was asked for his driver's license, but he only had a temporary one. She said that the day before the alleged injuries, she asked Applicant for his physical, plastic driver's license, and told him he could be terminated if he didn't have one. She said Applicant told her he didn't have one.

Ms. Troncoso testified that Applicant was not scheduled to be in San Francisco on the day of the alleged accidents. She said he was going to San Jose that day.

Ms. Troncoso testified that Applicant reported the San Bernardino injury to her but not the first one. She said he told her he injured the back of his head while uncoupling a trailer. She said she did not see any bruises or scrapes on the front of his head. She said she offered to send him to a doctor, but he declined. She said she did not send Applicant to Kaiser. She testified that there is no employee named "Chico" or "Chino" at the company, and she has never heard of any employee using that nickname.

Steve Wilkison also testified for the employer. He said he stays in contact with the drivers at work. He said there is a GPS tracking system which will send a message to him if a driver stops at a place where there is no customer for over 10 minutes. He said he doesn't recall getting such a message for Applicant stopping at the rest stop on the day in question, but if he did he would have called Applicant. He said Applicant did not report any injury to him. He said he does not believe Applicant could have injured his head while unhooking a trailer because of the setup for unhooking it.

A copy of selected pages of Applicant's deposition transcript were submitted as rebuttal evidence. He had testified that the San Bernardino accident occurred as he was bending down to unhook the trailer and he hit his head or forehead. He said he felt pain but it wasn't that bad. He had testified that when he fell at the rest stop he landed on his feet. He said he also hurt his face there because he hit it on the door handle. He said he didn't see any marks on his face.

Applicant was shown an Acknowledgement of Injury Form from the employer. He confirmed that it states the alleged injury was "hit head".

Applicant submitted a medical report from chiropractor Gerald Ferencz, D.C. dated May 3, 2019. The report says Applicant injured his back, neck, knees and feet on February 19, 2019, while he was disconnecting a box from the trailer. It says he slipped and fell while getting off the truck. It says he sought treatment on his own because the employer did not make an appointment for him.

Some selected records from Kaiser, dated April 2, 2019 were submitted. They state that Applicant injured his neck, back, and bilateral knees when he fell to the ground while opening the back door of a big rig.

Discussion:

Applicant was not a credible witness by any stretch. His account of what he claims happened to him varies widely between his trial testimony, his deposition testimony, the medical records and the Acknowledgement of Injury Form. Ms. Troncoso's testimony that he was told he could be fired if he didn't have a driver's license, which Applicant confirmed he did not have, is credible. So is her testimony that only alleged incident reported to her was Applicant hitting his head while uncoupling a trailer. However, Mr. Wilkison testified convincingly that it was unlikely such an incident could have occurred given the setup for the trailers. Moreover, even if such an incident did occur, it is found that it did not result in lost time or need for medical treatment, so it would not rise to the level of a workers' compensation injury.

The medical report of chiropractor Gerald Ferencz, D.C. is not substantial evidence. The history of injury is inconsistent with the employer witnesses' credible testimony, Applicant's deposition testimony and the employer records. The report also falsely states that Applicant had no prior work injuries.

The Kaiser records are also not substantial evidence to support the alleged injuries. They are inconsistent with the employer witnesses' testimony, Applicant's deposition testimony and the employer records.

Based on the foregoing, it is found that Applicant did not sustain injury arising out of and in the course of employment.



DOUGLAS A. WATKINS
Workers' Compensation Judge

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION

03-19-2020

OFFICIAL ADDRESS RECORD

Case Number: ADJ12018865

- ✓ GREENUP HARTSTON LONG BEACH Law Firm, 444 W OCEAN BLVD STE 1530 LONG BEACH CA 90802
- ✓ INS CO OF THE WEST WOODLAND HILLS Claims Administrator, PO BOX 509039 SAN DIEGO CA 92150, MMUELLER@ICWGROUP.COM
- ✓ MRS GROUP INC Employer, 305 S 9TH AVE LA PUENTE CA 91746
- ✓ TELLERIA TELLERIA SAN GABRIEL Law Firm, 828 W LAS TUNAS DR SAN GABRIEL CA 91776
- ✓ VICTOR SANCHEZ PENALOZA

I am over the age of 18, not a party to this proceeding, and I'm employed by the State of California, DWC, Los Angeles District Office of the WCAB, located at 320 W. 4th Street, Los Angeles, CA, 90013.

