

EXHIBIT

LOSE - Appeal



David P. Weidner
Chairman

LEGAL APPEALS UNIT
WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

20 PARK ST
ALBANY, NY 12207
www.wcb.ny.gov

195285-0/
JPB

State of New York - Workers' Compensation Board
In regard to Ray LaBow, (Est. #), WCB Case #69709732

APR 26 2006

MEMORANDUM OF BOARD PANEL DECISION

After your records.

Opinion By: Mona A. Bargen
Karl A. Henry
Michael T. Berns

In an application filed October 28, 2005, the Special Funds Conservation Committee ("Special Funds") requests review of the Workers' Compensation Law Judge ("WCLJ") review decision filed October 17, 2005. This matter involves the compensated death claim based on a previously established case involving an occupational disease of the decedent's lungs (WCB file #6051064). In the October 17, 2005 review decision, the WCLJ, *inter alia*, denied occupational disease, notice and causal relationship to include mesothelioma, resolved form C-X-1 issues in favor of the medical providers and found that WCLJ § 15-K(c) applies. Special Funds objects to the finding that § 15-K(c) applies, contending that the section cannot apply because the case is not established for a pneumoconiosis type disease. Special Funds cites *Sainte-Sauve v. Certain Teekl Products Corp., et al.*, N.Y.D.2d 823, for the precedence that mesothelioma is not a dust disease within the meaning of § 15-K(c).

By its own application filed November 16, 2005, the carrier objects to the decision in its entirety, maintaining that the record does not show that the decedent was exposed to asbestos while working for the employer or that there was any contamination of the dust at the employer's site from asbestos or asbestos fibers. The carrier argues that the testimony from the decedent's treating physician, Dr. Inhaber, was neither that of an authority on the talc's content, nor that of an authority on the talc's composition and did not cite any studies or analyses of the employer's talc used to show that the talc contained either asbestos or asbestos fibers. The carrier adds testimony showed that Dr. Inhaber did not obtain any history of the decedent's jobs prior to the employer in this file, and expressed that he did not know whether the claimant had been exposed to asbestos or talc prior to working for the employer.

By rebuttal filed December 16, 2005, the claimant's attorney highlights that a pulmonologist, a specialist in occupational medicine and an oncologist, all testified that the decedent's disease process related to his exposure through his thirty-three years of employment with the employer talc mining establishment, and only the carrier's paid consultant opined otherwise. The claimant's attorney argues that the record well supports the WCLJ's findings.

*** Continued on next page ***

Claimant - Ray LaBow, (Est. #) Employer - Counterpart Talc
Social Security No. - 6970 9762 Carrier - Zurich American Insurance Co.
WCB Case No. - W229031
Date of Accident - 05/07/2002 Carrier Case No. - 2673481212
District Office - Syracuse Date of Filing of this Decision - 04/25/2006

Placa: Informar a la oficina de la Junta de Comisionados Obreros en su oficina correspondiente, copia numerada de la decisión, copia de la

EBRB-1 (4/99)

The Board Panel does not accept the carrier's argument that the decedent's treating doctors did not reference in their testimony their respective sources for the premise that the employer's talc contained either asbestos or asbestos fiber. If the carrier desired to challenge the doctors' authorities, the opportunity for cross-examination was amply available in the course of the depositions. Without such challenge, the mere of fact could look to the conviction, credibilities and witness of the medical witnesses and infer that each competently and credibly testified with sufficient knowledge about the subject matter at issue. See, *Menter v. Allingers v. Dime Savings Bank of New York*, 152 A.D.2d 649, 650, 653 N.Y.S.2d 190, 191 (1st Dept., 1997). It is well settled that questions of credibility, reasonable beliefs, and weight of medical evidence are for the Workers' Compensation Board to decide, and it is within the province of the Board to resolve conflicts in the medical testimony as well as to determine the reasonableness of weight and credibility to be given to that testimony. *Forsyth v. Grossman's Lumber*, 175 A.D.2d 458, 522 N.Y.S.2d 774 (3rd Dept., 1991); *Gorenstein v. Crystal Corporation*, 213 A.D.2d 859, 652 N.Y.S.2d 426 (3rd Dept., 1997). The Board Panel has reviewed the entire record and has considered the testimony of the claimant's medical witnesses and the carrier's consultant. The Board Panel has also reviewed the reports of the doctors. With the exception of the WCLJ finding that WCLJ § 15-K(c) applies, the record fully supports the findings of fact and the opinion of the WCLJ that are noted in the review decision filed October 17, 2005. No finding of fact or law have been made. Aside from the § 15-K(c) issue, the Board Panel adopts the findings of fact and the opinion of the WCLJ as the findings of fact and the opinion of the Board Panel. With respect to the application of § 15-K(c), the Board Panel concurs with Special Funds that § 15-K(c) only applies to silicosis and other dust diseases, and the record simply documents that mesothelioma is not such a disease.

Accordingly, the review decision filed October 17, 2005 is MODIFIED. To the extent the WCLJ found that WCLJ § 15-K(c) applies, the decision is reversed. The review decision filed October 17, 2005 is in all other respects affirmed. The case is returned to the trial calendar for further development of the record on applicable benefits available to the claimant by virtue of the decedent's work related demise.

All concur.

Mona A. Bargen *Karl A. Henry*
Mona A. Bargen Karl A. Henry
Michael T. Berns
Michael T. Berns

DECISION

.006

Claimant - Ray LaBow, (Est. #) Employer - Counterpart Talc
Social Security No. - 6970 9762 Carrier - Zurich American Insurance Co.
WCB Case No. - W229031
Date of Accident - 05/07/2002 Carrier Case No. - 2673481212
District Office - Syracuse Date of Filing of this Decision - 04/25/2006

ATTENCION

Placa: Informar a la oficina de la Junta de Comisionados Obreros en su oficina correspondiente, copia numerada de la decisión, copia de la

EBRB-1 (4/99)

Page 2 of 2