February 2011 Vol. 48, No. 3

ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Workers' Compensation Law

The newsletter of the Illinois State Bar Association's Section on Workers' Compensation Law

Editor's notes

By Richard D. Hannigan of Hannigan and Botha

In our last newsletter I summarized the Senate and House Committee hearings on Workers' Compensation Reform. Since then much has transpired in Springfield. This special edition of our newsletter is to help you understand what has transpired and to help you determine what you may or may not want to do in dealing with the upcoming proposed changes in the Workers' Compensation Act.

Rita E. Mulcahy of Bryce Downey & Lenkov LLC has provided an interesting article on the *Cox v. IWCC* traveling employee case.

The opinions expressed in this newsletter are those of the editor/author and not the Illinois State Bar Association or anyone affiliated with the Illinois State Bar Association. I thank the co-editors for their help in editing the editor's comments. ■

Workers' Compensation Reform in the December 2010 veto session

By Richard D. Hannigan of Hannigan and Botha

It would be best to retell these facts going from the present time and then back to our last Newsletter when I advised you of what transpired at the Senate and House Committee meetings on Workers' Compensation Reform.

On January 12, 2011 the Senate and the House elected the Speaker of the House, the minority leader and the President of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate. I was present during the election conducted in the Senate and the acceptance speech by President John J. Cullerton and minority leader Christine Radogno. President Cullerton spoke of the many obstacles that this State has faced from the moment of his election two years ago when he had to preside over the impeachment of the then governor and then deal with the economic crisis in the State of Illinois. He spoke of the tax increase and the accomplishments of the veto session and added, "Workers' compensation reform still remains a top priority." In her acceptance speech minority leader Radogno indicated that, "I look forward to working with President Cullerton on workers' compensation reform." I have been advised that House Speaker Michael Madigan and Representative Cross expressed the same sentiments regarding workers' compensation reform.

On January 11, 2011 at approximately 7:00 p.m. President John Cullerton indicated that the issue of workers' compensation reform would be dealt with in the next session. No bill was presented to the House or the Senate during this veto session. However numerous bills and proposals were floated by all of the various interest groups. SB 1066 passed out of the House executive Committee and could have been called to a vote by the House at anytime up until the end of the veto session.

Just before Christmas and prior to the January 4, 2011 veto session numerous bills were

Continued on page 2

INSIDE

If you're getting this newsletter by postal mail and would prefer electronic delivery, just send an e-mail to Ann Boucher at aboucher@isba.org

Workers' Compensation Reform in the December 2010 veto session

Continued from page 1

drafted by the House with recommendations from the business interests and with input from most of the other interested parties. State representative John Bradley who was the democrat co chair and state representative Dan Brady who was the Republican co-chair tried to shepherd a bill through the House so that it would get to the Senate floor prior to the end of the veto session.