On March 19, 2020, I served the attached FINDINGS AND ORDER AND OPINION ON DECISION on the interested parties in said cause, by e-mail, fax or by placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage fully paid, addressed to the party or parties with a (✓) above.

"I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct."

Date: March 19, 2020

Signed



MARY GRAY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

VICTOR SANCHEZ PENALOZA,)
Applicant,) CASE NO. ADJ 12018865
vs.) LOS ANGELES DISTRICT OFFICE
MRS GROUP, INC.; ICW GROUP,) MINUTES OF HEARING
AND
Defendant(s).) SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

DISTRICT OFFICE: Los Angeles
PLACE AND TIME: Los Angeles, California
February 12, 2020
10:55 a.m. to 11:25 a.m.
1:50 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.

JUDGE: The Honorable **DOUGLAS WATKINS**
REPORTER: Gail Paige-Washington, Hearing Reporter
Returned to Judge: 2/20/20

APPEARANCES: Applicant:

TELLERIA, TELLERIA & LEVY
By: Neil Ratnasoma, Esquire
Attorneys for Applicant

GREENUP, HARTSTON & ROSENFELD, LLP
By: C. Duke Marsh, Esquire
Attorneys for Defendant

CARMEN KELLY INTERPRETERS
By: Elena Wilson,
Certified Spanish Language Interpreter

WITNESSES: Victor Sanchez Penaloza
Steve Wilkison
Maria Troncoso

EXHIBITS: (See page 2)

DISPOSITION: The matter stands submitted.
(56 pgs. est.)

ADJ 12018865

1 * * *

2 S T I P U L A T I O N S A N D I S S U E S

3 THE FOLLOWING FACTS ARE ADMITTED:

4 1. Victor Sanchez Penaloza, born while
5 employed on February 19, 2019 as a truck driver at
6 Victorville, Lancaster, San Bernardino and/or City of
7 Industry, California by MRS Group, Inc., claims to have
8 sustained injury arising out of and in the course of
9 employment to the neck, back, knee, foot, leg, and head.

10 2. At the time of injury the employer's workers'
11 compensation carrier was Insurance Company of the West.

12 3. The employer has furnished no medical treatment.

13 4. No attorney fees have been paid.

14 THE ISSUE IS AS FOLLOWS:

15 1. Injury arising out of and in the course of
16 employment.

17 * * * *

18 E X H I B I T S

19 **NOTE:** The following exhibits are located in FileNet
20 unless otherwise indicated:

21 APPLICANT'S EXHIBIT 1: (ADMITTED)

22 Medical report of Gerald Ferencz, DC, dated May 3rd,
23 2019.

24 APPLICANT'S EXHIBIT 2: (ADMITTED)

25 Subpoenaed records from Kaiser Permanente, visit date
4/2/2019.

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT A: (ADMITTED)
(Admitted over Applicant's objection)

Excerpted pages of the deposition transcript of
Applicant, dated May 10, 2019, pages 36, 39 and 42.

LET THE RECORD REFLECT that Defendant offers the
pages from the Applicant's deposition of May 10, 2019 which

2 ADJ 12018865

1 were referenced on cross-examination. Applicant objects to
2 the deposition pages on the basis that they can only be used
3 for impeachment. In light of the fact that they were used
4 to impeach the applicant, the deposition pages will be
5 admitted into the record as Defendant's Exhibit A.

6 * * *

7 **S U M M A R Y O F E V I D E N C E**

8 **VICTOR SANCHEZ PENALOZA**, Applicant, was called as a
9 witness on his own behalf, having been first duly sworn
10 through the Spanish Interpreter, also having been sworn,
11 testified substantially as follows:

12 **DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. RATNASOMA:**

13 The applicant worked for this employer. He knew them
14 as MRS Group. He started working there in December, 2018.
15 His last day of work was February 19, 2019.

16 The applicant's position was truck driver/operator.
17 His duties were to take his loads to San Francisco and other
18 places near there. He worked different hours. He had to
19 prepare a log for the hours that he worked. He generally
20 worked about 40 hours per week and 5 days per week.

21 Besides the San Francisco area, the applicant made
22 deliveries to Sacramento and another city between Sacramento
23 and San Francisco. All of the destinations were in Northern
24 California normally.

25 The applicant was injured while working for the
employer. He had an injury on February 19, 2019. He had
multiple injuries that day.

