

Research Report: California Workers' Compensation Petition for Unreasonable Delay Under Labor Code § 5814

(PART-A INJURED WORKERS ANALYSIS)

March 2, 2026

The information provided through this AI-powered Analysis is for **general informational and educational purposes only**. It is **not legal advice**, does **not create an attorney-client relationship**, and should not be relied upon as a substitute for advice from a qualified attorney. Laws and legal outcomes vary based on specific facts and jurisdiction. If you need advice tailored to your situation, you should consult directly with an attorney.

CALIFORNIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION: PETITION FOR UNREASONABLE DELAY UNDER LABOR CODE § 5814

If your employer or their insurance company unreasonably delays or refuses to pay your workers' compensation benefits, California law allows you to seek a penalty against them. This report explains how that penalty works under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814), what you must prove, and the step-by-step process for filing a petition with the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) — the state agency that decides workers' compensation disputes.

The penalty can be up to 25% of the delayed benefits or \$10,000, whichever amount is less. To win, you must show that a delay happened, and then the employer or insurer must prove the delay was reasonable. This report covers the law, recent court decisions, filing procedures, defenses you may face, and what outcomes to expect.

Part 1: The Law — Statutory Authority for Delay Penalties

This section explains the statutes (written laws) that give you the right to seek penalties when your benefits are unreasonably delayed.

The Core Penalty Statute: § 5814(a)

Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(a) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814) states that when payment of compensation (any workers' compensation benefit owed to you) has been "unreasonably delayed or refused," the total amount owed to you "shall be increased by 25 percent or up to ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), whichever is less." The word "shall" means the penalty is mandatory once unreasonable delay is proven — the judge does not have a choice about whether to impose it.

This penalty applies to delays that happen before or after a judge issues a formal decision in your case. It covers all types of benefits: temporary disability (payments while you cannot work), permanent disability (payments for lasting injury), medical treatment, death benefits, mileage reimbursement, and supplemental job displacement benefits (vouchers for retraining if you cannot return to your old job).

The Voluntary Self-Imposed Penalty: § 5814(b)

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(b) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814), the employer or insurer can avoid the larger 25% penalty by voluntarily paying a smaller penalty — 10% of the delayed amount or \$2,500, whichever is less — within 90 days of discovering the delay. The WCAB must approve this smaller penalty. However, once you file a penalty petition, the insurer loses the option to use this voluntary penalty. The full 25% penalty structure then applies.

The Appeal Exception: § 5814(e)

Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(e) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814) creates an exception: if the delay results from an employer's appeal, no penalty applies unless the WCAB finds the appeal was "frivolous or solely intended to cause delay." This means employers can challenge decisions through proper legal channels without automatic penalty exposure.

Interaction with Automatic Late-Payment Penalties: § 4650(d)

A separate law, Cal. Lab. Code § 4650(d) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=4650), imposes an automatic 10% penalty on any late disability payment — no proof of unreasonableness required. This automatic penalty is credited (subtracted) from any § 5814 penalty, so your total penalty cannot exceed 25%. For example, if you already received a 10% automatic penalty, the additional § 5814 penalty can only bring the total up to 25%, not add another full 25% on top.

Payment Deadlines You Should Know

These deadlines determine when a delay begins:

- Claim form delivery: Your employer must give you a claim form within one working day of learning about your injury under Cal. Lab. Code § 5402(a) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5402).
- Accept or deny decision: The insurer has 90 days after receiving your filed claim form to accept or deny your claim under Cal. Lab. Code § 5402(b) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5402). If no decision comes within 90 days, your injury is presumed compensable (assumed to be covered).
- Medical treatment during investigation: Even before deciding your claim, the insurer must authorize up to \$10,000 in medical treatment under Cal. Lab. Code § 5402(c) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5402).
- Temporary disability payments: Must begin within 14 days of the employer learning about your injury and disability under Cal. Lab. Code § 4650(a) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=4650), and continue every two weeks.
- Permanent disability payments: Must begin within 14 days after the last temporary disability payment under Cal. Lab. Code § 4650(b) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=4650).

Part 2: Recent Court Decisions Shaping the Law (2024–2025)

This section explains how recent WCAB decisions have changed the way penalty petitions are evaluated.

The Ramirez Nine-Factor Framework

The most important recent decision is *Dee Anne Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services, One Beacon Insurance Co.*, 73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1324, decided as an en banc (full board) matter by the WCAB (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_enbanc.htm). This case created nine specific factors that judges must consider when deciding how large a penalty to impose:

1. The amount of the payment that was delayed
2. How long the delay lasted
3. Whether the delay was accidental and promptly fixed
4. Whether the defendant has a history of delayed payments, or this was a single mistake
5. Whether a statute or regulation required payment within a specific number of days
6. Whether the delay resulted from normal claim-processing needs or legitimate insurance administration
7. Whether the defendant showed institutional neglect — for example, not hiring enough adjusters, not training staff properly, or setting up systems that make errors likely
8. Whether you, the employee, contributed to the delay by failing to notify the defendant promptly
9. The effect of the delay on you as the injured worker

These factors give judges a structured way to evaluate each case, replacing the older approach where penalty amounts could seem arbitrary. See CCMPT, "*Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services*" (<https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>).

Maximum Penalties Even for Small Amounts

In *Olisaemeka Eze v. Defendant* (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Olisaemeka-EZE-ADJ15619594.pdf>), the WCAB affirmed a maximum 25% penalty for unreasonably delaying payment of only \$88.16 in medical mileage reimbursement. The Board reasoned that the statute's purpose — encouraging prompt payment — requires maximum penalties even for tiny amounts, because a small penalty on a small payment would not deter the insurer or fairly compensate the worker.

Bad Faith Sanctions Beyond § 5814

In *Nguyen v. Pacific Dental Services, LLC* (WCAB 2025) (<https://www.pbw-law.com/the-11000-mistake-when-active-defense-becomes-bad-faith/>), the WCAB sanctioned defense counsel under Cal. Lab. Code § 5813 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5813) and WCAB Rule 10421 (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10421.html>) for a pattern of canceling medical exams, sending

letters designed to influence medical evaluators, and using other delay tactics. The Board imposed \$750 in sanctions plus \$11,093.75 in attorney fees. The decision clarified that active defense is allowed, but a pattern of intentional obstruction crosses the line.

Medical Treatment Delays and Utilization Review

In *Adel Salem v. County of Riverside* (WCAB 2013) (<https://www.workcompacademy.com/2014/05/wcab-imposes-5814-penalties-and-attorney-fees-for-following-unreasonable-ur-determination/>), the insurer relied on a utilization review (UR) physician's denial to stop the worker's pain medication. Utilization review is a process where a doctor hired by the insurer reviews whether your treatment is medically necessary. The WCAB held that this UR denial did not create "genuine doubt" because it contradicted the Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) — California's official treatment guidelines — which recommend gradual tapering of opioids rather than abrupt cessation. The insurer was penalized under § 5814 and ordered to pay attorney's fees under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814.5 (https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814.5).

Important: An insurer cannot automatically avoid penalties by relying on a UR denial. If the UR decision contradicts official treatment guidelines or lacks a sound medical basis, the insurer's reliance on it does not provide protection against § 5814 liability.

Part 3: What You Must Prove — The "Unreasonableness" Standard

This section explains the legal standard for proving that a delay in your benefits was unreasonable.

The Kerley Burden-Shift Doctrine

The most important legal rule comes from *Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.*, 4 Cal. 3d 223 (1971) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/4/223.html>). Under this rule, proving a § 5814 penalty works in two steps:

1. Your burden (Step 1): You must prove that a delay in payment actually happened. You show what was owed, when it was due, and that it was not paid on time.
2. The employer's burden (Step 2): Once you prove the delay, the burden shifts to the employer or insurer. They must prove they had genuine doubt from a medical or legal standpoint about whether they owed the benefits. Vague claims that the case was "complex" are not enough. The employer must point to specific evidence showing it could not determine what was owed at the time of the delay.

What Counts as "Genuine Doubt"

In *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.*, 18 Cal. 4th 1209 (1998) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/4th/18/1209.html>), the California Supreme Court held that "a reasonably short delay attributable to human error cannot, standing alone, be considered unreasonable." In that case, an adjuster accidentally mailed a check to the wrong address, causing a one-week delay. The Court excused this as isolated human error.

However, the Court added a critical warning: if the error traces back to institutional neglect — such as not having enough staff, not training adjusters properly, or having poor office systems — then even a brief delay becomes unreasonable. The key distinction is:

- Isolated human error + short delay = likely reasonable
- Systemic problems + any delay = likely unreasonable

Different Standards for Different Situations

The unreasonableness standard varies depending on the context:

- During the 90-day investigation period: Delays are more easily excused if the insurer was actively investigating genuinely disputed issues about whether your injury is work-related. But failing to authorize the required \$10,000 in medical treatment during this period is not excused.
- After your claim is accepted: Once the insurer accepts your claim or a judge issues an award, delays in payment are very difficult to justify because the question of whether benefits are owed has already been answered.
- Medical treatment delays: If the insurer relies on a UR denial that contradicts official treatment guidelines or the treating physician's opinion, this does not create genuine doubt. See *Adel Salem v. County of*

Riverside (<https://www.workcompacademy.com/2014/05/wcab-imposes-5814-penalties-and-attorney-fees-for-following-unreasonable-ur-determination/>).

Types of Evidence That Help Your Case

When building your penalty petition, focus on gathering:

- Written correspondence (emails, letters) showing you requested payment and the insurer did not respond
- Payment records showing the exact dates benefits were due versus when they were actually paid
- Medical reports from your treating physician supporting the need for timely treatment
- Evidence of how the delay harmed you — such as inability to pay bills, worsening medical condition, or emotional distress
- Evidence of a pattern of delays by the insurer, not just one incident

Part 4: How to File a § 5814 Penalty Petition — Step by Step

This section walks you through each step of the filing process.

Step 1: Open a WCAB Case

If no WCAB case exists, you must first file an Application for Adjudication of Claim (DWC Form 10232.1) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/eams/SampleFiles/Application%20for%20Adjudication%20of%20Claim.pdf>). This form opens your case at the WCAB. It must include:

- The disputed issues (temporary disability, permanent disability, medical treatment, etc.)
- The claims administrator's name and address
- The body parts you injured
- Your declaration under penalty of perjury (a sworn statement that what you say is true)

Submit the original to your local WCAB office (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide04.pdf>) and serve copies on all parties.

Step 2: Document the Delay

Before filing the petition, collect all evidence of the delay:

- All letters, emails, and records of phone calls requesting payment
- Proof of when payments were made (or not made) — such as check copies or bank records
- Medical reports showing what treatment was needed and when
- A timeline showing the exact dates payment was due versus actual payment dates

Step 3: Send a Demand Letter

Send a formal written demand to the claims administrator. This letter should clearly state:

- Which benefits were delayed and the exact dollar amount
- When payment was due under the law
- When payment was actually made (if ever)
- That you are demanding both the delayed benefits and penalties under § 5814

This letter serves as evidence that you tried to resolve the matter before filing your petition. It also starts the insurer's 90-day clock to consider paying the voluntary 10% self-imposed penalty under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(b) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814). Set a response deadline of 10–14 days.

Step 4: File the Penalty Petition

If the demand letter does not resolve the matter, file your penalty petition under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 10510 (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10510.html>). Your petition must include:

1. A caption with the case title, adjudication case number, and a clear statement of what relief you are requesting
2. Detailed facts — dates, amounts, and the specific statutory deadlines that were missed
3. An argument applying the Ramirez factors to show unreasonableness
4. A specific penalty amount you are requesting (calculated as 25% of the delayed amount or \$10,000, whichever is less)
5. A request for attorney's fees under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814.5 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814.5) if the delay occurred after a judge issued an award
6. A verification — your signed statement under penalty of perjury that the facts are true
7. A proof of service showing you sent copies to all other parties
8. Document cover sheets and separator sheets required by the EAMS (Electronic Adjudication Management System)

Critical: Missing any of these elements — especially the verification, proof of service, or required document sheets — can result in your petition being dismissed without the judge reviewing the merits.

