

# SAFETY OFFICER ATTORNEYS NEWSLETTER™

WINTER 2011 / WWW.SAFETYOFFICERATTORNEYS.COM

LAW OFFICES OF SCOTT A. O'MARA ★ BOBBITT, PINCKARD & FIELDS, A.P.C.

1-800-LAW-1199

## THE PRESUMPTIONS OF WORK-RELATED INJURY SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO ALL SAFETY WORKERS

by SCOTT A. O'MARA

In the mid-1930s, California legislators recognized that safety employees faced a unique risk of harm through their work as peace officers and firefighters. This recognition was reflected in legislative changes establishing various presumptions of work-related injury for specific safety members. The initial legislation — directed towards hernias — stated that if a peace officer or firefighter developed or manifested a hernia during their period of service as a peace officer or firefighter, it was presumed to be job-related.

In 1939, the presumption of work-related injury was extended to heart trouble and pneumonia for firefighters of the State Division of Forestry. Another legislative change occurred that same year with the enactment of Labor Code §3212.5, which stated that for certain police departments heart trouble and pneumonia would be considered job-related. This section of the Labor Code was expanded in 1943 to include officers of the California Highway Patrol, and again in 1949 to include state fish and game wardens.

Additional changes occurred in 1955 for specific members of the Sheriff's Office, and in 1957 tuberculosis was added as a new disease presumption for specific peace officers. Further changes occurred in 1959, 1961, 1971 and 1972, and have continued up to the present, including the William

Dallas Jones Cancer Presumption Act of 2010, which expanded the time parameters allowed for application of the cancer presumption.

---

*However, while these legislative enactments reflect the public policy of providing additional compensation benefits for certain public employees . . . they unfortunately exclude other significant public employees performing similar, equally hazardous services.*

---

However, while these legislative enactments reflect the public policy of providing additional compensation benefits for certain public employees — in recognition of the vital and hazardous service they provide to the public — by easing the burden of proof to establish job-related causation of injury, they unfortunately exclude other significant public employees performing similar, equally hazardous services.

As the reader is aware, in the past two decades, situations with grave consequences for students, teachers and parents have occurred on school campuses, ranging from multiple murders and shootings to gang activity. The work of the school police — whether it be at a four-year college, two-year college, high school or middle school — puts them in situations and at events which are occupationally demanding from both the aspect of physical activities (such as engaging in apprehension, detention and physical

methods of arrest) and the aspect of emotional challenges (such as dealing with shootings, gangs and unhappy parents).

In addition to the expanded risks to campus officers, there has been a dramatic shift in the dangers to which county probation officers are exposed in their work. For example, it is common now for these officers to be continually exposed to felons, presenting situations of high risk to both the officers and the public.

In conclusion, the demands of all these safety professionals place them at risk through routine exposure to the hazards and stress inherent in their work settings. Yet, under the present California law, county probation officers, city school police, community college police and California state university police do not have the full protection that is afforded the rest of our safety groups. *The lack of protection for these excluded safety groups needs to be rectified through legislative actions recognizing the extraordinary risks and hazards that all public safety officers face.* This protection should not be limited to just a select number of groups. Moreover, once rectified, the needed legislative changes should be applied retroactively to pending cases.

---

*The lack of protection for these excluded safety groups needs to be rectified through legislative actions recognizing the extraordinary risks and hazards that all public safety officers face.*

---

The following is derived from case law defining the purpose behind the enactment of the various presumptions, the legislative history, and the expressed frustration of the courts due to the disparity in application of the presumptions as they have evolved legislatively.

The foremost purpose of the statutory presumptions is to provide additional compensation benefits to certain public employees who provide vital and hazardous services by easing the burden of proof of industrial causation. The presumption is a reflection of public policy, implemented by shifting the burden of proof in an industrial injury case. (Zipton v. WCAB (1990) 55 Cal. Comp. Cases 78.)