The first injury occurred when the applicant went to
open the door to his truck and slipped while getting out of
the truck. It was raining that day. He went to grab
something as he was getting out of the truck and he fell.
He was able to stand up after that.

The accident occurred at a rest area. It is an area
where many other drivers stop but it was not an official
rest stop. He had stopped there because it is a requirement
to stop after he has been on the road for 8 hours. He had
been driving that long so he was required to stop. He also
had to get to his logbook.

The accident occurred somewhere between Victorville

3
ADJ 12018865

1 and Lancaster. The applicant was coming from San Francisco
2 and going to San Bernardino.

3 He may have testified at his deposition that the
4 injury happened in Victorville. He said it that way because
5 he was generalizing. The area where the incident occurred
6 was just an open space. There were no buildings there. It
7 was not off the freeway but was off a highway that allows
8 big trucks on it. A lot of trucks rest at that spot. It
9 was a common rest area because truck drivers have to stop
10 after 8 hours and that was a convenient place to stop when
11 coming from San Francisco.

12 The applicant was getting out of his truck to do an
13 inspection when he fell. He was not able to grab on well to
14 the door due to the rain. He fell onto his feet and hands.
15 The place he fell from was about 2 meters high. He had
16 missed the step on the truck.

17 The applicant injured his face, arms, feet, and knees
18 in that incident. The feet and knees were the strongest
19 injuries. He hurt his feet and knees first and then fell on
20 to his hands. Both his feet and knees hit the ground along
21 with his hands.

22 The applicant recovered from the first fall, did his
23 inspection, and worked on the logbook, and then drove to
24 San Bernardino. He did not report the fall at that time.
25 He had called his dispatcher but no one answered.

The next injury occurred in San Bernardino. The
Applicant was at the warehouse where he had to leave the
container. He did not fall onto his knees at that time. He
injured his face and back. He hit his face on the door and
he hit his back against the diesel can. He fell onto his
back and also hit his face on the door.

The injury occurred because the applicant was getting
out to disconnect the container. He may have fallen because
it was raining.

(AFTERNOON SESSION)

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MR. RATNASOMA:

Regarding the second injury he had opened the door
and it hit on something. He hit his face and something
else. He fell backward and then forward. He hit his back
area. He did not so much as fall from the cabin of the
truck but it was a slide type injury. He hit his face on

4
ADJ 12018865

1 the door and the handle of the door and other things that
2 were on the door.

3 The applicant hurt his back in that second injury
4 because he fell backward and his back hit some steps. They
5 were aluminum ones like when you are getting in to remove
6 mud.

7 The first injury occurred while he was somewhere on
8 Highway 140.

9 The applicant did not report it after the second
10 injury in San Bernardino. He only reported the first
11 injury. He reported it to Maria who is in charge of the
12 office. She made him sign some papers. He had papers to go
13 to the doctor. It was some papers agreeing to have him go
14 to the doctor the next day. The applicant signed the
15 papers. However, the doctor said he had to go back and sign
16 some other papers.

17 The employer sent him to the doctor for two months
18 after the injury. The reason it took 2 months to send him
19 to the doctor was because they wanted him to sign some other
20 papers. He does not recall what those papers were. The
21 doctor he went to was at Kaiser.

22 The Kaiser doctor treated him for his back and did
23 x-rays. He does not recall whether any other body parts
24 were treated.

25 When the applicant says he did not report both
injuries to Maria, he means he did not call her at that time
for the second incident but he did call when he got to the
City of Industry. The applicant called the dispatcher after
the first injury on the same day as the accident. When he
spoke to Maria it was after the second injury on the same
day.

The applicant does not know what city the first
injury occurred in exactly. He said Victorville because he
had to have a reference for the injury.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MARSH:

The applicant worked for the company maybe two to
three months before the day of the accidents. If the
employer records say he started working for the company on
January 11, 2019 that could be correct.

For the first injury, he may have had his hand on the

5
ADJ 12018865

1 steering wheel or the seat but he does not recall because it
2 happened so fast. One hand was on the door, and he thinks
3 the other hand was on the steering wheel but he is not sure.
4 The applicant fell onto his feet and knees from that
5 accident. When he says he fell to "the floor" he means the
6 pavement below.

7 The applicant called the dispatcher who was Steve
8 Wilkison. He was not able to reach him at that time. The
9 first injury occurred in the afternoon around 2:00 o'clock
10 or after.