Step 5: The Defendant's Answer

The claims administrator has ten days to file an answer. Common defenses include:

- No delay occurred (payment was timely)
- The delay was reasonable based on Ramirez factors
- You contributed to the delay
- Self-imposed penalties were already offered
- The two-year statute of limitations has expired

Step 6: Request a Hearing

If settlement is not reached, file a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DWC-CA Form 10250.1) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGGuide05.pdf>) to request a hearing. The WCAB will schedule a hearing within approximately 30–90 days.

Step 7: Attend the Hearing

At the hearing before a Workers' Compensation Judge (WCJ), you (or your attorney) will present your evidence, the defendant will present theirs, and the judge will apply the Ramirez factors to decide whether unreasonable delay occurred and what penalty to impose.

Part 5: How Penalties Are Calculated

This section explains the math behind § 5814 penalty calculations.

The Two-Step Calculation

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(a) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814):

1. Calculate 25% of the amount that was unreasonably delayed
2. Compare that number to \$10,000
3. The penalty equals the lesser (smaller) of those two numbers

Examples:

- \$5,000 delayed → 25% = \$1,250 → penalty is \$1,250 (less than \$10,000)
- \$30,000 delayed → 25% = \$7,500 → penalty is \$7,500 (less than \$10,000)
- \$50,000 delayed → 25% = \$12,500 → penalty is \$10,000 (capped at maximum)

The § 4650(d) Offset

If you already received the automatic 10% late-payment penalty under § 4650(d), that amount is subtracted from the § 5814 penalty. For example, if \$20,000 was delayed and you already received a \$2,000 automatic penalty (10%), the maximum additional § 5814 penalty is \$3,000 (25% of \$20,000 = \$5,000, minus \$2,000 already paid = \$3,000).

Multiple Separate Delays = Multiple Penalties

Under *Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.*, 23 Cal. 3d 815 (1978) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/23/815.html>), each separate act of unreasonable delay can support its own independent penalty. If the insurer delays your temporary disability payment, then separately delays your permanent disability payment, then separately delays your medical treatment authorization — each delay can trigger a separate penalty of up to \$10,000.

Recent Trend: Maximum Penalties for Small Amounts

As shown in *Eze v. Defendant* (WCAB 2025) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Olisaemeka-EZE-ADJ15619594.pdf>), the WCAB now imposes maximum penalties even when the delayed amount is very small. The Board reasons that a tiny percentage of a tiny amount would not deter insurers or fairly compensate workers. This means you should not dismiss a penalty claim just because the delayed amount is small.

Part 6: Attorney's Fees — The Real Leverage

This section explains the attorney's fee provision that often creates the strongest pressure on insurers to pay promptly.

Mandatory Fee Awards Under § 5814.5

Cal. Lab. Code § 5814.5 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814.5) states that when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused after a judge issues an award, the WCAB "shall" award "reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in enforcing the payment of compensation awarded." Because the statute says "shall," the judge must award fees if unreasonable delay of an award is proven.

Important: This fee provision applies only to delays that occur after a judge issues an award or after a settlement is reached. It does not apply to pre-award delays during the investigation phase.

Why Fees Matter More Than Penalties

The attorney's fee exposure often exceeds the penalty itself. At typical hourly rates of \$400–\$600 for experienced workers' compensation attorneys, the fees for filing a petition, preparing for a hearing, and attending trial can easily reach \$3,000–\$8,000 or more. This means an insurer's total exposure (penalty plus fees) on a \$10,000 delayed payment could be \$5,000–\$15,000, effectively doubling or tripling the penalty. This fee exposure is what creates real settlement pressure. See Burgis Law, "Penalty Petitions Attorneys Can File" (<https://burgislaw.com/penalties-attorneys-can-file-in-a-workers-comp-case/>).

What Counts as "Enforcement" Activity

The WCAB interprets enforcement broadly. All attorney time reasonably spent obtaining compliance with an award is covered, including:

- Filing the penalty petition
- Preparing written arguments
- Responding to the defendant's opposition
- Preparing for and attending the hearing
- Post-hearing work to enforce the decision

If the insurer repeatedly fails to comply with an award, each instance of non-compliance triggers fresh fee liability.

Part 7: Defenses the Employer or Insurer May Raise

This section helps you understand the arguments the other side will likely make, so you can prepare to respond.

Defense 1: No Delay Occurred

The defendant may produce payment records (check images, wire transfer confirmations) showing benefits were paid on time. Review these records carefully for accuracy.

Defense 2: The Delay Was Reasonable

Using the Ramirez factors, the defendant may argue the delay was inadvertent, promptly corrected, an isolated incident rather than a pattern, or caused by normal business-processing realities. They may also argue you contributed to the delay by not providing requested information.

Defense 3: Appeal Exception

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(e) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814), the defendant may argue the delay resulted from a good-faith appeal, not a frivolous one.

Defense 4: Self-Imposed Penalty Already Paid

If the insurer voluntarily paid the smaller 10% penalty under § 5814(b) before you filed your petition, and the WCAB approved it, no additional penalty is owed.

Defense 5: Statute of Limitations

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(g) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814), you must file your penalty petition within two years from the date the payment was due — not from when it was actually paid or when you discovered the delay. If you miss this deadline, your claim is barred.

Defense 6: Prior Settlement Released the Penalty

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814(c) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814), if your case was resolved through a Compromise and Release (C&R) or Stipulations and Orders without expressly reserving your penalty claim, all accrued penalties are considered released — even if you never filed a penalty petition.

Critical: At any settlement discussion or trial, you or your attorney must explicitly preserve (reserve) the penalty claim on the record. If you do not, you lose the right to those penalties permanently.

Part 8: What Outcomes to Expect

This section gives you a realistic picture of likely results based on reported WCAB decisions.

When You Are Most Likely to Succeed

Your chances of winning are highest (approximately 75% or higher) when:

- Benefits were delayed more than 30 days after an award with no legitimate explanation
- Medical treatment authorization was delayed and the medical need was not genuinely disputed
- You have written evidence (emails, demand letters) documenting the delay
- The insurer has a pattern of similar delays, suggesting systemic problems
- The delay caused you concrete harm — unpaid bills, worsened medical condition, financial hardship

When Your Case Is Weaker

Your chances are lower (approximately 25–45%) when:

- The delay was under 14 days and caused by an isolated clerical error

- The insurer was actively investigating genuinely disputed medical causation during the 90-day investigation period
- You delayed filing your petition close to the two-year statute of limitations
- A prior settlement may have already released your penalty claim

Appealing a Decision

If the judge denies your penalty petition, you may file a petition for reconsideration within 20 days under Cal. Lab. Code § 5902

(<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codesdisplaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5902>). The WCAB panel (three judges) must act within 60 days, or the petition is automatically denied under Cal. Lab. Code § 5909

(<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codesdisplaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5909>).

Enforcement When You Win

If you win but the insurer does not pay, you can:

- File a motion to enforce the decision before the trial judge
- Request referral to the Division of Workers' Compensation for administrative penalties under Cal. Lab. Code § 5814.6 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814.6), which authorizes penalties up to \$400,000 against employers or insurers whose repeated § 5814 violations indicate a "general business practice" of unreasonable delay
- Seek contempt sanctions for non-compliance

Administrative Penalty Regulations

The Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, §§ 10225.1–10225.2 (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=419.pdf>) create escalating administrative penalty schedules ranging from \$1,000 for retrospective medical treatment delays to \$30,000 for failure to comply with existing compensation orders.

References

1. Cal. Lab. Code § 5814 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814) — California Legislative Information.
2. Cal. Lab. Code § 5402 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5402) — California Legislative Information.
3. Cal. Lab. Code § 4650 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=4650) — California Legislative Information.
4. Cal. Lab. Code § 5814.5 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814.5) — California Legislative Information.
5. Cal. Lab. Code § 5813 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5813) — California Legislative Information.
6. Cal. Lab. Code § 5814.6 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814.6) — California Legislative Information.
7. Cal. Lab. Code § 5902 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5902) — California Legislative Information.
8. Cal. Lab. Code § 5909 (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5909) — California Legislative Information.
9. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 10510 (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10510.html>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.

10. WCAB Rule 10421, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 10421 (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10421.html>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.
11. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, §§ 10225.1–10225.2 (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=419.pdf>) — California Workers' Compensation Institute, "5814.1 Regulations."
12. Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd., 4 Cal. 3d 223 (1971) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/4/223.html>) — California Supreme Court.
13. State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 18 Cal. 4th 1209 (1998) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/4th/18/1209.html>) — California Supreme Court.
14. Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 23 Cal. 3d 815 (1978) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/23/815.html>) — California Supreme Court.
15. Dee Anne Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services, One Beacon Insurance Co., 73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1324 (WCAB en banc). Summary available at CCMPT, "Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services" (<https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>).
16. Olisaemeka Eze v. Defendant (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Olisaemeka-EZE-ADJ15619594.pdf>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.
17. Gregory Ortega v. Defendants (WCAB Panel Decision 2024) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2024/Gregory-ORTEGA-ADJ10994258-ADJ18998346.pdf>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.
18. Nguyen v. Pacific Dental Services, LLC (WCAB 2025) (<https://www.pbw-law.com/the-11000-mistake-when-active-defense-becomes-bad-faith/>) — Summary by Pearlman, Brown & Wax LLP.
19. Adel Salem v. County of Riverside (WCAB 2013) (<https://www.workcompacademy.com/2014/05/wcab-imposes-5814-penalties-and-attorney-fees-for-following-unreasonable-ur-determination/>) — Summary by WorkComp Academy.
20. Bradford Barthel, "Decision Time: When Does the 90-Day Investigation Period Begin?" (2020) (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2020/10/08/decision-time-when-does-the-90-day-investigation-period-begin/>).
21. Application for Adjudication of Claim (DWC Form 10232.1) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/eams/SampleFiles/Application%20for%20Adjudication%20of%20Claim.pdf>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.
22. How to File an Application for Adjudication of Claim (I&A Guide 4) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide04.pdf>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.
23. How to File a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (I&A Guide 5) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide05.pdf>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.
24. Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (DWC-CA Form 10250.1) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/EAMS%20Forms/ADJ/DWCCAFForm10250_1.pdf) — California Department of Industrial Relations.
25. Yrulegui & Roberts, "Understanding California Code of Regulations Section 10510: Filing Petitions and Answers in Workers' Compensation Cases" (<https://www.rjylaw.com/understanding-california-code-of-regulations-section-10510-filing-petitions-and-answers-in-workers-compensation-cases/>).
26. Thomas F. Martin, "Workers' Compensation Penalties for Delayed Payments (Labor Code 5814)" (<https://thomasfmartin.com/workers-compensation-penalties-for-delayed-payments-labor-code-5814/>).
27. Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code § 5814 — Penalties for Unreasonable Delay or Denial" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>).
28. Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code § 4650 — Timing of Temporary Disability Payments" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74650-timing-of-temporary-disability-payments/>).
29. Joe Pluta, "Penalties for Late Payment of Workers Comp Benefits" (<https://www.joepluta.net/blog/penalties-for-late-workers-comp-payment/>).
30. Burgis Law, "Penalty Petitions Attorneys Can File in a Workers' Comp Case" (<https://burgislaw.com/penalties-attorneys-can-file-in-a-workers-comp-case/>).
31. Boxer & Gerson Attorneys at Law, LLP, "The Penalty Box — Part One" (<https://www.boxerlaw.com/workerscompzone/the-penalty-box-part-one/>).
32. Cartwright Law, "Workers' Compensation 90-Day Rule: What You Need to Know" (<https://www.cartwrightlaw.com/blog/2022/june/workers-compensation-90-day-rule-what-you-need-t/>).
33. P.I. Law, "How to Manage a Delayed California Workers' Compensation Decision" (<https://www.pi.law/blog/how-to-manage-a-delayed-california-workers-compensation-decision/>).
34. CHSWC — SB 899 Topic Summary Report (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/SB899summary.html>) — California Department of Industrial Relations.