The vehicle that was used was prior Senate Bill 1066 that had passed down into the House. At no point in time, during the veto session, did President John J. Cullerton and the Senate present a bill to the executive committee in the Senate. Instead all of the work was done in the House of Representatives. Some of the proposed drafts totally eliminated the injured worker's right to choose a physician, included alternative dispute resolution, defined accident to include the limitation that the injury must be either the "primary cause" or "primary factor," reduced the Medical Fee Schedule rolling it back 15 percent and including implants. It also reduced the GEO zips from 29 to 4. There was a limitation on wage loss differentials limiting the wage loss benefits to age 67 or five years whichever is longer. The initial draft allowed only the employer to come in for a reduction in the wage loss deferential based upon a change in earning power and required the employee to sign an authorization allowing the respondent to obtain the current employer's payroll records on a quarterly basis. That was later changed to allowing both the employer and employee to come in and petition for either an increase or decrease in the wage loss deferential but limited payments through age 67 or five years whichever was longer. There was binding utilization review which would be admissible without foundation. In the end the amendment allowed for admissibility without a foundation and created a rebuttal presumption that the treatment recommended or denied in a utilization review was sufficient on its face to bind the arbitrator to the utilization review recommendations. This becomes problematic because it creates a greater burden of proof for the injured worker than the current burden which is "by a preponderance of the evidence." The injured worker always has the burden of proving that treatment is reasonable, necessary and related and when his board certified physician who has treated him testifies to the appropriateness of future treatment and he has met his burden of proof, what is it that the injured worker must do when the employer brings in a document that the arbitrator must presume has rebutted the petitioner's evidence in chief. The House refused to consider giving utilization review evidence "equal weight" or limit the peer review to physicians within the State of Illinois. The last draft of Senate Bill 1066 eliminated the injured worker's first choice of physician and required the injured worker to treat with the employer's physician and if dissatisfied he could seek one further physician. The proposed bill limited the amount of penalties on uninsured employers and imposed Rule 137 penalties on injured workers and employers whose cases were not well grounded in fact or law. There was a section that required reporting to the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission any gratuities or anything of value which was tangible or intangible given by attorneys to anyone but was void as to any penalty or method of reporting. There was an amendment that basically dealt with the Menard's correctional guard situation creating an advisory Board in CMS to recommend the best practices for administering state workers' compensation cases, required the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission to look into a system regarding paperless billing by medical providers, allowed the three panel Commissioners to issue stop work orders for uninsured employees but lowered the fine to $2,500 rather than $10,000. There was initial language submitted by the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission to deal with the *Keating* case which indicated that uninsured employers could be sued in the circuit court only after a finding by the Commission that the employer was uninsured. It therefore allowed the employer the defense of proving that he was unknowingly uninsured and therefore he would avoid the presumption of negligence in the circuit court. It codified the case law on intoxication but went further by creating a presumption that in the event an injured worker refuses to take a blood test or breathalyzer he would be presumably intoxicated and that would be a defense to the workers' compensation claim. It would be an absolute bar. The amendment would also require arbitrators to be attorneys, require certification of all documents filed at the Commission and would impose attorney's fees and costs. Costs would be those costs incurred by your opponent as well as the costs incurred by the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission. It beefed up the fraud provisions and created an insurance oversight provision. At one point AMA guidelines were submitted and were to be "considered" by the Commission.

I was in Springfield from January 5, 2011 through the evening of January 7, 2011. I returned on the morning of Sunday January 9, 2011, when the House was called back into session and remained until the evening of January 12, 2011. The Illinois State Bar Association and Jim Covington were very much involved in monitoring everything that transpired. The ISBA "list-serve" kept the council section members in the loop and the council section members were very much involved and productive in their responses.

What probably surprised the Legislature and business representatives the most was the well-coordinated efforts of Kim Presbrey, David Menchetti, Charles Haskins, the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association, their lobbyist Jim Collins, the numerous physicians, their lobbyist, the number of medical providers as well as the number of lawyers who descended upon Springfield in opposition of this bill. When the trial lawyers sent out a request for "boots on the ground," the response was immediate and lawyers from all over the State were in Springfield that Sunday morning and most remained until the end of the session.

It should be pointed out that the respondent bar is basically handcuffed from participating in this process. It is their own clients that wish to change the Act to reduce the employer's costs. To speak out against this and against your client would be economic suicide and therefore they could only sit on the sidelines and monitor the situation.

As stated, on January 7 and 8 the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association called upon every attorney to descend upon Springfield on Sunday, January 9. There were over 100 lawyers present on Sunday and they marched in mass to the capitol building, spread out and

spoke about the bill with any state representative who would listen and when the House executive committee voted on whether to allow Senate Bill 1066 to proceed to a vote both doctors and lawyers alike testified against many amendments to the bill. We were Springfield's economic stimulus package.

Please keep in mind that the bill was presented as a whole and not as parts. Therefore it was either an up or down vote to present that bill to the House floor for a vote. In what house representative Burke stated was the longest executive committee hearing on a bill it passed out of the executive committee with an 8 to 3 vote.