---

*The foremost purpose of the statutory presumptions is to provide additional compensation benefits to certain public employees who provide vital and hazardous services by easing the burden of proof of industrial causation.*

---

Commentators have suggested that the distinctions appearing in the series of legislative enactments reflect only the Legislature's response to recurring needs by particular groups. As noted in the case of Rowland Saal in 1975 (Saal v. WCAB, 40 Cal. Comp. Cases 456):

"Beyond question, these statutes show a purpose of the Legislature to provide additional benefits for certain public employees whose services are both vital to the public interests and hazardous. (Citations)

"All of the persons benefitted are in the general fields of law enforcement or firefighting, but by no means are all public employees in that field included. A casual review of the classes of peace officers listed in Penal Code Sections 830.1 through 830.12 indicates that, depending on how the respective classifications in the Penal and Labor Codes are interpreted, there are somewhere between 26 and 34 kinds of peace officers who are not benefitted at all by any of the sections in the 3212-3213 series."

---

*"All of the persons benefitted are in the general fields of law enforcement or firefighting, but by no means are all public employees in that field included."*

---

"It has been said that the provisions with respect to heart trouble are a recognition that such disease is caused or aggravated by stressful work. (Citations omitted). But the correlation between occupational stress and heart trouble does not explain why fish and game wardens and University of California campus police have the benefit of the non-attribution rule, while correctional officers in the state prisons do not."\*

*\*In 2001, the law changed to give state correctional officers the heart presumption, etc. In 2004, Labor Code §4663(e) provided non-attribution to all presumptions.*

---

*"There is even greater difficulty in understanding why the special benefits for hernia, pneumonia and tuberculosis are granted to some employees and not to others."*

---

"There is even greater difficulty in understanding why the special benefits for hernia, pneumonia and tuberculosis are granted to some employees and not to others."

The Saal case in 1975 underscored the inequity with respect to the heart presumption. Saal was a California State University police officer. He suffered an acute heart attack and sustained permanent disability of 73%. However, Saal was awarded a disability rating of only 7 1/4% based on medical evidence that the stress of his job played only a small role in accelerating his heart disease, and, as a member of the California State University police department he was not entitled to the statutory presumption for heart trouble because the pertinent statute specifically extended the presumption only to the University of California police — not the California State University police.

The attached legislative history provides an overview of the Labor Code provisions focusing primarily on the presumptions affecting public safety employees noted on the accompanying chart.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SAFETY OFFICER ATTORNEYS  
NEWSLETTER™**

*is written by*

**SCOTT A. O'MARA**

*and published periodically by:*

**LAW OFFICES OF  
SCOTT A. O'MARA**

and

**BOBBITT, PINCKARD  
& FIELDS, A.P.C.**

[WWW.SAFETYOFFICERATTORNEYS.COM](http://WWW.SAFETYOFFICERATTORNEYS.COM)

**1-800-LAW-1199**

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE**

*Making a false or fraudulent Workers' Compensation claim is a felony subject to up to 5 years in prison or a fine of up to \$50,000 or double the value of the fraud, whichever is greater, or by both imprisonment and fine.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The legislative history from the enactment of Labor Code section 3212 in 1935 through the 1972 enactment of Labor Code section 3212.3 is excerpted from the Saal case described above.

The special provisions of sections 3212-3213 have a long statutory background. Chapter 423 of the Statutes of 1935 amended the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1917 to provide that hernia, developing or manifesting itself during service as a member of certain police or fire departments, was presumed to arise out of and in the course of employment. This provision was carried forward in Section 3212 [Deering's] of the Labor Code, adopted in 1937. (Stats. 1937, ch. 90, p. 266, § 3212.)

In 1939 the presumption in section 3212 was extended to "heart trouble" and pneumonia for firefighting members of the State Division of Forestry. (Stats. 1939, ch. 256, p. 1511, § 1.)

Also in 1939 the Legislature enacted section 3212.5 creating a presumption with respect to heart trouble and pneumonia for members of the police department of a city or municipality, who had served five years or more in such capacities. (Stats. 1939, ch. 627, p. 2047, § 1.)