11 For the Victorville injury, it was not a strong blow
12 to the face. It was more like a scrape. He may have lost
13 his equilibrium from his feet. Where he said in his
14 deposition that the Victorville injury was a strong injury
15 to his face, that is correct. It just was not a strong blow
16 to the face.

17 The applicant discussed his injury with the owner of
18 the company named "Chico" or "Chino." He asked the
19 applicant how he got hurt. The applicant told him and then
20 he told the applicant to go inside to make a report. Chico
21 or Chino was at the City of Industry location. That is the
22 same location where Maria is.

23 The applicant had scratches, or bruises, on his face
24 for Chico or Chino to notice when he discussed the injury
25 with him. When he said in his deposition that he did not
have scratches on his face, he actually did. It was not a
big blow to the face; it was more like a scrape.

17 Maria did not give the applicant treatment. He did
18 not turn down treatment on the day of the accident. They
19 told him that he could go the next day if he wanted to.
20 Maria told him that he could go to Kaiser. He was not told
21 at Kaiser that he would have to do it a different way if he
22 wanted to report it as a workers' compensation injury. He
23 did not go to Kaiser on his own.

24 Maria told him to go to a hospital.

25 The applicant did not have a problem with his
driver's license while he worked for the company. He had a
temporary license when he started. Later the company said
he had to produce his commercial license and he did have a
license. The company did not ask him for his license on the
day before the accident. The applicant did not show his
license to Maria the day before the accident. He did not
have it yet.

1 The applicant had a prior workers' compensation claim
2 against California Cartage on March 1st, 2002. However, the
3 injury was only for his feet, not his knees. (Defendant
4 referenced Case No. ADJ 2299881).

5 The applicant also had a prior workers' compensation
6 claim against Tri State Staffing for an injury of October
7 1st, 2012. That injury involved his neck, back, trunk,
8 knees, and legs. (Defendant referenced Case No.
9 ADJ 8591145).

10 The applicant had ongoing pain from his prior
11 workers' compensation claim prior to the February 19, 2019
12 injury.

13 The applicant did not think he was going to be
14 terminated for not having a driver's license.

15 **EXAMINATION BY THE COURT:**

16 The first doctor the applicant saw was the doctor he
17 went to two months after the accident. The company sent him
18 to the doctor. It is not correct in the report where it
19 says the company did not make an appointment for him. The
20 applicant does not know why it says in the report of
21 Dr. Ferencz, that he had no prior injuries. The applicant
22 told the doctor that he did have prior injuries.

23 * * * *

24 **STEVE WILKISON**, called as a witness on behalf of
25 Defendants, having been first duly sworn, was examined and
testified substantially as follows:

1 **DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MARSH:**

2 The witness' title is operations manager for MRS
3 Group, Inc. He has been there for 14-and-a-half years. He
4 was the direct supervisor of the applicant.

5 The witness stays in contact with the drivers at
6 work.

7 There is a procedure in place whereby if a driver is
8 on an unscheduled stop for over 10 minutes the GPS tracker
9 will note that and send a message to the witness' cell
10 phone. If the stop is at a place where there is no
11 customer, the witness will get a beep on his cell phone and
12 he will be alerted about it.

13 ///
14

1 The witness does not recall whether he received such
2 a GPS message for the applicant having stopped somewhere
3 between Victorville and Lancaster. If so, he would have
4 called the applicant. He does not recall if he called the
5 applicant that day.

6 The applicant did not report an injury to the
7 witness. The witness found out about it because the
8 applicant had spoken to Maria about it. The applicant had
9 told Maria that he had gotten hurt on the job.

10 The witness is familiar with how the driver unhooks
11 the trailers. The witness does not believe the applicant
12 could have hurt his head while unhooking a trailer. Where
13 the trailer hooks up, there is a handle to pull to unhook
14 it. No part of the arm needs to go under the trailer to
15 unhook them.

16 The witness did not see the applicant after his
17 alleged injury.

18 The applicant was asked to provide his commercial
19 driver's license. The witness knows that because Maria told
20 him that.

21 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. RATNASOMA:**

22 Drivers are scheduled to make stops for 30 minutes
23 for lunch after 8 hours. The GPS system will track the
24 30-minute lunch break and the witness would be notified of
25 it.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MARSH:

 The witness does not know if the applicant was
scheduled to go to San Francisco on the day of the alleged
accident.

