

2016 Cal. Wrk. Comp. P.D. LEXIS 572

Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (board Panel Decision),

Opinion Filed October 25, 2016 ; October 25, 2016

W.C.A.B. No. ADJ10456401

Reporter

2016 Cal. Wrk. Comp. P.D. LEXIS 572 *

Juan Rivas, Applicant v. North American Trailer, Travelers Property Casualty Company of America, Defendants

Status:

CAUTION: This decision has not been designated a "significant panel decision" by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. Practitioners should proceed with caution when citing to this panel decision and should also verify the subsequent history of the decision, as these decisions are subject to appeal. WCAB panel decisions are citeable authority, particularly on issues of contemporaneous administrative construction of statutory language [see [Griffith v. WCAB \(1989\) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1264, fn. 2, 54 Cal. Comp. Cases 145](#)]. However, WCAB panel decisions are not binding precedent, as are en banc decisions, on all other Appeals Board panels and workers' compensation judges [see [Gee v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. \(2002\) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1418, 1425 fn. 6, 67 Cal. Comp. Cases 236](#)]. While WCAB panel decisions are not binding, the WCAB will consider these decisions to the extent that it finds their reasoning persuasive [see [Guitron v. Santa Fe Extruders \(2011\) 76 Cal. Comp. Cases 228, fn. 7 \(Appeals Board En Banc Opinion\)](#)]. LexisNexis editorial consultants have deemed this panel decision noteworthy because it does one or more of the following: (1) Establishes a new rule of law, applies an existing rule to a set of facts significantly different from those stated in other decisions, or modifies, or criticizes with reasons given, an existing rule; (2) Resolves or creates an apparent conflict in the law; (3) Involves a legal issue of continuing public interest; (4) Makes a significant contribution to legal literature by reviewing either the development of workers' compensation law or the legislative, regulatory, or judicial history of a constitution, statute, regulation, or other written law; and/or (5) Makes a contribution to the body of law available to attorneys, claims personnel, judges, the Board, and others seeking to understand the workers' compensation law of California.

Prior History:

W.C.A.B. No. ADJ10456401—WCJ Clint Feddersen (VNO); WCAB Panel: Commissioners Brass, Zalewski, Lowe

Disposition: [*1]

The Petition for Reconsideration is *denied*.

Core Terms

rehabilitate, expedited hearing, brain injury, traveler, medical treatment, petition for reconsideration, medical group, workers' compensation, treating physician, inpatient, verified, panel decision, correspondence, recommend, referral, attend, occupational therapy, medical evidence, physical therapy, specialty

Headnotes

HEADNOTES

Medical Provider Networks-Designation of Treating Physician Within Medical Group-Utilization Review-WCAB, affirming WCJ, ruled that applicant properly designated Kenneth K. Wogensen, M.D., employed by Casa Colina Transitional Living Center (Casa Colina), as his primary treating physician within defendant's MPN, notwithstanding that Dr. Wogensen was not listed as individual physician in MPN, and that applicant was entitled to medical treatment requested by Dr. Wogensen to cure or relieve effects of his 10/16/2015 admitted injury to his head, brain, neck, ears, and eyes, including 60 days of post-acute physical rehabilitation at Casa Colina, when Casa Colina was listed in defendant's MPN, and WCAB reasoned that under [Labor Code § 4616\(a\)\(3\)](#) and [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5.1](#), medical groups may be members of MPN and may employ services of physicians who do not register individually with MPN, such as Dr. Wogensen, that applicant's designation of Dr. Wogensen as his primary treating physician specifically referred to Casa Colina, and evidence established Dr. Wogensen, in rendering treatment to applicant, acted only through Casa Colina [*2] and not in his capacity as individual physician, and that defendant's assertion that Casa Colina was hospital that could only provide treatment upon referral from individual member of MPN was contradicted by description of Casa Colina in defendant's MPN listing stating that Casa Colina was in MPN for purpose of providing inpatient and outpatient treatment in areas that expressly included rehabilitation from brain injury, and that no referral was required for this kind of treatment; WCAB found that since Dr. Wogensen was properly designated treating physician, defendant was required to conduct utilization review under [Labor Code § 4610](#) before denying authorization for treatment requested by Dr. Wogensen, that because defendant failed to do so, WCAB had jurisdiction to decide medical dispute, and that reports of Dr. Wogensen and Dr. David R. Patterson, M.D., another Casa Colina physician who treated applicant, were substantial evidence to support award of requested treatment. [See generally [Hanna, Cal. Law of Emp. Inj. and Workers' Comp. 2d § 5.03\[1\]](#); Rassp & Herlick, California Workers' Compensation Law, Ch. 4, § 4.12[2].]

