

Gheorghita, David

PROTEST AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION (RCW 51.52.050)

Contents

The employer's protests to 14 time-loss compensation orders did not act as a protest to a wage order issued around the same time period. The protests' language didn't indicate that the employer disagreed with the wage information. The employer didn't list the date of the wage order as a date of the orders being protested. The wage order became final and binding.*In re David Gheorghita, BIIA Dec., 24 12743 (2025)*

Scroll down for order.

1 the Department's and employer's motions for summary judgment. The Department order dated
2 February 23, 2024, is correct, and is **AFFIRMED**.

4 **DISCUSSION**

5 The parties agreed that this appeal should be decided on summary judgment and stipulated
6 to the factual record. After consideration of the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment, the
7 judge granted Mr. Gheorghita's motion for summary judgment and denied the employer's and
8 Department's motions. We granted review of the Proposed Decision and Order as we find that
9 awarding summary judgment in favor of Mr. Gheorgita was incorrect. We grant the motions for
10 summary judgment filed by the employer and the Department.

11 David O. Gheorghita was injured on August 19, 2022, while working for Asset Roofing
12 Company. The Department allowed the claim, paid time-loss compensation, and issued its first
13 wage/time-loss compensation order on August 31, 2022, just a few days after the injury, setting
14 Mr. Gheorghita's wages at \$10,000 a month. This first order resulted in payments of \$6,700 a month
15 in time-loss compensation. The Department then paid time-loss compensation based upon this wage
16 rate through a series of 12 time-loss compensation orders spanning from September 16, 2022,
17 through March 14, 2023.

18 On July 19, 2023, the Department issued a second wage order, in which it recalculated
19 Mr. Gheorghita's wages at \$8,850.05 a month plus a \$1000 bonus, for a total wage calculation of
20 \$9850.05 a month. Also, on July 19, 2023, the employer, through Michelle Shirley of the Stop Claims
21 Corp Retro Group, filed 14 protests. The actual mechanism by which the employer filed these
22 protests is a single page, fill-in-the-blank form with various fields into which information is entered.
23 Each form includes Department letterhead and is titled "Protest a Claim Decision." The fields include
24 designated areas to enter the claim number, the injury date, and the names of the worker, claim
25 manager, and attending provider, and so forth. One field is titled "Date L&I mailed decision that you
26 disagree with." Another is titled "Decision protested." The last field, which is large enough for a
27 narrative, is titled "Please explain why you disagree with the decision."

28 The 14 protests filed by the employer are identical except for one field. They all list the
29 "Decision protested:" as "Payment Orders/Time Loss." They all have the same one-sentence
30 narrative: "I am protesting TL payments because the [injured worker] was working and collecting
31 commission checks the entire time this claim has been open while stating is [Worker Verification
32 Form] that he was not and has not worked" [*sic*]. The only field that differs among the 14 protests is
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 the date of the decisions being protested. On the 14 forms, the employer listed the date of the original
2 August 31, 2022 wage/time-loss compensation order and the dates of each of the subsequent 12
3 time-loss compensation orders, including a duplicate reference to the February 13, 2023 order. The
4 14 forms did not list July 19, 2023, as an order being protested. The Department did not reach out
5 to the employer to clarify the protest with the duplicate date, or whether the employer wished to
6 protest the July 19, 2023 wage order. Mr. Gheorghita also did not reach out to clarify the situation,
7 nor did he file his own protest of the July 19, 2023 wage order at that time.
8
9

10
11
12 On January 4, 2024, Mr. Gheorghita, through counsel, sent a seven-page letter to the
13 Department. In that letter, Mr. Gheorghita asked the Department to "review and reevaluate the
14 July 19, 2023 wage order,"¹ based upon "the employer filed protests of every time loss payment made
15 by the Department to Mr. Gheorghita,"² because "the Department had constructive timely notice that
16 the wage order was incorrect."³ On February 23, 2024, the Department issued an order indicating
17 that it could not reconsider the July 19, 2023 wage order because Mr. Gheorghita's protest was not
18 timely filed. Mr. Gheorghita appealed the February 23, 2024 order.
19
20
21

22 In *Boyd v. City of Olympia*,⁴ the court determined that if the Department receives a written
23 document from a party that reasonably puts the Department on notice that the party is requesting an
24 action that is inconsistent with the Department's decision, then it is considered a protest. Under *Boyd*,
25 the content and the context of the written communication must be considered, but not the intent of
26 the filing party. In the present case, the employer filed 14 protests on July 19, 2023, which was the
27 same date the Department issued the wage order.
28
29
30

31 First, the content of the employer's written communications to the Department on
32 July 19, 2023, involved various time-loss compensation orders. Although 14 time-loss compensation
33 order dates were listed on the protests, one was a duplicate. The communications from the employer
34 were not generic or blanket protests, but were very specific as to the dates of the time-loss
35 compensation orders protested. None of the protests mentioned the date of the wage order,
36 July 19, 2023. Also, the thrust of each of the protests was a specifically dated payment/time-loss
37 compensation order. The fact that the protests mention payment orders does not make them protests
38 to the wage order. A wage order is not an authorization of payment, but rather, it sets the worker's
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 ¹ Stipulation of the Parties, Ex. 1 (Claimant Representative Letter p. 188).

46 ² Stipulation of the Parties, Ex. 1 (Claimant Representative Letter p. 189).

47 ³ Stipulation of the Parties, Ex. 1 (Claimant Representative Letter p. 189).