State Representative John Bradley testified before the executive committee that he worked very hard on this bill from Christmas to New Year's and that even though it wasn't a perfect bill he felt that it was better than no bill at all. Hours later when he knew that he did not have the votes to pass the bill on the floor of the house he changed his opinion and indicated that he would rather get the bill "right" than have a bad bill. My observation is that there was a great deal of difficulty in Representative Bradley dealing with the trial lawyers. He seemed to move with ease in working with business. However I was not personally invited to the numerous close door meetings with Representative Bradley and only had the opportunity to meet with him once in his office, that being on January 5, 2011.

Whether you are for or against change please understand that change is coming. The degree of change is not only in the hands of the legislatures but is also in the hands of the people who practice at the Commission on a regular basis, the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission, labor, management and the citizens of the State of Illinois. If you have opposition to any proposed bills in the future make sure it is not silent opposition. If you believe strongly in what business is doing let them know. If you believe strongly in what the Illinois State Bar Association, Labor and the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association is doing let them know.

In the end the legislature wants to create a friendly work environment in the State of Illinois. They fear losing business in the State and they want to attract new business to the State. That is something certainly all the parties can agree too. The issue becomes whether or not business overreaches so that they have created a disposable work force in that injured workers' will not be able to obtain fair and reasonable treatment, will be terminated and a new employee picked out of the ranks of the unemployed will fill his spot. Yet we certainly do not want a State that unjustly enriches an injured worker or allows for treatment that isn't reasonable or necessary. ■

Workers' Compensation Law

Published at least four times per year.

Annual subscription rate for ISBA members: $20.

To subscribe, visit www.isba.org or call 217-525-1760

Office
Illinois Bar Center
424 S. Second Street
Springfield, IL 62701
Phones: 217-525-1760 OR 800-252-8908
www.isba.org

Why don't we simply abolish the Workers' Compensation Act?

By Richard D. Hannigan of Hannigan and Botha

What did not make it out of the House Executive Committee on January 10 was an amended workers' compensation bill that included the definition of accident, but what was proposed and likely can be seen in this legislative session is an amendment that would relate to causation and limit liability to an injury that is a "primary factor" in the cause of the injury. The following was proposed: "The term injury in this Act is hereby defined to be an injury which arises out of and in the course of employment. An injury by accident is compensable only if the accident was the primary factor in causing both the resulting medical condition and disability. The primary factor is defined to be the major contributory factor, in relation to other factors, causing both the resulting medical condition and disability. Injuries shall include the aggravation of a pre-existing condition by an accident arising out of and in the course of the employment, but only for so long as the aggravation of the pre existing condition continues to be the primary factor causing the disability.

(1) An injury is deemed to arise out of and in the course of the employment only if;
   (a) it is reasonably apparent, upon consideration of all circumstances, that the accident is the primary factor in causing in the injury;
   (b) it does not come from a hazard or risk unrelated to the employment to which employees would have been equally exposed outside of the employment.

(2) An injury resulting directly or indirectly from idiopathic causes is not compensable.

(3) Any condition or impairment of health of an employee employed as a suffered by a firefighter, paramedic or EMT which results directly or indirectly from any bloodborne pathogen, lung or respiratory disease or condition, heart or vascular disease or condition, hypertension, hernia, hearing loss, tuberculosis or cancer resulting in any disability to the employee shall be rebuttably presumed not to arise out of and in the course of the employment unless the accident is the primary factor in causing the resulting medical condition." (This would repeal Section 6(f) of the Act). "Primary factor" would also apply to repetitive trauma cases.

Utilization reviews would be admissible without foundation and would create a rebuttable presumption that the utilization review is correct and if the employee's physician did not submit to the utilization review process the physician would not be paid and therefore, treatment would not be rendered. One must wonder whether or not that employee used up his only choice and will never be able to obtain treatment for his injury.

Those are but two proposed changes to the Workers' Compensation Act. What has been lost upon the Legislature is the fact that this Workers' Compensation Act was born out of an industrial revolution almost 100 years ago. Back then every employer had contributory negligence as a defense. If the employee was the least bit contributorily negligent in the cause of his injury, that employee would receive nothing. If in fact the employer's negligence was the sole cause of the injured worker's disability a jury was not limited in the amount of money that could be awarded that injured employee. Labor and business got together, as they did in every State, and created remedial legislation commonly referred to as "workers compensation." The employer received the benefit of caps on payment for disability and the employee's negligence was not considered. The standard was whether or not the injury arose out of and in the course of his employment.