Counsel

For Applicant: Tina Eshghieh, Esq., Odjaghian Law Group

For Defendant: Afsaneh Grob, Esq., Trinidad & Associates

Opinion By: Commissioner Frank M. Brass

Opinion

OPINION AND ORDER DENYING PETITION [*3] FOR RECONSIDERATION

We have considered the allegations of the Petition for Reconsideration and the contents of the report of the workers' compensation administrative law judge (WCJ) with respect thereto. Based on our review of the record, and for the reasons stated in the WCJ's report, which we adopt and incorporate, we will deny reconsideration.

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that the Petition for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

Commissioner Frank M. Brass

I concur,

Commissioner Katherine Zalewski

Commissioner Deidra E. Lowe

* * * *

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

I

INTRODUCTION

Defendants Travelers Property Casualty Company of America and North American Trailer have filed a timely, verified petition seeking reconsideration of the August 8, 2016 Findings and Award after Expedited Hearing, which awarded applicant Juan Rivas 60 days of post-acute physical rehabilitation at the Casa Colina Transitional Living Center, and future medical treatment reasonably required to cure or relieve from the effects of an admitted injury of October 16, 2015 to applicant's head, brain, neck, ears and eyes. Mr. Rivas was 51 years old at the time [*4] of this injury.

Defendants contend that Casa Colina Transitional Living Center ("Casa Colina") may not serve as applicant's primary treating physician, and that it permissibly denied a Request for Authorization submitted by a physician at Casa Colina without utilization review. Defendants also contend that Casa Colina's medical reports do not constitute substantial medical evidence, that applicant's attorney impermissibly added issues to defendants' Declaration of Readiness to Proceed, and that applicant was required to attend the expedited hearing conducted on August 2, 2016.

Defendants' petition is procedurally defective only insofar as an exhibit has been attached to it in violation of [Title 8, Cal. Code Regs. § 10842\(c\)](#). The document attached to the petition is substantially the same as the Medical Provider Network (MPN) search results admitted at trial as Applicant's Exhibit 3, which was sufficiently legible.

Applicant's attorney has filed a timely, verified answer to the petition for reconsideration.

II

FACTS

The parties stipulated at expedited hearing that Juan Rivas, born December 12, 1963, while employed on October 16, 2015, sustained injury arising out of and in the course of employment [*5] to his head, brain, neck, ears and eyes, and claims to have sustained injury to his back, internal and nervous system, and in the form of sexual and sleep dysfunction (MOH 8/2/16, p. 2).

The parties further stipulated that the employer has furnished some medical treatment, but did not specify what that treatment was. (*Id.*) The only medical evidence submitted at hearing were two reports from "Casa Colina Hospital and Center for Healthcare," which appeared to be identically formatted, with one dictated by physician David R. Patterson, M.D. dated June 20, 2016 (admitted without objection as Applicant's Exhibit 2), and the other dictated by physician Kenneth K. Wogensen, M.D. for an evaluation of June 24, 2016 (admitted without objection as Applicant's Exhibit 1). Each of these two reports includes a brief history of injury, list of symptoms, medications, social and family history, review of systems, physical examination, assessment, and treatment plan. According to both reports, the injury occurred when applicant was struck on the right side of his head by a chain and hook, causing a loss of consciousness and a skull fracture that required five days of hospitalization and the installation [*6] of a titanium plate in Mr. Rivas' skull (Report of 6/24/16, Applicant's Exhibit 1, p. 1; Report of 6/20/16, Applicant's Exhibit 2, p. 1). Mr. Rivas' current symptoms include dizziness and unsteadiness, and cognitive problems. (*Id.*)

