

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS  
STATE OF WASHINGTON**

1     **IN RE: DAVID A. PLATZER**                     )     **DOCKET NOS. 18 26897, 18 26898 & 18 26899**  
2   )  
3   )  
4   )  
5     **CLAIM NO. H-151006**                             )     **ORDER VACATING PROPOSED DECISION**  
6   )  
7   )  
8   )  
9   )  
10    )  
11    )  
12    )  
13    )  
14    )  
15    )  
16    )  
17    )  
18    )  
19    )  
20    )  
21    )  
22    )  
23    )  
24    )  
25    )  
26    )  
27    )  
28    )  
29    )  
30    )  
31    )  
32    )  
33    )  
34    )  
35    )  
36    )  
37    )  
38    )  
39    )  
40    )  
41    )  
42    )  
43    )  
44    )  
45    )  
46    )  
47    )

David A. Platzer sustained an industrial injury in 1977. His claim was allowed for multiple lumbar spine conditions, in addition to other physical and mental health conditions. Mr. Platzer's claim was closed in 1987 with an award for permanent partial disability. Almost 15 years later, Mr. Platzer applied to reopen his claim. The Department granted Mr. Platzer's application and in so doing, the Director communicated to Mr. Platzer that he was exercising his discretionary authority to find him eligible for an increased permanent partial disability award, but he declined to exercise his discretionary authority to find Mr. Platzer eligible for time-loss compensation or pension benefits. Mr. Platzer appealed seeking additional benefits. Following Board precedent, our industrial appeals judge applied a preponderance of the evidence standard and determined that Mr. Platzer established entitlement to time-loss compensation and a pension. On further analysis, we depart from our prior preponderance of the evidence standard and instead apply the abuse of discretion standard under these circumstances. The Proposed Decision and Order dated January 16, 2020, is vacated and this appeal is **REMANDED FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**.

**DISCUSSION**

David Platzer was born on February 8, 1947. On May 5, 1977, he fell and injured his low back. His claim was allowed and benefits provided. Mr. Platzer underwent surgery to his low back, after which he began to suffer from bowel and urinary incontinence and pain in the perineal and perianal areas.

From 1977 to 1987, Mr. Platzer attempted carpentry work, but he was unable to perform full-time work due to pain. Mr. Platzer obtained vocational retraining as an electronics technician. Due to market and technological changes, he was unable to secure employment in this field. Mr. Platzer started his own business repairing VCRs, but he was unable to develop a successful business. He tried other vocational pursuits, such as carpentry and working as a handyman, but he was unable to perform the physical work necessary to sustain the business. In addition to physical pain and mobility problems, Mr. Platzer suffered from depression. Mr. Platzer's claim was closed in 1987 with an award for permanent partial disability for his low back and a mental health condition.

1 Almost 15 years later, in August 2002, Mr. Platzer filed an application to reopen his claim. In  
2 December 2002, the Department reopened the claim effective July 29, 2002, for medical treatment  
3 only. Mr. Platzer appeals one order and one letter determination providing that the Director has  
4 decided not to exercise his discretionary authority to find Mr. Platzer eligible for time-loss  
5 compensation or pension benefits, but will continue to exercise his discretionary authority to find  
6 Mr. Platzer eligible for permanent partial disability benefits in the interest of equity and good  
7 conscience. Mr. Platzer also appeals a Department order awarding permanent partial disability  
8 benefits consistent with the Director's determination that Mr. Platzer is eligible for those benefits.  
9 Mr. Platzer seeks time-loss compensation and permanent partial disability benefits.  
10

### 11 **Applicable Law**

12 Because Mr. Platzer's application to reopen his claim was granted more than seven years after  
13 the date of the last closing of his claim, his claim is referred to as an "over-seven" claim. Under  
14 RCW 51.32.160(1)(a), the Director is granted authority to "readjust" the worker's rate of  
15 compensation at any time on his or her own motion. The statute states in relevant part:  
16

17 If aggravation, diminution, or termination of disability takes place, the director may,  
18 upon the application of the beneficiary, made within seven years from the date the first  
19 closing order becomes final, or at any time upon his or her own motion, readjust the  
20 rate of compensation in accordance with the rules of this section provided for the  
21 same, or in a proper case terminate the payment; PROVIDED, That the director may,  
22 upon application of the worker made at any time, provide proper and necessary  
23 medical and surgical services as authorized under RCW 51.36.010.  
24

25 RCW 51.32.160 does not directly address the standard of proof applicable to the Director's decisions  
26 to reopen time-barred claims or make benefit determinations. These concepts have developed over  
27 the decades through Board and court decisions interpreting the above-quoted provision of the statute.  
28