State Representative John Bradley, who co chaired the Committee on Workers' Compensation Reform, testified that it is not his intent to limit the caps on an injured worker's right to compensation. And this is true. They did not reduce the permanent partial disability rates. They did not reduce the schedule for disability but instead he proposed changes that eliminated liability altogether. You have read what transpired down in Springfield and are left to your own conclusion as to how this affects the injured workers in the State of Illinois as well as the obligations and liabilities of insurance companies. It is my opinion that if these amendments to the Act ("primary factor" and utilization review) are implemented, what will be created in the State of Illinois is a disposable workforce. Should an employee be injured on the job, he must then go to the employer's physician. Should the employer's physician become careless and prescribe treatment, the insurance company is free to obtain a utilization review akin to a get-out-of-jail-free card. He will be denied his treatment, unable to work and terminated. That employer may then enter the room of the unemployed and pull out the next employee leaving the injured worker to fend for himself and devastating that family.

It must also be noted that the Illinois Chamber of Commerce is proposing changes which are more radical than those introduced in December. The intent of the Act was to place the burden of treating the injured worker on the employer, not the employee or the State. With the proposed changes, the employee will have a greater burden of proving his injury than if he were proceeding on a tort theory in the circuit court. If the employee is struck by a cart at work and he is a diabetic who does not heal, the primary cause of his not healing will be his diabetes. The thought that an employer takes his employee as he finds him will be legislatively stricken from the case law. If that same employee was making a delivery at another factory and was struck by the cart he and his spouse would at least have a lesser burden of proving his injury and sequalae were the result of the second employer's negligence and he will be compensated for pain and suffering, loss of consortium, disability both temporary and permanent and loss of earning capacity.

I would rather see the Legislature abolish the Workers' Compensation Act and I'll take my chances with a jury. Let the jury reduce the award by the amount of comparative negligence. At least with the tort law we would have a level playing field.

Anecdotally we can all come up with cases that approach the absurd from both sides of the aisle. Some awards are to high and some to low. Labor, the trial lawyers and medical providers are more than willing to meet the business interests more than half way. The pendulum seems to be moving way back to an opposite extreme. Let's just try to nail it in the middle.

I have represented employers and employees over my 37 years at the Commission. Going through different administrations

I have seen very conservative and liberal Commissions. The Act itself is fair but should be fine tuned. There is no need to throw the baby out with the bath water. The fee schedule should be rolled back but not to the point where good highly qualified physicians refuse to treat the injured workers. Implants and pharmaceuticals should be considered in the fee schedule. Business presented an all on nothing at all environment and lost but lives to fight another day. They walked away from minimum savings on the Fee Schedule and implants of a projected $200 to $300 million. That does not include what they would save based upon a change in the GEO zips and the limitations on 8(d)1 awards. My suggestion is that the Legislature take little steps and implement those changes that the doctors, labor, business and the trial lawyers have agreed upon. Once we know what the savings are we can better measure what the cost of doing business is against other states and what changes are needed to make Illinois a State that employers want to come to. Since the Chamber of Commerce made it perfectly clear that they will always be submitting new bills, there is no need to do it all their way all at once. Illinois Chamber President Doug Whitley testified in the House Executive Committee. He confirmed the Chamber's support of John Bradley's bill but clearly indicated that the changes were only a good start towards reform. He testified that, even if the bill passed, the Chamber would be back next session to introduce key issues that were not included and what they deemed critical to meaningful reform such as addressing Illinois' low causation threshold and the need for AMA guidelines to bring more objectivity to disability ratings.