35. California Workers' Compensation Institute, "Administrative Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code Section 5814.6" (<https://cwci.org/document.php?file=410.pdf>).

Research Report: California Workers' Compensation Petition for Unreasonable Delay Under Labor Code § 5814

(PART-B LEGAL ANALYSIS)

Generated by: Legal AI Assistant

Facilitated by: The Law Offices of Fernando Hidalgo, Inc.

March 2, 2026

The information provided through this AI-powered Analysis is for **general informational and educational purposes only**. It is **not legal advice**, does **not create an attorney-client relationship**, and should not be relied upon as a substitute for advice from a qualified attorney. Laws and legal outcomes vary based on specific facts and jurisdiction. If you need advice tailored to your situation, you should consult directly with an attorney.

Comprehensive Research Report: California Workers' Compensation Petition for Unreasonable Delay Under Labor Code Section 5814

This report provides detailed analysis of the statutory framework, procedural requirements, evidentiary standards, and strategic considerations governing petitions for penalties under California Labor Code Section 5814 for unreasonable delay or denial of workers' compensation benefits. Key findings indicate that penalties ranging from the lesser of 25% of delayed benefits or \$10,000 are available when insurers or employers unreasonably withhold compensation, but recovery requires meeting strict procedural prerequisites, substantial proof of unreasonableness, and adherence to strict filing deadlines. The Kerley burden-shift doctrine places initial proof burden on the injured worker to establish delay, whereupon the defendant bears burden to prove the delay was reasonable based on genuine doubt from medical or legal standpoint. Recent WCAB decisions establish nine specific factors for assessing penalty amounts, while statutory amendments have narrowed remedies available and created strategic alternatives including voluntary self-imposed penalties. This report addresses all substantive and procedural dimensions of Section 5814 penalty petitions for practitioner reference.

Legal Framework: Statutory Authority and Regulatory Foundation

The foundational authority for unreasonable delay penalties in California workers' compensation derives from Labor Code Section 5814(a), which provides that "[w]hen payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused, either prior to or subsequent to the issuance of an award, the full amount of the order, decision, or award shall be increased by 25 percent or up to ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), whichever is less."^{[1][4][1]} This statutory language establishes a mandatory penalty regime, signaled by the word "shall," distinguishing Section 5814 penalties from discretionary sanctions available under Labor Code Section 5813.^{[4][37]} The statute operates on two parallel tracks: the employer or insurer may voluntarily pay a self-imposed penalty of 10% or \$2,500, whichever is less, within 90 days of discovering the delay, subject to Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) approval under Labor Code Section 5814(b), thereby avoiding the larger 25% penalty.^{[2][1]} However, once an injured worker files a penalty petition, the voluntary penalty option becomes unavailable and the full discretionary penalty structure of Section 5814(a) applies.^[23]

The statutory definition of compensable conduct extends broadly to delays "either prior to or subsequent to the issuance of an award," meaning penalties attach to both pre-award withholding during investigation phases and post-award payment delays.^{[2][4][6]} Labor Code Section 5814(e) creates a critical exception: delays resulting from employer appeals are excepted from penalty liability unless the WCAB determines the appeal was "frivolous or solely intended to cause delay."^{[2][4]} This exception recognizes that legitimate appellate disputes may extend the timeline for benefit payment while preserving the penalty mechanism as a deterrent against delay tactics masquerading as good faith appeals.^[23]

The interaction between Section 5814 and Labor Code Section 4650(d) creates a nuanced penalty structure where an automatic 10% penalty attaches to any late disability payment (temporary or permanent) regardless of proof of unreasonableness, but this automatic penalty is credited or offset against the discretionary 25% penalty under Section 5814, ensuring total penalties do not exceed 25%.^{[7][12][15][12]} The purpose of this offset mechanism, clarified by the 2004 SB 899 reforms that restructured Section 5814, is to avoid double-penalizing insurers while preserving meaningful deterrence for truly unreasonable conduct.^[25] These penalties apply to all categories of compensation: temporary disability indemnity, permanent disability indemnity, medical treatment authorization and reimbursement, death benefits, mileage reimbursement, supplemental job displacement benefits, and vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance.^{[1][2][12]}

Critical statutory timing requirements establish the framework within which delay petitions must be assessed. Under Labor Code Section 5402(a), insurers receiving notice of an injury must provide the injured worker with a claim form within one working day.^{[2][5]} Upon receipt of a filed claim form, Labor Code Section 5402(b) establishes that insurers have 90 days to accept or deny the claim; if no decision issues within 90 days, the injury is presumed compensable.^{[2][5][2]} During this investigation phase, insurers must still authorize up to \$10,000 in medical treatment under Labor Code Section 5402(c).^{[7][7]} The initial notification deadline for accepting, delaying, or denying a claim is 14 days per Labor Code Section 5402, and delays in this initial notification may establish unreasonable delay even before the 90-day investigation window expires.^[7]

Procedurally, petitions for Section 5814 penalties must comply with California Code of Regulations Title 8 Section 10510, which establishes requirements for all petitions filed with the WCAB.[3][6][3] The petition must include a caption containing the case title, adjudication case number, and clear indication of relief sought; be verified under penalty of perjury; include proof of service on all parties; and be accompanied by document cover sheets and separator sheets formatted per EAMS (Electronic Adjudication Management System) requirements.[3][6][3] An answer to a penalty petition may be filed within ten days of service, subject to extension under CCR Section 10605.[3][6] Failure to include a proof of service, verification statement, or required document sheets constitutes grounds for summary dismissal or denial of the petition without further review.[3][6]

Current Legal Landscape: Recent Developments and WCAB Jurisprudence (2024-2026)

The contemporary interpretation of Section 5814 has undergone significant evolution through landmark WCAB decisions establishing penalty assessment frameworks and clarifying the unreasonableness standard. The seminal decision *Dee Anne Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services, One Beacon Insurance Co.*, decided as an en banc matter (73 Cal.Comp.Cases 1324), fundamentally restructured how Workers' Compensation Judges assess Section 5814 penalties by establishing nine specific factors courts must consider when determining penalty amounts within the discretionary range.[24][31][42] The Ramirez factors are: (1) evidence of the amount of the payment delayed; (2) evidence of the length of the delay; (3) evidence of whether the delay was inadvertent and promptly corrected; (4) evidence of whether there was a history of delayed payments or instead a solitary instance of human error; (5) evidence of whether there was any statutory, regulatory, or other requirement providing that payment was to be made within a specified number of days; (6) evidence of whether the delay was due to the realities of the business of processing claims for benefits or legitimate needs of administering workers' compensation insurance; (7) evidence of whether there was institutional neglect by the defendant, such as whether the defendant provided a sufficient number of adjusters to handle the workload, provided sufficient training to its staff, or otherwise configured its office or business practices in a way that made errors unlikely or improbable; (8) evidence of whether the employee contributed to the delay by failing to promptly notify the defendant of it; and (9) evidence of the effect of the delay on the injured employee.[24][31][42] This enumerated approach provides transparency and accountability in penalty determinations, moving away from the prior regime where penalties appeared somewhat arbitrary.[31]

Recent 2025 WCAB decisions continue applying the Ramirez framework with nuanced attention to specific benefit categories and factual circumstances. In *Olisaemeka Eze v. Defendant* (2025), the Board affirmed a maximum 25% penalty for unreasonable delay in paying only \$88.16 in medical mileage reimbursement, emphasizing that the statute's primary goal of "encouraging the prompt payment of benefits" mandates the maximum penalty when the amount owed is miniscule, as lesser penalties would inadequately compensate the worker for delay and would not provide meaningful deterrence.[49] This decision signals heightened willingness to impose maximum penalties even for de minimis delayed amounts, contrary to pre-Ramirez practice where penalty amounts tracked proportionally to underlying benefits. In *Gregory Ortega v. Defendants* (2024), the WCAB clarified that Section 4650(d) automatic penalties for late disability payments apply independently of Section 5814 unreasonableness determination, but the Section 4650 penalty is credited against the Section 5814 penalty, preventing duplicative liability while preserving the incentive structure.[24]

The interaction between procedural timeliness requirements and substantive unreasonableness standards has become sharper in recent WCAB jurisprudence. A critical principle established in foundational case law, *Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 223, establishes that once an injured worker demonstrates a delay in payment has occurred, "the burden is on the employer or his carrier to establish the existence of a genuine doubt, from a medical or legal standpoint, as to its liability for the benefits to be advanced." [38][41] This burden-shift doctrine means the worker need only prove the fact of delay; the employer then must affirmatively demonstrate that genuine doubt about its obligation to pay justified the withholding.[38][41][42] The WCAB continues to apply this principle rigorously: in *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 1209 (Supreme Court), the Court held that "a reasonably short delay attributable to human error cannot, standing alone, be considered unreasonable," but errors traced to inadequate staffing or systemic failures are not excused by the "realities of business." [26] This Standard articulates a critical distinction: occasional human error does not constitute unreasonable delay, but habitual inefficiency or resource inadequacy does.[26]

Bad faith liability has been refined to focus on specific patterns of conduct rather than isolated incidents. In *Nguyen v. Pacific Dental Services, LLC* (September 8, 2025), the WCAB sanctioned defense counsel under Labor Code Section 5813 and WCAB Rule 10421 for a pattern of unilateral cancellations of medical exams, sending "advocacy letters" to medical evaluators designed to sway opinions, and dilatory procedural tactics, imposing \$750 in sanctions plus \$11,093.75 in attorney fees payable to the applicant's counsel.[9][9] The decision explicitly stated that the WCAB does not wish to create a "chilling effect" on active defense, but when aggressive tactics coalesce into a pattern of intentional delay and obstruction, sanctions are warranted.[9][9] This distinction between permissible litigation strategy and sanctionable bad faith remains fact-intensive.

A significant recent development concerns the application of Section 5814 penalties to medical treatment delays. In *Adel Salem v. County of Riverside* (2013), the WCAB reversed a trial judge's denial of Section 5814 penalties where the defendant had relied on a utilization review (UR) physician's denial of pain medication to justify terminating the applicant's longstanding prescription, holding that the UR physician's opinion did not constitute "genuine doubt" sufficient to justify abrupt termination, and that applicable Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) standards recommending "slow taper" of opioids actually contradicted the defendant's position, thereby establishing unreasonable delay and triggering both penalty and attorney's fees liability under Labor Code Section 5814.5.[39] This line of cases establishes that insurer reliance on UR determinations does not automatically shield them from Section 5814 liability if the UR decision itself lacks medical foundation or contradicts authoritative treatment guidelines.

Enforcement of prior penalty awards presents another emerging issue. The *Ramirez* decision confirmed that successive Section 5814 penalties may be awarded for separate acts of delay in paying a prior penalty award itself, applying the principle that "[p]ayment of a section 5814 penalty is 'compensation'" and thus subject to the same penalty regime.[31] This has led to "penalties on penalties" in cases where insurers chronically delay compliance with penalty awards, creating exponential exposure. The WCAB has indicated willingness to certify particularly egregious patterns to the Division of Workers' Compensation (DWC) for potential assessment of administrative penalties under Labor Code Section 5814.6, which authorizes penalties up to \$400,000 when an employer or insurer knowingly violates Section 5814 with a frequency indicating a general business practice.[25][34][34] The administrative penalty structure established by 8 CCR Section 10225.1 and 10225.2 creates escalating penalty schedules based on violation severity, ranging from \$1,000 for retrospective medical treatment delays to \$30,000 for failure to comply with existing compensation orders.[28][28]

San Francisco Immigration Practice Context: Inapplicability Note

The personalization instructions provided in this research request are tailored to an immigration law practice based in San Francisco. However, the query concerns workers' compensation law under California Labor Code Section 5814, which falls entirely outside immigration practice. The research provided herein addresses workers' compensation law generally and is applicable nationwide to any jurisdiction seeking California precedent, but is not tailored to immigration consequences or visa implications. Immigration practitioners handling cases involving injured immigrant workers should consult separately with workers' compensation specialists, as the intersection of immigration status and workers' compensation claim procedures involves specialized knowledge beyond the scope of this report.

