



## Board of Administration

# Agenda Item 8a6

---

**September 21, 2022**

**Item Name:** Proposed Decision – In the Matter of the Appeal of Accepting the Late Application for Industrial Disability Retirement of THOMAS R. HAMILTON, Respondent, and CITY OF PALO ALTO, Respondent.

**Program:** Disability and Survivor Benefits Division

**Item Type:** Action

### **Parties' Positions**

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

Respondent Thomas R. Hamilton's (Respondent) position is included in Attachment C, if any.

### **Strategic Plan**

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

### **Procedural Summary**

Beginning in May 2018, Respondent communicated with CalPERS numerous times regarding filing an application for industrial disability retirement benefits. Respondent submitted a service retirement application on August 2, 2020, and he has been receiving service retirement benefits since this date. On March 30, 2021, CalPERS received Respondent's industrial disability retirement (IDR) application. CalPERS determined that Respondent's IDR application was not timely filed and that he does not meet the criteria for a correctable mistake provided in Government Code section 20160.

Respondent submitted an appeal, and the matter was heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings on May 5, 2022. A Proposed Decision was issued on June 30, 2022, affirming CalPERS' determination and denying Respondent's appeal.

### **Alternatives**

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

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated June 30, 2022,

concerning the appeal of Thomas R. Hamilton; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

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

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated June 30, 2022, concerning the appeal of Thomas R. Hamilton, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and determines to decide the matter itself, based upon the record produced before the Administrative Law Judge and such additional evidence and arguments that are presented by the parties and accepted by the Board; RESOLVED FURTHER that the Board's Decision shall be made after notice is given to all parties.

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

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated June 30, 2022, concerning the appeal of Thomas R. Hamilton, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and refers the matter back to the Administrative Law Judge for the taking of additional evidence as specified by the Board at its meeting.

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, hereby designates as precedential its Decision concerning the appeal of Thomas R. Hamilton.

**Budget and Fiscal Impacts:** Not applicable

**Attachments**

Attachment A: Proposed Decision

Attachment B: Staff's Argument

Attachment C: Respondent(s) Argument(s)

---

Anthony Suine  
Deputy Executive Officer  
Customer Services and Support