⁴ 1 Wn. App. 2d 17, 30 (2017).

1 wage rate for time-loss calculation purposes at the time of injury under RCW 51.08.178. The mere
2 mention of payment in the protests is not sufficient enough to challenge the wage rate, especially
3 when the protests specifically question time-loss compensation orders, which are payment orders.
4 All of the protests do reference commission checks, but the Department rightly points out that this
5 language was not significant and the term commission is not included in RCW 51.08.178 for
6 determination of a monthly wage. From the language of the protests, it appears that the employer
7 was referring to commission checks being paid to the claimant for work the claimant was allegedly
8 doing while collecting time-loss compensation, which is not a challenge to the wage order.
9

10
11
12
13 Next, we consider the context of the employer's time-loss compensation protests. The fact
14 that the protests were filed on July 19, 2023, the same date that the Department issued the wage
15 order, does not make it more probable that the protests should apply to the July 19, 2023 wage order.
16 Due to mailing, the order would not be presumed communicated until a later date. The evidence
17 does not reflect the date of actual communication of the July 19, 2023 order. While an order can be
18 protested on the same date as the date of issuance, in this instance, it is unlikely that the employer's
19 protests to the time-loss compensation orders would have been filed after the Department issued the
20 wage order and unlikely that the employer was filing protests to a wage order issued that same day.
21

22
23
24
25 The evidence presented does not raise a genuine issue of material fact. After providing all
26 reasonable inferences to Mr. Gheorghita, we hold that the employer's protests of the time-loss
27 compensation orders did not reasonably put the Department on notice that the employer was
28 protesting the July 19, 2023 wage order. Since we have determined that the content and context of
29 the 14 protests are sufficient to determine this issue, we need not examine the questions of whether
30 the employer was aggrieved by the July 19, 2023 wage order or if Mr. Gheorghita can benefit from
31 the employer's filings. Mr. Gheorghita's motion for summary judgment is denied and the motions for
32 summary judgment of the Department and the employer are granted. Since there was no timely
33 protest filed to the July 19, 2023 Department order, the February 23, 2024 Department order denying
34 reconsideration of the July 19, 2023 order is correct and is affirmed.
35
36
37
38
39

40 **DECISION**

41
42 In Docket No. 24 12743, the claimant, David O. Gheorghita, filed an appeal with the Board of
43 Industrial Insurance Appeals on March 18, 2024, from an order of the Department of Labor and
44 Industries dated February 23, 2024. In this order, the Department denied reconsideration of a
45
46
47

1 July 19, 2023 wage order because the protest was not received within the 60-day time limitation for
2 filing. This order is correct and is affirmed.
3

4 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- 5
6 1. On April 29, 2024, and August 15, 2024, an industrial appeals judge
7 certified that the parties agreed to include the Jurisdictional History in the
8 Board record solely for jurisdictional purposes.
9
10 2. On August 19, 2022, David O. Gheorghita injured his left knee while
11 working as a roofing estimator for Asset Roofing Company, LLC.
12
13 3. On July 19, 2023, the Department issued a wage order setting
14 Mr. Gheorghita's monthly wages at \$9,850.05.
15
16 4. On July 19, 2023, the employer filed 14 protests to time-loss
17 compensation orders.
18
19 5. The employer did not file a protest or request for reconsideration of the
20 July 19, 2023 wage order.
21
22 6. On January 4, 2024, Mr. Gheorghita sent a letter to the Department
23 requesting review and reevaluation of the July 19, 2023 wage order.
24
25 7. On February 23, 2024, the Department issued an order that it could not
26 reconsider the July 19, 2023 wage order because Mr. Gheorghita's
27 protest was not timely filed.
28
29 8. None of the employer's 14 protests submitted on July 19, 2023, put the
30 Department on notice that the employer was requesting action
31 inconsistent with the July 19, 2023 wage order.
32
33 9. The employer's protests did not reasonably put the Department on notice
34 that the employer was protesting the July 19, 2023 wage order.
35
36 10. The pleadings and evidence submitted by the parties demonstrate that
37 there is no genuine issue as to any material fact.

38 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

- 39 1. The Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals has jurisdiction over the parties
40 and subject matter in this appeal.
41
42 2. The parties are entitled to a decision as a matter of law pursuant to CR 56.
43
44 3. Neither Asset Roofing Company, LLC, nor David O. Gheorghita, filed a
45 timely protest to the July 19, 2023 wage order. *Boyd v. City of Olympia*,
46 1 Wn. App. 2d 17 (2017).
47

**Addendum to Decision and Order
In re David O. Gheorghita
Docket No. 24 12743
Claim No. BK-38664**

Appearances

Claimant, David O. Gheorghita, by Staton Silber, P.S., per Eleana Stevens

Employer, Asset Roofing Company, LLC, by Employer Solutions Law, per Alicia A. McDonnell
Department of Labor and Industries, by Office of the Attorney General, per Jennifer Chen, Rule 9
Clerk, and per Travis Alley

Petition for Review

As provided by RCW 51.52.104 and RCW 51.52.106, this matter is before the Board for review and decision. The Department and employer filed timely Petitions for Review of a Proposed Decision and Order issued on September 23, 2024, in which the industrial appeals judge reversed and remanded the Department order dated February 23, 2024. The claimant filed a response to the Department's and the employer's Petitions for Review.

Evidentiary Rulings

The Board has reviewed the evidentiary rulings in the record of proceedings and finds that no prejudicial error was committed. The rulings are affirmed.