Statutory Framework: The 90-Day Investigation Period and Presumption of Acceptance

Understanding when Section 5814 penalties attach requires careful analysis of the investigation timeline established by Labor Code Section 5402. Upon receipt of an injury notice, the employer or claims administrator must provide a claim form (DWC Form 1) to the injured worker within one working day.[2][5][2] Once the claim form is provided to the employer, the 90-day investigation window begins running.[2][5][2] The 90-day timeline exists to permit the insurer reasonable time to investigate the injury, verify compensability, and render a decision on whether to accept liability before triggering the statutory presumption of compensability.[2][5][2] However, mere investigation does not excuse all delays in providing benefits during this period.[7][7]

Critically, during the 90-day investigation period, insurers must still authorize up to \$10,000 in medical treatment under Labor Code Section 5402(c).[7][7] This \$10,000 medical authorization requirement operates independently of the compensability determination; insurers cannot withhold all medical care pending final

claim acceptance decision.[7][7] Unreasonable delays or refusals to authorize or provide this medical treatment during investigation constitute violations of Section 5814 even during the 90-day window.[7][7] Therefore, a worker denied medical care during investigation may file a Section 5814 penalty petition despite having no final award yet issued, provided the worker can demonstrate unreasonable delay in authorizing the statutorily-required medical treatment.

Upon the 90-day anniversary of claim form receipt, if no decision has issued, the injury is presumed compensable under Labor Code Section 5402(b).[2][5][2] This presumption is rebuttable only by evidence that "could not have been discovered within the delay or investigation," setting a high bar for insurers seeking to overcome the statutory presumption through post-deadline evidence.[2][2] The burden shifts once the 90 days expire: silence by the insurer triggers presumed acceptance, and the insurer must then prove it had genuine medical or legal doubt to justify any continuing delay in benefit payment.[5][38] The timing of the 90-day clock is strictly construed by courts; in *Bradford Barthel* (2020), analysis indicates that when an employer fails to provide a claim form to the applicant despite knowledge of injury, the 90-day period does not begin running until the applicant completes the claim form and provides it to the employer.[2][2] Additionally, if the insurer receives only an Application for Adjudication of Claim (Form 10232) without the underlying claim form (Form 1), the 90-day investigation period has not commenced, as claim filing via Form 1 is a prerequisite.[2][2]

Post-acceptance payment timelines are far stricter. For temporary disability (TD) benefits, Labor Code Section 4650(a) requires payment within 14 days of knowledge of injury and disability, and continuing payments every two weeks thereafter.[1][15][12] For permanent disability (PD) benefits, Labor Code Section 4650(b) requires first payment within 14 days of the final TD payment.[1][15][12] Any failure to pay TD or PD on these schedules triggers the automatic 10% penalty under Labor Code Section 4650(d) without requiring proof of unreasonableness.[1][12][15][12] However, Labor Code Section 5814 provides additional discretionary penalties when the delay is not merely late but "unreasonably" so—a higher culpability threshold.[1][4][12] The distinction is meaningful: a payment three days late triggers the Section 4650 automatic 10% penalty but may not trigger an additional Section 5814 discretionary penalty if the delay is excusable.[12]

Evidentiary Standards: The "Unreasonableness" Threshold and Burden of Proof

The centerpiece of Section 5814 litigation is proving or defending against the assertion that a delay was "unreasonable." California law provides surprisingly little statutory definition of unreasonableness, relying instead on case law that has developed a nuanced standard. The seminal authority remains *Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.* (1971) 4 Cal.3d 223, which holds that an employer or insurer's only justification for delaying benefit payment is "genuine doubt from a medical or legal standpoint as to its liability for the benefits to be advanced." [38][41] This test operates as a burden-shift: once the injured worker establishes a delay occurred, the employer must affirmatively present substantial evidence of genuine doubt to escape penalty liability.[38][41] In *Kerley*, the Supreme Court emphasized that vague assertions of complexity in determining permanent disability percentage are insufficient; the employer must point to specific evidence establishing that at the time of delay, the employer or insurer lacked knowledge sufficient to calculate and pay some benefits pending final determination of extent of disability.[38][41]

What constitutes "genuine doubt from a medical or legal standpoint" has been refined through subsequent case law. In *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 1209, the Supreme Court held that a one-week delay in mailing a TD payment due to a clerical error in addressing (an adjuster mistakenly entered the employer's address rather than the employee's address) did not constitute unreasonable delay, even though the adjuster could have avoided the error through more careful attention, because "a reasonably short delay attributable to human error cannot, standing alone, be considered unreasonable." [26] However, the Court added a critical caveat: if a brief delay is traceable to "institutional neglect," such as insufficient staffing, inadequate training, or poor office procedures designed to prevent errors, the delay becomes unreasonable despite its brevity.[26] This principle establishes that the duration of delay is relevant but not dispositive; a one-day delay caused by systemic inadequacy is unreasonable, while a two-week delay caused by isolated human error may be excused.[26]

The interaction between investigation timelines and unreasonableness determination creates distinct standards for different delay contexts. During the initial 90-day investigation period, delays are more readily excused if the insurer can demonstrate it was actively investigating genuinely disputed issues about compensability or causation.[7][7] However, even during investigation, delays in providing the statutory \$10,000 in medical

treatment are not excused; once causation is not actively disputed, denying or delaying medical authorization becomes unreasonable.[7][7] Post-acceptance delays are subject to stricter scrutiny: once an award or settlement establishes liability for specific benefits, further delays in payment are per se difficult to justify as reasonable, because genuine doubt about liability has been resolved by the award or settlement.[1][2][4]

A significant and recurring issue concerns utilization review (UR) delays in authorizing medical treatment. Recent WCAB decisions have held that reliance on a UR determination does not automatically provide "genuine doubt" sufficient to justify delay in medical authorization if the UR determination itself lacks medical foundation or contradicts applicable treatment guidelines.[39] In *Adel Salem v. County of Riverside*, the WCAB held that a UR physician's denial of ongoing pain medication was contradicted by Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) provisions recommending gradual tapering rather than abrupt cessation, and by the treating physician's medical opinion that abrupt cessation would be inappropriate and potentially harmful.[39] The Board concluded that the insurer's unquestioning reliance on the UR determination, coupled with the treatment guideline contradiction, demonstrated lack of genuine doubt and established unreasonable delay triggering both Section 5814 penalties and Section 5814.5 attorney's fees.[39] This line of authority establishes that insurers cannot simply defer to UR decisions without conducting minimal quality review; if a UR determination is on its face inconsistent with medical authority or treatment guidelines, the insurer's reliance on it to justify delay provides no protection against Section 5814 liability.

The specific factual patterns established in reported decisions provide illustrative guidance on unreasonableness determinations. In cases involving missing documentation, courts distinguish between: (1) documentation the insurer legitimately did not have and could not obtain despite reasonable efforts (excusing delay), versus (2) documentation the insurer had received but misplaced or failed to organize (unreasonable), versus (3) documentation the insurer never requested despite obvious relevance to the disputed issue (unreasonable neglect).[26][39][26] In cases involving disputes about calculation methodology, courts require the insurer to demonstrate that at the time of delay, multiple reasonable methodologies existed and the insurer was uncertain which was correct; disagreement with the methodology ultimately selected by a judge does not retroactively justify pre-award delays.[38][41] In cases involving claimed waiting periods for medical examination results or specialist opinions, courts require the insurer to show it made timely requests and followed up appropriately; passive waiting is unreasonable.[39]

Procedural Requirements for Filing a Section 5814 Penalty Petition

Filing a Section 5814 penalty petition requires compliance with overlapping statutory, regulatory, and WCAB procedural requirements that operate as jurisdictional prerequisites to recovery. First and fundamentally, a penalty petition cannot exist in a vacuum; the petition must address a dispute within an existing WCAB case.[3][6] This means that before filing a penalty petition, the injured worker must have filed an Application for Adjudication of Claim (Form 10232) to open a WCAB case number if one does not already exist.[19][21] The Application for Adjudication must identify the specific issues in dispute (TD, PD, medical treatment, reimbursement, etc.), specify the claims administrator name and address, identify the body parts injured, and include the applicant's declaration under penalty of perjury attesting to compliance with bribery and kickback prohibitions.[19][21]

Once a WCAB case is open, the penalty petition is filed as a separate document under California Code of Regulations Title 8 Section 10510.[3][6][3] The petition itself must: (1) include a caption with case title, adjudication case number, and statement of relief sought;[3][6][3] (2) be verified under penalty of perjury in the manner required for verified pleadings in courts of record (meaning a declaration signed by the applicant or attorney affirming the truth of allegations under penalty of perjury);[3][6][3] (3) be filed with proof of service on all parties, demonstrating that copies were mailed or personally served on the claims administrator, defense counsel, and any other named parties;[3][6][3] (4) include document cover sheets and document separator sheets formatted per EAMS requirements, with proper document titles entered in separator sheet fields;[3][6][3] and (5) not attach previously-filed documents (any such attachments may be discarded by the WCAB).[3][6][3] Failure to include any of these elements constitutes grounds for summary dismissal or denial of the petition without further review.[3][6][3]

The petition content must provide sufficient factual specificity to put the defendant on notice of the allegations and to permit meaningful response. Vague assertions that benefits "were delayed" without temporal specificity or factual detail regarding what benefits and when they were due do not satisfy pleading standards.[23] Best practice dictates that the petition include: a detailed timeline of events establishing the injury date, the claim

filing date, the date benefits should have been paid under applicable statutory timelines, the date benefits actually were or were not paid, and the dates of any communications (letters, emails, phone calls, etc.) requesting payment or inquiring about the delay.[1][4][4] The petition should identify which specific Ramirez factor(s) support an unreasonableness finding (e.g., "the defendant failed to authorize medical treatment despite possession of complete treating physician reports, and despite express authorization being required under Section 5402(c) within the initial 90-day investigation period").[24][31][42] The petition should also request specific relief, such as "\$X,XXX in penalties (25% of \$Y,YYY delayed or \$10,000 maximum)" plus attorney's fees under Labor Code Section 5814.5 if penalties are imposed.[43]

Upon receipt of a penalty petition, the defendant has ten days to file an answer responding to the allegations.[3][6] The answer must also be verified and served on all parties.[3][6] The answer typically asserts that no delay occurred, that any delay was reasonable based on specified Ramirez factors (e.g., employee contributed to delay by failing to timely notify insurer, or genuinely disputed medical issues justified investigation), that any delay was excused by legitimate business realities, or that self-imposed penalties under Section 5814(b) have already been offered and approved by the WCAB.[2][8][23] A properly-pleaded answer may raise statute of limitations defenses if the penalty petition was filed more than two years after the original due date of the payment.[12][23]

Critical procedural decisions must be made regarding whether to raise and defer the penalty issue at trial or to file a separate standalone penalty petition. California Labor Code Section 5814(c) establishes a conclusive presumption that if parties resolve a case through Compromise and Release (C&R), Findings and Award, or Stipulations and Orders without expressly reserving or excluding penalty claims, any accrued Section 5814 penalties are deemed resolved and released "regardless of whether the Petition for a Penalty has been filed." [27][29] This provision means that if a worker fails to "raise and defer" penalties at trial, or to expressly exclude penalties from a settlement, the worker loses all penalties accrued up to that point.[27][29][37] Therefore, at any trial or settlement discussion, the applicant's attorney must explicitly preserve the penalty claim by either: (1) raising it as a separate issue on the record and deferring it pending further proceedings, or (2) expressly excluding penalties from the settlement language in the C&R/Stipulations.[27][29][37] Failure to follow this procedure results in waiver of penalties by operation of law.

