
In the Matter of the Compensation of
EDWARD L. DEARDORFF, Claimant
WCB Case No: 16-00910C
ORDER APPROVING CLAIM DISPOSITION AGREEMENT
Glen J Lasken, Claimant Attorneys
Chad Kosieracki, Defense Attorneys

Reviewing Panel: Members Weddell and Johnson.

On April 13, 2016, the Board received the parties' Claim Disposition Agreement (CDA). In consideration of the payment of a stated sum, claimant releases certain rights to future workers' compensation benefits, except medical services-related benefits, for his compensable injury. We approve the proposed disposition.

The "summary page" and paragraph 12 of the proposed CDA provide for a total consideration of \$21,000. However, by handwritten interlineation on the "summary page" and paragraph 13 of the CDA, claimant's attorney fee has been changed to \$4,700. In addition, again by handwritten interlineation on the "summary page," the total due claimant has been changed to \$16,300.¹ The total consideration described by the "handwritten interlineation" portions of the "summary page" continue to equal the originally drafted \$21,000.

The agreement, as clarified by this order, is in accordance with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Board. *See* ORS 656.236(1). Accordingly, the parties' CDA is approved.

If the parties disagree with our interpretation of the CDA, they may move for reconsideration by filing a motion for reconsideration within 10 days of the date of mailing of this order. OAR 438-009-0035.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Entered at Salem, Oregon on April 26, 2016

¹ These hand written interlineations are apparently from claimant and his attorney. Generally, we require such interlineations to come from both the claimant and the carrier (or their respective representatives). However, here the interlineations only concern the manner in which the CDA proceeds are to be distributed between claimant and his counsel--they do not alter the total CDA proceeds to be paid by the carrier. Thus, under these particular circumstances, the carrier's (or its legal representative's) approval of the interlineation is not necessary. *See Christopher S. Chizek, 66 Van Natta 1243 (2014).*