29 Most significantly, in *Cascade Valley Hospital v. Stach*,<sup>1</sup> the Washington State Court of  
30 Appeals, Division 2, sought to clarify the authority of the Director of the Department to reopen  
31 over-seven claims. In that case, Ms. Stach injured her back while working for the self-insured  
32 employer, Cascade Valley Hospital. The claim was allowed, benefits provided, and the claim was  
33 closed in 1991 with a permanent partial disability award. In 1993, Ms. Stach applied to reopen her  
34 claim. The Department approved reopening and Ms. Stach received conservative treatment. The  
35 claim was closed in 1994 with no additional disability award.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 

---

<sup>1</sup> 152 Wn. App. 502 (2009).

1 In 2004, Ms. Stach applied to reopen the now "over-seven" back claim. On March 3, 2004,  
2 the Department issued an order reopening the claim for medical benefits only. The order also  
3 indicated that the Director had decided not to reopen Ms. Stach's claim for disability benefits.<sup>2</sup> This  
4 order was not appealed. The Department subsequently issued an order authorizing two surgeries.  
5 Ms. Stach then made a request for time-loss compensation. On February 3, 2006, the Director wrote  
6 Ms. Stach and informed her that she was "eligible" to receive time-loss benefits from the day her  
7 physician requested authorization for surgery. He also advised her that she "may" also be eligible to  
8 receive a permanent partial disability award and she would be contacted by the claims manager  
9 regarding that decision.<sup>3</sup> On February 9, 2006, the Department issued an order reopening  
10 Ms. Stach's back claim "for such additional disability benefits as are authorized by law."<sup>4</sup> At that  
11 point, Cascade appealed.  
12

13 In a separate set of events following the 1991 closure of the back claim, Ms. Stach injured her  
14 knee while working for a state fund employer. This claim resulted in additional surgeries, time-loss  
15 compensation benefits, and vocational training well into the reopening of her over-seven back claim.  
16

17 Cascade appealed the February 9, 2006 order to the Board and ultimately to the Washington  
18 State Court of Appeals, Division 2, where it argued that the Director's actions were tantamount to  
19 assigning it responsibility for Ms. Stach's state fund knee claim. Cascade further argued that the  
20 March 3, 2004 order reopening the over-seven claim for medical benefits only was res judicata; that  
21 RCW 51.32.160 limits the Director's authority in over-seven claims to medical benefits only; that the  
22 proper standard of review was by a preponderance of the evidence; and that it was improper for the  
23 Director to reopen the claim first by determining eligibility and then in a second order determining  
24 entitlement to time-loss compensation benefits. The court rejected all of these arguments finding that  
25 the finality of the March 3, 2004 order did not preclude the Director from determining that Ms. Stach  
26 could be awarded additional benefits at a later time based on new medical information. The court  
27 stated:  
28

29 In sum, the director's decision to review an over-seven claim is discretionary. Whether  
30 to reopen a claim for additional benefits is also discretionary, provided there is  
31 aggravation. Once the director reopens a claim on grounds of aggravation, he or she  
32 may grant additional benefits only "in accordance with the rules in this section provided  
33 for the same."<sup>5</sup>  
34

---

35 <sup>2</sup> *Cascade* at 505.

36 <sup>3</sup> *Cascade* at 505.

37 <sup>4</sup> *Cascade* at 505.

38 <sup>5</sup> *Cascade* at 512.

1 The court then stated:

2 The parties agree, and we concur, that the director's grant or denial of specific benefits  
3 is to be reviewed under the preponderance standard.<sup>6</sup>  
4

5 The court did not elaborate on the nature of the parties' agreement for which it concurred.<sup>7</sup> We note  
6 that *Ruse*, which was also cited in support of the preponderance standard, is an appeal of an order  
7 rejecting the claimant's application for workers' compensation benefits. It is not an over-seven case,  
8 and it merely recites the standard of review under RCW 51.52.115.  
9

10  
11 The *Stach* court then reviewed the specific language of the order on appeal, which stated:

12 In claims such as yours which have been closed over seven years (or ten years for  
13 eye injuries), only the director of the department has the discretion to grant benefits  
14 such as time-loss compensation or disability awards. The director has decided to  
15 reopen your claim for such additional disability benefits as are authorized by law,  
16 effective 06/02/05.<sup>8</sup>  
17

18 The court affirmed the Department order stating:

19 The order reopened Stach's over-seven claim but did not grant any benefits, and  
20 therefore the Board and the superior court correctly reviewed it for abuse of discretion  
21 and found none. We agree. Stach suffered an aggravation of her back injury, requiring  
22 two surgeries in August 2005. It was within the director's discretion to reopen her claim  
23 for disability benefits under RCW 51.32.160.<sup>9</sup>  
24