 * * * *

MARIA TRONCOSO, called as a witness on behalf of
Defendants, having been first duly sworn, was examined and
testified substantially as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MARSH:

 The applicant was not scheduled to be in
San Francisco on February 19, 2019. He was going to
San Jose that day.

1 The witness is the employee liaison which is a human
2 resource person.

3 The applicant's truck is equipped with the GPS
4 system. The company is notified of any GPS stops she
5 believes.

6 The witness' office is in the City of Industry.

7 After the applicant reached his final destination
8 which was the City of Industry, he reported his injury to
9 the witness. He reported that he had an injury to the back
10 of his head. The witness did not see any bruises or scrapes
11 on the front of his head.

12 The applicant did not report to the witness any
13 earlier injury in Victorville at that time. The witness
14 only learned about that injury at the applicant's
15 deposition.

16 There is no employee named Chico or Chino at the
17 company.

18 The witness asked the applicant to see his driver's
19 license upon his hire. The applicant gave her a temporary
20 paper license. The day before the alleged accident the
21 witness asked the applicant for his physical plastic
22 identification (Driver's license). He did not show it to
23 her. He said he did not have it.

24 When the applicant reported the San Bernardino injury
25 he said he was injured while uncoupling a trailer. When he
told her about the injury she offered to send him to a
doctor but he declined. The witness does not know whether
the applicant had Kaiser insurance at that time. The
witness did not send the applicant to Kaiser.

 When the applicant was hired, the witness was not
aware of any prior injuries.

 When she discussed the driver's license issue with
the applicant the witness told him he could be terminated
for not having it.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. RATNASOMA:

 The witness does not know whether the route to
San Jose is similar to the route to San Francisco. She is
not sure whether similar highways are used for both.

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

The company has about 30 employees.

The witness is not friends with all of the employees. She had never heard of any of them having a nickname of Chico or Chino.

EXAMINATION BY THE COURT:

The applicant only said that he hurt the back of his head in the incident on February 19.

* * * *

VICTOR SANCHEZ PENALOZA, Applicant, was **recalled** as a witness on his own behalf, having been previously duly sworn through the Spanish Interpreter, also having been previously sworn, testified substantially as follows:

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MARSH:

When reporting the injury to Maria, the applicant did not tell her that he only hit his head. He said that he had suffered the other blows as well and he showed them to her.

The applicant was shown a form of acknowledgement of injury and offer of medical treatment. It indicated that the injury was "hit head".

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. RATNASOMA:

The applicant signed multiple forms in connection with the injury. They were not in Spanish. Maria does speak Spanish.

Based on the testimony of the other witnesses it is possible that the applicant could have been coming from San Jose, not San Francisco, on the day of the alleged accident.

* * * * *



DOUGLAS WATKINS
WORKERS' COMPENSATION
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

2/20/20
DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION

02-21-2020

PROOF OF SERVICE FOR 2/12/20 MINUTES OF HEARING SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

(Reporter)

Case Number: ADJ12018865

GREENUP HARTSTON Law Firm, 444 W OCEAN BLVD STE 1530 LONG BEACH CA 90802
LONG BEACH

INS CO OF THE WEST Claims Administrator, PO BOX 509039 SAN DIEGO CA 92150,
WOODLAND HILLS MMUELLER@ICWGROUP.COM

MRS GROUP INC Employer, 305 S 9TH AVE LA PUENTE CA 91746

TELLERIA TELLERIA Law Firm, 828 W LAS TUNAS DR SAN GABRIEL CA 91776
SAN GABRIEL

VICTOR SANCHEZ Injured Worker,
PENALOZA

I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT I AM OVER AGE 18, NOT A PARTY IN THIS PROCEEDING, AND AM EMPLOYED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DWC, LOS ANGELES DISTRICT OFFICE OF THE WCAB, LOCATED AT 320 W. 4TH STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90013. ON FEBRUARY 21, 2020, I EMAILED OR DEPOSITED IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL AT 320 W. 4TH STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90013, A SEALED ENVELOPE CONTAINING A COPY OF THE FEBRUARY 12, 2020 MINUTES OF HEARING SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE (REPORTER) WITH POSTAGE FULLY PAID, ADDRESSED TO THE PARTY OR PARTIES LISTED ABOVE.

BY: GAIL PAIGE-WASHINGTON

Gail Paige-Washington