



Board of Administration Offsite

# Action Item – Proposed Decisions of Administrative Law Judges Item c

---

**July 13, 2022**

**Item Name:** Proposed Decision – In the Matter of the Appeal of Reinstatement from Industrial Disability Retirement of CRAIG M. CULP, Respondent, and CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL, Respondent.

**Program:** Disability and Survivor Benefits Division

**Item Type:** Action

## **Parties' Positions**

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

Respondent Craig M. Culp's (Respondent Culp) position is included in Attachment C, if any.

## **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**

On or about April 6, 2017, Respondent Culp applied for industrial disability retirement based on orthopedic (left elbow, left wrist, neck) conditions. CalPERS approved the application and placed Respondent Culp on disability effective February 22, 2017. In 2021, Respondent Culp was reevaluated and CalPERS determined that he is no longer incapacitated from performing the duties of a dispatcher. Respondent Culp appealed this determination and the matter was heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings on May 12, 2022. Due to Respondent California Highway Patrol's (CHP) failure to appear, the case proceeded as a default under Government Code 11520 as to CHP only. A Proposed Decision was issued on June 3, 2022, affirming CalPERS' determination, and 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 June 3, 2022,

concerning the appeal of Craig M. Culp; 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 June 3, 2022, concerning the appeal of Craig M. Culp, 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 June 3, 2022, concerning the appeal of Craig M. Culp, 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 appeal of Craig M. Culp, 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 appeal of Craig M. Culp.

**Budget and Fiscal Impacts:** Not applicable

**Attachments**

Attachment A: Proposed Decision

Attachment B: Staff's Argument

Attachment C: Respondent(s) Argument(s)

---

Anthony Suine  
Deputy Executive Officer  
Customer Services and Support