25 While the court refers to an agreement regarding the preponderance of evidence standard,  
26 the actual holding of the case is that the abuse of discretion standard should ultimately be applied to  
27 Ms. Stach's particular circumstances. In *In re George H. Higgins Sr.*<sup>10</sup> we applied the *Stach* holding  
28 to the identical circumstances presented by the Platzer appeal. We held that when the Director  
29 specifically grants disability benefits in the form of an increased permanent partial disability award,  
30 the Director's grant or denial of other specific benefits, such as temporary or permanent total  
31 disability, must be reviewed under the preponderance standard. In short, we interpreted *Stach* as  
32 supporting an "all or nothing" approach to the decision to reopen for disability benefits. At the time,  
33 we were mindful that the facts in *Stach* ultimately invoked the abuse of discretion standard. The  
34 *Stach* opinion appeared to articulate an agreed upon standard of proof for the circumstances  
35 presented by both *Higgins* and Mr. Platzer. At the time we issued *Higgins*, we felt bound by the stare  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 <sup>6</sup> *Cascade* at 512, citing *Ruse v. Dep't of Labor & Indus.*, 138 Wn.2d 1, 5 (1999).

45 <sup>7</sup> *Cascade* at 512.

46 <sup>8</sup> *Cascade* at 513.

47 <sup>9</sup> *Cascade* at 514.

<sup>10</sup> Dckt. No. 17 16301 (May 29, 2019).

1 decisis effect of an opinion outlining the standard of review from our own Division 2 court. We  
2 believed that the court's statement articulating the preponderance standard for specific types of  
3 benefits should be viewed as more persuasive than dicta.  
4

5  
6 However, on further examination we do not believe the court's decision in *Stach* requires an  
7 all or nothing approach to the application of the appropriate standard of review to the Director's  
8 decision to provide disability benefits. Nothing in the *Stach* decision prevents the Director from an  
9 exercise of his discretion to grant specific disability benefits and deny others; nor does the holding  
10 require the exercise of that specific discretion be reviewed under an abuse of discretion standard.  
11 *Stach* supports review of a decision to provide disability benefits under a preponderance standard  
12 when the Director's determination provided only the direction that the claim would be reopened for  
13 such additional disability benefits as are authorized by law. The holding of that decision does not  
14 require that a preponderance of evidence standard must be applied when the Director's exercise of  
15 discretion is explicit to the types of disability benefits to be provided, only dicta in that decision  
16 supports that analysis. We determine that we will not be constrained by the dicta in the *Stach* decision  
17 to apply the preponderance standard in this appeal.  
18

19  
20 We note that the Department appealed our *Higgins* decision to superior court and the matter  
21 was heard before the Honorable James J. Dixon under Cause No. 19-2-02868-34. The superior  
22 court agreed with the Department's determination that an abuse-of-discretion standard applies.  
23 Judge Dixon's order does not provide further analysis. While we are bound to obey the superior  
24 court's remand order and apply the abuse of discretion standard in the *Higgins* case, we are not  
25 bound to do so in the Platzler appeal.<sup>11</sup> Nonetheless, we reviewed the arguments presented in the  
26 parties' briefs before the superior court in *Higgins*, and we revisited some of the policy considerations  
27 presented by the application of the preponderance standard under these circumstances.  
28

29  
30 RCW 51.32.160(1)(a) grants the Director the authority to readjust the worker's rate of  
31 compensation on his or her own motion. This broad grant of discretionary authority does not have  
32 any particular qualifiers or restrictions. The Department points out that discretion of this sort allows  
33 the Director to take the circumstances of an individual worker into account. There may be a number  
34 of equities to consider in every worker's case, none of them being identical. In such a case, the  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

47 <sup>11</sup> *In re Lisa Soden*, BIIA Dec., 85 2993 (1987).