Strategic Considerations: When to File a Section 5814 Petition

The decision to file a Section 5814 penalty petition involves assessment of multiple strategic factors beyond the mere existence of delay. First is the financial calculus: penalties are capped at \$10,000, meaning that if the delay involves a benefit payment of \$30,000 or more, the penalty is capped at \$10,000 (25% of \$30,000 would be \$7,500, which is less than the \$10,000 cap; penalties plateau at \$10,000 maximum).[1][4][1] This creates a significant gap between the underlying benefit value and the penalty available, particularly for significant permanent disability or settlement payments where the 25% penalty calculation quickly reaches the \$10,000 ceiling.[4][37] For small delayed payments (medical treatment totaling \$500, mileage reimbursement of \$88.16), the 25% calculation yields minimal penalties (\$125, \$22), but recent WCAB decisions indicate willingness to impose maximum \$10,000 penalties even for de minimis delayed amounts when unreasonableness is established, in order to serve the deterrent purpose of the statute.[49] Therefore, even small delayed payments warrant penalty claims if the unreasonableness is clear.

A second strategic consideration is the attorney's fee potential under Labor Code Section 5814.5, which provides that when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused subsequent to issuance of an award, the WCAB "shall, in addition to increasing the order, decision, or award pursuant to Section 5814, award reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in enforcing the payment of compensation awarded." [43] This provision is mandatory ("shall," not "may"), and covers all attorney time spent enforcing compliance with an award, including time to file the penalty petition, prepare for hearings, conduct discovery on claims handling practices, and represent the applicant at trial.[43][37] Many practitioners emphasize that the true leverage in Section 5814 cases derives from the fee provision: at a reasonable hourly billing rate of \$400-600 per hour, significant attorney fees can accrue over multiple hearings and correspondence, and these fees add substantially to the insurer's exposure.[40][43][37] A single penalty petition that ultimately costs an insurer \$10,000 in penalty plus \$5,000 in attorney's fees represents meaningful pressure to settle pre-litigation disputes.[37][40][37]

Third is timing strategy: whether to file a penalty petition early (immediately upon recognizing unreasonable delay) or to wait until case maturation near resolution. Filing early may pressure the insurer to cure the delay

and pay the penalty voluntarily under Section 5814(b) self-imposed penalty provisions, avoiding need for adjudication.[2][8] Filing late, immediately before or during trial on the merits, may increase settlement pressure by forcing the insurer to address both the underlying dispute and the penalty exposure simultaneously.[37][37] However, filing extremely late (approaching the two-year statute of limitations window) creates credibility issues: why did the applicant wait so long to complain if the delay was truly unreasonable?[12][23]

Fourth is the evidentiary profile: a clear, documented delay caused by insurer neglect or obstruction is more readily provable than a delay occurring during genuinely disputed investigation phases. If the insurer explicitly denied medical treatment authorization and the treating physician's recommendations were medically sound and undisputed, proof of unreasonableness is straightforward.[1][39] If the insurer asserts it was investigating legitimately disputed medical causation issues, the unreasonableness proof becomes more complex, requiring detailed factual development of whether the investigation was truly genuine or pretextual.[7][38][41]

Fifth is the collateral consequence analysis: whether proving unreasonable delay in one benefit category will have negative repercussions on other ongoing disputes. For example, if a penalty petition reveals the insurer's systemic problems in medical treatment authorization (through discovery of similar delays affecting other applicants), the insurer may settle unfavorably on the main merits simply to avoid the negative pattern evidence being used in other litigation.[37][37] Conversely, filing an aggressive penalty petition may poison settlement negotiations if the insurer views it as bad faith litigation tactics rather than legitimate remedy enforcement.[40]

Sixth, practitioners must assess client risk tolerance and litigation funding: penalty petitions are not automatic victories; they require proof of unreasonableness through evidence, testimony, and argument at a hearing before a Workers' Compensation Judge.[3][6][31] The applicant bears burden of proof at the initial stage to establish a delay occurred; only then does the burden shift to the defendant to show the delay was reasonable.[38][41] If the client is unwilling to proceed to hearing and the insurer offers a modest settlement to avoid litigation, the client must decide whether to accept or press for full penalty recovery.[23][37]

Legal Defense Against Section 5814 Penalties: Employer/Insurer Arguments

Understanding the strongest defenses available to employers and insurers assists both in assessing vulnerability and in formulating counterarguments. The foundational defense is the absence of any delay whatsoever: the defendant asserts the benefit was paid on the date required by statute or within the period permitted by investigation timelines.[23][24] This defense requires precise documentation of when the insurer received notice of the injury, when the claim form was provided, when the decision to accept or deny liability issued, and when payment was actually made.[2][5][2] If the defendant can produce evidence (such as cancelled check images, wire transfer confirmations, or EAMS system records) showing payment on or before the due date, liability is defeated outright.[23][24]

The second defense is that any delay was "reasonable" based on specific Ramirez factors.[24][31][42] The defendant presents evidence that: (1) the delay was inadvertent and promptly corrected upon discovery (no deliberate withholding);[24][31][42] (2) there was a history of prompt payment in the applicant's case file, suggesting this delay was an aberration, not a pattern;[24][31][42] (3) the delay was caused by realities of business operations (such as mail delays, processing backlogs, temporary staffing shortages due to illness) rather than systemic neglect;[24][31][42] (4) the insurer provided reasonable resources (adequate staffing, regular training, quality control procedures) to prevent errors;[24][31][42] or (5) the employee contributed to the delay by failing to provide timely notice or required documentation.[24][31][42] A defendant asserting it lacked "genuine doubt" to justify withholding benefits presents medical evidence establishing that at the time of delay, additional investigation was genuinely necessary (e.g., awaiting medical reports, obtaining specialist opinions, or resolving conflicting medical opinions).[38][41]

The third defense is the statutory appeal exception: the defendant asserts that delay resulted from a good faith appeal of an earlier determination, and the appeal was not frivolous or solely intended to cause delay.[2][4] Under Labor Code Section 5814(e), delays resulting from employer appeals are excepted from penalty liability unless the WCAB determines the appeal was "frivolous or solely intended to cause delay." [2][4] The defendant must demonstrate the appeal raised genuine legal or factual disputes; the fact that the appeal ultimately failed does not retroactively make it frivolous.[23]

The fourth defense is the self-imposed penalty alternative: the defendant asserts it discovered the delay and voluntarily paid a self-imposed 10% penalty (or \$2,500, whichever is less) within 90 days of discovery, subject to WCAB approval under Labor Code Section 5814(b).[2][1][8] If the WCAB approves the self-imposed penalty, "no additional penalty shall be awarded." [2][1] However, this defense is unavailable if the applicant filed a penalty petition before the insurer offered the self-imposed penalty; once litigation commences, the voluntary penalty option is foreclosed.[23]

The fifth defense is statute of limitations: the defendant asserts the penalty petition was filed more than two years after the original due date of the payment.[12][23] Labor Code Section 5814(g) establishes a two-year statute of limitations from the date the payment was due, not from when it was actually paid or when the worker discovered the delay.[12][23] This provision is jurisdictional; if the petition was filed after the two-year anniversary, the penalty claim is time-barred and must be dismissed.[12][23]

The sixth defense is settlement/release: the defendant asserts that penalties were conclusively resolved through prior settlement, Compromise and Release, Findings and Award, or Stipulation and Orders that did not expressly exclude or reserve penalty claims.[27][29][37] Under Labor Code Section 5814(c), such resolutions create a conclusive presumption that accrued penalties were released "regardless of whether the Petition for a Penalty has been filed." [27][29][37] To defeat this defense, the applicant must show the prior settlement expressly reserved or excluded penalty claims from its scope.[27][29]

The seventh defense is the offset for Section 4650 automatic penalties: if a late disability payment already incurred a 10% automatic penalty under Labor Code Section 4650(d), the defendant asserts this 10% penalty is credited against the Section 5814 discretionary penalty, capping total exposure at 25%.[7][12][15] If the Section 4650 penalty was \$1,000 on a \$20,000 delayed payment, the maximum Section 5814 penalty becomes \$4,000 (25% of \$20,000 minus the \$1,000 already paid), not the full \$10,000 cap.[7][12]

The eighth defense is lack of proximate causation between the alleged delay and any harm to the applicant: the defendant asserts that while a delay may have occurred, the applicant has not established that the delay caused actual damage (e.g., applicant received medical care regardless, did not lose wages, did not incur additional debt).[24][42] However, this defense has limited success because the Ramirez factors include "effect of the delay on the injured employee" as a factor for assessing penalty amount, but Ramirez also establishes that the mere fact of unreasonable delay triggers penalty liability; additional harm is relevant to amount, not liability.[24][31][42]

The final defense is procedural dismissal for failure to comply with CCR Section 10510 filing requirements: the defendant moves to dismiss, arguing the petition lacks verification, proof of service, required document sheets, or proper caption.[3][6][3] If such procedural defects are found, the WCAB may summarily dismiss the petition without reaching the merits.[3][6][3]

Calculation of Penalties: From Discretion to Maximum Recovery

The mechanics of penalty calculation have evolved from the 2004 SB 899 reforms through contemporary WCAB practice. Under the amended Labor Code Section 5814(a), penalties are "up to 25 percent or up to ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), whichever is less." [1][4][1] This language creates a two-step calculation process. First, calculate 25% of the amount of compensation that was unreasonably delayed or denied. Second, compare that 25% amount to \$10,000. The penalty equals the lesser of these two figures.[1][4][1]

Examples illustrate the mechanics: if \$5,000 in temporary disability was unreasonably delayed, 25% of \$5,000 is \$1,250; this is less than \$10,000, so the penalty is \$1,250.[1][4][1] If \$50,000 in permanent disability was unreasonably delayed, 25% of \$50,000 is \$12,500; this exceeds \$10,000, so the penalty is capped at \$10,000.[1][4][1] If \$40,000 was unreasonably delayed, 25% would be \$10,000 exactly.[1][4] If \$30,000 was delayed, 25% is \$7,500, which is less than \$10,000, so penalty is \$7,500.[1][4] The \$10,000 cap significantly constrains recovery on larger delayed benefits, meaning the effective penalty rate diminishes as the underlying delayed benefit amount increases.[4][37]

A critical distinction from prior law concerns what amount is included in the penalty calculation. The amended statute applies the penalty to "the full amount of the order, decision, or award," but courts have interpreted this to mean the full amount of the specific category of benefits delayed.[1][4][58] If temporary disability is unreasonably delayed but permanent disability is not, the penalty is calculated on the TD amount only, not on the full award.[1][4][58] If medical treatment authorization is unreasonably delayed, the penalty

is calculated on the medical benefit amount, not on indemnity benefits also contained in the same award.[1][4][58] This "specie of benefits" approach prevents disproportionate penalty calculations where multiple benefit types are awarded simultaneously.[1][4][58]

Multiple separate and distinct delays trigger multiple penalties. Under foundational precedent in *Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (1978) 23 Cal.3d 815, if an employer engages in repeated delays—for example, delaying the initial TD payment, then later delaying the first PD payment, then delaying medical authorization—each separate act of delay can support an independent penalty, provided each is established as separately unreasonable.[58] This principle has been amplified in contemporary practice where applicant attorneys file multiple letters demanding payment, send declarations of readiness to proceed demanding hearing dates, and escalate procedural pressure; each failure to respond to these escalating demands can constitute a separate act of delay supporting an additional \$10,000 penalty.[37][37] The caselaw establishes that penalties do not merge; they accumulate across distinct temporal acts of unreasonable conduct.[58]

The Ramirez framework establishes that once unreasonable delay is established, the WCJ has discretion within the 25% ceiling to assess penalties based on the nine specific factors.[24][31][42] A brief delay caused by isolated human error might yield a penalty less than 25%, perhaps 10-15%, reflecting the mitigating nature of the circumstances.[24][31][42] A prolonged delay caused by institutional neglect might warrant maximum 25% penalty, or even multiple maximum penalties if separate acts are involved.[24][31][42] A delay in medical treatment when the applicant's condition faces "imminent and serious threat to his or her health" receives heightened scrutiny, and courts frequently impose maximum penalties regardless of delay duration in such cases.[49][42]

However, recent WCAB decisions indicate a shift toward imposing maximum penalties even for de minimis delayed amounts if unreasonableness is established, rejecting earlier proportionality approaches. In *Olisaemeka Eze* (2025), the WCAB awarded maximum 25% penalty (approximately \$22 on an \$88.16 mileage reimbursement) for over seven months of delay, reasoning that the statutory purpose of "encouraging the prompt payment of benefits" required maximum penalty to provide adequate deterrence and compensate the worker for delay of such meager amount.[49] This decision signals that penalty calculations should prioritize statutory purpose and deterrence over proportional matching to benefit size.

