



## Board of Administration Agenda Item 8i

April 20, 2016

**Item Name:** Proposed Decision – In the Matter of the Cancellation of the Application for Industrial Disability Retirement of KEITH BROWN, Respondent, and CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL, Respondent

**Program:** Benefit Services Division

**Item Type:** Action

### **Parties' Positions**

Staff argues that the Board of Administration should adopt the Proposed Decision.

Respondent Keith Brown (Respondent Brown) argues that the Board of Administration should decline to adopt the Proposed Decision.

### **Strategic Plan**

This item is not a specific product of either the Strategic or Annual Plans. The determination of administrative appeals is a power reserved to the Board of Administration.

### **Procedural Summary**

Respondent Brown submitted an application for Industrial Disability Retirement based on a psychological trauma (PTSD) condition as the result of an incident occurring on June 23, 2008. CalPERS rejected the application for Industrial Disability Retirement pursuant to *Haywood v. American River Fire Protection District* because Respondent Brown had been dismissed from his employment for reasons which were not the result of a disabling medical condition. Respondent Brown appealed this determination and the matter was heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings on January 19, 2016. A Proposed Decision was issued on February 17, 2016, denying the appeal.

### **Alternatives**

A. For use if the Board decides to adopt the Proposed Decision as its own Decision:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated February 17, 2016, concerning the application of Keith Brown; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

- B. For use if the Board decides not to adopt the Proposed Decision, and to decide the case upon the record:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated February 17, 2016, concerning the application of Keith Brown, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and determines to decide the matter itself, based upon the record produced before the Administrative Law Judge and such additional evidence and arguments that are presented by the parties and accepted by the Board; RESOLVED FURTHER that the Board's Decision shall be made after notice is given to all parties.

- C. For use if the Board decides to remand the matter back to the Office of Administrative Hearings for the taking of further evidence:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated February 17, 2016, concerning the application of Keith Brown, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and refers the matter back to the Administrative Law Judge for the taking of additional evidence as specified by the Board at its meeting.

- D. Precedential Nature of Decision (two alternatives; either may be used):

1. For use if the Board wants further argument on the issue of whether to designate its Decision as precedential:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System requests the parties in the matter concerning the application of Keith Brown, as well as interested parties, to submit written argument regarding whether the Board's Decision in this matter should be designated as precedential, and that the Board will consider the issue whether to designate its Decision as precedential at a time to be determined.

2. For use if the Board decides to designate its Decision as precedential, without further argument from the parties.

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, hereby designates as precedential its Decision concerning the application of Keith Brown.

**Budget and Fiscal Impacts:** Not applicable

**Attachments**

Attachment A: Proposed Decision

Attachment B: Staff's Argument

Attachment C: Respondent(s) Argument(s)

---

DONNA RAMEL LUM  
Deputy Executive Officer  
Customer Services and Support