There is an MPN notice letter from defendant Travelers dated October 16, 2015 (admitted without objection as Defendant's Exhibit F), but MPN validity and notice were not raised as issues at the expedited hearing (MOH 8/2/16, pp. 2–3). As shown in the Travelers' MPN Provider Search Results dated July 18, 2016 (admitted without objection as Applicant's Exhibit 3), "Casa Colina Transitional Living Center" is in the Travelers' MPN, in all of the following specialties: Occupational Therapy, Outpatient Facility, Physical Therapy, Rehabilitation Inpatient, Rehabilitation: Brain Injury, and Hospital: Rehabilitation. Of these, two specialties, Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, are marked with an asterisk indicating that they are "By Referral Only" (MPN Provider Search Results 7/18/16, Applicant's Exhibit 3, pp. 1 and 2).

On June 24, 2016, applicant, through his counsel, designated as his Primary Treating Physician "Kenneth Wogensen, M.D., Casa Colina Transitional [*7] Living Center, 255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767, Tel.: (909)596–7733" (Letter from Odjaghian Law Group 6/24/16, Defendant's Exhibit E, p. 1). Defendant Travelers objected to this designation on June 28, 2016 (Correspondence from Travelers 6/28/16, Defendant's Exhibit A, p.1).

On June 27, 2016, Dr. Wogensen signed a Request for Authorization (RFA) for "post-acute physical rehabilitation in transitional living center residential program" (RFA 6/27/16, Applicant's Exhibit 5, p. 1). Under "Practice Name," the RFA indicates "Casa Colina Transitional Living Center" (*Id.*), and a fax cover sheet indicates that it was transmitted by fax by Casa Colina Transitional Living Center to "Patricia Dicarlo, Adjuster, Travelers" on July 7, 2016 (*Id.*, p. 6, also admitted as Defendant's Exhibit D, p. 1). The RFA appears to be accompanied by a page of comments, a page of physician orders, along with two pages of information about the Casa Colina Transitional Living Center (*Id.*, Applicant's Exhibit 5, pp. 2–5, and Defendant's Exhibit D, pp. 3–6). The description of the Transitional Living Center, or "TLC," explains that TLC offers the services of an "interdisciplinary team," including "Board [*8] Certified Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Physicians" and "Neuropsychologists" (*Id.*, p. 4).

Defendants did not submit the June 27, 2016 RFA to utilization review, but did object to it in writing on July 5, 2016 in a letter addressed to Dr. Wogensen at Casa Colina, with a copy to applicant's counsel (Correspondence from Travelers 7/5/16, Applicant's Exhibit 4 and Defendant's Exhibit B), and a second letter was sent to Dr. Wogensen at Casa Colina, with a copy to applicant's counsel, on July 13, 2016 (Correspondence from Travelers 7/13/16, Defendant's Exhibit C). The sole grounds for denial of treatment in both letters was, "[y]ou are not in our Medical Provider Network." (Correspondence from Travelers 7/5/16, Applicant's Exhibit 4, p.1 and Defendant's Exhibit B, p.1; Correspondence from Travelers 7/13/16, Defendant's Exhibit C, p. 1).

On July 6, 2016, Defendants filed a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DOR) on the sole issue of "Entitlement to medical treatment per [Labor Code § 4600](#), except issues determined pursuant to [Labor Code §§ 4610](#) and [4610.5](#)." On July 18, 2016, applicant's [*9] attorney filed correspondence and a verified trial brief addressing specific medical treatment issues.

On August 2, 2016, counsel for both parties appeared for an expedited hearing, at which applicant was not present and no testimony was taken. As defendants had not served Mr. Rivas or his counsel with any request that he appear at trial, the hearing proceeded without his testimony. Exhibits were admitted into evidence by both parties without any objection and the matter was submitted for decision on 18 issues enumerated by the parties, most of which were centered on the fact that Casa Colina is in defendant Travelers' MPN, but attending physicians Dr. Wogensen and Dr. Patterson are not listed in the MPN as individual physicians (MOH 8/2/16, pp. 2–3). Other issues submitted for decision at the expedited hearing were whether the medical reports dictated by Dr. Wogensen and Dr. Patterson were substantial medical evidence, whether applicant's counsel impermissibly added issues raised by defendants' DOR, and whether applicant was required to attend the expedited hearing.