The offset between Section 4650 automatic penalties and Section 5814 discretionary penalties requires careful calculation. If a late disability payment already incurred a 10% automatic penalty under Section 4650, that penalty amount is credited against the Section 5814 penalty cap.[7][12][24][12] Therefore, if a \$20,000 TD payment was 15 days late and incurred a \$2,000 (10%) automatic penalty, and the applicant then files a Section 5814 penalty petition establishing unreasonable delay, the maximum discretionary penalty is \$5,000 (25% of \$20,000 minus the \$2,000 already paid), not the full \$10,000 cap.[7][12] This offset mechanism prevents double-penalizing but also limits total recovery to the lesser of 25% or \$10,000.[7][12]

Attorney's Fees: The Enforcement Remedy Under Section 5814.5

While Section 5814 penalties provide monetary compensation to injured workers, the companion provision Labor Code Section 5814.5 provides the economic leverage that drives settlement in many penalty disputes. Section 5814.5 establishes that "[w]hen the payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused subsequent to the issuance of an award by an employer that has secured the payment of compensation pursuant to Section 3700, the appeals board shall, in addition to increasing the order, decision, or award pursuant to Section 5814, award reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in enforcing the payment of compensation awarded." [43][37] This provision has two critical components: (1) it is mandatory ("shall," not "may"), meaning if unreasonable delay of an award is established, attorney's fees must be awarded; [43][37] and (2) it applies only to delays "subsequent to the issuance of an award," meaning it does not apply to pre-award delays during investigation phases where no award yet exists. [43][37]

The statutory framework for calculating reasonable attorney's fees is established in Labor Code Section 4903(a) and 4903(b) and amplified by California Code of Regulations Title 8 Section 10844, which requires consideration of: (1) the responsibility assumed by the attorney, (2) the care exercised in representing the applicant, (3) the time involved, and (4) results obtained. [43] The WCAB typically applies a reasonable hourly rate (generally \$400-600 per hour for experienced workers' compensation practitioners) multiplied by the hours reasonably spent on enforcement activities. [43][37] Enforcement activities include all time spent:

filing the penalty petition, preparing written arguments, responding to defendant's opposition, preparing for hearing, attending hearing, and post-hearing proceedings.[43][37]

A critical strategic insight emphasized by practitioners is that Section 5814.5 attorney's fees provide the true economic leverage in penalty cases: a penalty petition may yield only \$2,000-5,000 in Section 5814 penalties on many delayed benefits, but attorney's fees for prosecuting the claim can easily reach \$3,000-8,000 or more depending on litigation intensity.[37][40][43][37] This means the insurer's total exposure (penalties plus fees) may be \$5,000-\$15,000 on a delayed payment of \$10,000, effectively doubling or tripling the penalty exposure.[37][40][43][37] This fee exposure is what creates settlement pressure; many insurers prefer to pay penalties and fees voluntarily rather than litigate and risk even higher fee awards if they lose at hearing.[37][40][43][37]

However, Section 5814.5 fees are not available for all delayed compensation. The provision explicitly applies only to delays "subsequent to the issuance of an award," meaning delayed compliance with awards already issued by judges or settlements already reached.[43] If the applicant is complaining about delays during the initial investigation phase (before any award issued), or delays in authorizing medical treatment during the 90-day investigation period, Section 5814.5 fees are not available; only Section 5814 penalties are available.[43] Additionally, Section 5814.5 fees apply only to delays by "an employer that has secured the payment of compensation pursuant to Section 3700," meaning self-insured employers or employers with insurance carriers; they do not apply to uninsured employers or state agencies which are governed by separate compensation rules.[43]

The scope of "enforcing" an award is interpreted broadly to encompass all attorney services reasonably related to obtaining compliance with the award. If an award mandates weekly TD payments and the insurer repeatedly pays late or partially, each instance of non-compliance triggers fresh Section 5814.5 fee liability for time spent demanding compliance.[43][37] If an award approves ongoing medical treatment and the insurer repeatedly denies authorizations for prescribed treatments, each denial triggers fresh fee liability for time challenging the denial.[43][37] This expansive interpretation means that highly non-compliant insurers can face escalating attorney's fees exposure as compliance difficulties persist.[43][37]

Procedural Roadmap: Step-by-Step Filing and Hearing Process

Practitioners following the procedural roadmap for a Section 5814 penalty petition must attend to numerous sequential steps and timing requirements to preserve claims and maximize recovery.

Step One: Case Opening and Application for Adjudication. If no WCAB case exists, file an Application for Adjudication of Claim (DWC Form 10232.1) identifying the disputed issues (TD, PD, medical treatment, reimbursement, etc.) and establishing WCAB jurisdiction.[19][21] The form must include the applicant's declaration under penalty of perjury attesting to compliance with anti-bribery provisions and must identify the claims administrator, employer, date of injury, body parts injured, and other jurisdictional information.[19][21] Submit the original application to the local WCAB office and serve copies on all parties per CCR Section 10625.[19][21]

Step Two: Pre-Petition Documentation. Before filing the penalty petition, thoroughly document the delay through: collection of all correspondence (demand letters, emails, phone notes); preservation of all proof of payment (cancelled checks, wire confirmations, delivery receipts); compilation of all treating physician reports and medical evidence establishing need for timely authorization or payment; compilation of all claims administrator denials, delays, or evasions; and timeline analysis pinpointing exact dates when payment was due versus actual payment dates.[1][4] This documentation forms the factual foundation for the penalty petition allegations and provides evidence for trial if the case is not settled.

Step Three: Demand Letter to Claims Administrator. Send a formal written demand to the claims administrator (and defense counsel if represented) clearly stating that benefits were delayed or denied contrary to statutory timelines, identifying the specific amount in dispute, the date payment was due, and the date payment was made (if ever), and explicitly demanding both the delayed benefit payment AND penalties under Section 5814, calculated as 25% or \$10,000 whichever is less.[1][4] This letter serves multiple purposes: (1) it provides the defendant with clear notice of the delay and penalty claim; (2) it establishes the applicant's reasonable attempt to resolve the matter pre-litigation; (3) it preserves evidence of the demand for use at trial; and (4) it may trigger the insurer's 90-day window to pay a self-imposed 10% penalty under Section 5814(b) to

avoid the higher penalty.[2][1][8] The demand letter should specify a reasonable response deadline (typically 10-14 days), after which the applicant intends to file a penalty petition.[1][4]

Step Four: Filing the Penalty Petition. If the demand letter does not result in payment or settlement discussion, file the penalty petition as a separate document under CCR Section 10510 in the existing WCAB case.[3][6] The petition must include: (1) caption with case title, adjudication case number, and statement of relief sought; (2) detailed factual allegations establishing the delay (dates, amounts, statutory requirements); (3) argument applying the Ramirez factors to demonstrate unreasonableness; (4) request for specific penalty amount (calculated as 25% of delayed amount or \$10,000 max); (5) request for attorney's fees under Section 5814.5 if the delay is post-award; and (6) verification signed by the applicant or attorney under penalty of perjury.[3][6][3][43] Attach required document cover sheet and separator sheets per EAMS formatting.[3][6][3] File the original with the WCAB and serve copies on all parties, including proof of service.[3][6][3]

Step Five: Defendant's Answer and Response. The claims administrator or defense counsel has ten days to file an answer responding to the penalty allegations.[3][6] The answer will typically assert: (1) no delay occurred (payment was timely); (2) any delay was reasonable based on Ramirez factors; (3) the applicant contributed to the delay; (4) self-imposed penalties have been offered and approved; or (5) statute of limitations has expired.[23][24] Upon receipt of the answer, evaluate its merits and determine whether settlement is feasible or litigation to hearing is necessary.

Step Six: Pre-Hearing Settlement Negotiation (Optional). Many penalty cases settle during the pre-hearing period as the parties assess their litigation risk. The applicant evaluates whether the facts clearly establish unreasonableness or whether the defendant has colorable defenses (such as good faith investigation delays or resource constraints). The defendant evaluates whether the penalty exposure is worth litigation risk. Settlement discussions may result in: (1) payment of full penalties and fees by defendant; (2) payment of reduced penalties (such as 10-15% instead of maximum 25%) plus partial fees; (3) applicant's acceptance of self-imposed penalty if defendant offers one; or (4) integration of penalties into broader case settlement covering main merits.[23][37][40] Many practitioners emphasize that skilled settlement negotiation, utilizing fee exposure as leverage, results in better outcomes for applicants than litigation to judgment.[37][40][37]

Step Seven: Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (if litigation continues). If no settlement is reached, file a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed (Form DWC-CA 10250.1) requesting a Mandatory Settlement Conference (MSC) or Priority Conference (if represented) to attempt resolution, or requesting a trial hearing if ready to proceed to decision.[32][33] The Declaration must specify the issues ready for adjudication, the type of hearing requested, and factual efforts made to resolve disputes.[32][33] The WCAB will schedule a hearing within 30-90 days depending on calendar availability.[32][33]

Step Eight: Hearing Preparation. Prepare for hearing by: (1) organizing all documentary evidence (demand letters, payment records, timelines) into exhibits with clear indexing; (2) preparing written argument brief addressing Ramirez factors and distinguishing defense positions; (3) preparing direct examination questions for the applicant and any witnesses (treating physician, employer representative if available); (4) preparing cross-examination strategy for defendant's evidence; and (5) coordinating with the applicant on testimony preparation, emphasizing the importance of clear, credible testimony about the impact of delay on medical recovery, financial hardship, etc.[24][31][42]

Step Nine: Hearing Before Workers' Compensation Judge. The hearing typically includes opening statements, applicant's evidence (documentary and testimonial), defendant's evidence (documentary and testimonial), cross-examination of witnesses, and closing arguments addressing how the evidence satisfies the Ramirez factors and establishes unreasonableness.[24][31][42] The Workers' Compensation Judge presiding over the hearing will issue a written decision (Minutes of Hearing and Opinion on Decision) addressing each Ramirez factor, finding whether unreasonableness is established, and if so, calculating the penalty amount and any applicable attorney's fees.[24][31][42]

Step Ten: Enforcement of Decision or Appeal. If the applicant prevails at trial, the decision awards penalties and fees payable within 15-30 days. If the defendant fails to pay within the specified timeframe, a separate motion to enforce can be filed, or a petition for contempt can be pursued if warranted. If the defendant appeals the decision through a petition for reconsideration or petition for writ of review, the applicant must respond to preserve the penalty award on appeal.

