United States Department of Labor Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

	_	
ROBERT AYRES, Appellant)	
and)	Docket No. 04-1556 Issued: November 29, 2004
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE, WEST MARKET POST OFFICE, Philadelphia, PA, Employer)	issued. November 25, 2004
Appearances:	_)	Case Submitted on the Record
Jeffrey P. Zeelander, Esq., for the appellant		2332 23333333 270 21000 0

Office of Solicitor, for the Director

DECISION AND ORDER

Before:

COLLEEN DUFFY KIKO, Member DAVID S. GERSON, Alternate Member A. PETER KANJORSKI, Alternate Member

JURISDICTION

On May 27, 2004 appellant, through his attorney, filed a timely appeal of a May 24, 2004 merit decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, denying modification of its decision, finding that he was not entitled to a schedule award for permanent impairment of his lower extremities. Pursuant to 20 C.F.R. §§ 501.2(c) and 501.3, the Board has jurisdiction over the merits of this schedule award case.

<u>ISSUE</u>

The issue is whether appellant has established that he is entitled to a schedule award for permanent impairment of his lower extremities causally related to factors of his federal employment.

FACTUAL HISTORY

This case was previously before the Board. By decision dated March 4, 2003, the Board affirmed the Office's decisions dated August 9 and November 20, 2001, which denied appellant's claim for a schedule award for his lower extremities as he did not establish any

impairment causally related to the accepted April 22, 1988 aggravation of osteoarthritis in his knees.¹ The law and the facts as set forth in the previous Board decision are incorporated herein by reference.

By letter dated February 17, 2004, appellant, through his attorney, requested reconsideration, and submitted a February 10, 2004 medical report from Dr. George L. Rodriguez, a Board-certified physiatrist. In this report, Dr. Rodriguez provided a history that on approximately August 20, 1988 appellant could no longer tolerate bilateral knee pain. He noted appellant's medical treatment, his return to light-duty work after right knee surgery and his social and occupational background. Dr. Rodriguez provided his findings on physical and neurological examination and a detailed review of medical records. He diagnosed bilateral degenerative joint disease of the knees status post right knee chondroplasty and meniscectomy, gait abnormality and excessive bilateral joint knee pain secondary to an August 20, 1988 employment injury.² Dr. Rodriguez opined that appellant suffered significantly from bilateral knee pain and that he reached maximum medical improvement on or about August 14, 2001. He found no evidence of symptom magnification or nonphysiological complaints and stated that based on his examination and review of the medical records, the diagnosed conditions were attributable to the "April 22, 1988" employment injury. Regarding the right lower extremity, Dr. Rodriguez determined that appellant had a 40 percent impairment due to moderate to severe arthritis based on the American Medical Association, Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment (5th ed. 2001) (A.M.A., Guides) 544. Table 17-31 and a 7 percent impairment for a total meniscectomy based on the A.M.A., Guides 546, Table 17-33, totaling a 44 percent impairment. Regarding the left lower extremity, Dr. Rodriguez found that appellant had a seven percent impairment for mild arthritis based on the A.M.A., *Guides* 544, Table 17-31. He determined that appellant had a three percent impairment for pain utilizing the A.M.A., *Guides* 573, 575, section 18.3d(C).

In a decision dated May 24, 2004, the Office denied appellant's request for modification based on a merit review of his claim. The Office found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish that he sustained any impairment causally related to his April 22, 1988 employment injury.

LEGAL PRECEDENT

A claimant seeking compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act³ has the burden of establishing the essential elements of his claim by the weight of the reliable, probative and substantial evidence.³ Section 8107 provides that, if there is permanent disability

¹ The Board notes that on May 31, 1991 appellant, then a 55-year-old letter carrier, filed an occupational disease claim for osteoarthritis of the weight-bearing joints of both knees which he realized was either caused or aggravated by factors of his employment on April 22, 1988. The Office accepted the claim for aggravation of osteoarthritis of both knees. Docket No. 03-32 (issued March 4, 2003).

² It appears that Dr. Rodriguez inadvertently stated that the diagnosed conditions were caused by an August 20, 1988 employment injury rather than the accepted April 22, 1988 employment injury as he later indicated in his report that these conditions were caused by the accepted employment injury.

³ Edward W. Spohr, 54 ECAB ___ (Docket No. 03-1173, issued September 10, 2003); Nathaniel Milton, 37 ECAB 712 (1986).

involving the loss or loss of use of a member or function of the body, the claimant is entitled to a schedule award for the permanent impairment of the scheduled member or function.⁴ The schedule award provision of the Act⁵ and its implementing federal regulation⁶ sets forth the number of weeks of compensation payable to employees sustaining permanent impairment from loss, or loss of use, of scheduled members or functions of the body. However, the Act does not specify the manner in which the percentage of loss shall be determined. For consistent results and to ensure equal justice under the law to all claimants, the Office has adopted the A.M.A., *Guide* (5th ed. 2001) as the uniform standard applicable to all claimants.⁷

<u>ANALYSIS</u>

The Office accepted that appellant aggravated his osteoarthritis in both knees while in the performance of his duties as a letter carrier. As appellant seeks a schedule award in this case, he has the burden to establish that the employment factors caused permanent impairment of his lower extremities. He has not met his burden of proof.

While Dr. Rodriguez reported that appellant had a 44 percent impairment of the right lower extremity, a 7 percent impairment of the left lower extremity and a 3 percent impairment for pain, he did not state whether or discuss how the work factors caused or contributed to a permanent impairment of appellant's lower extremities. Dr. Rodriguez' report does not indicate any awareness that appellant began working limited duty in 1988 and stopped working altogether in 1996. The current claim for schedule award was filed in February 2000. There is no evidence of record explaining how appellant's lower extremities impairment was caused or aggravated by his employment. Therefore, the Office properly denied his schedule award claim.

CONCLUSION

The Board finds that appellant has not met his burden of proof to establish that he has a permanent impairment of his lower extremities causally related to factors of his federal employment.

⁴ 5 U.S.C. § 8107(a).

⁵ 5 U.S.C. § 8107.

^{6 20} C.F.R. § 10.404.

⁷ *Id*.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the May 24, 2004 decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is affirmed.

Issued: November 29, 2004 Washington, DC

> Colleen Duffy Kiko Member

David S. Gerson Alternate Member

A. Peter Kanjorski Alternate Member