1 Director should be allowed to compensate the worker for the unanticipated loss of function without  
2 also paying unneeded wage replacement benefits.  
3

4 Also pertinent, though, are the policy considerations should we adhere to the preponderance  
5 standard. Curtailing the Director's discretion by requiring him or her to take an "all or nothing"  
6 approach might well lead the Director to find a worker ineligible for any disability benefits when the  
7 Director would have found the worker to be eligible for some benefits but not others had such a  
8 decision been within the Director's discretionary authority. It would be anomalous to use the liberal  
9 construction standard to justify a view of the law that leads to workers being found ineligible for all  
10 benefits rather than eligible for at least some of them.  
11

12 In reexamining the law and policy, we now understand why Judge Dixon agreed with the  
13 Department and remanded *Higgins*. Nearly simultaneously, the Platzer case came before the Board  
14 on review. We are mindful that there are issues of judicial economy and efficiency that should be  
15 considered. We have a duty to engage in the efficient management of litigation so as to minimize  
16 duplication of effort. While we do not have to follow the *Higgins* superior court order in Platzer, we  
17 decline to apply two different standards in final orders of the Board. If either matter is appealed  
18 further, there will be consistent holdings of this Board for the appellate courts to consider. Though  
19 silent, the superior court necessarily concluded the preponderance standard mentioned in *Stach* was  
20 dicta. Technically speaking, it was a statement by the court that did not embody the resolution or  
21 determination of the *Stach* appeal. While we gave it authority in the *Higgins* decision, we are now  
22 convinced that the reference to the preponderance standard should be considered as extraneous  
23 material that is merely explanatory. What we considered guidance previously, we now view as dicta  
24 as it concerns the appeals before us.  
25

26 This matter is remanded to the hearings process to re-determine the claimant's entitlement to  
27 wage replacement benefits using the abuse-of-discretion standard of review of the Director's  
28 determinations.  
29

### 30 **ORDER**

31 These appeals are remanded to the hearings process, as provided by WAC 263-12-145(5),  
32 for further proceedings as indicated by this order. Unless the matter is settled or dismissed, the  
33 industrial appeals judge will issue a new Proposed Decision and Order. The new order will contain  
34 findings and conclusions as to each contested issue of fact and law. Any party aggrieved by the new  
35 Proposed Decision and Order may petition the Board for review, as provided by RCW 51.52.104.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

1 This order vacating is not a final Decision and Order of the Board within the meaning of  
2 RCW 51.52.110.  
3

4 Dated: August 4, 2020.  
5

6 BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS

7 

8 LINDA L. WILLIAMS, Chairperson

9 

10 JACK S. ENG, Member  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 **DISSENT**

17  
18 This case is separate and distinct from the *Higgins* case cited by the majority. The *Higgins*  
19 case was remanded by superior court and that determination has been appealed to the court of  
20 appeals. While the superior court, sitting in its appellate capacity over decisions of the Board of  
21 Industrial Insurance Appeals (Board), has the authority to remand the *Higgins* decision to the Board  
22 to apply a different standard of review and render a new decision, that decision has no precedential  
23 import until the court of appeals renders its decision. Because I believe the superior court's decision  
24 in *Higgins* conflicts with the court of appeals decision in *Stach*, I would not reverse *Platzer* based on  
25 the superior court's decision in *Higgins*.  
26  
27

28  
29 Originally, in *Higgins*, the Board cited to *Stach* "The parties agree and we concur that **the**  
30 **director's decision to grant or deny specific benefits to be received should be analyzed under**  
31 **the preponderance of evidence standard,**"<sup>12</sup> as the basis for finding that the standard of review in  
32 *Higgins* was preponderance of the evidence rather than abuse of discretion. Now that *Higgins* has  
33 been remanded, the majority calls that statement dicta and remands this case for another decision  
34 based on the higher abuse of discretion standard. But the above statement is not only found in the  
35 paragraph cited by the majority. In the opening paragraph of *Stach* the court states, "Where  
36 aggravation is shown, the director has discretion to reopen over-seven claims for consideration of  
37 medical and time loss benefits. **A grant of specific benefits must be supported by a**  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

<sup>12</sup> *Cascade Valley Hosp. v. Stach*, 152 Wn. App. 502, 504, 215 (2009). (Emphasis added.)

1 **preponderance of the evidence.**"<sup>13</sup> This is a clear indication that the court meant the later statement  
2 as more than just dicta.  
3

4 In *Stach* the employer argued in its appeal that the standard of review for the entire case  
5 should be preponderance of the evidence for both the original determination that the Director was  
6 granting benefits and the secondary order that defined what benefits were being granted. In response  
7 to this argument the court specifically delineated the standard of review between a general grant of  
8 disability benefits and a grant of a specific benefit as stated by the court twice in its decision. The  
9 majority states that the court ultimately applied the abuse of discretion standard in *Stach*, however  
10 that was specifically for the general determination that Ms. Stach was eligible for disability benefits  
11 as a whole, not for specific benefits, so that decision is not support for the Board's change in this  
12 particular case. The court also cited to our significant decision, *In re Bernard James*,<sup>14</sup> where we  
13 determined back in 1955 that once the Director had exercised his discretion to grant benefits, the  
14 claimant had the same rights as a claimant whose claim had not exceeded the statute of limitations.  
15 Because the superior court's decision in *Higgins* does not address these prior decisions, it should not  
16 be used as a basis to overturn precedent until a higher court affirms it.  
17  
18