Finally, what was missing in Springfield during the veto session were the insurance companies. They handle more than 80 percent of the injuries in the State. Why weren't they heard? They did testify at the public hearings around the State. Also, there was a total lack of any proof that any of the savings from any changes in the Act would trickle down to the employer. No one could answer the question as to why premiums have risen drastically when the ranks of the employed have been dramatically reduced as well as the great reduction in the number of injured employees. Just wondering. ■

Jeffrey Cox v. The Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission

By Rita E. Mulcahy of Bryce Downey & Lenkov LLC

Are traveling employees protected from the "personal deviation" defense?

On December 20, 2010, the Appellate Court of the First District of Illinois reversed the unanimous decision of the Illinois Workers Compensation Commission ("IWCC"), which had been confirmed upon judicial review by the Circuit Court of Cook County, to deny benefits to a worker who was injured in a car accident while returning to his route home from a stop at his personal bank to withdraw money. *Cox v. The Illinois Workers' Comp. Comm'n*, 1-09-25000WC (2010). In reversing the lower court's opinion that the claimant's injury did not arise out of and in the course of his employment, the Appellate Court focuses on the specific rules applicable to the case of a traveling employee, as further refined by the fact that the traveling employee's transportation was provided by his employer.

In *Cox*, the claimant was employed by Berger Excavating Contractors ("Berger") as a foreman of a six man crew that was assigned to work at job sites located away from Berger's premises. The claimant was provided with a truck owned by Berger of which claimant had possession 24 hours per day, and which he drove to and from work. The Berger company name was printed on both sides of the truck and Berger paid for the vehicle's licensing fees, insurance and fuel. According to Berger's owner, the truck was to be used for company business, but employees were permitted to perform personal side jobs with permission. Employees were also expected to carry money to pay for incidental expenses which would later be reimbursed out of Berger's petty cash fund.

On the day of his accident, claimant drove his truck to Berger's premises, filled it up with diesel fuel, and drove to a job site. At approximately 1:00 p.m., the claimant left the job site, with Berger's permission, to drive home to pick up his personal vehicle to drive to his physician's office. On the way home, claimant stopped at the Fifth Third Bank to make a withdrawal. Claimant testified that his main purpose for stopping was to get money to buy a cooler to place in his work truck for his crew, but he also admitted he withdrew money to pay carpenters who were performing work on his kitchen. According to claimant, he owed the carpenters $4,300. Fifth Third Bank records from that day established that claimant withdrew $4.200.

As claimant was in the process of making a left turn onto a major highway to return home, another vehicle ran a red light and struck claimant's truck. As a result of the injuries he sustained in the car accident, claimant was off work for 47 1/7 weeks and incurred $78,395.50 in related medical expenses.

Following a hearing, the arbitrator found that claimant did not sustain injuries arising out of and in the course of his employment with Berger. The arbitrator did not find claimant's testimony that his main purpose of stopping at the bank to buy a cooler was credible. Additionally, the arbitrator found that although the accident in which claimant was involved occurred as he was in the process of returning home, he had not yet returned to his home route, and was still engaged in a personal deviation that removed him from the course of employment at the time of injury. On appeal, claimant argued that the facts in the case demonstrated that he was a traveling employee operating a motor vehicle in a foreseeable manner, which did not remove him from the course of his employment.

In its analysis, the Appellate Court classifies the claimant as a "traveling employee." The court explains that a traveling employee is one who is required to travel away from his employer's premises to perform his job, as the claimant was required to do in the case at bar. Traveling employees may be compensated for an injury as long as the injury was sustained while the employee was engaged in an activity that was both reasonable and

foreseeable. *Wright v. Industrial Comm'n*, 62 Ill.2d 65, 71 (1975). Additionally, as a general rule, a traveling employee is held to be in the course of his employment from the time that he leaves home until the time he returns. *Urban v. Industrial Comm'n*, 109 Ill.2d 194 (1985).