In 1943 section 3212.5 was amended to apply to members of the State Highway Patrol. (Stats. 1943, ch. 255, p. 1168, § 1.)

In 1949 section 3212 was extended to State Fish and Game Wardens. (Stats. 1949, ch. 730, p. 1347, §1.)

1955 amendments extended section 3212 and section 3212.5 to certain members of the sheriff's office. (Stats. 1955, ch. 797, p. 1398, §§ 1, 2.)

In 1957 the Legislature enacted section 3212.6 creating a presumption with respect to tuberculosis for certain city and county police and members of the sheriff's office. (Stats. 1957, ch. 295, p. 939, § 1.)

In 1959 sections 3212 and 3212.5 were amended by the addition of the following language: "Such hernia, heart trouble or pneumonia so developing or manifesting itself in such cases shall in no case be attributed to any disease existing prior to such development or manifestation." (Stats. 1959, ch. 758, p. 2744, §§ 1, 2.)

Also in 1959 the Legislature enacted section 3212.2 creating a presumption with respect to heart trouble for custodial officers and employees of the Department of Corrections, the Youth Authority and the Atascadero State Hospital. (Stats. 1959, ch. 1155, p. 3247, § 1.)

In 1961 section 3212.7 was enacted, giving peace officers in the State Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement and the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation a presumption with respect to heart trouble, hernia, pneumonia and tuberculosis, and further providing that such diseases shall in no case be attributed to pre-existing disease. (Stats. 1961, ch. 619, p. 1777, § 1.)

In 1971 sections 3212, 3212.5, and 3212.6 were extended to include District Attorneys' investigators. (Stats. 1971, ch. 562, p. 1076, §§ 1, 2, 3.)

Also in 1971 the Legislature enacted section 3213, which created a presumption with respect to heart trouble and pneumonia applicable to “a member of the University of California Police Department who has graduated from an academy certified by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training when he and all members of the campus department of which he is a member have graduated from such an academy . . .” “Campus” is defined to “include any campus or other installation maintained under the jurisdiction of the Regents of the University of California.” This section also prohibited attribution to pre-existing disease. (Stats. 1971, ch. 918, p. 1801, § 1.)

Another 1972 statute added section 3212.4 which created a presumption with respect to heart trouble, hernia and pneumonia for members of University of California campus fire departments, and forbade attributing any such condition to pre-existing disease. (Stats. 1972, ch. 1149, p. 2243, § 1.)

---

Also in 1972 section 3212.3 was enacted, giving members of the California State Police the benefit of a presumption with respect to heart trouble and pneumonia, as well as non-attribution to pre-existing disease. (Stats. 1972, ch. 1360, p. 2709, § 1.)

Since 1975 the various provisions for the presumptions have been amended. Most notably:

In 1975, Labor Code section 3212 was amended to limit the presumption to injuries which manifest within a five-year period from the last day actually worked.

In 1976, sections 3212.2, 3212.3, 3212.4, 3212.5, 3212.6, 3212.7, 3212.13 were similarly emended to extend the presumption to a member following termination of service for a period of three calendar months or each full year of requisite service but not to exceed 60 months, commencing with the last date actually worked.

In 1999, section 3212.1, the cancer presumption, was amended shifting the burden of proof.

Subsequently, additional enactments added further presumptions:

In 2000, Labor Code section 3212.8 was added providing a presumption for meningitis.

In 2001, section 3212.8 was amended changing all references to hepatitis to refer to blood borne infections disease.

Also added in 2001 were sections 3212.2, the presumption of injury for lower back impairment for certain law enforcement employees (duty belt presumption); and 3212.10, providing heart and other presumptions for state correctional officers.

In 2002, section 3212.85 was enacted providing a presumption for death or illness from exposure to biochemical substances.

In 2010, section 3212.1 was amended to change the extended cancer presumption following termination of service from up to 60 months to up to 120 months, known as the William Dallas Jones Cancer Presumption Act of 2010.