19 The implication of the Department's briefing in *Higgins* that argues that a decision to uphold  
20 the preponderance standard for individual benefits might have the effect of the Director limiting the  
21 number of cases in which he exercises his authority to grant any benefits to claimants in over-seven  
22 cases is extremely concerning. The Director is charged with the welfare of injured workers and  
23 ensuring their sure and certain relief whether their cases have been closed for 2 years or 20. As the  
24 court stated in *Stach*, "even when acting sua sponte, the director may not grant benefits arbitrarily,  
25 but must do so according to the rules in Title 51."<sup>15</sup> A decision to deny benefits to an injured worker  
26 who would normally qualify for those benefits solely on the basis that it would be easier to defend  
27 that decision in court goes against over a century of Title 51 statutes, case law, and indeed the very  
28 basis of the Industrial Insurance Act as a whole.  
29  
30

31 Additionally, there is no judicial efficiency gained in this decision to backpedal on the Board's  
32 reasoning in *Higgins* prior to a precedential ruling on that case. Rather, this decision further muddies  
33 the waters. *Higgins* is being briefed to the court of appeals based on our reasoning in the original  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 \_\_\_\_\_  
46 <sup>13</sup> *Stach*, at 504. (Emphasis added.)

47 <sup>14</sup> BIIA Dec., 04,394 (1955).

<sup>15</sup> *Stach*, at 512.



1 decision. But in the midst of that briefing we are throwing the issue into disarray by stating that the  
2 ruling in *Stach*, on which we based our original decision, no longer means what we stated it meant  
3 even though that decision has not been overturned. The only case that currently has precedential  
4 value is Division 1's ruling in *Stach*. Should Division 2 follow Division 1's interpretation of *Stach*, then  
5 this case will come back again for another decision based on a different standard of review, rendering  
6 the majority's argument about judicial efficiency moot.  
7  
8  
9

10 Because I would adopt the Proposed Decision and Order as the decision of the Board, I  
11 dissent.  
12

13 Dated: August 4, 2020.  
14

15 BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS

16   
17

18 ISABEL A. M. COLE, Member  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

1  
2  
3 **Addendum to Decision and Order**  
4 **In re David A. Platzer**  
5 **Docket Nos. 18 26897, 18 26898 & 18 26899**  
6 **Claim No. H-151006**  
7

8 **Appearances**

9 Claimant, David A. Platzer, by Putnam Lieb Potvin, per Kathryn N. Potvin

10 Employer, Kipper & Sons Engineers, Inc. (did not appear)

11 Department of Labor and Industries, by Office of the Attorney General, per Steve Vinyard

12 **Department Order(s) Under Appeal**

- 13
- 14 1. In Docket No. 18 26897, the claimant, David A. Platzer, filed an appeal with the Board of  
15 Industrial Insurance Appeals on December 11, 2018, from an order/letter of the Department  
16 of Labor and Industries dated October 23, 2018. In this order, the Director corrected and  
17 superseded his letter dated August 24, 2018, stating that he continued to exercise his  
18 discretionary authority and find him eligible for permanent partial disability.
  - 19 2. In Docket No. 18 26898, the claimant, David A. Platzer, filed an appeal with the Board of  
20 Industrial Insurance Appeals on December 11, 2018, from an order of the Department of Labor  
21 and Industries dated October 24, 2018. In this order, the Department corrected and  
22 superseded its orders dated July 7, 2016; May 9, 2018; and August 29, 2018, and stated that  
23 the Director continued to exercise his discretionary authority over the claim.
  - 24 3. In Docket No. 18 26899, the claimant, David A. Platzer, filed an appeal with the Board of  
25 Industrial Insurance Appeals on December 11, 2018, from an order of the Department of Labor  
26 and Industries dated October 25, 2018. In this order, the Department took a deduction for the  
27 assessed overpayment and paid a permanent partial disability award for a Category 3  
28 permanent dorso-lumbar and/or lumbosacral impairments; a Category 2 permanent mental  
29 health impairments; paid 20 percent of compensation for unspecified disabilities of 100 percent  
30 as compared to total bodily impairment; and paid a Category 4 permanent impairments of  
31 bladder function  
32  
33

34 **Petition for Review**

35 As provided by RCW 51.52.104 and RCW 51.52.106, this matter is before the Board for review  
36 and decision. The Department filed a timely Petition for Review of Proposed Decision and Order  
37 issued on January 16, 2020. The claimant filed a response to the Petition for Review.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47