

MDLA Legislative Agenda and Response

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ADVISORY COUNSEL

NOVEMBER 8, 2023

KATIE STORMS & CARRIE JACOBSON

MDLA's GOALS



CREATE EFFICIENCIES IN THE LITIGATION SYSTEM



CREATE COHESION BETWEEN STATUTES AND RULES



MAINTAIN A BALANCED LITIGATION SYSTEM

POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS CAN BE REACHED ON:

- PROPOSAL: EXPEDITED HEARINGS ON PENALTIES
 - LIMITED TO PENALTIES ON TECHNICAL ISSUES **ONLY**
- CANNOT OVERLOOK CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO HAVE CLAIMS HEARD IN A COURT OF LAW
- CITING PENALTIES IN CLAIM PETITION SHOULD NOT OVERRIDE STANDARD LITIGATION TRACK
 - ► SAFEGUARDS IN PLACE TO PREVENT FORCING EXPEDITED LITIGATION

- PROPOSAL: PROVISION OF COURT CERTIFIED INTERPRETERS
 - ► GENERALLY SPEAKING, THE MDLA HAS NO OBJECTION TO THE PROVISION OF COURT CERTIFIED INTERPRETERS
- COST
 - IS THIS BORN BY THE COURT ALONE OR WILL THIS BE CHARGED BACK TO THE PARTIES?
- TYPE OF PROCEEDING
 - WILL THIS BE OFFERED FOR ALL APPEARANCES OR ONLY THOSE ON RECORD?
- AVAILABLE AT THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS NEEDED ON:

- PROPOSAL: INTERVENTION PROCESS UNDER MINN. STAT. § 176.361
 - "The potential intervenor may not collect, or attempt to collect, the extinguished interest from the Employee, Employer, Insurer, or any government program..."
 - Already a mechanism for protecting employees from Intervenors.
- ► FREQUENCY OR OCCURRENCE APART FROM STATUTE
- NEED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM OUTSIDE SOURCES
 - SPEAK WITH MEDICAL PROVIDERS
 - ► NEED ADDITIONAL METRICS INCLUDING PERCENTAGE OF CLAIMS WHERE INTERVENOR FAILS TO FILE AND EMPLOYEE IS UNABLE TO TREAT

- POSSIBILTY TO STREAMLINE PROCESS
- INTERVENTION WHEN NO LITIGATION IS AN ISSUE
- PROPOSAL: INDEPENDENT CAUSE OF ACTION FOR EMPLOYEE ON INTERVENTION CLAIMS
 - ▶ Totally destroys the settlement process
 - Does not solve the real issue

- ▶ ISSUE: REMOVE CAP ON ATTORNEY FEES UNDER MINN. STAT. §176.081
- MDLA POSITION: THERE IS ROOM FOR DISCUSSION
 - QUESTION TOTAL REMOVAL OF CAP
- COSTS DIFFER FROM FEES
 - ► COST OF BUSINESS IS SEPARATE FROM WHAT IS AWARDED
- ► HOW DOES IT LIMIT WHAT ATTORNEYS ARE CAPABLE OF DOING?
- REMEDIES FOR ADDITIONAL FEES IN CASE LAW AND STATUTE
 - ▶ PETITIONS FOR EXCESS FEES
 - ► MINN. STAT. § 176.191, HEATON, RORAFF, IRWIN, EDQUIST, GRUBER
 - ► AWARDED ON FORMULAIC AND SUBJECTIVE STANDARDS

- NEED MORE DATA
 - CASES TRIED VERSUS CASES SETTLED
 - ATTORNEY FEES PAID VERSUS OBJECTIONS FILED
- INCREASE IN DENIAL OF CLAIMS
 - **COVID**
 - ► MENTAL HEALTH
 - ► PHYSICAL INJURY

- QUESTIONS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED:
 - PERCENTAGE OR FEE ARRANGMENT IN OTHER STATES
 - ▶ WHO BEARS THE COST IN REMOVING THE ATTORNEY FEE CAP?
 - ▶ NEED DATA OF DENIALS THAT WERE LATER OVERTURNED
 - ▶ NEED DATA OF DENIALS BASED UPON NON-INJURY REASONS
 - ► SHOULD THERE BE SAFEGUARDS?
 - ▶ IS THERE JUSTIFICATION FOR KEEPING ATTORNEY FEE CAP?
 - ► WHY ARE CASES BEING TRIED VERSUS SETTLED?
 - ▶ IS THERE A RECIPROCAL PROPOSAL FOR THE FILING OF FRIVOLOUS OR DEFICIENT PETITIONS?

DECLINE FURTHER DISCUSSION ON:

- PROPOSAL: COMBINING TEMPORARY TOTAL AND TEMPORARY PARTIAL DISABILITY BENEFITS
 - ▶ 130 weeks + 275 weeks = 405 weeks or 7.8 years
 - ▶ Discourages a return to work → Goal of Workers' Compensation Act
- PROPOSAL: EWING LETTER REMOVAL
 - Already a process in place to terminate rehabilitation benefits
 - Further complicates process and creates additional litigation
- PROPOSAL: INCLUSION OF FRINGE BENEFITS IN CALCULATION OF AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGE
 - Further complicates calculations of wages
 - ▶ Turns temporary total disability into temporary partial disability
 - Room for discussion on comprehensive review of AWW statute

- ► ISSUE: INDEPENDENT MEDICAL EVALUATIONS
 - Lack of qualified and available providers
 - Petitioner's attorneys do not have to meet burden for causation opinion
- IME VENDORS TO PRESENT.
- MDLA PROPOSALS
 - Remove mileage caps, allow examinations pre-litigation, return authorizations prior to the commencement of litigation, expand ability to request pre-injury medical records
 - Need consequences for failing to return executed authorizations or failing to attend examination when no litigation has commenced as the Employer and Insurer cannot file a Motion to Compel
 - Address logistical issues including multiple body parts and types of injuries, location of Employees, available information, etc.

- Ethical obligation of attorney to provide best defense for clients
 - IME is one of the only tools available to defend claims.
 - Putting additional limits on the IME further hinders the ability to defend the claim
- Minn. R. 5221.6050 subp. 9C → Seven working days to review request for treatment
- Minn. Stat. §176.081 subd. 1(c)(3) \rightarrow Forty-five days to complete an IME or respond to a request or a dispute shall be certified
- Presents a Broader Issue
 - Number of qualified physicians
 - Minnesota Hospital Association Study
 - Surgical approval industry-wide
- Further modification the IME statutes will not redress the broader issue

MDLA DISCUSSION PROPOSALS

- Intoxication Defense
 - Use as mitigation rather than a bar
- Employer-Directed Medical Care
- Fix for Pierringer and Sershen
 - Allow settlements for individual insurers
- Extend deadline for filing Answer to Claim Petition
 - Proposal to extend to 30 days to be consistent with civil courts
- Extend time for filing deadline to 11:59 p.m.
 - Consistent with civil courts

MDLA DISCUSSION PROPOSALS

- ▶ Add language to Minn. Stat. §176.361 for intervention negotiations in good faith
 - Language requiring intervenors to provide fee-scheduled balances upon request
- Authorizations
 - Provide blank and non-redacted, executed authorizations within statutory timeframe at first request
 - Allow the suspension of benefits or a Motion to Compel without litigation
 - No recourse if the Employee fails to provide authorizations

QUESTIONS?

Katie Storms

Direct: 612.746.0107

Katie.Storms@lindjensen.com

Carrie Jacobson

Direct: 763.253.0140

CJacobson@brownandcarlson.com