The Appellate Court notes the rule of deference to the Commission's superior ability to adjudge the credibility of witnesses, and agrees that claimant's testimony about his reasons for stopping at the bank were not credible. However, the fact that the claimant deviated from his route home for personal reasons did not preclude recovery for his claim. The Appellate Court determined that, though the evidence sufficiently supported the inference that claimant went to the bank for personal reasons; such a deviation was "insubstantial." The Court cites *Wright* for the proposition that traveling employee should be compensated for injuries sustained while performing an activity that is both "reasonable and foreseeable." Yet, in its discussion the Appellate Court sidesteps the analysis of whether the claimant's deviation was "reasonable" or "foreseeable." Instead, the Court focuses on whether the claimant was traveling to or from the workplace at the time of his injury.

The general rule is that injuries incurred by an employee while traveling to or from the workplace are not considered to arise out of and in the course of employment. However, an exception exists where the employer, for its own benefit, provides the employee with the means of transportation to and from work. *Beattie v. Industrial Comm'n*, 86 Ill.2d 534 (1981). The employee's transportation to and from work expands the 'in the course of' element and provides a risk incidental to the exigencies of employment that satisfies the 'arising out of' requirement. *Becker v. Industrial Comm'n*, 308 Ill.App. 3d 278, 282, (1999). Here, claimant was a traveling employee and was driving Berger's truck at the time of the accident. These key facts triggered the application of the *Becker* rule and allowed the court to find that claimant's injury arose out of and was in the course of the his employment.

The Appellate Court goes on to disagree with the Arbitrator, Commission and Circuit Court's finding that claimant was still engaged in a personal deviation at the time of the car accident because he had not yet actually returned to his usual route home at the time of the incident. Rather, the Court reasons that the manifest weight of the evidence presented demonstrates that upon leaving the bank and attempting to turn towards home, the claimant re-entered the course of his employment.

What can practitioners take away from this case? An injury that occurs while a traveling employee who is driving a company vehicle is in the process of returning to his route home arises out of and in the course of employment. But, what if the claimant had been injured in the parking lot on his way out to the company truck? Or, what if claimant, at the time of the incident, was not on his way home, but on the way to stop for groceries? As the Appellate Court's ruling is being appealed by the defense, these and other questions raised by this case remain unanswered. ■

Upcoming CLE programs

To register, go to www.isba.org/cle or call the ISBA registrar at 800-252-8908 or 217-525-1760.

March

Friday, 3/4/11 – Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Dynamic Presentation Skills For Lawyers. Master Series Presented by the Illinois State Bar Association. 12:30-4:45.

Saturday, 3/5/11- Downer's Grove, Double Tree—DUI, Traffic and Secretary of State Related Issues. Presented by the Traffic Laws/Courts Section. 8:55-4:00.

Monday, 3/7/11- Normal, State Farm Building—Legal Writing: Improving What You Do Everyday. Presented by the Illinois State Bar Association; co-sponsored by the McLean County Bar Association and hosted by State Farm. 12:30-4:00.

Monday, 3/7/11-Friday, 3/11/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—40 Hour Mediation/ Arbitration Training. Master Series Presented by the Illinois State Bar Association and the ISBA Alternative Dispute Resolution Section. 8:30-5:45 each day.

Wednesday, 3/9/11- Webcast—Developing an Education Plan for your Legal Career. Presented at the 6th Annual Solo and Small Firm Conference. 12-1. <http://isba.fastcle.com/store/seminar/seminar.php?seminar=6788>.

Tuesday, 3/15/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Fraudulent Transfers and Piercing the Corporate Veil. Presented by the ISBA Corporation, Securities and Business Law Section. 9:00-12:15.

Thursday, 3/17/11- Webcast—Project Management for Lawyers. Presented at the 6th Annual Solo and Small Firm Conference. 12-1. <http://isba.fastcle.com/store/seminar/seminar.php?seminar=6789>.

Thursday, 3/17/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Litigating, Defending and Preventing Employment Discrimination Cases: Practice Updates for the Illinois Human Rights Act. Presented by the ISBA Human Rights Section. 1:30-4:45.

Friday, 3/18/11- Chicago, DePaul University College of Law—Civility and Professionalism in 2011. Presented by the ISBA Bench and Bar Section. 9:00- 4:15.

Thursday, 3/24/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Foundations, Evidence & Objections. Presented by the ISBA Tort Law Section Council. 9-12:30.