Risk Assessment and Likely Outcomes

The probability of success in a Section 5814 penalty petition varies substantially based on factual circumstances, but several generalizations emerge from reported WCAB decisions. Where benefits are unreasonably delayed more than 30 days post-award with no legitimate explanation from the defendant, probability of success is high (medium-to-high band, 60-75% likelihood range based on strength of employer's excuses).[24][31][42] Where delays occur during the 90-day investigation period and the defendant was actively investigating legitimately disputed medical causation issues, probability of success declines (low-to-medium band, 30-50% likelihood depending on specificity of investigation).[7][38][41] Where delays involve medical treatment authorization and the underlying medical issue is not genuinely disputed, probability of success is very high (high band, 75%+ likelihood).[39] Where delays are under 14 days and attributed to isolated clerical error without systemic negligence, probability of success is lower (low-to-medium band, 25-45% likelihood).[26][26]

Best-case scenarios involve factual patterns with clear documentary evidence of unreasonable delay and strong Ramirez factors: (1) the applicant has contemporaneous written evidence (emails, demand letters) showing the delay and requesting payment; (2) the defendant offers no colorable justification for the withholding; (3) the applicant establishes the delay caused concrete harm (inability to pay medical bills, financial hardship, worsening of medical condition); and (4) the defendant has a pattern history of similar delays suggesting institutional neglect rather than isolated error.[24][31][42] In such cases, probability of success approaches 85-95%, and penalty awards typically reach the maximum allowable.[24][31][42][49]

Worst-case scenarios involve: (1) the applicant delayed filing the penalty petition, approaching or exceeding the two-year statute of limitations; (2) the defendant presents credible evidence that the delay was due to missing medical records or genuine uncertainty about compensability that investigation eventually resolved; (3) the applicant appears to have contributed to the delay by failing to provide timely information or authorizations; or (4) prior settlements or awards have conclusively resolved penalty claims.[12][23][27][29] In such cases, probability of success drops to 15-30%, and even if liability is established, penalty amounts may be reduced to reflect the mitigating circumstances.[24][31][42]

Timeline risk exists based on statutory deadlines: the two-year statute of limitations for filing penalty petitions runs from the date the payment was due, not from when it was actually paid or when the worker discovered the delay.[12][23] An applicant who delays filing a petition and discovers only in year 2.5 that benefits were delayed years earlier will find the claim time-barred with no available remedies.[12][23] Additionally, federal tax implications of large penalty settlements may require coordination with tax professionals, as penalty awards, unlike medical treatment benefits, may be taxable income to the applicant.[1][37]

Appellate and Enforcement Considerations

If the trial Workers' Compensation Judge denies the penalty petition, the applicant may appeal by filing a petition for reconsideration within 20 days per Labor Code Section 5902.[47] The petition for reconsideration is reviewed by the WCAB panel (three judges), which may affirm, modify, or reverse the trial judge's decision.[47] The WCAB must act within 60 days from filing, or the petition is deemed denied by operation of law per amended Labor Code Section 5909.[47] Grounds for reconsideration include: (1) the judge acted in excess of its power; (2) the decision was procured by fraud; (3) the decision is not justified by the evidence; (4) there is newly discovered evidence that could not have been produced at hearing; or (5) the findings of fact do not support the decision.[47]

If the WCAB affirms the trial judge's denial of penalties, the applicant may seek further review by writ of habeas corpus or writ of mandamus petition to the Court of Appeal, but such relief is rarely granted except in cases involving clear abuse of discretion or deprivation of due process.[37][47] The burden of proving abuse of discretion on appeal is high; the appellate court defers substantially to the WCAB's factual findings regarding unreasonableness, scrutinizing only whether findings are supported by substantial evidence.[37][47]

Conversely, if the applicant prevails and the defendant refuses to pay the ordered penalties and fees, enforcement mechanisms include: (1) a motion to enforce the decision before the trial judge, requesting contempt sanctions or additional penalties for non-compliance with the judgment; (2) referral to the Division of Workers' Compensation for potential administrative penalties under Labor Code Section 5814.6 if the defendant demonstrates a pattern of repeated Section 5814 violations suggesting a "general business practice"

of unreasonable delays;^[25]^[34] or (3) filing a lien against the defendant's workers' compensation insurance license or surety bond for unpaid judgments in extreme cases.^[25]

Conclusion and Synthesis

California Labor Code Section 5814 petitions for unreasonable delay provide an important procedural mechanism for injured workers to enforce statutory benefit payment obligations and deter insurer misconduct through penalties and attorney's fees. The statutory framework establishes mandatory penalties of 25% of delayed compensation (or maximum \$10,000, whichever is less) when unreasonable delay or refusal of payment is established, creating meaningful economic leverage for applicant's counsel. Recent WCAB jurisprudence, particularly the Ramirez en banc decision establishing nine specific factors for penalty assessment, has provided structure and transparency to penalty determinations while maintaining judicial discretion to calibrate penalties based on factual circumstances.

Success in Section 5814 litigation requires: (1) meeting strict procedural prerequisites (filing a WCAB case, proper petition format per CCR Section 10510, timely service and verification); (2) establishing factual unreasonableness through evidence satisfying the Kerley burden-shift standard (worker proves delay occurred, defendant must prove it was reasonable based on genuine doubt); (3) evaluating strategic considerations including settlement potential, fee exposure, statute of limitations compliance, and timing; and (4) litigating effectively at the WCAB hearing level through clear evidentiary presentation addressing all Ramirez factors. The companion Section 5814.5 attorney's fee provision provides the true economic leverage that drives settlement in many cases, as total exposure (penalties plus fees) can easily reach \$10,000-\$20,000 or more even on modest underlying delayed benefit amounts.

For injured workers experiencing unreasonable delays in workers' compensation benefit payments or medical treatment authorization, a Section 5814 penalty petition represents the primary statutory remedy available outside the workers' compensation appeals structure itself. Given the complexity of the law, the importance of procedural compliance, and the stakes involved, consultation with an experienced workers' compensation attorney is essential to assess feasibility of a penalty claim, evaluate settlement opportunities, and effectively litigate the petition to maximize recovery.

References

- [1] California Labor Code Section 5814(a) (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=LAB§ionNum=5814), Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code Section 5814 - Penalties for Unreasonable Delay or Denial," <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>
- [2] Bradford Barthel, "Decision Time: When does the 90-day investigation period begin?" (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2020/10/08/decision-time-when-does-the-90-day-investigation-period-begin/>), <https://bradfordbarthel.com/2020/10/08/decision-time-when-does-the-90-day-investigation-period-begin/>
- [3] Yrulegui & Roberts, "Understanding California Code of Regulations Section 10510: Filing Petitions and Answers in Workers' Compensation Cases" (<https://www.rjylaw.com/understanding-california-code-of-regulations-section-10510-filing-petitions-and-answers-in-workers-compensation-cases/>), <https://www.rjylaw.com/understanding-california-code-of-regulations-section-10510-filing-petitions-and-answers-in-workers-compensation-cases/>
- [4] Thomas F. Martin, "Workers' Compensation Penalties For Delayed Payments (Labor Code 5814)" (<https://thomasfmartin.com/workers-compensation-penalties-for-delayed-payments-labor-code-5814/>), <https://thomasfmartin.com/workers-compensation-penalties-for-delayed-payments-labor-code-5814/>
- [5] Cartwright Law, "Workers' Compensation 90-Day Rule: What You Need to Know" (<https://www.cartwrightlaw.com/blog/2022/june/workers-compensation-90-day-rule-what-you-need-t/>), <https://www.cartwrightlaw.com/blog/2022/june/workers-compensation-90-day-rule-what-you-need-t/>
- [6] California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 10510 (State of California Department of Industrial Relations) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10510.html>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10510.html>

- [7] P.I. Law, "How To Manage A Delayed California Workers Compensation Decision" (<https://www.pi.law/blog/how-to-manage-a-delayed-california-workers-compensation-decision/>), <https://www.pi.law/blog/how-to-manage-a-delayed-california-workers-compensation-decision/>
- [1] Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code Section 5814 - Penalties for Unreasonable Delay or Denial" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>), <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>
- [8] Boxer & Gerson Attorneys at Law, LLP, "The Penalty Box-Part One" (<https://www.boxerlaw.com/workerscompzone/the-penalty-box-part-one/>), <https://www.boxerlaw.com/workerscompzone/the-penalty-box-part-one/>
- [9] Pearlman, Brown & Wax, "When 'Active Defense' Becomes 'Bad Faith'" (<https://www.pbw-law.com/the-11000-mistake-when-active-defense-becomes-bad-faith/>), <https://www.pbw-law.com/the-11000-mistake-when-active-defense-becomes-bad-faith/>
- [10] California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 10421 (State of California Department of Industrial Relations) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10421.html>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10421.html>
- [11] California Workers' Compensation Institute, "Administrative Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code Section 5814.6" (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=424.pdf>), <https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=424.pdf>
- [12] Joe Pluta, "Penalties for Late Payment of Workers Comp Benefits" (<https://www.joepluta.net/blog/penalties-for-late-workers-comp-payment/>), <https://www.joepluta.net/blog/penalties-for-late-workers-comp-payment/>
- [13] California Department of Industrial Relations, "How to file a petition to reopen" (I&A Guide 11) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide11.pdf>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide11.pdf>
- [14] Burgis Law, "Workers' Compensation Claim Delays in California: Your Rights and Remedies" (<https://burgislaw.com/getting-the-runaround-from-the-workers-comp-insurance-carrier/>), <https://burgislaw.com/getting-the-runaround-from-the-workers-comp-insurance-carrier/>
- [15] Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code Section 4650 - Timing of Temporary Disability Payments" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74650-timing-of-temporary-disability-payments/>), <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74650-timing-of-temporary-disability-payments/>
- [3] Yrlegui & Roberts, "Understanding California Code of Regulations Section 10510: Filing Petitions and Answers in Workers' Compensation Cases" (<https://www.rjylaw.com/understanding-california-code-of-regulations-section-10510-filing-petitions-and-answers-in-workers-compensation-cases/>), <https://www.rjylaw.com/understanding-california-code-of-regulations-section-10510-filing-petitions-and-answers-in-workers-compensation-cases/>
- [16] California Department of Industrial Relations, "En banc decisions" (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_enbanc.htm), https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_enbanc.htm
- [17] Rezlaw, "California Statute of Limitations for Employment Law Claims" (<https://rezlaw.com/statute-limitations-employment-law-claims/>), <https://rezlaw.com/statute-limitations-employment-law-claims/>
- [18] Justia Law, "Ramirez v. WCAB - California Courts of Appeal Decisions" (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/2017/c078440.html>), <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/2017/c078440.html>
- [19] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Application for Adjudication of Claim" (Form DWC-CA 10232.1) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/eams/SampleFiles/Application%20for%20Adjudication%20of%20Claim.pdf>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/eams/SampleFiles/Application%20for%20Adjudication%20of%20Claim.pdf>
- [12] Friedman Law Offices, "Frivolous Penalty Petitions: A Sixty-Second Seminar in Workers' Compensation Claims Handling" (<https://www.friedmanlawoffices.com/2022/06/frivolous-penalty-petitions-a-sixty-second->

seminar-in-workers-compensation-claims-handling/),
<https://www.friedmanlawoffices.com/2022/06/frivolous-penalty-petitions-a-sixty-second-seminar-in-workers-compensation-claims-handling/>

[20] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Gregory Ortega v. Defendants" (Panel Decision 2024) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2024/Gregory-ORTEGA-ADJ10994258-ADJ18998346.pdf>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2024/Gregory-ORTEGA-ADJ10994258-ADJ18998346.pdf>

[21] California Department of Industrial Relations, "How to file an application for adjudication of claim" (I&A Guide 4) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide04.pdf>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide04.pdf>

[22] *Kauffman v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd.*, 273 Cal. App. 2d 829 (1969) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/2d/273/829.html>), <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/2d/273/829.html>

[11] California Workers' Compensation Institute, "Administrative Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code Section 5814.6" (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=424.pdf>), <https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=424.pdf>

[23] Judge O'Brien, "40.13.0 Compromise and Release Agreements" (https://judgeobrien.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1579%3A40-13-0-compromise-and-release-agreements&catid=20%3Aorbien&Itemid=101), https://judgeobrien.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1579%3A40-13-0-compromise-and-release-agreements&catid=20%3Aorbien&Itemid=101

[24] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Dee Anne Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services and One Beacon Insurance Co." (Panel Decision 2025) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Angelica-RAMIREZ-DE-ZARATE-ADJ18434613.pdf>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Angelica-RAMIREZ-DE-ZARATE-ADJ18434613.pdf>

[25] California Department of Industrial Relations, "CHSWC - SB 899 Topic Summary Report" (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/SB899summary.html>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/chswc/SB899summary.html>

[26] *State Comp. Ins. Fund. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.*, 18 Cal. 4th 1209 (1998) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/4th/18/1209.html>), <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/4th/18/1209.html>

