

In the Matter of the Compensation of  
**EVELYN RAMIREZ-CORREA, Claimant**  
WCB Case No. 14-03031  
**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

Ransom Gilbertson Martin et al, Claimant Attorneys  
Travis L Terrall, Defense Attorneys

Reviewing Panel: Members Lanning and Johnson.

The self-insured employer requested review of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Mills's order that set aside its denial of claimant's injury claim for a right knee condition. The parties have submitted a proposed "Disputed Claim Settlement & Stipulations" that is designed to resolve all issues raised or raisable that are pending Board review and before the Hearings Division (WCB Case No. 15-04003). Those portions of the agreement that pertain to issues pending before the Hearings Division have received ALJ approval.

Pursuant to those portions of the settlement that pertain to this case, claimant agrees that her claim "shall remain in denied status," and that the ALJ's order "shall also be vacated as moot." The settlement further provides that all hearing requests and requests for Board review "shall all be dismissed as moot."<sup>1</sup>

We have approved those portions of the settlement that pertain to issues pending review, thereby fully and finally resolving the parties' dispute, in lieu of the ALJ's order.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, these matters are dismissed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Entered at Salem, Oregon on January 7, 2016

---

<sup>1</sup> The agreement states that claimant's request for reconsideration of a Notice of Closure shall also be dismissed. However, because that matter is pending before the Workers' Compensation Division (WCD), our approval of this agreement does not affect that separate proceeding. Thus, it is the parties' responsibility to notify WCD of this settlement and seek the termination of the reconsideration proceeding. *See Forest G. Hull*, 51 Van Natta 1795 (1999).

<sup>2</sup> Our approval pertains solely to the parties' DCS/Stipulation and does not extend to any other agreement (proposed or otherwise) involving the parties. *See, e.g., Karen A. Vearrier*, 42 Van Natta 2071 (1990) (disapproving a CDA that purported to release the claimant's rights to reemployment).