On August 8, 2016, a Findings and Award after Expedited Hearing and Opinion on Decision were issued, awarding applicant [*10] 60 days of post-acute physical rehabilitation at the Casa Colina Transitional Living Center, and future medical treatment reasonably required to cure or relieve from the effects of his admitted injury of October 16, 2015. The Opinion on Decision addressed each of the 18 issues submitted for decision, and indicated that defendants' motion to withdraw its DOR at hearing was denied. Defendants filed a timely, verified petition for reconsideration on September 1, 2016, and applicant's counsel filed a timely, verified answer on September 12, 2016.

III

DISCUSSION

[Labor Code § 4616](#) permits insurers, employers, or entities providing physician network services to establish a Medical Provider Network, or MPN, which must include an adequate number and type of physicians. [Labor Code § 4616\(a\)\(3\)](#) and Title 8, [Cal. Code Regs. § 9767.5.1](#) provide that physicians acting on behalf of a medical group need not acknowledge their membership in the MPN individually. Thus, medical groups may be members of the MPN, and may employ the services of physicians who do not register individually with the MPN.

Defendants' petition asserts that Casa Colina Transitional Living Center is merely a hospital and may not provide [*11] treatment except by referral from an individual physician member of its MPN. This assertion is contradicted by the description of Casa Colina included in Applicant's Exhibit 5, pp. 3–4 and Defendant's Exhibit D, pp. 4–6, which indicates that it is not a mere facility sans physicians, but an "interdisciplinary team" that includes "Board Certified Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Physicians" and "Neuropsychologists." (*Id.*) Furthermore, while defendant's MPN does list Casa Colina under the specialty "Hospital: Rehabilitation," it also lists Casa Colina as a provider of Occupational Therapy, Outpatient Facility,

Physical Therapy, Rehabilitation Inpatient, and Rehabilitation: Brain Injury. Of these, only two specialties, Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, are marked with an asterisk indicating that they are "By Referral Only" (MPN Provider Search Results 7/18/16, Applicant's Exhibit 3, pp. 1 and 2).

Additionally, the exhibits admitted at trial consistently show that Dr. Wogensen and Dr. Patterson acted only at, by, and through Casa Colina. The report for Dr. Wogensen's evaluation of June 24, 2016, Applicant's Exhibit 1, says "Casa Colina" at the bottom of every page, as does [*12] the report for Dr. Patterson's evaluation of June 20, 2016, Applicant's Exhibit 2, and both reports appear to be from the same source as they are similar in appearance and format.

The first page of Applicant's Exhibit 3 is an MPN search result showing Casa Colina's address as 255 E. Bonita Ave., Pomona, CA 91767, with as telephone number of (909) 596-7733. This matches the address to which defendants sent their objection letter of July 5, 2016, admitted as Applicant's Exhibit 4 as well as Defendant's Exhibit B, and the addressee of that letter is "Kenneth Wogensen MD, Casa Colina Transitional Living Center." Defendants' other objection letter, dated July 13, 2016, was admitted as Defendant's Exhibit C and is also addressed to "Kenneth Wogensen MD, Casa Colina Medical Center, 255 E Bonita Ave, Pomona CA 91767."

The RFA of June 27, 2016, admitted as both Applicant's Exhibit 5 and Defendant's Exhibit D, clearly indicates that it is from Casa Colina as a medical group, and not Dr. Wogensen's own practice, because under the heading "Practice Name" on the RFA form, it lists "Casa Colina Transitional Living Center," and the address on the RFA matches the one in Travelers' MPN in Exhibit 3. [*13] The RFA was also faxed to defendants on July 7, 2016 by a person identified as Admissions Manager of Casa Colina, who does not appear to be employed by Dr. Wogensen personally (RFA 6/27/16, Applicant's Exhibit 5, p. 6, and RFA 7/7/16, Defendant's Exhibit D, p. 1).

Finally, applicant's counsel's letter designating a primary treating physician from the MPN, admitted as Defendants' Exhibit E, does not simply designate Dr. Wogensen as an independent physician, but designates the primary treating physician as, "Kenneth Wogensen, M.D., Casa Colina Transitional Living Center, 255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767, Tel: (909)596-7733," thus naming Casa Colina as the medical group, with an address and telephone number that match the ones for Casa Colina in Travelers' MPN (Letter from Odjaghian Law Group 6/24/16, Defendant's Exhibit E, p.1).