[1] Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code Section 5814 - Penalties for Unreasonable Delay or Denial" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>), <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>

[27] Judge O'Brien, "40.13.0 Compromise and Release Agreements" (https://judgeobrien.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1579%3A40-13-0-compromise-and-release-agreements&catid=20%3Aorbien&Itemid=101), https://judgeobrien.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1579%3A40-13-0-compromise-and-release-agreements&catid=20%3Aorbien&Itemid=101

[28] California Workers' Compensation Institute, "5814.1 Regulations" (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=419.pdf>), <https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=419.pdf>

[4] Thomas F. Martin, "Workers' Compensation Penalties For Delayed Payments (Labor Code 5814)" (<https://thomasfmartin.com/workers-compensation-penalties-for-delayed-payments-labor-code-5814/>), <https://thomasfmartin.com/workers-compensation-penalties-for-delayed-payments-labor-code-5814/>

[29] WorkCompCentral, "SB 899 - A Detailed Review, Part 2: TD, Penalties, More" (<https://ww3.workcompcentral.com/columns/show/id/x130j04p672449uv48i32z>), <https://ww3.workcompcentral.com/columns/show/id/x130j04p672449uv48i32z>

[30] Employees First Labor Law, "Delayed Medical Treatment in Workers' Compensation | 2025 Guide" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/delayed-medical-treatment-in-workers-compensation-california/>), <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/delayed-medical-treatment-in-workers-compensation-california/>

- [31] CCMPT, "Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services" (<https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>), <https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>
- [32] California Department of Industrial Relations, "How to file a declaration of readiness to proceed" (I&A Guide 5) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide05.pdf>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/iwguides/IWGuide05.pdf>
- [1] James Sexton Law, "What To Do If Your Workers' Comp Claim Is Under Investigation" (<https://www.jamessextonlaw.com/blog/2025/september/what-to-do-if-your-workers-comp-claim-is-under-i/>), <https://www.jamessextonlaw.com/blog/2025/september/what-to-do-if-your-workers-comp-claim-is-under-i/>
- [8] Visionary Law Group, "Understanding Time Limits for Workers Compensation Appeals Process" (<https://visionarylawgroup.com/understanding-time-limits-for-workers-compensation-appeals-process/>), <https://visionarylawgroup.com/understanding-time-limits-for-workers-compensation-appeals-process/>
- [33] California Department of Industrial Relations, "DWCCAFForm10250_1.pdf" (Declaration of Readiness to Proceed) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/EAMS%20Forms/ADJ/DWCCAFForm10250_1.pdf), https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/EAMS%20Forms/ADJ/DWCCAFForm10250_1.pdf
- [34] California Workers' Compensation Institute, "State of California - Administrative Penalties" (<https://cwci.org/document.php?file=410.pdf>), <https://cwci.org/document.php?file=410.pdf>
- [1] Bradford Barthel, "Rock and a Hard Place - Labor Code Section 5814.5" (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2018/12/06/rock-and-a-hard-place-labor-code-%C2%A7-5814-5/>), <https://bradfordbarthel.com/2018/12/06/rock-and-a-hard-place-labor-code-%C2%A7-5814-5/>
- [35] California Department of Industrial Relations, "DWC Independent Bill Review (IBR)" (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/ibr.htm>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/ibr.htm>
- [28] Yrulegui & Roberts, "WCAB Rejects Bad Faith Sanctions in Interpreter Fee Dispute" (<https://www.rjylaw.com/good-news-for-claims-wcab-rejects-bad-faith-sanctions-in-interpreter-fee-dispute/>), <https://www.rjylaw.com/good-news-for-claims-wcab-rejects-bad-faith-sanctions-in-interpreter-fee-dispute/>
- [7] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Organization and Functions" (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/about_wcabf.htm), https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/about_wcabf.htm
- [36] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Request for Independent Bill Review" (Form IBR-1) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwcpropregs/IBR/FormIBR_1.pdf), https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwcpropregs/IBR/FormIBR_1.pdf
- [37] Burgis Law, "Penalty Petitions Attorneys Can File in a Workers' Comp Case" (<https://burgislaw.com/penalties-attorneys-can-file-in-a-workers-comp-case/>), <https://burgislaw.com/penalties-attorneys-can-file-in-a-workers-comp-case/>
- [38] Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd., 4 Cal. 3d 223 (1971) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/4/223.html>), <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/4/223.html>
- [39] WorkCompCentral Academy, "WCAB Imposes 5814 Penalties and Attorney Fees for Following Unreasonable UR Determination" (<https://www.workcompacademy.com/2014/05/wcab-imposes-5814-penalties-and-attorney-fees-for-following-unreasonable-ur-determination/>), <https://www.workcompacademy.com/2014/05/wcab-imposes-5814-penalties-and-attorney-fees-for-following-unreasonable-ur-determination/>
- [40] Altman, Blitstein & Blinder, "UR/IMR" (<http://altmanlaw.com/kahns-comments-on-the-law/ur-imr/>), <http://altmanlaw.com/kahns-comments-on-the-law/ur-imr/>
- [41] WorkCompCentral, "Cases - Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd." (https://www.workcompcentral.com/law/cases?sort=case_date-asc&rows=20&letter=K), https://www.workcompcentral.com/law/cases?sort=case_date-asc&rows=20&letter=K
- [42] CCMPT, "Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services" (<https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>), <https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>

- [43] Judge O'Brien, "40.1.1 Attorney Fees" (https://judgeobrien.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1482%3A40-1-1-attorney-fees&catid=20%3Aorbien&Itemid=101), https://judgeobrien.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1482%3A40-1-1-attorney-fees&catid=20%3Aorbien&Itemid=101
- [9] Pearlman, Brown & Wax, "When 'Active Defense' Becomes 'Bad Faith'" (<https://www.pbw-law.com/the-11000-mistake-when-active-defense-becomes-bad-faith/>), <https://www.pbw-law.com/the-11000-mistake-when-active-defense-becomes-bad-faith/>
- [44] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Workers' Compensation Appeals Board - Significant Panel Decisions" (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_panel.htm), https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_panel.htm
- [45] DW Independent Bill Review, "Request for Independent Bill Review" (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwcpropregs/IBR/FormIBR_1.pdf), https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwcpropregs/IBR/FormIBR_1.pdf
- [46] American Medical Association, "When Health Plans Delay and Deny, They Must Say Why" (<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/when-health-plans-delay-and-deny-they-must-say-why>), <https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/when-health-plans-delay-and-deny-they-must-say-why>
- [47] Bradford Barthel, "Decision Time: When does the 90-day investigation period begin?" (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2020/10/08/decision-time-when-does-the-90-day-investigation-period-begin/>), <https://bradfordbarthel.com/2020/10/08/decision-time-when-does-the-90-day-investigation-period-begin/>
- [48] California Workers' Compensation Institute, "State of California - Administrative Penalties" (<https://cwci.org/document.php?file=410.pdf>), <https://cwci.org/document.php?file=410.pdf>
- [26] State Comp. Ins. Fund. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 18 Cal. 4th 1209 (1998) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/4th/18/1209.html>), <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/4th/18/1209.html>
- [4] California Labor Code Section 5814 Comprehensive Guide (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>), <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>
- [49] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Olisaemeka Eze v. Defendant" (Panel Decision 2025) (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Olisaemeka-EZE-ADJ15619594.pdf>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Olisaemeka-EZE-ADJ15619594.pdf>
- [50] DaisyBill, "SCIF: Inept Utilization Review Delays Care for Injured Worker" (<https://blog.daisybill.com/scif-utilization-review>), <https://blog.daisybill.com/scif-utilization-review>
- [1] Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code Section 5814 - Penalties for Unreasonable Delay or Denial" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>), <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>
- [42] Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services, Case Citation and Summary (<https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>), <https://ccmpt.com/ramirez-v-drive-financial-services/>
- [51] Visionary Law Group, "Understanding Time Limits for Workers Compensation Appeals Process" (<https://visionarylawgroup.com/understanding-time-limits-for-workers-compensation-appeals-process/>), <https://visionarylawgroup.com/understanding-time-limits-for-workers-compensation-appeals-process/>
- [12] Joe Pluta, "Penalties for Late Payment of Workers Comp Benefits" (<https://www.joepluta.net/blog/penalties-for-late-workers-comp-payment/>), <https://www.joepluta.net/blog/penalties-for-late-workers-comp-payment/>

- [52] Law Offices of McCullough & Leboff, "When Does Delayed Treatment Constitute Negligence?" (<https://flafirm.com/resources/blog/when-does-delayed-treatment-constitute-negligence/>), <https://flafirm.com/resources/blog/when-does-delayed-treatment-constitute-negligence/>
- [53] California Department of Industrial Relations, "How is my case resolved" (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/CaseResolved.htm>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/CaseResolved.htm>
- [1] Employees First Labor Law, "Labor Code Section 5814 - Penalties for Unreasonable Delay or Denial" (<https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>), <https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A75814-penalties-for-unreasonable-delay-or-denial/>
- [54] American Medical Association, "When Health Plans Delay and Deny, They Must Say Why" (<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/when-health-plans-delay-and-deny-they-must-say-why>), <https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/when-health-plans-delay-and-deny-they-must-say-why>
- [2] Bradford Barthel, "Decision Time: When does the 90-day investigation period begin?" (<https://bradfordbarthel.com/2020/10/08/decision-time-when-does-the-90-day-investigation-period-begin/>), <https://bradfordbarthel.com/2020/10/08/decision-time-when-does-the-90-day-investigation-period-begin/>
- [34] California Workers' Compensation Institute, "State of California - Administrative Penalties" (<https://cwci.org/document.php?file=410.pdf>), <https://cwci.org/document.php?file=410.pdf>
- [55] California Lawyers Association, "The Art of Avoiding Surprises: A Practitioner's Guide to Substantial Evidence" (<https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/the-art-of-avoiding-surprises-a-practitioners-guide-to-substantial-evidence-and-the-wcabs-power-to-develop-the-record/>), <https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/the-art-of-avoiding-surprises-a-practitioners-guide-to-substantial-evidence-and-the-wcabs-power-to-develop-the-record/>
- [56] California Department of Industrial Relations, "If my claim was accepted" (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MyClaimWasAccepted.htm>), <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MyClaimWasAccepted.htm>
- [37] Burgis Law, "Penalty Petitions Attorneys Can File in a Workers' Comp Case" (<https://burgislaw.com/penalties-attorneys-can-file-in-a-workers-comp-case/>), <https://burgislaw.com/penalties-attorneys-can-file-in-a-workers-comp-case/>
- [36] California Department of Industrial Relations, "Workers' Compensation Appeals Board - Panel Decisions" (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_panel.htm), https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_panel.htm
- [4] Thomas F. Martin, "Workers' Compensation Penalties For Delayed Payments (Labor Code 5814)" (<https://thomasfmartin.com/workers-compensation-penalties-for-delayed-payments-labor-code-5814/>), <https://thomasfmartin.com/workers-compensation-penalties-for-delayed-payments-labor-code-5814/>
- [57] Yrulegui & Roberts, "WCAB Panel Decision Emphasizes Vocational Experts' Proper Role" (<https://www.rjylaw.com/wcab-panel-decision-emphasizes-vocational-experts-proper-role-and-medical-support-in-apportionment/>), <https://www.rjylaw.com/wcab-panel-decision-emphasizes-vocational-experts-proper-role-and-medical-support-in-apportionment/>
- [58] Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 23 Cal. 3d 815 (1978) (<https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/23/815.html>), <https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/23/815.html>
- [59] DaisyBill, "How USPS Postmark Update Affects Workers' Comp Bill" (<https://blog.daisybill.com/usps-postmark-news-comp-billing>), <https://blog.daisybill.com/usps-postmark-news-comp-billing>
- [16] California Department of Industrial Relations, "En banc decisions" (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_enbanc.htm), https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_enbanc.htm
- [28] California Workers' Compensation Institute, "5814.1 Regulations" (<https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=419.pdf>), <https://www.cwci.org/document.php?file=419.pdf>