Thursday, 3/24/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Fastcase: Introduction to Legal Research Training. Presented by the Illinois State Bar Association. 1:30-2:30.

Thursday, 3/24/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Fastcase: Advanced Legal Research Training. Presented by the Illinois State Bar Association. 3:00- 4:00.

Friday, 3/25/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Medical Marijuana: Workplace Issues. Presented by the ISBA Labor and Employment Section. 8:55-12:00.

Friday, 3/25/11- Quincy- Quincy Country Club—General Practice Update. Presented by the ISBA Bench and Bar Section; co-sponsored by the Adams County Bar Association. 8:30-5.

Wednesday, 3/30/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Why International Treaties Matter to Illinois Lawyers. Presented by the International and Immigration Committee. 12-2.

April

Friday, 4/1/11- Chicago, ISBA Regional Office—Military family Law Issues. Presented by the ISBA Family Law Section and the ISBA Military Affairs Section. TBD.

Thursday, 4/7/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—Your Aging Clients, Their Parents and You. Presented by the ISBA Standing Committee on Women and the Law; co-sponsored by the Elder law Section, the General Practice Section and the Senior Lawyers Section. 8:15-4:45.

Friday, 4/8/11- Bloomington, Holiday Inn and Suites—DUI, Traffic and Secretary of State Related Issues. Presented by the Traffic Laws/Courts Section. 8:55-4:00.

Friday, 4/8/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—Practice Tips and Pointers on Child-Related Issues. Presented by the ISBA Child Law Section; co-sponsored by the Mental Health Law Section. TBD.

Friday, 4/8/11- Dekalb, NIU School of Law—Mechanics Liens and Construction Claims. Presented by the ISBA Special Committee on Construction Law; co-sponsored by the ISBA Commercial, Banking and Bankruptcy Section and ISBA Real Estate Section. 8:55-3:45.

Tuesday, 4/12/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—Recent Developments in IP Law. Presented by the ISBA Intellectual Property Section. 3:00-4:30.

Thursday, 4/14/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—Civil Practice Update. Presented by the ISBA Civil Practice and Procedure Section. 9-4.

Friday, 4/15/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—Liens. Presented by the ISBA Tort Law Section. 9-12:30.

Wednesday, 4/27/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office (invitation only-do not publish!)—Faculty Development: Developing Effective Professional Responsibility MCLE Presentations. Presented by the Illinois State Bar Association

May

Wednesday, 5/4/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—Settlement in Federal Courts. Presented by the ISBA Federal Civil Practice Section. 11:55- 4:15.

Thursday, 5/5/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—Municipal Administrative Law Judge Education Program. Presented by the ISBA Administrative Law Section; co-sponsored by the Illinois Association of Administrative Law Judges. TBD.

Thursday, 5/12-13/11- Chicago, ISBA Chicago Regional Office—2011 Annual Environmental Law Conference. Presented by the ISBA Environmental Law Section. 9-5; 9-1. ■

Save the Date: February 21, 2011

Advanced Workers' Compensation—2011

Presented by the ISBA Workers' Compensation Law Section

Chicago	Fairview Heights
ISBA Regional Office	**The Four Points Sheraton**
20 South Clark Street, Suite 900	**319 Fountains Pkwy**
9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	**9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.**

5.50 MCLE hours, including 1.00 Professional Responsibility

Stay abreast of the ever-changing workers' compensation law arena and improve the outcome of your cases. Acquire the comprehensive updates you need to practice with confidence by attending this Law Ed program! Topics include occupational diseases; calculating temporary partial disability benefits; Carpal Tunnel Syndrome; diagnosing and treating Epicondylitis; properly presenting to the appellate court; and ethical/professional responsibilities. Workers' compensation practitioners and labor/employment attorneys with intermediate to advanced levels of practice experience will benefit from the information presented throughout this full-day program.

Go to www.isba.org/cle for more details and registration information.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW
ILLINOIS BAR CENTER
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701-1779
FEBRUARY 2011
VOL. 48 NO. 3

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Springfield, Ill.
Permit No. 820