Thus, the evidence in this case strongly supports the inference that Casa Colina is a medical group, providing treatment within Travelers' MPN through physicians, including Dr. Wogensen and Dr. Patterson, who need not individually register with the MPN per [Labor Code § 4616\(a\)\(3\)](#) and Title [8, Cal. Code Regs. § 9767.5.1](#).

[Title 8, Cal. Code Regs. § 9767.6\(e\)](#) [*14] clearly provides injured workers with the right to designate who will treat them within an MPN:

"At any point in time after the initial medical evaluation with an MPN physician, the covered employee may select a physician of his or her choice from the MPN. Selection by the covered employee of a treating physician and any subsequent physicians shall be based on the physician's specialty or recognized expertise in treating the particular injury or condition in question."

In this case, there is no dispute that Casa Colina is in defendants' MPN, and based on its MPN listing, it is in the MPN for the purpose of providing inpatient and outpatient treatment in areas that expressly include rehabilitation from brain injury. Also based on the MPN listing, no referral is required for this kind of treatment, as only occupational therapy and physical therapy are "By Referral Only" (Travelers' MPN Provider Search Results 7/18/16, Applicant's Exhibit 3, p.1).

Applicant has an admitted brain injury, and has requested treatment for this condition within the MPN through Casa Colina. As explained above, all of the evidence admitted at expedited hearing supports the inference that Casa Colina provides this [*15] treatment as a medical group, through the services of physicians, including Dr. Wogensen and Dr. Patterson. In order for Casa Colina to provide "Rehabilitation: Brain Injury" as listed on Travelers' MPN, applicant must be allowed to see the physicians who provide that treatment for Casa Colina. Therefore, applicant should be allowed to designate Casa Colina, and any physicians acting on behalf of Casa Colina.

There does not appear to be any case law that clearly defines the right to select a physician within a medical group in an MPN, but in a writ denied case, [Gonzalez v. WCAB \(2012\) 77 Cal.Comp.Cases 449](#), the WCAB upheld a WCJ's opinion that provided "in relevant part that Applicant was provided care at U.S. Healthworks following the injury, and that Applicant had every right to choose which doctor at that facility would treat him but did not exercise that right." [Gonzalez, 77 Cal.Comp.Cases at 451](#). This statement of the law is consistent with the Findings and Award after Expedited Hearing herein, and accounts for both the defendants' right to choose to have Casa Colina in its MPN as a medical group, and applicant's right to select a "physician" under [Title 8, Cal. Code Regs. § 9767.6\(e\)](#).

Accordingly, [*16] applicant permissibly designated "Kenneth Wogensen, M.D., Casa Colina Transitional Living Center" as his treating physician, when the evidence shows that Dr. Wogensen provided treatment through Casa Colina, which was in defendants' MPN, and the MPN listing indicated that brain injury rehabilitation at Casa Colina was not by referral only.

Proceeding from the premise that applicant permissibly designated "Kenneth Wogensen, M.D., Casa Colina Transitional Living Center" as his treating physician, it follows that defendants' objection to the June 27, 2016 RFA was in error, and defendants were required to conduct utilization review under [Labor Code § 4610](#) before denying the requested treatment. They did not.

Defendants' petition for reconsideration contends that the medical reports of Casa Colina dictated by Dr. Wogensen and Dr. Patterson were not substantial medical evidence in support of the requested treatment, because the doctors had an inadequate history and did not review all of the treatment records. Defendants cite authorities that correctly define substantial evidence as having probative force, being more than a mere scintilla, and being relevant evidence a reasonable mind might [*17] accept as adequate, reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value ([Insurance Company of North America v. WCAB \(1981\) 122 Cal.App.3d 905 at 910, 46 Cal.Comp.Cases 913 at 916](#)), and correctly point out that substantial evidence is not predicated upon an incorrect legal theory, devoid of a relevant factual basis, or beyond the physician's expertise ([Zemke v. WCAB \(1968\) 68 Cal.2d 794 at 798, 33 Cal.Comp.Cases 358 at 363](#)), nor may it be based upon an inadequate medical history or examination ([Place v. WCAB \(1970\) 3 Cal.3d 372 at 378, 35 Cal.Comp.Cases 525 at 529](#)).

In this case, it was found that the Casa Colina reports authored by Dr. Wogensen and Dr. Patterson do constitute substantial medical evidence on the issue of whether Mr. Rivas requires 60 days in an inpatient brain injury rehabilitation program. Although they did not review the treatment records, they did obtain an adequate medical history from Mr. Rivas and his wife, and performed an adequate assessment to support the conclusion that inpatient brain injury rehabilitation would be appropriate to cure or relieve from the effects of Mr. Rivas' admitted brain injury. Based upon Mr. Rivas' evident fall risk from dizziness and [*18] potential for self-endangerment from cognitive problems, a reasonable mind might accept the request for authorization for inpatient treatment as reasonable in nature. There is more than a "mere scintilla" of evidence to support Dr. Wogensen's conclusion, and as a physician providing evaluation and treatment through Casa Colina, which specializes in the rehabilitation of brain injuries, his opinion is probative and well within his expertise.

Further, defendants adduced no evidence at trial to contradict or rebut the history, findings, or request for authorization of Dr. Wogensen. Their assertion in the petition for reconsideration that "most of the recommended treatment for applicant had already taken place unbeknownst to Dr. Patterson" (Petition 9/1/16, p. 13) is without any evidentiary support. If defendants' assertion were true, it could have easily been substantiated by offering into evidence any unreviewed medical reports or records that contradict the history, opinions or recommendations of Dr. Wogensen. The difference between Dr. Patterson's recommendation of 30 days at Casa Colina and Dr. Wogensen's request for authorization of 60 days, pointed out as an inconsistency by defendants [*19] in their petition, seems to reinforce rather than impeach the conclusions of Dr. Wogensen that inpatient rehabilitation is appropriate. In any event, the finding that applicant requires additional medical care including the brain injury rehabilitation is based upon Dr. Wogensen's evaluation and request for authorization after he was properly designated by applicant's attorney on June 24, 2016.

With respect to defendants' contention that applicant's attorney impermissibly added issues to the defendants' July 16, 2016 Declaration of Readiness to Proceed to Expedited Hearing (DOR), the DOR requested hearing on only one issue, "Entitlement to medical treatment per [Labor Code § 4600](#), except issues determined pursuant to [Labor Code §§ 4610 and 4610.5](#)" (DOR 7/6/16, p. 1). Regarding specific, genuine, good faith efforts to resolve the dispute regarding medical treatment, the DOR indicates only that "applicant is treating outside of a properly set Travelers MPN for medical treatment and refusing to go back into the MPN despite multiple requests" (*Id.*, p. 2). Applicant's attorney's letter of July 18, 2016, together with a verified trial

brief, addressed specific medical treatment issues, but [*20] did not substantially add anything to the defendants' specified issue of medical treatment, and the contention in the DOR that treatment at Casa Colina was "outside" the MPN. AH issues heard at expedited hearing were within the scope of issues identified by the DOR.

Defendants' petition for reconsideration also asserts that applicant had a duty to be present at the expedited hearing, and that defendants' rights were prejudicially violated "by being denied a chance to call applicant as a witness for trial." Title 8, Cal. Code Regs. § 10652(a) allows applicant to appear through counsel, and § 10563(a) requires that "[e]ach party ... shall appear or have an attorney or other representative appear at all hearings pertaining to the case-in-chief." In this case, applicant appeared through counsel, and had an attorney present at the expedited hearing. Defendants did have a chance to require applicant's personal attendance at the expedited hearing, but applicant was not required to attend in the absence of a properly-served notice to appear or subpoena that would compel his personal attendance.

IV

RECOMMENDATION

It is respectfully recommended that the petition for reconsideration be denied.

Clint [*21] Feddersen

Workers' Compensation Administrative Law Judge

Dated: September 15, 2016

Opinion Summaries, headnotes, tables, other editorial features, classification headings for headnotes, and related references and statements prepared by LexisNexis™, Copyright © 2016 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. All rights reserved.

End of Document